arctic plants found on the south temperate Alps, or the south temperate plants found in the mountains of the tropics, originated in the south; though this appears probable from the absence in the south of so many of the leading families of plants and animals of the north, no less than from the number of endemic forms the south contains. These considerations have favoured the speculation of the former existence, during a warmer period than the present, of a centre of creation in the Southern Ocean, in the form of either a continent or of an archipelago, from which both the Antarctic and southern endemic forms radiated. I have myself suggested continental or insular extension[1] as a means of aiding that wide dispersion of species over the Southern Ocean, which it is difficult to explain without such intervention; and the discovery of beds of fossil trunks of trees in Kerguelen's Island, testifies to that place having enjoyed a warmer climate than its present one.

The rarity in the existing Archipelago (Kerguelen's Island, the Crozets, and Prince Edward's Island) of any of the endemic genera of the south temperate flora, or of representatives of them, is, however, an argument against such land, if it ever existed, having been the birthplace of that flora; and there are two reasons for adopting the opposite theory, that the southern flora came from the north temperate zone. Of these, one is the number of northern genera and species (which, from their all inhabiting north-east Europe, I have denominated Scandinavian)[2] that are found in all Antarctic and south temperate regions, the majority of them in Fuegia, the flora of which country is, by means of the Andes, in the most direct communication with the northern one. The other is the fact I have stated above, that the several south temperate floras are more intimately related to those of the countries north of them than they are to one another.

And this brings me to the latest propounded theoretical application of the laws of geographical distribution. It is that recently advanced by Mr. Thiselton Dyer, in a lecture "On Plant Distribution as a Field of Geographical Research"[3]; wherein he argues that the floras of all the countries of the globe may be traced back at some time of their history to the northern hemisphere, and that they may be regarded in point of affinity and specialisation as the natural results of the conditions to which they must have been subjected during recent geological times, on continents and islands with the configuration of those of our globe. This hypothesis derives its principal support from the fact that many of the most peculiar endemic plants of the south have representatives in the north, some of them living and all of them in a fossil state, whilst the northern endemic forms have not hitherto been found fossil in the southern regions. So that, given time, evolution, continental continuity, changes of climate and elevations of the land, and all the southern types may be traced back to one region of the globe, and that one palæontology teaches us is the northern.

A very similar view has been held and published at the same time by Count Saporta,[4] a most eminent palæontologist, in a suggestive essay entitled "L'Ancienne Végétation Polaire." Starting from Buffon's thesis, that the cooling of the globe having been a gradual process, and the Polar regions having cooled first, these must have first become fit for organic life, Count Saporta proceeds to assume that the termination of the azoic period coincided with a cooling of the waters to the point at which coagulation of albumen does not take place, when organic life appeared in the water itself. I have discussed Count Saporta's speculations elsewhere[5]; it is sufficient here to indicate the more important ones as bearing upon distribution. These are that the Polar area was the centre of origination of all the successive phases of vegetation that have appeared on the globe, all being developed in the north; and that the development of flowering plants was enormously augmented by the introduction during the latter part of the secondary period of flower-feeding insects, which brought about cross-fertilisation.

It remains to allude briefly to the most important general works on distribution that have appeared since the foundation of this Association. Of these, the two which take the first rank are Prof. Alphonse de Candolle's "Géographie Botanique" and Mr. Wallace's "Geographical Distribution of Animals." Prof. de Candolle's work[1] appeared at a critical period, when the doctrine of evolution with natural selection had only just been announced, and before the great influence of geological and climatal changes on the dispersion of living species had been fully appreciated; nevertheless it is a great and truly philosophical work, replete with important facts, discussed with full knowledge, judgment, and scrupulous caution. Of its numerous valuable and novel features, two claim particular notice, namely, the chapters on the history of cultivated and introduced plants; and the further development of Humboldt's "Arithmeticæ Botanices," by taking into account the sums of temperatures as well as the maxima, minima, and means, in determining the amount of heat required to satisfy all the conditions of a plant's life, at the various periods of its existence, and especially the maturation of its seeds.

Of Mr. Wallace's great work, "The Geographical Distribution of Animals," I cannot speak with sufficient knowledge of the subject, and can only appreciate and echo the high praises accorded to it by zoologists for its scientific treatment of a vast subject.

The "Géographie Botanique" was followed by the late Dr. Grisebach's "Die Vegetation der Erde,"[2] which contains an admirable summary of the vegetation of the different regions of the globe as limited by their physical features, divested of all theoretical considerations.

For the largest treatment in outline of the whole subject of distribution, I must refer to the chapters of Darwin's "Origin of Species" which are devoted to it.

In reference to these and other works, very able and instructive discussions of the principles of geographical distribution are to be found in the presidential addresses delivered before the Linnean Society, in 1869, 1870, and 1872, by the veteran botanist, G. Bentham.

With Mr. Wallace's "Island Life" I must conclude this notice, and very fittingly, for besides presenting an admirable account of the origin and migrations of animals and vegetables in oceanic and continental islands, it contains a complete and comprehensive analysis of those past and present conditions of the globe, astronomical, geological, geographical, and biological, which have been the earlier and later directors and controllers of the ever-warring forces of organic nature. In this work Mr. Wallace independently advocates the view of the northern origin of both the faunas and floras of the world.

I conclude with the hope that I have made the subject of the distribution of organic life on the globe interesting to you as geographers, by showing on the one hand how much it owes its advance to the observations made and materials collected by geographical explorers, and on the other how greatly the student of distribution has, by the use he has made of these observations and materials, advanced the science of physical geography.

## SECTION G

### MECHANICAL SCIENCE

### Opening Address by Sir W. Armstrong, C.B., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S., President of the Section

The astonishing progress which has been made in the construction and application of machinery during the half century which has elapsed since the nativity of the British Association for the Avancement of Science, is a theme which I might with much complacency adopt in this address, but instead of reviewing the past and exulting in our successes, it will be more profitable to look to the future and to dwell on our failures. It is but justice to say that by growing experience, by increasing facilities of manufacture, and by the exercise of much skill and ingenuity, we have succeeded in multiplying and expanding the applications of our chief motor, the steam-engine, to an extent that would have appeared incredible fifty years ago; but the

made either by the *Challenger* expedition or by the various "transit of Venus expeditions" that have recently visited this interesting island.

[1] "Flora Antarctica," pp. 230, 240. See also Moseley in *Journ.* Linn. Soc. Botany, vol. xv. p. 485, and "Observations on the Botany of Kerguelen's Island," by myself, in the *Philosophical Transactions*, vol. 168, p. 15.

[2] See "Outlines of the Distribution of Arctic Plants," *Transactions* of the Linnean Society, vol. xxiii. p. 257. Read June, 1860.

[3] *Proceedings* of the Royal Geographical Society, vol. xxii. p. 415 (1878)

[4] *Comptes rendus* of the International Congress of Geographical Science, which met in Paris in 1875, but apparently not published till 1877

[5] Address of the President delivered at the anniversary meeting of the Royal Society of London, November 30, 1878.

[1] Prof. Alph. de Candolle divides his subject into botanical geography and geographical botany; the distinction is obvious and sound, but the two expressions have been so long used and regarded as synonymous, and as embracing both branches, that they cannot now be limited each to one. Perhaps the terms topographical botany and geographical botany would prove more acceptable designations.

[2] Published in 1872. Translated into French under the title of "La Végétation du Globe," by P. de Tchihachef, Paris, 1875.

gratulation inspired by this success is clouded by the reflection that the steam-engine, even in its best form, remains to this day a most wasteful apparatus for converting the energy of heat into motive power. Our predecessors of that period had not the advantage of the knowledge which we possess of the true nature of heat, and the conditions and limits affecting its utilisation. In their time heat was almost universally regarded as a fluid which, under the name of caloric, was supposed to lie dormant in the interstices of matter until forced out by chemical or mechanical means. Although Bacon, Newton, Cavendish, and Boyle all maintained that heat was only internal motion, and although Davy and Rumford not only held that view, but proved its accuracy by experiment, yet the old notion of caloric continued to hold its ground, until in more recent times Joule, Meyer, Codling, and others put an end to all doubt on the subject, and established the all-important fact that heat is a mode of motion having, like any other kind of motion, its exact equivalent in terms of work. By their reasonings and experiments it has been definitely proved that the quantity of heat which raises the temperature of a pound of water 1° Fahrenheit, has a mechanical value equal to lifting 772 lbs. one foot high, and that conversely the descent of that weight from that height is capable of exactly reproducing the heat expended.

The mechanical theory of heat is now universally accepted, although a remnant of the old doctrine is displayed in the continued use of the misleading term "latent heat." According to the new theory, heat is an internal motion of molecules capable of being communicated from the molecules of one body to those of another, the result of the imparted motion being either an increase of temperature, or the performance of work. The work may be either external, as where heat, in expanding a gas, pushes away a resisting body, or it may be internal, as where heat pulls asunder the cohering particles of ice in the process of liquefaction, or it may be partly internal and partly external, as it is in the steam-engine, where the first effect of the heat is to separate the particles of water into vapour, and the second to give motion to the piston. Internal as well as external work may be reconverted into heat, but until the reconversion takes place, the heat which did the work does not exist as heat, and it is delusive to call it "latent heat." All heat problems are comprised under the three leading ideas of internal work, external work, and temperature, and no phraseology should be used that conflicts with those ideas.

The modern theory of heat has thrown new light upon the theory of the steam-engine. We now know what is the mechanical value in foot-pounds of the heat evolved in the combustion of one pound of coal. In practice we can determine how much of that heat is transmitted to the water in the boiler, and we are taught how to calculate the quantity which in the process of vaporisation takes the form of internal work. We can determine how much disappears in the engine in the shape of external work, including friction, and the remainder, with the exception of the trifling quantity saved in the feed-water, we know to be lost. Taking a good condensing engine as an example, we may roughly say that, dividing the whole heat energy into ten equal parts, two escape by the chimney, one is lost by radiation and friction, six remain unused when the steam is discharged, and only one is realised in useful work. It may be fully admitted that the greater part of the aggregate loss is inevitable; but are we to suppose that the resources of science, ingenuity, and skill have been exhausted in the attainment of so miserable a result? Nothing but radical changes can be expected to produce any great mitigation of the present monstrous waste, and without presuming to say what measures are practicable and what are not, I will briefly point out the directions in which amelioration is theoretically possible, and shall afterwards advert to the question whether we may hope to evade the difficulties of the steam-engine by resorting to electrical methods of obtaining power.

To begin with the loss which takes place in the application of heat to the boiler; why is it that we have to throw away, at the very outset of our operations, twice as much heat as we succeed in utilising in the engine? The answer is, that in order to force a transmission of heat from the fire to the water in the boiler, a certain excess of temperature over that of the water must exist in the furnace and flues, and the whole of the heat below the required excess must pass away unused, except the trifling portion of it which disappears in the production of draught. Further, that since we cannot avoid admitting the nitrogen of the air along with the oxygen, we have to heat a large volume of neutral gas which has no other effect than to rob the fire. Considering what efforts have been made to facilitate the transmission of the heat by augmenting the evaporative surface, and using thin tubes as flues, it is vain to expect any great result from further perseverance in that direction, and unless a method can be devised of burning the fuel inside instead of outside the apparatus, so as to use the heated gases conjointly with the steam as a working medium in the engine, a remedy appears to be hopeless. We already practise internal combustion in the gas-engine, and it is clear that with gaseous fuel, at all events, we could associate such a mode of combustion with the vaporisation of water. We may even regard a gun as an engine with internally-burnt fuel, and here I may remark that the action of heat in a gun is strictly analogous to that of heat in a steam-engine. In both cases the heat is evolved from chemical combination, and the resulting pressures differ only in degree. The gun is the equivalent of the cylinder, and the shot of the piston, and the diagrams representing the pressure exerted in the two cases bear a close resemblance to each other. While the powder is burning in the gun we have a nearly uniform pressure, just as we have in the cylinder while the steam is entering, and in both cases the uniform pressure is followed by a diminishing pressure, represented by the usual curve of expansion. If in the steam-engine we allowed the piston to be blown out it would act as a projectile, and if in the gun we opposed mechanical resistance to the shot, we might utilise the effect in a quieter form of motive power. But it is a remarkable fact that such is the richness of coal as a store of mechanical energy that a pound of coal, even as used in the steam-engine, produces a dynamic effect about five times greater than a pound of gunpowder burnt in a gun. I cannot, however, on this account encourage the idea that steam may be advantageously substitute for gunpowder in the practice of gunnery.

And now to turn from the fire which is the birthplace of the motive energy, let us follow it in the steam, to the condenser, where most of it finds a premature tomb. From the point at which expansion commences in the cylinder the temperature and pressure of the steam begin to run down, and if we could continue to expand indefinitely, the entire heat would be exhausted, and the energy previously expended in separating the water into steam would be wholly given up in external effect; but this exhaustion would not be complete until the absolute zero of temperature was reached (viz. 461° below the zero of Fahrenheit). I do not mean to say that an ideally perfect engine necessarily involves unlimited expansion, seeing that if instead of discharging the steam at the end of a given expansion, we made the engine itself do work in compressing it, we might, under the conditions of Carnot's reversible cycle, so justly celebrated as the foundation of the theory of the steam engine, recommence the action with all the unutilised heat in an available form. But an engine upon this principle could only give an amount of useful effect corresponding to the difference between the whole work done by the engine, and that very large portion of it expended in the operation of compression, and this difference viewed in relation to the necessary size of the engine, would be quite insignificant, and would in fact be wholly swallowed up in friction. Carnot did not intend to suggest a real engine, and his hypothesis therefore takes no cognisance of losses incident to the application of an actual fire to an actual boiler. His ideal engine is also supposed to be frictionless, and impervious to heat except at the point where heat has to be transmitted to the water, and there the condition of perfect conduction is assumed. In short an engine which would even approximately conform to the conditions of Carnot's cycle is an impossibility, and a perfect steam-engine is alike a phantom whether it be sought for in the cyclical process of Carnot, or under the condition of indefinite expansion. Practically we have to deal with a machine which, like all other machines, is subject to friction, and in expanding the steam we quickly arrive at a point at which the reduced pressure on the piston is so little in excess of the friction of the machine as to render the steam not worth retaining, and at this point we reject it. In figurative language we take the cream off the bowl and throw away the milk. We do save a little by heating the feed water, but this gain is very small in comparison with the whole loss. What happens in the condenser is, that all the remaining energy which has taken the form of internal work is reconverted into heat, but it is heat of so low a grade that we cannot apply it to the vaporisation of water. But although the heat is too low to vaporise water it is not too low to vaporise Ether. If instead of condensing by the external application of water we did so by the similar application of ether, as proposed and practised by

M. du Trembley twenty-five years ago, the ether would be vaporised, and we should be able to start afresh with high tension vapour, which in its turn would be expanded until the frictional limit was again reached. At that point the ether would have to be condensed by the outward application of cold water and pumped back, in the liquid state, to act over again in a similar manner. This method of working was extensively tried in France when introduced by M. du Trembley, and the results were sufficiently encouraging to justify a resumption of the trials at the present time, when they could be made under much more favourable conditions. There was no question as to the economy effected, but in the discussions which took place on the subject it was contended that equally good results might be attained by improved applications of the steam, without resorting to an additional medium. The compound engine of the present day does in fact equal the efficiency of Du Trembley's combined steam- and ether-engine, but there is no reason why the ether apparatus should not confer the same advantage on the modern engine that attended its application to the older form. The objections to its use are purely of a practical nature, and might very possibly yield to persevering efforts at removal.

I need scarcely notice the advantage to be derived from increasing the initial pressure of the steam so as to widen the range of expansion by raising the upper limit of temperature instead of reducing the lower one. It must be remembered however that an increase of temperature is attended with the serious drawback of increasing the quantity of heat carried off by the gases from the fire, and also the loss by radiation, so that we have not so much to gain by increase of pressure as is commonly imagined.

But even supposing the steam-engine to be improved to the utmost extent that practical considerations give us reason to hope for, we should still have to adjudge it a wasteful though a valuable servant. Nor does there appear to be any prospect of substituting with advantage any other form of thermodynamic engine, and thus we are led to inquire whether any other kind of energy is likely to serve us better than heat, for motive power.

Most people, especially those who are least competent to judge, look to electricity as the coming panacea for all mechanical deficiency, and certainly the astonishing progress of electricity as applied to telegraphy, and to those marvellous instruments of recent invention which the British Post Office claims to include in its monopoly of the electric telegraph, as well as the wonderful advance which electricity has made as an illuminating agent, does tend to impress us with faith in its future greatness in the realm of motive power as well.

The difference between heat and electricity in their modes of mechanical action is very wide. Heat acts by expansion of volume which we know to be a necessarily wasteful principle, while electricity operates by attraction and repulsion, and thus produces motion in a manner which is subject to no greater loss of effect than attends the motive action of gravity as exemplified in the ponderable application of falling water in hydraulic machines. If then we could produce electricity with the same facility and economy as heat, the gain would be enormous, but this, as yet at least, we cannot do. At present by far the cheapest method of generating electricity is by the dynamic process. Instead of beginning with electricity to produce power, we begin with power to produce electricity. As a secondary motor an electric engine may, and assuredly will, play an important part in future applications of power, but our present inquiry relates to a primary, and not a secondary, employment of electricity. Thus we are brought to the question, From what source, other than mechanical action, can we hope to obtain a supply of electricity sufficiently cheap and abundant to enable it to take the place of heat as a motive energy? It is commonly said that we know so little of the nature of electricity that it is impossible to set bounds to the means of obtaining it; but ignorance is at least as liable to mislead in the direction of exaggerated expectation as in that of incredulity. It may be freely admitted that the nature of electricity is much less understood than that of heat, but we know that the two are very nearly allied. The doctrine that heat consists of internal motion of molecules may be accepted with almost absolute certainty of its truth. The old idea of heat being a separate entity is no longer held except by those who prefer the fallacious evidence of their senses to the demonstrations of science. So also the old idea of electricity having a separate existence from tangible matter must be discarded, and we are justified in concluding that it is merely a strained or tensional condition of the molecules of matter. Although electricity is more prone to pass into heat than heat into electricity, yet we know that they are mutually convertible. In short I need scarcely remind you, that according to that magnificent generalisation of modern times, so pregnant with great consequences, and for which we are indebted to many illustrious investigators, we now know that heat, electricity, and mechanical action, are all equivalent and transposable forms of energy, of which motion is the essence.

To take a cursory view of our available sources of energy, we have, firstly, the direct heating power of the sun's rays, which as yet we have not succeeded in applying to motive purposes. Secondly we have water power, wind power, and tidal power, all depending upon influences lying outside of our planet. And thirdly we have chemical attraction or affinity. Beyond these there is nothing worth naming. Of the radiant heat of the sun I shall have to speak hereafter, and bearing in mind that we are in search of electricity as a cause, and not an effect, of motive power we may pass over the dynamical agencies comprised under the second head, and direct our attention to chemical affinity as the sole remaining source of energy available for our purpose. At present we derive motive power from chemical attraction through the medium of heat only, and the question is, can we with advantage draw upon the same source through the medium of electricity. The process by which we obtain our supply of heat from the exercise of affinity is that of combustion, in which the substances used consist, on the one hand, of those we call fuel, of which coal is the most important, and on the other, of oxygen, which we derive from the atmosphere. The oxygen has an immense advantage over every other available substance in being omnipresent and costless. The only money value involved is that of the fuel, and in using coal we employ the cheapest oxidisable substance to be found in nature. Moreover the weight of coal used in the combination is only about one-third of the weight of oxygen, so that we only pay upon one-fourth of the whole material consumed. Thus we have conditions of the most favourable description for the production of energy, in the form of heat, and if we could only use the affinities of the same substances with equal facility to evolve electric energy instead of heat energy, there would be nothing more to desire; but as yet there is no appearance of our being able to do this. According to our present practice we consume zinc, instead of coal, in the voltaic production of electricity, and not only is zinc thirty or forty times dearer than coal, but it requires to be used in about six-fold larger quantity in order to develop an equal amount of energy. Some people are bold enough to say that with our present imperfect knowledge of electricity we have no right to condemn all plentiful substances, other than coal, as impracticable substitutes for metallic zinc, but it is manifest that we cannot get energy from affinity, where affinity has already been satisfied. The numerous bodies which constitute the mass of our globe, and which we call earths, are bodies in this inert condition. They have already, by the union of the two elements composing them, evolved the energy due to combination, and that energy has ages ago been dissipated in space in the form of heat, never again to be available to us. As well might we try to make fire with ashes, as to use such bodies over again as sources of either heat or electricity. To make them fit for our purpose we should first have to annul their state of combination, and this would require the expenditure of more energy upon them than we could derive from their recombination. Water, being oxidised hydrogen, must be placed in the same category as the earths. In short the only abundant substances in nature possessing strong unsatisfied affinities are those of organic origin, and in the absence of coal, which is the accumulated product of a past vegetation, our supply of such substances would be insignificant. This being the case, until a means be found of making the combination of coal with oxygen directly available for the development of electric energy, as it now is of heat energy, there seems to be no probability of our obtaining electricity from chemical action at such a cost as to supplant heat as a motive agent.

But while still looking to heat as the fountain-head of our power, we may very possibly learn to transmute it, economically, into the more available form of electricity. One method of transformation we already possess, and we have every reason to believe there are others yet to be discovered. We know that when dissimilar metals are joined at opposite ends, and heated at one set of junctions while they are cooled at the other, part of the heat applied disappears in the process, and assumes the form of an electric current. Each couple of metals may be treated as the cell of a voltaic battery, and we may multiply them to any extent, and group them in series or in parallels, with the same results as are obtained by similar combinations of voltaic cells. The electricity so produced we term Thermo-electricity, and the apparatus by which the current is evolved is the thermo-electric battery. At present this apparatus is even more wasteful of heat than the steam-engine, but considering the very recent origin of this branch of electrical science, and our extremely imperfect knowledge of the actions involved, we may reasonably regard the present thermo-electric battery as the infant condition of a discovery, which, if it follow the rule of all previous discoveries in electricity, only requires time to develop into great practical importance. Now if we possessed an efficient apparatus of this description we could at once apply it to the steam-engine for the purpose of converting into electric energy the heat which now escapes with the rejected steam, and the gases from the fire. The vice of the steam-engine lies in its inability to utilise heat of comparatively low grade, but if we could use up the leavings of the steam-engine by a supplemental machine acting on thermo-electric principles, the present excessive waste would be avoided. We may even anticipate that in the distant future a thermo-electric engine may not only be used as an auxiliary, but in complete substitution of the steam-engine. Such an expectation certainly seems to be countenanced by what we may observe in animated nature. An animal is a living machine dependent upon food both for its formation and its action. That portion of the food which is not used for growth or structural repair, acts strictly as fuel in the production of heat. Part of that heat goes to the maintenance of the animal temperature, and the remainder gives rise to mechanical action. The only analogy between the steam-engine and this living engine is that both are dependent upon the combustion of fuel, the combustion in the one case being extremely slow, and in the other very rapid. In the steam-engine the motion is produced by pressure, but in the animal machine it is effected by muscular contraction. The energy which causes that contraction, if not purely electrical, is so much of that nature that we can produce the same effect by electricity. The conductive system of the nerves is also in harmony with our conception of an electrical arrangement. In fact a description of the animal machine so closely coincides with that of an electrodynamic machine actuated by thermo-electricity, that we may conceive them to be substantially the same thing. At all events, the animal process begins with combustion and ends with electrical action, or something so nearly allied to it as to differ only in kind. And now observe how superior the result is in nature's engine to what it is in ours. Nature only uses heat of low grade, such as we find wholly unavailable. We reject our steam, as useless, at a temperature that would cook the animal substance, while nature works with a heat so mild as not to hurt the most delicate tissue. And yet, notwithstanding the greater availability of high-grade temperature, the quantity of work performed by the living engine relatively to the fuel consumed, puts the steam-engine to shame. How all this is done in the animal organisation we do not yet understand, but the result points to the attainability of an efficient means of converting low-grade heat into electricity, and in striving after a method of accomplishing that object we shall do well to study nature, and profit by the excellence which is there displayed.

But it is not alone in connection with a better utilisation of the heat of combustion that thermo-electricity bears so important an aspect, for it is only the want of an efficient apparatus for converting heat into electricity, that prevents our using the direct heating action of the sun's rays for motive power. In our climate, it is true, we shall never be able to depend upon sunshine for power, nor need we repine on that account so long as we have the preserved sunbeams which we possess in the condensed and portable form of coal, but in regions more favoured with sun and less provided with coal the case would be different. The actual power of the sun's rays is enormous, being computed to be equal to melting a crust of ice 103 feet thick over the whole earth in a year. Within the tropics it would be a great deal more, but a large deduction would everywhere have to be made for absorption of heat by the atmosphere. Taking all things into account, however, we shall not be far from the truth in assuming the solar heat, in that part of the world, to be capable of melting annually, at the surface of the ground, a layer of ice 85 feet thick. Now let us see what this means in mechanical effect. To melt 1 lb. of ice requires 142·4 English units of heat, which, multiplied by 772, gives us 109,932 foot pounds as the mechanical equivalent of the heat consumed in melting a pound of ice. Hence we find that the solar heat, operating upon an area of one acre, in the tropics, and competent to melt a layer of ice 85 feet thick in a year, would, if fully utilised, exert the amazing power of 4000 horses acting for nearly nine hours every day. In dealing with the sun's energy we could afford to be wasteful. Waste of coal means waste of money and premature exhaustion of coal-beds. But the sun's heat is poured upon the earth in endless profusion—endless at all events in a practical sense, for whatever anxiety we may feel as to the duration of coal, we need have none as to the duration of the sun. We have therefore only to consider whether we can divert to our use so much of the sun's motive energy as will repay the cost of the necessary apparatus, and whenever such an apparatus is forthcoming we may expect to bring into subjection a very considerable proportion of the 4000 invisible horses which science tells us are to be found within every acre of tropical ground.

But whatever may be the future of electricity as a prime mover, either in a dominant or subordinate relation to heat, it is certain to be largely used for mechanical purposes in a secondary capacity, that is to say, as the offspring instead of the parent of motive power. The most distinctive characteristic of electricity is that which we express by the word "current," and this gives it great value in cases where power is required in a transmissible form. The term may be objected to as implying a motion of translation analogous to the flow of a liquid through a pipe, whereas the passage of electricity through a conductor must be regarded as a wave-like action communicated from particle to particle. In the case of a fluid current through a pipe, the resistance to the flow increases as the square of the velocity, while in the case of an electric current the resistance through a given conductor is a constant proportion of the energy transmitted. So far therefore as resistance is concerned electricity has a great advantage over water for the transmission of power. The cost of the conductor will however be a grave consideration where the length is great, because its section must be increased in proportion to the length to keep the resistance the same. It must also be large enough in section to prevent heating, which not only represents loss but impairs conductivity. To work advantageously on this system, a high electromotive force must be used, and this will involve loss by imperfect insulation, increasing in amount with the length of the line. For these reasons there will be a limit to the distance to which electricity may be profitably conveyed, but within that limit there will be wide scope for its employment transmissively. Whenever the time arrives for utilising the power of great waterfalls the transmission of power by electricity will become a system of vast importance. Even now small streams of water inconveniently situated for direct application may, by the adoption of this principle, be brought into useful operation.

For locomotive purposes also we find the dynamo-electric principle to be available, as instanced in the very interesting example presented in Siemens' electric railway, which has already attained that degree of success which generally foreshadows an important future. It forms a combined fixed engine and locomotive system of traction, the fixed engine being the generator of the power and the electric engine representing the locomotive.

Steam power may both be transmitted and distributed, by the intervention of electricity, but it will labour under great disadvantage when thus applied, until a thoroughly effective electric accumulator be provided, capable of giving out electric energy with almost unlimited rapidity. How far the secondary battery of M. Faure will fulfil the necessary conditions remains to be seen, and it is to be hoped that the discussions which may be expected to take place at this meeting of the British Association will enable a just estimate of its capabilities to be formed. The introduction of the Faure battery is at any rate a very important step in electrical progress. It will enable motors of small power, whatever their nature may be, to accomplish, by uninterrupted action, the effect of much larger machines acting for short periods, and by this means the value of very small streams of water will be greatly enhanced. This will be especially the case where the power of the stream is required for electric lighting, which, in summer, when the springs are low, will only be required during the brief hours of darkness, while in winter the longer nights will be met by a more abundant supply of water. Even the fitful power of wind, now so little used, will probably acquire new life when aided by a system which will not only collect, but equalise, the variable and uncertain power exerted by the air.

It would greatly add to the utility of the Faure battery if its weight and size could be considerably reduced, for in that case it might be applicable to many purposes of locomotion. We may easily conceive its becoming available in a lighter form for all sorts of carriages on common roads, thereby saving to a vast extent the labour of horses. Even the nobler animal that strides a bicycle, or the one of fainter courage that prefers the safer seat of a tricycle, may ere long be spared the labour of propulsion, and the time may not be distant when an electric horse, far more amenable to discipline than the living one, may be added to the bounteous gifts which science has bestowed on civilised man.

In conclusion I may observe that we can scarcely sufficiently admire the profound investigations which have revealed to us the strict dynamical relation of heat and electricity to outward mechanical motion. It would be a delicate task to apportion praise amongst those whose labours have contributed, in various degrees, to our present knowledge; but I shall do no injustice in saying that of those who have expounded the modern doctrine of energy, in special relation to mechanical practice, the names of Joule, Clausius, Rankine, and William Thomson, will always be conspicuous. But up to this time our knowledge of energy is almost confined to its inorganic aspect. Of its physiological action we remain in deep ignorance, and as we may expect to derive much valuable guidance from a knowledge of Nature's methods of dealing with energy in her wondrous mechanisms, it is to be hoped that future research will be directed to the elucidation of that branch of science which as yet has not even a name, but which I may provisionally term "Animal Energetics."

## *THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF PALÆONTOLOGY*[1]

THAT application of the sciences of biology and geology which is commonly known as palæontology took its origin in the mind of the first person who, finding something like a shell or a bone naturally imbedded in gravel or in rock, indulged in speculations upon the nature of this thing which he had dug out—this "fossil"—and upon the causes which had brought it into such a position. In this rudimentary form, a high antiquity may safely be ascribed to palæontology, inasmuch as we know that, 500 years before the Christian era, the philosophic doctrines of Xenophanes were influenced by his observations upon the fossil remains exposed in the quarries of Syracuse. From this time forth, not only the philosophers, but the poets, the historians, the geographers of antiquity occasionally refer to fossils; and after the revival of learning lively controversies arose respecting their real nature. But hardly more than two centuries have elapsed since this fundamental problem was first exhaustively treated; it was only in the last century that the archæological value of fossils—their importance, I mean, as records of the history of the earth—was fully recognised; the first adequate investigation of the fossil remains of any large group of vertebrated animals is to be found in Cuvier's "Recherches sur les Ossemens Fossiles," completed in 1822; and, so modern is stratigraphical palæontology, that its founder, William Smith, lived to receive the just recognition of his services by the award of the first Wollaston Medal in 1831.

But, although palæontology is a comparatively youthful scientific speciality, the mass of materials with which it has to deal is already prodigious. In the last fifty years the number of known fossil remains of invertebrated animals has been trebled or quadrupled. The work of interpretation of vertebrate fossils, the foundations of which were so solidly laid by Cuvier, was carried on, with wonderful vigour and success, by Agassiz, in Switzerland, by Von Meyer, in Germany, and last, but not least, by Owen in this country, while, in later years, a multitude of workers have laboured in the same field. In many groups of the animal kingdom the number of fossil forms already known is as great as that of the existing species. In some cases it is much greater; and there are entire orders of animals of the existence of which we should know nothing except for the evidence afforded by fossil remains. With all this it may be safely assumed that, at the present moment, we are not acquainted with a tithe of the fossils which will sooner or later be discovered. If we may judge by the profusion yielded within the last few years by the Tertiary formations of North America, there seems to be no limit to the multitude of Mammalian remains to be expected from that continent, and analogy leads us to expect similar riches in Eastern Asia whenever the Tertiary formations of that region are as carefully explored. Again, we have as yet almost everything to learn respecting the terrestrial population of the Mesozoic epoch—and it seems as if the Western Territories of the United States were about to prove as instructive in regard to this point as they have in respect of Tertiary life. My friend Prof. Marsh informs me that, within two years, remains of more than 160 distinct individuals of mammals, belonging to twenty species and nine genera, have been found in a space not larger than the floor of a good-sized room; while beds of the same age have yielded 300 reptiles, varying in size from a length of 60 feet or 80 feet to the dimensions of a rabbit.

The task which I have set myself to-night is to endeavour to lay before you, as briefly as possible, a sketch of the successive steps by which our present knowledge of the facts of palæontology and of those conclusions from them which are indisputable has been attained; and I beg leave to remind you, at the outset, that in attempting to sketch the progress of a branch of knowledge to which innumerable labours have contributed, my business is rather with generalisations than with details. It is my object to mark the epochs of palæontology, not to recount all the events of its history.

That which I just now called the fundamental problem of palæontology, the question which has to be settled before any other can be profitably discussed, is this,—What is the nature of fossils? Are they, as the healthy common sense of the ancient Greeks appears to have led them to assume without hesitation, the remains of animals and plants? Or are they, as was so generally maintained in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, mere figured stones, portions of mineral matter which have assumed the forms of leaves and shells and bones, just as those portions of mineral matter which we call crystals take on the form of regular geometrical solids? Or, again, are they, as others thought, the products of the germs of animals and of the seeds of plants which have lost their way, as it were, in the bowels of the earth, and have achieved only an imperfect and abortive development? It is easy to sneer at our ancestors for being disposed to reject the first in favour of one or other of the last two hypotheses; but it is much more profitable to try to discover why they, who were really not one whit less sensible persons than our excellent selves, should have been led to entertain views which strike us as absurd. The belief in what is erroneously called spontaneous generation—that is to say, in the development of living matter out of mineral matter, apart from the agency of pre-existing living matter, as an ordinary occurrence at the present day—which is still held by some of us, was universally accepted as an obvious truth by them. They could point to the arborescent forms assumed by hoar-frost and by sundry metallic minerals as evidence of the existence in nature of a "plastic force" competent to enable inorganic matter to assume the form of organised bodies. Then, as every one who is familiar with fossils knows, they present innumerable gradations, from shells and bones which exactly resemble the recent objects, to masses of mere stone which, however accurately they repeat the outward form of the organic body, have nothing else in common with it; and, thence, to mere traces and faint impressions in the continuous substance of the rock. What we now know to be the results of the chemical changes which take place in the course of fossilization, by which mineral is substituted for organic substance, might, in the absence of such knowledge, be fairly interpreted as the expression of a process of development in the opposite direction—from the mineral to the organic. Moreover, in an age when it would have seemed the most absurd of paradoxes to suggest that the general level of the sea is constant, while that of the solid land fluctuates up and down through thousands of feet in a secular ground swell, it may well have appeared far less hazardous to conceive that fossils are sports of nature than to accept the necessary alternative, that all the inland regions and highlands, in the rocks of which marine shells had been found, had once been covered by the ocean. It is not so surprising, therefore, as it may at first seem, that although such men as Leonardo da Vinci and Bernard Palissy took just views of the nature of fossils, the opinion of the majority of their contemporaries set strongly the other way; nor even that error maintained itself long after the scientific grounds of the true interpretation of fossils had been stated, in a manner that left nothing to be desired, in the latter half of the seventeenth century. The person who rendered this good service to palæontology was Nicholas Steno,

[1] Discourse given at the York meeting of the British Association by Prof. T. H. Huxley, Sec. R. S. Revised by the author.