

I have never had any doubt, nor I feel sure had he, that this advice was right. The more one saw of Hill and of Kew, the plainer it was how well man and post were assorted. Of this, visitors to Kew had much evidence in the condition of the Gardens; but it was not so much from the broad general picture as seen by the public as from minor indications that Hill's deep love of Kew and all that Kew stands for were to be gained. Watch him, for example, exult as a friend fails to detect on some smooth lawn the spot where a month or two before a bomb-crater yawned; or, again, note his pleasure over the complete recovery of some tropical plant, saved from destruction by the temporary repairs effected to badly damaged glass. Or accompany him on some Sunday afternoon to the loose boxes in which were two fine teams of Suffolk horses waiting impatiently for the carrots which clearly were expected as soon as Hill was seen. Trivial things these, but pointers to conditions that make the duties of a post not merely matters to be attended to, but a worth-while job.

In recent years my own association with Hill arose chiefly from the fact that we were both members of the Council of the John Innes Horticultural Institution. Here his Kew experience was most helpful to Hill's colleagues, and his loss will be much felt.

THOMAS H. MIDDLETON.

My first recollection of Arthur Hill is of seeing him riding through the streets of Cambridge. My next is of attending six lectures he gave on Algæ in the Easter Term of 1906 when he shared the elementary course with R. H. Biffen and A. C. Seward owing to the illness of Marshall Ward. By that time he had travelled to Iceland and the Andes and had written short accounts of their vegetation; his chief interest was, however, in histology, his work on protoplasmic connexions being of fundamental importance. The following year he left for Kew.

I do not think that Hill seriously concerned himself with the practice of systematic botany. He had no flair for herbarium work possibly because the new order in botanical ideas prevalent in his student days apparently regarded such studies as worthless. He was, however, a keen observer of growing plants and attributed his interest in natural history generally to the stimulus of his Marlborough days. He published a number of small systematic monographs but was attracted mainly by general problems of taxonomy, particularly the origin of Monocotyledons, which interested him to the end. The plants growing at Kew provided him with material for a steady flow of notes and papers on morphology and development; at the last meeting of the Linnean Society he exhibited a *Streptocarpus* with cleistogamous flowers.

The Royal Botanic Gardens were to Hill almost a religion. No improvement he carried out, so far as I recollect, did anything but enhance their beauty.

After the War of 1914-18 there was money available for schemes of imperial development, and Hill, always keen on travel, characteristically made full use of his opportunities. He believed in the eminence

and prestige of Kew and pushed his belief to the utmost. The Kew collections benefited from the contacts he made and he himself gained a wide first-hand knowledge of botanical conditions overseas, and in the years that followed continued and extended his interests. The tragedy of his death is that it should have occurred now, for his experience would have been invaluable in the reconstructions that are inevitable when peace ensues.

Arthur Hill was very much the boy at heart. He was the kindest of men, showing an understanding sympathy not only in the written word but also in unostentatious generosity to those in need.

J. RAMSBOTTOM.

### Mr. M. Ussishkin

PALESTINE and the Jewish people have suffered a great loss through the death in Jerusalem at the age of seventy-eight of Menachem Ussishkin. He was known as "the grand old man of Zionism", and his influence was felt in every Jewish activity in Palestine. But he had a particular love for the soil of Palestine, and for the last eighteen years of his life devoted himself to the buying of land in Palestine as the collective property of the Jewish people.

Ussishkin was closely associated with the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, which was inaugurated by the late Lord Balfour in 1925. He was a member of its Board of Governors, and attended the meetings of this body not only in Palestine, but also in many different centres in Europe. He was also a member of the executive committee of the University in Jerusalem. His enthusiasm for every branch of university life, and in particular his close personal contacts with successive generations of students, gave him a great influence on the development of the Hebrew University, which now has 1,100 students with a staff of more than 125 professors and lecturers.

Ussishkin's early training in his native land, Russia, was as an engineer, but he very soon became a leading figure in the movement for the return of the Jews to Palestine, and later in the Zionist movement. He was particularly ardent in the support of the movement to revive Hebrew as a language of daily intercourse, and as a language of literary and scientific writing.

Ussishkin's most obvious characteristics were indomitable courage and uncompromising adherence to principles. At the same time he was the kindest and the most courteous of men. When he died, 50,000 people followed his coffin to the grave, for Palestine had lost in him its greatest figure.

WE regret to announce the following deaths:

Mr. V. M. Foster, geologist in the U.S. Geological Survey, on September 2, aged thirty-seven.

Prof. A. C. Fraser, professor of plant breeding in Cornell University, on September 17, aged fifty-one.

Prof. E. E. Maar, professor of the history of medicine in the University of Copenhagen, aged sixty-eight.

Mr. J. D. Martin, assistant conservator of forests, Northern Rhodesia, on November 10, aged thirty-two.