

In July and August 1858, their first fortnightly articles appeared. But the scheme was not a complete success. Only nine articles appeared during 1859 and only nine middles and eleven reviews in 1860. Except for a slight surge of effort in 1864, science slowly passed from the *Saturday*<sup>10</sup>. Only reviews continued to come, but these were not, by and large, written by Huxley, Hooker or Tyndall. Indeed, their energies had turned in a different direction. The *Saturday* had not the measure of independence, consistency and balance of presentation that the scientists wished.

In 1860 Huxley was attracted by the possibility of transferring the Dublin *Natural History Review* to London. The *Natural History Review* had acquired a sound reputation but had suffered from a small circulation in Ireland. Huxley's motives were partly economic, partly missionary. To Hooker, he wrote<sup>11</sup>, "if I choose to join as one of the editors, the effective control would be pretty much in my hands". Once again Hooker was pessimistic. From his own sad experience with the short-lived *Journal of Botany* at Glasgow and Kew, Hooker warned Huxley against adding heavy editorial tasks to his existing academic commitments. Private publishing was expensive and could not be kept on schedule. It was too much work for one man, or even a panel of part-time editors, and reliance on unpaid contributions was illusory. "I do not believe", Hooker added dryly, "in the prolonged vitality of any unpaid review".

Moreover, a successful journal needed a sense of accepted authority. "You must . . . be in a position to command assistance, not to ask it", Hooker continued<sup>11</sup>, "and

without this you cannot do much". Huxley nonetheless persisted. With the agreement of Williams and Norgate, the scientific publishers, and in the midst of Darwinian controversy, the first number of the new *Natural History Review*, "A Quarterly Journal of Biological Science", appeared in January 1861. Hooker, typically the last to agree, was the first to congratulate<sup>12</sup>. "The only fault with the *Review* is its brevity", he wrote, and promised to contribute himself. An editorial board was formed of eleven distinguished naturalists, including George Busk, FRS, secretary of the Linnean Society; Francis Curry, FRS and FLS; R. MacDonnell, FLS; P. L. Sclater, FZS and FLS; W. B. Carpenter, FRS and FLS; J. R. Greene; John Lubbock, FRS and FLS; Daniel Oliver, FLS; Wyville Thomson, FRSE; E. P. Wright, FLS; and Huxley himself. Of these eleven, nine would later contribute to *Nature*.

The need for unity which Hooker and Huxley had discussed in 1856 was set out in the preface of the new journal. Without interfering with other journals, or with other than "scientific" considerations, it offered<sup>13</sup> "to all whom it may concern a means of discussing the general problems suggested by the progress of biological investigation in a scientific spirit". It would be as authoritative as the "ordinary quarterly". Its theme Huxley took from Goethe—as he was to do again 8 years later—"Everything in science is become too much divided into compartments". It would be specialized<sup>14</sup> but not so as to "demand a place in the Transactions of a scientific society".

But the *Review* did not last. It could not pay authors,

Reprinted from *Nature*, November 4, 1896

### TRIASSIC DINOSAURIA

IT will probably interest geologists and palæontologists to know that a recent examination of the numerous remains of *Thecodontosauria* in the Bristol Museum, enables me to demonstrate that these Triassic reptiles belong to the order *Dinosauria*, and are closely allied to *Megalosaurus*. The vertebrae, humerus, and ilium, found in the Warwickshire Trias, which have been ascribed to *Labyrinthodon*, also belong to *Dinosauria*. The two skeletons obtained in the German Trias near Stuttgart, and described by Prof. Plieninger, some years ago, are also unquestionable *Dinosauria* and, as Von Meyer is of opinion, probably belong to the genus *Teratosaurus*, from the same beds. Von Meyer's *Plataosaurus*, from the German Trias, is, plainly, as he has indicated it to be, a *Dinosaurian*.

As Prof. Cope has suggested, it is very probable that *Bathygnathus*, from the Triassic beds of Prince Edward's Island, is a *Dinosaurian*; and I have no hesitation in expressing the belief, that the *Deuterosaurus*, from the Ural, which occurs in beds which are called Permian, but which appear to be Triassic, is also a *Dinosaurian*. It is also very probable that *Rhopalodon*, which occurs in these rocks, belongs to the same order. If so, the close resemblance of the South African *Galesaurus* to *Rhopalodon*, would lead me to expect the former to prove a *Dinosaur*.

I have found an indubitable fragment of a *Dinosaurian* among some fossils, not long ago sent to me, from the reptiliferous beds of Central India, by Dr. Oldham, the Director of the Indian Geological Survey. Further, the determination of the Thecodonts as *Dinosauria*, leaves hardly any doubt that the little *Ankistrodon* from these Indian rocks, long since described by me, belongs to the same group.

But another discovery in the same batch of fossils from India, leaves no question on my mind that the Fauna of the beds which yield Labyrinthodonts and Dicynodonts in that country, represents the terrestrial Fauna of the Trias of Europe. I find, in fact, numerous fragments of a crocodylian reptile, so closely allied to the *Belodon* of the German Trias, that the determination of the points of difference requires close attention, associated with a *Hyporodapedon*, larger than those discovered in the Elgin Sandstones, but otherwise very similar to it.

Thus, during the Triassic epoch, extensive dry land seems to have existed in North America, Western and Central Europe, Eastern Europe, Central India, and South Africa, as it does now; and, throughout this vast area, the *Dinosauria*—the links between reptiles and birds—seem to have been represented by not fewer, probably by many more, than nine or ten distinct genera.

I hope, shortly, to have the honour of placing the details of the researches into the structure and distribution of the *Dinosauria*, in which I have been engaged for the last two years, and of which the above notice is one of the results, before the Geological Society.

T. H. HUXLEY