

Dines, Sir John Keltie, Chapman Jones, Emery Walker, Sir William Tilden, Sir Alexander Hill, J. H. Reynolds and Sir Richard Gregory. Congratulatory messages were received from forty British, ten foreign societies, and twelve British universities together with thirty-eight personal testimonials.

The same day Richard Gregory became by title what he had been in fact since the First World War, the new editor of what was already a "great international institution", a scientific brains trust, a movable feast of tradition and iconoclasm purveyed for the nourishment of ideas and the place of science in society. In August 1920, Lockyer died at Sidmouth leaving four sons and two daughters of his first marriage. His influence had been profound. One of the greatest testaments to his influence was the way in which *Nature* preserved from 1869 to 1919 the same form and general arrangement. Through him, *Nature's* influence on science, as H. G. Wells<sup>25</sup> later wrote, "has been far stronger and far more humane than that of any other journal on the ordinary course of human affairs".

<sup>1</sup> *Nature*, 63, 223 (1901).

<sup>2</sup> *Nature*, 63, 222 (1901).

<sup>3</sup> Preface quoted in "Education and National Development", pp. 488-9.

<sup>4</sup> Lockyer, Mary T., and Lockyer, Winifred L., *Life and Work of Sir Norman Lockyer* (London, 1928).

<sup>5</sup> Lockyer, J. N., *Education and National Progress: Essays and Speeches*, 180 (London, 1906).

<sup>6</sup> *Lockyer Papers*, Thursfield to Lockyer, August 25, 1903.

<sup>7</sup> *Quarterly Review*, 198, 464 (1903).

<sup>8</sup> *Lockyer Papers*, Avebury to Lockyer, August 10, 1906.

<sup>9</sup> *Lockyer Papers*, H. H. Turner to Lockyer, January 31, 1908.

<sup>10</sup> *Lockyer Papers*, A. J. Balfour to Lockyer, August 10, 1906.

<sup>11</sup> *Lockyer Papers*, J. M. Ludlow to Lockyer, October 9, 1899.

<sup>12</sup> *Lockyer Papers*, Hershie Ayrton to Lockyer, January 16, 1911.

<sup>13</sup> *Nature*, 95, 309 (1915).

<sup>14</sup> MacLeod, R. M., and Andrews, E. K., *Public Administration* (in the press).

<sup>15</sup> *Nature*, 96, 195 (1915).

<sup>16</sup> *Lockyer Papers*, G. E. Hale to Lockyer, August 14, 1916.

<sup>17</sup> *Nature*, 94, 29 (1914).

<sup>18</sup> *Nature*, 94, 137 (1914).

<sup>19</sup> *Nature*, 94, 527 (1915).

<sup>20</sup> *Nature*, 94, 139 (1914).

<sup>21</sup> *Nature*, 94, 275 (1914).

<sup>22</sup> *Macmillan Archives*, f. 166, Lockyer to Frederick Macmillan, September 22, 1918.

<sup>23</sup> *Macmillan Firm Letters* (Reading) file. 1569, R. A. Gregory to Maurice Macmillan, September 28, 1918.

<sup>24</sup> *Lockyer Letters*, f. 167, Lockyer to Frederick Macmillan, October 23, 1918.

<sup>25</sup> Wells, H. G., *The Record* (February, 1931); *The World of William Chissold* 396 (London, 1933).

I thank Miss E. Kay Andrews and Mrs A. Berridge for their help in the preparation of statistical data. The *Tyndall Papers* are quoted by courtesy of the Managers of the Royal Institution; the *Huxley Papers* by kind permission of the Governors of Imperial College; the *Stokes Papers* and the *Ludlow Papers* by courtesy of the University of Cambridge; the *Hooker Papers* by courtesy of the Librarian of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. I am very grateful to Lady Dorothy Gregory for the use of the *Gregory Papers*, and to the Norman Lockyer Observatory, the University of Exeter and Dr A. J. Meadows, University of Leicester, for the use of the *Lockyer Papers*. I also thank the Archivist of the California Institute of Technology and the Director of Mount Wilson Observatory, Pasadena, California, for the *Hale Papers*, and Dr Nathan Reingold, editor of the *Joseph Henry Papers*, for the use of the Lockyer letters in the Smithsonian Archives. The *Lubbock Papers* and the collection described as *Macmillan Archives* are in the British Museum, while the collection styled *Macmillan Firm Letters* is at the University of Reading.

*Reprinted from Nature, December 22, 1887.*

#### THE STAR OF BETHLEHEM.

THE fact that a little more than a month ago the planet Venus arrived at its maximum brilliancy when to the west of the sun, and therefore when the planet rises before the sun, has given rise to a flood of superstitious fears in this country, only to be equalled in modern times by that which the members of the Eclipse Expedition observed in Grenada last year, and chronicled in these columns, as having been met with among the semi-civilized inhabitants of that island.

In spite of School Boards and all the present stock-in-trade of elementary education, perhaps partly because that elementary education deals so little with natural science; and because before School Boards so many children scarcely went to school at all, the planet Venus, one of the most stable and the most brilliant member of the solar system, is being regarded as a second appearance of the star of Bethlehem!

This being the idea which ignorance has conjured up, superstition next comes in to bear her part, and hence very naturally all sorts of woe and desolations, the end of this world being naturally included among them, have been predicted, and in some places a considerable amount of alarm has really arisen. Nor is this all: thousands of people who ought to be able to look up pocket-books and almanacs for themselves have been for the last month pestering everybody who is known to possess a telescope for information on the subject.

We think it, therefore, worth while to refer to this subject, for we have in this ignorant fright an additional reason, which it may be worth while to dwell upon, why the young population of a country like England should not be allowed to grow up without some knowledge, however slight, of the natural phenomena which are always being unfolded around them—phenomena which will always delight, instruct, and interest them if understood, but which will be apt to cause alarm so long as they are shrouded in mystery.

As before stated, the brilliant body in the east which is the innocent cause of all the alarm is nothing but the planet Venus near that position in her orbit in which she can send the greatest amount of light towards us.

If our youngest reader will place a candle in the middle of a table, and support a little ball some six or eight inches away from the candle, on the same level, and then retire some little distance away, to represent a spectator on the earth, the reason why Venus sometimes appears to the right or to the west of the sun and at other times to the east or left of it will be at once clear to him, if the ball be imagined to go round the candle in a direction contrary to that of the hands of a watch. Further, the fact that when the ball is on the other side of the candle it is further away, and therefore appears smaller than it is when exactly between the candle and the spectator, will give a reason why in neither of these cases will the maximum brilliancy be observed, because in one case the planet is as far away as it can be, and in the other, though the planet is as near to us as it can be, it has its dark side turned towards us.