CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Mathematical Sciences

From its pre-historic roots in simple counting to the algorithms powering modern desktop computers, from the genius of Archimedes to the genius of Einstein, advances in mathematical understanding and numerical techniques have been directly responsible for creating the modern world as we know it. This series will provide a library of the most influential publications and writers on mathematics in its broadest sense. As such, it will show not only the deep roots from which modern science and technology have grown, but also the astonishing breadth of application of mathematical techniques in the humanities and social sciences, and in everyday life.

The Collected Mathematical Papers

Arthur Cayley (1821-1895) was a key figure in the creation of modern algebra. He studied mathematics at Cambridge and published three papers while still an undergraduate. He then qualified as a lawyer and published about 250 mathematical papers during his fourteen years at the Bar. In 1863 he took a significant salary cut to become the first Sadleirian Professor of Pure Mathematics at Cambridge, where he continued to publish at a phenomenal rate on nearly every aspect of the subject, his most important work being in matrices, geometry and abstract groups. In 1882 he spent five months at Johns Hopkins University, and in 1883 he became president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Publication of his Collected Papers - 967 papers in 13 volumes plus an index volume - began in 1889 and was completed after his death (while this volume was in the press) under the editorship of his successor in the Sadleirian Chair. This volume contains 70 papers published mostly between 1871 to 1873, as well as a 36-page obituary of the author.

The Collected Mathematical Papers

VOLUME 8

ARTHUR CAYLEY

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge New York Melbourne Madrid Cape Town Singapore São Paolo Delhi

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108005005

This edition first published 1895
This digitally printed version 2009

ISBN 978-1-108-00500-5

MATHEMATICAL PAPERS.

London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.
Glasgow: 263, ARGYLE STREET.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.
New York: MACMILLAN AND CO.

Vol. 8. Notes & References.

Ribaucour C.R. t. 75. 1872 pp. 533–536. Referring to my Note remarks that the condition (by means of the imaginary coordinates of M. Ossian Bonnet) expressed can be ~~expressed~~ in a simple form communicated by him to the Philomathic Society, May 1870. I reproduce this investigation, altho' it is not easy to present it in a quite intelligible form: we take ~~the investigation is as follows: he takes~~ $p = f(x, y, z)$ to represent a family of surfaces belonging to a triply orthotomic system. Considering two neighbouring surfaces (A) & (A') corresponding to the values z & $z + dz$; A & A' the two points where they meet the trajectories of the surfaces; AT, AT' the tangents to the curves of curvature of the same system at A, A' respectively. Then according to the remark of M. Lévy, it is to be expressed that these lines meet, and this is done by expressing that along the trajectory AA', the variation of the angle of AT with the osculating plane at A is equal to the angle of the osculating planes at A, A' respectively.

Let B' be the spherical image of A', the plane OBB' is parallel to the osculating plane at A of the trajectory, and the angle of the two osculating planes measures the geodesic curvature of BB': denote this by $d\gamma$.

Let β be the angle of BB' with BX, θ the angle of AT with BX, $\beta - \theta$ is the angle of AT with the osculating plane at A of the trajectory: $d\beta - d\theta = d\gamma$, $d\varepsilon$ in the passage from A to A'.

But dx & dy being the increments of x, y corresponding to dz (introducing the symmetric coordinates x & y, we then by a theorem of M. Liouville ... $(\frac{d\lambda}{\ } dx - \frac{d\lambda}{\ } dy)$; ...

A to A', then by a [illegible]

$$dy = d\beta - i\left(\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda\, dx}\, dx - \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda\, dy}\, dy\right);$$

the condition thus is

$$d\theta = i\left(\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda\, dx}\, dx - \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda\, dy}\, dy\right)$$

and the formula $e^{-2i\theta} = \pm\sqrt{\frac{da}{dx}} \div \sqrt{\frac{db}{dx}}$

imaginary coordinates x & y we write

$$a = \frac{dp}{\lambda^2 dx},\quad b = \frac{dp}{\lambda^2 dy},\quad c = \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\frac{d^2p}{dx\,dy}$$

$$ds^2 = 4\lambda^2 \frac{da}{dx}\frac{db}{dy}\, dx\, dy$$

enables this to be written in the definitive form

$$dx \frac{d}{dx}\left\{\left(\frac{db}{dy} \div \lambda^4 \frac{da}{dx}\right) - dy \frac{d}{dy}\left(\frac{da}{dx} \div \lambda^4 \frac{db}{dy}\right) + dz \frac{d}{dz}\left(\frac{db}{dy} - \frac{d}{dz}\left\{\frac{da}{dx}\right\}\right) = 0.\right.$$

we have

$$dx\left(\tfrac{1}{2}p + c\right) + dy \frac{db}{dy} + dz \frac{db}{dz} = 0$$

$$dx \frac{da}{dx} + dy\left(\tfrac{1}{2}p + c\right) + dz \frac{da}{dz} = 0$$

and hence eliminating dx, dy, dz we have

$$\begin{vmatrix} \frac{d}{dx}\left\{\left(\frac{db}{dy} \div \lambda^4 \frac{da}{dx}\right), & \frac{d}{dy}\left\{\left(\frac{db}{dy} \div \lambda^4 \frac{da}{dx}\right), & \frac{d}{dz}\left\{\left(\frac{db}{dy} \div \frac{da}{dx}\right)\right. \right. \\ \tfrac{1}{2}p + c, & \frac{db}{dy}, & \frac{db}{dz} \\ \frac{da}{dx} & \tfrac{1}{2}p + c & \frac{da}{dz} \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

which defines the triply orthotomic system.

THE COLLECTED

MATHEMATICAL PAPERS

OF

ARTHUR CAYLEY, Sc.D., F.R.S.,

LATE SADLERIAN PROFESSOR OF PURE MATHEMATICS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

VOL. VIII.

CAMBRIDGE:
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
1895

CAMBRIDGE:

PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY,

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE present volume contains 70 papers, numbered 486 to 555, published for the most part in the years 1871 to 1873.

The Table for the eight volumes is

Vol.	I.	Numbers	1	to	100.
,,	II.	,,	101	,,	158.
,,	III.	,,	159	,,	222.
,,	IV.	,,	223	,,	299.
,,	V.	,,	300	,,	383.
,,	VI.	,,	384	,,	416.
,,	VII.	,,	417	,,	485.
,,	VIII.	,,	486	,,	555.

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE death of Professor Cayley, which occurred on the 26th of January, 1895, has deprived the later part of this volume, as it will deprive the succeeding volumes, of the advantage of his supervision. The Syndics of the Press desired that the collection of the papers should be completed; and on the 15th of February, they asked me to undertake the duty of editing the remaining volumes. I willingly acceded to their request.

Professor Cayley had himself passed the first thirty-eight sheets of this volume for press; his illness prevented him from even revising any succeeding sheets. He had prepared one Note for the volume: it is printed at the end. The remaining volumes must appear without Notes and References: the reason being that he did not prepare these Notes in advance but only when the corresponding papers came before him in the proof-sheets.

The actual manuscript of the Note has been reproduced in facsimile upon the kind of paper which he regularly used during his mathematical investigations. As it refers to the memoir that ends only in the last sheet but one which he passed for press, it is one of the last pieces of his writing.

He left no instructions as to the Collection of his Mathematical Papers; the statement, prefixed to the first volume, is the only account of his method of arrangement. A comparison of the contents of the first seven volumes with the list of his papers in the Royal Society's *Catalogue of Scientific Papers* has enabled me to make out the detailed course of the method which will, of course, be followed in the remaining volumes.

The Syndics expressed their desire that I should insert some biographical notice of Professor Cayley in a volume of the series. Accordingly, one is inserted in the present volume; it is a reprint (with only slight verbal changes) of the notice which was written for the *Proceedings of the Royal Society*. And I have ventured to add a complete list of the lectures which he announced from year to year after his return to Cambridge in 1863 as Sadlerian Professor.

A. R. FORSYTH.

8 *June*, 1895.

ARTHUR CAYLEY.

[From the Obituary Notices in the *Proceedings of the Royal Society*, vol. LVIII. 1895.]

ARTHUR CAYLEY was the second son of Henry Cayley and Maria Antonia Doughty; he was born at Richmond, in Surrey, on 16 August, 1821.

The family, to whose fame so much honour has been added by one of the greatest mathematicians of all time, is of old origin and illustrious descent. Its name, like not a few English names, is derived from a locality in Normandy; there was a Castellum Cailleii, near Rouen, held by baronial tenure. The head of the house appears to have come to England with William the Conqueror and to have settled in Norfolk, becoming Lord of Massingham, Cranwich, Brodercross, and Hiburgh in that county. The influence of the family increased and, by the time of Edward II., Sir Thomas de Cailli possessed estates also in Yorkshire. On his decease without issue, the Yorkshire property was transferred to a younger branch of the family and was inherited by a long succession of Cayleys who made their home at Thormanby. One of these was knighted, as Sir William Cayley, in 1641; in 1661 he was created a baronet in recognition of his services during the Civil Wars, the title surviving to the present day. The fourth son of Sir William, Cornelius, settled at York; and the eldest son of the latter, also Cornelius, born in 1692, was a barrister and in 1725 was appointed Recorder of Kingston-upon-Hull, an office which he held until a few years before his death in 1779. Probably the advantages offered by Hull, then, as now, the greatest port on the northern coast of England, suggested commerce as an occupation for some members of the Recorder's large family; two of his sons became Russia merchants, settling in St Petersburg. The younger of these, being the fifth son of the Recorder, was Henry Cayley, born in 1768; he married, in 1814, Maria Antonia Doughty, a daughter of William Doughty. The eldest son of this marriage died in infancy. The youngest son, Charles Bagot, was a scholar, possessed of linguistic genius; he was particularly interested in the Romance Languages and he made verse-translations of Homer's *Iliad*, Dante's *Divine Comedy*, and the *Sonnets* of Petrarch. The second son was Arthur, the subject of the present sketch; he was born during a visit of his parents to England. Before passing to the details of his life, it may be added that the second of his father's sisters married Edward Moberly—also a Russia merchant living in St Petersburg—and was the mother of the late Dr. George Moberly, Bishop of Salisbury.

Mr. Henry Cayley took his young family to Russia and remained there for a few years. On retiring from business in 1829, he returned to England and settled into residence at Blackheath. Arthur was sent soon afterwards to a private school there, kept by the Rev. G. B. F. Potticary; and when he was fourteen he was transferred to King's College School, London. At a very early age he had begun to show some of those preferences by which the existence of mathematical ability is wont to reveal itself; he had a great liking for numerical calculations and he developed a great aptitude for them.

In his new school the boy showed himself to be possessed of remarkable ability: his power of grasping a new subject very rapidly and of seizing its central principles was certainly unusual. An old friend tells of an examination in chemistry: the subject had not been studied by Cayley before, but he soon acquired sufficient knowledge to carry off the medal from the professedly chemical students, to their surprise and mortification*. But it was most of all by the indications of mathematical genius that he astonished his teachers. It had been Mr. Cayley's intention to educate his son with the view of placing him in his former business—an intention not abandoned without reluctance. The impression, however, produced upon his teachers could not lightly be set aside; and the advice of the Principal to send him to Cambridge, where his abilities promised to secure brilliant distinction, was adopted.

Accordingly, he went to Cambridge. He was entered at Trinity College on 2nd May, 1838, as a pensioner, and he began residence in the succeeding October at the unusually early age of seventeen. He passed through the ordinary stages in the career of a successful student of mathematics. Like the other able undergraduates of his period, he "coached" with William Hopkins of Peterhouse, who has been described as a great and stimulating teacher—a description justified by the high achievements of a long line of distinguished and grateful pupils.

Cayley's fame grew rapidly: and, as is the way of Cambridge undergraduates, he soon was pointed out as the future Senior Wrangler of the year. It is interesting to find a record of him written about this time and published not long afterwards by an acquaintance†, who says that:—

> "As an undergraduate he had generally the reputation of a mere mathematician, which did him great injustice, for he was really a man of much varied information, and that on some subjects the very opposite of scientific—for instance, he was well up in all the current novels, an uncommon thing at Cambridge where novel-reading is not one of the popular weaknesses."

* It may be added that he maintained his interest in chemistry throughout his life, and acquired a considerable knowledge of it. When he was at Baltimore, in 1882, lecturing at the Johns Hopkins University by special invitation, he attended Professor Remsen's lectures with a pleasure which found expression in his letters home to his children in England. And on one occasion, at Professor Remsen's request, he lectured to the chemistry class on the hydrocarbon "trees" (*Brit. Assoc. Report*, 1875, pp. 257—305).

† Bristed, *Five Years in an English University* (second edition, 1852), p. 95.

It may be added that Cayley declared the story about him in the tripos, recorded by Bristed, to be quite apocryphal.

So also was another story, belonging to a later part of his life, according to which he is reported to have said that "the object of law was to say a thing in the greatest number of words, and of mathematics to say it in the fewest": this view, and the possibility of his ever having held it, he repudiated entirely.

Novel-readers are more frequent in Cambridge now than they appear to have been in 1842, and Cayley in his later days avoided reading some of the modern novels; but it is worth noting, as will subsequently be seen more in detail, that he had this "popular weakness" all his life.

He was admitted a scholar of the College on 1st May, 1840, winning his scholarship at the earliest time when it was possible to do so: and he secured a first class in each of the annual examinations of the College. No record of marks for the first and the second years is given in the Trinity Head Examiner's Book; but in the third year the marks are given and, as he then scored more than twice the marks of the second candidate, the Head Examiner separated him from the rest of the first class by drawing a line under his name. This presage of his powers was confirmed in the following year, 1842, when he graduated as Senior Wrangler; the Examiners were so definitely satisfied that he was first as to dispense in his case with the viva voce tests which at that time were a customary part of the Tripos. And in due course the first Smith's Prize was awarded to him in the succeeding examination.

Cayley's own "year" at Trinity was a distinguished one; for, in addition to himself, it contained Mr. (now the Right Honourable) George Denman, for many years a Judge of the High Court of Justice, and Mr. Hugh Andrew Johnstone Munro, one of the foremost of Latin Scholars of any period. And the distinction of Cayley's contemporaries in neighbouring years is marked: it is impossible to avoid noticing the names of some of the graduates in the Mathematical Tripos about that time. Sylvester and Green (second and fourth wranglers respectively in 1837), Leslie Ellis (senior in 1840), Stokes (senior in 1841), Cayley (senior in 1842), Adams (senior in 1843), Thomson—now Lord Kelvin—(second in 1845), constitute an extraordinary succession of mathematicians of whom England is justly proud. Their achievements in mathematical science have done much to render their University one of the acknowledged chief mathematical schools of the world.

Cayley was elected a Fellow of Trinity and admitted to fellowship on 3rd October, 1842, at an age younger than any other Fellow of the College, at least in the present century; and he was promoted from the position of Minor Fellow to that of Major Fellow on 2nd July, 1845, the year in which he proceeded to his M.A. degree. He was an Assistant Tutor of the College for three years; but such a post was then of an almost nominal character, and there appears to be no indication that any of the mathematical teaching of the College fell to him. He did, indeed, accept some private pupils: his lifelong friend, Canon Venables, has given a pleasant account* of a reading-party which Cayley took to Aberfeldie in 1842.

His pupils, however, did not tie him strictly to Cambridge, for it appears that the latter half of the year 1843 was devoted to continental rambles. The summer was spent in Switzerland, where his zest for walking and for mountain-climbing, a pleasure that never failed while his health lasted, found an active outlet: he had become a member of the Alpine Club in its comparatively early days. The last four months of the year were spent in Italy, partly in the North and in Florence, partly in Rome and Naples. It may have been on this tour that he acquired his love for

* *Guardian*, 6th Feb. 1895, p. 201.

both painting and architecture. The works of painters such as Masaccio, Giovanni Bellini, Perugino, and Luini, then first became known to him; they proved a delight at the time and remained a happy remembrance with him.

These and other continental journeys from time to time, while he remained in residence as a Fellow of his College, were his relaxations. He had no formal lecturing and he did not attempt to obtain a large number of private pupils. The leisure that he thus secured was turned to the best, and to him the most pleasant, of uses, in carrying out mathematical researches. It was, indeed, as an undergraduate that Cayley began the marvellous series of publications which, extending over more than fifty years of his life, have been concerned with practically every branch of pure mathematics as well as with theoretical dynamics and physical astronomy.

The time seemed ripe for the outburst of some mathematical activity. By the efforts of Herschel, Peacock, and Whewell, Cambridge teaching had been set free from the bonds that restricted methods of procedure to those which had proved effective in Newton's days; and the struggle to secure the admittance of analytical methods had been successfully completed. One sign of the new freedom was the foundation of the *Cambridge Mathematical Journal*, in 1837, by D. F. Gregory and Leslie Ellis. Before that time, practically the only English means of publication open to mathematicians was in the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society;* and young writers, whether modest or not about the value of their researches, might well have hesitated before seeking publication in a quarter that exacts so high a standard. The new journal then founded was open to young students and gave them an opportunity, previously difficult to obtain, of making their researches known; and it proved a great stimulus to the intellectual activity of those members of the University. Only four volumes of the journal appeared; but it was continued, first under the name of the *Cambridge and Dublin Mathematical Journal*, and, subsequently down to the present time, under that of the *Quarterly Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Though the opportunities of publication, which now are afforded to mathematicians both in England and abroad, are vastly more numerous than they were half a century ago, the undoubted service rendered to English mathematics by the initial venture of the two young Cambridge men should not be forgotten.

It was in the second volume of this journal that Cayley's earliest paper, written in 1841, was printed: and two other papers bearing the same date—it was the year before his degree—are included in the third volume. Though the results are not remarkable, the freshness and the independence of these early investigations are worthy of notice. Cayley had evidently read with enquiring and critical care the *Mécanique Analytique* of Lagrange, some of the work of Laplace, and several memoirs in the two continental journals of the time, those of Liouville and Crelle. These achievements of an undergraduate of nineteen or twenty, which are rarely accomplished now and were still rarer in his day, recall Abel's dictum*:—

> "Si l'on veut faire des progrès dans les mathématiques, il faut étudier les maîtres et non pas les écoliers."

* *Niels-Henrik Abel* (par Bjerknes, Paris, 1885), p. 173.

It was as certainly one of the characteristics of Cayley to find a stimulus to new developments in the main ideas of other writers as it was one of his characteristics to be able to follow out his own ideas with the insistent unwearying patience of an investigator creating a new work complete. And it is interesting to see how this faculty of receiving inspiration reveals itself from the beginning of his career.

Once free from the necessity of preparing for his Tripos and his Fellowship examination, he was able to throw himself into the work of production. His activity may be estimated from the fact that he produced three papers in 1842, eight in 1843, four in 1844, and thirteen in 1845. Moreover, these papers deal with a great variety of subjects. Thus he makes his first investigations in the numerative calculus of plane curves: he initiates his discussions about geometry of n dimensions: he founds the theory of invariants and covariants: and he elucidates the connexion between doubly-infinite products and elliptic functions. Some of these early papers are now classical; and the briefest inspection of them is sufficient to reveal the suggestiveness and the easy strength of the young mathematician who was not yet in his twenty-fifth year.

Even by this date the opportunities of publication in England had become inadequate to his needs. Curiously enough, he does not appear to have sent any paper to the Royal Society until the year 1852, when Sylvester communicated the "Analytical Researches connected with Steiner's Extension of Malfatti's Problem*" to that Society. Later in the same year, Cayley was elected a Fellow of the Society, and thereafter many of his papers appear in its *Philosophical Transactions*. Before 1852, there were few journals either at home or abroad which did not receive communications from him: and even in the quite early years of his researches, several of his papers, written in French, appeared in Liouville's journal and in Crelle's journal. As societies and journals grew in number, so the area over which his papers spread became ever wider.

At first, after winning his Trinity Fellowship, he remained at Cambridge, and his time must then have been largely at his own disposal. This freedom, in his circumstances, could last for only a limited time because, unless he either entered holy orders or devoted himself to teaching in some permanent post (if obtainable) in the College, the Fellowship could be held for not more than seven years after his M.A. degree—a period that would expire in 1852. He was unwilling to take holy orders—not that there was any religious obstacle in his way, for he was not harassed either by philosophical doubts or critical difficulties. His simple reason for remaining a layman was that, though devout in spirit and an active Churchman, he felt no vocation for the sacred office.

In consequence, it became necessary to choose some profession. Cayley selected the law, left Cambridge in 1846, entered at Lincoln's Inn, and became a pupil of the famous conveyancer, Mr. Christie. A story of their first interview, that Mr. Christie used to tell in after years, is an illustration of the modesty and the lack of self-

* Cayley's *Collected Mathematical Papers*, vol. II. No. 114. Subsequent references to this series will be made in the form *C. M. P.*

assertiveness which were leading features of Cayley's character: and this impression is confirmed by the recollections of a fellow-pupil, Mr. T. C. Wright, who says:—

> "... We fellow-pupils knew that Arthur Cayley had been the Senior Wrangler of his year, and that he possessed extraordinary abilities; but they were not indicated by his personal bearing, and the retiring modesty of his disposition prevented him from ever alluding to the honours he had won at Cambridge. He had one of the most unsophisticated minds I have ever known; jokes, and the badinage of the pupil-room, seemed to be delightful novelties to him, and his face beamed with amusement as he listened to them without taking much part in the conversation, being content to devote his time assiduously to work which I suspect was not altogether congenial to his taste...."

But if the modest, almost shy, man did not display his honours, he could not conceal his powers; and very soon his clearness of head, his almost intuitive grasp of the principles of any subject that came before him, his capacity for work and his power of concentration, made him a favourite pupil. He was called to the Bar on 3rd May, 1849, and thereafter he had no occasion to wait for business. Mr. Christie was always ready to supply him with at least as much conveyancing work as he was willing to undertake: but no advice, no encouragement, no opening however favourable, least of all any wish for fame or fortune, could tempt him to subside into a large practice. He restricted himself to "devilling" for Mr. Christie, and he limited the amount of work he would undertake in this way, always refusing work that came to him at first hand. There is no doubt that, had he remained at the Bar and devoted himself to its business, he could have made a great legal reputation and a substantial fortune: even as it was, some of his drafts* have been made to serve as models. But the spirit of research possessed him; it was not merely will but an irresistible impulse that made the pursuit of mathematics, not the practice of law, his chief desire. To achieve this desire, he reserved with jealous care a due portion of his time; and he regarded his legal occupations mainly as the means of providing a livelihood.

He remained at the Bar for fourteen years. Between two and three hundred papers are the mathematical outcome of that period; and they include some of the most brilliant of his discoveries. Among these papers are to be found the majority of his famous memoirs on quantics (particularly the sixth memoir, in which he develops his theory of geometry, and shows that all geometry can be made entirely descriptive), his work upon matrices, numerous contributions to the theory of symmetric functions of the roots of an equation, the elaborate calculations connected with the development of functions arising in the planetary and the lunar theories, and his valuable reports on theoretical dynamics. The enormous range over which his papers of these fourteen years extend is not more remarkable than the vigour of his contributions to knowledge; and a reference to them will show that he frequently recurs to some given problem, always adding something to the development.

* In Davidson's *Precedents and Forms in Conveyancing* (third edition, 1873), vol. III. Part II. p. 1067, the author adds a footnote, calling "attention to the remarkable skill exhibited in [a] settlement, the work of Mr. Arthur Cayley."

In judging of this persistent and unflagging activity, some account ought to be taken of his surroundings. It can hardly be that 2, Stone Court, from which many of his papers are dated, proved an inspiration to mathematical research. For part of the time, his friend Sylvester was in London—then as an actuary; and I have heard Cayley describe how Sylvester and he walked round the Courts of Lincoln's Inn discussing the theory of invariants and covariants which occupied (and occasionally absorbed) the attention of both of them during the fifties. And on matters which related to analytical geometry he was in frequent (but formal) correspondence with Salmon; indeed, the relation that existed between the two men developed ultimately into one of warm friendship and deep mutual regard: its sincerity can be gathered from the spirit animating Salmon's notice of Cayley, published in *Nature* in 1883, at the time when the latter was President of the British Association. But, with special exceptions of the types indicated, his work was so largely of the kind that is called path-breaking that he was bound to do it alone: he did it with a simple unconscious courage and with unfailing resolution.

It may easily be imagined that his links with life at Cambridge had now become slight. During the earliest of the years spent at the bar, he had returned on a few occasions. In 1848, the year before his call, he was the junior mathematical examiner in the regular annual examinations of Trinity; in 1849, and also in 1850, he was the senior mathematical examiner in the same examinations. In 1851 he was Senior Moderator for the Mathematical Tripos; one of the wranglers, Lightfoot, becoming subsequently his friend, and his colleague in the University, before going to his great work in the diocese of Durham as Bishop. In 1852 he was Senior Examiner for the Tripos, the senior wrangler of the year being Tait (also afterwards one of his intimate friends), now Professor of Natural Philosophy at Edinburgh. These seem to have been the only occasions when he was recalled to Cambridge; and they did not require any permanent connexion with the College or the University. He was settled in London, his allegiance divided between law and mathematics.

A change, however, in the statutes of the University offered an opportunity for his return to Cambridge; a professorship of pure mathematics was established upon an old foundation. Lady Mary Sadleir (who endowed the Croonian Lecture Fund of the Royal College of Physicians of London and also that of the Royal Society in memory of her first husband, Dr. William Croone, a physician and one of the earliest Fellows of the Royal Society) had, by her will, dated 25th September, 1701, and proved 6th November, 1706, given to the University an estate, which was to be used as an endowment of lectureships in algebra at nine of the colleges in Cambridge. These posts were duly established. The great developments of analysis, which took place at the end of the last century and during the first half of the present century, gradually proved that the restriction to algebra prevented the lectureships from being as adequate an encouragement to the advancement of mathematics as they were designed to be at the time of their establishment. Moreover, the lecturers had ceased to attract undergraduates to their lectures: so that the purpose of the foundation was not being fulfilled. Consequently, in 1857, a proposal was made by the Council of the Senate of the University that a new direction should be given to the endowment by the establishment

of a professorship, to be called the Sadlerian Professorship of Pure Mathematics: the duty of the professor was "to explain and teach the principles of pure mathematics, and to apply himself to the advancement of that science." The proposal was approved by the Senate on 3rd December, 1857, and the new statute was sanctioned by an Order of the Queen in Council on 7th March, 1860. Some time had to elapse before certain provisional arrangements could be completed, and it was not until after three years that the University was in a position to act.

On 10th June, 1863, Cayley was elected Sadlerian professor: he held the chair for the rest of his life. The stipend attached to the professorship was modest, though it was improved in the course of subsequent legislation; these changes, however, could not have been foreseen at the time when Cayley was elected. Yet he had no hesitation about returning to Cambridge: for the post enabled him to devote his life to the pursuit he liked best. He never showed the slightest regret at having neglected the prospects of distinction at the bar, or at having chosen to return to his University; and he always expressed perfect satisfaction and content with his life in Cambridge, which was one of great happiness.

His appointment as Sadlerian professor marks a turning point in his life. Henceforward he lived, for the most part, in the quiet of the University; yet it was by no means in seclusion, for he took his share in administration, which claims a part (often too large a part) of the leisure of men fitted for this necessary duty. But he was not burdened by heavy claims arising out of his official position: and he was directed by the statutes governing him to do what was, as a matter of fact, his ideal in life. No man could have been better suited than Cayley was to fulfil the charge of the statutes: his knowledge and his power of research pointed him out as the obvious choice of the electors.

He settled in Cambridge at once. On 8th September, 1863, he married Susan, daughter of Robert Moline, of Greenwich. This is not the place to dwell upon his domestic life; but it is impossible to omit in silence all reference to its singular happiness, based upon the affection felt by its members for one another. Friends and visitors who have been in that home will not soon forget the kindness and the gracious courtesy of the welcome they received, or the atmosphere of peace into which they were raised. Sometimes in the old garden by the river-side, more often in the drawing-room, the talk went on; the professor himself listening, attentive and watchful, frequently taking only a slight share, but ever ready to join in. No cynicism or paradox in speech was ventured upon in his presence; no harshness of judgment was tolerated without a quiet protest; no sense of bustle or ambition was felt there; in all things the charm of an old-world home, centred round him. His widow and their two children, Mary and Henry, remain to mourn their loss.

His teaching duty was limited to the delivery of one course of lectures in the academic year, and he usually chose the Michaelmas term. This practice was maintained for twenty-three years until he was placed under the new statutes, which in 1882 had come into operation so far as concerned all future appointments. After that change, he delivered two courses of lectures, one in the Michaelmas term, the other in the Lent term. An inspection of the list of his lectures* shows that he chose his

* The list is given on pp. xlv, xlvi.

subjects by preference from analytical geometry, dynamics (in his view, theoretical dynamics is a portion of pure mathematics), differential equations, theory of equations, Abelian functions, elliptic functions, and modern algebra. The titles of the lectures, as announced, were sometimes vague, nor were they intended to limit his range; in all cases he went far beyond the boundary that so frequently limits Cambridge studies. Thus a course of lectures on differential equations, announced for the Michaelmas term in 1879, was chiefly concerned with conformal representation, polyhedral functions, and Schwarz's investigations on the hypergeometric series.

For many years he dispensed with the use of blackboard and chalk in his class-room; this was possible because his class usually was small. He brought his work written out upon the blue draft-paper,* which was regularly used by him in all his writing of mathematics; the exposition consisted partly of verbal explanations made as he showed the manuscript, partly of details written out at the moment. A change came in 1881, when his class amounted to fifteen or sixteen: he was then obliged to use the blackboard, and he subsequently maintained the new practice. Occasionally his older habit of explaining his manuscript recurred—he then placed it upon the board. This was especially the case when he brought carefully prepared diagrams, such as those used in the modular-function division of the plane: these diagrams were made much clearer by the use of water-colours to distinguish different sets of regions, and their preparation evidently gave him pleasure.

But, as may be surmised, his influence as a teacher was overshadowed by his influence as an investigator. Those whom he affected by his lectures belonged for the most part to the mathematical teachers in Cambridge: the number of undergraduates whom he influenced was small, though, when any one of them did come under his influence, the effect was well marked. His starting point in any subject was usually beyond the range of all other than quite advanced students; but to any able under-graduate who was willing to devote time, not merely to the comprehension of the matter in the lectures but also to collateral reading, the lectures were stimulating and inspiring. This effect was partly due to the easy strength with which he worked, partly to the spirit in which he approached old and new subjects alike; an independent suggestiveness and a singular freshness marked his views, and gave an added interest to his exposition even of a well-known theory. One reason of this freshness may be found in the fact that his lectures consisted of the current researches upon which he was engaged at the time; sometimes, even, a lecture would be devoted to results which he had obtained since the preceding lecture. Though the titles of the courses occasionally recur from one year to another, the same course was never given twice. The new matter in any course, once given, was usually incorporated in a paper or memoir; and when the same subject was nominally lectured upon again, it was a distinct part of the subject—old notes were never used a second time.

It was not alone by his lectures that he acted as professor. Students, seeking help or desiring to interest him in their work, found him always willing to give them the benefit of his advice, his criticism, and his knowledge. Nor was it merely mathe-maticians in Cambridge whom he helped in this way. He was continually consulted by

* It was the customary "scribbling paper" of his undergraduate days.

foreigners, who appreciated the promptness no less than the fulness of information in his replies.

It frequently happens that a man of genius, great enough to leave a distinct impress of his originality upon his science, finds it irksome to study what others have written. With the growth of all sciences during the last fifty years, especially—it may be said—with the growth of pure mathematics in that time, the tendency of workers is to become specialists in their own subject and, perhaps, in subjects immediately cognate with it, and to acquire only a slight acquaintance with what is being done outside the circle of their limited interests. Not so was Cayley: he was singularly learned in the work of other men, and catholic in his range of knowledge. Yet he did not read a memoir completely through: his custom was to read only so much as would enable him to grasp the meaning of the symbols and understand its scope. The main result would then become to him a subject of investigation: he would establish it (or test it) by algebraical analysis and, not infrequently, develop it so as to obtain other results. This faculty of grasping and testing rapidly the work of others, together with his great knowledge, made him an invaluable referee; his services in this capacity were used through a long series of years by a number of societies to which he almost was in the position of standing mathematical adviser.

Concurrently with his teaching, he continued his investigations. He wrote only one book—a *Treatise on Elliptic Functions*, published in 1876, which was intended to bridge over the gap from Legendre's *Traité des Fonctions Elliptiques* to Jacobi's *Fundamenta Nova*; it contains a considerable amount of new matter. But paper after paper was published in a long unfailing succession almost until his death; their tale amounts to more than 800. Happily for the convenience of mathematicians, the republication of his papers in collected form was undertaken by the Cambridge University Press,—perhaps the most enduring, certainly not the least fitting, monument of his fame. The request was made to him in 1889 by the Syndics of the Press; he willingly acceded to it and deeply appreciated, both then and afterwards, what he regarded as a great compliment to himself. Seven large quarto volumes, under his own editorship, have already appeared. The preparation of them was always a great happiness to him; and, especially in the later years of his life, it gave him an occupation in his science which was still within the range of his failing strength. At the time when the collection was begun it was estimated that ten volumes would suffice for the purpose, but it is now evident that ten will be certainly insufficient. The Syndics of the Press intend to complete the series of volumes; it is a matter of regret that the illustrious author of the papers has not lived to complete it himself.

Even his teaching and investigations did not fully occupy his time. For the first few years after his return he was left comparatively free from a large share in administration, but gradually it was assigned to him. As he became better known for his effective business capacity, his share in administration grew until he came to be regarded as an indispensable member of the Council of the Senate. He was elected a member of that body on 7th November, 1876, and with the exception of some six months when he was absent in America, he continued a member of it until 1892, when failing health compelled him to resign. During this period of service he was

re-elected three times. Party feeling ran rather strongly at times during the discussions that led to the new statutes; but both parties included his name among their lists of nominations—an adequate proof that he possessed the confidence of the Senate. He was free from party bias, and he became established in his position of strength by his fairmindedness, his sound judgment, and his calm temperament. He would listen to a discussion, speaking only when he had something of importance to add; when speaking he was listened to with full attention. More frequently he would take no part in the discussion until his opinion was asked, as was usually the case in difficult questions; his opinion was always valued and sometimes final. Similarly, on syndicates, his co-operation was much sought, and in particular the services which he rendered to the Library Syndicate and the Press Syndicate were of substantial importance. He also took great interest in the movement for the higher education of women. In the early days of Girton College he gave direct help in teaching, and for some years he was Chairman of the Council of Newnham College, in the progress of which he took the keenest interest even to the last.

But, with all his general aptitude for business, he was perhaps most specially helpful by his legal knowledge. The training he had undergone and the knowledge he had acquired at the bar ultimately proved invaluable. His opinion on legal matters was sought by the University, by his own college, and by the scientific societies with which he was connected; when given, it frequently had the effect of a judicial decision. His powers of drafting were constantly being called into requisition; he responded to the calls upon him and, with unstinted generosity, placed his time and skill at the disposal of these bodies, so that the new statutes of Trinity College, and not a few of the statutes and ordinances of the University, owe much to him.

One other illustration, at once of his general business capacity and of the confidence reposed in him, may be given. The elections for representatives of the Universities in the House of Commons are still conducted openly and by means of voting papers, delivered either by the elector himself or by another elector whom he has nominated; objections may be raised against any voting paper, but they must be decided at once. In Cambridge the Vice-Chancellor, being the returning officer, nominates a number of assessors to act with him in the case of a contested election. At a bye-election in 1882, when the candidates were Mr. H. C. Raikes and Professor James Stuart, Cayley was nominated as presiding officer at one of the polling places. His imperturbable firmness, his calm courtesy, and the justice of his decisions secured for his effectiveness in this capacity the admiration of the University.

This brief account of his participation in business affairs is necessary; without some such indication a proper estimate of his position in Cambridge cannot be framed. And it also may help to show that his supremacy in the subjects of his investigations neither made him a recluse, nor limited his other interests, nor restricted his practical usefulness.

The merits of such a man were recognised by the only means at the disposal of a grateful and appreciative University. He was elected an honorary Fellow of Trinity College on 22nd May, 1872, at the same time as Dr. Lightfoot, Mr. James

Spedding, and Professor Clerk Maxwell; and on 11th October, 1875, he was made an ordinary Fellow, a position which he retained for the rest of his life. His friends subscribed for a presentation portrait,* painted by Lowes Dickenson in 1874; it now hangs in the College Hall. The simplest of inscriptions is on its frame, but the humorous lines which Clerk Maxwell† wrote at the time should not readily be forgotten. The graver element, seldom absent from his verses, is not entirely repressed even by his wit, and the lines were based upon a deep admiration of the man

> "Whose soul, too large for vulgar space,
> In n dimensions flourished unrestricted."

His bust, by Mr. Henry Wiles, was given to Trinity College by a donor who wished to remain anonymous. It was placed in the beautiful library of the College on 3rd December, 1888, an honour that has been conferred during life in only two other cases—Tennyson and Sedgwick.

After the new statutes came into operation, the Senate on 27th May, 1886, decided that the Sadlerian Professorship should at once be made subject to the improved provisions, a decision which, though it increased the amount of lecturing required, gave him the benefit of the full stipend. At the same time the Lucasian Professorship, held by Professor Stokes, was also made subject to the new statutes; and it was currently believed that the Lowndean Professorship would have been included in the proposal had Professor Adams been willing to have the change made. There was a wish on the part of members of the University to give some recognition to the glory conferred upon the mathematical school by Stokes, Adams, and Cayley; one possibility remained. The opportunity came in 1888 when Prince Edward (as he was known in Cambridge), afterwards Duke of Clarence, received the degree of LL.D. Such an occasion is customarily marked by the conferment of a number of honorary degrees upon distinguished men; among them, on this particular occasion, were the three professors who had been colleagues for a quarter of a century. On the 9th of June in that year a great assembly gathered to see these degrees conferred upon the recipients. It need hardly be said that the men singled out for honour received ovations on being presented; among the most enthusiastic ovations were those accorded to the three professors.

Nor were external bodies and learned societies, both at home and abroad, backward in recognising the merits of his work; the honours he received were numerous and came from all quarters. Honorary degrees were conferred upon him by several universities as well as his own, among them being Oxford, Dublin, Edinburgh, Göttingen, Heidelberg, Leyden, and Bologna. President Carnot nominated him an Officer of the Legion of Honour. He was either a Fellow or a foreign corresponding member of most of the scientific societies of the Continent, among them being the French Institute, the Academies of Berlin, Göttingen, St. Petersburg, Milan, Rome, Leyden, Upsala, and Hungary. He was also a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, of the Royal Irish

* A photographic reproduction of the portrait is prefixed to vol. VI. of the *C. M. P.*
† See Campbell and Garnett's *Life of James Clerk Maxwell*, p. 636.

Academy, and of the Royal Astronomical Society. He had been President of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, and he sat on its Council for many years; also President of the London Mathematical Society and of the Royal Astronomical Society. He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society on 3rd June, 1852, and he served as a member of its Council for six periods of office. In 1859 he received from the Royal Society a Royal medal, and in 1882 the Copley Medal, the highest scientific distinction it is in its power to bestow. When the De Morgan Medal was instituted in connexion with the London Mathematical Society, the first award was fitly made to Cayley. And from Leyden he received the Huyghens Medal.

Mention should be made of one other honour which he received: it is of a kind seldom conferred. The high opinion of his work which was held in America was indicated by an invitation in 1881 to deliver a course of lectures in the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, where his friend and fellow investigator, Sylvester, was then professor. He accepted the invitation, and left England in December of that year. During the next five months he lectured on Abelian and Theta Functions; the substance of these lectures was incorporated in a memoir subsequently published in the *American Journal of Mathematics**. He returned to England in June, 1882, bringing back pleasant remembrances of kindnesses and friendships.

His life, spent in mathematical research and in the quiet round of activity in the University, offered little of either interest or incident to make his name known by the outside world to the same extent or in the same way as the names of many scientific men, engaged in other lines of enquiry, are known. Once, however, in his life circumstances brought him prominently into notice. In 1883 he was President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, the meeting being held at Southport; and, in that capacity at the opening of the meeting, he had to deliver a formal address, an abstract of which appeared as usual in the leading newspapers of the country.

In the early days of the Association, the President's address frequently reviewed the whole field of science; but as knowledge has developed, a tendency has set in, according to which each later President has confined himself more particularly to those matters within whose range he is an authority. And, subject to this restriction, it is hoped that the address may be legitimately popular. There have been critics of presidential addresses prepared to assert that science was sacrificed to popularity; there have been immense audiences convinced that popularity was sacrificed to science. Taken together, the presidential addresses, some severe and others popular, form an interesting series of reviews of the successive stages in scientific achievements.

Cayley's address belonged to the severely scientific class. From the nature of his subject—the progress of mathematics, more particularly of pure mathematics—it was bound to have this character. Few of the members of a regular Association audience have more than a slight acquaintance with pure mathematics; and, consequently, it is impossible to deliver to such a gathering an address which, in a reasonable time, can give them any real idea of the condition or the progress of the science. Cayley felt

* Vol. v. (1883), pp. 137—179; vol. vii. (1885), pp. 101—167.

this and confessed to the feeling in a passage which is perhaps the best known in the address:—

> "It is difficult to give an idea of the vast extent of modern mathematics. The word 'extent' is not the right one: I mean extent crowded with beautiful detail—not an extent of mere uniformity such as an objectless plain, but of a tract of beautiful country seen at first in the distance, but which will bear to be rambled through and studied in every detail of hillside and valley, stream, rock, wood, and flower. But, as for everything else, so for a mathematical theory —beauty can be perceived but not explained."

But he also felt that the respect due to the Association requires its President to deal with that branch of science about which, as he knows it best, he is best fitted to tell them, so that different subjects may thus in turn be brought before successive meetings.

> "So much the worse," he added, "it may be, for a particular meeting; but the meeting is the individual which on evolution principles must be sacrificed for the development of the race."

Granting then the inevitably stern character (as popularly estimated) that must mark any proper exposition of his subject, the address is one of singular interest. It undoubtedly made a great impression. Parts of it were incomprehensible to all but mathematicians: still, there was much which others could understand and, understanding, found excellent. Even leader-writers at the time recognised its lucidity, its finish, its native elegance, and its instructive and stimulating essence. To mathematicians it counts for much. Not merely is it a valuable historical review of various mathematical theories; but the exposition possesses all the freshness, the independence of view, the suggestiveness and the amazing knowledge that were so characteristic of Cayley. And, consequently, it can often be recurred to with unfailing profit.

After this event, his life pursued the unbroken tenor of its scientific course. Ever thinking, working, writing, he maintained the flow of his papers with the same unslackening vigour, and he showed the same sympathetic encouragement of others, as had marked him before the scientific world had tried to acknowledge his genius by showering its honours upon him.

It is now some years since the painful internal malady, which ultimately was the cause of death, began to show itself. At first, its action was slow; and there was reasonable hope that his naturally strong constitution would enable him to throw it off. Unfortunately these hopes were not realised; its growth was steady, its undermining influence persistent. Change of scene was tried once or twice, but without good effect; and it soon appeared that Cambridge itself troubled him least. Three years ago his friends saw that his health began to fail: he had occasional attacks of severe illness which confined him to his bed for weeks together, each of them leaving him gravely frailer than before. Gradually he became confined to his house and his garden; he could see only very few friends, and usually even them only for a short time. When

they did see him, they found only too clearly how rare and brief were his intervals of relief from pain, though occasionally his gentleness and his patience would almost delude them into hope.

The last of the severe attacks began on the 8th of January; he seemed to be getting better when, on the 21st, his strength suddenly began to collapse. He died about six o'clock on the evening of Saturday, 26th January, 1895. The funeral took place on the succeeding Friday when, in Trinity Chapel, a great assemblage, composed of members of the University, of representatives of the embassies of Russia and America, as well as of various learned societies and of personal friends, gathered to pay him their last homage of respect and reverence.

Sufficient has been said to show that Cayley was a man of general activities; but his scientific work and his public duties by no means exhausted or limited his general interests.

It has already been stated that, as an undergraduate, he was fond of reading novels; this practice remained with him all his days. He preferred a novel of the old orthodox type with a "happy ending"; and though his greatest delight was in the older novels, a modern book, such as *Beside the Bonnie Briar Bush* (which he read quite late in 1894), met with words of warm praise. He had a good memory, and used to discuss plots and characters with considerable animation. The two novelists, by whose works many English people are divided into one or other of two classes, did not affect him much; Thackeray he read but did not like, and he would not read Dickens. His favourite authors were Scott and Jane Austen; all their works had been read by him many times, and they were read aloud to him during the long period of his illness. *Guy Mannering* and *The Heart of Midlothian*, among Scott's, and *Persuasion*, among Jane Austen's, were the books he liked the best. He also was fond of George Eliot's novels, particularly of *Romola*. Indeed, though he had aversions, his taste was somewhat general. Commendation of a book was enough to make him willing to try it; and there was only one limitation to his range of novel-reading—he had an instinctive abhorrence of anything that suggested either coarseness or vulgarity.

His English reading was not confined to novels. He had a keen liking for many of Shakespeare's plays, notably *Much Ado About Nothing*, and some of the historical dramas. He delighted in Milton's shorter poems, though he would not tolerate *Paradise Lost*. Scott's poems were frequently read; and he had a great appreciation of Byron's *Tales* and of Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*. Grote's *History of Greece* and Macaulay's *History of England* he read repeatedly and with zest; and he never seemed tired of Lockhart's *Life of Scott*.

He was also a good linguist. He knew French well; it was a second writing-language to him, as will be seen from the large number of papers, written in French, which occur in his collected mathematical papers. He read (but he did not talk) German and Italian with ease, and his Greek remained fresh throughout his life. This last power may have been due to the admiration he felt for Plato; he referred to the *Republic* and the *Theætetus* in his Presidential Address; and, on the afternoon of the

day of the "Greek division"* in the Senate House, I remember finding him at home reading the *Gorgias*.

He had the keenest interest, amounting almost to a passionate delight, in travelling; cities of historic or artistic fame delighted him equally with beautiful scenery. Long after he had become an invalid, he found a fascination in guide-books and maps; and all his younger friends will recall the sympathetic zeal with which he entered into their projected journeys, and the happy pleasure he took in hearing them speak of recent journeyings and in recalling, with a wonderful vivid memory, his own experiences and ideas about places they had visited.

Reference has been made to his early pleasure in the old Italian masters. Yet, if any inferences can be drawn from the likings of his later years, architecture attracted him even as much as pictures. He had a true feeling and a clear judgment as to genuine excellence: he sketched well, and had a quick eye for proportions, perspective, light and shade. One of his relaxations was to make coloured sketches of buildings that he liked, notably sepia drawings of some of the great Gothic cathedrals and churches of northern France. He kept up his practice of water-colour painting all his life, and in his closing years it proved a great solace to him at times when his strength was so far reduced that he could not work. He had great happiness in looking at architectural pictures and at books on architecture, one of his favourites among the latter being Street's *Brick and Marble in the Middle Ages*.

Financial matters and accounts also interested him; and only a few months before his death he published a brief pamphlet on book-keeping by double entry, which he has been known to declare one of the two perfect sciences. He could not resist some reference to the subject in his Presidential Address, making the remark that the notion of a negative magnitude "is used in a very refined manner in book-keeping by double-entry."

His bearing was gentle, and it was marked by a courtesy that was unfailing. On questions of administration and in discussions, his opinions were stated clearly and quietly. Not that he did not hold decided views or that he would abate one jot of his firm, even chivalrous, defence of what he held to be right; but there was a judicial temper in his mind which prevented the subjective element in a discussion from disturbing his equanimity. The even balance of his mind enabled him to recognise and appreciate the position of one who differed from him, and his quiet "I do not think so" was all the more effective because its very calmness excluded the slightest suggestion of hostile spirit.

His figure was spare: until his illness, he could easily endure the fatigue of long walks, in which he delighted, especially in hill country. In later years it became rather bent, and he had the appearance of being frail. His head was very impressive,

* In 1891 a proposal was made by the Council of the Senate for the appointment of a Syndicate to enquire, among other things, into the expediency of allowing alternatives for one of the two classical languages in the Previous Examination. Many members of the Senate were convinced that the adoption of an alternative would lead to the extinction of the study of Greek except in the greater public schools; they consequently opposed the proposal, which, on 29th October, 1891, was rejected by a great majority (525 to 185).

It may be added that Cayley was in the minority. He allowed his signature to be added to a letter which was sent to the London newspapers as an appeal for assistance in defeating the attempt to resist enquiry.

as may be seen from his portrait and from photographs. In repose, and when his attention was not concentrated upon what was passing, his face had a grave air and the blue-grey eyes suggested that he was far away in thought; but when attentive or amused, and when expressing pleasure, the eyes became singularly keen and a peculiar charm lightened up the whole face.

He was absolutely modest. The honours conferred on him in full profusion never injured in the least degree the grand simplicity of his character, never gave rise to the slightest trace of vanity, which was alien to his nature. He rarely spoke of them, and, when he did, it never was as of honours: they pleased him, but, perhaps, rather as recognition of his work than as tributes to the worker. If any one expressed appreciation of any of his papers, owing to the help it had given, he would reply very quietly: but he did not stint the expression of his pleasure at advances beyond his own results when they were made by others. Public appearances were rather distressing to him at first, for his disposition was retiring and he could be reserved; but as time wore on, duty often compelled him to take part in them. In such cases he accepted the claim and discharged it with a straightforward simplicity that was entirely devoid of self-consciousness; but he gladly avoided demonstrations whenever it was possible.

In the spirit of his work one great quality was his generosity to others, particularly to young men, whose work he was always willing to recognise. He ignored the fact that he was a great mathematician—probably it never occurred to him to think of his doings: but it may be doubted whether this unconsciousness of his greatness ever proved at once more fascinating or more bewildering than when he was discussing scientific results with young men. He so evidently had his wishes centred on a single-hearted desire for the right result that it was difficult to conceive him approaching a question merely as a learner: yet he was ever a learner. There are few men, if any, with not even a tithe of his scientific achievements, who have had less of controversy or have had such immunity from questions as to priority of discovery. This arose not merely from the indisputable priority of his results: it was partly owing to his nature. Salmon says of him:—

> "His motto has always been 'esse quam videri,' and I do not know any one to whom it would be more repulsive to engage in a personal contest by claiming for himself a particle of honour or of money more than was spontaneously conceded. He would be apt to take for his model the patriarch Isaac, who, when the Philistines claimed a well which he had dug, went on and dug another, and when they claimed that, too, went on and dug a third":

an exceedingly happy description of the man the tide of whose genius was

"Too full for sound or foam."

Some account of his work, some estimate of its character, some indication of the original contributions made by him to his science, may not improperly be given here. It is, of course, impossible to predict what his permanent influence will be upon mathematics, or what opinion coming generations of workers will hold of him: certainly, by his own contemporaries, he was deemed one of the greatest mathematicians the