

ber for November 1877). That microscope is at the service of this audience, and I hope to bring to you testimony from it again and again in the course of the next few months, as I did last winter in the lectures on Biology. Some time, when the noon can be darkened in this room, I am to give you its work actually in progress on a screen here, so that we shall get at the facts at first hand.

I understand that some think that they are not in Orthodox company when they are in my company and yours. It is supposed that Orthodoxy is in danger from this lectureship. I have heard that an eminent naturalist "is not clear that he is in Orthodox company" when he has the companionship of bishop Butler himself. It has been hinted here that Butler and Agassiz are perhaps correct in assuming that the argument for man's immortality, by striking against the possibility of the immortality of instinct, is not wrecked but glorified. For saying precisely what Bishop Butler has said ("Analogy," part I, chap. 1) I have lately been sharply assailed by a man who fights under a mask indeed, but who, although calling himself a prominent naturalist, from the beginning to the end of his article points out not one single error of biological fact in a discussion which he blames you for applauding ignorantly. When this house is as full as it is to-day, there are in it—among the fifteen hundred or two thousand persons present and representing all shades of opinion—at least three or five hundred who know what they are about; and I repel indignantly all the scapegrace scribble of anonymous writers, whether in the newspaper or quarterly press, against an audience which has been drawn together here now for more than a year in the busiest hour of the busiest day of the week, simply by large and complicated themes and not by the speaker. You have come here to listen to very imperfect discussions of very important themes; and although I am not a native of New England, I dare affirm that there is not on this continent another city that would send out for so long a period and at such an hour an audience as large as this to study problems as complicated as those that have come before you. My opinions are not worth a rush; but the general agreement of five or eight hundred or a thousand scholarly persons is a sign of the times. You blame me for having allowed a renowned publishing firm, whose judgment in matters of taste is not often questioned, to preserve a little record, made not by me but by the stenographer, of what this audience has said. Thomas Carlyle made a speech at Edinburgh, the lord rector's inaugural address, before scholars and the people at large. He sits down to edit his works in a costly final edition for posthumous circulation. He left in all the audience said.—(See Carlyle's "Collected Works," Vol. XI., pp. 295-384). It would have been my preference, as a matter of taste, to have left out what this audience said; but it is so peculiar an audience that it was thought the examples of Carlyle and Phillips—for Phillips's speeches are edited in the same way, hisses and all recorded—were worth following. Had I been hissed here as often as Phillips was in the days of the Anti-slavery contest, I should have thought those remarks of the audience quite as worthy of preservation as the others; and if any have thought that the audience has expressed