

*nifera* by special treatment. And these *Foraminifera* are themselves but *Monera* of the simplest form, which nevertheless have power to form shells of elaborate structure often.

Again, with regard to another most important point, he warns us that, "considering how low down among plants the sexual process occurs, it seems quite possible that some corresponding sexual process yet waits to be discovered among the *Monera*."

Again he states: "In fact rudiments of all the chief system of organs of the higher animals, with the exception, *more or less doubtful*, of the nervous, are thus sketched out in the *Protozoa* just as the organs of the higher plants are sketched out in *Caulerpa*."

Prof. Tyndall has really therefore no warrant for implicating science in his flights of imagination. His 'mystical and transcendental' matter, the 'gentle mother' of us all in his belief, cannot be shown ever to have produced a single germ, where (if his creed be true) she should be every day producing millions. Science maintains that the boundaries between the living and not-living are fixed and firm. And she refuses to give the sanction of her name to questions which are acknowledged to derive their present interest in great part from their 'audacity,'—an audacity whose meaning Prof. Tyndall has not left us to conjecture. Here it is:—

"Two courses, and only two, are possible. Either let us open our doors fully to the conception of creative acts, or, abandoning them, let us radically change our notions of matter."

The glorification of matter is not the fruit of science; it is a belief necessitated by unbelief. The scientific man's "refusal of the creative hypothesis is less an assertion of knowledge than a protest against the assumption of knowledge, which must long, if not forever, be beyond us, and the claim to which is the source of perpetual confusion upon earth." We thank Prof. Tyndall for his candour, at the least.