

plane; we would have as a plane section, a circle of changing size which would elongate, and divide into two circles, each of which would do the same, etc. This reminds us of the segmentation of cell life observed under the microscope as though this latter was caused by a four-dimensional figure passing through our space."

In closing, may I quote a bit from Hinton's writings on this point? "Were such a thought adopted we should have to imagine some stupendous whole, wherein all that has ever come into being or will come co-exists, which, passing slowly on, leaves in this flickering consciousness of ours, limited to a narrow space and a single moment, a tumultuous record of changes and vicissitudes which are but to us. Change and movement seem as if they were all that existed. But the appearance of them would be due merely to the momentary passing through our consciousness of ever-existing realities."

We should notice that four-fold geometry and four-fold phenomena are different things, and, while we may speak of tesseracts and other hypersolids with safety, it is quite another matter when we talk of natural phenomena in four-dimension, and we must not take some of these matters too seriously. If we admit the existence of a fourth dimension, we should be prepared to go further and allow a fifth, and sixth, and so on without limit. The geometries of these spaces might be studied by the mathematical methods or indeed by the method of analogy, but perhaps four dimensions will give us all the freedom we need.

Some one has said that the fourth dimension is the place of dreams, and I think he said better than he intended, so I am consoled when I think that if this is true, perhaps you have investigated the fourth dimension during this rather long and rambling talk, and that I have not utterly failed as I have tried to tell you of the fourth dimension.

A. L. CLARK.