

fragments of serpentinous limestone, without any structure whatever. I have seen in the collections of dealers and even in public museums, specimens labelled "*Eozoon Canadense*," which have as little claim to that designation as a chip of limestone has to be called a coral or a crinoid."*

These statements were called forth by the appearance of a learned and well illustrated paper, disputing the animal nature of *Eozoon*, by Prof. Karl Moebius of Kiel, and in which, on the evidence of several specimens given to him by Dr. Carpenter and myself, he assumes that he has "investigated more closely and described more minutely" than any other naturalist, its forms and structures, and that by his labours *Eozoon* has been "successfully eliminated from the domain of organic bodies."

Since the appearance of this memoir, and of my criticism upon it, Moebius has published in the same Journal a reply, which has appended to it a note by the principal editor, closing the controversy in so far as that Journal is concerned, by stating that the editor had pledged himself that no rejoinder would be permitted. This, of course, excludes the advocates of the animal nature of *Eozoon* from any farther argument, in so far as the principal organ of scientific opinion in the United States is concerned; and it is partly for this reason that I appear at present in the attitude of a defender of *Eozoon* on its own soil, instead of, as heretofore, carrying the war into the enemy's country.

Still later than this reply of Moebius, are two additional papers of still more remarkable character. For, while Moebius is content to take up a purely negative position, these undertake to account for the structures of *Eozoon* by other causes than that of animal growth, and by causes altogether inconsistent with one another. The first of these is an abstract of a memoir "On the origin of the mineral, structural and chemical characters of Ophites and related rocks," presented to the Royal Society of London by Professors King and Rowney. The second is a quarto pamphlet of 96 pages with 30 plates, by Dr. Otto Hahn, entitled "Die Urzelle," the "Primordial cell."

I confess I do not regard either of these papers as of any scientific value, in so far as *Eozoon* is concerned, but as they are at least bold and confident in their tone, and emanate from quarters which may be supposed to give them some little influ-

* Amer. Jour. of Science. March, 1879.