

King and T. H. Rowney, who maintained that it had no life-history. Again, in 1868 they renewed their opposition.¹ They met, however, with little support, the organic origin of *Eozoön* being championed by W. K. Parker, T. Rupert Jones, P. M. Duncan, and Carpenter, as well as by Huxley, the president. That it is ever hazardous to express an opinion unless you know, was forcibly brought to the mind of one opponent of *Eozoön* as a fossil, a palæontologist who was not an expert on Protozoa. On examining a slide under the microscope he expressed his conviction that the structure shown by it was not organic, only to be informed that he was looking at a recent foraminifer!

Needless to say, the 'organism' was figured in text-books, and soon became familiar to every geological student as the oldest known fossil. Nevertheless, whether at home or abroad, this belief did not continue to receive support as time progressed.

Faith in the fossil was seriously impaired in 1879 by Dr. Karl Möbius. Again, in 1891, Dr. J. W. Gregory pointed out not only that the famous specimen from Tudor, in Ontario, lacked all the structures which caused the typical *Eozoön* to be regarded as organic, but also that it was a calc-mica-schist, a metamorphic rock of post-Laurentian age. Belief in the fossil was generally abandoned when Dr. H. J. Johnston-Lavis and Dr. Gregory declared in 1894 that eozoönal structure occurred in ejected blocks of igneous rock at Monte Somma.²

That rocks as old as the Laurentian might occur in Britain was pointed out in 1859 by Ramsay, who, when accompanying Murchison to the North-west Highlands, suggested that the fundamental gneiss was the equivalent of the Laurentian system of Logan.³ In a paper read before the Society in June 1864, but not published until the following year, Dr. H. B. Holl expressed his opinion that the crystalline nucleus of the Malvern Hills was of

¹ See also their 'Old Chapter of the Geological Record,' 1881.

² *Scientif. Trans. Roy. Dublin Soc.* ser. 2, vol. v. p. 259.

³ Murchison, 'Siluria,' 5th ed. 1872, p. 171.