by Sir J. W. Dawson of Montreal,[13] who pronounced the organism to be the remains of a massive foraminifer which he called *Eozoon*, and which he believed must have grown in large thick sheets over the sea-bottom. This view was likewise adopted by the late Dr. W. B. Carpenter,[14] who, from additional and better specimens, described a system of internal canals having the characters of those in true foraminiferal structures. Other observers, however, notably Professors King and Rowney of Galway,[15] maintained that the "canal-system" is not of organic but of mineral origin, having arisen in many cases "from the wasting action of carbonated solutions on clotules of 'flocculite,' or, it may be, saponite—a disintegrated variety of serpentine, and in others from a similar action on crystalloids of malacolite. In both cases," according to Prof. King, "there are produced residual 'figures of corrosion' or arborescent configurations, having often a regular disposition." The regularity of these forms is attributed by Messrs. King and Rowney to their having been determined by a mineral cleavage.[16] Prof. Möbius of Kiel[17] also opposed the organic nature of *Eozoon*, maintaining that the supposed canals and passages are merely infiltration veinings of serpentine in the calcite. In some cases, however, the "canal-system" is not filled

---

[13] Q. J. Geol. Soc. xxi. 1865, p. 51; xxiii. 1867, p. 257. See also his "Acadian Geology," 2d edit., "Dawn of Life," 1875, and "Notes on Specimens of Eozoon Canadense," Montreal, 1888.

[14] Proc. Roy. Soc. 1864, p. 545. Q. J. Geol. Soc. xxi. 1865, p. 59; xxii. 1866, p. 219.

[15] Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc. xxii. 1866, p. 185.

[16] Prof. W. King, Geol. Mag. 1883, p. 47. See the views of these writers, summarized in their work, "An old Chapter in the Geological Record with a new Interpretation," London, 1881, where a full bibliography will be found.

[17] "Palæontographica," xxv. p. 175; Nature, xx. p. 272. See replies by Carpenter and Dawson, Nature, xx. p. 328. Amer. Journ. Sci. (3) xvii. p. 196; also Amer. Journ. Sci. (3) xviii. p. 117. See also A. G. Nathorst, Neues Jahrb. 1892, i. p. 169.