

evolutionary processes, or there does not. If such an explanation be possible, at least it must be admitted that it is very hard to conceive. Yet, recalling the difficulty before the idea of natural selection arose of imagining any mechanistic explanation whatever of fitness, we shall do well not to decide against such a possibility.

On the other hand, it is conceivable that a tendency could work parallel with mechanism without interfering with it, according to a view which has been held by such thorough-going mechanists as Descartes, Claude Bernard, Virchow, DuBois-Reymond, and many another. Although I have no intention of here seeking a choice between these two hypotheses, being in fact convinced that now, at all events, no choice is scientifically possible, and doubting if properly speaking they are alternatives at all,¹ I do feel concerned to

¹ "Either the multitudinous kinds of organisms which now exist, and the far more multitudinous kinds which have existed during past geologic eras have been from time to time separately made, or they have arisen by insensible steps, through actions such as we see habitually going on. Both hypotheses imply a Cause. The last, certainly as much as the first, recognizes this Cause as inscrutable. The point at issue is, how this inscrutable Cause has worked in the production of living forms. This point, if it is to be decided at all, is to be decided only by examination of evidence. Let us inquire which of these antagonistic hypotheses is most congruous