

ancient marine plants of ancient marine deposits, and, as such, lend quite as little support to the development hypothesis as the recent algæ of our existing seas. The case, stated in its most favorable form, amounts simply to this, — that at certain early periods, — represented by the Upper and Lower Silurian and the Old Red deposits, — the seas produced sea-plants; and that, at a certain later period, — that of the Carboniferous system, — the land produced land-plants. But even this, did it stand alone, would be a *too* favorable statement. I have seen, on one occasion, the fisherman bring up with his nets, far in the open sea, a wild rose-bush, that, though it still bore its characteristic thorns, was encrusted with serpula, and laden with pendulous lobularia. It had been swept from its original habitat by some river in flood, that had undermined and torn down the bank on which it grew; and after floating about, mayhap for months, had become so saturated with water, that it could float no longer. And in that single rose-bush, dragged up to the light and air from its place among Sertularia, Flustra, Serpula, and the deep-sea fucoids, I had as certain an evidence of the existence of the dicotyledonous plant, as if I had all the families of the Rosaceæ before me. Now, we are furnished by the more ancient formations with evidence regarding the existence of a terrestrial vegetation, such as that which the rose-bush in this case supplied. We cannot expect that the proofs should be numerous. In the chart of the Pacific attached to the better editions of “Cook’s Voyages,” there are several notes along the tract of the great navigator, that indicate where, in mid ocean, trees or fragments of trees had been picked up. These entries, however, are but few, though they belong to all the three voyages together: if I remember aright, there are only five entries in all, — two in the Northern, and three