

mations, that the class existed in that abundance which rendered it so peculiarly, above every other age, an age of creeping things and great sea-monsters. And so also in the Tertiary, regarded as but an early portion of the human division, there was a period of increase and diminution,—a morn-

cious use of a generalization, *made for a purpose*, and upon a principle not properly available for the writer's argument," &c. So far the "Proceedings" of the Academy.

This, surely, is very much the reverse of fair. I, however, refer the matter, without note or comment (so far at least as it involves the question whether Mr Foulke has not, in the face of the most express statement on my part, wholly misrepresented me), to the judgment of candid and intelligent readers on both sides the Atlantic.

I know not that I should recognise Mr Foulke as entitled, after such a display, to be dealt with simply as the member of a learned society who differs from me on a scientific question; nor does his reference to the "carboniferous era" as "the *latest* of the" Palæozoic "series," and his apparent unacquaintance with that Permian period, in reality the terminal one of the division during which the Palæozoic forms seem to have gradually died away in order to give place to those of the Secondary division, inspire any very high respect for his acquirements as a geologist. Waiving, however, the legitimacy of his claim, I may be permitted to repeat, for the further information of the non-geological reader, that the *carboniferous* formations, *wherever they have yet been detected*, justify, in the amazing abundance of their carbonized vegetable organisms, the name which they bear. Mr Foulke, in three short sentences, uses the terms "carboniferous era," "carboniferous rocks," "carboniferous period," four several times; and these terms are derived from the predominating amount of carbon (elaborated of old by the plants of the period) which occurs in its several formations. The very language which he has to employ is of itself a confirmation of the statement which he challenges. For so "patent" is this *carboniferous* character of the system, that it has given to it its universally accepted designation,—the verbal sign by which it is represented wherever it is known. Mr Foulke states, that "if taken for the entire surface of the earth," it cannot be truly asserted that the carboniferous flora preponderated over that of the present time, or, at least, that its preponderance could not be regarded as "patent to all." The statement admits of so many different meanings, that I know not whether I shall succeed in replying to the special meaning intended by Mr Foulke. There are no doubt carboniferous deposits on the earth's surface still unknown to the geologist, the evidence of which on the point must be regarded, in consequence, not as "patent to all," but as *nil*. They are witnesses absent from court, whose testimony has not yet been tendered. But equally certain it is, I repeat, that wherever carboniferous formations *have* been discovered