

restrial areas doubtless still exist where they existed long ages ago, but their surface has been continually altering, and unless renewed by upheaval, the dry land itself must in the course of a very few millions of years be everywhere worn down to the level of the sea. Obviously, then, the attempt to recognise in the present configuration of a country the forms impressed upon it by primeval upthrows that raised it from the sea-level, is really not deserving of serious consideration, and has long been abandoned by all competent observers.

The problem of the origin of the scenery of any part of the earth's surface must obviously include a consideration of the following questions :—(1) The nature of the materials out of which the scenery has been produced. (2) The influence which subterranean movements have had upon these materials, as for instance in their fracture, displacement, plication, and metamorphism, and whether any evidence can be recovered as to the probable form which they assumed at the surface when they were first raised into land. (3) The nature and effect of the erosion which they have undergone since their upheaval ; and (4) the geological periods within which the various processes were at work, to the conjoint operation of which the origin of the scenery is to be ascribed.

It is obvious that the history of the rocks is a subject entirely distinct from that of the forms which these rocks now wear on the surface of the land. Much as we know regarding the various systems and formations into which the rocks of the earth's crust have been grouped, we are still comparatively ignorant of the history of the surface of the land. The physical conditions and much of the organic life of the Silurian, Devonian, and Carboniferous periods, for example, are tolerably well ascertained for large areas of the earth's surface ; but when we are asked to say how Silurian,