

never dragged, nor plumb-line fathomed? Who shall say what species lurk in those unapproachable recesses never to be revealed to the eye of man, but in a fossil state. The giant *Inocerami*, the singular tribe of *Ammonites*, and all their cognate genera, as even Lamarck seems disposed to concede :* the *Baculites*, *Hamites*, *Scaphites*, and numerous others there have space enough to live unknown to fame, while they are reckoned by the geologist as expunged from the list of living animals. I do not mean to assert that these creatures are not extinct, but I would only caution the student of nature from assuming this as irrefragably demonstrated ; since we certainly do not yet know enough of the vast field of creation, to say dogmatically with respect to any species of these animals that this is no longer in being.

But besides the unexplored parts of the surface of the earth, and of the bed of the ocean, are we sure that there is no receptacle for animal life in its womb? I am not going here to revive the visionary speculations of Athanasius Kircher in his *Mundus subterraneus*, but merely to inquire whether there are any probable grounds for thinking that some creatures may be placed by their Creator at such a depth within the earth's crust, as to be beyond all human ken.

When Laplace says, " It is certain that the densities of its (*the earth's*) strata increase from the surface *to* the centre," it seems to follow that, in his opinion, there is no central cavity in our globe ; but as his object was chiefly to assert the increasing density of the strata as they approach the centre, perhaps his words are not to be taken strictly, especially as in another place he speaks of it merely as *probable* that the strata are more dense as they are *nearer* to the centre. Sir I. F. W. Herschel makes a similar, but

* In N. D. D. H. N. vii. 553.