

reptile dynasty. The Iguanodon must have been quite as tall as the elephant, — greatly longer, and, it would seem, at least as bulky. The Megalosaurus must have at least equalled the rhinoceros; the Hylæosaurus would have outweighed the hippopotamus. And when reptiles that rivalled in size our hugest mammals inhabited the land, other reptiles, — Ichthyosaurs, Plesiosaurs, and Cetiosaurs, — scarce less bulky than the cetacea themselves, possessed the sea. Not only was the platform of being occupied in all its *breadth*, but also in all its *height*; and it is according to our simpler and more obvious ideas of adaptation — simple and obvious because gleaned from the very surface of the universe of life — that such should have been the case. But it does appear strange, because under the regulation, it would seem, of a principle of adaptation more occult, and, if I may so speak, more *Providential*, that no sooner are the huge mammals introduced *as a group*, than, with but a few exceptions, the reptiles appear in greatly diminished proportions. They no longer occupy the platform to its full extent of *height*. Even in tropical countries, in which certain families of mammals still attain to the maximum size, the reptiles, if we except the crocodilean family, a few harmless turtles, and the degraded boas and pythons, are a small and comparatively unimportant race. Nay, the existing giants of the class — the crocodiles and boas — hardly equal in bulk the third-rate reptiles of the ages of the Oolite and the Wealden. So far as can be seen, there is no reason deduceable from the nature of things, why the country that sustains a mammal bulky as the elephant, should not also support a reptile huge as the Iguanodon; or why the Megalosaurus, Hylæosaurus, and Dicynodon, might not have been contemporary with the lion, tiger, and rhinoceros. The change which took place in the reptile group im-