

globe, and send the waves dashing around our own shores, against the ancient coast line, as of old.

Nor do I see that the bearing of these consequences on the sea-line,—consequences that would render its level dependent on the elevation or submergence of every continent that has existed, or shall yet exist,—can be set aside, save on the supposition that for every tract of land that rises, another tract of the same area and cubic contents sinks; or, to state the case in other words, and more definitely, that for every protuberance formed within the sea, there is a corresponding hollow formed *also within it* elsewhere. Now, even were it to be granted that for every protuberance which rises on the earth's crust there is a corresponding depression of the surface, which takes place somewhere else (though on what principle this should be granted is not in the least obvious), I do not at all perceive why that depression should always take place *within the sea*. It may take place not on any of the three parts of the earth's surface covered by water, but on that fourth part occupied by land. It may take place on the table-land of a continent. Or, *vice versa*, a hollow formed in the sea, considerable enough to lower the sea's level, may find its counterbalancing protuberance in the further elevation of the interior of some vast tract, such as Asia or New Holland, already raised over the ocean. The submerged continent of the Pacific, which now exists but as a wilderness of scattered atolls, may have been contemporary with that of South America, existing at the time as a flat tract, which simply occupied a certain *area* in the sea; and the hollow which the submergence of the Polynesian land occasioned may possibly have been balanced by the rise of those enormous table-lands of Mexico and the adjacent countries that give to the entire continent in which they are included a mean elevation of more than a thousand feet: or the submergence of that *Atlantis* which was drained by the