

its whole extent, covered mostly with sand, which is probably not derived from the detritus of rivers.<sup>1</sup> He observes, regarding this widely-diffused deposit, that it might be thought to be due to the grinding down of submarine rocks by the sea itself. But he contends that "how violent soever may be the movements of the sea, they can have but little effect, save on those rocks which emerge above the level of the water, the greatest storms being little felt except on the surface, and for a short way below it." In this sagacious and generally accurate inference, however, he was long before anticipated by Boyle.

Considering, further, the problem presented by the general diffusion of sand over the bed of the sea, he thinks that the erosive influence of the ocean cannot be enough to account for this deposit, which is spread over so vast an area. He concludes, therefore, that the sand must date back to the remote ages of the destruction of the mountains. The submarine rocks met with in sounding are, he thinks, unquestionably the remains of mountains formerly destroyed, and the detached boulders similarly discovered are no doubt the result of the destruction of these rocks, though in some cases they may have been derived from neighbouring islands where such exist.<sup>2</sup>

No argument against this view of the high antiquity of the sandy sediment on the sea-floor can, he believes, be drawn from the presence of shells, either singly or in numbers, in this sand. These he regards as obviously the relics of molluscs of the present time, those of former ages having been long ago destroyed.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. 401.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 401, 402.

<sup>3</sup> P. 402.