in the ridges being increased proximally by intercalation, and in the tubercles being squarely shaped and arranged in a close series, even in the proximal portion of the spine.



Lepracanthus rectus, sp. nov.—(*a*) Three ridges enlarged to show the ornamentation. (*b*) Ridge seen from the lateral aspect.

Type.—Author's collection.

Form. and Loc.—Shale above the Better Bed Coal, Lower Coal-measures, Low Moor, Yorks.

Both Dr. Traquair and Mr. A. Smith Woodward have seen the spine, and agree with me as to its specific distinction.

NOTICES OF MEMOIRS.

I.—British Association for the Advancement of Science. Dover, 1899.

Address to the Geological Section, by Sir Archibald Geikie, D.C.L., D.Sc., F.R.S., President of the Section.

AMONG the many questions of great theoretical importance which have engaged the attention of geologists, none has in late years awakened more interest or aroused livelier controversy than that which deals with Time as an element in geological history. The various schools which have successively arisen — Cataclysmal, Uniformitarian, and Evolutionist—have had each its own views as to the duration of their chronology, as well as to the operations of terrestrial energy. But though holding different opinions, they did not make these differences matter of special controversy among

themselves. About thirty years ago, however, they were startled by a bold irruption into their camp from the side of physics. They were then called on to reform their ways, which were declared to be flatly opposed to the teachings of natural philosophy. Since that period the discussion then started regarding the age of the Earth and the value of geological time has continued with varying animation. Evidence of the most multifarious kind has been brought forward, and arguments of widely different degrees of validity have been pressed into service both by geologists and palæontologists on one side and by physicists on the other. For the last year or two there has been a pause in the controversy, though no general agreement has been arrived at in regard to the matters in dispute. The present interval of comparative quietude seems favourable for a dispassionate review of the debate. I propose, therefore, to take, as perhaps a not inappropriate subject on which to address geologists upon a somewhat international occasion like this present meeting of the British Association at Dover, the question of Geological Time. In offering a brief history of the discussion, I gladly avail myself of the opportunity of enforcing one of the lessons which the discussion has impressed upon my own mind, and to point a moral which, as it seems to me, we geologists may take home to ourselves from a consideration of the whole question. There is, I think, a practical outcome which may be made to issue from the controversy in a combination of sympathy and co-operation among geologists all over the world. A lasting service will be rendered to our science if by well-concerted effort we can place geological dynamics and geological chronology on a broader and firmer basis of actual experiment and measurement than has yet been laid.

To understand aright the origin and progress of the dispute regarding the value of time in geological speculation, we must take note of the attitude maintained towards this subject by some of the early fathers of the science. Among these pioneers none has left his mark more deeply graven on the foundations of modern geology than James Hutton. To him, more than to any other writer of his day, do we owe the doctrine of the high antiquity of our globe. No one before him had ever seen so clearly the abundant and impressive proofs of this remote antiquity recorded in the rocks of the earth's crust. In these rocks he traced the operation of the same slow and quiet processes which he observed to be at work at present in gradually transforming the face of the existing continents. When he stood face to face with the proofs of decay among the mountains, there seems to have arisen uppermost in his mind the thought of the immense succession of ages which these proofs revealed to him. His observant eye enabled him to see "the operations of the surface wasting the solid body of the globe, and to read the unmeasurable course of time that must have flowed during those amazing operations, which the vulgar do not see, and which the learned seem to see without wonder."[1] In contemplating the stupendous results

[1] "Theory of the Earth," vol. i, p. 108.

achieved by such apparently feeble forces, Hutton felt that one great objection he had to contend with in the reception of his theory, even by the scientific men of his day, lay in the inability or unwillingness of the human mind to admit such large demands as he made on the past. "What more can we require?" he asks in summing up his conclusions; and he answers the question in these memorable words: "What more can we require? Nothing but time. It is not any part of the process that will be disputed; but after allowing all the parts, the whole will be denied; and for what?—only because we are not disposed to allow that quantity of time which the ablution of so much wasted mountain might require."[1]

Far as Hutton could follow the succession of events registered in the rocky crust of the globe, he found himself baffled by the closing in around him of that dark abysm of time into which neither eye nor imagination seemed able to penetrate. He well knew that, behind and beyond the ages recorded in the oldest of the primitive rocks, there must have stretched a vast earlier time, of which no record met his view. He did not attempt to speculate beyond the limits of his evidence. "I do not pretend," he said, "to describe the beginning of things; I take things such as I find them at present, and from these I reason with regard to that which must have been."[2] In vain could he look, even among the oldest formations, for any sign of the infancy of the planet. He could only detect a repeated series of similar revolutions, the oldest of which was assuredly not the first in the terrestrial history, and he concluded, as "the result of this physical inquiry, that we find no vestige of a beginning, no prospect of an end."[3]

This conclusion from strictly geological evidence has been impugned from the side of physics, and, as further developed by Playfair, has been declared to be contradicted by the principles of natural philosophy. But if it be considered on the basis of the evidence on which it was originally propounded, it was absolutely true in Hutton's time and remains true to-day. That able reasoner never claimed that the earth has existed from all eternity, or that it will go on existing for ever. He admitted that it must have had a beginning, but he had been unable to find any vestige of that beginning in the structure of the planet itself. And notwithstanding all the multiplied researches of the century that has passed since the immortal "Theory of the Earth" was published, no relic of the first condition of our earth has been found. We have speculated much, indeed, on the subject, and our friends the physicists have speculated still more. Some of the speculations do not seem to me more philosophical than many of those of the older cosmogonists. As far as reliable evidence can be drawn from the rocks of the globe itself, we do not seem to be nearer the discovery of the beginning than Hutton was. The most ancient rocks that can be reached are demonstrably not the first-formed of all. They

[1] "Theory of the Earth," vol. ii, p. 329.
[2] Op. cit., vol i, p. 173, note.
[3] Op. cit., vol. i, p. 200.

were preceded by others which we know must have existed, though no vestige of them may remain.

It may be further asserted that, while it was Hutton who first impressed on modern geology the conviction that for the adequate comprehension of the past history of the earth vast periods of time must be admitted to have elapsed, our debt of obligation to him is increased by the genius with which he linked the passage of these vast periods with the present economy of nature. He first realized the influence of time as a factor in geological dynamics, and first taught the efficacy of the quiet and unobtrusive forces of nature. His predecessors and contemporaries were never tired of invoking the more vigorous manifestations of terrestrial energy. They saw in the composition of the land and in the structure of mountains and valleys memorials of numberless convulsions and cataclysms. In Hutton's philosophy, however, "it is the little causes, long continued, which are considered as bringing about the greatest changes of the earth." [1]

And yet, unlike many of those who derived their inspiration from his teaching, but pushed his tenets to extremes which he doubtless never anticipated, he did not look upon time as a kind of scientific fetich, the invocation of which would endow with efficacy even the most trifling phenomena. As if he had foreseen the use that might be made of his doctrine, he uttered this remarkable warning: "With regard to the effect of time, though the continuance of time may do much in those operations which are extremely slow, where no change, to our observation, had appeared to take place, yet, where it is not in the nature of things to produce the change in question, the unlimited course of time would be no more effectual than the moment by which we measure events in our observations." [2]

We thus see that in the philosophy of Hutton, out of which so much of modern geology has been developed, the vastness of the antiquity of the globe was deduced from the structure of the terrestrial crust and the slow rate of action of the forces by which the surface of the crust is observed to be modified. But no attempt was made by him to measure that antiquity by any of the chronological standards of human contrivance. He was content to realize for himself and to impress upon others that the history of the earth could not be understood, save by the admission that it occupied prolonged though indeterminate ages in its accomplishment. And assuredly no part of his teaching has been more amply sustained by the subsequent progress of research.

Playfair, from whose admirable "Illustrations of the Huttonian Theory" most geologists have derived all that they know directly of that theory, went a little further than his friend and master in dealing with the age of the earth. Not restricting himself, as Hutton did, to the testimony of the rocks, which showed neither vestige of a beginning nor prospect of an end, he called in the evidence of the cosmos outside the limits of our planet, and declared that in

[1] "Theory of the Earth," vol. ii, p. 205.
[2] Op. cit., vol. i, p. 44.

the firmament also no mark could be discovered of the commencement or termination of the present order, no symptom of infancy or old age, nor any sign by which the future or past duration of the universe might be estimated.[1] He thus advanced beyond the strictly geological bases of reasoning, and committed himself to statements which, like some made also by Hutton, seem to have been suggested by certain deductions of the French mathematicians of his day regarding the stability of the planetary motions. His statements have been disproved by modern physics; distinct evidence, both from the earth and the cosmos, has been brought forward of progress from a beginning which can be conceived, through successive stages to an end which can be foreseen. But the disproof leaves Hutton's doctrine about the vastness of geological time exactly where it was. Surely it was no abuse of language to speak of periods as being vast which can only be expressed in millions of years.

It is easy to understand how the Uniformitarian school, which sprang from the teaching of Hutton and Playfair, came to believe that the whole of eternity was at the disposal of geologists. In popular estimation, as the ancient science of astronomy was that of infinite distance, so the modern study of geology was the science of infinite time. It must be frankly conceded that geologists, believing themselves unfettered by any limits to their chronology, made ample use of their imagined liberty. Many of them, following the lead of Lyell, to whose writings in other respects modern geology owes so deep a debt of gratitude, became utterly reckless in their demands for time, demands which even the requirements of their own science, if they had adequately realized them, did not warrant. The older geologists had not attempted to express their vast periods in terms of years. The indefiniteness of their language fitly denoted the absence of any ascertainable limits to the successive ages with which they had to deal. And until some evidence should be discovered whereby these limits might be fixed and measured by human standards, no reproach could justly be brought against the geological terminology. It was far more philosophical to be content, in the meanwhile, with indeterminate expressions, than from data of the weakest or most speculative kind to attempt to measure geological periods by a chronology of years or centuries.

In the year 1862 a wholly new light was thrown on the question of the age of our globe and the duration of geological time by the remarkable paper on the Secular Cooling of the Earth communicated by Lord Kelvin (then Sir William Thomson) to the Royal Society of Edinburgh.[2] In this memoir he first developed his now well-known argument from the observed rate of increase of temperature downwards from the surface of the land. He astonished geologists by announcing to them that some definite limits to the age of our planet might be ascertained, and by declaring his belief that this age must be more than 20 millions, but less than 400 millions of years.

[1] "Illustrations of the Huttonian Theory," § 118.
[2] Trans. Roy. Soc. Edin., vol. xxiii (1862).

Nearly four years later he emphasized his dissent from what he considered to be the current geological opinions of the day by repeating the same argument in a more pointedly antagonistic form in a paper of only a few sentences, entitled "The Doctrine of Uniformity in Geology briefly refuted."[1]

Again, after a further lapse of about two years, when, as President of the Geological Society of Glasgow, it became his duty to give an address, he returned to the same topic and arraigned more boldly and explicitly than ever the geology of the time. He then declared that "a great reform in geological speculation seems now to have become necessary," and he went so far as to affirm that "it is quite certain that a great mistake has been made—that British popular geology at the present time is in direct opposition to the principles of natural philosophy."[2] In pressing once more the original argument derived from the downward increase of terrestrial temperature, he now reinforced it by two further arguments, the one based on the retardation of the earth's angular velocity by tidal friction, the other on the limitation of the age of the sun.

These three lines of attack remain still those along which the assault from physics is delivered against the strongholds of geology. Lord Kelvin has repeatedly returned to the charge since 1868, his latest contribution to the controversy having been pronounced two years ago.[3] While his physical arguments remain the same, the limits of time which he deduces from them have been successively diminished. The original maximum of 400 millions of years has now been restricted by him to not much more than 20 millions, while Professor Tait grudgingly allows something less than 10 millions.[4]

Soon after the appearance of Lord Kelvin's indictment of modern geology in 1868, the defence of the science was taken up by Huxley, who happened at the time to be President of the Geological Society of London. In his own inimitably brilliant way, half seriously half playfully, this doughty combatant, with evident relish, tossed the physical arguments to and fro in the eyes of his geological brethren, as a barrister may flourish his brief before a sympathetic jury. He was willing to admit that "the rapidity of rotation of the earth *may* be diminishing, that the sun *may* be waxing dim, or that the earth itself *may* be cooling." But he went on to add his suspicion that "most of us are Gallios, 'who care for none of these things,' being of opinion that, true or fictitious, they have made no practical difference to the earth, during the period of which a record is preserved in stratified deposits."[5]

For the indifference which their advocate thus professed on their behalf most geologists believed that they had ample justification.

[1] Proc. Roy. Soc. Edin., vol. v, p. 512 (Dec. 18, 1865).
[2] Trans. Geol. Soc. Glasgow, vol. iii, pp. 1, 16 (February, 1868).
[3] "The Age of the Earth," being the Annual Address to the Victoria Institute, June 2, 1897: Phil. Mag., January, 1899, p. 66.
[4] "Recent Advances in Physical Science," p. 174.
[5] Presidential Address, Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc., 1869.

The limits within which the physicist would circumscribe the earth's history was so vague, yet so vast, that whether the time allowed were 400 millions or 100 millions of years did not seem to them greatly to matter. After all, it was not the time that chiefly interested them, but the grand succession of events which the time had witnessed. That succession had been established on observations so abundant and so precise that it could withstand attack from any quarter, and it had taken as firm and lasting a place among the solid achievements of science as could be claimed for any physical speculations whatsoever. Whether the time required for the transaction of this marvellous earth-history was some millions of years more or some millions of years less did not seem to the geologists to be a question on which their science stood in antagonism with the principles of natural philosophy, but one which the natural philosophers might be left to settle at their own good pleasure.

For myself, I may be permitted here to say that I have never shared this feeling of indifference and unconcern. As far back as the year 1868, only a month after Lord Kelvin's first presentation of his threefold argument in favour of limiting the age of the earth, I gave in my adhesion to the propriety of restricting the geological demands for time. I then showed that even the phenomena of denudation, which, from the time of Hutton downwards, had been most constantly and confidently appealed to in support of the inconceivably vast antiquity of our globe, might be accounted for, at the present rate of action, within such a period as 100 millions of years.[1] To my mind it has always seemed that whatever tends to give more precision to the chronology of the geologist, and helps him to a clearer conception of the antiquity with which he has to deal, ought to be welcomed by him as a valuable assistance in his inquiries. And I feel sure that this view of the matter has now become general among those engaged in geological research. Frank recognition is made of the influence which Lord Kelvin's persistent attacks have had upon our science. Geologists have been led by his criticisms to revise their chronology. They gratefully acknowledge that to him they owe the introduction of important new lines of investigation, which link the solution of the problems of geology with those of physics. They realize how much he has done to dissipate the former vague conceptions as to the duration of geological history, and even when they emphatically dissent from the greatly restricted bounds within which he would now limit that history, and when they declare their inability to perceive that any reform of their speculations in this subject is needful, or that their science has placed herself in opposition to the principles of physics, they none the less pay their sincere homage to one who has thrown over geology, as over so many other departments of natural knowledge, the clear light of a penetrating and original genius.

[1] Trans. Geol. Soc. Glasgow, vol. iii, p. 189 (March 26, 1868). Sir W. Thomson acknowledged my adhesion in his reply to Huxley's criticism. Op. cit., p. 221.

When Lord Kelvin first developed his strictures on modern geology he expressed his opposition in the most uncompromising language. In the short paper to which reference has already been made, he announced, without hesitation or palliation, that he "briefly refuted" the doctrine of Uniformitarianism which had been espoused and illustrated by Lyell and a long list of the ablest geologists of the day. The severity of his judgment of British geology was not more marked than was his unqualified reliance on his own methods and results. This confident assurance of a distinguished physicist, together with a formidable array of mathematical formulæ, produced its effect on some geologists and palæontologists who were not Gallios. Thus, even after Huxley's brilliant defence, Darwin could not conceal the deep impression which Lord Kelvin's arguments had made on his mind. In one letter he wrote that the proposed limitation of geological time was one of his "sorest troubles." In another, he pronounced the physicist himself to be "an odious spectre." [1]

The same self-confidence of assertion on the part of some, at least, of the disputants on the physical side has continued all through the controversy. Yet when we examine the three great physical arguments in themselves, we find them to rest on assumptions which, though certified as "probable" or "very sure," are nevertheless admittedly assumptions. The conclusions to which these assumptions lead must depend for their validity on the degree of approximation to the truth in the premises which are postulated.

Now it is interesting to observe that neither the assumptions nor the conclusions drawn from them have commanded universal assent even among physicists themselves. If they were as self-evident as they have been claimed to be, they should at least receive the loyal support of all those whose function it is to pursue and extend the applications of physics. It will be remembered, however, that thirteen years ago Professor George Darwin, who has so often shown his inherited sympathy in geological investigation, devoted his presidential address before the Mathematical Section of this Association to a review of the three famous physical arguments respecting the age of the earth. He summed up his judgment of them in the following words:—"In considering these three arguments I have adduced some reasons against the validity of the first [tidal friction]; and have endeavoured to show that there are elements of uncertainty surrounding the second [secular cooling of the earth]; nevertheless they undoubtedly constitute a contribution of the first importance to physical geology. Whilst, then, we may protest against the precision with which Professor Tait seeks to deduce results from them, we are fully justified in following Sir William Thomson, who says that 'the existing state of things on the earth, life on the earth—all geological history showing continuity of life, must be limited within some such period of past time as 100,000,000 years.'" [2]

More recently Professor Perry has entered the lists, from the

[1] Darwin's Life and Letters, vol. iii, pp. 115, 146.

[2] Rep. Brit. Assoc., 1886, p. 517.

physical side, to challenge the validity of the conclusions so confidently put forward in limitation of the age of the earth. He has boldly impugned each of the three physical arguments. That which is based on tidal retardation, following Mr. Maxwell Close and Professor Darwin, he dismisses as fallacious. In regard to the argument from the secular cooling of the earth, he contends that it is perfectly allowable to assume a much higher conductivity for the interior of the globe, and that this assumption would vastly increase our estimate of the age of the planet. As to the conclusions drawn from the history of the sun, he maintains that, on the one hand, the sun may have been repeatedly fed by infalling meteorites, and that on the other the earth, during former ages, may have had its heat retained by a dense atmospheric envelope. He thinks that "almost anything is possible as to the present internal state of the earth," and he concludes in these words: "To sum up we can find no published record of any lower maximum age of life on the earth, as calculated by physicists, than 400 millions of years. From the three physical arguments, Lord Kelvin's higher limits are 1,000, 400, and 500 million years. I have shown that we have reasons for believing that the age, from all these, may be very considerably underestimated. It is to be observed that if we exclude everything but the arguments from mere physics, the *probable* age of life on the earth is much less than any of the above estimates; but if the palæontologists have good reasons for demanding much greater times, I see nothing from the physicist's point of view which denies them four times the greatest of these estimates."[1]

This remarkable admission from a recognized authority on the physical side re-echoes and emphasizes the warning pronounced by Professor Darwin in the address already quoted—"at present our knowledge of a definite limit to geological time has so little precision that we should do wrong to summarily reject any theories which appear to demand longer periods of time than those which now appear allowable."[2]

This 'wrong' which Professor Darwin so seriously deprecated has been committed not once, but again and again, in the history of this discussion. Lord Kelvin has never taken any notice of the strong body of evidence adduced by geologists and palæontologists in favour of a much longer antiquity than he is now disposed to allow for the age of the earth. His own three physical arguments have been successively restated, with such corrections and modifications as he has found to be necessary, and no doubt further alterations are in store for them. He has cut off slice after slice from the allowance of time which at first he was prepared to grant for the evolution of geological history, his latest pronouncement being that "it was more than twenty and less than forty million years, and probably much nearer twenty than forty."[3] But in none

[1] Nature, vol. li, p. 585 (April 18, 1895).
[2] Rep. Brit. Assoc., 1886, p. 518.
[3] "The Age of the Earth," Presidential Address to the Victoria Institute for 1897, p. 10; also in Phil. Mag., January, 1899.

of his papers is there an admission that geology and palæontology, though they have again and again raised their voices in protest, have anything to say in the matter that is worthy of consideration.

It is difficult satisfactorily to carry on a discussion in which your opponent entirely ignores your arguments, while you have given the fullest attention to his. In the present instance geologists have most carefully listened to all that has been brought forward from the physical side. Impressed by the force of the physical reasoning, they no longer believe that they can make any demands they may please on past time. They have been willing to accept Lord Kelvin's original estimate of 100 millions of years as the period within which the history of life upon the planet must be comprised; while some of them have even sought in various ways to reduce that sum nearer to his lower limit. Yet there is undoubtedly a prevalent misgiving, whether in thus seeking to reconcile their requirements with the demands of the physicist they are not tying themselves down within limits of time which on any theory of evolution would have been insufficient for the development of the animal and vegetable kingdoms.

It is unnecessary to recapitulate before this Section of the British Association, even in briefest outline, the reasoning of geologists and palæontologists which leads them to conclude that the history recorded in the crust of the earth must have required for its transaction a much vaster period of time than that to which the physicists would now restrict it.[1] Let me merely remark that the reasoning is essentially based on observations of the present rate of geological and biological changes upon the earth's surface. It is not, of course, maintained that this rate has never varied in the past. But it is the only rate with which we are familiar, which we can watch and in some degree measure, and which, therefore, we can take as a guide towards the comprehension and interpretation of the past history of our planet.

It may be, and has often been, said that the present scale of geological and biological processes cannot be accepted as a reliable measure for the past. Starting from the postulate, which no one will dispute, that the total sum of terrestrial energy was once greater than it is now and has been steadily declining, the physicists have boldly asserted that all kinds of geological action must have been more vigorous and rapid during bygone ages than they are to-day; that volcanoes were more gigantic, earthquakes more frequent and destructive, mountain upthrows more stupendous, tides and waves more powerful, and commotions of the atmosphere more violent, with more ruinous tempests and heavier rainfall. Assertions of this kind are temptingly plausible and are easily made. But it is not enough that they should be made; they ought to be supported by some kind of evidence to show that they are founded on actual fact and not on

[1] The geological arguments are briefly given in my Presidential Address to the British Association at the Edinburgh Meeting of 1892. The biological arguments were well stated, and in some detail, by Professor Poulton in his Address to the Zoological Section of the Association at the Liverpool Meeting of 1896.

mere theoretical possibility. Such evidence, if it existed, could surely be produced. The chronicle of the earth's history, from a very early period down to the present time, has been legibly written within the sedimentary formations of the terrestrial crust. Let the appeal be made to that register. Does it lend any support to the affirmation that the geological processes are now feebler and slower than they used to be? If it does, the physicists, we might suppose, would gladly bring forward its evidence as irrefragable confirmation of the soundness of their contention. But the geologists have found no such confirmation. On the contrary, they have been unable to discover any indication that the rate of geological causation has ever, on the whole, greatly varied during the time which has elapsed since the deposition of the oldest stratified rocks. They do not assert that there has been no variation, that there have been no periods of greater activity, both hypogene and epigene. But they maintain that the demonstration of the existence of such periods has yet to be made. They most confidently affirm that whatever may have happened in the earliest ages, in the whole vast succession of sedimentary strata nothing yet has been detected which necessarily demands that more violent and rapid action which the physicists suppose to have been the order of nature during the past.

So far as the potent effects of prolonged denudation permit us to judge, the latest mountain upheavals were at least as stupendous as any of older date whereof the basal relics can yet be detected. They seem, indeed, to have been still more gigantic than those. It may be doubted, for example, whether among the vestiges that remain of Mesozoic or Palæozoic mountain-chains any instance can be found so colossal as those of Tertiary times, such as the Alps. No volcanic eruptions of the older geological periods can compare in extent or volume with those of Tertiary and recent date. The plication and dislocation of the terrestrial crust are proportionately as conspicuously displayed among the younger as among the older formations, though the latter, from their greater antiquity, have suffered during a longer time from the renewed disturbances of successive periods.

As regards evidence of greater violence in the surrounding envelopes of atmosphere and ocean, we seek for it in vain among the stratified rocks. Among the very oldest formations of these Islands, the Torridon Sandstone of North-West Scotland presents us with a picture of long-continued sedimentation, such as may be seen in progress now round the shores of many a mountain-girdled lake. In that venerable deposit, the enclosed pebbles are not mere angular blocks and chips, swept by a sudden flood or destructive tide from off the surface of the land, and huddled together in confused heaps over the floor of the sea. They have been rounded and polished by the quiet operation of running water, as stones are rounded and polished now in the channels of brooks or on the shores of lake and sea. They have been laid gently down above each other, layer over layer, with fine sand sifted in between them, and this deposition has taken place along shores which, though the waters that washed them

have long since disappeared, can still be followed for mile after mile across the mountains and glens of the North-West Highlands. So tranquil were these waters that their gentle currents and oscillations sufficed to ripple the sandy floor, to arrange the sediment in laminæ of current-bedding, and to separate the grains of sand according to their relative densities. We may even now trace the results of these operations in thin darker layers and streaks of magnetic iron, zircon, and other heavy minerals, which have been sorted out from the lighter quartz-grains, as layers of iron-sand may be seen sifted together by the tide along the upper margins of many of our sandy beaches at the present day.

In the same ancient formation there occur also various intercalations of fine muddy sediment, so regular in their thin alternations, and so like those of younger formations, that we cannot but hope and expect that they may eventually yield remains of organisms which, if found, would be the earliest traces of life in Europe.

It is thus abundantly manifest that even in the most ancient of the sedimentary registers of the earth's history, not only is there no evidence of colossal floods, tides, and denudation, but there is incontrovertible proof of continuous orderly deposition, such as may be witnessed to-day in any quarter of the globe. The same tale, with endless additional details, is told all through the stratified formations down to those which are in the course of accumulation at the present day.

Not less important than the stratigraphical is the palæontological evidence in favour of the general quietude of the geological processes in the past. The conclusions drawn from the nature and arrangement of the sediments are corroborated and much extended by the structure and manner of entombment of the enclosed organic remains. From the time of the very earliest fossiliferous formations there is nothing to show that either plants or animals have had to contend with physical conditions of environment different, on the whole, from those in which their successors now live. The oldest trees, so far as regards their outer form and internal structure, betoken an atmosphere neither more tempestuous nor obviously more impure than that of to-day. The earliest corals, sponges, crustaceans, mollusks, and arachnids were not more stoutly constructed than those of later times, and are found grouped together among the rocks as they lived and died, with no apparent indication that any violent commotion of the elements tried their strength when living or swept away their remains when dead.

But, undoubtedly, most impressive of all the palæontological data is the testimony borne by the grand succession of organic remains among the stratified rocks as to the vast duration of time required for their evolution. Professor Poulton has treated this branch of the subject with great fulness and ability. We do not know the present average rates of organic variation, but all the available evidence goes to indicate their extreme slowness. They may conceivably have been more rapid in the past, or they may have been

liable to fluctuations according to vicissitudes of environment.[1] But those who assert that the rate of biological evolution ever differed materially from what it may now be inferred to be, ought surely to bring forward something more than mere assertion in their support. In the meantime, the most philosophical course is undoubtedly followed by those biologists who in this matter rest their belief on their own experience among recent and fossil organisms.

So cogent do these geological and palæontological arguments appear to those at least who have taken the trouble to master them, that they are worthy of being employed, not in defence merely, but in attack. It seems to me that they may be used with effect in assailing the stronghold of speculation and assumption in which our physical friends have ensconced themselves and from which, with their feet, as they believe, planted well within the interior of the globe and their heads in the heart of the sun, they view with complete unconcern the efforts made by those who endeavour to gather the truth from the surface and crust of the earth. That portion of the records of terrestrial history which lies open to our investigation has been diligently studied in all parts of the world. A vast body of facts has been gathered together from this extended and combined research. The chronicle registered in the earth's crust, though not complete, is legible and consistent. From the latest to the earliest of its chapters the story is capable of clear and harmonious interpretation by a comparison of its pages with the present condition of things. We know infinitely more of the history of this earth than we do of the history of the sun. Are we, then, to be told that this knowledge, so patiently accumulated from innumerable observations and so laboriously co-ordinated and classified, is to be held of none account in comparison with the conclusions of physical science in regard to the history of the central luminary of our system? These conclusions are founded on assumptions which may or may not correspond with the truth. They have already undergone revision, and they may be still further modified as our slender knowledge of the sun, and of the details of its history, is increased by future investigation. In the meantime, we decline to accept them as a final pronouncement of science on the subject. We place over against them the evidence of geology and palæontology, and affirm that unless the deductions we draw from that evidence can be disproved, we are entitled to maintain them as entirely borne out by the testimony of the rocks.

Until, therefore, it can be shown that geologists and palæontologists have misinterpreted their records, they are surely well within their logical rights in claiming as much time for the history of this earth as the vast body of evidence accumulated by them demands. So far as I have been able to form an opinion,

[1] See an interesting and suggestive paper by Professor Le Conte on "Critical Periods in the History of the Earth": Bull. Dept. Geology, University of California, vol. i (1895), p. 313. Also one by Professor Chamberlin on "The Ulterior Basis of Time-divisions and the Classification of Geological History": Journal of Geology, vol. vi (1898), p. 449.

one hundred millions of years would suffice for that portion of the history which is registered in the stratified rocks of the crust. But if the palæontologists find such a period too narrow for their requirements, I can see no reason on the geological side why they should not be at liberty to enlarge it as far as they may find to be needful, for the evolution of organized existence on the globe. As I have already remarked, it is not the length of time which interests us so much as the determination of the relative chronology of the events which were transacted within that time. As to the general succession of these events, there can be no dispute. We have traced its stages from the bottom of the oldest rocks up to the surface of the present continents and the floor of the present seas. We know that these stages have followed each other in orderly advance, and that geological time, whatever limits may be assigned to it, has sufficed for the passage of the long stately procession.

We may, therefore, well leave the dispute about the age of the earth to the decision of the future. In so doing, however, I should be glad if we would carry away from it something of greater service to science than the consciousness of having striven our best in a barren controversy, wherein concession has all to be on one side and the selection of arguments entirely on the other. During these years of prolonged debate I have often been painfully conscious that in this subject, as in so many others throughout the geological domain, the want of accurate numerical data is a serious hindrance to the progress of our science. Heartily do I acknowledge that much has been done in the way of measurements and experiments for the purpose of providing a foundation for estimates and deductions. But infinitely more remains to be accomplished. The field of investigation is almost boundless, for there is hardly a department of geological dynamics over which it does not extend. The range of experimental geology must be widely enlarged, until every process susceptible of illustration or measurement by artificial means has been investigated. Field-observation needs to be supplemented where possible by instrumental determinations, so as to be made more precise and accurate, and more capable of furnishing reliable numerical statistics for practical as well as theoretical deductions.

The subject is too vast for adequate treatment here. But let me illustrate my meaning by selecting a few instances where the adoption of these more rigid methods of inquiry might powerfully assist us in dealing with the rates of geological processes and the value of geological time. Take, for example, the wide range of lines of investigation embraced under the head of Denudation. So voluminous a series of observations has been made in this subject, and so ample is the literature devoted to it, that no department of geology, it might be thought, has been more abundantly and successfully explored. Yet if we look through the pile of memoirs, articles, and books, we cannot but be struck with the predominant vagueness of their statements, and with the general absence of such numerical

data determined by accurate, systematic, and prolonged measurement as would alone furnish a satisfactory basis for computations of the rate at which denudation takes place. Some instrumental observations of the greatest value have indeed been made, but for the most part observations of this kind have been too meagre and desultory.

A little consideration will show that in all branches of the investigation of denudation opportunities present themselves on every side of testing, by accurate instrumental observation and measurement, the rate at which some of the most universal processes in the geological régime of our globe are carried on.

It has long been a commonplace of geology that the amount of the material removed in suspension and solution by rivers furnishes a clue to the rate of denudation of the regions drained by the rivers. But how unequal in value, and generally how insufficient in precision, are the observations on this topic! A few rivers have been more or less systematically examined, some widely varying results have been obtained from the observations, and while enough has been obtained to show the interest and importance of the method of research, no adequate supply of materials has been gathered for the purposes of accurate deduction and generalization. What we need is a carefully organized series of observations carried out on a uniform plan, over a sufficient number of years, not for one river only, but for all the important rivers of a country, and, indeed, for all the greater rivers of each continent. We ought to know as accurately as possible the extent of the drainage-area of each river, the relations of river-discharge to rainfall and to other meteorological as well as topographical conditions; the variation in the proportions of mechanical and chemical impurities in the river-water according to geological formations, form of the ground, season of the year, and climate. The whole geological régime of each river should be thoroughly studied. The admirable report of Messrs. Humphreys and Abbot on the "Physics and Hydraulics of the Mississippi," published in 1861, might well serve as a model for imitation, though these observers necessarily occupied themselves with some questions which are not specially geological and did not enter into others on which, as geologists, we should now gladly have further information.

Again, the action of Glaciers has still less been subjected to prolonged and systematic observation. The few data already obtained are so vague that we may be said to be still entirely ignorant of the rate at which glaciers are wearing down their channels and contributing to the denudation of the land.

The whole of this inquiry is eminently suitable for combined research. Each stream or glacier, or each well-marked section of one, might become the special inquiry of a single observer, who would soon develop a paternal interest in his valley and vie with his colleagues of other valleys in the fulness and accuracy of his records.

Nor is our information respecting the operations of the Sea much more precise. Even in an island like Great Britain, where the

waves and tides effect so much change within the space of a human lifetime, the estimates of the rate of advance or retreat of the shore-line are based for the most part on no accurate determinations. It is satisfactory to be able to announce that the Council of this Association has formed a Committee for the purpose of obtaining full and accurate information regarding alterations of our coasts, and that with the sanction of the Lords of the Admiralty the co-operation of the Coastguard throughout the three kingdoms has been secured. We may therefore hope to be eventually in possession of trustworthy statistics on this interesting subject.

The disintegration of the surface of the land by the combined agency of the Subaërial forces of decay is a problem which has been much studied, but in regard to whose varying rates of advance not much has been definitely ascertained. The meteorological conditions under which it takes place differ materially according to latitude and climate, and doubtless its progress is equally variable. An obvious and useful source of information in regard to atmospheric denudations is to be found in the decay of the material of buildings of which the time of erection is known, and in dated tombstones. Twenty years ago I called attention to the rate at which marble gives way in such a moist climate as ours, and cited the effects of subaërial waste as these can be measured on the monuments of our graveyards and cemeteries.[1] I would urge upon town geologists, and those in the country who have no opportunities of venturing far afield, that they may do good service by careful scrutiny of ancient buildings and monuments. In the churchyards they will find much to occupy and interest them, not, however, like Old Mortality, in repairing the tombstones, but in tracing the ravages of the weather upon them, and in obtaining definite measures of the rate of their decay.

The conditions under which subaërial disintegration is effected in arid climates, and the rate of its advance, are still less known, seeing that most of our information is derived from the chance observations of passing travellers. Yet this branch of the subject is not without importance in relation to the denudation not only of the existing terrestrial surface but of the lands of former periods, for there is evidence of more than one arid epoch in geological history. Here, again, a diligent examination of ancient buildings and monuments might afford some, at least, of the required data. In such a country as Egypt, for instance, it might eventually be possible to determine from a large series of observations what has been the average rate of surface-disintegration of the various kinds of stone employed in human constructions that have been freely exposed to the air for several thousand years.

Closely linked with the question of denudation is that of the Deposition of the material worn away from the surface of the land. The total amount of sediment laid down must equal the amount of material abstracted, save in so far as the soluble portions of that material are retained in solution in the sea. But we have still much to learn as to the conditions, and especially as to the rate of,

[1] Proc. Roy. Soc. Edin., vol. x (1879–80), p. 518.

sedimentation. Nor does there appear to be much hope of any considerable increase to our knowledge until the subject is taken up in earnest as one demanding and justifying a prolonged series of well-planned and carefully executed observations. We have yet to discover the different rates of deposit, under the varying conditions in which it is carried on in lakes, estuaries, and the sea. What, for instance, would be a fair average for the rate at which the lakes of each country of Europe are now being silted up? If this rate were ascertained, and if the amount of material already deposited in these basins were determined, we should be in possession of data for estimating not only the probable time when the lakes will disappear, but also the approximate date at which they came into existence.

But it is not merely in regard to epigene changes that further more extended and concerted observation is needed. Even among subterranean movements there are some which might be watched and recorded with far more care and continuity than have ever been attempted. The researches of Professor George Darwin and others have shown how constant are the tremors, minute but measurable, to which the crust of the earth is subject.[1] Do these phenomena indicate displacements of the crust, and, if so, what in the lapse of a century is their cumulative effect on the surface of the land?

More momentous in their consequences are the disturbances which traverse mountain-chains and find their most violent expression in shocks of earthquake. The effect of such shocks have been studied and recorded in many parts of the world, but their cause is still little understood. Are the disturbances due to a continuation of the same operation which at first gave birth to the mountains? Should they be regarded as symptoms of growth or of collapse? Are they accompanied with even the slightest amount of elevation or depression? We cannot tell. But these questions are probably susceptible of some more or less definite answer. It might be possible, for instance, to determine with extreme precision the heights above a given datum of various fixed points along such a chain as the Alps, and by a series of minutely accurate measurements to detect any upward or downward deviation from these heights. It is quite conceivable that throughout the whole historical period some deviation of this kind has been going on, though so slowly, or by such slight increments at each period of renewal, as to escape ordinary observation. We might thus learn whether, after an Alpine earthquake, an appreciable difference of level is anywhere discoverable, whether the Alps as a great mountain-chain are still growing or are now subsiding, and we might be able to ascertain the rate of the movement. Although changes of this nature may have been too slight during human experience to be ordinarily appreciable, their very insignificance seems to me to supply a strong reason why they should be sought for and carefully measured. They would not tell us, indeed, whether a mountain-chain was called into being in one gigantic convulsion, or was raised at wide intervals by successive uplifts,

[1] Report Brit. Assoc., 1882, p. 95.

or was slowly elevated by one prolonged and continuous movement. But they might furnish us with suggestive information as to the rate at which upheaval or depression of the terrestrial crust is now going on.

The vexed questions of the origin of Raised Beaches and Sunk Forests might in like manner be elucidated by well-devised measurements. It is astonishing upon what loose and unreliable evidence the elevation or depression of coast-lines has often been asserted. On shores where proofs of a recent change of level are observable it would not be difficult to establish by accurate observation whether any such movements are taking place now, and, if they are, to determine their rate. The old attempts of this kind along the coasts of Scandinavia might be resumed with far more precision and on a much more extended scale. Methods of instrumental research have been vastly improved since the days of Celsius and Linnæus. Mere eye-observations would not supply sufficiently accurate results. When the datum-line has been determined with rigorous accuracy, the minutest changes of level, such as would be wholly inappreciable to the senses, might be detected and recorded. If such a system of watch were maintained along coasts where there is reason to believe that some rise or fall of land is taking place, it would be possible to follow the progress of the movement and to determine its rate.

But I must not dwell longer on examples of the advantages which geology would gain from a far more general and systematic adoption of methods of experiment and measurement in elucidation of the problems of the science. I have referred to a few of those which have a more special bearing on the question of geological time, but it is obvious that the same methods might be extended into almost every branch of geological dynamics. While we gladly and gratefully recognize the large amount of admirable work that has already been done by the adoption of these practical methods, from the time of Hall, the founder of experimental geology, down to our own day, we cannot but feel that our very appreciation of the gain which the science has thus derived increases the desire to see the practice still further multiplied and extended. I am confident that it is in this direction more than in any other that the next great advances of geology are to be anticipated.

While much may be done by individual students, it is less to their single efforts than to the combined investigations of many fellow-workers that I look most hopefully for the accumulation of data towards the determination of the present rate of geological changes. I would, therefore, commend this subject to the geologists of this and other countries as one in which individual, national, and international co-operation might well be enlisted. We already possess an institution which seems well adapted to undertake and control an enterprise of the kind suggested. The International Geological Congress, which brings together our associates from all parts of the globe, would confer a lasting benefit on the science if it could organize a system of combined observation in any single one of the

departments of inquiry which I have indicated or in any other which might be selected. We need not at first be too ambitious. The simplest, easiest, and least costly series of observations might be chosen for a beginning. The work might be distributed among the different countries represented in the Congress. Each nation would be entirely free in its selection of subjects for investigation, and would have the stimulus of co-operation with other nations in its work. The Congress will hold its triennial gathering next year in Paris, and if such an organization of research as I have suggested could then be inaugurated, a great impetus would thereby be given to geological research, and France, again become the birthplace of another scientific movement, would acquire a fresh claim to the admiration and gratitude of geologists in every part of the globe.

II. — British Association for the Advancement of Science. Sixty-ninth Annual Meeting, held at Dover, September 14–20, 1899.

List of Papers read in Section C, Geology.

Sir Archibald Geikie, D.C.L., F.R.S., F.G.S., President.

Presidential Address by Sir A. Geikie (read 16th September).

R. Etheridge, F.R.S. — On the Relations between the Dover and Franco-Belgian Coal-Basins.

Professor W. Boyd Dawkins, F.R.S.—On the South-Eastern Coalfield.[1]

A. J. Jukes-Browne.—Note on a Boring through the Chalk and Gault near Dieppe.

Walcot Gibson.—Some recent Work among the Upper Carboniferous of North Staffordshire and its Bearings on concealed Coalfields.

E. Greenly.—Report of the Committee on the Drift Sections at Moel Tryfan.

C. B. Wedd.—Note on Barium Sulphate in the Bunter Sandstone of North Staffordshire.

Professor J. Milne, F.R.S.—Report of the Committee on Seismological Investigations.

Professor H. A. Miers, F.R.S.— Report of the Committee on the Structure of Crystals.

E. J. Garwood.—Report of the Committee on Life Zones in British Carboniferous Rocks.

Dr. A. W. Rowe.—The Photo-Micrography of Opaque Objects as applied to Delineation of the Minute Structure of Fossils. (Lantern.)

Dr. G. Abbott.—Water Zones: their Influence on the Situation and Growth of Concretions. (Lantern.)

——— Tubular and Concentric Concretions. (Lantern.)

E. Greenly.—On Photographs of Sandstone Pipes in the Carboniferous Limestone at Dwlbau Point, East Anglesey. (Lantern.)

——— Glaciation of Dwlbau Point, East Anglesey. (Lantern.)

P. F. Kendall.—Extra-Morainic Drainage in Yorkshire. (Lantern.)

[1] Professor W. Boyd Dawkins' diagrams of the new coal borings in Kent were on view in the Section Room.

J. Lomas.—On the Origin of Lateral Moraines and Rock Trains. (Lantern.)

Professor W. J. Sollas, F.R.S.—Note on the Origin of Flint. (Lantern.)

Dr. H. J. Johnston-Lavis.—The Structure of Oolite and Calcareous Confetti. (Lantern.)

Rev. G. C. H. Pollen.—Report of the Committee on the Ty Newydd Caves. (Lantern.)

Professor T. Rupert Jones, F.R.S.—Report of the Committee on Palæozoic Phyllopoda.

Professor W. J. Sollas, F.R.S.—On Homotaxy and Contemporaneity.

Professor W. W. Watts.—On the Rounded Surfaces of the Mount Sorrel Granite.

Professor A. Renard.—On the Origin of Chondritic Meteorites.

Captain McDakin.—On Coast Erosion. (Lantern.)

G. Dowker.—Coast Erosion. (Lantern.)

W. Whitaker, F.R.S.—Preliminary Report on Coast Erosion.

Vaughan Cornish.—On Photographs of Wave Phenomena. (Lantern.)

Dr. Tempest Anderson.—Note on the Eruption of Vesuvius in September, 1898. (Lantern.)

Professor G. Platania.—On Mount Etna and its recent Volcanic Phenomena.

Professor P. F. Kendall.—Investigation of the Underground Waters of Craven. Part I: The Sources of the Aire. (Lantern.)

Professor W. Boyd Dawkins, F.R.S.—On the Geology of the Channel Tunnel.

F. W. Harmer.—On a proposed New Classification of the Pliocene Deposits of the East of England.

——— The Meteorological Conditions of North-Western Europe during the Pliocene and Glacial Periods.

Professor W. W. Watts.—Report of the Committee on British Photographs of Geological Interest.[1]

Rev. J. M. Mello.—A note on some Palæolithic Implements of North Kent.

P. M. C. Kermode.—Report of Committee on Irish Elk Remains in the Isle of Man.

Professor A. P. Coleman.—Report of the Committee on the Flora and Fauna of the Interglacial Beds in Canada.

Mrs. Maria M. (Ogilvie) Gordon, D.Sc.—On Sigmoidal Curves in the Earth's Crust.

H. Bolton.—Report of the Committee on the Ossiferous Caves at Uphill.

Professor P. F. Kendall.—Report of the Committee on Erratic Blocks of the British Isles.

Dr. H. M. Ami.—On the Subdivisions of the Carboniferous System in certain portions of Nova Scotia.

A. Smith Woodward.—Report of the Committee on the Registration of Type Specimens.

[1] A series of geological photographs was exhibited by the Committee for the Collection and Preservation of Geological Photographs in the Committee Room.

III.—A Palæozoic Terrane beneath the Cambrian. By Geo. F. Matthew. [Annals New York Acad. Sci., vol. xii, No. 2, pp. 41–56.]

THIS article describes an unconformable series of rocks below the true Cambrian measures, containing *Paradoxides* and *Agraulos strenuus*, and therefore claimed to be pre-Cambrian. The series has been observed in Canada (Southern New Brunswick) and Newfoundland, in both of which countries the erosion of the underlying terrane (Etcheminian) to a greater or less extent had occurred before the deposition of the Cambrian.

Remains of a fauna had been found in these beds in New Brunswick, but only of a fragmentary kind, and only low organisms had, as a rule, been recognized. The Newfoundland beds yielded better results, and Mr. Matthew now records from the terrane the following forms:—

Hyolithes 2 species, *Orthotheca* 4 sp., *Urotheca* (n.gen.) 1 sp., *Aptychopsis* 1 sp., *Kutorgina* (?) 1 sp., *Obolella* 1 sp., *Obolus* 1 sp., *Coleoides* 1 sp., *Hyolithellus* 2 sp., *Helenia* 1 sp., *Palæaomæa* 1 sp., *Scenella* 2 sp., *Platyceras* 3 sp., *Modiolopsis* 1 sp., *Platysolenites* (?) 1 sp. Besides these there are fragments of Cystidians and burrows and trails of worms.

"The uniformity of conditions attending the deposition of the Etcheminian throughout the Atlantic Coast province of the Cambrian is surprising, and point to a quiescent period of long continuance, during which the Hyolithidæ and Capulidæ developed so as to become the dominant types of the animal world, while the Brachiopods, the Lamellibranchs, and the other Gasteropods still were puny and insignificant."

REVIEWS.

I.—The Survey Memoir on the Scottish Uplands.[1]

I HAVE been requested by my friend the Editor of the Geological Magazine to review this latest, finest, and most original of the monographs issued by the British Geological Survey; and although for many reasons I should have preferred that the request had been made to some younger geologist, and one less personally interested in the subject, yet as an old worker in the Upland region to which the volume is devoted, an opponent of the old ideas of the succession, and an advocate of the new, I have no choice but to comply.

In the first place attention must be directed to the great advance which this monograph shows upon the previous Survey publications of the corresponding type as regards external get-up, paper, printing, illustrations, and last, but by no means least, reasonableness in price. We have here a handsome volume, a large octavo of some

[1] Memoirs of the Geological Survey of the United Kingdom: "The Silurian Rocks of Britain," vol. i, Scotland, 1899.