over every part of the globe. We have the most pregnant proof of the importance of Palæontology in rectifying and expanding ideas deduced from recent zoology of the geographical limits of particular forms of animals, by the results of its application to the proboscidian or elephantine family. But such retrospective views of life in remote periods, in many important instances, confirm the zoologists deductions of the originally restricted range of particular forms of mammalian life. The sum of all the evidence from the fossil world in Australia proves its mammalian population to have been essentially the same in pleistocene, if not pliocene times, as now; only represented, as the Edentate mammals in South America were then represented by more numerous genera, and much more gigantic species, than now exist. But Geology has revealed more important and unexpected facts relative to the marsupial type of quadrupeds. In the miocene and eocene tertiary deposits, marsupial fossils of the American genus Didelphys have been found, both in France and England; and they are associated with Tapirs like that of America. In a more ancient geological period remains of marsupials, some insectivorous, as Spalacotherium and Triconodon, others with teeth like the peculiar premolars in the Australian genus Hypsiprymnus, have been found in the upper oolite of the Isle of Purbeck. In the lower oolite at Stonesfield, Oxfordshire, marsupial remains have been found having their nearest living representatives in the Australian genera Myrmecobius and Dasyurus. Thus it would seem, that the deeper we penetrate the earth, or, in other words, the further we recede in time, the more completely are we absolved from the present laws of geographical distribution. In comparing the mammalian fossils found in British pleistocene and pliocene beds, we have often to travel to Asia or Africa for their homologues. In the miocene and eocene strata some fossils occur which compel us to go to America for the nearest representatives. To match the mammalian remains from the English oolitic formations, we must bring species from the Antipodes. These are truly most suggestive facts. If the present laws of geographical distribution depend, in an important degree, upon the present configuration and position of continents and islands, what a total change in the geographical character of the earth's surface must have taken place since the "Stonesfield slate" was deposited in what now forms the County of Oxfordshire! These and the like considerations from the modifications of geographical distribution of particular forms or groups of animals, warn us how inadequate must be the phenomena connected with the present distribution of land and sea to guide to the determination of the primary ontological divisions of the earth's surface. Some of the latest contributions to this most interesting branch of natural history have been the result of endeavours to determine whether, and how many, distinct creations of plants and animals have taken place. But I would submit that the discovery of two portions of the globe, of which the respective Faunæ and Floræ are different, by no means affords the requisite basis for concluding as to distinct acts of creation. Such conclusion is associated, perhaps unconsciously, with the idea of the historical date of creative acts: it presupposes that the portion of the globe so investigated by the botanist and zoologist has been a separate and primative creation,—that its geographical limits and features are still in the main what they were when the creative fiat went forth. But geology has demonstrated that