

**KARST**

# KARST

## Important Karst Regions of the Northern Hemisphere

EDITED BY **M. HERAK**  
*Geological and Palaeontological Institute,  
Faculty of Natural Sciences, Zagreb (Yugoslavia)*

AND **V.T. STRINGFIELD**  
*Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey,  
Washington, D.C. (U.S.A.)*



ELSEVIER PUBLISHING COMPANY Amsterdam – London – New York 1972

ELSEVIER PUBLISHING COMPANY

335 JAN VAN GALENSTRAAT, P.O. BOX 211, AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS

AMERICAN ELSEVIER PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.

52 VANDERBILT AVENUE, NEW YORK 10017

Library of Congress Card Number: 74-151736

ISBN 0-444-40849-5

With 173 illustrations and 8 tables.

Copyright © 1972 by Elsevier Publishing Company, Amsterdam

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher, Elsevier Publishing Company, Jan van Galenstraat 335, Amsterdam

Printed in The Netherlands

## Preface

Karst areas with their specific morphologic and hydrogeologic features are widespread throughout the world. Since ancient times there has been a lively interest in deciphering the relationships of strange superficial erosional relics, ponors, dolines, vauclusian springs, caves, caverns, and so forth. The discovery of saw dust, leaves and some fresh-water animals suggested an entangled connection of underground water courses which at the beginning led to rather strange explanations. The first attempts to explain karst phenomena were recorded by ancient civilisations. But not until the nineteenth century was there any clear evidence of the origin of karst features. Until recently a descriptive method of presenting karst was dominant. With the improvement of detailed geologic investigations, karst relations have gradually come to be understood as the logical consequences of various geologic forces working under specific conditions.

Practical interest, especially in the areas of water supply and the positioning of power plants, has hastened the introduction of more exact methods in karst investigations. Every day new data are collected and new theories are put forth. However, new developments often do not reach the professional journals or are published in various reviews in different languages; therefore, they are not readily available to all who are interested in them. This fact led to the publishing of this book in which are presented karst relations and the problems of various countries having advanced theoretical and practical experience.

The number of countries was limited by the size of the book as well as by the willingness of the invited experts to cooperate. We endeavoured to present contributions covering all the main types of karst.

We are conscious that we have taken only the first step in preparing a common base for wider comparison and exchange of ideas for future theoretical and practical advances in the area of karst investigation and exploration. A proposed second edition may be the result of still greater cooperation in order to complete karst notions concerning the space, ideas, methods of investigation, and application. For that purpose any further suggestions would be very much appreciated.

MILAN HERAK (Zagreb)

# Contents

Preface . . . . .	v
-------------------	---

## *Chapter 1. Historical Review of Morphologic Concepts*

J. ROGLIĆ

Introduction . . . . .	1
Early investigators . . . . .	1
Scientific approach . . . . .	3
First phase of karst morphology investigation . . . . .	3
Second phase of karst morphology investigation . . . . .	9
Main characteristics of surface karst . . . . .	15
References . . . . .	17

## *Chapter 2. Historical Review of Hydrogeologic Concepts*

M. HERAK and V. T. STRINGFIELD

Introduction . . . . .	19
Early investigators . . . . .	20
Modern theories . . . . .	21
References . . . . .	24

## *Chapter 3. Karst of Yugoslavia*

M. HERAK

Introduction . . . . .	25
Lithostratigraphic and sedimentologic aspects . . . . .	26
Tectonic setting of Yugoslavia . . . . .	29
Phases of karstification . . . . .	30
Morphologic features . . . . .	31
Hydrogeologic conditions . . . . .	41
The Adriatic insular and coastal region . . . . .	42
The high karst region . . . . .	46
The inner region . . . . .	52
Practical problems and their approach . . . . .	53
Practical aspects of geology . . . . .	54
Application of geophysical methods . . . . .	56



Practical aspects of speleology . . . . .	58
Practical aspects of hydrology . . . . .	59
Surface water storage basins in karst. . . . .	62
Geologic basis for groundwater development . . . . .	67
Practical problems in water supply . . . . .	68
Practical aspects of forestry in the Dinaric karst . . . . .	74
Practical aspects of agriculture in the Dinaric karst . . . . .	75
References . . . . .	76

#### *Chapter 4. Karst of Italy*

S. BELLONI, B. MARTINIS and G. OROMBELLI

Introduction . . . . .	85
Lithostratigraphic and sedimentologic aspects. . . . .	85
Tectonic setting . . . . .	88
Phases of karstification . . . . .	90
Morphologic features . . . . .	93
Principal karst areas. . . . .	93
The Italian Karst . . . . .	95
Plateaus of the Friulian, Venetian and Lombardian pre-Alps . . . . .	98
The region of Apulia . . . . .	101
Lesser karst areas . . . . .	104
Italian Alps . . . . .	105
Apennines . . . . .	108
Sicily and Sardinia . . . . .	112
Karst phenomena in conglomerate . . . . .	113
Karst phenomena in gypsum . . . . .	115
Hydrogeologic conditions . . . . .	116
Practical problems and their approach . . . . .	124
References . . . . .	125

#### *Chapter 5. Karst of France*

J. AVIAS

Introduction . . . . .	129
Lithostratigraphy . . . . .	130
Structure . . . . .	131
Climate . . . . .	131
Karst phenomena in Palaeozoic, mainly Hercynian massifs (Ardennes, Vosges, Armorican Massif, Massif Central, Montagne Noire, Palaeozoic massifs in the Alps and the Pyrenees) . . . . .	133
Karst phenomena in Mesozoic and Tertiary formations . . . . .	135
Introduction . . . . .	135
Karst phenomena in Mesozoic and Tertiary formations in the Paris Basin . . . . .	136
Mesozoic formations . . . . .	136
Tertiary formations . . . . .	143
Karst phenomena in Mesozoic and Tertiary formations in the Aquitanian Basin . . . . .	144
Quercy . . . . .	144
Périgord and Pays des Charentes . . . . .	145
Karst phenomena of the Grands Causses . . . . .	146
Lithostratigraphy . . . . .	148
Structure . . . . .	148

Climate . . . . .	148
Karstology and hydrogeology . . . . .	149
The Languedocian karst . . . . .	153
Setting . . . . .	153
Lithostratigraphy . . . . .	153
Structure . . . . .	153
Climate . . . . .	154
Main characteristics . . . . .	156
Karst in Minervois, Corbières and the Pyrenees . . . . .	160
Lithostratigraphy . . . . .	160
Structure . . . . .	160
Karstification phases . . . . .	160
Main natural units . . . . .	161
Karst in Burgundy and the Jura Mountains . . . . .	164
Lithostratigraphy . . . . .	164
Structure . . . . .	164
Phases of karstification . . . . .	165
Main characteristics . . . . .	165
Alpine karst and Provence karst . . . . .	167
Lithostratigraphy . . . . .	167
Structure . . . . .	168
Karstification phases . . . . .	168
Main characteristics . . . . .	169
Conclusions: scientific and practical interest, resources and exploitation of French karst . . . . .	180
Scientific interest . . . . .	180
Geologic and hydrogeologic problems . . . . .	180
Erosion and concretion mechanisms . . . . .	181
Biologic and prehistoric questions . . . . .	181
Practical interest . . . . .	182
Tourism . . . . .	182
Water supply . . . . .	182
Further aspects . . . . .	183
References . . . . .	183

## Chapter 6. Karst of Germany

D. PFEIFFER and J. HAHN

Introduction . . . . .	189
Stratigraphic and sedimentologic aspects . . . . .	192
Geologic development of Germany . . . . .	192
Precambrian . . . . .	192
Palaeozoic . . . . .	192
Mesozoic . . . . .	194
Tertiary . . . . .	195
Rocks subject to karstification . . . . .	195
Carbonate sediments . . . . .	196
Saline sediments (sulphate and chloride) . . . . .	197
Geologic and tectonic setting of the karst areas . . . . .	198
Variscan basement . . . . .	198
Thuringian Basin . . . . .	200
The cuesta landscape of Swabia and Franconia . . . . .	205
Westfalian Cretaceous embayment (Münsterland Basin) . . . . .	208
The area of the Saxonian orogeny . . . . .	209

Phases of karstification . . . . .	210
Karst types . . . . .	210
Limestone karst. . . . .	211
Gypsum karst . . . . .	212
Saline karst . . . . .	213
The age of karstification . . . . .	215
Limestone karst. . . . .	215
Gypsum karst . . . . .	215
Soils in karst areas . . . . .	216
Hydrologic consequences . . . . .	216
Shallow karst. . . . .	218
Deep karst . . . . .	219
Problems of engineering geology in karst and leaching areas. . . . .	220
References . . . . .	221

## Chapter 7. Karst of Austria

F. BAUER and J. ZÖTL

Introduction . . . . .	225
The Northern Limestone Alps . . . . .	226
General description . . . . .	226
Stratigraphy and lithology . . . . .	226
Tectonics . . . . .	228
The morphologic development of the Limestone Alps . . . . .	228
Main types of the North Alpine karst . . . . .	229
The development of the North Alpine karst until the end of the Glacial Epoch. . . . .	230
Principles of hydrology . . . . .	232
Caves . . . . .	234
Surface karst phenomena . . . . .	236
Regional examples of North Alpine karst . . . . .	239
Schneebergalpen . . . . .	239
Totes Gebirge . . . . .	241
Dachstein . . . . .	241
Hochkönig. . . . .	244
Steinernes Meer. . . . .	244
Karwendel Gebirge . . . . .	247
Pre-Alps. . . . .	251
The Central Styrian Karst . . . . .	252
Karst of the Southern Alps. . . . .	257
Karst of the Helvetian nappe system . . . . .	258
Karst of the Waschberg zone . . . . .	260
Karst of the Central Alps. . . . .	260
Economic karst problems. . . . .	260
Forestry and agriculture . . . . .	260
Water supply and hydro-electric power plants . . . . .	261
Conclusions . . . . .	263
References . . . . .	263



*Chapter 8. Karst of Hungary*

F. DARÁNYI

Introduction . . . . .	267
Lithostratigraphic and sedimentologic aspects. . . . .	267
Transdanubian Central Mountains . . . . .	267
Northeast Range . . . . .	272
Mecsek Mountains . . . . .	274
Tectonic setting of the area. . . . .	276
Transdanubian Central Mountains . . . . .	276
Northeast Range . . . . .	279
Mecsek Mountains . . . . .	280
Phases of karstification . . . . .	281
Transdanubian Central Mountains . . . . .	281
Northeast Range . . . . .	282
Mecsek Mountains . . . . .	282
Morphologic features . . . . .	282
Hydrologic conditions . . . . .	284
Transdanubian Central Mountains . . . . .	288
Northeast Range . . . . .	290
Mecsek Mountains . . . . .	291
Practical problems and their approach . . . . .	292
References . . . . .	294

*Chapter 9. Karst of Czechoslovakia*

J. BYSTRICKÝ, E. MAZÚR and J. JAKÁL

Introduction . . . . .	297
Conditions of development of the karst phenomena . . . . .	298
Geologic conditions . . . . .	298
Relief and its reflection in the differentiation of the karst phenomena . . . . .	307
The other physical-geographical conditions . . . . .	309
Typological division of the karst in the West Carpathians. . . . .	312
Central European karst of the temperate zone. . . . .	314
Plateau karst – complete karst . . . . .	314
Articulated karst – imperfect karst . . . . .	318
Sporadic karst of the Klippen structure . . . . .	322
Alpine karst . . . . .	323
References . . . . .	323

*Chapter 10. Karst of Poland*

J. GLAZEK, T. DABROWSKI and R. GRADZIŃSKI

Lithostratigraphic and sedimentologic aspects. . . . .	327
Tectonic setting of the area. . . . .	328
Phases of karstification . . . . .	330
Morphologic consequences . . . . .	333
Hydrogeologic consequences . . . . .	336
Practical problems and their approach . . . . .	337
Acknowledgements . . . . .	338
References . . . . .	339

*Chapter 11. Karst of Rumania*

M. D. BLEAHU

Introduction . . . . .	341
Lithostratigraphic and sedimentologic aspects. . . . .	341
Open-sea carbonate associations . . . . .	342
The pelagic limestones. . . . .	342
The mixed deposits of terrigenous and carbonate rocks. . . . .	342
Shallow-water marine and marginal marine associations . . . . .	342
Massive limestones or dolomites . . . . .	344
Bedded limestones . . . . .	344
Tectonic setting . . . . .	344
Zones of pre-Alpine shields . . . . .	345
Zones of Alpine folding in the Carpathians. . . . .	345
Limy plateaus . . . . .	345
Limy ridges . . . . .	346
Isolated calcareous massifs . . . . .	347
Post-tectonic Neozoic depressions . . . . .	347
Phases of karstification and evolution of the karst areas . . . . .	347
Morphologic features . . . . .	349
Karst developed on salt and gypsum. . . . .	351
Volcanic rock karst . . . . .	351
Hydrogeologic conditions . . . . .	352
Practical problems and their approach . . . . .	352
References . . . . .	353

*Chapter 12. Karst of the U.S.S.R.*

I. V. POPOV, N. A. GVOZDETSKIY, A. G. CHIKISHEV and B. I. KUDELIN

Introduction . . . . .	355
The Russian Platform . . . . .	358
Karst of the crystalline basement of the Russian Platform . . . . .	359
Karst in rocks of the southern buried slope of the Baltic Shield . . . . .	360
Karst of the Latvian saddle, and karst of the Belorusskaya Arch . . . . .	360
Karst of the southern limb of the Moscow tectonic basin. . . . .	361
Karst of the western and northwestern limb of the Moscow tectonic basin . . . . .	362
Karst of the southeastern part of the Moscow tectonic basin . . . . .	364
Karst of the Timan Ridge . . . . .	364
Karst of the Volga-Ural Arch and the Vyatsk swell . . . . .	365
Karst of the southwestern borderland of the Russian Platform and the outer zone of the Ciscarpathian Trough . . . . .	366
Chalk karst in rocks of the Russian Platform . . . . .	367
The Alpine folded zone in the southern and southwestern framework of the Russian Platform . . . . .	367
The Crimea . . . . .	367
The Caucasus. . . . .	368
Karst of the eastern Carpathians . . . . .	373
The Ural orogenic belt of the Hercynian syncline . . . . .	376
The karst province of the west slope of the Urals . . . . .	378
The karst province of the central Urals . . . . .	381
The karst province of the east slope of the Urals . . . . .	382
The trans-Ural karst province. . . . .	384
The Turansk Platform . . . . .	385
The Siberian Platform . . . . .	387

The orogenic belt of the eastern part of Central Asia, with a folded Palaeozoic basement . . .	395
Karst of the Trans-Baikal region . . . . .	399
Karst of Palaeozoic fold structures of southern Siberia . . . . .	401
The Altay karst province. . . . .	401
The Tomsk-Kolyvansk karst province . . . . .	403
The Kuznetsk-Alatausk karst province . . . . .	403
The karst province of western and eastern Sayan . . . . .	404
Underground flow in karst regions of the U.S.S.R. . . . .	405
References . . . . .	411

### *Chapter 13. Karst of Great Britain*

M. M. SWEETING

Introduction . . . . .	417
The karst areas of the Carboniferous limestone . . . . .	419
Stratigraphic, sedimentologic and tectonic aspects . . . . .	419
Northwest Yorkshire . . . . .	420
Morecambe Bay district . . . . .	420
Derbyshire. . . . .	420
The Mendips. . . . .	423
South Wales . . . . .	424
North Wales . . . . .	424
Phases of karstification . . . . .	424
Morphologic features . . . . .	425
Northwest Yorkshire . . . . .	425
Morecambe Bay district . . . . .	431
Derbyshire. . . . .	432
The Mendips. . . . .	433
South Wales . . . . .	435
North Wales . . . . .	436
The karst areas of older Palaeozoic limestones . . . . .	436
The Durness Limestone area . . . . .	437
The Devonian limestone area. . . . .	438
Hydrogeologic conditions with special reference to the Carboniferous limestone area. . . .	438
Practical problems and their approach . . . . .	439
Problems of water supply . . . . .	439
Problems of land use . . . . .	440
References . . . . .	442

### *Chapter 14. Karst of Jamaica*

H. R. VERSEY

General geology . . . . .	445
The Montpelier Chalks . . . . .	447
The recrystallized limestones . . . . .	448
The rubbly limestones . . . . .	448
Tectonic setting. . . . .	449
Phases of karstification . . . . .	450
Hydrology . . . . .	451
Geomorphology . . . . .	458
The karst uplands. . . . .	459

Interior valleys (poljes) . . . . .	462
The Nassau Valley . . . . .	462
The interior valleys of northern Trelawny . . . . .	463
Practical aspects. . . . .	464
References . . . . .	466

### *Chapter 15. Karst of the United States*

W. E. DAVIES and H. E. LEGRAND

Foreword . . . . .	467
General areas. . . . .	469
Atlantic and Gulf coastal plain . . . . .	473
Abstract . . . . .	473
Geologic setting. . . . .	474
Karst features . . . . .	476
Hydrogeology . . . . .	477
Practical considerations . . . . .	480
Appalachians . . . . .	481
Introduction . . . . .	481
Great Valley . . . . .	484
Valley and Ridge section. . . . .	487
Appalachian plateaus . . . . .	490
Other karst areas . . . . .	494
Central Kentucky and southern Indiana . . . . .	495
The Pecos Valley of New Mexico . . . . .	501
Other karst regions . . . . .	502
References . . . . .	504

### *Chapter 16. Conclusions*

M. HERAK and V. T. STRINGFIELD

Terminology, genesis and classification . . . . .	507
Hydrology and hydrogeology . . . . .	512
Carbonate aquifers . . . . .	514
Hydrogeology and palaeohydrology . . . . .	515
Geologic structure. . . . .	516
Methods of investigation. . . . .	517
References Index . . . . .	519
Subject Index . . . . .	531

## Historical Review of Morphologic Concepts

J. ROGLIĆ

Geographical Institute, University of Zagreb, Zagreb (Yugoslavia)

### INTRODUCTION

Karst includes the circulation of water in fractures, fissures, joints and other cavities, and the development of corresponding forms in soluble, mostly carbonate rocks. The process and the produced forms reach to great depths in the rock complexes, but, in this review, as in geomorphology in general, it is mainly the surface, i.e., the visible forms, which will be treated. Since the surface features cannot be understood without knowledge of the process as a whole, the connection between them will be adequately respected. Analogous superficial forms also occur in some other deposits, e.g., in loess; these are called "pseudokarst", and will not be a subject of this article.

Limited space, the scope of the subject, and clearness required suggest a concentration on the essential problems, and on those which are interconnected in the historical development. Several papers are omitted, and those cited are used only for documentation of the explanation. This review is only an introduction to the up-to-date scientific endeavours, which are presented only by means of the basic data.

### EARLY INVESTIGATORS

Like geomorphology in general, the scientific investigation of karst relief is very young, in fact the term "geomorphology" was first mentioned by NAUMANN [1858]; the first textbook on the subject was written by PENCK [1894]. Only by means of the first results of the mapping and on the basis of more reliable investigations at the end of the 19th century, were the global relief features established. At that time the basic data concerning the composition and structure of the earth were known. In connection with practical works, and especially with the construction of railways, features of relief became important elements in the natural inventory. In the course of acquiring new ideas and of solving practical problems the Alps occupied a central position and were of predominant significance.

It is normal that perialpine Vienna, at that time one of the leading scientific centers in the world, also became the center of geomorphologic investigations, especially those concerning the karst. A second important fact was that the Dinaric karst was the main source of ideas and that it thus influenced the formation of con-



cepts. Admittedly there are in the surroundings of Vienna the Moravic karst and some calcareous areas in the Alps, but with respect to the extension and variety of their karst features, they can hardly be compared with the Dinaric karst. However, the comparative study was highly important for defining and improving scientific thought.

The classical connection of karstology with the Dinaric karst was not accidental but was dependent on the proximity of the scientific center in Vienna. Even in the present-day global endeavours, the Dinaric karst is still the most complex and attractive, and is still regarded as a classical karst area both in its content and in historical significance. Its importance is also emphasized by the many scientific terms which, regrettably, are not always correctly used.

Dinaric karst has remained almost until recent times in the shadow of cultural events, its existence being "discovered" at the beginning of this century. However, a small, narrow and marginal area between the northern part of the Adriatic Sea and the Pannonian Basin, was an important passage and a stage for interesting events and movements leading to the prehistoric legend of the Argonauts who might have come through this area from the Ister (Danube) to the Adriatic Sea. This karst threshold is exceptionally rich in specific features which attracted early attention and which required explanation. It is in this most peculiar part of the classical karst that the term "karst" has originated, based on the Indo-European word "kar" = rock. The Italian term is "carso", the Slovenian word is "kras", while "karst" is a Germanized form of the original expression. With the development of Trieste, the classical karst area got the name "karst of Trieste".

The impressive karst forms, the facts based on them, and the richness of the folk legend inspired VALVASOR [1689], a master of drawing and descriptions, to publish the legends and beliefs concerning karst which are still alive. Local people proceeded even further, in trying to explain the origin of some features. GRUBER [1781] was especially interested in long-lasting inundations of Cerknjško polje in Slovenia, considering these impressive "jamas" to be a consequence of collapses. His contemporary HACQUET [1778] gives useful data and observations on karst features. He considers dolines a consequence of the weathering of limestone. These observations were too early for the general scientific climate, and the country was outside the main flow of cultural aspirations and decisive events. Therefore, these problems had to wait during seven more decades before again becoming the subject of investigations. The French scientist VIRLET [1834] regarded the dolines in the southern Jura Mountains as the effects of collapse of the roofs of subsurface cavities, i.e., he followed the former idea of Gruber. Hacquet's idea was a forerunner of LYELL's [1839] explanation of the genesis of the "geologic organs" in the chalk of southern England by means of the solution process by atmospheric water. In France, FOURNET [1852] also explained the dolines in connection with collapses.

## SCIENTIFIC APPROACH

Since the middle of the 19th century (1850–1857), when a railway was constructed over the karst threshold from middle Europe to Trieste, the karst area has become a feature of modern life. Civil engineers of the Southern Railway were confronted with karst reality which required explanation and practical measures. Karst then became an object of scientific interest.

The Viennese speleologist SCHMIDL [1854] investigated caves in the karst of Trieste with good support and for practical purposes. He maintained, in accordance with predominant views, that dolines were formed as a result of collapses. In addition to speleologic explanations, other opinions were very numerous. The English geologist PRESTWICH [1854] agreed with Ch. Lyell's explanation that dolines were formed by the infiltration of water.

Shortly after, analogous explanations were published by American geologists. OWEN [1856] studied the karst of Kentucky (U.S.A.), whilst Cox [1874] expressed the opinion that the dolines in the karst of Indiana were produced by the solution of limestones. He recorded joints through which water infiltrated. Of special importance are the investigations of the English geologist SAWKINS [1869] in Jamaica; according to his opinion conspicuous dolines (cockpits) originated due to the solution of limestones.

*First phase of karst morphology investigation*

A new and more complex approach to karst problems coincided with the first geologic investigations of the middle and most complicated part of the Dinaric karst, following the occupation of Bosnia and Hercegovina (1878). The leading geologists in Vienna, E. Mojsisovics, E. Tietze and E. Bittner wrote about the geologic relations of that area and gave a scientific explanation for the genesis of the karst forms [MOJSISOVICS et al., 1880]. E. Tietze supported the collapse theory. MOJSISOVICS et al. [1880] pointed out that folding and erosional forces were factors in the development of karst depressions. They compared the Dinaric dolines with the Alpine karren. Thus, Hacquet's forecast and the practice of several English and American geologists were introduced into the explanation of the Dinaric karst. DIENER [1886] explains the dolines of the karst of the Lebanon on the basis of solution. Carbon dioxide was already commonly taken into account. In a lively discussion among the Viennese geologists, the advocates of the collapse theory were in the majority, constantly introducing new contributions into the speleologic investigations, especially those of the karst of Trieste. Most prominent among them was KRAUS [1887, 1894].

At the same time geomorphology was evolving as a separate discipline concerning karst relief. In Vienna the most prominent protagonist of the new discipline was A. Penck, respected in the whole world thanks to his observations and investigations of Alpine glaciation. The master suggested to his talented student J. Cvijić, that he

should prepare a doctor's dissertation on the subject of karst.

At first Cvijić was occupied with the karst of eastern Serbia. But his main ideas were based on the observations on the karst of Trieste.

CVIJIĆ's work "*Das Karstphänomen*" [1893] was a turning-point and at the same time the beginning of an intensified study of karst morphology. He also paid the most attention to dolines, "which give to the karst a special landscape character". In a cutting of the railway for Trieste, he recorded the connection between the formation of dolines and joints as COX [1874] had done. "Normal dolines" originated under the influence of water which percolated from the surface into the interior, enlarging joints and fissures into "funnels". He argued against the generally accepted importance of collapse of the roofs of caverns. He probably considered karst as primary relief on soluble rocks. This work of Cvijić was not only a pioneering monograph on karst, but also on geomorphology in general. Its special significance lies in the fact that as a result attention was paid to the problems of karst in Penck's world-renowned school of geomorphology.

In 1899, Penck, together with his students, and in company with the American geomorphologist W. M. Davis, gave instruction on field trips in Bosnia and Hercegovina. This meeting in the karst area of two outstanding masters of geomorphology and their discussions were of decisive importance for the further development of geomorphologic concepts.

PENCK [1900] and DAVIS [1901] pointed out conspicuous plains in the karst of Hercegovina and Dalmatia. According to general views and the logical deductions of DAVIS [1884], the formation of the plains was ascribed to denudation and fluvial erosion. Thus, two more schematic views entered into the explanation of karst relief: (a) fluvial erosion occurred first, followed by "karstification"; and (b) stages of morphologic evolution or of cyclic evolution became obtrusive. Karstification and cyclic evolution dominated the explanations of karst relief during the next four decades.

The reputations of Penck and Davis, as well as their convincing concepts, had also influenced Cvijić, already a leading researcher in karst morphology. CVIJIĆ [1901] accepted the priority of fluvial erosion and used the term "karstification". Among karst features he recorded cyclic relation of evolution, whereby the coalescence of dolines creates uvalas and by their coalescence poljes are formed as the final and largest karst features.

Penck's school was active in developing theoretical treatments of new concepts. GRUND [1903], a disciple of Penck, published a work which meant a new milestone in the development of karst morphology. He accepted the existence of "karst groundwater" rising progressively from sea level towards the hinterland. Above this stagnant level, during the wet seasons, joints and fissures are periodically filled up by water called "karst water" which, being unstable, discharges again very soon. Morphologic evolution occurs toward "karst groundwater" with the final results which represent plains, in the sense of the cyclic theory of Davis. Such treatments were resolutely



supported by PENCK [1904], whose own ideas were thus elaborated.

The concepts of Penck and Grund, deduced with “juridical logic”, were followed by numerous disciples of the Viennese morphologic school (E. Richter, N. Krebs, etc.). Grund himself was especially active. Objections and antagonistic concepts were not strong and logical enough to counter-balance the Davis–Penck–Grund concept. Speleologists like KNEBEL [1906], MARTEL [1910] and several others pointed out that the investigations did not confirm the existence of a groundwater level in karst; moreover, individual water streams flowing along fractures and fissures were established. An especially resolute opponent of the Penck–Grund concept was geologist KATZER [1909], who knew the geology of the Dinaric karst very well and was skilled in practical knowledge. According to him water circulates in karst in separate systems of channels instead of interconnecting channels of groundwater with a water table. However, his knowledge of geomorphology was limited.

Although its opponents could not push the Penck–Grund concept aside, they did call attention to its weak points. It was obvious that the evolution of surficial karst features can not be explained without taking into account the circulation of waters through fissures and fractures. This inspired Cvijić to look for a specific explanation of the genesis of the plains which form the basis of the Penck–Grund concept.

According to CVIJIĆ [1909], the plains are formed by means of specific “karst erosion”. Surficial erosion is a consequence of sinking water, while in the underground, karst rivers cut in, wash out, and enlarge the fissures. This double action characterized the erosion and planation of karst. His considerations were generalized, and without concrete and illustrative examples. He did not discuss the question of whether the plains were formed independently, or by dislocation of an originally uniform level, although the last may be concluded from the headline of the study. Afterwards he did not return to this specific explanation, but he accepted more schematic ideas of fluvial formation of the plains in karst, which were indicated by Penck and Grund. Such a procedure is curious, because in the same year SAWICKI [1909] published an analogous explanation of plain formation in calcareous terrains.

Sawicki maintained that “terra rossa”, which remains after the solution of limestones, closes joints and fissures in karst making a continuous cover, i.e., “Evolutionsniveau”, which prevents the sinking of the water and dominates its horizontal flow. His conclusions and deductions are based on the conditions which were recorded in the Slovakian karst. It is noteworthy that not so long ago BIROT [1954a] returned to this explanation of plains, as proposed by Cvijić and Sawicki.

In 1910 GRUND [1910] published his work on the karst relief of the Dinaric Mountains. Very skilled in constructions and deductions he argued against objections to his theory concerning the groundwater level in the karst. On the basis of his observations in the karst of Bosnia and Hercegovina, he delivered his concepts on the evolution of the main karst features and especially of poljes and plains on limestones. He ascribes the formation of poljes to the tectonic movements distinguishing different types. With this work, and the arguments connected with it, the concept of Penck and