

practical utility, as containing the best account of the coal strata. In his preface he misrepresents Hutton's theory altogether, and charges him with considering all rocks to be lavas of different colours and structure; and also with "warping every thing to support the eternity of the world."\* He descants on the pernicious influence of such sceptical notions, as leading to downright infidelity and atheism, "and as being nothing less than to depose the Almighty Creator of the universe from his office."†

*Kirwan—De Luc.*—Kirwan, president of the Royal Academy of Dublin, a chemist and mineralogist of some merit, but who possessed much greater authority in the scientific world than he was entitled by his talents to enjoy, said, in the introduction to his "Geological Essays, 1799," "that *sound* geology *graduated* into religion, and was required to dispel certain systems of atheism or infidelity, of which they had had recent experience."‡ He was an uncompromising defender of the aqueous theory of all rocks, and was scarcely surpassed by Burnet and Whiston, in his desire to adduce the Mosaic writings in confirmation of his opinions.

De Luc, in the preliminary discourse to his Treatise on Geology § says, "the weapons have been changed by which revealed religion is attacked; it is now assailed by geology, and the knowledge of this science has become essential to theologians." He imputes the failure of former geological systems to their having been anti-Mosaical, and directed against a "sublime tradition." These and similar imputations, reiterated in the works of De Luc, seem to have been taken for granted by some modern writers: it is therefore necessary to state, in justice to the numerous geologists of different nations, whose works have been considered, that none of them were guilty of endeavouring, by arguments drawn from physics, to invalidate scriptural tenets. On the contrary, the majority of them who were fortunate enough "to discover the true causes of things," rarely deserved another part of the poet's panegyric, "*Atque metus omnes subjicit pedibus.*" The caution, and even timid reserve, of many eminent Italian authors of the earlier period is very apparent; and there can hardly be a doubt, that they subscribed to certain dogmas, and particularly to the first diluvian theory, out of deference to popular prejudices, rather than from conviction. If they were guilty of dissimulation, we may feel regret, but must not blame their want of moral courage, reserving rather our condemnation for the intolerance of the times, and that inquisitorial power which forced Galileo to abjure, and the two Jesuits to disclaim the theory of Newton. ||

\* P. 577.

† P. 59.

‡ Introd. p. 2.

§ London, 1809.

|| In a most able article, by Mr. Drinkwater, on the "Life of Galileo," published in the "Library of Useful Knowledge," it is stated that both Galileo's work, and the book of Copernicus "*Nisi corrigatur*"

(for, with the omission of certain passages, it was sanctioned), were still to be seen on the forbidden list of the Index at Rome in 1828. I was however assured in the same year, by Professor Scarpellini, at Rome, that Pius VII., a pontiff distinguished for his love of science, had procured a repeal of the edicts against Galileo and the Copernican system. He