

brought together and compared. They have every indication of having been a pair. And is it so that they were always apart till the hand of man conjoined them? Was the lower valve created in connection with a shell of a totally different genus from itself, and the upper valve created a short way off, in a state of brokenness and detachment? The precise facts, here represented, have come under the observation of geologists; and there is surely a difficulty in ascribing to the God of truth this multifarious and bewildering mimicry of realities. On such principles, indeed, there could be no certainty or satisfaction in the interpretation of nature.*

* To maintain that rocks were created just as they are, is a doctrine of very dangerous tendency. If fossil shells were never inhabited by shell-fish, or if fossil teeth were never intended for mastication, what becomes of final causes? In Epicurus and La Marck such things excite no surprise; but writers of no ill intention have sometimes fallen into this strange mistake. For the sake of the non-geological reader, it is desirable to analyse this well-chosen example. The sea urchin (*Echinus*), while alive, was covered by numerous spines attached to the shell. On the death of the animal, a period must have elapsed during which decomposition took place, and the animal matter disappeared, and the spines fell from the shell. After this, the young crania attached itself to the denuded shell, and in its turn died, and one of its valves fell off, in consequence of the decay of the soft parts, while the other remained agglutinated to the sea urchin on which it grew.