

and he produced some memoirs of the deepest interest in physiography. His training in natural history enabled him to recognize and describe the organisms which he found in the rocks, and he thus became one of the founders of palæontological geology. He produced about 200 papers on a wide range of subjects in science, and published some half-dozen quarto volumes of his observations, together with many excellent plates.

It is astonishing that this man, who in his day was one of the most distinguished members of the Academy of Sciences of Paris, and who undoubtedly is entitled to rank among the few great pioneers of modern geology, should have fallen into complete oblivion in English geological literature. I shall have occasion to show that the process of ignoring him began even in his lifetime, and that, though free from the petty vanities of authorship, he was compelled in the end to defend his claim to discoveries that he had made. After his death he was the subject of a kindly and appreciative *éloge* by his friend Condorcet, the perpetual Secretary of the Academy.¹ His work was noticed at length in the great *Encyclopédie Méthodique* of Diderot and D'Alembert, published thirteen years after he was laid in the grave.² Cuvier

¹ *Œuvres de Condorcet*, vol. iii. p. 220.

² *Géographie Physique* by Desmarest, forming vol. i. of the *Encyclopédie*, and published An III (1794). The article on Guettard (by Desmarest) gives a critical review of his work, especially of those parts of it which bear on physical geography. The large number and value of his observations on fossil organisms is admitted. But his method of constructing mineralogical maps is severely