

obtained of the same region of France by the more detailed examination of other observers even in Guettard's lifetime. Desmarest, whose splendid achievements will be referred to in the next chapter, was conspicuously guilty of this injustice. He would never allow Guettard credit for his work in Auvergne, finding fault with it because it was imperfect and inaccurate. He wished that, before writing on the subject at all, his predecessor had studied the ground more carefully and in greater detail, and had attended to the different conditions and dates of the eruptions. "Can we regard as a true discovery," he asks, "the simple recognition of the products of volcanic action, when the facts are presented with so little order and so much confusion? Such a discovery implies a reasoned analysis of all the operations of fire, of which the results have been studied, so as to reveal the ancient conditions of all the volcanic regions. Without this it is impossible to dignify the recognition of a few stones with the name of a discovery that will advance the progress of the natural history of the earth."<sup>1</sup> Could any judgment be more unfair? As if no discovery is entitled to the name, unless it has been elaborated in the fullest detail and followed to its remotest consequences! When one of Guettard's countrymen and contemporaries could write thus of his claims to recognition, it is not surprising that for the best part of a century his name should have almost entirely passed out of mind.

That Guettard preceded every one else in the recognition of the old volcanoes of Auvergne, and

<sup>1</sup> *Géographie Physique*, Art. "Guettard."