

nomy became a great and solid science ; and, after a still fiercer controversy than that of the geographers, it asserted a supremacy in its own special walk against Popish theologians such as Caccini and Bellarmine, and against Protestants such as Turretine. We have seen a similar controversy carried on in the present century,—which has witnessed the rise of geology, just as the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries witnessed that of geography and astronomy,—between theologians who were also geologists, such as Chalmers, Sedgwick, and Sumner, and theologians who were wholly ignorant of geology, such as Granville Penn, Eleazor Lord, and Moses Stuart. And, as in astronomy and geography, the controversy may now be regarded as ultimately settled in favour of the new science, within at least the new science's own proper province. There are, however, other controversies than theological ones, which rise when, according to Bacon, “ things grow to equality ;” and that equality to which geology has attained with astronomy during the last fifty years may be properly regarded as the real cause of the very interesting controversy carried on at the present time between the author of the “ Essay on the Plurality of Worlds,” understood to be one of the distinguished ornaments of English science, and our great countryman Sir David Brewster,—a philosopher who, while supreme in his own special walk, is perhaps of all living men the most extensively acquainted with the general domain of physical science. The English writer, though he presses his argument by much too far, may be regarded as representative of the geological side ; Sir David, of the astronomical.

There are, we have said, certain stages in the course of discovery at which controversy becomes inevitable ; and it seems demonstrative of the fact, that the new arguments in which these controversies originate arise much about the same time, without concert or communication, in minds en-