

kind. From one point of view, Werner appears to us as the enthusiastic teacher, drawing men from all countries under his spell, and kindling in them much of his own zeal for the study of minerals and rocks. In another aspect, he stands out as the dogmatic theorist, intolerant of opinions different from his own, training his pupils in an artificial and erroneous system, and sending them out into the world not patiently to investigate nature, but to apply everywhere the uncouth terminology and hypothetical principles which he had taught them.

Though he himself mixed but little publicly in the dispute, he was directly the cause of the keen controversy over the origin of basalt, the echoes of which had hardly ceased when some of the older geologists of our day were born. I have myself known a number of men who remembered well the acrimony of the warfare, and some of whom even played the part of combatants in the struggle. Werner had a large following. He was undoubtedly the most popular teacher of the science of minerals and rocks in his time. His services to mineralogy were great, and have always been freely admitted. By the partiality of his pupils and friends he was also raised to the highest eminence as a teacher of geology, and was even looked up to as the founder of that science. The noise of conflict, and the plaudits of enthusiastic disciples have now long been silent. We can calmly consider what Werner did, in what state he found the science of the rocks, and in what condition he left it. As the result of my own investigation in this subject I have been compelled to arrive at the con-