

while in the Queen's Colleges in Ireland it includes Zoology and Botany, but excludes Mineralogy and Geology. Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin, ignore the term Natural History, but recognize Mineralogy and Botany, to the exclusion of Zoology. I could cite numerous other instances, but these names are wearisome to listen to, and I will only add further on this subject a few remarks of Dr. FLEMING, Professor in the New College in Edinburgh, which have been considered of value throughout Great Britain, as clearly expressing the true manner in which those studies should be subordinated. He says to this effect :

" Before proceeding to the examination of any of the branches usually included under the term Natural History, the student should prepare for the task by attending to Natural Philosophy and Chemistry ; for the intelligent inquirer in the present day seldom restricts himself to observation—he also experiments, and calls to his aid the balance, the crucible and the microscope. In proceeding to contemplate the different branches of Natural Science, an obvious division presents itself into inorganic and organized beings—the dead and the living—the laws regulating each being essentially different. Viewing the lifeless kingdom in all its bearings, we would propose the successive study of the air, the waters, the minerals, the rocks, which together may be called Mineralogy, and which should be studied after Chemistry, for this science must, in the very first step of the process, make us acquainted with the nature of the materials and their state of combination, before the building up of the object can be contemplated. For instance, the inquirer may soon learn to call a mass of rock *granite*, as he might designate a plantation a clump of *trees* ; but, if he was not acquainted with the materials, and the condition of arrangement in the three minerals—quartz, felspar and mica—and the difference between the force which constructed the individuals, and that which united the three very different species into one mass, he has proceeded but a short way in the study. The living kingdom, while obviously consisting of plants and animals, presents a field which may be regarded as common to both subjects, involving the consideration of the laws of life, by which chemical combinations, as existing in dead matter, are modified, the development of organisms, and the distribution of species. Botany, then, would include the study of recent and extinct plants ; Zoology of recent and extinct animals—each having to do with a physiology, or study of functions. In this way Geology, instead of being regarded as a separate branch of knowledge, is really identical with Natural History. To justify this remark, I would take leave to state that, in order to peruse intelligently any of the most popular treatises on Geology, the reader would require to be conversant, to some extent, with Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Mineralogy, Petrology, Botany and Zoology. The truth seems to be that every writer on Geology, aware of the indefinite character of his subject, thinks himself justified in bringing in