

tre of the World, nor immoveable, but that it moves, and also with a diurnal motion, is also absurd, philosophically false, and, theologically considered, at least erroneous in faith." He was condemned to suffer imprisonment for an indefinite period; and, as a salutary punishment, he was ordained to recite once a week, for three years, seven penitential psalms. This latter part we shall hope was not a heavy burthen, though we had rather do it voluntarily than by force. The aged philosopher having heard his sentence, was made to pronounce the abjuration dictated to him, "I abjure, curse, and detest the error and heresy of the motion of the Earth, &c., &c." Had they, then, enchained his soul? Had Galileo lost his freedom of mind? On the contrary, it is said, that after pronouncing the abjuration, and rising from his kneeling posture, amid the confusion of the moment, he indignantly stamped his foot and said, in an under tone, "*It moves notwithstanding.*" How incompetent the Inquisition or any other Tribunal to fetter the human soul! They compelled him to *utter* a falsehood, but they could not compel him to *think* one; his mind they were unable to coerce.*

* This statement concerning Galileo has been honoured by a column and a half of strictures in the "Melanges Religieux" of the 21st instant, the purport of which is to deny the usual avowment that the philosopher was brought before the Inquisition and subjected to punishment for his astronomical theories, and to maintain that bad theology was the offence for which he was tried. In other words, having been warned not to attempt to reconcile Scripture with the Copernican system, he persisted contumaciously in such attempts, and was for them brought up, gently dealt with, yet imprisoned and forced to recant. It is acknowledged that there was used an apparent rigour for form's sake, and for the sake of example. In reply to this article with its citation of authorities, I have to state:—1. That when the Lecture was written I was perfectly aware of the attempts which had been made by Bergier and others to vindicate the Court of Rome from the charge of prosecuting Galileo on account of his astronomical theories as being contrary to received opinions, and to Holy Scripture. The whole matter is briefly, but satisfactorily discussed in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, art. *Galileo*. 2. That if for the sake of argument we were to admit the hypothesis of the "Melanges Religieux" and its cited authorities, the case would still illustrate the position taken in the Lecture, and come legitimately under the unsparing condemnation it contains of all persecution for opinions. To have punished Galileo for his interpretation of Scripture, or for attempts to reconcile its narrative with his astronomical theories, would have been an outrage upon his essential freedom of mind, and a wrong done to his inherent right to think for himself. This is not the place to enter into controversy with the Church of Rome upon the existence of an earthly tribunal which men's consciences are bound to recognize in matters of religious faith, to which the article alluded to refers in its closing paragraph. It is enough to say that the doctrine of this Lecture distinctly refuses to recognize any