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PUBLISHER'S NOTE.

The first of the addresses of Professor Tyndall here published, i. e., that on the "Methods and Tendencies of Physical Investigation," was delivered at Norwich on the 19th of August, 1868, before the Physical Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, of which section Professor Tyndall was the President. The second, on "Haze and Dust," was delivered as a lecture before the Royal Institution of Great Britain—in which Institution Professor Tyndall is professor of physics—on the 21st of January, 1870. A note by the author, supplementing it in certain directions, was published in "Nature," vol. I, page 449, March 17, 1870. The third address, on the "Scientific Use of the Imagination," was delivered before the British Association at its meeting held in Liverpool, in September last.
I.

On the Methods and Tendencies of Physical Investigation.

The celebrated Fichte, in his lectures on the "Vocation of the Scholar," insisted on a culture for the scholar which should not be one-sided, but all-sided. His intellectual nature was to expand spherically, and not in a single direction. In one direction, however, Fichte required that the scholar should apply himself directly to nature, become a creator of knowledge, and thus repay, by original labors of his own, the immense debt he owed to the labors of others. It was these which enabled him to supplement the knowledge derived from his own researches, so as to render his culture rounded, and not one-sided.

Fichte's idea is to some extent illustrated by the constitution and the labors of the British Association. We have here a body of men engaged in the pursuit of natural knowledge, but variously engaged. While sympathizing with each of its departments, and supplementing his culture by knowledge drawn from all of them,
each student amongst us selects one subject for the exercise of his own original faculty—one line along which he may carry the light of his private intelligence a little way into the darkness by which all knowledge is surrounded. Thus, the geologist faces the rocks; the biologist fronts the conditions and phenomena of life; the astronomer, stellar masses and motions; the mathematician the properties of space and number; the chemist pursues his atoms, while the physical investigator has his own large field in optical, thermal, electrical, acoustical, and other phenomena. The British Association, then, faces nature on all sides, and pushes knowledge centrifugally outwards, while, through circumstance or natural bent, each of its working members takes up a certain line of research in which he aspires to be an original producer, being content in all other directions to accept instruction from his fellow-men. The sum of our labors constitutes what Fichte might call the sphere of natural knowledge. In the meetings of the Association it is found necessary to resolve this sphere into its component parts, which take concrete form under the respective letters of our sections.

This section (A) is called the Mathematical and Physical section. Mathematics and Physics have been long accustomed to coalesce, and hence this grouping. For while mathematics, as a product of the human mind, is self-sustaining and nobly self-rewarding,—while the pure mathematician may never trouble his mind with considerations regarding the phenomena of the material universe, still the form of reasoning which he employs, the power which the organization of that reasoning confers, the applicability of his abstract conceptions to actual phenomena, render his science one of the most potent
instruments in the solution of natural problems. Indeed, without mathematics, expressed or implied, our knowledge of physical science would be friable in the extreme.

Side by side with the mathematical method, we have the method of experiment. Here, from a starting-point furnished by his own researches or those of others, the investigator proceeds by combining intuition and verification. He ponders the knowledge he possesses and tries to push it further, he guesses and checks his guess, he conjectures and confirms or explodes his conjecture. These guesses and conjectures are by no means leaps in the dark; for knowledge once gained casts a faint light beyond its own immediate boundaries. There is no discovery so limited as not to illuminate something beyond itself. The force of intellectual penetration into this penumbral region which surrounds actual knowledge is not dependent upon method, but is proportional to the genius of the investigator. There is, however, no genius so gifted as not to need control and verification. The profoundest minds know best that nature's ways are not at all times their ways, and that the brightest flashes in the world of thought are incomplete until they have been proved to have their counterparts in the world of fact. The vocation of the true experimentalist is the incessant correction and realization of his insight; his experiments finally constituting a body, of which his purified intuitions are, as it were, the soul.

Partly through mathematical, and partly through experimental research, physical science has of late years assumed a momentous position in the world. Both in a material and in an intellectual point of view it has produced, and it is destined to produce, immense changes,
vast social ameliorations, and vast alterations in the popular conception of the origin, rule, and governance of things. Miracles are wrought by science in the physical world, while philosophy is forsaking its ancient metaphysical channels, and pursuing those opened or indicated by scientific research. This must become more and more the case as philosophic writers become more deeply imbued with the methods of science, better acquainted with the facts which scientific men have won, and with the great theories which they have elaborated.

If you look at the face of a watch, you see the hour and minute-hands, and possibly also a second-hand, moving over the graduated dial. Why do these hands move, and why are their relative motions such as they are observed to be? These questions cannot be answered without opening the watch, mastering its various parts, and ascertaining their relationship to each other. When this is done, we find that the observed motion of the hands follows of necessity from the inner mechanism of the watch when acted upon by the force invested in the spring.

This motion of the hands may be called a phenomenon of art, but the case is similar with the phenomena of Nature. These also have their inner mechanism, and their store of force to set that mechanism going. The ultimate problem of physical science is to reveal this mechanism, to discern this store, and to show that from the combined action of both, the phenomena of which they constitute the basis must of necessity flow.

I thought that an attempt to give you even a brief and sketchy illustration of the manner in which scientific thinkers regard this problem would not be uninteresting to you on the present occasion; more especially as it
will give me occasion to say a word or two on the tendencies and limits of modern science, to point out the region which men of science claim as their own, and where it is mere waste of time to oppose their advance, and also to define, if possible, the bourne between this and that other region to which the questionings and yearnings of the scientific intellect are directed in vain.

But here your tolerance will be needed. It was the American Emerson, I think, who said that it is hardly possible to state any truth strongly without apparent injury to some other truth. Under the circumstances, the proper course appears to be to state both truths strongly, and allow each its fair share, in the formation of the resultant conviction. For truth is often of a dual character, taking the form of a magnet with two poles; and many of the differences which agitate the thinking part of mankind are to be traced to the exclusiveness with which different parties affirm one half of the duality in forgetfulness of the other half. But this waiting for the statement of the two sides of a question implies patience. It implies a resolution to suppress indignation if the statement of the one half should clash with our convictions, and not to suffer ourselves to be unduly elated if the half-statement should chime in with our views. It implies a determination to wait calmly for the statement of the whole before we pronounce judgment either in the form of acquiescence or dissent.

This premised, let us enter upon our task. There have been writers who affirmed that the pyramids of Egypt were the productions of nature; and in his early youth Alexander Von Humboldt wrote an essay with the express object of refuting this notion. We now regard the pyramids as the work of men's hands, aided
probably by machinery of which no record remains. We picture to ourselves the swarming workers toiling at those vast erections, lifting the inert stones, and, guided by the volition, the skill, and possibly at times by the whip of the architect, placing the stones in their proper positions. The blocks in this case were moved by a power external to themselves, and the final form of the pyramid expressed the thought of its human builder.

Let us pass from this illustration of building power to another of a different kind. When a solution of common salt is slowly evaporated, the water which holds the salt in solution disappears, but the salt itself remains behind. At a certain stage of concentration, the salt can no longer retain the liquid form; its particles, or molecules, as they are called, begin to deposit themselves as minute solids, so minute, indeed, as to defy all microscopic power. As evaporation continues solidification goes on, and we finally obtain, through the clustering together of innumerable molecules, a finite mass of salt of a definite form. What is this form? It sometimes seems a mimicry of the architecture of Egypt. We have little pyramids built by the salt, terrace above terrace from base to apex, forming thus a series of steps resembling those up which the Egyptian traveler is dragged by his guides. The human mind is as little disposed to look at these pyramidal salt-crystals without further question as to look at the pyramids of Egypt without inquiring whence they came. How, then, are those salt pyramids built up?

Guided by analogy, you may suppose that, swarming among the constituent molecules of the salt, there is an invisible population, guided and coerced by some invisible master, and placing the atomic blocks in their posi-
tions. This, however, is not the scientific idea, nor do I think your good sense will accept it as a likely one. The scientific idea is that the molecules act upon each other without the intervention of slave labor; that they attract each other and repel each other at certain definite points, and in certain definite directions; and that the pyramidal form is the result of this play of attraction and repulsion. While, then, the blocks of Egypt were laid down by a power external to themselves, these molecular blocks of salt are self-posited, being fixed in their places by the forces with which they act upon each other.

I take common salt as an illustration, because it is so familiar to us all; but almost any other substance would answer my purpose equally well. In fact, throughout inorganic nature, we have this formative power, as Fichte would call it—this structural energy ready to come into play, and build the ultimate particles of matter into definite shapes. It is present everywhere. The ice of our winters and of our polar regions is its handwork, and so equally are the quartz, feldspar, and mica of our rocks. Our chalk-beds are for the most part composed of minute shells, which are also the product of structural energy; but behind the shell, as a whole, lies the result of another and more subtle formative act. These shells are built up of little crystals of calc-spar, and to form these the structural force had to deal with the intangible molecules of carbonate of lime. This tendency on the part of matter to organize itself, to grow into shape, to assume definite forms in obedience to the definite action of force, is, as I have said, all-pervading. It is in the ground on which you tread, in the water you drink, in the air you breathe. Incipient life, in fact,
manifests itself throughout the whole of what we call inorganic nature.

The forms of minerals resulting from this play of forces are various, and exhibit different degrees of complexity. Men of science avail themselves of all possible means of exploring this molecular architecture. For this purpose they employ in turn as agents of exploration, light, heat, magnetism, electricity, and sound. Polarized light is especially useful and powerful here. A beam of such light, when sent in among the molecules of a crystal, is acted on by them, and from this action we infer with more or less of clearness the manner in which the molecules are arranged. The difference, for example, between the inner structure of a plate of rock-salt and a plate of crystalized sugar or sugar-candy is thus strikingly revealed. These differences may be made to display themselves in phenomena of color of great splendor, the play of molecular force being so regulated as to remove certain of the colored constituents of white light, and to leave others with increased intensity behind.

And now let us pass from what we are accustomed to regard as a dead mineral to a living grain of corn. When it is examined by polarized light, chromatic phenomena similar to those noticed in crystals are observed. And why? Because the architecture of the grain resembles in some degree the architecture of the crystal. In the corn the molecules are also set in definite positions, from which they act upon the light. But what has built together the molecules of the corn? I have already said, regarding crystalline architecture, that you may, if you please, consider the atoms and molecules to be placed in position by a power external to themselves.
The same hypothesis is open to you now. But, if in the case of crystals you have rejected this notion of an external architect, I think you are bound to reject it now, and to conclude that the molecules of the corn are self-posited by the forces with which they act upon each other. It would be poor philosophy to invoke an external agent in the one case and to reject it in the other.

Instead of cutting our grain into thin slices and subjecting it to the action of polarized light, let us place it in the earth and subject it to a certain degree of warmth. In other words, let the molecules, both of the corn and of the surrounding earth, be kept in a state of agitation; for warmth, as most of you know, is, in the eye of science, tremulous molecular motion. Under these circumstances, the grain and the substances which surround it interact, and a molecular architecture is the result of this interaction. A bud is formed; this bud reaches the surface, where it is exposed to the sun’s rays, which are also to be regarded as a kind of vibratory motion. And as the common motion of heat with which the grain and the substances surrounding it were first endowed, enable the grain and these substances to coalesce, so the specific motion of the sun’s rays now enables the green bud to feed upon the carbonic acid and the aqueous vapor of the air, appropriating those constituents of both for which the blade has an elective attraction, and permitting the other constituent to resume its place in the air. Thus forces are active at the root, forces are active in the blade, the matter of the earth and the matter of the atmosphere are drawn towards the plant, and the plant augments in size. We have in succession, the bud, the stalk, the ear, the full corn in the ear. For the forces here at play act in a cycle, which is completed
by the production of grains similar to that with which the process began.

Now there is nothing in this process which necessarily eludes the power of mind as we know it. An intellect the same kind as our own, would, if only sufficiently expanded, be able to follow the whole process from beginning to end. No entirely new intellectual faculty would be needed for this purpose. The duly expanded mind would see in the process and its consummation an instance of the play of molecular force. It would see every molecule placed in its position by the specific attractions and repulsions exerted between it and other molecules. Nay, given the grain and its environment, an intellect the same in kind as our own, but sufficiently expanded, might trace out \textit{\`a priori} every step of the process, and by the application of mechanical principles would be able to demonstrate that the cycle of actions must end, as it is seen to end, in the reproduction of forms like that with which the operation began. A similar necessity rules here to that which rules the planets in their circuits round the sun.

You will notice that I am stating my truth strongly, as at the beginning we agreed it should be stated. But I must go still further, and affirm that in the eye of science the animal body is just as much the product of molecular force as the stalk and ear of corn, or as the crystal of salt or sugar. Many of its parts are obviously mechanical. Take the human heart, for example, with its exquisite system of valves, or take the eye or the hand. Animal heat, moreover, is the same in kind as the heat of a fire, being produced by the same chemical process. Animal motion, too, is as directly derived from the food of the animal, as the motion of Treve-
thyck's walking-engine from the fuel in its furnace. As regards matter, the animal body creates nothing; as regards force, it creates nothing. Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit to his stature? All that has been said regarding the plant may be re-stated with regard to the animal. Every particle that enters into the composition of the muscle, a nerve, or a bone, has been placed in its position by molecular force. And unless the existence of law in these matters be denied, and the element of caprice be introduced, we must conclude that, given the relation of any molecule of the body to its environment, its position in the body might be predicted. Our difficulty is not with the quality of the problem, but with its complexity; and this difficulty might be met by the simple expansion of the faculties which man now possesses. Given this expansion, and given the necessary molecular data, and the chick might be deduced as rigorously and as logically from the egg as the existence of Neptune was deduced from the disturbances of Uranus, or as conical refraction was deduced from the undulatory theory of light.

You see I am not mincing matters, but avowing nakedly what many scientific thinkers more or less distinctly believe. The formation of a crystal, a plant, or an animal, is in their eyes a purely mechanical problem, which differs from the problems of ordinary mechanics in the smallness of the masses and the complexity of the processes involved. Here you have one half of our dual truth; let us now glance at the other half. Associated with this wonderful mechanism of the animal body we have phenomena no less certain than those of physics, but between which and the mechanism we discern no necessary connection. A man, for example,
can say I feel, I think, I love; but how does consciousness infuse itself into the problem? The human brain is said to be the organ of thought and feeling; when we are hurt the brain feels it, when we ponder it is the brain that thinks, when our passions or affections are excited it is through the instrumentality of the brain. Let us endeavor to be a little more precise here. I hardly imagine that any profound scientific thinker who has reflected upon the subject exists, who would not admit the extreme probability of the hypothesis, that for every fact of consciousness, whether in the domain of sense, of thought, or of emotion, a certain definite molecular condition is set up in the brain; that this relation of physics to consciousness is invariable, so that, given the state of the brain, the corresponding thought or feeling might be inferred; or, given the thought or feeling, the corresponding state of the brain might be inferred. But how inferred? It is at bottom not a case of logical inference at all, but of empirical association. You may reply that many of the inferences of science are of this character; the inference, for example, that an electric current of a given direction will deflect a magnetic needle in a definite way; but the cases differ in this, that the passage from the current to the needle, if not demonstrable, is thinkable, and that we entertain no doubt as to the final mechanical solution of the problem; but the passage from the physics of the brain to the corresponding facts of consciousness is unthinkable. Granted that a definite thought and a definite molecular action in the brain occur simultaneously, we do not possess the intellectual organ, nor, apparently, any rudiment of the organ, which would enable us to pass by a process of reasoning from the one phenome-
non to the other. They appear together, but we do not know why. Were our minds and senses so expanded, strengthened, and illuminated as to enable us to see and feel the very molecules of the brain; were we capable of following all their motions, all their groupings, all their electric discharges, if such there be; and were we intimately acquainted with the corresponding states of thought and feeling, we should be as far as ever from the solution of the problem. "How are these physical processes connected with the facts of consciousness?" The chasm between the two classes of phenomena would still remain intellectually impassable. Let the consciousness of love, for example, be associated with a right-handed spiral motion of the molecules of the brain, and the consciousness of hate with a left-handed spiral motion. We should then know when we love that the motion is in one direction, and when we hate that the motion is in the other; but the "why?" would still remain unanswered.

In affirming that the growth of the body is mechanical, and that thought, as exercised by us, has its correlative in the physics of the brain, I think the position of the "Materialist" is stated as far as that position is a tenable one. I think the materialist will be able finally to maintain this position against all attacks; but I do not think, as the human mind is at present constituted, that he can pass beyond it. I do not think he is entitled to say that his molecular groupings and his molecular motions explain everything. In reality they explain nothing. The utmost he can affirm is the association of two classes of phenomena of whose real bond of union he is in absolute ignorance. The problem of the connection of the body and soul is as insoluble in
its modern form as it was in the pre-scientific ages. Phosphorus is known to enter into the composition of the human brain, and a courageous writer has exclaimed, in his trenchant German, “Ohne phosphor kein gedanke.” That may or may not be the case; but even if we knew it to be the case, the knowledge would not lighten our darkness. On both sides of the zone here assigned to the materialist he is equally helpless. If you ask him whence is this “matter” of which we have been discoursing, who or what divided it into molecules, who or what impressed upon them this necessity of running into organic forms, he has no answer. Science also is mute in reply to these questions. But if the materialist is confounded, and science rendered dumb, who else is entitled to answer? To whom has the secret been revealed? Let us lower our heads and acknowledge our ignorance, one and all. Perhaps the mystery may resolve itself into knowledge at some future day. The process of things upon this earth has been one of amelioration. It is a long way from the Iguanodon and his contemporaries to the president and members of the British Association. And whether we regard the improvement from the scientific or from the theological point of view as the result of progressive development, or as the result of successive exhibitions of creative energy, neither view entitles us to assume that man’s present faculties end the series—that the process of amelioration stops at him. A time may therefore come when this ultra-scientific region by which we are now enfolded may offer itself to terrestrial, if not to human investigation. Two-thirds of the rays emitted by the sun fail to arouse in the eye the sense of vision. The rays exist, but the visual organ requisite
for their translation into light does not exist. And so from this region of darkness and mystery which surrounds us, rays may now be darting which require but the development of the proper intellectual organs to translate them into knowledge as far surpassing ours as ours does that of the wallowing reptiles which once held possession of this planet. Meanwhile the mystery is not without its uses. It certainly may be made a power in the human soul; but it is a power which has feeling, not knowledge, for its base. It may be, and will be, and we hope is turned to account, both in steadying and strengthening the intellect, and in rescuing man from that littleness to which, in the struggle for existence or for precedence in the world, he is continually prone.
II.

On Haze and Dust.

Solar light in passing through a dark room reveals its track by illuminating the dust floating in the air. "The sun," says Daniel Culverwell, "discovers atomes, though they be invisible by candle-light, and makes them dance naked in his beams."

In my researches on the decomposition of vapors by light, I was compelled to remove these "atomes" and this dust. It was essential that the space containing the vapors should embrace no visible thing; that no substance capable of scattering the light in the slightest sensible degree should, at the outset of an experiment, be found in the "experimental tube" traversed by the luminous beam.

For a long time I was troubled by the appearance there of floating dust, which, though invisible in diffuse daylight, was at once revealed by a powerfully condensed beam. Two tubes were placed in succession in the path of the dust: the one containing fragments of glass wetted with concentrated sulphuric acid; the other, fragments of marble wetted with a strong solution of caustic potash. To my astonishment it passed through both. The air of the Royal Institution, sent through these tubes at a rate sufficiently slow to dry it and to remove its carbonic acid, carried into the experimental tube a considerable amount of mechanically-suspended matter, which was illuminated when the beam passed (20)
through the tube. The effect was substantially the same when the air was permitted to bubble through the liquid acid and through the solution of potash.

Thus, on the 5th of October, 1868, successive charges of air were admitted through the potash and sulphuric acid into the exhausted experimental tube. Prior to the admission of the air the tube was optically empty; it contained nothing competent to scatter the light. After the air had entered the tube, the conical track of the electric beam was in all cases clearly revealed. This, indeed, was a daily observation at the time to which I now refer.

I tried to intercept this floating matter in various ways; and on the day just mentioned, prior to sending the air through the drying apparatus, I carefully permitted it to pass over the tip of a spirit-lamp flame. The floating matter no longer appeared, having been burnt up by the flame. It was, therefore, organic matter. When the air was sent too rapidly through the flame, a fine blue cloud was found in the experimental tube. This was the smoke of the organic particles. I was by no means prepared for this result; for I had thought, with the rest of the world, that the dust of our air was, in great part, inorganic and non-combustible.

Mr. Valentin had the kindness to procure for me a small gas-furnace, containing a platinum tube, which could be heated to vivid redness. The tube also contained a roll of platinum gauze, which, while it permitted the air to pass through it, insured the practical contact of the dust with the incandescent metal. The air of the laboratory was permitted to enter the experimental tube, sometimes through the cold, and sometimes through the heated tube of platinum. The rapid-
ity of admission was also varied. In the first column of the following table the quantity of air operated on is expressed by the number of inches which the mercury gauge of the air-pump sank when the air entered. In the second column the condition of the platinum tube is mentioned, and in the third the state of the air which entered the experimental tube.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 inches</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Full of particles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 &quot;</td>
<td>Red-hot</td>
<td>Optically empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 &quot;</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Full of particles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 &quot;</td>
<td>Red-hot</td>
<td>Optically empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 &quot;</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Full of particles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 &quot;</td>
<td>Red-hot</td>
<td>Optically empty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phrase "optically empty" shows that when the conditions of perfect combustion were present, the floating matter totally disappeared. It was wholly burnt up, leaving not a trace of residue. From spectrum analysis, however, we know that soda floats in the air; these organic dust particles are, I believe, the rafts that support it, and when they are removed it sinks and vanishes.

When the passage of the air was so rapid as to render imperfect the combustion of the floating matter, instead of optical emptiness a fine blue cloud made its appearance in the experimental tube. The following series of results illustrate this point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 inches, slow</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Full of particles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 &quot;</td>
<td>Red-hot</td>
<td>Optically empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 &quot; quick</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>A blue cloud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 &quot; Intensely hot</td>
<td>A fine blue cloud.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The optical character of these clouds was totally different from that of the dust which produced them. At right angles to the illuminating beam they discharged
perfectly polarized light. The cloud could be utterly quenched by a transparent Nicol's prism, and the tube containing it reduced to optical emptiness.

The particles floating in the air of London being thus proved to be organic, I sought to burn them up at the focus of a concave reflector. One of the powerfully convergent mirrors employed in my experiments on combustion by dark rays was here made use of, but I failed in the attempt. Doubtless the floating particles are in part transparent to radiant heat, and are so far incombustible by such heat. Their rapid motion through the focus also aids their escape. They do not linger there sufficiently long to be consumed. A flame it was evident would burn them up, but I thought the presence of the flame would mask its own action among the particles.

In a cylindrical beam, which powerfully illuminated the dust of the laboratory, was placed an ignited spirit-lamp. Mingling with the flame, and round its rim, were seen wreaths of darkness resembling an intensely black smoke. On lowering the flame below the beam the same dark masses stormed upwards. They were at times blacker than the blackest smoke that I have ever seen issuing from the funnel of a steamer, and their resemblance to smoke was so perfect as to lead the most practiced observer to conclude that the apparently pure flame of the alcohol lamp required but a beam of sufficient intensity to reveal its clouds of liberated carbon.

But is the blackness smoke? The question presented itself in a moment. A red-hot poker was placed underneath the beam, and from it the black wreaths also ascended. A large hydrogen flame was next employed, and it produced those whirling masses of darkness far
more copiously than either the spirit-flame or poker. Smoke was, therefore, out of the question.

What, then, was the blackness? It was simply that of stellar space; that is to say, blackness resulting from the absence from the track of the beam of all matter competent to scatter its light. When the flame was placed below the beam the floating matter was destroyed in situ; and the air, freed from this matter, rose into the beam, jostled aside the illuminated particles and substituted for their light the darkness due to its own perfect transparency. Nothing could more forcibly illustrate the invisibility of the agent which renders all things visible. The beam crossed, unseen, the black chasm formed by the transparent air, while at both sides of the gap the thick-strewn particles shone out like a luminous solid under the powerful illumination.

But here a difficulty meets us. It is not necessary to burn the particles to produce a stream of darkness. Without actual combustion, currents may be generated which shall exclude the floating matter, and therefore appear dark amid the surrounding brightness. I noticed this effect first on placing a red-hot copper ball below the beam, and permitting it to remain there until its temperature had fallen below that of boiling water. The dark currents, though much enfeebled, were still produced. They may also be produced by a flask filled with hot water.

To study this effect a platinum wire was stretched across the beam, the two ends of the wire being connected with the two poles of a voltaic battery. To regulate the strength of the current a rheostat was placed in the circuit. Beginning with a feeble current the temperature of the wire was gradually augmented, but
before it reached the heat of ignition, a flat stream of air rose from it, which when looked at edgeways appeared darker and sharper than one of the blackest lines of Fraunhofer in the solar spectrum. Right and left of this dark vertical band the floating matter rose upwards, bounding definitely the non-luminous stream of air. What is the explanation? Simply this. The hot wire rarefied the air in contact with it, but it did not equally lighten the floating matter. The convection current of pure air therefore passed upwards among the particles, dragging them after it right and left, but forming between them an impassable black partition. In this way we render an account of the dark currents produced by bodies at a temperature below that of combustion.

Oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, carbonic acid, so prepared as to exclude all floating particles, produce the darkness when poured or blown into the beam. Coal-gas does the same. An ordinary glass shade placed in the air with its mouth downwards permits the track of the beam to be seen crossing it. Let coal-gas or hydrogen enter the shade by a tube reaching to its top, the gas gradually fills the shade from the top downwards. As soon as it occupies the space crossed by the beam, the luminous track is instantly abolished. Lifting the shade so as to bring the common boundary of gas and air above the beam, the track flashes forth. After the shade is full, if it be inverted, the gas passes upwards like a black smoke among the illuminated particles.

The air of our London rooms is loaded with this organic dust, nor is the country air free from its pollution. However ordinary daylight may permit it to disguise itself, a sufficiently powerful beam causes the air in
which the dust is suspended to appear as a semi-solid rather than as a gas. Nobody could, in the first instance, without repugnance place the mouth at the illuminated focus of the electric beam and inhale the dirt revealed there. Nor is the disgust abolished by the reflection that, although we do not see the nastiness, we are churning it in our lungs every hour and minute of our lives. There is no respite to this contact with dirt; and the wonder is, not that we should from time to time suffer from its presence, but that so small a portion of it would appear to be deadly to man.

And what is this portion? It was some time ago the current belief that epidemic diseases generally were propagated by a kind of malaria, which consisted of organic matter in a state of motor-decay; that when such matter was taken into the body through the lungs or skin, it had the power of spreading there the destroying process which had attacked itself. Such a spreading power was visibly exerted in the case of yeast. A little leaven was seen to leaven the whole lump, a mere speck of matter in this supposed state of decomposition being apparently competent to propagate indefinitely its own decay. Why should not a bit of rotten malaria work in a similar manner within the human frame? In 1836 a very wonderful reply was given to this question. In that year Cagniard de la Tour discovered the yeast plant, a living organism, which, when placed in a proper medium, feeds, grows, and reproduces itself, and in this way carries on the process which we name fermentation. Fermentation was thus proved to be a product of life instead of a process of decay.

Schwann, of Berlin, discovered the yeast plant independently, and in February, 1837, he also announced the
important result, that when a decoction of meat is effectually screened from ordinary air, and supplied solely with air which has been raised to a high temperature, putrefaction never sets in. Putrefaction, therefore, he affirmed to be caused by something derived from the air, which something could be destroyed by a sufficiently high temperature. The experiments of Schwann were repeated and confirmed by Helmholtz and Ure. But as regards fermentation, the minds of chemists, influenced probably by the great authority of Gay-Lussac, who ascribed putrefaction to the action of oxygen, fell back upon the old notion of matter in a state of decay. It was not the living yeast plant, but the dead or dying parts of it, which, assailed by oxygen, produced the fermentation. This notion was finally exploded by Pasteur. He proved that the so-called "ferments" are not such; that the true ferments are organized beings which find in the reputed ferments their necessary food.

Side by side with these researches and discoveries, and fortified by them and others, has run the germ theory of epidemic disease. The notion was expressed by Kircher, and favored by Linnaeus, that epidemic diseases are due to germs which float in the atmosphere, enter the body, and produce disturbance by the development within the body of parasitic life. While it was still struggling against great odds, this theory found an expounder and a defender in the President of this Institution. At a time when most of his medical brethren considered it a wild dream, Sir Henry Holland contended that some form of the germ theory was probably true. The strength of this theory consists in the perfect parallelism of the phenomena of contagious disease with those of life. As a planted acorn gives birth to an oak compe-
tent to produce a whole crop of acorns, each gifted with
the power of reproducing its parent tree, and as thus
from a single seedling a whole forest may spring, so
these epidemic diseases literally plant their seeds, grow,
and shake abroad new germs, which, meeting in the
human body their proper food and temperature, finally
take possession of whole populations. Thus Asiatic
cholera, beginning in a small way in the Delta of the
Ganges, contrived in seventeen years to spread itself
over nearly the whole habitable world. The develop-
ment from an infinitesimal speck of the virus of small-
pox of a crop of pustules, each charged with the orig-
inal poison, is another illustration. The reappearance
of the scourge, as in the case of the Dreadnought at
Greenwich, reported on so ably by Dr. Budd and Mr.
Busk, receives a satisfactory explanation from the theory
which ascribes it to the lingering of germs about the in-
fected place.

Surgeons have long known the danger of permitting
air to enter an open abscess. To prevent its entrance
they employ a tube called a cannula, to which is at-
tached a sharp steel point called a trocar. They punc-
ture with the steel point, and by gentle pressure they
force the pus through the cannula. It is necessary to
be very careful in cleansing the instrument; and it is
difficult to see how it can be cleansed by ordinary
methods in air loaded with organic impurities, as we
have proved our air to be. The instrument ought, in
fact, to be made as hot as its temper will bear. But
this is not done, and hence, notwithstanding all the sur-
geon's care, inflammation often sets in after the first op-
eration, rendering necessary a second and a third.
Rapid putrefaction is found to accompany this new in-

flammation. The pus, moreover, which was sweet at first, and showed no trace of animal life, is now fetid, and swarming with active little organisms called vibrios. Prof. Lister, from whose recent lecture this fact is derived, contends, with every show of reason, that this rapid putrefaction and this astounding development of animal life are due to the entry of germs into the abscess during the first operation, and their subsequent nurture and development under favorable conditions of food and temperature. The celebrated physiologist and physicist, Helmholtz, is attacked annually by hay-fever. From the 20th of May to the end of June he suffers from a catarrh of the upper air-passages; and he has found during this period, and at no other, that his nasal secretions are peopled by these vibrios. They appear to nestle by preference in the cavities and recesses of the nose, for a strong sneeze is necessary to dislodge them.

These statements sound uncomfortable; but by disclosing our enemy they enable us to fight him. When he clearly eyes his quarry the eagle's strength is doubled, and his swoop is rendered sure. If the germ theory be proved true, it will give a definiteness to our efforts to stamp out disease which they could not previously possess. And it is only by definite effort under its guidance that its truth or falsehood can be established. It is difficult for an outsider like myself to read without sympathetic emotion such papers as those of Dr. Budd, of Bristol, on cholera, scarlet-fever, and small-pox. He is a man of strong imagination, and may occasionally take a flight beyond his facts; but without this dynamic heat of heart, the stolid inertia of the free-born Briton cannot be overcome. And as long as the heat is employed to warm up the truth without singeing it over-
much; as long as this enthusiasm can overmatch its mistakes by unequivocal examples of success, so long am I disposed to give it a fair field to work in, and to wish it God speed.

But let us return to our dust. It is needless to remark that it cannot be blown away by an ordinary bellows; or, more correctly, the place of the particles blown away is in this case supplied by others ejected from the bellows, so that the track of the beam remains unimpaired. But if the nozzle of a good bellows be filled with cotton wool not too tightly packed, the air urged through the wool is filtered of its floating matter, and it then forms a clean band of darkness in the illuminated dust. This was the filter used by Schroëder in his experiments on spontaneous generation, and turned subsequently to account in the excellent researches of Pasteur. Since 1868 I have constantly employed it myself.

But by far the most interesting and important illustration of this filtering process is furnished by the human breath. I fill my lungs with ordinary air and breathe through a glass tube across the electric beam. The condensation of the aqueous vapor of the breath is shown by the formation of a luminous white cloud of delicate texture. It is necessary to abolish this cloud, and this may be done by drying the breath previous to its entering into the beam; or still more simply, by warming the glass tube. When this is done the luminous track of the beam is for a time uninterrupted. The breath impresses upon the floating matter a transverse motion, but the dust from the lungs makes good the particles displaced. But after some time an obscure disc appears upon the beam, the darkness of which increases, until
finally, towards the end of the expiration, the beam is, as it were, pierced by an intensely black hole, in which no particles whatever can be discerned. The air, in fact, has so lodged its dirt within the lungs as to render the last portions of the expired breath absolutely free from suspended matter. This experiment may be repeated any number of times with the same result. It renders the distribution of the dirt within the lungs as manifest as if the chest were transparent.

I now empty my lungs as perfectly as possible, and placing a handful of cotton wool against my mouth and nostrils, inhale through it. There is no difficulty in thus filling the lungs with air. On expiring this air through the glass tube, its freedom from floating matter is at once manifest. From the very beginning of the act of expiration the beam is pierced by a black aperture. The first puff from the lungs abolishes the illuminated dust and puts a patch of darkness in its place, and the darkness continues throughout the entire course of the expiration. When the tube is placed below the beam and moved to and fro, the same smoke-like appearance as that obtained with a flame is observed. In short, the cotton wool, when used in sufficient quantity, completely intercepts the floating matter on its way to the lungs.

And here we have revealed to us the true philosophy of a practice followed by medical men, more from instinct than from actual knowledge. In a contagious atmosphere the physician places a handkerchief to his mouth and inhales through it. In doing so he unconsciously holds back the dirt and germs of the air. If the poison were a gas it would not be thus intercepted. On showing this experiment with the cotton wool to Dr.
Bence Jones, he immediately repeated it with a silk handkerchief. The result was substantially the same, though, as might be expected, the wool is by far the surest filter. The application of these experiments is obvious. If a physician wishes to hold back from the lungs of his patient, or from his own, the germs by which contagious disease is said to be propagated, he will employ a cotton wool respirator. After the revelations of this evening, such respirators must, I think, come into general use as a defence against contagion. In the crowded dwellings of the London poor, where the isolation of the sick is difficult, if not impossible, the noxious air around the patient may, by this simple means, be restored to practical purity. Thus filtered, attendants may breathe the air unharmed. In all probability the protection of the lungs will be protection of the entire system. For it is exceedingly probable that the germs which lodge in the air-passages, and which, at their leisure, can work their way across the mucous membrane, are those which sow in the body epidemic disease. If this be so, then disease can certainly be warded off by filters of cotton wool. I should be most willing to test their efficacy in my own person. And time will decide whether in lung diseases also the woolen respirator cannot abate irritation, if not arrest decay. By its means, so far as the germs are concerned, the air of the highest Alps may be brought into the chamber of the invalid.
III.

Scientific Use of the Imagination.

I carried with me to the Alps this year the heavy burden of this evening's work. In the way of new investigation I had nothing complete enough to be brought before you; so all that remained to me was to fall back upon such residues as I could find in the depths of consciousness, and out of them to spin the fiber and weave the web of this discourse. Save from memory I had no direct aid upon the mountains; but to spur up the emotions, on which so much depends, as well as to nourish indirectly the intellect and will, I took with me two volumes of poetry, Goethe's "Farbenlehre," and the work on "Logic" recently published by Mr. Alexander Bain. The spur, I am sorry to say, was no match for the integument of dullness it had to pierce.

In Goethe, so glorious otherwise, I chiefly noticed the self-inflicted hurts of genius, as it broke itself in vain against the philosophy of Newton. For a time Mr. Bain became my principal companion. I found him learned and practical, shining generally with a dry light, but exhibiting at times a flush of emotional strength, which proved that even logicians share the common fire of humanity. He interested me most when he became the mirror of my own condition. Neither intellectually nor socially is it good for man to be alone, and the griefs of thought are more patiently borne when we find that they have been experienced by another. From cer-
tain passages in his book I could infer that Mr. Bain was no stranger to such sorrows. Take this passage as an illustration. Speaking of the ebb of intellectual force which we all from time to time experience, Mr Bain says: "The uncertainty where to look for the next opening of discovery brings the pain of conflict and the debility of indecision." These words have in them the true ring of personal experience.

The action of the investigator is periodic. He grapples with a subject of inquiry, wrestles with it, overcomes it, exhausts, it may be, both himself and it for the time being. He breathes a space, and then renews the struggle in another field. Now this period of halting between two investigations is not always one of pure repose. It is often a period of doubt and discomfort, of gloom and ennui. "The uncertainty where to look for the next opening of discovery brings the pain of conflict and the debility of indecision." Such was my precise condition in the Alps this year; in a score of words Mr. Bain has here sketched my mental diagnosis; and it was under these evil circumstances that I had to equip myself for the hour and the ordeal that are now come.

Gladly, however, as I should have seen this duty in other hands, I could by no means shrink from it. Disloyalty would have been worse than failure. In some fashion or other—feebly or strongly, meanly or manfully, on the higher levels of thought, or on the flats of commonplace—the task had to be accomplished. I looked in various directions for help and furtherance; but without me for a time I saw only "antres vast," and within me "deserts idle." My case resembled that of a sick doctor who had forgotten his art, and sorely needed the
prescription of a friend. Mr. Bain wrote one for me. He said: "Your present knowledge must forge the links of connection between what has been already achieved and what is now required."

In these words he admonished me to review the past and recover from it the broken ends of former investigations. I tried to do so. Previous to going to Switzerland I had been thinking much of light and heat, of magnetism and electricity, of organic germs, atoms, molecules, spontaneous generation, comets and skies. With one or another of these I now sought to re-form an alliance, and finally succeeded in establishing a kind of cohesion between thought and light. The wish grew within me to trace, and to enable you to trace, some of the more occult operations of this agent. I wished, if possible, to take you behind the drop-scene of the senses, and to show you the hidden mechanism of optical action. For I take it to be well worth the while of the scientific teacher to take some pains, and even great pains, to make those whom he addresses co-partners of his thoughts. To clear his own mind in the first place from all haze and vagueness, and then to project into language which shall leave no mistake as to his meaning—which shall leave even his errors naked—the definite ideas he has shaped.

A great deal is, I think, possible to scientific exposition conducted in this way. It is possible, I believe, even before an audience like the present, to uncover to some extent the unseen things of nature, and thus to give, not only to professed students, but to others with the necessary bias, industry and capacity, an intelligent interest in the operations of science. Time and labor are necessary to this result, but science is the gainer from the public sympathy thus created.
How then are those hidden things to be revealed? How, for example, are we to lay hold of the physical basis of light, since, like that of life itself, it lies entirely without the domain of the senses? Now, philosophers may be right in affirming that we cannot transcend experience. But we can, at all events, carry it a long way from its origin. We can also magnify, diminish, qualify, and combine experiences, so as to render them fit for purposes entirely new. We are gifted with the power of imagination, combining what the Germans called Anschauungsgabe and Einbildungskraft, and by this power we can lighten the darkness which surrounds the world of the senses.

There are tories even in science who regard imagination as a faculty to be feared and avoided rather than employed. They had observed its action in weak vessels and were unduly impressed by its disasters. But they might with equal justice point to exploded boilers as an argument against the use of steam. Bounded and conditioned by coöperant reason, imagination becomes the mightiest instrument of the physical discoverer. Newton’s passage from a falling apple to a falling moon was a leap of the imagination. When William Thomson tries to place the ultimate particles of matter between his compass points, and to apply to them a scale of millimeters, it is an exercise of the imagination. And in much that has been recently said about protoplasm and life, we have the outgoings of the imagination guided and controlled by the known analogies of science. In fact, without this power our knowledge of nature would be a mere tabulation of coëxistences and sequences. We should still believe in the succession of day and night, of summer and winter; but the soul of force
would be dislodged from our universe; casual relations would disappear, and with them that science which is now binding the parts of nature to an organic whole.

I should like to illustrate by a few simple instances the use that scientific men have already made of this power of imagination, and to indicate afterwards some of the further uses that they are likely to make of it. Let us begin with the rudimentary experiences. Observe the falling of heavy rain drops into a tranquil pond. Each drop as it strikes the water becomes a center of disturbance, from which a series of ring ripples expands outwards. Gravity and inertia are the agents by which this wave motion is produced, and a rough experiment will suffice to show that the rate of propagation does not amount to a foot a second.

A series of slight mechanical shocks is experienced by a body plunged in the water as the wavelets reach it in succession. But a finer motion is at the same time set up and propagated. If the head and ears be immersed in the water, as in an experiment of Franklin’s, the shock of the drop is communicated to the auditory nerve—the tick of the drop is heard. Now this sonorous impulse is propagated, not at the rate of a foot a second, but at the rate of 4,700 feet a second. In this case it is not the gravity but the elasticity of the water that is the urging force. Every liquid particle pushed against its neighbor delivers up its motion with extreme rapidity, and the pulse is propagated as a thrill. The incompressibility of water, as illustrated by the famous Florentine experiment, is a measure of its elasticity, and to the possession of this property in so high a degree the rapid transmission of a sound-pulse through water is to be ascribed.
But water, as you know, is not necessary to the conduction of sound; air is its most common vehicle. And you know that when the air possesses the particular density and elasticity corresponding to the temperature of freezing water, the velocity of sound in it is 1,090 feet a second. It is almost exactly one-fourth of the velocity in water; the reason being that though the greater weight of the water tends to diminish the velocity, the enormous molecular elasticity of the liquid far more than atones for the disadvantage due to weight. By various contrivances we can compel the vibrations of the air to declare themselves; we know the length and frequency of sonorous waves, and we have also obtained great mastery over the various methods by which the air is thrown into vibration. We know the phenomena and laws of vibrating rods, of organ pipes, strings, membranes, plates, and bells. We can abolish one sound by another. We know the physical meaning of music and noise, of harmony and discord. In short, as regards sound we have a very clear notion of the external physical processes which correspond to our sensations.

In these phenomena of sound we travel a very little way from downright sensible experience. Still the imagination is to some extent exercised. The bodily eye, for example, cannot see the condensations and rarefactions of the waves of sound. We construct them in thought, and we believe as firmly in their existence as in that of the air itself. But now our experience has to be carried into a new region, where a new use is to be made of it.

Having mastered the cause and mechanism of sound, we desire to know the cause and mechanism
of light. We wish to extend our inquiries from the auditory nerve to the optic nerve. Now there is in the human intellect a power of expansion—I might almost call it a power of creation—which is brought into play by the simple brooding upon facts. The legend of the Spirit brooding over chaos may have originated in a knowledge of this power. In the case now before us it has manifested itself by transplanting into space, for the purposes of light, an adequately modified form of the mechanism of sound. We know intimately whereon the velocity of sound depends. When we lessen the density of a medium and preserve its elasticity constant, we augment the velocity. When we heighten the elasticity and keep the density constant, we also augment the velocity. A small density, therefore, and a great elasticity are the two things necessary to rapid propagation.

Now light is known to move with the astounding velocity of 185,000 miles a second. How is such a velocity to be obtained? By boldly diffusing in space a medium of the requisite tenuity and elasticity. Let us make such a medium our starting point, endowing it with one or two other necessary qualities; let us handle it in accordance with strict mechanical laws; give to every step of your deduction the surety of the syllogism; carry it thus forth from the world of imagination to the world of sense, and see whether the final outcrop of the deduction be not the very phenomena of light which ordinary knowledge and skilled experiment reveal. If in all the multiplied varieties of these phenomena, including those of the most remote and entangled description, this fundamental conception always brings us face to face with the truth; if no contradiction to our deduc-
tions from it be found in external nature; if, moreover, it has actually forced upon our attention phenomena which no eye had previously seen, and which no mind had previously imagined; if by it we are gifted with a power of prescience which has never failed when brought to an experimental test; such a conception, which never disappoints us, but always lands us on the solid shores of fact, must, we think, be something more than a mere figment of the scientific fancy. In forming it that composite and creative unity in which reason and imagination are together blend, has, we believe, led us into a world not less real than that of the senses, and of which the world of sense itself is the suggestion and justification.

Far be it from me, however, to wish to fix you immovably in this or in any other theoretic conception. With all our belief of it, it will be well to keep the theory plastic and capable of change. You may, moreover, urge that although the phenomena occur as if the medium existed, the absolute demonstration of its existence is still wanting. Far be it from me to deny to this reasoning such validity as it may fairly claim. Let us endeavor by means of analogy to form a fair estimate of its force.

You believe that in society you are surrounded by reasonable beings like yourself. You are, perhaps, as firmly convinced of this as of anything. What is your warrant for this conviction? Simply and solely this, your fellow-creatures behave as if they were reasonable; the hypothesis, for it is nothing more, accounts for the facts. To take an eminent example, you believe that our president is a reasonable being. Why? There is no known method of superposition by which any one of us can
apply himself intellectually to another so as to demonstrate coincidence as regards the possession of reason. If, therefore, you hold our president to be reasonable, it is because he behaves as if he were reasonable. As in the case of the ether, beyond the "as if" you cannot go. Nay, I should not wonder if a close comparison of the data on which both inferences rest caused many respectable persons to conclude that the ether had the best of it.

This universal medium, this light-ether as it is called, is a vehicle, not an origin of wave motion. It receives and transmits, but it does not create. Whence does it derive the motions it conveys? For the most part from luminous bodies. By this motion of a luminous body I do not mean its sensible motion, such as the flicker of a candle, or the shooting out of red prominences from the limb of the sun. I mean an intestine motion of the atoms or molecules of the luminous body. But here a certain reserve is necessary. Many chemists of the present day refuse to speak of atoms and molecules as real things. Their caution leads them to stop short of the clear, sharp, mechanically intelligible atomic theory enunciated by Dalton, or any form of that theory, and to make the doctrine of multiple proportions their intellectual bourne. I respect the caution, though I think it is here misplaced. The chemists who recoil from these notions of atoms and molecules accept without hesitation the undulatory theory of light. Like you and me they one and all believe in an ether and its light-producing waves. Let us consider what this belief involves.

Bring your imaginations once more into play and figure a series of sound waves passing through air,
Follow them up to their origin, and what do you there find? A definite, tangible, vibrating body. It may be the vocal chords of a human being, it may be an organ pipe, or it may be a stretched string. Follow in the same manner a train of ether waves to their source, remembering at the same time that your ether is matter, dense, elastic, and capable of motions subject to and determined by mechanical laws. What then do you expect to find as the source of a series of ether waves? Ask your imagination if it will accept a vibrating multiple proportion—a numerical ratio in a state of oscillation? I do not think it will. You cannot crown the edifice by this abstraction. The scientific imagination, which is here authoritative, demands as the origin and cause of a series of ether waves a particle of vibrating matter quite as definite, though it may be excessively minute, as that which gives origin to a musical sound. Such a particle we name an atom or a molecule. I think the imagination when focused so as to give definition without penumbral haze is sure to realize this image at last.

To preserve thought continuous throughout this discourse, to prevent either lack of knowledge or failure of memory from producing any rent in our picture, I here propose to run rapidly over a bit of ground which is probably familiar to most of you, but which I am anxious to make familiar to you all.

The waves generated in the ether by the swinging atoms of luminous bodies are of different lengths and amplitudes. The amplitude is the width of swing of the individual particles of the wave. In water waves it is the height of the crest above the trough, while the length of the wave is the distance between two con-
secutive crests. The aggregate of waves emitted by the sun may be broadly divided into two classes, the one class competent, the other incompetent, to excite vision.

But the light-producing waves differ markedly among themselves in size, form, and force. The length of the largest of these waves is about twice that of the smallest, but the amplitude of the largest is probably a hundred times that of the smallest. Now the force or energy of the wave, which, expressed with reference to sensation, means the intensity of the light, is proportional to the square of the amplitude. Hence the amplitude being one hundred-fold, the energy of the largest light-giving waves would be ten thousand-fold that of the smallest. This is not improbable. I use these figures, not with a view to numerical accuracy, but to give you definite ideas of the differences that probably exist among the light-giving waves. And if we take the whole range of solar radiation into account—its non-visual as well as its visual waves—I think it probable that the force or energy of the largest wave is a million times that of the smallest.

Turned into their equivalents of sensation, the different light waves produce different colors. Red, for example, is produced by the largest waves, violet by the smallest, while green is produced by a wave of intermediate length and amplitude. On entering from air into more highly refracting substances, such as glass or water or the sulphide of carbon, all the waves are retarded, but the smallest ones most. This furnishes a means of separating the different classes of waves from each other—in other words, of analyzing the light. Sent through a refracting prism, the waves of the sun are turned aside in different degrees from their direct course,
the red least, the violet most. They are virtually pulled asunder, and they paint upon a white screen placed to receive them "the solar spectrum."

Strictly speaking, the spectrum embraces an infinity of colors, but the limits of language and of our powers of distinction cause it to be divided into seven segments: Red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo, violet. These are the seven primary or prismatic colors. Separately, or mixed in various proportions, the solar waves yield all the colors observed in nature and employed in art. Collectively they give us the impression of whiteness. Pure unsifted solar light is white; and if all the wave constituents of such light be reduced in the same proportion, the light, though diminished in intensity, will still be white. The whiteness of Alpine snow with the sun shining upon it is barely tolerable to the eye. The same snow under an overcast firmament is still white. Such a firmament enfeebles the light by reflection, and when we lift ourselves above a cloud-field—to an Alpine summit, for instance, or to the top of Snowdon—and see, in the proper direction, the sun shining on the clouds, they appear dazzlingly white. Ordinary clouds, in fact, divide the solar light impinging on them into two parts—a reflected part and a transmitted part, in each of which the proportions of wave motion which produce the impression of whiteness are sensibly preserved.

It will be understood that the conditions of whiteness would fail if all the waves were diminished equally, or by the same absolute quantity. They must be reduced proportionately instead of equally. If by the act of reflection the waves of red light are split into exact halves, then, to preserve the light white, the waves of yellow,
orange, green, and blue must also be split into exact halves. In short, the reduction must take place, not by absolutely equal quantities, but by equal fractional parts. In white light the preponderance as regards energy of the larger over the smaller waves must always be immense. Were the case otherwise, the physiological correlative, blue, of the smaller waves would have the upper hand in our sensations.

My wish to render our mental images complete, causes me to dwell briefly upon these known points, and the same wish will cause me to linger a little longer among others. But here I am disturbed by my reflections. When I consider the effect of dinner upon the nervous system, and the relation of that system to the intellectual powers I am now invoking; when I remember that the universal experience of mankind has fixed upon certain definite elements of perfection in an after-dinner speech, and when I think how conspicuous by their absence these elements are on the present occasion, the thought is not comforting to a man who wishes to stand well with his fellow-creatures in general, and with the members of the British Association in particular. My condition might well resemble that of the ether, which is scientifically defined as an assemblage of vibrations. And the worst of it is that, unless you reverse the general verdict regarding the effect of dinner, and prove in your own persons that a uniform experience need not continue uniform—which will be a great point gained for some people—these tremors of mine are likely to become more and more painful. But I call to mind the comforting words of an inspired, though uncanonical writer, who admonishes us in the Apocrypha that fear is a bad
counsellor. Let me then cast him out, and let me trustfully assume that you will one and all postpone that balmy sleep, of which dinner might, under the circumstances, be regarded as the indissoluble antecedent, and that you will manfully and womanfully prolong your investigations of the ether and its waves into regions which have been hitherto crossed by the pioneers of science alone.

Not only are the waves of ether reflected by clouds, by solids, and by liquids, but when they pass from light air to dense, or from dense air to light, a portion of the wave-motion is always reflected. Now our atmosphere changes continually in density from top to bottom. It will help our conceptions if we regard it as made up of a series of thin concentric layers or shells of air, each shell being of the same density throughout, and a small and sudden change of density occurring in passing from shell to shell. Light would be reflected at the limiting surfaces of all these shells, and their action would be practically the same as that of the real atmosphere.

And now I would ask your imagination to picture this act of reflection. What must become of the reflected light? The atmospheric layers turn their convex surfaces towards the sun; they are so many convex mirrors of feeble power, and you will immediately perceive that the light regularly reflected from these surfaces cannot reach the earth at all, but is dispersed in space.

But though the sun's light is not reflected in this fashion from the aerial layers to the earth, there is indubitable evidence to show that the light of our firmament is reflected light. Proofs of the most cogent description could be here adduced; but we need only consider that we receive light at the same time from all parts of
the hemisphere of heaven. The light of the firmament comes to us across the direction of the solar rays, and even against the direction of the solar rays; and this lateral and opposing rush of wave-motion can only be due to the rebound of the waves from the air itself, or from something suspended in the air. It is also evident that, unlike the action of clouds, the solar light is not reflected by the sky in the proportions which produce white. The sky is blue, which indicates a deficiency on the part of the larger waves. In accounting for the color of the sky, the first question suggested by analogy would undoubtedly be, is not the air blue? The blueness of the air has, in fact, been given as a solution of the blueness of the sky. But reason basing itself on observation asks in reply, How, if the air be blue, can the light of sunrise and sunset, which travels through vast distances of air, be yellow, orange, or even red? The passage of the white solar light through a blue medium could by no possibility redden the light. The hypothesis of a blue air is therefore untenable. In fact, the agent, whatever it is, which sends us the light of the sky, exercises in so doing a dichroitic action. The light reflected is blue, the light transmitted is orange or red. A marked distinction is thus exhibited between the matter of the sky and that of an ordinary cloud, which latter exercises no such dichroitic action.

By the force of imagination and reason combined we may penetrate this mystery also. The cloud takes no note of size on the part of the waves of ether, but reflects them all alike. It exercises no selective action. Now the cause of this may be that the cloud particles are so large in comparison with the size of the waves of ether as to reflect them all indifferently. A broad cliff re-
reflects an Atlantic roller as easily as a ripple produced by a sea bird’s wing; and in the presence of large reflecting surfaces the existing differences of magnitude among the waves of ether may disappear. But supposing the reflecting particles, instead of being very large, to be very small, in comparison with the size of the waves. In this case, instead of the whole wave being fronted and in great part thrown back, a small portion only is shivered off. The great mass of the wave passes over such a particle without reflection. Scatter then, a handful of such minute foreign particles in our atmosphere, and set imagination to watch their action upon the solar waves. Waves of all sizes impinge upon the particles, and you see at every collision a portion of the impinging wave struck off by reflection. All the waves of the spectrum, from the extreme red to the extreme violet, are thus acted upon. But in what proportions will the waves be scattered? A clear picture will enable us to anticipate the experimental answer. Remembering that the red waves are to the blue much in the relation of billows to ripples, let us consider whether those extremely small particles are competent to scatter all the waves in the same proportion. If they be not—and a little reflection will make it clear to you that they are not—the production of color must be an incident of the scattering. Largeness is a thing of relation; and the smaller the wave the greater is the relative size of any particle on which the wave impinges, and the greater also the ratio of the reflected portion to the total wave.

A pebble placed in the way of the ring-ripples produced by our heavy rain-drops on a tranquil pond will throw back a large fraction of the ripple incident upon it, while the fractional part of a larger wave thrown back
by the same pebble might be infinitesimal. Now we have already made it clear to our minds that to preserve the solar light white, its constituent proportions must not be altered; but in the act of division performed by these very small particles we see that the proportions are altered; an undue fraction of the smaller waves is scattered by the particles, and, as a consequence, in the scattered light blue will be the predominant color. The other colors of the spectrum must, to some extent, be associated with the blue. They are not absent, but deficient. We ought, in fact, to have them all, but in diminishing proportions, from the violet to the red.

We have here presented a case to the imagination, and assuming the undulatory theory to be a reality, we have, I think, fairly reasoned our way to the conclusion that, were particles, small in comparison to the size of the ether waves, sown in our atmosphere, the light scattered by those particles would be exactly such as we observe in our azure skies. When this light is analyzed all the colors of the spectrum are found; but they are found in the proportions indicated by our conclusion.

Let us now turn our attention to the light which passes unscattered among the particles. How must it be finally affected? By its successive collisions with the particles, the white light is more and more robbed of its shorter waves; it therefore loses more and more of its due proportion of blue. The result may be anticipated. The transmitted light, where short distances are involved, will appear yellowish. But as the sun sinks towards the horizon, the atmospheric distances increase, and consequently the number of the scattering particles. They abstract, in succession, the violet, the indigo, the blue, and even disturb the proportions of green. The trans-
mitted light under such circumstances must pass from yellow through orange to red. This also is exactly what we find in nature. Thus, while the reflected light gives us at noon the deep azure of the Alpine skies, the transmitted light gives us at sunset the warm crimson of the Alpine snows. The phenomena certainly occur as if our atmosphere were a medium rendered slightly turbid by the mechanical suspension of exceedingly small foreign particles.

Here, as before, we encounter our skeptical "as if." It is one of the parasites of science, ever at hand, and ready to plant itself and sprout, if it can, on the weak points of our philosophy. But a strong constitution defies the parasite, and in our case, as we question the phenomena, probability grows like growing health, until in the end the malady of doubt is completely extirpated.

The first question that naturally arises is, Can small particles be really proved to act in the manner indicated? No doubt of it. Each one of you can submit the question to an experimental test. Water will not dissolve resin, but spirit will, and when spirit which holds resin in solution is dropped into water the resin immediately separates in solid particles, which render the water milky. The coarseness of this precipitate depends on the quantity of the dissolved resin. You can cause it to separate in thick clots or in exceedingly fine particles. Professor Brücke has given us the proportions which produce particles particularly suited to our present purpose. One gramme of clean mastic is dissolved in eighty-seven grammes of absolute alcohol, and the transparent solution is allowed to drop into a beaker containing clear water kept briskly stirred. An exceedingly fine precipitate is thus formed, which declares its
presence by its action upon light. Placing a dark surface behind the beaker, and permitting the light to fall into it from the top or front, the medium is seen to be distinctly blue. It is not, perhaps, so perfect a blue as I have seen on exceptional days, this year, among the Alps, but it is a very fair sky blue. A trace of soap in water gives a tint of blue. London, and I fear Liverpool milk, makes an approximation to the same color through the operation of the same cause; and Helmholtz has irreverently disclosed the fact that a blue eye is simply a turbid medium.

Numerous instances of the kind might be cited. The action of turbid media upon light was fully and beautifully illustrated by Goethe, who, though unacquainted with the undulatory theory, was led by his experiments to regard the blue of the firmament as caused by an illuminated turbid medium with the darkness of space behind it. He describes glasses showing a bright yellow by transmitted, and a beautiful blue by reflected light. Professor Stokes, who was probably the first to discern the real nature of the action of small particles on the waves of ether, describes a glass of a similar kind. What artists call "chill" is no doubt an effect of this description. Through the action of minute particles, the browns of a picture often present the appearance of the bloom of a plum. By rubbing the varnish with a silk handkerchief optical continuity is established and the chill disappears.

Some years ago I witnessed Mr. Hirst experimenting at Zermatt on the turbid water of the Visp, which was charged with the finely divided matter ground down by the glaciers. When kept still for a day or so the grosser matter sank, but the finer matter remained suspended, and gave a distinctly blue tinge to the water. No doubt
the blueness of certain Alpine lakes is in part due to this cause. Professor Roscoe has noticed several striking cases of a similar kind. In a very remarkable paper the late Principal Forbes showed that steam issuing from the safety valve of a locomotive, when favorably observed, exhibits at a certain stage of its condensation the colors of the sky. It is blue by reflected light, and orange or red by transmitted light. The effect, as pointed out by Goethe, is to some extent exhibited by peat smoke.

More than ten years ago I amused myself at Killarney, by observing on a calm day, the straight smoke columns rising from the chimneys of the cabins. It was easy to project the lower portion of a column against a bright cloud. The smoke in the former case was blue, being seen mainly by reflected light; in the latter case it was reddish, being seen mainly by transmitted light. Such smoke was not in exactly the condition to give us the glow of the Alps, but it was a step in this direction. Brücke's fine precipitate above referred to looks yellowish by transmitted light, but by duly strengthening the precipitate you may render the white light of noon as ruby colored as the sun when seen through Liverpool smoke or upon Alpine horizons.

I do not, however, point to the gross smoke arising from coal as an illustration of the action of small particles, because such smoke soon absorbs and destroys the waves of blue instead of sending them to the eyes of the observer.

These multifarious facts, and numberless others which cannot now be referred to, are explained by reference to the single principle that where the scattering particles
are small in comparison to the size of the waves, we have in the reflected light a greater proportion of the smaller waves, and in the transmitted light a greater proportion of the larger waves, than existed in the original white light. The physiological consequence is that in the one light blue is predominant, and in the other light orange or red. And now let us push our inquiries forward. Our best microscopes can readily reveal objects not more than \( \frac{1}{10000} \) of an inch in diameter. This is less than the length of a wave of red light. Indeed, a first-rate microscope would enable us to discern objects not exceeding in diameter the length of the smallest waves of the visible spectrum. By the microscope, therefore, we can submit our particles to an experimental test. If they are as large as the light-waves they will infallibly be seen; and if they are not seen it is because they are smaller.

I placed in the hands of our president a bottle containing Brücke’s particles in greater number and coarseness than those examined by Brücke himself. The liquid was a milky blue, and Mr. Huxley applied to it his highest microscopic power. He satisfied me at the time that had particles of even \( \frac{1}{1000000} \) of an inch in diameter existed in the liquid they could not have escaped detection. But no particles were seen. Under the microscope the turbid liquid was not to be distinguished from distilled water. Brücke, I may say, also found the particles to be of ultra microscopic magnitude.

But we have it in our power to imitate far more closely than we have hitherto done the natural conditions of this problem. We can generate in air, as many of you know, artificial skies, and prove their perfect identity with
the natural one as regards the exhibition of a number of wholly unexpected phenomena. By a continuous process of growth, moreover, we are able to connect sky matter, if I may use the term, with molecular matter on the one side, and with molar matter, or matter in sensible masses, on the other.

In illustration of this, I will take an experiment described by M. Morren, of Marseilles, at the last meeting of the British Association. Sulphur and oxygen combine to form sulphurous acid gas. It is this choking gas that is smelt when a sulphur match is burnt in air. Two atoms of oxygen and one of sulphur constitute the molecule of sulphurous acid. Now it has been recently shown in a great number of instances that waves of ether issuing from a strong source, such as the sun or the electric light, are competent to shake asunder the atoms of gaseous molecules. A chemist would call this “decomposition” by light; but it behooves us, who are examining the power and function of the imagination, to keep constantly before us the physical images which we hold to underlie our terms. Therefore I say, sharply and definitely, that the components of the molecules of sulphurous acid are shaken asunder by the ether waves. Inclosing the substance in a suitable vessel, placing it in a dark room, and sending through it a powerful beam of light, we at first see nothing; the vessel containing the gas is as empty as a vacuum. Soon, however, along the track of the beam a beautiful sky-blue color is observed, which is due to the liberated particles of sulphur. For a time the blue grows more intense; it then becomes whitish; and from a whitish blue it passes to a more or less perfect white. If the action be continued long enough, we end by filling the tube
with a dense cloud of sulphur particles, which by the application of proper means may be rendered visible.

Here, then, our ether waves untie the bond of chemical affinity, and liberate a body—sulphur—which at ordinary temperatures is a solid, and which therefore soon becomes an object of the senses. We have first of all the free atoms of sulphur, which are both invisible and incompetent to stir the retina sensibly with scattered light. But these atoms gradually coalesce and form particles, which grow larger by continual accretion until after a minute or two they appear as sky matter. In this condition they are invisible themselves, but competent to send an amount of wave motion to the retina sufficient to produce the firmamental blue. The particles continue, or may be caused to continue, in this condition for a considerable time, during which no microscope can cope with them. But they continually grow larger, and pass by insensible gradations into the state of cloud, when they can no longer elude the armed eye. Thus, without solution of continuity, we start with matter in the molecule, and end with matter in the mass, sky matter being the middle term of the series of transformations.

Instead of sulphurous acid we might choose from a dozen other substances, and produce the same effect with any of them. In the case of some—probably in the case of all—it is possible to preserve matter in the skyey condition for fifteen or twenty minutes under the continual operation of the light. During these fifteen or twenty minutes the particles are constantly growing larger, without ever exceeding the size requisite to the production of the celestial blue. Now when two vessels are placed before you, each containing sky matter,
it is possible to state with great distinctness which vessel contains the largest particles.

The eye is very sensitive to differences of light, when, as here, the eye is in comparative darkness, and when the quantities of wave motion thrown against the retina are small. The larger particles declare themselves by the greater whiteness of their scattered light. Call now to mind the observation, or effort at observation, made by our president when he failed to distinguish the particles of resin in Brücke's medium, and when you have done so follow me. I permitted a beam of light to act upon a certain vapor. In two minutes the azure appeared, but at the end of fifteen minutes it had not ceased to be azure. After fifteen minutes, for example, its color and some other phenomena pronounced it to be a blue of distinctly smaller particles than those sought for in vain by Mr. Huxley. These particles, as already stated, must have been less than $\frac{1}{10000}$ of an inch in diameter.

And now I want you to submit to your imagination the following question: Here are particles which have been growing continually for fifteen minutes, and at the end of that time are demonstrably smaller than those which defied the microscope of Mr. Huxley. What must have been the size of these particles at the beginning of their growth? What notion can you form of the magnitude of such particles? As the distances of stellar space give us simply a bewildering sense of vastness without leaving any distinct impression on the mind, so the magnitudes with which we have here to do impress us with a bewildering sense of smallness. We are dealing with infinitesimals compared with which the test objects of the microscope are literally immense.
From their perviousness to stellar light, and other considerations, Sir John Herschel drew some startling conclusions regarding the density and weight of comets. You know that these extraordinary and mysterious bodies sometimes throw out tails 100,000,000 of miles in length, and 50,000 miles in diameter. The diameter of our earth is 8,000 miles. Both it and the sky, and a good portion of space beyond the sky, would certainly be included in a sphere 10,000 miles across. Let us fill this sphere with cometary matter, and make it our unit of measure. An easy calculation informs us that to produce a comet's tail of the size just mentioned, about 300,000 such measures would have to be emptied into space. Now suppose the whole of this stuff to be swept together, and suitably compressed, what do you suppose its volume would be? Sir John Herschel would probably tell you that the whole mass might be carted away at a single effort by one of your dray-horses. In fact, I do not know that he would require more than a small fraction of a horse-power to remove the cometary dust. After this you will hardly regard as monstrous a notion I have sometimes entertained concerning the quantity of matter in our sky. Suppose a shell, then, to surround the earth at a height above the surface which would place it beyond the grosser matter that hangs in the lower regions of the air—say at the height of the Matterhorn or Mont Blanc. Outside this shell we have the deep blue firmament. Let the atmospheric space beyond the shell be swept clean, and let the sky matter be properly gathered up. What is its probable amount? I have sometimes thought that a lady's portmanteau would contain it all. I have thought that even a gentleman's portmanteau—possibly his snuff-box—might take it
in. And whether the actual sky be capable of this amount of condensation or not, I entertain no doubt that a sky quite as vast as ours, and as good in appearance, could be formed from a quantity of matter which might be held in the hollow of the hand.

Small in mass, the vastness in point of number of the particles of our sky may be inferred from the continuity of its light. It is not in broken patches nor at scattered points that the heavenly azure is revealed. To the observer on the summit of Mont Blanc the blue is as uniform and coherent as if it formed the surface of the most close-grained solid. A marble dome would not exhibit a stricter continuity. And Mr. Glaisher will inform you that if our hypothetical shell were lifted to twice the height of Mont Blanc above the earth's surface, we should still have the azure overhead. Everywhere through the atmosphere those sky particles are strewn. They fill the Alpine valleys, spreading like a delicate gauze in front of the slopes of pine. They sometimes so swathe the peaks with light as to abolish their definition. This year I have seen the Weisshorn thus dissolved in opalescent air.

By proper instruments the glare thrown from the sky particles against the retina may be quenched, and then the mountain which it obliterated starts into sudden definition. Its extinction in front of a dark mountain resembles exactly the withdrawal of a veil. It is the light then taking possession of the eye, and not the particles acting as opaque bodies, that interfere with the definition.

By day this light quenches the stars; even by moonlight it is able to exclude from vision all stars between the fifth and the eleventh magnitude. It may be likened
to a noise, and the stellar radiance to a whisper drowned by the noise. What is the nature of the particles which shed this light? On points of controversy I will not here enter, but I may say that De la Rive ascribes the haze of the Alps in fine weather to floating organic germs. Now the possible existence of germs in such profusion has been held up as an absurdity. It has been affirmed that they would darken the air, and on the assumed impossibility of their existence in the requisite numbers, without invasion of the solar light, a powerful argument has been based by believers in spontaneous generation.

Similar arguments have been used by the opponents of the germ theory of epidemic disease, and both parties have triumphantly challenged an appeal to the microscope and the chemist's balance to decide the question. Without committing myself in the least to De la Rive's notion, without offering any objection here to the doctrine of spontaneous generation, without expressing any adherence to the germ theory of disease, I would simply draw attention to the fact that in the atmosphere we have particles which defy both the microscope and the balance, which do not darken the air, and which exist, nevertheless, in multitudes sufficient to reduce to insignificance the Israelitish hyperbole regarding the sands upon the seashore.

The varying judgments of men on these and other questions may perhaps be, to some extent, accounted for by that doctrine of relativity which plays so important a part in philosophy. This doctrine affirms that the impressions made upon us by any circumstance, or combination of circumstances, depends upon our previous state. Two travelers upon the same peak, the one hav-
ing ascended to it from the plain, the other having de-
scended to it from a higher elevation, will be differently
affected by the scene around them. To the one nature
is expanding, to the other it is contracting, and feelings
are sure to differ which have two such different anteced-
ent states.

In our scientific judgments the law of relativity may
also play an important part. To two men, one educated
in the school of the senses, who has mainly occupied
himself with observation, and the other educated in the
school of imagination as well, and exercised in the con-
ception of atoms and molecules to which we have so
frequently referred, a bit of matter, say \( \frac{\pi}{4} \) of an inch
in diameter, will present itself differently. The one de-
scends to it from his molar hights, the other climbs to
it from his molecular lowlands. To the one it appears
small, to the other large. So also as regards the appreci-
ation of the most minute forms of life revealed by the
microscope. To one of these men they naturally ap-
ppear conterminous with the ultimate particles of matter,
and he readily figures the molecules from which they di-
rectly spring; with him there is but a step from the
atom to the organism. The other discerns numberless
organic gradations between both. Compared with his
atoms, the smallest vibrios and bacteria of the micro-
scopic field are as behemoth and leviathan.

The law of relativity may to some extent explain the
different attitudes of these two men with regard to the
question of spontaneous generation. An amount of
evidence which satisfies the one entirely fails to satisfy
the other; and while to the one the last bold defense
and startling expansion of the doctrine will appear per-
fectly conclusive, to the other it will present itself as im-
posing a profitless labor of demolition on subsequent investigators. The proper and possible attitude of these two men is that each of them should work as if it were his aim and object to establish the view entertained by the other.

I trust, Mr. President, that you—whom untoward circumstances have made a biologist, but who still keep alive your sympathy with that class of inquiries which nature intended you to pursue and adorn—will excuse me to your brethren if I say that some of them seem to form an inadequate estimate of the distance which separates the microscopic from the molecular limit, and that, as a consequence, they sometimes employ a phraseology which is calculated to mislead.

When, for example, the contents of a cell are described as perfectly homogeneous, as absolutely structureless, because the microscope fails to distinguish any structure, then I think the microscope begins to play a mischievous part. A little consideration will make it plain to all of you that the microscope can have no voice in the real question of germ structure. Distilled water is more perfectly homogeneous than the contents of any possible organic germ. What causes the liquid to cease contracting at 39° F., and to grow bigger until it freezes? It is a structural process of which the microscope can take no note, nor is it likely to do so by any conceivable extension of its powers. Place this distilled water in the field of an electro-magnet, and bring a microscope to bear upon it. Will any change be observed when the magnet is excited? Absolutely none; and still profound and complex changes have occurred.

First of all, the particles of water are rendered dia-
magnetically polar; and secondly, in virtue of the structure impressed upon it by the magnetic strain of its molecules, the liquid twists a ray of light in a fashion perfectly determinate both as to quantity and direction. It would be immensely interesting to both you and me if one here present, who has brought his brilliant imagination to bear upon this subject, could make us see as he sees the entangled molecular processes involved in the rotation of the plane of polarization by magnetic force. While dealing with this question he lived in a world of matter and of motion to which the microscope has no passport, and in which it can offer no aid. The cases in which similar conditions hold are simply numberless. Have the diamond, the amethyst, and the countless other crystals formed in the laboratories of nature and of man, no structure? Assuredly they have, but what can the microscope make of it? Nothing. It cannot be too distinctly borne in mind that between the microscopic limit and the true molecular limit there is room for infinite permutations and combinations. It is in this region that the poles of the atoms are arranged, that tendency is given to their powers, so that when these poles and powers have free action and proper stimulus in a suitable environment, they determine first the germ and afterwards the complete organism. This first marshaling of the atoms on which all subsequent action depends baffles a keener power than that of the microscope. Through pure excess of complexity, and long before observation can have any voice in the matter, the most highly trained intellect, the most refined and disciplined imagination, retires in bewilderment from the contemplation of the problem. We are struck dumb by an astonishment which no microscope can re-
lieve, doubting not only the power of our instrument, but even whether we ourselves possess the intellectual elements which will ever enable us to grapple with the ultimate structural energies of nature.

But the speculative faculty, of which imagination forms so large a part, will nevertheless wander into regions where the hope of certainty would seem to be entirely shut out. We think that though the detailed analysis may be, and may ever remain, beyond us, general notions may be attainable. At all events, it is plain that beyond the present outposts of microscopic inquiry lies an immense field for the exercise of the imagination. It is only, however, the privileged spirits who know how to use their liberty without abusing it, who are able to surround imagination by the firm frontiers of reason, that are likely to work with any profit here. But freedom to them is of such paramount importance that, for the sake of securing it, a good deal of wildness on the part of weaker brethren may be overlooked. In more senses than one Mr. Darwin has drawn heavily upon the scientific tolerance of his age. He has drawn heavily upon time in his development of species, and he has drawn adventurously upon matter in his theory of pangenesis. According to this theory, a germ already microscopic is a world of minor germs. Not only is the organism as a whole wrapped up in the germ, but every organ of the organism has there its special seed.

This, I say, is an adventurous draft on the power of matter to divide itself and distribute its forces. But, unless we are perfectly sure that he is overstepping the bounds of reason, that he is unwittingly sinning against observed fact or demonstrated law—for a mind like that of Darwin can never sin wittingly against either fact or
law—we ought, I think, to be cautious in limiting his intellectual horizon. If there be the least doubt in the matter, it ought to be given in favor of the freedom of such a mind. To it a vast possibility is in itself a dynamic power, though the possibility may never be drawn upon.

It gives me pleasure to think that the facts and reasonings of this discourse tend rather towards the justification of Mr. Darwin than towards his condemnation, that they tend rather to augment than to diminish the cubic space demanded by this soaring speculator; for they seem to show the perfect competence of matter and force, as regards divisibility and distribution, to bear the heaviest strain that he has hitherto imposed upon them.

In the case of Mr. Darwin, observation, imagination, and reason combined have run back with wonderful sagacity and success over a certain length of the line of biological succession. Guided by analogy, in his “Origin of Species” he placed as the root of life a primordial germ, from which he conceived the amazing richness and variety of the life that now is upon the earth’s surface, might be deduced. If this were true it would not be final. The human imagination would infallibly look behind the germ, and inquire into the history of its genesis.

Certainty is here hopeless, but the materials for an opinion may be attainable. In this dim twilight of speculation the inquirer welcomes every gleam, and seeks to augment his light by indirect incidences. He studies the methods of nature in the ages and the worlds within his reach, in order to shape the course of imagination in the antecedent ages and worlds. And though the
certainty possessed by experimental inquiry is here shut out, the imagination is not left entirely without guidance. From the examination of the solar system, Kant and Laplace came to the conclusion that its various bodies once formed parts of the same undislocated mass; that matter in a nebulous form preceded matter in a dense form; that as the ages rolled away heat was wasted, condensation followed, planets were detached, and that finally the chief portion of the fiery cloud reached, by self-compression, the magnitude and density of our sun. The earth itself offers evidence of a fiery origin; and in our day the hypothesis of Kant and Laplace receives the independent countenance of spectrum analysis, which proves the same substances to be common to the earth and sun. Accepting some such view of the construction of our system as probable, a desire immediately arises to connect the present life of our planet with the past. We wish to know something of our remotest ancestry.

On its first detachment from the central mass, life, as we understand it, could hardly have been present on the earth. How then did it come there? The thing to be encouraged here is a reverent freedom—a freedom preceded by the hard discipline which checks licentiousness in speculation—while the thing to be repressed, both in science and out of it, is dogmatism. And here I am in the hands of the meeting—willing to end, but ready to go on. I have no right to intrude upon you, unasked, the unformed notions which are floating like clouds or gathering to more solid consistency in the modern speculative scientific mind. But if you wish me to speak plainly, honestly, and undisputatiously, I am willing to do so. On the present occasion

You are ordained to call, and I to come.
Two views, then, offer themselves to us. Life was present potentially in matter when in the nebulous form, and was unfolded from it by the way of natural development, or it is a principle inserted into matter at a later date. With regard to the question of time, the views of men have changed remarkably in our day and generation; and I must say as regards courage also, and a manful willingness to engage in open contest, with fair weapons, a great change has also occurred.

The clergy of England—at all events the clergy of London—have nerve enough to listen to the strongest views which any one amongst us would care to utter; and they invite, if they do not challenge, men of the most decided opinions to state and stand by those opinions in open court. No theory upsets them. Let the most destructive hypothesis be stated only in the language current among gentlemen, and they look it in the face. They forego alike the thunders of heaven and the terrors of the other place, smiting the theory, if they do not like it, with honest secular strength. In fact, the greatest cowards of the present day are not to be found among the clergy, but within the pale of science itself.

Two or three years ago in an ancient London college—a clerical institution—I heard a very remarkable lecture by a very remarkable man. Three or four hundred clergymen were present at the lecture. The orator began with the civilisation of Egypt in the time of Joseph; pointing out that the very perfect organization of the kingdom, and the possession of chariots, in one of which Joseph rode, indicated a long antecedent period of civilization. He then passed on to the mud of the Nile, its rate of augmentation, its present thickness, and the remains of human handiwork found therein;
thence to the rocks which bound the Nile valley, and which team with organic remains. Thus, in his own clear and admirable way, he caused the idea of the world's age to expand itself indefinitely before the mind of his audience, and he contrasted this with the age usually assigned to the world.

During his discourse he seemed to be swimming against a stream; he manifestly thought that he was opposing a general conviction. He expected resistance; so did I. But it was all a mistake; there was no adverse current, no opposing conviction, no resistance, merely here and there a half humorous but unsuccessful attempt to entangle him in his talk. The meeting agreed with all that had been said regarding the antiquity of the earth and of its life. They had, indeed, known it all long ago, and they good-humoredly rallied the lecturer for coming amongst them with so stale a story. It was quite plain that this large body of clergymen, who were, I should say, the finest samples of their class, had entirely given up the ancient landmarks, and transported the conception of life's origin to an indefinitely distant past.

In fact, clergymen, if I might be allowed a parenthesis to say so, have as strong a leaning towards scientific truth as other men, only the resistance to this bent—a resistance due to education—is generally stronger in their case than in others. They do not lack the positive element, namely, the love of truth, but the negative element, the fear of error, preponderates.

The strength of an electric current is determined by two things—the electro-motive force, and the resistance that force has to overcome. A fraction, with the former as numerator and the latter as denominator, expresses
the current-strength. The "current-strength" of the clergy towards science may also be expressed by making the positive element just referred to the numerator, and the negative one the denominator of a fraction. The numerator is not zero nor is it even small, but the denominator is large; and hence the current strength is such as we find it to be. Slowness of conception, even open hostility, may be thus accounted for. They are for the most part errors of judgment, and not sins against truth. To most of us it may appear very simple, but to a few of us it appears transcendently wonderful, that in all classes of society truth should have this power and fascination. From the countless modifications that life has undergone through natural selection and the integration of infinitesimal steps, emerges finally the grand result that the strength of truth is greater than the strength of error, and that we have only to make the truth clear to the world to gain the world to our side. Probably no one wonders more at this result than the propounder of the law of natural selection himself. Reverting to an old acquaintance of ours, it would seem, on purely scientific grounds, as if a Veracity were at the heart of things; as if, after ages of latent working, it had finally unfolded itself in the life of man; as if it were still destined to unfold itself, growing in girth, throwing out stronger branches and thicker leaves, and tending more and more by its overshadowing presence to starve the weeds of error from the intellectual soil.

But this is parenthetical; and the gist of our present inquiry regarding the introduction of life is this: Does it belong to what we call matter, or is it an independent principle inserted into matter at some suitable epoch—
say when the physical conditions become such as to permit of the development of life? Let us put the question with all the reverence due to a faith and culture in which we all were cradled—a faith and culture, moreover, which are the undeniable historic antecedents of our present enlightenment. I say, let us put the question reverently, but let us also put it clearly and definitely.

There are the strongest grounds for believing that during a certain period of its history the earth was not, nor was it fit to be, the theater of life. Whether this was ever a nebulous period, or merely a molten period, does not much matter; and if we revert to the nebulous condition, it is because the probabilities are really on its side. Our question is this: Did creative energy pause until the nebulous matter had condensed, until the earth had been detached, until the solar fire had so far withdrawn from the earth's vicinity as to permit a crust to gather round a planet? Did it wait until the air was isolated, until the seas were formed, until evaporation, condensation, and the descent of rain had begun, until the eroding forces of the atmosphere had weathered and decomposed the molten rocks so as to form soils, until the sun's rays had become so tempered by distance and by waste as to be chemically fit for the decompositions necessary to vegetable life? Having waited through those æons until the proper conditions had set in, did it send the fiat forth, "Let life be!"? These questions define a hypothesis not without its difficulties, but the dignity of which was demonstrated by the nobleness of the men whom it sustained.

Modern scientific thought is called upon to decide between this hypothesis and another; and public thought
generally will afterwards be called upon to do the same. You may, however, rest secure in the belief that the hypothesis just sketched can never be stormed, and that it is sure, if it yield at all, to yield to a prolonged siege. To gain new territory, modern argument requires more time than modern arms, though both of them move with greater rapidity than of yore.

But however the convictions of individuals here and there may be influenced, the process must be slow and secular which commends the rival hypothesis of natural evolution to the public mind. For what are the core and essence of this hypothesis? Strip it naked and you stand face to face with the notion that not alone the more ignoble forms of animalcular or animal life, not alone the nobler forms of the horse and lion, not alone the exquisite and wonderful mechanism of the human body, but that the human mind itself—emotion, intellect, will, and all their phenomena—were once latent in a fiery cloud. Surely the mere statement of such a motion is more than a refutation. But the hypothesis would probably go even further than this. Many who hold it would probably assent to the position that at the present moment all our philosophy, all our poetry, all our science, and all our art—Plato, Shakespeare, Newton, and Raphael—are potential in the fires of the sun.

We long to learn something of our origin. If the evolution hypothesis be correct, even this unsatisfied yearning must have come to us across the ages which separate the unconscious primeval mist from the consciousness of to-day. I do not think that any holder of the evolution hypothesis would say that I overstate it or overstrain it in any way. I merely strip it of all vagueness, and bring before you, unclothed and unvarnished, the notions by which it must stand or fall.
Surely these notions represent an absurdity too monstrous to be entertained by any sane mind. Let us, however, give them fair play. Let us steady ourselves in front of the hypothesis, and, dismissing all terror and excitement from our minds, let us look firmly into it with the hard, sharp eye of intellect alone. Why are these notions absurd, and why should sanity reject them? The law of relativity, of which we have previously spoken, may find its application here. These evolution notions are absurd, monstrous, and fit only for the intellectual gibbet in relation to the ideas concerning matter which were drilled into us when young. Spirit and matter have ever been presented to us in the rudest contrast, the one as all noble, the other as all vile. But is this correct? Does it represent what our mightiest spiritual teacher would call the eternal fact of the universe? Upon the answer to this question all depends.

Supposing, instead of having the foregoing antithesis of spirit and matter presented to our youthful minds, we had been taught to regard them as equally worthy and equally wonderful; to consider them, in fact, as two opposite faces of the self-same mystery. Supposing that in youth we had been impregnated with the notion of the poet Goethe, instead of the notion of the poet Young, looking at matter, not as brute matter, but as "the living garment of God;" do you not think that under these altered circumstances the law of relativity might have had an outcome different from its present one? Is it not probable that our repugnance to the idea of primeval union between spirit and matter might be considerably abated? Without this total revolution of the notions now prevalent the evolution hypothesis must stand condemned; but in many profoundly
thoughtful minds such a revolution has already taken place. They degrade neither member of the mysterious duality referred to; but they exalt one of them from its abasement, and repeal the divorce hitherto existing between both. In substance, if not in words, their position as regards spirit and matter is: "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder."

I have thus led you to the outer rim of speculative science, for beyond the nebula scientific thought has never ventured hitherto, and have tried to state that which I considered ought, in fairness, to be outspoken. I do not think this evolution hypothesis is to be flouted away contemptuously; I do not think it is to be denounced as wicked. It is to be brought before the bar of disciplined reason, and there justified or condemned. Let us hearken to those who wisely support it, and to those who wisely oppose it; and let us tolerate those, and they are many, who foolishly try to do neither of these things.

The only thing out of place in the discussion is dogmatism on either side. Fear not the evolution hypothesis. Steady yourselves in its presence upon that faith in the ultimate triumph of truth which was expressed by old Gamaliel when he said: "If it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; if it be of man, it will come to naught." Under the fierce light of scientific inquiry this hypothesis is sure to be dissipated if it possess not a core of truth. Trust me, its existence as an hypothesis in the mind is quite compatible with the simultaneous existence of all those virtues to which the term Christian has been applied. It does not solve—it does not profess to solve—the ultimate mystery untouched. At bottom it does nothing more than "transport the conception of life's origin to an indefinitely distant past."
For, granting the nebula and its potential life, the question, whence came they? would still remain to baffle and bewilder us. And with regard to the ages of forgetfulness which lie between the conscious life of the nebula and the conscious life of the earth, it is but an extension of that forgetfulness which preceded the birth of us all. Those who hold the doctrine of evolution are by no means ignorant of the uncertainty of their data, and they yield no more to it than a provisional assent. They regard the nebular hypothesis as probable, and in the utter absence of any evidence to prove the act illegal, they extend the method of nature from the present into the past. Here the observed uniformity of nature is their only guide. Within the long range of physical inquiry they have never discerned in nature the insertion of caprice. Throughout this range the laws of physical and intellectual continuity have run side by side. Having thus determined the elements of their curve in this world of observation and experiment, they prolong that curve into an antecedent world, and accept as probable the unbroken sequence of development from the nebula to the present time.

You never hear the really philosophical defenders of the doctrine of uniformity speaking of impossibilities in nature. They never say, what they are constantly charged with saying, that it is impossible for the builder of the universe to alter His work. Their business is not with the possible, but the actual; not with a world which might be, but with a world which is. This they explore with a courage not unmixed with reverence, and according to methods which, like the quality of a tree, are tested by their fruits. They have but one desire—to know the truth. They have but one fear—to believe