

of long words and classifying terms, and so explained that all may understand. The lectures before such a society as ours should be of this nature, explanatory and pleasing, yet possessing instruction, for perfect demonstrations never carry an audience with them.

Then, there is a difference again between literature and science. The former holds a certain attitude of conservatism, the latter is essentially revolutionary. In a few years hence the theories and writings of scientists of the present day, on many points, will be laid on the shelf, and like coral insects, those who built the science of to-day, will be dead from the moment that their successors have raised over them another inch of the interminable reef. They will have lived their day and done their work in paving the way and laying foundations for fresh lines of thought, for new theories of speculations, and whilst we at times feel a disposition to smile at what we are pleased to term "exploded" ideas and chimerical deductions, we must realize that what we ourselves accept as established facts will in all probability, under the kaleidoscopic revolutions of science, raise in future generations another smile at our want of penetration. The nebula we describe may turn out a star cluster, the aurora may be traced to far other causes than those we now assign to it, whilst the adaptability to navigation and other practical arts of the wild effusions of a Jules Verne may prove not in themselves a wonder, but a wonder why their adaptability lay so long unnoticed nor made use of.