

he seen that the great astronomer Arago has sanctioned this theory of the sun. After having proved to mathematical demonstration, as Dr. Lardner says (as shewn in page 4 of the Appendix,) "that the atmosphere of the sun is an ocean of flame," Arago, from subsequent experiments concludes, "that the sun is nothing but a grand mass of gas agglomerated in space." Now, with respect to "accounting for the unavoidable waste of the sun," I have to say, that Sir Isaac Newton, with the same wonderful sagacity with which he foretold the combustibility of the diamond, suggested that the comets were employed in restoring this waste of the light and heat of the sun. It was known probably in his time, that the courses of the comets generally were toward the sun; and since the discovery by Professor Black and others, of the gaseous sciences, it has been shewn that the enormous tails of the comets, some near fifty millions of miles long, are gaseous; I have therefore adopted this idea of Newton in my theory of the sun, and believe that it will naturally "account for the supply of the unavoidable waste of the sun's material."

Mr. Brewster's idea that the light returns to the sun, reminds me of Buffon's theory, that the earth and planets were struck off from the sun by the stroke of a comet, which theory has been long disproved by the astronomical fact, "that if that were the case, they must return to the sun in every revolution; so this idea of light returning to the sun after leaving its heat with the earth and planets, which it must do, would seem to form a very insufficient cause for restoring the waste of heat in the sun. Besides this, must not two counter currents of light mutually oppose and retard each other? I submit, therefore, to the candid sagacity of the author of the "New Philosophy of Matter," whether there be any necessity to refer to that theory, when the known fact of the gaseous tails of the comets