

with its integuments and muscles, all conspiring to one end, viz., to receive the image and convey it to the brain—all will follow as effect follows cause, and could not be different. Yet, no one of these scientists ever saw an atom. They do not know their weight, size, or shape—do not know, indeed, of their actual existence. It is true it is generally believed that they do exist. This belief arises from the fact that we can take a piece of molar matter and divide it and subdivide it till the pieces become too small to be seen with the naked eye. We then call in the aid of the microscope, and continue the subdivision without reaching the end, and we are compelled by the law of thought to suppose, that if this subdivision could be carried on indefinitely, we would finally arrive at particles of matter which would be indivisible. These we call atoms.

The opinions of learned men vary materially as to atoms and their constitution. Leibnitz and Faraday suppose them to be centres of force. Others suppose them to be hard, impenetrable substances, possessing length, breadth, and thickness, and of definite and uniform shape. Professor Clark Maxwell thinks that, though their properties are unalterable and themselves indestructible, they are not “hard or rigid, but capable of internal movements.” Dr. Chalmers says, though changes may go on in the heavens and in the earth, these atoms—“the foundation-stones of the material universe—remain unbroken and unworn. They continue this day as they were created, perfect in number, measure, and weight.”

Is it not surprising, when so little is known of atoms, and opinions are so widely different as to their constitution, that a man of Professor Tyndall's experience and learning should make them the basis of his argument in support of a theory which is to upset all our received opinions? Is it not wonderful that in these atoms of which we know nothing he should see the promise and potency of every quality of life? We have no doubt, to arrive at such a result, he forsakes the realm of observation and experiment,” and falls back on the “picturing power of the mind.” He must not be disappointed if others choose to reject this kind of evidence. Some one has well said,