

proof that light is not electricity, nor electricity light ; for we all know that the electric fluid produces the most destructive effects wherever it impinges ; while light, as is proved in Arago and Lardner's Astronomy, has no impulsive power whatever ; and we shall have more to say on this subject as we examine other parts of the work.

In pages 67 and 70, the author gives an ingenious theory of the formation of acid and alkaline tastes on tongue, which he believes are produced by electricity. It is possible, indeed, that this theory *may* be founded in nature ; but it must be observed, that the saliva contains various salts in solution. May not the positive current decompose most or all of these salts, and thus produce an acid taste ; and may not the negative current be able to decompose *only* a certain number of these salts, and so produce an alkaline taste ? for it is well known that electricity will decompose saline substances. In his endeavours to account for oxygen gas going to the positive pole, supposing it to be itself positive, as he does, I think this author has totally failed. He considers oxygen gas to be *electricity itself*, formed, as he says, by the positive electricity taking up a certain "incasement of watery particles," which gives it the appearance of gas ; but he must have forgotten that positive electricity decomposes water, therefore, such incasement could not exist. His error probably lies in not believing oxygen gas can be negative, and at the same time support combustion ; but according to the hitherto received theory of Lavoisier, combustion is nothing but an affinity of the combustible body for the oxygen of the oxygen gas with which it combines ; and the heat and light that kept it in a gaseous state is evolved. Now, this heat and light would be evolved, whether the oxygen gas were positive or negative ; it is merely a consequence of this gas being in a highly rarified state, and of course evolving much heat and light.