

bottom of the eye, and why we see things in their natural position.

The cause of this is similar to the former. There is no image formed at the bottom of the eye, and the eye by extending its vision to the object, sees things in their natural position, and also in their right place.

When I look with only one eye at an object singly, that one eye occupies nearly all the space between it and the object, and when I look with both my eyes, they together only occupy the same space as the one did; therefore, it is clear to be understood that if perceptions are taken by a mass of vision, leaving the eye never to return, only one perception can be had of one object at one time, any more with two eyes than one; but, if light brought the images of objects to the eyes when both were in readiness to receive them, it certainly would use both eyes alike and give each an image.

I will not trouble the reader with all the expedients I have had recourse to before bringing myself to the aforementioned conclusions, suffice it to say, that I have fully satisfied myself, and I will endeavour to satisfy the reader with more facility and less labour.

To avoid misunderstandings, it is necessary here to mention that it is not contended that the light of the universe does not reflect or refract, but it is strongly denied that light brings the images of objects to our eyes by any progressive motion. It is also denied that light has any regular progressive motion; and it is also asserted that there is no need for such a regular progressive motion; and it is also asserted that the eye is a producer of light, and by it, united with the light of the universe, takes percep-

tions
ligh
fract
the
obje
shad