mate

re so

nable

ingly

ge of

to be

)le to

shut

right

both

ewed

t eye

right

must

, and

it the

have

hould

, con-

and,

have

many

each

hmy

o had

ertain

; the

se.

17

phenomenon seemed to overpower me, and I found my curiosity aroused, and having recourse to a book of Philosophy upon the subject, the author's account only added mystery to mystery, it was there said, "As the image which is formed by a convex lens, is inverted as respects objects, so must the image which forms at the bottom of the eye. It has therefore been a question amongst optical writers why we see objects in the natural position, and also, why we do not see double, inasmuch as we have two eyes. Various explanations of these facts have been offered chiefly founded upon optical principles, none however appear to have given general satisfaction."

I therefore made it a particular portion of my enquiry, and, by a series of experiments and a deal of consideration, I plainly discovered that light did not bring images of objects to the eye, but that the eye, with vision extended, take perception of objects in their respective locality, and this is the sole cause why we only get one perception for each object with both eyes, or in other words why we do not see double, inasmuch as we have two eyes.

It must be evident, that if the two eyes send forth a stream of vision each, and those two streams after passing the nose, unite and form but one stream, the amount of both united will only be one stream and can take but one perception in the locality of the objects, but far different would it be if an object had to send its image to the eye, in that case it must either send two whole images in the the same manner that it sent them individually, or, two halves of an image, which process it never performs. It is therefore very clear why we do not see double. And the same may be said about images being formed at the

 $\mathbf{B2}$