

it not to become French? If not tried, this ought to be. —

2. Am I to conceive of an unpolarised ray as composed of undulations in every possible transverse direction, as I think some say - or only 2 directions at right angles before separated? I see that practically this is unimportant, because every possible direction must include 2 at 90° angles - but it ought to be stated one way or other. Fresnel gives I believe 2 directions.

3. I am of course aware that all doubly refracted rays are polarised. But is the converse as universal? I fancy not. ~~That is~~ I don't see how light, polarised by reflection if doubled also as in refraction, could escape producing a double image in our eyes. (stupid, I dare say.)

4. Do all reflecting surfaces polarise except metals?

5. Would it be right to call all contrivances in general - such as a Nicol prism, a Rochon crystal, a Tourmaline - a Niemenberg affair - in short everything that can polarise & analyse, — by the

name of Polariscope? or is this name restricted to some one contrivance? I see Foucault uses ^{"polariscope"} for analyseur but perhaps that is German, not English usage. —

There's a lot of bother! Do forgive it. The more I look into books, the more convinced I am that though they may be many-sided they are not all-sided.

We are thinking of going to Cheltenham to escape the lion-winds & give me a chance of donkey-lectures. And possibly we might run up to Town for a few days. How delighted we should be to see you!

As for the Sun, which I am to brag about, do you happen to have Prof. Young's book, which I hear a high character of. If you have, & think so of it yourself, & that it contains matter not touched upon in Col. Oh: would you kindly lend it me? ~~Or~~ if in RAS Library I would write to Wesley for it. —