(3.) Now, as regards only the general fact of the obstruction and ultimate extinction of light in its passage through gross media, if we compare the corpuscular and undulatory theories, we shall find that the former appeals to our ignorance, the latter to our knowledge, for its explanation of the absorptive phænomena. In attempting to explain the extinction of light, on the corpuscular doctrine, we have to account for the light so extinguished as a material body, which we must not suppose annihilated. It may, however, be transformed; and among the imponderable agents, heat, electricity, &c., it may be that we are to search for the light which has become thus comparatively stagnant. The heating power of the solar rays gives a *primâ facie* plausibility to the idea of a transformation of light into heat by absorption. But when we come to examine the matter more nearly, we find it encumbered on all sides with difficulties. How is it, for instance, that the most luminous rays are not the most calorific, but that, on the contrary, the calorific energy accompanies, in its greatest intensity, rays which possess comparatively feeble illuminating powers? These and other questions of similar nature may perhaps admit of answer in a more advanced stage of our knowledge; but at present there is none obvious. It is not without reason, therefore, that the question, "What becomes of light?" which appears to have been agitated among the photologists of the last century, has been regarded as one of considerable importance as well as obscurity by the corpuscular philosophers.

(4.) On the other hand, the answer to this question