

Mr. Wallace, that more of the horizon is seen on the theory of the earth being a globe than would be the case if it were a "flat," which is shown by his example of the sun and moon being above the horizon at the time of the eclipse.

AMATEUR CHEMIST.

#### THE DISCIPLES OF "PARALLAX."

[2897].—I HAVE read with interest the controversy which has been caused by the bringing forward of the theory of Mr. Rowbotham—the more so as I happened to be present at a course of three lectures given at Leeds, about four years since by "Parallax." I will first relate how the Yorkshiremen made it rather "warm" for him, and then will give him two or three proofs, which after these lectures occurred to my mind, and which conclusively show that the earth is not a "flat."

"Parallax" in his first lecture, said that the Astronomer-Royal, after a lecture he ("Parallax") had given at Greenwich, had confessed to him "that astronomers were over head and ears in scientific mud," and "that it was a recognised fact amongst astronomers that the Newtonian theory did not account for all the phenomena observed in astronomy." A gentleman that same evening wrote to Professor Airy, and asked if he had ever said so. His reply was that he believed a person calling himself "Parallax" had lectured at Greenwich, and some of the officials from the Observatory were present, and had conclusively proved the fallacy of his theory; but as to the part he himself took, it was untrue, as he had never attended the lectures of "Parallax." The next assertion he made was, "that the Ordnance surveyors in their calculations, did not take into account the rotundity of the earth." Another gentleman present wrote to the Ordnance-office at Southampton, and asked if that was so. The reply he received was, "that in all calculations of the survey the rotundity of the earth was taken into account." It was amusing to see the result on "Parallax's" countenance after the third lecture, when these two letters were read out to him. "Parallax" affirmed that there was no point in the southern hemisphere that the stars appeared to revolve round corresponding to a similar point in the northern hemisphere. Such of the astronomers as are now situated in the southern hemisphere must be a useless body of observers, if "Parallax" has discovered this and they have not.

The Equator of the "flat" theory is a circle drawn through North Africa, North America, &c., which passes, in fact, through the same countries as the globe theory represents, the North Pole being the centre of that Equator. Now, I maintain that the distances between, say, Cape Horn, the Cape of Good Hope, and Hobart Town, and again to Cape Horn, would be about 30,000 or 40,000 miles, which I can safely affirm is not so. According to the "flat" theory, the stars are at one uniform height, and not more than 4,000 miles away, now I should like to ask "W. G." (who evidently considers himself a proficient in perspective), if it would be possible for stars at that small distance from the earth, to maintain the relative apparent position in their passage from the east across to the west? If the theory of "Parallax" is correct, the stars would be clustered together in the east, and would then appear to open out as they approached the zenith, and as they neared the west would again appear to be clustered together.

Before concluding these remarks, I should just like to say a few words in answer to "W. G." He mentions as a curious (?) fact that in the eclipse of January 17th, 1870, both the sun and moon were above the horizon at the same time. If he will just take the trouble to think, it will become evident to his mind that within the Arctic circle, the sun and moon, in certain positions as to the latter, and taken during the summer months for the former, could be seen above the horizon together, without either of them setting for several days, and during that time it could be possible for an eclipse to take place. He says that the shadow of the earth upon the moon is a mere hypothesis; he happens unconsciously (and probably unwillingly) to be affording a proof of the assertion of