

why does refracting prism separate colors and not water, is it because of the material, or because rays enter but also exit? find out.  
it seems to me that hook simply did not take the color matter seriously, maybe he was happy enough about his refraction index / wave explanation.  
newton tried to change the colors again, not, make them white again. my previous thought comes from the observation that hooke surely must have / could have tried this as well.

"he altogether renounced the attempt to construct the universe from its foundations after the fashion of Descartes, and aspired to nothing more than a formulation of the laws which directly govern the actual phenomena. His theory of gravitation, for example, is strictly an expression of the results of observation, and involves no hypothesis as to the cause of the attraction which subsists between ponderable bodies; and his own desire in regard to optics was to present a theory free from speculation as to the hidden mechanism of light. Accordingly, in reply to Hooke's criticism, he protested\* that his views on colour were in no way bound up with any particular conception of the ultimate nature of optical processes. Xewton was, however, unable to carry out his plan of connecting together the phenomena of light into a coherent and reasoned whole without having recourse to hypotheses. The hypothesis of Hooke, that light consists in vibrations of an aether, he rejected for reasons which at that time were perfectly cogent, and which indeed were not successfully refuted for over a century. One of these was the incompetence of the wave theory to account for the rectilinear propagation of light, and another was its inability to embrace the facts discovered, as we shall presently see, by Huygens, and first interpreted correctly by Newton himself of polarization. On the whole, he seems to have favoured a scheme of which the following may be taken as a summary:"

I should make a list of these aether 'theories' each summarized like the one above.

"The truth of Hooke's hypothesis, that light is essentially a form of motion, seemed to Huygens to be proved by the effects observed with burning-glasses; for in the combustion induced at the focus of the glass, the molecules of bodies are dissociated; which, as he remarked, must be taken as a certain sign of motion, if, in conformity to the Cartesian philosophy, we seek the cause of all natural phenomena in purely mechanical actions."

"The question then arises as to whether the motion is that of a medium, as is supposed in Hooke's theory, or whether it may be compared rather to that of a flight of arrows, as in the corpuscular theory. Huygens decided that the former alternative is the only tenable one, since beams of light proceeding in directions inclined to each other do not interfere with each other in any way."

"Moreover, it had previously been shown by Torricelli that light is transmitted as readily through a vacuum as through air; and from this Huygens inferred that the medium or aether in which the propagation takes place must penetrate all matter, and be present even in all so-called vacua"

"It may be remarked that Huygens' "waves" are really what modern writers, following Hooke, call "pulses"; Huygens never considered true wave-trains having the property of periodicity"

if, in conformity to the Cartesian philosophy, we seek the cause of all natural phenomena in purely mechanical actions  
note. Understandable, as yet another ex. of experience extrapolation.

The process of wave-propagation he discussed by aid of a principle which was now introduced for the first time, and has since been generally known by his name. It may be stated thus: Consider a wave-front, or locus of disturbance, as it exists at a definite instant  $t$ : then each surface-element of the wave-front may be regarded as the source of a secondary wave, which in a homogeneous isotropic medium will be propagated outwards from the surface-element in the form of a sphere whose radius at any subsequent instant  $t$  is proportional to  $(t-t)$ ; and the wave-front which represents the whole disturbance at the instant  $t$  is simply the envelope of these secondary waves which arise from the various surface elements of the original wave-front. \*The introduction of this principle enabled Huygens to succeed where Hooke and other contemporary wave-theorists had failed, in achieving the explanation of refraction and reflexion

note. does this also help explain aberration instead of using a corpusc. theory? find out.

does not this make for a wavefront that travels 'forward' but also 'back' at all times? find out.

is it that the secondary spheres are only created at 'disturbance' points? this would then cause both refl and refr simultaneously

a footnote says this was justified a lot later by fresnel in anaes de chimie. Keep this in mind.

could heuygens' idea have originated from thinking of water? each particle gen'ing a secondary wave with 'Phases sync'd when there is no disturbance' ?

if not do not be bothered too much, remember model versus phys explanation. despite this, it would be nice to find who first thought about envelopes, does the idea follow when one thinks a bit about waves?

The actual explanation for the case of reflexion is as follows:

Let AB represent the interface at which reflexion takes place, AC the incident wave-front at an instant, GMB the position which the wave-front would occupy at a later instant if the propagation were not interrupted by reflexion. Then by "G Huygens' principle these secondary wavefronts from A is at the instant t as sphere ENS of radius equal to AG: the disturbance from Ht after meeting the interface at K, will generate a secondary wave TV of radius equal to KM, and similarly these secondary wave correspond to any other element of the original front can be found. It is obvious that the envelope of these secondary waves, which constitute the final wave-front, will be a plane BN, which will be inclined to AB at the same angle as AC. This gives the law of reflexion. The law of refraction is established by similar reasoning, on the supposition that the velocity of light depends on the medium in which it is propagated. Since a ray which passes from air to glass is bent inward towards the normal, it may be inferred that light travels more slowly in glass than in air

Huygens offered a physical explanation of the variation in velocity of light from one medium to another, by supposing that transparent bodies consist of hard particles which interact with the aetherial matter, modifying its elasticity. The opacity of metals he explained by an extension of the same idea, supposing that some of the particles of metals are hard (these account for reflexion) and the rest soft: the latter destroy the luminous motion by damping it

note. make precise wave of light and seeing 'only perp', eye device function.

note. i found a footnote related to the idea above, perp. in this case is not required. The word ray in the wave-theory is always applied to the line which goes from the centre of a wave (i.e. the origin of the disturbance) to a point on its surface, whatever may be the inclination of this line to the surface-element on which it abuts; for this line has the optical properties of the "rays" of the emission theory

The second half of the Theorie de la lumiere is concerned with a phenomenon which had been discovered a few years previously by a Danish philosopher, Erasmus Bartholin (b. 1625, d. 1698). A sailor had brought from Iceland to Copenhagen a number of beautiful crystals which he had collected in the Bay of Eoerford. Bartholin, into whose hands they passed, noticed\* that any small object viewed through one of these crystals appeared double, and found the immediate cause of this in the fact that a ray of light entering the crystal gave rise in general to two refracted rays. One of these rays was subject to the ordinary law of refraction, while the other, which was called the extraordinary ray, obeyed a different law, which Bartholin did not succeed in determining. The matter had arrived at this /origins

note. similarly for heuygens' spheroid, we need schizopgrsnia here, the 'free' modeller, the explaining philosopher. keep them separated.

note. only later did huygens craft the following 'explanation'  
I suppose one composed of small spheroids, and another which

occupiestheinterspacesaroundthesespheroids, andwhichserves tobindthemtogether. Besidesthese, thereisthematterof aetherpermeatingallthecrystal, bothbetweenandwithinthe parcelsofthetwokindsofmatterjustmentioned; forIsuppose boththelittlespheroids, andthematterwhichoccupiesthe intervalsaroundthem, tobecomposedofsmallfixedparticles, amongstwhicharediffusedinperpetualmotionthestillfiner particlesoftheaether. Thereisnownoreasonwhythe ordinaryrayinthecrystalshouldnotbeduetowavespropagatedinthisaetherealmatter. Toaccountfortheextraordinary refraction, I conceiveanotherkindofwaves, whichhavefor vehicleboththeaetherealmatterandthetwootherkindsof matterconstitutingthecrystal. Oftheselatter, Isupposethat thematterofthesmallsspheroidstransmitsthewavesalittle morequicklythantheaetherealmatter, whilethataroundthe spheroidstransmitsthese wavesalittle moreslowlythanthe sameaetherealmatter. . . . Thesesamewaves, whentheytravel inthedirectionofthebreadthofthespheroids, meetwith moreofthematterofthespheroids, oratleastpasswithless obstruction, andsoarepropagatedalittlemorequicklyinthis sensethanintheother; thusthelight-disturbanceispropagated asaspheroidalsheet

Thatarayoflightshouldpossesssuchpropertieesseemedto Newtonfaninsuperableobjectiontothehypothesiswhich regardedwavesoflightasanalogoustowavesofsound. On thispointthewasintheright: hisobjectionsareperfectly validagainstthewave-theoryasitwasunderstoodbyhis contemporaries, althoughnotagainstthetheorywhichwasput forwardacenturylaterbyYoungandFresnel

note. is it maybe that a general vibration source in 3d can simul. vibrate along all 3 axes? in other words be composed of 3 'elementary' ones? imagine a string, it vibrates in a plane, along on direction. imagine a string in the perp plane vibrating along, both not intersecting, now imagine a 3rd one, vibrating at tge remaining axis. is this what does not happen for sound waves, but can happen in general? light? is this polarization? does this explain the double refraction? i have serious doubts, but it is an idea nevertheless. in general somd additional property has to be added to the model to fix it. also, does not double refr. exclude the corpusc. theory? what would be needed to fix it? some material dynamics? a wild fix would be imagining the corpuscles hitting the biundary and switchung it between a state and anothr at every hit, just like a rotating mirror with two possible angles.

Between themagneticandelectricforcesGilbertremarked manydistinctions. Thelodestonerequiresnostimulusoffriction suchasisneededtostirglassandsulphurintoactivity. Thelodestoneattractsonlymagnetizablesubstances, whereas electrifiedbodiesattracteverything. Themagneticattraction betweenwobodiesisnotaffectedyinterposingasheetof paper, oralinencloth, orbyimmersingthebodiesinwaterj whereastheelectricattractionisreadilydestroyedbyscreens. Lastly, themagneticforcetendstoarrangebodiesindefinite

a graphical 'infographic' of yhe tgeiries of aether, light, and heat would not beva bad idea. together with vlad?

pg 54, attribution in footnote

pg 55, vocab. promulgation

this is trye for many theories of the past and to come Thetrue hypothesis, afterhavingmetwithgeneralacceptancethroughout acentury, andhavingbeenapprovedbyasuccessionof illustriousmen, wasdeliberatelyabandonedbytheirsuc cessors infavourofa conceptionutterlyfalse, and, insomeofits developments, grotesqueandabsurd

vocab. he propounded the theory ...

