

Q8211  
.N53

*Two Questions on Mr. Stone's Proposed Correction to the Measure of Time.* By Professor Simon Newcomb.

From Mr. Stone's note on p. 288 of the *Monthly Notices* for March it would seem that he has not carefully read the short Paper to which his note alludes. This Paper contains no attempt to disprove Mr. Stone's views, nor were any quantities in his theory neglected; on the contrary, the Paper was principally an attempt to apply his theory, as he states it, to the special case of the transit of the Moon observed at Oxford on 1892 January 6, on the supposition that the use of Le Verrier's tables, and the consequent introduction of the new measure of time, commenced in 1892. An inconsistency was found, and Mr. Stone was asked to explain it. He says nothing about this observation, and gives no explanation of the inconsistency. I therefore beg that Mr. Stone will answer these two questions:—

(1) What would have been the tabular error of Hansen's tables of the Moon given by the transit observed at Oxford on 1892 January 6, and printed on p. 4 of the *Monthly Notices* for the present session, if Carlini's tables of the Sun had been continued in use in the *Nautical Almanac* until the present time?

(2) What would have been the tabular error given by the same observation had Carlini's tables been continued until the end of 1891 and Le Verrier's introduced for the first time in 1892?

Either Mr. Stone can answer these very simple questions or he cannot. If he can answer them, I respectfully submit that it is only just to himself that he should do so, giving the numerical computation in each of the two cases fully enough to be understood, comparing it with the actual computation on p. 4, and showing how the result follows from his theory. If he cannot answer them, nothing more need be said.

Spottiswoode & Co. Printers, New-street Square, London.

CH.

DR. A. NEWCOMB, Mc GEE

OCT 12 1809