

circumstance than any abstract statements. The cycle set down in the column beginning with 1805 (Table 7) commences with the first year after leap year. Table 8 gives us new moon for this year of the cycle on the 28th of February, and the 29th of March. But the next cycle commences with leap year, and Table 8 gives us the same days for new moon. But we know that in leap year there is one day more between the 28th of February, and the 29th of March, and hence if the Table be correct for the first year it cannot be correct for the second. It is to be viewed, therefore, as merely an approximation in which the average dates are given for each year in the cycle, but which may be in some instances a day wrong for particular years, yet sufficiently accurate for general purposes.

We may add that the calculations on which it is based are not original, but the arrangement of the Tables here given we have not before seen.

We have now only to subjoin one or two remarks as to the possible simplification of the calendar. We shall not argue the desirableness of simplification, but those who have anything to do with the calculation and notation of days, and who have heads as little suited as our own for the notabilia of cycles and periods innumerable, may perhaps be disposed to bestow a measure of attention on the following hints.

1. The Calendar would be greatly simplified by throwing the intercalary day of leap year to the end of the year, instead of the end of February. As it now stands it introduces perplexity. The 1st of February is always the 32nd day of the year, but the 1st of March is in ordinary years the 60th day of the year, and in leap year, the 61st. All the days which follow are in like manner, made one day later in leap year than in ordinary years. The change which we desiderate would have the effect of giving each day of each month its own place in the calendar, and that place the same for each year, while the intercalary day would be the 366th of leap year. We should thus have two ways of designating any particular date, by the day of the month, and by the day of the year. The latter would give us an easy means of calculating the distance between two dates either in the same or in different years. If each day were known by its number, then to find the time between two dates in the same year, we should only have to subtract the former from the number answering to the latter. And for dates in two successive years, we should have to subtract the number of the first from 365 or 366, as it might happen to be ordinary year or leap year, and add to the remainder the number answering to the date in the following year.

This plan would also do away with the complicated part at the head of Table 2 of our last article, and the lines opposite January and February would then be as simple as the others.

It would also furnish a simple way of calculating from new moon to new moon. Having ascertained the time of first new moon in the year, to find the