ties

the coefficients of having em-

n the Monthly ov. 1854, Hann his tables of pualities in the

requalities by s itself in the asions and by es, but I have other. I am nination by a by the operato my tables sm but which nt the ancient etness, and it ture observa-

nus and the ns become

ored to what first power of the second g but slight-

61, Feb. 2d, Iansen again ts coefficient time he has nation of it, that in the yond Bradthe ancient

ks is the cocal calculabas never except that st power of

of long period in the mean motion of the Moon.

the disturbing force. This computation is found in vol. xvi of the Memoins of the Royal Astronomical Society. In the secoud part of his "Darlegung" we find a general method of treating inequalities of long period, but—unless I have overlooked it—no computation of any particular inequality. Nor do we find any statements of the numerical results of Hansen's various computations except those already quoted.

computations except those already quoted. The only geometer besides Hansen who has attacked the problem of these inequalities is Delaunay. His researches are published in full in the Additions to the Connaissance des Temps for years 1862 and 1868. For the first approximation to the first inequality his result is

$16'' \cdot 02 \sin(-l - 16l' + 18l'' + 35^{\circ} 20' \cdot 2)$

a result practically identical with that of Hansen. The ulterior approximations change it to

16".34 sin (-1-16l+18l"+35° 16'.5),

so that they increase the coefficient instead of diminishing it as in Hansen's theory. The difference is however so small that the results may be regarded as identical.

But, in the case of the second inequality instead of reproducing the result of Hansen, he finds a coefficient of only $0^{\prime\prime\prime}27$, a quantity quite insignificant in the present state of the question. We have thus an irreconcilable difference on a purely theoretical question.

I propose to inquire whether we have in either theory an entirely satisfactory agreement with observation. As a preliminary step to this inquiry I have prepared the following table of the mean longitude of the moon from the tables of Burckhardt and of Hansen respectively, for a series of equidistant dates, the interval being 36525 days, and the epoch 1800 Jan. 0, Greenwich mean noon. These dates are marked by the year near the beginning of which they fall. Column L. gives Burckhardt's mean longitude on the supposition of uniform motion, from the data given on the fifth page of the introduction to his tables. Next is given the acceleration of the mean longitude deduced from Table XLVIII. The inequality of long period is from Table XLIX. The sum of these three quantities gives the corrected mean longitude.

Hansen's mean longitude and secular acceleration are deduced in the same way from the elements given on page 15 of his *Tables de la Lune*. His terms of long period are deduced from Tables XLI and XLII, the constants being subtracted and the remainder reduced to are by being multiplied by the factor 0''004708. The last column of the table gives the correction to Burckhardt's mean longitude to reduce it to that of Hansen. That this difference is really the mean difference between the longitudes of the moon deduced from the two tables is shown

5