

Apr. 1903.]

Correspondence.

179

Erratum of Errata" is simply based on a mistake, a mistake which would certainly be rather amusing, seeing that the writer in the *Edinburgh Review* is laying special emphasis on the fact that errors will creep into the most carefully-prepared figures.

To clear up a matter which may appear trivial, may I venture to ask those who have copies of the *N. A.* for 1833 to examine the last page (without the Supplement) and see whether in any case the figures are given as

co-sine 14° and not co-sine 4° .

A glance at the Corrigenda will suffice, because the latter reading, which is the only one I have found, puts the arguments out of order.

Yours faithfully,

University Observatory, Oxford,
1903, Feb. 20.

H. C. PLUMMER.

Flamsteed's Well.

GENTLEMEN,—

When I wrote my letter on the above subject in your February number, I ought to have remembered Airy's plan of the buildings and grounds of the Royal Observatory, with explanations, in the Appendix to the Greenwich Observations for 1862. As Mr. Maunder remarks, it gives two positions of the well, the first of which Airy marked with a post, and it was there that the subsidence took place to which you allude in your editorial note on my letter. Mr. Maunder, however, suggests a third position, under what is now the Assistants' Common Room. A remarkable coincidence (I suppose it is no more) is that on Airy's plan there is marked, much farther to the south, another well (under a shed), said to be 120 feet deep, the very depth assigned to Flamsteed's Well. The matter is more of antiquarian than of scientific interest, as there is no record that Flamsteed made any use of it; and it appears to me most likely that it was merely an idea which occurred to him when he saw the well as possibly feasible for observing γ Draconis, but on subsequent thought abandoned as impracticable. The well may have existed from the time of the old castle.

Yours faithfully,

Blackheath, 1903, Mar. 16.

W. T. LYNN.

On accurate Phraseology.

GENTLEMEN,—

In the December number of *Popular Astronomy* there is an article on "Repulsive Forces in Nature," against the phraseology of which I ask your permission to submit a strong protest. As a University Extension Lecturer in Astronomy, my work brings me into