

moment (see my article pp. 23, 24), that is to say, dependent on the interval of time which would separate totality at these two stations, one sees immediately that these intervals are about four times more feeble for the differences No. 2 of Mr. Chree than for the differences No. 1 which I have studied. And one may deduce immediately in taking account of the results which have furnished these and by a simple proportion that the differences No. 2 ought to correspond to a variation in the magnetic declination of the order of $0'.2$. Since (as Mr. Chree himself recalls) one seldom measures the curves to the nearest $0'.1$, it should therefore not occasion astonishment that the curves No. 2 do not clearly put in evidence the phenomenon shown by my differences (No. 1) for which the effect is about four times greater.

Mr. Chree does not appear to be convinced that the apparent effect of the eclipse as placed in evidence by my curves may really be produced by the eclipse. It may suffice in conclusion to recall that Messrs. R. Cirera and A. Nippoldt, each independently and by different and distinct methods from mine, have arrived at an analogous result, viz., that the eclipse of August 30, 1905, for the stations studied, was accompanied by a retrogression of the magnetic needle towards its mean position.¹

CH. NORDMANN.

Observatoire de Paris, April 1, 1908.

PRINCIPAL MAGNETIC STORMS RECORDED AT THE CHELTEN- HAM MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY.

January 1–March 31, 1908.

Greenwich Mean Time				Range		
Beginning			Ending	D	H	Z
Day	h	m	Day	h		
January	9,	1 51	January	9, 22	18.5	95 36
February	3,	8 40	February	8, 2	20.0	99 39
February	22,	12 22	February	24, 17	19.3	91 53
February	29,	8 42	March	5, 3	26.1	114 80
March	26,	9 20	March	29, 24	50.8	220 380

J. E. BURBANK, *Observer-in-Charge.*

O. H. TITTMANN, *Superintendent,
Coast and Geodetic Survey.*

¹ R. CIRERA: Mémoires del' Observatoire de l'Ebro, No. 1, pp. 43, 44. A. NIPPOLDT: Physikalische Zeitschrift, April 1, 1906.