

ORDINARY, MS.

Public DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 4-11-91
No. 935 ✓

INDEXED.

When given for copying L/A

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating with reference
to a letter from Mr. Russell
regarding the S. I. Chrono-
-gical Table that a public
comm. from Dr. Burgess
should be awaited before
action is taken on it.
7 Oct 91. A 847.

Ref No 4439

Collector's Office
(Dated 22 October 1891)

From
R Sewell Esquire
Collector of
Betar

To The Chief Secretary
to Government,
Public Department,
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of G.O. No 847 dated 7th October 1891 with reference to the publication of the Chronological Tables. In its order Government is pleased to approve of the adoption of my original proposal, viz, to incorporate with the Tables Professor Bhattacharya's results for intercalary months, and then publish them as they stand.

2. Simultaneously with this comes a letter to me from Mr Burgess which I deem it advisable to communicate to Government with my remarks.

Dr. Burgess's letter	Remarks
When at Bonn last Wednesday I had a talk with Dr. Jacobi about your tables, and he was telling me that Mr. Fleet had applied to him to explain the use of Schram's Hilfstafeln for he could not make out the German instructions. This confirms my remark in para 2 of my letter. (1). I am not sure that the work of re-computing is so very enormous that it could not be faced by a person once put in the way of it, and completed in 20 days (2). I am exceedingly busy at present, but as soon as I get the Index of Volume "Epigraphia Indica".	(1) This is a strong confirmation also of my contention. Mr. Fleet is probably the best chronologist now in India, but even he cannot understand how to use the scientific German methods. Hence the necessity for simple forms. (2) I think that this depends entirely on the manner of computation. If done astronomically I am perfectly satisfied that a far longer time is required, there being 4000 very elaborate calculations to be worked out.

Dr. Burgess's letter	Remarks
off my hands I mean to try it for <u>one</u> century, and I hope to let you know the results (3). I cannot tell you how many or what errors there are in columns 7 and 10; for I only tried a few here and there. (4) Many were correct, but some were 1 day out, others 2, and I think one even 3; but I did not keep the paper on which I made the computations, very few however can be more than 1 day out. (5) I do not think it would be wise to engage anyone to recompute them until you have decided whether to adopt the whole of my suggestion in para (6).	(3) My opinion is that Government would be well advised to wait for Dr. Burgess's communication. (4) This is in answer to my question. (5) So far this is very satisfactory indeed, and far better than I had expected after reading the criticisms. (6) I think Dr. Burgess must be alluding to his paras 6 and 7. (See letter printed with G.O. 609 dated 22 July 1891 (Public); and I may say that I concur in his views.

Dr. Burgess's letter	Remarks
Then, remember that though G. Patell's intercalary months are correct for the Bombay Presidency and Surya Siddhanta, they occasionally differ from the results given by other Siddhantas. (7) I shall try to write you again when I have made some further computations, but I am tied to other work for <u>some</u> <u>weeks</u>. (8)	(7) Mr. Fleet, of course speaks for the Bombay Presidency. This may account for what are termed "inaccuracies" in some cases (perhaps in many) when considering the inter- calary months calculated for Southern India. (8) See note 3 above. The great object being accuracy I would ad- vocate awaiting Dr. Burgess's next letter.

I have the honor to be
 Sir
 Your most obedient servant

Osmond
 Collector

100
 2
 2670

[Signature]