

About Coggia be. - ~~It seems that~~  
You are especially kind about my publish-  
ing your observation - but that fact is  
it has been long published - for it related  
to the big Comet of 1861, and was engraved  
in Monthly Notices - & I wd. tell you in  
which, but I believe it wd. give you less  
trouble to find the Vol. than ~~me~~ it would  
me - as mine are in disorder: so you'll al-  
low me to be selfish about it, & refer to my  
original drawing. This shows most unequivocally  
the nucleus out of the vertex (if such is  
the right name,) of the parabola, & removed  
to some distance along one of its branches - the  
very phenomenon that is so striking <sup>in Coggia,</sup> only in  
two ~~parabolas~~ intersecting parabolas instead  
of one as in 1861 - not that symptoms of  
intersection were entirely absent in that ear-  
lier case. Had I had time to write a little  
paper for next meeting, which is very un-  
likely (& so you would say if you could see

how next week is laid out!) it would have  
been merely to point out that the peculiarities  
in Coggia had been already to a certain extent  
anticipated in 1861 & shown in the drawings  
which (or a part of which) the Soc.<sup>y</sup> had done  
me the honour to engrave. - Two courses  
are open. Either you (if you can satisfy your-  
self that I am right) can call attention to the  
corresponding structures - or the thing can  
stand over till the Nov. meeting, when if  
in this world, I can do it for myself, with an  
apology for absence. You shall settle which.  
The sole value of the affair is, pointing out  
that an extra-axial structure if I may  
use such a word (you will give me a better)  
having been detected in 2 large comets, may  
possibly be found to be typical. & detected in  
many others, if known how to be looked for.

You refer to a little note in Cel. Obj. on a  
tendency to division as if it had been in "the  
Donati"; but you will see it was 2 years later.  
Thank you very much about Inghall.