

Post comes - & impertinence goes -

Our united kind love ~

Your affectionate friend

[Old] Clerk. -

295

Hardwick Vicarage, 21 Nov. '82

~~232~~ (232)

My dearest Arthur

Many thanks - owing to your kind letter I was able to project on paper a sufficient image of that wonderful spot, to show that it was, or ^{must} have been, a noble object - but stiff mist, heralding rain, prevented anything sharp. -

About the anomalous tail - your explanation - which I recollect given for a smallish comet a good many years ⁽¹⁸²⁴⁾ ago - is very ingenious - but I want to controvert if I can - for 2 reasons - *in primis* because I love a mystery; & *secundo* because I have a strong impression that the explanation would not fit Newton's in 1660 - the first anomalous case I believe, & by the way one much resembling this in its close perihelion - now or 1660 was visible with a big tail before perihel: & afterwards with a still bigger after close approach -

There now! I have broken down. And feel I can't push the argument, for want of knowing more about it!

- I see from Flammarion's "Astronomie Populaire" - which my wife gave me some time ago, but as it had been in the binder's hands I have hardly had a chance of looking at - that after 1660 had gone so near the Sun, a vast Sunspot appeared. Might it not be worth your while to look up authorities - which I. (more shame) never gives - and see if anything could be made out of.