

Perhaps I have said all that is needful on this matter. If I were to celebrate Christmas, or the birthday of Christ, I should go back a little less than thirty-three years from his crucifixion, and it would bring it to Thursday, the 11th day of April, as the first day of the first year of the true Christian era; and reckoning on thirty-two years, 360 days and fifteen hours from that, it would bring it to the crucifixion, and bring it on Friday also.

In saying that "it was the thirty-fourth year, first month and fourth day of the month" on which the great storm and earthquakes took place, there is another thing to be noted—that it must have taken place on Friday, according to the Nephite reckoning in order to bring his crucifixion on Friday. If Tuesday was the first day of the 34th year, the second day would be Wednesday, the third Thursday, and Friday would have been the fourth day of the month, just as the Book of Mormon says, bringing it correct according to the reckoning of the days of the week.

There is another thing that, perhaps, a great many of the Latter-day Saints and many of the world have not reflected upon; that is; that the beginning of our present New Year is incorrect, reckoning the years from the birth of Christ, for the first day of January was not the day of his birth. We call it the first day of the year, but it has no reference to the day of Christ's birth. The first day of the year of the true Christian era should be the day of the Savior's birth—the 11th day of April. About 122 years ago we did not have the first day of January for New Year. At that time, or thereabouts, everybody in America and England reckoned New Year's Day on the 25th of March. That

had been the first day of the year for many generations. How came it to be changed to the first day of January? In 1751 the Parliament of Great Britain passed a law that the year should be moved backwards from the 25th day of March to the 1st day of January, making the year 1751 some eighty-four days shorter than all the other years had been. Why did they do this? In order to place New Year in connection with a certain event in astronomy. Those who are acquainted with the earth going round the sun, know that the path in which it moves is not a circle but an ellipse, or elongated circle. You make a wire into the form of a circle and then pull it out, and that is the form of an ellipse. The sun is situated in one of the foci of this ellipse, and is nearer to the earth on the 1st day of January or the 31st day of December, by about three millions of miles, than it is on the 1st day of July. The object of placing the year back was to have the year begin when the earth was in its perihelion in going around the sun. This was not the only alteration that has been made, but this accounts for the phrases "new style" and "old style," with which you occasionally meet in historical documents, the former having reference to the new mode of reckoning, the latter to the old mode.

I have said that this was not the only change made in time. In the year 1752—when the second day of September had arrived, in order to bring the year to correspond with the seasons, it was found necessary to set the time forward so that the 3rd day of September should be called the 14th, eleven days being dropped out of the calendar. This was also established by parliamentary law; and in this way the seasons have been brought to correspond, in some mea-