Perhaps I have said all that is need-
ful 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 an-
other 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 sec-
ond 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 re-
lected upon; that is; that the begin-
ing of our present New Year is incor-
rect, 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, mak-
ing 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 cer-
tain 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 De-
cember, by about three millions of miles,
than it is on the 1st day of July. The ob-
ject 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 doc-
uments, 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 Septem-
ber had arrived, in order to bring the
year to correspond with the seasons, it
was found necessary to set the time for-
ward so that the 3rd day of September
should be called the 14th, eleven days be-
ing 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-