

can only be because there actually exists a definite and well-defined organic type of modern Jews.'

A few words as to the characteristics of the face. It is not so much the common notion of the length of nose, as the flexibility of the nostrils that is Jewish; the mouth is large 'with ends well marked and pouting underlip, heavy chin and broad forehead;' 'large brilliant eyes set closely together, with heavy upper and protuberant lower lid, having thoughtful expression in youth, transformed into a keen and penetrating gaze by manhood.'

Considering the question historically, Mr. Jacobs in opposition to Dr. Neubauer whose paper was read just before his own, as also to Renan, holds that the evidence shows in favor of the purity of the race. The main points are these: The foreign element due to proselytism has been exaggerated through neglect of the consideration that only one small class of these—the Proselytes of righteousness had the full *jus connubii*. The strong penalty attached to such marriages in early days, the seclusion in ghettos, the natural aversion on both sides, the existence of the *Cobanim* (about 5% of all the Jews) who could not marry outside the race at all, all tend to reduce the foreign element considerably. Again, in all species the male varies more than the female; when this occurs we probably have a species. Jewesses do vary very slightly as compared with Jews. (Mr. Jacobs suggests a composite of Jewesses). Finally, granted that a certain foreign element is mingled with the race, even as much as 1-10 of the whole number; then owing to the difference in fertility of mixed and purely Jewish marriages, at the end of 200 years the 1-10 would have diminished to 1-50; where the tendency of reversion to the Jewish type has yet to be taken into account. For all these reasons the long-standing belief in the substantial purity of the Jewish race may hold its ground.

J. J.

REFORM IN OUR CALENDAR.

In *l'Astronomie* for August, M. Jules Bonjean discusses proposed changes in our method of reckoning time which would be advantageous. He would leave the seven-day week and the 365 or 366-day year of the Gregorian calendar as they are now; but he takes strong ground—and in this all can sympathize with him—against the present arbitrary and inconvenient grouping of days into months. He would reform it by making January have 30 days, February 31, March 30, and so alternating through the year till December, this month having 30 days in the ordinary year of 365, and 31 in leap year. No one can dispute the much greater simplicity and convenience of this. Then he would

always have the year begin on Sunday, and in consequence have an extra Sunday, or a holiday, for the 365th day, and in leap year two of them. He argues in favor of thus having the same day of any particular month always come on the same day of the week, and also having an extra day—and, once in four years, two—come during the world-wide period of festivities attending the Christmas and New-year holidays. There can be no question that some such plan would possess many advantages over the present arrangement. Of course it does away with the week as a continuously periodic measure of time, but practically it is never used for that either in civil or astronomical reckoning, but simply for the temporarily recurring period of rest or religious observances, and for this a break once per year is of no importance.

There is one point, however, in which it seems, to the writer, that M. Bonjean's plan might be slightly improved. Respect for religious observances would, no doubt, demand, throughout the greater part of the civilized world, that there should be 52 Sabbaths in the year; and such observance of Sunday as the first day of the year might clash with the peculiar social or civil ceremonies which either already, or in future might, very appropriately belong to the opening day of the new year. It would seem more appropriate to have New-year's day a world-wide holiday, to be celebrated by each nation as suited it the best, and then let Sunday, the New-year Sabbath, fall on January 2. The relative merits of the two plans are best seen below, where the 12 or 13 days at the end of the old and at the beginning of the new years are arranged with the two plans side by side, the two middle columns of dates referring to either one:

Bonjean's Plan.		Day of the year.	Day of the Month.	2d Proposed Plan.	
Holiday season.	Saturday	357	Dec. 22	Friday	Holiday season.
	Sunday	358	" 23	Saturday	
	Monday	359	" 24	Sunday	
	Tuesday	360	" 25	Monday	
	Wednesday	361	" 26	Tuesday	
	Thursday	362	" 27	Wednesday	
	Friday	363	" 28	Thursday	
	Saturday	364	" 29	Friday	
	Annual holiday	365	" 30	Saturday	
	Leap-year holiday	366	" 31	Leap-year holiday	
	Sunday and New-yr day	1	Jan. 1	New-year holiday	
	Monday, 1st business day	2	" 2	Sunday, New-year Sabbath	
	Tuesday	3	" 3	Monday, 1st business day	

With such a change in the calendar we can have a regular annual Christmas Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. Saturday for shopping, Sunday for the churches, and Monday for Christmas trees and giving of presents. Our own national holidays of February 22 and July 4 would fall, in M. Bonjean's plan, on Tuesday and Thursday respectively, and in the second plan upon Monday and Wednesday.

H. M. PAUL.