double its previous escapement. I have assumed an escapement of five seconds; but supposing that the escapement has been ten seconds, this does not make more difference than $6^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ in eighty days (the time from our departure from the Fram till the last ob-servation)-that is, $1^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ farther east than we ought to be. Assuming, too, that I have calculated our days' marches at too great length, in the days between April 8th and I3th, and that instead of 36 English geographical miles, or, rather, more than 40 statute miles, we have only gone 24 English geographical miles, or 28 statute miles (less we cannot possibly have gone), we should then have been in $89^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$. instead of $86^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$. on the 13 th, as we supposed. That is $3^{\circ}$ farther east, or with the figures above, let us say together $5^{\circ}$ farther east-i.e., we now instead of being in longitude $61^{\circ}$ E. should be in $66^{\circ}$ E.,* or about 70 miles from Cape Fligely. But it seems to me we ought to see land south of us just the same. Wilczek Land cannot be so low and trend suddenly so far to the south, when Cape Budapest is said to lie in about $6 \mathrm{I}^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$. and $82^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$., and should thus be not so much as 50 miles from us. No, this is inconceivable. On the other hand, it is not any easier to suppose ourselves west of it; we must have drifted very materially between April 8th and 13th, or

* In reality we were somewhat near the point I here assume (we were in $67^{\circ}$ E., approximately). The reason why we did not see the land here mentioned was because it does not exist, as was proved later.

