## BISHOP LETTUCE TRIAL 1976

The 1976 lettuce-trial by Mr Bishop was one of the very first experimental Moonzodiac sowing trials to be performed in the UK. I remember carefully weighing out 36 batches of 1.0 grams of organic lettuce seed, putting them into small glass ampoules, and sending them in a wooden box to Mr Bishop in Cardiff, with a list of 36 suggested sowing dates. These sowing dates cycled through three lunar months (sidereal) i.e. they matched the Moon journeying three times round the Zodiac. They were selected according to the 'Rulni calendar,' one per Moon-constellation. Thus he planted in succession one row per sign over three sidereal months.

The soil used for this experiment was a quickly draining silt, fairly low in humus content. Lettuce was used chiefly because Culpeper's "Complete Herbal" says of lettuce that "The Moon owns it". The lettuce were harvested in rotation, using a similar schedule to that for sowing, so that each row grew for a similar period of time. The weight of lettuce were taken after cutting off the roots. The total weight per row was divided by the number of lettuce grown, to give the figure here used. By some miracle, none of his lettuce bolted. Severe drought conditions that year caused the yields to be small.

BISHOP LETTUCE SOWINGS 36 rows, March - June 1976


Figure 1

The Thun theory predicts that leaf-crops should show peak yields in the three Water Moon-signs. Taking the nine rows sown at these times, and comparing their final yields with all of the others in the experiment, gave:

Leaf-day sowings Others

$$
131 \pm 63 \quad 87 \pm 54 \quad \text { gms } \quad \text { a } 51 \% \text { excess }
$$

That is a huge increase!

A four-point moving average was put through the data (see figure), representing the seasonal trend in the yield. The phases of the Moon are shown along the bottom of the diagram, and they had no discernable effect upon the crop yield - contrary to many centuries of tradition.

This moving average was subtracted out from the data.* After doing this, the two groups became:

Leaf-day sowings Others in oz. x 100

$$
29.6 \pm 25.6(\mathrm{n}=8) \quad-9.6 \pm 32 \quad(\mathrm{n}=24) \quad \mathrm{t}=3.0 \text {, significant at } 1 \text { in } 1000 .
$$

That is quite significant.
Let's try doing that the other way around, and see how the opposite element works - the Earth element. (I suggest memorising the sequence of the first four signs, Aries, Taurus, Gemini and Cancer, and their elements are Fire, Earth, Air and Water. That is the sequence which rotates). Biodynamic farmers call these 'Root days' just as the Water-trigon days are called 'Leaf-days.'

| Root-Day sowings | Others | in oz. $x 100$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $-34.1 \pm 34.8 \quad(\mathrm{n}=8)$ | $11.6 \pm 28.1(\mathrm{n}=24)$ | $\mathrm{t}=3.6$ |

So the decrease in yield from Root-day sowings is even more significant than the increase during the leaf-days. This strongly indicated to me that the celestial influence was working as some kind of wave-form, giving alternating maxima and minima over the nine-day period.

So, these three months of lettuce data confirmed that a sidereal pattern was involved: a star-rhythm, and it was elemental - the four elements seemed to be working in accord with the 'Thun model'. This lettuce data did not clearly show any other lunarmonthly effects.

This data has earlier been published in: Colin Bishop, Moon influence in Lettuce Growth, The Astrological Journal, Winter 1977/8 vol.10.1; Geoffrey Dean \& Arthur Mather, Recent advances in Natal Astrology 1977, p. 62.

[^0]Colin Bishop 1976 letuce

| day no. | d | m | no per row | Lettuce Weight oz | Lettuce Weight g | Mean Wt per plant oz | Mean Wt per plant g |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 23 | 3 | 7 | 0.25 | 7.1 | 0.036 | 1.0 |
| 2 | 25 | 3 | 7 | 0.25 | 7.1 | 0.036 | 1.0 |
| 5 | 28 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 28.3 | 0.143 | 4.1 |
| 7 | 30 | 3 | 7 | 1.25 | 35.4 | 0.179 | 5.1 |
| 10 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 2.25 | 63.8 | 0.321 | 9.1 |
| 12 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 2.5 | 70.9 | 0.357 | 10.1 |
| 15 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 85.0 | 0.5 | 14.2 |
| 17 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 3.5 | 99.2 | 0.583 | 16.5 |
| 19 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 113.4 | 0.8 | 22.7 |
| 21 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 113.4 | 0.667 | 18.9 |
| 23 | 15 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 340.2 | 1.714 | 48.6 |
| 25 | 17 | 4 | 6 | 8.5 | 241.0 | 1.417 | 40.2 |
| 27 | 19 | 4 | 7 | 10.5 | 297.7 | 1.5 | 42.5 |
| 30 | 22 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 226.8 | 1.143 | 32.4 |
| 32 | 24 | 4 | 7 | 11.5 | 326.0 | 1.643 | 46.6 |
| 34 | 26 | 4 | 2 | 4.5 | 127.6 | 2.25 | 63.8 |
| 37 | 29 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 396.9 | 2 | 56.7 |
| 39 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 12.5 | 354.4 | 1.786 | 50.6 |
| 42 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 56.7 | 1 | 28.3 |
| 44 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6.5 | 184.3 | 1.3 | 36.9 |
| 46 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 85.0 | 0.429 | 12.2 |
| 48 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 141.7 | 0.714 | 20.2 |
| 51 | 13 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 170.1 | 0.857 | 24.3 |
| 53 | 15 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 340.2 | 1.714 | 48.6 |
| 55 | 17 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 255.1 | 1.286 | 36.5 |
| 57 | 19 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 170.1 | 0.857 | 24.3 |
| 59 | 21 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 170.1 | 0.857 | 24.3 |
| 61 | 23 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 226.8 | 1.333 | 37.8 |
| 64 | 26 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 198.4 | 1 | 28.3 |
| 66 | 28 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 69 | 31 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 198.4 | 1.75 | 49.6 |
| 71 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 311.8 | 1.833 | 52.0 |
| 73 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 198.4 | 1 | 28.3 |
| 76 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 78 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 0.3 | 8.5 | 0.3 | 8.5 |
| 80 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |


[^0]:    *Using a moving average in this manner means that one loses the first two and last two data-points, because these are not covered by it; thereby the total number of rows included decreased to 32 .

