

H. J.
August 8, 1939

Dear Jeffreys,

Many thanks for your interesting letter. I think your analysis is identically equivalent to mine and would lead to the numerical values given by Sukhatme. I hope you know his table, as it is a very usefully arranged one. I see, and like, your distinction between estimation and tests of significance, but am not quite sure of its application in this case. You are probably right that the language used by "Student" and myself is not adequate to get into symbols what ^{we} you are trying to say; but, of course, the effort to fill in all the steps is full of the danger of saying something quite different.

I am beginning to realise that we know much more about the methods we practise in reasoning than about the systems of logical postulates necessary to justify these ^{methods} postulates. Consequently, such a question - which sounds urgent and important to purely deductive minds - as: "Is there any new principle or postulate required or assumed in this method?" cuts very little ice with me, because I do not know that the

principles or postulates required for previous methods have ever been satisfactorily taped. Unless that has been done, and I respect Whitehead and Russell, Keynes, etc, as I respect the leaders of forlorn hopes, the first question asked is really meaningless. After all, may not the recognition of logical rigour be as empirical as the recognition of the three-dimensionality of space?

I think you are right that we should use "Student's" pseudonym when referring to his work, and his true name only when referring to the man, other than the author.

Thanks for telling me about Watson's lemma. I had not known of it, and it is certainly very pretty.

Yours sincerely,