Professor C.G. Darwin, F.R.S., Newnham Grange, CAMBRIDGE.

Dear Prof. Darwin,

I enclose a reprint giving rather more fully the mathematics of the worst part of chapter IV, besides a quite unsuccessful letter to "Nature". In trying to avoid mathematical complications I am afraid I slurred over the actual method of calculating the differential coefficient

at u=0. The numerical values of v itself in this neighbourhood would really have been nearly useless unless I had worked them to 20 figures or more, as I found when I worked them to 10 figures. The behaviour of the "remainder" in the table is really rather reassuring. I do not think the constant .0146860717 can be expressed in terms of $v_v = 0.02$ etc., and this is the more likely as the function u_v is really a very odd one. Taking u > 1, it increases ultimately more rapidly than e^v or e^{e^v} or anything with a finite number of e^v s in it.

Yours sincerely