

St John's College  
Cambridge

1939 Nov. 4.

Dear Fisher,

I sent you a little paper some time in July or August, but I have heard no more about it. I haven't bothered you partly because I was away in America for a month, and partly because on my return I found that you had even more troubles than editing<sup>g</sup> on hand. A report<sub>has</sub> reached me that you had found other quarters somewhere, but it was not adequately checked. I remember enough about London colleges to have an idea of what they can do with red tape when they get going. Yule said that for once in a way he was in complete agreement with you.

Yates's paper is in proof.

Yours

Howard Jefferys

The Galton Laboratory,  
Rothamsted Experimental Station,  
Harpenden, Herts.

November 4, 1939

Dear Jeffreys,

I have just re-read your note on the Behrens-Fisher formula, which you sent me some time ago, and I forget whether you were inclined to publish it in the Annals of Eugenics or in the Camb. Phil. Soc. <sup>Journal</sup> It would seem perfectly suitable for either.

I find I can follow your argument perfectly, and should disagree, if at all, only on terminology, for you use the distinction between tests of significance and estimation differently from the way I do, including in the latter cases in which the answer is not, properly speaking, an estimate. However, apart from this and the propriety of using the a priori factor  $\frac{1}{2}$  when a precise null hypothesis is specifically in view, I think your paper enables me to appreciate your point of view a great deal better than I have previously done.

I have already printed in the Annals rather more than I should have liked on what is really a technical point in theoretical statistics, with no genetic or human

applications immediately in view; but, if you prefer the Annals to the Cambridge Philosophical Journal, I should be glad to put it in the first number of Vol X.

Yours sincerely,