Nov. 14.

Deer Fisher,

I don't know if you have thought at all about that question of combining standard errors that I saked you. On some reflection I think that I have got a method that is both fairly efficient and can be done with less than a month's arithmetic. If a is the estimated standard error, n the number of observations, two parameters eliminated for each phase, we can write approximately

$$\sigma = 8(1 \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(n-1)}})$$

or

But log f will be the sum of a term from the observer and one from the phase, and we can proceed by least squares. This of course goes back to pre-Student days but it is near enough.

I was glad to see that Yates got his Sc.D. If you think of notting him up for the Royal Society some time I should be gaid to add a signature. I don't suppose he is enywhere near the standard yet on quantity, but his quality has struck we as masterly - which I wouldn't... no I mustn't say that.

By the way who introduced the hynothetical infinite population? Your Phil. Trans. paper was the first place where I saw it mentioned, but it seems to be implicit in K.P.'s habit of calling chances frequencies in his tables, and it may have a longer history. There is a curious point about Laplace's (p + 1)/(p + q + 2) rule of succession. It is given in the Grammar, and I proved it myself about 1915 for a population of any size - it is exact even for a finite population. Rux I took it for granted that this was as

old as the hills, but apparently it was new, at least I can't find it anywhere. Laplace's constant chance at each trial would mean either drawing with replacement or a conclusion so large that the extraction of the sample produces a negligible change in the proportions in it. So perhaps Laplace may be responsible after all!

Yours sincerely,

It also fellers, if the sample is all fore type & of muter &, the forther that the factor of the table is probable to the top in the the sample in the population. There are funder externion.