

June 11, 1940

Dear Mr Hulme,

I am returning the bibliography, which you may like to have a copy of, although I hope to bring it up to date in the next edition. With it are two offprints of those you mark. I am afraid the others are rather old, and not now available except in the original journals, which I hope you have access to.

I have a further note bearing on the harmonic analysis problem in the current number of the Annals, of which I have not yet offprints.

I have just glanced at your paper, On the reality of periods, and perhaps I ought to say that I feel rather strongly that the only purely empirical evidence of periodicity ^{is that} ~~must be~~ based on one of the Fourier sub-multiple components, which are unfortunately disregarded in much periodogram work. The errors of these are independent if the original series of observations are.

Inequality of precision seems to be exceedingly common in astronomy. I do not, myself, know enough about current opinion to know whether an obstinate drive would induce observers to give at least qualitative weights to their observations. Qualitative

weights would be sufficient, because once the observations are classified each group will contain within itself some genuine evidence of its precision. I imagine observers can never give quantitative weights with any accuracy.

Yours sincerely,