

29 June 1934.

Dear Whately Garington,

I'm glad you are likely to be in London again soon and hope you will come and lunch with me on July 2nd., if that suits,

Yes, I think you have what I mean on the awkward topic of gap-filling. I suppose there might be 1023 classes for 5 sessions with 2 persons, but I do not mind, because 1) they can't all occur and 2) if there were a lot of words with few observations each, you probably would not want me to try to make anything of them. However, as a test of method you might sub-divide one list completely.

Yes, I mean for each such class the sum of the observed times which actually appear in it, i.e., if there were 7 words in the class, each represented on eight occasions, I should like the 8 totals of the 7 values each, besides, of course, a knowledge of which the occasions were for which these 7 words were observed.

In dealing with the miscellaneous material which hopeful people sometimes push my way, I have learned to sympathise with both your motives; which can, I think, only be completely satisfied by hammering without ceasing at the job of getting an

experimental programme carried out according to plan. It sounds dull, ^{but} that if you had an apprentice learner I should be inclined to press for a special study of the causes of the failure to get responses, which, I suppose produces a gap. If a word ever is not heard, or fails to reach the consciousness, could it be reinserted later in the same session? Or are the gaps due to any great extent to a failure in the physical apparatus? Or are they really a special kind of response (inhibition) by the subject and to be treasured as such? I do not see why you should only have Lodge vivens and much repaired with putty for comparison with Lodge perhaps beautified. However, if a substantial amount of gold is recoverable, I admit the technicians duty of finding out how to recover it; but I will not have the technician pretend to be an alchemist and to recover more than has been dug out.

To prefer a hundred to 74, except on the ground that it is bigger, is admirable, but, I suggest, a weakness. Of course, if your list of words has an internal structure, so many nouns, verbs and adjectives; or so many technical, descriptive, active, quiescent, simple or ornate, you would want some good factorisable number to balance out the effects. But, as it stands, a compact block of 74x6x2 is almost as artistically satisfying as a pyramid, at least as an experimental achievement.

Yours sincerely,