

4  
The University,  
Glasgow.

23/95

in Maxwell's §§. 783, 784, 790, 791, 792, 645,  
646, 794, 797, 798, 824-----829. I have never  
yet met anyone who understood a def-  
inite dynamical foundation for § 783.

Is there any chance of your being  
in London or Cambridge during May. We are  
to be in London for about the first half of  
the month, and in Cambridge staying with  
the Stokes's, probably during Whitweek.  
I shall be very glad if we have an opp-  
ortunity of meeting so as to fight or agree  
relatively to the waves of light.

Believe me

Yours very truly  
William Thomson



Dr. S. W. D.

23/95

I am returning to you my manuscript with many thanks for your kindness in taking so much trouble about it. I thought I had taken great care in copying down the quotations and was horrified to find I had not done so correctly. I have changed it very considerably in the direction you asked ~~the~~ ~~to~~ ~~show~~ ~~that~~. I dare say you are right in thinking that in its original form people would have thought you gave a definite velocity which you certainly did not. I was so anxious to prevent <sup>what I find is a very common mistake namely</sup> its being supposed that the velocity of transmission of signals ~~was the same~~ ~~that is~~ ~~as usually~~ calculated at all <sup>thing</sup> the same as Maxwell's velocity of light that I ~~constantly~~ wrote as if your whole paper had been upon it. Hence when I wrote "In his analysis of the three properties - he has only included two" I was not referring to the fundamental analysis but to your discussion of the transmission of signals where you draw cause for thinking that electric inertia produces little or no sensible effect. In my further enumeration of what should be taken into account I was giving my own not your analysis of what should be included and according to my view of Maxwell's theory there is no known phenomenon in electricity analogous to the compressibility of the water in the tube. As to the elasticity of the india-rubber being "fundamentally involved" I have changed "entirely omits" into "omits to mention" and explained that you should have either included the propagation of waves in the air or have explained that the <sup>india-rubber</sup> edges of your tube should have been indefinitely thick in order to introduce what would have been at all analogous to Maxwell's wave propagation in nonconductors.