

by polarisation the undulations are turned
in 2 directions at right angles to each other
how can we speak of light being polarised in
one plane, whatever it may be? Must it ~~not~~
~~be~~ there not be 2 planes of polarisation,
one corresponding to each direction of the trans-
verse undulations? — This exactly agrees
with your last kind note & diagram — but
statements are constantly made, I think, that
in such or such a case light is polarised in
a plane passing thro' so & so? Is this to be
understood as ^{an abridgment of the full meaning} meaning, in full, that the
light is polarised in 2 planes normal to each
other, but that, for ~~descrip~~ purposes of de-
scription one plane only is specified? and if
I am right as to this, possibly it may be
customary, in selecting ^{one} from these 2 planes,
to specify the one in which the light is
extinguished by a transverse analysis? —
All this I can suppose, but fear I shall
never have made it out from books. —

But then again, if I have travelled so far,
profiting by your tutorage, in safety, ought
I not to modify what I have written, &
which I re-enclose, hoping you will again for-
give the trouble I give? — I should omit
what I have crossed out with red ink on p. 1.
as quite wrong & ^{misleading} ~~misleading~~,
& add what is substituted in red at the bottom
of p. 2. Will this give a clear & correct
notion to an Ignoramus? — If that should
happen to be right, won't I crow? —

I don't think a master like yourself can
fully appreciate the difficulties of awkward-
squad-boys like me. But I will say this —
that I do hate needless ambiguity & per-
plexity — & find lots of it! — Amongst it
all I am stupid enough not to see the objection
you have taken to my opening sentence —
which as altered by you gives no name to the
property of light I am about to describe. Of
course it would be more correct to say, ^{instead of polarisation} its
capacity of being polarised — but is not this
a needless refinement for Nursery
Optics? —