REPLY TO MR. WERTHEIMER'S PAPER

Richmond T. Zoch

The attainment of rigor both in applied as well as pure mathematics is a slow process, and for this reason criticism of my paper, if constructive, is welcomed.

Properties like continuity, differentiability, and dimensionality are *local* properties, that is to say a function may be continuous or differentiable over a certain range but not outside this range, or otherwise a function may be continuous or differentiable over a given range except for singular points.

The presence of singularities in functions does not necessarily cancel their utility. Thus the function $y = \tan x$ contains points where it is discontinuous, but ordinarily it is regarded as a continuous function and the presence of these singular points seldom handicaps one when working with this function. Similarly, the function $f = \bar{x} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu_3}{\mu_2}$ is a function which satisfies all four Axioms as stated in Whittaker and Robinson's book and expresses the mode of Pearson's Type III curve as a symmetric function of the measures. The fact that this function is not differentiable along the line $x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = \cdots = x_n$ will never handicap the investigator for unless the frequency distribution is clearly skew the Type III curve would not be used to represent it.

It seems that Mr. Wertheimer bases nearly all his criticisms on the tacit addition of the word "*everywhere*" to Axiom IV as stated in Whittaker and Robinson's book. The word "everywhere" is not in the statement of Axiom IV and I assumed nothing else than stated in the axiom.

If one deliberately adds the word "everywhere" to Axiom IV then nearly all my criticisms of previous writers are incorrect, unfair, and unjust. However, it does not seem that clearness and rigor in mathematics are increased by reading into an axiom a word that is not there.

Consider first the criticism in my paper which remains valid even when the word "everywhere" is added. (Schimmack uses the word "everywhere" on page 127 although Whittaker and Robinson do not.) Both Schimmack and Whittaker and Robinson proceed as at the top of page 217 of the book by the latter authors with the statement: "In this equation make $k \to 0$ then each of the quantities $\left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}\right]$ tends to a value which is independent of the x's $\cdots$." This statement rests on the tacit assumption that the quantities $\left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}\right]$ are functions of k. Even if such were true the use of tacit assumptions in a rigorous proof is objectionable, but as a matter of fact these quantities are not functions of k. Thus the particular proof given in Whittaker and Robinson's book as