

James Hanley, Dr.  
Fri 2013-08-23 8:13 AM



To: James Hanley, Dr.

Dear Professor **Edwards**

Thanks for letting me know.

I admire the way you put it as a score!

As it happens, just yesterday I added the expectation question to my set of questions for the graduate students I will be teaching starting in 2 weeks.

Of course, my main point I is to try to get them interested in reading original historical material, but I find that, unlike me, who is now mainly looking back, at their age they are looking forward, and not very interested in anything per-Internet. But I would love to get them to read how **Bernoulli** arrived at his table of frequencies. To me, it is very elegant.

I am pasting in below the wording of my exercise. You will see that I tried to get them to think about the prior information, and your score up to then with **Bernoulli**.

But of course, they may simply go directly to Google, and find your updated story. I suppose that either way it is small victory for statistical education.

Again many thanks for ALL of your work, and the humility that we should all emulate.

Jim Hanley

PS: you will find my little bits of historical

## Reply

## Forward

On 2013-08-23, at 6:39 AM, "A.W.F. Edwards" <awfe@cam.ac.uk> wrote:

> Dear Dr Hanley,

> I'm not sure whether I replied to your message about Bernoulli's example (for which thanks). I think it was the first of several, so I wrote the following:

>

> Bernoulli's Problem XVII

>

> Thanks to the commentators who agree with Bernoulli's result. I have found my workings from July 2006 and it is clear from the numbers that in my concern not to count the case of 18 points twice I lost it altogether. There's no evidence how I managed this, but I evidently checked it and got the same wrong answer!

> The score is now Bernoulli 1, Edwards 1, since as I mentioned in my article I found an error in Bernoulli's table of the sums of the powers (in 1982; actually the coefficient of  $n^n$  in the polynomial for the sum of the ninth powers – see my 'Pascal's Arithmetical Triangle' page 128).

>

> Thanks for your interest. Evidently readers of Significance are a bit more on the ball than readers of The Mathematical Intelligencer!

> Yours, Anthony Edwards