of $\omega_{u}{ }^{2}$ is seen to be

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
H_{x_{u} x_{u}} X^{2}+2 H_{x_{u} y_{u}} X Y+H_{y_{u} y_{u}} Y^{2}+2 H_{x_{x^{u}} z_{u}} & X Z \\
& +2 H_{y_{w_{u}} z_{u}} Y Z+H_{z_{u} z_{u}} Z^{2}
\end{array}
$$

Equations (12), with $F$ replaced by $H$, reduce this to the form

$$
H_{11}\left(X^{2}+Y^{2}+Z^{2}\right)^{2}=H_{11}
$$

Similarly the coefficients of $\omega_{u} \omega_{v}$ and $\omega_{v}{ }^{2}$ can be proved equal to $2 H_{12}$ and $H_{22}$ respectively. The other coefficients will be called $H_{00}, 2 H_{01}$ and $2 H_{02}$ respectively, and equation (11) becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta^{2} J=\epsilon^{2} \iint_{\Omega}\left(H_{00} \omega^{2}+2 H_{01} \omega \omega_{u}\right. & +2 H_{02} \omega \omega_{v}+H_{11} \omega_{u}^{2} \\
& \left.+2 H_{12} \omega_{u} \omega_{v}+H_{22} \omega_{v}^{2}\right) d u d v
\end{aligned}
$$

This equation is in the same form as equation (5), and from this point on the argument is so nearly the same as in the nonparametric case that it need not be repeated here. The analogue of inequality (10) is seen to be

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{11}\left(x, y, z, x_{u}, \cdots, z_{v} ; \lambda\right) & H_{22}\left(x, y, z, x_{u}, \cdots, z_{v} ; \lambda\right) \\
& \quad-H_{12}{ }^{2}\left(x, y, z, x_{u}, \cdots, z_{v} ; \lambda\right) \geqq 0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Columbia University.

# NOTE ON THE DERIVATIVE AND THE VARIATION OF A FUNCTION DEPENDING ON ALL THE VALUES OF ANOTHER FUNCTION. 

1. In a recent article,* Fréchet has given a treatment of the differential of a function depending on a curve, by making use of and evaluating Riesz's expression of a linear relation in terms of a Stieltjes integral. According to Fréchet, if $F[\stackrel{b}{\varphi}]$ depends on all the values of $\varphi(x)$ between $a$ and $b$, then
[^0]
[^0]:    * M. Fréchet, "Sur la notion de différentielle d'une fonction de ligne," Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, vol. 15 (1914), pp. 135-161.

