

"GEOMETRICAL INVESTIGATIONS"

John Pottage.

Published by Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.,
U.S.A. (xxi + 480 pp.) £26.95 (stg.)

Here they are again - Galileo's famous trio - Salviati, Sagredo and Simplicio, reconstructed with great literary skill by the Professor of the History and Philosophy of Science in the University of Melbourne. In fourteen dialogues they discuss various geometrical problems about ratios of perimeters, areas and volumes, leading up to the evaluation of the perimeter of an ellipse and other matters. The dialogues are followed by interesting historical notes and geometrical problems for the reader to solve for himself, with some hints to help him. The book is beautifully reproduced, with many diagrams.

The keyword of the book is heuristic, a word of which I had forgotten the meaning, possibly for Freudian reasons. It means, of course, the art of discovery, but also includes a method of teaching in which the student finds out things for himself. Throughout my life I have hovered between mathematics and physics, and if I now regard myself as a mathematician rather than as a physicist, it is because when I was a school-boy about 1912, physics was taught heuristically and mathematics was not. The heuristic method, it seemed to me, was essentially dishonest, involving a pretence that you did not foresee the result of the experiment before you did it. And all this dithering took up so much time that you really got nowhere.

In these dialogues I was at first fascinated by the discussion in which the particular was gradually generalised, but it seemed to me that Salviati was holding back. The others seemed to have learned little during their absence of three centuries and so they were feeling their way. I was shocked

when Salviati obtained the perimeter of an ellipse by integration; had I been writing the dialogue I would have made Sagredo and Simplicio shout with one voice: "Why the hell have you been wasting our time?"

It reminds me of Churchill saying "Give us the tools and we will finish the job!" In mathematics and physics we use tools, and it is a delicate question in education how much attention to devote to their manufacture and how much to their use. No teacher in his right mind would ask a student to accept, *ex cathedra*, that the derivative of x^n is nx^{n-1} , but neither would the student want to go through the proof every time he needed to differentiate x^n . The tool has been made: now it is up to him to use it. It is fascinating to think of Euler using imaginary numbers as a tool without knowing what he was talking about.

We should be grateful to Professor Pottage for reviving the dialogue as a scientific literary form. It has great possibilities. Why not switch from geometry to physics? It was Galileo's physics, not his geometry, that got him into trouble. Perhaps we might meet his great trio again, representing, let us say, Einstein, Bohr and Schrödinger, but which of them should take the dominating role of Salviati I do not know.

J.L. Synge,
Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies,
Dublin.