



4. Geometrical Determination of K in the Trilinear Relation $\alpha \beta \gamma = K^2$

$= \text{K}^2$

Author(s): J. J. Milne

Source: *The Mathematical Gazette*, No. 3 (Dec., 1894), p. 21

Published by: The Mathematical Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3603993>

Accessed: 11-06-2016 08:55 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Mathematical Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Mathematical Gazette*

By symmetry the remaining group of three follows.

The properties of the polar triangle form a corollary to the above equations. G. HEPPEL.

4. Geometrical determination of K in the trilinear relation $a\beta = K\gamma^2$.

TQ, TQ' (Fig. 11) are two tangents to a conic, P any point on the curve. Through P and the centre O are drawn lines PG, PH, EPF , and Oa, Ob, Oc parallel to TQ, TQ', QQ' respectively. PL, PM, PN are perpendicular to TQ, TQ', QQ' .

Then, since the diameter OT bisects QQ', PP' , and EF , $EP' = PF$. $\therefore Oc^2 : Oa^2 = EP \cdot EP' : EQ^2$,
 $= EP \cdot PF : EQ^2$.

Since the right-angled triangles PEL, PGN are similar,
 $\therefore PE : PG (= EQ) = PL : PN$.

Similarly, $PF : PH (= FQ') = PM : PN$,
 $\therefore PE \cdot PF : EQ \cdot FQ' = PL \cdot PM : PN^2$,

and $EQ : FQ' = PG : PH = TQ : TQ' = Oa : Ob$,
 $\therefore \frac{PL \cdot PM}{PN^2} = \frac{PE \cdot PF}{EQ \cdot FQ'} = \frac{PE \cdot PF}{EQ^2} \cdot \frac{EQ}{FQ'} = \frac{Oc^2}{Oa^2} \cdot \frac{Oa}{Ob}$
 $= \frac{Oc^2}{Oa \cdot Ob}$.

It can easily be deduced from the above that in the trilinear relation—

$$a\beta = K\gamma\delta,$$

if Oa, Ob, Oc, Od are the semi-diameters parallel to the four lines to which $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ are respectively perpendicular,

$$K = \frac{Oc \cdot Od}{Oa \cdot Ob} \quad \text{J. J. MILNE.}$$

5. On the centroid of a trapezoid.

Let $ABCD$ (Fig. 12) be a trapezoid whose parallel sides AB, DC contain p and q units of length respectively. Bisect AB, DC at E, F , and let BD, EF cut at H .

By VI. 1 triangle $ABD : \text{triangle } BDC :: AB : DC$,
 $:: p : q$,
 $:: 3p : 3q$.

The centroid of triangle ABD is that of masses $2p$ at E and p at D . The centroid of triangle BDC is that of masses $2q$ at F and q at B .

Now $EH : HF :: BH : HD$,
 $:: BE : DF$,
 $:: p : q$.

Hence masses p at D and q at B are equivalent to a mass $p + q$ at H , and therefore to masses p at F and q at E .

Hence the system has the centroid of masses $2p + q$ at E and $p + 2q$ at F .

\therefore it is at G on EF where $(2p + q)EG = (p + 2q)FG$.

If we denote the centroids of triangles ABD, BDC by L and M , and adopt the notation of Möbius, the latter part of the demonstration would run thus—

$$\begin{aligned} (3p + 3q)G &= 3pL + 3qM, \\ &= 2pE + pD + 2qF + qB, \\ &= 2pE + 2qF + (p + q)H, \\ &= 2pE + 2qF + qE + pF, \\ &= (2p + q)E + (2q + p)F. \end{aligned}$$

E. M. LANGLEY.

6. On a proof of XI. 4.

Euclid's own demonstration, being rather long, is now usually superseded either by the demonstration which Legendre gives in his *Elements of Geometry*, Bk. V. prop. 4, or by a third demonstration in which the perpendicular is produced to the other side of the plane. In Wilson's *Solid Geometry* this third method of proof is ascribed (erroneously) to Legendre, and in my own edition of Euclid to A. L. Crelle. The latter certainly gives it, without any hint of its authorship, in an article (dated 1834) in his *Journal*, vol. xlv. pp. 35, 36 (1853). He had however published it, along with the proofs of Euclid and Legendre, in his *Lehrbuch der Elemente der Geometrie*, vol. ii. p. 532 (1827), and added the remark: "This proof is by Cauchy."

The correctness of this ascription to Cauchy is confirmed by Lacroix, who gives the proof in his *Elements of Geometry*, § 196 (12th edition, 1822), with the note:

"This demonstration, of the same kind as that of Euclid but simpler, has been communicated to me by Mr. Cauchy, a very distinguished young geometer." J. S. MACKAY.

APPROXIMATIONS AND REDUCTIONS.

(Continued from No. 1, which contains fully-worked numerical examples of the application of the methods of "Practice" to such multipliers as those given below.)

"It is an abiding delusion of the opponent of decimals that he will suppose the decimalist to be under a contract never to use a common fraction."—*De Morgan*.

$$\begin{aligned} 7. \text{ Degrees to radians} & \quad \cdot 01745329 \\ & \quad \frac{1}{60}(1 + \frac{1}{20})(1 - \frac{1}{400} - \frac{1}{8000}) = \cdot 01745333. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 8. \text{ Minutes to radians} & \quad \cdot 000290888 \\ (i) \quad & \cdot 00029(1 + \frac{3}{1000}) = \cdot 00029087, \\ (ii) \quad & \cdot 0006(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{70} - \frac{1}{1100}) = \cdot 000290883. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 9. \text{ Seconds to radians} & \quad \cdot 00000484814 \\ & \quad \cdot 00001(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{70} - \frac{1}{1100}) = \cdot 00000484805. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 10. \text{ Revolutions p. min. to radians p. sec.} & \quad \cdot 104719755 \\ & \quad \frac{1}{10}(1 + \frac{1}{20})(1 - \frac{1}{400} - \frac{1}{8000}) = \cdot 10472. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 11. \text{ Radians p. sec. to revolutions p. min.} & \quad 9 \cdot 5493 \\ & \quad 10(1 - \frac{3}{1000} - \frac{3}{2000}) = 10(1 - \frac{1}{200} + \frac{1}{2000}) = 9 \cdot 55, \\ \text{i.e. multiply by 10 and subtract } 4\frac{1}{2} \text{ per cent.} & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 12. \text{ Miles to kilometres} & \quad 1 \cdot 60933 \\ & \quad 2(1 - \frac{1}{5})(1 + \frac{1}{200} + \frac{1}{1400}) = 1 \cdot 609\frac{3}{7}, \\ \text{or} & \quad \frac{1}{6}(1 - \frac{1}{30} - \frac{1}{1000}) = 1 \cdot 609\frac{4}{5}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 13. \text{ Kilometres to miles} & \quad \cdot 62138 \\ (i) \quad & (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{5})(1 - \frac{1}{200} - \frac{1}{1400}) = \cdot 6214\frac{2}{7}, \\ (ii) \quad & \cdot 6 + \frac{1}{70} + \frac{1}{140} = \cdot 6214\frac{2}{7}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, approximately, 5 miles = 8 kilometres, or a mile and a quarter (i.e. 10 furlongs) = 2 kilometres, so that if our mile were increased by a quarter of its present length, the series *miles, furlongs, chains, and links* would