



Delta-k

Volume XV, Number 4, May 1976

MY CHILD WANTS A CALCULATOR!

GLENADINE GIBB
NCTM President

The following article appeared in the December 1975 NCTM Newsletter.

Should I get a calculator for my child? Does it interfere with children's learning mathematics? We do want our children to know mathematics—the basic facts, how to add, subtract, multiply, and divide. What do you advise?"

Undoubtedly you have been asked these questions, as have I, by parents of your students or by other parents of school-aged children. They may also ask, "And which calculator should I buy?" During the holiday season, we can expect even more of these questions. With prices for calculators declining, they are among possible gifts on those Christmas lists.

In the classroom. Many schools are already using minicalculators in a variety of ways, supported by the NCTM statement that "the minicalculator should be used in imaginative ways to reinforce learning and to motivate the learner as he becomes proficient in mathematics." Finding effective and creative ways is not necessarily an easy assignment, however. The NCTM Instructional Affairs Committee has suggested some uses in a report to be published in the January issue of the *Mathematics Teacher* and the *Arithmetic Teacher*. Other articles in those journals, as well as articles in the *Instructor*, *Today's Education*, and other professional journals and books can help you, as can the workshops and discussions at our professional meetings.

Suppose that we look ahead and make a checklist of the mathematical concepts and skills that we shall be teaching during the remainder of

the year. How can the calculator be used as an instructional aid to enhance learning beyond what we might otherwise expect?



Obviously our lists will reflect the age of our students and the mathematical content of our program. One guide for all of us, however, is that we *not* use the calculator until our students have developed a concept of number, a system for naming numbers, and an understanding of the meaning and processes of the basic operations—that is, until our students understand what the calculator is doing for them.

Once students have this understanding, using the calculator to check answers to paper-and-pencil computations might stimulate more thought than checking by simply looking up the answers. Checking

IN THIS ISSUE

MY CHILD WANTS A CALCULATOR!	1
FROM THE EDITOR'S FILE	2
"SORRY, YOU CAN'T USE THE CALCULATOR IN THE CLASSROOM."	3
GEOMETRY AND AXIOMATICS: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	8
NEW FROM COPP CLARK LIMITED	22
NEWS RELEASE FROM SSMA	23
1976 ALBERTA HIGH SCHOOL PRIZE EXAMS - WINNERS AND SOLUTIONS	24
MCATA ANNUAL CONFERENCE	37

answers, however, seems a very narrow, limited use of the minicalculator. More thinking may be stimulated by using it to "debug" problems; to obtain insight into the operations—as, for example, finding the solution to a division problem with subtraction; to explore topics in number theory; to become more sensitive to the order of operations; to generate patterns; . . . and our list continues. Not to be overlooked is the opportunity to develop skill in estimating and to have more experiences with decimals.

We need not be reminded of the difficulties that many students encounter in problem solving. The calculator can be an impetus for them to formulate more carefully the mathematical relations to be solved in order to provide the calculator with the necessary informa-

tion. Naturally, it enables students to solve problems that can be fascinating to them but were previously avoided because of the tedious, laborious computations involved. Thus, with the hand-held calculator it may be possible to increase considerably our students' skills in problem solving!

Selecting your calculator. The selection of a calculator must depend on how it is to be used and how much money is to be spent. Minimal capabilities for beginning use should include—

- a minimum of six display digits (eight is better);
- easily accessible, springloaded click keys;
- four functions: $+$, $-$, \times , \div ;
- a floating decimal;
- two clearing keys (clear entry and clear);

- no key having a dual purpose;
- a rechargeable unit or AC adapter;
- algebraic logic.

Also, the warranty, the reliability of the manufacturer, and the repair service should be considered.

Like any teaching device, the calculator can create more problems than it can solve if it is misused. It does not replace the need for understanding, skill, or good teaching in mathematics. It is not a substitute for pencil-and-paper skills, although it reduces their use. Creative use of minicalculators after students' mathematical understandings have been abstracted, however, can establish it as a valuable asset among the instructional devices already in today's mathematics classrooms.

From the Editor's File

Math kits have been updated by Bob Holt and his committee. Those persons interested may write to him to obtain a kit suitable to your grade level. The kits will begin circulation in September. They are to introduce new materials to as many teachers as possible. Therefore, do not expect to have time to try everything in your classroom, but consider others as you see and try some of the materials and/or ideas presented.

Membership in MCATA is now \$6 with NCTM membership at \$12.25 to \$16.50 depending on your choices of publications. Ms. Pat Beeler will be pleased to answer any questions you have or you may contact a member of the executive who is more conveniently located in your area.

Number Sentence Games

Grades IV-X

A 64-page book of worksheets giving students ample practice with the fundamental operations and number combinations in a game-type atmosphere. The worksheets are designed for various levels and can be used effectively in an individualized program as well as for group exercises. Special sections are included on order of operations and use of grouping symbols. Reproduction permission is granted. Spirit Duplicating Masters are also available.

Available at:

Western Educational Activities Ltd.
10577 - 97 Street
Edmonton, Alberta

“SORRY, YOU CAN’T USE THE CALCULATOR IN THE CLASSROOM.”

Wes Keener, Mathematics Consultant, London Board of Education

This article is reprinted from the Ontario Mathematics Gazette, Vol. 14, No. 2, December 1975, which is printed by the Ontario Association for Mathematics Education. Some classroom uses of the calculator are included in the article.

Pocket-size electronic calculators are sprouting everywhere, even in the pockets of school children, and some teachers are undecided what to do about them.

I have heard from concerned elementary and secondary mathematics teachers who feel many of their students have not yet mastered the basic operations with whole numbers, and some critics of calculators argue that their use will create a generation of computational illiterates.

There is little question as to the usefulness of a calculator in upper school or university, but the issue becomes more clouded at the elementary level.

John Del Grande in his booklet 'Pocket Mini-Calculator Revolution' states, "In educational circles, the calculator can provoke as much controversy as the Spadina Expressway, the price of Canadian oil or M.P.'s salaries." He reminds us that we may be on the verge of repeating the ridiculous flap that was staged over the use of ballpoint pens in our classrooms around 1950. Many of us recall the pressures exerted to try and keep these pens out of the classes because the kids wouldn't learn how to write properly.

CALCULATORS ARE HERE TO STAY

Drill in basic arithmetic and computational skills will still have to be learned and understood. A calculator cannot tell a student when to multiply or divide and in what order the operations should be performed. Pressing the wrong key or obtaining an incorrect answer because of a run-down battery are common problems, and if the student doesn't know what he's doing or what to expect, he's got problems.

The calculator cannot replace the understanding of numbers.

Practical Teaching Ideas at the Junior/Intermediate Levels

Following are simply a few of the ways that I used a set of calculators with different groups of children ranging from Grade 4 to Grade 8.

1. Pattern Work (done with a Grade 4 class).

Children are provided with a calculator and a dittoed worksheet similar to the one below while I used an overhead sheet which was the same as their dittoed copy.

Numeral	Multiplied By	Product
426	10	-----
426	100	-----
426	1000	-----
82	100	-----
926	1000	-----
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.

After being instructed on how to use the calculator, they were asked to use the instrument to find the products for questions 1 and 2. I entered their products on the overhead and they were encouraged to look for a pattern and to fill in the next product(s) by themselves using the calculator to check. Many discovered the pattern quickly and enjoyed checking their assumptions. Some children took longer to discover the pattern, but at the end of the lesson, my own intuitive feeling was that this enhanced more pupil involvement and learning than the traditional method.

Another day a similar exercise was initiated dividing whole numbers ending in zeros by 10's, 100's, and 1000's (care was taken not to introduce quotients with decimals at this stage).

2. Fractional - Decimal Equivalence

With a Grade 6 class, I continued the dividing process until I arrived at:

Numeral	Divided By	Quotient
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.
100	10	10
10	10	1
1	10	0.1

I was able to use the children's knowledge of fractions that $1 \div 10$ was the same as $1/10$, and at this point they used the calculator to find $1/10 = 0.1$ (printout on calculator conforms with SI notation as shown in the Ministry's Metric Styleguide). The pattern was developed estimating first

then using the calculator to check into hundredths and thousandths.

With a "slower" group of intermediate students, it was encouraging to see students taking $5/8$ and dividing 5 by 8 on the calculator to obtain the decimal equivalent instead of doing it the other way around.

3. Addition, Subtraction, Multiplication, Division Using Decimals (used at the Grade 6 level)

a) Addition

$$\begin{array}{r} 30 \\ +40 \\ \hline 70 \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{r} 3 \\ +4 \\ \hline 7 \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{r} 0.3 \\ +0.4 \\ \hline ? \end{array}$$

They were encouraged to use a pattern, estimate their answer, then use the calculator to verify their results. The above example was the easiest pattern used but it did lead into the more difficult additions. Obviously, subtraction was handled in much the same way.

b) Multiplication and Division by 10's, 100's, 1000's

<u>Number</u>	<u>Standard Numeral</u>
5.2 ÷ 10	-----
0.7 ÷ 10	-----
0.035 × 100	-----
4.03 × 10	-----
2.403 × 1000	-----
0.025 × 100	-----
.	.
.	.
.	.

Question	Product	Number of Figures to the Rt. of the Decimal in the		
		First Factor	Second Factor	Product
5 × 25	125	0	0	0
0.5 × 25	12.5	1	0	1
0.5 × 2.5	1.25	1	1	2
0.5 × 0.25	----	1	-	-
.
.
.

The children were able to see the pattern develop for

determining the number of decimal places in the product, come up with this pattern, and check it out using the calculator with further examples.

<u>Dividend</u>	<u>Divisor</u>	<u>Fraction</u>	<u>Quotient</u>
156	13	$\frac{156}{13}$	12
15.6	13	$\frac{15.6}{13}$	1.2
15.6	1.3	$\frac{15.6}{1.3}$	12
.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.

Which led to questions such as:

"What do you notice about the quotients for $\frac{156}{13}$ and $\frac{15.6}{1.3}$?"

"Why is $\frac{15.6}{1.3}$ equivalent to $\frac{156}{13}$?"

Which in turn, I believe, led to a better understanding of questions similar to:

$$\begin{aligned}
 3.708 \div 2.06 &= \frac{3.708}{2.06} \\
 &= \frac{3.708}{2.06} \times \frac{100}{100} \\
 &= \frac{370.8}{206} \\
 &= 1.8
 \end{aligned}$$

After each of the above type exercises, I asked students to answer many questions using the traditional pencil and paper technique using the calculator to check. I really believe that the calculator helped many children see the patterns involved in decimal operations.

Further Uses

1. At the Grade 6 and 7 levels, I found the calculator as a useful aid in teaching rounding off (the calculators had a floating decimal and decimal shift key).

e.g.

<u>First Factor</u>	<u>Second Factor</u>	<u>Product</u>	<u>Product Rounded Off to 1 Decimal Place</u>
3.9	4.3	16.77	16.8
.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.

Once again the children were encouraged to look for a pattern. i.e. "When the product is 16.77 and you push D.S. 1 on the machine, why does it become 16.8? (whereas with 16.43, why does it become 16.4?)"

2. In a Grade 8 class, I found it useful when teaching Newton's Method for finding square roots correct to one decimal place (or more). It eliminated a lot of the tedious calculations.

$$\text{i.e. } 9 < \sqrt{83} < 10$$

Since it is closer to 9, the possibilities become 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, or 9.5.

We were able to learn more mathematics by using the calculator at this stage to check these out.

$$\text{i.e. } 9.1 \times 9.1 = 82.81$$

$$9.2 \times 9.2 = 84.64$$

$$9.3 \times 9.3 =$$

$$9.4 \times 9.4 =$$

.
.
.

and find that $\sqrt{83} \approx 9.1$

The list goes on. Calculators can be effectively used for:

- checking work (even fractions by using decimal equivalents and a knowledge of rounding off)
- grocery list
- per cents
- powers

Will our students become "mathematical dummies" if allowed to use them? As W. Judd pointed out in his article "A New Case for the Calculator", if a student uses a machine to find 603×404 , then he needs to know something about estimating and rounding off.

$$\text{i.e. } 603 \times 404$$

$$\longrightarrow 600 \times 400$$

which means he still has to know 6×4

Place value understanding is essential:

$$\text{i.e. } 200 \div 0.03 \text{ "Is the answer very big or very small?"}$$

$$200 \times 0.03 \text{ "Is the answer very big or very small?"}$$


Many children now have mini-calculators and many more will have them as the ten dollar calculator becomes a reality. Children see their mothers using them when they go grocery shopping and their fathers when they do the family budget. Can we simply tell children "Sorry, you can't use the calculator in the classroom"? ■

Geometry and Axiomatics: An Historical Perspective

by Wayne J.P. Turley
Lord Beaverbrook High School
Calgary

The evolution of axiomatics was predicated upon the evolution of geometrical thought. Since the concepts of what constitutes a geometry and what constitutes axiomatic development change as a function of the time period under consideration, it becomes essential that we examine the evolution of these ideas from antiquity to the present. The profound contributions made by geometrical thought to the genesis of axiomatics were principally derived through the critique of Euclid's fifth postulate, through the rise of non-Euclidean geometry, through the construction of abstract geometry, nay, through the development of logic. Hence, an investigation of this evolution, which has shaped our present perspective, would be most valuable.

The earliest extant records of geometrical activity are on baked-clay tablets from Mesopotamia believed to date from Sumerian times (3000 B.C.). From the first Babylonian dynasty of King Hammurabi's era, the new Babylonian empire of Nebuchadnezzar II, and the following Persian and Seleucid eras, there exists a superabundance of cuneiform tablets which suggest that Babylonian geometry involved practical mensuration. Between 2000 and 1600 B.C. the Babylonians had derived rules for computing the area of a rectangle and the areas of right and isosceles triangles. An example of the state of geometry in the Babylonian period of the seventeenth century B.C. derives from a 1958 excavation of a unique mathematical tablet containing the following right triangle problem:



Given ABC is a right triangle at A.
AD perpendicular to the hypotenuse BC.

$$AC = 60 (1), AB = 45, BC = 75 (1,15).$$

$$BD = \sqrt{AB/AC \times 2 \times \text{area } ABD}$$

$$= \sqrt{45/60 \times 2 \times 486}$$

27.

(The area 486 was written as 8,6 in Babylonian numeration, as shown on the diagram.)*

*Daniel B. Lloyd, "Recent Evidences of Primeval Mathematics," *The Mathematics Teacher* (Washington, D.C.: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1965), p. 721.

Ancient Egyptian geometry is contained in the Moscow and Rhind papyri and of the 110 problems in these texts, 26 are devoted to geometry. Problem number 14 of the Moscow Mathematical Papyrus indicates that the Egyptian scribes were familiar with the formula $V = h/3 (a^2 + ab + b^2)$ for the volume of a truncated pyramid, where h is the height and a and b are the edges of the square base and the square top, respectively.

Both the Babylonians and the Egyptians displayed mathematical initiatives. They used intuition, experiment, induction, and plain guessing to create some of their results, but irrespective of how well these rules agreed with experiences and no matter how exact the measurement, the rule was not deduced from explicit assumptions. The time when and the place where the distinction between inductive inference and deductive proof from a set of postulates became clear is not known, but it is known that the Greeks were the first to transform geometry from a set of empirical conclusions of the Egyptians and Babylonians to a deductively-based, systematic geometry. Perhaps the paradoxes of Zeno and the problem of incommensurables structured Greek thought to the direction of a logical base which ultimately led to an axiomatic treatment of geometry.

The Eudemian Summary of Proclus places the genesis of Greek geometry with Thales of Miletus in the first half of the sixth century B.C. He was the first among the Seven Wise Men of Greece. He is also the first known individual with whom the use of deductive methods in geometry is associated. Thales brought geometry from Egypt on his commercial ventures and then applied Greek procedures of deduction to his findings. He is credited with the following propositions relating to plane figures:

1. Any circle is bisected by its diameter.
2. The angles at the base of an isosceles triangle are equal.
3. When two lines intersect, the vertical angles are equal.
4. An angle in a semicircle is a right angle.
5. The sides of a similar triangle are proportional.
6. Two triangles are congruent if they have two angles and a side respectively equal.

As propositions in geometry, they may appear to be trivial since they are intuitive but we must be reminded that prior to this time geometry was confined almost exclusively to the measurement of surfaces and solids. The fundamental contributions of Thales consisted of his geometry of lines, and he is also credited with the idea of a logical proof to substantiate his geometrical results.

Pythagoras of Samos (572 B.C.) continued the systematization of geometry. Particularly important in the deductive aspects of geometry was the founding of the Pythagorean school. Members of the Pythagorean society developed the properties of parallel lines and used them to prove that the sum of the angles of any triangle is equal to two right angles. In the Eudemian Summary we are lead to believe that a Pythagorean, Hippocrates of Chios, was the first to attempt a logical presentation of geometry as a sequence of propositions which were ultimately based on some initial definitions and assumptions. Leon, Theudius and others developed this concept further until approximately 300 B.C. Euclid produced his treatise, the Elements, which consisted of an elegant chain of some 465 propositions on plane geometry (Books I to IV),

the theory of proportions (Books V and VI), the theory of numbers (Books VII to IX), the theory of incommensurables (Book X) and solid geometry (Books XI to XIII).

It is generally accepted, however, that Aristotle's work as a systematizer of logic really prepared the way for Euclid's organization of the geometry of his time. Sir Thomas Heath, in the introductory chapters of his definitive English translation of the Elements, quotes a long passage from Aristotle's Posterior Analytics, containing a very careful analysis of the idea of a demonstrative science:

Every demonstrative science, says Aristotle, must start from indemonstrable principles: otherwise, the steps of demonstration would be endless. Of these indemonstrable principles some are (a) common to all science, others are (b) particular, or peculiar to the particular science; (a) the common principles are the axioms, most commonly illustrated by the axiom that, if equals be subtracted from equals, the remainders are equal. Coming now to (b) the principles peculiar to the particular science which must be assumed, we have first the genus or subject-matter, the existence of which must be assumed, viz. magnitude in the case of geometry, the unit in the case of arithmetic. Under this we must assume definitions of manifestations or attributes of the genus, e.g. straight lines, triangles, deflection etc. The definition in itself says nothing as to the existence of the thing defined: it only requires to be understood. But in geometry, in addition to the genus and the definitions, we have to assume the existence of a few primary things which are defined, viz. points and lines only: the existence to everything else, e.g. the various figures made up of these, as triangles, squares, tangents, and their properties, e.g. incommensurability etc., has to be proved (as it is proved by construction and demonstration). In arithmetic we assume the existence of the unit: but, as regards the rest, only the definitions, e.g. those of odd, even, square, cube, are assumed, and existence has to be proved. We have then clearly distinguished, among the indemonstrable principles, axioms and definitions. A postulate is also distinguished from a hypothesis, the latter being made with the assent of the learner, the former without such assent or even in opposition to his opinion.

So the conception of a demonstrative science as a deductive sequence from an accepted set of initial statements was developed during the first 300 years B.C. by Greek mathematicians and philosophers. Certainly one of the greatest achievements of the Greeks was the creation of the postulational form of thinking (now called "material axiomatics") and the geometry they structured according to this posture.

Since changes and additions have been made in what now appears as Euclid's Elements, it is not certain precisely what statements Euclid assumed for his postulates and common notions nor what definitions he made, but the available evidence suggested that there were five postulates:

1. To draw a straight line from any point to any point.
2. To produce a finite straight line continuously in a straight line.
3. To describe a circle with any centre and distance.
4. That all right angles are equal to one another.

5. That, if a straight line falling on two straight lines makes the interior angles on the same side less than two right angles, the two straight lines, if produced indefinitely, meet on that side on which are the angles less than two right angles.

There were five common notions (axioms):

1. Things which are equal to the same thing are also equal to one another.
2. If equals be added to equals, the wholes are equal.
3. If equals be subtracted from equals, the remainders are equal.
4. Things which coincide with one another are equal to one another.
5. The whole is greater than the part.

There were twenty-three definitions, some of which appear below:

1. A point is that which has no part.
2. A line is breadthless length.
3. A straight line is a line which lies evenly with the points on itself.
4. A plane angle is the inclination to one another of two lines in a plane which meet one another and do not lie in a straight line.
5. Parallel straight lines are straight lines which, being in the same plane and being produced indefinitely in both directions, do not meet one another in either direction.

It appears then that Euclid adopted Aristotle's distinction between postulates and common notions. He could also have adopted Plato's assumptions for classical constructions in the first three postulates. However, the remarkable insights of Euclid are contained in his ideal to establish geometry on any unimpeachably-logical foundation. Though his attempt failed, he nevertheless conceived it.

What Euclid did not seem to realize is that in a sense his postulates impose constraints on points and lines which therefore are defined. Hence any further attempt to define these terms is redundant mathematically. The question now arises as to why Euclid insisted on defining what should have remained undefined. The reason, in historical perspective, appears to be that Euclid thought his geometry constituted a description of the physical universe. It follows that his geometry should refer to external realities and therefore be definable.

Another remarkable insight of Euclid was his recognition of the importance of the parallel postulate and the necessity of assuming it. Given that he avoided the use of the fifth postulate until Proposition 29 of Book I, we may infer that Euclid himself may even have questioned its inclusion. From the beginning this postulate was criticized. It lacked the brevity of the other four postulates; and its converse, viz. - "The sum of two angles of a triangle is less than two right angles" - was proved as a theorem. Consequently, it was thought to be capable of proof. Posidonius, in the first century B.C., who defined parallel lines as lines that are coplanar and equidistant, attempted to prove the equivalent of Euclid's parallel postulate. In the second century, Claudius Ptolemy of Alexandria also worked on a proof of this postulate. Even

Proclus in the fifth century considered it alien to the special character of postulates. He was successful in reducing the proof to one that depended on the establishment of the following: Given any two parallel lines and a third distinct line which intersects one of the given lines, then it also intersects the remaining given line. Proclus' argument was based on the assumption that parallel lines everywhere are equidistant and this is tantamount to the fifth postulate. The logical anathema was that Proclus assumed what he was trying to prove.

Apollonius of Perga (225 B.C.) studied under the successors of Euclid. Their influence was manifest in his eight books on the Conics. Only seven books have survived, four in Greek and three in Arabic which contain 387 propositions. While Apollonius used a systematic and deductive process of construction and demonstration in his treatise, the form of the propositions was horrendous by virtue of the subject he was treating - a distinct contrast to the elementary conceptions of the line and circle of Euclid. Though Apollonius marks the termination of the golden age of Greek geometry, such geometers as Heron of Alexandria (A.D. 75), Menelaus (100), Ptolemy (85 - 165) and Pappus (320) did make some contributions to geometry. Of these, perhaps the greatest work was that of Pappus. His "Collection" contained original propositions and improvements.

A gradual decline in original thinking typified the period of the Roman Empire which devoured Greece in 146 B.C. Then, from the fall of the Roman Empire in the middle of the fifth century, the Dark Ages gave rise to little new mathematical thinking in Western Europe. It was during this time that mathematics was influenced by the Hindu and Arabian people. But the idea of deductive proof was alien to the thinking of the Hindus as exemplified in Aryabhata's book called Aryabhatiya which was written in 499. The Hindus' chief interest was in numbers and there was little influence of Greek geometry. However, the Arabian scholars of geometry were attracted to the proof of Euclid's fifth postulate. Alhazen (ibn-al-Haitham) (965-1039) "proved" that the fourth angle in a trirectangular quadrilateral must also be a right angle. (Actually, the fifth postulate follows from the assumption that Alhazen made.)

Omar Khayyam (1044-1123) also attempted the proof of Euclid's fifth. Khayyam's second book, Commentaries on the Difficulties in the Postulates of Euclid's Elements, was in part an attempt to connect the fifth and fourth postulates by means of five Aristotelian principles. For instance, Khayyam used the principle that quantities can be divided without end, *id est*, there are no indivisibles. He used the principle that a straight line can be indefinitely produced; two principles of intersecting lines and the axiom of Archimedes.

In order to prove one of his propositions it was necessary for him to conceive of three situations which in later history became known as (a) the acute angle case, (b) the obtuse angle case, and (c) the right angle case. This trichotomy which ultimately became known as non-Euclidean Bolyai-Lobachevskii geometry, non-Euclidean Riemann geometry, and Euclidean geometry, was also quoted by the Persian mathematician Nasir ed-din (1201-1274) who tried to prove the parallel postulate from the hypothesis:

If a line u is perpendicular to a line w at A , and if line v is oblique to w at B , then the perpendiculars drawn from u upon v are less than AB on the side on which v makes an acute angle with w and greater on the side on which v makes an obtuse angle with w .

The history of the development of axiomatics is replete with attempts to prove the fifth postulate. These so-called proofs may be catalogistically trichotomized according to the following types: direct proof from the other four postulates; substitution for the fifth postulate some other ostensibly simpler one, of which Alhazen, Omar Khayyam and Nasir ed-din are typical examples, and indirect proof. While we know now that these approaches were illogical, they were instrumental in the evolution of synthetic methods.

The latter half of the eleventh century saw the infiltration of Greek learning into Europe. Significant though in terms of the history of mathematics was the twelfth century. The Elements appeared in Latin from the Arabic and were translated in 1142 by Adelard of Bath (1075-1160). It also appeared as a revised Latin translation from the Arabic work of Thabit ibn Qurra.

The rise of the universities in the thirteenth century at Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, Padua, and Naples contributed to the development of mathematics. It was during this century in approximately 1260 that Johannes Campanus of Novara made a commanding Latin translation of Euclid's Elements, which later, in 1482, became the first printed version. The hundred-year hiatus of the fourteenth century abounded in unproductiveness by virtue of the Black Death and the Hundred Years' War but was followed by the invention of the printing press in the fifteenth century which revolutionized the dissemination of knowledge.

The mathematical achievements of the sixteenth century were more algebraic than geometric, although the symbolization of algebra was to have a pervasive effect on the development of geometry. More importantly though were the 1533 translation of Proclus' Commentary on Euclid, Book I, the 1566 Latin translation of Books I-IV of Apollonius' Conic Sections, and the 1572 Commandino translation of the Elements of Euclid. With an increasing number of the great Greek works in geometry readily accessible it would only be a question of time before the attention of scholars would again be focused on the development of geometry.


From the Greek era until the seventeenth century there was an enormous gap in the axiomatization of geometry. But it appears that the impetus of symbolized algebra and the general climate in the arts and sciences affected the formation of different conceptual patterns in geometry. One such development was that of non-Euclidean geometry.

Non-Euclidean geometry was created as a direct consequence of a critique of Euclid's parallel postulate. It became a compulsive challenge to prove this postulate from the others. It was hereditary stress. It appeared that there was a cultural "intuition" not unlike that of the Pythagoreans who, when presented by Theodorus of Cyrene with the proof of the irrationality of $\sqrt{2}$, refusing to scrap their philosophy, and, unable to ferret out the "faulty" step in the proof, arrived at a solution by labelling the discovery "alagon" (unutterable) and swore never to tell of this new number. This cultural bias then was probably responsible for the prevailing opinion in the Middle Ages that the fifth postulate could not conceivably be "independent" of the other postulates.

So it became almost a lifetime pursuit of Girolamo Giovanni Saccheri (1667-1733) to demonstrate once and for all that Euclid's system of geometry with its postulate of parallels was the only one possible. The first work, *Logica demonstrativa*, appeared in 1697 but was published under the name of Count Gravere, one of Saccheri's students. In this text, Saccheri makes a

clear distinction between *definitiones quid nominis* and *definitiones quid rei* (nominal and real definitions). The nominal definition refers to a specific term while the real definition refers to the existence of a thing or its constructibility. Hence the nominal becomes real with a postulate.

His most definitive attempt to prove the parallel postulate was published in 1733 under the title of *Euclides ab omni naevo vindicatus sive conatus geometricus quo stabiliuntur prima ipsa geometriae principia*. In this masterpiece, Saccheri, using the method of *reductio ad absurdum*, tried to clear Euclid of all blemishes, including the supposed error of assuming the fifth postulate. His technique was to deny Euclid's parallel postulate, retain the other postulates and consequently derive a self-contradictory geometry. To arrive at a contradiction, he used a figure contained in the Clavius edition of Euclid's Elements, the birectangular quadrilateral (the Saccheri quadrilateral)



which consisted of two equal perpendiculars AC and BD to segment AB. Saccheri called $\angle ACD$ and $\angle BDC$ the summit angles of the quadrilateral. He noted three possibilities:

1. The summit angles are right (the right-angle hypothesis).
2. The summit angles are obtuse (the obtuse-angle hypothesis).
3. The summit angles are acute (the acute-angle hypothesis).

Saccheri showed that if any of these hypotheses is valid for one Saccheri quadrilateral, it is valid for every quadrilateral of the same type. He also showed that the parallel postulate is a logical consequence of the right-angle hypothesis. He showed further that by assuming a straight line is infinitely long, the obtuse-angle hypothesis is self-contradictory. To dispose of the acute-angle hypothesis was another matter, however. He obtained many results different from those that had been established by use of the fifth postulate, but he never did find a contradiction. Consequently, he concluded on the basis of intuition that the "hypothesis of the acute angle is absolutely false, because it is repugnant to the nature of a straight line." We now know that it would have been impossible for Saccheri to ever deduce a contradiction from the acute-angle hypothesis.

In his attempt, though, he succeeded in creating a geometry independent of the parallel postulate. Perhaps the title of his treatise suggests that he expected to find no contradictions in Euclid, his idol. Certainly, the able logician Saccheri was cognizant that the system of fundamental propositions in every demonstrative science is precisely their indemonstrability. Perhaps Saccheri just could not conceive of this because of the extremely strong tradition that the only conceivable mathematics of space was Euclidean. He did not

recognize his creation, yet he proved several theorems in two new geometries which were as sound logically as Euclid's.

The geometers of the eighteenth century were influenced by the work of Saccheri, especially Johann Heinrich Lambert (1728-1855), a Swiss mathematician, who, in 1766, analyzed the work of Saccheri and concluded that the obtuse-angle hypothesis is consistent with spherical geometry. Another geometer influenced by Saccheri, Adrien Marie Legendre (1752-1853) wrote *Éléments de géométrie* which clearly resembles Saccheri's work, except that Legendre proposed three hypotheses in which the sum of the angles in a triangle is equal to, greater than, and less than two right angles. He succeeded in producing a proof that the angle sum of a triangle cannot be greater than two right angles but failed to show that the sum cannot be less than two right angles. In any case, his "proof" was based on assumptions equivalent to what he was trying to prove. In 1809, Bernhard Friedrich Thibaut tried to prove Legendre's first hypothesis basing his argument on the assumption that every rigid motion can be resolved into a rotation and a translation, and assumption equivalent to that of the fifth postulate. John Playfair in 1813 tried to tidy up the errors in Thibaut's argument but with no success.

It remained for Gauss to bring the expression of the concept of non-Euclidean geometry to our attention. Carl Friedrich Gauss (1777-1855) also attempted to prove the parallel postulate by assuming its falsity. It is not known when Gauss recognized the existence of a logically-sound geometry without Euclid's fifth postulate but it is certain that he spent some thirty years in pursuit of such an aim given the cultural prejudice associated with it. In a letter to Franz Adolf Taurinus on November 8, 1824, he wrote:

The assumption that the angle sum (of a triangle) is less than 180° leads to a curious geometry, quite different from ours but thoroughly consistent, which I have developed to my entire satisfaction. The theorems of this geometry appear to be paradoxical, and, to the uninitiated, absurd, but calm, steady reflection reveals that they contain nothing at all impossible.

However, the discovery of non-Euclidean geometry was not made by one person but by three almost simultaneously and independently. Gauss did not complete his discoveries but Janos Bolyai did. Bolyai (1775-1856) replaced the parallel postulate with: "In a plane two lines can be drawn through a point parallel to a given line and through this point an infinite number of lines may be drawn lying in the angle between the first two and having the property that they will not intersect the given line." Bolyai's work was published in 1832. Nikolai Ivanovich Lobachevskii (1793-1856) also invented a new geometry, published in 1829. Lobachevskii's replacement of Euclid's parallel postulate was: "Through a point P not on a line there is more than one line which is parallel to the given line." Consider the apocalyptical though logical consequences of this postulate: (1) No quadrilateral is a rectangle; if a quadrilateral has three right angles, the fourth angle is acute, (2) The sum of the measures of the angles of a triangle is always less than 180° , and (3) If two triangles are similar, they are congruent.

The obtuse-angle hypothesis was not a consideration of Bolyai or Lobachevskii but of Georg Friedrich Bernhard Riemann (1826-1866), a student of Gauss. Replacing the parallel postulate of Euclid with: "Through a point in a plane there can be drawn in the plane no line which does not intersect a given

line not passing through the given point," Riemannian geometry was born. It gave rise to other curious results:

1. Two perpendiculars to the same line intersect.
2. Two lines enclose an area.
3. The sum of the measures of the angles of a triangle is greater than 180° .
4. If two sides of a quadrilateral are congruent and perpendicular to a third side, the figure is not a rectangle, since two of the angles are obtuse.

But, we may add, it was Eugenio Beltrami in 1868 who finally established the relative consistency of the new geometries by interpreting plane non-Euclidean geometry as the geometry of geodesics on a certain class of surfaces in Euclidean space.

The solution of the parallel postulate was finally found. It is rather curious that its initial solution should occur almost simultaneously and independently through the work of Gauss, Bolyai and Lobachevskii unless we invoke a cultural explanation referred to at an earlier time in this paper. The equipment needed, the ideas prerequisite to appropriate analogies are additive within the mathematical community, being ubiquitous and yet accumulative until sufficient stress is created that the problem commences to be solved by several investigators in the same temporal domain. (There are many such examples of this phenomenon in the history of mathematics. Witness, for example, the development of calculus.) The solution of the parallel postulate problem was long in coming and yet its discovery occurred because the concepts and ideas that were prevalent just prior to its solution, such as the advent of axiomatic systems in algebra, initiated new insights unique to a solution.

The enigma of the fifth postulate was also slow in coming not only because of the inherited tradition that surrounded it but also because of the prevailing philosophy of Kant (1724-1804) who treated space not as empirical but as something existing in the mind and hence non-experiential. The obstacle to overcome then was to view geometry as an experimental science complete with postulates as a function of convenience but correlated with the data in the physical world. Certainly Kantian philosophy was responsible for the lack of true regard for the discoveries of Gauss, Bolyai and Lobachevskii. But there is no question that the role of the non-Euclidean geometries did have a pervasive effect on mathematical and philosophical thought especially in the nineteenth century. It lent credence to the idea that mathematics ought not to be bound to specific patterns à la Kant or even patterns displayed in the physical universe, but rather that mathematics ought to create its own patterns predicated on contemporary thought.

The stage was set for the abstract conception that geometric theories are true only in the sense that they are logical consequences of the axioms that constitute their bases. Mathematicians were almost ready to accept the notion that Euclidean geometry is no more true than non-Euclidean geometry.


Euclid defined point and line as an approximation of the physical universe because he thought that they represented something extant. For centuries, this conception of the universe was not questioned. Even today the mathematician hesitates to define which geometry is more representative of his world. The truth of the matter is that he may never know if he agrees with the Henri

Poincaré model: If our universe were enclosed in a sphere of finite radius and our planet were close to its centre; if, when entities approach the boundary of the sphere they become increasingly but uniformly smaller, then they can never reach the boundary and we would be unaware of this shrinking since our measuring devices would also get smaller and smaller; consequently, our universe, from our conception of it, would appear to be unbounded but, in fact, it is bounded. But physical space is locally Euclidean which means that in the neighborhood of a point, space is Euclidean. In contradistinction, universal space may be Euclidean, elliptic or hyperbolic and notwithstanding Poincaré, Einstein's general theory of relativity predicts hyperbolic space.

Non-Euclidean geometry transmogrified deductive reasoning. It was the basis of viewing mathematics as a creation of postulates by mathematicians. The advance of mathematics is gradual as Bell points out in "The Development of Mathematics" so even by 1945 some still adhered to the Platonic doctrine of mathematical truths. But the greatest iconoclasm of non-Euclidean geometry, nevertheless, was its destruction of the myth of absolute truth in mathematics. This, then, was an important precursor to the notion that a mathematical system could have an intrinsic independence of any notion of physical reality.

The self-consistency concept of a mathematical system was consonant with the prevailing scientific philosophy of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The first step on the ladder of maturity is the view of mathematics as a science independent of physical reality, a science whose entities are themselves abstract systems capable of self-consistency without being true of any particular reality but necessarily of some other structure. So Frege's conception of a foundation for mathematics - because mathematics is independent of physical reality, its truths must also be independent of this reality - was ultimately an outgrowth of the existing conception of the universe as suggested by non-Euclidean geometry.

It was also during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, after the foundations of geometry had been examined extensively, that satisfactory postulate sets emerged for Euclidean geometry. It is not the purpose of this paper to ferret out all the inconsistencies in Euclid's Elements but we shall mention a few that gave rise to the further advance of geometry. Postulate two which was referred to earlier, that a straight line may be produced indefinitely, does not mean necessarily that a straight line is infinite. Riemann in 1854 pointed out that distinction. In Proposition I 21 Euclid made an assumption that Moritz Pasch (1843-1930) recognized must be made explicit. So he supplied what is sometimes called Pasch's Axiom: If a line l intersects AB , one side of a triangle ABC , it intersects either BC or AC in a point between B and C or in a point between A and C .



Dedekind supplied a continuity postulate sometimes called Dedekind's Axiom: If a line segment connects a point inside a circle to a point outside a circle (in the same plane) then the line segment will intersect the circle. This postulate was necessary to the logical analysis of Proposition II where it is assumed that circles with centres at the ends of a line segment and having the line segment as a common radius intersect. To tidy up some of these and other criticisms of Euclid such men as Veblen, Hilbert, Pieri and Huntington suggested other postulates and other undefined terms. So it was the quest for a logically acceptable postulate set for Euclidean geometry coupled with the apocalypse of consistent hyperbolic, parabolic and elliptic geometries that advanced the development of axiomatics.

We now descend to a more profound level of Pasch's work where we observe antecedents of the postulational method in geometry. He effectively obliterated both the Newtonian conception of space as the absolute ultimate and the Leibnizian idea of space as a labyrinth of relations. Pasch, like Peirce before him, thought of geometry as an hypothetico-deductive system in which the elemental terms like points, lines, and planes remained undefined. It is important for us to note that Pasch's lucid representation of geometry was the first after Euclid's in the postulational tradition, though he went beyond Euclid, as we have explained, in his ferreting out of covert assumptions. That our present conception of geometry is close to that of Pasch is testimony to support his profound influence on the subject.

In the early 1890s, Peano began the monumental task of restructuring all of mathematics, including geometry, to a precise symbolism. Consonant with this approach were postulate sets that were necessary and sufficient conditions for proofs. The nineteenth century witnessed an unprecedented development of mathematical shorthand, especially in the work of Boole. It was this movement, spearheaded by Peano and culminated by David Hilbert (1862-1943), that probably more than anything else laid the foundation to mathematical logic. Also consonant with the Peanoian approach was the view of geometry as an abstract, purely formal system without any intrinsic content save that implied by the postulates. In the penultimate year of the nineteenth century the ultimate advance was made in Hilbert's classical *Grundlagen der Geometrie*. Once and for all the postulational method was established not only for geometry but for most of mathematics to come, if we are permitted the liberty of a hindsight. Here was the genesis of the realization that axiomatics were not peculiar to geometry.

The adoption of the axiomatic method as a general foundational device was slow in coming. The method *ipso facto* was not fully accepted until the nineteenth century. Then the beginnings of the power of the method not only as a means of generalizing mathematical concepts but also as a research tool were realized. The stage was set for the prominent role that logic was to assume in the Edwardian period. While it is not the purpose of this paper to consider the role of axiomatics in logic, it is, nevertheless, interesting to note the parallel between the destruction of the uniqueness of Euclidean geometry by the invention of the non-Euclidean geometries and the destruction of the uniqueness of mathematical logic by the axiomatic analysis of logic.

Having traveled the non-Euclidean highway so far we should now like to glance over the route and note some other geometric landmarks that contributed to the development of axiomatics. Mathematicians were profoundly influenced in the development of modern mathematical thought by projective geometry and the attendant elements such as the law of duality. J.D. Gergonne (1771-1859) noticed that if point and line were interchanged in some plane geometry theo-

remains it would be possible to create independently provable but dual propositions. He suggested that the original theorem is a sufficient condition for the dual. Further, Gergonne reasoned analogously in three-dimensional space that point and plane were duals. J.V. Poncelet (1788-1867) published his *Traité des propriétés projectives des figures* in 1822 which was a classic of the synthetic method and a definitive precursor to the conception of geometry as an hypothetico-deductive system. In observing that certain characteristics of a plane configuration, for instance, collinearity (Pascal's theorem), remain invariant under projection, Poncelet defined the projective properties of figures. But it was Julius Plücker (1801-1868) who generalized the classic duality for configurations of points and lines in plane geometry. While Gergonne may have believed his duality an absolute attribute of "space" born of intuition, the "space" of elementary projective geometry for Plücker's geometry was a trivial consequence of a narrow way of choosing systems of coordinates. In fact, it was Plücker's abandonment of visual intuition for an algebraic and analytic treatment that finished something that the non-Euclidean geometries only began. It was this kind of mathematical construction of "spaces" and "geometries" that finally demolished Kant's conception of the nature of mathematics. In any case, there is no question that the residue of the work of Plücker was another testimony that geometry was fast becoming an abstract formal discipline.

The development of axiomatics was profoundly influenced by a number of geometric themes: abstract geometry in the laws of duality, Plücker's coordinates and hyperspace, non-Euclidean geometry, and the criticism of the fundamental principles of geometry in reference to physical facts. It was all of these and more that precipitated the so-called hypothetico-deductive system of contemporary mathematical theory. These themes have retained their vitality and interest although particular concepts may have lost their attractiveness for those trained in newer habits of thought for which those very concepts were partly responsible. But in seeking the things that have endured in mathematics, we are led to processes and ways of thinking rather than to their products in any one epoch. However, the creation of a set of axioms that is fecund in profound results, small in number, platitudinous in difficulty, self-evident to reasonable people and demonstrably independent will enhance the aesthetic appearance of the creation but the axiom system can never be proved consistent by methods formalizable within the system itself. Consequently, the closer we approach the foundations of mathematics the more illusory is our grasp on the axiomatic method, until, in the final analysis, when we transcend the threshold of mathematics, the heuristics of axiomatics disappear and the focus ought to change to new methods of exploration.

Bibliography

- Belge, Edward G. (ed.). "Mathematics for Education." *The Sixty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1970, pp. 10-22.
- Bell, E.T. *The Development of Mathematics*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1945, pp. 263-266 and 320-360.
- Eves, Howard. *An Introduction to the History of Mathematics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966, pp. 121-130.
- _____. "The History of Geometry." *NCTM Thirty-first Yearbook: Histor-*

ical Topics for the Mathematics Classroom. Washington, D.C.: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc., 1969.

Guggenbuhl, Laura. "The New York fragments of the Rhind Mathematical Papyrus." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (October 1964), pp. 406-410.

Heath, T.L. (ed.). *Apollonius of Perga: Treatise on Conic Sections.* Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons Ltd., 1961.

_____. *The Thirteen Books of Euclid's Elements.* Cambridge, 1926.

Hilbert, D. "Mathematical Problems." *American Mathematical Society Bulletin.* Lancaster, Pa.: The MacMillan Co., 1902, pp. 447-451.

Fant, Alfred B. "Half Man, Half Myth." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (March 1969), pp. 225-228.

Fitzpatrick, Sister Mary. "Saccheri, forerunner of non-Euclidean geometry." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (May 1964), pp. 323-332.

Gemignani, M.C. "On the Geometry of Euclid." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (February 1967), pp. 160-164.

Goodstein, R.L. *Essays in the Philosophy of Mathematics.* Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1965, pp. 84-86, 116-125, 126-138.

Hatcher, William S. *Foundations of Mathematics.* Philadelphia, Pa.: W.B. Saunders Company, 1968, pp. 76-85.

Kattsoff, Louis O. "The Saccheri quadrilateral." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (December 1962), 630-636.

Kenner, Morton R. "Helmholtz and the nature of geometrical axioms: a segment in the history of mathematics." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (February 1962), pp. 98-104.

Kleene, Stephen Cole. *Mathematical Logic.* New York: John Wiley & Son, Inc., 1967, pp. 191-198.

Kline, Morris. "Mathematics and Axiomatics." *The Role of Axiomatics and Problem Solving in Mathematics.* Washington, D.C.: The Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Ginn and Company, 1966, pp. 57-62.

Kneebone, G.T. *Mathematical Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics: An Introductory Survey.* London: D. Van Nostrand Company Limited, 1963.

Lloyd, Daniel B. "Recent evidences of primeval mathematics." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (December 1965), pp. 720-723.

Lobatschewsky, Nicholas. *Geometrical Researches on the Theory of Parallels.* Translated from the original by George Bruce. Halsted, Austin, 1892.

Maiers, Wesley W. "Introduction to non-Euclidean geometry." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (November 1964), pp. 457-461.

Meder, A.E., Jr. "What is wrong with Euclid?" *The Mathematics Teacher*, (December 1958), pp. 578-584.

- Meschkowski, Herbert. *Noneuclidean Geometry*. Berlin, Germany: The Free University of Berlin. Translated by A. Shenitzer, Department of Mathematics, Adelphi University, Garden City, Long Island, New York, and published by Academic Press, New York and London, 1964.
- Meserve, Bruce E. "Euclidean and other Geometries." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (January 1967), pp. 2-11.
- _____. "The evolution of geometry." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (May 1956), pp. 372-382.
- Murray, Earl. "Conflicting Assumptions." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (February 1944), pp. 57-63.
- Reeve, William David. "Thales." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (February 1930), pp. 84-86.
- Rolwing, Raymond H. "The Parallel Postulate." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (December 1969), pp. 665-669.
- Sanford, Vera. "Adrien-Marie Legendre." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (March 1935), pp. 182-184.
- Striuk, D.J. "Omar Khayyam, Mathematician." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (April 1958), pp. 282-284.
- Webb, Harrison E. "Certain Undefined Elements and Tacit Assumptions in the First Book of Euclid's Elements." *The Mathematics Teacher*, (December 1919), pp. 41-60.
- Wilder, Raymond L. *Evolution of Mathematical Concepts*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968, pp. 99-110.



Aftermath

Grades V-IX

This is a series of four enrichment books designed to reinforce the regular curriculum as well as to reinforce new aspects of math. The activities in these books are guaranteed to keep you and your students fascinated with mathematics. Activities are simple and self-explanatory and emphasis is on teaching students to solve problems creatively. One hundred twenty-eight pages in each book, of cartoons, humor, designs, puzzles, codes, games, and answers make students eager to learn. Suitable for all ability levels. Reproduction permission is granted. Spirit Duplicating Masters are also available.

Available at:

Western Educational Activities Ltd.
10577 - 97 Street
Edmonton, Alberta

New From Copp Clark Limited

Mathematics Alive 1 by Ronald Paterson, (principal, Northmount High School, Montreal), Martin Clenman (Department of Mathematics, HumberSide Collegiate Institute, Toronto), and Reynold Clarke (Lakeshore School Board, Beaconsfield, Quebec) is a textbook designed for use in Grades IX and X under the Alberta curriculum content. The book appears to have very good organization throughout with topics in good sequence for use as a basic text. For those already using a multi-text approach this book will be useful in helping the middle and weaker groups of students with its good simple explanations and challenging problems. All measurements that I have found are in the SI system which is desirable at this time. Anyone who has experience with this text is requested to give us further information.


B Math by Mary A. St. Louis-Garson-Falconbridge Secondary School, Sudbury, Ontario, and W.H. Jennings, Windsor, Ontario, formerly with High School of Commerce, is designed for advanced business education students as a basic text. In reading and studying the book it appears to be organized well to meet the needs of the students in both its order of development and its ability to lead from the simple to complex with a good refresher section at the beginning for the students who have been away from basic math for several years. This book could be very useful as a source book for teachers in the junior high area of option math courses. Much of the simpler work is very practical for the students who need to understand business math but who are not going to be able to take courses in business in their high school program. Anyone who has used this book is asked to present his reactions from his experience.

The cooperation of teachers in the classroom in reacting to books they are using is the best way for us to get our publishers to write the texts and supplementary materials in the way we need and want for most efficient aids to our teaching. ■



EPIE Reports

Two new reports by the Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE) have just been released: "Early Learning Kits--25 Evaluations" (EPIE REPORT No. 68) and "Analyses of Elementary School Mathematics Materials" (EPIE REPORT No. 69/70). "Early Learning Kits--25 Evaluations" deals with the evaluation of instructional materials for use by pre-elementary school children, as well as feedback by educators who have actually used these materials. "Analyses of Elementary School Mathematics Materials" investigates major mathematics programs in overall assessment and recommendation, content, methodology, and means of evaluation.



Copies of these reports are available for \$20 each (\$10 for EPIE members) from EPIE Institute, 463 West Street, New York, New York 10014. ■

News Release From SSMA


Career education and its implications for science and mathematics teachers is the theme of the special issue just published by the School Science and Mathematics Association. The recent emphasis in the schools on career education has stressed that teachers from elementary school through the university level are to have extensive input into the career education of their students. What input have mathematics and science teachers had in the implementation of career education of their schools? Will career education be a vehicle through which more students become interested in mathematics and science? The articles in this special issue provide some of the answers to these questions.

Some of the topic areas of individual articles include the history of career education and the legislative and funding programs during the last five years; how science and mathematics can be infused with career education in the elementary schools; introducing career education into secondary school science and mathematics classes; how career education can play a larger role in the junior colleges; how teacher education can facilitate including science and mathematics in career education; and a comprehensive listing of resources for getting more ideas for infusing career education in science and mathematics classes.

Career education is interesting and challenging. Today, more than at any other time in our history, mathematics and science teachers should be aware of how their disciplines can become the first stepping stone to a life-long career. Single copies of this publication are available for \$1.50 from the School Science and Mathematics Association, P.O. Box 1614, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA 15701. ■



National Statistics Examination



For all interested institutions, a National Statistics Examination (NSE) is available for course administration at the end of this academic term and in May 1976. The NSE tests cover all the topics that might appear in any non-calculus statistics course. Examination booklets and scoring are free for schools that report their results. Persons writing for further information or for the NSE will automatically be placed on a mailing list for the periodical TEACHING STATISTICS. Richard G. Lefkø, Associate Director, Arithmetical Statistics Project, Staten Island Community College, Staten Island, New York 10301, is the contact for NSE. ■

1976 Alberta High School Prize Exams

- Winners and Solutions

RESULTS -- 1976 Alberta High School Prize Exam

<u>Prize</u>	<u>Amt.</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>School</u>
Canadian Math. Congress Scholarship	\$400	ROTH, Dwayne C.	Medicine Hat High School Medicine Hat
Nickel Foundation Scholarship	\$400	CHIPPERFIELD, Randall	Ernest Manning High School Calgary
Third Highest	\$200	MATTHEWS, Paul	Dr. E.P. Scarlett High Calgary
Fourth Highest	\$200	SAMPLE, Rick	Harry Ainlay Comp. High Edmonton

SPECIAL PROVINCIAL PRIZES

Highest Grade 12 student (below first 4):

\$100	HEWITT, Lawrence	William Aberhart High School Calgary
-------	------------------	---

Highest Grade 10/11 student (below first 4):

\$100	FENSKE, Keith	Harry Ainlay Comp. High Edmonton
-------	---------------	-------------------------------------

DISTRICT PRIZES

<u>District No.</u>	<u>Amt.</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School</u>
1		No prize awarded in District #1	
2	\$50	HERCHEN, Harald	Grand Trunk High School Evansburg
3	\$50	OSBORNE, Norman	Androssan Jr. Sr. High Androssan
4	\$50	YOUNG, Bryan	Wm. E. Hay Comp. High Stettler
5	\$50	HUANG, LingLing	Cochrane High School Cochrane
6	\$50	NEUFELDT, Kevin	Kate Andrews High School Coaldale
7	(1) \$50	DOMIER, Calvin	Harry Ainlay Comp. High Edmonton
7	(2) \$25	GOON, Veiven	Harry Ainlay Comp. High Edmonton
		FUJINAGA, Masao	Harry Ainlay Comp. High Edmonton
8	(1) \$50	PATTULLO, Andrew	William Aberhart High Calgary
8	(2) \$50	PATTERSON, Roger	Bishop Grandin High Calgary

CANADIAN MATHEMATICAL CONGRESS

1976 ALBERTA HIGH SCHOOL

PRIZE EXAMINATION IN MATHEMATICS

PART I ANSWER SHEET

To be filled in by the Candidate.

PRINT:

Last Name	First Name	Initial
-----------	------------	---------

Candidate's Address	Town/City
---------------------	-----------

Name of School

Grade

ANSWERS:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20

To be completed by the Department of Mathematics, University of Alberta:

Points	Points Correct	Number Wrong
1 - 20 5	5 × =	1 × =
Totals	C = _____	W = _____

SCORE = C - W =

Do all problems. Each problem is worth five points. TIME: 60 Minutes

1. What is the value of $5^{\log_5 6}$?
(A) 1 (B) 5 (C) 6 (D) $\log_6 5$ (E) none of these
2. Let S be the set of points, (x,y) , in the plane satisfying both $x^2 + y^2 \leq 1$ and $x^2 + y^2 \geq r^2$. A value of r such that S is the empty set is:
(A) 1 (B) -1 (C) $\frac{1}{2}$ (D) $-\frac{1}{2}$ (E) none of these
3. If S , T , and V are any sets, then $[(S \cap T) \cup (S \cap V)]$ is the same set as
(A) S , (B) $T \cup V$, (C) $T \cap V$, (D) $S \cap (T \cup V)$,
(E) none of these
4. A metal disc has one face marked "1" and the other face marked "2". A second metal disc has one face marked "2" and the other marked "3". Assume that, when tossed, the two faces of a disc are equally likely to turn up. If both discs are tossed, what is the probability that "4" is the sum of the numbers turning up?
(A) $\frac{1}{4}$ (B) $\frac{1}{2}$ (C) $\frac{3}{4}$ (D) $\frac{1}{3}$ (E) none of these
5. Which of the following statements about $\frac{1 + \sqrt{2}}{1 - \sqrt{2}}$ is true?
(A) It is irrational (B) It is rational (C) It is imaginary
(D) It is positive (E) None of these are true
6. If $i = \sqrt{-1}$, then i^6 is
(A) 1 (B) -1 (C) i (D) $-i$ (E) none of these

7. The solution set of the inequality $x^2 - x - 2 < 0$ is the interval
- (A) $-2 \leq x \leq 1$ (B) $-2 < x < 1$ (C) $-2 \leq x < 1$
- (D) $-2 < x \leq 1$ (E) none of these
8. At the end of a party, everyone shakes hands with everyone else. Altogether there are 28 handshakes. How many people are there at the party?
- (A) 8 (B) 14 (C) 20 (D) 56 (E) none of these
9. Let $[x]$ denote the largest integer not exceeding x . Thus, e.g. $[2] = 2$, $[3.99] = 3$, $[-.5] = -1$. Which of the following statements are always true?
- (i) $[x+y] = [x] + [y]$
- (ii) $[2x] = 2[x]$
- (iii) $[-x] = -[x]$
- (A) (i) (B) (ii) (C) (iii) (D) all (E) none
10. If the sum of the first n positive integers is $n(n+1)/2$, the sum of the first n positive odd integers is
- (A) $n(n+1)/4$ (B) $\frac{n(2n+1)}{2}$ (C) n^2 (D) $n^2 - 4$ (E) none of these.
11. Suppose that $d = x^2 - y^2$ where x and y are two odd integers. Which of the following statements are always true?
- (i) d is odd
- (ii) d is divisible by 4
- (iii) d is a perfect square.
- (A) (i) (B) (ii) (C) (iii) (D) (ii) and (iii)
- (E) none of these

12. If each term of the sequence a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n is either $+1$ or -1

then $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n$ is always

- (A) 0 (B) 1 (C) $\begin{cases} \text{odd if } n \text{ is odd} \\ \text{even if } n \text{ is even} \end{cases}$
- (D) $\begin{cases} \text{odd if } n \text{ is even} \\ \text{even if } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$ (E) none of these

13. If x is a real number satisfying the equation

$$x^x \cdot x^{x^x} \cdot x^{x^{x^x}} \cdot \dots = 2$$

then x is equal to

- (A) ∞ (B) 2 (C) $\sqrt[4]{2}$ (D) $\sqrt{2}$ (E) none of these

14. The number of pipes of inside diameter 1 unit that will carry the same amount of water as one pipe of inside diameter 6 units of the same length is:

- (A) 6π (B) 6 (C) 12 (D) 36 (E) none of these

15. $2^{-(2k+1)} - 2^{-(2k-1)} + 2^{-2k}$ is equal to

- (A) 2^{-2k} (B) $2^{-(2k-1)}$ (C) $-2^{-(2k+1)}$ (D) 0 (E) none of these

16. Let P be the product of any 3 consecutive positive odd integers.

The largest integer dividing all such P is:

- (A) 15 (B) 6 (C) 5 (D) 3 (E) none of these

17. If $|x - \log y| = x + \log y$ where x and $\log y$ are real, then
- (A) $x = 0$ (B) $y = 1$ (C) $x = 0$ and $y = 1$ (D) $x(y-1) = 0$
 (E) none of these
18. Each of a group of 50 girls is blonde or brunette and is blue or brown eyed. If 14 are blue-eyed blondes, 31 are brunettes and 18 are brown eyed, the number of brown-eyed brunettes is
- (A) 7 (B) 9 (C) 11 (D) 13 (E) none of these
19. After finding the average of 35 scores, a student carelessly included the average with the 35 scores and found the average of these 36 numbers. The ratio of the second average to the true average was
- (A) 1:1 (B) 35:36 (C) 36:35 (D) 2:1 (E) none of these
20. If the line $y = mx + 1$ intersects the ellipse $x^2 + 4y^2 = 1$ exactly once, then m^2 is equal to
- (A) $1/2$ (B) $2/3$ (C) $3/4$ (D) $4/5$ (E) none of these


PART II

TIME: 110 Minutes

1. Prove that it is impossible to find positive integers a, b satisfying

$$\frac{21}{23} = \frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < a < b .$$


2. A fly sitting in the upper corner A of a room measuring $6 \times 6 \times 2$ wishes to walk to the opposite lower corner B. What is the minimum distance the fly must walk and how many different paths achieve this distance?



3. Find all real values of k so that the equation $x^3 + x^2 - 4kx - 4k = 0$ has two of its three roots equal.
4. In a round-robin tournament, each of n players P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n plays one game with each of the other players. The rules are such that no ties can occur. If w_i and ℓ_i denote respectively, the number of games won and lost by player P_i , show that

$$w_1^2 + \dots + w_n^2 = \ell_1^2 + \dots + \ell_n^2$$

5. Find the side x of the triangle shown in the diagram



6. Given real numbers a, b, c which satisfy $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 = 1$, find the smallest value of r so that $-\frac{r}{2} \leq ab + bc + ca \leq r$ is always true.

7. Find all possible integers a, b, c such that

$$a \log_{10} 2 + b \log_{10} 5 + c \log_{10} 7 = 1$$

8. Given that

$$\cos 3\theta = A \cos^3 \theta + B \cos \theta$$

holds for every real number θ , find A, B .

9. Nine lines are drawn parallel to the base of a triangle so that the other two sides are divided into 10 equal segments and the area into 10 portions, the largest of which is 38 square units. Find the area of the triangle.

10. Let a and b be odd integers and let n be a positive integer. If $a - b$ is divisible by 2^n prove that $a^3 - b^3$ is divisible by 2^n . Moreover, if $a^3 - b^3$ is divisible by 2^n prove that $a - b$ is divisible by 2^n .

SOLUTIONS

1976 Alberta High School

PRIZE EXAMINATION IN MATHEMATICS

PART I - KEY

C	E	D	B	A	B	E	A	E	C
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10


B	C	D	D	C	D	D	D	A	C
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20

PART II - ANSWERS

1. If a and b are positive integers such that $0 < a < b$, then if $a = 1$, $\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} > 1$, and if $a \geq 2$, then

$$\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} = \frac{5}{6} < \frac{21}{23}$$

2. Unfold the room to get:



The closest distance is the straight dotted line which is the hypotenuse of a right triangle with sides 6 and 8. Thus

$d = \sqrt{6^2 + 8^2} = 10$. Using the floor and ceiling, there are 4 distinct paths achieving this distance.

3. Factoring, one gets $x^3 + x^2 - 4kx - 4k = x^2(x+1) - 4k(x+1) = (x+1)(x^2 - 4k)$. Hence the roots are given by $x = -1$ and $x = \pm 2\sqrt{k}$. Clearly then two of the roots are 0 if $k = 0$, and two of the roots are -1 if $k = 1/4$.


4. Taking the difference of the two sides:

$$\begin{aligned} (w_1^2 + \dots + w_n^2) - (l_1^2 + \dots + l_n^2) &= (w_1^2 - l_1^2) + \dots + (w_n^2 - l_n^2) \\ &= (w_1 - l_1)(w_1 + l_1) + \dots + (w_n - l_n)(w_n + l_n) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (w_1 - l_1)(n - 1) + \dots + (w_n - l_n)(n - 1) \\
&= [(w_1 - l_1) + \dots + (w_n - l_n)](n - 1) \\
&= [(w_1 + \dots + w_n) - (l_1 + \dots + l_n)](n - 1) \\
&= 0 .
\end{aligned}$$

Since every game is either won or lost, the total of the wins is equal to the total of all the losses. We also used the fact that for each player, the total of his wins and losses is the number of games $(n - 1)$ that he played.

5.



Construct the altitude AD , thus bisecting EG at H . Then $\overline{HG} = 1/2$, $\overline{AG} = \sqrt{7}$ and by Pythagoras' Theorem applied to ΔAHG we have

$$\overline{AH} = \sqrt{(\sqrt{7})^2 - (1/2)^2} = 3\sqrt{3}/2$$

Now if the perpendicular EF is dropped to BC , then

$\overline{EF} = \overline{HD} = \overline{AD} - \overline{AH}$ and by Pythagoras' Theorem again, applied to ΔABD ,

$$\overline{AD} = \sqrt{x^2 - (x/2)^2} = x\sqrt{3}/2$$

and hence

$$\overline{EF} = \sqrt{3}/2(x-3) .$$

Finally, since $\overline{FJ} = \overline{EG} = 1$, we must have $\overline{BF} = (x-1)/2$ and applying Pythagoras' Theorem to ΔBEF we obtain

$$\left(\frac{x-1}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(x-3)\right)^2 = 2^2$$

and upon simplifying,

$$x^2 - 5x + 3 = 0$$

so that $x = (5 \pm \sqrt{13})/2$. Now since $(5 - \sqrt{13})/2 < 1$ and we clearly require $x > 1$, we must have $x = (5 + \sqrt{13})/2$.

6. $(a+b+c)^2 = a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + 2ab + 2bc + 2ac$. Since $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 = 1$,
 $ab + bc + ac = \frac{1}{2} [(a+b+c)^2 - 1]$. The right side will be smallest
if $a + b + c = 0$, and largest if $a = b = c = 1/\sqrt{3}$. Hence

$$-\frac{1}{2} \leq ab + ac + bc \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad r = 1.$$

7. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= a \log_{10} 2 + b \log_{10} 5 + c \log_{10} 7 \\ &= \log_{10} 2^a + \log_{10} 5^b + \log_{10} 7^c \\ &= \log_{10} (2^a 5^b 7^c) \end{aligned}$$

Taking antilogs,

$$10 = 2^a 5^b 7^c$$

Since $10 = 2^1 5^1 7^0$ uniquely, the only solution in integers is
 $a = 1, b = 1, c = 0$.

8. Since $\cos 0^\circ = 1$, $\cos 60^\circ = 1/2$, and $\cos 180^\circ = -1$,
if

$$\cos 3\theta = A \cos^3 \theta + B \cos \theta$$

we must have

$$-1 = A \cdot (1/2)^3 + B \cdot (1/2)$$

$$1 = A \cdot 1^3 + B \cdot 1$$


i.e.

$$\frac{1}{8}A + \frac{1}{2}B = -1$$

$$A + B = 1$$

and solving we obtain $A = 4$, $B = -3$. (There are other methods of solution.)

9.



In $\triangle ABC$, let ED denote the first of the 9 lines inserted above and parallel to the base BC . If h denotes the altitude of the quadrilateral $BCDE$, then the altitude of $\triangle ABC$ is $10h$ (by construction) and since $\triangle ABC$ is similar to $\triangle ADE$,

we must have $\overline{DE} = \frac{9}{10} \overline{BC}$. Now

$$\text{Area } BCDE = \frac{1}{2}(\overline{BC} + \overline{DE}) \cdot h = \frac{1}{2}(1.9)\overline{BC} \cdot h$$

is given to be 38. Hence

$$\text{Area } ABC = \frac{1}{2}\overline{BC} \cdot 10h = \frac{10}{1.9} \left[\frac{1}{2}(1.9)\overline{BC} \cdot h \right] = \frac{10}{1.9} \cdot 38 = 200$$

square units. (There are several other methods of solution.)

10. $a^3 - b^3 = (a-b)(a^2 + ab + b^2)$. Clearly, if 2^n divides $a - b$, it must divide $a^3 - b^3$. Suppose 2^n divides $a^3 - b^3$, then since $a^2 + ab + b^2$ is odd, it must divide $a - b$.



Mathematics Council Executive – 1975–76

President	<i>Res/Bus</i>	<i>Terry Tiffen</i>	<i>Res/Bus</i>
<i>Dr. K. Allen Neufeld</i>	436-0571	Box 67, Killam TOB 2L0	385-3798
11647 - 72 Avenue	432-4188		385-3690
Edmonton T6G 0B9			
		REPRESENTATIVES	
Past President		ATA	
<i>Dr. W. George Cathcart</i>	435-1949	<i>Dr. M.T. Sillito</i>	459-4811
Dept. of Elementary Education	432-4153	Barnett House	453-2411
University of Alberta		11010 - 142 Street	Ext. 269
Edmonton T6G 0A9		Edmonton T5N 2R1	
		Department of Education	
Vice-President		<i>Arthur Peddicord</i>	435-7075
<i>Matt Pawluk</i>	469-6813	Dept. of Education	427-2952
EPSB 10010 107A Avenue	454-9171	500, 11160 Jasper Avenue	
Edmonton		Edmonton T5K 0L1	
		Faculty of Education	
Secretary		<i>Dr. John Percevault</i>	328-1259
<i>Dr. Arthur Jorgensen</i>	723-5370	Faculty of Education	329-2111
Box 2069, Edson TOE 0P0	723-3815	University of Lethbridge	
		Lethbridge	
		Mathematics	
Treasurer		<i>Dr. H.I. Freedman</i>	487-1238
<i>Donald H. Hinde</i>	782-6849	Department of Mathematics	432-3530
Box 741, Lacombe TOC 1S0	782-3812	University of Alberta	
		Edmonton T6G 0A9	
DIRECTORS		NCTM	
<i>Doug McIntyre</i>	281-3679	<i>Robert Holt</i>	462-1847
823 Cannell Road SW	281-3366	4255 - 74 Street	454-9171
Calgary T2W 1T5		Edmonton T6K 0W1	
		Newsletter Editor and Publicity Chairman	
<i>Lyle Pagnucco</i>	271-0259	<i>Ed Carriger</i>	843-6138
Forest Lawn High School	272-6665	RR#1, Site 2, Box 3	843-6528
1304 - 44 Street SE		Bluffton TOC 0M0	
Calgary T2A 1M8		Monograph Editor	
<i>Ms. Pat Beeler</i>	683-7568	<i>Dr. K. Allen Neufeld</i>	436-0571
John Ware Junior High School	253-1611	11647 - 72 Avenue	432-4188
10020 - 19 Street SW		Edmonton T6G 0B9	
Calgary T2V 1R2			
<i>Francis Sommerville</i>	249-8056		
Faculty of Education	249-2449		
University of Calgary			
Calgary			

Delta-K is a publication of the Mathematics Council, ATA. Editor: Ed Carriger, R.R.1, Site 2, Box 3, Bluffton. Publisher: The Alberta Teachers' Association, 11010 - 142 Street, Edmonton T5N 2R1. Editorial and Production Services: Communications Department, ATA. Please address correspondence regarding this publication to the editor:

Extend Your Professional Involvement

Attend the

MCATA ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Red Deer Lodge, October 1 and 2, 1976

SPEAKERS:

Frank Ebos - Canadian author, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Faculty of Education, University of Toronto. An entertaining and informative speaker who has presented secondary mathematics sessions at numerous NCTM conferences including the National Conference in Denver in 1975.

Joan Routledge - Canadian Representative to the NCTM. Elementary teacher, author with exciting ideas for activities in the classroom.

Robert Wirtz - Lecturer and writer from Carmel, California. Presenting a unique approach to the teaching of mathematics through problem solving.

FEATURES:

- Relevant topics for Divisions I through IV.
- Idea exchanges at all levels.
- Work shops.
- A chance to meet concerned mathematics teachers from throughout the province.

Join the

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics

Receive the Arithmetic Teacher and/or the Mathematics Teacher, NCTM newsletter, publication lists and reduced fees on each NCTM yearbook.

NCTM publications are a wealth of information for the concerned Mathematics teacher.

Join now and receive free "Mathematical Challenges!" Selected problems from the Mathematics Student Journal.

For more information write to: G. R. Holt
4255 - 74 Street
EDMONTON, Alberta

MCATA ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Red Deer Lodge, October 1 and 2, 1976

PRE-REGISTRATION

Please complete fully. A cheque or money order, payable to the MCATA, must accompany this form.

NAME _____
 (last name) (first name) (initial)

MAILING ADDRESS _____
 (city/town) (province) (post code)

MCATA Member

Conference registration fee (includes luncheon)

Pre-registration post marked prior to September 15, 1976. . . . \$ 14.00

(Registration in Red Deer October 1, 1976. . . . \$ 16.00)

Additional luncheon tickets _____ at \$ 7.00 \$ _____

MCATA membership regular, \$6.00 new
 student, \$3.00 renewal \$ _____

NCTM membership (optional) new
 renewal
 -with *Arithmetic Teacher* \$12.00 ()
 -with *Mathematics Teacher* \$12.00 ()
 -with both journals \$18.00 ()

TOTAL.. \$ _____

Accommodation available at the Red Deer Lodge, Red Deer, Alberta

(Register directly requesting MCATA Conference rates)

Regular Room: Single \$20.00; Double \$26.00

Bed Sitting Room: Single \$23.00; Double \$28.00

You may pre-register by completing the above form and mailing it, with your cheque, to: Mr. Dave Mackenzie, 49 Greenfields Estates, ST. ALBERT T8N 2G2.