Some teachers withdraw models as soon as possible so that the student c
be trained to read from drawings rather than models.

The book is attractively produced, contains 213 pages and 430 well-dra
figures. With such a large number of drawings, the author has eviden
been obliged to concentrate on good ones, so that the wealth of descript:
necessary can be cut down to a minimum in order to save space. On 1
whole he has done the job well, but the private student may find it hard go:
to understand all the figures from the sometimes somewhat perforce sketc
descriptions, for example in Figs. 129–131 and Fig. 324.

Chapters I, II, IV, V and VIII could be taken together, followed by Chapt
III, VI and VII. Chapter X starts off with a difficult example. The pho
graphs on page 124 are rather small, but those on pages 174A to 174D ↓
particularly good.

The ellipse, it is stated, is most frequently used by craftsmen in the buildi
trades. The parabola comes next in importance, and there is one applicati
of the hyperbola in Chapter XIV.

The author warns the reader that his treatment will differ consideral
from that to be expected in a book on deductive geometry, and he has co
centrated on good draughtmanship which, he maintains, can be an object
supreme beauty to anyone educated to appreciate its value. There is
wealth of experience in this low-priced book.

Altogether this is a fascinating book, and one to be recommended to
teachers of geometry and building geometry.   A.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PROJECTIVE GEOMETRY.

To the Editor of the *Mathematical Gazette*.

SIR,—I am grateful to Dr. E. A. Maxwell for having drawn attention,
his letter which you published on p. 303 of the *Math. Gazette*, to a point w
which I might have dealt more thoroughly in my article on pp. 122, *et seq.*
Vol. XXX. I do not think, though, that any logical slip has been made.

The argument concerns a conic which is defined by five points, viz. th:
points of the base of a pencil of conics and the two double points of the invo
tion created by the pencil on a straight line l. Now this conic degenerate:
l connects two (appropriately chosen) diagonal points of the complete qua
rangle of the base. In that case the four points of my theorem reduce to 1
well-known harmonic range on the diagonal of a complete quadrangle. I
not know of any reason why this special case of a general theorem should 1
be considered as legitimately implied, although simpler proofs may clea
be available. The present case merely requires that an equality of cro
ratios should be deemed to hold when both are zero. It seems a moot po
whether such a situation can be called a breakdown, but it is in any cas
breakdown of a peculiar sort, in that it leads always to correct results.

I am, Sir, Yours faithfully,   S. VAJI