

use of undecidable disjunctions so the defect is not peculiar to this treatment alone. I am, however, convinced that it is not possible to avoid the use of undecidable disjunctions without a complete sacrifice of the conventional outward form of mathematical analysis. It may eventually prove expedient to take this step, but for the present the sole justification for a change in teaching practice must lie in the gain in simplicity for the student.

It might be profitable even for students reading Special Honours in Mathematics to be introduced to Function-theory in this way, though in writing this paper it is the needs of the ordinary, three-subject, degree student that I have in mind. I do not believe that such students should be *examined* in the fundamental theorems of analysis but I do believe that degree students ought to be sufficiently intelligent and mature in their final year to master the technique of the calculus the better for having seen something of the ideas underlying that technique. It seems to me most undesirable to award a University degree in mathematics to that level of intelligence which acquires the technical tricks of a subject the more readily for lack of the inclination to doubt and the talent for reflection.

R. L. GOODSTEIN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SIR,—On p. 18 of the February *Gazette* is a quotation from *Pure Mathematics*. I hope that readers will have appreciated that this was intended not as a separate Gleaning—it would be an impertinence to present a sentence from this source as if it could be unfamiliar—but solely for comparison with the quotation which precedes it. Whatever the cause of the slovenly teaching in elementary analysis which was all but universal in England until Professor Hardy directed his expository genius to its eradication, it was not that his standard of accuracy in thought was unprecedented here. In Gleaning 1316 (Vol. XXIV, p. 181) was evidence that in 1842 Cambridge was, so to speak, already waiting for Weierstrass.

Yours truly,

E. H. NEVILLE.

SIR,—Is there any name, approved by the Mathematical Association, for a non-rectangular parallelogram, *i.e.* a figure which may be either rhombus or rhomboid? If not, can anybody suggest one suitable for pupils aged about 10 years?

Yours truly,

R. S. WILLIAMSON.