## DEAR EDITOR,

Re: Paul Scott, Some recent discoveries in elementary geometry, Math. Gaz. 81 (Nov 1997), pp. 391-397 and I. Ward, The tritet rule, Math. Gaz. 79 (July 1995), pp. 380-382.

Readers may like to know of some earlier references which discuss the generalisation of Pythagoras' Theorem to 3-space. The first, originally published in 1962 is George Pólya, Mathematical discovery, Wiley (1981), p. 34. The others were collected as Note 62.23 in the Gazette: (1) Lewis Hull, (2) Hazel Perfect, (3) I. Heading, Pythagoras in higher dimensions: three approaches, Math. Gaz. 62 (October 1978) pp. 206-211.

Yours sincerely,
A. K. JOBBINGS

Bradford Grammar School, Keighley Road, Bradford BD9 4JP

## DEAR EDITOR,

In Note 82.53 a proof is given for a test of divisibilty by 19. I offer a shorter proof.

Let the number to be tested be $N=10 a+b$ where $b$ is the units digit. The reduced test number is given by $P=a+2 b$, so that $2 N-P=19 a$. Therefore, $19 \mid N$ if and only if $19 \mid P$.

Yours sincerely,
E. J. PEET

3 Queensway, Newby, Scarborough YO12 6SJ

## DEAR EDITOR,

In [1] Murray Humphreys and Nicholas Macharia show that the $(n+1)$-digit number

$$
\begin{equation*}
k=\overline{a_{n} a_{n-1} \ldots a_{0}}=10^{n} a_{n}+10^{n-1} a_{n-1}+\ldots+a_{0} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

is divisible by 19 if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
m=10 a_{n}+a_{n-1}+2 a_{n-2}+4 a_{n-3}+\ldots+2^{n-2} a_{1}+a_{0} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

is divisible by 19. This is essentially a special case of the method of James Voss in [2] for determining divisibility by any integer $s$ relatively prime to 10 . The method hinges on using the multiplicative inverse of $10(\bmod s)$. When $s=19$, the multiplicative inverse is 2 because

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 \times 10=20 \equiv 1(\bmod 19) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we multiply (1) by $2^{n-1}$ we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
2^{n-1} k= & 2^{n-1}\left(10^{n} a_{n}+10^{n-1} a_{n-1}+10^{n-2} a_{n-2}+10^{n-3} a_{n-3}+\ldots+10 a_{1}+a_{0}\right) \\
= & 2^{n-1} 10^{n-1} 10 a_{n}+2^{n-1} 10^{n-1} a_{n-1}+2^{n-2} 10^{n-2} 2 a_{n-2}+2^{n-3} 10^{n-3} 4 a_{n-3} \\
& +\ldots+2 \times 10 \times 2^{n-2} a_{1}+2^{n-1} a_{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
=20^{n-1} 10 a_{n}+20^{n-1} a_{n-1}+20^{n-2} 2 a_{n-2}+ & 20^{n-3} 4 a_{n-3} \\
& +\ldots+20 \times 2^{n-2} a_{1}+2^{n-1} a_{0} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using (3),

$$
2^{n-1} k \equiv 10 a_{n}+a_{n-1}+2 a_{n-2}+4 a_{n-3}+\ldots+2^{n-2} a_{1}+2^{n-1} a_{0}(\bmod 19)
$$

By (2),

$$
2^{n-1} k \equiv m(\bmod 19)
$$

from which it is readily seen that 19 divides $k$ if and only if 19 divides $m$.
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Yours sincerely,
ROGER F. HOUSE
Sonoma State University, Mathematics Department, 1801 E. Cotati Ave.
Rohnert Park, CA 94928 USA
e-mail: rhouse@sonic.net

## More percentage problems

For the record, $1,101,887$ members voted for conversion and $1,135,597$ against-a difference of 33,710 . A resounding victory? I don't think so. There is not even a percentage point in it.

From The Sunday Times 26 July 98 and sent in by Hamish Sloan.

## Too much!

But the British mother, according to Unicef figures just released, either doesn't bother trying ( 34 per cent) or gives up within four months ( 73 per cent).

From a reference to breast-feeding in The Times 18 May 98 and sent in in by Hamish Sloan who observes 'Well, most mothers give over 100\% don't they?!!'

## Needed - a new agent

[The Duke of Buccleuch] owns 2,700 acres, equivalent, his agent calculates, to a mile-wide, 400 -mile long corridor running from Scotland to London.

From The Daily Telegraph TV \& Radio Supplement 27 February 99 and spotted by Harrold Farnsworth.

