is perhaps rather a point of view than a criticism, but it is one which frequently creates difficulties and its absence from most of the published treatments of the theory of errors is partly responsible for the unwillingness of many observers to use the methods of least squares.

A useful feature of the book is the Appendix, which contains some of the mathematical deductions which, placed in the body of the work, would perhaps have repelled or frightened the student. The various technical terms, rules and formulas are also gathered together ready for use.

ERNEST W. BROWN.

CARSLAW'S NON-EUCLIDEAN GEOMETRY.

I SHOULD like to point out that Professor Coolidge has quite misunderstood the definition of "nominal length" to which he refers on page 466 of his review of my little book on Non-Euclidean Geometry in the July BULLETIN; and he has failed to notice the indication I give at the beginning of § 94 of "just how a nominal line *corresponds* to a rectilinear segment."

As a matter of fact the full discussion of the euclidean case was given in my paper in the *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society,* and in Appendix V to the English translation of Bonola's book, both of which are mentioned in the footnote to page 156 of the book under review. It seemed unnecessary to repeat this introductory passage in full. In giving an abstract of it, the process of condensation has obviously been carried too far.

But a glance at one or other of the passages referred to will show that I am not guilty of the "lamentable" error with which your reviewer credits me.

H. S. CARSLAW.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY,
    August 10, 1917.