


Breton: "So you have proven the proposition for all cases.

Einstein: "This is hard to visualize.


Breton: "We have proven the proposition algebraically, but the geometric rendition remains obscured. Some drawings may be helpful.

In a few minutes Breton handed his friends these three sketches.




Breton: "This first sketch shows the two vectors, \mathbf{v}_2 and \mathbf{v}_3 and their sum lying in the same plane. The vector \mathbf{v}_1 sticks up from the plane. The dotted lines show the orthogonals from \mathbf{v}_1 to \mathbf{v}_2 , \mathbf{v}_3 , and $\mathbf{v}_2 + \mathbf{v}_3$. The orthogonals are related to inner products.

This next sketch show the area designated by $\mathbf{v1} \cdot (\mathbf{v2} + \mathbf{v3})$



Breton: "Geometrically, this area lies in a plane orthogonal to the plane defined by $\mathbf{v1}$ and $(\mathbf{v2} + \mathbf{v3})$."

The next sketch shows the two areas $\mathbf{v1} \cdot \mathbf{v2}$ and $\mathbf{v1} \cdot \mathbf{v3}$.



Breton: "While the algebraic proof requires fine reasoning, the geometric proof would be even more difficult. Now are you convinced.

Einstein grudgingly: "It does follows that

$$\mathbf{v1} \cdot (\mathbf{v2} + \mathbf{v3}) = \mathbf{v1} \cdot \mathbf{v2} + \mathbf{v1} \cdot \mathbf{v3}$$

Breton, pressing the victory to a deliciously bitter ending: "The conclusion is ambiguous. If your mean

$$\mathbf{v1} \cdot (\mathbf{v2} + \mathbf{v3}) = \mathbf{v1} \cdot (\mathbf{v2} + \mathbf{v1}) \cdot \mathbf{v3}$$

then the result is a inner product between a scalar and a vector, which is meaningless. If you mean

$$\mathbf{v1} \cdot (\mathbf{v2} + \mathbf{v3}) = (\mathbf{v1} \cdot \mathbf{v2}) + (\mathbf{v1} \cdot \mathbf{v3})$$

then the result is the sum of two scalar quantities, a meaningful result."

After a short pause Breton continued in an agreeable tone. "Your reasoning follows the format for our formal proofs. Why not use the format we agreed upon? But before that, I suggest we simplify our notation. Let us write

q1 for $q(\mathbf{v1})$

q2 for $q(\mathbf{v2})$

q3 for $q(\mathbf{v3})$

uv1 for $u(\mathbf{v1})$

uv2 for $u(\mathbf{v2})$

uv3 for $u(\mathbf{v3})$

Whenever no ambiguity will follow, we can do the same in other contexts.

Einstein joining gladly: "Agreed. Here's my proof."