[174r] [(mostly) in AAL's hand]

Theorem. Page 199.

If N be a function of x and y, giving  $\frac{dN}{dx} = p + q\frac{dy}{dx}$ then the equation  $\frac{du}{dx.dy} = V.\frac{dN}{dx.dy}$  is incongruous & self-contradictory, except upon the assumption that u is , as to x and y , a function of N; or contains x and y only thro' N.

Let  $N = \psi(x, y)$  give  $y = \chi(N, x)$ , and suppose, if possible, that the substitution of this value of y in u gives  $u = \beta(N, x)$ , x not disappearing with y. Then x and y varying

 $\frac{du}{dx.dy} = \frac{d\beta}{dN} \cdot \frac{dN}{dx} + \frac{d\beta}{dN} \cdot \frac{dN}{dy} + \frac{d\beta}{dx}$ [in above line,  $\frac{du}{dx.dy}$  is crossed through in pencil, and '1' written above; '=  $\frac{du}{dx} + \frac{du}{dy}$ ' added in pencil at end of line — in ADM's hand?]

$$= \frac{d\beta}{dN} \cdot \left(\frac{dN}{dx} + \frac{dN}{dy}\right) + \frac{d\beta}{dx} = \frac{d\beta}{dN} \cdot \frac{dN}{dx \cdot dy} + \frac{d\beta}{dx} =$$
$$= V \frac{dN}{dx} \quad \text{which equation being}$$

 $= V \cdot \frac{dN}{dx \cdot dy} , \text{ which equation being}$ universal, is true on the supposition that xdoes not vary, or that  $\frac{d\beta}{dx} = 0$ . This gives  $\frac{d\beta}{dN} = V$ ; or  $\frac{du}{dx \cdot dy} = V \frac{dN}{dx \cdot dy} + \frac{d\beta}{dx} = V \frac{dN}{dx \cdot dy}$ because  $\frac{d\beta}{dN}$  and V being independent of the variations

because  $\frac{d\beta}{dN}$  and V being independent of the variations &c, &c. Hence  $\frac{d\beta}{dx} = 0$  always ; or  $\beta$  does not contain x directly, &c.

I think the above is correct. I cannot see [174v] the use (page 200) of introducing t in the proof <u>there</u> given . Is it possible that I have committed an error in my original understanding of the <u>ennunciation</u> [sic] of the Theorem; & that the du ['of the equation' crossed out] and the dN of the equation du = V.dN, do not mean the du and dN derived from differentiating with respect to the quantities x and y, already introduced ; but with respect to ['some' crossed out] other given quantity?\_\_\_\_\_\_ I suspect so \_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

[the following appears underneath in pencil — still in Ada's hand]

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \beta(N, x) \\ \frac{du}{dx} &= \frac{d\beta}{dN} \quad \frac{dN}{dx} + \frac{d\beta}{dx} \\ \frac{d^n u}{dx \cdot dy} &= \end{aligned}$$