VII. Remarks upon a supposed Demonstration, that the moving Forces of the same Body are not as the Velocities, but as the Squares of the Velocities. By the same.

HE Demonstration runs thus: "Concipio cor-" pus C Fig.7. moveri oblique in elastrum L, ve-" locitate C L ut 2, angulo inclinationis C L P existente 30 gr. cujus nempe finus CP est semislis radii CL. " Suppono autem eam esse resistentiam in elastro, ut ad illud tendendum requiratur præcisè unus velocita-" tis gradus in illo corpore, si perpendiculariter im-" pingeret. Quid ergo jam siet post incursionem ob-" Iquam corporis C in elastrum L? Quoniam motus " per CL componitur, ut notum est, ex duobus colla-" teralibus per CP & PL, & cum CP, secundum " quam corpus directe impingit in elastrum L, exprimit dimidiam celeriratem corporis per CL, confumetur hic motus per CP, tenso elastro (perinde enim es-" fet, ac si corpus C celeritate C P perpendiculariter incurreret in elastrum, quod per Hypothefin, eam " celeritatem destruere pesset) remanente corporis ce-" leritate, & directione P L. Producta igitur P L in " M, ita ut LM fit = PL= 13 (ponitur enim CL " = 2) & applicato in M also fimili elastro faciente cum LM angulum LMQ, cujus finus LQ=CP= 1, per eandem rationem manifestum est corpus C. post tensionem elastri L, tensurum esse elastrum M, amisso motu per LQ, & servato motu per QM. Prolongata itaque QM ad N, ut fiat MN = QM

" =  $\sqrt{2}$  ibique substituto elastro simili tertio constitu-" ente cum MN angulum MNR semirectum, quo " scilicet M R iterum sit = CP=1; patet similiter " motum per MR totum impendi in tensionem elastri " N, corpore interim moveri pergente directione & " celeritate R N=1. Denique si hac celeritate residua " impingat perpendiculariter in elastrum O, huic ten-" dendo totam suam vim reliquam dabit; ipsum ita-" que corpus ad quietem redigetur. Hisce ita præ-" missis, patet nunc potentiam corporis C tantam su-" isse, ut per se solum tendere possit præcisè quatuor e-" lastra talia, ad quæ singula seorsim tendenda requi-" ritur dimidia velocitas corporis æqualis ipsi C, ade-" óque cum effectus illius quadruplo major sit quàm " effectus hujus, evidens est quoque vim corporis velo-" citate 2 grad quadruplam effe vis corporis ejusdem, " vel æqualis, velocitate i grad.

"Haud abimili modo demonstrarem corpus C ve"locitate 3 grad tendere posse 9 elastra, ad quorum u"num tendendum unus velocitatis gradus in eo corpore requiritur, & tandem in genere numerum ela"strorum tensorum semper esse quadratum numeri
"graduum velocitatis. Unde igitur sequetur, vires
"corporum æqualium esse in duplicata ratione celeri-

" tatum. Q E.D.

1. This Argument is founded entirely on the commonly received Doctrine of the Composition and Refolution of Forces, and not upon any decisive Experiments, that have been actually made upon this occasion.

2. All that is proved from this Doctrine, is, that a Body moving with two Degrees of Velocity, may be made to bend 4; with 3 Degrees of Velocity it may be made to bend 9 similar springs, each destroying one Degree

Degree of Velocity in a perpendicular Direction, before its force is entirely spent, provided you take care to alter the Directions of the Motion in every Stroke but the last, after a certain manner: That had the same Body moved but with one degree of Velocity in one Direction, and that in a perpendicular one, it would have lost all its sorce at once, and bent but one of those Springs: Which is far from proving the thing in Question.

- 3. To make the Reasoning on this Head conclusive, the two Bodies should not only be equal in Quantity of Matter, but alike in that material Circumstance the Direction of their Motions; so that if one of the Bodies move in a perpendicular Direction, the other should do so too; or if the one strikes in an oblique Direction, the other should do the same, and that in the same degree of Obliquity; and lastly, if one moves in severalDirections, the other should do the same. But in the case before us one is supposed to move but in one Direction perpendicularly, and the other to move in three oblique Directions, and but one perpendicular.
- 4. Let therefore the same Body move always in the same Directions, and with a small Alteration, the Argument used in this Demonstration will be so far from proving that side only of the Question for which it was brought, that it will equally serve to prove the truth of the other, namely, that the Forces of the same Body moving with different Velocities are as those Velocities.

Let therefore the same Body, instead of moving with two Degrees of Velocity, move but with one, and in the same Directions as above; only let the Springs be capable of destroying but half a Degree of Velocity in a perpendicular Direction; then by the same steps of reasoning it will sollow, that this Body will now also bend 4 similar Springs, before its Force is spent; so that the same Body moving with half the Velocities, and in the same Directions as before, bends the same number of Springs; only now the Springs make but half the Resistance, that the Springs in the former case made; therefore the Essect in this case, according to our way of estimating an Essect, is but half the tormer Essect; consequently the Forces producing these Essects are as 2 to 1; But in this Ratio are the Velocities, with which the Body moved in the two Cases; therefore the Forces are as the Velocities.

Let the Body move with 3 degrees of Velocity, and it will bend 9 fimilar Springs each destroying one Degree of Velocity in a perpendicular Direction, before the whole Force is consumed. So also by the same way of arguing, 'tis as certain, that if the same Body move with one degree of Velocity, it will bend 9 similar Springs, each destroying a third part of one Degree of Velocity in a perpendicular Direction, before its Force is extinguished: So that still the Effects, or Resistances overcome in the same Directions, are, according to our way of computing, as 3 to 1; and so also their Forces must be but in the same Ratio of 3 to 1, as were the Velocities; consequently the Forces are as the Velocities.

5. Since therefore this Proof drawn from the Doctrine of Composition and Resolution of Forces equally proves both sides of the Question, it proves too much, or in reality nothing at all; and is therefore far from deserving the Name of a Demonstration.

