Notices

HOW TO TALK MATHEMATICS
By P. R. Halmos

Apology

The purpose of what follows is to suggest to a young mathematician what he might do (and what he had better not do) the first few times that he gives a public lecture on his subject. By a "public lecture" I mean something like a colloquium talk (to more or less the entire mathematics department at a large university), or an invited address (to more or less the entire membership in attendance at a meeting of the American Mathematical Society); I do not mean a classroom lecture (to reluctant beginners) or a seminar talk (to dedicated experts).

That an article on how to talk mathematics might serve a good purpose was suggested by some of the officers of the American Mathematical Society. It seems that there have been more and more complaints about invited addresses ("they are incomprehensible, and therefore useless"), and that, therefore, it might do some good to let a speaker know about such complaints before he adds to the reason for them.

A genius makes his own rules, but a "how to" article is written by one ordinary mortal for the benefit of another. Harpo Marx, one of the greatest harpists of all times, was never taught how to play; everything he did was "wrong" according to standard teaching. Most things that an article such as this one can say have at least one counterexample in the practice of some natural born genius. Authors of articles such as this one know that, but, in the first approximation, they must ignore it, or nothing would ever get done.

Why lecture?

What is the purpose of a public lecture? Answer: to attract and to inform. We like what we do, and we should like for others to like it too; and we believe that the subject's intrinsic qualities are good enough so that anyone who knows what they are cannot help being attracted to them. Hence, better answer: the purpose of a public lecture is to inform, but to do so in a manner that makes it possible for the audience to absorb the information. An attractive presentation with no content is worthless, to be sure, but a lump of indigestible information is worth no more.

The question then becomes this: what is the best way to describe a subject (or that small part of a subject that has recently been the center of the lecturer's attention) to an audience of mathematicians most of whom are interested in something else? The problem is different from describing a subject to students who, willy nilly, must learn it in usable detail, and it is different from sharing a new discovery with fellow experts who have been thinking about the same sort of thing and are wondering what you know that they don't.

Simplicity

Less is more, said the great architect Mies van der Rohe, and if all lecturers remembered that adage, all audiences would be both wiser and happier.

Have you ever disliked a lecture because it was too elementary? I am sure that there are people who would answer yes to that question, but not many. Every time I have asked the question, the person who answered said no, and then looked a little surprised at hearing the answer. A public lecture should be simple and elementary; it should not be complicated and technical. If you believe and can act on this injunction ("be simple"), you can stop reading here; the rest of what I have to say is, in comparison, just a matter of minor detail.

To begin a public lecture to 500 people with "Consider a sheaf of germs of holomorphic functions..." (I have heard it happen) loses people and antagonizes them. If you mention the Künneth formula, it does no harm to say that, at least as far as Betti numbers go, it is just like what happens when you multiply polynomials. If you mention functors, say that a typical example is the formation of the duals of vector spaces and the adjoints of linear transformations.

Be simple by being concrete. Listeners are prepared to accept unstated (but hinted) generalizations much more than they are able, on the spur of the moment, to decode a precisely stated abstraction and to re-invent the special cases that motivated it in the first place. Caution: being concrete should not lead to concentrating on the trees and missing the woods. In many parts of mathematics a generalization is simpler and more incisive than its special parent. (Examples: Artin's solution of Hilbert's 17th problem about definite forms via formally real fields; Gelfand's proof of Wiener's theorem about absolutely convergent Fourier series via Banach algebras.) In such cases there is always a concrete special case that is simpler than the seminal one and that illustrates the generalization with less fuss; the lecturer who knows his subject will explain the complicated special case, and the generalization, by discussing the simple cousin.

Some lecturers defend complications and technicalities by saying that that's what their subject is like, and there is nothing they can do about it. I am skeptical, and I am willing to go so far as to say that such statements indicate incomplete understanding of the subject and of its place in mathematics. Every subject, and even every small part of a subject, if it is identifiable, if it is big enough to give an hour talk on, has its simple aspects, and they, the simple aspects, the roots of the subject, the connections with more widely known and older parts of mathematics, are what a non-specialized audience needs to be told.

Many lecturers, especially those near the foot of the academic ladder, anxious to climb rapidly, feel under pressure to say something brand new - to impress their elders with their brilliance and profundity. Two comments: (1) the best way to do that is to make the talk simple, and (2) it doesn't really have to be done. It may be entirely appropriate to make the lecturer's recent research the focal point of the lecture, but it may also be entirely appropriate not to do so. An audience's evaluation of the merits of a talk is not proportional to the amount of original material included; the explanation of the speaker's latest theorem may fail to improve his chances of creating a good impression.

An oft-quoted compromise between trying to be intelligible and trying to seem deep is this advice: address the first quarter of your talk to your high-school chemistry teacher, the second to a graduate student, the third to an educated mathematician whose interests are different from yours, and the last to the specialists. I have done my duty by reporting the formula, but I'd fail in my duty if I didn't warn that there are many who do not agree with it. A good public lecture should be a work of art. It should be an architectural unit whose parts reinforce each other in conveying the maximum possible amount of information - not a campaign speech that offers something to everybody and, more likely than not, ends by pleasing nobody.

Make it simple, and you won't go wrong.

Details

Some lecturers, with the best of intentions, striving for simplicity, try to achieve it by being overly explicit and overly detailed; that's a mistake.

"Explicit" refers to computations. If a proof can be carried out by multiplying two horrendous expressions, say so and let it go at that; the logical simplicity of the steps doesn't necessarily make the computation attractive or informative to carry out. Landau, legend has it, never omitted a single epsilon from his lectures, and his lectures were inspiring anyway - but that's the exception, not the rule. If, on an exceptional occasion, you think that a brief computation will be decisive and illuminating, put it in, but the rule for ordinary mortals still stands: do not compute in public. It may be an explicit and honest thing to do, but that's not what makes a lecture simple.

"Detailed" refers to definitions. Some lecturers think that the way to reach an audience of non-experts is to tell them everything. ("To get to the theorem I proved last week, I need, starting from the beginning, 14 definitions and 11 theorems that my predecessors have proved. If I talk and write fast, I can present those 25 nuggets in 25 minutes, and in the rest of the time I can state and prove my own thing.") This, too, is honest, and it makes the lecture self-contained, in some sense - but it is impossible to digest, and its effect is dreadful. If someone told you, in half an hour, the meaning of each ideogram on a page of Chinese, could you then read and enjoy the poem on that page in the next half hour?

Proofs

Some lecturers understand the injunction "be simple" to mean "don't prove anything". That isn't quite right. It is true, I think, that is not the main purpose of a public lecture to prove things, but to prove nothing at all robs exposition of an essential part of what mathematicians regard as attractive and informative. I would advise every lecturer to be sure to prove something - one little theorem, one usable and elegant lemma, something that is typical of the words and the methods used in the subject. If the proof is short enough, it almost doesn't matter that it may, perhaps, not be understood. It is of value to the listener to hear the lecturer say that Bernoulli numbers enter the theory of stable homotopy groups, even if the listener has only an approximate idea of what Bernoulli numbers or homotopy groups are.

Something that's even better than a sample proof is the idea of a proof, the intuition that suggested it in the first place, the reason why the theorem is true. To find the right words to describe the central idea of a proof is sometimes hard, but it is worth the trouble; when it can be done, it provides the perfect way to communicate mathematics.

Problems

In the same vein, it is a false concept of simplicity that makes a lecturer concentrate only on what is safe and known; I strongly recommend that every public lecture reach the frontiers of knowledge, and at least mention something that is challenging and unknown. It doesn't have to be, it shouldn't be, the most delicate and newest technicality. Don't be afraid of repeating an old one; remember that many in your audience probably haven't heard of your subject since they took a course in it in graduate school, a long time ago. They will learn something just by hearing today that the unsolved problem they learned about years ago is still unsolved. The discussion of unsolved problems is a valuable part of the process of attracting and informing - it is, I think, an indispensable part. A field is not well described if its boundaries are missing from the description; some knowledge of the boundaries is essential for an understanding of where the field is today as well as for enlarging the area of our knowledge tomorrow. A public lecture must be simple, yes, but not at the cost of being empty, or, not quite that bad but bad enough, it must not be incomplete to the point of being dishonest.

Organization

The organization of a talk is like the skeleton of a man: things would fall apart without it, but it's bad if it shows. Organize your public lecture, plan it, prepare it carefully, and then deliver it impromptu, extemporaneously.

To prepare a talk, the first thing to know is the subject, and a very close second is the audience. It's much more important to adjust the level to fit the audience in a public lecture than it is in a book. ("Adjust the level" is not a euphemism for "talk down". Don't insult the audience, but be realistic. Slightly over the mark,

156

the injunction
e anything".
I think, that it
ic lecture to
g at all robs the
what mathema-
nformative. I
e sure to prove
le usable and
typical of the
e subject. If
est doesn't mat-
understood. It
the lecturer
the theory of
he listener has
Bernoulli num-

than a sample
ituition that
reason why
ight words to
of is sometimes
when it can be
to communicate

e concept of
oncentrate
strongly rec-
reach the
st mention
unknown. It
the most
Don't be afraid
that many in
ird of your
it in graduate
learn some-
unsolved
igo is still un-
problems is
tracting and
ensable part.
boundaries
some knowl-
for an under-
as well as
edge tomor-
ile, yes, but
not quite that
incomplete to

ike the skel-
rt without it,
our public
y, and then
ously.
ing to know
ond is the
t to adjust the
lecture than
s not a eu-
ult the au-
er the mark,

very slightly, doesn't do much harm, but too
much over is much worse than somewhat under.)
A reader can put down a book and come back to
it when he has learned more; an annoyed and an-
tagonized listener will, in spirit, leave you, and,
as far as this talk is concerned, he'll never come
back.

The right level for a talk is a part of what
organization is meant to achieve, but, of course,
the first and more important thing to organize is
the content. Here I have two recommendations
(in addition to "prove something" and "ask some-
thing", already mentioned): (1) discuss three or
four related topics, and the connections between
them, rather than relentlessly pursue one cen-
tral topic, and (2) break each topic into four or
five sub-topics, portable, freely addable or sub-
tractable modules, the omission of any one of
which would not wreck the continuity.

As for extemporaneous delivery, there are
two reasons for that: it sounds good, and it makes
possible an interaction between the speaker and
the listeners. The faces in the audience can be
revealing and helpful: they can indicate the need
to slow down, to speed up, to explain something,
to omit something.

Preparation

To prepare a lecture means to prepare the
subjects it will cover, the order in which those
subjects are to come, and the connections be-
tween them that you deem worthy of mention; it
does not mean to write down all the words with
the intention of memorizing them (or, much
worse, reading them aloud). Still: to write it all
out is not necessarily a bad idea. "All" means
all, including, especially, exactly what is to be
put on the blackboard (with a clear idea of when
it will be put on and whether it will remain for
long or be rubbed out right away). To have it all
written out will make it easier to run through it
once, out loud, by a blackboard, and thus to get
an idea of the timing. (Warning: if the dry run
takes an hour, then the actual delivery will take
an hour and a half.)

Brevity

Most talks are described as "one-hour lec-
tures", but, by a generally shared tradition,
most are meant to last for 50 minutes only. No-
body will reproach you for sitting down after 45
minutes, but the majority of the audience will
become nervous after 55, and most of them will
glare at you, displeased and uncomfortable, after
65.

To take long, to run over time, is rude.
Your theorems, or your proofs, are not all that
important in other peoples' lives; that hurried,
breathless last five minutes is expendable. If
you didn't finish, say so, express your regret if
you must, but stop; it's better thus than to give
the audience cause for regret.

Techniques

A public lecture usually begins with an in-
troduction by the chairman of the session. Rule
of etiquette: give him a chance. Before the lec-
ture begins, sit somewhere by the side of the
room, or with the audience, near the front; do
not stand by or near the blackboard, or hover

near the chairman worrying him.

One good trick to overcome initial stage-
fright is to memorize one sentence, the opener.
After that, the preparation and your knowledge
of the subject will take over.

Try very hard to avoid annoying manner-
isms. Definition: an annoying mannerism is any-
thing that's repeated more than twice. A man-
nerism can be verbal ("in other words", pro-
nounced " 'n 'zer w'rs", meaning nothing), it
can be visual (surrounding a part of the material
on the blackboard by elaborate fences), or it can
be dynamic (teeter-tottering at the edge of the
platform).

If you are in mechanical trouble, catch the
chairman's eye and say, to him only, "I am out
of chalk", or "May I have an eraser?". Do not
bumble about your awkwardness and do not keep
on apologizing. ("Oh, dear, where can I put
this - sorry, I seem to have run out of room - well,
let's see, perhaps we don't need this any-
more...".) Make the appropriate decision and
take the appropriate action, but do so silently.
Keep your own counsel, and do not distract the
audience with irrelevancies.

Silence is a powerful tool at other times
too; the best speakers are also the best non-
speakers. A long period of silence (five seconds,
say, or ten at most) after an important and
crisply stated definition or theorem puts the au-
dience on notice ("this is important") and gives
them a chance to absorb what was just said.
Don't overdo it, but three or four times during
the hour, at the three or four high points, you
might very well find that the best way to explain
something is to say nothing.

Speak slowly and speak loudly; write large
and speak as you write; write slowly and do not
write much. Intelligently chosen abbreviations,
arrows for implications, and just reminder
words, not deathless prose, are what a board is
for; their purpose is to aid the audience in fol-
lowing you by giving them something to look at as
well as something to listen to. (Example: do not
write "semisimple is defined as follows:"; write
"semisimple:".) Do not, ever, greet an audience
with a carefully prepared blackboard (or over-
head projector sheets) crammed with formulas,
definitions, and theorems. (An occasionally ad-
visable exception to this rule has to do with pic-
tures - if a picture, or two pictures, would help
your exposition but would take too long to draw
as you talk, at least with the care it deserves,
the audience will forgive you for drawing it be-
fore the talk begins.) The audience can take
pleasure in seeing the visual presentation grow
before its eyes - the growth is part of your lec-
ture, or should be.

Flexibility

Because of the unpredictability of the pre-
cise timing (you didn't rehearse enough, the au-
dience asks questions during the talk, the lec-
ture room is reserved for another group at 5:00
sharp, or you just plain get mixed up and waste
time trying to get unscrambled), flexibility is an
important quality to build into a lecture. You
must be prepared to omit (or to add!) material,
and you must be prepared to do so under pres-
sure, in public, on the spur of the moment,

without saying so, and without seeming to do so. There are probably many ways to make a lecture flexible; I'll mention two that I have found useful.

The first is exercises. Prepare two or three statements whose detailed discussion might well be a part of the lecture but whose omission would not destroy continuity, and, at the proper places during your lecture, "assign" them to the audience as exercises. You run the slight risk of losing the attention of some of the more competitive members of the group for the rest of the hour. What you gain is something else that you can gracefully fill out your time with if (unlikely as that may be) you finish everything else too soon, and, at the same time, something that'll never be missed if you do not discuss the solution. (Exercises in this sense may yield another fringe benefit: they'll give the audience something to ask their courtesy questions about.)

A second way to make a lecture flexible is one I mentioned before and I believe is worth emphasizing again: portable modules. My notes for a lecture usually consist of about 20 telegraphically written paragraphs. The detailed presentation of each paragraph may take between 2 and 4 minutes, and at least half the paragraphs (the last 10) are omittable. These omittable modules often contain material dear to my heart: that clever proof, that ingenious generalization, that challenging question - but no one (except me) will miss them if I keep mum. Knowing that those modules are there, I sail through the first half of the period with no worries: I am sure that I won't run out of things to say, and I am sure that everything that I must say will get said. In the second half, or last third, of the period I keep an eye on the time, and, without saying anything about it, make instantaneous decisions about what to throw overboard.

One disadvantage of this method is that at the end of your time you might sound too abrupt, as if you had stopped in the middle of a sentence. To avoid the abrupt ending, prepare your peroration, and do not omit it. The peroration can be a three-sentence summary of the whole lecture, or it can be the statement of the most important unsolved problem of the subject. Make it whatever you think proper for an ending, and then end with it.

Rule of etiquette: when you stop, sit Literally sit down. Do not just stop talking look helpless, and do not ask for questions that's the chairman's job.

Short talks

Short talks are harder to prepare and deliver than long ones. The lecturer has le time to lay the groundwork, and the audien less time to catch on; the lecturer feels un pressure to explain quickly, and the audien under pressure to understand quickly.

In my experience a 20-minute talk ca still be both enjoyable and enlightening; all need to do is prepare a 10-minute talk and sent it leisurely. A 10-minute talk is the h to do right; the precepts presented above (s ple, organized, and short) must be applied again, but this time there is no room for e Focus on one idea only, and on its simplest trivial special case at that, practice the ta time it carefully, and under no circumstan allow a 10-minute contributed paper to bec a 45-minute uninvited address. It has been but the results were neither informative no attractive.

Some experts are willing to relax the for a 10-minute talk: it is all right, they sa dive into the middle of things immediately, it is all right, they say, to use prepared pr jection sheets. Others, having in mind the ited velocity and capacity of the human min absorb technicalities, disagree.

Summary

My recommendations amount to this: n it simple, organized, and short. Make your ture simple (special and concrete); be sure prove something and ask something; prepare detail; organize the content and adjust to the of the audience; keep it short, and, to be su doing so, prepare it so as to make it flexibl

Remember that you are talking in orde attract the listeners to your subject and to i form them about it; and remember that less more.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Editor, the *Notices*

Many of us have worked to help North Vietnamese mathematicians keep up their active teaching and research under the difficult conditions imposed by the war. Individuals have sent many scientific books, and this year the American Mathematical Society has contributed a large number of its publications.

Such support seems to us just as appropriate now as in the past. Beside sending books, and corresponding with mathematicians in the same field, there is one more thing we can do.

To send a delegation to the International Congress at Vancouver in August could be quite important to the North Vietnamese mathematical community, but would strain available resources

considerably. Why doesn't the world mathem cal community share the load? Specifically, try to collect at least $2,000 toward the air to bring North Vietnamese mathematicians t Congress. (This amount is proposed as one we can contribute without hardship, yet whic might be enough to make a difference to the sibility of their coming.)

Contributions may be sent to Chandler Davis, Department of Mathematics, Univers of Toronto, Toronto M5S 1A1, Canada.

Chandler Davis
E. E. Moise
Anatol Rapopor
Rimhak Ree
Steve Smale