Analysis of Contents

PAGE

§ 1. Recent work in mathematics has shown a tendency towards rigour of proof and sharp definition of concepts 1e

§ 2. This critical examination must ultimately extend to the concept of Number itself. The aim of proof. 2e

§ 3. Philosophical motives for such an enquiry: the controversies as to whether the laws of number are analytic or synthetic, a priori or a posteriori. Sense of these expressions 3e

§ 4. Task of the present work 4e

I. Views of certain writers on the nature of arithmetical propositions.

Are numerical formulae provable?

§ 5. Kant denies this, which Hankel justly calls a paradox . . 5e

§ 6. Leibniz's proof that $2 + 2 = 4$ contains a gap. Grassmann's definition of $a + b$ is faulty 7e

§ 7. Mill's view that the definitions of the individual numbers assert observed facts, from which the calculations follow, is without foundation 9e

§ 8. These definitions can be justified without any need of observing his facts 11e

PAGE

Are the laws of arithmetic inductive truths?

§ 9. Mill's law of nature. In calling arithmetical truths laws of nature, Mill is confusing them with their applications 12e

§ 10. Grounds for denying that the laws of addition are inductive truths: numbers not uniform; the definition of number does not of itself yield any set of common properties of numbers; probably the reverse is true and induction should be based on arithmetic 14e

§ 11. Leibniz's term "innate" 17e

Are the laws of arithmetic synthetic a priori or analytic?

§ 12. Kant, Baumann, Lipschitz, Hankel. Inner intuition as the ground of knowledge 17e

§ 13. Distinction between arithmetic and geometry 19e

§ 14. Comparison between the various kinds of truths in respect of the domains that they govern 20e

§ 15. Views of Leibniz and Jevons 21e

§ 16. Against them, Mill's ridicule of the "artful manipulation of language". Symbols are not empty simply because not meaning anything with which we can be acquainted 22e

§ 17. Inadequacy of induction. Conjecture that the laws of number are analytic judgments; what in that case is their advantage. Estimate of the value of analytic judgments 23e

II. Views of certain writers on the concept of Number.

§ 18. Necessity for an enquiry into the general concept of Number . 24e

§ 19. Its definition not to be geometrical 25e

§ 20. Is number definable? Hankel. Leibniz 26e

Is Number a property of external things?

§ 21. Views of M. Cantor and E. Schröder 27e

§ 22. Opposite view of Baumann: external things present us with no strict units. Number apparently dependent on our way of regarding things 28e

§ 23. Mill's view untenable, that a number is a property of an agglomeration of things 29e

PAGE

§ 24. Wide range of applicability of number. Mill. Locke. Leibniz's immaterial metaphysical figure. If number were something sensible, it could not be ascribed to anything non-sensible . . 30e

§ 25. Mill's physical difference between 2 and 3. Number according to Berkeley not really existent in things but created by the mind. 32e

Is number something subjective?

§ 26. Lipschitz's description of the construction of numbers will not do, and cannot take the place of a definition of the concept. Number not an object for psychology, but something objective 33e

§ 27. Number is not, as Schoemilch claims, the idea of the position of an item in a series 36e

The set theory of Number.

28. Thomae's name-giving 38e

III. Views on unity and one.

Does the number word "one" express a property of objects?

§ 29. Ambiguity of the terms "μονάς" and "unit". E. Schröder's definition of the unit as an object to be numbered is apparently pointless. The adjective "one" does not modify any description, cannot serve as a predicate 39e

§ 30. Attempts to define unity by Leibniz and Baumann seem to blur the concept completely 41e

§ 31. Baumann's criteria, being undivided and being isolated. Not every object suggests to us the notion of unity (as Locke) . . 41e

§ 32. Still, language does indicate some connexion with being undivided and isolated, with a shift of meaning however . . 42e

§ 33. Indivisibility (G. Köpp) as a criterion of the unit is untenable . 43e

Are units identical with one another?

§ 34. Identity as the reason for the name "unit". E. Schröder. Hobbes. Hume. Thomae. To abstract from the differences of things does not give us the concept of Number, nor does it make things identical with one another 44e

PAGE

§ 35. Indeed diversity is actually necessary, if we are to speak of plurality. Descartes. E. Schröder. W. S. Jevons . . . 46e

§ 36. The view that units are different also comes up against difficulties. Different distinct ones in W. S. Jevons 46e

§ 37. Definitions of number in terms of the unit or one by Locke, Leibniz and Hesse 48e

§ 38. "One" is a proper name, "unit" a general term. Number cannot be defined as units. Distinction between "and" and + . . 48e

§ 39. The difficulty of reconciling identity of units with distinguishability is concealed by the ambiguity of "unit" 50e

Attempts to overcome the difficulty.

§ 40. Space and time as means of distinguishing between units. Hobbes. Thomae. Against them: Leibniz, Baumann, W. S. Jevons 51e

§ 41. The goal is not achieved 53e

§ 42. Position in a series as a means of distinguishing between units. Hankel's putting 54e

§ 43. Schröder's copying of objects by the symbol 1 . . . . 54e

§ 44. Jevons' abstraction from the character of the differences while retaining the fact of their existence. 0 and 1 are numbers like the rest. The difficulty still remains 55e

Solution of the difficulty.

§ 45. Recapitulation 58e

§ 46. A statement of number contains an assertion about a concept. Objection that the number varies while the concept does not . 59e

§ 47. That statements of number are statements of fact explained by the objectivity of concepts 60e

§ 48. Removal of certain difficulties 61e

§ 49. Corroboration found in Spinoza 62e

§ 50. E. Schröder's account quoted 62e

§ 51. Correction of the same 63e

§ 52. Corroboration found in a German idiom 64e

§ 53. Distinction between component characteristics of a concept and its properties. Existence and number 64e

§ 54. Unit the name given to the subject of a statement of number. How indivisible and isolated. How identical and distinguishable 65e

PAGE

IV. The concept of Number.

Every individual number is a self-subsistent object.

§ 55. Attempt to supplement the definitions of the individual numbers as given by Leibniz 67e

§ 56. The attempted definitions are unusable, because what they define is a predicate in which the number is only an element . 67e

§ 57. A statement of number should be regarded as an identity between numbers 68e

§ 58. Objection that we can form no idea of number as a self-subsistent object. In principle number cannot be imagined . . . 69e

§ 59. Because we cannot imagine an object, we are not to be debarred from investigating it 70e

§ 60. Even concrete things are not always imaginable. In seeking the meaning of a word, we must consider it in the context of a proposition. 71e

§ 61. Objection that numbers are not spatial. Not every objective object is spatial 72e

To obtain the concept of Number, we must fix the sense of a numerical identity.

§ 62. We need a criterion for numerical identity 73e

§ 63. Possible criterion in one-one correlation. Logical doubt over defining identity specially for the case of numbers . . . 73e

§ 64. Examples of similar procedures: direction of a line, orientation of a plane, shape of a triangle 74e

§ 65. Attempt at a definition. A second doubt: are the laws of identity satisfied? 76e

§ 66. Third doubt: the criterion of identity fails to cover all cases . 77e

§ 67. It cannot be supplemented by taking as a defining characteristic of a concept the way in which an object is introduced . . 78e

§ 68. Number as the extension of a concept 79e

§ 69. Elucidation 80e

Our definition supplemented and its worth proved.

§ 70. The relation-concept 81e

§ 71. Correlation by means of a relation 83e

§ 72. One-one relations. The concept of Number 84e

PAGE

§ 73. The Number which belongs to the concept F is identical with the Number which belongs to the concept G, if there exists a relation which correlates one to one the objects falling under F with those falling under G 85e

§ 74. Nought is the Number which belongs to the concept "not identical with itself" 86e

§ 75. Nought is the Number which belongs to a concept under which nothing falls. No object falls under a concept if nought is the Number belonging to that concept. 88e

§ 76. Definition of the expression "n follows in the series of natural numbers directly after m" 89e

§ 77. 1 is the Number which belongs to the concept "identical with 0" 90e

§ 78. Propositions to be proved by means of our definitions . . 91e

§ 79. Definition of following in a series 92e

§ 80. Comments on the same. Following is objective . . . 92e

§ 81. Definition of the expression "x is a member of the ϕ-series ending with y" 94e

§ 82. Outline of the proof that there is no last member of the series of natural numbers 94e

§ 83. Definition of finite Number. No finite Number follows in the series of natural numbers after itself 95e

Infinite Numbers.

§ 84. The Number which belongs to the concept "finite Number" is an infinite Number 96e

§ 85. Cantor's infinite Numbers; "power." Divergence in terminology 97e

§ 86. Cantor's following in a succession and my following in a series 98e

V. Conclusion.

§ 87. Nature of the laws of arithmetic 99e

§ 88. Kant's underestimate of the value of analytic judgments . . 99e

§ 89. Kant's dictum: "Without sensibility no object would be given to us." Kant's services to mathematics 101e

§ 90. For the complete proof of the analytic nature of the laws of arithmetic we lack a flawless chain of deductions . . . 102e

§ 91. My concept writing makes it possible to supply this lack . . 103e

Other numbers.

§ 92. The sense, according to Hankel, of asking whether some number is possible 104e

§ 93. Numbers are neither outside us in space nor subjective . . 105e

PAGE

§ 94. That a concept is free from contradiction is no guarantee that anything falls under it, and itself requires to be proved . . 105e

§ 95. We cannot regard (*c*—*b*) without more ado as a symbol which solves the problem of subtraction 106e

§ 96. Not even the mathematician can create things at will . . 107e

§ 97. Concepts are to be distinguished from objects . . . 108e

§ 98. Hankel's definition of addition 108e

§ 99. The formalist theory defective 109e

§ 100. Attempt to produce an interpretation of complex numbers by extending the meaning of multiplication in some special way . 110e

§ 101. The cogency of proofs is affected, unless it is possible to produce such an interpretation 111e

§ 102. The mere postulate that it shall be possible to carry out some operation is not the same as its own fulfilment. 111e

§ 103. Kossack's definition of complex numbers is only a guide towards a definition, and does not avoid the importation of foreign elements. Geometrical representation of complex numbers . 112e

§ 104. What is needed is to fix the sense of a recognition-judgment for the case of the new numbers. 114e

§ 105. The charm of arithmetic lies in its rationality 115e

§ 106–109. Recapitulation 115e–119e