AN ESSAY ON THE FOUNDATIONS OF GEOMETRY

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649000098

An essay on the foundations of geometry by Bertrand A. W. Russell

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

BERTRAND A. W. RUSSELL

AN ESSAY ON THE FOUNDATIONS OF GEOMETRY

Trieste

THE

FOUNDATIONS OF GEOMETRY.

London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.
Glasgow: 263, ARGYLE STREET.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.
New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.
Bombay: GEORGE BELL AND SONS.

AN ESSAY

ON THE

FOUNDATIONS OF GEOMETRY

BY

BERTRAND A. W. RUSSELL, M.A.

FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

CAMBRIDGE:
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
1897

[*All Rights reserved.*]

QA681
R9
cop. 2
MATH.-
STAT.
LIBRARY

PREFACE.

THE present work is based on a dissertation submitted at the Fellowship Examination of Trinity College, Cambridge, in the year 1895. Section B of the third chapter is in the main a reprint, with some serious alterations, of an article in *Mind* (New Series, No. 17). The substance of the book has been given in the form of lectures at the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, and at Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania.

My chief obligation is to Professor Klein. Throughout the first chapter, I have found his "Lectures on non-Euclidean Geometry" an invaluable guide; I have accepted from him the division of Metageometry into three periods, and have found my historical work much lightened by his references to previous writers. In Logic, I have learnt most from Mr Bradley, and next to him, from Sigwart and Dr Bosanquet. On several important points, I have derived useful suggestions from Professor James's "Principles of Psychology."

My thanks are due to Mr G. F. Stout and Mr A. N. Whitehead for kindly reading my proofs, and helping me by many useful criticisms. To Mr Whitehead I owe, also, the inestimable assistance of constant criticism and suggestion throughout the course of construction, especially as regards the philosophical importance of projective Geometry.

HASLEMERE.
May, 1897.

951

TO

JOHN McTAGGART ELLIS McTAGGART

TO WHOSE DISCOURSE AND FRIENDSHIP IS OWING

THE EXISTENCE OF THIS BOOK.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

OUR PROBLEM DEFINED BY ITS RELATIONS TO LOGIC, PSYCHOLOGY AND MATHEMATICS.

PAGE

1. The problem first received a modern form through Kant, who connected the *à priori* with the subjective 1
2. A mental state is subjective, for Psychology, when its immediate cause does not lie in the outer world . . . 2
3. A piece of knowledge is *à priori*, for Epistemology, when without it knowledge would be impossible 2
4. The subjective and the *à priori* belong respectively to Psychology and to Epistemology. The latter alone will be investigated in this essay 3
5. My test of the *à priori* will be purely logical: what knowledge is necessary for experience? 3
6. But since the necessary is hypothetical, we must include, in the *à priori*, the ground of necessity 4
7. This may be the essential postulate of our science, or the element, in the subject-matter, which is necessary to experience; 4
8. Which, however, are both at bottom the same ground . . 5
9. Forecast of the work 5

CHAPTER I.

A SHORT HISTORY OF METAGEOMETRY.

10. Metageometry began by rejecting the axiom of parallels . 7
11. Its history may be divided into three periods: the synthetic, the metrical and the projective 7
12. The first period was inaugurated by Gauss, ... 10

PAGE

13. Whose suggestions were developed independently by Lobatchewsky 10
14. And Bolyai 11
15. The purpose of all three was to show that the axiom of parallels could not be deduced from the others, since its denial did not lead to contradictions 12
16. The second period had a more philosophical aim, and was inspired chiefly by Gauss and Herbart 13
17. The first work of this period, that of Riemann, invented two new conceptions: 14
18. The first, that of a manifold, is a class-conception, containing space as a species, ... 14
19. And defined as such that its determinations form a collection of magnitudes 15
20. The second, the measure of curvature of a manifold, grew out of curvature in curves and surfaces 16
21. By means of Gauss's analytical formula for the curvature of surfaces, ... 19
22. Which enables us to define a *constant* measure of curvature of a three-dimensional space without reference to a fourth dimension 20
23. The main result of Riemann's mathematical work was to show that, if magnitudes are independent of place, the measure of curvature of space must be constant . . 21
24. Helmholtz, who was more of a philosopher than a mathematician, ... 22
25. Gave a new but incorrect formulation of the essential axioms, . 23
26. And deduced the quadratic formula for the infinitesimal arc, which Riemann had assumed 24
27. Beltrami gave Lobatchewsky's planimetry a Euclidean interpretation, ... 25
28. Which is analogous to Cayley's theory of distance; . . 26
29. And dealt with n-dimensional spaces of constant negative curvature 27
30. The third period abandons the metrical methods of the second, and extrudes the notion of spatial quantity . . . 27
31. Cayley reduced metrical properties to projective properties, relative to a certain conic or quadric, the Absolute; . 28
32. And Klein showed that the Euclidean or non-Euclidean systems result, according to the nature of the Absolute; . . 29
33. Hence Euclidean *space* appeared to give rise to all the kinds of Geometry, and the question, which is true, appeared reduced to one of convention 30
34. But this view is due to a confusion as to the nature of the coordinates employed 30