

Analysis of Contents.

		PAGE
§ 1.	Recent work in mathematics has shown a tendency towards rigour of proof and sharp definition of concepts	1 ^e
§ 2.	This critical examination must ultimately extend to the concept of Number itself. The aim of proof.	2 ^e
§ 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	3 ^e
§ 4.	Task of the present work	4 ^e

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	5 ^e
§ 6.	Leibniz's proof that $2 + 2 = 4$ contains a gap. Grassmann's definition of $a + b$ is faulty	7 ^e
§ 7.	Mill's view that the definitions of the individual numbers assert observed facts, from which the calculations follow, is without foundation	9 ^e
§ 8.	These definitions do not require, for their legitimacy, the observation of his facts	11 ^e

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 12^e
- § 10. Grounds for denying that the laws of addition are inductive truths: numbers not all of the same sort; 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 14^e
- § 11. Leibniz's term "innate" 17^e

Are the laws of arithmetic synthetic a priori or analytic?

- § 12. Kant. Baumann. Lipschitz. Hankel. Inner intuition as the ground of knowledge 17^e
- § 13. Distinction between arithmetic and geometry 19^e
- § 14. Comparison between the various kinds of truths in respect of the domains that they govern 20^e
- § 15. Views of Leibniz and W. S. Jevons 21^e
- § 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 22^e
- § 17. Inadequacy of induction. Conjecture that the laws of number are analytic judgments; what in that case is the use of them. Estimate of the value of analytic judgments 23^e

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

- § 18. Necessity for an enquiry into the general concept of Number 24^e
- § 19. Its definition not to be geometrical 25^e
- § 20. Is number definable? Hankel. Leibniz 26^e

Is Number a property of external things?

- § 21. Views of M. Cantor and E. Schröder 27^e
- § 22. Opposite view of Baumann: external things present us with no strict units. Their number apparently dependent on our way of regarding them 28^e
- § 23. Mill's view untenable, that the number is a property of the agglomeration of things 29^e

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

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

Numbers as sets.

28. Thomae's name-giving 38^e

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 add anything to a description, cannot serve as a predicate 39^e
- § 30. Attempts to define unity by Leibniz and Baumann seem to blur the concept completely 41^e
- § 31. Baumann's criteria, being undivided and being isolated. The notion of unity not suggested to us by every object (as Locke) . 41^e
- § 32. Still, language does indicate some connexion with being undivided and isolated, with a shift of meaning however . . . 42^e
- § 33. Indivisibility (G. Köpp) as a criterion of the unit is untenable . 43^e

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 between things does not give us the concept of their Number, nor does it make the things identical with one another . . . 44^e

	PAGE
§ 35. Indeed diversity is actually necessary, if we are to speak of plurality. Descartes. E. Schröder. W. S. Jevons	46 ^e
§ 36. The view that units are different also comes up against difficulties. Different distinct ones in W. S. Jevons	46 ^e
§ 37. Definitions of number in terms of the unit or one by Locke, Leibniz and Hesse	48 ^e
§ 38. "One" is a proper name, "unit" a concept word. Number cannot be defined as units. Distinction between "and" and +	48 ^e
§ 39. The difficulty of reconciling identity of units with distinguishability is concealed by the ambiguity of "unit"	50 ^e

Attempts to overcome the difficulty.

§ 40. Space and time as means of distinguishing between units. Hobbes. Thomae. Against them: Leibniz, Baumann, W. S. Jevons	51 ^e
§ 41. The purpose not achieved	53 ^e
§ 42. Position in a series as a means of distinguishing between units. Hankel's putting	54 ^e
§ 43. Schröder's copying of objects by the symbol $\mathbf{1}$	54 ^e
§ 44. Jevons' abstraction from the character of the differences while retaining the fact of their existence. 0 and $\mathbf{1}$ are numbers like the rest. The difficulty still remains	55 ^e

Solution of the difficulty.

§ 45. Recapitulation	58 ^e
§ 46. A statement of number contains an assertion about a concept. Objection that the number varies while the concept does not	59 ^e
§ 47. That statements of number are statements of fact explained by the objectivity of concepts	60 ^e
§ 48. Removal of certain difficulties	61 ^e
§ 49. Corroboration found in Spinoza	62 ^e
§ 50. E. Schröder's account quoted	62 ^e
§ 51. Correction of the same	63 ^e
§ 52. Corroboration found in a German idiom	64 ^e
§ 53. Distinction between component characteristics of a concept and its properties. Existence and number	64 ^e
§ 54. Unit the name given to the subject of a statement of number. How indivisible and isolated. How identical and distinguishable	65 ^e

IV. The concept of Number.

Every individual number is a self-subsistent object.

- § 55. Attempt to complete the definitions of the individual numbers as given by Leibniz 67^e
- § 56. The attempted definitions are unusable, because what they define is a predicate in which the number is only an element 67^e
- § 57. A statement of number should be regarded as an identity between numbers 68^e
- § 58. Objection that we can form no idea of number as a self-subsistent object. In principle number cannot be imagined 69^e
- § 59. Because we cannot imagine an object, we are not to be debarred from investigating it 70^e
- § 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. 71^e
- § 61. Objection that numbers are not spatial. Not every objective object is spatial 72^e

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

- § 62. We need a criterion for numerical identity 73^e
- § 63. Possible criterion in one-one correlation. Doubt as to the logic of defining identity specially for the case of numbers 73^e
- § 64. Examples of similar procedures: direction of a line, orientation of a plane, shape of a triangle 74^e
- § 65. Attempt at a definition. A second doubt: are the laws of identity satisfied? 76^e
- § 66. Third doubt: the criterion of identity fails to cover all cases 77^e
- § 67. We cannot supplement it by taking as a defining characteristic of a concept the way in which an object is introduced 78^e
- § 68. Number as the extension of a concept 79^e
- § 69. Elucidation 80^e

Our definition completed and its worth proved.

- § 70. The relation-concept 81^e
- § 71. Correlation by means of a relation 83^e
- § 72. One-one relations. The concept of Number 84^e

	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	85 ^e
§ 74. Nought is the Number which belongs to the concept "not identical with itself"	86 ^e
§ 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.	88 ^e
§ 76. Definition of the expression " n follows in the series of natural numbers directly after m "	89 ^e
§ 77. 1 is the Number which belongs to the concept "identical with 0"	90 ^e
§ 78. Propositions to be proved by means of our definitions	91 ^e
§ 79. Definition of following in a series	92 ^e
§ 80. Comments on the same. Following is objective	92 ^e
§ 81. Definition of the expression " x is a member of the ϕ -series ending with y "	94 ^e
§ 82. Outline of the proof that there is no last member of the series of natural numbers	94 ^e
§ 83. Definition of finite Number. No finite Number follows in the series of natural numbers after itself	95 ^e

Infinite Numbers.

§ 84. The Number which belongs to the concept "finite Number" is an infinite Number	96 ^e
§ 85. Cantor's infinite Numbers; "power." Divergence in terminology	97 ^e
§ 86. Cantor's following in the succession and my following in the series	98 ^e

V. Conclusion.

§ 87. Nature of the laws of arithmetic	99 ^e
§ 88. Kant's underestimate of the value of analytic judgments	99 ^e
§ 89. Kant's dictum: "Without sensibility no object would be given to us." Kant's services to mathematics	101 ^e
§ 90. For the complete proof of the analytic nature of the laws of arithmetic we still need a chain of deductions with no link missing	102 ^e
§ 91. My concept writing makes it possible to supply this lack	103 ^e

Other numbers.

§ 92. The sense, according to Hankel, of asking whether some number is possible	104 ^e
§ 93. Numbers are neither outside us in space nor subjective	105 ^e

	PAGE
§ 94. That a concept is free from contradiction is no guarantee that anything falls under it, and itself requires to be proved	105 ^e
§ 95. We cannot regard $(c-b)$ without more ado as a symbol which solves the problem of subtraction	106 ^e
§ 96. Not even the mathematician can create things at will	107 ^e
§ 97. Concepts are to be distinguished from objects	108 ^e
§ 98. Hankel's definition of addition	108 ^e
§ 99. The formalist theory defective	109 ^e
§ 100. Attempt to produce an interpretation of complex numbers by extending the meaning of multiplication in some special way . .	110 ^e
§ 101. The cogency of proofs is affected, unless it is possible to produce such an interpretation	111 ^e
§ 102. The mere postulate that it shall be possible to carry out some operation is not the same as its own fulfilment.	111 ^e
§ 103. Kossack's definition of complex numbers is only a guide towards a definition, and fails to avoid the importation of foreign elements. Geometrical representation of complex numbers . .	112 ^e
§ 104. What is needed is to fix the sense of a recognition-judgment for the case of the new numbers.	114 ^e
§ 105. The charm of arithmetic lies in its rationality	115 ^e
§ 106-109. Recapitulation	115 ^e -119 ^e