

From Concrete to Abstract in Indian Mathematics

Jaidev Dasgupta

Independent Researcher, jaidevd101@gmail.com

Abstract

Despite the extensive amount of scholarly work done on Indian mathematics in the last 200 years, the conditions under which it originated and evolved is still not clear. Often, one reads the ancient texts with the present concepts and methods in mind. The fact of absence of script over a long stretch of Indian history in ancient times also gets overlooked in such readings. The purpose of this article is to explore the journey of mathematics by examining what the ancient texts tell us about the nature of mathematics in their times. What one finds from the investigation of – arithmetic, geometry and algebra – is that while it was concrete and context bound, rooted in solving practical problems in ancient times, Indian mathematics transitioned to context-free, abstract stage with the advent of algebra supported by writing.

Introduction

It is well established now that ancient humans developed their sense of number through concrete, lived experience. Born with natural mathematical ability or “math instinct,” a vague sense of numbers, there is a good likelihood that in different parts of the world in antiquity humans developed early stages of mathematics. Twenty to thirty thousand years old or even older archaeological finds such as bone and stones with scratch marks are indicative of record keeping of numerical information and, perhaps, of number counting in the remote past. Notched or tally sticks and human hands are also considered among the ancient tools for counting and calculations, though fingers could not be used for record keeping. Although very little is known about the origins of numbers and counting, a wide range of numeration systems have been invented by humanity since antiquity. The cognitive capacity of counting is believed to have developed in humans sometime between the Upper Paleolithic, pre-historic time and the historic time. The need to keep account of personal material possessions, e.g., jewelry, weapons, animals etc. or of the tally marks (scratches/notches) on bones and sticks is believed to have inspired the need for counting (Barras, 2021). Fast forward and we find ancient Egyptians counting oxen, goats and prisoners gained from the victory of the predynastic king Narmer over lower Egypt in the late fourth millennia BCE (Clagett, 1999; p. 2). Archaeological evidence from around the same time or even before show the use of clay tokens of multiple shapes and their assemblages as clay balls, bullae, by the Mesopotamians for recording goods such as wheat, cloth, oil, etc. and their quantities received or disbursed. These tokens or counters were concrete representations of specific items that believably led to the invention of cuneiform writing system representing objects and numbers (Schmandt-Besserat, 1996; Damerow, 2012).

On the Indian subcontinent, however, there is no archaeological evidence of tokens, buildings, or rock inscriptions that could demonstrate the knowledge of numbers and arithmetic in the period from the 18th century to 3rd century BCE. However, the ancient texts make extensive references to mathematics - especially in astronomy, calendrics, and sacrificial altar-making. The *Śulvasūtras* for alter-making and the astronomical text *Vedanga Jyotish* for calendar making are prime examples of mathematical knowledge in antiquity. These texts provide clues to the nature of mathematics practiced at that time. The purpose of this article is to explore the journey of mathematics in ancient India from concrete and context-dependent phase to abstract and context-independent phase in three parts - arithmetic, geometry, and algebra.

Arithmetic

The Rig Veda (RV), the most ancient Indian text, displays the knowledge of numbers and arithmetic in around 1500 BCE. It mentions (RV 1.164.10-15, 48) numbers three, five, six, seven, ten, twelve, three-hundred-and-sixty, and seven-hundred-and-twenty. Verse 1.164.11 speaks of a year with 720 days (*ahas*) and nights (*rātris*) joined in pairs, together suggesting a year of 360 days. The two verses RV 10.62.7-8 mention a thousand (*sahasra*) cows and a hundred (*sata*) horses. There are other texts as well, such as Taittiriya Samhita sections 7.2.11-20, and the use of poetic meters or *chandās* that offer ample evidence of the knowledge of numbers.

But these texts neither mention number symbols nor mathematical operations between them. With the absence of any script for writing in the period 1,500 – 500 BCE, the question is – how these numbers were represented and calculations performed?

Interestingly, there is significant evidence of counting, creating number words or number names and some arithmetical operations in that period. The Shatapatha Brahman (SB; Eggeling, 1897), a middle of the first millennium BCE text, seemingly displays the knowledge of numbers and multiplication: Sections SB 10.4.2.2-17 present fifteen numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20 and 24 as the divisors of 720 - the 360 pairs of day and night (represented by bricks) mentioned above. However, in the absence of numerals and operations between them, it would be more appropriate to consider that SB actually enumerates ways of distributing or splitting 720 bricks into smaller collections of bricks. Each verse has the form: He (*Prajapati*) made himself four bodies of a hundred and eighty bricks each; ... He made himself six bodies of a hundred and twenty bricks each; ... He made himself ten bodies of seventy-two bricks each; and finally, ... He made himself twenty-four bodies of thirty bricks each (SB 10.4.2.4-17). The repeating phrase “made himself” indicates creating collections of concrete objects, bricks, and counting and adding them; which was the practical way of keeping account of things or objects prior to the invention of written symbols for numbers and abstract procedures for addition and multiplication.

In addition, the *yajushmati* bricks and enclosing-stones also represented day (*aha*) and night (*ratri*) and their corresponding 15 *muhurtas* of time, respectively, making three-hundred-and-sixty each of stones and bricks in an altar (SB 10.4.2.30; 10.5.4.5). These *yajushmati* bricks referred to half-moons (fortnights), months, and seasons, as well, and *lokamprina* bricks to the *muhurtas* in a year

(SB 10.4.3.12). The nakshatras that are time markers in their own way, were also represented by these bricks (SB 10.5.4.5).

Thus, while the *yajushmati* bricks referred to multiple entities, both stones and bricks referred to *muhurtas*. Obviously, this system of representation lacked standardization. These objects had context-specific meanings. Hence, the Shatapatha Brahman points to an ancient method of representation and computation. At this stage, arithmetic was more of a “proto-arithmetic,” embedded in the context of a social activity of fire sacrifice and tied to concrete entities representing abstract notions of time units, time points, and numbers. This kind of mathematics allowed physical operations of collecting, combining, removing, sorting, separating, distributing, apportioning, and counting of concrete objects in contrast to the mathematics with operations performed on numerals. While the former was fixed and embedded in its context with a specific purpose and meaning, the latter is independent of context, permitting freedom for its growth by manipulating written symbols.

Not just the bricks and stones, even sunrise, sunset, and the full- and the new-moon also served as tokens or counters for representing numbers. The annual year-long ritual, *satra*, was performed in which oblations were offered every morning (sunrise) and evening (sunset), every new and full moon (i.e., *parvas*), and at the start of every season and *ayana*, when the sun changes its direction of motion from north to south and vice versa at the two solstices (SB 1.6.3.35-36, Eggeling, 1882; Tilak, 1893). These periodic sacrifices served the same purpose as the tally marks on a stick or a piece of bone in prehistoric times used for time-tracking by following lunar phases (Marshack, 1991). The concept of *sadaha* was yet another tool developed for time tracking by counting, in which a set of six consecutive days were identified by specific rituals (SB pt. III, p. xxi, Eggeling, 1885; SB pt. V, p. 148, Eggeling, 1894; Dikshit, 1969, p. 22). *Sadaha* divides a thirty-day month into five equal parts. Every time the full moon returned a day early on the 29th day instead of 30th, the last day of the *sadaha* was dropped to keep in sync with the lunar phase.

Thus, the annual ritual functioned as a concrete calendar by tracking solar and lunar movements. It entailed counting the number of days as one moved through the fortnights, months, seasons and a year, one day at a time, dropping a day here, adding another there, using no more than simple addition and subtraction. Using this method, they reconciled the lunar and solar years, and figured out the length of year between 365 and 366 days.

Names were also used as markers. Ancient Indians were prolific with generating names: Five names for years in a five-year *yuga*; the twelve month names; the dark (*krishna*) and bright (*shukla*) fortnights or *parvas* of a month; the names for 24 *parvas* in a year; the two parts of each day in the light and dark halves in a month adding up to sixty distinct names of days (*ahas*) and nights (*rātris*) in a month; the 30 divisions of a day called *muhurtas*, each with its own name in the two fortnights or *paksha* in a month; and each *muhurta* further subdivided into fifteen *prati-muhurtas* with their own specific names (Dikshit, 1969). Also, every fortnight has fifteen *tithis* with their ordinal names: *Prathama* (first), *dvitiya* (second), *tritiya* (third), *Chaturthi* (fourth) and so on until the fifteenth day, called either *punamasi* (full moon) or *amavasya* (new moon), depending on the bright or the dark half of a month, respectively. Even *nakshatras* or star names were used for

pointing to a time. The practice of using some of these names is still prevalent in India, especially in astrological and religious contexts.

In short, in the absence of script and symbolic representation of numbers and operations, natural events, physical objects, and names representing a thing or time were used to count, and add and subtract to calculate.

Geometry

Geometry was another field of mathematics which was tied to concrete objects and processes. Unlike Euclidean geometry, it was not founded on definitions and axioms; instead, it emerged as practical geometry from measurement of land, more specifically, in altar construction. In order to achieve specific desired goals, altars of different shapes but of the same size, $7\frac{1}{2}$ (square) *purusha*, had to be built for fire sacrifice. A *purusha* is a unit of length (= 108 *angulas* or 6 feet 9 inches) but the same name was also used for a square with side one *purusha* long. To add to the challenge of construction, the size of these altars was increased by one square *purusha* at each subsequent performance of the *yajña*, thus, scaling up from $7\frac{1}{2}$ to $8\frac{1}{2}$ to $9\frac{1}{2}$ up to $101\frac{1}{2}$ square *purusha* while keeping the same shape. The ancient texts, named *Śulvasūtras* (800 - 300 BCE), are the manuals or practical guides for building these altars and fireplaces using ropes/cords, pegs and bamboo that involve solving geometric problems. Their authors, the *sūtrakārs*, were not the geometers driven by the need to prove theorems of geometry through deductive reasoning; instead, they were altar makers doing their job following common sense, observation, and intuition. In this process, they discovered certain geometrical truths and principles.

Let us look at some of the geometrical operations *sūtrakārs* performed while making altars. The first thing was to draw the east-west line on a leveled piece of ground. This line, called *prāchī*, was the line of symmetry for the construction and orientation of altars. The sun's motion and associated shifting direction of shadows of objects on the ground were leveraged to accomplish the goal. A peg was stuck in a measured piece of level ground, and a circle was drawn around it by means of a rope with one end of it tied to the peg. Two points at which the tip of the shadow of the stake touched the circumference at sunrise and sunset were marked, and a line drawn through them was taken as the east-west line (Kātyāyana Sulba Sutra, KS, 1.2; Khadilkar, 1974).

The next step was to draw a perpendicular to this line pointing to the other two cardinal directions north and south. Two pegs were stuck at points A and B equidistant from the point C on the east-west line at which the perpendicular was to be drawn (Fig. 1). Then a rope/cord of desirable length was tied to the two pegs and the middle point M on the cord was marked. Holding the marked point M the cord was stretched to the north till it was taut with point M touching the ground, where point P was marked. Likewise, the cord was stretched in the opposite direction and point Q was marked in the south. A line passing through the points P and Q was perpendicular to the *prāchī* (KS 1.3). Other variations of this method were also used. Using a similar method, Baudhāyana showed how to draw a square whose corners point in the four intermediate directions (north-east, north-west, etc.) such that the body of the square is parallel to *prāchī*, hence permitting the construction of altars aligned in the east-west direction (BS 1.22-28, Thibaut, 1875; Dani, 2010).




Figure 1. Drawing a perpendicular line PQ on line AB at point C with a rope

It is to be noted that the sūtrakārs had no notion of angle such as 90-degree angle between two lines perpendicular to each other. The idea of perpendicularity was tied to constructing a line following the method described above on another line. Prāchi was a special case of base-line AB with east-west orientation.

The various constructions in the Sutras cannot all be presented here. The above example is only to show the method of operation of the sūtrakārs. Once the structure like in figure 1 was in place and the four points A, B, P and Q on the ground were joined, the structure thus produced was a quadrilateral (*caturasra*) APBQ with its sides $AM=BM=AP=BP$, and AB and PQ its diagonals perpendicular to each other. If the two diagonals were of equal length, it was a square (*samcaturasra*), otherwise, a rhombus (*ubhayatah prauga*), half of which cut along a diagonal was an Isosceles triangle (*prauga*), such as APB or PBQ. Drawing other shapes, such as trapezia, using ropes and pegs were also possible.



Figure 2. Forming a rectangle by joining unit squares

By appending two or more unit-squares (units of any length) side-by-side, a rectangle (*dīrghacaturasra*) could be formed with one side longer than the other (Fig. 2), the area of which could be determined simply by counting the number of unit squares joined together. The 7 square *purusha* altar included seven squares each of area one square *purusha*. Conversely, a rectangle could be divided into unit squares the total number of which would be the area of the rectangle.

Similarly, a square consisted of multiple unit squares. When divided into smaller subunits, it yielded geometrical objects of fractional area. For example, a square with its side $1/2$, $1/3^{\text{rd}}$ or $1/4^{\text{th}}$ the length of a given measure (unit) was found to have an area $1/4^{\text{th}}$, $1/9^{\text{th}}$ and $1/16^{\text{th}}$ of the total area produced by the original measure (KS 3.8-10). The opposite of it was also found true: a square with its side twice or thrice or four-times the length of a given unit measured four-fold, nine-fold or sixteen-fold in area, respectively, of the original square with the measure as its side (KS 3.6). Thus, it was established that the area of a square increases or decreases based on the length of its

side (measuring cord) (KS 3.12), and it was found simply by counting the number of unit squares in a given square (KS 3.7).

Following this method of calculating the area of a square, an identity, what is now known as the Pythagoras theorem, was discovered by counting the numbers of unit squares inside the squares drawn on two sides of a rectangle and its diagonal. Notice, this observation was not in reference to the right-angled triangle. Similar observations led to the discovery of Pythagorean triples (3, 4, 5), (5, 12, 13), (7, 24, 25), (8, 15, 17) and (12, 35, 37). And on the basis of these observations, the general conclusion – “in a rectangle, the diagonal produces by itself an area, which its length and breadth produce separately (BS 1.48; KS 2.11)” – was reached by the sūtrakārs, inductively. They had no knowledge of the modern algebraic expression of the theorem $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$, where a and b are the two sides of a right-angle triangle and c its hypotenuse.

Here is another good example of their concrete, hands-on approach, instead of a theoretical one. As they tried measuring the length of the diagonal AB of the square APBQ (assuming AB=PQ in Fig. 1) using AM as the unit length (side of the square), they had to go through several steps of addition and subtraction of pieces of cord (BS 1.61; KS 2.13) to cover the length of AB. First, they stretched the cord AM along the diagonal AB, starting from the point A, the distance MB was left. To cover this gap, they added a third portion of the unit length to the unit AM itself ($1 + 1/3$), then they further added a fourth portion of $1/3^{\text{rd}}$ of length ($1 + 1/3 + 1/3.4$), and as this length slightly exceeded the actual length of the diagonal, they subtracted a 34^{th} part of $1/3.4^{\text{th}}$ length, thus covering the length AB, almost. Following these operations, the length of the diagonal found in unit (AM) lengths was $= 1 + 1/3 + 1/3.4 - 1/3.4.34$. When expressed in modern decimal notation, this number is equal to 1.414215, which is close to the value 1.4142136 of $\sqrt{2}$. But this closeness of values should not mislead us into believing that the sūtrakārs performed mathematical calculations by manipulating numbers and fractions or they knew of $\sqrt{2}$ as an irrational number. They reached the value stepwise through trial-and-error method – by adding and subtracting fractions of a unit length to cover the length of diagonal. Once the value was established empirically, it became a geometrical fact that the diagonal of a square is $\sqrt{2}$ times its side; and it was called a “doubler,” or *dvikarani*, for the square on it is twice the size of the original square (KS 2.12).

Thus, the way arithmetic was tied to bricks and stones and other concrete objects, geometry, based on altar construction, was also concrete and practice bound – using ropes, pegs and bamboo. Extending or reducing the length of a rope by a part of it to draw a circle or a square or other geometrical figures of a certain area is not the same as doing calculations using symbolic numerals. While the former is concrete, the latter is abstract. Since the Brahmi script appeared in the 3rd century BCE and developed thereafter, it is hard to conceive of the existence of any symbolic manipulation of numbers and fractions prior to that time.

Algebra

It is with this invention of writing and its development one sees a parallel growth of abstract mathematics in India. Aryabhata’s (late 5th century) Aryabhatiya is a testament of such growth in

early centuries. The second chapter of the book covers various topics including numbers, fractions, squares and cubes, square roots and cube roots, rule of three, interest calculation, geometry, trigonometry, arithmetic progression series, quadratic and indeterminate equations. While some of these topics are also mentioned in religious, non-mathematical Jain texts such as the *Sthananga Sutra* from around the turn of era, absence of any details in them renders it hard to conceive how these calculations were performed, especially when writing was still in its early stages. Even Arthashastra (3rd century BCE - 3rd century CE) fails to throw light on this matter. It simply mentions metrology – measures of time, length, weight, capacity – and salaries, taxes, tariffs, revenues, rations, etc. Knowledge of fractions is also visible in this text.

This is why the appearance of algebra in Aryabhata (AB) with no precedence of it in the previous centuries seems puzzling. The lack of direct evidence of it coming from outside the Indian subcontinent also adds to this puzzlement. Hence the questions – Did it develop in India? And how did it develop? Below is a presentation of its roots in concrete mathematics, practical geometry.

As noticed above, geometry was quite prominent in earlier periods. Although mathematicians in the classical period (400-1,600 CE) do not mention altar-making or Śulvasūtras, the knowledge of these Sutras lasted through later centuries even when altar-making was no longer in practice. Commentaries were written on these Sutras till as late as the 16th century, and some of them mention the new mathematical works (Ch. 2, Datta, 1932). Sarasvati Amma suggests that the later mathematicians used geometry as an aid to prove the algebraical results (Sarasvati Amma, 1999, p.220). However, considering the precedence of geometry over algebra in ancient India, the former may also have a role in the inception of the latter.

A path to algebra may be traced through the idea of fractions and equivalence of fractions. Concrete experiences with handling of bricks and ropes and their parts in altar-making led to the knowledge, for example, that one out of two equal parts of a brick (or rope) is the same as two out of four or four out of eight equal parts. This relationship between parts and whole and between numbers made the generalization (in modern symbols) $1/2 = 2/4 = 4/8 = \dots = a/b$ possible, where a and b could be any two numbers as long as b is twice as much as a.

The consequence of this observation is seen in the use of ‘the rule of three’ or ‘the rule of proportionality’ in solving many problems. Interestingly, Aryabhata mentions the rule of three and manipulation of fractions (ratios) next to each other (see AB 2.26, 27). He uses the rule to solve the gnomon and shadow problems (AB 2.15, 16) in which ratios of perpendicular to base in two similar right triangles are equated. Brahmagupta and Bhaskar II also use the rule for solving certain geometry problems. Before them, Vedanga Jyotish mentions the rule as well.

Essentially, the rule equates two ratios, such as $a/b = x/y$, and says that if three quantities (a, b, x) are known, then y, the fourth one, what is called the desired result or *icchāphala*, can be obtained from the relation. The structure of the rule is of the form: that if for quantity a, the result is b, then for quantity x, what will be the result? The symbol y that stands for the unknown quantity or the desired result, may be represented in the form of a simple linear equation with one unknown $y = (b/a).x = mx$, where m equals b/a. Similar rules of 5, 7, 9 and 11 were apparently derived from the rule of three (Datta and Singh, 2004) to solve more complex problems. These are algorithmic

methods, enumerating steps for how to solve practical problems such as calculation of interest on a loan, principal amount, period of loan, or profits or taxes, and so on. Instructions were provided for which quantities in a given problem to be multiplied together and what should be divided by what to find the answer.

Thus, through proportions, though they are now considered part of arithmetic, developed the method for computing unknown values from the known ones in linear equations. They provided a general means for solving multiple types of practical problems. In these solutions, however, there was no symbol used for unknown quantities. Further, it was an explicit quantity tied to a concrete something such as the loan amount or the length of a shadow. It was not a variable that required a symbol to represent an unknown quantity as in algebra.

Thus, while the notions of two characteristics of algebra – one, general solutions, and the other, finding the value of unknown from the known ones – had developed early on with proportions, the latter was still further away from algebra as it had no concept of equation. An algebraic expression, e.g., $ax^3 + bx^2 + cx + d = 0$ is a generalized form of cubic equation in which the letters a, b, c, d and x could be any number, where the first four letters represent constants or parameters, the values of which are given in a mathematical problem, and x is the unknown variable for which the equation has to be solved. Another characteristic of such expressions is that they have two sides - the left-hand side and the right-hand side that have to be kept equal, hence the equation. Any mathematical operation performed on one side with unknowns has to be performed on the other with known quantity in order to keep the equation balanced, as indicated by the equal (=) sign. Proportions, unlike in algebra, do not have two sides of an equation that are to be kept balanced.

An example might help draw the distinction between proportions (arithmetic) and algebra better. Let us consider the problem AB 2.25 in Aryabhata's which is as follows (Shukla & Sarma, 1976):

A certain amount of loaned money, say P, earned some interest (unknown) in a month. This interest was further loaned at the same rate for T months. The sum A of the original interest and the interest on the original interest is known. What was the original interest earned on P?

Assuming the original interest on P is x per month, and the interest on interest x for the same period of time is y, by applying the rule of three $P : x :: x : y$, one gets $P/x = x/y$. Therefore, $y = x^2/P$. Applying the proportionality rule again, i.e., $(1 : y :: T : ?)$ if the interest on x for one month is y, then for T months it is equal to $T.y = T(x^2/P) = (T/P).x^2$. If this interest amount were known, it would be possible to find the interest x by first dividing it by T and then taking the square root of yP ($x = \sqrt{yP}$), but instead, the problem gives the sum A (a mixture) of two interests – the original interest x plus the interest on interest $(T/P).x^2$.

So, $(T/P).x^2 + x = A \quad \dots (1)$

Aryabhata provides a formulaic solution to the problem without saying how he reached it:

“Multiply the interest on the principal plus the interest on that interest by the time and by the principal; (then) add the square of half the principal; (then) take the square root; (then) subtract half the principal; and (then) divide by the time: the result is the interest on the principal.”

In modern notations, the interest $x = 1/T[\sqrt{\{APT + (P/2)^2\}} - P/2]$, which may be computed following above instructions.

Brahmagupta (7th century) offers a general solution for quadratic equation (Colebrooke, 1817, p. 346), but it is Bhaskar II (12th century) who, in his BijaGanita, first provides the method for solving quadratic equation (Ibid, pp. 207-9). According to him: both sides of the equation – unknown quantities on one side and known on the other – should be multiplied by an assumed quantity, and some number is to be added on both sides so the unknown side may yield a square root. Equate it with the square root of the known quantity on the other side, and find the value of the unknown quantity. Let us solve equation 1 following the method Bhaskar quotes in 5.131 from the 8th century mathematician Sridhara (in modern notation):

Step 1: Multiply both sides of equation by a number equal to four times the coefficient (T/P) of x^2

$$4.(T/P)^2.x^2 + 4.(T/P).x = 4.(T/P).A$$

Step 2: Then add the square of the original coefficient, 1, of x on both sides

$$4.(T/P)^2.x^2 + 4.(T/P).x + 1 = 4.(T/P).A + 1$$

Simplify the equation by multiplying it with P^2 on both sides (not in Sridhar):

$$4T^2.x^2 + 4TP.x + P^2 = 4ATP + P^2$$

Therefore, $(2Tx + P)^2 = 4ATP + P^2$

Step 3: Extract the root [and equate]

$$2Tx + P = \sqrt{\{4ATP + P^2\}}$$

Hence, $x = (1/2T).[\sqrt{\{4ATP + P^2\}} - P] = 1/T.[\sqrt{\{ATP + (P/2)^2\}} - P/2] \dots(2)$

Which is exactly the solution Aryabhata provided (see above).

We do not know, however, if he followed this method independent of concrete problem. But if he did, then it reflects the knowledge of the algebraic identity $(X + Y)^2 = X^2 + 2XY + Y^2$. Notice the use of this identity in rewriting the expression $4T^2.x^2 + 4TP.x + P^2$ as $(2Tx + P)^2$ above. Although the solution in AB 2.25 does not reveal the knowledge of this identity, verse AB 2.23 does. It says: to subtract the sum of squares of two factors (X, Y) from the square of their sum and divide the difference by two to get the product of the two factors, i.e., $X.Y = 1/2[(X + Y)^2 - (X^2 + Y^2)]$, which is just another way of writing the abovementioned identity. With the knowledge of Śulvasūtras still around, it is not hard to believe that Aryabhata and maybe even his predecessors knew about the identity through geometry. If one draws a square of side (X + Y), one can clearly see the two squares X^2 and Y^2 in addition to two rectangles of area XY each within the square (see Fig. 3). Hence, if Aryabhata followed the procedure above – known as the method of completing the square – he must have used the identity. Indian mathematicians called this method “elimination of the middle term” or *Madhyamāharana*. The same method was used to solve the problem AB 2.24 where the values of two factors x and y are calculated from the given values of their difference ($x - y = a$) and their product ($x.y = b$) that yield a quadratic equation $x^2 - ax = b$.




Figure 3. Geometric representation of identity $(X + Y)^2 = X^2 + 2XY + Y^2$

The above scenario shows a possible origin of algebra in India rooted in arithmetic and geometry. Proportions, though different from algebra, were the precursors to it and instrumental in transitioning mathematical thinking from arithmetic and practical geometry to algebra. Before the mind shifted from concrete objects to abstract ones in algebra, proportions helped solve many problems. The *icchāphala* in the rules of 3 was a place holder for the concrete such as the cost of a commodity or the length of a shadow cast by a gnomon. But these rules were limited in the kinds of problems solvable by them. Methods to solve more complicated problems had to be invented. In this process, not only mathematics shifted gradually from concrete to abstract, the three characteristics of algebra – generality, unknown quantity, and equation – also emerged over time. This shift, however, had to depend on the knowledge of certain identities discovered in geometry.

While the notions of generality and unknown quantity are obvious from the examples discussed above from Aryabhatiya, the idea of an equation with two sides isn't clear. It was Bhaskar I (7th century) who first used the term *sami-karana* or *sama-karana* for equations in the sense of “making equal” in his commentary on Aryabhatiya. He also used the term *yāvat-tāvat* (‘as many as’ or ‘as much as’) or *yā* to represent an unknown quantity, the square of which was *yā varga* or *yā va*. Brahmagupta in CE 628 called unknown, *avyakta*, and absolute or fixed quantity, *rūpa*, in *Brāhmasphuṭa-siddhānta*. For more than one unknown he used the names of colors (Colebrooke, p. 348). Indian mathematics also lacked a symbol for equality in an equation. So, how Aryabhata set the equations with what kind of symbols for the known and unknown quantities is a mystery. But if allowance be made that all these problems, though important, are peripheral to the central concepts of generality, unknown quantity, and equation in algebra of which Aryabhata seems to have had the knowledge as presented above, then it may be said that he and his contemporaries were familiar with algebra.

Conclusion

Thus, similar to Babylonian mathematics that progressed from concrete to abstract stage, mathematics in the Indian subcontinent too started from the use of bricks and stones (arithmetic), and ropes and pegs in altar constructions (geometry) till it transitioned to algebra. Proportions, the

precursors to algebra, had their origin in the idea of ratio tied to the experience of parts of concrete objects. They were themselves used for solving concrete problems. The abstract notions of generality of solution, unknown quantity, and equation - the three characteristics of algebra developed during the march from proportions to algebra, seeking methods of solution free from concrete problems. The validity of these methods, however, remained tied to solving practical problems. Ancient texts gave ample examples to demonstrate their validity. This transition from concrete to abstract, however, would not have been possible without the invention of writing. Symbols and symbol manipulation are essential in algebra.

References

1. Barras, C., How did ancient humans learn to count?, *Nature*, v. 594, 3 Jun 2021
2. Clagett, M., Ancient Egyptian Science, *Ancient Egyptian Mathematics V3*, Am. Phil. Soc., 1999
3. Colebrooke, H.T., Algebra with Arithmetic and Mensuration of Brahmegeupta and Bhascara, London, 1817
4. Damerow, P., The Origins of Writing and Arithmetic, Ch. 6 in *The Globalization of Knowledge in History*, Max-Planck Inst. for the Hist. of Sci., 2012
5. Dani, S.G., Geometry in the Sūlvasūtras in *Studies in the History of Indian Mathematics*, (Ed. C.S. Seshadri) pp. 9-37, Hindustan Book Agency, 2010
6. Datta, B., The Science of the Sulba: A Study in Early Hindu Geometry, Univ. Calcutta, 1932
7. Datta, B. and Singh, A.N., History of Hindu Mathematics-Vol 1, Bhartiya Kala Prakashan, Delhi, 2004
8. Dikshit, S.B., Bhartiya Jyotish Sastra V1, Govt. India Press, 1969
9. Eggeling, J. (Tr.), The Satapatha-Brāhmana, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1882-97
10. Khadilkar, S.D. (Ed.), Katyayana Sulba Sutra, Vaidika Samsodhana Mandal, Poona, 1974
11. Marshack, A., The Roots of Civilization: The Cognitive Beginnings of Man's First Art, Symbol and Notation, Moyer Bell Ltd., 1991
12. Sarasvati Amma, T.A., Geometry in Ancient and Medieval India, Motilal Banarsidass Pbl., Pvt. Ltd., Delhi, 1999
13. Schmandt-Besserat, D., How Writing Came About, Univ. of Texas Press, 1996
14. Shukla, K.S. and Sarma, K.V., Aryabhata of Aryabhata, INSA, New Delhi, 1976
15. Thibaut, G., Sūlvasūtra of Baudhayana, The Pandit, 1875
16. Tilak, B. G., The Orion, Mrs. Radhabai Atmaram Sagoon, 1893