

TELEPHONE No 768.

BARRMORE,
LADY MARGARET ROAD,
CAMBRIDGE.

Wednesday Sept 20th

Dear Bertie

I am awfully
sorry to have kept the
proofs in this unconscionable
way. Every day I thought
that I could get a little
time. But this wretched
Astronomy (interesting enough
in itself) has taken
all my time - including

the 'reducing' of the derivation,
so that I have never been
fresh enough to follow the
reasoning. This relation-
arithmetic is too complicated
to be corrected by eye, and
wants a fresh brain to
manage the reasoning -
As usual the notation
(eg *182) struck me
as beautiful. You have
surpassed yourself -

I am here till Friday (inclusive),
then on Saturday go to Lockenidge, and
on Monday return to Carlyle Square.
Please send me Broad's dissertation,
I shall like to tackle it -
There has been no time to put anything
on paper about Time and Space -

Besides some necessary
mass are in Town.

The thing to do is to have
a section on Point-Formation,
starting with a number
on the class of relations
[rel(pt)] - really 'whole
& part' relations] from
which the characteristic
relations of points to objects
can be derived -

Then apply the theory in
subsequent numbers

BERTRAND RUSSELL

ARCHIVES

TELEPHONE No 768.

BARRMORE,
LADY MARGARET ROAD,
CAMBRIDGE.

to Time and Space. As far
as I can ~~cor~~ recollect the propy
of the bus in London, we
must have

$$R \ell(\mu) = \hat{R} \{ R^2 \subset R. \}$$

$$R \dot{\imath} R \subset J:$$

$$J! \vec{R}^x \cap \vec{R}^y. \vec{R}^x \cap \vec{R}^y$$
$$[Jx]. z \in R \cap R^y. \vec{R}^x \cap \vec{R}^y \subset R^z \}$$

Then from the fundamental
relations which ^{are} to give
the Time-order.

Space-order we cook
up relations which belong
to $Rel(pt)$ - anyhow the
Kfs are such as to make them
belong to $Rel(pt)$ -

The entities forming the
fields of the time and
Space relations are the
same and have extension
both in time and in space.

The definition of simultaneity
is to have space-relations.
Of course recording space

relations between non-simultaneous objects
can be looked up later. Also time-
relations directly only hold between
parts of the same object [e.g. parts
of me]. Secondary time relations between
you and me arise *via* simultaneity.
The essential reason why time cannot
rearrange is that objects are different.
i.e. the part of me during 1900 is

different from the
 part of me during 1910,
 so not. and this difference
 is unaltered by similarity
 of circumstances.

Note that language is a very
 sanction this view. It
 talks of 'my life' during
 1900 and 'my life' during
 1910. But there is not
 one thing 'my life' and
 another thing 'me'. Thus
 my life during 1900 is an
 object which is part of the
 complete me. ^{2nd diff.} H. W.