

An Historical Note: Euler's Königsberg Letters

Horst Sachs
Michael Stiebitz
Robin J. Wilson

TECHNISCHE HOCHSCHULE ILMENAU
6300 ILMENAU, DDR
AND THE OPEN UNIVERSITY
MILTON KEYNES, ENGLAND

ABSTRACT

In this paper we discuss three little known letters on the Königsberg bridges problem. These letters indicate more clearly Euler's attitude to the problem and to his solution of it.

1. INTRODUCTION

On August 26, 1735, Leonhard Euler presented a paper on the Königsberg bridges problem to the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg (now Leningrad). In the following year he wrote up his solution in his celebrated paper *Solutio problematis ad geometriam situs pertinentis* (The solution of a problem relating to the geometry of position) [2]. In this paper Euler formulated necessary and sufficient conditions under which, given any arrangement of islands and bridges, one can find a connected trail that crosses each bridge exactly once. Euler discussed, but did not prove, the sufficiency of his conditions; a valid proof of sufficiency was not published until 1873, by Carl Hierholzer [4]. For further information about the history of the Königsberg bridges problem, see [1] or [8].

We have recently tried to find out how Euler became aware of the Königsberg problem and why it intrigued him. Although we have been unable to discover the full story, we have found some letters from Euler's correspondence that shed some light on his involvement with it.

A persistent theme running through the correspondence is Euler's preoccupation with the geometry of position. In 1679 Leibniz [5, pp. 18–19] had declared

I am not content with algebra, in that it yields neither the shortest proofs nor the most beautiful constructions of geometry. In view of this, I consider that we need yet another kind of analysis, geometric or linear, which deals directly with position, as algebra deals with magnitude . . .

Although Leibniz was probably anticipating vector analysis when he wrote this, it was widely interpreted as referring to topics we now consider “topological”. In particular, Euler and others regarded the Königsberg problem as a problem in *geometria situs*. Further information on the various interpretations that have been ascribed to this term can be found in [6] or [7].

2. EHLER’S LETTER TO EULER

Carl Leonhard Gottlieb Ehler was mayor of Danzig, a friend of Euler, and a lover of mathematics. From 1735 to 1742 he corresponded with Euler in St. Petersburg [3, pp. 282–387], acting as an intermediary between Euler and Heinrich Kühn (1690–1769), professor of mathematics at the academic gymnasium in Danzig. Via Ehler, Kühn communicated with Euler about the Königsberg problem. In a letter dated March 9, 1736, Ehler wrote to Euler (see Figs. 1 and 2):

You would render to me and our friend Kühn a most valuable service, putting us greatly in your debt, most learned Sir, if you would send us the solution, which you know well, to the problem of the seven Königsberg bridges, together with a proof. It would prove to be an outstanding example of the calculus of position [*Calculi Situs*], worthy of your great genius. I have added a sketch of the said bridges . . .

It emerges from this letter that Ehler and Euler had already exchanged ideas on the Königsberg problem, but we have been unable to locate any earlier references.

37 05
*Rem et mihi et Kühnio nostro praestares gratias
 amam, omni officiorum genere deprecandam, Vir es
 ditissime, si Solutionem Problematis Tibi satis an
 de conjunctione 7 pontium Regionontanarum,
 cum Demonstratione transmitters velles. Egregius
 horum foret Calculi Situs specimen, ingenio Tuos
 quissimum. Adjeci Schema situs dictorum pontium*

FIGURE 1

scribing his solution, but demonstrating (as in his paper) only the necessity of the conditions and not their sufficiency. He introduced his ideas on the problem as follows (see Fig. 3):

A problem was proposed to me about an island in the city of Königsberg, surrounded by a river spanned by seven bridges, and I was asked whether someone could traverse the separate bridges in a connected walk in such a way that each bridge is crossed only once. I was informed that hitherto no-one had demonstrated the possibility of doing this, or shown that it is impossible. This question is so banal, but seemed to me worthy of attention in that neither geometry, nor algebra, nor even the art of counting [ars combinatoria] was sufficient to solve it. In view of this, it occurred to me to wonder whether it belonged to the geometry of position [geometria situs], which Leibniz had once so much longed for. And so, after some deliberation, I obtained a simple, yet completely established, rule with whose help one can immediately decide for all examples of this kind, with any number of bridges in any arrangement, whether such a round trip is possible, or not . . .

4. EULER'S LETTER TO EHLER

On April 3, 1736, Euler replied to Ehler's letter of March 9. The following extract is interesting in that it reveals much more clearly his attitude toward the Königsberg problem (see Fig. 4):

Thus you see, most noble Sir, how this type of solution bears little relationship to mathematics, and I do not understand why you expect a mathematician to produce it, rather than anyone else, for the solution is based on reason alone, and its discovery does not depend on any mathematical principle. Because of this, I do not know why even questions which bear so little relationship to mathematics are solved more quickly by mathematicians than by others. In the meantime, most noble Sir, you have assigned this question to the geometry of position, but I am ignorant as to what this new discipline involves, and as to which types of problem Leibniz and Wolff expected to see expressed in this way . . .

5. EULER'S 1736 PAPER

In spite of the above remarks, Euler considered the problem important enough to write a paper on it. This was his celebrated 1736 paper, mentioned in the introduction. In this work he explicitly ascribed the Königsberg problem to the geometry of position, as follows:

1. In addition to that branch of geometry which is concerned with distances, and which has always received the greatest attention, there is another branch, hitherto almost unknown, which Leibniz first mentioned, calling it the *geometry of position*. This branch is concerned only with the determination of position and its properties; it does not involve distances, nor calculations made with them. It has not yet been satisfactorily determined what kinds of problem are relevant to this geometry of position, or what methods should be used in solving them. Hence, when a problem was recently mentioned which seemed geometrical but was so constructed that it did not require the measurement of distances, nor did calculation help at all, I had no doubt that it was concerned

Vides ergo Vir Amplissime solutionem
 hanc ita esse comparatam ut viz
 ad marheleū pertinere videatur, neq[ue]
 ego reprehensio circa potius a
 Mathematico fit ea, rectanda quam
 a quocvis alio homine, scia enim ra-
 tione nititur ista solutio nec ulla
 marheleū propriis principis ad eam
 invenendam opus fuit. Ne hoc igitur
 quomodo fit ut q[ui]s s[er]iorum etiam
 ad marheleū minime pertinet, citius
 a mathematicis obiantur quam ab aliis.
 Scrum interim hinc quaestioni concedis
 Vir Amplissime in Geometria situs, de qua
 autem nova disciplina fateor me
 ignorare cuiusmodi problemata ad
 eam referenda velint Leibnitiū et
 Wolffius? Deo iurur te si me ido-
 neum iudicas in hac nova disciplina
 quicquam praestandi ut mihi aliquot
 definita problemata eo spectantia
 proponere velis, quo distinctius
 perspicere queam curd praecise de-
 sideretur.

FIGURE 4

derstood it, represented a significant mathematical discipline. Against this, it is worth noting that when, in 1750, he discovered his famous *polyhedral formula*

$$(\text{vertices}) + (\text{faces}) = (\text{edges}) + 2,$$

he seems not to have ascribed it to the geometry of position, even though later authors were to do so.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to express our grateful thanks to the following: Prof. K. -R. Biermann (Berlin) for his energetic support; J. Apel (Ilmenau) and A. S. Hollis (Oxford) for help and advice on the Latin translations; the Archive Collection of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in Leningrad for kindly placing at our disposal reproductions of the letters F.1, op.3, d.21, L.35–37 ob; F.1, op.3, d.22, L.33–41 ob; and F.136, op.2, d.3, L.74–75.

References

- [1] N. L. Biggs, E. K. Lloyd, and R. J. Wilson, *Graph Theory 1736–1936*. Clarendon Press, Oxford (1976) [paperback version, Oxford, 1986].
- [2] L. Euler, Solutio problematis ad geometriam situs pertinentis. *Commentarii Academiae Scientiarum Imperialis Petropolitanae* **8** (1736) 128–140.
- [3] L. Euler, *Pis'ma k učenyim*, Izd. Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moscow–Leningrad (1963).
- [4] C. Hierholzer, Über die Möglichkeit, einen Linienzug ohne Wiederholung und ohne Unterbrechnung zu umfahren. *Math. Ann.* **6** (1873) 30–32.
- [5] G. W. Leibniz, *Mathematische Schriften (1) Vol. 2*, Berlin (1850).
- [6] J. C. Pont, *La Topologie Algébrique des Origines à Poincaré*. Bibl. de Philos. Contemp., Presses Universitaires de France, Paris (1974).
- [7] R. J. Wilson, Analysis situs. *Graph Theory and Its Applications to Algorithms and Computer Science*. John Wiley & Sons, New York (1985).
- [8] R. J. Wilson, An Eulerian trail through Königsberg. *J. Graph Theory* **10** (1986) 265–275.