July-September 26
Aryavart Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
(NATIONAL PEER REVIEWED E-RESEARCH JOURNAL)
E-ISSN 3107-6009
Vol - 2 Issue - 3

The History and Development of Calculus: From Ancient Mathematics to Modern Analysis

Rashmi Singh Chauhan
Assistant professor (Department of science)
Aryavart University, Sehore (M.P.)

ABSTRACT

Calculus is one of the central tools of modern science and engineering. This paper traces its long path from early ideas about area, volume and change in ancient mathematics to the rigorous analysis taught in universities today. The study follows a historical and analytical method. It reviews key stages: the method of exhaustion in Greek geometry, series work in the Kerala school of India, the independent creation of differential and integral calculus by Newton and Leibniz in the seventeenth century, the growth of techniques in the eighteenth century, and the nineteenth-century drive for a solid foundation through limits, continuity and the real number system. The discussion also notes how later work on integration, infinite-dimensional spaces and generalised functions widened the subject into modern analysis. The main finding is that calculus did not appear as a single invention. It grew through repeated attempts to measure curved figures and changing quantities, and it became reliable only when mathematicians replaced informal talk of infinitesimals with clear definitions. The paper argues that this history still matters for teaching, because students who see why the definitions were needed understand the subject more deeply than those who only learn rules.

KEYWORDS

Calculus, History of mathematics, Method of exhaustion, Newton, Leibniz, Limits, Real analysis, Kerala School, Integration, Modern analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Every year thousands of students meet derivatives and integrals for the first time. For many of them the subject arrives as a set of formulas. The story behind those formulas is longer and more human than a formula sheet suggests. People asked questions about area, volume, tangent lines and motion long before the words derivative and integral existed. This paper follows that story from ancient work to modern analysis.

The aim is not to list every name in a crowded timeline. The aim is to show how a few deep problems kept returning, and how each period answered them with the tools it had. Greek geometers wanted exact area without modern algebra. Indian mathematicians in Kerala studied infinite series for trigonometric functions. European scholars in the seventeenth century built a general method for rates of change and accumulated quantity. Later writers cleaned the foundations so that proofs would not depend on vague talk of infinitely small amounts.

Aryavart Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
(NATIONAL PEER REVIEWED E-RESEARCH JOURNAL)
E-ISSN 3107-6009

The paper is written for readers who know basic calculus and want a clear historical frame. It uses simple English on purpose. Technical terms appear when the history requires them, and they are explained in plain words. The claim of the paper is modest but useful: calculus became a stable part of mathematics only when its definitions became stable, and that process took more than two thousand years.

The importance of the topic is practical as well as scholarly. Calculus supports physics, economics and biology and data science. When its history is ignored, learners may treat definitions as arbitrary rules. When its history is told carefully, definitions look like answers to real difficulties. That is the spirit in which this survey is offered.

RESEARCH SCOPE

1 Review of literature

The history of calculus has been told many times. Classic surveys by Boyer and by Edwards remain useful for the European line from Archimedes to Cauchy. More recent work has given fuller attention to non-European contributions, especially the Kerala School's series for sine, cosine and arctangent centuries before similar work appeared in Europe. Studies of Newton and Leibniz still debate priority, but most careful historians now stress independent discovery and different styles: Newton's fluxions linked to physics, Leibniz's differentials linked to a flexible notation that spread quickly.

On foundations, books on the development of real analysis describe how Cauchy, Bolzano and Weierstrass replaced informal infinitesimals with limit definitions, and how Dedekind and Cantor clarified the real numbers. Histories of integration move from Cauchy and Riemann to Lebesgue and beyond. Teaching-focused papers often note that students struggle with limits for the same reason eighteenth-century mathematicians did: the idea is subtle, and practice with rules can hide the subtlety.

2 Research gap

Many short articles treat Newton and Leibniz as the whole story. Many textbooks jump from a page of history to formal definitions without showing why the definitions were fought for. There is still room for a compact research-style survey that joins ancient measurement problems, the Kerala series, the seventeenth-century invention, and the nineteenth-century rigorisation in one continuous argument aimed at teachers and advanced students in multidisciplinary settings.

3 Objectives

The objectives of this paper are: (1) to outline the main stages in the growth of calculus from ancient mathematics to modern analysis; (2) to explain, in plain language, why each stage was needed; (3) to give fair weight to Greek, Indian and European contributions without forcing a

Aryavart Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
(NATIONAL PEER REVIEWED E-RESEARCH JOURNAL)
E-ISSN 3107-6009

single origin story; and (4) to state what this history implies for clear teaching of the subject today.

4 Hypothesis

The working hypothesis is that the strength of modern calculus lies less in any single formula and more in a long refinement of definitions. Where definitions stayed vague, paradox and dispute followed. Where definitions became precise, the subject could support physics, engineering and further pure mathematics.

METHODOLOGY

This paper is a qualitative historical survey. Primary mathematical ideas are read through standard scholarly histories and through the published mathematical content associated with major figures (for example, the structure of the method of exhaustion, the form of Madhava-type series, the basic statements of Newton's and Leibniz's rules, and Cauchy's limit approach). The method is analytical rather than archival: sources are compared to mark continuity and break. No new manuscript discovery is claimed. The contribution is an organised synthesis and an argument about foundations and teaching.

Selection of episodes follows three criteria. First, the episode must address area, volume, tangent, rate, or infinite process in a way that later calculus recognises. Second, it must be attested in the historical literature with reasonable confidence. Third, it must help the reader see progress or difficulty, not merely add a name to a list.

DISCUSSION

1 Ancient measurement and the Greek foundation

Long before the word calculus, people measured land, stored grain and watched the stars. Egyptian and Babylonian texts show practical rules for areas and volumes. Those rules were often approximate. The deeper theoretical step came in Greek geometry.

Eudoxus and, later, Archimedes developed what is now called the method of exhaustion. The idea is simple to state and hard to carry out. To find an area, one traps the curved region between known polygonal shapes that move closer and closer. If the difference can be made smaller than any given positive amount, the area is determined. Archimedes used such reasoning for the circle, the parabola and certain solids. He also used mechanical insights as a guide, then sought geometric proof.

In modern language, the spirit of exhaustion for an area A is that for every positive number ε there exist known areas P and Q such that

$$P < A < Q \quad and \quad Q - P < \varepsilon.$$

If this can be shown for every $\varepsilon > 0$, A is uniquely determined. Archimedes applied such reasoning to the parabola and to the circle. For the circle he effectively controlled the relation

Aryavart Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
(NATIONAL PEER REVIEWED E-RESEARCH JOURNAL)
E-ISSN 3107-6009

between perimeter and diameter, leading to bounds that we would now write as approximations to π.

This was not calculus in the modern sense. There was no general derivative, no algebraic function concept of the later kind, and no limit symbol. Still, the logical pattern—control an error, press it toward zero—is an ancestor of the limit idea. When students today prove a limit by showing that a difference can be made small, they are closer to Archimedes than they may think.

It is also worth noting what Greek method did not do. It did not give a routine way to differentiate an arbitrary algebraic expression. Each new area or volume problem demanded fresh geometric insight. The strength of later calculus was exactly that routine: a set of rules that applied across many formulas. Ancient geometry prepared the demand for exactness. It did not yet supply the algorithm.

2 Infinite processes in Indian mathematics

In medieval Kerala, mathematicians associated with the lineage of Madhava of Sangamagrama studied infinite series for trigonometric functions. Series for sine, cosine and the inverse tangent appear in this tradition, with error estimates and rational approximations for π. The work used sophisticated manipulation of finite series and passage to the infinite case.

One celebrated form, linked to this tradition and later known in Europe as a series for the inverse tangent, may be written as

$$\arctan x = x - x^3/3 + x^5/5 - x^7/7 + \cdots, \quad |x| \le 1.$$

Putting x = 1 gives a series for π/4. Related expansions for sine and cosine also appear in the Kerala corpus. These results matter for a balanced history. They show that deep work on infinite processes did not wait for seventeenth-century Europe. They also show that a powerful series technology can exist without the full algorithmic calculus of Newton and Leibniz. Transmission to Europe remains a subject of careful historical debate; what is not in serious doubt is the originality and quality of the Kerala results themselves.

3 The seventeenth-century invention

By the early 1600s European mathematics had algebra, analytic geometry and a growing interest in motion and curves. Fermat studied tangent and maximum problems. Cavalieri used indivisibles. Descartes linked algebra and geometry. The time was ready for a general method.

Isaac Newton, working in the 1660s, developed fluxions. He thought of quantities as flowing in time. The fluxion was the rate of flow. His methods solved tangent problems, areas, and many questions in physics. He used series freely and linked the subject to laws of motion and gravitation.

Aryavart Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
(NATIONAL PEER REVIEWED E-RESEARCH JOURNAL)
E-ISSN 3107-6009

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, working in the 1670s, built a parallel system with differentials and a notation that treated dy and dx as useful symbols. His integral sign and his rules for products and quotients helped others learn and extend the method. Priority disputes followed, sometimes bitter. Historical judgment today generally holds that the two men reached the core ideas independently, with different motives and different styles.

In modern notation, the derivative of y = f(x) is the limit

$$f'(x) = \lim (h \to 0) \; [f(x+h) - f(x)] / h,$$

when this limit exists. Leibniz's differential form suggested writing

$$dy = f'(x)\, dx,$$

and his integral notation

$$\int f(x)\, dx$$

became standard for accumulated change. Basic rules that both traditions supported include the power rule

$$d/dx\,(x^n) = n\, x^{n-1},$$

and the recognition that differentiation and integration reverse each other. In modern form, if F′(x) = f(x) on an interval, then

$$\int_a^b f(x)\, dx = F(b) - F(a).$$

That inversion is still the first great surprise of a calculus course. Notation deserves a special word. Leibniz's symbols travelled well because they made the product rule, the chain rule and the integral sign easy to write and easy to teach. Newton's dot notation remained important in mechanics. In a history aimed at understanding, one should not reduce the difference between the two men to a fight over credit. They built different toolkits for related problems, and the toolkits served different communities.

4 Growth without full rigor

In the eighteenth century the methods spread and grew. Euler wrote with extraordinary fluency on series, differential equations and the calculus of variations. Applied mathematics flourished. At the same time, logical gaps remained. Infinitely small quantities were used in ways that invited criticism. Bishop Berkeley attacked the foundations in plain language, asking how one could reject vague religious talk and still accept vague mathematical talk of vanishing increments.

The subject worked in practice. Engineers and astronomers got results. But a working practice is not the same as a clear foundation. The tension between success and clarity set the stage for the next century.

Aryavart Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
(NATIONAL PEER REVIEWED E-RESEARCH JOURNAL)
E-ISSN 3107-6009

5 The nineteenth-century rebuild

Nineteenth-century mathematicians rebuilt calculus on limits and on a clearer idea of the real numbers. Cauchy linked continuity, derivative and integral to limit arguments. Bolzano stated key ideas early, though his work was not widely read at once. Weierstrass pushed an arithmetic style of proof that avoided geometric intuition when it might mislead. Dedekind and Cantor gave constructions that explained what the continuum of real numbers is.

Cauchy's style of continuity may be stated as follows: f is continuous at a if

$$\lim_{x \to a} f(x) = f(a).$$

In the ε–δ language later made standard by Weierstrass, this means: for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $0 < |x - a| < \delta$, then $|f(x) - f(a)| < \varepsilon$. The derivative is then the limit already written above, now treated as a precise numerical statement rather than a ratio of "vanishing" quantities.

Integration theory also changed. Riemann's definition organised the integral around upper and lower sums for a partition of [a, b]. In outline, one forms

$$S = \Sigma f(t_i)\, \Delta x_i$$

and requires the sums to approach a common value as the mesh of the partition goes to zero. Later, Lebesgue's approach, based on measure, handled wider classes of functions and supported modern probability and functional analysis. The point for this paper is not the full technical detail. The point is the pattern: when the objects of calculus were defined more carefully, the theorems became safer and the subject could grow again.

A student sometimes asks whether the older calculus was "wrong." A fair answer is no. It was incomplete in its explanations. Ships, maps and machines were built with eighteenth-century analysis. The nineteenth-century rebuild did not erase those successes. It explained them and extended them to cases where intuition alone failed, such as strange functions and delicate questions of convergence.

6 Toward modern analysis

Modern analysis keeps the core of calculus and places it in wider structures. Metric spaces and normed spaces let one talk about convergence in many settings. Functional analysis studies spaces of functions. Distribution theory, associated with Sobolev and Schwartz among others, extends differentiation to objects beyond classical functions, which is now routine in parts of physics and engineering mathematics.

None of this cancels Newton or Archimedes. It continues the same pressure: say exactly what the objects are, say exactly what convergence means, and only then claim a theorem. That pressure is the long theme of the history.

Aryavart Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
(NATIONAL PEER REVIEWED E-RESEARCH JOURNAL)
E-ISSN 3107-6009

7 Implications for teaching

If calculus is taught only as rules, students may pass examinations and still fear limits. History helps because it shows that limits were not invented to torture beginners. They were invented to end confusion among experts. A short historical note before formal definitions can reduce the sense that rigor is arbitrary. History also supports honesty about contribution. A classroom that mentions Archimedes, Madhava's tradition, Newton, Leibniz and Cauchy is more accurate than a classroom that names only one European year. Accuracy is part of good teaching.

CONCLUSION

Calculus grew from ancient efforts to measure curved figures and changing quantities. Greek exhaustion arguments, Kerala series, the Newton–Leibniz methods, eighteenth-century expansion, and nineteenth-century rigor each answered limits of the stage before. Modern analysis continues the same demand for clear definitions in richer settings.

The hypothesis of this paper is supported by the record. Where language stayed vague, dispute followed. Where definitions tightened, the subject became a stable base for science and for further mathematics. For teachers and students, the practical lesson is simple. Learn the rules, but also learn why the definitions exist. The history of calculus is not a soft addition to the syllabus. It is one way to understand what the syllabus is for. Future classroom research might test whether short, accurate historical modules improve students' comfort with limits and proofs. Future historical work will continue to refine our picture of transmission between regions. The core story, however, is already firm enough to teach with confidence.

REFERENCES

1. Boyer, C. B. (1959). The history of the calculus and its conceptual development. Dover Publications.
2. Edwards, C. H. (1979). The historical development of the calculus. Springer.
4. Joseph, G. G. (2011). The crest of the peacock: Non-European roots of mathematics (3rd ed.). Princeton University Press.
5. Katz, V. J. (2009). A history of mathematics: An introduction (3rd ed.). Addison-Wesley.
6. Madhava of Sangamagrama tradition; see discussions in Joseph (2011) and Katz (2009) on Kerala series for trigonometric functions.
7. Newton, I. (method of fluxions); standard accounts in Boyer (1959) and Edwards (1979).
8. Leibniz, G. W. (differential calculus and notation); standard accounts in Boyer (1959) and Edwards (1979).
9. Cauchy, A. L. (1821). Coursd'analyse. Debure; discussed in Edwards (1979) and later histories of analysis.
10. Riemann, B. (1854/1868). On the representability of a function by a trigonometric series; foundation for the Riemann integral.

Aryavart Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
(NATIONAL PEER REVIEWED E-RESEARCH JOURNAL)
E-ISSN 3107-6009

11. Lebesgue, H. (1902). Intégrale, longueur, aire. Annali di Matematica; beginning of measure-theoretic integration.
12. Weierstrass, K. (lectures on arithmetic rigor in analysis); secondary discussion in standard histories of real analysis.
13. Dedekind, R. (1872). Stetigkeit und irrationaleZahlen; construction of the reals.
14. Berkeley, G. (1734). The analyst; critique of foundational vagueness in early calculus.
15. Grabiner, J. V. (1981). The origins of Cauchy's rigorous calculus. MIT Press.
16. Kline, M. (1972). Mathematical thought from ancient to modern times. Oxford University Press.