

# Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2005-03/2024.html>

---

**From:** aeo6 (aeo6\_at\_cornell.edu)

**Date:** 03/17/05

Date: Thu, 17 Mar 2005 14:38:49 -0500

Daryl McCullough said:

> *Tony says...*

>>

>> *Daryl McCullough said:*

>

>> *Are you saying that if I write down*

>>>

>>> *3 1 4*

>>>

>>> *that suddenly 3 has lost its meaning? \*I\* still remember what it*

>>> *means, even if you don't. With a little practice, you can learn*

>>> *to recite your telephone number, or the digits of pi, even when*

>>> *the digits are out of order. The digits don't lose their meaning.*

>>

>> *If you are saying 3 comes before 1, which immediately precedes 4 in a number*

>> *system, then you are changing the meaning of the numerals.*

>

> *Who said anything about a number system? I am talking about orderings*

> *of the natural number system. Sometimes, we write 3 before 1; for example,*

> *when we are writing out the decimal expansion of pi. That doesn't mean*

> *that 3 has lost its meaning.*

>

> --

> *Daryl McCullough*

> *Ithaca, NY*

>

>

That is entirely unrelated to the reordering of the number system that I was cautioning against. The use of digits to form numbers is a matter of a digital system for expressing numbers as numerals. If you write 3.1415, that's a number between 3.1 and 3.2. Do you think I am saying that all 1's should come before all 2's? I have never made any such stupid assertion. My statement was specifically in the context of cardinality and concerning arbitrary reorderings of the number system in general to achieve a mapping function. And people accuse me of being confused.....

--

Smiles,

Tony