

## Re: The extent of the mistake

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-12/1177.html>

---

**From:** |-|erc (h\_at\_r.c)

**Date:** 12/13/04

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 2004 00:49:43 +1000

"Barb Knox" <see@sig.below> wrote in  
> *poopdeville@gmail.com* wrote:  
>  
> > *John Jones* wrote:  
> > > *Here I present a short list of some of the mistakes that riddle logic*  
> > > *and arithmetic.*  
> > >  
> > > *1. A list of numbers is not a list of numbers, but a list of*  
> > > *numerals.*  
> > > *Succession, represented by [1,2,3,4..] is not a defining property of*  
> > > *number.*  
> > > *2. A set of numbers is not a set. This is because a number is a*  
> > > *number*  
> > > *in its application and not outside it. It is also the case that*  
> > > *numbers are not transferable between applications.*  
> >  
> > *I'm sure you're just trying to be cute here, but the numeral's referent*  
> > *is fixed to the number. So, sequence of numerals 1,2,3... refers to a*  
> > *sequence of numbers -- the obvious ones.*  
> >  
> > > *3. The largest number is the number you count to. The count of three*  
> > > *is the largest number, unless I count to four. It is not sufficient*  
> > > *to say five is the largest number because if five is merely stated*  
> > > *and not counted, then five is a numeral. Again, numbers are not*  
> > > *transferable between applications.*  
> >  
> > *Gibberish.*  
> >  
> > > *4. There is no infinite number. Number is defined by a limit of an*  
> > > *operation, so no limit means no number.*  
> >  
> > *More gibberish. What the hell is "a limit of an operation" supposed to*  
> > *mean?*  
> >  
> > > *5. A proposition of logic presents no meaning but assumes one. The*  
> > > *meaning of a proposition of logic comes from placing the proposition*  
> > > *in a particular case. The part*