

Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-05/msg00254.html>

- From: "george" <greeneg@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - Date: 21 May 2005 13:07:38 -0700
-

HERC777 wrote:

> A set is a list with no special meaning given to the ordering.

Not in modern math it isn't.

The way it's usually done around here,
set is the PRIOR simpler concept.

Besides, you can't say what you mean by
"special meaning". Every list has the ordering it
has. If it had a different ordering it would be a
different list.

> Any set that cannot have the elements line
> up in a list is illegal.

SEZ WHO?

Who appointed You the lawgiver?

That is just ridiculous.

.

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ ***Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians***

◇ From: The Ghost In The Machine

- ◆ ***Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians***

◇ From: HERC777

- Prev by Date: ***Re: a question on infinite models***
- Next by Date: ***Re: a question on infinite models***
- Previous by thread: ***UCLA Logic Colloquium, May 27***
- Next by thread: ***Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians***
- Index(es):

Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians

◆ *Date*

◆ *Thread*