

# Re: Finest partition – exercise in Suppes's book

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-11/msg00442.html>

---

- *From:* "MoeBlee" <jazzmobe@xxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 20 Nov 2005 22:35:27 -0800
- 

William Elliot wrote:

> I wasn't. I skipped the proof giving a direct definition of what  
> ever it was that's the now forgotten topic of discussion as it  
> wasn't included in the subthread you started. So I don't see  
> what the hell-a-boo is about, as a direct definition sufficed,  
> did it not?

Okay. You were talking about the definition still. I thought your comment had moved on from the definition to the proof. I have no questions about the definition, and my altering it was merely incidental. I was asking about the author's statement that the proof is difficult. It's no big deal anyway.

Thanks,

MoeBlee

---

• *References:*

- ◆ ***Finest partition – exercise in Suppes's book***  
◇ *From:* MoeBlee
  - ◆ ***Re: Finest partition – exercise in Suppes's book***  
◇ *From:* William Elliot
  - ◆ ***Re: Finest partition – exercise in Suppes's book***  
◇ *From:* MoeBlee
  - ◆ ***Re: Finest partition – exercise in Suppes's book***  
◇ *From:* William Elliot
  - ◆ ***Re: Finest partition – exercise in Suppes's book***  
◇ *From:* MoeBlee
  - ◆ ***Re: Finest partition – exercise in Suppes's book***  
◇ *From:* William Elliot
- 
- Prev by Date: ***Re: tedious sledding re set existence in FOL***
  - Next by Date: ***Re: What is the 1st order formal system known as PA?***
  - Previous by thread: ***Re: Finest partition – exercise in Suppes's book***
  - Next by thread: ***Re: Finest partition – exercise in Suppes's book***

Re: Finest partition – exercise in Suppes's book

- Index(es):

- ◆ *Date*

- ◆ *Thread*