

Re: Scott and George's Teaching Thread

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2007-08/msg00697.html>

- *From:* Scott <ToaTerra@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 27 Aug 2007 20:34:05 -0000
-

On Aug 23, 2:43 pm, george <gree...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

No, we don't. Definitions ARE NOT axioms, although some axioms should be thought of as definitions. It ABSOLUTELY WILL HELP your understanding HERE, at the BEGINNING, to treat Def/Thm/Ax as a trichotomy. "Is this a Def, a Thm, or an Ax?" is a question that will SPARE you confusion! ASK IT FREQUENTLY!
Subset as presented here is a Def AND NOT an Ax.

Okay, so e is the only predicate in set theory.

A definition is like a macro, its just a syntactical re-arrangement of symbols whose overall meaning does not change. So are $\&$, $|$, \sim , \rightarrow , and \leftrightarrow macros for predicates of FOL; ie, $\&$ is a macro for AND(t_1, t_2), etc.?

The notation " $U c V =df Ax[xeU \rightarrow xeV]$ " is a notation used strictly for readability, which means everywhere I see " UcV " I should replace with " $Ax[xeU \rightarrow xeV]$ "; eg, $UcVcW$ is equivalent to $Ax[xeU \rightarrow xeV \rightarrow xeW]$. Correct?