

Re: Zenkin's paper on Cantor (reply of Dr. Zenkin)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-11/3043.html>

From: Shmuel (Seymour J.) Metz (*spamtrap_at_library.lspace.org.invalid*)

Date: 11/15/04

Date: Mon, 15 Nov 2004 03:25:25 -0500

In <320e992a.0411140136.75b1a6fe@posting.google.com>, on 11/14/2004 at 01:36 AM, examachine@gmail.com (Eray Ozkural exa) said:

>*If you understand the terms, it can be mathematics.*

The inability to formulate a definition usually indicates that you don't understand the terms. Definitions in Mathematics are omitted only when they are commonly agreed upon, and even then it is customary to set forth the nomenclature used to avoid ambiguity. Using a nonstandard term without a definition is a sign of sloppy thinking and is a red flag.

>*While the truth of Cantor's theorem follows from ZFC in a finite number of steps (this is easily seen!), I must admit that I cannot readily observe how Cantor's diagonal *proof* terminates in a finite number of steps.*

A proof is not an automaton. A proof is not an algorithm. A proof is a series of applications of rules of inference. It doesn't start and stop, it just is. Every step lies there for your examination.

--

Shmuel (Seymour J.) Metz, SysProg and JOAT <<http://patriot.net/~shmuel>>
Unsolicited bulk E-mail subject to legal action. I reserve the right to publicly post or ridicule any abusive E-mail. Reply to domain Patriot dot net user shmuel+news to contact me. Do not reply to spamtrap@library.lspace.org