

## Re: re:derivative notation

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-01/7483.html>

---

**From:** Shmuel (Seymour J.) Metz (*spamtrap\_at\_library.lspace.org.invalid*)

**Date:** 01/25/05

Date: Tue, 25 Jan 2005 18:09:42 -0500

In <1106604097.250300.240740@f14g2000cwb.googlegroups.com>, on 01/24/2005

at 02:01 PM, whopkins@csd.uwm.edu said:

>Actually addition is more efficient in Roman numerals, since it  
>involves only a combinatorial process and is, essentially, an  $O(1)$   
>process, with 0 commitment to memorizing tables.

Huh? What is V plus V? You most certainly do need to memorize tables, in order to perform required substitutions.

>The advantage of the Hindu-Arabic system was not its efficiency with  
>addition (or even multiplication, *per se*), but that it was  
>positional involving a 0. However, the assessment of this as an  
>"advantage" is, in actual fact, a fallacy. It is not necessary to  
>have a 0 to have a positional system. For instance, the numerals  
>I,II,III,IV,V,VI,VII,VIII,IX,X suffice quite well for representing  
>all positive integers.

What is the positional representation of 144 using those numerals? And does it qualify as a Roman numeral?

>With relatively minor extension,

If pigs had wings they could fly. A "relatively minor extension" is no longer Roman numerals.

>(a) Everything to the left of a comma is multiplied by 1000 (b)  
>Everything to the left of a dash is multiplied by 10 (commas take  
>precedence over dashes)

So now instead of having one "0" symbol you have two. You've succeeded in producing a system more complicated than either Arabic or Roman numerals.

--

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

sci.math: Re: re:derivative notation

domain Patriot dot net user shmuel+news to contact me. Do not  
reply to spamtrap@library.lspace.org