

Re: a set family indexed by an empty set

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-05/msg02889.html>

- *From:* "Justin Young" <x_static66@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 15 May 2005 02:27:51 GMT
-

<porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1116121541.534219.258870@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

>>It is hard to help you when you do not provide the information
>>required. Your textbook tells you that you must read the definitions
>>carefully, but you did not think that perhaps others may have to read
>>them to know what you are talking about.

>
> Yes, my only excuse is that I've thought both definitions are fairly
> standard so there is no need to post them. Now I feel like this is not
> the case which frankly surprises me. If the same operation is defined
> in different ways, and those different ways lead to entirely different
> answers --- well, I'm in trouble.

this is not true. definitions can be different but equivalent.

-
- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ ***Re: a set family indexed by an empty set***
◇ *From:* porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxxx

- *References:*
 - ◆ ***a set family indexed by an empty set***
◇ *From:* porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - ◆ ***Re: a set family indexed by an empty set***
◇ *From:* Arturo Magidin
 - ◆ ***Re: a set family indexed by an empty set***
◇ *From:* porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxxx

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Beer constant***
- Next by Date: ***Re: a set family indexed by an empty set***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: a set family indexed by an empty set***
- Next by thread: ***Re: a set family indexed by an empty set***

Re: a set family indexed by an empty set

- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*