Re: The # Operator

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005−05/msg03055.html

- *From*: klewis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Keith A. Lewis)
- *Date*: Mon, 16 May 2005 15:11:40 +0000 (UTC)

"Frank J. Lhota" <NOSPAM.lhota@xxxxxxxxxx> writes in article <W%5he.43$E05.31@trndny09> dated Fri, 13 May 2005 18:05:42 GMT:
>I recall seeing this problem used as a means of testing software that does
>Mathematical deductions. I though it might also make for an entertaining
>recreational algebra problem.
>
>We have a set U with a binary operation #. It is not known if # is
>commutatve, or if # is associative. What is known is that # satifies the
>following
>axioms:
>
>Axiom 1: For all x, y in U, x # (x # y) = x # (x # x)

So you can calculate x # (x # y) without knowning the value of y.

>Axiom 2: For all x, y, z in U, (x # y) # (y # z) = y

Again, you can calculate (x # y) # (y # z) without knowing x or z.

>if U is a finite set, what can we say about the cardinality of U?

I'd say it's finite. :^) (What did you really mean to ask?)

−−Keith Lewis klewis {at} mitre.org
The above may not (yet) represent the opinions of my employer.
.

- ***References***:
  - ♦ ***The # Operator***
    - ◊ *From:* Frank J. Lhota

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Will NIST fix their tables?***
- Next by Date: ***Re: expected value for sampling without replacement***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: The # Operator***
- Next by thread: ***i don't understand how to do this...***
- Index(es):
  - ♦ ***Date***

- ***Thread***