

## Re: naive question from a non-mathematician

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-05/msg04794.html>

---

- *From:* David C. Ullrich <[ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 28 May 2006 13:34:30 -0500
- 

On Sun, 28 May 2006 18:12:02 GMT, Stephen Montgomery-Smith <[stephen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:stephen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

G.E. Ivey wrote:

It's hard for me to believe this has gone on so long. While every "quibble" is correct (and mathematicians love quibbles!) John Smith did say "mathematically equivalent", not "identical" or "the same" or "equal" so I would have no trouble at all accepting "Yes, they are mathematically equivalent".

That's a great answer. But I don't think it could be fully appreciated without the long discussion that preceded it.

I think the question of whether this could be fully appreciated without that long discussion is something that needs to be addressed. At great length.

\*\*\*\*\*

David C. Ullrich

.