

Re: set theory : the blunder

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-07/msg02196.html>

- *From:* tommy1729 <tommy1729@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 14 Jul 2007 14:07:53 EDT
-

On Sat, 14 Jul 2007 10:15:42 EDT, tommy1729
<tommy1729@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

wanna get personal hmm ?

I no way. I said:

yes way !! and once again you snip to much !!!

this is what you said earlier !! :

Of course note, since you are an idiot.

although (y,z) is y,z [bla blah]

sounds pretty personal to me !

so dont play good cop , bad cop with me.

Look, man, either (y,z) is y or (y,z) is z . Your

claim

Re: set theory : the blunder

(y,z) is y,z

is meaningless

no its not.

$$(x-3)(x-2)=0$$

solution $(3,2)$ or $3,2$

rather the difference is meaningless so i remove it (the brackets)

$(3,2)$ different from $3,2$ is the real meaningless.

(at least in standard math lingo).

aha

Try to FORMALIZE it in a logical system of your choice:

$$(x,y) = y,z [???$$

no $(x,y) = x,y$

and if i said otherwise it was a typo.

it follows naturally from $(x)=x$

Though

$$[[x,y]] = [x,y]$$

does make sense (in a certain framework),

and in a similar way $(x,y)=x,y$!

Re: set theory : the blunder

Re: set theory : the blunder

$[x,y] = y,z$

doesn't. (See comments above.)

nope it doesnt , if you read that from me it was a typo, not my point of view.

For example, in my theory of heaps

"[y,x]"

is a name/term referring to a heap.

your theory ???

that means you disagree too on cantor :p

i havent seen your theory...

you accused me before of not fully defining my replacement theory , but i havent seen your theory (which you suddenly dare to introduce) either.

and if your theory has heaps in the way i have bags its stolen , and you actually agree with me , and against cantor.

whether you want that or not.

While

"x,y"

is just a list of names/terms/variables (each of which is referring to a heap); but "x,y" itself does not refer to a certain heap. Which one?

If you want to refer to the heap which has (at least) x and y as constituents use the term

"[x,y]".

Re: set theory : the blunder

you assume x and y to be unique , this is not necessary.

Here we have:

$x \in [x,y]$

$y \in [x,y]$

and $x \in (x,y)$ and $y \in (x,y)$

and $x \in x,y$ and $y \in x,y$

tommy1729

x and y are constituents of [x,y].

F.

--

E-mail: info<at>simple-line<dot>de

.