

Re: set theory : the blunder

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-07/msg02207.html>

- *From:* G. Frege <nomail@invalid>
 - *Date:* Sat, 14 Jul 2007 20:41:27 +0200
-

On Sat, 14 Jul 2007 14:07:53 EDT, tommy1729 <tommy1729@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I said:

Your claim

(y,z) is y,z

is meaningless (at least in standard math lingo).

no its not.

Yes, it is.

[Consider:]

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

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

This are two ways of giving the two solutions of the equation. Either you use the "pair notation" (actually denoting a pair of numbers, i.e. a certain `_set_`), or you just use a list of numbers, listing the two solutions of the equation, here and 3 and 2.

This does not mean that the following identity claim (i.e. the following expression) is "meaningful":

$$(3,2) = 3,2.$$

" $(3,2)$ " denotes a certain pair (a set), the first element of which is

Re: set theory : the blunder

3 and the second element of which is 2. While on the other hand "3,2" doesn't (in NO common set theory) denote a pair (or a set).

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

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

it follows naturally from $(x) = x$

Huh? Well imho it "follows" naturally from the fact that you are a crank.

Though

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

does make sense (in a certain framework),

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

No. (Well, only if your framework is not a "standard" system, i.e. not a standard system of mathematical logic.)

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

doesn't. (See comments above.)

To get some ground under our feet...:

For example, in my theory of heaps

"[y,x]"

is a name/term referring to a heap.

Re: set theory : the blunder

your theory ???

Right.

that means you disagree too on cantor :p

No, that means that I just considered an alternative framework (i.e. a part/whole theory instead of a set theory).

I already told you that there are alternative theories out there. (Not meant to REPLACE set theory of course.)

i haven't seen your theory...

So you missed my posts here. Well... :-/

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

I recently posted 2 or 3 short accounts. In the present thread, or one
of it's relatives.

and if your theory has heaps in the way i have bags its stolen,

Well, heaps certainly do NOT behave like bags. That's for sure.

and you actually agree with me, and against cantor.

That's why I mentioned my theory in the first place.

Note that

"x,y"

Re: set theory : the blunder

Re: set theory : the blunder

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

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

"[x,y]".

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

Huh? I did what?

Here we have:

$x \in [x,y]$

$y \in [x,y]$

With other words, x and y are constituents of [x,y].

Now if we have $x = [a, b]$, then

$[x, y] = [[a, b], y] = [a, b, y]$.

F.

—

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

.