

For JKL,

To your claim that *my domain of maths thinks Bourbaki is a pastry*, my inquiry brought to light this origin of confusion:

This dish, "Bourbaki", is from *A WSC Cook Book*. I risk a banishing by making it public in this way.

A Num. Analyst's Cryptic Concoction: Bourbaki

To start, round up:

4 axioms from Turino philosophy
 1 work of an Oulipo madman¹
 10 l. unfailing logic
 a supply of intuition, physics and topology
 1 giant portion of abstraction
 1 shot of strong liquor (to aid in swallowing it all)

Plan: Throw all intuition, physics, and topology out a window—an illustration is worth a thousand words, but a thousand words is our goal. Now, swallow all axioms on trust: a foundation for your faith. Or you can simply proclaim said axioms as truths or propositions on which your playing-card construction is built. Slowly stir in logic, until you construct a class. Go on with caution, stirring vigorously for 50 yrs, until you obtain 9-10 monographs. If you distinguish an odor of calculus on manifolds, you should quit whilst you still can.

(Following V.I. Arnol'd, who was critical of Bourbaki from a didactic standpoint, maintaining that abstract formalism must not obstruct our ability to grasp a notion. And, BTW, Bourbaki also did not know Num. Analysis.)

Much joy in your continuation of your work.

Jason Frank

¹ You might try *La Disparition*?