Abstract: In a quest to understand the relationship of a set or **condition** and an element, through “*partially known*” definitions of **topological identifiers**: Define, Identity, Property, Equality, Inequality and Element, a deep analysis into obtaining **absolute definition** is realized. To obtain **absolute definition,** such that no other possibilities exist but one. An **absolute definition** is absolutely specific. If a definition has two possibilities then it is known an **ambiguous definition**. Earlier experiments involving exploration of converging possibilities of topology of **Elemen**t, f**,** and **Condition**, C, inevitably, even predicted as such, led to the fundamental question: **How exactly does a condition or set, with respect to its subset, gain the property of membership and non-membership? Also a set, with respect to an Element, gives the property of membership and non-membership?** Following paper will focus mainly on axioms derived in each step of illustration as the word definitions that explains **topological identifiers** is expected to be sufficient in providing proof simultaneously.

 Represents **Super Element.**

With respect to itself, Super Element’s absolute definition can be formulated by solving for **Equality** and **Inequality** of itself.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Represents unknown version of **Super Element** and will be known as **Hypothetical K**. No other or assumption is taken into account **Hypothetical K** other than the assumption of its ability to **define**.    If K defines another K, then with respect to **K** (on the right), **K** (on the left) is **identified**.    This implies that K on the left, can be also be identified    Note: [n] where n represents a number does not signify any sequence and is solely used for unique identification.  Since the identification of both **K** are distinguishable, it can be implied that **K [2] is not equal to K [1]**.    Previous step gives an idea to make an assumption when **K** might be known to not be equal to each other however unless it is known when K can be determined to be equal, the proof will still be incomplete.  **Assumption 1:** If **K** defines another **K**, then the **defined K** is identified with respect to the **defining K**, such that it is apparent to imply that both **K** receive distinct identity. Thus, **defined K** is not equal to **defining K**.    If **K** defines **K**, it is assumed to create an inequality, so to create an equality, another assumption can be made that **K** might define itself.  **Assumption 2:** **K** defines itself and will be known as **Super Element**.    If **K** defines itself then **K** gives itself an Identity.  **Assumption 3:** If **K** defines itself, then it implies that **K** has multiple identities.    **Assumption 4:**  If **K** has multiple identities, then **K** has “lost” its identity or has no identity.    **Assumption 5:** if Assumption 2 is true then Assumption 3 must also be true.  At this point, valid questions arise:   1. What does it mean for Super Element to be equal and unequal? 2. Is “**defining**”, a process of giving identity?   To answer above questions better, more questions need to be raised:  **Q1.1:** When is **K** not equal to **K**?  **Q1.2:** When is **K** equal to **K**?  **Q2.1:** When is **Super Element** equal to **Super Element**?  **Q2.2:** When is **Super Element** not equal to **Super Element**?  **Q3.1:** When is **Super Element** equal to **K**?  **Q3.2:** When is **Super Element** not equal to **K**?  To answer all of above questions, perhaps raising the following question of commutative property might be important:  **Q4.1**: If **K [2]** defining **K [1]**, then can **K [1]** define back **K [2]** such that both **K [1]** and **K [2]** have distinct identities?  **Q4.2**: If **Super Element [1]** defines **Super Element [2]** ¸then can **Super Element [2]** defineback **Super Element [1]**?  Hence **Q4.1** concludes all questions, **Q1** to **Q3** are ambiguous.  **Q5.1** However does commutative property signify that both **Hypothetical Element** and **Super Element** cannot have the property of defining its duplicate?  **Q5.2** If such is the case, then is **Super Element**’s self-defining property valid?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Questions 1 to 4 and their possible solutions:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Q1.1** | **Q1.2** | **Q2.1** | **Q2.2** | | **Q3.1** | **Q3.2** | **Q4.1** | **Q4.2** | |      |  | | --- | |  | |
|  |