

Re: infinity

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-09/msg02229.html>

- *From:* Virgil <ITSnetNOTcom#virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 09 Sep 2005 17:15:01 -0600
-

In article <MPG.1d8baf718ca536d598a24e@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Tony Orlow (aeo6) <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> William Hughes said:
> <snip>
>>>> No, I never claimed the sum of all finite naturals "exists".
>>>>
>>>> No I suppose you didn't. You have claimed that:
>>>>
>>>> a: the sum of a finite number of finite integers is finite.
>>>>
>>>> b: there are only a finite number of finite naturals.
>>>>

>> I may or may not be interested in why you believe them. This is
>> not relevant. What is relevant is the fact that a and b imply
>> that the sum of all finite numbers exists

> b implies a,

Only in the sense that a false statement implies anything.

It is equally valid to say that b implies $1 + 1 = 5$.

What would be invalid, and false, would be to say that 'a' implies 'b'.

> but knowing that a number is finite is not the same as ever being
> able to pin it down.

The issue is existence of sums, not evaluation of them.

> You cannot pin down the largest finite natural,
> but can you deny that, if in concept it existed, that it would be,
> without a doubt, finite?

Yes, I can, and do, deny that such thing as a largest natural exists