

Re: Calculus XOR Probability

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-04/msg03238.html>

- *From:* Tony Orlow <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 17 Apr 2006 13:24:08 -0400
-

iminatorium@xxxxxxxxxxxx said:

Tony Orlow wrote:

No, I talk more about completed actual infinities, and Han speaks more about unboundedly large but more or less finite sets with constant relationships, but there's not a lot of difference there, really. Brian likes to say I am talking about the "imponderably large but finite", because I am dealing with these infinite values similarly to finite values. So, what Han and I agree on is that considering infinities is a lot like considering the infinite case for finite sets, ...

OK, I'll bite. What does it mean to "consider the infinite case for finite sets"? (I'm not entirely sure I can even parse it correctly.)

Brian Chandler
<http://iminatorium.org>

Basically, all I'm saying boils down to inductive proof of equality holding for infinite n . If some relationship between measures of a set holds for all finite cases greater than some n , then it can be considered to hold for infinite n , and the same applies to sets defined by that n . For instance, if the set of naturals from 1 through n has size n , and the set size is always equal to the largest element, then this holds for infinite n as well, leading to the notion that this set contains infinite values when the size is infinite, and is finite when all values are finite. Sorry if that wasn't worded well.

—
Smiles,

Tony

.