

Re: Calculus XOR Probability

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-04/msg03927.html>

- *From:* Virgil <vmhjr2@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 20 Apr 2006 17:23:20 -0600
-

In article <MPG.1eadc4e1cc196b0298ac38@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Tony Orlow <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

imaginatorium@xxxxxxxxxxxx said:

Tony Orlow wrote:

imaginatorium@xxxxxxxxxxxx said:

<snip>

Actually, I DID define all finite reals in terms of a few non-circular rules:

- 1) $0 < x \leq 1 \rightarrow \text{finite}(x)$
- 2) $\text{finite}(x) \rightarrow \text{finite}(0-x)$
- 3) $\text{finite}(x) \rightarrow \text{finite}(1/x)$
- 4) $\text{finite}(x) \rightarrow \text{finite}(2^x)$ (optional)

Infinite values are then defined as being larger than any finite value, in absolute terms. So, it's not really circular, but not fully finished. I'm not sure I am comfortable that this part is complete. Sorry. I'm considering a number of things involved in this. Suggestions? Comments?

Yes. READ A BOOK. If you had the first clue how real mathematics is done, you might have a chance of representing what ideas you have in an understandable way. In particular the rules above simply assume that all the "numbers" you want are already there, and you merely say things about how they relate to each other.

The rules above are about distinguishing the finite from the infinite, once the concept of numbers is established.

Re: Calculus XOR Probability

But TO is quite incapable of establishing a workable concept of numbers by himself. And if he uses someone else's, it won't work the way he needs it to.

.