

Re: A new definition of natural numbers

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-11/msg00869.html>

- *From:* "Tonico" <Tonicopm@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 3 Nov 2006 05:25:06 -0800
-

Jon Slaughter wrote:

"kunzmilan" <kunzmilan@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1162543882.937839.226090@xx

Many long discussions in this group lead to the conclusion, that it is necessary to define anew what is a natural number. I propose this:

A natural number is a number which has its own name in form of a numeral in a natural language (for example English).

Therefore, infinity is not a natural number, since it is from its nature indefinite, as numerals some or many are. It can be discussed, if mathematical expressions for large numbers belong to natural languages or or if they form an artificial language, as Esperanto or computer languages are. Physicists must precise in next hundreds years the definition of the Avogadro number. Otherwise, it can not keep its status of the natural number.
kunzmilan

Is it April already?

Either it is april, or the above poor guy is a student of Mueck, HdB, Georgie or any other of those cranks and/or trolls that think themselves very smart because they're unable to understand set theory....**sigh**....oh well.
Regards
Tonio