Re: ** says: Definition: sum{i in N} i = 0

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007−07/msg00356.html

- *From*: WM <mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Tue, 03 Jul 2007 04:32:18 −0700

On 3 Jul., 05:08, "Dik T. Winter" <Dik.Win...@xxxxxx> wrote:

> In article <1183012627.739093.74...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> WM
> <mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:
> > On 28 Jun., 03:23, "Dik T. Winter" <Dik.Win...@xxxxxx> wrote:
> ...
> > > You:
> > > > > > > > > And as
> > > > > > > > > every n is not less than 1, the sum of all cannot be less than
> > > > > > > > > omega.
> > > You:
> > > > > > > > Still lacking proof.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Still lacking proof that every n is not less than 1?
> > >
> > > Lack of reading comprehension? It is about the sum.
> >
> > Every sum 1+2+3+...+n is less than the sum with as many, namely n 1's.
> > (You need proof?)
>
> No. The finite case is clear. For "the sum of all" you need definition,
> although you do not think so. Within analysis the sum of all is undefined.
> Within topology the sum can be defined if you compactify the reals, but
> the result will depend upon the manner of compactification. Within set
> theory the sum is in general undefined, but can be defined, as I already
> wrote oh so many articles ago; but at that time you rejected my definition.
> It is your assumption that a definition in one discipline should be
> identical to a definition in another discipline leads you astray.

I need not consider disciplines. In mathematics every sum 1+2+3+...+n
is less than the sum with as many, namely n 1's. This immediately
leads to the infinite case −−− if it exists. Otherwise you could also
state that the set given by the axiom of infinity has 0 elements. You
may think so, but it is rubbish.

Regards, WM

.