

Re: Ultimate debunking of Cantor's Theory

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-07/msg02205.html>

- *From:* Virgil <virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 14 Jul 2007 12:35:15 -0600
-

In article <1184400384.279727.37760@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, WM <mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 14 Jul., 00:50, Calvin <cri...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jul 13, 12:52 pm, WM <mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 11 Jul., 16:20, Calvin <cri...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

The original post doesn't restrict set theory to finite sets. It says that only sets which are finite exist. Obviously natural numbers exist, and can be used for example to count the words in this post. Since they exist, and there are supposedly only a finite number of them, then there must be a largest one.

That is a naive misunderstanding.

comp.mail.eudora.mac > I hope you understood that my words, "there are

supposedly only a finite number of them," did not mean that I supposed such a thing. I was stating the proposition that was to be disproved.

To spell it out clearly: There is only a limited number of natural numbers. Nevertheless there is no largest one among them.

Re: Ultimate debunking of Cantor's Theory

While there is only a limited number of names (including descriptions) for natural numbers, or anything else, for that matter, in standard mathematics, there can exist naturals without names, and rationals without names, and reals without names, and all sorts of other unnamed things.

So that WM is barking up the wrong tree to claim that such a limit on names enforces a limit on numbers. it only limits our ability to name numbers.

.