

Re: Zenkin's paper on Cantor (reply of Dr. Zenkin)

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.theory/2004-11/0296.html>

stephen_at_nomail.com

Date: 11/21/04

Date: 21 Nov 2004 18:47:19 GMT

In sci.math Eray Ozkural exa <examachine@gmail.com> wrote:
: stephen@nomail.com wrote in message news:<cnp65n\$ibp\$1@msunews.cl.msu.edu>...
:> In sci.math Eray Ozkural exa <examachine@gmail.com> wrote:
:> : stephen@nomail.com wrote in message news:<cnmolo\$1gp8\$1@msunews.cl.msu.edu>...
:>
:> : It is obvious what cardinality means, and it is not a definite thing,
:> : because THIS PARADOX EXISTS. If you do not understand WHY this is a
:> : paradox this is your problem.
:>
:> : Do you accept that there is a paradox or not?
:>
:> : Yes or no?
:>
:> What paradox are you talking about? There is no paradox
:> involved with defining cardinality in terms of bijections
:> of which I am aware. I would not call it paradoxical
:> that different definitions of cardinality could be considered
:> that lead to different conclusions. All results in mathematics
:> are based upon your assumptions. Change the assumptions
:> and the results change.

: That would be mathematical solipsism. You can't define things
: completely freely in mathematics. Once you define "number" you have
: very little space to move...

: I think "cardinality" must be synonymous with "size of a set" or
: otherwise, it would be meaningless. To agree with your terminology,
: consider that I've replaced all occurrences of "cardinality" with
: "size" in this exchange. Could you please answer my previous question
: in that fashion?

You have to define "size of set". When talking about infinity
size is not all that well defined. For a finite set "size"
can be determined by counting, which is the same thing as
putting the elements in a bijection with a subset of the natural
numbers. "Cardinality" has been defined. What you think
about the matter is not all that relevant, especially if you
think "cardinality" should mean something it does not.

comp.theory: Re: Zenkin's paper on Cantor (reply of Dr. Zenkin)

To answer your question, if I replace "cardinality" with "size" and use "cardinality" as the definition of "size" then clearly my opinion does not change at all. If you want me to replace "cardinality" with some undefined term such as "awer" then I cannot possibly answer the question because I do not know what "awer" means.

Using undefined terms seems to be a trend in your posts. It is quite simply bad mathematics. You must define your terms in a mathematical argum