

Re: An instance of Russell's paradox?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-08/msg00552.html>

- *From:* "A.T." <andrzej-tomaszewski@xxxxx>
 - *Date:* 30 Aug 2005 06:49:07 -0700
-

Jim Spriggs wrote:

>> 1. Can all algorithms be enumerated,
>
> Yes. An algorithm can be expressed in finite terms in a formal
> language. Therefore there are no more than countably many of them.

I think I must do a lot more thinking here.

>> or will that be another
>> formulation of Russell's paradox
>
> Diagonalize out of your enumeration to prove that not all functions are
> algorithmic.

So it has to do with Cantor's diagonalization. I need to study a lot more, and there is just one thing I know, I will never give up.

>> (with the list of all algorithms being
>> another way of expressing the set of all sets)?
>
> No, just a confusion.
>
> (I'm amused by Eagleson's "I hope I am clear.")

:~)

I don't know who you are Sir, or where you come from,
but you've done me a power of good.

Thank You very much indeed.
Tom

-
- *References:*
 - ◆ [*An instance of Russell's paradox?*](#)

Re: An instance of Russell's paradox?

◇ *From:* A.T.

◆ ***Re: An instance of Russell's paradox?***

◇ *From:* Jim Spriggs

- Prev by Date: ***Re: An instance of Russell's paradox?***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Non-standard models of PA***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: An instance of Russell's paradox?***
- Next by thread: ***Ping Herbert B. Enderton***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***