

Re: Computable functions/reals: followup.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-09/msg00186.html>

- *From:* Bill Taylor <w.taylor@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 7 Sep 2008 22:05:23 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Sep 5, 10:16 pm, David C. Ullrich <dullr...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Which, curiously, is at this level of imprecision precisely equivalent to what various "idiots" suggested the definition "should" be – exactly what the standard definition "must" be if there was a standard definition, because, given that a real is just something that can be approximated by rationals, there's clearly nothing else the definition could be.

.....which is hopefully clear to him, if no-one else.

Please Dave – try not to embarrass yourself in public.

You'll feel better for it!

.