

# Re: abundance of irrationals!)

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-04/msg01897.html>

---

- *From:* Virgil <ITSnetNOTcom#virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Wed, 13 Apr 2005 13:03:33 -0600
- 

In article <fb701d3c.0504130312.3c3b96e5@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (W. Mueckenheim) wrote:

> richard@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Richard Tobin) wrote in message  
> news:<d3e1jn\$2udj\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>...  
>> In article <fb701d3c.0504110456.5298f0df@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,  
>> W. Mueckenheim <mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:  
>>  
>>> It talks about "ALL n" > n\_0. Do you think "ALL n" supply a finite sum?  
>>  
>> Yes. For all n, the sum is finite, because all for all n, n is finite.  
>  
> That's why I said that  
>  $\sum 1/2^k < 1$   
>  $k \in \mathbb{N}$   
>  
> I is not important, how many of the terms  $1/2^k$  may come along. W know  
> for sure that each of them is > 0, so that  $1 - 1/2^k$  remains strictly  
> < 1.

What everyone else understands by your symbol is  
 $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{k=1..n} 1/2^k)$   
since it has no legitimate mathematical meaning otherwise.

---

• *References:*

- ◆ *Re: abundance of irrationals!)*  
◇ *From:* Dik T. Winter
- ◆ *Re: abundance of irrationals!)*  
◇ *From:* Dik T. Winter
- ◆ *Re: abundance of irrationals!)*  
◇ *From:* Dik T. Winter
- ◆ *Re: abundance of irrationals!)*  
◇ *From:* W. Mueckenheim
- ◆ *Re: abundance of irrationals!)*  
◇ *From:* Richard Tobin
- ◆ *Re: abundance of irrationals!)*

Re: abundance of irrationals!)

◇ *From:* W. Mueckenheim

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Determining an ellipse***
- Next by Date: ***Re: abundance of irrationals!)***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: abund***