Re: Cantor and the binary tree

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005−05/msg04929.html

- *From*: Virgil <ITSnetNOTcom#virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Thu, 26 May 2005 10:54:11 −0600

In article <MPG.1cffa061d4f6cb89989d2f@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
Tony Orlow (aeo6) <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> Virgil, you're totally convoluted. Try to poke a hole in the argument I just
> posted regarding insertion of nodes in ANY tree. Sorry, the prior existence
> of
> leaf nodes is not a ruse that's available for you in this one.

It is the absence, not existence, of leaf nodes that creates the
situation that TO does not comprehend.

In such a maximal binary tree, where there are no leaf nodes since no
path ends, the number of nodes is Card(N) and the number of paths is
Card(P(N))
.

- ***Follow−Ups***:
  - ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
    - *From:* aeo6

- ***References***:
  - ***Cantor and the binary tree***
    - *From:* mueckenh
  - ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
    - *From:* Dik T. Winter
  - ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
    - *From:* mueckenh
  - ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
    - *From:* Virgil
  - ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
    - *From:* mueckenh
  - ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
    - *From:* Virgil
  - ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
    - *From:* aeo6

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Help (polynomial)***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
- Index(es):
    - ♦ ***Date***
    - ♦ ***Thread***