

Re: Cantor and the binary tree

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-06/msg04301.html>

- *From:* Martin Shobe <mshobe@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 24 Jun 2005 11:49:28 GMT
-

On Thu, 23 Jun 2005 19:27:45 -0600, Virgil
<ITSnetNOTcom#virgil@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>In article <5rbmb11h2kph14fsjb57mfubs8pt5fcpm7@xxxxxxxx>,
> Martin Shobe <mshobe@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>
>> for finite trees this is true. For infinite trees it no longer holds.
>
>Actually, it is not even true for finite trees.
>
>For a binary tree in which every path is only one branch long, there the
>same number of paths as branches, namely 2.
>
>For a binary tree in which each path is two branches long, there are 4
>paths and 6 branches.
>
>If each path is 3 branches, there are 14 branches and 8 paths.
>
>And in general if each path in n branches there are 2^n paths and
> $2*(2^n-1)$ branches, which is never quite twice the number of paths.
>
>So that TO's "TWICE as many" is always wrong.

I must have had a whiff... Sorry.

Martin

.

- *References:*
 - ◆ ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
 ◇ *From:* Virgil
 - ◆ ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
 ◇ *From:* mueckenh
 - ◆ ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***
 ◇ *From:* Martin Shobe
 - ◆ ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***

Re: Cantor and the binary tree

◇ *From: aeo6*

◆ **Re: Cantor and the binary tree**

◇ *From: Virgil*

◆ **Re: Cantor and the binary tree**

◇ *From: aeo6*

◆ **Re: Cantor and the binary tree**

◇ *From: Martin Shobe*

◆