Re: infinity

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005−08/msg06198.html

- *From*: Tony Orlow (aeo6) <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Wed, 31 Aug 2005 10:44:55 −0400

Virgil said:
> In article <MPG.1d76ad0ae099937898a179@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
> Tony Orlow (aeo6) <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > David R Tribble said:
>
>
> > > Sure, given S symbols in L digits, you can represent exactly L^S
> > > unique values. But why does this apply to natural numbers?
> > S^L you mean. This applies to digital numbers, which for each base
> > consistute a symbolic language. If you are required to have infinite
> > strings in an infinite set of strings from a finite alphabet
>
> But one is not so required. One may quite nively have such strings.
> This allows an infinite set finite strings.
> It is only when there is some finite bound on the lengths of strings
> that the set of strings ust be finite.
if there is no finite bound on the lengths of the strings, then you have no
reason to claim they are all finite, see?
>
> That is, the set of strings does not have to be finite unless there is a
> longest allowable (finite) string. In which case, one should be able to
> specify its length.
And if the length is longer than any finite number you could name, what do you
call that? Unbounded means potentially infinite.
>
> SO if TO says that such sets of strings are finite, he must be able to
> give us that maximal length, or at least some finite upper bound on the
> lengths.
I