

Re: infinity

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-09/msg01939.html>

- *From:* Virgil <ITSnetNOTcom#virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 08 Sep 2005 13:46:37 -0600
-

In article <MPG.1d8a1fc94761f8f698a230@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Tony Orlow (aeo6) <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> Virgil said:
>> In article <MPG.1d88e60baef09fd398a207@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, >> Tony Orlow (aeo6) <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>
>>
>>> I suppose I can live with an image with no leaf nodes, but that >>> doesn't affect the relationship between branches and paths, does >>> it?
>>
>> Yes it does! In trees in which every path has a leaf node, there is >> an obvious bijection between paths and leaf nodes, but in a maximal >> binary tree there are infinitely many paths and zero leaf nodes. If >> that correspondence fails so dramatically in the "lomiting" case, >> what is TO's evidence that any others still hold?
>>
>
> I don't think that the leaf nodes automatically disappear when the > tree is infinite.

Then where are they? A path with no last node cannot have a last node, and that is what a leaf node has to be. If it is not the last node of some finite path, then it is not anywhere.

When one extends a path through a leaf node to another node, the leaf node ceases to be a leaf node. When a path is extended unendingly, there is no end. That is what unending means.

.

-
- *References:*
 - ◆ *Re: infinity*
 - ◇ *From:* aeo6
 - ◆ *Re: infinity*
 - ◇ *From:* imaginatorium
 - ◆ *Re: infinity*

Re: infinity

◇ *From: aeo6*

◆ ***Re: infinity***

◇ *From: imaginatorium*

◆ ***Re: infinity***

◇ *From: aeo6*

◆ ***Re: infinity***

◇ *From: Virgil*

◆ ***Re: infinity***

◇ *From: aeo6*

- Prev by Date: ***Re: what makes it true?***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Expected value***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: infinity***
- Next by thread: ***Re: infinity***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***