Re: infinity

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005−10/msg01367.html

- *From*: "Ross A. Finlayson" <raf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

- *Date*: 13 Oct 2005 16:45:11 −0700

sci.math_030803:
This is different than the "limit of list" (3) argument, which supposes that as the sequence of the list progresses that there would always be a number getting nearer the antidiagonal, thus that any antidiagonal would eventually be generated, it is after all an infinite list and never terminates.

sci.math_030803:
Thus, from that two different infinite expansions in the same base can have the same value, infinite lists are easily constructible in design that contain as an element the number equal in value to one of the list's diagonal numbers."

sci.math_030803:
Virgil states again "real number not on list" (18), and goes on to say "diagonal argument says diagonal argument" (17). I say "listed element is counterexample" (10) and "binary is sufficient" (6). I go on to say "infinite set is infinite" (20) and "list of reals is list of reals" (21) about "limit of list" (3) and "real number not on list" (18).

sci.math_030803:
Manukah calls me wrong and then says "ordering of list to derive element on list" (22) is contrived. I say "list allows reordering" (23) and "listed element is counterexample" (10) and also "limit of list" (3)/"infinite set is infinite" (20).

sci.math_030803:
Virgil puts forward again "no point in constructing antidiagonal on the list" (9) and "antisemitridiagonal" (4). I repeat "list of rationals is similar to list of reals" (25) and "eroding explanation" (12). I also put forth some "antidiagonal not in set" (26), and then again "infinite set is infinite" (20).

sci.math_030803: