

Re: Logarithm of transfinite numbers

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-03/msg02789.html>

- *From:* matt271829-news@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 15 Mar 2006 17:58:59 -0800
-

stephen@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

matt271829-news@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Randy Poe wrote:

matt271829-news@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

It doesn't seem right because it isn't right. The bit string representations of natural numbers, whatever representation you choose, consist of only a countable subset of the uncountable bit strings of length \aleph_0 .

For instance

you might choose to represent the natural numbers as ...001, ...010, ...100, ...1000, i.e, infinite bit strings where only a single bit is nonzero.

Yes, we *can* represent them this way, but we can already list them as 1,2,3,4... which we know is countable. You're just putting one bit in the positions 1,2,3,4... so what new does this tell us?

Imagine instead that we *do* represent them in proper binary form. We still need \aleph_0 bits, and every arrangement of those \aleph_0 bits seems to map to a unique natural number.

No, every arrangement of those \aleph_0 bits does not seem to map to a unique natural number. Which natural number is mapped to

..111111111111

or

..01010101010

Re: Logarithm of transfinite numbers

I assume ".." means a (countably) infinite series. They would both have to be non-finite, I suppose, if that's what you mean. Are you saying, very roughly speaking, that the problem is that the "number infinity" appears infinitely many times in all those arrangements of aleph_0 bits?

Only the bit strings which have an infinite number of leading zero's correspond to a natural number, and there are only aleph_0 such bit strings.

This is where it goes wrong,
and where the flaw in the logic must lie. It seems to me that we need to somehow show that this one-to-one mapping can't be made.

That is what Cantor did all those years ago.

Didn't he go bonkers or something? I can't say I'm surprised!

.