

Re: Cantor Confusion

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-03/msg03831.html>

- *From:* Virgil <virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 17 Mar 2007 15:50:09 -0600
-

In article <1174139848.400476.4970@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On 16 Mrz., 21:18, Virgil <vir...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article <1174054064.244699.153...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,

The function of all cross sections, $f: n \rightarrow 2^n$, is "continuous" in the sense that never a jump by more than a factor 2 can occur because the nodes of the tree are connected by an untearable network.

Following WM's argument, $g: n \rightarrow n$ is even more continuous in that it can never "jump" by a difference of more than 1, so can never become infinite at all.

It does never "become" infinite.

Then $\lim_n \{n \rightarrow \infty\} = \aleph_0$ is false.

This function "is" infinite, i.e., n

The range of $f: n \rightarrow 2^n$ can never be the same as the domain, unless both are empty.

That is fact, not by claim but by construction of the tree. That's why I constructed it.

Re: Cantor Confusion

A construction which requires N for both the domain and range of $f: n \mapsto 2^n$ is fatally flawed.

You need only consider the number of pairs of parentheses and of unit fractions per pair of parentheses in the proof by Oresme.

There has been a long discussion of how to define functions. According to EVERY definition considered in that discussion, the alleged function described by WM as having domain and range equal to N and having $f: n \mapsto n^2$, is NOT a function at all.

WM's ignorance of even the most primitive of mathematical ideas leads him to make a fool of himself too often.

.