

Re: Review of Mueckenheims book.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-03/msg03986.html>

- *From:* Tony Orlow <tony@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 18 Mar 2007 14:46:44 -0500
-

Mike Kelly wrote:

On 18 Mar, 15:51, Tony Orlow <t...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Virgil wrote:

In article <45fc8...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Tony Orlow <t...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

cbr...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Mar 17, 8:59 am, Tony Orlow <t...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

cbr...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Mar 13, 9:22 am, Tony Orlow <t...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

<snip>

In a countable set, there are only a

Re: Review of Mueckenheims book.

finite
number
of
elements
between
any
two
specific
elements.

Counterexample:

The
set
of
rationals
in
[0,1]
is
a
countable
set,
and
there
are
an
infinite
number
of
elements
between
any
two
distinct
elements
of
that
set.

Not in the
order in
which they
are
countable.

<snip>

Does TO mean to suggest that there is a linear ordering
which makes them
uncountable?

The question of the size of the set of rationals is a little more
complicated than that.

Re: Review of Mueckenheims book.

What I have said is that there are sequences which are uncountable.

Under what definition of sequence?

--
mike.

Under the definition of the Peano set, basically.

.