Re: ** says: Definition: sum{i in N} i = 0

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007−06/msg05275.html

- *From*: Virgil <virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Thu, 28 Jun 2007 11:42:20 −0600

In article <1183020275.320012.107920@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
WM <mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> On 28 Jun., 08:02, Virgil <vir...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > In article <1183009493.535511.143...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
>
> > > That means
> > > P/K = lim_{x −−> oo} (2^]x[) / (2^[x+1] − 1) > 2
> > > or set theory is selfcontradictory.
>
> > It only means that, as usual, WM has the wrong end of the stick.
>
> > WM is claiming that a rule that only applies to some paths because they
> > have leaf nodes must apply to paths not having leaf nodes also.
>
> First: I consider every path, including such which do not end, by]x[.
> Second: All paths, except some divine ones, consist of nodes.
> Third: My consideration does not end, is not estricted to leaves, but
> concerns the limit x −−> oo.
>
> Regards, WM

Does WM deny that for every finite binary tree in which all paths are of equal length that there is a different path for every subset of the set of all non−terminal levels defined by having for every set of levels a path branching left from those levels and right from every other level?

I.e., Does WM deny that for such finite trees there is a bijection between the power set of the set of non−terminal levels and the set of paths?

And why does WM argue that such a correspondence should suddenly fail
when the tree becomes infinite, when it clearly does not.
.