Re: 1−1/2+1/3−1/4+1/5−1/6+1/7

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2008−02/msg02046.html

- *From*: Han de Bruijn <Han.deBruijn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Tue, 12 Feb 2008 14:58:43 +0100

Gonçalo Rodrigues wrote:

> On Tue, 12 Feb 2008 14:05:44 +0100, Han de Bruijn
> <Han.deBruijn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> fed this fish to the penguins:
>
> > Jesse F. Hughes wrote:
> >
> > > G. Frege <nomail@invalid> writes:
> > >
> > > > For simplicity we assume that n, m are in N,
> > > > then we can write:
> > > >
> > > > x e E* <−> AnEm >= n: x e E_m,
> > > >
> > > > x e E <−> EnAm >= n: x e E_m.
> > > > *
> > > > Thinking about it, I get the following criteria
> > > > for the limit − if it
> > > > exists:
> > > >
> > > > E = lim E_n
> > > > n
> > > > iff
> > > > x e E <−> EnAm >= n: x e E_m for all x.
> > > >
> > > > With other words, x is element of the limit
> > > > (if it exists) iff it is not
> > > > element _only_ of finitely many elements
> > > > E_n.
> > >
> > > Just to be clear: lim E_n = E ? n *
> > >
> > > Or am I missing something? If I read you right, I guess I
> > > don't see

> much need to discuss the lim sup and lim inf at present, since we
> haven't discussed lim sup and lim inf is just another name for lim.
>
> Surely I'm missing something.

> Is mathematics the art of making things unnecessarily complicated?
>
> http://rescomp.stanford.edu/~cheshire/EinsteinQuotes.html
>
> "Everything should be made as simple as possible, but not simpler." (Albert Einstein)
>
> Please !!

> Is that your pavlovian response whenever you see some mathematics that is beyond your understanding? That it is an unnecessary complication?

Geez! In my _finitary_ comprehension, the whole thing is sooo obvious !
But that's not the game I want to play here. Therefore I'm _begging_ you
to employ a formalism which is as simple and straightforward as possible
and not invoke unneccessary complications / generalizations or whatever.

Han de Bruijn

.