Re: Marie Jean Faucounau sues me for at least 8,487 Swiss Fr

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2005−01/1381.html

---

From: dgomez (*rationalprocess_at_hotmail−dot−com.no−spam.invalid*)
Date: 01/11/05

```
Date: 11 Jan 2005 15:26:48 −0600
```

Mr. Franz Gnaedinger,

It is clear you are unable to answer such a simple question.
Just refrain yourself from pasting my name in your postings trying to relate my work with "your" Bernoulli's sequence for the square root.
Stop by making false statements about me and my work. That's it.
Domingo Gomez Morin
mipagina.cantv.net/arithmetic

> *dgomezwrote:*
Dear Mr. Franz Gnaedinger,
>
> *Your are just talking about the SQUARE ROOT columns,*
> *1 −−−−− 1 −−−−− 2*
> *2 −−−−− 3 −−−−− 4*
> *5 −−−−− 7 −−−− 10*
> *.*
> *.*
> *I'M ASKING YOU SPECIFICALLY ABOUT THE CUBE ROOT COLUMN :*
> *(http://www.mathforum.com/epigone/math−history−list/skunclerdsax)*
> *1 1 1 2*
> *2 2 3 4*
> *4 5 7 8*
> *.*
> *.*
> *.*
> *Could you please, for God sake, answer this simple question.*
>
>
> *When did you publish the [b]CUBE*
ROOT[/b] COLUMN?
> *Why do you choose those specific initial integer values: (1,1,1,2)*
> *and what is the REASON FOR SUCH SUMS AND THE CONVERGENCE to*
> *the cube root ??.*
>

>
> *Domingo Gomez Morin*
> *mipagina.cantv.net/arithmetic*

****
GNAEDINGER WROTE:

−−− 1 −−−−− 1 −−−−− 2
−−−−−−− 2 −−−−− 3 −−−−− 4
−−−−−−−−−−− 5 −−−−− 7 −−−− 10
−−−−−−−−−−−−−− 12 −−−− 17 −−−− 24
−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−− 29 −−−− 41 −−−− 58
−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−− 70 −−−− 99 −−− 140 −−− and so on

That number column does work. Multiply the first by the last number of each line: 1x2 = 2, 2x4 = 8, 5x10 = 50, and so on. Compare them to the square of the central number of each line: 1x1 = 1, 3x3 = 9, 7x7 = 50, and so on. The square of the central number is always 1 unit smaller larger smaller larger smaller larger smaller larger ... than the product of the numbers on the sides, and while the absoulte mistake remains always one, the numbers of the column increase, which means the relative mistake is diminishing.

When I had established my first number column, back in 1979, I expanded the principle, in late 1993 and early 1994: the same principle works for the lines 1−1−3, 1−1−5, and 1−1−1−2. It also works for the line 1−1−4, and this case shows how quickly the small−numbered columns approximate:

−−− 1 −−−−− 1 −−−−− 4
−−−−−−− 2 −−−−− 5 −−−−− 8
−−−−−−−−−−− 7 −−−− 13 −−−− 28
−−−−−−−−−−−−−− 20 −−−− 41 −−−− 80 −−− and so on

The ratios 1/1, 5/2, 13/7, 41/20 ... are approximating the square root of 4, which is 2. The correct ratios would be 2/1, 4/2, 14/7, 40/20. You can also start with

−−− 1 −−−−− 2 −−−−− 4
−−−−−−− 3 −−−−− 6 −−−− 12
−−−−−−−−−−− 9 −−−− 18 −−−− 36 −−− and so on

In this case you obtain the ratios 2/1, 6/3, 18/9 = 2, always the correct number.

You can start a number column of mine with any pair of numbers, for example 1−7−2, and you can make mistakes, you will nevertheless approximate the root of 2 (in this case). This means the algorithm is robust. And the mathematical correctness of my number columns had been proved by Dr. Christoph Poeppe, editor of the German version of the Scientific American in 1994 or 95, as I recall, while he published my method for calculating pi in the May 1997 issue of the German SciAm, not in the 1994 issue, as I said in my previous message. Sorry for that mistake.

Franz Gnaedinger www.seshat.ch
−[/quote][/quote]