

Re: A simple undiagonalisable list – ILLUSTRATED

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005–05/msg00169.html>

- *From:* "HERC777" <herc777@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 14 May 2005 18:50:14 –0700
-

George wrote

>HERC777 wrote:

>> i.e. the property should hold for all

>> permutations of elements of the

>> list.

>

>Well, it doesn't.

Given any list using elements only from $k/9$, $0 \leq k \leq 9$

e.g.

0.44444444..

0.66666666..

0.22222222..

0.88888888..

0.11111111..

...

for the purpose of creating an antidiagonal number not on the list, any diagonal can be digit shuffled.

e.g. DIAG:0.46281.. \Leftrightarrow DIAG:0.12468..

FURTHERMORE, if the class of set/list used has the property the list contains ALL reals from $k/9$,

*** THE DIAGONAL DOES NOT GIVE ANY INFORMATION ABOUT THE LIST ***

Herc

.

- *References:*

Re: A simple undiagonalisable list – ILLUSTRATED

◆ **Re: A simple undiagonalisable list – ILLUSTRATED**

◇ From: george

- Prev by Date: **Re: Question on Chaitin**
- Next by Date: **Re: A Simple Non-Diagonalisable List**
- Previous by thread: **Re: A simple undiagonalisable list – ILLUSTRATED**
- Next by thread: **Re: A simple undiagonalisable list – ILLUSTRATED**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**