

Re: FOL, ZFC, NGB and Prolog

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-06/msg00154.html>

- *From:* Jim Spriggs <jim.spriggs@xx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 8 Jun 2005 18:15:13 +0000 (UTC)
-

Tom wrote:

>
> Jim Spriggs wrote:
>> Tom wrote:
>>>
>>> Prolog is,
>>> merely, FOL in executable notation.
>>
>
> : No, Prolog is much more restrictive than FOL.
>
> I see. I thought that it is, as is FOL, Turing complete.

Prolog, like all reasonable programming languages, is Turing complete.
But not every wff of FOL is meaningful to Prolog. Also in Prolog id
something cannot be proved it is deemed to be false.

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ ***Re: FOL, ZFC, NGB and Prolog***
 - ◇ *From:* Tom
- *References:*
 - ◆ ***FOL, ZFC, NGB and Prolog***
 - ◇ *From:* Tom
 - ◆ ***Re: FOL, ZFC, NGB and Prolog***
 - ◇ *From:* Jim Spriggs
 - ◆ ***Re: FOL, ZFC, NGB and Prolog***
 - ◇ *From:* Tom
- Prev by Date: ***Re: [OT] Right Books (was re: Excuses, Excuses)***
- Next by Date: ***Quandary.***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: FOL, ZFC, NGB and Prolog***
- Next by thread: ***Re: FOL, ZFC, NGB and Prolog***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***