

Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-12/msg00263.html>

- *From:* David C. Ullrich <ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 15 Dec 2005 07:34:55 -0600
-

On 14 Dec 2005 18:10:58 -0800, "Charlie-Boo" <chvol@xxxxxxx> wrote:

>Prove $(P = \neg Q) \Rightarrow \neg(P = Q)$

Various people have asked what the heck this means.
You should say what it means, instead of replying
with questions.

Hint: My best attempt at deciphering it leads to
something obviously false:

"If P equals 'Q has a proof' then there is a
proof of 'P equals Q'."

Obviously false, since if P equals 'Q has a proof'
then P does not equal Q. So that must not be what you mean.

>(P and Q have the same sets of free variables.) This simple theorem (I
>created 12/1/05) provides the link between Theory of Computation and
>Proof Theory (Incompleteness in Logic) that theoreticians such as
>myself have been looking for since the 1930's. (Each Theory of
>Computation theorem becomes an Incompleteness theorem in Logic,
>providing almost trivial formal derivation of the exact results of
>Godel, Rosser and Smullyan.)

Awesome.

>C-B

>

>Hint: Consider the equivalent $(P = \neg Q) \Rightarrow (P = \neg P)$

David C. Ullrich

Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ *Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem*
◇ *From:* Charlie-Boo

- *References:*
 - ◆ *Simple yet Profound Metatheorem*
◇ *From:* Charlie-Boo

- Prev by Date: *Re: is such that equal to \leq ?*
- Next by Date: *Re: Evaluation of article*
- Previous by thread: *Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem*
- Next by thread: *Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem*
- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*