Re: The formal and informal proofs

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005−12/msg00429.html

- *From*: "Charlie−Boo" <chvol@xxxxxxx>
- *Date*: 19 Dec 2005 07:47:13 −0800

T.B. wrote:

> Hello,
> Is a system strictly formal when each and every of its parts is made
> entirely explicit, i.e. when the computing model with which it is
> identified is a register machine? I hope I am not being a disgrace

Only dishonesty, greed, the way some people treat others here, etc. are disgraceful.

If you are a computer programmer, think of a formal exposition (system, theorem, proof) as "programmable specs". It gives the exact syntax and semantics of a system which contains an infinite number of elements (wffs, theorems, proofs.) An informal exposition is a "spec" in which the semantics are given but the actual input and output (the syntax) is not given. You know what they mean, but no formal representation of the infinite number of variations is given.

System = specifications for a computer program

Formal = syntax and semantics are given

Informal = only semantics are given

C−B

> Tom

.

- ***Follow−Ups***:
  - ***Re: The formal and informal proofs***
    - ◊ *From:* T.B.

- ***References***:
  - ***The formal and informal proofs***
    - ◊ *From:* T.B.

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem***
- Next by Date: ***Re: paradoxes***
- Previous by thread: ***The formal and informal proofs***
- Next by thread: ***Re: The formal and informal proofs***
- Index(es):
    - ***Date***
    - ***Thread***