

# Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-12/msg00595.html>

---

- *From:* "Charlie-Boo" <chvol@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 29 Dec 2005 11:59:02 -0800
- 

Daryl McCullough wrote:

> Charlie-Boo says...

>>

>>Torkel Franzen wrote:

>

>>> There are no truth tables for intuitionistic propositional logic.

>>

>>That has no relevance.

>

> If you are interested in intuitionistic propositional logic,  
> then it is certainly relevant. If you are *\*not\** interested  
> in intuitionistic propositional logic, then what is the  
> point of your claim that every wff that is provable  
> in intuitionistic logic is also provable using truth tables?

Change "you are not interested in" to "there's nothing gained in the final analysis", then the answer is: It shows that Frege is wasting his time since nobody has ever come up with a wff that he produces that case analysis does not.

Case closed.

Coming Soon: "Metamathematically True or False?"

C-B

> --

> Daryl McCullough

> Ithaca, NY

.

---

- *Follow-Ups:*
  - ◆ ***Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem***
    - ◇ *From:* Daryl McCullough

- *References:*

Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem

- ◆ ***Simple yet Profound Metatheorem***
  - ◇ *From:* Charlie-Boo
- ◆ ***Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem***
  - ◇ *From:* Charlie-Boo
- ◆ ***Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem***
  - ◇ *From:* Daryl McCullough

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Simple yet Profound Metatheorem***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***