Re: Liar's Paradox in Godel's Theorem (newbie question)

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2006−05/msg00031.html

- *From*: David C. Ullrich <ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Mon, 01 May 2006 06:50:23 −0500

On 30 Apr 2006 16:47:01 −0700, "Charlie−Boo" <shymathguy@xxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

> Aatu Koskensilta, Charlie−Boo wrote:
>
> > You don't believe in correcting the record, now that you see
> > the close
> > relationship between Liar and Godel?
>
> There's nothing to correct. It's not particularly illuminating to know
> that "this sentence is not true" is not equivalent to "this sentence is
> not provable in PA".
>
> It proves Godel's Theorem.

Right. Exactly how does this proof go?

> Where have you seen a simpler proof? Do
> you believe in Occam's Razor (or its extension, C−B's Razor)?
>
> > That implication of the first incompleteness
> > theorem doesn't tell us anything substantial about the liar paradox.
>
> How is that an implication of the first incompleteness theorem? Truth
> can be different from provability, but that doesn't show that "This is
> not true." (one use of truth) is different from "This is not provable."
> (You're confusing an implication with its converse.)
>
> C−B

> There is a connection between the liar paradox and Gödel's proof; Gödel
> arrived at his proof of the first incompleteness theorem after realizing
> that arithmetical truth can't arithmetical as that would lead to the
> liar being expressible. This does not mean that the incompleteness
> theorems tell us anything about the paradox.
>
> −−
> Aatu Koskensilta (aatu.koskensilta@xxxxxxxxx)
>
> "Wovon man nicht sprechen kann, darüber muss man schweigen"
> − Ludwig Wittgenstein, Tractatus Logico−Philosophicus

****

David C. Ullrich
.