

Re: Godel's comments about the "true reason" for incompleteness

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-03/msg01494.html>

- *From:* MoeBlee <jazzmobe@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 20 Mar 2008 15:45:48 -0700 (PDT)
-

Re: Mar 20, 10:55 am, "R. Srinivasan" <sradh...@xxxxxxxxxxxx>:

After having responded to that post, I think it would help to focus on just, say, two of the most obviously ridiculous things in it:

Now think of the following situation. Let us add $P \& \sim P \rightarrow Q$ (and only this single sentence, where P and Q are arbitrary) into the language of PA,

Please get back after you've consulted a logic book to see that it makes no sense to say that we add just a single sentence to a language.

If $P \& \sim P \rightarrow Q$ has been translated to a formula S in the first-order language of PA, and if PA proves S, are you denying that PA has *effectively* proven itself consistent?

Please get back after you've consulted a book on logic to see that a theory proving a tautology (or even just a contingency) does not entail that the theory is consistent, and not anywhere in the imagination of anyone but the most bitterly confused does it entail that the theory has ""effectively" proven ITSELF consistent".

MoeBlee

.