

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-03/msg01716.html>

- *From:* MoeBlee <jazzmobe@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 24 Mar 2008 12:10:44 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 21, 6:18 pm, "R. Srinivasan" <sradh...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 22, 4:12 am, MoeBlee <jazzm...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:> On Mar 21, 3:46 pm, "R. Srinivasan" <sradh...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I do not have any essential disagreement over what you have said above. Thanks for the clarification.

Okay, good. So we got tautologies worked out.

Sure, The main point to which we both agree on is that a first-order language cannot express sentences like "All sentences follow from a contradiction".

No, I NEVER said ANYTHING like that!

And the main point was NOT that. The main point, which I belabored over and over, is that (ordinarily) a schema of tautologies is not a tautology but rather each INSTANCE of the schema is a tautology and that first order theories certainly DO prove every tautology in the language of the theory.

The infinitely many sentences in this schema may all be tautologies proven by the object theory, but the object theory cannot formalize the notion of "all sentences", at least not without the coding employed by Godel.

It DEPENDS on the object theory T and whether "all sentences" refers to sentences of the T's OWN language or of some object language T* that is also a meta-theory.

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

For example, Z set theory is a first order theory. And it's an object theory. AND it's a meta-theory for certain object theories. And in Z set theory as meta-theory for PA we may discuss all kinds of things about sentences of PA.

So the truth of the assertion that "All sentences follow from a contradiction" would have to be a metamathematical truth *about* the object theory. At least prior to Godel this was the situation. The claim that such a meta-sentence can be translated into a sentence in the object language is what I am contesting.

Define what YOU mean by 'translated'. And you can "contest" all you want; meanwhile, though, you've shown no contradiction or even intuitive problem with incompleteness proofs.

Such a translation
cannot be via purely finitary first-order reasoning.

Please define what YOU mean by 'translation'.

MoeBlee

.