

Re: Godel proved maths inconsistent not incompleteness theorem

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-05/msg00473.html>

- *From:* David C. Ullrich <dullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 07 May 2008 04:33:08 -0500
-

On Tue, 6 May 2008 19:10:35 -0700 (PDT), Charlie-Boo <shymathguy@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On May 6, 8:07 pm, "Jesse F. Hughes" <je...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Charlie-Boo <shymath...@xxxxxxxx> writes:

There are an infinite number of theorems generated in one step?
How?

Never heard of the axiom scheme of induction? Or regularity? Or separation?

An axiom scheme is not an axiom. Furthermore, if there can be an infinite number of axioms, then we cannot write a proof generator in general in the first place, as I said earlier.

Yes, you said that. It's hilarious. There are infinitely many axioms in ZF, and we can write proof checkers and proof generators.

This was the case I had in mind.

Then it is not an axiomatic system and if it were you couldn't program them in general anyway as I said.

Er, right. Sure.

Re: Godel proved maths inconsistent not incompleteness theorem

It has to be r.e. You are going way beyond a list of axioms and rules of inference. See <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Finitary>

C-B

--

Jesse F. Hughes

"Contrariwise," continued Tweedledee, "if it was so, it might be, and if it were so, it would be; but as it isn't, it ain't. That's logic!"

-- Lewis Carroll

David C. Ullrich

.