

Re: What does G?del's Incompleteness mean for the Working Mathematician?

# Re: What does G?del's Incompleteness mean for the Working Mathematician?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-08/msg05190.html>

---

- *From:* [pa@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:pa@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Pierre Asselin)
  - *Date:* Sat, 27 Aug 2005 00:05:26 +0000 (UTC)
- 

In sci.logic Timothy Murphy <[tim@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:tim@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

> Surely it is normal usage to say that theorems in a formal system  
> are true?

Nope.

(Or rather: yes, but only when they really are true.)

--

pa at panix dot com

---

- *Follow-Ups:*
  - ◆ **[Re: What does G?del's Incompleteness mean for the Working Mathematician?](#)**  
◇ *From:* Timothy Murphy
- *References:*
  - ◆ **[What does Gödel's Incompleteness mean for the Working Mathematician?](#)**  
◇ *From:* Bob Stewart
- Prev by Date: **[What should an int\(\) function do?](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: 0.999... = 1? \(I know, a beaten dead horse\)](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: What does Gödel's Incompleteness mean for the Working Mathematician?](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: What does G?del's Incompleteness mean for the Working Mathematician?](#)**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **[Date](#)**
  - ◆ **[Thread](#)**