

Re: True = [proven | provable]

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.theory/2005-01/0560.html>

From: David McAnally (*D.McAnally_at_i'm_a_gnu.uq.net.au*)

Date: 01/18/05

Date: 18 Jan 2005 10:52:38 GMT

Lysander <lysander@hellas.net> writes:

>D.McAnally@i'm_a_gnu.uq.net.au (David McAnally) writes:

>> Ogie Ogelthorpe <boogielooogie@gmail.com> writes:

>>

>>>|-/erc wrote:

>>>> *Mathematicians don't need the word true.*

>>>>

>>>> *For "I think its true" say "I think its provable".*

>>>>

>>>> *For "G is true" say "G is proven"*

>>>>

>>>< *snipped the rest of the useless drivel*>

>>

>>>*The only thing true is that you are a certified nut job who should be*

>>>*locked up before you hurt yourself or someone else.*

>>

>> *The distinction between "provable" and "true" is easy to demonstrate.*

>>

>> *A sentence is "provable" or "unprovable" for a given theory (a set of*

>> *sentences). It is inappropriate to describe a sentence as being "true"*

>> *or "false" for a theory.*

>>

>> *A sentence is "true" or "false" for a specific model (the truth value of*

>> *a formula for a certain assignment of variables within a model is defined*

>> *by recursion on the complexity of the formula, and the truth value of a*

>> *sentence for a model is independent of the assignment of variables).*

>> *It is inappropriate to describe a sentence as being "provable" or*

>> *"unprovable" for a model.*

>>

>> *So a sentence is "provable" or "unprovable" for a theory, but not for a*

>> *model. A sentence is "true" or "false" for a model, but not for a theory.*

>>

>> *A sentence*