

## Re: Name the thesis: "Formal sentences capture informal ones"

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.theory/2005-01/1213.html>

---

*Helene.Boucher\_at\_wanadoo.fr*

*Date:* 01/30/05

Date: 30 Jan 2005 00:51:10 -0800

Torkel Franzen wrote:

> *Helene.Boucher@wanadoo.fr* writes:

>

>> *Look at it this way. Proof(x,y) – the first-order wff in PA that x is*

>> *a Godel number of a proof P of the theorem T represented by the Godel*

>> *number of y – asserts more than that P is a proof of T. One can*

>> *imagine the situation where there is a proof P of T, but not that there*

>> *is the extremely large number x which is used to represent the proof*

>> *P.*

>

> *If we take the view that the existence of n does not imply the*

> *existence of  $2^n$ , there is very much in mathematics that falls away,*

> *and the question of whether Con(PA) is an adequate formalization of*

> *"PA is consistent" becomes a very minor side issue.*

It's not a side issue to this thread, because that was what this thread was about.

I'm not quite sure whether anything essential falls away, in any case.