

Re: Existence as predicate

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-09/0004.html>

From: Immortalist (*Reanimater_2000_at_yahoo.com*)

Date: 08/31/04

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 20:53:16 -0700

"Paul Holbach" <paulholbachSPAMBAN@freenet.de> wrote in message
news:881c8779.0408301717.1492ae27@posting.google.com...

> > "Immortalist" <Reanimater_2000@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<

> > EYqdnUfMwtwFxa7cRVn-jA@comcast.com>...

> > > "Paul Holbach" <paulholbachSPAMBAN@freenet.de> wrote in message

> > > news:881c8779.0408291601.7c80f331@posting.google.com...

>

>

> > > In my opinion "to exist" can and should be employed both as a

> > > first-order and as a second-order predicate.

> > > [...]

> > > "to exist" can also be treated rather unproblematically as a property

> > > of individuals:

>

>

> > By whatever and by however many predicates we may think a thing--even if we

> > completely determine it--we do not make the

> > least addition to the thing when we

> > further declare that this thing ("is"); Otherwise, it would not be exactly

the

> > same thing that exists, but something more

> > than we had thought in the concept;

> > and we could not, therefore, say that the exact object of my concept exists.

>

>

> The concept of existence is pretty uninformative, and so is eg the

> concept of self-identity. -- So what?!

> This fact doesn't mean that the objects which fall under these

> concepts cannot possess them as their properties. [Frege: "I call the

> concepts under which an object falls its properties."]

>

> By the way, even if we regard the concept of necessary existence as a

> possible property of an individual, no ontological "proof" will ever

> work, for if I conceive of God as a/the being which exists

> necessarily, this in no way implies that there actually is anything

> which has the property of necessary existence!

>

- > *There is absolutely no a priori route from the mere definition*
- >
- > *"God is almighty, perfectly good, ..., and exists necessarily"*
- >
- > *to the truth of*
- >
- > *"There is something such that it is almighty, perfectly good, ..., and*
- > *exists necessarily" ,*
- >
- > *because it is always logically possible that nothing exists*
- > *necessarily, that nothing falls under the concept of necessary*
- > *existence!*
- >

Antinomies are contradictions that Kant believed follow necessarily from our attempts to conceive the nature of transcendent reality. Kant thought the Antinomies cannot be resolved and that attempts to conceive the transcendent will always produce irresolvable contradictions. This does not mean that there is no transcendent or that attempts to conceive the transcendent are meaningless. They are, just as Kant said, necessitated by reason itself. It does mean, however, that the transcendent defeats rational representation.

antinomies ('conflict of laws') which are usually described as 'paradox' or 'contradiction'. An example of one Kant sought to deal with is whether the universe has a beginning (first cause) or whether it has always existed.

The contradiction arises because valid arguments can be made in favour of both views. If unresolved this antimony could lead to 'the euthanasia of pure reason' (skepticism).

Thus Kant believed antinomies must be reconciled.

<http://www.faithnet.org.uk/Philosophy/kant.htm>

- >
- > > *A complete list of an object's properties*
- > > *would not be expanded by adding another*
- > > *property, namely existence; therefore,*
- > > *existence is not another property over and*
- > > *above all the other properties.*
- >
- >
- > *Existence is a property b e s i d e all the other properties. ; -)*
- >
- > *The descriptive value of concepts such as existence and self-identity*
- > *is indeed close to zero.*
- > *You really don't know much about me if you learn that I'm*
- > *self-identical.*
- > *This fact notwithstanding, I deny that the degree of informativeness*
- > *determines whether a concept can be had by individuals as a property!*

- >
- >
- > > *"...physical object exists. This is a true claim; what makes it true? One would*
- > > *like to be able to say that it is the fact that the physical object has the*
- > > *property of existence. It seems that the claim asserts that existence is a*
- > > *property of the physical object.*
- > >
- > > *The foregoing definition of 'exists' is incorrect just because the definition*
- > > *does treat existence as a property.*
- >
- >
- > *I'm afraid, you're begging the question!*
- >
- > *Generally, the possession of the logical properties of existence and*
- > *self-identity is a necessary condition for an entity's existence, but*
- > *it's not a sufficient one, because everything must also possess some*
- > *"substantial" properties other than existence and self-identity.*
- >

Define existence.

> #PH