

Re: "Friendly Premises"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-08/msg00112.html>

- *From:* "George Dance" <georgedance04@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 4 Aug 2005 08:19:18 -0700
-

Torkel Franzen wrote:

```
> "George Dance" <georgedance04@xxxxxxxx> writes:
>
> <unsnip>
>>> I am pointing out that, if Mr. Shobe is correct that the
>>> concepts of 'self-proving procedure' and 'proof' refer to the same
>>> things, then "There is no concept of
>>> 'self-proving procedure' in logic" is equivalent to "There is
>>> no concept of 'proof' in logic."
> </us>
>
> Is "the concepts of 'self-proving procedure' and 'proof' refer to
> the same things" another way of saying "all self-proving procedures
> are proofs and all proofs are self-proving procedures"?
```

It looks to me like Mr. Shobe was saying "all"; but you can interpret his statement as well as I can:

"In other words, a "self-proving procedure" is nothing other than a proof."

However, the equivalence follows no matter how one quantifies: if some but not all Fs were Gs and vice versa, "There are no Fs" and "There are no Gs" would still have the same truth value.

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ [Re: "Friendly Premises"](#)
 - ◇ *From:* Torkel Franzen
- *References:*
 - ◆ [Re: "Friendly Premises&](#)