

Re: "Friendly Premises"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-08/msg00331.html>

- *From:* Jesse Alama <alama@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 20 Aug 2005 10:02:59 -0500
-

"Acme Diagnostics" <LFinezapthis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:

> Jesse Alama <alama@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>> "Acme Diagnostics" <LFinezapthis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:
>>> ram@xxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:
>>>> Acme Diagnostics <LFinezapthis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> [...]
>>>>> p.s. Hope I didn't overdo it! Hehe. Me? Never!
>>>>
>>>>> Was that the "flame" you were considering?
>>>>
>>>> Some inside humor.
>>>>
>>>> But I do seem to have flamed the bad faith arguers
>>>> out of this discussion. So I'm reasonably hopeful that we
>>>> won't be arguing self-evident things like "What is a self-proving
>>>> procedure?" or "Is logic math?" or "Are axioms-theorems-proofs
>>>> for math or RW reasoning?" All that was false agenda pushing
>>>> nonsense.
>>>>
>>>>> As far as I know, we still don't know what a "self-proving procedure"
>>>>> is. (It's not self-evident!)
>>>>>
>>>>> Well, I need to ignore the exclamation because that would make
>>>>> a hard universal resulting in a probable contradiction with "As
>>>>> far as I know." So I'm converting it to a soft universal.
>>>>>
>>>>> With that in mind, I can stipulate that you and other posters who
>>>>> have asked that question can't grok the phrase without limiting
>>>>> the generality of the foregoing statements, set in the *context*
>>>>> which you have *snipped*, for the reasons explained in these two
>>>>> recent posts in the thread:
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://tinyurl.com/cnssf>
>>>>> <http://tinyurl.com/b97lq>
>>>>>
>>>>> and for other context generally throughout the debate which
>>>>> bears on the interpretation of the quote.

Re: "Friendly Premises"

I can't grok the phrase because I can't grep it. In the text of the first link you mention, the string "self" doesn't even appear, and in the second the string "self" does appear, but you're not the one who used it. In the text from the first link you talk about your ideas concerning context, and the second is similar. The text you wrote in these links is just like the one to which I'm replying now: you are asked outright what you mean by "self-proving procedure", and you respond not by answering the question (that is, you don't define the term) but by talking about context and quotation.

I find this thread frustrating. Many of us have asked for a definition, but you have evaded offering one again and again. Your theory of context and quotation is interesting and applicable to the hermeneutic aspect of newsgroup discussions, but I hope you can sympathize with those who prefer a more direct response.

It's as though I ask you, as a colleague, what Kant meant by "intuition" and you respond by giving me a copy of the Critique of Pure Reason and telling me (with some murmurings about context) to figure it out for myself.

Jesse

--

Jesse Alama (alama@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

.

-
- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ *Re: "Friendly Premises"*
◇ *From: Acme Diagnostics*

 - *References:*
 - ◆ *Re: "Friendly Premises"*
◇ *From: Jesse Alama*
 - ◆ *Re: "Friendly Premises"*
◇ *From: Acme Diagnostics*

 - Prev by Date: *Re: "Friendly Premises"*
 - Next by Date: *Re: Constructive Math query.*
 - Previous by thread: *Re: "Friendly Premises"*
 - Next by thread: *Re: "Friendly Premises"*
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*