

Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-10/msg00059.html>

- *From:* "William of Ockham" <d3uckner@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 2 Oct 2005 09:05:55 -0700
-

I said:

- > What we call "learning a
- >language" is assigning a reference to all of the terms that we learn.
- >So we learn that "hamburgers" mean hamburgers, "Socrates" means
- >Socrates, "two" means the number two, and so on. An interpretation (as
- >I understand) is the information which we must have about a sentence in
- >order to understand it.
- >So by "set theory as expressed in some language *English" I mean the
- >language+ the interpretation given to it as a part of learning the
- >language itself.'
- >An interpretation is "An allocation of significance to the terms of a
- >purely formal system, by specifying ranges for the variables,
- >denotations for the individual constants &c".

I'm sorry, I can't see anywhere here where I said that "x" means two. Obviously learning a language means learning how quantifiers like "all", "some", "any", "no" &c are used. This obviously does not mean "assigning a reference". Quite the opposite. That's why the traditional logicians called the quantifiers "syncategoremata" – co-signifying words, words which do not have a meaning in their own right, but which qualify the meaning of other words. I thought that was too obvious to mention.

Perhaps I should not have said "all of the terms that we learn". If that caused the confusion, sorry.

Except, qualifying this apology, a quantifier is not strictly speaking a "term".

.

-
- *References:*
 - ◆ ***Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox***
 - ◇ *From:* William of Ockham
 - ◆ ***Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox***
 - ◇ *From:* David C . Ullrich

Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox

- ◆ **Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox**
 - ◇ *From:* William of Ockham
- ◆ **Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox**
 - ◇ *From:* David C . Ullrich

- Prev by Date: **Re: Why are rules of inference not laws of sentential calculus?**
- Next by Date: **Re: Why are rules of inference not laws of sentential calculus?**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox**
- Next by thread: **Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**