

Re: Existence, Self-identity and Uniqueness.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2006-12/msg00481.html>

- *From:* Jan Burse <janburse@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 28 Dec 2006 12:28:03 +0100
-

Hi

Owen wrote:

Jan Burse wrote:
Wrong again.
The introduction of "the $x:Fx$ " does not render FOL= inconsistent at all, unless you foolishly assume that non-referring descriptions are values of the individual variable.
I don't do that, why do you persist in doing that??

I was on purpose using some foolishly substitutions.
Someone has to do sometimes foolishly things to show inconsistency, even in the presence of initially innocent concepts.

I did this to show you that you are not strictly working in FOL=. Because FOL= does not distinguish between foolishly and non foolishly substitutions.

How do you bar foolishly substitutions from FOL=?
How do you control the following reasoning step, which works in FOL= (even in FOL without =):

forall x A(x)

A(t)

Note again A is a formula. So we could also rewrite the step as follows:

forall x A

A[x/t]

Here A[x/t] denotes the result of substituting t for x in the formula A. How do you control this, and still claim you have FOL= at hand?

Re: Existence, Self-identity and Uniqueness.

Bye

.