

# Re: An argument against modus ponens

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-09/msg00496.html>

---

- *From:* george <[greeneg@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:greeneg@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 21 Sep 2008 10:13:23 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Sep 21, 8:52 am, John Jones <[jonescard...@xxxxxxx](mailto:jonescard...@xxxxxxx)> wrote:

Then kindly follow your own example and remember that we are talking about formal languages. Unlike our natural language conditions, formal languages do not have access to local weather forecasts.

But they DO have truth-values, both presumptively and potentially. They just do. It's just a fact about logic. Logic is about what happens when you PRESUME that the truth of some sentence could somehow be linked to the truth of another. That's just WHAT YOU ARE DOING whenever you are doing logic. But that's not the point. The point IS, since I HAVE TWO DEGREES IN LOGIC AND YOU HAVE ZERO, why are you trying to TELL me what is going on? Why don't you just ASK??

Nobody ever said anything could BE different things.  
Things can only be what they are.

Thankyou. Things can only be what they are, without truth or falsehood.

Oh, bullshit. That is like saying you could be who and what you are without a height or a weight. These things INHERENTLY HAVE this property (of being boolean/bivalent in type).

So you can't speak of P being false.

I CAN SO TOO. I just DO.

Why? Because a false P assumes both P and R.

Re: An argument against modus ponens

I truly don't know what you mean by R.  
I think you are confusing P (the variable) with P (the sentence, asserting that the variable's value is true). I concede that there is some ambiguity of notation in the usual presentation around this.

WE are NOT talking about words in the natural–language sense, OR about the things those words refer to. WE ARE TALKING ABOUT \*STRINGS\*. We are talking about SYMBOLS. We are talking about FINITE LISTS OF CHARACTERS. THOSE are our atomic building–blocks around here.

Then follow your own example and remember that. Strings etc represent themselves. They don't tell us what the weather might be doing, whether 'it's raining' is false or not.

They do IF WE SAY they do. "Dog" IS A STRING, dumbass. You can't claim that it doesn't MEAN a certain kind of 4–legged carnivorous mammal IF WE'RE SPEAKING ENGLISH. These strings OCCUR IN A CONTEXT that IMPUTES meaning to them. When the context is logic, some of the strings are propositions and some of them are sentences, and formally, SENTENCES HAVE truth–values, JUST as surely has they have letters. Those are a DEFINED PART of what it MEANS to BE a sentence.

The number is not (necessarily) the SAME as its numeral, and the truth–value is not the same as the symbol or string that names it, BUT THEY MIGHT AS WELL be; they are both abstract.

That is airy–fairy land.

Of course it is! That is WHAT THIS IS ALL ABOUT!

I'm surprised you've gone there.

That's why you can't do logic.

Re: An argument against modus ponens

Re: An argument against modus ponens

You have no conception of the realm where it is occurring  
(well, you do; we all do; it's unavoidable, but you are arguing  
against  
it because you are a dipshit).

Peter Pan says  
that numbers are numerals when they're abstract.

No, we ALL notice that numerals, LIKE numbers, are abstract.  
That doesn't MAKE them numbers; it doesn't make the distinction  
disappear.

That's sad. It's sad that someone out there thinks that numerals and  
numbers are all alike in the far-off, auto-put-right land of  
mathmatico-logic.

That's obviously THE ONLY place THEY CAN be.  
You try to ascribe any OTHER, CONCRETE properties to them and you just  
GET REFUTED as soon as somebody decides to count things that don't  
have  
that property.

.