

Re: what follows from denying an axiom

Re: what follows from denying an axiom

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2009-01/msg00684.html>

- *From:* Chris Menzel <cmenzel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 23 Jan 2009 20:35:15 +0000 (UTC)
-

On Thu, 22 Jan 2009 16:49:56 -0800 (PST), george <greeneg@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> said:

On Jan 22, 2:58 pm, Chris Menzel <cmen...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

you frequently stick your foot in your mouth.

Flaunting ignorance is an efficient way of getting it corrected, in a context where that is what people care about. Unfortunately, people here (me included) usually care more about defending their egos.

Case in point here.

Yes, indeed, it is.

What I **said** was:

I DO NOT give a shit!
THIS is about what **I** am saying!

Well, yes, about what you said I said:

Second-order languages have a generalized model theory (from Henkin) that is essentially first-order.

To which you responded:

The Henkin semantics IS NOT SECOND-ORDER ANYTHING

despite the fact that, not only had I not said it Henkin's semantics was second-order, I had explicitly stated that it is first-order.

Re: what follows from denying an axiom

Re: what follows from denying an axiom

You do understand English well enough to see that that does not say that
Henkin's semantics itself is se