

Re: Platonism

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-12/1982.html>

From: David Longley (David_at_longley.demon.co.uk)

Date: 11/26/04

Date: Fri, 26 Nov 2004 20:45:52 +0000

In article <320e992a.0411261232.41252e2e@posting.google.com>, Eray Ozkural exa <examachine@gmail.com> writes

>

>*I actually like your point about "model". But I cannot say if I like*

>*the point about "exist". What is this sense used by *most**

>*mathematicians then? Would you care to explain? [I don't say "all", I*

>*say "most" in the above discussion.]*

>

>*I am hoping you do not mean that in (most!) mathematics consistency is*

>*identical to existence. That would be quite silly, would not it?*

>*Eray Ozkural*

This is why you have missed so much of what has been said and why you say very naive things about "behaviourism". It's also why I have frequently told you that you literally don't know what you are talking about.

"To be is to be the value of a variable" – where is that from? What does it have to do with the failure of (existential) quantification into intensional contexts such as those of propositional attitude and the modalities)? What does that have to do with "the extensional stance"?

--

David Longley

<http://www.longley.demon.co.uk/Frag.htm>