A Way to Avoid Intensions

by Dennis J. Darland

December 2020

1 Exemplification.

Let there be relations of exemplification Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 . . . . Q_n relates an object of order n to several objects (at least one) ofder $n-1$. Objects of order 0 are particulars. Objects of order 1 or greater are universals (but still individuals).

2 Intension Avoided.

This discussion follows PM to *56, pp. 72-76.

Suppose we take animals as individuals.

And we take x is a man and x is a featherless biped as universals of order 1.

Then suppose the classes of men and featherless bipeds are identical.

We can still say the universals are different.

The predicate Q_1 can still be extensional.

We can have $Q_1(\text{man}, x)$

and $Q_1(\text{featherless biped}, x)$

for the same x, without man = featherless biped.

3 Belief

If Russell has an idea of man and an idea of featherless biped,

S(Russell, 1910, idea_man, man)

S(Russell, 1910, idea_featherless_biped, featherless_biped)

It may be Russell believes either the class of men and the class of featherless bipeds are identical or are different.

Pure logic does not deal with any particular universals or particulars.

It only deals with the Q's.

If one gets into relations such as my R, S, and belief relations, it is no longer pure logic, but the rules of pure logic still apply - but they are only particular applications.

4 No Classes

There would be no classes. The closset thing being the theory of Q_n with 2 terms - a universal of order n = 1 and a particular, or universal of order n > 1 and universal of order n-1.

5 Classes and Relations

I think the existence of classes and relations would be empirical. They would exist based on what individuals and universals are found in the world. Mathematicians would find it convienient to make some existence axioms.