

§1 Human knowledge.

If science is true, how do we know it?

According to science, the only knowledge a human being has is due to the effects of the external world upon ~~the~~ ^{his} nervous system and to the structure and functioning of his nervous system.

~~Some of the objects of knowledge are~~
~~contradict science.~~ I suppose that there is some sort of foundation for science to contradict science itself. Then science is false. If science is false we can't know science. Therefore there is no foundation for the knowledge of science.

~~It is epistemology, not science.~~
Someone believing that science is knowledge, and who desires to understand the character of scientific knowledge should not seek a foundation of scientific knowledge, but study what science says about human knowledge. Someone who seeks a foundation for human knowledge cannot merely cast doubt upon science for the time being; they must openly repudiate the results of science. Someone who says that there must be a foundation of knowledge says that science must be false. How this is known is beyond me. It is probably a prejudice natural to most philosophers. Someone can consistently maintain that there is some sort of knowledge different than scientific knowledge and that this knowledge has a foundation. I cannot see how such a view can be taken seriously.

The Clarification of Stimulus Meaning.

Quine defines the stimulus meaning of a ~~word~~ ^{sentence} as ~~the~~ ordered pair of the affirmative and negative stimulus meanings of the ~~word~~ sentence.

The positive stimulus meaning of a sentence is roughly the class of stimulation which would prompt assent to the sentence. The negative stimulus meaning of a sentence is roughly the class of stimulation which would prompt dissent to the sentence. (p 32) ~~stimulation~~ I think a

stimulation ~~could~~ could best be viewed as the impingement of the external world upon our sensory surfaces, (p 33) although Quine also speaks of stimulation as ~~the~~ the condition of the sensory surface itself. ~~All say~~. In either ^{more clear} case, a stimulation must ~~be~~ be a universal in order to serve the ~~proper~~ purpose in the definitions above.

Otherwise it is impossible that a sentence could have the same stimulus meaning for two people, or even for one person at two times. Although it would be possible to remove this difficulty by talking of similar, or like stimulation the problem would remain due to the subjunctive condition in the definition. (p 34) We must be able to speak of possible ^{stimulations.}

~~Quine's~~ ~~to~~ ~~Quine~~

Certainly upon a straightforward interpretation of the above definition stimulations would be quantified over in the theory. But then ~~these~~ ~~stimulations~~ and possible objects have ontological status in the theory.