Relational Referring, How We Know What We Are Talking About

Dennis J. Darland

August 10, 2024

SECTION 1.
This paper relies on previous work found at:
Link to my philosophy using WildLIFE.
Namely:
$*402\cdot13\vdash qqqq[rrss,p,t,w,o] =. qqqq[rrrr,p,t,w,i]. qqqq[ssss,p,t,i,o]$
and:
$*402\cdot14\vdash qqqq[rrtt,p,t,w,o] =. qqqq[rrrr,p,t,w,i]. qqqq[tttt,p,t,i,o]$
Some examples are:
$qqqq[rrss,dennis,now,waverly-word,waverly]$
$qqqq[rrtt,dennis,now,dog-word,dog-class]$
$qqqq[rrss,dennis,now,sun-word,sun]$
$qqqq[rrtt,dennis,now,electron-word,electron-class]$
$qqqq[rrtt,dennis,now,minds,class-of-minds]$
$qqqq[rrtt,dennis,now,matter,class-of-matter]$

We refer to these things by using the words we have learned from others. We don't need full analyses in order to use the words. And the usage of the words establishes their reference, without a complete analysis being available. This does not mean we should not seek such analyses. But we couldn't seek them, if we didn't know what we were talking about - know well enough to establish their usage. We can know what we are talking about without a full analysis. An analysis tells us more. This also solves the Paradox of Analysis!

Link to my philosophy using WildLIFE.