Re: Nonfirstorderizability

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005−08/msg00216.html

- *From*: "George Dance" <georgedance04@xxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: 8 Aug 2005 03:44:07 −0700

Michael De wrote:

> So I guess my interpretation is incorrect since arithmetic is not
> essential in cooking up the models.

Being incorrect is OK; By raising your points and making your hypotheses here, you make it possible for many besides yourself to learn about them.

In that light, I was wondering: when you have time (ie, when the real discussion is over), would you mind explaining to a simple lay person why the Geach−Kaplan sentence cannot be 'firstorderized' as:

ExEyAz((Cx & Cy) & (Axy & Ayx) & (Axz −> z=y) & (Ayz −> z=x))
(Ca =df. a is a critic; Aab =df. a admires b)?

Or refer me to a weblink, if that's easier.

.

- ***Follow−Ups***:
  - ♦ ***Re: Nonfirstorderizability***
    - ◊ *From:* Michael De
  - ♦ ***Re: Nonfirstorderizability***
    - ◊ *From:* Chris Menzel
  - ♦ ***Re: Nonfirstorderizability***
    - ◊ *From:* Torkel Franzen

- ***References***:
  - ♦ ***Nonfirstorderizability***
    - ◊ *From:* Michael De
  - ♦ ***Re: Nonfirstorderizability***
    - ◊ *From:* Michael De

- Prev by Date: ***Re: "Friendly Premises"***
- Next by Date: ***Re: "Friendly Premises"***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Nonfirstorderizability***

- Next by thread: ***Re: Nonfirstorderizability***
- Index(es):
  - ***Date***
  - ***Thread***