

Re: Nonfirstorderizability

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-08/msg00229.html>

- *From:* "Michael De" <mikejde@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 8 Aug 2005 15:16:39 -0700
-

George Dance wrote:

- > 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:
- >
- > $ExEyAz((Cx \ \& \ Cy) \ \& \ (Axy \ \& \ Ayx) \ \& \ (Axz \ \rightarrow \ z=y) \ \& \ (Ayz \ \rightarrow \ z=x))$
- > $(Ca \ \text{=df.} \ a \ \text{is a critic; } Aab \ \text{=df. } a \ \text{admires } b)?$
- >
- > Or refer me to a weblink, if that's easier.

I take that sentence to imply the Geach-Kaplan sentence but not the converse. That there are at most two critics who admire only each other (and not themselves) implies that there are some critics (provided those critics are not the same since we using the plural--'critics') who admire only each other. But that there are some critics who admire only each other does not imply that there are at most two critics who admire only each other--there could be three, four, etc.

-
- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ ***Re: Nonfirstorderizability***
 - ◇ *From:* George Dance
 - ◆ ***Re: Nonfirstorderizability***
 - ◇ *From:* Torkel Franzen

- *References:*
 - ◆ ***Nonfirstorderizability***
 - ◇ *From:* Michael De
 - ◆ ***Re: Nonfirstorderizability***
 - ◇ *From:* Michael De
 - ◆ ***Re: Nonfirstorderizability***
 - ◇ *From:* George Dance

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Introduction to Lambek-Calculus***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Nonfirstorderizability***

Re: Nonfirstorderizability

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