

Re: Nonfirstorderizability

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-08/msg00301.html>

- *From:* "George Dance" <georgedance04@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 16 Aug 2005 09:13:32 -0700
-

Keith Ramsay wrote:

> George Dance wrote:
> |george wrote:
> |>>> Some relative of each villager and some relative
> |>>> of each townsman hate each other.
> |>
> |> How about
> |> Axy[Vx&Ty -> Euv[Rxu & Ryv & Huv & Hvu]]
> |
> |How does that differ from what you snipped:
> | AxAyEzEu((Vx -> Rzx) & (Ty -> Ruy) & (Hzu & Huz))
> |?
>
> Suppose there are no villagers or townsmen. Then the
> first version is true, while the second version still
> requires that (if there is anyone) there exists either
> one person z=u who hates himself or two people z<>u
> who hate each other.

I was hoping that george would answer the question, but...

That is a difference: On george's 'boolean' interpretation, "Some relative of each villager and some relative of each townsman hate each other" does not imply that "Some people hate each other": it would be illogical to infer, from someone's asserting the first statement, that he is also asserting the second.

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ **[Re: Nonfirstorderizability](#)**
 - ◇ *From:* george
- *References:*
 - ◆ **[Nonfirstorderizability](#)**
 - ◇ *From:* Michael De
 - ◆ **[Re: Nonfirstorderizability](#)**

Re: Nonfirstorderizability

◇ *From:* Michael De

◆ **Re: Nonfirstorderizability**

◇ *From*