

# Re: The king of france is ...

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-04/msg01210.html>

---

- *From:* "Jesse F. Hughes" <jesse@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sat, 19 Apr 2008 14:23:06 -0400
- 

Newberry <newberryxy@xxxxxxxxxx> writes:

On Apr 19, 4:17 am, "Jesse F. Hughes" <je...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Newberry <newberr...@xxxxxxxxxx> writes:

One could object however that since and English sentence must carry the information about the cardinality of the subject class, neither (3) nor (4) are equivalent to (2). In that case we would have to express (2) as

"The apple in my basket is red or all the apples in my basket are red."

(4) would be expressed as

$$(x)[Bx \rightarrow (Rx \ \& \ (y)(By \rightarrow y=x))] \quad (5)$$

and (3) would be expressed as

$$(x)[Bx \rightarrow (Rx \ \& \ \sim(y)(By \rightarrow y=x))] \quad (6)$$

Re: The king of france is ...

However it is not clear how (2) could possibly become

$$(Ex)[Bx \ \& \ Rx \ \& \ (y)(By \ \rightarrow \ y=x)] \quad (7)$$

It is not clear what the hell you mean when you say "(2) could become" some other sentence. The sentence (2) says that every apple in my basket is red. It does not convey any information about how many apples there are. There could be zero, one, or 23.

This is very true.

(7) says

something more about the situation. Why do you suppose that (2) is supposed to "become" (7)?

That is what Russel said.

Who said what? Where?

If you mean Russell's article on denoting, I don't think that he ever claims a particular formula somehow "becomes" some other formula.

Anyway, another way to express "there is one apple in my basket and it is red" is:

$$(x)(Bx \ \rightarrow \ Rx) \ \& \ (Ex)(Bx \ \& \ (Ay)(By \ \rightarrow \ x=y)). \quad (8)$$

Is it clear how (2) could "become" (8)?

The problem is not how to express "there is one apple in my basket in it is red." The problem is that (3) cannot be used to express (2) when there is only apple in the basket.

You seem to have changed direction and now you're talking about whether a certain English sentence expresses a formula or not. Before you were asking whether a formula expresses an English sentence or not. Was this intentional?

Anyway, if you intend to point out that plain English treats quantification somewhat differently than formal logic, then surely we agree. If someone told me "All the apples in my basket are red" in a

Re: The king of france is ...

Re: The king of france is ...

normal conversational context, I'd be a little surprised to learn that there was only one (or no) apples in the basket. But so what? What consequence do you want to draw from this observation?

--

Jesse F. Hughes

"This Trojan appears to utilize a function of the Windows Media DRM designed to enable license delivery scenarios as part of a social engineering attack." -- MS candidly explains the role of DRM licenses

.