

Re: The king of france is ...

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-04/msg01228.html>

- *From:* Newberry <newberryxy@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 19 Apr 2008 13:52:31 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Apr 19, 1:08 pm, "Jesse F. Hughes" <je...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Newberry <newberr...@xxxxxxxxxx> writes:

On Apr 19, 11:23 am, "Jesse F. Hughes" <je...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Newberry <newberr...@xxxxxxxxxx> writes:

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

Re: The king of france is ...

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

(4) would
be
expressed
as

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

and (3)
would be
expressed
as

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

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

Re: The king of france is ...

(Ex)[Bx
& Rx &
(y)(By ->
y=x)]
(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.

Re: The king of france is ...

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?

I was NEVER interested in formalizing "there is one apple in my basket and it is red"

That didn't answer my question, but whatever.

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 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

Re: The king of france is ...

Re: The king of france is ...

consequence do you want to draw from this observation?

If you express

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

as

$$\text{"The apple in my basket is red"} \quad (4)$$

But *who* has suggested doing this?

Who suggested it is not relevant for the problem before us, and the problem is how to express

$$(x)(Bx \rightarrow Rx) \quad (2)$$

when there is only one apple in the basket. Got it?

Not me. After all, (5) expresses something like "There is no more than one apple in my basket and it is red."

then (4) cannot at the same time mean

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

Got it?

You're the only one who ever suggested that (5) could represent (4). Sorry if you thought I agreed, but I do not.

Re: The king of france is ...

Are you saying that the singular of "all the apples in my basket are red" = $(x)[Bx \rightarrow (Rx \ \& \ \sim(y)(By \rightarrow y=x))]$ is not

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

but

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

?

.

Re: The king of france is ...