

# Re: The king of france is ...

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-04/msg01247.html>

---

- *From:* Newberry <[newberryxy@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:newberryxy@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 19 Apr 2008 19:48:06 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Apr 19, 5:58 pm, "Jesse F. Hughes" <[je...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:je...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Newberry <[newberr...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:newberr...@xxxxxxxxxx)> writes:

On Apr 19, 1:08 pm, "Jesse F. Hughes" <[je...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:je...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Newberry <[newberr...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:newberr...@xxxxxxxxxx)> writes:

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?

Re: The king of france is ...

Er, \*I\* suggest it isn't relevant, since it (5) is true even if there are zero apples in the basket.

NOTE: Perhaps you would consider (5) to be neither true nor false if there are no apples in the basket, but it makes no difference. If there are no apples in the basket, then (4) is false and so (5) does not express the same thought as (4).

You're the only one who ever suggested that (5) could represent (4).

Sorry if you thought I agreed, but I do not.

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

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

but

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

?

I don't know what you mean by "the singular" of a sentence,

You should purchase a textbook of English grammar then. "All the apples in my basket are red" is in plural. "The apple in my basket is red" is in singular.

but I am saying that "There is one apple in my basket and it is red" is expressed by (7) and not (5).

Sometimes, you really do surprise me. I really think that you understand classical logic well enough to be able to do such simple translations, but the past week or so you seem utterly bumfuzzled.

Re: The king of france is ...

Re: The king of france is ...

For that matter, I would not agree that "all the apples in my basket are red" is properly translated by  $(x)[Bx \rightarrow (Rx \ \& \ \sim(y)(By \rightarrow y=x))]$ . That formula expresses:

"Every apple in my basket is red and there is not exactly one apple in my basket."

I.e., that every apple in the basket is red and there are either zero apples in the basket or more than one apple in the basket.

Any suggestion for a better translation of "all the apples in my basket are red"?

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

perhaps?

.