Re: In need of the all−out revision of symbolic logic

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008−04/msg01989.html

- *From*: sarabt1@xxxxxxxxx

- *Date*: Tue, 29 Apr 2008 16:31:38 −0700 (PDT)

On Apr 29, 4:59 am, Eukie_M_SHIRAISHI <ms.eu...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> In the Fregean Theory of Logic (the standard theory of logic in the
> 20th century),
> p implies q has had been defined to mean not−p or q .
>
> Here let P be A lion is a mammal and Q be A lion and a whale are
> both mammals
> It is clear that Q implies P but P does not imply Q.
> Hence P implies Q is a falsity.
> On the other hand, not−P or Q is a truth.
> Therefore, it is a mistake to define p implies q to mean not−p or
> q .

Sorry, but I don't see why is not−P or Q true. I mean, what if a
lion and a whale are both not mammals?

It is not the situation in real world, but when you compare logic
statements, only the possible truth vlues of p and q metter. In our
case, they both aree true, so the truth values of both p implies q
and not−p or q are T.

I'm not a logician, so I'd be dilighted to see an explanation on the
subject...
.