

# Re: An argument against modus ponens

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-09/msg00042.html>

---

- *From:* John Jones <jonescardiff@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Thu, 04 Sep 2008 21:25:56 +0100
- 

OP wrote:

John Jones wrote:

Modus Ponens:  
If P, then Q.  
P. Therefore, Q.

The "If" announces a truth value. So "if P" requires the consideration of another element or object through which a truth value may be ascertained.

Why does "if P" require the consideration of another element or object through which a truth value may be ascertained?

"If P" does not mean this: P may be presented or may not be presented.  
Rather, "If P" requires us to consider the non-representation of P as an element.

So if "if P" turns out for P (P is true), and not for the other, unnamed element (R, as I term it) we still need to entertain the idea of that element (R) which P is not if we want to retain the ontological significance of "if" statements.

"If P" then, says P, R. In fact, simply "if" says P, R.

.