www. GrammaticalPhysics. ac GrammaticalPhysics@groups.msn.com

What's New
Join Now
Message Boards
General
Definition of GP
Problems from GP
Products of GP
Gram.Exp.Observ.
Physical Logic
Chronology
Links
Tools

Physical Logic : Physical Time and Logical Time

Choose another message board

Prev Discussion Next Discussion Send Replies to My Inbox

Reply | Recommend — Message 1 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome (Original Message) Sent: 4/22/2008 7:15 PM

Logic contains the notions 'before' and 'after'.
For example, we consider p before considering q when we see "p ⇒ q."

We may consider q before p in the above case,
but we can avoid using neither 'before' nor 'after'.

Because of it, I suppose the possibility that logic could not stand but for physical time.

First Previous 13-27 of 27 Next Last

Reply | Recommend — Message 13 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 6/2/2008 7:46 PM

Yet I am not satisfied with the ordinary definition of '⇒'.

Reply | Recommend — Message 14 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 6/30/2008 5:26 PM

The truth of a mathematical proposition can not vary.

As for a mathematical proposition,
we can not consider what we would see when a true proposition were false.

As for a mathematical proposition,
when we suppose that a true proposition were false,
we must necessarily encounter some contradiction.

On the other hand,
the truth of a proposition representing a physical fact can vary
in the meaning that we can consider what we would see when a true proposition were false.

As for a proposition representing a physical fact,
when we suppose that a true proposition were false,
we do not necessarily encounter any contradiction.

Reply | Recommend | Message 15 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome | Sent: 6/30/2008 5:42 PM

How is the following possibility?

Because of the reasons mentioned at the previous message,
the definition of '⇒' for propositions representing physical facts

can not be reduced to the ordinary definition of '⇒' for mathematical propositions.

Reply | Recommend | Message 16 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome | Sent: 7/13/2008 6:11 PM

I feel that I have been straying in thinking of '⇒' till now.

So, now I want to newly start thinking of '⇒' again.

Reply | Recommend | Message 17 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome | Sent: 7/14/2008 3:53 PM

'⇒' corresponds to 'if' of the ordinary language.
'if' is used for assuming something.
On the other hand, '⇒' does not have a meaning such that it assumes something.

Let us consider the following sentence.

(1) If my parent was not born, I was born.

The fact described by this sentence is not true.
In spite of it, the following proposition is true,

(2) my parent was not born ⇒ I was born

because 'p ⇒ q' is defined as 'not p or q'.

Does not it matter?

Reply | Recommend | Message 18 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome | Sent: 7/14/2008 4:15 PM

Because of the point mentioned at the previous message,
'⇒' is not an exact translation of 'if'.

So, the problem to be solved is to construct a logical definition to 'if'.

Reply | Recommend | Message 19 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 7/14/2008 4:27 PM

I think that 'q if p' is defined as the following proposition.

(3) 'p and q' is possible, and 'p and not q' is not possible.

Reply | Recommend Message 20 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 7/14/2008 4:36 PM

Possibility is determined by the physical law.
So, 'if' is physical and '⇒' is logical.

Reply | Recommend Message 21 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 7/14/2008 4:46 PM

My physical logic is to base logic on physics.
So, I must aim at basing '⇒' on 'if'.

Reply | Recommend Message 22 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 7/15/2008 12:50 PM

Can the definition of 'if' be expressed in terms of '⇒'?

Reply | Recommend Message 23 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 7/15/2008 1:14 PM

Can we define 'q if p' as 'p is possible ⇒ q is possible'?
This definition is wrong
because 'p is possible ⇒ q is possible' is defined as follows.

(4) p is not possible or q is possible.

This differs from

(3) 'p and q' is possible, and 'p and not q' is not possible.

Possibility of 'p and q' can not be reduced to possibility of p and possibility of q.

Reply | Recommend Message 24 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 7/15/2008 2:08 PM

The definition of 'p ⇒ q' can be rewritten as follows.

(5) p is not true or 'p and not q' is not true.

So, the definition of 'q if p' should be

(6) p is not possible or 'p and not q' is not possible

, letting 'possible' replace 'true', rather than (3).

Reply | Recommend — Message 25 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome — Sent: 7/15/2008 2:23 PM

For 'q if p', is it necessary that 'p and q' is possible?
It is not so if p is not possible, but it is so if p is possible.

Reply | Recommend — Message 26 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome — Sent: 7/15/2008 2:37 PM

How about defining 'q if p' as

(7) p is not possible or 'p and q' is possible and 'p and not q' is not possible?

This may be correct, but is not smart.

Reply | Recommend — Message 27 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome — Sent: 7/15/2008 2:46 PM

It is necessary that 'p and q' is possible,
but q must be true if p is true and 'p and not q' is not possible.
So, the condition (7) is equivalent to the condition (6).
Is it wrong?

First Previous 13-27 of 27 Next Last

Return to Physical Logic Prev Discussion Next Discussion Send Replies to My Inbox