MSN Home | My MSN | Hotmail
Sign In Web Search: Go

imPACTFUL Now Windows Live™ Hotmail® is part of the i'm Initiative from Microsoft. So now there are more ways to help. JOIN NOW ▸

msn Groups Groups Home | My Groups | Language | Help

Important Announcement
The MSN Groups service will close in February 2009. You can move your group to Multiply, MSN's partner for online groups. Learn More

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

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 2-12 of 27 Next ▸ Last ▸

Reply | Recommend | Message 2 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 4/22/2008 7:31 PM

I talked about the relationship between logical time and physical time, when I discussed the principle of mathematical induction with one of my friends.

I said that infinite number of operations do not take infinite logical time
differently from physical time,
when I hear he claims that it will never end.

Reply | Recommend | Message 3 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 5/26/2008 9:22 AM

I wrote wrong sentences as English in messages 1 and 2
because I was in a hurry then.

Today I will correct them.

Reply | Recommend | Message 4 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 5/26/2008 6:00 PM

By Rewriting Message 1, it follows that

Logic seems to include the notions 'before' and 'after' inevitably.
For example, when we see 'p ⇒ q', we first consider p and after that consider q.
We may consider q before considering p instead,
but we must use at least one of the notions 'before' and 'after'.

Reply | Recommend | Message 5 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 5/26/2008 6:37 PM

By Rewriting Message 2, it follows that

I talked about the relationship between logical time and physical time
when I discussed the principle of mathematical induction with one of my friends.
Then I said that a set of an infinite number of operations takes no time as a logical time
differently from physical time,
hearing from him that a set of an infinite number of operations could not end.

Reply | Recommend | Message 6 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 5/26/2008 7:20 PM

Seeing that the definition of 'p ⇒ q'

(not p) or q

does not include the notion of time at all,
It seems as if logic succeeded in eliminating the notion of time completely,
but I dare to try criticizing its completeness.

Reply | Recommend | Message 7 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 5/27/2008 7:38 PM

According to the ordinary definition of 'p ⇒ q'

(not p) or q,

q is completely independent of p.

If q is true, p ⇒ q even when q is independent of p.

I am not satisfied with this point.

I wish I could define 'p ⇒ q'

so that it represents a relationship between p and q.

Reply | Recommend | Message 8 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 5/27/2008 8:04 PM

I think of the logical relationship between a specific definition and a specific theorem
as an example of the logical relationship represented by 'p ⇒ q'.

I would like to recognize the situation that taking the definition lets the theorem hold
as the definition ⇒ the theorem.

Reply | Recommend | Message 9 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 5/28/2008 11:49 AM

To attain the purpose proposed in Message 8,
let p be an independent variable and let q be a function of p.
And let's write

$$q = q(p).$$

Then we can write new definition of 'p ⇒ q' as follows.

$$\forall p;\ (\text{not } p) \text{ or } q(p).$$

Reply | Recommend | Message 10 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 6/2/2008 6:53 PM

The condition of previous message seems to be too strong.
How about the definition that q(p) is true not for all p but for a specific p?

Reply | Recommend | Message 11 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 6/2/2008 7:08 PM

As for a number value function, the equation:

$$x=a \Rightarrow f(x)=b$$

can be rewritten as

$$\forall x;\ x=a \Rightarrow f(x)=b$$

even by using the ordinary definition.
So, new definition proposed at Messages 9 and 10 may not be necessary.

Reply | Recommend | Message 12 of 27 in Discussion

From: SourceCodeOf_HumanGenome Sent: 6/2/2008 7:39 PM

That a definition ⇒ a theorem may also not be intrinsically new.

For example, that the theorem:

$$[f+g]'(x)=f'(x)+g'(x)$$

follows the definition:

$$f'(x)\equiv df(x)/dx$$

can be expressed as follows using the ordinary definition of '⇒'

without using the notion of definition.

$$\forall f,g,h;\exists f',g',h';$$

$$f'(x)=df(x)/dx \text{ and } g'(x)=dg(x)/dx \text{ and } h'(x)=dh(x)/dx \text{ and}$$

$$f+g=h \Rightarrow f'+g'=h'$$

This is trivial from the famous point of view that a definition is an abbreviation.

First | Previous | 2-12 of 27 | Next | Last

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

Notice: Microsoft has no responsibility for the content featured in this group. Click here for more info.

Try MSN Internet Software for FREE!

MSN Home | My MSN | Hotmail | Search Feedback | Help

©2005 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved. Legal Advertise MSN Privacy