

Re: Liar paradox, one more time

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-07/3248.html>

From: Poker Joker (*Poker_at_wi.rr.com*)

Date: 07/30/04

Date: Fri, 30 Jul 2004 02:26:00 GMT

"Paul Holbach" <paulholbachSPAMBAN@freenet.de> wrote in message news:881c8779.0407291735.34ac845a@posting.google.com...

> > "Poker Joker" <Poker@wi.rr.com> wrote in message news:<

> > HPBNC.4015\$ju6.2109@twister.rdc-kc.rr.com>...

> > > "Barb Knox" <see@sig.below> wrote in message

> > > news:ce6j71\$3ov\$I@lust.ihug.co.nz...

>

>

> > > 3-valued logic doesn't solve the "strengthened liar" paradox:

> > > "The truth value of this statement is 'false' or 'maybe'"

> > > or more concisely,

> > > "This statement is not 'true'".

>

>

> > Putting those words together might be mistaken as an assertion, but

> > they no more make up an assertion than the sentence: "Take out

> > the garbage." Or, "Take out the garbage is not true." The first

> > sentence is semantically acceptable but not the second and

> > certainly your sentence is not semantically acceptable. They are

> > gibberish.

>

>

> Would you mind revealing your definition of "semantically acceptable"?

Let's just say that a sentence is semantically acceptable if its meaning is well understood; Almost everyone who would be expected to receive the message would gather the same meaning. With regards to the following sentence: "This sentence is not true." What meaning do you gather? Do you think it is the same meaning I gather?

> PH

>

> P.S.:

>

> Gibberish looks like "3j6)=!GDk+*j"!

Are you telling us it doesn't look like "3j6(=!GDk+*j"!

sci.logic: Re: Liar paradox, one more time

If it does, then each of the following are also gibberish:

Do cars wonder if three years know?

Never revolve his night.

This statement is not true or it is gibberish.

If this statement is not true then it isn't gibberish, otherwise it is gibberish.

Thi