

Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-09/msg00641.html>

- *From:* "William of Ockham" <d3uckner@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 25 Sep 2005 09:31:01 -0700
-

Ullrich:

- >> The "paradox" has to do with the existence of models of
 - >> set theory with certain "paradoxical" properties.
 - [Ockham]
 - >If you read Moore's article, you will see he does not state that. "
- Ullrich:
- > You say he doesn't state that
 - > this arises from the existence of certain models of set
 - > theory.

I note you use the expression "arises from" in your restatement of what you said, whereas in you first statement you say "has to do with".

Certainly, Moore would agree that the paradox "arises from" the existence of certain models of set theory, i.e. that their possible existence is the root cause of it. I'm sure he would NOT agree that these models themselves have "paradoxical" properties. He says the paradox is that any statement of the "relativism" in our claim that $P(w)$ is uncountable will have to be understood within a framework that casts it as a straightforward error. This is perfectly consistent with the claim that the models in question have in themselves no "paradoxical properties".

Ullrich

- > He doesn't use the word "paradox" in the paragraph above.
- > He does use the word later. You say he doesn't state that
- > this arises from the existence of certain models of set
- > theory. Did you see the sentence "...will still be true under
- > an interpretation which results from the intended interpretation
- > by the elimination of all but countably many of its sets."

And then he says right afterwards "not that this is paradoxical, nor does it constitute our difficulty". This is where I say "Jeez".

Me:

- > Is what he says above incorrect, then? He later says, in the version
- >which I did quote, what the "problem" alluded to above really is. I
- >shall quote it again.

Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox

>" Our description of $P(w)$ as uncountable, even though correct, must be
>understood relative to our own current point of view. From another
>point of view this very set may be countable.

> And now explain to me exactly what he might mean about talking
> about this and that from this point of view versus that point
> of view, _except_ that this or that is true in one model and
> false in another.
> Jeez.

Read to the end. The whole passage, from which you snipped the crucial part, is:

" Our description of $P(w)$ as uncountable, even though correct, must be understood relative to our own current point of view. From another point of view this very set may be countable. But I want to argue that such relativism, compelling though it is, is subject to the by now familiar predicament that any statement of it, if it is to be intelligible at all, will have to be understood within a framework that casts it as a straightforward error. ****It is this which I take to be Skolem's paradox****."

The asterixes are there from my last posting. The predicament is NOT that some statement is true in one model and false in another. It is how we, from our point of view, can state the relativistic statement "S is true in one model and false in another" in a language whose model is the one in which S is true (S being the statement that $P(w)$ is uncountable).

• **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **[Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox](#)**
◇ From: Chris Menzel

• **References:**

- ◆ **[Moore on Skolem's Paradox](#)**
◇ From: William of Ockham
- ◆ **[Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox](#)**
◇ From: David C . Ullrich
- ◆ **[Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox](#)**
◇ From: William of Ockham
- ◆ **[Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox](#)**
◇ From: David C . Ullrich

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Moore's account of Skolem's Paradox](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: Moore's account of Skolem's Paradox](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox](#)**

Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox

- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*