

Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-09/msg00649.html>

- *From:* "William of Ockham" <d3uckner@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 26 Sep 2005 11:16:52 -0700
-

Chris

> You seem to be getting off track here. The "paradox" has to do with the
> fact that S can be *true* in models that are in fact countable, not that
> it's true in some models and false in others.

Didn't I say exactly that? I said in the post you quoted that Moore's predicament is NOT that some statement is true in one model and false in another. But nor is it simply that S can be *true* in models that are in fact countable. It is, as you say, that the thesis of relativism about cardinality is either unintelligible or false.

.

• *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
 - ◆ *Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox*
 ◇ *From:* William of Ockham
 - ◆ *Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox*
 ◇ *From:* Chris Menzel
- Prev by Date: *all the good books are OOP*
 - Next by Date: *Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox*
 - Previous by thread: *Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox*
 - Next by thread: *Re: Moore on Skolem's Paradox*
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*