

Re: The set of all JOKES.....

## Re: The set of all JOKES.....

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2007-02/msg01003.html>

---

- *From:* "John Jones" <jonescardiff@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 25 Feb 2007 09:50:02 -0800
- 

On Feb 25, 4:46?pm, "charlesweh...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx"  
<charlesweh...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 24 Feb., 20:47, "John Jones" <jonescard...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 24, 5:29?pm, "charlesweh...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx"

<charlesweh...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 23 Feb., 21:54, "John Jones" <jonescard...@xxxxxxx>  
wrote:

Yes, we can never stop the process of  
substituting for 'itself'. But  
the first move was untenable anyway:  
?Which is 'this' set? And how can you refer  
to a self-reference  
(itself)?

The set is "This is the set of all jokes that does include  
itself".

The jokes within the set are:

Re: The set of all JOKES.....

"This is the set of all jokes that does include "This is the set of  
of  
all jokes that does include itself".".

"This is the set of all jokes that does include "This is the set  
of  
all jokes that does include "This is the set of all jokes that  
does  
include itself".".

"This is the set of all jokes that does include "This is the set  
of  
all jokes that does include "This is the set of all jokes that  
does  
include "This is the set of all jokes that does include  
itself".".".

"This is the set of all jokes that does include "This is the set  
of  
all jokes that does include "This is the set of all jokes that  
does  
include "This is the set of all jokes that does include "This is  
the  
set of all jokes that does include itself".".".

and so on to infinite length.

The first move was untenable. Correct. However, one can put  
any word  
one likes into a sentence. By retaining the word "itself", one  
has  
avoided the untenable move. This word is retained in the  
original,  
which although a set, is not a joke.

When we fall into the trap of substituting that word, we have  
entered  
into the collection of jokes. The question only remains – how  
many

Re: The set of all JOKES.....

times does one make the untenable move before one "twigs"  
that one  
should leave the word UNCHANGED?

As one can put any word into a sentence that one wants to,  
one can put  
"itself" in – as a word – without it necessarily referencing  
anything.  
It is just a pattern of letters of the alphabet, which must be  
present  
for the original specification to be met.

Charles Douglas Wehner

I don't dispute your analysis, but the first question to ask is this:  
"This is the set of all jokes that does include itself"  
– which is 'this' set of all jokes that does include itself?..– Zitierten Text  
ausblenden –

– Zitierten Text anzeigen –

The string of words itself, which is not a joke until the untenable  
substitution takes place. Then it expands out into all the jokes.

Charles Douglas Wehner– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

Right. It is the string of words. And here we see the same problem  
that besets Godel, that besets realism and Kantian methodological  
interpretations of reality.

The 'string of words' is not definable in the scenario you present. It  
stands outside it. It cannot be referred to as the object that holds  
the sense of the sentence for an object cannot fulfill that duty.

The string of words cannot relate sentence and meaning if all it can  
do is determine that they both fall in the same place on the page.

.

Re: The set of all JOKES.....