

Re: The fallacy of strengthened liar's paradox.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-01/msg00101.html>

- *From:* stevendaryl3016@xxxxxxxxxx (Daryl McCullough)
 - *Date:* 2 Jan 2008 09:40:31 -0800
-

Newberry says...

On Jan 1, 11:22=A0am, stevendaryl3...@xxxxxxxxxx (Daryl McCullough) wrote:

Once again, let's try this exercise:
Define a string of symbols to be "truish" if it
is the same string of symbols as some true sentence.

Now, let sentence number 42 be the sentence:

42. Sentence number 42 is not truish.

Is sentence number 42 truish? If the answer is "yes",
that leads to a contradiction. If the answer is "no",
that also leads to a contradiction.

I have another Zen riddle for you.

It's not a Zen riddle, it's the liar paradox, in which
the word "truish" is being used instead of "true". The
only difference is that "truish" gets around the nit-picky
response that two syntactically identical sentences may
have different meanings. That response doesn't actually
help to resolve the liar paradox.

Forget about "truish."

I suggest, instead, that you forget your
"resolution" to the Liar paradox. It **isn't**
a resolution.

Re: The fallacy of strengthened liar's paradox.

I think (1) is different than (2) because (1) is self-referential and (2) is not. Your sentence 42 only managed to map two different sentences onto the same string. That proves nothing.

It proves that your resolution to the liar paradox is not a resolution! The liar paradox remains even if you introduce your "tokenism". If you don't like the word "truish", then spell it out what it means explicitly:

42. No sentence that is syntactically identical to sentence number 42 is true.

Is there a sentence that is syntactically identical to sentence number 42 that is true? If the answer is "yes", then you have a contradiction. If the answer is "no", then you have a contradiction. The claim that sentence 42 is meaningless is *not* a resolution, as long as you maintain that no meaningless sentence can be true.

I'm getting rather tired of this discussion. It is apparent to me that your "resolution" of the Liar paradox is nothing of the sort. It's a band aid that provides an ad hoc rule for preventing a contradiction that arises from a specific form of the liar paradox, but does not prevent other contradictions from slight variations of the liar paradox.

—

Daryl McCullough
Ithaca, NY

.