

Re: The fallacy of strengthened liar's paradox.

Re: The fallacy of strengthened liar's paradox.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-01/msg00243.html>

- *From:* Charlie-Boo <shymathguy@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 6 Jan 2008 07:51:24 -0800 (PST)
-

On Dec 29 2007, 6:54 pm, Marshall <marshall.spi...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Dec 29, 3:40 pm, djr...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

On Dec 29, 10:33 pm, Marshall <marshall.spi...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Dec 25, 5:42 pm, djr...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

Meaninglessness is when a statement is grammatically incorrect, like "2++exp(+)=8". It is a concept that can be applied to mathematical statements.

Hmmm. Do you mean to imply that every syntactically well-formed mathematical expression is meaningful? What is the meaning of $1/0$?

Yes, or at least statements in elementary number theory, for example (I don't wish to get into a debate about the continuum hypothesis).

Okay.

The statement " $1/0$ " is not syntactically correct.

Re: The fallacy of strengthened liar's paradox.

An intriguing statement! Can you supply further justification?
It appears syntactically correct to me, but perhaps I am not clear what you mean by that.

Further thoughts:

What is the meaning of the expression

$$1/(x-1)$$

When $x=2$? When $x=1$? It is the same syntax in both cases, isn't it?

The definition of a/b unfortunately makes the faulty assumption that there is a c such that $b*c=a$ and doesn't answer that question (or else requires such a c to exist and you didn't pass that requirement.)

C-B

Marshall