

## Re: An argument against modus ponens

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-09/msg00497.html>

---

- *From:* george <[greeneg@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:greeneg@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 21 Sep 2008 10:04:44 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Sep 21, 8:52 am, John Jones <[jonescard...@xxxxxxx](mailto:jonescard...@xxxxxxx)> wrote:

george wrote:

On Sep 19, 11:01 pm, John Jones <[jonescard...@xxxxxxx](mailto:jonescard...@xxxxxxx)> wrote:  
"It's raining" has a truth-value!

Ridiculous.

By replying "ridiculous", YOU are alleging that the sentence THAT YOU ARE REPLYING TO has a truth-value, AND THAT ITS TRUTH-VALUE IS false. SO YOU ARE ACTING as though YOU KNOW that sentences have truth-values.

So just stop arguing the point. EVERYbody, INCLUDING you, KNOWS that sentences have truth-values. We speak that way ALL THE TIME. Nobody could EVER respond to ANYbody else, "That's not true.", if this were NOT the case. But the mere fact that "That's not true" IS a sentence, where the antecedent of the "That" IS ITSELF OFTEN a sentence, PROVES this point.

You gotta pick your battles, man.

.