Studla Logica, vol. XV (1964), pp 237-8/

JOSEPH AGASSI

VARIATIONS ON THE LIAR'S PARADOX

Line 1: The statement on line one is false.

Line 2: All statements on line two are false. p and not-p

Line 3: All statements on line 3 are true, or all of them are false. p and not-p

Line 4: The statement on line 4 is false, or (p and not-p).

Line 5: The statement on line 5 is true if and only if (p and not p).

Line 6: All statements on line 6 are false. p.

Line 7: All statements on line 7 are false. Not-p.

Line 8: The statement on 9 is true.

Line 9: The statement on line 8 is false.

Line 10: The statement on line 11 is true if and only if the statement on line 12 is true.

Line 11: The statement on line 10 is true and p.

Line 12: The statement on line 10 is true and not-p

Line 13: The statement on line 13 is true and p, if and only if, the statement on line 13 is true and not-p Line thirteen is perhaps somewhat more reminiscent of Russell's paradox than Tarski's 'the statement on line 1 is true if and only if the statement on line 1 is false' which he has deduced from the statement on line 1 (Logic, Semantics, Metamathematics, p. 158). Moreover, line thirteen contains no explicit mention of falsehood, an advantage achieved by Tarski (ibid., p. 162) in a somewhat less sitnple fashion. Obviously, all these formulations are both demonstrable and refutable, and Tarski's method disposes of them all. The methods of the language analysts may dispose of line 1 (by viewing self-reference as meaningless) and perhaps of lines 8 and 9 (Lewis' visiting card), though by somewhat more elaborate techniques (such as Ryle's). But at least *prima facie* the ordinary language analysts' techniques fail to dispose of line 13, especially since these techniques are largely based on common-sense which stumbles when applied to complicated propositions that one rarely used in ordinary circumstances. (Being only partly self-referring, and rather complicated, line 13 scarcely lends itself to the analyses so far offered by members of this school. Hence, it may be viewed as a tentative argument in favor of Tarski's solution of the paradox and against the ordinary language analysts' solutions.

Allatum est die 17 Januarii 1963 The University of Hong Kong