This Article Should Not Be Rejected by Mind

JON PEREZ LARAUDOGOITIA

I

If the statement in Section I of this article is trivially true, then this article should be accepted for publication by the journal *Mind*.

II

If the statement which appears in section I of this article were false, then its antecedent 'the statement in section I of this article is trivially true' would be true, which means that the statement itself would be true; this is a contradiction. Therefore, the statement in section I of this article should be true. If the antecedent were true, the consequent would also have to be true. This does not seem right, however, since *Mind* is a serious journal which enjoys great prestige, and as such should not accept articles the content of which boils down to a statement which is trivially true (for example, the statement in section I) followed by a commentary (as in this section) proving its trivially true character (which is what we seem to have done up to now), or, even worse, proving that it is not trivially true (which is what we hope to do by the end of this discussion). So, the statement in section I is either false or it is a non-trivial truth; it must in fact be this latter, since, as we have already seen, it cannot be false; consequently it is the antecedent which is false. What is then the truth-value of its consequent? If it were false, this would mean that this article should not be accepted for publication by *Mind*, and this in spite of the fact that, as we have just seen, its content consists basically of a non-trivial truth, followed by a justification that this is so (sections I and II respectively). But, let us remember, *Mind* is a magazine of great prestige and, as such, would never reject its duty of accepting for publication all articles on logical analysis which are submitted to it when these articles contain a demonstration of a new and surprising non-trivial truth. In other words, the consequent about which we are talking must be true, and therefore the present article should be accepted for publication by *Mind*. *Mind* should not reject it.

Somebody might counter-argue by saying that the previous discussion does not make sense, since to introduce at the level of the object language its own concept of 'trivial truth' ('non-trivial truth', 'trivial falsity', 'non-trivial falsity') is just as illegitimate as to introduce merely the concept of

truth itself (or falsehood). But such a radical posture is not acceptable, since, in fact, none of the usual paradoxes which appear in every discourse in which, for example, Tarski's hierarchy of levels is forgotten, will occur when instead of 'truth-falsehood', we talk of 'truth(trivial or non-trivial)-falsehood(trivial or non-trivial)'. For example, one of the forms, both inoffensive, which Epimenides' statement would take would be 'this statement is trivially false', which is false, but in a non-trivial way. What we might call Rosser's paradox would become something like 'if this statement is trivially true, then unicorns exist', a simple statement of truth, but a non-trivial truth. (Should *Mind*, therefore, admit an exposition and justification of the same within its pages?) It turns out also that 'if this statement is not trivially true, then unicorns exist', is simply a trivial truth or a falsehood. Finally, Jourdain's card no longer appears to be a paradox; in fact, we can immediately see that when A and B are statements such that

A: B is trivially false
B: A is trivially true

we arrive at the non-contradictory (non-paradoxical) solution that B is trivially false and A true (though not trivially so). Our discussion seems to indicate clearly that to introduce in a given language the notion of 'trivial truth' relative to the same does not lead to contradiction (as in the case of the simplest concept of truth), but if, at the same time, we do the same relative to the idea of 'non-trivial truth' we automatically find that it is possible to derive Tarski's impossibility proof (on the reasonable assumption that all truth is either trivial or not). The same does not happen if together with 'trivially true' we formalize in the object language the predicate 'trivially false' or (exclusive disjunction) 'non-trivially false'.

This is, I believe, the first article in the whole history of philosophy the content of which is concerned exclusively with its own self, or, in other words, which is totally self-referential. The reason why it is published is because in it there is a proof that it should not be rejected and that is all.

I hope that I have clarified to the reader that the concepts 'trivial' and 'non-trivial' are only counter-intuitive but not contradictory (for example, our previous modification of Epimenides' statement turned out to be a non-trivial falsehood; nevertheless, we proved this in a fairly trivial way!). In actual fact, I believe I have brought to light a pragmatic paradox, not a contradiction. Personally, I feel incapable of demonstrating that this article should be rejected by *Mind*!

Departamento de Lógica y Filosofía de la Ciencia   JON PEREZ
Facultad de Filología y Geografía e Historia   LARAUDOGOITIA
Universidad del País Vasco
C/Marqués de Urquijo, s/n
Apartado 2111, 01006–Vitoria
España