

This is a review submitted to Mathematical Reviews/MathSciNet.

Reviewer Name: Bruni, Riccardo

Mathematical Reviews/MathSciNet Reviewer Number: 138582

Address:

Dipartimento di Lettere e Filosofia
Università di Firenze
via della Pergola 58-60
50121 Florence
ITALY
riccardo.bruni@unifi.it

Author: Huemer, Michael

Title: Paradox lost.

MR Number: MR3889984

Primary classification:

Secondary classification(s):

Review text:

Since the end of the 19th Century paradoxes have been the source of seminal directions of research of mathematical, logical and philosophical nature. The book under review is a contribution to the field with some distinctive features, the most prominent of which being the fact that, although the volume collects together a notable number of different paradoxical arguments, it is not meant to have just the goal of surveying them. Rather, the author aims at providing each of the paradoxes he addresses with a solution in the form of an explanation disclosing the particular step(s) that cause the reasoning to err. This is not novel, of course, since paradoxes are commonly dealt with for the sake of disclosing solutions, which caused some of them to have a multiplicity of different solutions too. There are two prominent features of the way this is done in this volume, namely: (i) paradoxes are solved here by conceptual analysis, and solutions only involve less substantial technical detours; (ii) solutions to different paradoxes are not given against the background of a unifying theory, like an axiomatic theory within which they are carried out, as they are only connected to one another by assumptions of a very general nature (“commitments”, as the author himself calls them), which basically reduce to the “theoretical commitment” according to which: “principles that almost everyone finds self-evident are probably not flat-out wrong” (p. 9). So, solutions that are sought-for here are explanations of the source of contradictions that do not force to renounce to self-evident principles.

The book is divided into twelve chapters, including the introduction, con-

taining a general definition of “paradox”, as well as the explanation of the said character that solutions should have, and a concluding chapter grouping together some general observations coming out from the treatment of the antinomies in the form of common errors of reasoning we are prone to. Each of the ten remaining chapters analyzes a different puzzle, and follows a common pattern: after presenting the paradox, the author evaluates the importance of it by singling out hidden assumptions and implications, and puts forth solutions that are coherent with the theoretical proviso of saving self-evident principles. Every chapter is equipped with a dedicated bibliography.

The ten chapters constituting the theoretical core of the volume are grouped into three parts reflecting the nature of the paradoxes they contain: part I is dedicated to the semantic paradoxes, part II to the paradoxes of rational choice, and part III to the paradoxes of probability.

The two chapters part I of the book is made out of are dedicated to the much celebrated Liar paradox and to the equally notorious Sorites paradox. The theoretical commitment I have referred to above turns here into the attempt of avoiding solutions that require changes in the logic, on the basis of the presupposition that the principles of classical logic are self-evident, and should not therefore be renounced to if possible. The solutions the author proposes here have a Fregean flavour, and are based upon assuming that only some sentences of the language do express a content, in the form of a proposition, which is the bearer of their truth-value. This is not the same as renouncing to classical logic, as sentences not expressing a proposition do not cause the background logic to be not bivalent. The two paradoxes dealt with here turn out to depend upon one of the assumptions of the arguments they rest upon being unable to express a proposition and therefore lacking a truth-value. The author argues that other paradoxes are subject to the same explanation, like Curry’s paradox from [The inconsistency of certain formal logics, *Jour. of Symb. Log.*, 7, 1942, pp. 115-117; MR0007366], Russell’s paradox from [Letter to Frege dated 16 June, 1902, in J. van Hejenoort (ed.), *From Frege to Gödel. A Source Book in Mathematical Logic, 1879-1931*, Harvard University Press, 1967, pp. 124-125], and Grelling-Nelson paradox from [Bemerkungen zu den Paradoxien von Russell und Burali-Forti, *Abhand. der Fries. Schule n.s.*, 2, 1908, 301-334].

The second part of the book is richer as it contains four chapters dealing with four different paradoxes. The first one is the self-torturer paradox from [Quinn, W., The puzzle of the self-torturer, *Phil. Studies*, 59, 1990, pp. 79-90]. Then comes the paradox named after the physicist William Newcomb and discussed as “Newcomb’s problem” in [Nozick, R., Newcomb’s problem and two principles of choice, in N. Rescher (ed.), *Essays in honour of Carl G. Hempel*,

Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1969, pp. 114-146]. The third paradox is the so-called “Surprise quiz” that goes back to [O’Connor, D.J., Pragmatic paradoxes, *Mind*, 60, 1948, pp. 358-359], although some sources draw it back to the circulation of a draft by Quine around the 1940, which ended up being published as [On a so-called paradox, *Mind*, 62, 1943, pp. 65-67]. Finally, comes the paradox of the two envelopes that derives from [Kraitchick, M., *Mathematical recreations*, New York: W.W. Norton, 1942, pp. 133-134; MR0052446]. Issues connecting these puzzles to rational choice are many, like the difficulty of setting thresholds in phenomena which appear to be continuous (an issue that is involved in the first, and in the third paradox of the list), or how to solve a conflict between two apparently obvious principles of rational choice (that is related to the second paradox), or how probabilities should be understood when dealing with rational decisions (which is the main issue related to the fourth paradox).

The third part of the book, devoted to the paradoxes of probability, is equally populated by four different puzzles. The first one is the paradox of the principle of indifference from [Keynes, J.M., *A treatise on probability*, 1921, p. 43-44; MR1113699] and [Fumerton, r., *Metaepistemology and skepticism*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 1995, p. 215]. The subsequent chapter, no. 9 of the book, is devoted to Hempel’s paradox of the ravens from [Hempel, C.G., Studies in the logic of confirmation I, *Mind*, 54, 1945, pp. 1-26; MR0011654], that challenges inductive reasoning. Then comes the paradox of the shooting room, which is based on [Leslie, J., *The end of the world*, London: Routledge, 1996, pp. 235-236, 251-256]. Chapter no. 11 is finally devoted to the problem of self-locating beliefs as engendered by the sleeping beauty paradox due to [Elga, A., Self-locating beliefs and the sleeping beauty problem, *Analysis*, 60, 2000, pp. 143-147].

As it was said before, the volume ends with a chapter that attempts at detecting wrong patterns of reasoning that come out of the analysis of the paradoxes dealt with in the three parts of it. This chapter also contains some final remarks devoted to supporting the methodological choice of avoiding radical revision of knowledge while trying to seek solutions to intellectual problems, as well as to listing some good reasons that make the attempt of solving paradoxes worth pursuing.