Refutation of the paradox of Epimenides the Cretan

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VŁ4 with Tautology as the designated *proof* value, F as contradiction, N as truthity (non-contingency), and C as falsity (contingency). The 16-valued truth table fragment) is row-major and horizontal.

LET LET p q s: Epimenides, Cretan, statement;
~ Not; & And; + Or; = Equivalent; @ Not Equivalent; > Imply, greater than;
# necessity, for all; lie (s@s).

From: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Epimenides_paradox

"Epimenides the Cretan said that all Cretans were liars, and
all other statements made by Cretans were certainly lies. Was this a lie?" (1.1)

((p=q)>(s=(#q>(s@s)))) & ((q>#(~(s=(#q>(s@s)))=(s=s)))>(s@s)) ;
FFTN FFTN FFCC FFCC (1.2)

Eq. 1.2 as rendered is *not* tautologous and *not* contradictory. Therefore the paradox of Epimenides is refuted as a paradox. The answer to the question "Was this a lie" is neither contradiction nor proof.