

A Response to the Refutation¹ of the Paper, “A Logical Analysis of the Stone Paradox with First-Order Logic”²

Tze-ho Fung

In one version of the stone argument against omnipotence, the argument goes as follows:

- (1) If God can create a stone which God cannot lift, then God is not omnipotent (because God cannot lift the stone in question).
- (2) If God cannot create a stone which God cannot lift, then God is not omnipotent (because God cannot create the stone in question).
- (3) The antecedents of (1) and (2)³ are contradictory to each

1 CHEUNG Kwok Tung, “A Refutation of Tze-ho Fung’s Argument against the Stone Argument,” *CGST Journal* 46 (January, 2009): 235–46.

2 Tze-ho Fung, “A Logical Analysis of the Stone Paradox with First-Order Logic,” *CGST Journal* 42 (January 2007): 205–24.

3 I have been careless in my paper, as pointed out in Cheung’s paper on pp. 236–37 . What I want to show is that the antecedents of statements (1) and (2) are exhaustive and mutually exclusive or contradictory to each other; instead of statement (1) and (2) themselves. I hope, according to what I have discussed in my whole paper, the correct meanings could be somehow understood by readers.