



Research Paper

Communication and Language: Yet Another Approach to Solving The Sorites Paradox

M. R. Pinheiro¹

Abstract

We here provide a new solution to the Sorites Paradox. It involves Communication and Language. It is based on the concepts of synthetizer and specifier from a previous article.

Keywords

Sorites, solution, eubulides, synthetizer, specifier

Received 01 Aug., 2025; Revised 09 Aug., 2025; Accepted 11 Aug., 2025 © The author(s) 2025.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. Introduction

The name 'sorites' derives from the Greek word soros

"The name 'sorites' derives from the Greek word soros (meaning 'heap') and originally referred, not to a paradox, but rather to a puzzle known as *The Heap*: Would you describe a single grain of wheat as a heap? No. Would you describe two grains of wheat as a heap? No. ... You must admit the presence of a heap sooner or later, so where do you draw the line? [1]

Thus, The Sorites/The Heap is a semantic puzzle, since it is about Semantics: the meaning of the word 'heap' or 'soros' in Greek. Its origins can be traced back to Eubulides of Miletus in the 4th century BC (400-300 BC), according to some sources we have consulted in the remote past (2000).

The key sigmatoid [2] in the soritical sequence ('bald', 'heap', etc.) is seen associated with a world reference [2] that gets its defining element increasing or decreasing in amount and implications of the type 'if... then' appear as ideal for marking the incremental steps. Yet another famous example of sorites is that of *The Bald*: "A man with no hair is bald. If you add just one more hair to a bald man's head, then he is still bald. As a result, it must be the case that a man with 10^7 hairs on his head is bald."

The argument seems to be successful and have, as its conclusion, a statement that seems obviously absurd and therefore this is a paradox in Quine's definition [3].

In this paper, we provide yet one more solution to The Sorites Paradox: this time we talk about communication and language and the approach consists in examining the connection between these two realms and humanity, when we analyse things from the perspective of utility or functionality.

II. Development

Language exists only because of people attempting to communicate with each other somehow, so that language will only exist for as long as communication does [4]. One must here remember the case of the baby: when it says its first words, it is usually those that designate its carer, since it is usually worried about getting things from them, whoever they may be. Here we ask the reader to appeal to their own experience and observation, since we were unable to find research in that direction. It has to be universal agreement that the only thing babies that are really young do and can do that communicate messages to us is crying or showing annoyance through the body, so that the first ever attempts to communicate of a human being are in the direction of 'asking for help', thus functionality. If the infant did not want to communicate some message to

¹ Elsie.dunnam@yahoo.com

those who listen, so possibly that they appreciate a toy or a carer, or that they need someone to provide them with something, say change of diapers, food and water, it wouldn't produce language at all.

Dictionary entries, thus what becomes language that is known as such by humanity, are created out of repetition of use, even if it is use by the same person when communicating with humanity, say through scientific papers (as it should happen with our term, Starant [5]).

There are different types of communication. To mention two, there is communication of mathematical type (thus involving the language of Mathematics) and communication that is informal and happens between members of a family that have nothing in common, so say one is the owner of a cleaning business and has up to secondary school and the other is a famous researcher from Philosophy who has published, so far, 100 articles, some of which are very respected in Academia. If the researcher is speaking to the relative who is a cleaner and business owner, they will put maximum effort in having that relative spiritually 'with them' as they tell that relative something that happened in their life, so say getting a prize and attending a prestigious ceremony to receive it. When they are describing what happened to this relative, they will say, 'I solved a major problem in Philosophy, considered such because 80 top philosophers tried to solve it in the past, for more than 100 years, but couldn't. The government then put a prize of 1 million dollars on the solution. 'The relative then may or may not ask for details but this communicator has managed to make it possible for the relative to put himself in their shoes, thus feel things in the most similar way as possible to how they feel in what regards that situation. The same researcher, when speaking to a crowd of academics, will instead say that the problem of vagueness in Eubulides' Puzzle has been solved through an approach involving parallel worlds and logical systems. Researchers are trained to enter problems through only their mind, so through the spirit of the brain only, not with their entire spirit, so also that of the heart, or hohe (Attachment no. 1), so that that will be enough to put them in the same spiritual realm as the researcher.

The purpose of recreation of the expression 'major problem' in the mind of the researcher, when speaking to the relative, is synthesizing a spiritual impression taken from several situations, including those involving his cleaning tasks, so that the relative can relate to the idea quickly, with minimum effort ('major problem' is then a synthesizer [7]). The researcher then thinks of the situations the relative goes through in his daily life, a few examples, compares to what they have done and is trying to communicate, and they then extract the common core of the spiritual idea in terms of world reference, when they then come up with the right sigmatoids, which connect to all those situations they saw happening in their mind (for the researcher, when it comes to things to do with everyone else apart from their spouse, it is only mind) in a way to describe them all. The mental process involved, using the Bloom's Taxonomy, is then that of the synthesis because, from several different life scenes, involving different types of people, environments, topics and all else, the researcher was able to extract a single linguistic element, which happens to be an expression. When communicating with other academics, he used the expression 'the problem of vagueness in Eubulides' Puzzle'. When the researcher created this expression in their mind, they just thought of one scene of their lives, say their published paper with the result, since all in the room would have the same unique world reference in their Collective Unconscious (our definition) for it. The purpose of creation or recreation of this expression was using a unique key that led to the same world reference both in their and in the audience's spirit. For that to happen, the researcher just had to use the memory and selection functions of their brain and that involves processes that are actually located in the lower part of the Bloom's Taxonomy Pyramid. Synthesis, on the other hand, is located in the upper part, that composed of the three top levels, which seem to only be reached by humans who have managed to activate both hohe and mind, so who have managed to connect their spirit (physics connected to biology of the body) to their soul [6].

The expression selected to communicate with the academics is a specifier [7], since we start with 'the problem', then we refine that into 'the problem of vagueness', then we refine that into 'the problem of vagueness in Eubulides' Puzzle', so that we are specifying each time more until we get to uniquely pick what is intended in the spirit/Collective Unconscious (our definition, which is just a common world reference or perception of the spirit of things/events or procedure (maybe a few more things) that immediately comes to the spirit upon us being presented with the 'right' environmental stimuli) of the group that belongs to Academia.

Even though the researcher had much more mental/spiritual work when creating/recreating the expression used with the relative, some could judge that the result of the communication was better when they created/recreated the expression used with the academics. The same people could still think that, since the object of the communication is the same, namely the attendance to the prize ceremony, the expression used should be the same.

We wish for whoever reads to notice that that is absurd idea. Yet that is the same idea that we see translated into the Sorites Paradox.

When one tells their relative about an accumulation of grains of sand somewhere, they say 'heap' in a loose manner, but both relative and them, who are the only people involved in the communication process, are extremely happy with the result of their communication process and all that had to be achieved with it was

achieved. If the same person is speaking to a crowd of academics about art, so say someone is learning how to paint the same heap, then they are probably going to say something similar to 'an accumulation of grains of sand of more or less the shape of a cone in normal position, one with a diameter of 1m.' Both expressions are completely acceptable and equally do the job, so solve the communication problem at hand to best. Consequently, there is nothing wrong with the first option, 'heap', and therefore there shouldn't be any questions about whether this amount or that amount of grains form a heap. Addressing questions like that of The Sorites and then changing the linguistic token used to communicate in the same situation with the same sort of people in some sense, so say the world reference for the sigmatoid 'heap', will create problems in communication, so that the new token will not have the same spiritual effect on the listener anymore, which may mean annoyance of one of the parties involved in the communication process (responses of the type, 'what do you mean?', for instance). The function of the communication, which was giving a spiritual, quick idea, to the person we know, so, whose unconscious part of the mind we think we know well (we only conclude we actually don't know, then reinventing or inventing strategies to communicate, if the communication fails to achieve its purpose or fulfil its function) in what regards that expression/term, is now either impaired or has ceased.

Instead of saying the term 'heap' is wrongly or vaguely defined, which is the purpose of the puzzle, it is necessary to understand that another expression is the answer when the function of the communication has not been fulfilled on a first go instead, so another term or expression, not 'heap' anymore, since we have then left the realm of common or usual communication, that with the relative, and have entered the realm of specialized or scientific communication, what can happen anytime, even when we speak to a relative, given that human beings who are spiritually free are always shaping and reshaping themselves through the activities of their biological organism, specially brain and heart.

III. Conclusions

The Sorites was created out of a misunderstanding of the relationship between human communication and language. Were our world formed of computers, it would be right thinking in the ways of The Sorites, since we would then be looking for terms that would make the machine/AI uniquely pick the right world reference in its database and the machine's database contains only objective and most accurate information, in principle. Yet, because our world involves at least computers and human beings and human beings, actually also the systems or AIs involved, since those come from humans as well, are of varied types and 'contain' varied world references in their spirit, communication can only be effective if catering for that variation, so only if the linguistic terms deployed in a 'communication mission' are adequate for the intended audience. The primary function of language is communication, the reason for it to exist, so that this function cannot ever be forgotten or neglected. A father may say to his baby, 'baba is here'. If the same sort of people who built The Sorites are around, that man will have to pay a fine or something: how dare he? 'Baba' is 'father' only in his insane mind. 'Baba' is actually a macumba thing, can't he speak correctly, like perhaps say 'your baba' if we think of the lightest proponent of this problem. 'Baba' is not OK for them because it is not precisely defined in the dictionary. The grandfather comes and says the same sentence to the same baby. Now it got worse: how dare he? Baba1 and Baba2 is minimum thing. How is the kid going to know when baba1 finishes and baba2 starts, like they are not the same person and so on. All that can be said is that language is ours and we like saying 'heap' and mean exactly that, so any shape with the spirit of the accumulation of sand. If we want to speak to a scientist or if the person we are communicating with ever demands specifiers, then we shall give them those, but, so far, we are happy with the term as it is.

How many grains determine a heap or how many hairs and distribution of those determine a bald person (see our work on The Bald to understand this part, if necessary)? That is not a question that has got a single answer and humanity would like to keep it like that, since it is about spirit of the things, how the spirit receives the image when the body sees it or refers to it and the spirit is not into Mathematics at all, sometimes not even logic. If you want to do that to 'heap' and 'bald', then you want to do that to 'love' or 'like', like, this same people would ask, so how many degrees of closeness do you have in spirit to your spouse if you say you love him, is it more or less than the love of Amanda for her husband? That is simply a person who cannot accept the ways of humanity and prefers a world of computers or dead people instead, so entities without spirit of their own. Notice that if what is required by the proponent of the problem were done, so say we define 'heap' as 1,000 grains of sand accumulated in the shape of a cone, our current use of the word 'heap' would be deemed illegal/ignorant or incompetent/inadequate, perhaps insane and nobody on earth would be able to use the term apart from a freak who would count all grains one by one and manage to organize those in such a perfect shape. That is like the fight between a dictatorship defender and a democracy defender or between a Christian and a satanist or between a libertarian and a person who defends human slavery. It seems that it is all fine in the way it is with language and nobody apart from the proponents or defenders of this problem sees issues with the usage

or definition of these terms/expressions. Also notice that our use of ‘major problem’ would also be deemed incorrect/illegal/insane, since there is a more refined way of putting that, as explained in this paper.

It seems that no human being who is actual human, so who has managed to connect their spirit with their soul, would like to be further limited in their creation, recreation and use of linguistic tokens than they already are and it is nice to have both synthetizers and specifiers available for use, so that we can adapt our communication to the audience at hand and therefore make it be as effective as possible in all its purposes. While the proponents and defenders of The Sorites wish for a world of humans that communicate in the ways of the machines, we wish for a world of humans that communicate in the ways of heavens or humans who are on the path to it, which means most humane and particularized or tailored way as possible, therefore with maximum respect for the personhood and individuality of others that is possible for us to have.

References

- [1]. Hyde, D. (2005) 'Sorites Paradox', Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, available at: <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2010/entries/sorites-pa>> (Accessed: 5 August 2025).
- [2]. Pinheiro, M. R. (2022) 'Higher Order Vagueness (Corrigendum)', IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 27(11), pp. 61-66, DOI: 10.9790/0837-2711026166, available at: <<http://dx.doi.org/10.9790/0837-2711026166>> (Accessed: 5 August 2025).
- [3]. Pinheiro, M. R. (2024) 'On Four Solutions to the Barber Paradox', International Journal of Advances in Philosophy, 6(1), pp. 8-13, available at: <<http://article.sapub.org/10.5923.j.ap.20240601.03.html>> (Accessed: 5 August 2025).
- [4]. Fedorenko, E., Piantadosi, S. T. & Gibson, E. A. F. (2024) 'Language is primarily a tool for communication rather than thought', Nature, 630, pp. 575-586, DOI: 10.1038/s41586-024-07522-w, available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07522-w>> (Accessed: 5 August 2025).
- [5]. Pinheiro, M. R. (2016) 'Starants: A New Model for Human Networks', Applied Mathematics, 7(3), pp. 267-271, DOI: 10.4236/am.2016.73024, available at: <<http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/am.2016.73024>> (Accessed: 5 August 2025).
- [6]. Pinheiro, M.R. (2015) 'Translation Techniques', *Communication & Language at Work*, 4(4). doi: 10.7146/claw.v1i4.20775.
- [7]. Pinheiro, M.R. (2017) 'The Intrinsic Vagueness of Language', International Journal of Advances in Philosophy, 1(1), pp. 1-4. doi:10.5923/j.ap.20170101.01.

1) Hohe and Mind

Hohe is the spirit of the heart and Mind is the spirit of the brain. What happens to an individual, if they don't activate the spirit of both heart and brain - and we come without the spirit of those being activated to this world for obvious reasons (not to feel pain when we are little, like we feel lack of food and drink but not pain most of the time or all the time. We will leave this proof to psychology), which include respect - is that the individual does not leave the situation of animal, which is the initial situation of humanity, from before Our God came and introduced the soul to our body, our access to the tickets that will give us entry into heavens. Our Lord has infinite respect for us as individuals and see us all as such at all times. We then only get our spirit immersed in the Holy Ghost if we want that to happen, like otherwise we can spend life like we were originally set up to do by the creator, which is like the animal. The animals form packs (what would be the derivation of what Leinha (part of the satanic sisterhood) called 'being gregarious', when 'she' then stated that 'she' was such, as for our spiritual understanding), so that they stay together based on physical similarity and spirit, but not similarity in terms of soul and their mind is limited because their brain is limited, they copulate² but don't have sex or make love, and so on.

² That means they have genital contact exclusively for procreation.