

Update Semantics 2

Frank Veltman



Mini course at the Department of Philosophy, Peking University



Identity and Identification



The languages we're interested in

I will **sketch** a semantics for languages of first order predicate logic with

- identity: $=$
- epistemic possibility: *might*
- logical necessity: $\Box$



Modeling Information about the world

Definition 1 Fix a domain $\mathcal{D}$ of objects. Then w is an element of the set of possible worlds $\mathcal{W}$ iff $w = \langle \nu, \iota \rangle$, where

- (a) the *naming function* ν assigns to every individual constant c an element $\nu(c) \in \mathcal{D}$;
- (b) the *interpretation function* ι assigns to every n -place predicate P an n -ary relation $\iota(P) \subseteq \mathcal{D}^n$.



Example

This example involves two objects d_1 , and d_2 . One is called a and one (possibly the same one) is called c . One – you don't know which one – is blue, and the other is red.

Now what are the relevant possible worlds?

Set $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, d_2\}$. Then $\mathcal{W}$ is the set of pairs $\langle \nu, \iota \rangle$ such that

- (a) ν is a function from $\{a, c\}$ into $\{d_1, d_2\}$;
- (b) ι is a function from $\{blue, red\}$ into the powerset of $\{d_1, d_2\}$ such that either $\iota(blue) = \{d_1\}$ and $\iota(red) = \{d_2\}$, or $\iota(blue) = \{d_2\}$ and $\iota(red) = \{d_1\}$

Note that there are four naming functions, and two interpretation functions

$$\nu_1 = \{\langle a, d_1 \rangle, \langle c, d_1 \rangle\}$$

$$\nu_2 = \{\langle a, d_1 \rangle, \langle c, d_2 \rangle\}$$

$$\nu_3 = \{\langle a, d_2 \rangle, \langle c, d_1 \rangle\}$$

$$\nu_4 = \{\langle a, d_2 \rangle, \langle c, d_2 \rangle\}$$

$$\iota_1(\text{blue}) = \{d_1\}, \iota_1(\text{red}) = \{d_2\}$$

$$\iota_2(\text{blue}) = \{d_2\}, \iota_2(\text{red}) = \{d_1\}$$

So, there are eight possible worlds, pictured on next slide. In these pictures, d_1 is the left object, and d_2 the right object.

The table also shows which of these possible worlds are left if you learn that

- *the blue one* $= a$
- $c = a$
- $this_{d_1} = a$

world	<i>the blue one = a</i>	<i>c = a</i>	<i>this_{d₁} = a</i>
 a  c			yes
 c  a	yes		
 ac		yes	yes
  ac	yes	yes	
 a  c	yes		yes
 c  a			
 ac	yes	yes	yes
  ac		yes	



The puzzle

Now let's look at set of worlds left if all you know about the case is this: $Red(this_{d_1}); Blue(this_{d_2}); c \neq a$.

Given this information the possibilities left are

world	
 a	 c
 c	 a

Given these two epistemic possibilities, do you accept $\forall x \text{ might}(x = a)$? How about $\forall x \text{ might}(x = this_{d_1})^*$?

*Read ' $\forall x$ ' as 'for all objects x in the domain $\mathcal{D}$ '

I expect that most of you accept $\forall x \text{ might}(x = a)$. I also expect that most of you, knowing that $c \neq a$ will reject $c = a$. But then, it looks like *universal instantiation* is not always valid.

Right!!

In the resulting system *universal instantiation* is not always valid. You can always instantiate with a demonstrative, but with an individual constant only if you know which object it denotes. And here you don't .

Likewise, existential generalization sometimes fails:

$$\forall y \text{ might}(y \neq a) \not\models \exists x \forall y \text{ might}(y \neq x)$$

Here, too, generalization is not allowed because the constant a is not – not yet – *epistemically* rigid.



Analytic *a posteriori*

In *Naming and Necessity* Saul Kripke claims that true identity statements like *The Morning Star = The Evening Star* express necessary truths, but that they are not epistemically *a priori*. In many cases it's a truth that has to be discovered.

We already saw that in the logical system I am describing identity statements can be *a posteriori*. One can at first be in a state in which one accepts *might*($a \neq c$), and next find out that in fact $a = c$. Now we want to get on top of this that

$$a = c \models \Box(a = c)$$



Sketch

A *cognitive state*^{*} S is function that assigns to every naming function ν a pair $\langle U, F \rangle$, where U and F are sets of interpretation functions such that (a) $F \subseteq U$, and (b) If $F = \emptyset$, then $U = \emptyset$.

- If $\langle U, F \rangle = S(\nu)$, and $\iota \in U$, then the world $\langle \nu, \iota \rangle$ is a world that the agent considers *logically possible*.
- If $\langle U, F \rangle = S(\nu)$, and $\iota \in F$, then, given the agent's information, the world $\langle \nu, \iota \rangle$ *might be the actual world*.
- If $S(\nu) = \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle$, this means that the possibility is excluded that the objects in $\mathcal{D}$ are named as ν describes.

^{*}I am leaving out everything needed for the quantifiers

- The *minimal state* is the state **1** which assigns to every ν the pair $\langle I, I \rangle$ where I is the set of all interpretation functions.
- The *absurd state*, is the state **0** which assigns to every ν the pair $\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle$.

Before we can define the update clauses for the full language we first define what it means to update a set of worlds that all have the same naming function with a descriptive sentence.

Definition 2

- Let X be a set of interpretation functions. Set ${}^\nu X = \{\nu\} \times X$
- ${}^\nu X[Ra_1 \dots a_n] = \{\iota \in X \mid \langle \nu(a_1), \dots, \nu(a_n) \rangle \in \iota(R)\}$.
- ${}^\nu X[c = a] = X$ if $\nu(c) = \nu(a)$, and ${}^\nu X[c = a] = \emptyset$ if $\nu(c) \neq \nu(a)$.
- etcera

Before we can define the update clauses for the full language we first define what it means to update a set of worlds that all have the same naming function with a descriptive sentence.

Definition 3

- Let X be a set of interpretation functions. Set ${}^\nu X = \{\nu\} \times X$
- ${}^\nu X[Ra_1 \dots a_n] = \{\iota \in X \mid \langle \nu(a_1), \dots, \nu(a_n) \rangle \in \iota(R)\}$.
- ${}^\nu X[c \text{= } a] = X$ if $\nu(c) = \nu(a)$, and ${}^\nu X[c \text{= } a] = \emptyset$ if $\nu(c) \neq \nu(a)$.
- etcera

Now the update clause for descriptive sentences φ is given by

- $S[\varphi]$ is determined as follows.

Suppose $S(\nu) = \langle U, F \rangle$. Then $S[\varphi](\nu) = \langle U', F' \rangle$, where

(a) $F' = {}^\nu F[\varphi]$

(b) $U' = U$ if $F' \neq \emptyset$, and $U' = \emptyset$ if $F' = \emptyset$.

The clause for *might* φ remains the same.

- $S[\text{might } \varphi] = S$ if $S[\varphi] \neq 0$
 $S[\text{might } \varphi] = \emptyset$ if $S[\varphi] = 0$

- $S[\Box\varphi]$ is determined as follows.

Suppose $S(\nu) = \langle U, F \rangle$. Then $S[\Box\varphi](\nu) = \langle {}^\nu U[\varphi], {}^\nu F[\varphi] \rangle$

Exercise 1

- (a) Check that $1[\textit{might}(c \neq a)][c = a] \neq 0$
- (b) Prove that $c = a \models \Box(c = a)$.

There is a lot more to say...

But now it's time for comments and questions.