

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 1 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Barriers to Inference

Greg Restall

University of Melbourne

restall@unimelb.edu.au

Gillian Russell

Washington University in St Louis

grussell@artsci.wustl.edu

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 2 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Prior's Argument

P1 Tea-drinking is common in England

C Tea-drinking is common in England
or all New Zealanders ought to be
shot

P1 Tea-drinking is common in England
or all New Zealanders ought to be
shot

P2 Tea-drinking is not common in
England.

C All New Zealanders ought to be shot.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 3 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

More Arguments

$$D \wedge \neg D \vdash N$$

$$D \vdash N \vee \neg N$$

$$D \vdash \neg D \rightarrow N$$



Relevance?

- 1 $\lceil D \wedge N \rceil$ relevantly entails N .
- 2 $\lceil D \wedge N \rceil$ is not a descriptive statement.
- 3 $\lceil D \wedge N \rceil$ is a normative statement.
- 4 $\lceil \neg(D \wedge N) \rceil$ is a normative statement
- 5 $\lceil \neg D \rceil$ relevantly entails $\lceil \neg(D \wedge N) \rceil$
- 6 $\lceil \neg D \rceil$ is descriptive.
- 7 Some descriptive statement relevantly entails a normative one.

Informal Arguments

- 1 Jones uttered the words “I hereby promise to pay you, Smith, five dollars.”
- 2 Jones promised to pay Smith five dollars.
- 3 Jones placed himself under (undertook) an obligation to pay Smith five dollars.
- 4 Jones ought to pay Smith five dollars.

Jones wants the car to go faster.

If Jones puts pressure on the accelerator the car will go faster.

Jones has a reason to put pressure on the accelerator.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 6 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Gideon's Argument

Definition 1 (to flurg) To flurg is to do something that one ought not to do in front of children.

Jones is in the presence of children.

Jones ought not to flurg.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 7 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Other Inference Barrier Theses

Russell's Law: You can't derive a universal sentence from particular sentences.

Hume's Second Law: You can't derive a claim about the future from claims about the past and present.

Kant's Law: You can't derive a claim about necessities from contingent sentences.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 8 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Collateral Damage

Bird A is white.

Bird A is white or all ravens are black.

The sun has risen every day so far.

The sun has risen every day so far or the future will resemble the past.

Event A was followed by event B

Event A was followed by event B or it is necessary that A causes B

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 9 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Conceptual Arguments

The only chair in the room is black.

All the chairs in the room are black.

Hesperus exists.

Necessarily, Hesperus is Hesperus.

Dracula is immortal.

At all future times it will be the case
that Dracula is alive.



The Structure of the Flurg-style Examples

The form of the definition of flurg is:

$$\forall x(\text{Fl}(x) \Leftrightarrow C \rightarrow O\neg D x)$$

where ‘Fl’ is the predicate ‘flurg’, ‘D(x)’ is ‘x is done’ and ‘C’ is ‘there are children around’. The argument against Hume’s Law then has the form:

$$C \vdash \forall x(\text{Fl}(x) \rightarrow O\neg D x)$$

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 11 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Eternal Blue and Determinate Earnestness

Definition 2 (eternal blue) Something is eternal blue, iff, providing colour is determined by chemical structure, it will be blue at all future times.

Colour is determined by chemical structure.

Eternal blue things will be blue at all future times.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 12 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Definition 3 (Determinately earnest) Someone is determinately earnest iff, if character traits are inherited, he is necessarily earnest.

Character traits are inherited

Anyone who is determinately earnest is necessarily earnest.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 13 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Projectable Pink

The generality case is more difficult. But we look at more general features of the flurg argument. The RHS of the definition consists of a condition, under which a statement of the conclusion kind will hold.

Definition 4 (Projectable Pink) Something is projectable pink iff, if it is quartz, everything that is quartz is pink.

This is quartz.

If it is projectable pink, all quartz is pink.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 14 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

An idea

Particular claims do not constrain the whole world in the way that universal ones do. They are local. Universal claims are global.

If a particular claim is true, it is also true in extensions of that model.

If a universal claim is true, it can be made false by some extension of that model.



Genuine Particularity and Universality

Let R be the relation of model-extension (\supseteq).

Definition 5 (Genuine Particularity) A sentence is genuinely particular iff for each $\mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{M}' \in \mathcal{U}$, if $\mathfrak{M} \models A$ and $\mathfrak{M}' \supseteq \mathfrak{M}$ then $\mathfrak{M}' \models A$.

Definition 6 (Genuine Universality) A sentence is genuinely universal iff for each $\mathfrak{M} \in \mathcal{U}$ where $\mathfrak{M} \models A$, there is some $\mathfrak{M}' \supseteq \mathfrak{M}$ where $\mathfrak{M}' \not\models A$.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 16 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Which type of sentence am I?

Genuinely particular: Fa , $\neg Gb$, $Fa \wedge Gb$.

Genuinely universal: $(\forall x)Fx$, $(\forall x)(Fx \supset Gx)$

Neither: $Fa \vee (\forall x)Gx$

Both: $Fa \wedge \neg Fa$

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 17 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Russell's Law

Theorem 7 (Russell's Law) If Σ is a satisfiable set of sentences, each of which is genuinely particular, and \mathbf{A} is genuinely universal, then $\Sigma \not\vdash \mathbf{A}$.

Prior counterexamples - conclusion is not genuinely universal

Inconsistency counterexample - Law doesn't cover those cases

Proof: Russell's law is an instance of the Barrier Construction Theorem



More General Definitions

Definition 8 (**R-Fragility**) A formula A is **R-fragile** if and only if $(\forall \mathfrak{M} \in \mathcal{M})(\text{if } \mathfrak{M} \models A \text{ then } (\exists \mathfrak{M}')(\mathfrak{M}R\mathfrak{M}' \text{ and } \mathfrak{M}' \not\models A))$

Definition 9 (**R-Preservation**) A formula A is **R-preserved** if and only if $(\forall \mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{M}' \in \mathcal{M}) (\text{if } \mathfrak{M} \models A \text{ and } \mathfrak{M}R\mathfrak{M}' \text{ then } \mathfrak{M}' \models A)$

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 19 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Barrier Construction Theorem

Theorem 10 (Barrier Construction Theorem)
Given a class \mathcal{M} of models, and a collection $\mathbf{X} \cup \{\mathbf{A}\}$ of formulas. If (a) \mathbf{X} is satisfied by some model in \mathcal{M} ; (b) \mathbf{A} is \mathbf{R} -fragile; and (c) each element of \mathbf{X} is \mathbf{R} -preserved, then $\mathbf{X} \not\vdash_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{A}$.

Necessity

Let \mathbf{R} be the relation of modal model extension (\sqsupseteq).

Definition 11 (modal particularity) A sentence \mathbf{A} is modally particular iff it is \sqsupseteq -preserved, that is, for each $\mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{M}' \in \mathcal{V}$, if $\mathfrak{M} \models \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathfrak{M}' \sqsupseteq \mathfrak{M}$ then $\mathfrak{M}' \models \mathbf{A}$.

Definition 12 (modal generality) A sentence \mathbf{A} is modally general iff is \sqsupseteq -fragile, that is, for each $\mathfrak{M} \in \mathcal{V}$ where $\mathfrak{M} \models \mathbf{A}$, there is some $\mathfrak{M}' \in \mathcal{V}$, such that $\mathfrak{M}' \sqsupseteq \mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{M}' \not\models \mathbf{A}$.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 21 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Kant's Law

Theorem 13 (Kant's Law) If Σ is a satisfiable set of sentences, each of which is modally particular, and \mathbf{A} is modally general, then $\Sigma \not\models \mathbf{A}$.

Proof: Kant's law is an instance of the Barrier Construction Theorem



Which sentences are modally general?

The class of modally particular sentences includes sentences from three groups:

i) sentences with no modal operators, such as \mathbf{p} , and $\mathbf{p} \vee \mathbf{q}$,

ii) sentences such as $\diamond \mathbf{p}$ and $\neg \square \mathbf{p}$ whose truth can be secured by a single world, or a structure of worlds, regardless of additions to that structure. For S5, $\square \diamond \mathbf{p}$ falls into this category.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 23 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

iii) the logical truths of modal logic, such as
 $\Box p \vee \neg \Box p$.

Hume's 2nd Law

We let the \mathbf{R} relation between models be the symmetric relation of history sharing (Υ) where two models stand in this relation if they are the same with respect to the present moment and all earlier moments.

Definition 14 (genuinely historical) A sentence \mathbf{A} is genuinely historic iff it is Υ -preserved, that is for each $\mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{M}' \in \mathcal{T}$, if $\mathfrak{M} \models \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathfrak{M}' \Upsilon \mathfrak{M}$ then $\mathfrak{M}' \models \mathbf{A}$.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 25 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Definition 15 (genuinely future-constraining)
A sentence \mathbf{A} is genuinely future-constraining iff it is Υ -fragile, that is, for each $\mathfrak{M} \in \mathcal{T}$ where $\mathfrak{M} \models \mathbf{A}$, there is some $\mathfrak{M}' \in \mathcal{T}$, such that $\mathfrak{M}' \Upsilon \mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{M}' \not\models \mathbf{A}$.

Theorem 16 (Hume's Second Law) If Σ is a satisfiable set of sentences, each of which is genuinely historic, and \mathbf{A} is genuinely future-constraining, then $\Sigma \not\models \mathbf{A}$.

Proof: Hume's 2nd law is an instance of the Barrier Construction Theorem

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 26 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Which sentences are historic/future-constraining?

Suppose that the $>$ relation is transitive, irreflexive and anti-symmetric. Then:

i) p , Pp , Hp , GPp are genuinely historic,

ii) Fp and Gp are genuinely future-constraining and

iii) $p \vee Fp$ and PFp are neither genuinely historic nor genuinely future-constraining.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 27 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

An Ambiguity in Hume's Law

Does Hume's Law say that one cannot get 'ought'-sentences from 'is'-sentences? Or does it say that one cannot get normative sentences from descriptive sentences?

Reading Hume suggests the former.

But the literature suggests the latter.

We think both are true and so will formulate both.

Normative Extension

Definition 17 (normative extension - \ni) $\mathfrak{M}' \ni \mathfrak{M}$ just in case you can obtain \mathfrak{M}' from \mathfrak{M} by adding new worlds and extending the S relation relation.

Definition 18 (normative particularity) A sentence A is normatively particular iff it is \ni -preserved, that is, for each $\mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{M}' \in \mathcal{N}$, if $\mathfrak{M} \models A$ and $\mathfrak{M}' \ni \mathfrak{M}$ then $\mathfrak{M}' \models A$.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 29 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Definition 19 (normative generality) A sentence A is normatively general iff is \exists -fragile, that is, for each $\mathfrak{M} \in \mathcal{N}$ where $\mathfrak{M} \models A$, there is some $\mathfrak{M}' \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{M}' \supseteq \mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{M}' \not\models A$.



Which sentences are normatively particular/general?

Three kinds of sentence turn out to be normatively particular:

- i) no deontic operators e.g., \mathbf{p} and $\mathbf{p} \supset \mathbf{q}$;
- ii) sentences containing deontic operators whose truth can be secured by some structure of worlds at least one of which is in the relation of moral satisfaction to the actual world (regardless of what else we add to that structure), e.g., \mathbf{Pp} , \mathbf{PPp} and $\neg\mathbf{Op}$

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 31 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

iii) the deontic tautologies.

The normatively general sentences include
 O_p and $\neg P_p$.

Normative Translation

Definition 20 (normative translation - \checkmark) $\mathfrak{M}' \checkmark \mathfrak{M}$ just in case you can obtain \mathfrak{M}' from \mathfrak{M} simply by changing the pairs of worlds related by the S relation.

Definition 21 (descriptiveness) A sentence A is descriptive iff it is \checkmark -preserved, that is, for each $\mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{M}' \in \mathcal{N}$, if $\mathfrak{M} \models A$ and $\mathfrak{M}' \checkmark \mathfrak{M}$ then $\mathfrak{M}' \models A$

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 33 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Definition 22 (normativity (sufficient condition))

A sentence \mathbf{A} is normative if it is \emptyset -fragile, that is, for each $\mathfrak{M} \in \mathcal{N}$ where $\mathfrak{M} \models \mathbf{A}$, there is some $\mathfrak{M}' \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{M}' \not\models \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathfrak{M}' \not\sim \mathfrak{M}$.

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 34 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

Which sentences are descriptive/normative?

The descriptive sentences are, intuitively, those that make no appeal to the deontic structure of the model (at least, not the parts that can change. Deontic tautologies will be descriptive.) They include p , $p \vee q$ and $Op \vee \neg Op$.

The normative sentences are, intuitively, the ones which make demands on the arrangement of the relation of moral satisfaction, e.g., Pp .

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 35 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

N.B. important normatively general sentences such as \mathbf{Op} are not \checkmark -fragile. Consider a model in which every world is one where \mathbf{p} is true. No rearranging of the S relation can make it the case that \mathbf{Op} is false, and so \mathbf{Op} not \checkmark -fragile (though it is not \checkmark -preserved either).



Normativity and Hume's Laws

Definition 23 (Normativity) A sentence A is normative iff it is either \exists -fragile or \exists -fragile, that is, either i) for each $\mathfrak{M} \in \mathcal{N}$ where $\mathfrak{M} \models A$, there is some $\mathfrak{M}' \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{M} \not\subseteq \mathfrak{M}'$ and $\mathfrak{M}' \not\models A$ or ii) for each $\mathfrak{M} \in \mathcal{N}$ where $\mathfrak{M} \models A$, there is some $\mathfrak{M}' \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{M}' \supseteq \mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{M}' \not\models A$

Theorem 24 (Hume's Law (Ought-formulation))

If Σ is a satisfiable set of sentences, each of which is normatively particular, and \mathbf{A} is normatively general, then $\Sigma \not\models \mathbf{A}$.

Theorem 25 (Hume's Law (Normativity-formulation))

If Σ is a satisfiable set of sentences, each of which is descriptive, and \mathbf{A} is normative, then $\Sigma \not\models \mathbf{A}$.

Proof: The ought-formulation is follows from the Barrier Construction Theorem, and the normativity formulation follows from the Barrier Construction Theorem and

Home Page

Title Page

Contents



Page 38 of 38

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

lemma 26.

Lemma 26 All descriptive sentences are normatively particular.