

QUESTIONS

Ted Sider
Metaphysical Structure

1. Purity

“Joint-carving notions apply only to other joint-carving notions”

- A modalist’s primitive \Box shouldn’t “know about cities”
- The fundamental building blocks are all that really exists, so they shouldn’t have the capacity to interact with anything else
- “doesn’t apply” \neq “generates falsehoods”
- Requires a distinction between everyday and fundamental notions
- Objection: city facts aren’t “extra”
- My argument *not* that $\Box\forall x(Cx \rightarrow \text{city}(x))$ would be a fundamental fact

2. Completeness

“Everything ultimately derives from the fundamental”

- “Everything supervenes on the fundamental”
- “Every truth has a truthmaker”
- “Every fact is a fundamental fact”

Linguistic approach to completeness Every language can be given a *metaphysical semantics*—a theory of meaning, stated in metaphysically fundamental terms, whose goals are more modest than the goals of empirical linguistics.

Metaphysical truth theory a semantic theory for a nonfundamental language L issuing in theorems of the form:

Sentence S of L is true in L iff ϕ

where ϕ is phrased in fundamental terms

Metaphysical expressivist theory a semantic theory for a nonfundamental language L issuing in theorems of the form:

Sentence S of L , as uttered by speaker x , is expressively appropriate for x in L iff $\phi(x)$

where $\phi(x)$ is a condition on speaker x 's attitudes, but stated in purely fundamental terms

A metaphysical semantics might "violate logical form":

'There exists a hydrogen atom' is true in English iff $\exists x \exists y [E x \wedge P y \wedge R x y]$

E : 'is an electron', ' P ': 'is a proton', ' Rxy ': 'are bonded'.

3. Determinacy

"The fundamental is determinate"

1. No fundamental ideology distinctive of vagueness (e.g., 'determinately')
2. Classical logic at the fundamental level

Determinacy + Completeness \Rightarrow "vagueness is not in the world"?

4. Is structure structural?

Melanism: structure is given by a list. (Underlying thought: abstract entities are never explainers; they are for the purpose of expressing things we couldn't otherwise express.) No further fact unifies the list.

5. Atomism

Since 'structure' is all-or-nothing, I require a most fundamental level. But:

- I don't rule out gunk
- I just require a bottom to ideology (and bottomless ideology is really odd)
- *Possibility* of bottomless ideology?—modal deflationism