

Philosophy 240
Symbolic Logic

Russell Marcus
Hamilton College
Fall 2015

Class #19: Logic and the Philosophy of Science

Business

- Test #3 is next Wednesday
 - Avoid skipping steps
 - Logical truths don't appear in your proofs until the last line!
 - First line for a conditional LT is typically its antecedent
 - First line for others are often the negation of the whole LT
- For Monday:
 - Last HW set for a while
 - Read 4.11: Axiom Systems
 - not 4.7 Metalogic, though that one's good too!
- Emily Hedison at QSR:
 - Monday 2-4
 - Tuesday 12-2
- Paper proposal due on November 16
 - Sooner than you think!

Three Topics In the Philosophy of Science

For which our logic is helpful


1. The Deductive-Nomological Model of Scientific Explanation
2. Confirmation and the Paradox of the Ravens
3. Resolving Contradictions

We'll see what we can get to, today.

Explanations

- One of the goals of science is to explain phenomena.
- What is an explanation?
- Typical philosophical answer: explanations are answers to why questions.
 - Why do you study logic?
 - Why did the United States enter World War I?
 - Why does the Earth revolve around its axis?
- *Scientific explanations* involve (or even *are*) descriptions of the world which explain an event or phenomenon or law.

Why Does A Baseball Take a Particular Trajectory?



Laws and Initial Conditions


- Two aspects to any scientific explanation
- Laws are general principles
 - ▶ Physical Laws (mechanics, electromagnetism)
 - ▶ Biological laws (e.g. DNA, cicadas, honeycombs)
 - ▶ Chemical laws (ideal gas law)
 - ▶ Psychological laws (neuro-chemical, cognitive)
 - ▶ Historical?
- Initial conditions provide instances of laws
 - ▶ From observation
 - ▶ Events are subsumed under laws.

The Deductive-Nomological (D-N) Model of Scientific Explanation

$L_1, L_2, L_3, \dots, L_n$	The relevant laws...
$I_1, I_2, I_3, \dots, I_n$...and the relevant initial conditions...
-----	...logically entail...
E	...the explanandum.

The D-N Model and the Baseball Trajectory


- Premises:
 - ▶ Laws
 - Transfer of momentum
 - Friction
 - Gravitational attraction?
 - ▶ Initial conditions
 - Mass of ball and bat
 - Velocities at impact
 - Air resistance
- Conclusion:
 - ▶ Flight of the ball



Gap-Free Inferences and Science

- Frege's *Begriffsschrift* promised a gap-free account of logical inference.
- If we can put scientific explanations into D-N forms, we can take advantage of the gap-free logic in science, too.
 - ▶ Explanations of particular events
- Explanations of lower-level laws from higher-level laws, too
 - ▶ Boyle's Law: $P_1V_1 = P_2V_2$
 - ▶ Charles's Law: $V_1/T_1 = V_2/T_2$
 - ▶ Ideal gas law: $PV = kT$

Problems with the D-N Model 1



- Given the height of the flagpole and the angle of the sun, we can explain the shadow.
- Given the length of the shadow and the angle of the sun, we can explain the height of the flagpole.
- Only one of those is ordinarily taken as an explanation.
- What's missing from the D-N model?

Problems with the D-N Model 2

- Wesley Salmon:
 - ▶ (L) All persons who take birth control pills regularly fail to get pregnant.
 - ▶ (I) John Jones has been taking birth control pills regularly.
 - ▶ (E) John Jones fails to get pregnant.
- Henry Kyburg:
 - ▶ (L) All samples of table salt that have been hexed by a witch dissolve in water.
 - ▶ (I) This salt has been hexed.
 - ▶ (E) This salt dissolves in water.



Laws and Accidental Generalizations

- Laws are often universal.
- But universality is insufficient for lawhood.
 - All people in this room have DNA.
 - All people in this room know the difference between Modus Tollens and Constructive Dilemma.
- Our logical rules of inference are syntactic.
- It would be nice if we had a syntactic criterion for lawhood.
- But:
 - All gold spheres are less than one mile in diameter.
 - All uranium spheres are less than one mile in diameter.
- To identify the laws, we have to know science, not just logic or grammar.



The Paradox of the Ravens

On Confirmation

Nicod's Criterion

- In our class on conditionals we saw that Nicod's criterion captures how such scientific laws are confirmed.
 - ▶ Evidence confirms a law if it satisfies both the antecedent and consequent.
 - ▶ Evidence disconfirms a law if it satisfies the antecedent, and fails to satisfy the consequent.
- 'All ravens are black'
 - ▶ 'If something is a raven, then it is black.'
 - ▶ When we find a black raven, which satisfies the antecedent and the consequent, it confirms the claim.
 - ▶ If we were to find a raven which is not black, which satisfies the antecedent but falsifies the consequent, then it would disconfirm the claim.




The Paradox of the Ravens

- Any evidence which confirms a proposition should confirm any logically equivalent proposition.
 - Hempel's equivalence condition
- 'All ravens are black' is logically equivalent to 'all non-black things are non-ravens'.
 - Law of Contraposition!
- What evidence confirms 'all non-black things are non-ravens' (according to Nicod's criterion)?
- Uh-oh.
 - Accept the consequence?
 - Natural kinds?
 - Give up equivalence condition?
 - Change our logic?

Scientific Method

Contradictions and Theory Change

- A theory is a set of sentences.
- Our beliefs form a theory.
- Consistency is a basic condition of rationality.
 - ▶ Not for Walt Whitman
 - ▶ “Do I contradict myself? Very well, then I contradict myself,
 - ▶ I am large, I contain multitudes.”
 - ▶ Not all of us are Whitman.
- Sometimes we discover that our belief set is inconsistent.
 - ▶ New observation which conflicts with background beliefs
 - ▶ Discovery of an unseen entailment
- In such cases, we are faced with a set of hypotheses and often want to restore consistency.
- We must choose which belief(s) to cede.
- A contradiction within a theory merely tells us that there is a problem in the theory, not how to resolve it.
- It need not tell us where the problem lies.



The Dull Weekend

- Imagine that you believe that there are going to be no parties this weekend.
- Then, you receive a flyer for a gathering on Friday.
- Adding the belief that there is a party on Friday to your prior set of beliefs is inconsistent.
- You could resolve the contradiction in various ways:
 - ★ You could give up your belief about there being no parties this weekend.
 - ★ You could check the date on the flyer; maybe there is a confusion about the date.
 - ★ You could redefine the term 'party' such that the gathering is not a party.
 - ★ et al.



The Dull Weekend, Regimented

- T: $S_1 \cdot S_2 \cdot S_3 \cdot \dots \cdot S_n$
- Imagine that T yields some claim: O
 - ▶ $T \supset O$
- We get new information:
 - ▶ $\sim O$
- By modus tollens, we know that T is false:
 - ▶ $\sim T$
 - ▶ $\sim(S_1 \cdot S_2 \cdot S_3 \cdot \dots \cdot S_n)$
 - ▶ $\sim S_1 \vee \sim S_2 \vee \sim S_3 \vee \dots \vee \sim S_n$
- That's as far as the logic will take us.
- We don't know which of the sentences of the theory to reject.

Restoring Consistency

$$\sim S_1 \vee \sim S_2 \vee \sim S_3 \vee \dots \vee \sim S_n$$

- We need methods for weighing evidence to choose among the options.
 - Governed by various abstract principles
- Various ways to proceed each fit the logical requirements.
 - Theories are generally under-determined by evidence.
 - Evidence often provides correlation without indicating causation.
 - Facebook users get lower grades in college.

Virtues of Theories

1. Conservatism

- ▶ Revise as little as possible.

2. Modesty

- ▶ We accept only the weakest, or most modest, principles, as the most plausible.
- ▶ “The lazy world is the likely world” (68).

3. Simplicity

- ▶ Simplicity for a large theory trumps simplicity for any portion of that theory when the two conflict.
 - ‘Objects fall to the Earth’ is simple, but conflicts with gravitational theory which is simpler overall, and more general.

4. Generality

- ▶ Explanatory Breadth

5. Refutability

- ▶ A theory which explains everything is empty.
- ▶ Good theories should be testable.