

Letter from A.N. Prior to Hans Kamp, December 11, 1967, I

Balliol
11 Dec 67

Dear Hans¹,

Continuation of my last. It's obviously an adaptation of Meredith on n , as in Notre Dame Jnl. of Formal Logic vol. 6, no. 2 (Apr. 65), pp. 99-109. And my abridgment of $LCnp$ to Jp (p -now) is like Meredith's abridgment of same to Hp in last section of his article (I use J because I need H for something else). If we don't get J this way but use it directly, along with H , G , & L (with postulates for these as given – dropping the special ones 4.1 & 4.2 for dates – though the restriction on $\vdash \alpha \rightarrow \vdash L\alpha$, $\vdash H\alpha$, $\vdash G\alpha$ will need to run “except where α contains J ”), the special postulates for J should include

- RJ: $\vdash \alpha \rightarrow \vdash Ja.$
- J1. $CpJp$
- J2. $CJpp$
- J3. $CJCpqCJpJq$
- J4. $CJpLJp.$

Note that $J1 \rightarrow \vdash CNpJNp$, $\vdash CNJpNp$, & that $J2 \rightarrow \vdash CNpNJp$, $\vdash CJNpNp$, all of which together yield $\vdash ENJpJNp$, which can be used to strengthen J3 to $\vdash EJCpqCJpJq$.^{*2} J4 is very nice. I think J3 & J4 (though of course certainly not J1 & J2) should be preceded by L .

– In your notation –

- J1. $\phi \rightarrow N\phi$
- J2. $N\phi \rightarrow \phi$
- J3. $L(N(\phi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (N\phi \rightarrow N\psi))$
- J4. $L(N\phi \rightarrow LN\phi).$

– with T and Y as in Scott, I suppose {2} what you mean by the real tomorrow and yesterday will be JT and JY (not TJ & YJ , which are both equivalent to the plain J .)

Yours,

Arthur Prior.

¹ Editors' note: This letter is an aerogramme and has been transcribed by Woosuk Park, Adriane Rini, Patrick Blackburn and David Jakobsen. It is located at the Bodleian Library Oxford in the Arthur Prior Collection, box 2. It was sent from: A Prior, Balliol College, Oxford, England. To: Hans Kamp, Dept of Philosophy, UCLA, 405 Hilgard Ave., Los Angeles, California 90024, U.S.A.

² Prior's marginal note reads as follows: *We also have $\vdash EJpLJp$, and $\vdash CLpLJp$, but not $\vdash CLJpLp$.

P.S. Looking harder at your models, I don't think your N is quite the same as my J , but (a) I think my J catches the real force of "now" better than your N , (b) I cannot get postulates for your N , but can for my J , & (c) a model for my J is not difficult to construct, by having a "designated instant" (as, e.g. Kripke has in his modal models a constant for the "actual" world).

I'm trying to work out an inductive extension of your $\mathcal{P}_N(\varphi)$, $\mathcal{F}_N(\varphi)$, $\mathcal{U}(\varphi)$ & $\mathcal{L}(\varphi)$ ³ analogous to my Ωnqp in the note at bottom of p. 112 of P, P & F.

³ Editors' note: There appears to be an attempt to use a different font in the last sentence discussion inductive extensions.