Department of Philosophy
1879 Hall
Princeton, New Jersey 08544 U.S.A.

February 3, 1987

Professor Nathan Salmon
Department of Philosophy
University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA   93106

Dear Nathan,

Enclosed are two papers, including the one in the Linsky volume too. The treatment of the relation $\underline{R}$ is on pp. 69-70 (section 2.1) of "Semantical Analysis" and on p. 64 of "Semantical Considerations". The same characterization of $\underline{R}$ is given in both places. As you see, there is no suggestion that S5 is basic and the weaker systems come from some restricted conception. $\underline{R}$ is characterized in terms of truth and possibility of propositions in worlds. Notice also the discussion of the reduction axioms on p. 70 of "Semantical Analysis", and in particular of transitivity and S4.

One thing I do is, I now think, somewhat misleading. I should have stressed that the use of $\underline{R}$ does not make "possible" (as applied to worlds) into a two-place predicate, any more than, as you say, "is bald" is. Probably I only noticed this afterwards. Also, I should have stressed that strictly speaking, many of the worlds are not "possible" but only "possibly possible", and so on, unless we have S4.

By the time I gave the seminar I talked to you about I had definitely thought these points through, having seriously considered whether the conventional presupposition that the basic modal logic is S5 is justified.

I am getting closer to thinking that your treatment of the ship is the correct solution. Certainly it is a very good piece of work. I am sorry if almost everyone is unable to see its virtues (you don't say quite that in the paper). As far as I can see, their counterarguments, as presented, are confused or circular. It was good talking to you. Talk to you about Russell, etc., some time.

Best,

Saul Kripke

Enc.