

I4. MEMORY

Soul Theory: Y is your future self iff Y and you share the same soul

Body Theory: Y is your future self iff Y and you share the same body

Clearly we don't reidentify people by reidentifying their souls. But, reidentification is not always via bodies either! You wake up and know who you are without looking under the covers. You might find yourself in a new body!

Then what is it that Y and you have to share to be identical? Maybe nothing. Why should personal identity consist in the identity of ANY other kind of thing?

"The Charles River in Cambridge = the Charles River in Newton." There is no other thing T such that the river-identity holds because T in Cambridge = T in Newton.

Rather, the river-part in Cambridge is so and so related to the river-part in Newton. How related? Continuity, flow, etc. That will be the unity relation for river-parts.

Locke held that the unity relation for people is consciousness. This holds both for synchronic unity and diachronic unity. Simultaneous consciousness is availability to introspection. Diachronic or backward-looking consciousness is availability to memory.

Simultaneous ideas are co-personal iff they are, or can be, caught up in a single act of introspection.

A maximal bunch of simultaneous co-personal ideas is a person-stage.

(MT) Y-tomorrow is a stage of the same person as X-today iff

Y-tomorrow remembers from the inside X-today's experiences.

Here is how to imagine surviving death: just imagine someone in the afterlife walking around and remembering your part in this present conversation.

But what is it to imagine that? Just to imagine someone's having accurate mental images of this conversation? No. Perhaps God or some powerful demon invested them with those memory-images as a kind of joke.

There is a difference between seeming to remember something and really remembering it. (Post-hypnotic suggestion.) How shall we explain this difference? Obvious thought is:

(RM) Y-tomorrow *really* remembers X-today's experiences iff

- (a) Y-tomorrow seems to remember X-today's experiences, and
- (b) Y-tomorrow *really is* a stage of the person she remembers being (X-today)

But now the theory is circular:

(MT*) Y-tomorrow is a stage of the same person as X-today iff

- (a) Y-tomorrow seems to remember X-today's experiences, and
- (b) Y-tomorrow is a stage of the *same* person as X-today.

You might think that that was already implicit in (MT), since 'remember' is a factive. So (MT*) doesn't work. Anyway, it's wrong. I could be hypnotized to eliminate my memories of this conversation and then put under post-hypnotic suggestion to seem to remember a conversation just like this one. Then (a) and (b) would be met but I wouldn't really remember the conversation. So we need to define (MT) in terms of real memories, and then define real memories in some non-circular way:

(RM*) Y-tomorrow really remembers X-today's experiences iff

- (a) Y-tomorrow seems to remember X-today's experiences, and
- (c) the seeming memory is *caused* by X-today's experiences *in the right way*.

Why 'in the right way'? Causation in the case of post-hypnotic suggestion. How to define 'right way'? Deviant causal chains. It had better not be: 'caused in the way that it is caused in real cases of memory'. Perhaps we can simply point to good examples. If so then real memory on (RM*) does not presuppose personal identity so Locke is back in business.

Transitivity problem (Reid): If stage 2 really remembers being stage 1, and stage 3 really remembers being stage 2, but stage 3 doesn't remember being stage 1. Then stage 1 is the same person as stage 2, and stage 2 is the same person as . But we were supposed to be getting at personal identity. And identity is a transitive relation.

Fix: take (MT) as the definition of being *immediately continuous*; and then define personal identity in terms of the ancestral of that relation: i.e. A is the same person as B iff there is a chain of immediately continuous stages between A and B.

Splitting Problem. If God can create one Gretchen-like body in the afterlife, he can create two, both of them really remembering this present conversation according to (RM*). (MT) and the ancestral

relation entail Gretchen-A and Gretchen-B are both the same person as Gretchen. Identity is transitive; so they are identical to each other! But this is absurd. Whatever else may be true, Gretchen-A is not the same person as Gretchen-B.

Perhaps we should insist on uniqueness:

(MT–No Competitor Version) Y-tomorrow is immediately continuous with X-today iff

(A) Y-tomorrow has real memories of X-today's experiences, and

(B) no one else tomorrow has real memories of X-today's experiences.

Back to the teletransporter. If two Kirks materialize, neither one is really Kirk. How can double success count as failure? Or suppose slight time delay for one of them. Does the first go out of existence when the second one arrives? Should Kirk-1 try to block or kill Kirk-2 so that "he" can go on existing? This goes against our idea that personal identity is intrinsic to the two candidates. Whether I am some later person is a matter between me and that person.

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

24.00 Problems in Philosophy
Fall 2010

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.