



OXFORD JOURNALS  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

ANALYSIS

---

Can There Be Vague Objects?

Author(s): Gareth Evans

Source: *Analysis*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (Oct., 1978), p. 208

Published by: [Oxford University Press](#) on behalf of [The Analysis Committee](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3327996>

Accessed: 25/03/2013 19:04

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Oxford University Press* and *The Analysis Committee* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Analysis*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## CAN THERE BE VAGUE OBJECTS?

By GARETH EVANS

IT is sometimes said that the world might itself *be* vague. Rather than vagueness being a deficiency in our mode of describing the world, it would then be a necessary feature of any true description of it. It is also said that amongst the statements which may not have a determinate truth value as a result of their vagueness are identity statements. Combining these two views we would arrive at the idea that the world might contain certain objects about which it is a *fact* that they have fuzzy boundaries. But is this idea coherent?

Let 'a' and 'b' be singular terms such that the sentence 'a=b' is of indeterminate truth value, and let us allow for the expression of the idea of indeterminacy by the sentential operator '∇'. Then we have:

$$(1) \quad \nabla(a=b).$$

(1) reports a fact about *b* which we may express by ascribing to it the property '♠[∇(x=a)]':

$$(2) \quad \spadesuit[\nabla(x=a)]b.$$

But we have:

$$(3) \quad \sim \nabla(a=a)$$

and hence:

$$(4) \quad \sim \spadesuit[\nabla(x=a)]a.$$

But by Leibniz's Law, we may derive from (2) and (4):

$$(5) \quad \sim(a=b)$$

contradicting the assumption, with which we began, that the identity statement 'a=b' is of indeterminate truth value.

If 'Indefinitely' and its dual, 'Definitely' ('Δ') generate a modal logic as strong as S5, (1)–(4) and, presumably, Leibniz's Law, may each be strengthened with a 'Definitely' prefix, enabling us to derive

$$(5') \quad \Delta \sim(a=b)$$

which is straightforwardly inconsistent with (1).

University College, Oxford

© GARETH EVANS 1978