Mereotopology

Ramón de Villegas Dopacio

February 1st, 2023

Index

- Why mereotopology? Philosophical necessity
- Formal mereotopology
 - Basic axioms
 - Extensions of M
- Mereotopology
 - MTand its axioms
 - CMT and CEMT
 - GEMT and topological operators
 - Defining a whole
- The atomicity/boundary problem

Mereology

Mereolgy is the branch of ontology in charge of studying the parthood relation. It has three fundamental principles:

- Objects have hierarchically structured and spatially articulated parts.
- Objects are made of matter, which is located where they are.
 Put otherwise, objects occupy space.
- Objects can be classified into whole and disconnected.

Wholeness & connectedness

How is a intact cup different from a shattered one?

- They have the same parts, so mereologically they are equal.
- Connection between parts

Three strategies

- Whitehead: only admit connected wholes
- Topology (A): Use topology as a ground theory and define mereology over it.
- Topology (B): Use mereology for parthood and topology for connectedness.

Whitehead's approach

x is connected to $y \iff$ there is z overlapping both x and y and there is no part of z that doesn't overlap either x or y. (see blackboard)

Circularity problem

Top (A)

Clarke(1981): x part of y \iff everything connected to x is also connected to y

- P1) Insistence of regions → neglect of contact points, boundaries...
- P2) Either of these must hold
 - All spatial entities can be mapped onto their regions
 - Topological regions apply to events and objects alike

Basic axioms

- Pxy or 'x is a part of y' works as primitive
- M=(P1-3): P is a partial order

We can now define:

- $Oxy \iff \exists z (Pzx \land Pzy)$
- $Uxy \iff \exists z (Pxz \land Pyz)$
- $PPxy \iff Pxy \land \neg Pyx$

Extensions of M

MM=M+(P4) and EM=M+(P5)

- (P4): $PPxy \rightarrow \exists z (Pzy \land \neg Ozx)$
- (P5): $\neg Pyx \rightarrow \exists z (Pzy \land \neg Ozx)$

Given the definition of PPxy we can see that (P5) implies (P4)

EM implies that objects with the same proper parts are identical

Closure principles

X+(P6-7)=CX
• (P6):
$$Uxy \to \exists z \forall w (Owz \iff (Owx \lor Owy)) [z = x + y]$$
• (P7): $Oxy \to \exists z \forall w (Pwz \iff (Pwx \land Pwy)) [z = x \times y]$
(P7)+(P4) \to (P5), so CMM=CEM

Infinitary fusions

$$X+(P8)=GX$$

- (P8): $\exists x \varphi(x) \to \exists z \forall y (Oyz \iff \exists x (\varphi(x) \land Oyx))$ Every specifiable set of objects corresponds to a whole
- $[z = \sigma x \varphi]$
- $[\pi x \varphi = \sigma z \forall x (\varphi(x) \rightarrow Pxz)]$
- $[\sim x = \sigma z \neg Ozx]$

Atoms

- Atomicity (P9): $\forall x \exists (Pyx \land \forall z \neg PPzy)$
- Atomlessness (P10): $\forall x \exists y PPyx$

New relations

- Cxy, 'x is connected to y' as a new primitive
- T= (C1-2): C is reflexive and symmetric
 - $Exy \iff \forall z (Czx \rightarrow Czy)$
 - $ECxy \iff Cxy \land \neg Oxy$
- (C3): $Pxy \rightarrow Exy$
 - Corollary: Oxy → Cxy

MT

- $IPxy \iff Pxy \land \forall z (Czx \rightarrow Ozy)$
- $TPxy \iff Pxy \land \neg IPxy$
- $IOxy \iff \exists z (IPzx \land IPzy)$
- $TOxy \iff Oxy \land \neg IOxy$
- $IUxy \iff \exists z (IPxz \land IPyz)$
- $TUxy \iff Uxy \land \neg IUxy$

Problem, how are TOxy and ECxy different?

Self-Connectedness 1

$$SCx \iff \forall yz(\forall w(Owx \iff Owy \lor Owz) \rightarrow Cyz)$$

CMT, CEMT

CMT = CM + T + (C4)

- (C4): $Cxy \rightarrow Uxy$
- $SCx \land SCy \land Cxy \rightarrow \exists z (SCz \land \forall w (Owz \iff Owx \lor Owy))$

$$CEMT=CMT+(P5)=CEM+T+(C4)$$

- $SCx \land SCy \land Cxy \rightarrow \exists z (SCz \land z = x + y)$
- $SCx \iff \forall yz((x = y + z) \rightarrow Czy)$

GEMT

GEMT=GEM+T. Now we can define topological operators:

- $ix = \sigma z(IPzx)$
- $ex = i(\sim x)$
- $cx = \sim (ex)$
- $bx = \sim (ex + ix) \Rightarrow$ Difference between TOxy and ECxy

Topological axioms

GEMTC = GEMT + (C5-7)

- Inclusion(C5): Px(cx)
- Idempotence(C6): c(cx) = cx
- Additivity(C7): c(x + y) = cx + cy

Here you can prove that

• $Cxy \iff Oxy \lor Oxc(y) \lor Oc(x)y$

Self-Connectedness 2

- $SSCx \iff SCx \land SCix$
- $MSSCx \iff SSCx \land \forall y(SScy \land Oyx \rightarrow Pyx)$

Our wholes will be the φ – MSSC

Atomicity problem

- Boundarylessness(C9): $\forall x \exists y IPPyx$
- $z \neq U \rightarrow \exists y (y = bz)$
- $y = bz \rightarrow \neg \exists x (IPxy)$

Thank you! Questions?