

# IPP-SR-11: Presentism and relativity

James Read<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Philosophy, University of Oxford, UK, OX2 6GG

HT20

# The course

1. Newton's laws
2. Galilean invariance
3. The Michelson-Morley experiment
4. Einstein's 1905 derivation of the Lorentz transformations
5. Spacetime structure
6. General covariance
7. Relativity and conventionality of simultaneity
8. Frame-dependent effects
9. The twin paradox
10. Dynamical and geometrical approaches to relativity
11. Presentism and relativity
12. Acceleration and redshift

Does only the present exist?

Does only the present exist?

How can this be possible, in light of the relativity of simultaneity?

# Today

The metaphysics of time

Presentism and relativity

Presentist fallbacks

Presentism and cosmology

The growing block and relativity

# Today

The metaphysics of time

Presentism and relativity

Presentist fallbacks

Presentism and cosmology

The growing block and relativity

# Static versus dynamical views

Intuition: far-future moments become near-future moments, which become present moments, which in turn become near-past and far-past moments, in an endless 'flow of time'.

# Static versus dynamical views

Intuition: far-future moments become near-future moments, which become present moments, which in turn become near-past and far-past moments, in an endless 'flow of time'.

But: Is temporal passage—becoming—truly an objective feature of reality?



# Static versus dynamical views

Intuition: far-future moments become near-future moments, which become present moments, which in turn become near-past and far-past moments, in an endless ‘flow of time’.

But: Is temporal passage—becoming—truly an objective feature of reality?

- *Dynamic* views hold that temporal passage is fundamental.

# Static versus dynamical views

Intuition: far-future moments become near-future moments, which become present moments, which in turn become near-past and far-past moments, in an endless ‘flow of time’.

But: Is temporal passage—becoming—truly an objective feature of reality?

- ▶ *Dynamic* views hold that temporal passage is fundamental.
- ▶ *Static* views deny this.

# A-series and B-series

In his (in)famous 1908 paper, *The Unreality of Time*, McTaggart distinguishes between the A-series and the B-series:

# A-series and B-series

In his (in)famous 1908 paper, *The Unreality of Time*, McTaggart distinguishes between the A-series and the B-series:

A-series: That ordering of events according to whether they are past, present, or future.

# A-series and B-series

In his (in)famous 1908 paper, *The Unreality of Time*, McTaggart distinguishes between the A-series and the B-series:

A-series: That ordering of events according to whether they are past, present, or future.

B-series: That ordering of events according to whether they are earlier or later.

# A-series and B-series

- ▶ Those who maintain that the universe contains irreducible A-series ('tensed') facts are known as *A-theorists*.

# A-series and B-series

- ▶ Those who maintain that the universe contains irreducible A-series ('tensed') facts are known as *A-theorists*.
- ▶ Those who maintain that the universe does not contain irreducible A-series facts, but only B-series facts, are known as *B-theorists*.

# A-series and B-series

- ▶ Those who maintain that the universe contains irreducible A-series ('tensed') facts are known as *A-theorists*.
- ▶ Those who maintain that the universe does not contain irreducible A-series facts, but only B-series facts, are known as *B-theorists*.
- ▶ Those who believe in a 'moving present'—i.e., those who believe that temporal passage is fundamental—will be A-theorists.



# A-series and B-series

- ▶ Those who maintain that the universe contains irreducible A-series ('tensed') facts are known as *A-theorists*.
- ▶ Those who maintain that the universe does not contain irreducible A-series facts, but only B-series facts, are known as *B-theorists*.
- ▶ Those who believe in a 'moving present'—i.e., those who believe that temporal passage is fundamental—will be A-theorists.
- ▶ **Question:** Does the reverse of this implication hold?

# The metaphysics of time

Which moments in time *really exist*?


# The metaphysics of time

Which moments in time *really exist*?

There are three main views:


1. The block universe view
2. The growing block view
3. Presentism

# The block universe




The *block universe view* (sometimes: *eternalism*) holds that past, present and future events are all equally real.

# The growing block



- ▶ The *growing block view* holds that the past and present are real, but the future is not.
- ▶ Reality is four-dimensional, but the four dimensional block grows over time.

# Presentism



According to *presentism*, reality is three-dimensional; the past and future are unreal.

# Varieties of presentism

There are several different varieties of presentism:

# Varieties of presentism

There are several different varieties of presentism:

1. *Solipsistic presentism*: Nothing exists that is not present, and only one present ever exists—*this* one. (A static view.)



# Varieties of presentism

There are several different varieties of presentism:

1. *Solipsistic presentism*: Nothing exists that is not present, and only one present ever exists—*this* one. (A static view.)
2. *Many-worlds presentism*: Reality as a whole includes many momentary presents that are *not* temporally related to one another, and so do not succeed each other in any way. (A static view. **Question**: how does this differ from the block view? Cf. also Barbour's views on time.)

# Varieties of presentism

There are several different varieties of presentism:

1. *Solipsistic presentism*: Nothing exists that is not present, and only one present ever exists—*this* one. (A static view.)
2. *Many-worlds presentism*: Reality as a whole includes many momentary presents that are *not* temporally related to one another, and so do not succeed each other in any way. (A static view. **Question**: how does this differ from the block view? Cf. also Barbour's views on time.)
3. *Dynamic presentism*: Reality takes the form of a succession of instantaneous (or near-instantaneous) presents; no sooner has one present come into existence than it will depart from it, to be replaced by another.

# Connections

It's natural to group, e.g.,

1. Presentism/dynamic views/A-series.
2. Eternalism/static views/B-series.

# Connections

It's natural to group, e.g.,

1. Presentism/dynamic views/A-series.
2. Eternalism/static views/B-series.

However, one should be wary of thinking that these connections are stronger than they are. They need not necessarily hold; for example,

- ▶ Solipsistic and many-worlds presentism are presentist static views.
- ▶ Eternalism (i.e. the block universe picture) is compatible with events having auxiliary, A-series properties. (See e.g. the 'moving spotlight view'.)

# Today

The metaphysics of time

**Presentism and relativity**

Presentist fallbacks

Presentism and cosmology

The growing block and relativity

# Newtonian mechanics

Newtonian mechanics looks to be an hospitable environment for presentism:

---

<sup>1</sup>But NB: (Brown 2005) presents concerns regarding the conventionality of simultaneity even in the Newtonian context!

# Newtonian mechanics

Newtonian mechanics looks to be an hospitable environment for presentism:

- ▶ Time in Newtonian mechanics is absolute. (In either Newtonian or Galilean spacetime.)

---

<sup>1</sup>But NB: (Brown 2005) presents concerns regarding the conventionality of simultaneity even in the Newtonian context!

# Newtonian mechanics

Newtonian mechanics looks to be an hospitable environment for presentism:

- ▶ Time in Newtonian mechanics is absolute. (In either Newtonian or Galilean spacetime.)
- ▶ Simultaneity in Newtonian mechanics is also absolute. (In either Newtonian or Galilean spacetime.)<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>But NB: (Brown 2005) presents concerns regarding the conventionality of simultaneity even in the Newtonian context!



# Newtonian mechanics

Newtonian mechanics looks to be an hospitable environment for presentism:

- ▶ Time in Newtonian mechanics is absolute. (In either Newtonian or Galilean spacetime.)
- ▶ Simultaneity in Newtonian mechanics is also absolute. (In either Newtonian or Galilean spacetime.)<sup>1</sup>
- ▶ So there exists sufficient spacetime structure to identify the class of spacetime points which might qualify as ‘the present’.

---

<sup>1</sup>But NB: (Brown 2005) presents concerns regarding the conventionality of simultaneity even in the Newtonian context!

# Special relativity

Special relativity does not appear to be an hospitable environment for presentism:

# Special relativity

Special relativity does not appear to be an hospitable environment for presentism:

- ▶ The relativity of simultaneity tells us that how we 'spread time through space' depends upon the frame from which the physics is described.

# Special relativity

Special relativity does not appear to be an hospitable environment for presentism:

- ▶ The relativity of simultaneity tells us that how we 'spread time through space' depends upon the frame from which the physics is described.
- ▶ The conventionality of simultaneity tells that, even within a frame, there's no fact of the matter about the simultaneity of spatially-separated events.

# Putnam's 1967 argument

Putnam attempts to construct a formal argument against the viability of presentism in SR:

# Putnam's 1967 argument

Putnam attempts to construct a formal argument against the viability of presentism in SR:

1. All events that I consider to be simultaneous with me-now are real. (Remember, the presentist thinks only these things are real.)

# Putnam's 1967 argument

Putnam attempts to construct a formal argument against the viability of presentism in SR:

1. All events that I consider to be simultaneous with me-now are real. (Remember, the presentist thinks only these things are real.)
2. Some of these events involve other observers, so I should believe that these other observers are real. Some of them are in motion relative to me.

# Putnam's 1967 argument

Putnam attempts to construct a formal argument against the viability of presentism in SR:

1. All events that I consider to be simultaneous with me-now are real. (Remember, the presentist thinks only these things are real.)
2. Some of these events involve other observers, so I should believe that these other observers are real. Some of them are in motion relative to me.
3. There are no privileged observers, so if one of the other observers thinks something's real, then I should think it's real too.



# Putnam's 1967 argument

Putnam attempts to construct a formal argument against the viability of presentism in SR:

1. All events that I consider to be simultaneous with me-now are real. (Remember, the presentist thinks only these things are real.)
2. Some of these events involve other observers, so I should believe that these other observers are real. Some of them are in motion relative to me.
3. There are no privileged observers, so if one of the other observers thinks something's real, then I should think it's real too.
4. Special relativity tells me that the events moving observers consider to be simultaneous will be different from those that I think are simultaneous.

# Putnam's 1967 argument

Putnam attempts to construct a formal argument against the viability of presentism in SR:

1. All events that I consider to be simultaneous with me-now are real. (Remember, the presentist thinks only these things are real.)
2. Some of these events involve other observers, so I should believe that these other observers are real. Some of them are in motion relative to me.
3. There are no privileged observers, so if one of the other observers thinks something's real, then I should think it's real too.
4. Special relativity tells me that the events moving observers consider to be simultaneous will be different from those that I think are simultaneous.
5. Therefore, some events are real that are not simultaneous with me—so presentism is false!

# Today

The metaphysics of time

Presentism and relativity

**Presentist fallbacks**

Presentism and cosmology

The growing block and relativity

# Presentist fallbacks

Hinchliff (2000) discusses three special relativistic presentist fallbacks:

# Presentist fallbacks

Hinchliff (2000) discusses three special relativistic presentist fallbacks:

1. Privileged simultaneity slicing

# Presentist fallbacks

Hinchliff (2000) discusses three special relativistic presentist fallbacks:


1. Privileged simultaneity slicing
2. Point presentism

# Presentist fallbacks

Hinchliff (2000) discusses three special relativistic presentist fallbacks:

1. Privileged simultaneity slicing
2. Point presentism
3. Cone presentism

# Privileged simultaneity slicing





# Privileged simultaneity slicing

A privileged simultaneity slicing is not *incompatible* with special relativity—although it does involve adding extra structure.  
Here's one way to implement it:

# Privileged simultaneity slicing

A privileged simultaneity slicing is not *incompatible* with special relativity—although it does involve adding extra structure.

Here's one way to implement it:

- ▶ Suppose simultaneity is *not* conventional, but that the correct  $\epsilon$  factor changes from frame-to-frame.

# Privileged simultaneity slicing

A privileged simultaneity slicing is not *incompatible* with special relativity—although it does involve adding extra structure.

Here's one way to implement it:

- ▶ Suppose simultaneity is *not* conventional, but that the correct  $\epsilon$  factor changes from frame-to-frame.
- ▶ Then, we can *eliminate* the relativity of simultaneity.

# Privileged simultaneity slicing

A privileged simultaneity slicing is not *incompatible* with special relativity—although it does involve adding extra structure.

Here's one way to implement it:

- ▶ Suppose simultaneity is *not* conventional, but that the correct  $\epsilon$  factor changes from frame-to-frame.
- ▶ Then, we can *eliminate* the relativity of simultaneity.
- ▶ Moreover, since simultaneity is not conventional, there is a fact about simultaneity in each frame.

# Privileged simultaneity slicing

A privileged simultaneity slicing is not *incompatible* with special relativity—although it does involve adding extra structure.

Here's one way to implement it:

- ▶ Suppose simultaneity is *not* conventional, but that the correct  $\epsilon$  factor changes from frame-to-frame.
- ▶ Then, we can *eliminate* the relativity of simultaneity.
- ▶ Moreover, since simultaneity is not conventional, there is a fact about simultaneity in each frame.
- ▶ In this way, we can introduce a privileged slicing into special relativity—though, of course, it won't be empirically accessible.

# Privileged simultaneity slicing


A privileged simultaneity slicing is not *incompatible* with special relativity—although it does involve adding extra structure.

Here's one way to implement it:

- ▶ Suppose simultaneity is *not* conventional, but that the correct  $\epsilon$  factor changes from frame-to-frame.
- ▶ Then, we can *eliminate* the relativity of simultaneity.
- ▶ Moreover, since simultaneity is not conventional, there is a fact about simultaneity in each frame.
- ▶ In this way, we can introduce a privileged slicing into special relativity—though, of course, it won't be empirically accessible.

Central concern: The extra, privileged simultaneity structure is otiose, and a throwback to Lorentz. (For more, see e.g. discussion of Lane Craig's *neo-Lorentzianism*.)

# Point presentism



# Point presentism

The *point presentist* says that only the present exists, but the present is not a simultaneity surface, but rather *a single point on a worldline*.



# Point presentism

The *point presentist* says that only the present exists, but the present is not a simultaneity surface, but rather *a single point on a worldline*.

Possible concerns:

# Point presentism

The *point presentist* says that only the present exists, but the present is not a simultaneity surface, but rather *a single point on a worldline*.

Possible concerns:

1. Lonely/solipsistic?

# Point presentism

The *point presentist* says that only the present exists, but the present is not a simultaneity surface, but rather *a single point on a worldline*.

Possible concerns:

1. Lonely/solipsistic? (Hinchliff: “just a restatement of the view as an objection” (p. 579).)

# Point presentism

The *point presentist* says that only the present exists, but the present is not a simultaneity surface, but rather *a single point on a worldline*.

Possible concerns:

1. Lonely/solipsistic? (Hinchliff: “just a restatement of the view as an objection” (p. 579).)
2. *Whose* worldline?


# Point presentism

The *point presentist* says that only the present exists, but the present is not a simultaneity surface, but rather *a single point on a worldline*.

Possible concerns:

1. Lonely/solipsistic? (Hinchliff: “just a restatement of the view as an objection” (p. 579).)
2. *Whose* worldline? (Present as relativised to an observer?—But then why be a point presentist?)

# Cone presentism



# Cone presentism

Another option is to try to use the structures that *are* held to be invariant by special relativity—namely, the lightcone structure. Call this view *cone presentism*.

# Cone presentism

Another option is to try to use the structures that *are* held to be invariant by special relativity—namely, the lightcone structure. Call this view *cone presentism*.

*One virtue of [cone presentism] is that it captures the idea that what is present is what I am seeing now. A second virtue is that it identifies the present with an invariant feature of the special theory. A third virtue is that we are not alone. (Hinchliff 2000, p. 580)*



# Two subviews

The present is...

# Two subviews

The present is...

1. The 'past' lightcone? ('Backward-cone presentism')

# Two subviews

The present is...

1. The 'past' lightcone? ('Backward-cone presentism')
2. The entire lightcone? ('Double-cone presentism')

# Savitt on backward-cone presentism

*[Backward-cone presentism] seems to rest on the idea that events on the past light cone of  $E$  have a lightlike separation from  $E$  and hence the spacetime interval from  $E$  to (say)  $E'$  (on the past light cone of  $E$ ) is 0. But then it seems arbitrary to exclude from the present events on the future light cone of  $E$ , which are also light like separated from  $E$ . (Savitt 1998, p. 6)*

# Hinchliff's response

*The surface of  $E$ 's past light cone is the set of events from which a light signal or ray could be sent to  $E$ . The surface of  $E$ 's future light cone is the set of events to which a light signal or ray could be sent from  $E$ . The difference between the cones is due to the asymmetry built into the nature of a light ray or signal. And that asymmetry arises from the asymmetric nature of causation itself, which is a non-arbitrary foundation on which to rest the distinction between cone and double-cone presentism. (Hinchliff 2000, p. 582)*

# Hinchliff's response

*The surface of  $E$ 's past light cone is the set of events from which a light signal or ray could be sent to  $E$ . The surface of  $E$ 's future light cone is the set of events to which a light signal or ray could be sent from  $E$ . The difference between the cones is due to the asymmetry built into the nature of a light ray or signal. And that asymmetry arises from the asymmetric nature of causation itself, which is a non-arbitrary foundation on which to rest the distinction between cone and double-cone presentism. (Hinchliff 2000, p. 582)*

Is Hinchliff introducing extra structure in the form of a primitive causal relation here?

# Other worries about cone presentism

- ▶ Again, there is a worry about with respect to *whose* worldline the present is meant to be defined.

# Other worries about cone presentism

- ▶ Again, there is a worry about with respect to *whose* worldline the present is meant to be defined.
- ▶ Radiation is currently reaching us from the cosmological decoupling period—does that mean we're simultaneous with the 'early' universe? (A worry for the double-cone presentist.)



# Are we simultaneous with the ‘early’ universe?

*To the extent that you find this objection compelling, you should be a presentist. The objection derives its force from the “fact” that CMBR originated 15 billion years ago. This “fact” comes from outside the special theory. The special theory is silent on the matter. Indeed, according to the special theory, there is no fact of the matter concerning how long ago this event happened. If we think it is a fact that this event happened 15 billion years ago, we must think there is a distinguished inertial frame which assigns events their “correct” dates. As a presentist, I say, “Great, the events that are simultaneous with me now in that frame are the existing events.” If we think there is no distinguished inertial frame, then we cannot appeal to alleged facts like the radiation’s originating 15 billion years ago in objecting to cone presentism. If there is a distinguished frame, we can stay good old-fashioned presentists. If not, we can be cone presentists. Either way, presentism is unscathed by objections of this sort. (Hinchliff 2000, p. 581)*

# Today

The metaphysics of time

Presentism and relativity

Presentist fallbacks

**Presentism and cosmology**

The growing block and relativity

# General relativity to the rescue

Some authors (e.g. Swinburne 2008) have suggested that the prospects for presentism *improve* when one moves from special relativity to general relativity. Here's the reasoning.

# General relativity to the rescue

Some authors (e.g. Swinburne 2008) have suggested that the prospects for presentism *improve* when one moves from special relativity to general relativity. Here's the reasoning.

- ▶ Minkowski spacetime is just one solution of general relativity. Another solution is the Friedman-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) cosmological ('big bang') solution—and it's *this* spacetime which cosmologists use to model out universe.

# General relativity to the rescue

Some authors (e.g. Swinburne 2008) have suggested that the prospects for presentism *improve* when one moves from special relativity to general relativity. Here's the reasoning.

- ▶ Minkowski spacetime is just one solution of general relativity. Another solution is the Friedman-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) cosmological ('big bang') solution—and it's *this* spacetime which cosmologists use to model out universe.
- ▶ Unlike the Minkowski metric, there is a preferred choice of temporal coordinate (i.e., foliation; i.e., frame) in which the FLRW metric simplifies.

# General relativity to the rescue

Some authors (e.g. Swinburne 2008) have suggested that the prospects for presentism *improve* when one moves from special relativity to general relativity. Here's the reasoning.

- ▶ Minkowski spacetime is just one solution of general relativity. Another solution is the Friedman-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) cosmological ('big bang') solution—and it's *this* spacetime which cosmologists use to model out universe.
- ▶ Unlike the Minkowski metric, there is a preferred choice of temporal coordinate (i.e., foliation; i.e., frame) in which the FLRW metric simplifies.
- ▶ Thus, there *is* a preferred frame, once one moves to general relativity. This gives a notion of *cosmic simultaneity*.

# Worries for cosmic simultaneity

There are a number of concerns about this strategy (Read and Qureshi-Hurst 2020). For example:

# Worries for cosmic simultaneity

There are a number of concerns about this strategy (Read and Qureshi-Hurst 2020). For example:

1. FLRW spacetime is an idealisation (it assumes perfect homogeneity and isotropy). The actual universe would be better represented by a 'perturbed FLRW' spacetime. Can cosmic simultaneity be defined in such spacetimes?



# Worries for cosmic simultaneity

There are a number of concerns about this strategy (Read and Qureshi-Hurst 2020). For example:

1. FLRW spacetime is an idealisation (it assumes perfect homogeneity and isotropy). The actual universe would be better represented by a ‘perturbed FLRW’ spacetime. Can cosmic simultaneity be defined in such spacetimes?
2. There are other solutions of general relativity in which the spacetime cannot be foliated into hypersurfaces *at all*—e.g., Gödel’s time travel solution. There are no good prospects for presentism there. But since metaphysics cannot be contingent (so the claim goes), there are no prospects for presentism in the actual world, either. (This is Gödel’s ‘modal argument’—see Gödel 1949.)

# Worries for cosmic simultaneity

There are a number of concerns about this strategy (Read and Qureshi-Hurst 2020). For example:

1. FLRW spacetime is an idealisation (it assumes perfect homogeneity and isotropy). The actual universe would be better represented by a ‘perturbed FLRW’ spacetime. Can cosmic simultaneity be defined in such spacetimes?
2. There are other solutions of general relativity in which the spacetime cannot be foliated into hypersurfaces *at all*—e.g., Gödel’s time travel solution. There are no good prospects for presentism there. But since metaphysics cannot be contingent (so the claim goes), there are no prospects for presentism in the actual world, either. (This is Gödel’s ‘modal argument’—see Gödel 1949.)

These debates are ongoing. What we can say, though, is that there are (*prima facie*) serious problems for presentism in *special* relativity, which the proponent of the view must address.

# Today

The metaphysics of time

Presentism and relativity

Presentist fallbacks

Presentism and cosmology

The growing block and relativity

# The growing block and relativity

- ▶ General concerns about the growing block: “How fast is the block growing? With respect to what is the block growing—some additional dimension?” (Earman 2008, p. 138)

# The growing block and relativity

- ▶ General concerns about the growing block: “How fast is the block growing? With respect to what is the block growing—some additional dimension?” (Earman 2008, p. 138)
- ▶ Again, the growing block seems to have better prospects in Newtonian theories than in SR, due to the absolute simultaneity structure.

# The growing block and relativity

- ▶ General concerns about the growing block: “How fast is the block growing? With respect to what is the block growing—some additional dimension?” (Earman 2008, p. 138)
- ▶ Again, the growing block seems to have better prospects in Newtonian theories than in SR, due to the absolute simultaneity structure.
- ▶ How to define the hypersurfaces into which the block is growing in the relativistic context?

# The growing block and relativity

- ▶ General concerns about the growing block: “How fast is the block growing? With respect to what is the block growing—some additional dimension?” (Earman 2008, p. 138)
- ▶ Again, the growing block seems to have better prospects in Newtonian theories than in SR, due to the absolute simultaneity structure.
- ▶ How to define the hypersurfaces into which the block is growing in the relativistic context?
- ▶ (Further concern in general relativity: not all spacetimes are foliable into hypersurfaces—recall again the Gödel solution.)

# The growing block and quantum gravity?

It might be that the growing block view finds a more natural home in certain approaches to *quantum gravity*...



# Causal set theory

*Think of the causal set as an idealized growing tree (in the botanical sense, not the combinatorial one). Such a tree grows at the tips of its many branches, and these sites of growth are independent of one another. Perhaps a cluster of two leaves springs up at the tip of one branch (event A) and at the same moment a single leaf unfolds itself at the tip of a second branch (event B). To a good approximation, the words “at the same moment” make sense for real trees, but we know that they are not strictly accurate, because events A and B occur at different locations and distant simultaneity lacks objective meaning. If the tree were broad enough and the growth fast enough, we really could not say whether event A preceded or followed event B. (Sorkin 2007, p. 4)*

# Summary

In this lecture, we've:

# Summary

In this lecture, we've:

1. Introduced various metaphysical positions in the philosophy of time.

# Summary

In this lecture, we've:

1. Introduced various metaphysical positions in the philosophy of time.
2. Seen how these positions interact with one another.

# Summary

In this lecture, we've:

1. Introduced various metaphysical positions in the philosophy of time.
2. Seen how these positions interact with one another.
3. Witnessed the *prima facie* problems for presentism in the context of special relativity.

# Summary

In this lecture, we've:

1. Introduced various metaphysical positions in the philosophy of time.
2. Seen how these positions interact with one another.
3. Witnessed the *prima facie* problems for presentism in the context of special relativity.
4. Evaluated three presentist attempts to get around these problems—*viz.*, (i) introducing privileged simultaneity slices, (ii) point presentism, and (iii) cone presentism.

# Summary

In this lecture, we've:

1. Introduced various metaphysical positions in the philosophy of time.
2. Seen how these positions interact with one another.
3. Witnessed the *prima facie* problems for presentism in the context of special relativity.
4. Evaluated three presentist attempts to get around these problems—*viz.*, (i) introducing privileged simultaneity slices, (ii) point presentism, and (iii) cone presentism.
5. Seen that while presentism might have better prospects in general relativity, the debates on this are ongoing.

# Summary

In this lecture, we've:

1. Introduced various metaphysical positions in the philosophy of time.
2. Seen how these positions interact with one another.
3. Witnessed the *prima facie* problems for presentism in the context of special relativity.
4. Evaluated three presentist attempts to get around these problems—*viz.*, (i) introducing privileged simultaneity slices, (ii) point presentism, and (iii) cone presentism.
5. Seen that while presentism might have better prospects in general relativity, the debates on this are ongoing.
6. Said something of the growing block view in the relativistic context.



# Summary

In this lecture, we've:

1. Introduced various metaphysical positions in the philosophy of time.
2. Seen how these positions interact with one another.
3. Witnessed the *prima facie* problems for presentism in the context of special relativity.
4. Evaluated three presentist attempts to get around these problems—*viz.*, (i) introducing privileged simultaneity slices, (ii) point presentism, and (iii) cone presentism.
5. Seen that while presentism might have better prospects in general relativity, the debates on this are ongoing.
6. Said something of the growing block view in the relativistic context.

Next time, we'll consider Einstein's transition from special relativity to general relativity.

# References



Barry Dainton, *Time and Space*, second edition, London: Routledge, 2010.



John Earman, "Reassessing the Prospects for a Growing Block Model of the Universe", *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 22, pp. 135-164, 2008.



Kurt Gödel, "A Remark about the Relationship between Relativity Theory and Idealistic Philosophy", in P. A. Schlipp (ed.), *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*, La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1949.



Mark Hinchliff, "A Defense of Presentism in a Relativistic Setting", *Philosophy of Science* 67, pp. S575-S586, 2000.



John M. E. McTaggart, "The Unreality of Time", *Mind* 17, pp. 457-474, 1908.



Oliver Pooley, "Relativity, the Open Future, and the Passage of Time", *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* CXIII, part 3, pp. 321-363, 2013.



Hilary Putnam, "Time and Physical Geometry", *Journal of Philosophy* 64, pp. 240-247, 1967.



James Read and Emily Qureshi-Hurst, "Getting Tense About Relativity", Synthese, 2020. (Forthcoming.)



Simon W. Saunders, "How Relativity Contradicts Presentism", in C. Callender (ed.), *Time, Reality and Experience*, pp. 277-92, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.



Steven F. Savitt, "There's No Time Like the Present (in Minkowski Spacetime)", *Philosophy of Science* 67, pp. S563-S574, 2000.



Rafael Sorkin, "Relativity Theory Does not Imply that the Future Already Exists: A Counterexample", in V. Petkov (ed.), *Relativity and the Dimensionality of the World*, Berlin: Springer, 2007.



Richard Swinburne, "Cosmic Simultaneity", in W. L. Craig and Q. Smith (eds.), *Einstein, Relativity and Absolute Simultaneity*, London: Routledge, pp. 224-261, 2008.