

---

# Submitted Summaries

---

Filozofia Nauki 14/2, 165-169

---

2006

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

## Submitted Summaries

### **Cezary Cieśliński, Deflationism and the ‘Insubstantiality’ of Truth**

The deflationist’s intuition is that truth is in some sense ‘insubstantial’ or ‘metaphysically thin’. The property of conservativeness comes as a handy explication of this intuition: the deflationist should adopt a theory of truth which is conservative over its base (syntactic) theory. Accepting the conservativeness requirement as given, we discuss a certain objection against deflationism: it was claimed that the deflationist can’t explain various ‘epistemic obligations’, which we should accept once we adopt some base theory  $S$ . In particular, anyone who accepts a mathematical base theory  $S$  and understands the notion of truth, has a reason to accept the following:

1. Global reflection principle: All theorems of  $S$  are true.
2. Local reflection scheme: If a sentence  $\ulcorner\varphi\urcorner$  is provable in  $S$ , then  $\varphi$ .

But if our base theory is something like elementary arithmetic, then no deflationary truth theory can prove (1) or (2) on pain of losing its conservative character. In this situation the deflationist could still claim, that it is not our understanding of the notion of truth, but our knowledge of some additional non-semantic facts which explains our readiness to accept reflection principles. We claim however, that the explanation of this sort could perhaps be provided in case of (2), but in case of (1) — that of global reflection — it is out of the question. Since this path is blocked, the deflationist is left with a serious problem.

### **Aleksandra Derra-Wlochowicz, Selected Problems of Paul Horwich Theory of Truth**

The author characterizes Paul Horwich’s view on truth formulated in his deflationary theory of truth. She presents selected problems which arise when one analyzes

the elements of the theory in a more detailed way. She investigates the mentioned problems in order to show the importance of such categories like truth, acceptance, understanding, proposition and property for philosophy of language. The author concludes with a claim that philosophical acceptance (or antipathy) for minimalism in theory of truth is connected with some metaphysical assumptions which are taken for granted in advance.

### **Jerzy Szymura, Troubles with the Concept of Correspondence**

The article is an analysis of various versions of the correspondence theory of truth and shows that this theory — in all of its versions — rests on two irreconcilable assumptions. First, according to the theory, the relation between the truth bearer and the truth maker — i.e. the portion of reality which makes the bearer true — is a *g r o u n d e d* relation, which means that it holds whenever the elements grounding the relation exist, and that each of the elements may exist independently of the other. Secondly, the correspondence theory of truth explicitly or implicitly presupposes that the truth maker always — i.e. *n e c e s s a r i l y* — makes the truth bearer true. The first assumption implies that truth as a feature of convictions, assertions, judgments, etc. is either impossible or by nature unrecognizable. The second assumption is fulfilled only when the alleged „grounded” relation is replaced by an *i n t e r n a l* relation of identity between the truth bearer and its truth maker. The thesis that the so-called relation of correspondence between thought and reality is essentially their identity follows — contrary to what is commonly believed — from every version of the correspondence theory of truth that does not lead to either nihilism or scepticism. The author illustrates this fact by means of an analysis of the theories of G. E. Moore, B. Russell, H. Field, B. Smith and A. Newman. All of this paves the way for the identity theory of truth, which nevertheless faces its own difficulties in providing a satisfactory explanation of the existence of falsity.

### **Tadeusz Szubka, Why One Should Forget About the Correspondence Theory of Truth?**

It is often assumed that any attempt to undermine the so-called correspondence theory of truth is motivated by the conviction that truth is an idea which should be more or less forgotten in our postmodernist period. However, this is not always the case. One can believe that truth is one of our indispensable concepts but at the same time argue that the correspondence theory of truth is not a proper and illuminating theory of that concept. This position is reasonable, since — as it has been shown (e.g. by Huw Price and Michael Dummett) — without the notion of truth one would not be able to provide a coherent and satisfactory account of our discursive practice and linguistic meaning. Moreover, as it has been recently argued by David Lewis, the correspondence theory is not a stable account of that concept, and it faces the following dilemma: either (putting aside some minor and irrelevant differences) it turns into a minimalist or redundancy theory of some sort, or it becomes a (mostly) meta-

physical theory about various kinds of things which make our statements true. Defenders of the correspondence theory have made some efforts to meet the challenge posed by Lewis, but those efforts do not seem successful. Hence we should perhaps not longer consider the correspondence theory as a major and clearly specifiable contender in the debate about truth, and thus significantly reshape it.

### **Anna Sierszulska, Realistic Minimalism about Truth**

The paper presents three different Fregean approaches towards the question of truth, all of which can be classified as belonging to the category of minimalistic theories, namely the identity theory of McDowell and Hornsby, the ‘modest’ conception of truth proposed by Wolfgang Künne and the ‘alethic realism’ of William Alston. The conceptions are described as realistically biased, in spite of their refusal to accept ‘objectual’ facts as entities in the world. It is argued that a legitimate position can be distinguished within the current truth-theoretical investigations that can be called ‘realistic minimalism about truth’. It is emphasised that the conceptions of meaning which are assumed by Fregean truth theories have an essential impact upon the tendency of such minimalistic theories to gravitate either towards deflationism or towards realism. Four typical characteristics of realistically biased minimalistic theories of truth are distinguished, three of which are also accepted by deflationists of different kinds. These characteristics are: (1) assuming indefinability of truth, (2) describing truth in terms of identity between the content of a proposition and the fact, (3) accepting the status of truth as a property (the status of truth as a property is questionable for most minimalists, but there are some who accept it), and (4) describing truth as a relational property of propositions with respect to „the ways things are” in reality. Accepting the latter thesis without rejecting the first two must be grounded in assuming a referential conception of meaning, i.e. a conception of meaning according to which separate expressions and the content of a proposition as a whole concern something that is independent of the subject and of the language. Such a semantic base makes it possible for a theory of truth to be minimalistic, in the sense of not trying to define the nature of truth, while remaining realistic with respect to the question of truth. This can only be the case because the assumed referential conception of meaning itself makes the claim that the contents of true propositions express the ways things are in reality.

### **Adriana Schetz, Alethic Pluralism and Minimalism**

Among various recent approaches to truth one should distinguish a large family of minimalist accounts, which emphasize that the notion of truth is less substantial than it was traditionally taken for granted. Some philosophers (including, among others, Crispin Wright and Michael P. Lynch) propose to combine this minimalism about the notion of truth with pluralism of some kind, namely the idea that „what property serves as truth may vary from discourse to discourse”. Briefly, there is one minimal notion of truth but many properties satisfying it. I consider and contrast two

ways of elaborating this interesting and promising view, defended respectively by Wright and Lynch. For Wright the common minimal notion of truth does not express any single property; the notion is simply multiple realized by various properties in different discourses. Lynch amends this view by claiming that the common notion of truth expresses a single property after all: it is a supervenient role property. I argue that more minimalistic Wright's alethic pluralism has certain advantages over functional-supervenient alethic pluralism advocated by Lynch.

### **Adam Grobler, Truth and Knowledge**

A novel analysis of knowledge is offered. The idea is to use the logic of presupposition and replace truth requirement with non-falsity requirement in the tripartite definition of knowledge. This move can be used to explain the difference between outdated knowledge and mere superstition and to solve some problems about the epistemic closure. In this regard, it is claimed that the present offer improves upon Nozick's conditional theory of knowledge and Dretske's relevant alternatives approach. Next, an attempt to elucidate Wittgenstein's and Wiśniewski's anti-sceptical strategies is made. Finally, the prospects of avoiding circularities in reliabilism are indicated.

### **Marek Magdziak, Is the Concept of Truth Constructive?**

The paper deals with several problems concerning with notion of truth. The author is interested in logical aspects of the definition of truth given by Ajdukiewicz and Kotarbiński. He introduces the multimodal logical calculus with propositional quantifier and applies it to analysis of some formulations of the definition. The analysis is focused on two main formulations of the definition, namely on absolute and partial formulation. It is shown that the notion of truth specified by absolute formulation is unconstructive i.e. it is possible to state that some utterance is true without stating any sentence which express the propositional content of the utterance. On the other hand after the partial formulation the notion of truth seems to have some counterintuitive features, for example the falsehood is no longer the same as the lack of truth. Moreover only the absolute approach leads to difficulties connected with the Liar Paradox.

### **Maciej Witek, The argument about the nature of truth from the point of view of speech act theory**

There are at least three distinct arguments about the nature of truth. The first two are, respectively, between correspondence theories and epistemic theories and between inflationism and deflationism. The aim of the paper is to characterise the third dispute whose starting question is whether truth and truth conditions are semantic or pragmatic concepts. In other words, the question is whether it is semantics or pragmatics that provides an adequate account of truth conditions of utterances. There are two competing answers: the conception of literal truth conditions, which takes its

origins in H.P. Grice's theory of language, and the conception of context-sensitive truth conditions, which appeals to the phenomena called semantic underdeterminacy. The author claims that the argument between these two conceptions in question cannot be identified with the dispute between literalism and contextualism. Whereas the former focus on the specific problem of truth conditions of utterances, the latter deals with a more general issue called Semantics/Pragmatics Interface. According to the author, these two dilemmas seem to cut across each other. More precisely, the idea of context-sensitive truth conditions can be interpreted either along the literalist's or contextualist's lines. According to the author it contextualism, not literalism, that provides a better, pragmatic account of truth conditions.

**Joanna Odrowąż-Sypniewska, Are theoretical identifications necessary *a posteriori* truths?**

As it is well known, Kripke has argued that theoretical identifications (such as „Water is H<sub>2</sub>O”, „Cats are animals”, „Heat is the motion of molecules”) are statements which if true are examples of the necessary *a posteriori*. In this paper we will show that all these claims can be challenged. First of all, not all of the statements that Kripke mentions are identity statements. Second, Kripke justifies their necessity by arguing that they contain rigid designators. The problem is that the notion of rigid designation has not been defined by him for general terms and it is not obvious how it should be defined. Moreover, it seems that even if we assume that the terms „water” and „H<sub>2</sub>O” are rigid, their rigidity does not suffice to establish that the statement „Water is H<sub>2</sub>O” is necessary. Third, it might be argued that „Water is H<sub>2</sub>O” is not even true, because the claim that water is H<sub>2</sub>O leads to the claim that water vapor is H<sub>2</sub>O and snow is H<sub>2</sub>O, which in turn leads to the absurd conclusion that snow is water vapor. Fifth, terms such as „water” are indeterminate and the precise borders of their extensions have to be fixed by stipulation, which casts some doubt upon the claim that statements such as „Water is H<sub>2</sub>O” are *a posteriori*.