

# Epistemic and semantic commitments of foundational theories

## *project synopsis*

### Project participants:

- Cezary Cieśliński, University of Warsaw (principal investigator)
- Ali Enayat, University of Göteborg
- Mateusz Łeżyk, University of Warsaw
- Bartosz Wcisło, Polish Academy of Science

### Research project objectives

The principal objective of the project is to provide a deep conceptual and formal analysis of the notion of commitments of a foundational theory, where the latter expression stands for a theory that can develop a significant portion of mathematics. The notion of a commitment is essentially involved in many discussions in contemporary formal philosophy. The project focuses on the following two types of commitments.

- Epistemic commitments of a theory  $Th$ : sentences of the language of  $Th$  (possibly with the truth predicate added) that should be accepted once we accept the axioms and the inference rules of  $Th$ .
- Semantic commitments of a theory  $Th$ : restrictions on possible interpretations of  $Th$  imposed by the axioms and the deductive machinery of  $Th$ .

A typical example of an epistemic commitment of a theory  $Th$  is the consistency statement: it has been claimed that when you accept  $Th$ , you should also accept that  $Th$  is consistent, even though by Gödel's second incompleteness theorem, the consistency of  $Th$  cannot be proved in  $Th$  itself. Another example is the statement that all theorems of  $Th$  are true.

Semantic commitments differ from the epistemic ones in that we do not require that they can be described in the language of  $Th$  (even enriched with the truth predicate). A description of such commitments involves explaining how our specific choice of axioms restricts the class of possible interpretations (or models) of  $Th$ .

The project consists of the following main three tasks.

- *Task 1:* Providing a general characterisation of the scope and the source of epistemic commitments.
- *Task 2:* Analyzing the truth axioms and the epistemic commitments they generate.
- *Task 3:* Analyzing the truth axioms and the semantic commitments they generate.

### Research project methodology

This is an interdisciplinary research project, engaging both philosophy and formal disciplines. Accordingly, apart from the methods of philosophical analysis, the techniques of modern logic will be extensively employed. In particular, the tools and techniques of arithmetic, model theory, set theory, recursion theory, and proof theory will be of crucial importance.

## Expected impact of the research project

The results of the project will be important for the international communities of philosophers, logicians and researchers working on the foundations of mathematics. Commitments of theories have been central to many philosophical discussions (for example, they have been crucial in the debates about deflationary truth theories and in discussions concerning the choice of logic). There is a growing awareness (views expressed both in print and at international conferences) that the topic of commitments of theories is not sufficiently explored and is worthy of substantive investigation. Moreover, this assessment applies both to the philosophical and to the logical aspects of the proposed area of research. In particular, asking fundamental questions about the nature and justification of implicit commitments of our theory will connect work on formal truth theories with broader issues in the philosophy of mathematics.

## Selected bibliography

- [1] Cezary Cieśliński. *The Epistemic Lightness of Truth. Deflationism and its Logic*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [2] Cezary Cieśliński. Minimalism and the generalisation problem: on Horwich's second solution. *Synthese* 195(3), 1077-1101, 2018.
- [3] Cezary Cieśliński. Truth, Conservativeness, and Provability. *Mind* 119, 409-422, 2010.
- [4] Cezary Cieśliński. Deflationary truth and pathologies. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 39(3), 325-337, 2010.
- [5] Cezary Cieśliński, Mateusz Łełyk, and Bartosz Wcisło. Models of PT- with internal induction for total formulae. *Review of Symbolic Logic* 10, 187-202, 2017.
- [6] Ali Enayat and Fedor Pakhomov. Truth, disjunction, and induction. *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 58, 753-766, 2019.
- [7] Ali Enayat and Albert Visser. New constructions of satisfaction classes. In T. Achourioti, H. Galinon, K. Fujimoto, and J. Martínez-Fernández, editors, *Unifying the Philosophy of Truth*, pages 321-335. Springer, 2015.
- [8] Ali Enayat, Mateusz Łełyk, and Bartosz Wcisło. Truth and feasible reducibility. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, forthcoming.
- [9] Kentaro Fujimoto. Relative truth definability of axiomatic truth theories. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, 16(03), 305-344, 2010.
- [10] Kentaro Fujimoto. Classes and truths in set theory. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 163, 1484-1523, 2012.
- [11] Volker Halbach. *Axiomatic Theories of Truth*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [12] Volker Halbach and Carlo Nicolai. On the costs of nonclassical logic. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 47(2), 227-257, 2018.
- [13] Leon Horsten and Graham Leigh. Truth is simple. *Mind* 126, 195-232, 2017.
- [14] Henryk Kotlarski, Stanisław Krajewski, and Alistair Lachlan. Construction of satisfaction classes for nonstandard models. *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin*, 24(3), 283-293, 1981.
- [15] Mateusz Łełyk. *Axiomatic theories of truth, bounded induction and reflection principles*. PhD thesis, University of Warsaw, 2017.
- [16] Mateusz Łełyk and Bartosz Wcisło. Notes on bounded induction for the compositional truth predicate. *Review of Symbolic Logic* 10, 355-480, 2017.

- [17] Mateusz Łeżyk and Bartosz Wcisło. Models of weak theories of truth. *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 56, 453–474, 2017.
- [18] Mateusz Łeżyk and Bartosz Wcisło. Models of positive truth. *Review of Symbolic Logic* 12, 144–172, 2019.
- [19] Carlo Nicolai and Mario Piazza. The implicit commitment of arithmetical theories and its semantic core. *Erkenntnis* 84, 913–937, 2019.