

# TARSKI ON TRUTH

Ted Sider  
Phil Language

Alfred Tarski sought a “non-metaphysical” and mathematically precise definition of the term ‘true’.

## 1. Criteria for an acceptable theory of truth

**Material adequacy** The theory must entail every sentence of the following form, where ‘ $p$ ’ is replaced by any sentence of the language  $L$ , and ‘ $X$ ’ is replaced by any name of that sentence:

(T)  $X$  is true-in- $L$  if and only if  $p$

**Formal correctness** The definition must conform to ordinary standards of mathematical rigor

Note:

- this defines truth for sentences, not for propositions (or ideas, or...)
- “To say of what is that it is, or of what is not that it is not, is true”
- Note the use-mention subtleties

## 2. The Liar

According to Tarski, because of the Liar Paradox, in some languages you simply can’t give an adequate definition of truth.

(S) Sentence (S) is not true

- *Suppose (S) is true.* Then what (S) says is the case. But (S) says that (S) is not true. So (S) must not be true after all. So a contradiction results from the supposition that (S) is true.
- *Suppose (S) is not true.* But this is exactly what (S) says is the case. So (S) is true after all. So a contradiction results from the supposition that (S) is not true.

Contradiction either way!

According to Tarski, you get the liar paradox whenever a language is:

**semantically closed:** contains a truth predicate—i.e. a predicate obeying (T)—and also has the means to name all of its own sentences

**classical:** obeys the laws of ordinary logic

Tarski avoids the paradox by rejecting i). You can only introduce a truth predicate for an object language in a metalanguage.

### 3. Inductive definitions

**base** if  $x$  is a parent of  $y$  then  $x$  is an ancestor of  $y$

**induction** if  $x$  is a parent of some ancestor of  $y$ , then  $x$  is an ancestor of  $y$

**nothing-else** the only ancestors of  $y$  are things that can be shown to be ancestors of  $y$  using base and induction

### 4. A little language

*Symbols of  $L$ :*

Names: **Ted, Michael**

1-place predicates: **is a basketball player, is human**

2-place predicate: **admires**

Logical symbols:  $\sim$ ,  $\&$ ,  $\vee$

Parentheses:  $)$ ,  $($

*Definition of formulas of  $L$ :*

**base** if  $\alpha$  is a name or variable and  $\gamma$  is a 1-place predicate then " $\alpha\gamma$ " is a formula (of  $L$ ); if  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are names or variables and  $\gamma$  is a two-place predicate then " $\alpha\gamma\beta$ " is a formula

**induction** if  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are formulas then the following are all formulas: " $\sim\phi$ ", " $(\phi\&\psi)$ ", " $(\phi\vee\psi)$ "

**nothing else**

## 5. Definition of truth

*Definition of denotation:*

- ‘**Ted**’ denotes-in- $L$  Ted Sider
- ‘**Michael**’ denotes-in- $L$  Michael Jordan
- nothing else denotes-in- $L$  anything

*Definition of application-in- $L$*

- ‘**is a basketball player**’ applies to an object,  $u$ , iff  $u$  is a basketball player
- ‘**is human**’ applies to an object,  $u$ , iff  $u$  is human
- ‘**admires**’ applies to an ordered pair,  $\langle u, v \rangle$  iff  $u$  admires  $v$

*Definition of truth-in- $L$ :*

**base** If  $\alpha$  is a name and  $\gamma$  is a one-place predicate then “ $\alpha\gamma$ ” is true-in- $L$  if and only if  $\gamma$  applies-in- $L$  to the denotation-in- $L$  of  $\alpha$ . If  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are names and  $\gamma$  is a two-place predicate then “ $\alpha\gamma\beta$ ” is true-in- $L$  iff  $\gamma$  applies-in- $L$  to  $\langle a, b \rangle$ , where  $a$  and  $b$  are the denotations-in- $L$  of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , respectively.

**induction** Where  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are formulas:

- “ $\sim\phi$ ” is true-in- $L$  if and only if  $\phi$  is not true-in- $L$
- “ $\phi\&\psi$ ” is true-in- $L$  if and only if  $\phi$  is true-in- $L$  and  $\psi$  is true-in- $L$
- “ $\phi\vee\psi$ ” is true-in- $L$  if and only if either  $\phi$  is true-in- $L$  or  $\psi$  is true-in- $L$