

Using methods from definability theory to compare scientific theories

Koen Lefever

<http://lefever.space/>

Centre for Logic and Philosophy of Science
Vrije Universiteit Brussel

2018-10-05

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
 - A theory which explains more phenomena or predicts results more accurately is superior.

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
 - A theory which explains more phenomena or predicts results more accurately is superior.
 - Problems with this approach:

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
 - A theory which explains more phenomena or predicts results more accurately is superior.
 - Problems with this approach:
 - Some theory may explain one part of the phenomena, another theory may explain another part.
Example: Relativity Theory versus Quantum Mechanics.

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
 - A theory which explains more phenomena or predicts results more accurately is superior.
 - Problems with this approach:
 - Some theory may explain one part of the phenomena, another theory may explain another part.
Example: Relativity Theory versus Quantum Mechanics.
 - The old theory may initially make more accurate predictions than the new theory.
Example: Ptolemaic geocentrism versus Copernican heliocentrism; see Kuhn 1957.

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
 - A theory which explains more phenomena or predicts results more accurately is superior.
 - Problems with this approach:
 - Some theory may explain one part of the phenomena, another theory may explain another part.
Example: Relativity Theory versus Quantum Mechanics.
 - The old theory may initially make more accurate predictions than the new theory.
Example: Ptolemaic geocentrism versus Copernican heliocentrism; see Kuhn 1957.
 - Empirical adequacy is not sufficient to explain the scientific practice of choosing a theory.

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
 - A theory which explains more phenomena or predicts results more accurately is superior.
 - Problems with this approach:
 - Some theory may explain one part of the phenomena, another theory may explain another part.
Example: Relativity Theory versus Quantum Mechanics.
 - The old theory may initially make more accurate predictions than the new theory.
Example: Ptolemaic geocentrism versus Copernican heliocentrism; see Kuhn 1957.
 - Empirical adequacy is not sufficient to explain the scientific practice of choosing a theory.
 - We need additional methods to compare theories.

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
 - Empirical adequacy is not sufficient to explain the scientific practice of choosing a theory.
 - We need additional methods to compare theories.

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
 - Empirical adequacy is not sufficient to explain the scientific practice of choosing a theory.
 - We need additional methods to compare theories.
- Historical methods

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
 - Empirical adequacy is not sufficient to explain the scientific practice of choosing a theory.
 - We need additional methods to compare theories.
- Historical methods
- Informal philosophical discussion

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
 - Empirical adequacy is not sufficient to explain the scientific practice of choosing a theory.
 - We need additional methods to compare theories.
- Historical methods
- Informal philosophical discussion
- Formal methods from mathematical logic

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
- Formal methods from mathematical logic

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
- Formal methods from mathematical logic
 - Equivalent theories

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
- Formal methods from mathematical logic
 - Equivalent theories
 - Logical equivalence
Example: Euclidean geometry with Euclid's fifth postulate versus with Euclidean geometry with Playfair's axiom; see Playfair 1846 & Heath 1908.
This only works if the theories use the same language.

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
- Formal methods from mathematical logic
 - Equivalent theories
 - Logical equivalence
Example: Euclidean geometry with Euclid's fifth postulate versus with Euclidean geometry with Playfair's axiom; see Playfair 1846 & Heath 1908.
This only works if the theories use the same language.
 - Definitional equivalence
Example: Boolean algebra in terms of intersections and complements of sets versus Boolean algebra in terms of partial order relations.
This works when the theories use different languages, but the same sorts (types).

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
- Formal methods from mathematical logic
 - Equivalent theories
 - Logical equivalence
This only works if the theories use the same language.
 - Definitional equivalence
This works when the theories use different languages, but the same sorts (types).

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
- Formal methods from mathematical logic
 - Equivalent theories
 - Logical equivalence
This only works if the theories use the same language.
 - Definitional equivalence
This works when the theories use different languages, but the same sorts (types).
 - Definitional equivalence extended to languages with different sorts, a.k.a. Conceptual Equivalence or Morita Equivalence; see Andr eka–N emeti 2008 & Barrett–Halvorson 2016a.

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
- Formal methods from mathematical logic
 - Equivalent theories
 - Logical equivalence
This only works if the theories use the same language.
 - Definitional equivalence
This works when the theories use different languages, but the same sorts (types).
 - Definitional equivalence extended to languages with different sorts, a.k.a. Conceptual Equivalence or Morita Equivalence; see Andr eka-N emeti 2008 & Barrett-Halvorson 2016a.
 - Categorical equivalence

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
- Formal methods from mathematical logic
 - Equivalent theories
 - Non-equivalent theories

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
- Formal methods from mathematical logic
 - Equivalent theories
 - Non-equivalent theories
 - Classical Mechanics versus Relativistic Mechanics

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
- Formal methods from mathematical logic
 - Equivalent theories
 - Non-equivalent theories
 - Classical Mechanics versus Relativistic Mechanics
 - Classical Thermodynamics versus Statistical Thermodynamics

Comparing theories

- Classical approach: empirical adequacy
- Formal methods from mathematical logic
 - Equivalent theories
 - Non-equivalent theories
 - Classical Mechanics versus Relativistic Mechanics
 - Classical Thermodynamics versus Statistical Thermodynamics
 - Phlogiston Theory versus Compound Theory; see Chang 2012
 - etcetera...

- Algebraic Logic Group at Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics in Budapest

- Algebraic Logic Group at Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics in Budapest
- Inspired by
 - Wiener Kreis; see Andréka et al. 2011

- Algebraic Logic Group at Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics in Budapest
- Inspired by
 - Wiener Kreis; see Andréka et al. 2011
 - Alfred Tarski's initiative "Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science"; see Nagel–Suppes–Tarski 1962

- Algebraic Logic Group at Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics in Budapest
- Inspired by
 - Wiener Kreis; see Andréka et al. 2011
 - Alfred Tarski's initiative "Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science"; see Nagel–Suppes–Tarski 1962
 - David Hilbert's sixth problem "Mathematical Treatment of the Axioms of Physics"; see Hilbert 1902

- Algebraic Logic Group at Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics in Budapest
- Inspired by
 - Wiener Kreis; see Andréka et al. 2011
 - Alfred Tarski's initiative "Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science"; see Nagel–Suppes–Tarski 1962
 - David Hilbert's sixth problem "Mathematical Treatment of the Axioms of Physics"; see Hilbert 1902
 - Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz' *characteristica universalis* & *calculus ratiocinator* ?

- Algebraic Logic Group at Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics in Budapest
- Inspired by
 - Wiener Kreis; see Andréka et al. 2011
 - Alfred Tarski's initiative "Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science"; see Nagel–Suppes–Tarski 1962
 - David Hilbert's sixth problem "Mathematical Treatment of the Axioms of Physics"; see Hilbert 1902
 - Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz' *characteristica universalis* & *calculus ratiocinator* ?
- Many-Sorted First-Order Logic

- Algebraic Logic Group at Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics in Budapest
- Inspired by
 - Wiener Kreis; see Andréka et al. 2011
 - Alfred Tarski's initiative "Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science"; see Nagel–Suppes–Tarski 1962
 - David Hilbert's sixth problem "Mathematical Treatment of the Axioms of Physics"; see Hilbert 1902
 - Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz' *characteristica universalis* & *calculus ratiocinator* ?
- Many-Sorted First-Order Logic
- Mainly Relativity Theories, but also Classical Mechanics, Maxwell's Theory, etc...

- PhD dissertation **“Using Logical Interpretation and Definitional Equivalence to Compare Classical Kinematics and Special Relativity Theory”**
 - June 2014 – May 2017
 - Supervisors: Jean Paul Van Bendegem (VUB) and Gergely Székely (Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics)

- PhD dissertation **“Using Logical Interpretation and Definitional Equivalence to Compare Classical Kinematics and Special Relativity Theory”**
 - June 2014 – May 2017
 - Supervisors: Jean Paul Van Bendegem (VUB) and Gergely Székely (Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics)
 - Results:
 - Classical Kinematics and Relativistic Kinematics are not equivalent.

- PhD dissertation **“Using Logical Interpretation and Definitional Equivalence to Compare Classical Kinematics and Special Relativity Theory”**
 - June 2014 – May 2017
 - Supervisors: Jean Paul Van Bendegem (VUB) and Gergely Székely (Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics)
 - Results:
 - Classical Kinematics and Relativistic Kinematics are not equivalent.
 - Classical Kinematics is definitionally equivalent to Relativistic Kinematics extended with a “primitive ether”.

- PhD dissertation **“Using Logical Interpretation and Definitional Equivalence to Compare Classical Kinematics and Special Relativity Theory”**
 - June 2014 – May 2017
 - Supervisors: Jean Paul Van Bendegem (VUB) and Gergely Székely (Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics)
 - Results:
 - Classical Kinematics and Relativistic Kinematics are not equivalent.
 - Classical Kinematics is definitionally equivalent to Relativistic Kinematics extended with a “primitive ether”.
 - Only one concept is needed to distinguish both theories.

- PhD dissertation **“Using Logical Interpretation and Definitional Equivalence to Compare Classical Kinematics and Special Relativity Theory”**
 - June 2014 – May 2017
 - Supervisors: Jean Paul Van Bendegem (VUB) and Gergely Székely (Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics)
 - Results:
 - Classical Kinematics and Relativistic Kinematics are not equivalent.
 - Classical Kinematics is definitionally equivalent to Relativistic Kinematics extended with a “primitive ether”.
 - Only one concept is needed to distinguish both theories.
 - The “knowledge acquisition” that there is no ether.

- PhD dissertation **“Using Logical Interpretation and Definitional Equivalence to Compare Classical Kinematics and Special Relativity Theory”**
 - June 2014 – May 2017
 - Supervisors: Jean Paul Van Bendegem (VUB) and Gergely Székely (Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics)
 - Results:
 - Classical Kinematics and Relativistic Kinematics are not equivalent.
 - Classical Kinematics is definitionally equivalent to Relativistic Kinematics extended with a “primitive ether”.
 - Only one concept is needed to distinguish both theories.
 - The “knowledge acquisition” that there is no ether.
 - Published in *Logique et Analyse*, Vol 61, Nr 241: 57-117 (2018)
 - K. Lefever & G. Székely: **“Comparing Classical And Relativistic Kinematics In First-Order Logic”**
 - arXiv:1707.05371, DOI:10.2143/LEA.241.0.3275105

- Questions and remarks by the Jury during the public defence:

- Questions and remarks by the Jury during the public defence:
 - Marcoen Cabbolet: our definition of definitional equivalence is not consistent with the definition by Thomas Barrett and Hans Halvorson 2016b.

- Questions and remarks by the Jury during the public defence:
 - Marcoen Cabbolet: our definition of definitional equivalence is not consistent with the definition by Thomas Barrett and Hans Halvorson 2016b.
 - Sonja Smets: we always use syntactical proofs for theorems, except for Theorem 5 where we use semantics (models) to prove that Classical Kinematics and Relativistic Kinematics are not equivalent.

- Questions and remarks by the Jury during the public defence:
 - Marcoen Cabbolet: our definition of definitional equivalence is not consistent with the definition by Thomas Barrett and Hans Halvorson 2016b.
 - Sonja Smets: we always use syntactical proofs for theorems, except for Theorem 5 where we use semantics (models) to prove that Classical Kinematics and Relativistic Kinematics are not equivalent.

- Michèle Friend: we are counting how many concepts are needed to distinguish theories, can this be used to calculate a metric distance between theories?

- Questions and remarks by the Jury during the public defence:
 - Marcoen Cabbolet: our definition of definitional equivalence is not consistent with the definition by Thomas Barrett and Hans Halvorson 2016b.
 - Sonja Smets: we always use syntactical proofs for theorems, except for Theorem 5 where we use semantics (models) to prove that Classical Kinematics and Relativistic Kinematics are not equivalent.
 - Accepted for publication in *Journal of Philosophical Logic*:
 - K. Lefever & G. Székely: **“On Generalization of Definitional Equivalence to Non-Disjoint Languages”**
 - arXiv:1802.06844
 - Michèle Friend: we are counting how many concepts are needed to distinguish theories, can this be used to calculate a metric distance between theories?

- Questions and remarks by the Jury during the public defence:
 - Marcoen Cabbolet: our definition of definitional equivalence is not consistent with the definition by Thomas Barrett and Hans Halvorson 2016b.
 - Sonja Smets: we always use syntactical proofs for theorems, except for Theorem 5 where we use semantics (models) to prove that Classical Kinematics and Relativistic Kinematics are not equivalent.
 - Accepted for publication in *Journal of Philosophical Logic*:
 - K. Lefever & G. Székely: **“On Generalization of Definitional Equivalence to Non-Disjoint Languages”**
 - arXiv:1802.06844
 - Michèle Friend: we are counting how many concepts are needed to distinguish theories, can this be used to calculate a metric distance between theories?
 - Submitted:
 - M. Friend, M. Khaled, K. Lefever & G. Székely: **“Distances between Formal Languages”**
 - arXiv:1807.01501

- Comparing theories:

- Comparing theories:
 - Classical Dynamics

- Comparing theories:
 - Classical Dynamics
 - Newton–Cartan Theory

- Comparing theories:
 - Classical Dynamics
 - Newton–Cartan Theory
 - General Relativity Theory

- Comparing theories:
 - Classical Dynamics
 - Newton–Cartan Theory
 - General Relativity Theory
- Automated proof verification of theorems:

- Comparing theories:
 - Classical Dynamics
 - Newton–Cartan Theory
 - General Relativity Theory
- Automated proof verification of theorems:
 - Isabelle/HOL ? See Stannett–Németi 2014

- Comparing theories:
 - Classical Dynamics
 - Newton–Cartan Theory
 - General Relativity Theory
- Automated proof verification of theorems:
 - Isabelle/HOL ? See Stannett–Németi 2014
 - Diagrammatic proof checker TALOS (Rensselaer Artificial Intelligence and Reasoning Lab) ? See Sen et al. 2015

- Comparing theories:
 - Classical Dynamics
 - Newton–Cartan Theory
 - General Relativity Theory
- Automated proof verification of theorems:
 - Isabelle/HOL ? See Stannett–Németi 2014
 - Diagrammatic proof checker TALOS (Rensselaer Artificial Intelligence and Reasoning Lab) ? See Sen et al. 2015
- Trying to get financing:

- Comparing theories:
 - Classical Dynamics
 - Newton–Cartan Theory
 - General Relativity Theory
- Automated proof verification of theorems:
 - Isabelle/HOL ? See Stannett–Németi 2014
 - Diagrammatic proof checker TALOS (Rensselaer Artificial Intelligence and Reasoning Lab) ? See Sen et al. 2015
- Trying to get financing:
 - Marie Skłodowska–Curie Action application to go to Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics and a secondment to the Logic Department of the Loránd Eötvös University in Budapest has been submitted (September 2018)

- Comparing theories:
 - Classical Dynamics
 - Newton–Cartan Theory
 - General Relativity Theory
- Automated proof verification of theorems:
 - Isabelle/HOL ? See Stannett–Németi 2014
 - Diagrammatic proof checker TALOS (Rensselaer Artificial Intelligence and Reasoning Lab) ? See Sen et al. 2015
- Trying to get financing:
 - Marie Skłodowska–Curie Action application to go to Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics and a secondment to the Logic Department of the Loránd Eötvös University in Budapest has been submitted (September 2018)
 - Next round of FWO junior post-doc grant (December 2018)

- Comparing theories:
 - Classical Dynamics
 - Newton–Cartan Theory
 - General Relativity Theory
- Automated proof verification of theorems:
 - Isabelle/HOL ? See Stannett–Németi 2014
 - Diagrammatic proof checker TALOS (Rensselaer Artificial Intelligence and Reasoning Lab) ? See Sen et al. 2015
- Trying to get financing:
 - Marie Skłodowska–Curie Action application to go to Alfréd Rényi Institute for Mathematics and a secondment to the Logic Department of the Loránd Eötvös University in Budapest has been submitted (September 2018)
 - Next round of FWO junior post-doc grant (December 2018)
 - ????????

- H. Andréka, J. X. Madarász and I. Németi, with contributions from A. Andai, G. Sági, I. Sain, and Cs. Tóke: "On the logical structure of relativity theories", Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, Hungar. Acad. Sci., <https://old.renyi.hu/pub/algebraic-logic/Contents.html> (2002)
- H. Andréka, J. X. Madarász and I. Németi: "Defining new universes in many-sorted logic", Research Report, Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242602426> (2008)
- H. Andréka, J. X. Madarász, I. Németi, P. Németi, and G. Székely: "Vienna Circle and Logical Analysis of Relativity Theory", in: The Vienna Circle in Hungary (Wiener Kreis und Ungarn) 247–268, Springer Verlag (2011)
- T. W. Barrett and H. Halvorson: "Morita Equivalence", The Review of Symbolic Logic 9 (3): 556–582 (2016a).
- T. W. Barrett and H. Halvorson: "Glymour and Quine on Theoretical Equivalence", Journal of Philosophical Logic 45 (5): 467–483 (2016b)
- H. Chang: "Is Water H_2O ? Evidence, Realism and Pluralism", Springer (2012)
- T. L. Heath: "The Thirteen Books of Euclid's Elements", Cambridge University Press (1908)
- D. Hilbert "Mathematical Problems", Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, vol. 8, no. 10 437–479 (1902)
- T. Kuhn: "The Copernican Revolution: Planetary Astronomy in the Development of Western Thought", Harvard University Press (1957).
- E. Nagel, P. Suppes and A. Tarski (editors): "Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science", Stanford University Press; 1st edition (1962)
- J. Playfair: "Elements of Geometry", W. E. Dean (1846)
- A. Sen, S. Bringsjord, N. Marton and J. Licato: "Toward Diagrammatic Automated Discovery in Axiomatic Physics", preliminary draft presented at the 2nd Logic, Relativity and Beyond conference (2015)
- M. Stannett and I. Németi: "Using Isabelle/HOL to verify first order relativity theory", Journal of Automated Reasoning 52 (4): 361–378 (2014)