

Truth is one of the most vague concepts. Human thought was interested in it from the very beginning, but now many announce the crisis of truth. It is emphasized that no one knows what the truth is, since falsehoods are legitimized as pure information. This problem is not a new one, but in the age of a dynamic information flow, its importance is rising.

Even the first philosophers looked for an answer to the question "what is truth?" Indeed, the number of attempts to answer this fundamental question is impressive. Although they often vary, in almost every case they seem to be connected by the joined belief that the truth depends on something. When I say something true, one tends to assume that it is just like I said. In this sense, truth is something that lies on the border between the world and the language in which I express something about the world. The length of this border was the main concern for many philosophers. Does the truth lay somewhere closer to the world, or maybe it belongs to the language? These two options delimit a whole panorama of ideas about the mysterious question of truth.

I claim that when we express the truth, we do not grasp the world accidentally. Quite the contrary – there must be a certain relation between what I say and what is real. Language and the world might be divided by the abyss, but the task of philosophy is to fill it. Therefore, the aim of my project is to show how truth depends on being.

In my research I am going to proceed on the discussions on the subject of the dependence mentioned above that have been going on for over thirty years. The debate is much older, but in 1984 three philosophers – Kevin Mulligan, Peter Simons, and Barry Smith – presented it in a contemporary style by introducing a new name for a phenomenon identified by their predecessors. This phenomenon is truthmaking, which is making the content (a truthbearer) true. If someone says something that I identify as true, it is because her or his statement was made true by something different from the sentence alone. What makes it true? I suppose that it is the world itself, the reality which becomes a subject of what we say or think.

The first step of my research is to present and analyse three different approaches to the subject of truth. Each of them tries to show the relationship between language and the world. Each of them gives different answers, and each one provokes specific problems, but I believe that one of them is particularly promising. Philosophers usually describe it in terms of coherence notion of the truth. It is thought that the coherence theory of truth defines the truth as something belonging purely to the linguistic dimension, but I believe that if we present it with a proper interpretation, one can show how coherence depends on the world as it is.

Such an interpretation is possible if we think of the world as being an ultimate reference for all true propositions. What is the world? Everything that was truly said about it. Why was something truly said about the world? Because the given statement, the content of the world, does not provoke any clash with other statements. The world becomes the most primitive ground for all true statements - a big fact that discerns between truth and falsehood. Considering the nature of this grounding relation is the last step of my research.

If truth has actually become just an opinion, then I think it is worth to rethink once more what truth is. It is worthwhile to show that the truth is not accidental, but it depends on the world. We do not get truth for granted by the very fact that something was said. For these reasons I decided to take the research subject described above.