

Preface

Hintikka's theory of interrogative models of inquiry is the starting point of this volume. Interrogative models of inquiry (IMI, for short) present an interesting take on various epistemic issues including Socratic *elenchus*, learning theory, abductive reasoning, social choice theory, and nonclassical and modal logics. This relates IMI very closely to a variety of different fields, and this relation is perfectly well displayed by the articles in this volume.

It is important to note that Hintikka's contribution to logic and formal epistemology is usually clouded by his work on other fields, such as epistemic logic and game semantics. Perhaps for this reason, IMI does not seem to be very popular among researchers. One of the goals of producing this volume is to change this tendency by showing that IMI has influence on many different subfields in logic and formal philosophy.

This volume also demonstrates it very clearly that IMI in itself is a very rich theory. Helping in understanding its (current) depth and breadth, the volume includes both technical and logical articles as well as conceptual and analytical work.

In short, there are three main goals behind producing this volume: (i) showing that IMI heavily relates to a wide variety of fields in logic and philosophy, (ii) underlying the centrality of IMI in Hintikkan thought, and (iii) showing the breadth and depth of the field. I leave it to the reader to judge how much we managed to achieve our goals.

*

The volume opens with Hakli's article on inquiry and justification. Hakli's account argues as to how Hintikkan interrogative theory can unite inquiry and justification. The second paper, by Genot and Gulz, carries the debate over to learning theory. At first glance, the connection between the learning theory and IMI is clear, yet Genot and Gulz develop the connection further by resorting to various game theoretical elements. Then Angere, Olsson, and Genot take an interesting step and introduce formal epistemological and social choice theoretical issues to the discussion. They focus on jury sizes and use Bayesian methods to present

an analytical solution. In my own article, I suggest that Hintikkan inquiry and Lakatosian method of proofs and refutations share some common themes, which interestingly include both of them being inconsistency-friendly. This paper relates IMI to nonclassical logic. Van Bendegem's article considers mathematical practice and its connection to problem solving which can be seen as a Hintikkan inquiry. Antonelli presents a formal application of defeasible logic to IMI and suggests two different approaches. Urbański and Wiśniewski's article reminds us of the Socratic roots of Hintikkan epistemology and in particular of IMI and presents an elaborated formal structure. Hamami's article relates IMI to a quite broad field of dynamic epistemic logic and presents an axiomatic system for dynamic logic of interrogative inquiry. Naibo, Petrolo, and Seiller discuss an important epicenter of Hintikkan epistemology and introduce a novel philosophical perspective from a computational angle.

*

The volume originated within the framework of a research project which was funded by the French National Research Agency (ANR, *Agence Nationale de la Recherche*). The project was conducted at IHPST (*Institut d'histoire et de philosophie des sciences et des techniques*) which is a research institute affiliated with CNRS and the University of Paris 1 Panthéon – Sorbonne. During its two-year lifespan, I was employed at the project for one year in 2012–2013. The project produced two international workshops and conferences, numerous monthly seminars, research visits, conference participations, and a variety of research articles. Once the project came to an end, there already has been established an international network of researchers who were heavily influenced by Hintikka's philosophy and willing to share their expertise. This volume can be considered as an output of this network.

For this project and the volume, I am grateful to many people. Gabriel Sandu, who first developed the idea behind this project, was helpful in every stage of the project; hosted me and Yacin in Helsinki, and even organized a lunch for us with Hintikka himself. My colleagues Francesca Poggiolesi, Yacin Hamami, and Henri Galinon were always there when I needed some help and assistance. I am also more than thankful to our anonymous reviewers who helped us immensely with their feedback and guidance.

My deepest special gratitude is for Marco Panza, the director of the project, who encouraged me immensely for producing this volume. The idea of making this book belongs to him. Without him, this volume would not have existed.

*

Finally, I hope that this volume will serve as a bridge between Hintikkan theory of interrogative inquiry and the researchers working on similar fields and show that there is still a lot left to be worked on.