

POSITION

On a Competition for the Academic Position "Associate Professor" in 2.3.
Philosophy (Theory of Knowledge), Announced in the Official Gazette, No. 55,
June 28, 2024

by assoc. prof. Anna Ivanova, PhD, Department of Philosophical Sciences,
St. Cyril and St. Methodius University of Veliko Tarnovo

There is one candidate in the competition for the position – Rosen Lyubomirov Lyutskanov, assoc. prof. PhD. His biography testifies to a serious scientific commitment and productivity - participation in 15 scientific projects, over 70 publications, numerous participations in scientific forums, attainment of the prestigious young scientist award of BAS. In addition, Rosen Lyutskanov has many years of teaching experience in disciplines from the domain of competition and related fields. It is evident from the submitted documents that the candidate conforms to the minimum national requirements under Art. 2b of the Law for the Development of the Academic Staff of the Republic of Bulgaria for the position of "Associate professor".

I am acquainted with Rosen Lyutskanov through his membership in the Bulgarian Society of Analytic Philosophy, and I can confidently state that his work is characterized by exceptional professionalism and high quality, comparable to that of philosophers in major world universities. His research is a model of erudition and thoroughness, his presentations are meticulously clear, discussions with him are always useful.

For his participation in the competition, 2 monographs and 13 articles and conference papers that are published in respectable scientific issues have been

submitted. The monograph *Epistemology of Disagreement: with Measure, Number and Weight* is in a progressive recent field in which research in Bulgarian is, at best, scarce. The main topic of the study is the disagreement among epistemic peers as a factor for the rational revision of positions. The theme's problems and concepts are examined in the text in depth and systematically, following the interrelatedness between the theses. The author first presents the normative problem about the revision of the level of confidence in the case of established disagreement with an agent who is an epistemic peer (or peers); after that he pinpoints the main "variables" that determine the differences between the concrete conceptions of the problem. In the third chapter, he discusses the types of approaches to disagreement, in the fourth - reconstructs the debate between the proponents of the uniqueness thesis and permissivism and analyzes the subject of group beliefs. In the fifth chapter, the author presents formal approaches to the problem of peer disagreement, and finally (in an appendix) proposes a new formal approach for computing the change in the level of confidence.

The text has a number of scientific merits. The conditions for epistemic equality, the anatomy of the assessment that determines whether we should be steadfast or not, the role of background beliefs concerning whether disagreement is local or deep are discussed in a very clear and thorough way. The character of a contribution has the very way in which the traditional category approach to beliefs as positions in disagreement and formal approaches using degrees of confidence are related. The thesis that there are epistemic differences that are not included in the conditions for equality - differences in thinking styles (p. 47) is also of significance.

Without claiming to be able to appreciate fully the merits of the proposed formal approach to measuring the change in the confidence level under conditions

of peer disagreement, I would say that the monograph is a notable achievement in the contemporary philosophical literature.

Regarding the monograph *Handbook of Critical Thinking*, I have to state for a start that for a long time the Bulgarian philosophical literature has been in a need of a publication that would both present the empirical base essential to the area and at the same time relate the data to the fundamental philosophical questions. Prof. Lyutskanov has worked extensively and analytically in both directions. Among the many merits of the research are: The presented cases and data from experiments are considered in their own context without generalized conclusions about the human rationality. Traditional philosophical discourses of explanatory importance are connected in a novel manner to established problems of critical thinking. For instance, the analysis of inferential errors in value judgments is further developed with a comment on the exceptions to Hume's Rule. The section on fallacies begins with Plato and Aristotle and continues with Bacon and Locke etc. In my opinion, the drawing on of not just topics related to external mistakes and to the imperfections of cognitive abilities, but also of positively formulated principles, especially – the re-establishment of the ethics of argumentation, is a contribution. Finally, the text contains many felicitous translations of key terms for philosophizing in Bulgarian - "burden of proof", "bias", "solid argument", etc.

Rosen Lyutskanov's articles stand out for his formal approach to the problems of epistemology, as well as with the understanding of rationality that is relevant to the approach. I believe that his work in this regard is a distinct contribution to Bulgarian philosophy, since formalization is one of the most progressive modern trends in this domain.

I agree with the contribution points of the publications stated in the reference and I think that their number is significantly higher.

All of the above is my justification to fully support the candidacy of Assoc. prof. Rosen Lyutskanov, PhD for the academic position of "Associate professor" in 2.3. Philosophy (Theory of Knowledge).

19.09.2024

Assoc. prof. Anna Ivanova, PhD