



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Formalizations après la lettre : studies in Medieval logic and semantics
Dutilh Novaes, C.

Citation

Dutilh Novaes, C. (2006, January 17). *Formalizations après la lettre : studies in Medieval logic and semantics*. Haveka BV, Akblasserdam, The Netherlands. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4288>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4288>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Formalizations *après la lettre*

Studies in Medieval Logic and Semantics

ISBN 90-9020204-8

© 2005 Catarina Dutilh Novaes

All rights reserved.

Cover Design by Francis Braga

Printed by Haveka BV, Alblaserdam, The Netherlands

Formalizations *après la lettre*

Studies in Medieval Logic and Semantics

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus Dr. D.D. Breimer,
hoogleraar in de faculteit der Wiskunde en
Natuurwetenschappen en die der Geneeskunde,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 17 januari 2006
klokke 15.15 uur

door

Catarina Dutilh Novaes

geboren te São Paulo in 1976

Promotor:

prof. dr. B. G. Sundholm

Co-promotor:

dr. E. P. Bos

Referent:

dr. S. L. Read (University of St. Andrews)

Overige leden:

prof. dr. F. A. J. de Haas

prof. dr. M. J. B. Stokhof (Universiteit van Amsterdam)

For Reinout and Marie
À memória de meu pai

Introduction..... 1

Part 1

Supposition theory: algorithmic hermeneutics

1.0 Introduction..... 7

1.1 Theories on theories of supposition.....8

 1.1.1 Two kinds of approach: projections.....8

 1.1.2 Commentators..... 10

 1.1.3 Theories of reference..... 12

 1.1.3.1 The mechanisms of reference..... 13

 1.1.3.2 Determination..... 15

 1.1.3.3 Many-one mapping..... 16

1.2 What supposition theories do not do..... 18

 1.2.1 Theories of supposition do not explain the mechanisms of reference... 19

 1.2.2 Supposition theories do not determine referent..... 22

 1.2.3 General and ambiguous designation: one-many correspondence..... 28

 1.2.4 Similarities..... 32

1.3 What are supposition theories then?..... 32

 1.3.1 Historical arguments..... 34

 1.3.1.1 Fallacies..... 34

 1.3.1.2 Commentaries..... 36

 1.3.2 Conceptual arguments..... 38

 1.3.2.1 *Denotatur*..... 39

 1.3.2.2 *Propositio est distinguenda*..... 44

1.4 The structure of Ockham’s theory..... 50

 1.4.1 Quasi-syntactic rules..... 51

 1.4.1.1 Personal, simple and material supposition..... 51

 1.4.1.2 Modes of personal supposition..... 52

1.4.2 Semantic rules.....	53
1.4.2.1 Personal, simple and material supposition.....	54
1.4.2.2 Modes of personal supposition.....	55
1.4.3 Combination.....	56
1.4.4 Conclusion.....	57
1.5 Formalization.....	59
1.5.1 Personal, simple, material supposition.....	59
1.5.1.1 Preliminary notions.....	59
1.5.1.2 Definitions of the three kinds of supposition.....	62
1.5.1.3 Quasi-syntactical rules for personal, simple, and material supposition.....	64
1.5.1.4 Table.....	64
1.5.2 Modes of personal supposition.....	66
1.5.2.1 Semantic rules for the modes of personal supposition.....	68
1.5.2.2 Quasi-syntactical rules for the modes of personal supposition..	76
1.5.3 Examples.....	83
1.6 Conclusion.....	84

Part 2

Buridan's notion of *Consequentia*

2.1 Introduction and history.....	85
2.1.1 Introduction.....	85
2.1.2 History.....	86
2.2 Inference and consequence.....	89
2.2.1 Fundamental notions: tokens and types, inference, (formal) consequence, <i>consequentia</i>	91
2.2.2 Buridan's definitions of consequence.....	95
2.2.2.1 First attempt.....	95
2.2.2.2 Second attempt.....	96
2.2.2.3 Third and Final Attempt.....	98
2.2.3 Modalities.....	100
2.2.3.1 '...holds in ...' and '... is true in ...'.....	100
2.2.3.2 Matrices.....	101
2.2.3.3 Oppositions.....	103
2.2.3.4 Example.....	105

2.2.4	Consequentia.....	106
2.2.4.1	<i>Consequentia</i> as inference.....	107
2.2.4.2	<i>Consequentia</i> as consequence.....	107
2.2.4.3	Example.....	108
2.2.5	<i>Consequentia Formalis</i>	109
2.3	Comparisons.....	111
2.3.1	Two-dimensional semantics.....	112
2.3.1.1	Indexicals.....	113
2.3.1.2	Character vs. content.....	115
2.3.1.3	Inference and consequence in a token-based semantics.....	116
2.3.1.4	Conclusion.....	121
2.3.2	The concept of logical consequence.....	121
2.3.2.1	Four notions of logical consequence.....	122
2.3.2.1.1	Model-theoretic notion.....	123
2.3.2.1.2	Interpretational notion.....	125
2.3.2.1.3	Representational notion.....	126
2.3.2.1.4	Intuitive (pre-theoretic) notion.....	127
2.3.2.2	Buridan's hybrid notion of formal consequence.....	128
2.3.2.2.1	Material and formal consequence.....	128
2.3.2.2.2	Shapiro and Buridan: the hybrid notion.....	129
2.3.2.2.3	Extension.....	130
2.3.2.3	Conclusion and open questions.....	131
2.4	The Buridanian account of inferential relations between doubly quantified propositions: a proof of soundness.....	132
2.4.1	Review of Karger's results.....	133
2.4.2	Modes of personal supposition.....	136
2.4.2.1	Determinate supposition.....	138
2.4.2.2	Confused and distributive supposition.....	141
2.4.2.3	Merely confused supposition.....	141
2.4.3	The models verifying each sentential schema.....	143
2.4.3.1	Schema (1).....	143
2.4.3.2	Schema (2).....	144
2.4.3.3	Schema (3).....	145
2.4.3.4	Schema (4).....	146
2.4.4	The relations of inference.....	147
2.4.4.1	Proofs by absurdity.....	148
2.4.4.1.1	Schema (1) implies schema (2)	148
2.4.4.1.2	Schema (2) implies schema (3).....	149

2.4.4.1.3 Schema (3) implies schema (4).....	149
2.4.4.2 Proof by relation of containment.....	150
2.4.4.2.1 Schema (1) implies schema (2).....	150
2.4.4.2.2 Schema (2) implies schema (3).....	151
2.4.4.2.3 Schema (3) implies schema (4).....	152
2.4.5 Concluding remarks.....	152
2.5 Conclusion.....	153
Appendix: A visual rendering of the hexagon of inferential relations.....	154

Part 3

***Obligationes* as logical games**

3.0 Introduction.....	155
3.1 History.....	155
3.2 Overview of the literature.....	157
3.2.1 Different suggestions.....	157
3.2.2 Arguments against the counterfactual hypothesis.....	160
3.2.3 Conclusion.....	164
3.3 Burley's <i>obligationes</i> : consistency maintenance.....	165
3.3.1 The rules of the game.....	165
3.3.1.1 Preliminary notions.....	165
3.3.1.2 Two interpretations of the rules.....	166
3.3.1.2.1 Deterministic interpretation.....	167
3.3.1.2.2 'Point system'.....	167
3.3.1.3 Stages of the game.....	169
3.3.2 Moves and trees.....	170
3.3.3 Strategies.....	172
3.3.3.1 Can Respondent always win?.....	172
3.3.3.2 Why does Respondent not always win?.....	174
3.3.3.3 The game is dynamic.....	176
3.3.4 Problems.....	180
3.3.5 Conclusion.....	181

3.4 Swyneshed's <i>obligationes</i> : inference recognition.....	182
3.4.1 Reconstruction.....	182
3.4.1.1 Central notions.....	182
3.4.1.2 Rules of the game.....	184
3.4.1.2.1 <i>Positum/Obligatum</i>	184
3.4.1.2.2 <i>Proposita</i>	186
3.4.1.2.3 Outcome.....	187
3.4.2 Characteristics of Swyneshed's game.....	188
3.4.2.1 The game is fully determined.....	188
3.4.2.2 The game is not dynamic.....	188
3.4.2.3 Two disputations with the same <i>positum</i> will prompt the same answers, except for variations in thing.....	191
3.4.2.4 Responses do not follow the properties of the connectives....	192
3.4.2.5 The set of accepted/denied propositions can be inconsistent...	195
3.4.3 What is Respondent's task then?.....	196
3.4.4 Conclusion.....	197
3.5 Strode's <i>obligationes</i> : the return of consistency maintenance.....	199
3.5.1 The essentials of Strode's treatise.....	200
3.5.1.1 Description of the text.....	200
3.5.1.2 Remarks, suppositions and conclusions.....	200
3.5.1.3 Reconstruction.....	206
3.5.2 <i>Contra</i> Swyneshed: consistency maintenance re-established.....	209
3.5.2.1 Swyneshed spotted the wrong problems.....	209
3.5.2.2 An even worse form of inconsistency?.....	210
3.5.2.3 The core of the matter: definition of pertinent / impertinent propositions.....	212
3.5.2.4 Avoiding time-related inconsistency.....	213
3.5.2.5 Conjunctions and disjunctions.....	215
3.5.2.6 Conclusion.....	217
3.5.3 Focus on epistemic / pragmatic elements of the disputation.....	217
3.5.3.1 Epistemic clauses.....	218
3.5.3.2 Only explicitly proposed propositions belong to the informational base.....	220
3.5.3.3 Self-referential <i>posita</i>	221
3.5.3.4 Some rules that do not hold.....	224
3.5.4 Conclusion.....	228
3.6 Conclusion.....	229

Part 4
The Philosophy of Formalization

4.0 Introduction.....	231
4.1 Preliminary notions.....	233
4.1.1 Objects of formalization.....	233
4.1.2 Formal vs. formalized.....	235
4.1.3 The notion of the formal.....	241
4.2. Axiomatization: structuring.....	249
4.2.1 Axioms and rules of transformation.....	249
4.2.2 Why axiomatize.....	257
4.2.2.1 Completeness.....	257
4.2.2.2 Meta-perspective.....	260
4.2.3 In what sense to axiomatize is to formalize.....	264
4.2.4 Conclusion.....	266
4.3 Symbolization.....	267
4.3.1 Words vs. symbols.....	268
4.3.1.1 Languages: natural vs. conventional vs. artificial.....	268
4.3.1.2 What is a symbol?.....	271
4.3.2 Expressivity.....	276
4.3.2.1 Inadequacy of ordinary language.....	276
4.3.2.2 Displaying/depicting.....	282
4.3.2.2.1 Wittgenstein on depicting.....	283
4.3.2.2.2 Peirce and icons.....	287
4.3.2.2.3 Iconic symbols.....	290
4.3.2.3 Kinds of symbols: interpreted vs. uninterpreted languages.....	290
4.3.3 In what sense to symbolize is to formalize.....	296
4.3.4 Conclusion.....	299
4.4 Conceptual translations.....	300
4.4.1 What is conceptual translation?.....	301
4.4.1.1 The history of conceptual translations.....	301
4.4.1.2 Foundation for conceptual translation: conceptual identity and conceptual similarity.....	304
4.4.2 The outcome of a conceptual translation.....	308
4.4.2.1 Formal semantics.....	308
4.4.2.2 Transference of formality.....	309
4.4.2.3 Dialogue.....	311
4.4.3 Conceptual translation in the present work.....	312
4.5 Conclusion.....	314

Conclusion	317
References	327
Samenvatting	345
Curriculum Vitae	349

