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Ockham's account of the truth conditions for categorical propositions of the forms 'N is B' and 'A is B' is dictated by his two-fold ontological program: to eliminate universals other than names or concepts and to restrict particular things (res) to the categories of substance and quality.(1) For endorsing (T1) 'N is B' is true if and only if B-ness inheres in N and (T2) 'A is B' is true if and only if something that is A has B-ness, or B-ness inheres in something that is A for all substitutions of proper names for 'N', concrete general terms for 'B', and abstract general terms for 'B-ness' would be tantamount to adopting the ontology of the moderns with a distinct kind of thing for each of the ten Aristotelian categories. According to Ockham's description in the Summa Logicae, the moderns saw substances such as Socrates as having a certain layer-like structure: at the core is a particular substance composed of prime matter with several substantial forms; it is made one by the inherence of discrete quantity and extended by the inherence of dimensive quantity; other absolute quality-accidents such as color, flavor, odor, shape, etc. inhere in dimensive quantity immediately and substance mediately. Accidents in the remaining seven categories are relative things (respectus) that have their foundations either in the substance, quantity, or qualities and their term in something else. For example, when Socrates and Plato are similar, a relative similarity thing inheres in Socrates' whiteness and is Socrates' similarity to Plato, while another relative similarity-thing inheres in Plato's whiteness and is Plato's similarity to Socrates. For reasons that lie beyond the scope of this paper,(2) Ockham thought this ontology was as prolific of contradiction and absurdity as it was of entities. His own contention is that the truth of a proposition depends not merely on which things exist, but on how they exist. In what follows, I shall explain how Ockham sacrifices the simplicity of across-the-board adherence to (T1) and (T2), applying them only to a certain range of case in the category of quality. Then I shall examine a series of objections that his own ontology offers no advantage commensurate with this loss. (p. 175).

(...) "SUMMARY. Ockham's theory of truth-conditions is calculated to accommodate his ontology. He adopts a two-name theory of predication for categories involving absolute terms only, and admits the inherence-analysis for only a restricted range of concrete quality terms. Although he argues extensively that its wider application to the last eight Aristotelian categories of accident leads to contradiction and absurdity, his own positive proposal -- to treat all terms in those categories as connotatives that signify particular substances and/or particular qualities existing one way or another -- remains essentially programmatic. A full development of it would involve supplementing (T3)-(T7) by stating truth-conditions for statements about how things are related, quantified, active, etc., using absolute terms that name only
substances and qualities. Ockham never delivers on the promissory notes he issues. Nevertheless, we must ask how many nominalists have gone further, and by how much, and how recently? In Ockham's view, the realists' program is demonstrably impossible; how much less an evil, if his own is merely incomplete." (p. 188.).

(1) Although Ockham thinks that unaided natural reason will restrict its ontology to substances and qualities, he himself feels forced by the doctrines of revealed Christian theology -- viz., the Trinity, the Incarnation, and transubstantiation -- to admit really distinct relations of Paternity, Filiation, and Spiration in the Godhead, a relation of assumption in the human nature of Christ, real relations of inherence between matter and form, substance and accident, and relation of union between parts of the continuum (Ordinatio I, d. 30, q. 4; OT IV, 360-374).
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Bibliography on the Ontology of William of Ockham


Reprinted in: Boehner, Collected articles on Ockham pp. 156-174


"When the treatises on knowing and doubting first appeared as separate specialized pieces of logical literature in the first half of the 14th century, (1) Ockham was already deeply involved in political controversies.(2) His work on logic and theoretical philosophy was certainly behind him by 1330 and his personal Odyssey began, ending in Munich in 1347. Although he left us with many detailed discussions of the most important logical theories of the day, his treatment of epistemic-logical materials indicate that he was himself struggling to understand what little he found on the subject in his predecessors, to fit it properly into his own Summa logicae and to show its use in the formulation of the theory of scientific demonstration.(3) The main aim of this paper is to identify the epistemic principles involved in a demonstrative syllogism and to recognize the pragmatic dimension of language in which such a syllogism is expressed. To achieve our goal, we must begin with observations about the state of epistemic logic in Ockham's time and about some of the problems which comprised such logic." p. 241

"Summary and Conclusion.
Ockham's contributions to epistemic logic are diversified, ranging from his recognition of several special modes (scire, credere, opinari, dubitare, etc.), through his extensive concern with epistemic syllogistic moods in all three figures, and through his perceptive judgment regarding composite and divided sense of epistemic proposition, and culminating perhaps in his epistemization of the theory of demonstration. Although there is a sparsity of the most general rules of consequence (i.e. the propositional rules) in Ockham, there are at least some.
Moreover, Ockham says enough in various places on the basis of which we can reconstruct his most important presuppositions and his implied awareness of general principles of epistemic logic, especially those which are relevant for the theory of demonstration. One such principle is that if the antecedent is known by a, the consequent is known by a, but only on the condition that a knows that the consequence is sound. Whereas other writers on Post. Anal. and on scientific demonstration concentrated on the objective side of the matter, treating demonstration as if it were a matter of logical and extra-logical connections independently of the investigator, questioner, or doubter, Ockham showed a great deal of attention to the role of the knower and he recognized most vividly that the reference to the epistemic subject in the statement of epistemic/doxastic principles is essential and not accidental or superfluous." p. 255

(1) One of the earliest special treatises on the subject of knowing and doubting was written by Ockham's younger contemporary William Heytesbury whose *De scire et dubitare* appeared as one of the chapters of *Regulae solvendi sophismata* (ca. 1335). In this chapter Heytesbury refers back to the famous Grosseteste's characterization of the various senses of 'to know' (*scire*), but, unlike Ockham, he concerns himself with explicating primarily the nature of knowing in the sense of knowing "necessary" propositions of the sort which can become objects of scientific demonstration.


(3) For an attempt to identify the most general aspects of Ockham's epistemic logic and to relate them to similar concerns in the works of Burley see I. Boh, "Propositional Attitudes in the Logic of Walter Burley and William Ockham", *Franciscan Studies* 44 (1984), 31-59


Acts of the Symposium organized by the Dutch Society for Medieval Philosophy Medium Aevum on the occasion of its 10th anniversary (Leiden, 10-12 September 1986).


Introduction to the translation.


"Connotation plays a central role in Ockham's analysis of the language of natural philosophy and mathematics. Some simple connotative terms belong to the deep structure of mental language. Ockham's program cannot guarantee the objectivity of things being quantified or located in space and time without his connotation-theory. Ockham's theory provides a partial explanation of why fourteenth-century philosophers shifted attention from discussion about the objects of mathematics to discussion of mathematics as a language. The shift explains in part the adoption of mathematical and metalinguistic approaches to philosophical and theological problems."


"Many medieval grammar and logic texts contain treatments of relativa grammaticalia, expressions some of which we now call anaphoric pronouns. The first philosopher who paid attention to these treatments seems to have been Peter Geach. Apparently, Geach found their treatments both stimulating and frustrating.' In his main work on semantics, Reference and Generality (1), he presents some theses of Walter Burleigh's on this topic, a fourteenth century logician and opponent of William Ockham, at considerable length. Elsewhere, however, he remarks that while 'the logic of pronouns with antecedents was extensively studied by medieval logicians in their chapters de suppositione relativorum; [...]this medieval treatment of pronouns was inconclusive" (2) and that ' [...] the medievals who discussed relativa - pronouns with antecedents - were groping in the dark despite all their ingenuity'. (3) What Geach deplored was the apparent tendency of 'the medievals' to treat anaphoric pronouns, relativa grammaticalia substantiae identitatis in terms of co-reference, of 'supponere pro eodem'. As is well known, Geach himself favors a rather different approach, according to which it is nonsense to talk about the reference of such pronouns at all, for they act like bound variables. His view on pronouns has now a considerable number of adherents and a few critics - most notably Gareth Evans. (4)

I am not concerned here with the question whether Geach's own theory of pronouns is correct, but whether his verdict about medieval theories of relativa is justified. His verdict is of unrestricted generality: it is not some medieval treatment of pronouns that is inconclusive, but "the" medieval treatment. This makes his claims an easy target for counterattack: Just find some medieval logician, whose theory does not fit Geach's claims. I have done this elsewhere. (4) Here I want to consider two logicians Geach has actually dealt with himself: Burleigh and Ockham. (1) Geach (1962), Reference and Generality: An Examination of Some Medieval and Modern Theories, Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press (3rd edition) 1980. (2) Geach (1960-61), "Ryle on Namely-Riders"; Analysis 21/3, repr. in Geach, Logic Matters, Oxford 1972, pp. 88-92, p. 92. All page-references will be to this edition. (3) Geach (1968-69), "Quine's Syntactical Insights", Synthese 19, repr. in Geach, Logic Matters, pp. 115-127, p. 118. All page-references will be to this edition. (4) Evans (1977), "Pronouns, Quantifiers, and Relative Clauses (1), Canadian Journal of Philosophy 7, pp. 467-536. (5) On a few such logicians see my Die Semantik anaphorischer Pronomina, Leiden 1994.


"This volume gives an introduction to William Ockham's theory of signs, his ontology, his epistemology, and the interrelations between these fields. Some recent results of analytic philosophy turn out to be useful instruments for the interpretation of Ockham's thought.

Part one contains a presentation of the basic concepts of Ockham's semantics. It is followed by an investigation of his ontology, including a comparison with modern ontology. Part three deals with the common and different elements in the conceptions of supposition and of quantification. Part four shows some similarities of Ockham's views on the truth of sentences with those of Davidson. The final part presents Ockham's epistemology within the discussion of his contemporaries and confronts it with actual issues raised by Quine and Putnam."


First introductory essay to the translation.
"The distinctions between singular and general terms, on the one hand, and abstract and concrete terms, on the other, play crucial roles in discussions of ontological issues. Although these dichotomies can be expressed in purely grammatical terms, they have traditionally been thought to point to two over-arching distinctions among things. Philosophers have frequently claimed that the singular-general term distinction is rooted in a distinction between objects that are particulars and objects that are universals; whereas, the distinction between concrete and abstract terms forces us to confront the distinction between substances (minimally interpreted to include material bodies and persons) and the various characteristics they possess or exhibit.
But because they appear to carry these far-reaching metaphysical implications, these grammatical dichotomies receive detailed treatment at the hands of the nominalist. If his theory is to be at all plausible, the nominalist must have the resources for providing a metaphysically neutral account of the singular-general and concrete-abstract dichotomies. In this essay I want to examine William of Ockham's ontology by focusing on his treatment of these distinctions. My aim here is twofold. By examining Ockham's analysis I hope to provide an introduction to the central
themes of Part I of the *Summa Logicae* and to clarify the concept of a nominalistic ontology in general." p. 1


"The author analyses philologically and philosophically the two different expressions 'nomen' and 'terminus' used by Ockham in the chapters given up to the supposition theory in his "Summa logicae". By that we can say that Ockham's logic of terms is interested primarily in the words, and in the concepts just with reference with these last ones, without qualifying Ockham's logic as 'nominalist': in fact 'nomen' receives his own capacity of meaning by the concept as natural linguistic sign."


Introduction, traduction et commentaire du Prologue des Sentences de Guillaume d'Occam quaestio 1, 1.


Métaphysiques Médiévales. Études en l'Honneur d'Andrè de Muralt - Éditées par Curzio Chiesa et Léo Freuler.


   "It is argued that Ockham's theory of language either fails to provide a principle of individuation to account for the diversity of mental entities he posits or is committed to certain spoken terms both having and not having some one entity as a significant. It is suggested that this problem can be solved by allowing that every categorematic term is subordinated to an infinite number of concepts and by modifying Ockham's supposition theory."


About this volume see the special number of "Laval Théologique et Philosophique" vol. 57 n. 2 (June 2001)


Replies to the essay by E. J. Ashworth and P. King in the same journal.


"Within the Ockhamist semantics, the predicate 'true' is explained by another more basic semantical relation, the relation of supposition. The author shows how this relationship between two semantical predicates figures in the analysis of the truth-conditions of propositions about the past, and demonstrates that it is a model that can be extended to propositions about both the future and the possible. The author indicates how the semantics of alethic modalities is in continuity with the semantics of propositions about the past and about the future. If we consider another aspect of Ockham's modal theory, viz., the fact that modalities are defined as any term that can be predicated of a whole proposition, the importance of this point becomes clear. In conclusion, the author points out the different levels of analysis of alethic modalities within an Ockhamist framework."


"William of Ockham's Summa Logicae is a classic of analytical metaphysics, using a typical fourteenth century logic treatise to defend a reductionist ontology. For Ockham, everything is an individual, and this is to be shown by the correct logical analysis of language, reinterpreting Aristotle's *Categories* as a taxonomy of the many ways in which terms can be predicated. The ultimate basis is the attribution of an individual quality to an individual substance. This theory of the signification of terms is then extended to an account of the truth-conditions of propositions and the truth-preservation of arguments, but always with the reduction to individuals as the key. This classic work in the logical analysis of language still contains lively insights for contemporary scholars."


Reprinted as chapter XIV in: *Through language to reality: studies in medieval semantics and metaphysics.*

"IV. Schlüfbetrachtung. Ockham anerkennt ohne Einschränkung den transzendenten Bezirk, d. h. das Metaphysische oder Übersinnliche als Bezirk; in diesem Sinne ist er also gewiß kein Antimetaphysiker. Aber verwirrt er denn die Metaphysik als Wissenschaft, oder höhlt er sie zumindest aus? Zuerst muß anerkannt werden, daß Ockham im Prinzip der Metaphysik das Weisungsrecht über die Seienden (d. h., für Ockham, die individuellen Seienden) keineswegs abspricht. Zugleich kann nicht geleugnet werden, daß bei ihm der Metaphysik eine auffallend bescheidene Stelle zukommt. Wie läßt sich das unter Berücksichtigung von Ockhams unzuweifelbarer Ehrfurcht vor dem Übersinnlichen erklären? Der Schlüssel zur Lösung dieser Frage liegt nicht bloß in Ockhams Ontologie des individuellen Seins, sondern auch in seinen anthropologischen Auffassungen. Der Mensch ist nach ihm in seinen Denken und Sprechen nicht imstande, das Erhabene wesentlich zu durchforschen. Dessen soll sich der Mensch fort während eingedenk sein. Dies ist für Ockham in zwei deutliche Strategien übersetzbar:"
a) nicht jedem modus significandi oder loquendi entspricht ein modus essendi in der Wirklichkeit
b) viele maßgebende Aussagen, sowohl sakrale wie profane, soll man nicht de virtute sermonis (dazu reicht unser Sprechen zuwenig aus), ondern der Ab sicht des Redners oder Schriftstellers entsprechend deuten." pp. 326-327 (Notes omitted).


"Conclusion. There is no single reason, I think, to ascribe to Ockham any feelings of hostility towards metaphysics on this account. God created 'true and real being', but He created it in shaping 'what is truly and really being', individual beings, that is. As created, it is radically changeable and contingent as well. Uncreated, unchangeable being is not to be created, not even as some mysterious constituent present in creatural being. Human beings are not entitled to sublimate their (indispensable) conceptual tools (e.g. universal terms) so that they represent unchangeable ontic standards. Whenever we are inclined to do so, Ockham's razor comes in, not however, to make us say that the metaphysical domain is void. Rather logic (and human thought in general) should make us recognize our own limitations, and refrain from speaking about the unspeakable when, and inasmuch as, our linguistic tools are bound to lead us astray. The same applies to Ockham's view of proofs of God's existence. He only admits the proof of God as first preserver of these actual things in this actual world and rejects all atemporal proofs. However, his faith is unshakeable and not involved in any philosophical thinking either. Likewise it is Ockham's ontology (doctrine of being) which is modest, the onta 'beings') are as abundant as they are. For that matter, Ockham let them really be (ontós einai Plato would say). Well, in order to let them be, human thinking should be prudent in cautiously managing its homemade conceptual apparatus." pp. 38-39


"Far from being a sceptic William of Ockham made every effort to corroborate the basis of philosophical and theological thought by purifying it of all sorts of untenable presuppositions. His main contribution to fourteenth century philosophical and theological development lies in systematically rethinking scholastic doctrines, and especially their assumptions, on the firm basis of his own favourite leading principles: the strictly individual nature of all that really is and the radical contingency of all creatural being.

These two principles also play a major part in Ockham's way of dealing with the Aristotelian theory of demonstration. The present paper aims at investigating Ockham's doctrine of demonstrative proof, focusing on the way in which he felt forced to adapt or rephrase the special requirements Aristotle had laid down for propositions to enter into syllogistic proof, especially strict proof (the so-called 'demonstratio potissima'). Our main argument will concern Aristotle's rather peculiar 'kath holou' requirement and Ockham's appliance of the 'kath hauto' (Latin: 'per
se') notion which is also involved in framing correct premisses for demonstrative proofs. A few preliminary remarks will be made about the essentials of Aristotle's theory of demonstration." p. 232

(...) "Conclusions.

To sum up our findings: Ockham's adaptations and manipulations of Aristotle's requirements for genuine demonstrative propositions are as many demands imposed by his own metaphysical views. He comments on Aristotle, always starting from his own favourite views. Though Aristotle is the Master, Ockham is the one to say what the Master meant, or what he should have meant. On the other hand, his introducing the 'per se strictissimo modo' rather seems to be a matter of technicality. Whereas in Posterior Analytics Aristotle deals with the scientific procedure of apodeixis in general, in which the apodeictic syllogism is merely a vehicle for correctly framing an apodeixis, the Medieval, and Ockham in particular, were apt to reduce Aristotle's theory of demonstrative proof to a theory of demonstrative syllogism. That is why the 'demonstratio potissima' (including its specific demands) so heavily influenced Ockham's theory of demonstration." p. 239


1. Introduction; 2. Preliminary: Aristotle on demonstrative or epistemonic proof; 2.1 On the three requirements 'kata pantos', kath' 'hauto', 'kath' holou', 2.2 On the notion of necessity; 2.3 On the four types of questions. On 'Middle' and 'Definiens'; 2.3.1 Subject and attribute. The Middle; 2.3.2. On definition and the four question-types; 2.3.3 The role of definitions in epistemonic proof; 2.3.4 Recipes for the discovery of definitions; 2.4 The 'kath' holou' requirement revisited; 2.5 Particulars and the proper objects of Aristotle's epistemonic proof; 3. Ockham as a Commentator of Posterior Analytics; 3.1 Ockham's treatment of the four basic question-types; 3.2 Ockham's view of the 'kath' holou' requirement; 3.3 The impact of Ockham's ontology upon his theory of demonstration; 3.3.1 Ockham's problem concerning the First Subject; 3.3.2 Ockham's introduction of 'Non-First Subject'; 3.3.3 'Demonstratio particularis' in Ockham; 3.3.4 Ockham's view of necessity; 3.5 'Dici per se' and 'propositio per se vera' in Ockham; 3.5.1 Two kinds of 'per se' assignment; 3.5.2 The 'propositio per se (vera)' in Ockham; 3.5.3 The strict and strictest senses of 'per se'; 4. Conclusion.

"The present paper aims to clarify the attitude towards Aristotle adopted by one of the leading lights of fourteenth century philosophical and theological thought, William of Ockham, by investigating (a) how in some of the vital subjects of Aristotelian doctrine, the Venerable Inceptor understood and interpreted the Master, (b) how and why on specific occasions, he deliberately took the liberty to stray from Aristotle's teachings. It goes without saying that in such an undertaking, one has to confine oneself to certain doctrinal themes the choice of which might seem quite arbitrary. The present author has picked out the Aristotelian doctrine of demonstrative proof as interpreted by Ockham." p. 78


Quodlibetaria: miscellanea studiorum in honorem prof. J. M. da Cruz Pontes anno iubilationis suae, Conimbrigae MCMXCV


"The logic of William of Ockham is commonly -- and, I believe, rightly - thought to be nominalistic. It is also commonly -- and, I believe, wrongly -- thought to be helpful in the solution of those philosophical problems which cluster about the issue of the "one and the many." The allegedly helpful features of his logic are the theories of signification and supposition. I intend to show that these theories, far from being helpful, lead to certain intolerable results, in particular, (1) construing singular propositions, like "Socrates is a man," either as analytic or as no propositions at all (i.e., neither true nor false) and (2) construing all general propositions as either analytic or contradictory. These results follow from taking Ockham as offering object language analyses of object language propositions. Taking him as offering metalanguage analyses of object language propositions is to start off with attributing an intolerable "result" to his logic. It will be helpful, at the end, briefly to compare his logic with that of a contemporary nominalist, Nelson Goodman, for neither of the intolerable results follows from Goodman's logic. Whether the latter is, therefore, acceptable is another issue.

My strategy is as follows. In Part I, I wish to show that a rather straightforward interpretation of Ockham does have him offering metalinguistic analyses of object language propositions and also to show how certain contemporary interpreters and Ockham himself have managed to blind themselves to this fact. In Part II, I wish to show that the so-called "descent to singulars" affords a possibility of construing Ockham as offering object language analyses of object language propositions and to show how, given the doctrines discussed in Part I, he is led to adopt the 'is' of identity, the latter in such a way as to lead into the "intolerable results" mentioned above. In Part III, I wish to make the brief comparison with Goodman's logic. No detailed descriptions of the Ockhamite theories of signification and supposition will be attempted. Ockham states them quite clearly, and there exist excellent contemporary accounts of both, especially those of Fr. Boehner and Prof. Moody. (*) I shall discuss just what is necessary to make good the several claims listed above. The discussion will, furthermore, be limited to Ockham's doctrine of categorical propositions of present time. This is quite enough, for his doctrines of past, future, and modal propositions are directly dependent upon his doctrine of present-time categoricals." (pp. 79-80 of the reprint).

(*) Cf. P. Boehner, Collected Articles on Ockham, ed. E. Buytaert (St. Bonaventure, N. Y., 5958); E. Moody, The Logic of William of Ockham (New York, 5935); E. Moody, Truth and Consequence in Medieval Logic (Amsterdam, 1953).


Texts translated into English with commentary by Martin M. Tweedale. "This work is meant to make accessible to students of philosophy and later medieval thought the key texts in one of the most crucial philosophical debates of that period. The concentration is on Scotus's positive doctrine since it is difficult and has not received the detailed attention it deserves. Ockham's polemic against Scotus raises a host of objections to the internal coherence of Scotus's reworking of the traditional line. Some of these are ones it seems to me Scotus could have countered quite easily; others would have required some revisions, but ones that are basically within the spirit of the doctrine. Some, however, are very difficult indeed, and I shall leave to the commentary and its introductory essay the exposition of my own view on whether Scotus's position can survive intact. There is also a positive side to Ockham's views about universals, and that is only partially covered in what follows. The texts that show how Ockham envisioned preserving all the essentials of Aristotelian science even after real universals have been excised, are presented and discussed, and the very real issue of whether Ockham's effort here could possibly succeed is broached but not definitely resolved one way or the other."


"The commentary which composes the greater part of this volume attempts not only to explain the texts translated in the first volume and to understand the positions adopted by the protagonists in this debate, but also to assess the cogency of the various arguments put forward. After all that work is done, however, there remains the task of drawing attention to the crucial issues that have emerged and arriving at some understanding of the debate as a whole and the relative merits of the positions put forward. It is this task that this introductory essay undertakes. Perhaps it would be better read after a thorough study of the commentary, but I am inclined to think that some awareness of the general issues and positions taken by Scotus and Ockham helps in making one's way through the individual texts and their often elaborate argumentation. In explaining these issues and positions I have made free use of philosophical ideas of our own day, at least to the extent that this is not grossly anachronistic."


"The importance of the connotation theory in Ockham's semantics and metaphysics can hardly be overstated--it is the main mechanism that brings forth Ockham's famous ontological elimination. Yet none of the extant interpretations can satisfactorily accommodate three widely accepted theses: (1) there is no synonym in mental language; (2) a connotative term has a semantically equivalent nominal definition; and (3) there are simple connotative terms in Ockham's mental language. In this paper I offer an interpretation that I argue can accommodate all."