

Studies in Universal Logic

Series Editor

Jean-Yves Béziau (*Federal University of Rio de Janeiro and Brazilian Research Council, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*)

Editorial Board Members

Hajnal Andréka (*Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary*)

Mark Burgin (*University of California, Los Angeles, USA*)

Răzvan Diaconescu (*Romanian Academy, Bucharest, Romania*)

Josep Maria Font (*University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain*)

Andreas Herzig (*Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Toulouse, France*)

Arnold Koslow (*City University of New York, New York, USA*)

Jui-Lin Lee (*National Formosa University, Huwei Township, Taiwan*)

Larissa Maksimova (*Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, Russia*)

Grzegorz Malinowski (*University of Łódź, Łódź, Poland*)

Darko Sarenac (*Colorado State University, Fort Collins, USA*)

Peter Schröder-Heister (*University Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany*)

Vladimir Vasyukov (*Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia*)

This series is devoted to the universal approach to logic and the development of a general theory of logics. It covers topics such as global set-ups for fundamental theorems of logic and frameworks for the study of logics, in particular logical matrices, Kripke structures, combination of logics, categorical logic, abstract proof theory, consequence operators, and algebraic logic. It includes also books with historical and philosophical discussions about the nature and scope of logic. Three types of books will appear in the series: graduate textbooks, research monographs, and volumes with contributed papers.

Arnold Koslow • Arthur Buchsbaum

Editors

The Road to Universal Logic

Festschrift for 50th Birthday of Jean-Yves Béziau
Volume I

Editors

Arnold Koslow
City University of New York
New York, NY
USA

Arthur Buchsbaum
Federal University of Santa Catarina
Florianópolis, SC
Brazil

ISSN 2297-0282

Studies in Universal Logic

ISBN 978-3-319-10192-7

DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-10193-4

Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

ISSN 2297-0290 (electronic)

ISBN 978-3-319-10193-4 (eBook)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014953260

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 03B22, 03B42, 03B62, 03G30, 03A05, 01A99

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2015

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Preface

These two volumes gather together the tributes of a distinguished group of colleagues and friends in honor of Professor Jean-Yves Beziau on his fiftieth birthday.

The articles in each of the two volumes (of which this is the first) fall, broadly speaking, into four categories:

1. those concerned with universal logic,
2. those concerned with hexagonal and other geometrical diagrams of opposition,
3. those concerned with paraconsistency, and
4. current work not directly connected to the work of Jean-Yves Beziau.

With these contributed papers, we want to record our gratitude for the intellectual and organizational work of Jean-Yves in uncovering a golden tradition of logical thought, and his constant encouragement to all of us to insure that tradition will continue and flourish. Many thanks, Jean-Yves. Our heartfelt thanks on this your fiftieth birthday.

With the possible exception of the last category, there are three subdivisions of universal logic as conceived by Jean-Yves Beziau. In order to understand this project, we can do no better than to recall the way in which universal logic was compactly described by Beziau in the preface to what is probably the defining collection on the subject,¹ and to expand upon it, briefly:

- (i) [**Beyond particular Logical Systems**] “Universal logic is a general study of logical structures. The idea is to go beyond particular logical systems to clarify fundamental concepts of logic and to construct general proofs.” (p. v)
- (ii) [**Comparison of Logics**] “Comparison of logics is a central feature of universal logic.” (p. v)
- (iii) [**Abstraction and the central notion of Consequence**] “But the abstraction rise is not necessarily progressive, there are also some radical jumps into abstraction. In logic we find such jumps in the work of Paul Hertz on *Satzsysteme* (Part 1), and of Alfred Tarski on the notion of a *consequence operator* (Part 3). What is primary in these theories are not the notions of logical operators or logical constants (connectives and quantifiers), but a more fundamental notion: a relation of consequence defined on undetermined abstract objects that can be propositions of any science, but also data, acts, events.” (p. vi)

¹Beziau [2].

- (iv) **[Beyond Syntax and Semantics]** “In universal logic, consequence is the central concept. But this consequence relation is neither syntactical (proof-theoretical), nor semantical (model-theoretical). We are beyond the dichotomy syntax/semantics (proof theory/model theory.” (p. vi)

There are of course other themes that are characteristic of Universal Logic, but it seems evident to me that the first observation—(i) **[Beyond particular Logical Systems]**—indicates clearly that universal logic does not advocate a unique logical system that is the one correct, most expressive, accurate, and useful logical structure. Universal logic includes in its domain a host of logical structures in all their variety. But universal logic is not simply a catalogue of all advocated or imagined logical structures, all logical possibilities, as it would have all the utility of a telephone book that is useful for certain problems, but cognitively dumb.

It is the second observation—(ii) **[Comparison of Logics]**—which adds intellectual content to the project. Comparison is indeed central to universal logic, but not comparisons of a rapid kind. What is intended are comparisons that not only note the difference between logical structures, but explanations of why there are those differences in a way that reveal their different logical character. That is, the second observation suggests that not only are comparisons offered, but that there may be many different ways of ordering those logics, and one cannot take for granted that those orderings or comparisons are coherent when taken together. This kind of issue is nicely illustrated when we think of a paper now commonly referred to as “Beziau’s translation paradox”.² Simply put, two logical systems K (classical propositional logic), and $K/2$ are described. Two orderings or relations are proved to hold: that K is an extension of $K/2$ and also that there is a faithful translation of K into $K/2$. So there are two orderings. The first seems to indicate that K is clearly the stronger logic, yet the second result seems to say otherwise (that there is within $K/2$ a faithful translation of classical propositional logic). Each of the two orderings seems to measure the strength of one logic over another. According then to Beziau’s concept of universal logic, comparisons are a central task, but it is also a task of universal logic to figure out what to do when the orderings seem to go in different directions.

Beziau has suggested that it is like the so-called Galilean “paradox”, which notes that there are more square natural numbers than there are natural numbers, and also notes that those two collections are evenly matched. It is not that Galileo’s solution is recommended for the Beziau example. That is not a possible way out, since Galileo’s solution is in the case of infinite collections, the notion of “is larger than” just doesn’t apply. The intended similarity, as we see it, is that in both cases there are two ways of explaining the notion of one collection having more members than another, and one logic being more powerful than another. The two ways give opposing verdicts, and the resolution of this situation, Beziau maintains, is a task that lies squarely within the province of universal logic.

We mentioned that the study of Hexagonal logics of opposition falls squarely within the province of universal logic, for they provide a good example of finite logical systems, with a specified particular implication relation between their sentences (taken pairwise). In fact there is a growing literature which considers consequence relations on finite geometrical arrays of different dimension. All belong comfortably within the project that is universal logic.

²Beziau [1].

We also mentioned that paraconsistent logics are included in the program. That should be obvious if one considers the various consequence relations to be found in that branch of logic. Also we need to mention the beautiful studies of Dov Gabbay in which he proposed the study of *restrictive access logics* as an alternative to paraconsistent logics that is an extension of classical logic.³

These restrictive access logics can be described by using a substructural consequence relation, where there is a modification of the Gentzen structural conditions on implication. It then becomes an interesting problem to see what features the logical operators have will have as a consequence.⁴ The examples of paraconsistent and restrictive logics lie well within the province of present day logic.

In contrast, what is interesting and novel is that Beziau's observation's in (iv) [**Beyond Syntax and Semantics**] permits the extension of the program beyond the more traditional range of contemporary logical systems. As he stated it, not only can we have the notion of consequence for scientific propositions, and non-propositional, non-sentential objects including, data, acts, and events, but we do now add pictures (perhaps mathematical diagrams), and even the epistemic notion of states of belief for which consequence relations exist, and the possibility of logical operators acting on pictures as well as states of belief. We are concerned with consequence relations that are beyond the semantical or proof-theoretical.

The case for a consequence relation between pictures has recently been forcefully made by Jan Westerhoff. Here, compactly, is the claim:

"I will describe an implication relation between pictures. It is then possible to give precise definitions of conjunctions, disjunctions, negations, etc. of pictures. It will turn out that these logical operations are closely related to, or even identical with basic cognitive relations we naturally employ when thinking about pictures."⁵

This example with its particular consequence relation, and the pictures it relates, is an extension well beyond the usual restriction of logic to syntax and semantics. It illustrates the broad implications of Beziau's observations in (iv) and the fertility of the project of universal logic. It is not business as usual.

Finally we will briefly describe another case due to Peter Gärdenfors,⁶ who developed a logic of propositions upon the basis of a theory about belief revision. His results can be recast in such a way that they also follow as a case where he defines propositions as special kinds of functions, and also defines a special relation among those functions that turns out to be a consequence relation. The result is fascinating: the conjunction of functions turns out to be the functional composition of functions, and Gärdenfors' special relation among the functions is a consequence relation provided that functional composition is commutative and idempotent.

More exactly, (1) let S be a set of states of belief of some person. (2) Let P be a set of functions from S to S (called propositions) which is closed under functional composition. (3) For any members f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n and g in P , let (G) be the condition

³D.M. Gabbay and A. Hunter [4].

⁴Private communication from D. Gabbay, 2005.

⁵Westerhoff, J. [6]. The implication relation proposed for pictures is similar to one that Corcoran [3] proposed for propositions, as noted by Westerhoff.

⁶Gärdenfors [5].

that

$$f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n \Rightarrow g \quad \text{if and only if} \quad g f_1 f_2 \dots f_n = f_1 f_2 \dots f_n$$

(the concatenation of two functions here indicates their functional composition).

In particular, for any two propositions (functions) f and g , f implies g ($f \Rightarrow g$) if and only if $gf = f$. It is easy to prove that the relation (G) is a consequence condition if and only if functional composition is commutative and idempotent. The logic of these propositions has been shown by Gärdenfors to be Intuitionistic, and his consequence relation (G) is clearly epistemic. Again, it is not logic as usual, but it is just one more case of the fruitfulness of the ideas that the project of universal logic embodies.

References

1. Beziau, J-Y.: Classical negation can be expressed by one of its halves. *Log. J. IGPL* 7(2), 145–151 (1999)
2. Beziau, J-Y.: *Universal Logic: An Anthology, from Paul Hertz to Dov Gabbay*. Birkhäuser, Boston (2012)
3. Corcoran, J.: Information-theoretic logic. In: Martinez, C. (ed.) *Truth in Perspective*, pp. 113–135. Ashgate, Aldershot (1998)
4. Gabbay, D.M.: Restrictive access logics for inconsistent information. In: *ECCSQARU. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 137–144. Springer, Berlin (1993)
5. Gärdenfors, P.: The dynamics of belief as a basis for logic. *Br. J. Philos. Sci.* 1–10 (1984)
6. Westerhoff, J.: Logical relations between pictures. *J. Philos.* **102**(12), 603–623 (2005)

New York, USA
 Florianópolis, Brazil

Arnold Koslow
 Arthur Buchsbaum

Contents

Ibn Sīnā’s Two-Partite Versus Nine-Partite Logicography	1
Musa Akrami	
Homotopical Categories of Logics	13
Peter Arndt	
Semi-implication: A Chapter in Universal Logic	59
Arnon Avron	
A Formal Framework for Hypersequent Calculi and Their Fibring	73
Marcelo Esteban Coniglio and Martín Figallo	
Investigating Knowledge and Opinion	95
John Corcoran and Idris Samawi Hamid	
The Algebra of Opposition (and Universal Logic Interpretations)	127
Răzvan Diaconescu	
Universal Logic as a Science of Patterns	145
Brian R. Gaines	
Hexagonal Logic of the Field \mathbb{F}_8 as a Boolean Logic with Three Involutive Modalities	191
René Guitart	
The Move from One to Two Quantifiers	221
Wilfrid Hodges	
On the Contrary: Disjunctive Syllogism and Pragmatic Strengthening	241
Laurence Horn	
Aristotle on Language and Universal Proof	267
Jean-Louis Hudry	
Béziau on <i>And</i> and <i>Or</i>	283
Lloyd Humberstone	
Universal Logic or Logics in Resemblance Families	309
Dale Jacquette	

Causality and Attribution in an Aristotelian Theory	327
Srećko Kovač	
Using Each Other’s Words	341
Marcus Kracht	
On Universality and Formality in 19th Century Symbolic Logic: The Case of Schröder’s “Absolute Algebra”	351
Javier Legris	
Caramuel and the “Quantification of the Predicate”	361
Wolfgang Lenzen	
Lossy Inference Rules and Their Bounds: A Brief Review	385
David Makinson and James Hawthorne	
Nonsets	409
Daniel Parrochia	
A Roadmap to Decidability	423
João Rasga, Cristina Sernadas, and Amílcar Sernadas	
John Buridan on Non-contingency Syllogisms	447
Stephen Read	
Symbolic Existence in Hugh MacColl: A Dialogical Approach	457
Juan Redmond	
Béziau’s Contributions to the Logical Geometry of Modalities and Quantifiers	475
Hans Smessaert and Lorenz Demey	
On Metalogical Relativism	495
Vladimir L. Vasyukov	
Constructivism and Metamathematics	513
Jan Woleński	

Contributors

Musa Akrami Department of Philosophy of Science, Science and Research Branch of Tehran, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Peter Arndt Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Regensburg, Regensburg, Germany

Arnon Avron School of Computer Science, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Israel

Marcelo Esteban Coniglio Department of Philosophy and Centre for Logic, Epistemology and the History of Science (CLE), State University of Campinas (UNICAMP), Campinas, Brazil

John Corcoran Philosophy, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, USA

Lorenz Demey Center for Logic and Analytic Philosophy, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

Răzvan Diaconescu Simion Stoilow Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest, Romania

Martín Figallo Department of Mathematics and Institute of Mathematics (INMABB), National University of the South (UNS), Bahía Blanca, Argentina

Brian R. Gaines University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada; University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

René Guitart IMJ-PRG Université Paris Diderot, Paris, France

Idris Samawi Hamid Philosophy, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA

James Hawthorne Department of Philosophy, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK, USA

Wilfrid Hodges Herons Brook, Sticklepath, Okehampton, Devon, England, UK

Laurence Horn Departments of Linguistics and Philosophy, Yale University, New Haven, USA

Jean-Louis Hudry Departamento de Filosofia, Universidade de São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, SP, Brazil

Lloyd Humberstone Department of Philosophy, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia

Dale Jacquette Institut für Philosophie, Abteilung Logik und theoretische Philosophie, Unitobler, Universität Bern, Bern 9, Switzerland

Srećko Kovač Institute of Philosophy, Zagreb, Croatia

Marcus Kracht Fakultät Linguistik und Literaturwissenschaft, Universität Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany

Javier Legris IIEP-BAIRES, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Wolfgang Lenzen University of Osnabrück, Osnabrück, Germany

David Makinson Department of Philosophy, Logic and Scientific Method, London School of Economics, London, UK

Daniel Parrochia University Jean Moulin, Lyon, France

João Rasga Dep. Mathematics, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal; SQIG, Instituto de Telecomunicações, Lisboa, Portugal

Stephen Read Arché Research Centre, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Scotland, UK

Juan Redmond Instituto de Filosofía, Universidad de Valparaíso and Conicyt, Valparaíso, Chile

Amílcar Sernadas Dep. Mathematics, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal; SQIG, Instituto de Telecomunicações, Lisboa, Portugal

Cristina Sernadas Dep. Mathematics, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal; SQIG, Instituto de Telecomunicações, Lisboa, Portugal

Hans Smessaert Research Group on Formal and Computational Linguistics, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

Vladimir L. Vasyukov Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia; National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

Jan Woleński Sucha Beskidzka, Poland