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The breadth of Klima’s scholarship stretches historically from some of philosophy’s best-known figures in Anselm, Aquinas, Ockham and Descartes to lesser-known figures including Thomas of Sutton and Henry of Ghent, to Frege, Geach, Kenny, and others who have produced some of the most consequentional scholarship in the analytic tradition; and thematically from debates on identity, categories, and causation in metaphysics, on skepticism in epistemology and theories of mental content in philosophy of mind, to others too numerous to mention.

[INTRODUCTORY PARAGRAPH OUTLINING PAPER STRUCTURE HERE]

# 1 Between Thomism and the Analysts: Gyula Klima’s contributions to the history of metaphysics

One of the first things one notices as Klima’s student is that he does not think of medieval thinkers as part of a past age, a lost curiosity. He once remarked that, as far as intellectual culture is concerned, the middle ages lasted in Hungary well into the 19th century. (Lukacs confirms: “[T]he Enlightenment, the Century of Reason, the French Revolution hardly touched Hungary” [Lukacs 114].) While in many ways Klima is fully modern and even ahead of his time—for instance, as early adopter of the internet as a tool for researching and sharing work—this in now way compromises the sense that he survives from times often thought long past, one who thinks as if a contemporary of philosophers long dead.

This transcending of categories, or creative traditionalism, is reflected in the category to which some might fit the genre of much of Klima’s work in philosophy: “Analytic Thomism.” Edward Feser, trying to articulate his contested label, distinguished three types: (1) analytic philosophers first, who happen to show interest in Thomism, (2) those attempting to give both the analytic and Thomistic traditions equal weight, and (3) those (with whom he groups Klima) “whose training was in the analytic tradition and whose modes of argument and choice of topics reflects this background, but whose philosophical views are in substance basically just traditional ones, without qualification or reinterpretation.” (Feser 2009; “The Thomistic tradition, Part II” <https://edwardfeser.blogspot.com/2009/10/thomistic-tradition-part-ii.html>)

Whether he would accept this description or not, Klima is rare among Thomists in not being primarily trained within one of the dominant mid-20th C “schools” (Existential, Laval, Transcendental, Lublin), whose particular preoccupations, and sometimes idiosyncratic jargon, therefore seem less significant to Klima’s students. Studying Aquinas more or less on his own—and effectively finding himself persuaded by Aquinas after attempting to find fault with his Five Ways—Klima was formed not by a *Thomism*, but by *Thomas*, the philosophical saint treated on his own terms and as capable of dialogue with the most prominent contemporary thinkers Thomistic or otherwise.

Although he has criticized Peter Geach in particulars [CITE FIVE MISTAKES article], Klima was inspired by Geach’s confidence in Christian theology’s power to keep logic honest, and in the importance of reconstructing a pre-modern conceptual schema. As an epigraph to the third essay (“General Terms in their Referring Function”) in his early volume *Ars Artium* (p. 44), Klima quoted Geach’s hope to achieve the “Paradise Regained” of reconstructing an Aristotelian semantic framework (from Geach’s essay, “History of the Corruption of Logic”).

In this underlying hope of recapturing a lost classical framework, Klima has something in common with another philosopher known for bringing Aquinas into conversation with very different contemporary philosophical conversations. Alasdair MacIntyre’s *After Virtue* taught many to think of our moral discourse as a collection of confusing scraps and fragments; ethics would make more sense, he proposed, if its questions could be reformulated in terms of a once fundamental, but now lost, teleological framework. Where MacIntyre’s attempted to recapture lost concepts of practical reason through an alternative narration, Klima seeks to recapture lost concepts of theoretical reason by bringing them into dialogue with whatever displaced them—confident that, if they were ever intelligible, a judicious application of argument can make them intelligible once again.

If for MacIntyre the most important tool for renewing the intelligibility of a tradition is narrative, for Klima the most important tool is logic. More specifically, Klima’s project commits him to dialectic, applied to semantics. It is in these terms that we can review more properly some of his particular contributions to philosophy and philosophical scholarship.

# 2 Klima’s contributions in the history of semantics

From his earliest work in semantics, Klima recognized that classical logic, being primarily interested in developing an account of the semantics of propositions as a precondition for the development of a theory of consequence, affords much less attention to the components of propositions themselves. Klima fills this lacuna by providing some of the earliest and most ambitious applications of restricted quantification in the history and philosophy of logic, using it both to formalize the medieval theory of supposition and to provide a general account of quantitatively ambiguous natural language sentences.[[1]](#footnote-2) Elsewhere, Klima’s formalizations of supposition theory specifically and medieval semantics more broadly provide us with an account of the semantics of intensional verbs (Klima 1991b), a semantic foundation for Aquinas’ theory of the analogy of being (Klima 1996, 2002a), and a clean resolution of the problem of existential import in the Aristotelian square of opposition.[[2]](#footnote-3)

In one sustained thread of that work, Klima decouples *via antiqua* and *via moderna* semantics from the realist and anti-realist metaphysics with which they are most commonly paired, contending that neither semantics by itself strictly entails its associated metaphysics (Klima 1999, 2011b). Rather, archtypical realists were required to adopt non-straightforward semantic accounts of the meanings of terms in at least some cases by their antecedent metaphysical commitments (e.g. to divine simplicity) (Klima 2002b), while some of the best known nominalist logicians incorporated what today would be regarded as realist elements in their logic (Klima 2005). For Klima, the *via antiqua* and *via moderna* traditions of medieval logic differ not in their *quantity* of ontological commitments, but in the tools they provide for *handling* ontological commitments, which in turn differ from those of the model-theoretic framework dominant today.

*Via antiqua* semantics takes an affirmative statement to be true when what is signified by its predicate inheres in what is signified by its subject - sometimes called the *inherence theory of predication*. Within this framework, terms predicating common natures or accidental features of a subject are taken to ultimately refer to exactly the categorical entities one might expect. But the framework avoids full, immediate, fundamental commitment to entities today’s nominalists might find objectionable by providing a rich theory according to which being is predicated in different degrees.[[3]](#footnote-4)

Conversely, the *via moderna* framework that became ascendant after Ockham takes an affirmative statement to be true when its subject and predicate term refer to the same object - sometimes called the *identity theory of predication*. Within this framework, terms predicating common natures or accidental features of a subject need not be taken to ultimately refer to different types of objects such as abstract genera or relations, but instead refer to familiar objects *differently*. For example, the truth of ‘Socrates is a father’ does not require commitment to a distinct entity that is Socrates’ fatherhood. Instead, the sentence’s predicate may (non-rigidly) refer to Socrates himself, albeit connoting his being a father, and hence refer to the same object as that rigidly referred to by the proper name ‘Socrates’. Granting some license for intensional contexts,[[4]](#footnote-5) the verb ‘is’ or ‘exists’ in *via moderna* semantics is equally ontologically committing in its various uses, but *what* one is committed to by its uses need not be immediately apparent (Klima 2008b, 437–30).

Both medieval frameworks would reject the object-language metalanguage distinction taken for granted since Tarski in their theory of truth, and in their use of ampliation for tensed, modal, and intensional contexts, both provide ample tools for rejecting a naïve application of Quine’s account of ontological commitment in terms of existential quantification.[[5]](#footnote-6)

## 2.1 Ontological neutrality and independence

None of this means that there is *no* relationship between an author’s positions in metaphysics and his semantics: rather, the semantic framework an author adopts conditions what options that author has in metaphysics without fully determining them. For example, extreme realism in metaphysics doesn’t follow strictly from the *via antiqua*’s inherence theory of predication, but it is the most natural fit for that theory if one accepts the view that terms signifying accidental being denote their referents rigidly while rejecting that framework’s insistence on multiple, analogically related senses of ‘being’ (Klima 1999, 125). Conversely, the broad outlines of Ockham’s account of the relation between language, thought, and reality serve not only as a foundation for Ockham’s own metaphysical reductionism, but also for the realism of a Descartes, Malebranche, Putnam or a Leibniz (Klima 1991b).

There is, however, no relationship of *entailment* from purely semantic principles to metaphysical truths. Klima writes:

To be sure, this is not to say that metaphysical principles are to be derived from, or somehow justified in a weaker sense on the basis of, semantic principles. Metaphysical principles, being first principles using the most general terms, such as the transcendentals and the categories, cannot be derived from prior principles, and their terms cannot be defined on the basis of more general terms. What semantics can do, however, is that it can provide the principles of interpretation of metaphysical principles. On the basis of these principles of interpretation the implications of metaphysical principles are more clearly delineated, which then can be used in their evaluation in dialectical disputations concerning their acceptability in the interpretations thus clarified. Furthermore, if the semantic principles of interpretation are made explicit, they can also be subject to further evaluation, in a disputation on a different level, the sort appropriate to the comparison of different logical theories (Klima 2011a, 49).

Modern mathematics calls this relation *independence*, though as the name implies the fundamental notion itself is by no means a recent one. Just as Cantor’s continuum hypothesis is neither provable nor refutable from the principles of Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory alone, or - to provide a more medieval example - truths of revealed theology are neither provable nor refutable from the principles of natural philosophy, neither on Klima’s account are metaphysical principles provable or refutable from those of semantics alone.

Is there perhaps something *sly*, then, when Klima describes the medieval proponents of *Via Antiqua* semantics as positing different senses of ‘being’ as if to *avoid* ontological commitments? While Klima’s semantic focus may avoid *presuming* metaphysical conviction, it isn’t a way of altogether avoiding metaphysical *reflection*, but has such reflection as the natural end towards which it is directed. By emphasizing, for instance, a specifically semantic sense of realism and nominalism, Klima helps us appreciate the sense in which a *metaphysical* realism would have to be formulated differently in each of them, and encourages us to look for the possibility of moving back and forth the between the various conceptual frameworks in order even to raise the genuine metaphysical questions that may have helped facilitate the initial semantic innovations.

## 2.2 Pluralism, linguistic imperialism, and the problem of cross-cultural communication

Two complications distinguish the semantic case from those mentioned. The first is that while both the set-theoretic and theological case mentioned above concern provability and refutability in a single system, the sheer multiplicity of semantic frameworks itself may provide a barrier to a broadly acceptable account of provability across those frameworks. The second generalizes a problem nearly the opposite of that established by Gödel in his first incompleteness theorem (Gödel 1931): where that theorem established the expressibility of unprovable claims of number theory in any sufficiently robust system, the semantic problem we face here is that a claim of metaphysics may be taken to be established or refuted merely on account of the lack of expressibility of the particular semantic framework one is working in.

Klima’s response to these problems is anti-pluralist without thereby being dogmatically classical. While it would be easy enough to, for instance, construct a metalogical account of validity by quantifying over distinct logical systems on the model of possible world semantics and regarding as valid all and only those theorems valid in every system, Klima instead recognizes the known limitations of classical semantics while also taking the provable equivalence of systems containing distinct logical primitives as *prima facie* evidence for the possibility of a fundamental diversity at the *conceptual* level that nevertheless doesn’t entail a despairing or indifferent anti-realism at the *metaphysical* level (Klima 2012). Instead, Klima’s response, both technically and philosophically, is to *extend the framework*. Meeting the tradition where it is, he extends classical semantics to allow for treatment of donkey sentences (Klima 1988, 2010), non-existent entities (Klima 2001), and quantificational phenomena (Klima and Sandu 1990), while more broadly appealing (in a rare quote of a ‘continental’ philosopher that shows up in multiple places throughout his *œuvre*) to the possibility of a ‘fusion of horizons’ mentioned by Gadamer as a solution to the impasse of communication across distinct semantic frameworks, cultures, or philosophical traditions and the attitude of metaphysical anti-realism it encourages (Klima 2000, 2009a).

# 3 John Buridan

Nowhere has this effort been more sustained than in Klima’s scholarship on John Buridan’, which has helped elevate the 14th century arts master from a lesser-known figure to one whose stature is closer to that of an Ockham, arguably surpassing the Franciscan in his logic.

Klima’s seminal contributions on Buridan provide an excellent example of how one can solve apparently intractable philosophical and communicational problems simply by *expanding the framework* - whether that framework be classical semantics expanded to include an existence predicate and restricted quantifiers or the broader historical consciousness of Anglophone philosophy of the past seventy or so years.

[INSERT FULL SECTION ON KLIMA’S BURIDAN SCHOLARSHIP HERE]

# **4 Introducing this volume’s articles**

## **5 Conclusion**

Despite the depth and breadth of his work, the amount of space Klima devotes to advancing positions that are unambiguously his own, rather than to steel-manning positions of historical or contemporary figures he may or may not agree with, is comparatively little.[[6]](#footnote-7) Still, Klima’s solution here provides a window into the answer to a more personal question that his scholarship solicits: namely, of all the intellectual pursuits to devote oneself to, why study medieval philosophy, and specifically medieval semantics?

In one uncommonly autobiographical passage, Klima writes:

I remember that when I was at Notre Dame (so this happened in the second half of the nineties), I asked several of my colleagues, and even the then visiting David Armstrong, to provide metaphysically non-committal clarifications of the semantics of the language they were using in describing their metaphysical theories. In response, I was given puzzled looks and declarations strongly reminiscent of the way medieval nominalists characterized the attitude of their realist opponents: we don’t care about names; we go right to the things themselves!—Well, just look at the history of late-scholasticism and early modern philosophy to see what good that attitude did for them.

So, what can we do to avoid the late-scholastic scenario, going on another cycle of endless and more and more meaningless metaphysical debates until the arrival of another Kant declaring the whole enterprise ill-founded and another Carnap declaring it to be meaningless, to launch another anti-metaphysical cycle of meaningless search for meaning to be abandoned yet again for metaphysics, etc., etc.? Why don’t we try both in tandem, i.e., analysis and metaphysics at the same time, as the very designation “analytic metaphysics” would seem to demand? For then we could start by laying down our clearly defined semantic principles (instead of making them up and twisting them around as we go) and engage each other in our metaphysical debates according to the same principles, instead of talking past each other, making clear that whoever is talking according to different semantic principles is just playing a different game (Klima 2014, 86–87).

Here, the difficulty that Klima’s apology for analysis aims to alleviate remains - namely, that in much debate in the core disciplines of analytic philosophy and in metaphysics in particular, rival participants are often unable or unwilling to state their positions in a linguistic context their opponents would be able to agree to, leaving such debates unfruitful from the start. Without the opportunity for common ground that semantics provides, not only shared understanding, but even proof, refutation, and disagreement itself become unattainable.

With this problem in mind, Klima’s study of medieval semantics, as a study of frameworks of meaning remarkably foreign to that of our own time, provides an example *par excellence* of the kind of interpretive charity needed to surmount our own crises of meaning and communication.
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