



# UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

## ARCHIVIO DELLA RICERCA

University of Parma Research Repository

Turning Potentialities into Possibilities: Early Medieval Approaches to the Metaphysics of Modality

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

*Original*

Turning Potentialities into Possibilities: Early Medieval Approaches to the Metaphysics of Modality / Binini, Irene. - STAMPA. - 54:(2022), pp. 151-169. [10.1007/978-3-030-97303-2\_7]

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11381/2928192 since: 2023-06-21T16:43:36Z

*Publisher:*

Springer

*Published*

DOI:10.1007/978-3-030-97303-2\_7

*Terms of use:*

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available

*Publisher copyright*

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

20 April 2024

# Turning Potentialities into Possibilities: Early Medieval Approaches to the Metaphysics of Modality

Irene Binini  
Università di Parma – University of Toronto<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** Early medieval reflections on modalities are deeply indebted to the modal theories developed by Aristotle in his *De Interpretatione*, to which scholars were acquainted through the mediation of Boethius' translations and commentaries. Although Aristotle's modal system was considerably enriched in the early Middle Ages with a more sophisticated syntax and a more expressive logic, the general framework in which modal language was analyzed remained essentially Aristotelian in spirit. However, Aristotle's modal views were also loaded with metaphysical assumptions that some early medieval authors felt uncomfortable carrying along. This metaphysical background was connected to the Aristotelian interpretation of possibilities as ontologically grounded in the *potencies* or *potentialities* of things, that is in the powers, tendencies or capacities that certain substances have of being otherwise than they actually are (See e.g. Simo Knuuttila, *Modalities in Medieval Philosophy*, London, 2003, New York: Routledge, p. 19-31; 46-8). The potency-based account of possibility, further reinforced by Boethius in his commentaries, was questioned by some logicians in the early twelfth century. These authors were driven by a special interest in unactualized possibilities and in the modalities of non-things, an interest that ultimately led them to detect a number of problems related to the Aristotelian modal paradigm. In opposition to it, they developed a modal theory according to which the term "possible" has no such ontological correlate, and does not denote any modal property or intrinsic feature possessed by substances.

## 1. The "potency-based" account of possibility

Early medieval reflections on modalities are deeply indebted to the modal theories developed by Aristotle in *De Interpretatione*, with which scholars were acquainted through the mediation of Boethius' translation and commentaries. Late eleventh- and early twelfth-century authors inherited from Aristotle and Boethius a specific syntactical structure, one that they used to construct propositions about possibility, impossibility, necessity, and contingency, as well as a number of rules they applied to describe the logical behavior of such propositions. From the same sources, they also inherited a number of philosophical issues related to modalities, such as the discussion about what the realm of possibility should comprise (in particular, whether this should include possibilities that are never actualized) and the problems concerning future contingents and the existence of free agency. Even though these traditional modal views were considerably enriched in the early Middle Ages with a more sophisticated syntax for modal propositions and a more expressive logic, the general

---

\* This research has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program, under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement n° 845061. I am very grateful to Yukio Iwakuma and C.H. Kneepkens for sharing with me their transcriptions of some unedited texts that will be considered in this article, and to Wojciech Wciórka for his valuable help in the interpretation of several manuscript passages. I am also grateful to the anonymous referees for their useful suggestions. I dedicate this article to Professor Massimo Mugnai, who first introduced me to the study of Abelard and twelfth-century modal logic. For this and for his supervision during the first steps of my research, I am extremely thankful.

framework in which modal language was analyzed remained essentially Aristotelian in spirit. However, the theories of modalities reported by Aristotle and Boethius were also loaded with certain metaphysical assumptions that some early medieval authors felt uncomfortable adopting. This metaphysical background was mostly connected to what Simo Knuuttila has called the “potency-based” account of possibility, that is, the interpretation of possibilities as ontologically grounded in the *potencies* or *potentialities* of things. According to this modal paradigm, the truth-makers of claims about possibility are the powers, capacities, or tendencies that certain substances have to be otherwise than they actually are.<sup>2</sup>

The term that Aristotle uses for the word “possible” (the Greek *dynaton*) is said to derive its signification from that of “potency” (*dynamis*; see, for example, *Metaphysics* V 12, 1019b34 ff.), which, according to Aristotle, is the principle of motion or change that allows a substance to be mutable with respect to either its existence or its properties. For Aristotle, possibilities may be ascribed to individuals insofar as they possess such a principle of change, which enables them to activate or undergo a process in which they transition from being in a certain state to being in a different one. For instance, saying that “it is possible for a doctor (or for a patient) to heal” means that the doctor has the power or ability to activate a process of change through which someone goes from being ill to being healthy, or that the patient has the disposition to undergo the same process. This sort of possibility cannot be attributed to substances that are not susceptible to change with respect to their nature or state. To this invariant and fixed part of reality, Aristotle attributes the modality of necessity, which he characterizes in terms of the immutability and impossibility of being otherwise (e.g., *Metaphysics* V 5, 1015a33–1015b15).<sup>3</sup>

Now, as is very often the case with Aristotle, things are more complicated than I have suggested in this sketchy presentation. For one thing, it is debatable whether Aristotle took every possibility to be reducible to a correspondent potentiality. In fact, there is at least one passage in which Aristotle affirms that some meanings of the term “*dynaton*” are not related to the notion of potency, thereby suggesting that the extension of “possible” is wider than that of “potential” (*Metaphysics* V 12, 1019b27–35). Moreover, scholars have often highlighted that the potency-based account of possibility is just one of several modal paradigms that are mixed together in Aristotle’s texts, and that such paradigms are not always consistent with one another.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, at least in

---

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Knuuttila 1993, 19–30 and 46ff.; Knuuttila 2017, Sections 1–2. In this article I will use the terms “powers,” “capacities,” “tendencies” as being roughly synonymous, and I will not enter into the (in other respects, important) discussions concerning the differences between them.

<sup>3</sup> See Knuuttila 1993, 8–9.

<sup>4</sup> See, in particular, Knuuttila 1993, 11–12.

*De Interpretatione*—the main Aristotelian source on modalities that medieval logicians up to the early twelfth century had to hand—Aristotle seems quite consistent in analyzing every possibility in terms of a corresponding potentiality. In Chapters 12 and 13 of this work, Aristotle only takes into account examples of possibility-propositions whose meaning is spelled out in terms of a substance’s capacities or dispositions, such as “it is possible for fire to warm,” “it is possible for someone to walk,” or “it is possible for this cloth to be cut in two pieces.” Here, the philosopher claims that the truth conditions of propositions of this sort depend on the fact that the corresponding potencies may come to actuality in present or future situations (e.g., *De interpretatione* XIII, 23a6–15). The connection between possibility and potentiality is further strengthened by the association established in *De interpretatione* (e.g., XIII, 23a21–3) between the notions of necessity and actuality: in this way, the pair of concepts *actual/potential* mirrors that of *necessary/possible*.

The potency-based account of possibility was further consolidated in Boethius’ commentaries on *De Interpretatione*. Here, Boethius treats possibility as a genus within which we may distinguish different aspects or species. In his *divisio*, “possible” is first said of what is actually the case (*quod iam est*), as when we say that it is possible for someone to write because he/she is currently writing: Boethius calls this “*possibile actu*” or “*verum possibile*.” Second, possible is what, though not actually being the case, might nonetheless be (*quod cum non sit esse potest*): this is referred to as “*possibile extra-actum*” or “*forsitanum possibile*.”<sup>5</sup> Within the first species of possibility, Boethius further distinguishes possibilities that are always in act (which are, in fact, necessities) and possibilities that are presently in act, but which have existed in potency before being realized and which may return to being *extra-actum* in the future, for example, the possibility for a person to walk insofar as he/she is now walking, even though there are past or future times in which he/she is seated.<sup>6</sup> This second aspect of *possibile actu*, Boethius remarks, is specific to the mutable and corruptible part of the world, in which potency and actuality alternate. The second species of the possible—which includes things that are potentially, though not actually, the case—is itself divided into two categories. On the one hand, there are possibilities that will actualize in the future, and, on the other hand, there are those that will never be actualized but will remain perpetually *in potestate*.<sup>7</sup> Except for the part of the possible coinciding with the necessary, all possibilities considered by Boethius in this *divisio* are interpreted as being grounded in a certain potentiality or power (*potentia, potestas*) possessed by a

---

<sup>5</sup> See Boethius 1880, 411 ff. and 454 ff.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. Boethius 1877, 203.

<sup>7</sup> Of this last category, there are some possibilities that remain eternally unrealized because of some contingent development of events, such as that of the cloth that can be cut in half but which will wear out first (the example is from Aristotle’s *De interpretatione* IX 19a12–14), and there are some that are in principle unrealizable, for instance, the existence of an infinite number (Boethius 1877, 207, and Boethius 1880, 463).

substance. The relation between possibility and potentiality is implicitly assumed throughout the entire commentaries on *De interpretatione* 12–13, where Boethius often goes from talking about the *possibilitates* pertaining to a certain individual to the *potestates* or *potentiae* that this individual has to bring something about. On a few occasions, Boethius makes the connection between possibility and potentiality explicit, for instance, where he affirms that the signification of the term “possible” is derived from that of potency (*possibile a potestate trductum est*).<sup>8</sup> Similarly, in some passages he draws a parallel between the multiple meanings of the term *potestas* and the semantic ambivalence of the modal term *possibile*.<sup>9</sup> Boethius also thinks that when we affirm that something non-actual is possible, the affirmation is true if the predicated possibility corresponds to a potency or power that exists in a latent, “inactive” state (*potestate tantum*) in the subject. According to his view, certain capacities remain in their bearer even when they are not manifest, and, because of this we can say, for instance, that it is not impossible for a man who is not walking to walk, insofar as he possesses the *potestas* to do so.<sup>10</sup>

A special case of *extra-actum* possibilities are those that may be antecedently attributed to a bearer before their manifestation. Indeed, Boethius claims that every property or action manifested in a (contingent) subject is preceded by the corresponding potentiality to have that property or perform that action. For instance, he affirms that before I started to write, a *potentia scribendi* existed in me, which eventually came to actualization, thus allowing me to write.<sup>11</sup> At times, Boethius also speaks as if antecedent possibilities of this sort could be truly predicated of subjects that do not yet exist. He says that Socrates “can be” (*potest esse*) in those times that precede his existence, just as all other mortal beings are first potentially and then actually alive.<sup>12</sup> He also considers the case of an, as yet, non-existing house, saying that the potency of it being built exists before the house's construction,

---

<sup>8</sup> See Boethius 1880, 453.

<sup>9</sup> See Boethius 1877, 201–202.

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, Boethius 1880, 203: “nam et quae actu quidem non est, esse tamen poterat, ut homo cum non ambulat, ambulandi tamen retinet potestatem, non est eum impossibile ambulare.”

<sup>11</sup> See Boethius 1880, 413.

<sup>12</sup> See Boethius 1880, 411: “Possibilis duae sunt partes: unum quod cum non sit esse potest, alterum quod ideo praedicatur esse possibile, quia iam est quidem. Prior pars corruptibilis et permutabilis propria est. In mortalibus enim Socrates potest esse cum non fuit, sicut ipsi quoque mortales, qui sunt id quod antea non fuerunt. Potest enim homo cum non loquitur loqui et cum non ambulat ambulare” (my emphasis).

and it is by virtue of this potency that we could have truly said that “It is possible for the house to be,” when in fact there was no such house.<sup>13</sup>

Borrowing the terminology used in contemporary debates on the metaphysics of modality, we could say that Aristotle’s and Boethius’ account of possibility is *realist*, in the sense that “it recognizes [possibility] as a real and mind-independent feature of reality [...] Because possibility is grounded in potentiality, and potentialities are [...] real and mind-independent properties of real, mind-independent objects.”<sup>14</sup> In recent years, the interpretation of possibility in terms of potentiality has come back into fashion in contemporary metaphysics of modality, where it is usually defended by claiming that it is more intuitive than other accounts of possibility (e.g., possible-worlds semantics) and “firmly rooted in everyday life,” since potentialities are “ubiquitous in our ordinary thought about, and dealing with, the world.”<sup>15</sup> A further advantage of this interpretation is that grounding possibilities in potentialities, which are distinctive features of individuals, would allow for a finer-grained treatment of modality than the one permitted by the more classical possible-worlds framework.<sup>16</sup>

As Knuuttila has pointed out, many philosophers throughout the Middle Ages interpreted modalities by applying the potency-based account of possibility inspired by the works of Aristotle and Boethius.<sup>17</sup> As I mentioned above, however, this understanding of possibility was received with some discomfort by early medieval logicians, who were particularly interested in the nature of *extra-actum* possibilities predicated of future individuals or non-existent substances. Their reflection on this sort of modality uncovered some gaps in the traditional reading of possibilities in terms of potency. For instance, they thought that such a framework could not satisfactorily explain the meaning of propositions such as “it is possible for my future son to exist,” in which a possibility is attributed to an object that—not yet being in existence—can bear no capacity or disposition. As I propose in Section 2, concerns of this sort were already advanced in the works of Anselm of Canterbury, who asked whether we may antecedently attribute potencies to future objects, as when we say that a house can exist before its fabrication or that the world can exist before creation. In

---

<sup>13</sup> See Boethius 1877, 206: “quae actu sunt cum potestate, id est quae et actum habent et aliquando habuerunt potestatem, ut fabricata iam domus aliquando potuit fabricari et prius habuit potestatem secundum tempus, postea vero actum.” One may interpret this passage as if the relevant potentiality were attributed to some substance other than the house, for example, the builder of the house or the materials with which the house will be fabricated. However, Boethius does not explicitly appeal here to these explanations.

<sup>14</sup> See Vetter 2018, 291.

<sup>15</sup> See Vetter 2018, 292.

<sup>16</sup> See Borghini 2016, 159.

<sup>17</sup> See Knuuttila 2017, Section 2.

Sections 3 and 4 I show that Anselm’s examples, together with many other cases of the same sort, return in the texts of Abelard and his contemporaries in the early twelfth century. I then present some of the doubts that logicians of the time raised concerning the possibilities of future individuals and non-existent things, and their attempts at a new interpretation of possibility that could account for such cases.

## 2. Anselm on the predication of antecedent possibilities

One early discussion on the relation between potency and possibility—and on how this relation should work when possibilities are ascribed to non-things—is the one found in the *Philosophical Fragments*, an incomplete late work by Anselm of Canterbury. In the opening lines of this work, which has the form of a dialogue between a student and a master, the former poses a question concerning the notions of potency and impotency (*potestas et impotentia*) and possibility and impossibility (*possibilitas et impossibilitas*). One problem emerges from the fact that, on some occasions, we predicate possibilities of things that cannot bear any *potestas*. For instance, we say that a house that does not yet exist “can be” (*potest esse*), thus attributing possession of a certain potency (*potestas*) to it. Indeed, as Anselm remarks, every ascription of possibility involves the ascription of a correspondent potency, for no one doubts that whenever we say that something “can,” it does so by virtue of a potency (*Nullus enim negat omne, quod potest, potestate posse*).<sup>18</sup> The case under consideration is the same as that used by Boethius in his first commentary on *De interpretatione* to exemplify possibilities *extra-actum*. Anselm’s student—who explicitly declares that no *potest* phrase could be true without an ascription of *potestas* being implicitly involved—seems to adopt the Boethian understanding of possibility as potency described in Section 1.

The student then proceeds by construing an argument *ad absurdum*, stating that since a non-existing thing cannot bear any potency, it possesses neither the potency to exist nor the potency not to exist. From this, it follows that (i) *it is not possible for it to exist* and that (ii) *it is not possible for it not to exist*. But from (i), it follows that *it is necessary for it not to exist*, and from (ii) that *it is necessary for it to exist*, by virtue of the inferential rules holding among modal propositions. We may

---

<sup>18</sup> See Anselm of Canterbury 1969, 341,1–12: “DISCIPULUS. Plura sunt, de quibus tuam diu desidero responcionem. Ex quibus sunt postestas et impotentia, possibilitas et impossibilitas, necessitas atque libertas. Quas idcirco simul quaerendo connumero, quia earum mihi mixta videtur cognitio. In quibus quid me moveat, ex parte aperiam, ut cum de his mihi satisfeceris, ad alia, ad quae intendo, facilius progrediar. Dicimus namque potestatem esse aliquando, in quo nulla est potestas. Nullus enim negat omne, quod potest, potestate posse. Cum ergo asserimus, quod non est, posse esse, dicimus potestatem esse in eo, quod non est; quod intelligere nequeo, velut cum dicimus domum posse esse, quae nondum est. In eo namque, quod non est, nulla potestas est.”

then conclude that for the same (non-existent) thing, it is necessary both to be and not to be, which is absurd.<sup>19</sup>

Because the *Fragments* are interrupted before the master in the dialogue advances his solution to the student's puzzle, one can only try to reconstruct Anselm's way out of the paradox. As Serene notes, one way to solve cases such as the one raised by the student would be to "transfer" the ability that cannot be ascribed to the non-existent thing (in this case, the future house) to some other subject. In this way, one could paraphrase the modal proposition about the house's possibility as being in fact about some other subject's capacities, for example, the builder of the house. This, however, does not seem to be Anselm's strategy here, as he relies instead on distinguishing between proper and improper ascriptions of the term "possible." Anselm does not reject the traditional view, according to which the term "possible" properly expresses a potency or capacity existing in a subject; rather, he suggests that in certain cases the modal term is used improperly. This happens when the thing to which the capacity is attributed could be considered a subject only in an improper sense, for example, when it is a non-existing being. Rather than understanding the details of Anselm's solution, what is important here is to acknowledge that the argument raised by Anselm in the *Philosophical Fragments* unveils a fragility in the traditional, potency-based interpretation of possibilities, as it suggests that the interrelation between possibility and potency needs to be further explained in cases in which non-existing beings are used as the subjects of modal claims.<sup>20</sup>

Similar concerns about the ascription of possibilities to things that are yet to exist are raised by Anselm in the twelfth chapter of *De casu diaboli*. Here, while seeking an answer to the problem of whether an angel has the ability to will even though he has never exercised it, another discussion between a master and a student begins about possibilities that are predicated antecedently to their actualization (*de potestate quae praecedat rem*). According to the student, everything that is, at a certain time, actual was possible before being actualized. Indeed, as he points out, if it were not possible for something to be, this would never have actualized (*Si enim non potuisset, numquam esset*). The master replies that if something did not exist at an earlier time, it did not possess either the potency to exist or any other potency (*potestas*), for something that does not exist is nothing, and therefore it would seem that no possibility could be predicated of it (*quod nihil est omnino nihil habet, et ideo nullam habet potestatem, et sine potestate omnino nihil potest*). This discussion is then applied

---

<sup>19</sup> See Anselm of Canterbury 1969, 341,12–39; for a detailed analysis of this argument, see Serene 1981 and Knuuttila 2004.

<sup>20</sup> For this reconstruction of Anselm, see Serene 1981, 120–1. Cf. in particular p. 121: "The paradoxical status of the future house is symptomatic of two gaps in the Aristotelian-Boethian view of modalities: the lack of a systematic explanation of the relationship between capacity and possibility, and the lack of an adequate treatment of antecedent ascription of capacity or possibility to particular subjects."



to a specific case: Was it possible for the world to exist before its creation? On the one hand, one would intuitively say that it was, since there could be no actuality without a former possibility of something being the case. On the other hand, because the world was entirely nothing before its creation, it had no capability, and therefore no “*potest*” phrase about it could have been true.

The teacher “solves” the puzzle by saying that it was both possible and impossible that the world existed before creation: impossible because no potency could be predicated of a non-existing subject; and possible because another agent (God) had the ability to cause the world to exist before he actually created it.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, a modal proposition such as “it is possible for an S to be P” is said to be true in two senses: when “S” has the potency (*potestas*) to be P; or when some other thing has the potency to actualize what the proposition “S is P” says.<sup>22</sup> The teacher remarks, however, that the latter is an improper use of the term “possible,” because possibility is properly used to ascribe a certain ability to the proposition’s subject, that is, to the thing denoted by “S.” If we speak accurately, then, no possibility can be predicated of subjects that do not yet exist.<sup>23</sup>

Both examples of antecedent predications of possibility employed by Anselm in the *De Casu Diaboli* and the *Philosophical Fragments*—that is, the possibility of a house being fabricated before its actual existence and the possibility of the world existing before creation—return in logical sources from the early twelfth century, together with new cases involving the possibilities of non-things, such as chimaeras, goat-stags or future sons. Similarly to Anselm, early twelfth-century authors asked what is signified by the term “possible” in such cases, where there is no proper subject in which to ground the relevant potentialities. Differently from what Anselm suggests in *De casu diaboli*, though, early twelfth-century logicians did not resort to the idea that these sorts of possibility could be ontologically grounded in God and his power. As far as I know, there is only one text in which this strategy is mentioned, namely, the *Dialectica* of Garlandus, a logical treatise whose dating is still uncertain but which was probably written at the turn of the twelfth century.<sup>24</sup> While distinguishing between absolute

---

<sup>21</sup> Anselm of Canterbury 1946-1961, vol. I, 253: “Et possibile et impossibile erat antequam esset. Ei quidem in cuius potestate non erat ut esset, erat impossibile; sed deo in cuius potestate erat ut fieret, erat possibile. Quia ergo deus prius potuit facere mundum quam fieret, ideo est mundus, non quia ipse mundus potuit prius esse.” This reference to God’s ability to create the world as existing “before” (*prius*) creation should perhaps be interpreted as a natural priority rather than a temporal one. The latter interpretation would in fact commit Anselm to the assumption that there existed time before creation, which he does not explicitly state here.

<sup>22</sup> Anselm of Canterbury 1946-61, vol. I, 253-4: “Ita ergo quidquid non est, antequam sit sua potestate non potest esse; sed si potest alia res facere ut sit, hoc modo aliena potestate potest esse.”

<sup>23</sup> For this analysis of Anselm’s argument, see Serene 1981, 126; Knuuttila 2004, 119.

<sup>24</sup> The authorship of this logical textbook is still debatable. Iwakuma (Iwakuma 1992, 47-54) argued that the author should be identified with Garlandus of Besançon, who died after 1148, and not with Garlandus Compotista, who was believed by de Rijk to be the author. Because of the uncertainty concerning the authorship, the dating of the

and determinate modal propositions, Garlandus considers the claim “it is possible for birds to fly” (*possibile est avem volare*), which was employed in Boethius’ *De hypotheticis syllogismis* as an example of *absolute* modal proposition, namely, as a proposition in which the modal term is not qualified by any temporal determination and which, as such, must be applied to all times (“*omni tempore*”).<sup>25</sup> For the proposition to be true, Garlandus notes that it must be possible for birds to fly even in those times in which they do not exist. Garlandus maintains that this proposition is indeed omnitemporally true, because even when there are no birds it is still *possible for God* to create them and make them fly.<sup>26</sup> Not dissimilarly from what Anselm proposes in *De casu diaboli*, then, Garlandus suggests that the possibilities of non-existent things may be ontologically grounded in the power that God has to bring them about. To my knowledge, however, this is the only case in which such an explanation is put forward in early twelfth-century logical sources. Rather, the common strategy that we find in this period to deal with modalities of non-things and *extra-actum* possibilities was to substitute the traditional view of possibilities as potencies or powers embedded in things with a new interpretation of the term “possible,” as I show in the next section.

### 3. Early twelfth-century logicians on the signification of modal terms

Many sources from the first decades of the twelfth century raise questions concerning the proper interpretation of the modal terms “possible,” “impossible,” and “necessary.” A doubt about the signification of modes that often returns in logical texts of this time is whether or not the term “*possibile*” has denotation, that is, whether there is some existing *res* to which it refers. Specifically, Abelard’s contemporaries were interested in whether this term denotes a form or property existing in things, so that when we say “it is possible for Socrates to be a man,” what we mean is that a *possibilitas* of some sort inheres in Socrates. A discussion of this topic may be found in Abelard’s *Dialectica* (circa 1110–1115), as well as in an anonymous commentary on *De Interpretatione* labeled *H9*,<sup>27</sup> and in a brief treatise on modalities, also anonymous but containing references to masters of the time, such as William of Champeaux and Joscelyn of Soissons, labeled *M3*.<sup>28</sup> These last two texts

---

*Dialectica* also remains an open question. Marenbon suggests that the text could have been written any time between the 1080s (or even earlier) and the 1120s (see Marenbon 2011, 194–6 on this).

<sup>25</sup> See Boethius 1969, 238.

<sup>26</sup> See Garlandus Compotista 1959, 84: “Item possibile est quod absolute omni tempore contingere potest, ut ‘possibile est avem volare’: licet enim avis omni tempore non sit, potest tamen contingere ut fiat a Deo et ut volet.”

<sup>27</sup> *H9*: Orléans, Bibl. Municipale, 266, pp. 5a–43a; Assisi, Bibl. Conv. Franc., 573, fols. 48rb–67vb. A catalogue of twelfth-century logical texts, including some unpublished sources, to which I will refer in this article, may be found in Marenbon 1993 (republished and updated in Marenbon 2000a).

<sup>28</sup> *M3*: Orléans, Bibl. Municipale, 266, pp. 252b–257b.

are preserved in the same manuscript and are probably to be dated around the same time in which Abelard wrote the *Dialectica*, with *H9* supposedly being the oldest among the three texts, and perhaps a common source for both Abelard and the author of *M3*. Despite maintaining very different opinions with respect to the logic of modal propositions, the authors of these three texts answer in the negative as to whether the term “possible” signifies a property inhering in things, and they employ similar arguments to justify their position. This may lead us to suppose that this was a shared opinion in their time, and indeed there is no evidence of people defending the opposite view.

In the *Dialectica* Abelard reports that it is the opinion of “some” that by predicating terms such as “possible” and “necessary,” one attributes a certain property (*aliqua proprietas*) to a substance. This cannot be the case, Abelard continues, for if modal terms signified an intrinsic feature of things, then every modal proposition about non-existent objects should turn out to be false, since non-things can bear no property. However, evidently there are many such propositions that are true, such as “it is possible for my future son to exist” (*filium futurum possibile est esse*)<sup>29</sup> or “it is necessary for chimaeras not to be humans” (*nesesse est chimaeram non esse hominem*). Therefore, he concludes, nothing is attributed to non-things by means of modal terms:

We shall now investigate whether any property is predicated by means of nominal modes,<sup>30</sup> as some people want. They say that by the noun “possible” a possibility is predicated, and a necessity by the noun “necessary”, so that when we say “It is possible (or necessary) for Socrates to be” we attribute a certain possibility or a certain necessity to him. But this is false. There are many affirmations of this sort that are true even though they are about non-existent things, which – being non-existent – admit no property of accidents. Indeed, what does not exist cannot bear anything existent. Of this sort of modals [that is, nominal modal claims], the following are true: “It is possible for my future son to exist”, “It is possible for a chimaera not to exist” or

---

<sup>29</sup> In the glosses on *De interpretatione* contained in the *Logica Ingredientibus*, Abelard offers a different reading of such modal propositions, stating that all claims about possibility and necessity (with the exception of those that are impersonal in both grammatical construction and meaning) have an implicit existential import. Recurring to the same example used in the *Dialectica*, he affirms that the proposition “it is possible for my future son to exist” is false if there is no actual object to which the subject term refers (Abelard 2010, 417). On this, see Binini 2018.

<sup>30</sup> In logical sources of this time, nominal modes (*casuales modi*) are opposed to adverbial ones. Propositions containing adverbial and nominal modes are considered by some authors to have a different nature and different semantics. Other authors, such as Abelard, argue instead that every nominal proposition, despite a few exceptions, may be rephrased as having a corresponding adverbial form. On the relation between these two categories of modal, see Binini forthcoming.

“It is necessary for chimaeras not to be human”; nonetheless, nothing is taken to be attributed to non-existent things by means of these propositions.<sup>31</sup>

Moreover, Abelard continues, paradoxical consequences would follow on from interpreting modes as attributing properties to substances, for instance, “if S will exist, then S presently exists.” Suppose that a certain subject S will exist in some future time. We may then infer that it is possible for S to exist (Abelard does not justify this inference here, but he uses it elsewhere by arguing that “whatever is future is possible”).<sup>32</sup> But if we take the term “possible” to refer to a certain property of *possibilitas* existing in the subject, this implies that “S has the *possibilitas* to exist” (*possibilitatem existendi habet*) and therefore that it exists now, which would contradict the premise. Similarly, we may argue that “if S does not exist, it exists,” for if the subject does not exist, then it is possible for it not to exist (it would seem, by virtue of the principle—commonly accepted in early medieval logic—that whatever is actual is possible), and therefore S has the possibility not to exist, which implies that S exists.<sup>33</sup> Note that even though Abelard uses these arguments to deny that the term “possible” refers to a form of “*possibilitas*,” what they in fact show is more general, namely, that modal terms do not denote *any property* or intrinsic feature of the things that are denoted by the proposition’s subject.

On at least two other occasions, Abelard denies that the predication of a possibility amounts to the ascription of a property to a thing. In one passage of the *Dialectica* he writes that when we say that someone *is able* (*potens*) to do or be something, we understand no form as being posited by this term, but we only intend that being in a certain way is not repugnant to the nature of the subject.<sup>34</sup> The same idea is repeated once more in the same work, where Abelard says that, when affirming that

---

<sup>31</sup> Abelard 1970, 204: “Nunc autem utrum aliqua proprietas per modalia nomina, ut quidam volunt, praedic[ar]etur, persequamur. Aiunt enim per ‘*possibile*’ possibilitatem praedicari, per ‘*necesse*’ necessitatem, ut, cum dicimus: ‘*possibile est Socratem esse vel necesse*’, possibilitatem aut necessitatem ei attribuimus. Sed falso est. Multae verae sunt affirmationes huiusmodi etiam de non existentibus rebus, quae, cum non sint, nullorum accidentium proprietates recipiunt. Quod enim non est, id quod est sustentare non potest. Sunt itaque huiusmodi verae: ‘*filium futurum possibile est esse*’, ‘*chimaeram possibile est non esse*’, vel ‘*necesse est non esse hominem*’; nihil tamen attribui per ista his quae non sunt, intelligitur.”

<sup>32</sup> See Abelard 1970, 196: “*Quod futurum est, possibile est.*”

<sup>33</sup> Abelard 1970, 204: “Alioquin haberemus quod, si erit, tunc est, vel, si non est, est. Quod sic ostenditur: ‘si erit, possibile est esse’; unde ‘et possibilitatem existendi habet’, unde ‘et est’; qua re ‘si erit, et est’. Sic quoque: ‘si non est, est’, ostenditur: ‘si non est, possibile est non esse’; unde ‘et possibilitatem non-existendi habet’; unde ‘est’; ‘si non est, est’.”

<sup>34</sup> Abelard 1970, 98: “Sic quoque et potentiae non esse album, cum sit actus non esse album, ipsi tamen universaliter subdi non potest, ut videlicet dicamus omne quod non est album potentiam illam habere, sed fortasse ita: ‘*potens non esse album*,’ ut nullam formam in nomine ‘*potentis*’ intelligamus, sed id tantum quod naturae non repugnet; in qua quidem significatione nomine ‘*possibilis*’ in modalibus propositionibus utimur.”

“it is possible for Socrates to be a man,” we do not attribute any property to anyone (*non aliquam alicui attribuimus proprietatem*); we simply say that the content of the proposition “Socrates is a man” is one of the things that “nature allows” (*unum de his quae natura patitur esse*).<sup>35</sup>

The idea that the predication of modal terms does not amount to a predication of forms or properties of things is also proposed in commentary *H9* (whose arguments Abelard might in fact be rehearsing), in which the author concludes that the modal terms “possible,” “impossible,” and “necessary” “do not posit the existence of anything in the substances that modal propositions are about” (*nichil ponunt in rebus de quibus agitur in propositionibus illis*). The author of *H9* proposes an argument *ad absurdum* that starts by considering a case in which no thing exists. He then infers the proposition “it is not possible for Socrates to be a stone,” the truth of which seems to be implicitly derived by the truth of “Socrates does not exist” and the consequent “Socrates has no *possibilitas*.” The author then infers that “it is impossible for Socrates to be a stone,” by virtue of the laws of equipollence among modes, replacing “not possible” with “impossible.” Finally, he says that if we intend this affirmation as positing the existence of an *impossibile* in the subject, then we must admit that the subject actually exists, which contradicts the premise. “For this reason – the author concludes – we should say that, when ‘possible’, ‘impossible’ and ‘necessary’ are predicated in modal claims, they signify possibility, impossibility and necessity, but they do not posit the existence of anything in the substances that modal propositions are about (*nihil ponunt circa res de quibus agitur in propositionibus modalibus*).”<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Abelard 1970, 205: “Similiter et quando dicimus: ‘*possibile est Socratem esse hominem*,’ non aliquam alicui attribuimus proprietatem, sed id dicimus quod id quod dicit haec propositio: ‘*Socrates est homo*,’ est unum de his quae natura patitur esse.” The use of the term “*natura*” in this and similar contexts is still not yet entirely understood. On some occasions, Abelard and other authors of his time use “nature” to talk about the nature of individual substances (e.g., *natura Socratis*). Elsewhere, they talk about the nature of species of genera (e.g., the nature of human beings), or even about nature in a more general sense, such as “*Natura rerum*.” In the passage in question, it seems to me that Abelard is using “*natura*” in this latter and wider sense, but this is open to speculation. On the notion of nature in Abelard, see, for example, King 2004 and Binini 2021.

<sup>36</sup> See *H9*: Orléans, Bibl. Municipale, 266, p. 37a–b: “Notandum etiam quod iste voces ‘*possibile*’, ‘*necessarium*’ et alii modi qui predicantur, nichil ponunt in rebus de quibus agitur in propositionibus illis. Si enim ponerent, sequeretur: ‘*si nichil est, aliquid est*’ hoc modo. Verum est enim ‘*si non est possibile Socratem esse lapidem, tunc impossibile est Socratem esse lapidem*’. Et si quia non est possibile Socratem esse lapidem, impossibile est Socratem esse lapidem, et quia non est possibile Socratem esse lapidem, Socrates habet impossibile, et ita Socrates est. Et si quia non est possibile Socratem esse lapidem, Socrates est, et quia nichil est, Socrates est – ab antecedenti, quia si nichil est, Socrates non est; si Socrates non est, non habet possibile, et ita non est possibile eum esse lapidem. Quare si nichil est, aliquid est. Quare dicendum est – quando ‘*possibile*’ et ‘*impossibile*’ et ‘*neceesse*’ in modalibus praedicantur – quod significant possibilitatem et impossibilitatem et necessitatem, sed nihil ponunt circa res de quibus agitur in propositionibus modalibus.”

In the treatise *M3*, where the author advances a theory on the signification of modal propositions that is in many respects opposite to that of Abelard,<sup>37</sup> we again find the question about whether the existence of any property is predicated by means of modal nouns (*utrum aliqua proprietas per modalia nomina ponatur*). And, again, we find the idea that this view leads to paradoxical consequences, such as “if something does not exist, it exists” (*si non est, est*) or “if something will exist, it exists now” (*si erit, est*).<sup>38</sup> Having offered this and other arguments, the author of *M3* insists that “clearly many inconveniences follow if we admit that the existence of something is posited by modal words” (*videamus utrum aliqua proprietas per modalia nomina ponatur. Si enim per ea aliquid ponitur, multa sequentur inconvenientia*).

In another passage of *M3*, the author considers modal propositions about non-things and points out that they reveal important aspects concerning the signification of modal terms. He says that there are some who interpret modal claims such as “for every human it is possible to be an animal,” as if the modal term posited the existence of something (a *possibilitas*) possessed by the subject. This interpretation, however, fails to account for the many cases in which modal claims are true despite their dealing with *non-existent things*, such as “it is possible for a chimaera not to be a goat-stag” or even “it is possible for the world to be created” (*possibile mundum fieri*), if uttered before the creation of the world. The author takes both propositions to be evidently true, and yet he wonders which thing would be the “possessor” of the possibility, if nothing exists:

There are some who expound [nominal propositions such as] “for every man to be an animal is possible” in this way: “things have the possibility that every man is an animal”. But this cannot be right. Indeed, it is true that “for chimaeras not to be goat-stags is possible”. [To which] we will say: How would things have the possibility that chimaeras were not goat-stags? After all, there are no things having that possibility, because neither chimaeras nor any other thing exist. And yet the proposition is true. In the same way, if before the creation of the world one said: “It is possible for the world to be made”, this proposition would be true, but which things would have

---

<sup>37</sup> For the analysis of the theory of modals included in *M3* and a comparison with Abelard, see Binini forthcoming.

<sup>38</sup> See *M3*, p. 254b: “Investigato sensu modalium, videamus utrum aliqua proprietas per modalia nomina ponatur. Si enim per ea aliquid ponitur, multa sequentur inconvenientia. [...] Item “*si erit, et est*”, sic: Si Socrates erit, possibile est esse Socratem; et sic Socrates habet possibilitatem existendi; et ita est. Item si non est, non possibile est esse, quia si est possibile esse, et est. Si Socratem esse est possibile, Socrates habet possibilitatem existendi; et ita possibilitas est in Socrate; et ita est.”

the possibility of the world being made, if nothing whatsoever existed? Thanks to this and many other examples, it can be shown that their exposition [of modals] is incorrect.<sup>39</sup>

The author of *M3* seems to suggest not only that modal terms fail to denote the *possibilitates* existing in the modal proposition's subject, but also that we cannot "relocate" these possibilities as existing in any other subject. In a case in which the world did not yet exist, there would be no *res* bearing the relevant potency, but it would still be true to predicate the possibility of its existence. The example concerning the antecedent possibility of the world to exist is the same as the one brought up by Anselm in *De casu diaboli*, as seen in the previous section. However, differently from what Anselm says there, the idea that God's power may grant the truth of propositions such as "it is possible for the world to exist" is not mentioned here; nor is it generally put forward in other early twelfth-century logical sources. In the contrary, their authors seem to lean towards the idea that some possibilities could be admitted without being analyzed in terms of properties or intrinsic features that substances possess, thereby abandoning the traditional potency account of possibility.

Were early twelfth-century authors aware that, by rejecting the traditional potency account, they were also discarding part of Aristotle's legacy on modalities? At least Abelard seems to realize this, as in the *Logica Ingredientibus* he counters Aristotle's view of possibility with his own, saying that Aristotle interpreted the term "*possibile*" as referring to some *possibilitas* or *potestas*, that is, to some form or property existing in a substance, and therefore he made "possible" "a name of things" (*nomen rerum*), that is, a name denoting some real component of reality. Abelard claims to have abandoned this idea, and he thinks that no form or property is understood by the terms "possible" or "necessary":

Note that, from the words of Aristotle, when he speaks of "possibilities" (*potestates*) it seems that in the name "possible" he understands a certain form, that is, a certain potency or possibility, which seems to make [the name "possible"] a name of things (*nomen rerum*) – a position that we have rejected above. We, on the contrary, do not understand any form when

---

<sup>39</sup> See *M3*, p. 254b: "Sunt qui exponant ita '*Omnem hominem esse animal est possibile*': res habent possibilitatem quod omnis homo sit animal. Sed hoc nihil est. Vera est enim '*chimaeram non esse hircocervum est possibile*'. Dicemus: quomodo [*corrected from: dicemus modo quod*] res habent possibilitatem quod chimaera non sit hircocervus, quippe nullae res habent illam possibilitatem, quia neque chimaera neque alia, tamen vera est illa propositio. Item antequam mundus fieret, si diceretur '*possibile mundum fieri*', vera esset talis propositio; sed cum nulla res esset, quae res habebant possibilitatem ut mundus fieret? His et multis aliis exemplis nulla esse ostenditur illa expositio."

speaking of “possibility” or “necessity”, but we expound [these terms] according to the meaning of modals.<sup>40</sup>

In the *Logica* Abelard further stresses this “*de-reification*” of the notion of possibility. Appealing to his twofold theory of signification, he argues that modal terms have no denotation (*nominatio*), for they do not refer to substances or to any form possessed by a subject, and that they do not have signification (*significatio*) either, for no image is caused in the hearer’s mind when they are uttered outside of a context.<sup>41</sup> After rehearsing what he had already said in the *Dialectica*—namely, that “we cannot take modal terms as forms inhering in things” (*quasi formas aliquas in rebus*), otherwise, modal propositions about non-existent beings could not be true—Abelard goes on to say that “possible” and “necessary” only signify when they are considered in the linguistic context in which they are embedded, as they express a *way of conceiving* the things that are conjoined to them:

Since [the modal nouns] “possible” and “necessary” are not derivative (*sumpta*) expressions, and they neither contain any thing by denoting it nor determine any form, it should be asked what is it that they signify. Indeed, when it is said “It is possible for what is not to be”, or “It is necessary for God to exist” or again “It is necessary for chimaeras not to exist”, we do not intend this in the sense that certain forms exist in such things. We say that in propositions of this sort [the terms] “necessary” and “possible” co-signify rather than having a signification of their own, because nothing is understood in them unless they are applied to the phrase (*oratio*) that is the subject. And therefore, these terms *express a way of conceiving* the things that the subject phrase is about, just as an interposed verb or the conjunction “if” (which expresses a necessity of conjunction) would do. And, just as in the case of these last expressions no image is created in the understanding, but by means of the verb or the conjunction the mind captures a certain way of conceiving those things that are adjoined to them, the same happens for the terms

---

<sup>40</sup> Abelard 2010, 472: “Nota etiam quod ex verbis Aristotelis, cum ait ‘*potestates*’, videtur ipse in hoc nomine ‘*possibile*’ (quod etiam nomen rerum facere videtur) potestatem sive possibilitatem, quandam formam, intelligere, cum ipsum in modalibus propositionibus ponit; quod supra negavimus. Nos tamen, cum dicit ‘*potestatem*’ vel ‘*necessitatem*,’ nullas intelligimus formas sed iuxta sensum modalium omnia exponimus.”

<sup>41</sup> On the notion of *consignificatio* in Abelard and in the grammatical tradition of the late eleventh-century *Glosulae* on Priscian, see for example, Rosier-Catach 2003.



“possible” and “necessary”. And here with “necessary” the meaning is what is inevitable, and with “possible” what is not incompatible with nature.<sup>42</sup>

#### 4. A new understanding of possibility

At the end of the passage from the *Logica Ingredientibus* quoted above, Abelard mentions his idea, already encountered in other passages, that the modal term “possible” should be understood in terms of “what is not incompatible with nature” (*non repugnans naturae*). This characterization of possibility often recurs in both the *Dialectica*<sup>43</sup> and the *Logica Ingredientibus*,<sup>44</sup> and it is at the basis of Abelard’s theory of modalities.<sup>45</sup> Indeed, as Martin recently pointed out, the same definition returns in other logical sources from the early twelfth century and seems to be a standard characterization in this period.<sup>46</sup> In Abelard’s *Dialectica*, the definition of possibility as non-repugnancy with nature is presented in connection with his explanation of unrealized possibilities: in a well-known passage, Abelard states that the truth value of propositions about possibility does not depend on the actual happening (or non-happening) of things, for there are certain things that are possible even though they are never actualized, for instance, that Socrates is a bishop. What is needed for a proposition such as “it is possible for Socrates to be a bishop” to be true is the absence of an incompatibility relation (*non repugnantia*) between what is expressed by the predicate and the nature of the thing denoted by the subject, namely, Socrates.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> See Abelard 2010, 407–408: “At vero cum ‘*possibile*’ vel ‘*necessarium*’ sumpta non sint nec res aliquas nominando contineant nec formas determinant, quid significant quaerendum est; non enim, cum dicitur: ‘*Id quod non est possibile est esse*’ vel: ‘*Deum necesse est esse*’ vel: ‘*Chimaeram necesse est non esse*’ quasi formas aliquas in rebus accipimus. Dicimus itaque necessarium sive possibile in huiusmodi enuntiationibus magis consignificare quam per se significationem habere; nil quippe in eis est intelligendum nisi subiectae orationi applicentur, et tunc modum concipiendi faciunt circa res subiectae orationis sicut facit verbum interpositum vel coniunctio *si*, quae ad necessitatem copulat; ac, sicut in istis nulla imagine nititur intellectus sed quendam concipiendi modum anima capit per verbum vel per coniunctionem circa res earum vocum quibus adiunguntur, ita per *possibile* et *necessarium*. Et est hoc loco necessarium pro inevitabili, possibile quasi non repugnans naturae.”

<sup>43</sup> See, for example, Abelard 1970, 98; 176; 196–198; 200–204; 385.

<sup>44</sup> See, for example, Abelard 2010, 266; 408; 414–415.

<sup>45</sup> On Abelard’s paradigm of possibility as non-repugnance with nature, see Knuuttila 1993; Martin 2001; Martin 2004; Thom 2003; Marenbon 2000b.

<sup>46</sup> See Martin 2016, 121.

<sup>47</sup> See Abelard 1970, 193–194: “‘*Possibile*’ quidem et ‘*contingens*’ idem prorsus sonant. Nam ‘*contingens*’ hoc loco <non> quod actu contingit accipimus, sed quod contingere potest, si etiam numquam contingat, dummodo natura rei non repugnaret ad hoc ut contingat, sed patiaturo contingere; ut, cum dicimus: ‘*Socratem possibile est esse episcopum*’, etsi numquam sit, tamen verum est, cum natura ipsius episcopo non repugnet; quod ex aliis eiusdem speciei individuis perpendimus, quae proprietatem episcopi iam actu participare videmus. Quicquid enim actu contingit in uno, idem in omnibus eiusdem speciei individuis contingere posse arbitramur, quippe eiusdem sunt omnino naturae.”

Similarly to Abelard, Garlandus advances the same understanding of possibility in connection to the notion of *extra-actum* possibilities: while commenting on Aristotle’s idea at the end of *De Interpretatione* 13 concerning the existence of some “pure potencies,” Garlandus states that these are said to be “possible,” though never actualized, insofar as they are not incompatible with nature (*nec natura repugnat nec tamen umquam erit*).<sup>48</sup> Early twelfth-century logicians were particularly attracted to possibilities that remain perpetually *extra-actum*, and indeed we may suppose that they may have favored the explanation of possibility in terms of non-repugnancy with nature in order to account for unactualized (and unactualizable) possibilities.

At least two other mentions of this same definition of possibility can be found in sources of the time. Though brief, these mentions are interesting because they suggest that this particular interpretation of possibility might have been elaborated in the early twelfth century in response to the ontological concerns related to “problematic” possibilities, such as those that are predicated of non-existent or future things, which could not be accounted for in terms of properties or potentialities inhering in substances. The first occurrence is in the commentary *H9*, where the anonymous author, while presenting Boethius’ *divisio* of the many species of “possible,” argues that some *possibilia* may come to actualization after having existed in potency at an earlier time. Borrowing the example that Boethius uses in his first commentary on *De interpretatione*, the author of commentary *H9* claims that a house that now exists in act was already existing *potestate*, as an *extra-actum* potency, before it was fabricated. Perhaps willing to further explain how possibility can be predicated of something that does not yet exist, the author remarks that things of this sort are said to be possible before their existence (*prius potuerunt existere quam fuerunt*), in the sense that their existence is not incompatible with nature (*ita quod natura non repugnat*).<sup>49</sup> Although this passage is so brief that any conclusions drawn from it should be regarded as speculative, it is interesting that the analysis of possibility as “non-incompatibility with nature” comes up in connection with the same example that puzzled Anselm’s student in the *Philosophical Fragments*. As we saw in Section 2, the student wondered how

---

<sup>48</sup> See Garlandus Computista 1959, 83–84: “Potentia vero extra actum quam effectus non consequitur, est illa cui nec natura repugnat nec tamen umquam erit, ut cum dico: ‘*possibile est Iarlandum fieri episcopum*’, numquam tamen episcopus erit.” Notice that, differently from Abelard in the *Dialectica*, Garlandus speaks here not of the nature of a thing but of nature in general.

<sup>49</sup> See *H9*, p. 39b: “Possibilia alia sunt in actu, alia numquam in actu. Subdividit ea etiam que sunt in actu, sic: quod alia sunt in actu sine precedente potestate, ut divine substantie, alia vero sunt in actu cum precedente potestate, idest prius habuerunt potestatem quam actum, ut fabricata domus. [...] Que, scilicet ea que sunt in actu, priora sunt et digniora scilicet potestatibus natura, idest per naturam ipsius actus. Actus namque natura et dignitate precedunt solas potestates, sed vera sunt posteriora in tempore ipsis potestatibus. Potestas namque, ut dictum est, eos actus secundum tempus precedit. Vel sic. Que priora sunt natura, idest naturaliter, prius potuerunt existere quam fuerunt et *ita quod natura non repugnat*; tempore vero, idest secundum tempus existendi actu, sunt posteriora se ipsis quantum ad hoc quod natura prius potuerunt existere. Alia vero numquam sunt, sed potestate sola, ut quod rusticus fiat episcopus vel rex.” (my emphasis)

one could account for possibilities that are antecedently ascribed to a particular subject, given that no capacity or power could be provided to ground them. While treating the same example, the author of *H9* seems to suggest that possibilities of this sort need not be ontologically grounded in some modal property embedded in things, for the term “possible” merely expresses the absence of an incompatibility between a certain predication and “nature” taken in a general sense.

A passage of the treatise *M3* also suggests that this new account of possibility was developed to avoid the embarrassment of providing an ontological foundation for possibilities based on modal properties, therefore allowing for predication of modalities to non-things. As I mentioned above, the author of this treatise rejects the idea that modal terms signify properties existing in substances, because he thinks that propositions such as “it is possible for Socrates to be an animal” are true, even though Socrates does not actually exist and therefore cannot bear any property. Once he has presented the many difficulties that would follow from interpreting possibilities as forms existing in things, the author mentions a strategy designed by “Master W.” (probably, William of Champeaux) to expound the signification of modes without an undesired ontological commitment to special kinds of property or to these properties’ bearers. According to Master W’s interpretation, propositions such as “it is possible for Socrates to be an animal” should be expounded “in a negative sense” (*in negativo sensu*), that is, to mean that: “It is not repugnant to the nature of the thing that Socrates is an animal” (*Socratem esse animal est possibile, id est non repugnat natura rei Socratem esse animal*).<sup>50</sup> Again, saying that something is possible amounts to saying that no relation of incompatibility exists between a certain predication and the nature of things, and this could be the case even if the thing in question does not exist.

## 5. Conclusion

The interest in the modalities of non-existent things or future things pushed logicians from the early twelfth century to reconsider the semantics of modal propositions and the nature of possibility. As seen in Section 2, concerns about the signification of the term “possible” were already present in the works of Anselm of Canterbury, who wondered how the construal of possibilities in terms of

---

<sup>50</sup> See *M3*, p. 255a: “Investigato sensu modalium, videamus utrum aliqua proprietas per modalia nomina ponatur. Si enim per ea aliquid ponitur, multa sequentur inconvenientia. [...] Item si non est, non possibile est esse, quia si est possibile esse, et est. Si Socratem esse est possibile, Socrates habet possibilitatem existendi; et ita possibilitas est in Socrate; et ita est. Quare si possibile est esse, et est. Quare ‘si non est, non est possibile esse’ haec et plura alia inconvenientia, si per modales voces aliquid ponatur, sequi manifestum est. Unde m. W. exponebat eas in negativo sensu, ut istam: ‘Socratem esse animal est possibile’, id est non repugnat natura rei Socratem esse animal.”

potencies, inherited by Aristotle and Boethius, could be compatible with attributing possibilities to not yet existing things, for example when affirming the possibility for a future house to be fabricated or the possibility for the world to exist before creation. Anselm did not abandon the idea that the term “possible” properly denotes a potentiality or a power embedded in a subject, but he unveils an unsolved issue in the traditional explanation of possibilities as potencies, suggesting that this explanation could hardly account for cases in which possibilities are truly predicated of non-existent objects.

As I proposed in Section 3, in early twelfth-century logical sources examples concerning the modalities of non-things and future beings are multiplied, highlighting their authors’ interest in the ontology of modalities. Logicians of this time wanted to speak about things having certain possibilities without “anchoring” them in the individuals and without committing themselves to the existence of either modal properties or the bearers of these properties, and in order to do so they unanimously ruled out the idea that modal nouns denote properties existing in substances. To defend this view, authors of the time have recourse to arguments having a similar structure: they admit that certain modal propositions are true even though they predicate the possibilities of a non-existent subject, such as “it is possible for my future son to exist” or “it is not possible for (a non-existing) Socrates to be a stone,” and they show that if the term “possible” is taken to refer to a form inhering in the subject, paradoxical consequences will follow. They therefore deny that the predication of a possibility amounts to the ascription of a property to a thing, and they say that, in fact, terms such as “possible” and “necessary” do not posit the existence of anything in the substances that modal propositions are about (“*nihil ponunt circa res de quibus agitur in propositionibus modalibus*,” as the author of *H9* claims). Interestingly, there is agreement on this thesis even among logicians that offer, in other respects, a very different doctrine on modal propositions. The inclination that these authors show toward a “de-reified” understanding of possibility is further stressed by Abelard in the *Logica Ingredientibus*, where he claims that the modal terms “possible” and “necessary” have entirely no denotation or signification when taken in isolation from a context, and that they simply convey to the mind a certain “way of conceiving” the things of which they are predicated.

In Section 4 I advanced the idea that the definition of possibility as “non-repugnancy with nature,” which we often find in Abelard’s texts and in other sources from the early twelfth century, might have been developed by logicians of Abelard’s time as a way out of problems related to the ontology of possibilities. This new account of possibility—according to which possibilities are not grounded in the individuals as their real constituents, but analyzed as non-contradictoriness relations holding between certain predicates and the natural laws governing creatures—enabled early twelfth-

century logicians to offer an analysis of the possibilities of non-things, possibilities of future states of affairs, and generally every sort of *extra-actum* possibility.

## **Bibliography**

### **Primary Texts**

Anselm of Canterbury. 1946–1961. *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia*, 6 vols, ed. F.S. Schmitt. Edinburgh: Nelson.

Anselm of Canterbury. 1969. *Philosophical Fragments*. In *Memorials of St. Anselm*, eds. Richard W. Southern and Franciscus S. Schmitt, 334–351. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boethius. 1877. *Commentarii in librum Aristotelis Perihermeneias*, vol. I, ed. C. Meiser. Leipzig: Teubner.

Boethius. 1880. *Commentarii in librum Aristotelis Perihermeneias*, vol. II, ed. C. Meiser. Leipzig: Teubner.

Boethius. 1969. *De Hypotheticis Syllogismis*, ed. L. Orbetello. Brescia: Paideia.

Garlandus Compotista. 1959. *Dialectica*, ed. L. M. de Rijk. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Peter Abelard. 1970. *Dialectica* (2nd ed.), ed. L. M. de Rijk. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Peter Abelard. 2010. *Glossae super Peri Hermeneias*. In *Petri Abaelardi Glossae super Peri Hermeneias*, eds. K. Jacobi and C. Strub. Turnhout: Brepols.

## Secondary Literature

Binini, Irene. 2018. “My Future Son is Possibly Alive.” Existential Presupposition and Empty Terms in Abelard’s Modal Logic. *History and Philosophy of Logic* 39/4: 341–356.

Binini, Irene. 2021. Some Further Remarks on Abelard’s Notion of Nature. In *Women’s Perspectives in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Isabelle Chouinard et al. Berlin: Springer.

Binini, Irene. Forthcoming. The “De re”-“De dicto” Distinction: A Twelfth-Century Logical Discovery, *Vivarium*.

Borghini, A. 2016. *A critical introduction to the metaphysics of modality*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Brower, Jeffrey E. and Guilfooy, Kevin (eds.). 2004. *The Cambridge Companion to Abelard*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Engelhard Kristina and Quante Michael (eds.). 2018 *Handbook of Potentiality*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Iwakuma, Yukio. 1992. “Vocales”, or Early Nominalists. *Traditio* 47: 33–111.

Jacobi, Klaus. 2004. Philosophy of Language. In Brower – Guilfooy 2004, 126–157.

King, Peter. 2004. Metaphysics. In Brower – Guilfooy 2004, 65–125.

Knuuttila, Simo. 1993. *Modalities in Medieval Philosophy*. London and New York: Routledge.

Knuuttila, Simo. 2004. Anselm on Modality. In *The Cambridge Companion to Anselm*, ed. Brian Davies, 111–131. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knuuttila, Simo. 2017. Medieval Theories of Modality. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2017 Edition), ed. Edward N. Zalta. URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/modality-medieval/>>.

Marenbon, John. 1993. Medieval Latin Commentaries and Glosses on Aristotelian Logical Texts, before ca.1150 A.D. In *Commentaries and Glosses on Aristotelian Logical Texts: the Syriac, Arabic and Medieval Latin Traditions*, ed. Charles S. F. Burnett, 77–127. London: Warburg Institute, University of London (republished and updated in Marenbon 2000a, 77–140).

Marenbon, John (ed.). 2000a. *Aristotelian Logic, Platonism, and the Context of Early Medieval Philosophy in the West*. Aldershot: Routledge.

Marenbon, John. 2000b. Abelard's Concept of Possibility. In Marenbon 2000a, 595–609.

Marenbon, John. 2011. Logic at the Turn of the Twelfth Century: A Synthesis. In *Arts du langage et théologie aux confins des XIe-XIIIe siècle*, ed. Irène Rosier-Catach, 181–218. Turnhout: Brepols (Studia Artistarum, 26).

Marmodoro, Anna. 2018. Potentiality in Aristotle's Metaphysics. In Engelhard – Quante 2018, 15–43.

Martin, Christopher J. 2001. Abaelard on Modality: Some Possibilities and Some Puzzles. In *Potentialität, und Possibilität. Modalaussagen in der Geschichte der Metaphysik*, eds. Thomas Buchheim, Corneille H. Kneepkens, and Kuno Lorenz, 97–124. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.

Martin, Christopher J. 2004. An Amputee is Bipedal! The Role of Categories in the Development of Abelard's Theory of Possibility. In *La tradition médiévale des Catégories*, eds. Irène Roseier-Catach and Joël Biard, 225–242. Louvain-la-Neuve: Editions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie.

Martin, Christopher J. 2016. Modality without the Prior Analytics: Early Twelfth Century Accounts of Modal Propositions. In *Logical Modalities from Aristotle to Carnap*, eds. Max Creswell, Edwin Mares, and Adriane Rini, 113–132. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosier-Catach, Irène. 2003. Priscien, Boèce, les Glosulae in Priscianum, Abélard: les enjeux des discussions autour de la notion de consignification. *Histoire Epistémologie Langage* 25/2: 55–84.

Serene, Eileen F. 1981. Anselm's Modal Conceptions. In *Reforging the Great Chain of Being. Studies of the History of Modal Theories*, ed. Simo Knuuttila, 117–162. Dordrecht: Reidel (Synthese Historical Library 20).

Thom, Paul. 2003. *Medieval Modal Systems: Problems and Concepts*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Vetter, Barbara. 2018. From Potentiality to Possibility. In Engelhard – Quante 2018, 279–301.