

## University of Groningen

### Reasoning with Defeasible Reasons

Pandzic, Stipe

DOI:  
[10.33612/diss.136479932](https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.136479932)

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*  
2020

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Pandzic, S. (2020). *Reasoning with Defeasible Reasons*. University of Groningen.  
<https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.136479932>

#### Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

#### Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Propositions accompanying the thesis

## Reasoning with Defeasible Reasons

by Stipe Pandžić

1. Reasons are logical entities in themselves that cannot be reduced to propositions or inference rules. (Chapter 2, Chapter 3)
2. Default justification logic models defeasible arguments as object-level formulas. (Chapter 2, Chapter 3)
3. The idea of rebutting reasons is well understood in the non-monotonic reasoning community. Undercutting reasons, however, introduce an intricate opposition among default reasons that cannot be adequately represented without reasons as terms of a logical language. (Chapter 2)
4. Default theories in justification logic are logical counterparts (“realizations”) of abstract argumentation frameworks that make structures of arguments explicit in a logical language. (Chapter 3)
5. Undermining defeaters are intuitively understood as attacks on premises of arguments. Their logical interpretation in justification logic requires using belief revision operations that result in removing premises of a default theory. (Chapter 4)
6. Classical logic is normative for human reasoning. Although rules of classical logic are non-defeasible, the norms they give rise to are defeasible. (Chapter 5)
7. After you acquire a belief in the statement “At least one of my beliefs is false”, this belief by itself does not cause joint inconsistency of your beliefs. (Chapter 6)
8. Marcus Aurelius wisely claimed that “the opinion of 10,000 men is of no value if none of them know anything about the subject”, but things dramatically change when one of them is assigned as your reviewer.
9. Given the trends in academia, platitudes about “originality of research” are best replaced with proverbs praising “like-mindedness”. The next *linguistic victim* is the phrase “academic authorship”.