Qua qua qua

Philipp Keller*

7th June 2004

very rough first draft
comments very welcome

0.1 Intentional objects

qua, in the following, is used as a generic connective of which also are "in so far as", "in virtue of" and "with respect to" are instances.

ARISTOTLE

Aristotle, in Metaphysics $\Gamma 1003^a 21$, defines metaphysics as the science of 'being qua being' (*to on hei on*), that which "studies that which is *qua* [*hei*] thing-that-is and those things that hold good of this in its own right'

He explicitly uses the construction to indicate respects in which things are similar to each other (cf. Met. Γ 4, $1006^a 15$) and to describe the way a capacity can originate a change or alteration in itself, but only in itself-qua-other. In the *Posterior Analytics*, he identifies "qua itself" with "in its own right", and contrasts the latter with "coincidentially"

In general, Aristotle seems to use qua-locutions adverbially.[1]

in Aristotle: Met IV being qua being Matthen (1983) discusses formal properties of propositions containing *qua* expressions in De Int 21a7, Post An 73b26 and Top 115b15. predication is conspicously absent from his account of truth statement of the principle of non-contradiction: nothing can be both F and not be F at the same time *and in the same respect*. -¿ analogue to the problem of temporary intrinsics

——— different senses of being in Aristotle (Owen 1960) (Owen 1965a) (Owen 1965b) (Dancy 1975) (Ferejohn 1980) (Kahn 1976) (Bolzano 1862) (Loux 1973) (Matthen 1984) (Hamlyn 1977-1978) (Morrison 1987) (Grice 1988) (Dancy 1983) (Frede 1981) (Thorp 1974) (Cobb 1973), and the reply by (Sprague 1975) *Met.*, Δ $7.1017^a 31$-35 and E 4, (Matthen 1983) and (Thorp 1982)

——— MEDIEVALS ——-

WILLIAM OF SHERWOOD in William of Sherwood, Introductiones ad logicam 77, 18-28: plays a role in the analysis of the supposition (reference) of subject terms in sentences like "man is the worthiest of creatures"

Aristotelian theory worked out by the end of the 12th century - reduplicative sense "every man qua rational is risible" - specificative sense "the Ethiopian is white with respect to his teeth" (Arist Soph El 167a7)

For the reduplicative sense, the inference $\frac{S \text{ is } P \text{ qua } M}{S \text{ is } P}$ is valid, for the specificative not, for in those sentences it changes the ference of the subject term.

*University of Geneva, Switzerland, philipp.keller@lettres.unige.ch.

[1]This has been argued for by Christopher Kirwan: "To say [...] that a doctor visited some patient *qua* patient is not to say anything about the nature of the patient, but of the visit..." (Aristotle 1993: 77).

Some medievals used "intrinsic" interdefinable with "inhering". According to Fox (1987: 198), they took "Fa" to be an intrinsic predication of a iff its truthmaker (a's F-ness) is or inheres in a.

WILLIAM OCKHAM; Walter Burley, De puritate artis logicae tractatus longior

$$S \text{ is } P \text{ qua } M \qquad :\Longleftrightarrow \qquad S \text{ is } M \ \wedge \text{ every } M \text{ is } P \ \wedge \ \textit{being } M \text{ entails } \textit{being } P \tag{1}$$

William Ockham, in Summa logicae, II 16, adds a further component for what he calls the "causal reduplicative" sense of qua-sentences: "M is the cause of P".

ALBERT THE GREAT De Sophisticos Elenchos I.III.6 tried to explicate the reference-shift in sentences in which "qua" occurs in its specificative sense in terms of part/whole relationships. In the case of "the Ethiopian is white with respect to his teeth", the reference shifts from the whole, the human body, to one of its integral parts, the teeth.

AQUINAS in Aquinas: Angelelli (1967) analysis of incarnation Sentences III XI 1, Summ Theol UUU 16 8-10

SCOTUS also in analysis of incarnation Sentences III XI 2

SUAREZ Suarez solves the Bradley regress by claiming that inherence is a mode rather than an entity which requires further inherence: cf. Disputationes metaphysicae, VII Sec I ch 17 cf Angelelli (1967)

BOLZANO as we saw on p.**??** of sct. **??**

BRENTANO Brentano accepts qua objects "drunken John" has John as a part but no other part that distinguishes it from John Brentano (1933: 53ff?, 107ff, 119ff, 151ff) and Chisholm (1978) Drunken Rupert and Rupert, if Rupert is drunk, are plausibly taken to be identical (Mulligan et al. 1984: 307, n. 34)

IN HUSSERL Ce que j'ai dit vendredi dernier tait comme une rminiscence ¿ ancienne, qui a surgit pendant la confrence de Stefan. C'est aussi un ¿ peu la raison pour laquelle je me suis emball. L'ide me semble ¿ intressante, mais vrai dire, il faudrait prciser plus amplement, et ¿ vrifier. Je crois qu'il faudrait aller voir du ct des Ideens. J'ai ¿ aussi lu il y a longtemps quelque chose de Bell ce propos, concernant ¿ "l'objet en tant que x" (un autre aussi, mais je n'ai plus le nom en ¿ tte). Je te rponds ici rapidement, mais il faudrait que je creuse un ¿ peu mes articles pour retrouver les choses. ¿ Mon ide a un peu voluer depuis vendredi, car d'autres souvenirs me ¿ sont revenus. Je pense que Husserl soutient bien les deux thses: ¿ - l'arbre en tant que peru est dans le jardin ¿ - l'arbre en tant que perru ne peut pas bruler. ¿ ¿ Ma conclusion me semble valide, partir de l, sur la tendance aux "qua ¿ objets" de Husserl. Mme localisation spatiotemporelle, et non identit ¿ des objets puisque l'un brle et pas l'autre. Reste deux problmes. Si ¿ l'arbre en tant que peru ne peux pas brler, pourquoi disparait-il ¿ quand l'arbre en tant matire physique brle? Que percevrais-je au bout ¿ d'un certain temps? Le deuxime problme, et qui d'une certaine manire ¿ contrebalance celui-ci, c'est que Husserl n'accepterait pas ma ¿ connaissance (trs vague) les "qua objets". Pour lui, il y a un seul ¿ objet, il est dans le jardin, et il est en mme temps intentionnel. ¿ Lorsque l'exprience arrive l'expression de son propre sens (pour ¿ reprendre le fil directeur de husserl), nous pouvons dire ce qu'est ¿ vraiment un objet, c'est quelque chose de rel, mais qui est prsent ¿ la conscience. S'il y a un seul objet et non deux, reste le problme des ¿ deux thses ci-dessus qui contredisent cette nouvelle thse d'unicit. ¿ Je pense que Husserl n'est pas trs clair la-dessus, mais il faudrait ¿ aller voir dans le dtail. Stefan avait donc raison en faisant le ¿ parallle entre heidegger et Fine, et non avec Husserl. Reste que les ¿ objets nomatiques ressemblent ces objets en tant que, selon moi. ¿ mon sens, la notion d'"objet en tant que" est une dformation de la ¿ notion classique "objet sous une description". Il y a plusieurs ¿ descriptions, mais il n'y a jamais qu'un objet. ¿ ¿

RUSSELL uses "qua" in his solution to the paradox Principles of Mathematics I X 104

BAECK, REDUPLICATION

GUISE THEORY cf. on Castaneda Tomberlin (1983), Tomberlin (1986) most important articles: Castañeda (1974) and Castañeda (1977)

Guises are complex entities generated by applying a 'concretizer operator' c to a set of properties (which is called the "core" of the guise). Two guises are identical iff their cores have the same members.

Guises are proposed as "aspects, facets, indeed *guises of* ordinary objects", "the concrete individuals somehow present to our mind in our thinking episodes and perceptual experiences, whether veridical or not" and "the entities which function as (thinkable) *denotate* of singular terms" (cf. Orilia 1991: 339). Ordinary physical objects are characterised as consubstantiational clusters, infinite sets of guises bearing to themselves and each other a contingent relation of 'consubstantiation'.

0.2 The semantics of nominal modifiers

the former president

semantics of qua:

Qua objects referents of appositive phrases? though "a = the Fa" seems true, they are not substitutable cf. p. **??** in sct. **??** the property of being drunk – Apposition, cf. Levinson (1978: 9), Wolterstorff (1970: 70), Wiggins (1984: 320), Teichmann (1992: 67) general on appositions Lawrenz (1993), Meyer (1992) treat them as singular descriptions cf. Neale (1990: 116, fn. 55) sie sind "präsentierend" cf Künne (1983: 177), also Schiffer (1990: 604) and Quinton (1973: 252)

7 is prime

The natural number 7 is prime

not the same proposition - but in virtue of containing different concepts?

Names being so-called because of its name is not a property of Richard Lionheart because it does not apply to him independently of his name

In order to make it perspicuous that only singular terms denote entities, Sellars (1963) proposed to replace the monadic predications Fa, Ga, Ha etc. by single letters that are only typographically different, i.e. $\dashv$, a, a etc. Dyadic predications would then be rendered by parts differing in their spatial relations, Rab as ab, Sab as $\overset{a}{b}$ and so on. This is plausibly taken as a "recognition of the difference between the object as such and the object as exemplifying a property" (Hochberg 1979: 345, n. 7)

commentary: Ackermann (1974)

0.3 Things with a gloss

Fine's theory

I will argue that qua objects exist, or, at least, that qua objects, if they existed, would solve a broad range of problems. Though they date at least as far back as to Aristotle, I will discuss their credentials under the form they got in Kit Fine's 1982 note "Acts, Events and Things". I will show how they naturally arise in natural deduction, and how powerful a tool they are to explain all kinds of substitutivity failures and associated puzzles in the debates on material constitution, modes of presentation, belief ascription and quotation. I will show how they could be used to streamline ontology, while at the same time providing truthmakers galore and explaining, e.g., what essences are. I will criticize the only Ersatzist construal I know of and then finally try to

sketch some ways in which qua objects might be given a place within one's favourite ontological picture, not offending our taste for desert landscapes.

Qua objects entered the contemporary philosophical stage in 1982, when Kit Fine wrote a short note entitled "Acts, Events and Things". They have, though, a much longer history, dating back at least as far as to Aristotle, though this is not something that will concern me here. A qua object, according to Fine, is a special kind of intensional entity, consisting of a particular, say a (its 'basis'), together with a property, say F (its 'gloss'), and denoted by "a qua F" (Fine 1982: 100). For any particular a and any property F there is such a qua object, which exists at times and in worlds when and where a is F. Qua objects in Fine's sense are intensional entities: they are identical only if they have the same glosses and they are distinct from their bases, though they have them as constituents[2] and exemplify, at any given time and in any given world, all the properties of their bases which are not 'formal', i.e. which are not about the time or world in question.

I propose to generalise Fine's idea, in order to accommodate my own ontological views, which I will sketch, though not try to justify, later. The crucial properties of qua objects, compared with their bases, are that they, on the one hand, have some *privileged* properties, properties which must be mentioned to give a full account of what that object is, while being *impoverished* in properties on the other. Qua objects are, in a sense to be made more precise later, description-relative. They are, however, existentially dependent on properties, not on predicates. So far, this does not tell us much about the ontological status of qua objects. Kit Fine, e.g., is wary not to assign them too high a grade of being:

> "The acts, as qua objects, are in an obvious sense artificial and derivative. They are not genuinely 'out there' in the world, but are formed from what is out there by means of an alliance with a purely intensional element. (It is tempting to say that they are partly formed in our own minds, but this would be too psychologistic)." (Fine 1982: 103)

I would prefer a much more robust realistic construal. The usefulness, however, of qua objects does not depend on their ultimate ontological status, but one their following properties:

- a qua F is *essentially* F.
- a qua F has different modal andtemporal persistence conditions than its base and any other qua object a qua G (for F and G not necessarily coextensive).
- a qua F depends existentially on the state of affairs of a's being F.

For the present, I will call a "qua object" whatever satisfies these conditions.

against qua objects Simons (1987: 26) for they are things having just one part

Modal careers

check Yablo, Identity, Essence J of Ph 1987 for qua objects

different counterpart relations: not a partitioning de re, but not referentially transparent failure on its own terms

Another possibility to accommodate qua objects is to stay content with ordinary, non-qua, things, but allow for different counterpart relations. Something b in a possible world v is a counterpart of a in w iff a would be b if w turned out to be v. Counterpart relations depend on overall intrinsic and extrinsic similiarity and sometimes on similarity-in-a-given-respect.

[2]This is not Fine's term: he says that "the qua object should be regarded as some sort of amalgam of the given object and the property..." (Fine 1982: 100). He later says that the basis is part of the qua object (Fine 1982: 101), but this commits him to the thesis that the whole of the basis and the gloss (the qua object) exists only if the basis has the gloss, which makes qua objects a rather special kind of whole.

If we allow for different counterpart relations we might say that one and the same thing, e.g. the lump of matter and the statue, might have counterparts in one respect which are not counterparts of it in another respect, e.g. melted-down counterparts which are sufficiently similar to it with respect to lump-hood, but not to statue-hood. The difficulty is, of course, to say how such counterpart relations are selected and why their difference does not violate Leibniz's Law. Letting, as Lewis (1971: 53) does, the appropriate counterpart relation by the sense of the proper name used, not only riddles us with senses of proper names, but neither gives us a general procedure.[3] For sometimes, Lewis says, the appropriate counterpart relation is selected by a special clause like "regarded as an F". We are very close to qua objects indeed. Different counterpart relations are distinguished by the fact that they derive from different properties of one and the same thing:

> "... counterpart relations are a matter of over-all resemblance in a variety of respects. If we vary the relative importances of different respects of similarity and dissimilarity, we will get different counterpart relations. Two respects of similarity and dissimilarity among enduring things are, first, personhood and personal traits, and, second, bodyhood and bodily traits. If we assign great weight to the former, we get the *personal counterpart* relation. Only a person, or something very like a person, can resemble a person in respect of personhood and personal traits enough to be his personal counterpart. But if we assign great weight to the latter, we get the *bodily counterpart* relation. Only a body, or something very like a body, can resemble a body in respect to bodyhood and bodily traits enough to be its bodily counterpart." (Lewis 1971: 51–52)

> "Is [the thing that survives squashing] a counterpart of Lumpl/Goliath? Yes and no. It is a counterpart under the counterpart relation that is called to mind when we describe Lumpl/Goliath as a lump, but not under the different counterpart relation that is called to mind when we describe the very same thing as a statue." (Lewis 2003: 28)

> "Thanks to the multiplicity of counterpart relations, we have no need to multiply entities. [...] One identical thing can have different potentialities and different essences if it has them relative to different counterpart relations." (Lewis 2003: 28)

Because glosses of qua objects are precisely what constrains their similarity relations, it seems to me that the different-counterpart-relations theory is just a variant of the full-blown qua object theory, perhaps preferable to the ontologically cautious. As always where there is a trade-off between what Quine calls 'ontology' and 'ideology', however, there is a price to pay: even de re modal predications, when couched in a multiple counterpart theory, will not be referentially transparent and the great advantage of counterpart theory in the first place will be lost. By accepting qua objects we will restore referential transparency and gain much more.

Yablo (1999: 496–497) tries to define duplication in terms of part/whole: diff

> "... counterpart relations are a matter of over-all resemblance in a variety of respects. If we vary the relative importances of different respects of similarity and dissimilarity, we will get different counterpart relations." Lewis (1971: 51)

implication: it is no longer true that

> "The counterpart relation serves as a substitute for identity between things in different worlds." Lewis (1971: 50)

[3] Lewis (2003: 28) speaks of names evoking counterpart relations.

Here is what Lewis says about multiple counterpart relations:

> "My real essence consists of the properties common to all my counterparts. [...] My nominal essence under the description 'person' consists of the properties common to all possible persons. My intermediate essence under the description 'person' consists of the properties common to all my personal counterparts." (Lewis 1971: 54)

disanalogy:

> "Two two relations of unity [personal and bodily unity among stages] are equivalence relations, at least for the most part and as a matter of contingent fact. Therefore it is easy and natural to form the concept of an enduring person or body, consisting of stages linked together pairwise by a relation of personal or bodily unity. It is tempting to do the same with the counterpart relations, forming the concept of a superperson or superbody consisting of persons or bodies in different worlds, linked together by a personal or bodily counterpart relation. But this cannot be done in any straightforward way because counterpart relations are not equivalence relations." (Lewis 1971: 52)

Though counterpart relations are reflexive by stipulation (cf. postulate 6 in 1968: 27), they are in general neither transitive nor symmetric.

That is why we cannot define continuants as equivalence classes but have to take them to be maximally counterpart-interrelated things (1968 app. 41)

The right counterpart relation is selected by the sense of the term or by a special clause like "regarded as an F" (1971: 53)

Analogy: if, as argued on p. **??**, events have their temporal location essentially CHEKC THIS, then an utterance of "shall we prolong this walk?" will refer by "this walk" to "the walk, whatever it is, of which this walk-slice is a part"

contra Schnieder (2003: 193), it doesn't matter if it's artificial

LOGIC John Bacon's system **Q4** of quantified modal logic with contingent domains, where names and variables stand for world-lines. close to Thomason's **Q3** (Thomason 1969) and the *Acta philosophica fennica* system of Kripke (1963) cf Bressan (1972) – **Q4** is described in Bacon (1980) – combines well with the logic of common nouns of Gupta (1980)

straight worldlines correspond to the counterpart-relations being equivalence relations (Bacon 1995: 69)

similarity relation: reflexive and symmetric but not necessarily transitive, gives similarity classes which are 'loose bundles' (Bacon 1995: 96), can overlap without being identical

Modal occurents

Varzi There is an attractive way to combine both proposals just sketched. Achille Varzi (2001) has shown that counterpart theory may be smoothly couched in terms of modal occurrents,[4] i.e. trans-world individuals which have their worldy parts as modal stages in much the same way that perduring things have and consist of temporal stages. As counterpart relations, being a matter of similarity, are not equivalence relations, one and the same thing will be part of many different modal continuants. But given a multiplicity of counterpart relations, this was to be expected anyway.

These trans-world individuals, I would like to argue, are nothing else than qua objects. Qua objects are partially identical, they may share stages, and these stages are the objects what we normally refer to. In modal, as in temporal, discourse, the wholes of which these stages are part matter:

[4] Lewis (1983: 40–42) misleadingly calls such trans-world individuals "modal continuants".

they are what makes true our modal and temporal predications. The vagueness of statements like "Pavarotti might have been a ballerina", our uncertainty with respect to what will count as a counterpart of Pavarotti and our uncertainty about whether the person or the body is relevant, is assimilated to the case of Tibbles, the cat which is partly identical to many lumps of feline matter which might have been cats if Tibbles had not. So contingent and temporal identity is nothing but partial identity, of temporal and modal continuants respectively.

Non-spatio-temporal parts

The most straightforward way is to make them *parts* of ordinary objects, in the ordinary sense of "part" (which I think is the *only* sense of part). The details are somehow more complicated, however. Call a property F of an object a *intrinsic to* a iff a's being F is only a matter of how a is and not at all of how other objects are, a property a could have if it were the only existing thing. *Being bent* (under at least one reading), or *talking* are intrinsic properties of mine, while *being a philosopher* or *being called "Philipp"* are not.

Intrinsicness is a relational term. If the particular involved is chosen large enough, I think, every property and relation is intrinsic to some thing. If we allow for enough structural properties, e.g., relations are intrinsic to the mereological sum or fusion of their relata.

My proposal now is that exemplification of intrinsic properties is ordinary parthood. So every property or relation is part of some thing, though not, of course, a spatio-temporal part, and a qua F for any property F intrinsic to a is just the mereological fusion of a's spatio-temporal parts with F. a qua F may still share other properties with a, but these will be extrinsic to it, with the exception of all the properties implied by it's being F.[5]

PROBLEM (BY BENJAMIN): You suggest that "properties are sums, fusions, or sets of their instances. F is what all a qua F and b qua F have in common". (A very small point about your notation: you use "F", it seems, as a placeholder for a general term; then however, this symbol is not apt for denoting a property, but you should use a nominalisation of it. "wise" is a general term, and the corresponding property is not: wise, but wisdom.) ¿ But your identification seems wrong; there is not only one property that all qua F-objects (with "qua F-objects" I mean any qua object with an arbitrary basis and F-ness as its gloss) have in common, but there are at least three: ¿ ¿ (i) they are qua objects ¿ (ii) they are F ¿ (iii) they are essentially F ¿ ¿ (i) could be eliminated by saying that F-ness is what all qua F-objects have in common, and what only these have common. This move however would also get rid of (ii), at least for many choices of "F". If there are contingent Fs, then F-ness is something that all Fs have in common and not only what all qua F-objects have in common. But then your identification picks out not: F-ness but: being essentially F. This affects your goal of generally reducing properties to qua objects.

References

Ackermann, Robert, 1974, "Perspicuous Languages", in Gram, M. S. and Klemke, E.D. (editors), *The Ontological Turn: Studies in the Philosophy of Gustav Bergmann*, Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa Press.

Angelelli, Ignacio, 1967, *Studies on Gottlob Frege and Traditional Philosophy*, Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Co.

Aristotle, 1993, *Metaphysics, Books* Γ*,* Δ *and E*, Clarendon Aristotle series, ed. Christopher Kirwan, 2nd edition, Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

[5]Given qua objects, the parthood analysis may perhaps be extended to all properties and relations. Take, e.g., a certain relation, say *being in the same room as* that holds between me and all of you. This relation may be taken to be a part of our mereological sum s. We would then have a qua object, s qua *being in the same room*. I, by being part of s, am a part of that qua object: the relational property *being in the same room than all of you* is this property that is a non-spatiotemporal part both of me and of the qua object s qua *being in the same room*. So I qua *being in the same room than all of you* is a part of me.

Bacon, John, 1980, "Substance and first-order quantification over individual-concepts", *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 45, pp. 193–203.

Bacon, John, 1995, *Universals and Property Instances: The Alphabet of Being*, number 15 in Aristotelian Society Series, Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell Publishers.

Bolzano, Bernard, 1862, *Von der mannigfachen Bedeutung des Seienden nach Aristoteles*, Freiburg, Germany, translated as (**?**).

Brentano, Franz, 1933, *Kategorienlehre*, Leipzig, Germany: Meiner, edited by A. Kastil; English translation by R.M. Chisholm and N. Guterman: **?**.

Bressan, Aldo, 1972, *A General Interpreted Modal Calculus*, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Castañeda, Hector-Neri, 1974, "Thinking and the structure of the world", *Philosophia* 4, 1, pp. 3–40.

Castañeda, Hector-Neri, 1977, "Perception, belief, and the structure of physical objects and consciousness", *Synthèse* 35, pp. 285–351.

Chisholm, Roderick M., 1978, "Brentano's Conception of Substance and Accident", *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 5, pp. 197–210, reprinted in **?**: 3–16.

Cobb, R.A., 1973, "The Present Progressive Periphrasis and the Metaphysics of Aristotle", *Phronesis* 18, pp. 80–90.

Dancy, Russell M., 1975, "On Some of Aristotle's First Thoughts about Substances", *Philosophical Review* 84, pp. 338–373.

Dancy, Russell M., 1983, "Aristotle and Existence", *Synthèse* 54, pp. 409–442, reprinted in **?**.

Ferejohn, M.T., 1980, "Aristotle on Focal Meaning an dthe Unity of Science", *Phronesis* 25, pp. 117–128.

Fine, Kit, 1982, "Acts, Events and Things", in Leinfellner, W., Kraemer, E., and Schank, J. (editors), *Proceedings of the 6th International Wittgenstein Symposium: Language and Ontology*, number 8 in Schriftenreihe der Österreichischen Ludwig Wittgenstein Gesellschaft, pp. 97–105, Wien, Austria: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky.

Fox, John F, 1987, "Truthmaker", *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 65, pp. 188–207.

Frede, Michael, 1981, "Categories in Aristotle", in *Studies in Aristotle*, pp. 1–24, Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, reprinted in **?**: 29–48.

Grice, H. Paul, 1988, "Aristotle on the Multiplicity of Being", *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 69, pp. 175—200.

Gupta, Anil, 1980, *The Logic of Common Nouns – An Essay in Quantified Modal Logic*, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Hamlyn, D.W., 1977-1978, "Focal Meaning", *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 78, pp. 1–18.

Hochberg, Herbert, 1979, "Mapping, Meaning, and Metaphysics", in French, Peter A., Uehling, Jr., Theodore E., and Wettstein, Howard K. (editors), *Midwest Studies in Philosophy 4: Studies in Metaphysics*, Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, reprinted in **?**.

Kahn, Charles H., 1976, "Why Existence does not Emerge as a Distinct Concept in Greek Philosophy", *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 58, pp. 323–334.

Kripke, Saul A., 1963, "Semantical Analysis of Modal Logic I: Normal Modal Propositional Calculi", *Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik and Grundlagen der Mathematik* 9, pp. 67–96.

Künne, Wolfgang, 1983, *Abstrakte Gegenst´ande*, Frankfurt a.M., Germany: suhrkamp.

Lawrenz, Birgit, 1993, *Apposition: Begriffsbestimmung und syntaktischer Status*, number 44 in Studien zur Deutschen Grammatik, Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Levinson, Jerrold, 1978, "Properties and Related Entities", *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 39, pp. 1–22.

Lewis, David K., 1971, "Counterparts of Persons and Their Bodies", *The Journal of Philosophy* 68, pp. 203–11, reprinted in Lewis (1983).

Lewis, David K., 1983, *Philosophical Papers*, volume 1, Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, David K., 2003, "Things qua Truthmakers", in Lillehammer, Hallvard and Rodriguez-Pereyra, Gonzalo (editors), *Real Metaphysics – Essays in honour of D.H. Mellor*, Routledge Studies in twentieth-century Philosophy, pp. 25–38, London, England: Routledge.

Loux, Michael J., 1973, "Aristotle on the Transcendentals", *Phronesis* 18, pp. 225–239.

Matthen, Mohan, 1983, "Greek Ontology and the 'Is' of Truth", *Phronesis* 28, pp. 113–135.

Matthen, Mohan, 1984, "Aristotle's Semantics and a Puzzle concerning Change", *Canadian Journal of Philosophy, Supplement* 10.

Meyer, Charles F., 1992, *Apposition in Contemporary English*, Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Morrison, D.R., 1987, "The Evidence for Degrees of Being in Aristotle", *Classical Quarterly* 37, pp. 382—-401.

Mulligan, Kevin, Simons, Peter, and Smith, Barry, 1984, "Truth-Makers", *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 44, pp. 287–321.

Neale, Stephen, 1990, *Descriptions*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Orilia, Francesco, 1991, "Guise Theory", in Burkhardt, Hans and Smith, Barry (editors), *Handbook of Metaphysics and Ontology*, volume 1 of *Analytica: Investigations in Logic, Ontology, and the Philosophy of Language*, pp. 338–341, Wien, Austria: Philosophia.

Owen, G.E.L., 1960, "Logic and Metaphysics in Some Earlier Works of Aristotle", *Medieval Studies* 21, pp. 303–322, reprinted in **?**.

Owen, G.E.L., 1965a, "Aristotle in the Snares of Ontology", in Bambrough, J.R. (editor), *New Essays on Plato and Aristotle*, London, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., reprinted in **?**.

Owen, G.E.L., 1965b, "The Platonism of Aristotle", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 51, reprinted in **?**.

Quinton, Anthony, 1973, *The Nature of Things*, London, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd.

Schiffer, Stephen, 1990, "Fodor's Character", in Villanueva, Enrique (editor), *Information, Semantics, and Epistemology*, Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell Publishers.

Schnieder, Benjamin, 2003, *Substanzen und (ihre) Eigenschaften*, Ph.d. dissertation, Department of Philosophy, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland.

Sellars, Wilfrid, 1963, "Naming and Saying", in *Science, Perception and Reality*, pp. 225–246, London, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd.

Simons, Peter, 1987, *Parts: A Study in Ontology*, Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

Sprague, R.K., 1975, "Aristotelian Periphrasis: A Reply to Mr Cobb", *Phronesis* 20, pp. 75–76.

Teichmann, Roger, 1992, *Abstract Entities*, Basingstroke, London: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Thomason, Richmond H., 1969, "Species, Determinates and Natural Kinds", *Noûs* 3, pp. 95–101.

Thorp, J.W., 1974, "Aristotle's Use of Categories", *Phronesis* 19, pp. 238–256.

Thorp, J.W., 1982, "Aristotle on Being and Truth", *De Philosophia* 3, pp. 1–9.

Tomberlin, James E. (editor), 1983, *Agent, Language, and The Structure of the World: Essays Presented to Hector-Neri Castañeda, with His Replies*, Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Co.

Tomberlin, James E. (editor), 1986, *Hector-Neri Castañeda*, Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Co.

Varzi, Achille C., 2001, *Parole, oggetti, eventi e altri argomenti di metafisica*, Roma: Carocci Editore.

Wiggins, David, 1984, "The Sense and Reference of Predicates: A Running Repair to Frege's Doctrine and a Plea for the Copula", *The Philosophical Quarterly* 34, pp. 311–328.

Wolterstorff, Nicholas, 1970, *On Universals: An Essay in Ontology*, Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Yablo, Stephen, 1999, "Intrinsicness", *Philosophical Topics* 26, pp. 479–505.