

ARISTOTLE'S CATEGORIES. A BIBLIOGRAPHY

by Raul Corazzon

*Aristotle's Categories. A
Bibliography*

Raul Corazzon
(2019)

Aristotle's *Categories*. Annotated Bibliography of the studies in English

RELATED WEB PAGES

On the website [Theory and History of Ontology](#)

Aristotle's *Categories*. Annotated Bibliography of the studies in English:

[First part: A - C](#)

[Second part: D - H](#)

[Third part: I - O](#)

[Fourth part: P - Z](#)

[Bibliographie der deutschen Studien zur Aristoteles *Kategorien*](#)

[Bibliografia degli studi italiani sulle *Categorie* di Aristotele](#)

[Bibliographie des études en français sur les *Catégories* d'Aristote](#)

[Aristotle: Bibliographical Resources on Selected Philosophical Works](#)

On the website [History of Logic from Aristotle to Godel. A Survey](#)

[Selected Bibliography on the Logic of Aristotle: General and Introductory Readings](#)

[Annotated bibliography on Aristotle's *De Interpretatione \(Peri Hermeneias\)*](#)

[Selected Bibliography on Aristotle's Theory of Categorical Syllogism](#)

Selected Bibliography on Aristotle's Theory of Modal Syllogism (under construction)

Selected Bibliography on Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* (under construction)

Selected Bibliography on Aristotle's *Topics* and *Sophistical Refutations* (under construction)

BIBLIOGRAPHY (last update: April 14th, 2019)

1. Ackrill, John Lloyd, ed. 1963. *Aristotle's Categories and De interpretatione*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Translated with notes and glossary by John Lloyd Ackrill.

Contents: Translations. *Categories* 3; *De Interpretatione* 43; Notes. Introductory Note 69; *Categories* 71; *De Interpretatione* 113; Note on Further Reading 156; Glossary 159; Index of Subjects 161-162.

Chapter I-V are reprinted in: J. M. E. Moravcsik (ed.), *Aristotle. A Collection of Critical Essays*, Garden City (NY): Doubleday, pp. 3-12 (translation) and 71-91 (notes).

"The *Categories* divides into three parts. Chapters 1-3 make certain preliminary points and explanations. Chapters 4-9 treat of the doctrine of categories and discuss some categories at length. Chapters 10-15 deal with a variety of topics, such as opposites, priority, and change.

The second part fades out in Chapter 9, and the passage serving as a transition to the third part (11b10-16) is certainly not genuine Aristotle. The third part itself (the *Postpraedicamenta*) has only a loose connexion with what precedes. There is no reason to doubt its authenticity, but probably it was not a part of the original *Categories* but was tacked on by an editor.

The concept of categories plays an important part in many of Aristotle's works, specially the *Metaphysics*. But it undergoes developments and refinements as Aristotle's thought develops. So the study of the *Categories* is only a first step in an investigation of Aristotle's ideas about categories." (pp. 69-70)

2. ———. 1972. "Aristotle on "Good" and the Categories." In *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition. Essays Presented by His Friends and Pupils to Richard Walzer on His Seventieth Birthday*, edited by Stern, S.M., Hourani, Albert and Brown, Vivian, 17-25. London: Bruno Cassirer.

"in the *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.6. 1096a23-29 Aristotle argues

that goodness is not a single common universal: if it were it would be “said” in only one category, whereas in fact it is, like *being*, “said” in all the categories.

Aristotle discusses in many places the transcategorial character of *ov* and of *ev*, but most of his accounts of types of goodness or senses of “good” do not rest upon the point about categories — a point which is, however, taken up in the traditional treatment of *bonum* along with *ens* and *unum* as categorially unclassifiable. The *Ethics* passage is therefore of considerable interest, and it has not, I think, received sufficient attention or final elucidation from the commentators. The present discussion will be far from exhaustive, but it may raise some questions worth further examination.” (p. 17)

3. Allen, Reginald E. 1969. "Individual Properties in Aristotle's *Categories*." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 14:31-39.

"At *Categories* 1 a 23-29, (1) Aristotle marks off a set of items which are present in but not predicable of a subject. Thus, for example, a certain knowledge of grammar (ἡ τις γραμματική) is present in a subject, the soul, and a certain white (το τι λευκόν) present in a subject, the body; but neither is predicable of a subject." (p. 31)

(...)

What is present in a subject as individual and one in number is incapable of existing apart from the particular subject it is in; for at 1 a 24-25, Aristotle defines presence as follows: "By present in a subject I mean what is in something, not as a part, but as incapable of existing separately from what it is in." It would seem to follow from this that an item present in an individual subject is itself individual, and numerically distinct from items present in other individual subjects.

Suppose this is so. Then if there are two pieces of chalk, A and B, and if they are of the same determinate shade of color, say, white, there will be a particular instance of white in A and a particular instance of white in B. Call those instances respectively *s* and *t*. Then *s* and *t* are the same in that they are

instances of the same shade of color.

But they are different in that they are themselves numerically different individuals, and this difference is to be explained by the fact that they are present in numerically different subjects: *s* is the white of *A*, and *t* is the white of *B*. Thus *s* and *t* are different members of the same species, the given shade of white, in a way precisely analogous to the way in which *A* and *B* are members of the same species, chalk. This situation will obtain generally in categories other than substance; that is, it will obtain, not only for qualities such as colors, but for sizes, shapes, places, times, and so on for any items present in but not predicable of a subject.

At least in outline, the foregoing interpretation of particular properties in the *Categories* has been widely accepted.⁴ But it has recently been challenged by Professor Owen.⁽⁵⁾ (p. 32)

(...)

"Professor Owen's interpretation has the virtue of simplifying the ontology of the *Categories* by doing away with the cloud of particulars that most readers have found in categories other than substance. A world which can dispense with these extraneous particulars is a neater, and therefore a better world than one which cannot: *entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*. Supposing that Professor Owen's interpretation is mistaken, it remains worth asking why Aristotle should have been led to multiply particulars with so lavish a hand." (p. 38)

(1) 1 Line numbers cited from the Oxford text of L. Minio-Paluello.

See, for example: W. D. Ross, *Aristotle*, London, 1923, p. 24, n. 1; G. E. M. Anscombe, *Three Philosophers*, Oxford, 1963, pp. 8-10; J. L. Ackrill, op. cit., [*Aristotle's Categories and De Interpretatione*, Oxford, 1963] pp. 74-75; K. von Fritz, *Phronesis* ii (1958), pp. 72-3.

6 G. E. L. Owen, "Inherence", *Phronesis* x (1965), pp. 97-105.

4. ———. 1973. "Substance and Predication in Aristotle's *Categories*." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy*:362-373.

Supplementary vol. I: E. N. Lee, A. P. D. Mourelatos, R. M. Rorty (eds.), *Exegesis and Argument. Studies in Greek Philosophy presented to Gregory Vlastos*, Assen: Van Gorcum.

Abstract: "It is a characteristic common to every substance not to be in a subject. For a primary substance is neither said of a subject nor in a subject. And as for secondary substances, it is obvious at once that they are not in a subject. For man is said of the individual man as subject but is not in a subject: man is not in the individual man. Similarly, animal also is said of the individual man as subject but animal is not in the individual man. Further, while there is nothing to prevent the name of what is in a subject from being sometimes predicated of the subject, it is impossible for the definition to be predicated. But the definition of the secondary substance, as well as the name, is predicated of the subject: you will predicate the definition of man of the individual man, and also that of animal. No substance, therefore, is in a subject.(1)"

(1) *Categories* 3a7-21, of. 2a19-34, 1a20-22, trans. J. L. Ackrill, *Aristotle's Categories and De Interpretatione* (Oxford, 1963). I should like to acknowledge my debt in what follows to Professor Ackrill's admirable translation and notes; textual references to the *Categories* are to the edition of L. Minio-Paluello.

5. Angelelli, Ignacio. 1967. *Studies in Gottlob Frege and Traditional Philosophy*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

On Aristotle's *Categories* see: 1. Ontology 9; 1.1 Contemporary logic and ontology 10; 1.2 The ontological square (*Categoriae*, 1a, 20-1b, 10) 11; 1.3 Universal-singular, substance-accident in other works of Aristotle 15; 1.4 Universal-singular, substance-accident in the philosophical tradition 16; 1.41 Middle Ages and Renaissance 16; 1.42 Descartes, Port-Royal, Locke, Reid 18; 1.43 Leibniz-Russell 19; 1.44 'Parallelism' of singular-universal, substance-accident 21; 1.45 Husserl. Pseudo-properties of properties: Carnap, Ingarden, F. Kaufmann 22; 1.46 Frege 24; References 26-36.

"The ontological square ('*Categoriae*', 1a, 20-1b, 10).

This passage of *Categoriae* is traditionally understood as making a distinction between universal substances, particular substances, universal accidents and particular accidents. The history of commentaries on the *Organon* provides an extensive number of paraphrases and presentations of this text. Boethius' text and other ancient commentators illustrate our, quoted passage by means of a diagram similar to ours above: a square in each of whose vertices one of the four classes of entities is located. The Aristotelian text explicitly states that this is a classification of entities, but it is of course contrary to traditional Aristotelianism to call universals entities *simpliciter*. In fact, Ioannes a Sancto Thoma elegantly modifies the formulation(17). Still, universals do enjoy an objective being, and *ens rationis* falls under *ens communissime sumptum*.

The classification of entities into four classes is achieved by means of two relations: to be in a subject and to be said of a subject." (pp. 12-13)

(17) Ioannes a Sto. Thoma, *Cursus philosophicus thomisticus. Tomus primus* (ed. Reiser), Marietti, Torino 1930, p. 476: "Atque ita in hoc tertio antepredicamento distinguit Aristoteles duplex genus entium, scilicet substantiam et accidens, et duplex genus intentionum, scilicet universalitatis et singularitatis."

6. Annas, Julia. 1974. "Individuals in Aristotle's *Categories*: Two Queries." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 19:146-152.

"Mr. Barrington Jones, in his recent article in *Phronesis* ,(1) has suggested a new way of solving the standing debate about the nature of non-substance individuals in the *Categories*. Mr. Jones' article suggests some exciting new approaches to the *Categories*, but I would like to put forward two difficulties I find with the way he proposes to cut through the main problem.

In the *Categories*, but nowhere else, there seem to be individuals in non-substance categories, corresponding to primary substances. What sort of thing are these non-substance individuals? According to Ackrill (2) they are non-

repeatable individual instances of (for example) a property. An example would be the particular instance of white exhibited by this paper: it is peculiar to this piece of paper and will perish when it does. According to Owen (3) they are the most specific types of (for example) a property. The white exhibited by this piece of paper and all the paper in the same batch would be an example: it can continue to exist when this piece of paper perishes, as long as some other piece of paper from the batch continues to exhibit it.

I shall not go into the controversy that has arisen over these differing interpretations of Aristotle. I have the more limited objective of examining the way Jones proposes to restate the terms of the debate.

If Jones is right the alternatives just sketched represent a false dichotomy: the new solution supersedes them both. It is merely the proffered new solution that is my concern." (p. 146)

(1) "Individuals in Aristotle's Categories", *Phronesis* XVII (1972) 107-123.

(2) In his notes on the *Categories and De Interpretatione*, Oxford 1963.

(3) "Inherence", *Phronesis* X (1965) 97-105.

7. Anscombe, Elizabeth G. M. 1961. "Aristotle: The Search for Substance." In *Three Philosophers*, edited by Anscombe, Elizabeth G. M. and Geach, Peter Thomas, 1-63. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Contents: Analytical Table of Contents VI-XX; G. E. M. Anscombe: Aristotle: The Search for Substance 1; P. T. Geach: Aquinas 65; P. T. Geach: Frege 127-162.

"The doctrine of his *Categories* is very straightforward. First substance is introduced, and explained in the first place as what neither is asserted of nor exists in a subject: the examples offered are 'such-and-such a man' 'such-and-such a horse'. A 'first substance' then is what is designated by a proper name such as the name of a man or of a horse, or again, if one cared to give it a proper name, of a cabbage. A proper name is never, *qua* proper name, a predicate. Thus what a proper name

stands for is not asserted of a subject.

Aristotle explains the second point, that first substance does not exist in a subject, by giving as an example of what is 'in' a subject: 'such-and-such grammarianship. He means that an individual occurrence of grammatical science, such as a particular man's knowledge of grammar, while not being asserted of a subject, exists in a subject. The example is slightly obscure to us; 'such-and-such a surface' would perhaps be a better one. If we think of a particular surface, such as the surface of my wedding ring, this is not something that is asserted of a subject, but it exists in a subject—namely, the ring. (He explains that when he speaks of things being in a subject, he is not speaking of parts, such as arms and legs which are parts of a man.) Thus, we can see that when he speaks of 'first substance' Aristotle is talking about what modern philosophers discuss under the name 'particulars' or 'individuals'. But his doctrine has features not found in modern treatments. The most notable of these are, first the distinction we have just noticed between individuals that do, and individuals, or particulars, that do not, exist in subjects (though Aristotle rarely calls what exists in something else an individual, using that term mostly for substances); and second, that he speaks of 'first substance' and 'second substance'. Second substances, he says, are the kinds to which belong the first substances, such as man, horse, cabbage.

It will help us to understand this if we remember, and see the mistake in, Locke's doctrine that there is no 'nominal essence' of individuals. Locke said that if you take a proper name, 'A', you can only discover whether A is, say, a man or again a cassowary, by looking to see if A has the properties of man or a cassowary. This presupposes that, having grasped the assignment of the proper name 'A' you can know when to use it again, without its being already determined whether 'A' is the proper name of, say, a man, or a cassowary: as if there were such a thing as being the same without being the same such-and-such. This is clearly false. Aristotle's 'second substance' is indicated by the predicate, whatever it is, say 'X that is so associated with the proper name of an individual that the proper name has the same reference when it is used to refer to

the same X: with the restriction that the individual is not such as to exist in a subject, like an individual surface." (pp. 7-8)

8. Anton, John Peter. 1957. *Aristotle's Theory of Contrariety*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Contents: Preface VII; Acknowledgments IX; Chapter I. Approaching Aristotle 1; Chapter II: The Ontological foundations of Contrariety and Its Relation to Substance as Nature 19; Chapter III. From the Cosmological to the Ontological Use of the Principle of Contrariety 32; Chapter IV. Contrariety in the Locus of Process and in the Categories 49; Chapter V. The Prime Contrariety and the Ontological Analysis of Determinate or Linear Processes 69; Chapter VI. Contrariety in the Theory of Opposition in Language as as the Foundation for the Law of Non-Contradiction 85; Chapter VII. Process and the Principle of Soul 104; Chapter VIII. Being and the Range of Knowledge 136; Chapter IX. Contrariety and the Range of Conduct 171; Epilogue 200; Appendix 203; Bibliography 242; Index of Subjects; 247; Index of Names 253-253.

Preface: "The present volume is the result of several years of research in ancient philosophy. It began with the main purpose of elucidating the theme of contrariety and the role it played in the Aristotelian treatises. But the many vexing problems which made their appearance as my inquiry progressed led me to extend my studies of this theme and look into its pre-Aristotelian history. A number of valuable ideas came to light as a result of the investigations into the concept of contrariety and its place in the various types of philosophical thinking from the early pre-Socratics down to Aristotle. This work in no wise claims to be an exhaustive study of contrariety in all ancient Greek thought, for a task of this kind would doubtlessly require the space of many volumes. The bulk of this work is centred around the philosophy of Aristotle with whom the principle of contrariety received, I believe, its most clear and classical formulation. The discussion on the pre-Aristotelian uses of this principle is so designed as to throw only what historical light was required for the full appreciation of the main theme. At the same time I have tried to avoid doing injustice to Aristotle's predecessors

by paying as close attention as possible to their own original writings, fragmentary as they are."

"The very fact that contrariety is necessarily joined with process, change, and development imposes the demand that it cannot occur in all the categories. Thus, contrariety is present only in those genera of categoriae which imply *change*: (35) *substance, quantity, quality, and place*. Within each of these four categories, there are two distinguishable *termini* which form the extremities of a distinct and inclusive categorical contrariety: (36) (1) in substance it is form-privation; (2) in quantity it is completeness-incompleteness; 3) in place it is up-down; and (4) in quality it presents no exhaustive general extremities; instead it yields a variety of contrarieties, such as white-black, hot-cold, (37) etc.

Each categorical contrariety when developmentally conceived stands for two directions or types of change characteristic of each category, as subsequent analysis will show." (p. 61)

(36) *Phys.* 201a 3-9; *Phys.* I, ch. 6, 189a 13.

(37) The qualitative pairs of contraries were hypostatized by Anaxagoras, who made them the ultimate constituents of the universe. See Diels, *Die Frag. der Vors.* (Anaxagoras), B 6; B 12.

9. ———. 1968. "The Aristotelian Doctrine of 'Homonyma' in the *Categories* and Its Platonic Antecedents." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* no. 6:315-326.

Reprinted as Chapter 4 in: J. P. Anton, *Categories and Experience. Essays on Aristotelian Themes*, Oakdale, N.Y.: Dowling College Press, 1996, pp. 87-114.

"The Aristotelian doctrine of *homonyma* is of particular historical interest at least for the following reasons: (1) It appears that the meaning of *homonyma* was seriously debated in Aristotle's times and that his own formulation was but one among many others. Evidently, there were other platonizing thinkers in the Academy who had formulated their own variants. According to ancient testimonies, the definition which Speusippus propounded proved to be quite influential in later times.(2) The fact that Aristotle chose to open the

Categories with a discussion, brief as it is, on the meaning of *homonyma*, *synonyma*, and *paronyma*, attests to the significance he attached to this preliminary chapter. Furthermore, there is general agreement among all the commentators on the relevance of the first chapter of the *Categories* to the doctrine of the categories. (3) The corpus affords ample internal evidence that the doctrine of *homonyma* figures largely in Aristotle's various discussions on the nature of first principles and his method of metaphysical analysis. This being the case, it is clear that Aristotle considered this part of his logical theory to have applications beyond the limited scope of what is said in the *Categories*.

Since we do not know the actual order of Aristotle's writings it is next to the impossible to decide which formulation came first. It remains a fact that Aristotle discusses cases of *homonyma* and their causes as early as the *Sophistici Elenchi*. Special mention of the cause of *homonyma* is made in the very first chapter of this work. We find it again in the *Topics*, *de Interpretatione*, the *Analytics* and the other logical treatises. He opens the *Sophistici Elenchi* with a general distinction between genuine and apparent reasonings and refutations, and then proceeds to explain why some refutations fail to reach their goal, that is, establish the contradictory of the given conclusion.(3)" (pp. 87-88)

(2) See *De Speusippi Academici scriptis*, ed. P. Lang (Bonn, 1911), frag, 32. Simplicius comments that Speusippus defended this formulation and remarks that once the definition is granted, it could be shown that *homonyma* are also *synonyma*, and vice versa (*In Aristotelis Categoriae Commentarium*, ed. C. Kalbfleisch, *Commentaria in Aristotelis Graeca*, VIII [Berlin, 1907] 29, 5-6).

(3) "It is impossible in a discussion to bring in the actual things discussed: we use their names as symbols instead of them; and, therefore, we oppose that what follows in the names, follows in the things as well, just as people who calculate suppose in regard to their counters. But the two cases (names and things) are not alike. For names are finite and so is the sum-total of formulae, while things are infinite in number. Inevitably, then, the same formulae, and a single

name, have a number of meanings. Accordingly just as, in counting, those who are not clever in manipulating their counters are taken in by the experts, in the same way in arguments too those who are not well acquainted with the force of names misreason both in their own discussions and when they listen to others. For this reason, then, and for others to be mentioned later, there exists both reasoning and refutation that is apparent but not real” (165a 5-20, Oxford trans.).

10. ———. 1968. "The Meaning of 'Ο λόγος τῆς οὐσίας in *Categories* 1a." *The Monist* no. 52:252-267.

Reprinted as Chapter 3 in: J. P. Anton, *Categories and Experience. Essays on Aristotelian Themes*, Oakdale, N.Y.: Dowling College Press, 1996, 61-85.

"The purpose of this paper is to inquire into the meaning of the troublesome Aristotelian expression ὁ λόγος τῆς οὐσίας; as it occurs at the very opening of *Categories* 1a 1-2, 7. That the passage has presented serious difficulties to commentators and translators alike can be easily ascertained through a survey and comparison of the relevant literature. It would seem from the disagreements among translators that the passage is either vague in the original Greek or that Aristotle did not have a special doctrine to put across at the very opening such that would require technical formulations that would comply with the ontology presented in this treatise.

The main body of this paper is given to an examination of the diverse difficulties the passage raises in connection with the doctrine of *homonymy* and the ontology which supports it. On the basis of this analysis, and after consideration of the available evidence, textual and historical, attention is given to the possibility of proving the thesis that ὁ λόγος τῆς οὐσίας; (hereafter abbreviated as *L of O*, L for *logos* and O for *ousia*) has its special doctrinal meaning and is, therefore, free from terminological imprecision. Accordingly, the interpretation defended in this paper advocates a definite reading for *logos* and for *ousia*, and one that forbids a strict identification of *ousia* with the variant meaning of *tode ti* (individual existents or particular substances),(2) let alone taking liberties with the

notion so that it may include in its denotation the *symbebekota* (accidental properties). More pointedly, an argument is presented in favor of interpreting *ousia* to mean substance in the sense of species, on the ground that only in this sense is *ousia* definable.(3)

The thesis that the expression *L of O* has a precise and technical meaning can be put as follows: if we admit that *ousia* can occur as both subject and predicate, and that as ultimate subject it denotes individual substances whereas as predicate it ranges in denotation from *infima species* to *summa genera*, it can be shown that Aristotle means to say in this context that *ousia* must be understood in the sense of being (a) definable and (b) predicable. If so, then, it can only mean secondary substance, with the added restriction that the highest genera be excluded on account of their undefinability. The context of the first chapter is unmistakably one in which *homonymy* is presented and explained as a topic highly requisite to the exposition of the ontology that undergirds the general doctrine presented in the *Categories*." (pp. 61-62)

(2) *Cat.* 3b 10; *Post. An.* 73b 7, 87b 29.

(3) For *infima species*, *Post. An.* esp. *passim*; 73a 32. It must be remembered that unless *ousia* means species, *infima* or otherwise, it cannot be defined. *Post. An.* 83b 5.

11. ———. 1975. "Some Observations on Aristotle's Theory of Categories." *Diotima.Epitheoresis Philosophikes Ereunes* no. 3:66-81.

Reprinted as Chapter 6 in: J. P. Anton, *Categories and Experience. Essays on Aristotelian Themes*, Oakdale, N.Y.: Dowling College Press, 1996, 153-174.

"This paper deals with what seems to be a rather small topic but one, as I hope to show, which has significant implications. At many interpreters before me have said, the treatise titled *Categories* brings together certain basic logical and ontological views of Aristotle. I find myself in agreement with this interpretation but I take it a step further to say that the treatise contains enough evidence to support the view that Aristotle intended and in fact did make a basic distinction

between a theory of being and a theory of categories, and even more sharply than has been hitherto recognized.

I will argue that this distinction has been largely overlooked and even ignored by every major interpreter of Aristotle, with the subsequent result that these two basic doctrines as presented in the *Categories*, instead of being kept apart, have been treated as identical theories. One of the most serious consequences of the tendency to collapse the meanings of the key terms “being” and “category” is not so much that they have been used interchangeably, but more importantly, that their fusion obscures our understanding of that treatise. I propose to show that Aristotle's intent was to correlate the ultimate genera of being, *ta gene tou ontos*, and the logically fundamental modes of predication, *ta schemata tes kategorias*. I do not contend that scholars have been remiss to notice the fact that Aristotle has a theory which deals with these modes of predication but only that they have been misled by the prevailing tendency to overlook the difference between the two concepts, “being” and “category.” (pp. 153-154)

12. ———. 1992. "On the Meaning of *kategoria* in Aristotle's *Categories*." In *Aristotle's Ontology*, edited by Preus, Anthony and Anton, John Peter, 3-18. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Reprinted as Chapter 7 in: J. P. Anton, *Categories and Experience. Essays on Aristotelian Themes*, Oakdale, N.Y.: Dowling College Press, 1996, 175-201.

"In a paper written in 1974 and subsequently published in 1975, (1) I argued that the Aristotelian texts, particularly that of the *Categories*, allow for a parallel yet distinct interpretation to the traditional and prevalent one that takes the categories to be terms, ultimate classes, types, and concepts. (2) My position there was that the primary use of *kategoria* refers to well-formed statements made according to canons and, to be more precise, to fundamental types of predication conforming to rules sustained by the ways of beings.

In trying to decide how Aristotle uses the term *kategoria* in

the treatise that bears the same name, *Categories*, (3) provision must be made for the fact that there is nothing in the text to justify the meanings that ancient commentators and also modern writers assigned to it and that found their way both into translations of Aristotle's works and into the corpus of established terminology. (4) The present article is written in the hope that it will contribute in some small measure to understanding why certain distinctions in the treatise *Categories* should have prevented interpreters from assigning the traditional meaning of "genera of being" to the term *category*, hence giving it the meaning of "highest predicate" rather than "fundamental type of predication"." (p. 175)

(1) Anton 1975, 67-81.

(2) The paper published here was presented at the December 28, 1983, meeting of the Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy, Boston, MA.

(3) The title of the treatise was a subject of considerable dispute in antiquity. For a recent survey on this problem see M. Frede 1987b, 11- 28. According to Frede "the question of authenticity is crucially linked to the question of unity" (12). The problem of the unity covers the relation of the early part of the treatise to the part that discusses the postpredicamenta.

(4) There are many surveys of interpretations concerning the categories. I do not plan to offer another survey, for my main interest lies in the investigation into what we can learn about the theory of categories in the *Categories*. Nor am I concerned with reproducing and commenting on the table of enumeration of the "categories" in Aristotle's works. The list can be readily found in Apelt 1891, conveniently reproduced in Elders 1961, 194-96. One can still raise the question about the intent of the list or lists. If a defense of objections can be made to the reading that makes the list of "categories" refer to classes of being, then we have an alternative before us, which has not been adequately explored, namely whether the list refers not to classes of being or classes of predicates, but to the types of statements that pertain to the attribution of genuine features present in the entity named in the subject position. It is the existence of the concrete individual qua subject that sets

the context for the selective lists of relevant types of attribution.

13. ———. 1996. *Categories and Experience. Essays on Aristotelian Themes*. Oakdale: Dowling College Press.

Table of Contents: 1. Introduction 7; 2. Aristotle's Principle of Contradiction: Its Ontological Foundations and Platonic Antecedents (1972) 35; 3. The Meaning of *o Logos tes Ousias* in *Categories* 1a (1968) 61; 4. The Aristotelian Doctrine of *Homonyma* (1968) 87; 5. Ancient Interpretations of Aristotle's *Homonyma* (1969) 115; 6. Observations on Aristotle's Theory of Categories (1975) 153; 7. On the Meaning of *Kategoria* in Aristotle's *Categories* (1992) 175; 8. Aristotle's Theory of Categories and Post-Classical Ontologies (1981) 203; 9. The Unity of Scientific Inquiry: The Scope of *Ousia* (1989) 215; 10. Revolutions and Reforms (1988) 237; 11. *Politeia* and *Paideia*: The Structure of Constitutions (1988) 249; 12. Aristotle on Justice and Equity (1989) 279; 13. Ideal Values and Cultural Action (1991) 293; 14. Timely Observations on Aristotle's Architectonic of *Politike Techne* (1994) 307; Bibliography 325; Index 333; About the Author 337-338.

14. Bäck, Allan. 2000. *Aristotle's Theory of Predication*. Leiden: Brill.

Table of Contents: Acknowledgments IX; Preface XI, Notation and Conventions XIV; Introduction 1; Chapter One The Linguistic Evidence 11; Chapter Two Aristotle's Precursors 31; Chapter Three Aristotle on the Uses of 'Be' in Greek 59; Chapter Four The Statement 98; Chapter Five The Categories as Predicates 132; Chapter Six Type of Predication 166; Chapter Seven Negations 199; Chapter Eight Inference 228; Chapter Nine Consequences 264; Bibliography 321; Index 339-346.

"In *Categories* 2 Aristotle presents a fourfold division of beings, known as the ontological square. There he distinguishes substance and accident, and the universal and the singular. The distinctions that he makes parallel distinctions that he makes elsewhere for types of predications: the essential versus the accidental, and, again, the singular versus the universal. Aristotle also uses these distinctions in

his various discussions of the ten categories.

In the next chapter I shall discuss the types of predication. Here I wish to investigate the relation between Aristotle's theory of the categories and his views on predication. After all, 'category' ('κατηγορία') means 'predication', and Aristotle has said that the categories are the different ways in which being per se may be said.⁽¹⁾ He even calls the ten ultimate sorts of being, substance (τί ἐστίν) quantity, relation, ..., "the figures of predication". [*Metaph.* 1017a23] Above I have claimed that whatever, S, has being per se is such that 'S is' is true, where 'is' means real presence, and can be specified further through certain additional predicates. The categories would then be the types, or figures, of such predicates. In this way, Aristotle's doctrines about being per se in the *Metaphysics* embody the aspect theory of predication, so I have claimed. Here I shall consider whether what Aristotle says about the various categories agrees with this interpretation. Now Aristotle says too that "being" is divided into the four divisions of the ontological square. So I shall also have to consider the relationship between these two classifications, the one into four, the other into ten divisions." (p. 132)

(1) 'Predication' in the sense that "the kinds of predication define classes or kinds of predicates, namely the classes of those predicates which occur in a statement of a given kind of predication,"[sc., of being per se], as Michael Frede, "Categories in Aristotle," p. 32, says.

He also notes that Aristotle is using 'κατηγορία' in a new way. L. M. De Rijk, "On Ancient and Mediaeval Semantics and Metaphysics: 4. The Categories as Classes of Names," pp. 18-9; 21, notes that 'κατηγορία' here means 'predication', but originally 'accuse', or better 'reveal'.

15. Barnes, Jonathan. 1971. "Homonymy in Aristotle and Speusippus." *Classical Quarterly* no. 21:65-80.

Reprinted with the title *Aristotle and Speusippus on Homonymy*, in J. Barnes, *Logical Matters: Essays in Ancient Philosophy II*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 284-311.

"1. 'There are important differences between Aristotle's account of homonymy and synonymy on the one hand, and Speusippus' on the other; in particular, Aristotle treated homonymy and synonymy as properties of things, whereas Speusippus treated them as properties of words. Despite this difference, in certain significant passages Aristotle fell under the influence of Speusippus and used the words "homonymous" and "synonymous" in their Speusippean senses.

These sentences are a rough expression of what I shall call the Hambruch thesis. The thesis was advanced by Ernst Hambruch in 1904 in his remarkable monograph on the relation between Academic and early Aristotelian logic. (*)

Hambruch singled out *Topics* A 15 as peculiarly Speusippean, and he conjectured that it was based on some written work of Speusippus." (p. 65)

(*) Ernst Hambruch, *Logische Regeln der platonischen Schule in der aristotelischen Topik*, Berlin, 1904, pp. 28-29. [Reprinted with Curt Arpe, *Das ti en einai bei Aristoteles* (1938), New York: Arno Press, 1976].

16. ———. 2011. "Aristotelian Quantities." In *Studi sulle Categorie di Aristotele*, edited by Bonelli, Maddalena and Guadalupe Masi, Francesca, 337-370. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.

"A quantity is usually conceived to be a kind of property. It is thought to be a kind of property that admits of degrees, and which is therefore to be contrasted with those properties which have an all-or-none character (for example being pregnant, or being crimson). According to this conception, objects possess quantities in much the same way as they possess other properties, usually called 'qualities'(1).

That conception of quantities is Aristotelian:

Of things said without any complexity, each signifies either a substance or a quantum or a quale (...) Roughly speaking, substances are, say, a man, a horse; quanta, say, two-foot, three-foot; qualia, say, white, cultivated [...](2).

(Arist. *Cat.* 4, lb25-29)

Quanta (or quantities, as they are usually called) form the second of the ten groups of items (or the ten categories, as they are usually called) which Aristotle discusses in the central part of his *Categories* and to which he not infrequently alludes in his other philosophical writings. The third group of items consists of qualia (or qualities, as they are usually called): quanta stand alongside qualia, and objects are supposed to possess them 'in much the same way' as they possess qualia.

Quanta have a chapter to themselves in the *Categories*, and another in Book Δ of the *Metaphysics*, and there are remarks scattered elsewhere in the corpus³. But all told, Aristotle says little about quanta (in part perhaps because much of his science was qualitative rather than quantitative); and what he says in the *Categories* does not always chime with what he says in the *Metaphysics*. Moreover, the whole business (or so I find) is curiously elusive." (p. 337)

(*) This is a revised version of a paper which I gave at a Colloquium held in Bergamo in December 2010. The paper excited a flurry of criticism, to my great advantage. I thank also, and in particular, Maddalena Bonelli, who both organized and animated the Colloquium.

(1) Cf. Ellis 1966, 24.

(2) Τῶν κατὰ μηδεμίαν συμπλοκὴν λεγομένων ἕκαστον ἦτοι οὐσίαν σημαίνει ἢ ποσὺν ἢ ποιόν ἢ πρὸς τι ἢ ποῖ) ἢ ποτέ ἢ κείσθαι ἢ ἔχειν ἢ ποιεῖν ἢ πάσχειν. ἔστι δὲ οὐσία μὲν ὡς τυπφ εἰπεῖν οἶον ἄνθρωπος, ἵππος· ποσὸν δὲ οἶον δίπληχυ, τρίπληχυ· ποιόν δὲ οἶον λευκόν, γραμματικόν [...]

(3) Notably in Book I of the *Metaphysics* and in the discussions of motion, place and time in the *Physics*. The following pages largely restrict themselves to the chapters in *Cat.* and *Metaph.* Δ - and they touch on only some of the issues which those chapters raise."

References

B. Ellis, *Basic Concepts of Measurement*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1966.

17. ———. 2012. "Aristotle's *Categories* and Aristotle's

'categories'." In *Logical Matters: Essays in Ancient Philosophy II*, 187-265. New York: Oxford University Press.

Revised English translation of: *Les Catégories et les catégories*, in Otto Bruun, Lorenzo Corti (éds.), *Les Catégories et leur histoire*, Paris: Vrin, 2005, pp. 11-80, with an Appendix on the new critical edition by Richard Bodéüs, *Aristote. Catégories*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres 2001, pp. 258-265.

"The history of Aristotle's theory of categories is the history of a doctrine and the history of a text — or rather, of a small corpus of texts. For the text which Aristotle himself wrote — the *Categories* — was abridged and paraphrased and attacked and defended and commented upon and translated, so that its fifteen pages are accompanied by a vast library of secondary literature. The *Categories* had an extraordinary success, in late antiquity and after, and the doctrine of the categories had an immense influence on the history of philosophy — ancient, medieval, and modern. But if the theory was familiar in all parts of the republic of letters, knowledge of the Aristotelian doctrine did not always carry with it an acquaintance with Aristotle's text. Sometimes it is plain that an author who 'cites' the *Categories* has read no more than an epitome or a doxographer's report. Often enough, Aristotle's theory is exploited on the basis of a paraphrase or a commentary. And in any event — what ought to depress but not to astonish — an understanding of the doctrine was always filtered through the secondary literature, and the doctrine took some flavour from the particular filter it passed through.

With hindsight, the triumph of the doctrine may seem inevitable — after all, a glorious future presupposes a distinguished past, and if the past is distinguished, then the future is likely to be rosy. But in reality things were otherwise. The birth of the doctrine (as I have just recalled) was difficult. Its adolescence was neither robust nor promising.

Aristotle's successors often worked on the same subjects and wrote under the same titles as he had done: they attempted to fill the gaps which he had left (and sometimes indicated), they tried to state more clearly what he had set out obscurely or approximatively, and they sometimes sought to mend his

errors." (pp. 198-199)

18. Barnes, Kenneth T. 1977. "Aristotle on Identity and Its Problems." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 22:48-62.

Abstract: "There are certain problematic arguments, collective reference to which is often compressed into the expression, "the problems of identity."

Strictly speaking, of course, there are no problems of identity. But there are problems, if only apparent, for a certain view about identity, namely, the view that identicals are indiscernible. In light of the seeming freshness of these philosophical problems, it is remarkable that we find in Aristotle's early writings what seems to be a formulation of the view that identicals are indiscernible, as well as a confrontation with certain arguments that raise apparent difficulties for that view. Philosophers have not always been clear about these arguments, and some have taken them to prove the need to qualify the view that identicals are indiscernible. Aristotle is among those who have drawn such a conclusion, but so are some contemporary philosophers. In this paper I examine Aristotle's solution to certain problems of identity. I attempt to state the solution clearly and indicate the mixture of insight and error that influenced it."

19. Baumer, Michael R. 1993. "Chasing Aristotle's Categories Down the Tree of Grammar." *Journal of Philosophical Research* no. 18:341-349.

Abstract: "This paper addresses the problem of the origin and principle of Aristotle's distinctions among the categories. It explores the possibilities of reformulating and reviving the 'grammatical' theory, generally ascribed first to Trendelenburg. the paper brings two new perspectives to the grammatical theory: that of Aristotle's own theory of syntax and that of contemporary linguistic syntax and semantics. I put forth a provisional theory of Aristotle's categories in which (1) I propose that the categories sets forth a theory of lexical structure, with the ten categories emerging as lexical or semantic categories, and (2) I suggest conceptual links, both in Aristotle's writings and in actuality, between these semantic

categories and certain grammatical inflections."

20. Benson, Hugh. 1988. "Universals as Sortals in the Categories." *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* no. 69:282-306.

"In his essay *Individuals in Aristotle*,⁽¹⁾ Michael Frede suggests that in the *Categories* Aristotle attempts to maintain the independence of the Platonic distinction between universals and particulars on the one hand, and his new distinction between properties and objects, on the other. Thus, according to Frede, in the *Categories* there are universal objects and particular objects as well as universal properties and particular properties.

As a result, Frede thinks we must reject, at least in the context of the *Categories*, what might be called the traditional analysis of the universal.

In this essay I want to defend this suggestion at greater length. (2)"

(...)

"First, I will briefly explain the distinction between the traditional analysis of the universal, (TA), and what I will call the sortal system analysis, (SA). The former is traditional in that it is commonly accepted as Aristotle's analysis of the universal/particular distinction. The latter may be equivalent to Frede's subjective part analysis.⁽³⁾ Second, I will defend the claim that in the *Categories* Aristotle is committed to the existence of particular properties, (A). This is a corollary of the suggestion that Aristotle took the universal/particular and property/object distinctions to be independent. Third, I will explain why such a commitment leads us to reject the traditional analysis, and why the sortal analysis is an appropriate replacement. Finally, I will sketch how an appeal to such an analysis might solve one of the more traditional problems of the middle books of the *Metaphysics*." (pp. 282-283)

(1) Frede (1978), first appeared as 'Individuen bei Aristoteles' in *Antike and Abendland*.

Anscombe (1967) also suggests the independence of these

distinctions when she discusses the two ‘most notable’ features of Aristotle’s doctrine not found in modern treatments (p. 8).

(2) As we will see, this should not be taken as suggesting that I agree with either his position concerning the trope controversy (cf. n. 24 below) nor with his position concerning his resolution to one of the traditional difficulties of the central books of *Metaphysics*.

(3) Cf. n. 15 below.

References

Anscombe, G.E.M. (1967), “Aristotle” in G.E.M. Anscombe and P. T. Geach, *Three Philosophers*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Frede, M. (1978), “Individuals in Aristotle” in *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 49-71.

21. Benveniste, Émile. 1971. "Categories of Thought and Language." In *Problems in General Linguistics*, 55-64. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press.

English translation by Mary E. Meek of *Catégories de pensée et catégories de langue* (1958).

"We must enter into a concrete historical situation, and study the categories of a specific thought and a specific language. Only on this condition will we avoid arbitrary stands and speculative solutions. Now, we are fortunate to have at our disposal data which one would say were ready for our examination, already worked out and stated objectively within a well-known system: the Aristotle's categories. In the examination of these categories, we may dispense with philosophical technicalities. We will consider them simply as an inventory of properties which a Greek thinker thought could be predicated of a subject and, consequently, as the list of a priori concepts which, according to him, organize experience. It is a document of great value for our purpose.

Let us recall at first the fundamental text, which gives the most complete list of these properties, ten in all (*Categories* 4, 1)

(...)

Aristotle thus posits the totality of predications that may be made about a being, and he aims to define the logical status of each one of them. Now it seems to us-and we shall try to show-that these distinctions are primarily categories of language and that, in fact, Aristotle, reasoning in the absolute, is simply identifying certain fundamental categories of the language in which he thought. Even a cursory look at the statement of the categories and the examples that illustrate them, will easily verify this interpretation, which apparently has not been proposed before." (p. 57)

(...)

"In working out this table of "categories," Aristotle intended to list all the possible predications for a proposition, with the condition that each term be meaningful in isolation, not engaged in a *συμπλοκή*, or, as we would say, in a syntagm. Unconsciously he took as a criterion the empirical necessity of a distinct expression for each of his predications. He was thus bound to reflect unconsciously the distinctions which the language itself showed among the main classes of forms, since it is through their differences that these forms and these classes have a linguistic meaning. He thought he was defining the attributes of objects but he was really setting up linguistic entities; it is the language which, thanks to its own categories, makes them to be recognized and specified.

We have thus an answer to the question raised in the beginning which led us to this analysis. We asked ourselves what was the nature of the relationship between categories of thought and categories of language. No matter how much validity Aristotle's categories have as categories of thought, they turn out to be transposed from categories of language. It is what one can say which delimits and organizes what one can think. Language provides the fundamental configuration of the properties of things as recognized by the mind. This table of predications informs us above all about the class structure of a particular language.

It follows that what Aristotle gave us as a table of general and permanent conditions is only a conceptual projection of a given linguistic state." (pp. 60-61)

22. Blackwell, Richard J. 1957. "The Methodological Function of the *Categories* in Aristotle." *The New Scholasticism* no. 31:526-537.

"It is a curious fact that the ten categories are listed in only two places in the writings of Aristotle.(1) In the majority of cases only five or less categories are listed.(2) Furthermore Aristotle unlike St. Thomas does not designate the categories by the definite number "ten" but rather merely gives a listing, usually a partial one, of the individual categories.

This situation, plus the lack of any explicit statement by Aristotle as to how the individual categories are established, has led to a complicated controversy among modern scholars regarding the nature and origin of the doctrine of the categories.

Most of the literature on this problem centers around the question of how Aristotle arrived at the listing of the ten categories which have become a permanent part of the Aristotelian tradition. The results have by no means been conclusive.

The controversy began with F . A. Trendelenburg's position that the categories are derived from the distinction of the various grammatical parts of speech. H. Bonitz disagreed with this interpretation, claiming that the categories indicate the different determinations in which the notion of being is predicated.(4)" (p. 526)

(1) *Categories*, 1 b 26, and *Topics*, 103 b 22.

:(2) For a complete catalogue of the listing of the categories in Aristotle and the Greek terms used in each case, see Otto Apelt, "Kategorienlehre

des Aristoteles," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Griechischen Philosophie* (Leipzig, 1891) pp. 140-41.

(3) Friedrich Adolf Trendelenburg, "Geschichte der Kategorienlehre," *Historischer Beiträge zur Philosophie* (Leipzig, 1846) I, 23 ff., 194 ff.

(4) H. Bonitz, *Ueber die Kategorien des Aristoteles* (Wien, 1853).

23. Block, Irving. 1978. "Predication in Aristotle." *Philosophical Inquiry* no. 1:53-57.

Abstract: "This article traces briefly the development of Aristotle's thoughts on predication as this progressed from the *Categories* to the *Posterior Analytics* with the *Topics* coming somewhere in between. In the *Categories* predication is only of essential attributes and the subject of a predicating statement need not be a substance. In the *Posterior Analytics*, predication is the attribution of either essential or accidental attributes and the subject must be a substance, otherwise it is not predication in the true sense. The *Topics* represents a half-way house in between as it makes no mention of the predication-inherence distinction of the *Categories* on the one hand, and on the other gives no predominance to the notion of substance when discussing the subject of predication, as we find in *Posterior Analytics*."

24. Bolton, Robert. 2013. "Two Doctrines of Categories in Aristotle: *Topics*, *Categories*, and *Metaphysics*." In *Aristotle on Method and Metaphysics*, edited by Feser, Edward, 68-101. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

"Introduction. The aim of this chapter is to offer support for the view – one contrary to the main tradition represented by Alexander and most more recent commentators – that there are, in fact, two different sets and two different, and incompatible, doctrines of categories in Aristotle. I do not have in mind here any difference between the *Categories*, or the *Organon*, and the *Metaphysics*. Rather, both doctrines are present in the *Organon* and even in a single chapter of the *Organon*, *Topics* I.9. The proper explanation for this striking fact is not, as some would suggest, historical or developmental – that one doctrine came earlier in Aristotle's thinking, the other later. Nor is it, as others have suggested, that both doctrines need to be mastered to adequately employ dialectic, so that both are present in the *Topics*. Instead, as we shall see, one doctrine, for Aristotle, is precisely suited to the needs of the art of reasoning *kata doxan*, i.e. to the practice of dialectic, the other to procedure *kat' aletheian*, or to the needs and the practice of science, indeed of metaphysical science. I go on to consider a main question for this result, one whose proper

resolution helps us to understand better Aristotle's scientific method overall and the special, if limited, role of dialectic in it. I begin by developing a problem for the interpretation of *Topics I.9*." (p. 68)

25. Brakas, George. 1988. *Aristotle's Concept of the Universal*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Contents: Acknowledgments 1; Preface 3; I: Recent Views of Aristotle's Universal 11; II: The Definition of Aristotle's Early Concept of the Universal 17; III: Interpretations of Aristotle's Doctrine of the Categories in Recent Times 21; Chapter IV: A Consideration of the Main Interpretations 31; V: The Categories and the Meaning of 'an Existent' at the Time of the *Prior Analytics* 55; VI: Fundamentals of Aristotle's Theory of the Simple Statement at the Time of the *De Interpretatione* and *Prior Analytics* 65; VII: Interpretations of 'is Said of' in the Recent Literature 77; VIII: The Senses of 'Is Asserted of' 87; IX: Aristotle's Early, Middle and Late Views of the Universal 97; Selected Bibliography 111-113.

"The main interpretations. The fundamental question concerning Aristotle's doctrine of the categories is: Just what is it supposed to classify? Even on this most fundamental issue the chorus of voices arguing for one interpretation over another seems a virtual Tower of Babel — the literature, vast as it is, seems to encompass interpretations of every possible and impossible variety. This is to exaggerate, of course, but not by so very much.

It is possible, however, to sort out what has been said on this question in recent times. In the last 150 years or so there have been mainly five interpretations of what the doctrine is supposed to classify. According to one, the categories are categories of existing things — that is, of that general domain, not some sub-category of it; according to a second, they are categories of concepts — either 'real' of 'in the mind'; according to a third, they are categories of subject and predicate expressions; according to a fourth, they are categories of the meanings of subject and predicate expressions; and according to a fifth, they are categories of the different senses of the copula. Most commentators, I would

venture to say, have accepted one or another of these interpretations — either in these ‘pure’ forms or some approximation of them, either one singly or several in combination. To illustrate this, let us consider some of the major studies of Aristotle’s doctrine that have appeared in recent times. (p. 21)

The views of Trendelenburg, Bonitz, Brentano, Apelt, and De Rijk.

"Let us sum up this discussion. Trendelenburg seemed to hold that Aristotle’s doctrine classifies subject and predicate expressions; Bonitz held that it classifies beings; Brentano held that it classifies beings, concepts (that is, ‘real concepts’) and predicates; Apelt held that it classifies concepts, predicates and copulae; and De Rijk, it seems, held that it classifies ‘reality’, the meanings of subjects and predicates, and the senses of the copula. These scholars, then, illustrate that most commentators have accepted one or another of the five interpretations indicated at the outset - either in their ‘pure’ forms or some approximation of them, either one singly or several in combination.

However, other prominent writers have expressed views on the nature of Aristotle’s categories, and we should consider at least some of these. For, even though they do not appear as the theses of major studies of the doctrine, these writers are prominent, and it therefore behooves us to consider whether what they have to say offers anything of interest that has not already been mentioned." (p. 26)

The views of H. W. B. Joseph (*), W. D. Ross, Ernst Kapp, Joseph Owens, Kneale and Kneale, J. L. Ackrill, and J. M. E. Moravcsik.

(*) [*An Introduction to Logic*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Clarendon Press, 1916), pp. 48-66. First edition published in 1906].

"We can see, then, that these additional interpretations offer little that is new. Except for Joseph’s view that the doctrine classifies universals and Owens’ that it classifies individuals, every one of these interpretations is a combination of two or

more of those indicated at the outset, either in their 'pure' forms or in some approximation to them." (p. 29)

26. Brentano, Franz. 1975. *On the Several Senses of Being in Aristotle*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Translation of *Von der mannigfachen Bedeutung des Seienden nach Aristoteles* (1862) by Rolf George.

Contents: Editor's Preface XI; Preface XV; Introduction 1; Chapter I. The Fourfold Distinction of Being 3; Chapter II. Accidental Being 6; Chapter III. Being in the Sense of Being True 15; Chapter IV. Potential and Actual Being 27; Chapter V. Being According to the Figures of the Categories 49; Notes 149-197.

"This is Brentano's doctoral dissertation and his first book. In it he contemplates the several senses of "being," using Aristotle as his guide. He finds that (in Aristotle's view) being in the sense of the categories, in particular substantial being, is the most basic; all other modes, potential and actual being, being in the sense of the true, etc., stand to it in a relation of well-founded analogy. Many of his mature views are prepared in this work.

For example his discussion of being in the sense of being true appears to be the foundation of his later nonpropositional theory of judgment." (Editor's Preface XI)

"Thus the discussion of the several senses of being form the threshold of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. This makes clear why these considerations must have had great importance for him, and this importance becomes even more obvious if one considers that in this context there is considerable danger of confounding several concepts which have the same name. For, as he remarks in the second book of the *Posterior Analytics* 10, it becomes more and more difficult to recognize equivocation the higher the degree of abstraction and generality of concepts. Thus the possibility of deception must be greatest with being itself since, as we have already seen, it is the most general predicate.

But we have not yet established the fact that, according to Aristotle, being is asserted with several significations, not only

with one (*Categories* 1. 1a1. 6). To begin with we shall establish this through several passages of the *Metaphysics* and show, at the same time, how the various distinctions of the several senses of being can be initially subordinated to four senses of this name; subsequently we shall proceed to a special discussion of each of them." (p. 2)

"The modes of predication naturally correspond to the modes of being if one makes the subject [*hypokeimenon*] of all being into the subject of the sentence.

" 'To be' signifies as many different things as there are different ways of using it" (*Met.* V. 7. 1017a23)." (p. 131)

27. Carson, Scott. 2000. "Aristotle on Existential Import and Non Referring Subjects." *Synthese* no. 124:343-360.

Abstract: "Much contemporary philosophy of language has shown considerable interest in the relation between our linguistic practice and our metaphysical commitments, and this interest has begun to influence work in the history of philosophy as well.(1) In his *Categories* and *De interpretatione*, Aristotle presents an analysis of language that can be read as intended to illustrate an isomorphism between the ontology of the real world and how we talk about that world. Our understanding of language is at least in part dependent upon our understanding of the relationships that exist among the enduring πράγματα that we come across in our daily experience. Part of the foundations underlying Aristotle's doctrine of categories seems to have been a concern, going back to the Academy, about the problem of false propositions: language is supposed to be a tool for communicating the way things are, and writers in antiquity were often puzzled by the problem of how we are to understand propositions that claim that reality is other than it is.(2) Aristotle's analysis of propositions raises a particular problem in this regard: if the subject of a proposition does not refer to anything, how can the proposition be useful for talking about a state of the world?

The problem falls into two separate but related parts: propositions whose subjects are singular terms and hence make claims about some particular thing, and propositions

whose subjects are general terms and hence make claims about classes. In this paper I will explain Aristotle's treatment of each kind, focusing in particular on what has widely been perceived as a problem in his treatment of singular terms. My discussion of his treatment of general terms will be more brief, but will show that his treatment of them is consistent with his treatment of singular terms."

(1) An interesting treatment of this topic that illustrates how such concerns intersect with issues in the history of philosophy can be found in Diamond (1996), Introduction II (pp. 13–38). Whittaker (1996) also touches on these themes.

(2) On the treatment by ancient philosophers of the problem of falsehood see Denyer (1991).

References

Denyer, N.: 1991, *Language, Thought and Falsehood in Ancient Greek Philosophy*, Routledge, London.

Diamond, C.: 1996, *The Realistic Spirit: Wittgenstein, Philosophy, and the Mind*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Whittaker, C.: 1996, *Aristotle's De Interpretatione: Contradiction and Dialectic*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

28. ———. 2003. "Aristotle on Meaning and Reference." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* no. 20:319-337.

I. Meaning: language and Reality.

This part of the paper is divided into two Sections. Section I examines a three-part relation among objects, thought, and language from the *De interpretatione* that shows how Aristotle conceived of the nature of mental representation. Section II has to do with a parallel three-part relation from the *Categories* that shows how this conception of mental representation also grounds a conception of linguistic representation that serves to link the natural and the conventional aspects of psychosemantics in a unique account of meaning." (p. 320)

(...)

I.2 The *Categories* Scheme [pp. 326-332]

"The formal isomorphism that we have been examining in the *De interpretatione* lies in a three-place relation among things (*pragmata*), affections of the soul, and words (either spoken or written). There is a similar three-place relation described in the *Categories* that will serve to show how Aristotle conceives of the formal isomorphism between language and ontology that will complete our account of his representational scheme. The three-place relation that we find in the *Categories* is among things (here the phrase used is not *ta pragmata*, but *ta onta*, things that are), accounts (*logoi*) of what those things are, and names (*onomata*) that stand for those accounts. In this scheme *ta onta* and *onomata* play the same roles played by *ta pragmata* and the words (spoken and written signs) of the *De interpretatione* scheme. The middle place in the relation - the affections of the soul in the *De interpretatione* scheme - is held in the *Categories* scheme by "accounts" of the essences (*ousiai*) of the things being represented. It is not immediately clear that these "accounts" play the same role as that played by the affections of the soul in the *De interpretatione* scheme, but in what follows it will be seen that the roles are, indeed, the same. Showing the relation between the two schemes vis-a-vis this central part of the three-part relation will help to make clear how Aristotle conceived of the connection between the natural part of his scheme and the conventional." (p. 327)

29. Chen, Chung-hwan. 1957. "On Aristotle's Two Expressions: καθ' ὑποκειμένου λέγεσθαι and ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ εἶναι: Their Meaning in *Cat.* 2, 1a20-b9 and the Extension of This Meaning." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 2:148-159.

"In the second chapter of the *Categoriae* Aristotle deals chiefly with the division of entities; (I) καθ' ὑποκειμένου λέγεσθαι (II) ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ εἶναι serve here as two principles of division. By their combination, both in their affirmative (Ia, IIa) and in their negative (Ib, IIb) forms, entities are divided into four groups: first group characterized by Ia and IIb, for instance, man; second group characterized by Ib and IIa, for instance, a certain grammatical knowledge, a certain whiteness; third group characterized by Ia and IIa, for instance, knowledge;

fourth group characterized by Ib and IIb, for instance, a certain man.(1)

The meaning of these two principles is far from being clear; each of them needs some explanation. First of all, let us note at once that the term ὑποκειμένον is very equivocal. ὑποκειμένον means in (I) the subject of which something is predicated, and in (II) the substrate in which something is present. Thus the two principles are of quite different nature: the one is a logical, and the other a metaphysical principle. Whether a clear distinction between the logical and the metaphysical is really Aristotelian or not, the fact remains that these two principles set up here are meant to be different from each other.

Otherwise their combination would not divide entities into four different groups. Hence each of these principles must have a distinct realm in which it has its application." (p. 149)

(1) 1, a 20-b 6.

30. Code, Alan. 1985. "On the Origins of Some Aristotelian Theses About Predication." In *How Things Are. Studies in Predication and the History of Philosophy and Science*, edited by Bogen, James and McGuire, James E., 101-131. Dordrecht: Reidel.

To facilitate the discussion of the TMA [Third Man Argument] and the [*Metaphysics*] Z6 thesis, I begin by stating briefly how the notion of predication figures into Aristotle's thought. (5)

Taking the two-place relations *Being* and *Having* as primitive, we may define *essential* and *accidental predication* as follows:

DEF 1: X is essentially predicable of Y iff Y Is X.

DEF2: X is accidentally predicable of Y iff Y Has X.

Predication is defined in terms of the disjunction of essential and accidental predication; *identity* is simply two-way, or reciprocal, essential predication.

A *universal* is an item that can be truly predicated of something distinct from itself; a *particular* is an item that cannot be predicated, either essentially or accidentally, of anything distinct from itself; an *individual* is an item not essentially predicable of anything distinct from itself.

Ontological predication helps us to understand linguistic predication. A universal is essentially predicable of a logical subject X if and only if both the name and the definition of that universal truly apply to X ; otherwise, either the universal is not predicable of X , or it is accidentally predicable. One consequence of this, crucial to my assessment of the significance of the TMA is that, since the definition of man applies to particular men, the associated universal is an essential predicate of those particulars. Furthermore, since the definition applies to both the universal man and the particular men, the universal is essentially predicable of itself and those particulars in the same way.

According to Aristotelian doctrine, a particular is a logical subject, or subject for predication, in virtue of the fact that it is something (definable) essentially. The species under which a particular falls is the definable something that it, the particular, must essentially be if it is to be anything at all."

(...)

"Some linguistic predicates, such as 'man', signify universals that are essentially predicable of all the particulars of which they are predicable. These terms may be used to classify particulars according to their natural kinds. In the *Categories*, though not in the middle books of the *Metaphysics*, particulars are primary substances, the natural kinds that are essentially predicable of them (i.e. their species and genera) are secondary substances, and there are no other substances besides these." (pp. 103-104, some notes omitted)

(5) The ideas sketched in this section are given an extended treatment in my 'Aristotle: Essence and Accident', *Philosophical Grounds of Rationality: Intentions, Categories and Ends*, ed. by R. Grandy and R. Warner (Oxford, 1985). The definitions are adapted from unpublished work by H. P. Grice.

31. Cohen, S.Marc. 2008. "Kooky Objects Revisited: Aristotle's Ontology." *Metaphilosophy* no. 39:3-19.

Abstract: "This is an investigation of Aristotle's conception of accidental compounds (or "kooky objects," as Gareth

Matthews has called them) -- entities such as the pale man and the musical man. I begin with Matthews's pioneering work into kooky objects, and argue that they are not so far removed from our ordinary thinking as is commonly supposed. I go on to assess their utility in solving some familiar puzzles involving substitutivity in epistemic contexts, and compare the kooky object approach to more modern approaches involving the notion of referential opacity. I conclude by proposing that Aristotle provides an implicit role for kooky objects in such metaphysical contexts as the *Categories* and *Metaphysics*."

32. Corkum, Phil. 2009. "Aristotle on Nonsubstantial Individuals." *Ancient Philosophy* no. 29:289-310.

"As a first stab, call a property recurrent if it can be possessed by more than one object, and nonrecurrent if it can be possessed by at most one object. The question whether Aristotle holds that there are nonrecurrent properties has spawned a lively and ongoing debate among commentators over the last forty-five years.

One source of textual evidence in the *Categories*, drawn on in this debate, is Aristotle's claim that certain properties are inseparable from what they are in.

Here the point of contention is whether this commits Aristotle to holding that these properties are inseparable from individuals, since it is commonly held that a property is nonrecurrent, if it is inseparable from an individual. I argue that this evidence is neutral on the question whether there are nonrecurrent properties in Aristotle. One of my aims here is to disentangle the question of recurrence from local issues of individuality and universality in the *Categories*. But another aim is to turn from the textual considerations, which have dominated the debate, to broader methodological considerations. It is a shared assumption among all those who look to textual evidence from the *Categories*, so to decide whether Aristotle believes there are nonrecurrent properties, that in this work Aristotle is engaged

in a project where the question of recurrence is relevant. I argue that Aristotle's concerns in the *Categories* are disjoint from the question of recurrence, and so this shared

assumption is false." (p. 289)

33. ———. 2013. "Aristotle on Predication." *European Journal of Philosophy*:793-813.

Abstract: "A predicate logic typically has a heterogeneous semantic theory. Subjects and predicates have distinct semantic roles: subjects refer; predicates characterize.

A sentence expresses a truth if the object to which the subject refers is correctly characterized by the predicate. Traditional term logic, by contrast, has a homogeneous theory: both subjects and predicates refer; and a sentence is true if the subject and predicate name one and the same thing. In this paper, I will examine evidence for ascribing to Aristotle the view that subjects and predicates refer. If this is correct, then it seems that Aristotle, like the traditional term logician, problematically conflates predication and identity claims. I will argue that we can ascribe to Aristotle the view that both subjects and predicates refer, while holding that he would deny that a sentence is true just in case the subject and predicate name one and the same thing. In particular, I will argue that Aristotle's core semantic notion is not *identity* but the weaker relation of *constitution*. For example, the predication 'All men are mortal' expresses a true thought, in Aristotle's view, just in case the mereological sum of humans is a part of the mereological sum of mortals."

34. Crivelli, Paolo. 2017. "Being-Said-Of in Aristotle's *Categories*." *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica*:531-556.

Abstract: "The ontology of the *Categories* relies on several fundamental relations that obtain between beings. One of these is the relation of being-said-of. The most widespread view among commentators is that the relation of being-said-of amounts to essential predication.

After drawing attention to some relatively neglected textual evidence that tells against such an interpretation, I explore a different account of the relation of being-said-of.

On this alternative picture, while the relation of being-said-of is essential predication when it obtains between universals, it coincides with mere predication when it obtains between a

universal and an individual. The relation of being-said-of turns out to be closely linked with paronymy: in most (but not all) cases where a property (e.g. generosity) is in an individual, a paronymous universal (e.g. generous) is said of that individual.

Also the alternative picture faces difficulties, however. In conclusion, it remains unclear what position, if any, can be coherently attributed to Aristotle."

35. Dancy, Russell. 1975. "On Some of Aristotle's First Thoughts about Substances." *The Philosophical Review* no. 84:338-373.

"But here I shall be concerned only indirectly with Aristotle's criticism of Platonism; my primary object is getting clear on Aristotle's way of answering the question "What are the substances?" (p. 338)

(...)

"V. *Conclusion*. There is a cloud on Aristotle's horizon; we have glanced at it before. It is worth another, very brief, look. Nothing in the *Categories* tells us how to describe such drastic changes as the death and cremation of Socrates, or Jago's becoming a baboon. We need the notion of matter for that, and if we introduce that as a subject for predicates on a level lower than that of Socrates and Jago, we are in trouble: we shall no longer be able to pick out the primary substances by looking for rock-bottom subjects. And that same trouble may threaten from another direction, only I have been suppressing it. Aristotle talks as if the real subject that underlies white and black (2. 1a27-28, 5. 2a31-34, b1-3, 4a3-4, 8. 4a34-35) and disease and health (10. 12a5-6, 11. 14a1I6) were the *body* of the man or animal, and as if the real subject that underlies literacy (2. 1a25-26), knowledge (1b1-2), insanity, irascibility (8. 9b33 ff.), justice and injustice (11. 14a17-I8) were the soul of the man or animal. Only once (that I know of) does he make the man himself the underlying subject (compare 10. 12a13-14). But then, which are the primary substances? What are the interrelationships between matter, form, and the compound? Aristotle owes us something here; elsewhere he tries to pay the debt. I shall leave the question whether his balance is enough to cover his check for another occasion." (pp. 372-373)

36. ———. 1978. "On Some of Aristotle's Second Thoughts About Substances: Matter " *The Philosophical Review* no. 87:372-413.

"In *Metaphysics Z 3*, Aristotle tells us (1029a3-4) that by "matter" he means, "for example, the bronze" of which a statue is made, and a few lines later, at a20-2 1, that by "matter" he means "what is not in its own right called either something or so big or any of the other things by which being is determined." But the bronze of which a statue is made is something in its own right, and in the *Meteorologica* (Γ 6 and elsewhere), Aristotle is prepared to tell us something about what it is in its own right.

The explanation I shall try to provide for this apparent contradiction makes it a reflection of a larger apparent contradiction.

Most of *Metaphysics Z 3* is an examination of the claim of "subjects" ("things that underly," [ὑποκείμενα]) to be substances (realities, οὐσίαι). It turns out that this claim at best demands clarification and at worst rejection, since people who take subjects to be substances might be forced into saying that matter is the ultimate subject, and so the chief substance - but matter isn't anything in its own right, and isn't knowable in its own right. So such people would be making substances, the ultimate realities, things about which there is no saying what they are. And that is no good. So the claim of subjects to be substances must either be clarified or rejected. But that claim was one Aristotle himself advanced, in the *Categories* especially, and it was fundamental in his rejection of Platonism. So Aristotle is attacking a view of his own.

What is needed is a sorting out of the various concepts: matter, subject, substance. That is what *Z 3* is about, and that is what this paper is about. The job is not done at the end of *Z 3*: the notion of form remains foggy. So it does in this paper. And the problem does not arise only at the beginning of *Z 3*: the *Organon* and the physical works had set it up. So let us first go back to the *Categories* and the rest of the *Organon*." (P. 373)

37. Derrida, Jacques. 1982. "The Supplement of Copula:

Philosophy Before Linguistics." In *Margins of Philosophy*, 175-205. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Translation, with Additional Notes, by Alan Bass of *Le supplément de copule. La philosophie devant la linguistique* (1972).

Also translated by James S. Creech and Josué Harrani in *Georgia Review*, 30, 1976, pp. 527-564.

"We know that Benveniste, in "Categories of Thought and Language,"(6) analyzed the limiting constraints which the Greek language imposed upon the system of Aristotelian categories.

Benveniste's propositions are part of a stratified ensemble; nor does he restrict himself to the text which directly states the thesis of the ensemble. We will have to take this into account when the time comes. Moreover, this thesis already has encountered objections of the philosophical type;(7) together the thesis and the objections form a debate which in its development will be invaluable for us.

First, the thesis: "Now it seems to us—and we shall try to show—that these distinctions are primarily categories of language and that, in fact, Aristotle, reasoning in the absolute, is simply identifying certain fundamental categories of the language in which he thought" (p. 57)." (pp. 179-180)

(...)

"The concept or category of the category systematically comes into play in the history of philosophy and of science (in Aristotle's *Organon* and *Categories*) at the point where the opposition of language to thought is impossible, or has only a very derivative sense. Although Aristotle certainly did not reduce thought to language in the sense intended here by Benveniste, he did attempt to take the analysis back to the site of the emergence, that is to the common root, of the language/thought couple. This site is the site of "Being." Aristotle's categories are simultaneously of language and of thought: of language in that they are determined as answers to the question of knowing how Being is said (*legetai*); but also, how Being is said, how is said what is, in that it is, such as it is:

a question of thought, thought itself, the word "thought" which Benveniste uses as if its signification and its history went without saying, in any case never having meant anything outside its relation to Being, its relation to the truth of Being such as it is and in that it is (said)." (p. 182)

(6) In Benveniste, *Problems in General Linguistics*, trans. Mary E. Meek (Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1971). All further references are to this edition.

(7) See Pierre Aubenque, "Aristote et le langage, note annexe sur les catégories d'Aristote. A propos d'un article de M. Benveniste," *Annales de la faculté des Lettres d'Aix* 43 (1965); and J. Vuillemin, *De la logique à la théologie. Cinq études sur Aristote* (Paris: Flammarion, 1967), pp. 75ff.

38. Devereux, Daniel. 1992. "Inherence and Primary Substance in Aristotle's *Categories*." *Ancient Philosophy* no. 12:113-131.

"In chapter 2 of the *Categories*, Aristotle makes use of two predication relations, *being said of* a subject and *being in* a subject, to distinguish four classes of entities. (i) Some things are neither *said of* nor *in* a subject: (ii) some are *said of* but not *in* any subject; (iii) some are both *said of* and *in* a subject; and (iv) some are *in* but not *said of* any subject. There is general agreement about the kinds of entities belonging to in the first class: in the first class are particular substances, e.g., a particular human being or a particular tree; in the second are the species and genera of these particular substances, e.g., Man, Animal, Tree; in the third class are the general kinds or types falling under non-substance categories, e.g. Color as a kind of quality, or Larger Than as a kind of relation. As one successively divides these non-substance kinds into species and sub-species, one arrives at entities such as 'this particular white' or 'this particular knowledge of grammar' which cannot be further subdivided. There has been a spirited debate in recent years over the exact nature of these entities belonging to the fourth class. Is the 'particular white' a specific shade of white that can be shared by a number of things? Or is it a particular instance of such a shade, belonging uniquely to one individual?

Entities in the fourth class have traditionally been regarded as

instances or tokens of types, and it has been thought that this view is required by Aristotle's special notion of what it is to be *in* a subject. Recent opponents of the traditional view have argued that a correct understanding of 'being in a subject' does not support the claim that entities of the fourth class are particular instances of qualities, quantities, etc., and that the weight of the textual evidence in the *Categories*. supports the view that they can be shared by a number of subjects.

In the following discussion I shall try to show that there are passages in the *Categories* that clearly imply that type (iv) entities cannot be shared by a number of subjects - passages that have not been exploited by defenders of the traditional view. I will then turn to the question of what Aristotle means by 'being in a subject', and will argue for an interpretation that seems to make better sense of the relevant texts than other views in the current literature." (p. 113)

39. ———. 1998. "Aristotle's *Categories* 3b10-21: A Reply to Sharma." *Ancient Philosophy* no. 18:341-352.

"In an article published several years ago in this journal (Devereux 1992). I argued for a new way of understanding Aristotle's explanation of what he means by the expression 'in a subject' at *Categories* 1 a24-25. One of my contentions was that although this explanation does not imply that things that are *in* but not *said of* a subject are particulars, there are other passages in the *Categories* that do have this implication: i.e., there are passages besides 1 a24-25 that clearly imply that 'first-order accidents' (things *in* but not *said of* a subject) are not universals but what are called 'tropes' in the contemporary literature. This latter claim is challenged by Ravi Sharma in a recent note in this journal (Sharma 1997).

Though his arguments have not persuaded me to give up my view, I have learned from Sharma's acute discussion." (p. 341)

40. Driscoll, John A. 1981. "ΕΙΔΗ in Aristotle's Earlier and Later Theories of Substance." In *Studies in Aristotle*, edited by O'Meara, Dominic, 129-159. Washington: Catholic University Press.

"My object in this paper is to cast doubt on the view of M. J.

Woods (1) and G. E. L. Owen(2) that the species which is a secondary substance in the *Categories* is elevated to the status of primary substance in *Metaphysics Z*. Woods and Owen(3) commit themselves to this view in the course of very interesting discussions of the differences separating Aristotle's early *Categories* theory and his later *Metaphysics ZHΘ* theory of sensible substance.(4) However, serious objections have been raised against both writers on the basis of Aristotle's remarks in chapter 13 of *Z*. My strategy will be to show that these objections can be met and the most important of Woods' and Owen's insights on Aristotle's two theories of sensible substance maintained provided only that their view on the upgrading of *Categories* species is abandoned.

The εἶδος which is primary substance in *Z*, I will suggest, is neither the species of the *Categories*, as Woods and Owen hold, nor the particular form of a particular substance, as Wilfrid Sellars(5) Edward Harter,(6) and Edwin Hartman(7) insist, but a third entity to be described below.(8)" (p. 129, notes abbreviated)

(1) M. J. Woods, "Problems in *Metaphysics Z*, Chapter 13," in *Aristotle: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. J. M. E. Moravcsik (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1967), pp. 215-38.

(2) E. L. Owen, "The Platonism of Aristotle," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 51 (1965): 125- 50, esp. p. 137; reprinted in *Studies in the Philosophy of Thought and Action*, ed. P. F. Strawson (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 147-74. References below are to the British Academy pagination.

(3) My reasons for believing that Owen is committed to the thesis as stated will be given in section 2 below.

(4) I will follow Woods and Owen in assuming that the *Categories* is an early authentic work of Aristotle and that Books *ZHΘ* of the *Metaphysics* date from much later in his career.

(5) Wilfrid Sellars, "Substance and Form in Aristotle," *Journal of Philosophy*, 54 (1957): 688- 99, and "Aristotle's *Metaphysics*: An Interpretation," in Wilfrid Sellars,

Philosophical Perspectives (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publishers, 1959), pp. 73- 124.

(6) Edward D. Harter, "Aristotle on Primary Ousia," *Archiv fur Geschichte der Philosophie*, 57 (1975): 1- 20.

(7) Edwin Hartman, "Aristotle on the Identity of Substance and Essence," *Philosophical Review*, 85 (1976): 545-61; reprinted with revisions as chapter two of Edwin Hartman, *Substance, Body, and Soul: Aristotelian Investigations* (Princeton University Press, 1977), pp. 57-87.

(8) See section 3 below, especially note 58. My aim here will not be to disprove the Sellars-Harter-Hartman position (a major undertaking which would require extended discussion of their complex arguments) but only to isolate a defensible alternative to it.

41. Duerlinger, James. 1970. "Predication and Inherence in Aristotle's *Categories*." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 15:179-203.

"In *Categories* and *De Interpretatione* (Oxford, 1963), J. L. Ackrill has performed the notable task of clearly delineating a number of questions and alternative answers to these questions involved in the interpretation of Aristotle's discussions about predication and inherence in the *Categories*. As a result of Ackrill's excellent translation and penetrating analysis of the text of the *Categories*, we have arrived at a point at which Aristotle's early distinction between predication and inherence may be discussed with some degree of exactness and clarity. Although I do not agree with everything that Ackrill has said about predication and inherence, my disagreement is grounded in an account of the text which his translation and analysis have helped to make possible. In recent papers G. E. L. Owen ("Inherence," *Phronesis*, 1965) and J. M. E. Moravcsik ("Predication in Aristotle," *Philosophical Review*, 1967) have attempted to improve upon Ackrill's account of Aristotle's distinction between predication and inherence.

I shall use Ackrill's commentary and translation as a base from which to launch an investigation of predication and inherence

in the *Categories*, but I shall find it convenient at times to refer to the comments of Owen and Moravcsik. I shall begin with a very rough summary of what I have to say about predication and inherence, and then discuss them in more exact terms." (p. 179)

42. Duncombe, Matthew. 2015. "Aristotle's Two Accounts of Relatives in *Categories* 7." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 60:436-461.

Abstract: "At *Categories* 7, 6a36-7 Aristotle defines relatives (R1), but at 8a13-28 worries that the definition may include some substances. Aristotle introduces a second account of relatives (R2, at 8a31-2) to solve the problem. Recent commentators have held that Aristotle intends to solve the extensional adequacy worry by restricting the extension of relatives. That is, R2 counts fewer items as relative than R1. However, this cannot explain Aristotle's attitude to relatives, since he immediately returns to using R1. I propose a non-extensional reading. R1 and R2 do not specify different sets of relatives, but rather different ways to understand each relative."

43. Edel, Abraham. 1975. "Aristotle's *Categories* and the Nature of Categorical Theory." *Review of Metaphysics* no. 29:45-65.

Abstract: "The aim of this paper is twofold. First, I want to propose a fresh approach to Aristotle's *Categories*. Second, I want to reflect, in the light of the outcome, on the expectations we can have for categories in metaphysics. No apology is needed for starting with Aristotle. Ever since the *Categories* was placed at the head of the *Corpus*, the foundational character of categorical theory has been explicit. That is why a fresh way of looking at the *Categories* is at the same time a fresh way of looking at Aristotle's metaphysics, and suggests a mode of reckoning with categorical theory generally."

44. Erginel, Mehmet. 2004. "Non-Substantial Individuals in Aristotle's *Categories*." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* no. 26:185-212.

"Aristotle's *Categories* (1) classifies entities by using two predication relations, being 'said of' a subject and being 'in' a

subject.(2)

(...)

The traditionally accepted view, which I shall call the ‘traditional view’, is that a non-substantial individual is a property that cannot be shared by (be ‘in’) more than one individual substance; thus, on this view, the individual white ‘in’ Socrates cannot also be ‘in’ Plato (or anyone else). This interpretation of the *Categories* as challenged by Owen, setting of the modern debate.(4)

Owen and Frede(5) have argued that non-substantial individuals are maximally determinate properties, which can be shared by more than one individual substance; on this view, an individual white would be a particular shade of white, which could be ‘in’ both Socrates and Plato. One way of putting the difference is that the latter view does, whereas the former view does not, allow the recurrence of non-substantial individuals.

In this paper I shall defend a version of the latter view, arguing that the non-substantial individuals of the *Categories* may be ‘in’ several individual substances. I shall proceed by first discussing, and offering an interpretation of, 1A24–5, the critical passage that the traditional view originates from. After defending an interpretation of 1A24–5 that allows recurrence, I shall argue, in Section 2, that the interpretation commonly held by proponents of the traditional view is inconsistent with various passages in the *Categories*. In my third section I shall challenge attempts to find other passages that support the traditional view, and I shall show that the traditional view does not enjoy the purported textual support." (pp. 185-186)

(1) In this paper I mostly rely on, but occasionally differ from, J. L. Ackrill’s translation in *Aristotle: Categories and De interpretatione* [Categories], translation and notes (Oxford, 1963).

(2) I shall use the terms ‘said of’ and ‘in’ in quotation marks when they are meant in Aristotle’s technical sense. Likewise, it is the technical sense of ‘in’ that is meant when I refer to the ‘x is in y’ relation.

(4) G. E. L. Owen, 'Inherence', *Phronesis*, 10 (1965), 97–105, repr. in id., *Logic, Science and Dialectic: Collected Papers in Greek Philosophy*, ed. M. Nussbaum (Ithaca, NY, 1986), 252–8.

5 M. Frede, 'Individuals in Aristotle' ['Individuals'], in id., *Essays in Ancient Philosophy* (Minneapolis, 1987), 49–71.

45. Findlay, John N. 2007. "Aristotle and Eideticism II." *Philosophical Forum* no. 37:333-386.

"This article continues our publication of lectures given by J. N. Findlay (1903–87) at Boston University in 1978. The present article concludes Findlay's discussion of Aristotle, the first part of which was published in *The Philosophical Forum*, XXXVI, No. 4 (Winter 2005)." (The Editors).

"The *Categories*, probably an early treatise of Aristotle's and very individualistic in doctrine, deals with the basic types of predication, substantial and definitory, quantitative, relational, qualitative etc., which leads up, though this is not so clearly stated as elsewhere, to various different genera of entities each of which can be said to have being in a different sense, some primary some derivative in various manners. The issue is complicated by the fact that secondary and derivative entities can have their own series of divergent predications, some substantial and definitory, others quantitative, relational, qualitative etc. There are not only entities parasitic on primary entities in various manners, but entities parasitic on the parasites in a corresponding variety of manners. All this renders the ontology very complex. Though Aristotle approaches many issues through language, what he is dealing with is always conceived of as ontic, not linguistic." (p. 334)

[Follows a description of *Categories* 1-9, pp. 334-339.]

46. Fine, Gail. 1983. "Relational Entities." *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* no. 65:225-249.

"Aristotle's theory of universals is sometimes thought to differ from Plato's in being nonrelational; it does not hold that Socrates' being a man, or being rational, consists in or involves his standing in some relation to the universal man, or to the universal rationality." (p. 225)

(...)

"Why should a nonrelational account be preferred? Matthews and Cohen suggest that Plato's relational theory is vulnerable to an awkward dilemma: either particulars are "bare particulars", or else they are "mere relational entities" that owe their identity and continued existence to the relations they bear to other things. Aristotle's allegedly nonrelational theory is thought to go between the horns of this dilemma.(5)" (p. 226)

(...)

"I am sympathetic to some features of this general view. I agree that, on some accounts of relationality, Plato has a relational theory of universals. I also agree that Plato, but not Aristotle, separates universals.

I agree too that relational accounts are vulnerable to Matthews and Cohen's dilemma. But I do not agree that Aristotle's theory of universals is nonrelational. Or, at least, the arguments used to commit Plato to a relational account seem to me to commit Aristotle to one as well. Nor do I conclude that Plato's and Aristotle's theories are therefore both hopelessly misguided; for I do not find both horns of the dilemma unattractive. Although I reject bare particulars, I accept relational entities.(6) If it is a consequence of Plato's or Aristotle's theory that particulars are relational entities, that is a desirable consequence.

I ask first what a relational analysis is (I). I then turn to Matthews and Cohen's dilemma (II). In subsequent sections I ask whether Plato and Aristotle are vulnerable to their dilemma and, if so, whether that is an undesirable consequence of their views." (pp. 226-227)

(...)

"It is important to note, first of all, however, that nowhere in the *Categories*, at least, does Aristotle say that primary substances could exist if nothing else did; perhaps their privileged status does not consist in existential independence from everything else. Certainly that is not the only sort of priority Aristotle recognizes.(48)" (p. 247)

(5) See, e.g., pp. 634f., 643f. Matthews and Cohen also suggest another difficulty with relational accounts or, at least, with Plato's holding one; see p. 633f. It is also often objected that relational accounts are vulnerable to a regress. See, for example, Armstrong I, Part 2, passim; P.P. Strawson; *Individuals* (London, 1959), esp. pp. 168-181; F.H. Bradley, *Appearance and Reality*, 2nd. ed. (Oxford, 1897), chapter 3.

Plato considers a regress argument, The Third Man Argument, at *Parm.* 132 ab. I do not discuss the TMA or regress arguments here ; but see my "Aristotle and the More Accurate Arguments, in *Language and Logos*, edd. M. Nussbaum and M. Schofield (Cambridge, 1982), and my "Owen, Aristotle, and the Third Man", *Phronesis* 27 (1982), pp. 13-33.

(6) As I shall use the phrase, a relational entity is an entity that possesses at least one essential property relationally. This is to be distinguished from Bradley's doctrine of internal relations, according to which all of a thing's relational properties are essential to it; I do not discuss Bradley's views in this paper. For Bradley, see esp. pp. 16-25.

(48) For some discussions of priority, see *Cat.*, chapter 12; *Met.* Δ, chapter 11; Z 1.

Referenecs

D.M. Armstrong, *Universals and Scientific Realism*, 2 volumes (Cambridge, 1978),

G.B. Matthews and S. Marc Cohen, "The One and the Many", *Review of Metaphysics* 21 (1968), pp. 630-655.

47. Fraser, Kyle. 2003. "Seriality and Demonstration in Aristotle's Ontology." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* no. 25:131-158.

"*Metaphysics* G and Z support a distinction between 'seriality' and 'focality' in demonstrations of ontological structure, and a precise account of the categories as they appear in these books of the *Metaphysics* can be given in the serial mode of demonstration. In appendix: *On the Neoplatonist 'deduction' of the Categories.*"

From the review by Michael Pakaluk in Bryn Mawr Classical

Review 06.18.2006: "It is commonly thought that Aristotle distinguishes just two ways of classifying things: genus-species hierarchies; and *pros hen* or 'focally related' analogues. Fraser considers whether we might take Aristotle's mention, at *Met.* IV.2.1005a11, of classification "with reference to a serial ordering" (*tôi ephechês*), to be indicating a third. Aristotle's famous remarks in *De Anima*, about how types of soul form a sequence (414b20-415a3), presumably refer to just that sort of ordering. But the bulk of Fraser's paper is an examination of whether Aristotle regarded the categories, too, as displaying that sort of ordering -- especially, that some categories are related to substance through the mediation of other categories. It turns out that the evidence that Aristotle thought this is surprisingly good. Fraser's program in examining this evidence is to develop, ultimately, an account of the method of the Aristotelian metaphysics as being systematic and scientific; Fraser rejects the 'dialectical' interpretations of the last several decades as over-influenced by ordinary language philosophy."

48. Frede, Michael. 1981. "Categories in Aristotle." In *Studies in Aristotle*, edited by O'Meara, Dominic, 1-25. Washington: Catholic University Press.

Reprinted in: M. Frede, *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987, pp. 29-48.

"There is a theory called the theory of categories which in a more or less developed form, with minor or major modifications, made its appearance first in a large number of Aristotelian writings and then, under the influence of these writings, came to be a standard part of traditional logic, a place it maintained with more or less success into the early part of this century, when it met the same fate as certain other parts of traditional logic.

There are many questions one may ask about this theory." (p. 28)

(...)

"I will leave aside the fact that the present order of the writings of the *Organon* was only established in the second century

A.D., that there is no good reason to think that Aristotle himself had meant these writings to be read in this order, that it is even far from clear whether Aristotle himself would have classified the *Categories* as a logical treatise, and that hence the position of the treatise in the *Organon* and the view of logic which goes with it should not have had any influence on what we take categories in Aristotle to be. More important, it seems to me, is that it is far from clear whether the treatise *Categories* in whole or even in part was meant to be a treatise on categories.

We cannot rely for this on the title *Categories*. For this is just one of a good number of titles the work had in antiquity and possibly not even the most common one. There is no good reason to think that the title is Aristotle's own. As to the content, it may have seemed obvious that the treatise is a treatise on categories.

But if it did seem obvious, this—apart from the title—was due to the fact that the second part of the treatise, the so-called *Postpraedicamenta*, was not taken seriously. Hence, one focused on the first part, and this part, of course, would seem to constitute a treatise on categories, if one made the additional assumption that the genera of entities distinguished in this part are just the categories or that the categories amount to a classification of expressions depending on the classification of entities given in this part of the treatise. It is revealing that ancient supporters of the title *Categories* claimed that the *Postpraedicamenta* were material alien to the purpose of the treatise, added by somebody who wanted to turn the treatise into an introduction to the *Topics* and who gave it a corresponding title, namely, *Introduction to the Topics*, becoming thus responsible for the other title of the treatise common in antiquity⁽¹⁾ and for another ordering of the treatises in the collection." (pp. 30-31)

(1) Cf. Ammon. *In cat.* 14, 18ff.: Simpl. *In cat.* 379, 8ff.

49. ———. 1987. "The Title, Unity, and Authenticity of the Aristotelian *Categories*." In *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, 11-28. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

English translation of: *Titel, Einheit und Echtheit der*

aristotelischen Kategorienschrift, (1983).

"The *Categories*, ascribed to Aristotle, has played a unique role in our tradition.

(...)

Already in late antiquity, however, doubts were raised about its authenticity,⁽¹⁾ though we know of no ancient scholar who, on the basis of such doubts, declared the treatise to be spurious."

(...)

"The question of authenticity, however, turns out to be crucially linked to the question of unity. Given that it seems highly questionable whether the *Postpraedicamenta* were originally part of the treatise or were appended by a later editor,⁽¹²⁾ it might seem as if the question regarding the authenticity of the treatise needs to be asked as two questions, viz., questions regarding the authenticity of the first and second part individually. Many authors have indeed taken this for granted and have thus assumed that the first part was authentic, the second either probably or certainly not.⁽¹³⁾"

(...)

"Therefore, in what follows, I will pay particular attention to the question of unity. The dangerous tendency to consider this treatise almost exclusively with reference to the first part and thus to jeopardize the status of the second part is, of course, reinforced considerably by the title. Hence, I will also discuss the title in connection with the question of unity." (pp. 11-12)

(...)

"Thus, it is by no means the case that the incompatibility of the two theories of substance forces us to reject the *Categories* as spurious. On the contrary, it seems as if the theory of the *Categories* ought, rather, to be seen as a stage in a long development that proceeds from the forms of Plato's middle dialogues to the substantial forms of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.

Thus, we have met the objection against the authenticity of the *Categories* that has survived the longest; and so we can,

indeed, follow the tradition and attribute the treatise to Aristotle. However, we have also seen that we have reason not to follow the tradition blindly in its understanding of the treatise. Unlike the tradition, which sought to gloss over the differences between the *Categories* and the *Metaphysics*, we ought to take care not to project the universals of the *Categories* into the ontology of the *Metaphysics*." (p. 28)

(1) Olymp., *Prolog.* 22, 38ff.; *Schol.* 33a 28ff.; Brandis.

(12) 12. See J. G. Buhle, *Aristotelis Opera*, vol. I, 1791, 436; Ch. A. Brandis in: *Abh.* Berlin 1833, 268ff.; E. Zeller, *Philos. d. Gr.*, II 24, 1921, 67 n. 1; Th. Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, IV, 514; Uberweg-Praechter, 379; D. Ross, *Aristotle*, 10; L. M. De Rijk, *The Authenticity*, in: *Mnemos.* 4 (1951), 159; I. During, *R E Suppl.* XI, s.v. *Aristoteles*, 205, 61; J. L. Ackrill, 70; V. Sainati, *Storia*, 151ff. Some ancient authors took this line (Olymp., *In cat.* 133, 14), especially Andronicus (*Simpl.*, *In cat.* 379, 8ff.).

(13) E.g., J. G. Buhle, 436; E. Zeller, II 24, 1921, 67; H. Maier, *Die Syllogistik*, II 2, 292 n.

We hear of this view being taken by some in antiquity (Ammon., *In cat.* 14, 18ff.; Olymp., *In cat.* 133, 14ff.). Whether Andronicus was among these, as is often claimed, is doubtful; at any rate, we never hear that he argued against the authenticity of the *Postpraedicamenta*; we would assume, if this had been the case, that he would be referred to by name when their authenticity was being discussed.

50. ———. 1987. "Individuals in Aristotle." In *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, 49-71. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

English translation of: "Individuen bei Aristoteles", *Antike und Abendland*, 24, 1978, pp. 16-39.

"By way of introduction, I offer a few remarks to give an overview of the subject of this paper. Aristotle assumes that, in addition to objects, there are properties of objects. This assumption is rather stronger than one might think, since it turns out that statements about properties are not just reducible to statements about objects; on the contrary, the truth of at least some statements about objects is to be

explained by assuming that there are properties."

(...)

"Besides this division of things into objects and properties, Aristotle, in the *Categories*, makes use of the distinction between general and particular, between individuals and universals. Although Aristotle does not, in this treatise, use any term like 'universal' (*katholou*), he does speak of 'individuals', and he contrasts these with their kinds. These two divisions, into objects and properties, on the one hand, and into particular and general, on the other, do not turn out to be the same. For Aristotle counts as general not only properties but also the kinds, into which objects fall, i.e., the genera, species, and differentiae of substances; and these are to be differentiated strictly from properties."

(...)

"At this point, three difficulties arise. First of all, how is it possible to speak of individuals in the case of properties; second, how can there be a single notion of being an individual that can be applied to objects as well as properties; and third, what sorts of objects are these general objects, the genera and species, supposed to be? These difficulties, especially the first two, will be our concern in the first part of this paper, which deal with the *Categories*." (pp. 49-50)

51. Fritz, Kurt von. 1954. "Review of: *The Place of the Categories of Being in Aristotle's Philosophy* by L. M. De Rijk." *The Philosophical Review* no. 63:600-605.

"The author of this book tries once more to solve the difficult problem of the meaning of Aristotle's theory of categories or, more specifically, the question of whether the categories are a system of grammatical, of logical, or of ontological distinctions. He rejects from the outset the explanation of the categories as grammatical distinctions though he does admit—which is very important—that Aristotle in his metaphysical and logical analyses is, generally speaking, guided by the structure of his native tongue. Concerning the two other main explanations which have been offered, he points out in his introduction that "the later distinction between the logical and

the ontological aspect qua a conscious opposition which is carried through rigorously" should not be applied to ancient thought, i.e., to that of Aristotle, and expresses the opinion that "the seeming difficulty of interpretation disappears" if this distinction is not made. He tries to show that the solutions offered by his predecessors are all wrong or insufficient because they did not follow this principle of interpretation.

The author then elaborates his theory in six chapters and an appendix. The first three chapters deal with various aspects of the relation between logic and ontology in Aristotle's philosophy, namely: Aristotle's doctrine of truth, the distinction between "essential and accidental being" (κατ' αὐτό and κατὰ συμβεβηκός), logical and ontological accident. The second series of three chapters deals with the problem of the categories directly, first the categories in the *Metaphysics*, then the categories in the special treatise devoted to that subject, the first treatise of the Organon, and finally the use which Aristotle makes of the categories in his philosophy in general. The appendix deals with the various expressions by which Aristotle designates the categories, with their origin and their relation to the logical and the ontological aspects of the categories. Each chapter, as well as the appendix, concludes with a convenient summary of the theses which the author has tried to prove." (pp. 600-601)

52. ———. 1958. "Once More καθ' ὑποκειμένου and ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 3:72-73.

"On p. 148 ff. of the second volume of *Phronesis* Mr. Chung-Hwan Chen has published an article on the above subject taking his starting point from a review of a book by the Dutch scholar L. M. De Rijk which I had published some time ago in *The Philosophical Review*, vol. 53 (1954), p. 600 ff., but without knowledge of the book reviewed itself. As a consequence some special points have remained in the dark; and since this is in no way Mr. Chung-Hwan Cheng's fault, who was unable to obtain a copy of the book reviewed, but to a large part my own fault and to a certain extent perhaps the fault of Mr. De Rijk, I would appear to be under some obligation to clear up the question." (p. 72)

(...)

"It is one of the main contentions of Mr. De Rijk in the book which I reviewed that it is wrong to make a sharp distinction between the ontological and the logical aspect of Aristotle's theory of the categories because the ontological aspect is always the essential one and the logical only its reflection. In contrast to this I had contended that Aristotle's theory has an ontological, a logical, and to some extent a grammatical aspect; and that to understand its philosophical meaning, as well as the difficulties with which Aristotle had to struggle in its elaboration fully, it is necessary to distinguish sharply between them." (p. 73)

53. Furth, Montgomery. 1988. *Substance, Form and Psyche: An Aristotelean Metaphysics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Contents: Preface XI; §0. A short discourse on method 1; I. Cross- and Intra-Categorial Predication in the *Categories* 9; II. Substance in the *Metaphysics*: A First Approximation 49; III. The Zoological Universe 67; Bibliography 285; Index 291-300.

"My aim in what follows is to explain and to motivate a theory of essence, existence and individuation that I think is to be found in the later and more advanced of the extant writings of Aristotle. The view to be explored has several features that are noteworthy from a scientific as well as a philosophical standpoint: it centers especially, though not exclusively, on a concept of what an individual material object is - a concept that has both intrinsic interest and (if some suggestions I shall advance as to its provenance and motivation are accepted) a historical significance that has not always been accurately appreciated." (p. 1)

(...)

"largely dispense with questions like what differentiates the various nonsubstantial categories from one another, the rationale (if there be one) for comprehending into a single category the monstrous motley horde yclept Quality, the justification (which seems to me quite hopeless) for a category, co-ordinate with the others, of Time, and other such. It will be

seen that numerous particular points will emerge along the way in the course of the general discussion of Inherence. But enough has even now been fixed to allow statement of three general truths about the relationship between the tetrachotomy of "things that are" and the total categorial scheme. None of them is explicitly stated in the work, but all of them are in practice observed with great fidelity, and their controlling place in the theory will become more evident in what follows (were one to essay the project, conceivably worthwhile, of axiomatizing the theory, they would be plausible candidates for axioms):

- (i) said-of is always intra-categorial, and conversely,
- (ii) inherence is always cross-categorial, and conversely,
- (iii) substances and only substances can be subjects of inherence." (p. 14)

54. Garver, Newton. 1974. "Notes for a Linguistic Reading of the *Categories*." In *Ancient Logic and its Modern Interpretations*, edited by Corcoran, John, 27-32. Dordrecht: Reidel.

"1. If Aristotle's *Categories* provide a classification of things and not of sayings, as is traditionally insisted, the things classified are at any rate 'things that can be said'. It is interesting, therefore, to inquire whether the *Categories* may be regarded as containing, in rudimentary form, results that might be more appropriately and more completely presented in terms of current methods of linguistic analysis, applied to a level of language or discourse that linguists usually ignore.

2. Both the name 'categories', which signifies predications or sayings, and the position of the work at the beginning of the *Organon*, which deals with matters of logic and language, reinforce the temptation to interpret the *Categories* linguistically. Although neither the title nor the position of the work in the corpus is directly due to Aristotle, they do show that the inclination to treat the *Categories* as at least partially linguistic goes back to the very earliest tradition of Aristotelian scholarship.

3. The determination that the categories can be given a linguistic interpretation - even the conclusion that they are

linguistic, Ackrill (1) and Benveniste (2) notwithstanding - would not suffice to show that they are not also (in some sense) metaphysical, nor that they are not universal.

4. The most useful linguistic method to employ in this inquiry is distinctive feature analysis, (3) which has been used in several kinds of linguistic analysis. Passages in the *Categories* can be interpreted as employing a related method, if not an early version of the method itself." (p. 27)

(1) J. L. Ackrill, *Aristotle's 'Categories' and 'De Interpretatione'*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1963, p. 71. I have used Ackrill's translation. His notes, to which I refer here, are both helpful and stimulating.

(2) E. Benveniste, *Problems in General Linguistics*, Univ. of Miami Press, Coral Gables; 1971, Chapter 6.

(3) This method of analysis is due to Roman Jakobson more than to anyone else. See R. Jakobson, C. G. M. Fant, and M. Halle, *Preliminaries to Speech Analysis*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1952; N. Chomsky and M. Halle, *Sound Pattern of English*, Harper and Row, New York, 1968; and Fred W. Householder, *Linguistic Speculations* Cambridge Univ. Press, London, 1971. Most recent linguistic textbooks have a discussion of features.

55. Georgiadis, Costantine. 1973. "Two Conceptions of Substance in Aristotle." *The New scholasticism* no. 47:157-167.

"In Aristotle we find the view that an individual thing is a substance but we also find the view that form is substance. Is the meaning of substance (οὐσία) the same in the two cases? As the title of my paper suggests, I hold that it is not. I shall argue that there are two distinct, though related, conceptions of substance in Aristotle. These are what I call, on the one hand, the reistic conception of substance, according to which substance is an individual thing (res) (2) and, on the other hand, the archological (3) conception of substance, according to which substance is a principle (ἀρχή) of the individual thing." (p. 157)

(2) The use of the term 'reistic' here does not imply the narrowing of reality to individual objects alone as in T.

Kotarbinski's philosophy of reism but only underlines the central position of the individual within reality.

(3) Giovanni Reale, in his book *Il Concetto di Filosofia Prima e l'unità della Metafisica di Aristotele*, wrongly uses the term *archeologia* in the sense of aitiologia. He should have used the term *archologia*.

56. Gill, Mary Louise. 1984. "Aristotle on the Individuation of Changes." *Ancient Philosophy* no. 4:9-22.

Abstract: "In *Physics V 4* Aristotle lists a set of conditions that must be met for a change to be an individual. This account should be viewed against the background of the *Categories*, where the problem of individuals is first addressed. In the *Categories* changes apparently fall into the two nonsubstance categories of doing and suffering. So one might expect that the characterization of individual changes in *Physics V 4* will fit the account of individual nonsubstances proposed in the *Categories*. I do not think it does.

This paper aims to show how the two treatments differ and why individual changes require a different analysis from other nonsubstances."

57. Gillespie, Charles Melville. 1925. "The Aristotelian *Categories*." *Classical Quarterly* no. 19:79-84.

Reprinted in: J. Barnes, M. Schofield, R. Sorabji (eds.), *Articles on Aristotle, 3. Metaphysics*, London: Duckworth, 1979, pp. 1-12.

"The precise position to be assigned to the *Categories* in the Aristotelian system has always been somewhat of a puzzle. On the one hand, they seem to be worked into the warp of its texture, as in the classification of change, and Aristotle can argue from the premiss that they constitute an exhaustive division of the kinds of Being (*An. Post. I. 22*, p. 83 b 15). On the other hand, both in the completed scheme of his logic and in his constructive metaphysic they retire into the background, giving place to other notions, such as causation, change, actuality and potentiality." (p. 75)

(...)

"I shall accordingly assume in what follows that the scheme of the *Categories* was evolved in the course of efforts to establish a doctrine of judgment which should settle the difficulties raised by Megarian and other critics; that the application to the solution of the larger metaphysical problems was a later development ;(3) that the foundations of the scheme were laid in the Socratic tradition of the Academy; that the completed scheme is probably Aristotle's own; and that the original working out of the scheme did not contemplate extension beyond the metaphysics implied in predication to the more fundamental metaphysics of the First Philosophy. Hence we must look to the analysis of empirical propositions for the origin of the scheme." (p. 76)

(3) a Here I follow Maier [*Die Syllogistik des Aristoteles*, (3 voll., Leipzig: K. F. Koehler, 1896–1900)].

58. Graham, Daniel W. 1987. *Aristotle's Two Systems*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Contents: "Preface VII; List of figures XIV; Abbreviations XV; 1. The Two Systems Hypothesis 1; 2. S1: Atomic Substantialism 20; 3. S2: Hylomorphic Substantialism 57; 4. The Incommensurability of the Systems 84; 5. The Hylomorphic Turn 119; 6. The Growth of S2: The Four Causes 156; 7. The Growth of S2: Potentiality and Actuality 183; 8. The Paradoxes of Substance: Matter 207; 9. The Paradoxes of Substance: Form 233; 10. S2 Without S1: What Aristotle Should Have Said 263; 11. The Two Systems Theory as an Interpretation of Aristotle 290; References 333; Index Locorum 347; Subject Index 354-359.

"The idea for this study emerged while I was still working on my dissertation, which I wrote on a topic in Aristotle's philosophy of action. As I was researching the history of the potentiality- actuality distinction, I discovered that Aristotle did not use his word 'matter' anywhere in the logical works. The discovery was a discovery only to me; it had long been known. Yet it seemed amazing to me that a principle as important as that of matter should not appear in so large a body of work. Did this omission have important consequences for the interpretation of Aristotle? I found that interpreters

saw the omission as at most a curiosity; after all, the subject-matter of the logical works was unique. Yet the same interpreters had long ago abandoned the assumption that the logical works were purely devoted to logic. In particular, the *Categories* is commonly taken to be a prime source of information about Aristotle's early metaphysical theory. But how could Aristotle have formulated anything like this mature metaphysical theory without the matter-form distinction? Was the unity of Aristotle's thought not really an illusion? Were there not really two sets of theories, two metaphysical conceptions, two philosophical systems?" (p. VII)

(...)

"In what follows I have tried to give my vision of Aristotle's two systems concrete expression in an argument with historical, philological, but above all philosophical dimensions. If the argument is right, a fact about Aristotle's development that has been relegated to asides and footnotes should have a central place in interpretations of Aristotle--should be a point of departure for many studies and provide a limit of inquiry for others. At present few scholars would agree with such claims. To be sure, many would grant that the metaphysical assumptions of the *Categories* are different from those of the *Metaphysics*; but this fact does not seem to have any far-reaching implications for their interpretations of Aristotle, and so I infer that they do not subscribe to a dualistic interpretative theory. A mere handful of scholars have advocated a two-systems theory in some form or other, and I believe that there is only one person who holds the Two Systems Theory with all its ramifications. However, as Socrates has taught us, it does not matter what the many think, but what the expert in truth has to say--that is, what the outcome of the argument is." (p. IX)

59. Granger, Edgar Herbert. 1980. "A Defense of the Traditional Position Concerning Aristotle's Non-Substantial Particulars." *Journal of Philosophy* no. 10:593-606.

"In this paper I shall defend the traditional claim that Aristotle's nonsubstantial particulars discussed in the second chapter of the *Categories* are unsharable particulars against G.

E. L. Owen's claim that they are sharable universals. I shall proceed by presenting first a sketch of the traditional position that makes explicit why it holds that non-substantial particulars are unsharable particulars. (1) Secondly, I shall sketch Owen's position and recount how it differs in certain important respects from the traditional position. (2) Thirdly, I shall present some of my own considerations that I believe support the traditional position at the expense of Owen's position. Finally, I shall offer what I take to be the primary reason Aristotle was committed to the existence of such odd items as non-substantial particulars." (pp. 593-594)

(1) My reconstruction of the traditional position is based on the following sources: W. D. Ross, *Aristotle*, 5th ed. (London: Methuen, 1949): 23-24, 24, n. 1 (hereafter cited as *Arist.*); J. R. Jones, "Are the Qualities of Particular Things Universal or Particular?" *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 152-156, 162-163; G. E. M. Anscombe and P. T. Geach, *Three Philosophers: Aristotle, Aquinas and Frege* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1961): 8-10; R. E. Allen, "Individual Properties in Aristotle's *Categories*," *Phronesis* 14 (1969): 31-32; Ignacio Angelelli, *Studies on Gottlob Frege and Traditional Philosophy* (New York: Humanities Press, 1967): 12-15. Angelelli's account is especially important because it reflects the opinion of scholars from late antiquity to the present.

(2) G. E. L. Owen, "Inherence," *Phronesis* 10 (1965): 97-105.

60. ———. 1984. "Aristotle on Genus and Differentia." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* no. 22:1-23.

Abstract: "In Aristotle's writings there are at least three accounts of the nature of genus and differentia. These accounts may be briefly described in these terms: (I) genus and differentia are radically distinct in character, and the genus is the more important element in the definition; (II) genus and differentia are very similar in character and importance; (III) genus and differentia are similar in character, but the differentia is the more important element in the definition. These accounts represent, I believe, three stages in the development of Aristotle's thought. In this paper I shall examine each account and explain, at least in part, why

Aristotle adopts them."

61. Gregoric, Pavel. 2006. "Quantities and Contraries: Aristotle's *Categories* 6, 5b11-6a18." *Apeiron* no. 39:341-358.

"The immediate purpose of this paper is fairly modest. I would like to provide an analysis of Aristotle's three counterexamples to his claim that no quantity has a contrary in *Categories* 6. I will have something to say about Aristotle's discussion of the first two counterexamples, although the bulk of my paper will be devoted to his discussion of the third counterexample at 6a11-18, a passage which has not received due attention by modern commentators. My analysis will then provide a basis for some suggestions of wider significance.

In *Categories* 6, 5b11 Aristotle introduces one salient characteristic of quantities, namely that none of them has a contrary (*enantion*). Immediately following the statement of this characteristic, Aristotle takes on an anticipated objection. The objection consists of two counterexamples: to the many the contrary is the few, to something large the contrary is something small. Each pair of terms is supposed to present a counterexample to Aristotle's characteristic for one type of quantity: the former pair for discrete quantities, the latter for continuous quantities. Aristotle takes each pair of terms in turn, and shows that what they introduce are (a) neither quantities (b) nor contraries." (p. 341)

62. Hacking, Ian. 2001. "Aristotelian Categories and Cognitive Domains." *Synthese* no. 126:473-515.

Abstract: "This paper puts together an ancient and a recent approach to classificatory language, thought, and ontology. It includes on the one hand an interpretation of Aristotle's ten categories, with remarks on his first category, called (or translated as) *substance* in the *Categories* or *What a thing is* in the *Topics*. On the other hand is the idea of domain-specific cognitive abilities urged in contemporary developmental psychology. Each family of ideas can be used to understand the other. Neither the metaphysical nor the psychological approach is intrinsically more fundamental; they complement each other. The paper incidentally clarifies distinct uses of the word 'category' in different disciplines, and also attempts to

make explicit several notions of 'domain'. It also examines Aristotle's most exotic and least discussed categories, *being-in-a-position* (e.g., sitting) and *having-(on)* (e.g., armour). Finally the paper suggests a tentative connection between Fred Sommers' theory of types and Aristotle's first category."

63. Hamlyn, David W. 1961. "Aristotle on Predication." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 6:110-126.

"In dealing with the Greek Philosophers we tend to take the notion of predication for granted: we tend to assume that we have the right to use the term 'predicate' without question, in discussing the theories put forward by e.g. Plato and Aristotle. An example of this tendency is the common assertion that Plato held that the Forms were self-predicable. While this assertion may be in some sense true, it does assume that the notion of predication may be taken for granted. This assumption is, perhaps, partly due to a further assumption that the notion of predication is a logical or even grammatical notion, and that Plato and Aristotle must therefore have seen its importance and employed it accordingly. I wish to question that assumption in Aristotle's case.

I have already questioned it in connection with Plato,(1) saying that Plato was continually trying to account for what we should call predication in terms of notions akin to that of identity. It is tempting to assume that because Aristotle had the term 'predicate' at his disposal, he must have known all about the notion. It is moreover, a feasible suggestion that in Aristotle 'κατηγορέιν' is a technical term the origins of which are obvious. The use of the phrase 'κατηγορέιν τι κατά τινος' stems from legal contexts; it thus comes to mean 'to maintain or assert something of something' and it perhaps retains something of an accusatorial aura.

But while the use of the phrase implies that Aristotle knew in some sense something about what it is to assert something of another thing, it does *not* imply that he could *ipso facto* provide the correct theory about it. What is true is that the trend of Aristotle's metaphysical thought led him towards a view of predication which involved treating it as something much more than a mere grammatical notion." (p. 110)

(1) See my "The Communion of Forms and the Development of Plato's Logic" *Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 5. No. 21, 1955, pp. 289 ff.

64. ———. 1978. "Focal Meaning." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* no. 78:1-18.

"In recent years much philosophical scholarship has been devoted to the place in Aristotle's thinking of what G. E. L. Owen has called 'focal meaning'; and much is due to Professor Owen in particular in this connexion. Less attention has perhaps been given to the question whether Aristotle should be complimented on that idea - whether, that is, the concept is one that we should welcome and accept into our inherited philosophical treasury. It is this question with which I am mainly concerned in this paper; a full answer would no doubt demand a broader conspectus of Aristotle's thought than I can take in the space available." (p. 1)

(...)

"I have pointed out that the explanation of the uses of 'healthy' by reference to health provides no true instances of primary and secondary uses or senses of a word, let alone cases. But when Aristotle says the substance is said to be in the primary way while things in the other categories are said to be in a secondary way we may be provided with an instance of primary and secondary senses, or so it might appear. In fact we are not provided with this in a technical sense, since Aristotle does not operate with a sense and reference distinction. That is why I, as in effect Aristotle normally does, put the point in terms of something's being said to be in a primary or secondary way.

That homonymy is for Aristotle something that belongs to things in relation to words rather than to words *simpliciter* is notorious; hence he approaches the relation between words and things from the side of things, rather than from the side of words as we are perhaps inclined to do." (pp. 6-7)

65. Harari, Orna. 2011. "The Unity of Aristotle's Category of Relatives." *Classical Quarterly* no. 61:521-537.

"In *Categories* 7 Aristotle discusses relative terms, which he defines in the opening paragraph of this chapter as 'things as are said to be just what they are, of or than other things, or in some other way in relation to something else' (6a36–7).(1) In clarifying this definition, he presents two lists of examples; the first contains 'greater' and 'double' and the second contains 'states', 'conditions', 'perception', 'knowledge' and 'position' (6a38–b3). The terms of the second list seem to be foreign to this discussion. The definition of relatives and the terms presented in the first list suggest that relatives are incomplete predicates or relational attributes,(2) but states, conditions, perception, knowledge and position are complete predicates.

Linguistic usage does not require these terms to be followed by a preposition.

The difficulty involved in understanding the place of conditions and states in the category of relatives extends beyond linguistic considerations. Other linguistically complete predicates are included in Aristotle's category of relatives, but their categorial status seems pretty obvious. 'Slave', for instance, is a linguistically complete term, but it can easily be construed as implicitly referring to the correlative 'master': that is, the proposition 'x is a slave' may be construed as implying the proposition 'x is a slave of y (when y stands for x's master)'. Similarly, the term 'large', though linguistically complete, implies (as Aristotle says in *Categories* 6) that its subject is larger than other things of its kind (5b15–20). By contrast, the categorial status of conditions and states remains uncertain, even if their correlatives

are supplied, because they seem to be internal dispositions of their subjects rather than relational attributes." (p. 521)

(1) Ackrill's translation.

(2) For this interpretation see J.L. Ackrill, *Aristotle's Categories and De Interpretatione* (Oxford, 1962), 98; M. Mignucci, 'Aristotle's definition of relatives in *Categories* 7', *Phronesis* 31 (1986), 101–29, at 103–4.

66. Heinaman, Robert. 1981. "Non-Substantial Individuals in the *Categories*." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no.

26 (295):307.

Abstract: "There is a dispute as to what sort of entity non-substantial individuals are in Aristotle's *Categories*. The traditional interpretation holds that non-substantial individuals are individual qualities, quantities, etc. For example, Socrates' white is an individual quality belonging to him alone, numerically distinct from (though possibly specifically identical with) other individual colors. I will refer to these sorts of entities as 'individual instances.'

The new interpretation (1) suggests instead that non-substantial individuals are atomic species such as a specific shade of white that is indivisible into more specific shades. On this view, non-substantial individuals are what we would call universals (2) which can be present in different individual substances, but are labelled 'individuals' by Aristotle because, like individual substances, there is nothing they are *said of*. (3)

In this paper I will defend the traditional account by attempting to show that it is supported by the slender textual evidence that is available. I will begin by stating three serious objections to the traditional interpretation. Next I will show that in works later than the *Categories* Aristotle accepted individual instances of properties of the sort found in the *Categories* by the traditional interpretation. Finally, I will set out the evidence that supports the traditional interpretation and answer the three objections."

(1) G. E. L. Owen, "Inherence," *Phronesis* (1965), pp. 97-105; Michael Frede, "Individuen bei Aristoteles," *Antike and Abendland* (1978), pp. 16-31. In fact, it is not clear to me what Professor Frede considers non-substantial individuals to be. While he refers approvingly to Owen, Owen's account collapses the distinction between εἶδει ἐν and ἀριθμὸν ἐν in the case of non-substances whereas it appears that Frede wishes to retain this distinction (pp. 23-24). Since he does not explain what individual non-substances which are numerically different but specifically identical are supposed to be or in virtue of what they are numerically different, by the "new interpretation" I will mean solely that explained in the text.

(2) This is not, as Allen, Matthews and Cohen think, an

objection to the new interpretation (R. E. Allen, "Individual Properties in Aristotle's Categories," *Phronesis* (1969), p. 37; Gary Matthews and S. Marc Cohen, "The One and the Many," *Review of Metaphysics* (1968), pp. 640-41). There is no justification for the presupposition that Aristotle must have used the terms 'individual' and 'universal' in the *Categories* in the same way as in later works or as they are used today. (Of course, the word καθόλου' does not appear in the *Categories*).

(3) That is, for any individual x there is no y such that the name and definition of x are predicable of y (2a19-27).

67. Hetherington, Stephen. 1984. "A Note on Inherence." *Ancient Philosophy*:218-223.

"In Aristotle's *Categories* (2a34-b6: see also *Meta.* VII. 1), the category of substance is claimed to be prior in existence to the various categories of nonsubstance.

This priority is articulated in the *Categories* largely *via* Aristotle's relation of inherence. The latter is one of two relations whereby Aristotle purports to quarter the furniture of the world, the members of the categories. The other is that of 'being said of'. The quartering is effected thus (*Cat.* 1 a20-b9): some things are said of others but are not in anything: other things are said of a subject as well as being in a subject: still others are not said of anything, but are in a subject: the rest are neither said of nor in something; and these four combinations are mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive.

Now, while the said-of relation is fairly straightforward, the inherence relation is not. According to *Cat.* 2a1 9-26, y is said of x if and only if y's name and y's definition, or account, are both predicated of x. And y is in x if and only if... what?

There are several competing interpretations of Aristotle's inherence relation, but it is not my aim in this paper to choose among them. I do want, however, to sharpen the terms of the debate by formulating a particularly important one of those interpretations, G .E.L. Owen's, much more clearly than it has hitherto been formulated.

We will then be in a better position to evaluate the various merits of Owen's interpretation, some of which, up to now,

have not been clearly perceived. Aristotle's notion of inherence is a technical one, but it is one that relies on a comparatively *nontechnical* notion of inherence. We shall see that understanding the latter is the key to the former, and hence that once the technical notion is precisely understood, Owen's interpretation can itself be properly assessed." (p. 218, notes omitted)

68. Hintikka, Jaakko. 1959. "Aristotle and the Ambiguity of Ambiguity." *Inquiry* no. 2:137-151.

Reprinted as Chapter 1 in: J. Hintikka, *Time and Necessity. Studies in Aristotle's Theory of Modality*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973 pp. 1-26.

"Chapter I is a revised and expanded version of a paper which appeared under the same title in *Inquiry*, 2 (1959), 137-51. In its present form it also incorporates most of my note, 'Different Kinds of Equivocation in Aristotle', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 9 (1971), 368-72." (*Time and Necessity*, Preface, VII).

"*Homonymy v. synonymy*"

Aristotle explains his sense of homonymy (together with that of the contrary notion of synonymy) in the beginning of the *Categories*.

According to these explanations, two things are synonymous if both the same name (i.e. term) and the same definition (λόγος) are applicable to them. They are homonymous if they share only the name, the definitions (λόγοι) being different in the two cases. (In these definitions, λόγος should perhaps be understood as an explanatory phrase or an account of the meaning of the name rather than as a definition.) I have already pointed out that Aristotle sometimes violates his own definition of homonymy.

Similarly, he violates the definition of synonymy at least once by calling a pair of objects synonyms although, according to his own considered judgement, they share only the name but not the definition. (6)

These violations are little more than occasional reversions to

looser usage. But in another respect Aristotle violates the definitions of homonymy and synonymy given in *Categories* 1 almost systematically. In so far as the definitions are concerned, only *things* can be called homonymous or synonymous, not *words*. And two things can be called synonymous only if the *same* term is applied to them. Both these limitations are transgressed by Aristotle. A word is said to be homonymous in *De Gen. et Corr.* 1 6. 322b29 ff.; (7) and similar uses of the notion of synonymy are found in *Top.* VIII 13. 162b37, *Soph. El.* 5. 167a24 and in *Rhet.* III 2. 1404b37-1405a2. In many other passages, too, Aristotle is obviously interested exclusively in the word and not in the things to which it is applied. In fact, he sometimes seems to express synonymy and homonymy by such phrases as *εν σημαίνει* and *πολλά σημαίνει* (or *πλείω σημαίνει*), respectively. In the sequel, we shall take the same liberty as Aristotle and talk about synonymy (homonymy) in connection both with certain terms and with the entities to which they are applied." (p. 9)

(6) See *Met.* A 6. 987b10; cf. 9. 990b6, 991a6, and *Met.* I 10. 1059a13.

(7) Cf. also *Top.* V 2. I 29b30 ff.

69. ———. 1983. "Semantical Games, the Alleged Ambiguity of 'Is' and Aristotelian Categories." *Synthese* no. 54:443-468.

Reprinted in: J. Hintikka, *Analysis of Aristotle. Selected Papers, Vol. 6*, Dordrecht: Springer 2004, pp. 23-44.

"Our findings concerning the multiple relations between different semantical phenomena may thus be summed up in the form of a list of correlated distinctions. They amount to differences among the following:

(10) (i) Different wh-words (and phrases).

(ii) Different widest classes of entities over which English quantifiers can range.

(iii) Different uses of the existential is in English.

(iv) Different uses of the is of identity in English.

(v) Different uses of the predicative is in English.

(vi) Different classes (mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive) of simple predicates of English." (p. 35)

(..)

"Aristotelian categories reconstructed

At this point, a philosophical reader is likely to have a vivid *déjà vu* experience. For what seems to be emerging as a consequence of the basic assumptions of game-theoretical semantics is nothing but a modernized version of Aristotle's doctrine of categories, not in its details (after all, Aristotle was dealing with a different language), but in all of its leading theoretical ideas. Aristotelian scholars have found the combination of different ideas in Aristotle's distinction between different categories intensely puzzling. These different aspects of Aristotle's theory include the following:

(11) (i) Different questions one can ask about a given entity, and hence different question words (and certain related phrases) in a language. (Cf. Ockham (Loux), pp. 8–9; Ackrill, p. 79; Gomperz, p. 39; Kahn, *passim*.) Several scholars have argued on this basis that Aristotle's distinction is firmly based on the structure of Greek (Trendelenburg, Benveniste, Kahn).

(ii) Different highest predicates under one or other of which everything that is has to fall (Bonitz et al.).

(iii)–(v) Different senses of verbs for being in their different uses: (iii) existential, (iv) copulative (Apelt, etc.), (v) identifying.

(vi) Different widest classes of primitive predicates in the language in question. Indeed, (vi) is closest to Aristotle's explanation of the categories in his *Categoriae* (see 1b25–2a10)." (pp. 35–36)

References

Apelt, O.: 1891, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie*, Leipzig.

Benveniste, Emile: 1966, 'Categories de pensée et catégories de langue', in *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, Gallimard, Paris, pp. 63–74.

Bonitz, Hermann: 1853, *Über die Kategorien des Aristoteles*, Staatsdruckerei, Vienna.

Gomperz, Theodor: 1912, *Greek Thinkers*, vol. 4 (tr. by G.G. Berry), Murray, London.

Kahn, Charles: 1978, 'Questions and categories', in Henry Hiz (ed.), *Questions*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht, pp. 227–78.

Loux, Michael J.: 1974, translator and editor, *Ockham's Theory of Terms*, Notre Dame.

Trendelenburg, Adolf: 1846, *Geschichte der Kategorienlehre*, Bethge, Berlin.

70. ———. 1986. "The Varieties of Being in Aristotle." In *The Logic of Being: Historical Studies*, edited by Knuuttila, Simo and Hinitkka, Jaakko, 81-114. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

"In this paper, I shall try to enhance our understanding of Aristotle's thought by relating it to certain contemporary problems and insights of philosophical logicians. Now one of the most central current issues in philosophical logic is a challenge to a hundred-year old dogma. Almost all twentieth-century philosophers in English-speaking countries have followed Frege and Russell and claimed that the words for being in natural languages - "is", "ist", ἔστι, etc. - are ambiguous between the is of predication, the is of existence, the is of identity, and the generic is. The significance of this ambiguity thesis has not been limited to topical discussions but has extended to historical studies, including studies of ancient Greek philosophy." (p. 81).

(...)

"One of the most fundamental and most perplexing questions concerning Aristotle's distinction between different categories is: What is being distinguished from each other? What is Aristotle classifying in separating the different categories from each other?"

(...)

"Scholars have debated intensively which of these different things Aristotle "really" meant. For example, one persuasion

maintains that the categories represent the different kinds of questions one can (according to Aristotle) ask of a given entity. This view is in different variants held by among others Ockham, Charles Kahn, Benveniste, and Ackrill.

Other scholars hold that Aristotelian categories are what he says they are, predicables. Others, led by the formidable Hermann Bonitz, have held that categories were for Aristotle first and foremost the widest genera of entities." (p. 100)

(...)

"Still others have held that Aristotle's category distinction is primarily a differentiation between several senses of *esti*, a reminder of the "systematic ambiguity" of words for being in Aristotle. This view is found, e.g., in *Phys. A 2*, 185 b 25 - 32. Among commentators, it has

been represented by Heinrich Maier, and in a sense it can be maintained that G. E. L. Owen is another case in point. He has certainly been followed by a host of younger scholars." (pp. 100-101)

71. Hood, Pamela M. 2004. *Aristotle on the Category of Relation*. Washington: University Press of America.

Contents: Preface IX; Acknowledgements XI; Part One: The Exegesis; Chapter 1: The Critics' Charges 1; Chapter 2: *Categories* 7 21; Chapter 3: *Metaphysics* V.15 55; Chapter 4: Interpreting Aristotle's Relatives 85; Chapter 5: Epistemological Issues; Chapter 6: Conclusion 141; Notes 143; Bibliography 147; Index 151-154.

"Preface.

Many philosophers believe that Aristotle does not have, and indeed could not have, a theory of relation, even one that accounts for relations involving two terms, i.e., dyadic relations. Aristotle's logical, metaphysical and ontological views, especially his substance-accident ontology, are seen as restricting Aristotle to only one-place or monadic relations, and prohibiting the logical space for a separate entity, relation, to exist. Hence, Aristotle's conception of relation is perceived to be so divergent from our own that it does not count as a

theory of relation at all. I aim to show that the critics are wrong to speak so poorly of Aristotle's account of relation.

I argue that Aristotle's theory has some of the basic features that a theory of relation must have. I begin in Part One by sketching out the critics' charges. I then outline the main features of Aristotle's philosophy that inform his treatment of the category of relation, and briefly survey Aristotle's discussion of relational issues scattered throughout the corpus. Next, I present an exegesis of Aristotle's two central texts on relation, *Categories* 7 and *Metaphysics* V 15, and discuss the various accounts of relational entities or relatives therein. In Part Two, I examine two problems. First, I address the problem of how best to interpret Aristotle's relatives. Second, I explore the epistemological difficulties stemming from Aristotle's view in the *Categories* that relation involves two relative items or terms and that if one relative item is known definitely the other item must also be known definitely.

I conclude that Aristotle's treatment of relatives reveals his commitment to the view that there be a dyad, i.e., at least two items, involved in a relation. Furthermore, I show that Aristotle includes in his theory something that accounts for the relation itself, i.e., something approaching a logical relational predicate. I do not suggest that Aristotle attempts to construct a relational theory comparable to our own. But I do suggest that given Aristotle's grasp of the dyadic nature of relation, we have good reason to believe Aristotle's theory of relation is more robust than many suspect."

72. Husik, Isaac. 1904. "On the *Categories* of Aristotle." *The Philosophical Review* no. 13:514-528.

Reprinted (conjoined with Husik 1939) in: I. Husik, *The Categories of Aristotle* (1942).

"The little treatise of Aristotle which stands at the head of the *Organon* has caused a great deal of difficulty to students, both ancient and modern. The bulk of the discussion has centered about the question of its place in the *Organon* and in Aristotle's system, and the character of the ten categories to which the greater part of the book is devoted. But there have been found also critics who expressed a doubt as to the

authenticity of all or part of the treatise in question. To say nothing of the ancient commentators of Aristotle, the earliest attempt in modern times to cast a doubt on the genuineness of the work seems to be that of Spengel in *Münchener Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1845, Vol. XX, No. 5, pp. 41 sq. He was followed by Prantl in *Zeitschrift für Alterthumswissenschaft*, 1846, p. 646, and in his *Geschichte der Logik*, I, p. 90, Note. 5, also by Valentinus Rose in *De Aristotelis librorum ordine et auctoritate*, p. 234 sq. Zeller, on the other hand (*Philos. d. Griechen*, second edition, II, pt. 2, p. 67, note i), decides in favor of the genuineness of the first part of the work, the *Categories* proper, and against the so-called *Postpraedicamenta* from ch. X to the end." (p. 514)

(...)

"I have shown, I trust, not only that the treatise of the *Categories* is closely related to that of the *Topics*, but also that it was written before the latter and serves as a basis for it upon which it builds, very often going beyond the *Categories*. This applies to the first nine chapters, properly called *Categories*, in the same measure as to the *Postpraedicamenta*. The unity of the book of the *Categories* as we now have it is also maintained by Valentinus Rose (*De Arist. libr. ord.*, etc., p. 235). Ergo, the whole work is genuine, and its peculiar character is to be explained on the ground of its being one of the earliest attempts of Aristotle." (p. 528)

73. ———. 1939. "The Authenticity of Aristotle's *Categories*." *Journal of Philosophy* no. 36:427-431.

Reprinted (conjoined with Husik 1904) in: I. Husik, *The Categories of Aristotle* (1942).

"*Habent sua fata libelli*. Thirty-four years ago I published a paper, "On the *Categories* of Aristotle," in the *Philosophical Review*.⁽²⁾ Like the case of the proverbial Irishman who desired to be buried in a Jewish cemetery because that was the last place the devil would look for an Irishman, so it seems that the *Philosophical Review* at that time was the last place where an Aristotelian scholar would look for a literary-historical article on the *Categories* of Aristotle. And so the article was stillborn. No European student of Aristotle knew

about it and it did not find its way into the bibliographies of the subject. Dupréel, whose article on the same subject appeared five years later,(3) does not refer to my article and shows no knowledge of it." (p. 427)

(...)

"There would be no point in reproducing here the arguments advanced in my article of long ago. All I need do here is to give the gist of the argument, which can be done in a few sentences.

An examination of the treatise of the *Categories* and a comparison thereof with the *Topics*, in respect of terminology, style, and doctrine, proves conclusively that they are either the work of one author or that one was a close and deliberate imitator of the other. The same examination shows that the *Categories* was written before the *Topics*. Hence, since no one doubts the genuineness of the *Topics*, the *Categories* must be equally genuine, for no one has suggested that some one before Aristotle wrote the *Categories*, which Aristotle imitated in the *Topics*.

Dupréel, as I said before, is the only one who has made a considerable contribution to the question since my article was published.

His argument has no point of contact with mine, for he compares the *Categories* not with the *Topics*, but with the *Metaphysics*, and finds that they do not agree in doctrine.

I have no reason to quarrel with Dupréel when he tries to show that the first nine chapters, the categories proper, and the last six chapters, the *Postpraedicamenta*, are a unit and the work of the same author, for my comparison of the treatise with the *Topics* has led me to the same conclusion." (p. 429)

(2) Vol. XIII (1904), pp. 514-528. "Differences" on page 517, line 10 from bottom, should read "diffuseness."

74. ———. 1942. "The Categories of Aristotle." In *Philosophical Essays in Honor of Edgar Arthur Singer Jr.*, edited by Clarke, F. P. and Nahm, C. M., 317-334. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Two articles conjoined: "The Categories of Aristotle" (1930)

and "On the Categories of Aristotle" (1904).

Reprinted in: I. Husik, *Philosophical Essays. Ancient, Mediaeval, and Modern*, Edited by Milton C. Nahm and Leo Strauss, Oxford: Blackwell, 1952, pp. 96-112.

75. Irwin, Terence H. 1981. "Homonymy in Aristotle." *Review of Metaphysics* no. 34:523-544.

"What, then, are Aristotle's conditions for homonymy and multivocity?

It is often assumed that the conditions are different, but that they both reflect differences in the senses of words. I will argue that each of these assumptions is less than the whole truth; homonymy and multivocity are often the same, and neither is intended to mark different senses of words." (pp. 523-524, note omitted)

(...)

[Aristotle] search for homonymy is not meant to encourage skepticism about the existence of essences for words to name, but to forestall skepticism that might result from the rejection of the Platonic attempt to see one essence for every name; Aristotle does not want to renounce the search for essences, but only to recognize different essences correlated with the same name. While the Wittgensteinian arguments about family resemblance are arguments against essentialism, Aristotle's arguments are a defence of essentialism. The difficulties in his doctrine of homonymy are difficulties in his general views about real essences." (p. 544)

76. Jansen, Ludger. 2011. "Aristotle's *Categories*." *Topoi* no. 26:153-158.

"We need reliable techniques of information retrieval: search engines, indices, and categorisation.

Faced with such an urgent need for categorisation, a book on categories is more than welcome.

Aristotle, a young philosopher from Athens in Greece with a Macedonian background, has now published a philosophical investigation on this topic.

Such could be the beginning of a review of Aristotle's *Categories*, were it published today. The aim of this essay as an "Untimely Review" is to speculate how such a review would continue. Such an exercise in counterfactual history is easier when we review some neglected and hitherto uninfluential text. For such a text can really have a fresh impact on contemporary philosophy, whereas a classic text, being neither neglected nor uninfluential, is, as a rule, already an active force that has shaped and continues to shape the philosophical landscape. This applies in particular in the case of Aristotle's *Categories*, which has been for more than two millennia one of the most influential textbooks in philosophy." (p. 353)

(...)

"How could such a review conclude? Maybe thus: Aristotle's *Categories* can help to find our way around the internet. The first question of any retrieval technique that is more than a search for strings of characters should be: To which category does the thing that I am searching for belong? Aristotle's little treatise suggests helpful changes in perspective that could benefit contemporary ontology, and especially the steadily growing field of applied ontology. They can give new impulses towards applications in biomedical, legal or business information sciences, but also inspire new work on the old question: What is being?" (p. 158)

77. Jones, Barrington. 1972. "Individuals in Aristotle's *Categories*." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy*:107-123.

"With the publication of J. L. Ackrill's translation of the *Categories*(1) and G. E. L. Owen's paper "Inherence"(2) a dispute has arisen over what Aristotle means in that work by an individual where the individuals in question are not prime substances. The bulk of published opinion has favoured Ackrill's account of the matter,(3) an account which is also found in the writings of W. D. Ross and Miss Anscombe.(4) However, this account involves certain difficulties.

The major difficulty is an internal one, the question of the interpretation of 2 a 34-b 6. This passage is described by Ackrill as "compressed and careless,"(5) while Owen claims

that the matter "is put beyond question" in favour of his own view by the lines, and that "by themselves they settle the issue."(6) A second immediate difficulty is that such non-substantial individuals do not seem to reappear elsewhere in the Aristotelian corpus and are absent even from his discussion of the various categories in the *Categories* itself." (p. 107)

(...)

"Accordingly, I wish to re-examine the issue. I shall try to show that what Aristotle means by a non-substantial individual is fully captured by neither of the two current accounts, that 2 a 34-b 6 has been misconstrued by both parties, that Aristotle's account is entirely

reasonable, relying simply on an accurate observation of what is presupposed by the activity of counting, and, finally, that the account offered in the present paper enables us to understand aright his distinction between synonymy, homonymy and paronymy.(9)" (p. 108)

(1) Aristotle's *Categories* and *De Interpretatione* (Oxford, 1963).

(2) *Phronesis*, X (1965), pp. 97-105.

(3) v. J. M. E. Moravcsik, "Aristotle on Predication," *Philosophical Review*, LXXVI (1967), pp. 80-96; G. B. Matthews and S. M. Cohen, "The One and the Many," *Review of Metaphysics*, XXI (1968), pp. 630-655; R. E. Allen, "Individual Properties in Aristotle's Categories," *Phronesis*, XIV (1969), pp. 31-39.

(4) W. D. Ross, *Aristotle* (London, 1923), p. 24, n.1.; G. E. M. Anscombe and P. T. Geach, *Three Philosophers* (New York, 1961), pp. 7-10.

(5) Ackrill, p. 83.

(6) "Inherence," p. 100.

(9) I shall suppose that the *Categories* is a genuine work of Aristotle's. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from the *Categories* are those of Ackrill and all translations from

elsewhere in the corpus are my own. The technical vocabulary of the *Categories* is used according to Ackrill's translation throughout.

78. ———. 1975. "An Introduction to the First Five Chapters of Aristotle's *Categories*." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 20:146-172.

"In an earlier paper (1) I have argued that a satisfactory account of Aristotle's postulation of individuals, both substantial and nonsubstantial, in the *Categories* can be achieved by taking seriously his characterization of these individuals as things that are 'one in number' and by interpreting this characterization as 'a unit in a possible act of enumeration'. This approach to the *Categories* as important consequences for the interpretation of the remainder of the work.

In this essay I wish to present an account of the first five chapters (bar chapter 4 which lays out the categories themselves) based on the former paper.

In particular, I wish to examine the fourfold division of 'the things that are' in chapter 2 and the two relations of 'being said of' and 'being in' (or, rather, 'existing in') that are used to construct this fourfold division, and the nature of 'primary substance' (or, rather, 'primary being') and the basis for its distinction from 'secondary substance' (or, rather, 'secondary being'). The account that will be developed here is substantially and importantly different from any other that I am aware of, and, even if it does not secure conviction, its publication will hopefully make the dogma that the *Categories* is a 'common-sensical' work less readily tenable and force a re-thinking of the usual account of the work." (p. 146)

(1) "Individuals in Aristotle's *Categories*," *Phronesis*, 17 (1972) 107-123.

79. Jones, J. R. 1949. "Are the Qualities of Particular Things Universal or Particular?" *The Philosophical Review* no. 58:152-170.

"There are some curious things in the opening chapters of Aristotle's *Categoriae*. One is the admission, which seems to

justify Porphyry's inclusion of the species as a fifth predicable, that "man" can be predicated of "the individual man." Another is the hint of a sense in which the qualities of a particular thing share in its particularity.

A distinction drawn in the second chapter between "presence in a subject" and "assertability of a subject" yields a division of fundamental entities in which the opposition of "man" to "this individual man" is paralleled by a similar opposition of "white" to "this individual white." This doctrine is nowhere else repeated in Aristotle and may have little relevance to a study of the development of the Peripatetic philosophy. But it does seem to me to provide a significant alternative to the view that all that is adjectival to a thing, that is, every quality of it, is universal. I have become increasingly dissatisfied with this view and would like, in what follows, to examine the alternative to it which seems to be implied in the passage of Aristotle's to which I am referring." [*Cat.* 1a, 16-1b, 9.] (p. 152)

(...)

"I submit that Aristotle pointed to the correct solution of his problem (but regrettably missed the significance of it) when he suggested that what is "present in" substance, namely, its accidents or attributes, can be "individual and one in number." For the moment

it is thus recognized that characters may occur unrepeatably, the bare substantival "this" becomes clothed in the content of an adjectival or attributive "thisness" and its individual essence need no longer be sought in an empty material substratum.(34)

The view that characters are necessarily universals has been held by philosophers who have insisted that recognition presupposes acquaintance with a bare "this." But I should have thought it self-evident that an object which we may know by merely confronting must have content, as well as an existence, that is irrecurrably its own." (p. 170)

(34) It is sometimes claimed that Aristotle redeemed his doctrine of individual essence by suggesting that the individual may possess a distinct form as well as distinct

matter, that is, content, as well as a substrate, that is irrecurrably its own. But, as Cook Wilson has seen, it is only in terms of a doctrine of particular qualities that this suggestion can be made good. Speaking of Aristotle's description of particularity as "matter which has the form," he points out that "form" here must be "the particular quality of the thing and not the universal; it is the particular definiteness of the thing" (S.I. ii, 713).

80. Kahn, Charles H. 1978. "Questions and Categories. Aristotle's Doctrine of Categories in the Light of Modern Research." In *Questions*, edited by Hiz, Henry, 227-278. Dordrecht: Reidel.

"The categories of Aristotle do not represent a complete logical inventory, a classification of all terms or concepts represented in language. They do attempt to classify all the terms of a basic object language, where these terms are specified by the questions that can be asked or answered concerning an individual subject. Hence the number of categories will be determined by the number of fundamentally distinct questions that can be raised concerning such a subject. As has often been pointed out, the full list of ten given in the *Categories* and in *Topics* 1.9 suggests that Aristotle must have taken a human being as his specimen subject, for only in this case would the two minor categories, Posture and Having (or Clothing) be natural topics of inquiry.

There is, then, a factual connection between Aristotle's list of categories and the linguistic forms of question or inquiry. But what is the philosophical significance of this connection? Reflection on this matter may proceed along two quite distinct lines of thought, each of which could provide material for a study devoted to questions and categories. On the one hand, we might consider Aristotle's doctrine simply as an early example of the genre, and widen the concept of category to include modern theories of logical, conceptual, and grammatical categories. Our topic would then become: the connection between interrogative forms and categorial distinctions in general. On the other hand, we may keep our attention fixed on Aristotle's doctrine but generalize the remark about interrogative forms to include other grammatical or linguistic considerations. Our topic will then

be: the significance of the connections between Aristotle's scheme of categories and certain facts of grammar, including the grammar of questions in Greek. It is this second topic that I propose to study here: I will discuss Aristotle's theory, not category theories in general." (pp. 227-228, notes omitted)

(...)

"The doctrine of categories is not, after all, the central thesis in Aristotle's ontology. It provides a kind of introduction to metaphysics and to theoretical philosophy in general, by sorting and circumscribing the domain of things that are beings per se, 'in their own right'. When the categorial scheme is applied in connection with the focal meaning of being, it effects a preliminary unification and ordering of this domain in its ontological dependence on substance or 'entity'. But in the final analysis the scheme does not tell us what is to count as an entity or how the structure of a substance is to be understood. The deeper analysis of substance itself and its relation to the dependent beings must be carried out by the use of different concepts, φυσικῶς not λογικῶς as Aristotle will sometimes say, concepts derived not from the theory of predication but designed specifically for the analysis of natural motion and change: concepts like mover and goal (τέλος), matter and form, potency and act. Both physics and metaphysics culminate in the theory of the Unmoved Mover, the entity (or entities) whose being is actuality, the final cause of all motion and change, the 'primary substance' on which all other substances depend (Λ.7, 1072b 14; cf. Γ.2, 1003b16–17, E.1, 1026a27-31). In this ultimate perspective for ontology, which Aristotle himself never worked out in full detail, the preliminary contribution of the categories in distinguishing substance from the various kinds of dependent beings must seem quite modest and elementary. All the more reason, however, why the categorial scheme itself should be firmly rooted in humble, everyday questions like What is it? How big? Of what sort or quality? In relation to what? Where? and When?" (p. 266)

81. Kapp, Ernst. 1942. *Greek Foundations of Traditional Logic*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Contents: Preface V-VIII; I. The origin of logic as a science 5; II. Concepts, terms, definitions, ideas, categories 20; III. Judgments, subject and predicate 43; IV. Syllogisms 60; V. Induction: ancient and modern logic 75; Books cited 89; Index 91-95.

On the categories see pp. 36-42.

"There is no doubt that the book *Categories* is partly responsible for the contents of this first part of traditional logic, because it professes to deal with the significance of unconnected parts of sentences; but the *Topics*, our earliest document, not only of Aristotle's treatment of syllogisms but also of categories, shows that the doctrine of categories was originally a doctrine of sentence-predicates and was only later transformed by Aristotle himself into some scheme for pigeonholing whatever carries a single word as its name." (p. 23)

(...)

"[*Categories*] contains, on the basis of a short but very interesting preparatory section (chaps. I-III), which one might call more-logical than ontological, a minute description of the first four categories (substance, quantity, relation, and quality), in which an ontological point of view seems to prevail. The doctrine here revealed is far from the flexible subtleties of Aristotle's fully developed metaphysics, but there are some striking coincidences with statements otherwise peculiar to the *Topics*; and the conclusion that the treatise *Categories* was a comparatively early work by Aristotle himself is fairly safe.

In any case, even without reference to the question of authorship and chronology it can be stated that nowhere else in Aristotle's writings is the source of the difficulties which are inherent in the later form of the doctrine so transparent as here." (p. 40)

82. Kenny, Anthony John Patrick. 1983. "A Stylometric Comparison Between Five Disputed Works and the Remainder of the Aristotelian Corpus." In *Zweifelhaftes im Corpus Aristotelicum. Studien zu einigen Dubia. Akten des 9.*

Symposium Aristotelicum, Berlin, 7-16 September 1981, edited by Moraux, Paul and Wiesner, Jürgen, 345-366. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

[The five dubious works examined are: *Categoriae*, *Meteorologica IV*, *De Motu Animalium*, *Metaphysica α*, *Metaphysica K*.]

"What can stylometric techniques tell us about the authenticity of the five possibly Aristotelian works which are the topic of this Symposium? In the present state of our knowledge it is not easy to give a precise answer to this question. There is no doubt, to my mind, that the statistical examination of literary style is a valuable auxiliary tool in the study of the questions which interest the philologist and the philosopher who approach an ancient text. But to decide whether a work is genuine or spurious is one of the most difficult tasks for stylometry." (p. 345)

(...)

"A firm stylometric conclusion about the authenticity of the works which are the topic of this symposium would have to be based on a truly gigantic amount of investigation: investigation which would take a very long time even now when machine-readable texts of Aristotle are available and when computers will produce concordances, word counts, and statistical analyses with a modicum of effort. The present essay offers only a minute contribution to such an investigation. It studies the use of twenty-four common particles and connectives in the dubious works, comparing the four commonest of them with virtually the whole Aristotelian corpus, and the other twenty with a large sample of some three hundred thousand words, which constitute about thirty per cent of the round million words of the entire corpus. The essay will provide only tentative indications of the genuineness or spuriousness of the works in dispute; but it will illustrate the difficulties and pitfalls of the use of stylometric methods in authorship attribution studies.

The four commonest particles in the Aristotelian corpus are καί, δέ, γάρ and μὲν, in that order. Between them these four particles constitute around fourteen per cent of a typical

Aristotelian text. Because of their frequency and topic-neutrality they provide suitable material for statistical study. We shall use them as a starting-point for a comparison between the dubious works and the rest of the Aristotelian corpus." (pp. 346-347)

(...)

"The overall conclusion, then, of this study is as follows. We have discovered in our examination of twenty four particles no real evidence suggesting the spuriousness of *Metaph. K* or of *Mot. Anim.* But the frequencies of ἀλλά, δῆ, διό, ὡσπερ and γε in *Cat.* and of καί, μὲν, δέ, αὐ, γε, διό in *Mete. IV* are eccentric enough to be suspicious. And the overall picture of particle usage in *Metaph. α* appears to be quite different from that in other works of Aristotle." (pp. 365-366)

83. Kohl, Markus. 2008. "Substancehood and Subjecthood in Aristotle's *Categories*." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 53:172-179.

Abstract: "I attempt to answer the question of what Aristotle's criteria for 'being a substance' are in the *Categories*. On the basis of close textual analysis, I argue that subjecthood, conceived in a certain way, is the criterion that explains why both concrete objects and substance universals must be regarded as substances. It also explains the substantial primacy of concrete objects. But subjecthood can only function as such a criterion if both the subjecthood of concrete objects and the subjecthood of substance universals can be understood as philosophically significant phenomena. By drawing on Aristotle's essentialism, I argue that such an understanding is possible: the subjecthood of substance universals cannot simply be reduced to that of primary substances. Primary and secondary substances mutually depend on each other for exercising their capacities to function as subjects. Thus, subjecthood can be regarded as a philosophically informative criterion for substancehood in the *Categories*."

84. Kosman, Louis Aryeh. 1967. "Aristotle's First Predicament." *Review of Metaphysics* no. 20:483-506.

Reprinted in: Mary L. O'Hara (ed.), *Substances and Things. Aristotle's Doctrine of Physical Substance in Recent Essays*, Washington: University Press of America, 1982, pp. 19-42.

"Is the aristotelian list of categories, enigmatically entitled "κατηγορίαι-predicates," a list of terms classifying types of predicates, or a list of predicates classifying types of entities? Consider two ways in which a list of categories might be generated. Given some entity, we may distinguish different types of questions which we ask about it, such that each type determines a limited and exclusive range of appropriate answers."

(...)

"Alternatively, we might attend not to the different answers appropriate to different questions asked about the same entity, but to the different answers which result when, about *different* entities, the *same* question is asked repeatedly, the question "What is it?"

(...)

"Each ultimate answer will signify a supreme and irreducible genus of entity, not a *type* of predicate, but a predicate, effecting a classification of *things* into *their* ultimate types." (pp. 483-484)

85. Kunkel, Joseph C. 1971. "A New Look at Non-Essential Predication in the "Categories"." *The New Scholasticism* no. 45:110-116.

"Recent commentators appear in general agreement over the essential nature of the expression 'predicated of' in Aristotle's Categories(1) 'Predicated of' denominates the genus-species-individual or essence-singular relationship. Only the species, genus, or essence is predicable of the individual subject. Accidental predication is prohibited. Moreover, the species and genera can be subjects, but individuals can never be predicates.

My opposition is not to the expression 'predicated of' including the species, genera, or essences as predicable of individuals, but to this expression as only including, or being equivalent to,

that type of predication. Does 'predicated of' exclude accident. as predicable of substances? Reflecting the thinking or the other commentators, C.-H. Chen says, "What it is still more important to observe in this connection is that in the *Categoriae* no intergeneric predication and, therefore, also no intercategorical predication are conceived to be genuine predication.(2) I think the limitation of predication to essential, categorical lines is untenable for three reasons." (p. 110)

(1) Cf. S. Mansion, "La doctrine aristotélicienne de la substance et le traité des *Categories*," *Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Philosophy*, I, pt. II (Amsterdam, 1949), pp. 1097-98; L. M. de Rijk, *The Place of the Categories of Being in Aristotle's Philosophy* (Assen, 1952), p. 70; C.-H. Chen, "On Aristotle's Two Expressions: καθ' ὑποκειμένου λέγεσθαι and ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ εἶναι" *Phronesis*, 2 (1957), 149-50; J. Owens, "Aristotle on Categories," *Review of Metaphysics*, 14 (1960-61), 75-76; J. L. Ackrill, *Aristotle's Categories and De Interpretatione* (Oxford, 1963), pp. 74-76 ; G. E. L. Owen, "Inherence," *Phronesis*, 10 (1965). 97-98; and J. M. E. Moravcsik, "Aristotle on Predication," *Philosophical Review*, 16 (1967), 85-93.

(2) Chen, *Phronesis*, 2, 150.

86. Kwan, Tze-Wan. 2008. "The Doctrine of Categories and the Topology of Concern." In *The Logic of the Living Present (Analecta Husserliana, Vol. 46)*, edited by Tymieniecka, Anna-Teresa, 243-301. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

"Introduction. There is little doubt that the problem of categories has been among one of the most frequently discussed topics in philosophy ever since Aristotle.

Important as it was, the problem of categories has however become in the eyes of today's students of philosophy an old-fashioned or even out-dated problem. If philosophy itself is for most people a marginal discipline of little practical value, then the problem of categories would turn out to be the most abstract and most detached issue of all. But is the problem of categories really that abstract?

Compared with more sensuous problems such as "Life and Death", "Freedom" or "Justice", the problem of categories gives us the impression of being a matter of theoretical technicality that is of mere scholastic interest. However, we will see bit by bit in the following, that the problem of categories has in the last analysis a strong relevance to the basic concerns of philosophy as well as to the very world perspective of man.

We will also show that as man's basic concerns vary from culture to culture and from one age to another, the respective systems of categories will take up an utterly different structural outlook." (p. 243)

(...)

"If we examine the original Greek expressions of the ten categories, we discover that they are not at all abstract conceptual expressions, but rather a checklist of some very commonly used everyday locutions. Take the categories $\tau\omicron\upsilon\omicron$ and $\tau\omicron\tau\sim$ for example: if

it was Aristotle's wish to express what we now call Place and Time, he could have readily used expressions such as $\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\sim$ and $\chi\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\sim$ which were already very common in those days.

Taking this point into consideration, one can decide upon another principle of translation. Instead of rendering the ten categories as ten abstract conceptions, one might describe them as ten basic patterns of ordinary locution (or better, interrogation) arriving thus at the following table: (19)

Οὐσία [τί ἐστὶ] Substantive

Ποσόν Adjective (quantitative)

Ποιόν Adjective (qualitative)

Πρὸς τι Adjective (comparative)

Ποῦ Adverb of place

Πότε Adverb of time

Κεῖσθαι Verb - middle voice

Ἐχειν Verb - perfect

Ποιεῖν Verb - active voice

Πάσχειν Verb - passive voice

(19) See Aristotle's *Categories*, translated by Harold P. Cooke, *Aristotle in Twenty-three Volumes*, Vol. 1; The Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1938/1973), pp. 16-19.

87. Lang, Helen. 2004. "Aristotle's Categories "Where" and "When"." In *Categories: Historical and Systematic Essays*, edited by Gorman, Michael and Sanford, Jonathan J., 21-32. Washington: Catholic University of America Press.

The word “category” itself comes from the verb κατηγορέω, meaning “to denounce,” “to accuse,” or, as we shall see in Aristotle, “to be predicated.” In his entry “Categories” in the *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Manley Thompson turns first to “Aristotelian Theory” and asserts:

The word “category” was first used as a technical term in philosophy by Aristotle. In his short treatise called *Categories*, he held that every uncombined expression signifies (denotes, refers to) one or more things falling in at least one of the following ten classes: substance, quantity, quality, relation, place, time, posture, state, action, and passion.(1)

This list of categories is almost always attributed to Aristotle. But in fact it does not reflect Aristotle's language either in the *Categories*, which Thompson cites, or in the rest of the corpus. With the exception of the first category, substance, none of Aristotle's categories is a noun;(2) they are adjectives, adverbs, infinitives, and in one case (“relation”) a prepositional phrase, made to stand as substantives. Although classical Greek certainly allows for the formation of substantives by means of a definite article, Aristotle does not always use an article when specifying categories, and even when he does, these expressions seem odd. Indeed, they are part of the reason why Aristotle's Greek is often thought of as Hellenistic rather than “classical,” strictly speaking.

The question for a philosopher is not translation per se but what is at stake substantively in this apparently linguistic matter. Here I shall consider two of Aristotle's categories. They appear above as “place” and “time,” but I shall argue that they

are more properly “where” and

“when”—indefinite adverbs that are sometimes best translated as “somewhere” and “sometime.” I shall conclude that the translations “place” and “time” obscure important substantive issues at stake in these categories. These issues appear clearly in both the historical origins of these categories in Plato and in the relation of these categories to Aristotle’s physics.” (pp. 21-22)

1. Manley Thompson, “Categories,” in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards (New York: Macmillan, 1967), 2:46–47.

2. A good deal of work has been done on the etymology of Aristotle’s word οὐοία. For example, see the excellent discussion in Joseph Owens, *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics*, 3d ed. (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1978), 137–54.

88. Leszl, Walter. 1970. *Logic and Metaphysics in Aristotle (Aristotle's Treatment of Types of Equivocity and Its Relevance to His Metaphysical Theories)*. Padova: Antenore.

Contents: Preface 1; Introduction 7; Part I. Aristotle on Meaning and What Is Meant 23; Chapter I. The meaning of words 25; Chapter II. The unity of the components of definition 50; Chapter III. The structure of reality 60; Part II. Homonymy, Synonymy and Related Concepts 81; Chapter I. Aristotle’s classification of the uses of predicate words and expressions and of sentences 83; Chapter II. Generalities on focal meaning and on analogy 114; Part III. Some Intepreters Treatment of Focal Meaning and Analogy 133; Chapter I. The prevailing accounts of focal meaning and of analogy and of Aristotle’s employment of them in the context of his metaphysics 135; Chapter II. The synonymy account of focal meaning as applied to the being of the categories 162; Chapter III. The synonymy account of focal meaning as applied to the model-copy situation 182; Part IV. Close Analysis of the Logical Mechanism of Focal Meaning and f Analogy According to the Various Competing Accounts 203; Chapter I. Criticism of the synonymy account of focal meaning as applied to the being of the categories 205; Chapter II. Criticism of the

synonymy account of focal meaning as applied to the model-copy situation 252; Chapter III. Introduction of some logical distinctions concerning relations and related terms and of some other accounts of focal meaning 285; Chapter IV. The homonymy account of focal meaning and of analogy 303; Part V. Evidence for and Against each of the Competing Accounts of Focal Meaning and of Analogy 327; Chapter I. Examination of the evidence concerning Aristotle's alleged changes in his treatment of words with focal meaning and with analogy 329; Chapter II. Interpretation of the evidence concerning analogy 373; Chapter III. Interpretation of the evidence concerning focal meaning 387; Part VI. Aristotle's Criticism of Platonic Metaphysics 451; Chapter I. Self-defeating character of Aristotle's objections to Plato on the traditional account of his metaphysical thought 453; Chapter II. Suggestions towards the elimination of the alleged contradictions in Aristotle's metaphysical thought 486; Chapter III. Aristotle's methodology as contrasted with the methodology of the Academics 539; Bibliography 553; Indexes 567; Index of Texts 569; Index of Greek terms 579; Index of Subjects 583; Index of Persons 595-601.

"The generality of the main title of the present work may be misleading as to its actual scope, which is more appropriately defined by its subtitle. It is an inquiry into Aristotle's treatment of *ὁμωνυμία* and of its species, considered in the background of his metaphysical theories, which both condition and are conditioned by that logical treatment. It is the prevalence of an interest in these two-way conditionings which is expressed by the main title.

In spite of misgivings, then, I have preserved it on this ground, and also because the work is meant to be a part of a more comprehensive treatment of logic and metaphysics in Aristotle, which should include a detailed examination of the way in which the logical distinctions here introduced are used in dealing with fundamental words like "being", "one" and "good". At least in the conclusive chapter I have actually gone beyond (the theme defined by the subtitle by showing that Aristotle's treatment of types of equivocity is only one instance, if probably the most important and interesting one,

of his methodology of definition." (from the Preface, p. 1)

89. Lewis, Frank A. 2004. "Aristotle on the Homonymy of Being." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* no. 68:1-36.

"The topic of homonymy, especially the variety of homonymy that has gone under the title, "focal meaning," is of fundamental importance to large portions of Aristotle's work—not to mention its central place in the ongoing controversies between Aristotle and Plato. It is quite astonishing, therefore, that the topic should have gone so long without a book-length treatment.

And it is all the more gratifying that the new book on homonymy by Christopher Shields should be so comprehensive, and of such uniformly high quality.(1)

Everyone who cares about Aristotle will be in his debt.

Shields's book falls into two parts. In the first, he is concerned to lay out the basic structure of Aristotle's views about homonymy; in the second part, we are led through the various applications of the idea, to the analysis of friendship, for example, the homonymy of the body, the account of goodness and, not least, the homonymy of being. Shields's book brings out well how the topic of homonymy weaves in and out of the fabric of Aristotle's thinking in a variety of areas. I will resist the temptation to follow Shields through these various subject-matters, and instead take up essentially two topics. First, (I), the basic outline of Aristotle's notion of homonymy, more or less independently of its different applications (here, I follow Shields's example in the first half of his book). Thereafter, I discuss a single application: the homonymy of being (this is the subject of Shields's last and longest chapter). Here, I will be interested (II) in how homonymy relates to the theory of the categories; and (III) in the application of homonymy to the analysis of substance in the *Metaphysics*." (p. 1)

(1) Shields, Christopher (1999), *Order in Multiplicity: Homonymy in the Philosophy of Aristotle*, Oxford.

90. Lloyd, Antony C. 1966. "Aristotle's Categories Today." *Philosophical Quarterly* no. 16:258-267.

Review-article of: *Aristotle's Categories and De Interpretatione*, translated with notes, by J. L. Ackrill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963).

"The *Categories* have always had at least three centres of interest: the distinction of primary and secondary substances, the concept of homonymy and synonymy and its application to the concept of being, and the more or less formal properties discovered in the categories one by one. I shall be concerned mostly with the first.

To my judgement there is a comparatively simple way into the categories according to which the word translated 'substance' means 'being' and the primary notion of being is existence. (This is the εἶναι ἀπλῶς opposed to εἶναι ἐπὶ μέρους, i.e. εἶναι τοῦ ἢ τοῦ (of *An. Post.* II 2 and *Met.* Z 1, 1028a31.) About existence we can ask (or so it seems) "what is it to exist?" and "what exists" The first question is given, though not in the *Categories*, the answer "to be active" (*energeia*). The second question could be a request to identify everything that there is, which would not even *prima facie* be a sensible request. Or it could be a request to identify the sorts of thing that exist: this is given two answers in the *Categories*, individuals and those genera and species which are composed of individuals. But so as to understand the ten categories we can distinguish these two kinds of things from all the kinds of things-or, what it is superfluous to add, all the kinds of things there are (*onta*), which are the ten categories. The individuals and the species and genera are then called 'beings', in the plural and in the usage which has regularly been translated 'substances'." (p. 258)

91. Malcolm, John. 1981. "On the Generation and Corruption of the Categories." *Review of Metaphysics* no. 33:662-681.

"It is tempting to assume that an obvious way in which Aristotle determined his list of categories was to take a primary substance as subject and classify its predicates. (1) The advantage of this suggestion is that it appears to give us the list of categories given at *Categories*

1 b25 ff. For example, if we take Socrates as subject, then, when we predicate man of him, we get a predicate which is a

substance (*ousia*). When we consider "Socrates is grammatical" we get a predicate in quality or "how qualified" (*poion*). "Socrates is in the market

place" gives us place or "where" (*pou*) and so on.

Although I shall propose that, in the case of the first category, *ousia*, this is not how Aristotle, in fact, proceeds in the *Categories* (see p. 674 below), the major shortcoming of this procedure is that it cannot account for individuals, and a fortiori individual substances, as

items in the categories." (p. 662)

(...)

"My procedure, therefore, will not be to start with the SRPR [*subject restricted to substance predicate relative*] option and try to adjust it to harmonize with the doctrine of the work entitled *Categories*, nor indeed to take this work as my point of departure, for, somewhat paradoxically, I shall contend that the list of *Categories* 1b25 ff. was assembled in a rather haphazard fashion. I shall, in fact, begin with *Topics* 1.9 and, taking this as basic, endeavor to explain the other relevant passages in the Aristotelian corpus in the light of what is to be found there." (p. 663)

(1) See J. Ackrill, *Aristotle's Categories and De Interpretatione* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1963), pp. 78-79, for this alternative.

92. Malink, Marko. 2007. "Categories in *Topics* I.9." *Rhizai. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy and Science* no. 4:271-294.

"In the first sentence of *Topics* 1.9, Aristotle proposes to determine the γένη τῶν κατηγοριῶν. These are the ten categories he is going to discuss in this chapter. He seems to think of them as genera classifying items which are referred to as κατηγορίαί. What are these items? Commentators tend to agree that they are either predications or predicates.(1) In the first case, the categories would classify items such as 'Socrates is white' or 'man is animal'. In the second case, they would classify terms such as 'white' or 'animal' which are able to serve as predicates of predications. The two options need not

be incompatible with each other, for the categories might provide a classification both of predicates and of predications. At any rate, we should like to determine the criteria by which the categories manage to classify either predicates or predications or both." (p. 271)

93. Mann, Wolfgang-Rainer. 2000. *The Discovery of Things. Aristotle's Categories and Their Context*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Contents: Acknowledgments IX; A Note on Citations XI; Introduction 3; Part I. Setting the stage: The "Antepredicamenta" and the "Predicamenta" 39; Part II: Plato's metaphysics and the status of things 75; PART III. The categories picture once more: an alternative to Platonism and late-learnerism 184; Epilogue 205; Select Bibliography 207; Index Locorum 219; Index Rerum 226-231.

"1. The Project

In two of his early works—in the *Categories* especially, but also in the *Topics*—Aristotle presents a revolutionary metaphysical picture. This picture has had a peculiar fate. Its revolutionary theses are so far from being recognized as such that they have often been taken to be statements of common sense, or expressions of an everyday, pretheoretical ontology.² The most striking and far-reaching of those theses is the claim that, included among what there is, among the entities (τὰ ὄντα), there are things. Aristotle, famously, goes on to maintain that these things are ontologically fundamental. All the other entities are (whatever they are)³ by being appropriately connected to the things, for example, either as their features (their qualities, sizes, relations-to-each-other, locations, and so on), or as their genera and species, that is, the kinds under which the things fall.⁴ These further claims and their proper interpretation have received considerable discussion. Yet the fundamental one has gone virtually unnoticed. To formulate it most starkly: before the *Categories* and *Topics*^ there were no things. Less starkly: things did not show up ^5 things, until Aristotle wrote those two works." (pp. 3-4)

(...)

"With a better understanding of Plato's metaphysical picture before us, we will be in a position to appreciate just how revolutionary and innovative Aristotle is being in the *Categories* and *Topics*. We will also be able to see how Aristotle set the stage for turning "the unaccustomed" into "longstanding custom" (Heidegger's phrase). The unique and central role which the *Categories* played in the philosophical curricula of late antiquity and the Latin middle ages obviously contributed enormously to this philosophical picture's successful ascendancy, to the point where it truly could appear to be nothing more than a reflection of common sense, precisely because it had become a part of common sense. And I am inclined to believe that this success, to a large extent, also explains why Plato is read in the ways he is commonly read: the mistake is neither one of simply overlooking something obvious—or not so obvious—nor one of inadvertently smuggling in Aristotelian notions. Rather, the ascent and dominance of the ontological picture of the *Categories* has so thoroughly eclipsed other pictures and interpretative possibilities that they cannot even come into view, much less be made to seem plausible, without considerable effort." (p. 6)

94. Matthen, Mohan. 1978. "The *Categories* and Aristotle's Ontology." *Dialogue. Canadian Philosophical Review* no. 17:228-243.

Abstract: "What were Aristotle's aims in the *Categories*? We can probably all agree that he wanted to say something about different uses of the verb 'to be' - something relevant to ontology. The conventional interpretation goes further: it has Books Γ and Z of the *Metaphysics* superseding theories put forward in the *Categories*. We should expect then that the *Categories* and these books of the *Metaphysics* try to do the same sort of thing. Most exegetes do indeed ascribe to the earlier work fairly elaborate ontologies, though they are in disagreement as to what theory Aristotle held while writing it. I shall argue in this paper that the whole enterprise of reconstructing the ontology of the *Categories* from its small stock of clues is misguided; that the business of the *Categories* is to set out data for which the *Metaphysics* tries to account. This view is not without consequences relevant to some widely

held theses. I shall claim that the differences between the *Categories* and the *Metaphysics* cannot uncritically be used to trace the development of Aristotle's ontology, that the differences between the two doctrines has been greatly exaggerated. More of this later: let me first explain the distinction on which I shall depend."

95. Matthews, Gareth B. 1989. "The Enigma of Categories 1a20ff and Why it Matters." *Apeiron* no. 22:91-104.

Of things there are: (a) some are said of a subject but are not in a subject ... (b) some are in a subject but not said of any subject. (By 'in a subject' I mean what is in something, not as a part, and cannot exist separately from what it is in.) ... (c) Some are both said of a subject and in a subject ... (d) some are neither in a subject nor said of a subject, ...'(1)

Perhaps no passage in Aristotle has excited more attention in recent years, or aroused more controversy, than the second paragraph of Chapter 2 of the *Categories*, from which the above quotation is taken.

I want to offer a fresh assessment of this recent discussion, as well as some thoughts on why the controversy remains philosophically important.

Paradoxically, I shall offer my fresh assessment by presenting some of the discussion of an ancient commentator, Ammonius.(2) After we have learned what we can from Ammonius, I shall say a little about why it matters which interpretation of *Cat.* 1a20ff we accept." (p. 91)

(1) *Categories* 1a20ff. The translation is by J.L. Ackrill, *Aristotle's Categories and De Interpretatione*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1963).

(2) I choose Ammonius, not because he is especially original, but because I am currently working with Marc Cohen on an English translation of his commentary on the *Categories* and hence am most familiar with it. [Ammonius, *On Aristotle's Categories*, translated by

S. Marc Cohen and Gareth B. Matthews, Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1991]

Citations of Ammonius will give the page and line numbers in volume IV.4 of *Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca*, Berlin Academy edition of 1895, edited by A. Busse.

96. ———. 2009. "Aristotelian Categories." In *A Companion to Aristotle*, edited by Anagnostopoulos, Georgios, 144-161. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

"That which is there to be spoken of and thought of, must be.

Parmenides, *Fragment 6* (McKirahan trans.)

The short treatise entitled *Categories* enjoys pride of place in Aristotle's writings. It is the very first work in the standard edition of Aristotle's texts. Each line of the thirty columns that make up this treatise has been pored over by commentators, from the first century BCE down to the present. Moreover, its gnomic sentences still retain their fascination for both philosophers and scholars, even today.

In the tradition of Aristotelian commentary, the first works of Aristotle are said to make up the *Organon*, which begins with the logic of terms (the *Categories*), then moves on to the logic of propositions (the *De Interpretatione*) and then to the logic of syllogistic argumentation (the *Prior Analytics*). But to say that the *Categories* presents the logic of terms may leave the misleading impression that it is about words rather than about things. That is not the case. This little treatise is certainly about words. But it is no less about things. It is about terms and the ways in which they can be combined; but this "logic" of terms is also meant to be a guide to what there is, that is, to ontology, and more generally, to metaphysics.

The *Categories* text was not given its title by Aristotle himself. Indeed, there has long been a controversy over whether the work was even written by Aristotle. Michael Frede's discussion of this issue in "The Title, Unity, and Authenticity of Aristotle's *Categories*" (Frede 1987: 11-28) is as close to being definitive on this issue as is possible. Frede concludes that the *Categories* can only be the work of Aristotle himself or one of his students.

The question of authenticity is often connected with the issue of whether the last part of the *Categories*, chapters 10-15,

traditionally called the "*Postpraedicamenta*," and the earlier chapters really belong to the same work. We shall have very little to say about the *Postpraedicamenta* here." (p. 144)

97. Matthews, Gareth B., and Cohen, S. Marc. 1968. "The One and the Many." *Review of Metaphysics* no. 21:630-655.

The Platonic argument that Aristotle calls "The One Over Many" ([*Metaphysics*, Book 1] 990b13; 107B69) (1) doubtless had something like this as its key premiss:

Whenever two or more things can be properly said to be F, it is by virtue of some one thing, F-ness, that they are properly called F.

The following sentence from Plato's *Republic* suggests such a premiss:

We are in the habit of assuming one Form for each set of many things to which we give the same name.(2)

The pattern of reasoning is familiar. x and y are round. It must be in virtue of roundness (or in virtue of their participating in roundness) that they are properly said to be round. Exactly what is established by the reasoning -- for that matter, what is supposed to be established-is not obvious. Taken in one way, Plato's Theory of Forms presents us with nothing more than a manner of speaking.

(...)

But if we take Plato's theory this way, we ignore the perplexities that give rise to it. There are at least two distinguishable perplexities that lead to a doctrine like Plato's. (3) One perplexity is ontological: Why is it that things naturally fall into kinds? The other - -and it is this perplexity especially that gives life to the One-Over-Many Argument -- is linguistic.(4) The puzzle is this: How can it be that many things are properly called by one name? To take this puzzle seriously we must indulge (I) the inclination to take the case of one name for each thing named (i.e., the case of an ideal proper name) as the paradigm case of a name, and also (II) the inclination to suppose that 'wise' in 'Pericles is wise' and 'a man' in 'Callias is a man' are names. If we go along with these

inclinations,• then the puzzle, How can it be that many things are properly called by one name?, becomes real.

(...)

We want to try to show that the *Categories*, on at least one plausible interpretation, offers a more general answer to Plato than has usually been thought to be the case. We shall then make some comments toward assessing the philosophical strengths and weaknesses of this Aristotelian answer." (pp. 631-632, some notes omitted)

(1) Line references, unless otherwise identified, are to the works of Aristotle.

(2) *Republic* 696A. Translations of passages from Plato and Aristotle are our own.

(3) Cf. David Pears's two questions, "Why are things as they are?" and "Why are we able to name things as we do?" in his article, "Universals," in *Logic and Language* (2nd series), ed. by A. Flew (Oxford, 1963), pp. 61-64.

98. Menn, Stephen. 1995. "Metaphysics, Dialectic and the *Categories*." *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* no. 100:311-337.

Abstract: "I examine the status and function of the *Categories* in Aristotle's philosophy. The work does not belong to «first philosophy, » or indeed to philosophy at all, but to dialectic; not as a « dialectical discussion » of being, but in the strict sense that it is intended, together with the *Topics*, to help the dialectical disputant to decide whether a given term can fall under a proposed definition or a proposed genus. Although the *Categories*, like dialectic in general, has uses in philosophical argument, the supposed opposition between the accounts of substance in the *Categories* and in the *Metaphysics* depends on a misunderstanding of the different aims of the two works."

99. Mignucci, Mario. 1986. "Aristotle's Definitions of Relatives in *Categories* Chapter 7." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 31:101-127.

"Chapter 7 of Aristotle's *Categories* is dedicated to a study of relatives, which are called "πρός τι". (p. 101)

(...)

"To sum up, I take Aristotle's definition of relatives to mean exactly that a property F is said to be a relative property if, and only if, it can be expanded into a relation that determines F univocally." (p. 104)

(...)

"Aristotle does not clarify the nature of the link that there is between a relative property and its constitutive relation. As we have seen, it is surely an intensional connection, which involves the senses both of the property and of the relation. But how senses are implied is not explicitly stated by him. Shall we leave the problem here? Perhaps an advance can be made if the definition of P1-relatives [*the class of relatives identified by Aristotle's definition*] at the beginning of Cat. 7 is compared with another definition of relatives which is discussed at the end of the same chapter." (p. 106)

(...)

"Many problems remain. One concerns the nature and meaning of stereotypes. Can they be conceived in the way in which Johnson-Leard has devised them, i.e. as frame systems in which default values are given?(26) And is this view consistent with Aristotle's doctrine about meanings and concepts?

I cannot try to answer these questions here. What my attempt to explain Aristotle's view aims at is to show that his position is far from being trivially false, as it is on the traditional interpretation, and that it can be credited with having some philosophical importance. Moreover, his attempt is stimulating because it approaches a modern problem from a different point of view. Nowadays we are accustomed to consider what is entailed by the fact that substitutivity does not hold in cognitive contexts, and we try to explain why it does not obtain. Aristotle is well aware of these restrictions, (27) but he is more interested in isolating cases in which substitutivity can be safely applied. Perhaps this change of perspective may help to refresh our own patterns of analysis." (p. 126)

(26) Cf. Johnson-Laird, pp. 26-29.

(27) Cf. e.g. *SE [De Sophisticis Elenchis]* 24, 179a35-b5.

References

Johnson-Laird, P.N.: "Formal Semantics and the Psychology of Meaning", in Peters, S. and Saarinen, E. (eds.), *Processes, Beliefs, and Questions, Essays on Formal Semantics of Natural Language and Natural Language Processing*, Dordrecht 1982, pp. 1-68.

100. Minio-Paluello, Lorenzo. 1945. "The Text of the *Categoriae*: the Latin Tradition." *Classical Quarterly* no. 39:63-74.

Reprinted in: L. Minio-Paluello, *Opuscula: the Latin Aristotle*, Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert 1972, pp. 28-39.

Abstract: "The Latin versions of Aristotle's *Categoriae* have never received much attention from the editors of the Greek text. J. Th. Buhle (*Arist. Op. Omn.* I, Bipont. 1791) and Th. Waitz (*Arist. Organ.* I, Lpz., 1844) availed themselves of Latin texts, but in a very unsatisfactory way; and since then the Latin field has remained unexplored throughout the last hundred years, in which both Hellenists and Orientalists have done much to increase our knowledge of the textual tradition of the *Categ.* It is the purpose of these pages to give a summary account of the Latin tradition and to contribute to a revision of the Greek text by a collation of Boethius' recently discovered translation with the best printed Greek and Oriental sources."

101. Morales, Fabio. 1994. "Relational Attributes in Aristotle." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 39:255-274.

Abstract: "Aristotle's theory of relations involves serious difficulties of interpretation. By attempting to solve some of the problems posed by J. L. Ackrill in his famous commentary on the *Categories* (Ackrill, 1963), I hope to contribute to a better understanding of Aristotle's statements on the nature and status of relational attributes. In general, my procedure has been to analyze the criteria by which entities are supposed to fall under the category of 'the relative'. The following topics will be considered: i) Aristotle's two definitions of relatives in

Categories 7, ii) the pseudo-relational character of the parts of substances, and iii) the threefold classification of relatives in *Metaphysics* chapter 15. A corollary of these discussions will be that relations may have played for Aristotle a far more conspicuous role in the 'definition' of substances and attributes than has been hitherto acknowledged."

102. Moravcsik, Julius M. E. 1967. "Aristotle's Theory of Categories." In *Aristotle. A Collection of Critical Essays*, edited by Moravcsik, Julius, 125-145. New York: Anchor Books.

"In several of his writings Aristotle presents what came to be known as a "list of categories." The presentation of a list, by itself, is not a philosophic theory.

This paper attempts a few modest steps toward an understanding of the theory or theories in which the list of categories is embedded. To arrive at such understanding we shall have to deal with the following questions: What classes of expressions designate items each

of which falls under only one category? What is the list a list of? and what gives it unity? To show this to be a worthwhile enterprise, let us consider a few passages in which the list of categories is introduced or mentioned." (p. 125)

(...)

"Conclusion. The theory of categories is partly a theory about language and partly a theory about reality.

With regard to language it states that certain elements of a language have key-designating roles, the full understanding of which requires that we understand the designata as falling within those classes which jointly form the set definitive of that to which a sensible particular must be related. We can see from this that Aristotle did not think of the structure of language as mirroring the structure of reality. But he did believe that there are specific items of language and reality the correlation of which forms the crucial link between the two." (p. 145)

103. ———. 1967. "Aristotle on Predication." *The Philosophical*

Review no. 76:80-96.

Erratum, *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 76, No. 4 (Oct., 1967), p. 543.

104. Morrison, Donald. 1992. "The Taxonomical Interpretation of Aristotle's *Categories*: A Criticism." In *Aristotle's Ontology*, edited by Preus, Anthony and Anton, John Peter, 19-46. Albany: State University of New York Press.

"In the *Topics*, *Categories*, and *De Interpretatione*, Aristotle is struggling with a variety of problems that span the fields of metaphysics and philosophy of language. Both the problems and the attempted solutions have much relevance to some of the main issues in contemporary British and American philosophy. Thus it is unfortunate that though there is a large number of ancient commentaries on these texts, little has been written on these matters in modern times that is of genuine philosophical significance. Professor Ackrill's new translation and notes (1) make a fine contribution toward remedying this deficiency."

(...)

"One of the reasons for selecting predication as the nest of problems to be discussed is that though much has been written on this during the past sixty years, we seem far from any adequate solution." (p. 80)

(...)

"The point of this review is not to show that Aristotle succeeded in answering the general question that contemporary philosophers failed to answer. Aristotle did not attempt to answer that general question.

He discusses in the *Categories* -- to which we shall limit our attention several interesting features of predication, and then distinguishes between at least two different types of configuration that underlie predication. The suggestion of this review is that paying attention to

these less sweeping problems of predication might be a useful way of adopting a fresh approach to this topic.

The following four claims will be discussed. (a) Ackrill interprets Aristotle as holding that general terms and the correlated abstract singular terms, whether in subject or predicate position, introduce the same entity. (b) Aristotle seems to be committed to the view that

general terms have meaning both inside and outside of sentences. (c) Aristotle distinguishes at least two different ontological configurations underlying predication. (d) Aristotle takes predication to be showing the ontological dependence of the entity denoted by the predicate on the entity denoted by the subject." (p. 82)

(1) Aristotle's "Categories" and "De Interpretatione," trans. with notes by J. L. Ackrill (Oxford, 1963), pp. VI, 162.

105. Novak, Michael. 1965. "Toward Understanding Aristotle's *Categories*." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* no. 26:117-123.

"There are three positions one must gain in order to interpret the first five chapters of the *Categories* and, specifically, the meaning and role

therein of 'present in a subject'. The first of these positions is a rejection of univocity; the second is the dual conception of accident; the third is

the principle of discrimination on which Aristotle (implicitly) relies in sorting out the strands of his description "of things," (1a20)." (p. 117)

(...)

"'Present in a subject' thus operates in *Categories* 1-5 as a definition of accident, inadequately distinguished from secondary substance. It is inadequately distinguished because its meaning (incapable of existence apart from a subject) applies just as well to secondary substance, though for a different reason, and this reason is never stated by Aristotle. He says (3a8-10) that secondary substances are not present in a subject, while of course (1a24.1) accidents are. But neither accidents nor secondary substances are; capable of existence apart from primary substances (2b5-6). Some unspoken

criterion is therefore operating to distinguish the exact natures of secondary substance, accident, and primary substance.

I have argued that the discriminating factor is the differing relation which each bears to the act of intelligence operating with imagination.

Secondary substances are universalizations of the necessity grasped in insight, are essences, apart from particulars, and yet arising exclusively from insight into concrete particulars. They are not 'present in a subject', yet are incapable of existence apart from a subject. Accidents are, on the one hand, incapable of science because, occurring neither always nor for the most part, they are not necessarily relevant to any particular thing; and, on the other hand, are not capable of being pointed to as a 'this'. They alone are properly 'present in a subject.' Primary substance can be pointed to as a 'this', a unity, grasped not, however, by mere sense knowledge, nor imagination, but by intelligence which distinguishes the inessential from the essential, the permanent and independent from the adventitious, in the presentations of sense and imagination. They are not 'present in a subject,' but are subjects." (pp. 122-123)

106. O'Farrell, Frank. 1982. "Aristotle's Categories of Being." *Gregorianum* no. 63:87-131.

"It is no exaggeration to say that the understanding of Aristotle's First Philosophy and hence of his philosophy as a whole depends largely on the interpretation one gives to his categories of being. For as far as they express the theme itself of First Philosophy - being as being - to their understanding can be justly applied Aristotle's oft quoted words: « The beginning is greater in potentiality than in magnitude and therefore a small mistake in the beginning becomes immense in the end» (1).

But though one must agree with Brentano when he writes « Aristotle's division of categories has in a wonderful way defied the change time brings. When one follows the history of the doctrine of the categories, one sees how even their adversaries unconsciously pay homage to them » (2). Yet in the course of the two thousand odd years since Aristotle formulated them

they have met with very varied and opposed interpretations. These changing interpretations have acted as a sort of apriori, a kind of pre-judice for each succeeding age trying to reach Aristotle's thought. For they formed part of the history of being in the Heideggerian sense of the word (3), i.e. what has become the universal unquestioned foreknowledge according to which and in function of which in each epoch one encounters reality."

(...)

"Being for Aristotle is not a subsistent idea - *auto to on* - as it is for Plato, but it is the categories (162). And being is the categories because of the plurality implied by *hupokeimenon* in its to be. And *hupokeimenon* in its to be is being as being according to Aristotle's way of conceiving it. Because therefore Aristotle understands being itself as meaning the categories, being is perceived by the ways of necessary predication (163).

Hence it is not the modes of necessary predication which found the categories of being, as Aubenque seems to believe (164), but it is the categories of being which require these modes of predicating to bring themselves to view and to be known in their truth. « For as each thing is as regards to be so is it as regards truth » (165)".

(1) *De Coelo*, 1.5. 271 b 13.

(2) Franz Brentano, *Von der mannigfachen Bedeutung des Seienden nach Aristoteles*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1862, 193.

(3) Cf. M. Heidegger, *Die Metaphysik als Geschichte des Seins* (1941) and *Entwürfe zur Geschichte des Seins als Metaphysik* (1941) in *Nietzsche*, Bd. 2, 399-457; 458-480.

(162) I. Düring, (*Aristoteles, Darstellung und Interpretation seines Denkens*, Heidelberg, 1966, 60) remarks appositely: « The word *Kategoria* in the sense of predication (*Aussage*) does not occur in Plato: we find it only once (*Theait.* 167 a) in this sense. The choice of this word shows that Aristotle wanted consciously to distance himself from his older contemporaries in the Academy ».

(163) E. Tugendhat, *Ti kata tinos*, Freiburg-München, 1958,

23.

(164) P. Aubenque, *Le probleme de l'être chez Aristote*, Paris, 1962, 170.

(165) *Met. a* (2), 1, 993 b 32.

107. Owen, Gwilym Ellis Lane. 1960. "Logic and Metaphysics in some Earlier Works of Aristotle." In *Aristotle and Plato in the Mid-Fourth Century. Papers of the Symposium Aristotelicum held at Oxford in August, 1957*, edited by Düring, Ingemar and Owen, Gwilym Ellis Lane. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag.

Reprinted in: G. E. L. Owen, *Logic, Science and Dialectic. Collected Papers in Greek Philosophy*, Edited by Martha Nussbaum, Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1986, pp. 180-199.

"Much of Aristotle's early work in logic sprang from the practice and discussions of the Academy in Plato's lifetime. This is a commonplace, but I have tried to illustrate it here by evidence which throws an unfamiliar light on the development of some of Aristotle's most characteristic theories. The commonplace itself is not to be confused with a narrower thesis about the origins of the theory of syllogism: on that well-worn issue I have nothing to say here. I have confined myself to another part of Aristotle's logical studies, namely that part which shaped his views on the nature and possibility of any general science of *to on hêi on* ('being qua being'), any inquiry into the general nature of what there is. Here his major issues were problems of ambiguity, particularly the ambiguity that he claimed to find in 'being' or *to on* as that expression is used in the different categories. And his problems were shared by his contemporaries in the Academy. By opposition and by suggestion they helped to form the logic that underlay First Philosophy." (p. 180)

(...)

"In sum, then, the argument of *Metaphysics* IV, VI seems to record a new departure. It proclaims that 'being' should never have been assimilated to cases of simple ambiguity, and consequently that the old objection to any general metaphysics of being fails. The new treatment of *to on* and cognate

expressions as *pros hen kai mian tina phusin legomena*, - or, as I shall henceforth say, as having *focal meaning* - has enabled Aristotle to convert a special science of substance into the universal science of being, 'universal just inasmuch as it is primary.' (p. 184)

(...)

"Nor does focal meaning find formal recognition in the class of paronyms which is introduced in the *Categories* and recognized in the *Topics*, for the definition of paronyms is merely grammatical. It shows, not how subordinate senses of a word may be logically affiliated to a primary sense, but how adjectives can be manufactured from abstract nouns by modifying the word-ending. Plainly the *Categories* does not and could not make any use of this idea to explain how the subordinate categories depend on the first. Nor does it use focal meaning for that purpose (2b4-6). If focal meaning can be seen in the *Categories* it is in the analysis of some one category - clearly enough in the definition of quantity (5a38-b10),) far more doubtfully in the account of the two uses of 'substance' (2b29-37, 3b18-21) - but not in that logical ordering of different categories and different senses of 'being' which lies at the root of the argument in *Metaphysics IV*." (pp. 188-189)

108. ———. 1965. "Inherence." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 10:97-105.

Reprinted in: G. E. L. Owen, *Logic, Science and Dialectic. Collected Papers in Greek Philosophy*, Edited by Martha Nussbaum, Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1986, pp. 252-258.

"Often in the *Categories* and once in the *Topics* Aristotle draws a distinction between *being in a subject* and *being said, or predicated, of a subject* (*Cat.* 1a20-b9, 2a11-14, 2a27-b6, 2b15-17, 3a7-32, 9b22-24; *Postpred.* 11 b38-12 a 17, 14a 16-18; *Top.* 127b 1-4). Elsewhere

he makes no use of the distinction, at least in this form. Once in the *Categories* he blankets it under the formula belonging to something (11b38-12a17). But it has earned a good deal of

attention, and there is a fashionable dogma about it that I should like to nail. Hints of the dogma can be seen in older writers such as Porphyry and Pacius. Its modern exponents are Ross, *Aristotle* p. 24 n. 1; Jones, *Phil. Rev.* 1949 pp. 152-170; and most recently Miss Anscombe in *Three Philosophers* pp. 7-10, and Mr. Ackrill in *Aristotle's 'Categories' and 'De Interpretatione'* pp. 74-5, 83, 109." (p. 252)

(...)

"To say

that if the Idea of man is a substance it cannot exist apart from that of which it is the substance is to say that its existence requires (indeed consists in) the existence of at least one individual falling under the classification human. And to say that pink or a particular shade of

pink cannot exist apart from what contains it is to say, as Aristotle always says against Plato, that something must contain it if it is to exist at all." (p. 258)

109. ———. 1965. "Aristotle on the Snares of Ontology." In *New Essays on Plato and Aristotle*, edited by Bambrough, Renford, 69-95. New York: Humanities Press.

Reprinted in: G. E. L. Owen, *Logic, Science and Dialectic. Collected Papers in Greek Philosophy*, Edited by Martha Nussbaum, Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1986, pp. 259-278.

"Aristotle's commonest complaint against other philosophers is that they oversimplify. One oversimplification to which he is especially attentive is the failure to see that the same expression may have many different senses. And among such expressions there is one arch-deceiver against which he often issues warnings: the verb 'to be', 'einai'. I shall discuss part of his attempt to unmask this deceiver, namely his account of the verb in what is ordinarily, and too sweepingly, called its 'existential' use." (p. 259)

110. ———. 1965. "The Platonism of Aristotle." *Proceedings of the British Academy* no. 50:125-150.

Reprinted in: J. Barnes, M. Schofield, and R. Sorabji (eds.),

Articles on Aristotle, Vol. 1 (Duckworth, 1975), pp. 14-34 and in G. E. L. Owen, *Logic, Science and Dialectic. Collected Papers in Greek Philosophy*, Edited by Martha Nussbaum, Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1986, pp. 200-220.

"Eight years ago, in a memorable Dawes Hicks Lecture to this Academy, (1) David Ross spoke of Aristotle's development as a philosopher. One theory of that development he singled out as having established itself in the fifty years since it appeared. It was pioneered in this country by Thomas Case and in Germany, with great effect, by Werner Jaeger. It depicts Aristotle, in Sir David's words, as 'gradually emerging from Platonism into a system of his own'. Aristotle's philosophical career began in the twenty years that he spent learning and practising his trade in Plato's Academy, and it ended in the headship of his own school. So it is tempting to picture him first as the devoted partisan, then as arguing his way free of that discipleship." (p. 200)

(...)

"Next, in saying that Aristotle's logic was bred of discussion in the Academy, I do not imply that it was a donation from his colleagues. There used to be a myth, promoted by Burnet and Taylor, that the theory of categories was a commonplace of the Academy, derived from scattered hints in Plato's writings. This myth was exposed, not simply by the obvious lack of system in the supposed hints, but by the fact that no other Academic known to us endorsed the theory and that Xenocrates, Plato's self-appointed exegete, denounced it as a pointless elaboration and went back to a simpler distinction derived from Plato's dialogues. Nor again do I mean that Aristotle's logic had come to full maturity before Plato's death. The division of the categories and probably the general theory of the syllogism, had been worked out by then; but Aristotle continued to review and develop these doctrines in his later work. The same is true of his theory of definition and, more generally of his theory of meaning. What is beyond question is that these theories were developed in practice and not as an independent exercise. The theory of definition was modified to keep pace with the work of a biologist who had once held that a definition could be reduced to a single differentia and then

found himself, when he set out to define any natural species, faced with a set of competing criteria. The theory of meaning, of synonymy and homonymy, was enlarged to allow a value to philosophical inquiries which had been earlier denounced as trading on an equivocation. At every stage Aristotle's logic had its roots in philosophical argument and scientific procedure: it would be an anachronism to think otherwise. So what arguments lie at the root of his early account of substance and the categories?" (p. 207)

111. Owens, Joseph. 1960. "Aristotle on Categories." *Review of Metaphysics* no. 14:73-90.

Reprinted in J. Owens, *Aristotle, the Collected Papers of Joseph Owens*, Edited by John R. Catan, New York: State University of New York Press 1981, pp. 14-22.

"In particular, the present paper would inquire whether the notion of category construction was intended in its beginnings to be an arbitrary procedure, whether it was meant to categorize words, and how it stands up to later examples of category mistakes. The paper,

accordingly, will first examine briefly the doctrine of categories in its original Aristotelian setting; secondly, it will try to determine the type of treatment found there; and finally it will confront the Aristotelian doctrine with some irritant instances of category mistakes." (p. 14)

(...)

"This brief glance at the Aristotelian doctrine of categories and its confrontation with instances of category mistakes will indicate, it is hoped, some pertinent features of the earliest explicit category construction. It was based upon the natures of things and not upon the use of language. Because it was concerned with natures and not primarily with words, it was not at all an arbitrary procedure. The natures of things resist the manipulations of human whims, and keep the universe from becoming a world where everything is nonsense. But these natures exist in two ways, in reality and in cognition. Some predicates will belong to the nature just of itself, no matter where it is found. Other predicates will belong to a

nature only in real existence. They are those concerned with its real history in some individual. Still other predicates will belong to it only as it exists in intellectual cognition, for instance that it is a species or a genus. These considerations show why categories are the concern of both the metaphysician and the logician, and why confusion in the three ways in which predicates apply will necessarily give rise to category mistakes. The Aristotelian doctrine likewise shows why the intrinsic principles of things cannot be placed directly in a category.

Its basic grooves of category construction, along with this warning, still serve quite well as dissolvents for such category mistakes as the ghost in the machine, the elephant with the baggage, or murder a relation. The category doctrine as found originally in the Stagirite's works is open to a great amount of development and elaboration, both to smooth out its own difficulties and to meet problems of current discussion. It offers a solid basis for profitable philosophic construction. It is far from complete, but what is there is very good." (pp. 21-22, notes omitted)

112. Perin, Casey Carlton. 2007. "Substantial universals in Aristotle's *Categories*." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* no. 33:125-144.

"Aristotle in the *Categories*, but not elsewhere, presents the distinction between individual substances such as Socrates or Bucephalus and their species and genera as the distinction between primary (πρώται) and secondary (δευτέραι) substances (2A11–19).

The distinction between primary and secondary substances, in turn, is a distinction between substances that are particulars and substances that are universals.

(...)

"Therefore, according to the definitions of 'universal' and 'particular' Aristotle gives in *De interpretatione*, a primary substance is not a universal but a particular. In the *Categories* a secondary substance is the species or genus of a primary substance (2A14–19). The

species human being, for instance, is said of, and so predicated of, all individual human beings (Socrates, Callias, Coriscus, etc.). The genus animal is said of, and so predicated of, its species (human being, horse, dog, etc.) as well as all individual animals (Socrates,

Bucephalus the horse, Fido the dog, etc.). Since a secondary substance is predicated of more than one being or entity as its subject, it is not a particular but a universal.³ The question I want to try to answer here is why, according to Aristotle in the *Categories*, certain

universals such as the species human being or the genus animal are substances." (pp. 126-127, notes omitted)

(...)

"On Aristotle's view in the *Categories*, then, the species or genus of a primary substance is both a subject for inherence, and for this reason a substance, and, being a universal, a predicable predicated of (said of) a plurality of subjects. The non-substantial items that

inhere in the species or genus of a primary substance are all of those non-substantial items that inhere in the primary substances of which that species or genus is predicated. As a result the species or genus of a primary substance, unlike a primary substance itself,

is a subject for inherence in which contraries can inhere at one and the same time. This view obviously invites a question that, as far as I know, no commentator has yet answered: what kind of being or entity could *this* be?" (pp. 142-143)

113. Rijk, Lambertus Marie de. 1951. "The Authenticity of Aristotle's *Categories*." *Mnemosyne* no. 4:129-159.

"Most scholars either deny Aristotle's authorship of the first treatise of the Organon, or else consider the problem of authorship to be insoluble. I maintain, however, that such judgements are wrong and that the treatise is of genuine Aristotelian authorship, and of considerable importance for our knowledge both of Aristotle's own development, and also that of later Platonism. I shall try to show the authenticity of

the treatise in the following study, and shall divide my investigation into the following main divisions:

- A. The view of the ancient commentators concerning the authenticity of *Categories* Chs. 1-9;
- B. Modern criticism of the authenticity of *Categories* Chs. 1-9;
- C. The authenticity of *Categories* Chs. 10-15." (p. 129)

[See also the following note to *Ancient and mediaeval semantics and metaphysics* (Second part), *Vivarium*, November, 1978, p. 85: "Unlike some 30 years ago (see my papers published in *Mnemosyne* 1951), the present author has his serious doubts, now, on the authenticity of the first treatise of the *Organon*" and the review by Kurt von Fritz (1954)].

114. ———. 1952. *The Place of the Categories of Being in Aristotle's Philosophy*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Ph.D. thesis, Utrecht University.

Contents: Bibliography I-III; Introduction 1-7; Chapter I. Aristotle's doctrine of truth 8-35; Chapter II. The distinction of essential and accidental being pp. 31-43; Chapter III. Logical and ontological accident 44-52; Chapter IV. The nature of the categories in the *Metaphysics* 53-66; Chapter V. The doctrine of the categories in the first treatise of the *Organon* 67-75; Chapter VI. The use of the categories in the work of Aristotle 76-88; Appendix. The names of the categories 89-92; Index locorum 93-96.

"It seems to be the fatal mistake of philology that it always failed to get rid of Kantian influences as to the question of the relation of logic and ontology. Many modern mathematical logicians have shown that the logical and the ontological aspect not only are inseparable but also that in many cases it either lacks good sense or is even impossible to distinguish them. Accordingly, the distinction of logical and ontological truth (especially of propositional truth and term-truth), that of logical and ontological accident and that of logical and ontological categories, has not the same meaning for modern logic as it seems to have for 'traditional' logic (for instance the logic of most Schoolmen).

I hope to show in this study that the distinction of a logical and an ontological aspect (especially that of logical and ontological categories) can be applied to the Aristotelian doctrine only with the greatest reserve. A sharp distinction carried through rigorously turns out to be unsuitable when being applied to Aristotelian logic. For both aspects are, for Aristotle, not only mutually connected but even interwoven, and this in such a way that the ontological aspect seems to prevail, the logical being only an aspect emerging more or less in Aristotle's generally ontological way of thinking." (pp. 6-7)

115. ———. 1978. "On Ancient and Mediaeval Semantics and Metaphysics. Part II. The Multiplication of Being in Aristotle's *Categories*." *Vivarium* no. 16:81-117.

"3. *The Multiplication of Being in Aristotle's Categories*

3.1. *Introduction*. One of the results of the preceding section may be that Lloyd (1956, p. 59) seems to be wrong in asserting that in Plato's view the rôle of the universal is played by the Idea exclusively, and that only by the time of the Middle Academy, that is, for the Platonists of the first two centuries A.D., the performers of this rôle have been multiplied. As a matter of fact the distinction between Plato and his followers of the Middle Academy on this score would seem to be a different one. The ontological problems of participation were felt as early as in the Platonic dialogues (see our section 2), as well as the logical ones concerning predication (which will be discussed in a later section). Well, the Platonists of the first two centuries A.D., introduced explicitly a threefold distinction of the Platonic Form or rather of its status which was (only) implied with Plato. I think, Lloyd is hardly more fortunate in ascribing (*ibid.*) this introduction chiefly to the influence of Aristotelian logic on Platonic interpretation. It is true, in stating the basic distinction between *en hypokeimenôî* and *kath' hypokeimenou* Aristotle tried to face the same cluster of fundamental problems which induced later Platonists to the distinction of the Forms as taken before or after the *methexis* (cf. Simplicius, In Arist. Categ. 79, 12ff.). However, Plato's disciple, Aristotle (the most unfaithful one, in a sense, as must be acknowledged) was as deeply engaged on the same problems as were his condisciples and the Master

himself in his most mature period. It is certainly not Aristotle who played the rôle of a catalyst and was the first to provoke the multiplication of the Platonic Form in order to solve problems which were not recognized before in the Platonic circle. On the contrary, Plato himself had saddled his pupils with a basic and most intricate problem, that of the nature of participation and logical predication. It was certainly not left quite unsolved in the later dialogues, but did still not have a perspicuous solution which could be accepted in the School as a scholastic one. So any of his serious followers, (who were teachers in the School, at the same time) was bound to contrive, at least, a scholastic device to answer the intricate question. To my view, Aristotle's solution should be discussed in this framework. For that matter, Aristotle stands wholly on ground prepared by his master to the extent that his works on physic and cosmology, too, are essentially discussions held within the Academy (Cp. Werner Jaeger, *Aristotle. Fundamentals of the history of his development*, Oxford 1949, 308)." pp. 81-82

3.2. Aristotle's classification of being as given in the Categories; 3.2.1. The common view: categories = predicates; 3.2.2. The things said 'aneu symplokés'; 3.2.3. The doctrine of substance given in the Categories; 3.2.4. The ontological character of the classification; 3.2.5. Some obscurities of the classification; 3.2.6. The different status of the 'things' meant; 3.2.6.1 The first item of the classification; 3.2.6.2. The second item of the classification; 3.2.6.3. The third item of the classification; 3.2.6.4. The ontological status of the 'things' meant in the items (2) and (3); 3.2.6.5. The fourth item of classification; 3.2.7. The relation between the different 'things'; 3.3. Categories and predicables; 3.3.1. The opposition of category and predicable; 3.3.2. The impact of the opposition; 3.3.3. The obscure position of the differentia; 3.3.4. Conclusion.

116. ———. 1980. "On Ancient and Mediaeval Semantics and Metaphysics. Part III. The Categories as Classes of Names." *Vivarium* no. 18:1-62.

"4. *The Categories as Classes of Names; 4.1. Status quaestionis.* The previous sections contain several hints to the

close interrelation between three major issues in Plato's doctrine, viz. the question about the true nature of the Forms and those about participation and predication. Indeed, for the founder of the theory of the Forms, predication was bound to become a problem. Forms are immutable and indivisible; yet other Ideas have to participate in them; they are unique, by themselves and subsistent; yet, when saying 'John is man' (or *white*), 'Peter is man' (or *white*), should there be one perfect, eternal, immutable *etc.* Form of MAN (or WHITE) in the one and another in the other? Or, as I have put it above [1977: 85]: if John, Peter, and William are wise, does this mere fact mean that there must be something which they are all related to *in exactly the same manner*, namely WISDOM itself? And if 'John is wise', 'Peter is wise', and 'William is wise' are all true statements, what exactly is the meaning of the predicate name 'wise'? The former question is concerned with participation, the latter with predication. Well, that the crux of the latter problem is not the separate existence of the Forms (*chôrismos*) clearly appears from the fact that also the author of the *Categories*, who had entirely abandoned all kind of *chôrismos*, could apparently not get rid of a similar problem: if the categories really are classes of 'things there are' (1 a 20) (i.e. 'real' substances, 'real' natures, and 'real' properties), rather than concepts (i.e. logical attributes), what kind of 'thing' is *meant by* a term *qua* 'category'? So for Aristotle the semantic problem still remained. His distinction between *en hypokeimenôî* and *kath' hypokeimenou* could only hide the original problem. It is often said that these phrases refer to different domains, the metaphysical and the logical one, respectively. We have already found some good reasons to qualify this opposition (see [1978], 84; 88). It seems to be useful now to collect all kind of information from Aristotle's writings, not only the *Categories*, about the proper meaning of the categories. This will be the aim of our sections 4.2-4.7." pp. 1-2

4.2. *On some modern interpretations of 'kata symplokên';*
 4.3. *Aristotle's use of the categories;* "For this section see also my Utrecht dissertation, *The place of the Categories of Being in Aristotle's philosophy*, Assen 1952 pp. 76-88. I have to

correct or to adjust my former views on several points."; 4.31. *The categories as a classification of reality*; 4. 32. *The categories as a classification of sentence predicates*; 4.33. *The categories as a classification of 'copulative being'*; 4.4. *How did Aristotle arrive at his list of categories?*; 4.5. *Are the categories the 'highest predicates'?*; 4.6. *The categories taken as names in Metaph. Z 1-6 and Anal. Post. I 4*; 4.7. *An attempt at a reinterpretation of Categories, chs. 1-5*; 4.8. *Aristotle's view on relatives*; 4.9. *Conclusion*.

117. ———. 1988. "'Categorization' as a Key Notion in Ancient and Medieval Semantics." *Vivarium* no. 26:1-18.

"The aim of this paper is to argue for a twofold thesis: (a) for Aristotle the verb '*katêgorein*' does not as such stand for statemental predication, let alone of the well-known 'S is P' type, and (b) 'non-statemental predication' or 'categorization' plays an important role in Ancient and Medieval philosophical procedure.

1. *Katêgorein and katêgoria in Aristotle*

Aristotle was the first to use the word 'category' (*katêgoria*) as a technical term in logic and philosophy. It is commonly taken to mean 'highest predicate' and explained in terms of statement-making. From the logical point of view categories are thus considered 'potential predicates'.(*)

(...)

1.3 *Name giving ('categorization') as the key tool in the search for 'true substance'*

What Aristotle actually intends in his metaphysical discussions in the central books of his *Metaphysics* (Z-Th) is to discover the proper candidate for the name 'ousia'. According to Aristotle, the primary kind of 'being' or 'being as such' (*to on hêi on*) can only be found in 'being-ness' (*ousia*; see esp. *Metaph.* 1028b2). Unlike Plato, however, Aristotle is sure to find 'being as such' in the domain of things belonging to the everyday world. Aristotle's most pressing problem is to grasp the things' proper nature *qua* beings. In the search for an answer name-giving plays a decisive role: the solution to the problem consists in finding the most appropriate

('essential') name so as to bring everyday being into the discourse in such a way that precisely its 'beingness' is focussed upon.

(...)

2. *The use of 'praedicare' in Boethius*

The Greek phrase *katêgorein ti kata tinos* is usually rendered in Latin as *praedicare aliquid de aliquo*. The Latin formula primarily means 'to say something of something else' (more precisely 'of somebody'). Of course, the most common meaning of the Latin phrase is 'to *predicate* something of something else in making a statement of the form S = P'. However, the verb *praedicare*, just as its Greek counterpart *katêgorein*, is used more than once merely in the sense of 'naming' or 'designating by means of a certain name', regardless of the syntactic role that name performs in a statement. In such cases *praedicare* stands for the act of calling up something under a certain name (designation), a procedure that we have labelled 'categorization'. (...)

Boethius' use of *praedicare* is quite in line with what is found in other authors. Along with the familiar use of the verb for statemental predication, Boethius also frequently uses *praedicare* in the sense of 'naming' or 'designating something under a certain name' whereby the use of the designating word in predicate position is, sometimes even explicitly, ruled out." pp. 1, 4, 9-10.

(* See L. M. de Rijk, *The Categories as Classes of Names* (= *On Ancient and Medieval Semantics* 3), in: *Vivarium*, 18 (1980), 1-62, esp. 4-7

118. ———. 2002. *Aristotle: Semantics and Ontology. Volume I: General Introduction. The Works on Logic*. Leiden: Brill.

From the Preface: "In this book I intend to show that the ascription of many shortcomings or obscurities to Aristotle resulted from persistent misinterpretation of key notions in his work. The idea underlying this study is that commentators have wrongfully attributed anachronistic perceptions of 'predication', and statement-making in general to Aristotle. In Volume I, what I consider to be the genuine semantics

underlying Aristotle's expositions of his philosophy are culled from the *Organon*. Determining what the basic components of Aristotle's semantics are is extremely important for our understanding of his view of the task of logic -- his strategy of argument in particular.

In chapter 1, after some preliminary considerations I argue that when analyzed at deep structure level, Aristotelian statement-making does not allow for the dyadic 'S is P' formula. An examination of the basic function of 'be' and its cognates in Aristotle's philosophical investigations shows that in his analysis statement-making is copula-less. Following traditional linguistics I take the 'existential' or hyparctic use of 'be' to be the central one in Greek (*pace* Kahn), on the understanding that in Aristotle *hyparxis* is found not only in the stronger form of 'actual occurrence' but also in a weaker form of what I term 'connotative (or intensional) be' (1.3-1.6). Since Aristotle's 'semantic behaviour', in spite of his skilful manipulation of the diverse semantic levels of expressions, is in fact not explicitly organized in a well-thought-out system of formal semantics, I have, in order to fill this void, formulated some semantic rules of thumb (1.7).

In chapter 2 I provide ample evidence for my exegesis of Aristotle's statement-making, in which the opposition between 'assertible' and 'assertion' is predominant and in which 'is' functions as an assertoric operator rather than as a copula (2.1-2.2). Next, I demonstrate that Aristotle's doctrine of the categories fits in well with his view of copula-less statement-making, arguing that the ten categories are 'appellations' ('nominations') rather than sentence predicates featuring in an 'S is P' formation (2.3-2.4). Finally, categorization is assessed in the wider context of Aristotle's general strategy of argument (2.5-2.7).

In the remaining chapters of the first volume (3-6) I present more evidence for my previous findings concerning Aristotle's 'semantic behaviour' by enquiring into the role of his semantic views as we find them in the several tracts of the *Organon*, in particular the *Categories De interpretatione* and *Posterior Analytics*. These tracts are dealt with *in extenso*, in order to avoid the temptation to quote selectively to suit my purposes."

119. ———. 2002. *Aristotle: Semantics and Ontology. Volume II: The Metaphysics, Semantics in Aristotle's Strategy of Argument*. Leiden: Brill.

From the Preface to the first volume: "The lion's part of volume two (chapters 7-11) is taken up by a discussion of the introductory books of the *Metaphysics* (A-E) and a thorough analysis of its central books (Z-H-O). I emphasize the significance of Aristotle's semantic views for his metaphysical investigations, particularly for his search for the true *ousia*. By focusing on Aristotle's semantic strategy I hope to offer a clearer and more coherent view of his philosophical position, in particular in those passages which are often deemed obscure or downright ambiguous.

In chapter 12 I show that a keen awareness of Aristotle's semantic *modus operandi* is not merely useful for the interpretation of his metaphysics, but is equally helpful in gaining a clearer insight into many other areas of the Stagirite's sublunar ontology (such as his teaching about Time and Prime matter in *Physics*).

In the Epilogue (chapter 13), the balance is drawn up. The unity of Aristotelian thought is argued for and the basic semantic tools of localization and categorization are pinpointed as the backbone of Aristotle's strategy of philosophic argument.

My working method is to expound Aristotle's semantic views by presenting a running commentary on the main lines found in the *Organon* with the aid of quotation and paraphrase. My findings are first tested (mainly in Volume II) by looking at the way these views are applied in Aristotle's presentation of his ontology of the sublunar world as set out in the *Metaphysics*, particularly in the central books (ZHO). As for the remaining works, I have dealt with them in a rather selective manner, only to illustrate that they display a similar way of philosophizing and a similar strategy of argument. In the second volume, too, the exposition is in the form of quotation and paraphrase modelled on Aristotle's own comprehensive manner of treating doctrinally related subjects: he seldom discussed isolated problems in the way modern philosophers

in their academic papers, like to deal with special issues tailored to their own contemporary philosophic interest."

120. Rohr, Michael D. 1978. "Aristotle on the Transitivity of *Being said of*." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* no. 16:379-385.

Aristotle, in several of his treatises, discusses or makes use of the ontological tie or relation 'being said of (and its converse partaking of), whose importance to his thought has been recognized by many scholars. Its pervasiveness guarantees that there will be difficulties in its interpretation. (2) To isolate it as an object of Aristotelian exegesis, I shall tentatively identify it with the sortal tie and so take it as connecting (in Aristotelian terms) each genus to all the species and individuals falling under that genus and each species to all the individuals and subordinate species (if any) falling under that species." (p. 379), two notes omitted)

(2) Some recent attempts at interpreting it may be found in Chung-Hwan Chen, "On Aristotle's Two Expressions," *Phronesis* 2 (1957):148-59; *Aristotle's Categories and De Interpretatione*, trans. J. L. Ackrill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), pp. 75-90; R. E. Alien, "Substance and Predication in Aristotle's Categories," in *Exegesis and Argument*, ed. E. N. Lee, A. P. D. Mourelatos, and R. M. Rorty (New York: Humanities Press, 1973), pp. 362-73; and Russell Dancy, "On Some of Aristotle's First Thoughts About Substances," *The Philosophical Review* 84 (1975): 338-73.

121. Ross, William David. 1939. "The Authenticity of Aristotle's *Categories*." *Journal of Philosophy* no. 36:431-433.

"Professor Husik (*) has done a service to students of Aristotle by reminding them of his earlier article, which, buried in the decent obscurity of a learned journal, had escaped my attention, as well as that of many other students.

The authenticity of the *Categories* is well attested by external evidence. The work was accepted as genuine by almost all the ancient scholars (πάντες παρτυρώσι, says Philoponus). A succession of scholars wrote commentaries on it as on a genuine work of Aristotle, from the third century A.D. onwards -- Porphyry, Dexippus, Ammonius, Philoponus,

Simplicius, Olympiodorus, not to speak of the later commentators, Elias and David. Its genuineness was, however, probably doubted by some scholars, for several of the commentators devote themselves to refuting arguments against its genuineness -- e.g., Philoponus 12.34-13.5, Simplicius 379.7-380.15, Olympiodorus 22.38-24.20. The arguments which they set themselves to meet-arguments derived from supposed contradictions between the *Categories* and certain works of Aristotle- are invariably weak, and the answers given by the commentators are convincing." (p. 431)

[* I. Husik, "The Authenticity of Aristotle's *Categories*", *Journal of Philosophy*, 1939]

122. ———. 1995. *Aristotle*. London and New York: Routledge.

Sixth edition. With an introduction by John L. Ackrill (First edition 1923, fifth revised edition 1953); on the *Categories* see pp. 22-26.

"Ross's book gives a concise and comprehensive account of Aristotle's philosophical works—and no better account exists.

In this Introduction I will say something about Ross and about his book, and I will then outline some of the ways in which the study of Aristotle has developed in the years since he wrote it." (From the *Introduction* by J. L. Ackrill, p. VII).

(...)

"It is highly probable that the doctrine [of categories] began as an attempt to solve certain difficulties about predication which had troubled the Megaric school and other earlier thinkers.

(18) Aristotle's object seems to have been to clear up the question by distinguishing the main types of meaning of the words and phrases that can be combined to make a sentence. And in doing this he arrived at the earliest known classification of the main types of entity involved in the structure of reality.

Why are they called categories? The ordinary meaning of is 'predicate,' but the first category has for its primary members individual substances, which according to Aristotle's doctrine are never properly predicates but always subjects. It has

sometimes, therefore, been thought that primary substances do not fit properly into the doctrine of the categories. But this is not the case. 'Socrates' is, indeed, on Aristotelian principles no proper predicate; but if we ask what Socrates is, the ultimate, i.e. the most general, answer is 'a substance,' just as, if we ask what red is, the ultimate answer is 'a quality.' The categories are a list of the widest predicates which are predicable essentially of the various nameable entities, i.e. which tell us what kinds of entity at bottom they are." (pp. 23-24)

(18) This view is ably expressed in O. Apelt's: *Kategorienlehre des Aristoteles in Beiträge zur Geschichte der Griechischen Philosophie*. Leipzig, 1891

123. Sanford, Jonathan J. 2004. "Categories and Metaphysics: Aristotle's Science of Being." In *Categories: Historical and Systematic Essays*, edited by Gorman, Michael and Sanford, Jonathan J., 3-20. Washington: Catholic University of America Press.

"The relationship between Aristotle's *Categories* and his *Metaphysics* is a matter of some debate. If one assumes that the *Categories* is fundamentally a metaphysical work, then there appear to be irreconcilable differences between the notion of substance presented in the *Categories* and that presented in *Metaphysics Z* (VII). The *Categories* account of substance does not present matter as a component of hylomorphic substance, nor does it consider substance as a formal cause of unity, both of which are key ideas of *Metaphysics Z* (VII). The *Metaphysics* therefore represents a break with Aristotle's older metaphysical scheme. On the other hand, if one assumes that the *Categories* is fundamentally a logical work that makes no pretence to being a work of metaphysics, then the account of substance and the other categories in the *Categories* is at worst irrelevant to, and at best only obliquely related to, what Aristotle attempts to accomplish in the *Metaphysics*. I think that the truth lies somewhere between these two views. The *Categories* is best understood as both a logical and a metaphysical account. The metaphysics presented in the *Categories* is by no means complete, but Aristotle does not claim that it is. Aristotle does

not, in the *Metaphysics*, break with his ideas in the *Categories*, but deepens them and works to fill out his metaphysics. In this essay I consider the relationship between Aristotle's metaphysics and his theory of categories from the perspective of the requirements of science. The *Metaphysics* presents Aristotle's science of being, but, as his logical works show, science depends on categories.

Thus the *Metaphysics* cannot be understood apart from the works—especially the *Categories*, the *Topics*, and the *Posterior Analytics*—in which Aristotle explains what categories are, how they are used, and what their relationship to science is. There are indeed some difficulties in positing a close relationship between Aristotle's earlier and later works, especially in regard to what gives unity to a science and the importance of being in the sense of potentiality and actuality. Still, these problems are not so great as to constitute a disjunction between Aristotle's earlier and later works. Indeed, Aristotle's attempts to describe being in each of its four senses in the *Metaphysics* are possible only because of the close relationship between logic and metaphysics, a relationship that he elucidates in his *Categories* and some other earlier works." (pp. 3-4, notes omitted)

124. Scheu, Marina M. 1944. *The Categories of Being in Aristotle and St. Thomas*. Washington: Catholic University of America Presss.

Contents: List of tables VIII; Preface IX; List of abbreviations XIII; Part I. Categories in Aristotle. I. The history and general nature of the categories 3; II. The logical aspect of the categories in Aristotle 13; III. The metaphysical aspect of the categories in Aristotle 23; Part II. Categories in St. Thomas. IV. The history of the categories from Aristotle to St. Thomas 38; V. General nature of the categories in Thomistic philosophy 46; VI. The nature of substance 64; VII. The nature of accident 77; Summary and conclusion 96; Bibliography 98; Index 102-109.

""Knowledge to be of value must be founded on reality. Hence it follows that unless our ideas faithfully reflect reality, our judgments about it will be false. One of the most evident

illustrations of this fact is found in the divergent views philosophers have taken with regard to our widest universal concepts, the categories of being. It is, therefore, an important task of metaphysics to inquire into the modes which characterize the being that these concepts represent.

Aristotle, the first philosopher known to have undertaken this task, presents a classification of categories in his logical treatise entitled *Categories*. Nor does he confine his doctrine to but this one of his works. Numerous references to the categories are found in practically all of his writings, especially in the *Metaphysics*.

To St. Thomas Aquinas, however, we owe the development and perfection of the theory of the categories. He, it is true, wrote no authentic logical treatise' on the subject as did Aristotle, but his doctrine of the categories can be culled from his numerous discussions of them throughout his more metaphysical works in particular, especially from the *Quaestiones Disputatae*, the *Commentary on Aristotle's Metaphysics*, and the *Summa Theologica*.

It is the purpose of this study, which is to be primarily metaphysical and Thomistic in character, to present the general teaching of St. Thomas on the categories. Our treatment of Aristotle, then, is to give the proper background, since obviously it is the Aristotelian plan that is the point of departure for all Thomistic study of the subject. Without this Aristotelian environment in which St. Thomas worked, his position would be much less clear. In a word, the Thomistic section of this study will reveal that St. Thomas developed and perfected Aristotelian thought.

The problem of the categories is twofold: logical, in so far as it involves a classification of our generic concepts ; metaphysical, in that it must necessarily regard and classify the objects of those concepts, that is, real beings Therefore, after considering the history and general nature of the categories in the first chapter of the Aristotelian section, we shall examine the logical and metaphysical aspect in the two chapters following. Chapter four will present the historical transition from Aristotle to St. Thomas. Since St. Thomas wrote no logical

treatise on the categories, nor any commentary on Aristotle's logical treatment of them, it will be necessary for us to proceed in a somewhat different manner in the Thomistic section of our work. In keeping with the primarily metaphysical trend in St. Thomas' thought, which is particularly evident in his treatment of the categories, we propose to present in the last three chapters respectively the general character of his teaching on the categories and a consideration of the nature of substance and the nature of accidents." (pp. IX-X notes omitted)

125. Sedley, David. 2002. "Aristotelian relativities." In *Le style de la pensée. Recueil d'hommages à Jacques Brunschwig*, edited by Canto-Sperber, Monique and Pellegrin, Pierre, 324-352. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Originally published in Italian as: "Relatività aristoteliche", *Dianoia*, 2, 1997 pp. 11-15 (first part) and 1998, 3, 11-23 (second part).

"In chapter 7 of the *Categories*, devoted to the category of relativity (πρός τι), Aristotle starts with a definition of the relative (6a 36-b 8)" (p. 324)

(...)

"At the end of the chapter (8a 13ff.) he raises a worry about whether this definition will allow some substances to be relative, namely those which are themselves the organic parts of larger substances. We must recall that in the *Categories* he has none of his later qualms about allowing some substances to be composed of substances (1). Hence his question: won't those substances which are parts of larger substances be relative, namely to the wholes of which they are parts? The worry is a proper one, because he has already spoken of the parts of substances as falling into both categories: in chapter 5, at 3a 29-32, they were substances, yet in chapter 7, at 6b 36-7 a 22, relatives include «wing», «head» and «rudder»." (p. 325)

(...)

"Aristotle's point is metaphysical, not linguistic. It is important not to be misled into thinking that he is in any way appealing to what can and cannot be said in the Greek language. It is not

even obvious that Greek usage would consider an expression like πρὸς τι χεῖρ unacceptable. His observation about primary and secondary substances is rather, I suppose, as follows. If a hand appears to be relative, namely to its owner, it is not in virtue of being this particular hand that it is relative, but in virtue of being a hand- that is, not because of

its individuality, the hallmark of a primary substance, but because of its species, the hallmark of a secondary substance." (pp. 325-326)

(...)

"I hope that I have made a sufficient case, based on Aristotle's own text, for attributing to him the distinction between what I have called soft and hard relativity. But now let me confess that my reading him this way was inspired by a much more lucid version of the same distinction, attributed by Simplicius to the Stoics. The report comes from his commentary on Aristotle's *Categories* (166.15-29) (22)" (p. 339)

(22) SVF [*Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*] II 403. The translation here is based on that at LS [A. A. Long, D. N. Sedley (eds.), A. A. Long, D. N. Sedley (eds.), *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, Cambridge University Press, 1987] 29B.

126. Sharma, Ravi K. 1997. "A New Defense of Tropes? On *Categories* 3b10-18." *Ancient Philosophy* no. 17:309-315.

"A long-standing debate among interpreters of the *Categories* concerns the nature of first-order accidents, the entities designated by expressions such as 'the particular white' (το τι λευκόν). Some interpreters maintain that Aristotle takes them to be *universals*, entities that may be *present in* many substances; others, that Aristotle takes them to be *tropes*, each of which is peculiar to a single substance.(1)

In a recent issue of this journal, Daniel T. Devereux offers a new defense of the tropes-reading, one that is not based, as most others have been, on Aristotle's cryptic remark concerning the *present-in* relation at 1a24-25.(2) If Devereux is right, the debate has now been settled in favor of tropes. In this note, I shall maintain that Devereux misreads the passage crucial to his argument and that the proper reading

undermines his proposed defense." (p. 309)

(1) Throughout this discussion, I italicize 'present in' (ἐν) and 'said of' (λέγεται κατά) when those locutions are used technically, for relations between entities.

(2) See Devereux 1992 ['Inherence and Primary Substance in Aristotle's *Categories*', *Ancient Philosophy* 12: 113-131]. The term 'trope' is my choice; Devereux expresses the same idea by speaking of tokens, or particular instances, of types.

127. Shields, Christopher. 1999. *Order in Multiplicity. Homonymy in the Philosophy of Aristotle*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Contents: Abbreviations XIII; Introduction 1; Part I: Homonymy as Such. 1. The Varieties of Homonymy 9; 2. The Promises and Problems of Homonymy 43; 3. Homonymy and Signification 75; 4. Core-Dependent Homonymy 103; Part II: Homonymy at Work. 5. The Body 131; 6. Oneness, Sameness, and Referential Opacity 155; 7. The Meaning of Life 176; 8. Goodness 194; 9. The Homonymy of Being 217; Afterword: Homonymy's Promise Reconsidered 268; Bibliography 271; Index of Passages Cited 281; General Index 287-290.

"Aristotle's treatments of the homonymy of core philosophical concepts, including especially being and goodness, are sometimes highly abstract, and they must be understood as arising from the polemical contexts which motivate them.

For these reasons, I consider these topics only after recounting Aristotle's general framework for introducing homonymy. Accordingly, I divide the study into two parts.

In Part I, I consider homonymy as such, mainly by reflecting on the uncontroversial cases upon which Aristotle

himself relies when trying to explicate and motivate homonymy. I begin, in Chapter 1, by recounting Aristotle's introduction of homonymy in the *Categories*, settling some exegetical difficulties concerning his general conception of its nature. "

(...)

In Part II, I investigate homonymy at work. I do not move

through Aristotle's appeals to homonymy seriatim. Rather, I consider a very few cases, selected for their importance, interest, and representative character. In two cases, I urge that some of Aristotle's critics have failed to appreciate the power of homonymy in meeting objections to substantive Aristotelian theories.

(...)

Although I maintain that Aristotle cannot establish the homonymy of being, I do not infer that his commitment to homonymy as such is misguided. On the contrary, I maintain that outside this one application, Aristotle's commitment to homonymy is altogether well motivated; in particular, the method of definition it introduces is of genuine and lasting importance. At the very minimum, I argue, Aristotle is right to advocate homonymy as a form of constructive philosophical analysis. He has identified a framework which has too often been overlooked by those disenchanted with the prospects for genuine philosophical progress. Accordingly, I end Part II with a concluding afterword in which I appraise in a fully general way homonymy's enduring value." (pp. 3-5)

128. Simons, Peter. 1988. "Aristotle's Concept of State of Affairs." In *Antike Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie*, edited by Gigon, Olof and Fischer, Michael W., 97-112. Bern: Peter Lang.

"The concept of state of affairs (*Sachverhalt*) is one which is of general interest in philosophy in connection with the theory of truth, but is also of special interest for legal philosophy.(1) Its heyday in philosophy was the late (2) nineteenth century and early twentieth century ; it is therefore tempting to regard the concept in its philosophical employment as a thoroughly modern invention. Nevertheless, a similar concept was known to medieval philosophy(3), and the medievals in question - as was usual then - referred back to the authority of Aristotle in support of their views. I claim that those medievals who ascribed something like a concept of state of affairs to Aristotle were right.(4) Discussing the identity of concepts, especially over a time-span of millennia, is fraught with difficulties, so I shall need first to establish what conditions a concept must satisfy to be a concept of state of affairs. This will occupy § 2. I

shall then in § 3 endeavour to show that Aristotle's works employ a concept closely answering these conditions." (p. 97)

(...)

"The evidence from Aristotle

The texts supporting my interpretation come mainly from the logical works "Categories" and "De interpretatione". In particular, I claim that the term *pragma* is used on several occasions with a meaning corresponding closely to that of "state of affairs" as specified above. First, some preliminary remarks on interpreting these texts.

We must be clear from the start that in these works Aristotle's discussion is so compressed and so full of ambiguities that no interpretation can be uncontroversial. In discussing semantic matters, Aristotle uses no specially developed terminology, and he is also sparing in his use of examples. It is no accident that medieval commentators on these writings of Aristotle, which were for a long time the chief source of information on his work, diverged widely in their interpretations. Having now got used to making distinctions and employing more specific semantic concepts than Aristotle, it would be futile for us to expect to find, sitting in his work, a concept of state of affairs which unambiguously coincides with the one specified in the previous section. The best we can expect, even using plausible interpolations and taking interpretative risks, is an anticipatory approximation. But while Aristotle does not have a fully-fledged modern concept of state of affairs, it is surprising, in view of the subsequent history of semantics, how close he comes to one. (pp. 101-102)

129. Stough, Charlotte L. 1972. "Language and Ontology in Aristotle's *Categories*." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* no. 10:261-272.

"Yet there is an attendant danger in reading the *Categories* freely in the light of later works such as the *Metaphysics*. It is altogether too easy to find in that early text the more sophisticated ideas of a maturer period of Aristotle's philosophical development and hence unwittingly to incorporate into our procedure the assumption, dubious at

best, that Aristotle's views remained virtually unchanged throughout his philosophical career. Thus there would seem to be *prima facie* reason for raising some questions of a rather special sort about the body of the *Categories* as such --- about what can be said of Aristotle's notion of categories of being without going beyond that work (or at least the *Organon*) for support.

One question in particular deserves attention, because it strikes at the very center of the theory expounded in the *Categories*. Granted that Aristotle attached a privileged status to the category of substance -- a status importantly not enjoyed by the other nine categories -- we want to know what he conceived that special status to be. Our question concerns the relation between substance and the remaining categories. Aristotle had some important things to say on this subject in later works, (1) but how much of that was originally central to the theory of categories cannot be uncovered by his subsequent remarks. Very little can be said about the philosophical significance of the early doctrine of categories until we understand precisely how Aristotle ordered the category of substance in relation to the nine nonsubstantial forms of predication in the *Categories* itself. As might be expected, Aristotle offers no easy answer to this question, but his own words are suggestive in ways that are worth exploring and yet, at the same time, quite easily overlooked." (p. 261)

(1) For example, *Met.*, Zeta 1 (cf. *Delta* 11); Aristotle's doctrine of τα πρὸς ἓν λεγόμενα set forth in central sections of the *Metaphysics* may represent his most finished thoughts on this subject.

130. Studtmann, Paul. 2003. "Aristotle's Category of Quality: A Regimented Interpretation." *Apeiron* no. 36:205-227.

"In Chapter Eight of the *Categories*, Aristotle divides the genus, quality, into four species: (1) habits and dispositions; (2) natural capabilities and incapacities; (3) affective qualities and affections; and (4) shape." (p. 205)

(,,)

"in this paper, I argue that there is an alternative

interpretation to the canonical interpretation, what I will call the regimented interpretation, that can go some way toward removing the dissatisfaction that he and others have had with it. I do not think that such an interpretation can entirely remove all the difficulties with Aristotle's discussion — some peculiarities will remain. Nonetheless, as I hope to show, there is a way to regiment the category that makes it vastly more systematic, and as a result, far more philosophically interesting than the canonical interpretation suggests.

My main argument for the regimented interpretation proceeds in two stages. First, I examine the details of Aristotle's discussion of the first three canonical species and conclude not only that they are subsumed under the single genus of dispositions but also that the genus of dispositions admits of a more or less systematic and symmetrical differentiation.

As a result, the category of quality should be understood as being primarily divided into two species: shape and dispositions. And because the genus of dispositions is systematically differentiated and Aristotle does not differentiate shape at all, any arbitrariness in the category of quality must be located in the division of the genus, quality, into the two species, shapes and dispositions. In the second stage of the argument, I propose a hypothesis about the way Aristotle understands the nature of quality itself, a hypothesis that leads to a very plausible division of quality into shape and dispositions. Hence, the divisions in the category of quality can be understood as flowing systematically from the very nature of the genus being divided." (p. 207)

131. ———. 2004. "Aristotle's Category of Quantity: A Unified Interpretation." *Apeiron* no. 37:69-91.

"Aristotle provides two different treatments of the category of quantity: one in *Categories* V and one in *Metaphysics* V 7. Interestingly (and perhaps not surprisingly) the treatments differ in important respects. In the *Categories*, Aristotle provides two different differentiations of quantity.

According to the first, quantity divides into continuous and discrete quantity; the former then divides into line, surface, body and time, and the latter into number and speech.

According to the second, quantity divides into quantities whose parts have a relative position with respect to one another and quantities whose parts do not (*Cat.* 4b20-2). Although the differences between these two differentiations are interesting, for the purposes of this paper I shall focus on the first. For, in the first instance, the differentiations appear to be compatible; and second, by presenting the division into continuous and discrete quantities before the other division, Aristotle, it would seem, gives priority to the former. In this paper, therefore, not only will I assume that the two differentiations do not need philosophical correction to make them compatible but I will also follow Aristotle's lead and take the division into continuous and discrete quantities to be the more fundamental." (p. 69)

132. ———. 2008. *The Foundations of Aristotle's Categorical Scheme*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

Contents: Chapter 1: Whence the Categories? 7; Chapter 2: The Body Problem in Aristotle 25; Chapter 3: Form 49; Chapter 4: Prime Matter 79; Chapter 5: Quality 101; Chapter 6: Quantity 125; Chapter 7: Substance 141; Index 173-175.

"Aristotle's categorial scheme had an unparalleled effect not only on his own philosophical system but also on the systems of many of the greatest philosophers in the western tradition.

The set of doctrines in the *Categories*, what I will henceforth call *categorialism*, play, for instance, a central role in Aristotle's discussion of change in the *Physics*, in the science of being qua being in the *Metaphysics* and in the rejection of Platonic ethics in the *Nicomachean Ethics*."

(...)

"Despite its influence, however, categorialism raises two fundamental questions that to this day remain open. The first concerns Aristotle's list of highest kinds." (p. 7)

(...)

"Unlike the first question, the second concerns the way in which categorialism relates to doctrines Aristotle articulates in other works. The question arises as a result of a rather

common story that is told about the categories and its apparent deep tensions with hylomorphism." (p. 9)

(...)

"This book contains a series of interrelated chapters that collectively support an interpretation that provides answers to the two great questions concerning Aristotle's categories. According to the interpretation, Aristotle's categorial scheme is derivable from his hylomorphic

ontology, which itself is derivable from very general theses about the nature of being." (p. 15)

133. ———. 2012. "Aristotle's Categorial Scheme." In *The Oxford Handbook of Aristotle*, edited by Shields, Christopher, 63-80. New York: Oxford University Press.

"In this chapter I shall discuss a tradition of interpretation that has for the most part been abandoned and shall do so by way of discussing two questions concerning Aristotle's categorialism that are not often treated together. By pointing out just how controversial any approach to Aristotle's *Categories* is bound to be, I hope to forestall any initial strong objections to the admittedly non-standard approach I shall take. And even if I fail to convince the reader of the cogency of the approach by the end of the chapter, I hope that the reader will have benefitted from seeing Aristotle's categorial scheme treated from a heterodoxical perspective. For what it is worth, it is my contention that Aristotle's categorial scheme, as is the case with many works in the history of philosophy, is best illuminated by opposing beams of interpretive light.

The following discussion is framed by two questions concerning Aristotle's categorialism: (1) How did Aristotle arrive at his list of categories? and (2) What is the connection between Aristotle's categories and his hylomorphic ontology. These questions are not often treated together, which is not altogether surprising, since each question is extremely difficult to answer in its own right. Hence, treating them together piles difficulty upon difficulty. Moreover, owing to their difficulty scholars have given wildly different answers to each of the questions. So the amount of scholarly disagreement about the

issues involved is rather daunting. Nonetheless there is an interpretively and philosophically interesting reason for discussing both questions in a single paper, namely the possibility of interestingly co-ordinated answers to the questions. The possibility stems from a tradition of interpretation that finds its origin in the Middle Ages. Because of its medieval origin, the interpretation is out of step with recent scholarly trends. Nonetheless, I hope at least to show the interest in the interpretation. My goal in this chapter is not to present anything like a definitive case for an interpretation of Aristotle's *Categories* but rather to discuss what I take to be a provocative and interesting interpretation that has the resources to provide systematic and co-ordinated answers to two very large questions concerning Aristotle's categorial scheme. In short, according to the interpretation, Aristotle's list of highest kinds can be derived a priori from his hylomorphic ontology. To understand the import of such a claim, however, first requires a discussion of the two questions I have just mentioned." (pp. 64-65)

134. Surdu, Alexandru. 2006. *Aristotelian Theory of Prejudicative Forms*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Contents: Vorwort des Herausgebers IX; Foreword XI; List of Signs XV; Part I. Hermeneutic Investigations 1; 1. Interpretation of the First Two Chapters of Aristotle's *Categoriae* 3; 2. Interpretation of the Third Chapter of Aristotle's *Categoriae* 19; 3. Interpretation of the Fifth Chapter of Aristotle's *Categoriae* 25; 4. The Problem of Prejudicative Relations in other Aristotelian Works 33; 5. Commentaries and Interpretations 61; 6. Specificity of Prejudicative Relations 105; Part II. Logical Significance of Prejudicative Relations 125; 1. A Short Characterization 127; 2. Introducing the Symbolic Notation 129; 3. Classical-Traditional Analysis of Prejudicative Relations 133; 4. Logical-Mathematical Significance of Prejudicative Relations 167; Part III. General Philosophical Conclusions 209; 1. A Short Characterization 211; 2. Subsistence, Existence, and Being 213; 3. The Five Voices, Essence, and Quiddity 217; 4. The Problem of the Universal (General) 221; 5. Intellect, Reason, and Rational Intellect 223-228.

"The starting point of the present paper was the symbolic interpretation - of a logical-mathematical type - of the first chapters of Aristotle's work *Categoriae* - work which is usually not taken into account by the moderns. Beginning with the first attempts I was surprised to notice that the mentioned texts are lending themselves -more than any other text - to a logical-mathematical formalisation, the difference being that they show, besides the currently interpretable forms, other ones that are not to be found either within symbolic logic, or within the classical-traditional one. We named them "prejudicative forms", since they have a certain resemblance with the classical judgements, but precede them, without being judgements in their own right, that is affirmations or negations.

The prejudicative forms represent an unstudied field, so far. Their affinity with symbolic forms grants them a prejudicative character and complete these last ones in many respects, which leads to the conclusion that, although the symbolic logic is the most recent logic, its field is anterior - from a logical point of view - to the classical field. And certainly Aristotle and some ancient commentators of the *Organon* had this intuition.

By means of the entities they focus on, the prejudicative forms -the individual, the singular, the species, the genus and the supreme genus - contribute to the solving of some of the generally philosophical issues which are still debatable on, as the problem of universal, which also appeared in relation with Aristotle's logic and was pointed out by Porphyrius Malchus in his famous *Isagoge*.

Coming back to Aristotle, one can indeed wonder whether it was possible for him to accomplish so many things in the field of logic and, moreover, to foresee - explicitly or not - problems which find a reasonable explanation just nowadays. One should not forget that subtle scholars preceded Aristotle, and that the problems of logic were so to say "floating" in the atmosphere of Greek philosophy. Moreover, once discovered, the field of logic could have been unrestrictedly covered, as these were no hindrances. Aristotle did cover it. Faced with a savage and hardly coverable field, he was often forced to clear it. Today, these soundings are astonishing, since the field is

crossed by large railways and rapidly covered. Nevertheless, there are some moments when nobody can say "Dig here!"

Aristotle did not finish, but he gave a lot of suggestions, and, if we do not think in a different way, but we think something else, his logic will still be a precious source of hints and information." (Foreword, pp. XII-XIII)

135. Tarán, Leonardo. 1978. "Speusippus and Aristotle on Homonymy and Synonymy." *Hermes. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie* no. 106:73-99.

Reprinted in: Leonardo Tarán, *Collected Papers 1962-1999*, Leiden: Brill, 2001, pp. 421-454.

"Modern scholarship since the middle of the last century has generally accepted it as an established fact that Speusippus made an exhaustive classification of words or names (ὀνόματα) in relation to the concepts they express and that he gave definitions of *homonyma* and *synonyma* only in reference to words and their meanings; that is to say that for him *homonyma* and *synonyma* are properties of linguistic terms and not of things, whereas for Aristotle, especially in the first chapter of the *Categories*, they are properties of things." (p. 421)

(...)

"He [Jonathan Barnes, "Homonymy in Aristotle and Speusippus," *Classical Quarterly*, N.S. 21 (1971), pp. 65-80] contends, in the first place, that Speusippus's conception of *homonyma* and *synonyma* is essentially the same as that of Aristotle, the slight differences between their respective definitions of each being trivial, and, secondly, that even though in a few places Aristotle does use *homonyma* and *synonyma* as properties of linguistic terms, this is due to the fact that Aristotle's use of these words is not as rigid as the *Categories* would lead one to believe; he could not have been influenced by Speusippus because the latter conceived homonymy and synonymy as properties of things and, in any case, if influence of one on the other be assumed, it could as well have been Aristotle that influenced Speusippus.

Though I believe that his two main contentions are mistaken, I

am here mainly concerned with the first part of Barnes' thesis; for, if he were right in believing that for Speusippus *homonyma* and *synonyma* are properties of things and not of names or linguistic terms, then Hambruch's [*] notion that Speusippus did influence Aristotle when the latter uses *synonymon* as a property of names would be wrong, even though Barnes himself were mistaken in his analysis of the Aristotelian passages he reviews in the second part of his paper. Whereas, on the other hand, if Speusippus's classification is really of ὀνόματα, then, since Barnes himself admits that Aristotle does sometimes use *homonyma* and *synonyma* as properties of names, the influence of Speusippus on Aristotle is at least possible; and it becomes plausible and probable, regardless of the relative chronology of their respective works, when it is seen, as I shall try to show, that in some cases Aristotle is in fact cracking doctrines which presuppose a use of *homonyma* and *synonyma* such as can be ascribed to Speusippus or is using *synonymon* in the Speusippean sense, different from Aristotle's own notion of synonymous words." (pp. 422-423)

(...)

"Our only source for Speusippus's classification of names is the three texts that Lang has assembled as frags. 32a, 32b, and 32c, (7) three passages from Simplicius's commentary on Aristotle's *Categories*."

[*] E. Hambruch, *Logische Regeln der platonischen Schule in der aristotelischen Topik* (1904).

References

Margherita Isnardi Parente, *Speusippo: Frammenti; Edizione, traduzione e commento*, Naples: Bibliopolis 1980 (Greek text and Italian translation; see Fragments 13, 14, 15).

Paul Lang, *De Speusippi academici scriptis accedunt fragmenta*, Bonn 1911; reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1965.

136. Thorp, J.W. 1974. "Aristotle's Use of Categories. An Easing of the Oddness in "Metaphysica" Δ 7." *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 19:238-256.

"We are accustomed to think that when Aristotle introduces a list of categories into an argument he is effecting a *division* of the matter into ten separate kinds or predicates or senses. For example, at *de anima* 410 a 23 when he is wondering what sort of thing the soul is,

he gives a list of the categories to show what sorts of things there are and goes on to ask of each sort whether the soul belongs to it.

The list of categories divides up all that is into ten departments for easier handling. Again in the *Categoriae* he divides up predicates into ten sorts by a list of categories, and goes on in the rest of the book to give the peculiar logical and grammatical features of the sorts - although the treatment of the later sorts is not extant. Here the list of categories serves almost as a table of contents, dividing up the matter for piecemeal treatment. Let us call this use of a list of categories to divide the matter into ten departments "use (a)". No doubt this is the most prevalent use in Aristotle: a philosopher of analytic temperament like the Master is always dividing things up." (pp. 244-245)

(...)

"Conclusion

The orthodox view of the mesh of four uses with ten senses - that only per se being has ten senses - can now be revised. There are five uses of εἶναι, not four, and only the fifth, the existential use (not mentioned in A 7) is divided into ten senses according to the categories.

Per se being is semantically unvarying. (p. 256)

137. Ushida, Noriko. 2003. "Before the *Topics*?: Isaak Husik and Aristotle's *Categories* revisited." *Ancient Philosophy* no. 23:113-134.

"I. Husik, in arguing for the authenticity of the *Categories* (in: *Philosophical Review* 13, 1904, pp. 514-528), substantially overstated the case for the similarity of that treatise to the *Topics*. The two works differ greatly in their treatment of the theory of substance (*Cat.* 5, 3 B 10-21; *SE* 22, 178 B 38ff.)."

138. Verdenius, Willem Jacob. 1948. "Two Notes on the *Categories* of Aristotle " *Mnemosyne* no. 4:109-110.

"Cat. 6 a, 19-22: Aristotle does not say: "A thing which is two cubits long does not possess its length to a higher degree than a thing of three cubits possesses its length of three cubits", but: "One thing cannot be two cubits long to a higher degree than another". That means: a thing of a certain length does not possess this length to a higher degree than things which are longer or shorter, for these things do not have this length at all. The same applies to numbers: "three is not three to a higher degree than five is three, nor is five five to a higher degree than three is five", i.e. a number does, or does not, possess a certain amount. This meaning is clearly expressed by the traditional text." (p. 109)

(...)

"Cat. 8 a, 31-32: Aristotle wants to say that the use of a wide definition should not induce us to suppose that the possession of a relation makes a thing essentially relative in the sense that its existence can only be explained in terms of a relation to another thing."(p. 110)

139. Ward, Julie K. 2007. *Aristotle on Homonymy. Dialectic and Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Contents: Acknowledgments VII; Abbreviations IX; Introduction 1; 1. Aristotle's theory of homonymy in *Categories* 1 and its precursors 9; 2. Homonymy in the *Topics* 43; 3. Systematic homonymy 77; 4. The homonymy of *Being* 103; 5. *Physis, Philia*, and homonymy 137; 6. Homonymy and science 168; Afterword 201; Bibliography 207; Index of passages 215; General index 219-220.

"The present book had its origin in many puzzles I encountered about *pros hen* predication." (p. VII)

(...)

"This work examines homonymy, a topic that lies within Aristotle's theories of language and predication. In Aristotle's work, the idea of homonymy is paired with that of synonymy, and in fundamental ways, rests upon it. To English

speakers, homonymy is known as a grammatical category referring to the case in which the same word has different meanings, and synonymy, the case in which different words have the same meaning. In contrast, Aristotle finds homonymy and synonymy to be concerned not merely with words, but also, and primarily, with things. As he explains in *Cat. 1*, synonymy refers to the situation in which two or more things have the same name, or term, and the same defining character (cf. *Cat. 1a6–7*).” (p. 1)

(...)

“The present book on homonymy seeks to augment recent discussions, particularly aspects of Irwin’s and Shields’ work, by furthering the investigation in some areas and initiating study in others. In brief summary, the present chapters fall into three areas: (1) Aristotle’s account of homonymy in *Cat. 1* and its possible precursors, (2) the utility of homonymy for refining premises in scientific arguments, and (3) the application of homonymy to specific concepts.” (p. 3)

140. Wardy, Robert. 2000. *Aristotle in China. Language, Categories and Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Contents: Preface page IX; 1. The China syndrome: language, logical form, translation 1; 2. Aristotelian whispers 69; Epilogue 150; Glossary of technical terms 153; References 161; Index 166-170.”

“Aristotle in China is about the relation between language and thought. That is, of course, a topic of absurdly ambitious scope: it is only slightly less absurd to say that it concerns the particular question of the relation between language and philosophical thought, or even the relation between the Chinese language and Chinese logic. Perhaps readers will concede at the outset that my decision to explore these huge issues through reading Aristotle’s *Categories* in Chinese is mere wilful circuitousness, rather than outright absurdity; and I trust that, if they persevere, they will discover that indirection has its compensations.

Chapter 1 introduces, defines and dissects varieties of

linguistic relativism, with specific reference to the China question. Chapter 2 is entirely devoted to a reading of the (*ming li t'an*), 'The Investigation of the Theory of Names', a seventeenth century translation of Aristotle's *Categories* into Chinese; indeed, one of my goals is to reanimate an ancient tradition, both Chinese and Western, by producing a sort of metacommentary.

In principle, philosophers could read chapter 1 and dispense with chapter 2; and Sinologists could study chapter 2 and avoid philosophy: but of course my intention is to address philosophers, classicists, Sinologists, linguists, anthropologists and devotees of missionary studies throughout." (p. IX)

141. Wedin, Michael. 1979. "'Said of' and 'predicated of' in the *Categories*." *Philosophical Research Archives* no. 5:23-34.

Abstract: "Anyone with more than casual interest in Aristotle's *Categories* knows the convention that "predicated of" ["κατηγορεῖται"] marks a general relation of predication while "said of" ["λέγεται"] is reserved for essential predication. By "convention" I simply mean to underscore that the view in question ranks as the conventional or received interpretation. Ackrill, for example, follows the received view in holding that only items within the same category (not arbitrarily, of course) can stand in the being-said-of relation and, thus, that only secondary substances can be said of primary substances. Despite its long received status the convention has never received a fully comprehensive examination and defense. In fact such an account is needed because, while enjoying considerable textual support, certain passages of the *Categories* appear to clash with the convention. My aim in this paper is, first, to develop and defend the standard interpretation, as I shall call it. Since the standard interpretation has lately been challenged in a closely argued article by Russell Dancy, my defense will proceed partly with an eye to his criticisms. Having met these, I go on to raise some difficulties with the rather unorthodox reading Dancy gives the *Categories*. The crucial point here turns out to be what Aristotle understands by a paronym."

142. ———. 1993. "Non-Substantial Individuals." *Phronesis*.A

Journal for Ancient Philosophy no. 38:137-165.

Abstract: "The rock bottom items of the *Categories* are individuals. Those neither present-in nor said-of a subject are unproblematic. They are primary substances such as Socrates and Secretariat. But the exact nature of those that are present-in but not said-of a subject is a matter of lively debate. Roughly, two schools of thought dominate discussion. For some, type-III individuals, as I call them, are nonrecurrent accident particulars; for others, they are fully determinate accident properties. I begin with Ackrill's version of nonrecurrence, the progenitor of the modern debate, and then turn to Owen's attack, which established what may be called the new orthodoxy. (1) After assaying Owen's arguments, I consider a kindred but improved version due to Frede. Finally, I argue for a revised version of the standard nonrecurrence view."

(1) Owen, G. E. L. 1965. "Inherence." *Phronesis* 10, 97-105.

143. ———. 1997. "The Strategy of Aristotle's *Categories*." *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* no. 79:1-26.

"The *Categories* begins without fanfare. Missing is the promotional pitch customary in Aristotle's works, and even the obligatory announcement of subject matter is absent. Instead, we are given definitions of three technical notions: homonymy, synonymy, and paronymy. That is all the first chapter contains. In particular, there is no hint as to why Aristotle begins with these notions or how they fit into the *Categories* as a whole. In fact, by most accounts it is not clear that much would be lost were the first fifteen lines simply omitted. Indeed, chapter two's discussion of $\tau\alpha\ \omicron\nu\tau\acute{\alpha}$ or things that are is arguably a more natural starting place for what follows. For this reason, perhaps, most scholarship has focused on the three *onymies* themselves to the neglect of their wider role in the *Categories*. Some scholars would go so far as to maintain that the first four chapters are little more than a random assemblage of scraps. I shall argue, on the contrary, that the three *onymies* are part of a carefully drawn strategy that underwrites the unity of the first five chapters of the *Categories*. In particular, I propose that they are grouping

principles, introduced to isolate the one relation that is able to provide the foundation for the system of categories, namely, synonymy." (p. 1, notes omitted)

144. Wheeler, Mark Richard. 1999. "The Possibility of Recurrent Individuals in Aristotle's *Organon*." *Gregorianum* no. 80:539-551.

"In 1965, G.E.L. Owen's article "Inherence" sparked a contemporary debate concerning whether or not the nonsubstantial individuals posited by Aristotle in the *Organon* are universals.(1) Owen's antagonists claim that nonsubstantial individuals are nonrecurrent particulars. Owen's defenders claim that nonsubstantial individuals can recur and, hence, are universals.

In this paper, I present an analysis of Owen's position in "Inherence", arguing that Owen commits Aristotle to the possibility of recurrent nonsubstantial individuals which are one in number. The implications of Owen's position for Aristotle's theory of primary substance in

the *Organon* are considered. I demonstrate that the modal status of recurring individuals cannot be determined by Aristotle's explication of being present in a subject at 1a24 of the *Categories*. I then argue that, according to the sameness conditions laid down by Aristotle in the *Topics*, it is impossible for something which is one in number to recur and, hence, that it is impossible both for substantial individuals and for nonsubstantial individuals to be universals." (pp. 539-540, notes omitted)

(1) See, for examples of the early debate in the journal literature, Ackrill [1963], Owen [1965], Matthews and Cohen [1968], Allen [1969]. See Frede [1978], Devereux [1992], and Wedin [1993] for examples of how the debate has developed since.

References

Akrill, J.L. (1963). *Aristotle's Categories and De Interpretatione*, translation and notes by Ackrill, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Allen, R.E. (1969). "Individual Properties in Aristotle's Categories," *Phronesis*, 14, pp. 31-39.
- Devereux, Daniel T. (1992). "Inherence and Primary Substance in Aristotle's Categories," *Ancient Philosophy* 12, pp. 113-131.
- Frede Michael. (1978). "Individuen bei Aristoteles," in *Antike und Abendland*, Walter De Gruyter & Co. Translated as "Individuals in Aristotle" in *Essays in Ancient Philosophy* by Michael Frede (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987).
- Matthews, Gareth B. and Cohen, S. Marc. (1968). "The One and the Many," *The Review of Metaphysics*, pp. 630-655.
- Owen, G.E.L. (1965). "Inherence," *Phronesis* 10, pp. 97-105. Reprinted with original page numbers noted in *Logic, Science, and Dialectic*, ed. M. Nussbaum, Ithaca: Cornell University Press (1986), pp. 252-258.
- Wedin, Michael V. (1993). "Nonsubstantial Individuals," *Phronesis* 38, pp. 137-165.
145. ———. 2001. "κατηγορία in the *Topics* and the *Categories*." *Journal of Neoplatonic Studies* no. 8:37-60.
- "The term *kategoria* in Aristotle's *Topics* and *Categories* denotes predicates. Hence the categories are best understood as classifying predicates and not predications. The equivocal use of the term in *Top.* 1, 9 is related to its use in signifying either linguistic or non-linguistic entities, and not because it can be used to mean *predication*."