

**Fourth Edition**

Michael J.  
Loux and  
Thomas M.  
Crisp

# METAPHYSICS

**A Contemporary  
Introduction**

# Metaphysics

*Metaphysics: A Contemporary Introduction* is for students who have already completed an introductory philosophy course and need a fresh look at the central topics in the core subject of metaphysics. It is essential reading for any student of the subject. This Fourth Edition is revised and updated and includes two new chapters on (1) Parts and Wholes, and (2) Metaphysical Indeterminacy or vagueness. This new edition also keeps the user-friendly format, the chapter overviews summarizing the main topics, concrete examples to clarify difficult concepts, annotated further reading at the end of each chapter, endnotes, and a full bibliography.

Topics addressed include:

- the problem of universals
- the nature of abstract entities
- the problem of individuation
- the nature of modality
- identity through time
- the nature of time
- the nature of parts and wholes
- the problem of metaphysical indeterminacy
- the Realism/anti-Realism debate.

Wherever possible, Michael J. Loux and Thomas M. Crisp relate contemporary views to their classical sources in the history of philosophy. As experienced teachers of philosophy and important contributors to recent debates, Loux and Crisp are uniquely qualified to write this book.

**Michael J. Loux** is Shuster Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at the University of Notre Dame, USA. He is also editor of *Metaphysics: Contemporary Readings*, designed to accompany this textbook and also published by Routledge. His book *Substance and Attribute* (1978) is one of the major metaphysics books of recent years.

**Thomas M. Crisp** is Professor of Philosophy and Chair of the Department of Philosophy at Biola University, USA. He has published widely on topics in metaphysics, epistemology, and the philosophy of religion.

**Routledge Contemporary Introductions to Philosophy**  
Series editor: Paul K. Moser, Loyola University  
of Chicago

This innovative, well-structured series is for students who have already done an introductory course in philosophy. Each book introduces a core general subject in contemporary philosophy and offers students an accessible but substantial transition from introductory to higher-level college work in that subject. The series is accessible to nonspecialists, and each book clearly motivates and expounds the problems and positions introduced. An orientating chapter briefly introduces its topic and reminds readers of any crucial material they need to have retained from a typical introductory course. Considerable attention is given to explaining the central philosophical problems of a subject and the main competing solutions and arguments for those solutions. The primary aim is to educate students in the main problems, positions and arguments of contemporary philosophy rather than to convince students of a single position.

## **Published Volumes**

### **Philosophy of Art**

*Noël Carroll*

### **Philosophy of Biology**

*Alex Rosenberg and Daniel W. McShea*

### **Philosophy of Economics**

*Julian Reiss*

### **Philosophy of Language**

2nd Edition

*William G. Lycan*

### **Philosophy of Mathematics**

2nd Edition

*James Robert Brown*

### **Philosophy of Mind**

3rd Edition

*William Fish*

### **Philosophy of Perception**

*William Fish*

### **Philosophy of Psychology**

*José Luis Bermudez*

### **Philosophy of Religion**

2nd Edition

*Keith E. Yandell*

### **Philosophy of Science**

3rd Edition

*Alex Rosenberg*

### **Philosophy of Social Science**

*Mark Risjord*

### **Social and Political Philosophy**

*John Christman*

# Metaphysics

A Contemporary Introduction

Fourth Edition

Michael J. Loux and Thomas M. Crisp

Fourth edition published 2017  
by Routledge  
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2017 Taylor & Francis

The right of Michael J. Loux and Thomas M. Crisp to be identified as authors of this work has been asserted by them in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

First edition published by Routledge 1998  
Third edition published by Routledge 2006

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*

Names: Loux, Michael J., author. | Crisp, Thomas M., author.  
Title: *Metaphysics : a contemporary introduction* / Michael J. Loux & Thomas M. Crisp.

Description: New York City: Routledge, 2017. | Series: Routledge contemporary introductions to philosophy | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 201602955 1 (print) | LCCN 2016035270 (ebook) | ISBN 9781138639331 (hardback) | ISBN 9781138639348 (pbk.) | ISBN 9781315637242 (ebook) | ISBN 9781315637242 (eBook)

Subjects: LCSH: Metaphysics.

Classification: LCC BD131 .L83 2017 (print) | LCC BD131 (ebook) | DDC 110—dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2016029551>

ISBN: 978-1-138-63933-1 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-138-63934-8 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-63724-2 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman and Gill Sans  
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

*For Dian, Alison, Madeline, and Peyton*



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

# Contents

<i>Preface to First Edition</i>	xi
<i>Preface to Second Edition</i>	xiii
<i>Preface to Third Edition</i>	xiv
<i>Preface to Fourth Edition</i>	xv
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>I</b>
Overview	I
The Nature of Metaphysics—Some Historical Reflections	2
Metaphysics as Category Theory	10
Notes	15
Further Reading	15
<b>I The Problem of Universals I: Metaphysical Realism</b>	<b>17</b>
Overview	17
Realism and Nominalism	17
The Ontology of Metaphysical Realism	19
Realism and Predication	21
Realism and Abstract Reference	26
Restrictions on Realism—Exemplification	29
Further Restrictions—Defined and Undefined Predicates	35
Are There Any Unexemplified Attributes?	39
Notes	42
Further Reading	44
<b>2 The Problem of Universals II: Nominalism</b>	<b>45</b>
Overview	45
The Motivation for Nominalism	45
Austere Nominalism	50
Metalinguistic Nominalism	60
Trope Theory	70
Fictionalism	77
Notes	79
Further Reading	81

<b>3 Concrete Particulars I: Substrata, Bundles, and Substances</b>	<b>82</b>
Overview	82
Substratum and Bundle Theories	83
An Objection to the Bundle Theory—Subject-Predicate Discourse	90
Another Objection to the Bundle Theory—the Identity of Indiscernibles	94
An Argument for the Substratum Theory	99
Problems for the Substratum Theory	101
Aristotelian Substances	104
Notes	114
Further Reading	116
<b>4 Propositions and Their Neighbors</b>	<b>118</b>
Overview	118
The Traditional Theory of Propositions	118
Nominalism about Propositions	127
Facts, States of Affairs, and Events	139
Notes	146
Further Reading	148
<b>5 The Necessary and the Possible</b>	<b>149</b>
Overview	149
Problems about Modality	150
Possible Worlds	154
Possible Worlds Nominalism	157
The Metaphysics of Possible Worlds Nominalism—David Lewis	162
Actualism and Possible Worlds—Alvin Plantinga	168
Notes	179
Further Reading	180
<b>6 Causation</b>	<b>181</b>
Overview	181
Hume’s Account of Causation	181
The Response to Hume	186
Neo-Humean Approaches	189
Notes	196
Further Reading	197
<b>7 The Nature of Time</b>	<b>198</b>
Overview	198
McTaggart’s Argument	198
The B-Theory	205

The A-Theory	209
The New B-Theory	216
Notes	221
Further Reading	222
<b>8 Concrete Particulars II: Persistence through Time</b>	<b>223</b>
Overview	223
Two Theories of Persistence—Endurantism and Perdurantism	223
Persistence and the Nature of Time	227
The Ontology of Perdurantism	231
An Argument for Perdurantism—Change in Properties	235
A Second Argument for Perdurantism—Change in Parts	239
Notes	248
Further Reading	249
<b>9 Concrete Particulars III: Parts and Wholes</b>	<b>250</b>
Overview	250
The Problem of the Many	251
Mereological Nihilism	253
Mereological Moderatism	255
Mereological Universalism	263
Constitution Metaphysics	264
Partism	267
Relative Identity	269
Simple Universalism	271
Notes	275
Further Reading	278
<b>10 Metaphysical Indeterminacy</b>	<b>279</b>
Overview	279
What Is Metaphysical Indeterminacy?	280
Epistemic Indeterminacy	283
Examples of Metaphysical Indeterminacy?	287
Composition and Metaphysical Indeterminacy	287
Future Contingents and Metaphysical Indeterminacy	290
Quantum Physics and Metaphysical Indeterminacy	292
Linguistic and Metaphysical Indeterminacy	292
Moral Indeterminacy and Metaphysical Indeterminacy	294
Evans's Argument Against Vague Identity	295
Notes	301
Further Reading	303
<b>11 The Challenge of Anti-Realism</b>	<b>304</b>
Overview	304
Two Views about the Nature of Reality	304

x Contents

Dummett's Anti-Realist	310
The Inscrutability of Reference	317
Putnam's Anti-Realism	323
Realism or Anti-Realism?	328
Notes	337
Further Reading	338
<i>Bibliography</i>	339
<i>Index</i>	350

# Preface to First Edition

Metaphysics is a discipline with a long history; and over the course of that history, the discipline has been conceived in different ways. These different conceptions associate different methodologies and even different subject matters with the discipline; and anyone seeking to write an introductory text on metaphysics must choose from among these different conceptions. For reasons I try to make clear in the introduction, I have chosen to follow a very old tradition (one that can be traced back to Aristotle) that interprets metaphysics as the attempt to provide an account of being *qua* being. On this conception, metaphysics is the most general of all the disciplines; its aim is to identify the nature and structure of all that there is. Central to this project is the delineation of the categories of being. Categories are the most general or highest kinds under which anything that exists falls. On this conception of metaphysics, what the metaphysician is supposed to do is to identify the relevant kinds, to specify the characteristics or categorial features peculiar to each, and to indicate the ways those very general kinds are related to each other. It turns out, however, that metaphysicians have disagreed about the categorial structure of reality. They have disagreed about the categories the metaphysician ought to recognize; and even where they have agreed about the categories to be included in our metaphysical theory, they have disagreed about the characteristics associated with those categories and about the relations of priority that tie the various categories together. These disagreements have given rise to debates that lie at the very core of the philosophical enterprise; those debates are the focus of this book.

In the first two chapters, we examine one of the oldest and most fundamental of the debates over categories, the debate over the existence and nature of universals. Here, the central question is whether our metaphysical theory must include among its basic categories things which can be common to or shared by numerically different objects. In Chapter One, we examine the views of those (called “metaphysical realists”) who answer the question affirmatively, and in Chapter Two, we consider the accounts provided by those (called “nominalists”) who defend a negative answer to the question. In Chapter Three, we turn to an examination of the nature and structure of familiar concrete particulars. Again, the question is whether the objects in question constitute a basic or irreducible metaphysical category. In Chapter Four, we examine debates about the existence

and nature of a family of complex entities. The emphasis here is on what philosophers have called “propositions,” but we also consider debates over what appear to be things from other categories—facts, states of affairs, and events. Next, we consider one feature of propositions, the fact that they can be said to be possible, necessary, impossible, or contingent, the fact that they are subject to what are called the “modalities.” This feature of propositions has been the focus of much recent work in metaphysics. A central theme in this work has been the claim that the concept of a possible world enables us to shed light on the nature of modality. In Chapter Five, we discuss the different accounts recent metaphysicians have given of the concept of a possible world and the ways these accounts have figured in their theories of modality. In the final chapter, we return to the notion of familiar concrete particulars. Here, we focus on the temporality of familiar objects. Ordinary objects are things that persist through time; the interesting metaphysical question here is how we are to understand this feature of ordinary objects. In Chapter Six, we consider two opposing accounts of temporal persistence and explore the relationship between metaphysical accounts of the nature of time and metaphysical accounts of the nature and structure of temporal beings.

The topics considered in this book represent only a selection from the issues that prove central when philosophers attempt to identify the categories of being. They are, however, all important issues. Hopefully, our discussion of these topics will give the reader a good sense of what metaphysics understood as category theory is.

I want to thank the students in various metaphysics classes at Notre Dame on whom I tried out this book. I want to thank as well Trenton Merricks and Michael Rea, who read sections of the book and gave helpful comments. Frank Jackson and Jonathan Lowe, who read the book for Routledge, saved me from a number of mistakes. I owe them my gratitude. Most of all, I want to thank Marian David and Dean Zimmerman, who gave me line-by-line criticism of an early draft of the manuscript. I am fortunate to have colleagues as talented and generous as they. Thanks, finally, to Margaret Jasiewicz, whose skills so artfully conceal my computer illiteracy.

## Preface to Second Edition

This edition involves modest revisions in the text of the original edition, and there is an expanded bibliography; but the most important change is the addition of a new chapter on the debate between Realists and anti-Realists. This chapter takes the notion of truth as its focus. I approach the issue by laying out the central themes in a traditional view about the relationship between thought/language and the world. The view, which can be traced back to the origins of philosophy in the Greek period, is that there is a mind-independent world, correspondence to which makes our beliefs/statements true. This picture comes under attack in the modern era. In the new chapter, I consider the arguments of three recent critics of the traditional view—Michael Dummett, W.V. Quine, and Hilary Putnam. All three have difficulties with the idea of a mind-independent world, and all three are inclined to understand truth not in correspondence-theoretic terms, but in epistemic terms.

The publication of this revised edition of *Metaphysics* coincides with the publication, also by Routledge, of *Metaphysics: Contemporary Readings*, a collection of readings in recent metaphysics which I have edited and introduced. Although the collection has a slightly broader focus, its core topics are those addressed in this book—universals, individuation, modality and possible worlds, time, persistence through time, and Realism/anti-Realism; and the readings on these topics include much of the literature I discuss in this book. Although the two books can be used independently of each other, they constitute a natural pairing of required texts for a general course in metaphysics.

I want to express my appreciation to those who helped with the preparation of the second edition. First, I want to thank my colleague, Marian David, who read an early draft of the new chapter and offered helpful suggestions for revision. I want also to thank Margaret Jasiewicz and Cheryl Reed, who helped with the preparation of the manuscript; and finally I want to thank Tony Bruce and Siobhan Pattinson, who saw this project through for Routledge and made it far less onerous than it otherwise would have been.

## **Preface to Third Edition**

This edition adds a chapter on causation and a chapter on the nature of time. The chapter on causation (Chapter 6) discusses Hume's attack on the idea of necessary connection and his analysis of causation as constant conjunction; then, the chapter considers more recent thinking about causation, including both work that is critical of the Humean approach and work that attempts to defend a Humean, nonmodal account of causation. The chapter on time (Chapter 7) discusses McTaggart's argument for the unreality of time and considers the responses to that argument by both so called A-theorists and B-theorists. In addition, I have added a brief discussion of fictionalism about abstract entities to Chapter 2, and I have revised the account of persistence in Chapter 8 in the light of the new chapter on time. I want to thank my colleagues, Michael Rea for his help with some issues discussed in the new Chapter 7 and Stephen Grimm for his help with the vast literature on causation. Special thanks are due to E.J. Coffman, who read the two new chapters and made valuable suggestions about how to improve them. Finally, I want to thank Cheryl Reed for her help in preparing the typescript of the third edition.

## **Preface to Fourth Edition**

This edition adds two chapters: one on the relation between a commonsense whole and its parts (Chapter 9: Concrete Particulars III: Parts and Wholes) and one on the problem of metaphysical indeterminacy (Chapter 10: Metaphysical Indeterminacy). Both were written by Thomas Crisp. In addition, there are revisions in the nine chapters making up the third edition. Most of these revisions incorporate references to more recent discussions of the topics of those chapters. The only substantive change is in the last section of Chapter 3, where the discussion of the substance theory of concrete particulars has been revised and hopefully improved.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

# Introduction

## Overview

Philosophers have disagreed about the nature of metaphysics. Aristotle and the medievals give us two different accounts of the discipline. Sometimes, they characterize it as the attempt to identify the first causes, in particular, God or the Unmoved Mover; sometimes, as the very general science of being *qua* being. They believed, however, that these two characterizations identify one and the same discipline. The rationalists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by contrast, expanded the scope of metaphysics. They took it to be concerned not merely with the existence and nature of God, but also with the distinction between mind and body, the immortality of the soul, and freedom of the will.

The empiricists and Kant were critical of both Aristotelian and rationalist conceptions of metaphysics, arguing that they seek to transcend the limits of human knowledge; but even Kant thought that there can be a legitimate kind of metaphysical knowledge. Its aim is to delineate the most general structures at work in our thought about the world. This Kantian conception of metaphysics continues to enjoy popularity among contemporary philosophers, who insist that metaphysics has as its aim the characterization of our conceptual scheme or conceptual framework. These philosophers typically agree with Kant that the structure of the world as it is in itself is inaccessible to us, and that metaphysicians must be content to describe the structure of our thinking about that world.

The case for this Kantian conception of metaphysics is not, however, particularly impressive; for if there are problems with characterizing the world as it is, there ought to be similar problems with characterizing our thought about the world. But if we agree that Aristotelian or rationalist metaphysics is not doomed from the start, we must concede that the two conceptions suggest very different topics for a text in metaphysics. In this book, we will follow the Aristotelian characterization of metaphysics as a discipline concerned with being *qua* being. That characterization gives rise to the attempt to identify the most general kinds or categories under which things fall and to delineate the relations that hold among those categories.

## The Nature of Metaphysics—Some Historical Reflections

It is not easy to say what metaphysics is. If one looks to works in metaphysics, one finds quite different characterizations of the discipline. Sometimes these characterizations seek to be descriptive, to provide us with an account of what philosophers who have been called metaphysicians do. Sometimes, they are normative; they represent attempts to identify what philosophers ought to be doing when they do metaphysics. But descriptive or normative, these characterizations give such different accounts of the subject matter and methodology appropriate to metaphysics that the neutral observer is likely to think that they must be characterizing different disciplines. Disagreement about the nature of metaphysics is certainly tied to its long history. Philosophers have been doing or trying to do something they have called metaphysics for more than 2,000 years; and the results of their efforts have been accounts with a wide variety of subject matters and approaches. But the difficulty of identifying a unique subject matter and methodology for metaphysics is not simply traceable to the long history of the discipline. Even in its origins, there is ambiguity about just what metaphysics is supposed to be.

The term ‘metaphysics’ as the name of the discipline is taken from the title of one of Aristotle’s treatises. Aristotle himself never called the treatise by that name; the name was conferred by later thinkers. Aristotle called the discipline at work in the treatise *first philosophy* or *theology*, and the knowledge that is the aim of the discipline *wisdom*. Nonetheless, the subsequent use of the title *Metaphysics* makes it reasonable to suppose that what we call metaphysics is the sort of thing done in that treatise. Unfortunately, Aristotle does not give us a single account of what he is up to there. In some contexts, he tells us that what he is after in the treatise is a knowledge of *first causes*.<sup>1</sup> This suggests that metaphysics is one of the departmental disciplines, a discipline with a subject matter distinct from that considered by any other discipline. What subject matter is identified by the expression ‘first causes’? Perhaps, a number of different things; but central here is God or the Unmoved Mover. So what subsequently came to be called metaphysics is a discipline concerned with God, and Aristotle tells us a good bit about the discipline. He tells us that it is a theoretical discipline. Unlike the various arts that are concerned with production and the various practical sciences (ethics, economics, and politics) whose end is the direction of human action, metaphysics has as its goal the apprehension of truth for its own sake. In this respect, it agrees with the mathematical sciences and the various physical sciences. The former take quantities as their subject matter (discrete quantities in the case of arithmetic and continuous quantities in the case of geometry), and the latter are concerned with the nature and structure of the material or physical substances (both living and nonliving) that make up the natural world. Metaphysics, by contrast, has immaterial substance as its subject matter.<sup>2</sup> And the relationship between the discipline and its subject matter gives metaphysics an intriguing status. Unlike the other disciplines, it does not simply assume the existence of its subject matter; it must actually prove that there is

an immaterial substance for it to be about. So the project of proving that there is an Unmoved Mover outside the world of nature is a part of metaphysics itself; but since Aristotle thinks that we have a distinctive discipline only where we have a distinctive subject matter, he is committed to the idea that metaphysicians can be sure that there is a discipline for them to engage in only if they succeed in carrying out one of the projects on the agenda of the discipline.

But Aristotle is not satisfied to describe metaphysics as the investigation of first causes. He also tells us that it is the science that studies being *qua* being.<sup>3</sup> As this characterization gets fleshed out, metaphysics turns out to be not another departmental discipline with a special subject matter of its own. It is rather a universal science, one that considers all the objects that there are. On this characterization, then, metaphysics examines the items that constitute the subject matter for the other sciences. What is distinctive about metaphysics is the *way* in which it examines those objects; it examines them from a particular perspective, from the perspective of their being beings or things that exist. So metaphysics considers things as beings or as existents and attempts to specify the properties or features they exhibit just insofar as they are beings or existents. Accordingly, it seeks to understand not merely the concept of being, but also very general concepts like unity or identity, difference, similarity, and dissimilarity that apply to everything that there is. And central to metaphysics understood as a universal science is the delineation of what Aristotle calls *categories*. These are the highest or most general kinds under which things fall. What the metaphysician is supposed to do is to identify those highest kinds, to specify the features peculiar to each category, and to identify the relations that tie the different categories together; and by doing this, the metaphysician supposedly provides us with a map of the structure of all that there is.

So we meet with two different accounts of what metaphysics is in Aristotle. On the one hand, there is the idea of a departmental discipline concerned to identify the first causes—in particular, God; and, on the other, there is the idea of a universal or perfectly general discipline whose task it is to consider things from the perspective of their being beings or existents and to provide a general characterization of the whole realm of being. At first glance, there appears to be a tension between these two conceptions of metaphysics. It is difficult to understand how a single discipline can be both departmental and universal. Aristotle is himself aware of the appearance of tension here, and takes pains to show that the tension is only apparent.<sup>4</sup> On the one hand, he suggests that a science of first causes will identify the causes underlying the primary features of things, those features that are presupposed by any other features they may exhibit; and he seems prepared to say that since the being or existence of a thing is primary in this way, the science that studies first causes will just be the science that investigates being *qua* being. On the other, he seems to hold that any discipline that examines everything insofar as it is a being will number God among the items it seeks to characterize.

In the medieval Aristotelian tradition, we continue to meet with this dual characterization of metaphysics; and like Aristotle, the medievals believed that

## 4 Introduction

the two conceptions of metaphysics are realized in a single discipline, one that aims both to delineate the categorial structure of reality and to establish the existence and nature of the Divine Substance. But when we reach the metaphysical writings of the Continental rationalists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, we meet with a conception of metaphysics that expands the scope of the metaphysical enterprise. Although they rejected many of the details of Aristotle's metaphysical theory, they agreed that the point of doing metaphysics is to identify and characterize the most general kinds of things there are, and they agreed that a reference to the Divine Substance and His causal role is a central part of this task. Nonetheless, topics that do not figure as items on the Aristotelian metaphysical agenda came to be viewed as proper objects of metaphysical inquiry. For Aristotle, the examination of changeable physical objects, the delineation of the gap between living and nonliving things, and the identification of what is unique to human beings are all to be carried out within the context of natural or physical science rather than metaphysics. But the rationalists, confronted with an intellectual landscape where Aristotelian physics is displaced by the more mathematical and experimental account of the new physics, thought of these issues as metaphysical. As they saw things, metaphysics was concerned not simply with the existence and nature of God, but with the distinction between mind and body, their relationship in human beings, and the nature and extent of freedom of the will.

Someone schooled in the Aristotelian tradition would be puzzled by this new use of the term 'metaphysics' and would likely charge that, in the hands of the rationalists, what is supposed to be a single discipline with a single subject matter turns out to be the examination of a hodgepodge of unrelated topics. Evidently, rationalists were sensitive to this sort of charge, and they sought to provide a rationale for their redrawing of disciplinary boundaries within philosophy. What ultimately emerged is a general map of the metaphysical terrain.<sup>5</sup> The claim was that there is a single subject matter for metaphysics; it is being. So the metaphysician seeks to provide an account of the nature of being; but there is a variety of different perspectives from which one can provide such an account, and corresponding to these different perspectives are different subdisciplines within metaphysics. First, one can examine being from the perspective of its being just that—being. Since this represents the most general perspective from which one can consider being, the branch of metaphysics that considers being from this perspective was dubbed *general metaphysics*. But the rationalists insisted that we can also examine being from a variety of more specialized perspectives. When we do, we are pursuing this or that branch of what the rationalists called *special metaphysics*. Thus, we can consider being as it is found in changeable things; we can, that is, consider being from the perspective of its being changeable. To do so is to engage in *cosmology*. We can, as well, consider being as it is found in rational beings like ourselves. To consider being from this perspective is to pursue that branch of special metaphysics the rationalists called *rational psychology*. Finally, we can examine being as it is exhibited in the Divine case, and to examine being in this light is to engage in *natural*

*theology*. Pretty clearly, the rationalist notions of general metaphysics and natural theology correspond to the Aristotelian conceptions of metaphysics as a thoroughly universal science that studies being *qua* being and as a departmental discipline concerned with first causes, whereas the claim that metaphysics incorporates cosmology and rational psychology as branches expresses the new and broader scope associated with metaphysics in the rationalist scheme.

But it was not merely in its subject matter that rationalist metaphysics differed from Aristotle's. Aristotle's approach to metaphysical issues had been cautious. In his delineation of the categories, he had sought to remain faithful to our prephilosophical conception of the world. As he had seen things, the fully real or metaphysically basic entities are the familiar objects of common sense—things like individual horses and individual human beings. And even in his account of God or the Unmoved Mover, he had been anxious to show the continuity between his philosophical account and our prephilosophical beliefs about the causal structure of the world. The result was a relatively conservative metaphysics. The metaphysical theories of the rationalists, by contrast, were anything but conservative. In their hands, metaphysics results in abstract speculative systems far removed from any recognizably commonsense picture of the world. Here, one has only to skim the works of a thinker like Spinoza or Leibniz to appreciate the extravagance of rationalist metaphysics.

The highly abstract and speculative nature of rationalist metaphysics made it a natural target for the criticisms of empiricist thinkers. The empiricists insisted that any claim to knowledge requires a justification by reference to sensory experience; and they argued that since no experience could ever justify the assertions making up rationalist metaphysical systems, the rationalist's claims to be providing scientific knowledge of the nature of reality were spurious.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, the empiricists frequently made the stronger claim that the characteristic assertions of rationalist metaphysics were without meaning. The empiricists held that all of our conceptual representations are derived from the contents of sensory experience. Accordingly, they insisted that an assertion has genuine cognitive content or meaningfulness only if the terms it employs are susceptible of an analysis or explanation in terms of purely sensory contents. Since the claims of the rationalist metaphysicians did not pass this test, the empiricists concluded that they were mere sounds without sense.

In the work of Kant, we meet with further criticism of the metaphysical enterprise.<sup>7</sup> In Kant's account, human knowledge involves the interplay of concepts innate to the human cognitive faculties and the raw data of sense experience. The sensory data are the effects on our subjective sense faculties of a world external to those faculties. The data get structured or organized by way of the innate concepts, and the result is an object of knowledge. So what we call an object of knowledge is not a thing external to and independent of our cognitive machinery; it is the product of the application of innate conceptual structures to the subjective states of our sensory faculties. The world that produces those subjective states is something that, as it is in itself, is inaccessible to us; we grasp it only as it affects us, only as it appears to us. An object of knowledge,

## 6 Introduction

then, requires the sensory contents of the empiricists; but more is required. The contents must be unified and organized by conceptual structures that do not have their origin in sense experience. Kant, however, wants to insist that just as the sensory contents constitute an object of knowledge only when structured by the innate concepts, the innate conceptual structures yield an object of knowledge only when they are applied to the sensory contents for which they provide principles of unity and organization.

Now, as Kant saw it, metaphysics, whether of the rationalist or Aristotelian variety, represents the attempt to know what lies beyond the scope of human sensory experience. It seeks to answer questions for which sense experience is incapable of providing answers: questions about the immortality of the soul, the existence of God, and freedom of the will. It promises us knowledge about these matters. In the attempt to provide the promised knowledge, however, the metaphysician employs the conceptual structures that underlie less controversial forms of knowledge, structures like those at work in talk about substances, causation, and events. But since the relevant structures yield knowledge only when they are applied to the raw data of sensory experience, the philosopher's use of those structures to answer the perennial questions of metaphysics never delivers the knowledge the metaphysician promises us. Given the way our cognitive machinery operates, the conditions required for knowledge can never be satisfied in the metaphysical case. The claims the metaphysician wants to make go beyond the limits of human knowledge. Accordingly, there can never be genuinely scientific knowledge in metaphysics.

To bring out this feature of traditional metaphysics, Kant calls it *transcendent metaphysics*. He contrasts transcendent metaphysics with what he calls *critical metaphysics*. Critical metaphysics, he tells us, is a perfectly respectable, legitimate enterprise. Whereas transcendent metaphysics seeks to characterize a reality that transcends sense experience, critical metaphysics has as its task the delineation of the most general features of our thought and knowledge. It seeks to identify the most general concepts at work in our representation of the world, the relationships that obtain among those concepts, and the presuppositions of their objective employment. The project set by critical metaphysics is precisely the project Kant takes himself to be carrying out when he gives us his own account of the conditions for human knowledge.

Kant's conception of a metaphysical enterprise whose task it is to identify and characterize the most general features of our thought and experience is one that continues to find defenders in our own day.<sup>8</sup> These philosophers tell us that metaphysics is a descriptive enterprise whose aim is the characterization of our *conceptual scheme* or *conceptual framework*. As these philosophers see things, any thought or experience we might have involves the application of a single unified body of representations. That body of representations constitutes something like a picture of how things are; it is a kind of story we tell about the world and our place in it. The story has a distinctive structure: it is organized by way of very general concepts, and the use of those concepts is regulated by principles (often called 'framework principles'). The aim of metaphysics is simply to delineate that structure in its most general contours.

Philosophers who endorse this idea of a conceptual scheme or conceptual framework do not all agree on the status enjoyed by our picture of the world. Although they do not endorse the details of Kant's own account of human knowledge, some proponents of the idea of a conceptual scheme agree with Kant that there is a single unchanging structure that underlies anything that can be called human knowledge or experience. Others emphasize the dynamic and historical character of human thought, and they speak of alternative conceptual frameworks. They see great conceptual changes, such as the scientific revolution that saw Newtonian mechanics displaced by relativity theory, as cases where one conceptual scheme is rejected in favor of a new and different picture of the world. For thinkers of the former sort, metaphysics has a stable and unchanging subject matter: the single, uniquely human way of representing the world; for the latter, the task of metaphysics is comparative: it attempts to display the different forms at work in the alternative schemes that have historically played a role in our attempts at picturing the world.

Philosophers of both sorts stand squarely opposed to those who defend a more traditional, pre-Kantian conception of metaphysics. Philosophers who take the notion of a conceptual scheme seriously will take metaphysics to be concerned with our way or ways of representing the world. Whether they limit the subject matter of metaphysics to the items on the Aristotelian agenda or follow the rationalists in expanding the scope of metaphysics to include topics like the mind-body problem, the immortality of the soul, and freedom of the will, philosophers who view metaphysics in pre-Kantian terms take metaphysics to have as its task an account of the nature and structure of the world itself. An inquiry into the structure of human thought is, however, something quite different from an inquiry into the structure of the world thought is about. Of course, if one believes that the structure of our thought reflects or mirrors the structure of the world, then one might claim that the results of the two inquiries must be the same. But philosophers who are attracted by talk of conceptual schemes do not typically believe this. They claim that metaphysics has as its subject matter the structure of our conceptual scheme or schemes precisely because, like Kant, they think that the world as it really is is something that is inaccessible to us.

Why do they think this? Because they agree with Kant that our thought about the world is always mediated by the conceptual structures in terms of which we represent that world. As they see it, to think of anything external to my cognitive faculties, I must apply concepts that represent the thing as being some way or other, as belonging to some kind or as characterized in some way; but, then, what I grasp is not the object as it really is independently of my thought about it. What I grasp is the object as I conceptualize or represent it, so that the object of my thought is something that is, in part at least, the product of the conceptual or representational apparatus I bring to bear in doing the thinking. What I have is not the thing as it is in itself, but the thing as it figures in the story I tell of it or the picture I construct of it.

Now, some of those who invoke the idea of a conceptual framework (the conceptual schemers, we might call them) go further and claim that the very

idea of an object separate from and independent of the conceptual scheme by which we form our representations is incoherent.<sup>9</sup> On this radical view, all that there is is the conceptual framework or frameworks. There is nothing more than the stories we tell, the pictures we construct. What we call the existence of an object is simply a matter of something's figuring in a story; and what we call the truth of our beliefs is just a matter of the various components of a story fitting together or cohering with each other.

This more radical version of the conceptual scheme account is a version of what has been called *idealism*, and it is a view that is extremely difficult to articulate coherently. If we hold that there is nothing but the stories that human beings construct, then what are we to say of the human beings who are supposedly doing the constructing? If they are really there doing the constructing, then it is not the case that there is nothing but the stories that get constructed, and it is not the case that to exist is just to be a character in a story. If, on the other hand, we human beings are just further characters in the stories, then is it really the case that there are any stories that get told? Or is it just a further story that all these stories get constructed? And is this new story (the story that the original stories get told) itself just one more story?

As I have suggested, not all conceptual schemers endorse the more radical view we have been discussing; but even the schemer who concedes that the idea of an item that exists independently of a conceptual framework is coherent will deny that any such items as there may actually be can constitute the objects of metaphysical study. Any such items, they will insist, are grasped only by way of the conceptual structures we bring to bear in our representation of them. Those structures constitute a kind of screen that bars us from access to things as they really are. Accordingly, even the moderate conceptual schemer will deny that it is possible to do what the traditional metaphysician wants to do—to provide knowledge of the ultimate structure of reality; they will claim that if there is to be an enterprise with the generality, systematicity, and comprehensiveness philosophers have wanted to claim for metaphysics, that enterprise can consist in nothing more than the characterization of the most general structure of our conceptual scheme or schemes.

What will be the response of traditional metaphysicians to this neo-Kantian account? Most probably, they will argue that if the conceptual schemer is correct in denying that the world as it really is can be an object of serious philosophical inquiry, then the schemer is wrong to suppose that a conceptual scheme can be. The central premise in the schemer's argument against traditional metaphysics is the claim that the application of conceptual structures in the representation of things bars us from genuine access to those things; but the defender of traditional metaphysics will point out that we need to employ concepts in our characterization of what the schemer calls a conceptual framework, and they will conclude that, by the schemer's own principles, that entails that there can be no such thing as characterizing the nature and structure of a conceptual scheme. So traditional metaphysicians will argue that if their conception of metaphysics is problematic,

so is the schemer's. But traditional metaphysicians will insist that there is a deeper moral here. That moral is that there is something self-defeating in the conceptual schemer's account of conceptual representation. If the conceptual schemer is correct in claiming that the activity of conceptual representation bars us from an apprehension of anything we seek to represent, then why should we take seriously the schemer's claims about conceptual representation? Those claims, after all, are just further conceptual representations; but, then, so far from revealing the nature of the activity of conceptual representation, the claims would seem to preclude our getting a hold on what those claims are supposed to be about—the activity of conceptual representation.

Traditional metaphysicians will go on to insist that we manage to think and talk about things—things as they really are and not just things as they figure in the stories we tell. They will insist that the very idea of thinking about or referring to things presupposes that there are relations that tie our thoughts and words to the mind-independent, language-independent things we think and talk about; and they will insist that so far from barring us from access to things, the concepts we employ in our thinking are the vehicles for grasping the things to which they apply. They are not screens or barriers between us and things; they are, on the contrary, our routes to objects, our ways of gaining access to them. And traditional metaphysicians will argue that there is no reason to suppose that it needs to be otherwise with the concepts traditional metaphysicians employ in their attempts at giving us an account of what there is and its general structure. They will concede that metaphysicians can get things wrong, that there can be false metaphysical claims; but they will insist that the threat of falsehood is no more serious here than it is in any other discipline where we attempt to say how things are. It may be difficult to provide a true characterization of the nature of reality, but that does not mean that it is impossible.

Defenders of a Kantian conception of metaphysics will insist that the issues surrounding this debate are more complex and more difficult than the traditional metaphysician suggests; and although we may initially find ourselves sympathetic with the traditional metaphysician, we must concede that this debate over the methodology appropriate to metaphysics hinges on the much larger issue of the relationship between thought and the world. That issue strikes at the core of any characterization of being and, by any standards, counts as metaphysical. It is, however, such an important issue that it cannot be resolved in the introductory paragraphs of a book on metaphysics. The characterization of the relationship of our thought or language and the world requires separate and extended treatment; and in this book, the concluding chapter will be devoted to that issue. There, we will examine in detail the challenge that philosophers of a Kantian persuasion—anti-Realists, as they are often called—present to the traditional account of the relationship between thought and the world. In the meantime, however, we need a conception of metaphysics to guide us; and the strategy will be to assume, tentatively, the traditional, pre-Kantian approach.

## Metaphysics as Category Theory

The aim, then, will be to characterize the nature of reality, to say how things are. As we have seen, different traditions associate different subject matters with this project. In the Aristotelian tradition, there is the idea of a science of first causes and the idea of a science that studies being *qua* being. Even if there is a single science answering to the two ideas, the ideas, initially at least, appear to be different. The idea of a general science that studies beings from the perspective of their being beings corresponds to what the rationalists called general metaphysics; and a central task suggested by the idea of a science of first causes corresponds to the task associated with that branch of special metaphysics the rationalists dubbed natural theology; and we have the two other branches of special metaphysics—cosmology, which provides a characterization of the changeable, material world; and rational psychology, which deals, among other things, with the mind-body problem and, presumably, the problem of free will.

Many introductory books on metaphysics accord with the rationalist chart of the discipline. Indeed, they make issues in what the rationalists called special metaphysics their focus. Thus, questions about the existence and nature of God, questions about the nature of human beings and the mind-body problem, and questions about freedom of the will occupy center stage. This is a perfectly appropriate strategy. Since the seventeenth century, these issues have all been dubbed metaphysical. A different strategy for constructing an introductory text in metaphysics is, however, equally defensible. This strategy limits the topics to be discussed roughly to those that fall under the rubric of Aristotle's science of being *qua* being or the rationalist's science of general metaphysics.

A number of considerations support this way of approaching metaphysics. Contemporary philosophers divide philosophy in ways that do not respect the disciplinary boundaries of the rationalist account. The topics that were central in the various branches of what the rationalists called special metaphysics are now discussed in subdisciplines of philosophy that are not essentially or exclusively concerned with metaphysical topics. The focus of natural theology, for example, was the existence and nature of God; that set of issues is now typically addressed in what we call the philosophy of religion, a subdiscipline of philosophy that addresses a much broader range of issues than old-style natural theology. It deals with epistemological questions about the rationality of religious belief in general as well as the rationality of particular religious beliefs, questions about the relationship between religion and science, and questions about the relationship between religion and morality. Philosophers of religion even discuss issues that were part of what the rationalists called rational psychology—questions about personal survival and immortality. Other issues discussed in rational psychology now fall under what we call the philosophy of mind; but while philosophers of mind worry about metaphysical questions about the existence and nature of mind, they worry about much else besides. They raise epistemological questions about our knowledge of our own mental states and those of others; and they spend much time attempting to get clear on the nature of explanation in

psychology and the cognitive sciences. Sometimes, we find philosophers of mind raising questions about freedom of the will, but this problem is as likely as not to be debated in a still different part of philosophy called the theory of action. Contemporary philosophers typically use the term ‘metaphysics’ to refer to a branch of philosophy different from each of these branches; and when they do, what they are talking about is something that is not far removed from what the rationalists called general metaphysics and what Aristotle spoke of as the science that studies being *qua* being.

So the way introductory texts in metaphysics are organized does not reflect the way philosophers today typically use the term ‘metaphysics.’ One consequence is that the issues that are central in what we nowadays call metaphysics are not much discussed in introductory fashion. And that is unfortunate since those issues are as fundamental as any philosophical issues. So there’s one argument for an introductory metaphysics text that investigates being *qua* being; but there is another. The series of which this book is a part will have texts in the Philosophy of Religion and the Philosophy of Mind; topics like the existence and nature of God and the mind-body problem will be addressed in those volumes. The metaphysics volume should focus on different issues, and it will. It will focus on the issues that arise when we attempt to provide a general account of the structure of all that there is.

But what are those issues? In discussing Aristotle’s conception of metaphysics as a perfectly general discipline, I said that a central aim of such a discipline is the identification and characterization of the categories under which things fall. It would not be far off the mark to say this is what metaphysics as it is understood these days aims at. But just what is it to identify the categories under which things fall? As I indicated earlier, Aristotle took the categories to be the highest or most general kinds under which things can be classified. This suggests that what metaphysicians do is to take all the things there are and sort them into the most general kinds under which they fall. According to Aristotle, the kinds under which a thing falls enable us to say what the thing is. It would seem, then, that if they are to identify the highest kinds, metaphysicians should seek out the most general answers to the “What is it?” question. One way it might seem they might do this is to take a familiar object like Socrates and pose the question “What is he?” The obvious answer is “A human being.” But while ‘human being’ picks out a kind under which Socrates falls, there are more general answers to the question “What kind of thing is Socrates?” He is, after all, a primate, a mammal, a vertebrate, and an animal. To identify the category to which Socrates belongs is to identify the terminus or endpoint in this list of ever more general answers to the “What is it?” question. And when do we have that? The standard reply is that we arrive at the category of a thing when we arrive at an answer to the “What is it?” question such that the only more general answer is given by a term like ‘entity,’ ‘being,’ ‘thing,’ or ‘existent’ that applies to everything that there is. Aristotle thought that the relevant answer for Socrates was given by the term ‘substance,’ so Aristotle took substance to be the category under which Socrates and other living beings fall.

Now, it might seem that if our metaphysicians want to come up with the complete list of categories, they need only apply the kind of question-and-answer procedure they employed in the case of Socrates to other objects. Provided they choose their sample objects in a way that is sensitive to the differences among things, they will find themselves arriving at new and different categories. At some point, however, they will find that no new categories emerge. Repeating the procedure just brings them back to categories they have already isolated. At that point, they can be confident, subject to normal concerns about the adequacy of inductive procedures, that they have identified all the highest kinds or categories of being.

This is one way of thinking about categories and their role in the enterprise of metaphysics. It is, in fact, a way in which many philosophers view the whole business of identifying categories. Unfortunately, it has serious shortcomings as an account of what goes on in metaphysics. For one thing, it makes metaphysics a pretty boring business. Coming up with a table of categories is simply the mechanical procedure of finding the most general answers to the “What is it?” question; and it is difficult to understand how a procedure requiring as little imagination as that could have occupied the efforts of mankind’s greatest minds for over 2,000 years. For another, the account makes it difficult to understand how there could be any interesting disagreements or disputes in metaphysics. On this view, if two metaphysicians give us different lists of categories, it can only be because at least one of them has made some pretty gross and palpable mistake: either he or she committed an inductive error, failing to apply the question-and-answer procedure to a proper sample of objects, or was confused about the way the classificatory terms in our language work. The fact is, however, that nothing is more common in metaphysics than debate and controversy; and the opponents in metaphysical debates are typically perceptive, clear-minded thinkers, thinkers who are not likely to be guilty of gross intellectual failings.

But the difficulties with this understanding of categories and the nature of metaphysics run deeper. The picture assumes that metaphysicians begin their work confronted with a totality of objects that is nonproblematically given and that their job is to find niches in which to place the objects in that totality. The fact is, however, that philosophers who disagree about categories disagree about what objects there are. There is no antecedently given set of objects about which all metaphysicians agree. Disputes in metaphysics are typically disputes about how one is to answer the question “What objects are there?” and to provide alternative lists of categories is just to provide different answers to this question.

A simple example enables us to understand the nature of metaphysical disputes. Consider somersaults. ‘Somersault’ is a term that most of us who speak English know how to use; we all apply it in roughly the same situations and we withhold it in roughly the same situations; and we use it to express beliefs most of us share, beliefs about what somersaults are, beliefs about when one has occurred, beliefs about when one was done well, and so on. Now, we can imagine two philosophers reacting to these facts about the term ‘somersault’ in very different

ways. One tells us that there are such things as somersaults. He/she tells us that a somersault is simply a complete revolution of what is typically a human body, done either forwards or backwards, with the heels going over the head. He/she insists that since many such revolutions have occurred, there have been many somersaults; and he/she claims that unless we suppose there are such things as somersaults, we will be unable to explain how claims like:

(1) George performed five somersaults between 3 p.m. and 4 p.m. on Thursday

can be true. The other philosopher, however, disagrees. He/she denies that there are such things as somersaults. He/she concedes that people and some animals roll themselves over in the relevant way, but he/she denies that this implies the existence of a special class of entities, somersaults. He/she concedes as well that many claims like (1) are true; but, again, he/she denies that this implies the existence of a special type of entity. What makes (1) true, he/she insists, is simply that George turned himself over five times during the relevant time period.

What are our two philosophers disagreeing about? Certainly they are not disagreeing about how we use the term ‘somersault’ in our ordinary, prephilosophical talk about the world, nor are they disagreeing about the truth value of claims like (1). They are disagreeing about whether the relevant facts of ordinary usage and the truth of the relevant prephilosophical claims require us to recognize somersaults in our “official” philosophical story about the world and its workings; they are disagreeing about whether things like somersaults should enter into our “official” philosophical inventory of things that are. Such an “official” inventory is usually called an *ontology*. Using this term, we can say that our two philosophers are disagreeing about whether our ontology should include somersaults. The dispute between them is a metaphysical dispute. It is not, however, the sort of dispute that is likely to occupy serious metaphysicians. It isn’t that all metaphysicians think that our ontology must include somersaults; they do not. The reason metaphysicians would not concern themselves with an argument about the status of somersaults is that the topic of somersaults is too specific, too local. The disagreement between our two philosophers is, however, easily generalized; and when it is, it becomes the sort of dispute metaphysicians do characteristically enter into. The philosopher who claims that we must recognize the existence of somersaults does not make that claim out of any special fondness for somersaults. Almost certainly, the claim is inspired by the philosopher’s belief in the existence of things of a more general type. It is because he/she believes that events in general must enter into our ontology that he/she makes this claim for somersaults. In the same way, his/her opponent denies that there are such things as somersaults, not because he/she harbors a special prejudice against somersaults, but because he/she denies that our “official” story of the world should make reference to events. So the dispute over somersaults has its origin in a more general dispute. The more general dispute is a category dispute. The one philosopher believes that we should embrace the category of events; the other denies this.

To disagree about categories, then, is to disagree about what things exist; and many of the most central disputes in metaphysics are disputes of this sort. Although they operate at a more general level than the dispute over somersaults, they often display a certain structure. We have a dispute organized around a question about the existence of things of a very general type or category. Are there properties? Are there relations? Are there events? Are there substances? Are there propositions? Are there states of affairs? Are there possible worlds? In each case, there is a body of prephilosophical facts that function as data for the dispute. One party to the dispute insists that to explain the relevant prephilosophical facts, we must answer the existential question affirmatively. The other party claims that there is something philosophically problematic in the admission of entities of the relevant sort into our ontology, and argues that we can account for the prephilosophical facts without doing so.

Disputes over categories do not, however, always have precisely this form. We do not always find the parties to the dispute giving opposed answers to a question of the form “Are there *C*’s?” (where ‘*C*’ is a category word). Sometimes we find them agreeing that there exist entities of this or that category; but, then, one party goes on and tells us that while there actually are entities corresponding to the category, they are all to be analyzed in terms of entities from some other category. Suppose the dispute centers on material objects. While both parties agree that there are material objects, one party tells us that material objects are to be analyzed as collections of sensory qualities. His/her opponent in the dispute is likely to respond by saying, “Look, you don’t really think that there are material objects. You just mouth the words. In your view, there really are no material objects; there are just sensory qualities.” In reply, his/her opponent will doubtless object that he/she really does believe that there are material objects. “I am not denying that material objects exist; I am merely telling you what they are like.” It is difficult to know how to resolve the argument about the term ‘exists’; but however we resolve it, we must concede that there is deep metaphysical disagreement here, a disagreement that is, in some broad sense, existential. A way to express the disagreement is to say that while the one metaphysician wants to include material objects among the *primitive* or *basic* elements in his/her ontology, the other does not. The former denies that material objects can be analyzed in terms of or reduced to any more basic entities; the latter takes material objects to be mere constructions out of more fundamental entities. Although he/she says that there are material objects, when we look to the primitive items in his/her ontology (that is, the items in his or her ontology that are not reducible to entities of a more basic kind), we find no material objects, just sensory qualities. At rock bottom, then, there are no material objects in his/her ontology. In his/her metaphysical theory, material objects are not among the basic “building blocks” of reality. We can say that while material objects comprise a *primitive or underived category* in the ontology of the one philosopher, they constitute a *derived category* in that of the other.

So disputes over categories are disputes about the existence of entities of some very general kind or category. Sometimes the parties to the dispute

disagree about the existence of entities of the relevant kind; sometimes they disagree about whether entities of the category are reducible to entities of some more basic category. Now, to provide a complete metaphysical theory is to provide a complete catalog of the categories under which things fall and to identify the sorts of relations that obtain among those categories. The latter task will involve the identification of certain categories as basic and others as derived, and a specification of just how entities from the derived categories are to be reduced to or analyzed in terms of entities from the basic categories. A complete catalog of this sort would represent a general account of all that there is. Aristotle believed that an account of this sort is the goal of the metaphysical enterprise. Not many metaphysicians today are prepared to offer this kind of complete theory of categories. The issues surrounding any one of the categories that have historically been the focus of metaphysical theorizing are so complex that contemporary metaphysicians are satisfied if they can work their way through just a handful of these sets of issues. In this book, we will follow their lead. We will not attempt anything so ambitious as a complete system of categories. We will focus on the issues that arise when one seeks to answer just a few of the category questions that arise in metaphysics. The questions we will consider are all very important, very fundamental questions, so examining them should give us a good sense of just what metaphysics is. Let us get on, then, with the questions; and let us begin with the set of questions that has been called the problem of universals.

## Notes

- 1 See *Metaphysics A.1* included in R. McKeon (1941).
- 2 See *Metaphysics E.1* in McKeon (1941).
- 3 See *Metaphysics Γ.1* in McKeon (1941).
- 4 See, especially, *Metaphysics E.1* in McKeon (1941).
- 5 For a discussion of this map, see the entry on Christian Wolff in Edwards (1967).
- 6 For the classical empiricist attack on metaphysics, see Hume (1739). A more modern form of the attack is found in Ayer (1936).
- 7 See Kant (1787), especially the preface to the second edition and the “Transcendental Dialectic.”
- 8 For examples of this approach to metaphysics, see Collingwood (1940), Rescher (1973), Körner (1974), Putnam (1981), and Putnam (1987). The claim that metaphysics has as its subject matter the description of our conceptual scheme is defended in the introduction to Strawson (1959); but while the language is neo-Kantian, much of what Strawson does in *Individuals* embodies an Aristotelian approach to the discipline.
- 9 See, for example, Rorty (1979).

## Further Reading

The literature on the nature of metaphysics is vast. The beginning student should look, first, to Aristotle, especially the first two chapters of *Metaphysics A* (i.e., Book I), the first

## 16 Introduction

two chapters of *Metaphysics*  $\Gamma$  (i.e., Book IV), and the first chapter of *Metaphysics* *E* (i.e., Book VI). Then, I would recommend a look at the criticisms of metaphysics in Kant (1787), especially the preface to the second edition, and in the opening sections of Ayer (1936). For recent discussions, the student should look at Körner (1974), the introduction to Strawson (1959), and van Inwagen (1998).

# I The Problem of Universals I

## Metaphysical Realism

### Overview

The phenomenon of similarity or attribute agreement gives rise to the debate between realists and nominalists. Realists claim that where objects are similar or agree in attribute, there is some one thing that they share or have in common; nominalists deny this. Realists call these shared entities universals; they say that universals are entities that can be simultaneously exemplified by several different objects; and they claim that universals encompass the properties things possess, the relations into which they enter, and the kinds to which they belong.

Toward showing us that we must endorse the reality of universals, realists point to the phenomena of subject-predicate discourse and abstract reference. They claim that unless we posit universals as the referents of predicate expressions, we cannot explain how subject-predicate sentences can be true, and they argue that we can explain the truth of sentences incorporating abstract referring terms only if we take universals to be the things identified by the use of those terms.

Realists, however, frequently disagree about the generality of their accounts of predication and abstract reference. Some realists, for example, deny that their account of predication holds for sentences incorporating the term 'exemplifies.' Other realists insist that their account holds only for primitive or undefined predicates or abstract terms. Furthermore, some realists hold that there are universals corresponding only to predicates that are actually true of existing objects, whereas other realists believe that there are both exemplified and unexemplified properties, kinds, and relations.

### Realism and Nominalism

The objects we talk and think about can be classified in all kinds of ways. We sort things by color, and we have red things, yellow things, and blue things. We sort them by shape, and we have triangular things, circular things, and square things. We sort them by kind, and we have elephants, oak trees, and paramecia. The kind of classification at work in these cases is an essential component in our experience of the world. There is little, if anything, that we can think or say,

little, if anything, that counts as experience, that does not involve groupings of these kinds. Although almost everyone will concede that some of our ways of classifying objects reflect our interests, goals, and values, few will deny that many of our ways of sorting things are fixed by the objects themselves.<sup>1</sup> It is not as if we just arbitrarily choose to call some things triangular, others circular, and still others square; they *are* triangular, circular, and square. Likewise, it is not a mere consequence of human thought or language that there are elephants, oak trees, and paramecia. They come that way, and our language and thought reflect these antecedently given facts about them.

There are, then, objective similarities among things. Prior to our classifying them in the ways we do, the familiar objects of the everyday world agree in their characteristics, features, or attributes. This is not a claim born of any metaphysical theory. It is, on the contrary, a prephilosophical truism, but one that has given rise to significant philosophical theorizing. Indeed, a question that goes back to the origins of metaphysics itself is whether there is any general explanation for the prephilosophical truism that things agree in attribute. Suppose it to be a fact that certain objects agree in attribute; they are all, say, yellow. Is there some fact more basic or fundamental than this fact, such that it is because and only because the more fundamental fact holds of these objects that they are all yellow? And if there is, is it possible to generalize from this case? That is, is there a very general type or form of fact such that, given any case of attribute agreement, that case obtains because and only because some fact of the relevant, very general type or form obtains?

An affirmative answer to this question is suggested in Plato's *Parmenides*, where we read that:

there exist certain Forms of which these other things come to partake and so to be called after their names; by coming to partake of Likeness or Largeness or Beauty or Justice, they become like or large or beautiful or just.<sup>2</sup>

What is being proposed here is a general schema for explaining attribute agreement. The schema tells us that where a number of objects,  $a \dots n$ , agree in attribute, there is a thing,  $\phi$ , and a relation,  $R$ , such that each of  $a \dots n$  bears  $R$  to  $\phi$ , and the claim is that it is in virtue of standing in  $R$  to  $\phi$  that  $a \dots n$  agree in attribute by being all beautiful, or just, or whatever. It turns out that many philosophers since Plato have found this schema attractive.<sup>3</sup> They have not always used Plato's language. Where he speaks of things partaking of a Form, they have said that things *instantiate*, *exhibit*, or *exemplify* a single property, quality, or attribute. Nonetheless, the form of explanation being recommended is precisely the one Plato proposes. Different things are qualified or characterized in some way by virtue of their all standing in a relationship to the quality or characteristic in question. Attribute agreement gets grounded in a characteristic or quality *common to* or *shared by* the agreeing objects.

Philosophers who endorse the Platonic schema have traditionally been called *metaphysical realists* or simply *realists*;<sup>4</sup> but while many philosophers have found

the realist's explanation of attribute agreement in terms of shared or common entities attractive, the form of explanation proposed by Plato has also had its critics. These critics have been known as *nominalists*. They argue that there are deep conceptual problems with the metaphysical machinery implied by the Platonic schema. Some nominalists take those problems to point to the need for a quite different theoretical explanation for attribute agreement, one making no reference to shared or common entities, whereas others take them to show that no theoretical account at all is required here, that the phenomenon of attribute agreement is a basic or fundamental fact not susceptible of further analysis. The debate between metaphysical realists and nominalists is perhaps the oldest sustained debate in metaphysics. Certainly the issues on which the debate has turned are as important as any in metaphysics. We need to become clear on these issues, and we will begin by attempting to delineate the main contours of the perspective labeled metaphysical realism.

### The Ontology of Metaphysical Realism

Metaphysical realists want to insist that an adequate account of attribute agreement presupposes a distinction between two types or categories of objects: what are called *particulars* and what are called *universals*. The category of particulars includes what the nonphilosopher typically thinks of as “things”—familiar concrete objects like human beings, animals, plants, and inanimate material bodies; and the realist tells us that what is peculiar to particulars is that each occupies a single region of space at a given time. Universals, by contrast, are construed as repeatable entities. At any given time, numerically one and the same universal can be wholly and completely exhibited or, as realists typically put it, exemplified by several different spatially discontinuous particulars. Thus, different people can exemplify the same virtue at the same time; different automobiles can simultaneously exemplify the same shape; and different houses can, at a given time, exemplify literally the same color. The virtue, the shape, and the color are all universals.<sup>5</sup> The claim of the metaphysical realist is that familiar particulars agree in attribute in virtue of their jointly exemplifying a single universal. So there are nonrepeatable entities that stand in a special relation to repeatable entities, and this fact is what grounds attribute agreement among the familiar objects of the everyday world.

Realists typically want to claim that there is more than one kind of universal. All the cases of attribute agreement we have mentioned involve what are called *one-place* or *monadic* universals. They are universals that particulars exemplify individually or one by one; but there are also relations, universals that are exemplified by several individuals in relation to each other. Thus, *being a mile apart* is something that is exemplified by a pair of objects: one thing is a mile away from another; and it is a universal: many pairs of objects can be so related at any given time. Likewise, *being next to* is a spatial relation between objects: one object is next to another and, again, it is a universal: many pairs of objects can agree in entering into it. Both these relations are what are called *symmetrical*

relations; given any pair of objects,  $a$  and  $b$ , such that  $a$  bears either relation to  $b$ ,  $b$ , in turn, bears that same relation to  $a$ . But not all relations are symmetrical. Many relations are such that pairs of objects enter into them only when taken in a certain order. Thus, *being the father of* is an *asymmetrical* relation: if one thing,  $a$ , is the father of another thing,  $b$ , then  $b$  is not the father of  $a$ . As logicians put it, it is the ordered pair,  $\langle a, b \rangle$  ( $a$  and  $b$  taken in just *that* order), that exhibits the relation. The three relations we have considered are all two-place or dyadic relations; but obviously there can be three-place, four-place, and, generally,  $n$ -place relations.

Relations, then, are *polyadic* or *many-place* universals. But colors, virtues, and shapes are all monadic. Each is exhibited by objects taken individually. Now, many realists lump all monadic universals together under the title 'property'; but some realists (typically those influenced by the Aristotelian tradition) insist on a further distinction here. We are asked to distinguish between properties and kinds. Kinds are things like the various biological species and genera.<sup>6</sup> Whereas objects exemplify properties by *possessing* them, things exemplify kinds by *belonging to* them. Philosophers who draw this distinction frequently tell us that while kinds constitute the particulars that exemplify them as *what* they are, properties merely modify or characterize particulars antecedently so marked out; and they often claim that kinds are *individuating* universals. What is meant is that kinds constitute their members as individuals distinct from other individuals of the same kind as well as from individuals of other kinds. Thus, everything that belongs to the kind *human being* is marked out as a discrete individual, as one human being countably distinct and separate both from other human beings and from things of other kinds.

So attribute agreement can involve a variety of different types of universal. Several particulars can agree in belonging to a single kind; they can agree in possessing a single property; and several pairs, triples, or generally,  $n$ -tuples of particulars can agree in entering into a single relation. And realists want to claim that attribute agreement of any of these forms is subject to degrees. A dog and a cat agree in kind: both are mammals; but their agreement in kind is not as close as that tying two dogs. According to the realist, what gives rise to the difference in degree of agreement is the fact that the universals particulars exemplify exhibit varying degrees of generality. The more specific or determinate a shared universal, the closer is the resulting attribute agreement. Universals, then, come in hierarchies of generality. Presumably, every such hierarchy terminates in fully determinate universals, universals such that they have no less general or more determinate universals under them, and the particulars that jointly exemplify any such fully determinate universal will agree exactly in color, shape, kind, spatial relation, or whatever.

So particulars exemplify different sorts of universals of varying degrees of generality; but realists want to claim that the universals that serve to explain the attribute agreement among particulars can themselves agree in exemplifying further universals. Thus, the properties of red, yellow, and blue have various properties of tone and hue; they all belong to the kind *color*; and they enter into

relations like *being lighter than* and *being darker than*. And, of course, the universals exemplified by colors can be more or less determinate, thereby explaining why, for example, red is closer to orange than blue is.

Thus, the original insight that familiar particulars agree in attribute by virtue of jointly exemplifying a universal gives rise to a picture of considerable complexity. Particulars and  $n$ -tuples of particulars exemplify universals of different types: properties, kinds, and relations. Those universals, in turn, possess further properties, belong to further kinds, and enter into further relations; the same is true of these further properties, kinds, and relations; and so on, seemingly without end. And the seemingly endless series of universals that have come onto the scene enter into complicated hierarchies of generality, thereby inducing complex patterns of attribute agreement of varying degrees of generality. What began, then, as an apparently innocent extension of common sense has blossomed into a full-scale metaphysical theory, an ontology, that is a long distance from common sense.

Some might balk at the complexity of the theory, but realists want to insist that the complexity of the structure has a theoretical payoff. The structure represents a fruitful theory, one with the resources for explaining a wide range of phenomena. Although the phenomena realists claim their account explains are diverse and numerous, we will consider just two. Both bear on semantical issues, and both have played significant roles in the history of metaphysical realism. The first concerns *subject-predicate discourse*; the second bears on *abstract reference*. According to the realist, both phenomena give rise to pressing philosophical questions, and the realist insists that the theoretical machinery associated with metaphysical realism provides straightforward and satisfying answers to those questions.

## Realism and Predication

The subject-predicate sentence is about as basic a form of discourse as there is. The following sentences are examples of this form of discourse:

- (1) Socrates is courageous,
- (2) Plato is a human being,
- (3) Socrates is the teacher of Plato.

Using a sentence like one of these, we pick out or refer to a particular and go on to say something about it—to characterize or describe it in some way, to indicate what kind of thing it is, or to relate it to something else. Using (1), for example, we refer to Socrates and we say of him that he is courageous. This characterization of (1) suggests that it is only the subject term ‘Socrates’ that plays a referential role or picks out an object in (1), but metaphysical realists want to insist that such an account is incomplete. Any satisfactory analysis of (1), they claim, will show the predicate term ‘courageous’ to have referential force as well.<sup>7</sup>