Accidental Beings in Aristotle's Ontology[1]

S. Marc Cohen

Aristotle, as is well known, proposes an ontology of substances and accidents. Substances, such as a man or a horse, are the basic, independent, entities in this ontology; accidents are the dependent entities that inhere in the substances. Accidents are usually thought of as the properties[2] of substances, and on the whole this is a reasonably accurate way to think about them. A horse, for example, is a substance, and pallor, perhaps, is a property (an "accident") of that horse. But that is not the end of Aristotle's story. For in addition to the substance and the property, he thinks that there is something else—an accidental being, I will call it—that is intermediate between the substance and the property. In the case of our example, Aristotle would use the expression "the pale horse," or sometimes, without specifying which substance enters into the compound, simply "the pale [thing]" to pick out this intermediate entity.

In the interests of maintaining a deflationary ontology, it would be tempting to suppose that the expression "the pale [thing]" does not pick out something distinct from both the substance, the horse, and its property, pallor; it simply picks out the substance, albeit not in the same way that the simple expression "the horse" does. But, as we will see, this is not the approach that Aristotle takes. For him, accidental beings are neither substances nor properties. They are typically picked out by definite descriptions such as "the *F*" or "the *FG*" where "*F*" is replaced by an adjective and "*G*" is replaced by a noun, or by noun phrases of the form "*Fa*," where "*F*" is replaced by an adjective and "*a*" is replaced by a proper name. Examples are *the pale*, *the musical man*, and *seated Socrates*.

Accidental beings have been noted in the literature for some time now, the *locus classicus* being Matthews (1982). Here is what he said about them:

> Aristotle's picture of an accidental unity is that of an ephemeral object—an object whose very existence rests on the accidental presence, or compresence, of some feature, or features, in a substance. (p. 224)

Such objects are ephemeral because they last only as long as their components are united, only as long as the accident in question is present in its host substance. The musical man did not come into existence until the man became musical; seated Socrates ceased to exist when Socrates stood up.

Aristotle is very clear about this. In discussing the topic of coming-to-be in the *Physics*, he considers the case in which a man becomes musical. Here is what he says:

> the man survives, but the unmusical does not survive, *nor does the compound of the two, namely the unmusical man*. (190a19-21, emphasis mine)[3]

This compound, the unmusical man, is something that goes out of existence when the man becomes musical, and comes into existence when the man loses his musicality. The man and the unmusical man are clearly distinct entities, on Aristotle's view, since they have distinct identity and persistence conditions.

In Matthews' view, Aristotle's positing of these ephemeral objects is a concomitant of his understanding of the semantics of definite descriptions, an understanding that is very different from a more recent, basically neo-Fregean, one. On the more recent view, the expressions "Socrates" and "Socrates seated" have the same reference, but different senses. That is, these expressions pick out one and the same man, although they do so in different ways. As it is sometimes put, Socrates and Socrates seated are the same man under different descriptions. But on Aristotle's understanding, the difference is not just semantic but ontological. For he takes pains to point out (*Top* I.7 103a23-31) that Socrates and Socrates seated are only the same in a sense, and are strictly speaking not the same at all.

No doubt it was this feature of accidental unities such as *seated Socrates* and *the musical man* that led Matthews to dub them "kooky objects." For if seated Socrates is not just Socrates under another description, then seated Socrates must be a very kooky object indeed, one whose identity conditions do not correspond to those of any "straight" object that we are inclined to recognize.

The fact that such objects are kooky did not lead Matthews to despise them, however. On the contrary, he shows how Aristotle is able to appeal to them in dealing with puzzles that we characterize today as involving substitutivity of co-referential expressions in opaque contexts (*SE* 24 179a33-b22). The puzzle is this: how can it be that one knows Coriscus but does not know the masked man, when Coriscus is the masked man? Aristotle's answer is, in effect, that Coriscus and the masked man are only accidentally the same, and are not strictly speaking identical. Aristotle thus accepts the principle of substitutivity of co-referential expressions but refuses to allow that the expressions "Coriscus" and "the masked man" are co-referential. Rather, they denote distinct objects that are only accidentally the same. Aristotle is quite explicit about accepting the principle of indiscernibility of identicals only in this strengthened form: "[O]nly to things that are undifferentiated in substance and one in being is it generally agreed that all the same attributes belong" (*SE* 24 179a37).[4] Coriscus and the masked man may be one in number, but they are not one in being, and so we cannot infer that they have all the same attributes, especially the attribute of being known by you.[5]

In previous writings (e.g., Cohen 2008) on this topic, I have adopted Matthews' terminology, referring to such entities as *the pale man* or *seated Socrates* as kooky objects. But in this essay I have retreated to the less pejorative sounding "accidental beings." For I want to make two claims about accidental beings that I hope will make them seem somewhat more attractive, or at least not as strange as they might at first appear to be. First, they can help us resolve a long-standing dispute in Aristotelian scholarship, and second, they can be located within a more familiar latter-day conceptual scheme.

The long-standing dispute concerns the nature of the so-called non-substantial individuals of Aristotle's *Categories*. As you will recall, in that work Aristotle posits a number of basic categories, each of which is populated by both universals and particulars (or individuals[6]). Just as the category of substance contains both universals, such as *man* and *animal*, and particulars, such as *this man* (*ho tis anthrôpos*), so the category of quality contains both universals, such as *pallor* and *color*, as well as particulars, such as *this pale* (*to ti leukon*). The status of these particulars or individuals

in the non-substance categories has been a matter of great dispute over the years. There have been basically two lines of interpretation.[7] The traditional interpretation holds that these entities are indeed particulars, that is to say, non-shareable, non-repeatable, entities, peculiar to the particular substances in which they inhere. A minority interpretation, championed by Owen (1965), holds that these entities are individuals only in the sense that they are the lowest-level members of their categories, but that they are shareable, and in that sense universal. On the traditional interpretation, the expression *to ti leukon* picks out a *trope*, that is, a particular bit of pallor that is peculiar to a particular substance, say, Socrates; on Owen's interpretation, it picks out a determinate pale shade that may well turn up elsewhere in the world than on the surface of Socrates.

The literature on this dispute is enormous, and I have no intention of trying to summarize it here. Rather, what I hope to show is that each side of the dispute is partly right and partly wrong. The trope-theorists are right to maintain that non-substantial individuals are not universals, but wrong about what it is that makes them particulars. The Owen side is right to say that Aristotle allows universals to inhere in particular substances, but wrong to suppose that this requires non-substantial individuals to be universals.

I am going to assume that the traditional interpretation is correct at least in holding that individual non-substances are indeed non-repeatable particulars.[8] This alone makes it clear that they are at the very least ancestors or close cousins of the accidental beings under discussion, if not the very same entities.[9] The question is what light this sheds on the *Categories*.

The ontology of the *Categories* exhibits two different kinds of ontological dependence: the dependence of universals on particulars, and the dependence of non-substances on substances. In Aristotle's terminology, the former is the dependence that things "said of a subject" have on the subjects of which they are said; the latter is the dependence that things "in a subject" have on the subjects in which they inhere.

Individual substances, or primary substances (*prôtai ousiai*), as Aristotle calls them, are the ultimate foundational entities in the ontological scheme—they underlie both substance universals (which

Aristotle calls secondary substances) and non-substance universals. But they do so in different ways. The dependence of secondary substances on primary substances is immediate: horse exists because there are horses, not because of the existence of something else that in turn depends on the existence of horses. But the dependence of universal non-substances on primary substances is mediated. The particulars on which the universal, pallor, immediately depends are not particular substances, but particulars in the category of quality, such as *this pale (thing)*, each of which in turn depends on the substance in which it inheres, say, this particular horse.

There are thus two steps to the dependence of non-substance universals on primary substances, which is what makes them doubly dependent.[10] First, there is the dependence of universals on particulars, and second, there is the dependence of non-substances on substances. Particular non-substances thus play an intermediate role in the ontological scheme of the *Categories*; universal non-substances (i.e., property universals) are dependent on them, and they in turn depend on particular substances.

This intermediate role that particular non-substances play in the *Categories* is precisely the role that Aristotle assigns to accidental beings in the *Metaphysics*.[11] In *Metaphysics* Z.1, after claiming that substances are the primary beings, Aristotle goes on as follows:

> And all other things are said to be because they are, some of them, quantities of that which is in this primary sense, others qualities of it, others affections of it, and others some other determination of it. And so one might even raise a question about *walking* (*to badidzein*), *being healthy*, or *sitting*, whether each of these things is existent, and similarly in any other case of this sort; for none of them is either self-subsistent or capable of being separated from substance, but rather, if anything, it is that which walks (*to badidzon*) or sits or is healthy that is an existent thing. Now these are seen to be more real because there is something definite which underlies them (i.e., the substance or individual) . . . . (1028a18-28)[12]

Notice that in addition to the property of walking (*to badidzein*) and the substance (e.g., Coriscus) that does the walking, there is an intermediate entity, *the walker* ("the walking [thing]," *to badidzon*). That there are three entities here and not just two is made clear by the fact that Aristotle takes pains to point out that *the walker* is

"more real"[13] than the property of walking because of the substance (say, Coriscus) that underlies it. The existence of the property of walking is dependent on the existence of substances, but the dependence is not immediate. Rather, there is such a thing as walking because there are walkers, and there are walkers because there are substances "underlying" them. An accidental being, such as a walker, cannot exist unless there is a substance (a man, or a horse) with which it coincides. Notice that the relation between the accidental being and its "parent" substance (as Frank Lewis calls it) is coincidence, not identity. The walker is not identical to the substance that underlies it; rather, it coincides with that substance.

What is the point of introducing these intermediate entities? Why is the dependence of a non-substance such as walking on substances mediated by accidental beings? Why can't walking depend on substances right from the start? The answer seems to me to be the following: walking is a universal, and (as the *Categories* makes clear) universals depend on there being particulars that they are said of. The particulars that the universal, walking, is said of are items in the same category as walking. Hence, those particulars are not substances (for the relation between walking and the substances which walk is that of being *in a subject*, not being *said of a subject*). The intermediate entity is thus a particular case of walking, which in turn owes its existence to the particular substance that is engaged in that particular case of walking.

Notice that it is the particular substance, not the property, that gives the intermediate entity its particularity. No matter how closely Callias manages to approximate the walk of Socrates, the walk he produces will still be the walk of Callias, not the walk of Socrates. The two may walk the same way, but they cannot be the same walker. The point will be important below when we turn to the non-substantial individuals of the *Categories*.

We can encapsulate the aforementioned levels of dependence involving accidental beings by means of the following two schemata. Where *F* is a predicate from a non-substance category, and *F* things are accidental beings:

- Schema 1: *F*-ness exists because *F* things exist.
- Schema 2: *F* things exist because some substances are *F*.[14]

When we place these two schemata side by side, however, there appears to be an important difference between them. For the dependence in Schema 2 (the dependence of accidental beings on substances) is asymmetrical; an accidental being (an *F* thing) cannot exist apart from the substance it coincides with, but the substance does not similarly depend on its coinciding with that *F* thing. However, it seems doubtful that the dependence in Schema 1 (the dependence of properties on accidental beings) can be similarly asymmetrical. Rather, the dependence here seems to be two-way. Just as *F*-ness cannot exist unless there are *F* things, neither can *F* things exist unless *F*-ness does. Walking cannot exist unless there are walkers, but walkers cannot exist unless walking is what some substances do.

It thus appears that in explaining the existence of accidental beings we must appeal to the very universals whose existence the accidental beings are supposed to explain. This lack of asymmetry in Schema 1 seems to make the entire explanatory framework hopelessly circular.

That the dependence claimed in Schema 1 should be reversed also seems to be supported by Frank Lewis' account of what he calls "accidental compounds." Lewis (1985, p. 85) claims that accidental compounds (such as *Socrates seated*, or *the generous one*) "are constructed out of individual substances and accidents." An accidental compound, Lewis tells us, "is an entity of the form $a + \varphi$, where *a* is an individual substance, φ is an accident of *a*, and the '+' notation introduces the primitive operation of compounding" (ibid.). And if accidents (i.e., properties) are among the components of accidental compounds, then, contrary to Schema 1, it would seem that accidents are prior to those compounds, since (as Aristotle insists[15]) a compound is always posterior to its components.

We are now faced with two serious difficulties. For not only does Aristotle's effort to ground the existence of properties on that of substances via intermediate accidental beings seem doomed to failure, but my account of accidental beings as playing the same explanatory role as the non-substantial individuals of the *Categories* seems equally flawed. For it is clear that the non-substantial individuals of the *Categories* do play the grounding role that the

accidental beings of the *Physics* and *Metaphysics* now seem to be incapable of.

Fortunately, there is a solution to these difficulties, for they both depend on a conflation of two different notions of priority and dependence that Aristotle takes pains to distinguish.[16] On the one hand, there is priority in formula or definition (*kata logon*); in this sense, the parts of a definition are prior to the definition constructed out of those parts. On the other hand, there is priority in nature and substance (*kata phusin kai ousian*); in this sense, one thing is prior to another if it is capable of existing independent of the other. Here is how Aristotle applies the distinction:

> [I]n formula . . . the accident is prior to the whole, e.g. musical to musical man, for the formula cannot exist as a whole without the part; yet musicalness cannot exist unless there is someone who is musical. (*Met* Δ.11 1018b34-36)

Clearly, the priority that Schema 1 requires of accidental beings is priority in substance, not priority in definition. Indeed, Aristotle himself marks this distinction with the very example we have been discussing:

> [N]ot all things which are prior in definition (*tôi logôi*) are prior in substance (*têi ousiai*). For those things are prior in substance which when separated from other things continue to exist, but those are prior in definition out of whose definitions the definitions of other things are compounded … white is prior to the white man in definition, but not in substance. For it cannot exist separately, but is always along with the compound thing; and by the compound thing I mean the white man. (*Met* M.2 1077b1ff)

In the relevant sense of priority, then, an accidental being, Lewis' *a* + φ, is prior to its component accident, φ. So by Aristotle's lights, at least, the charge of circularity can be avoided.

This is all well and good, but one may still be left with a feeling of bewilderment. It is easy to see why accidents are prior in definition to the accidental compounds of which they are components, but harder to see how priority in substance is supposed to work. It is easy to see how the existence of accidents depends on that of accidental beings, since, according to Aristotle, accidents cannot go uninstantiated. But how is the required asymmetry

possible? Why doesn't the existence of accidental beings similarly depend on that of accidents? How can the white horse exist unless whiteness does too?

This question actually lies at the heart of the dispute between Aristotelian and Platonic metaphysics, and for that reason is too large for a thorough discussion within the confines of this essay. But Aristotle gives us a few clues in the remainder of the passage just quoted:

> [I]t is plain that neither is the result of abstraction prior nor that which is produced by adding posterior; for it is by adding to the white that we speak of the white man. (1077b10-11)

Aristotle characterizes the accident, white, as "the result of abstraction," as he also characterizes numbers, lines, and planes. There is thus a sense in which we must first have the physical objects from which we abstract these things, before we can do the abstracting. Whatever that sense is, it is the sense in which substances and accidental beings are prior to and independent of the accidents we abstract from them.

Aristotle seems to think that if accidents were not in this sense posterior to accidental compounds, they would be available as components from which to construct those compounds. At any rate, a few lines earlier he makes the corresponding point about these geometrical examples:

> But how can lines be substances? Neither as a form or shape, as the soul perhaps is, nor as matter, like body; for we have no experience of anything that can be put together out of lines or planes or points, while if these had been a sort of material substance, we should have observed things which could be put together out of them. (1077a32-6)

A pale horse is no more capable of existing in a world in which pallor does not exist than a cube is capable of existing in a world in which there are no squares, but that does not deprive the compounds of their ontological priority. Just as cubes are not constructed out of squares, neither is a pale horse constructed out of pallor. A pale horse may be analyzed, à la Lewis, as this horse + pallor, but it is not constructed out of those ingredients. The accident is only a definitional, but not an ontological, constituent of the compound.

The accidental compound is ontologically prior to the accident that is one of its (definitional) constituents. This is precisely what makes Lewis' formulation, "accidental compounds are constructed out of individual substances and accidents," so misleading.

I hope that I have by now made it at least plausible to think that accidental beings should be assimilated to, or are at the very least close cousins of, the non-substantial individuals of the *Categories*. But one may still resist this assimilation, on the grounds that these two kinds of beings are categorially different. Non-substances, one might say, are properties, or property-like entities, whereas accidental beings are not properties—they are things that *have* properties. The accidental being, the pale horse, has the property of being pale, whereas the non-substantial individual, this pale, does not have the property of being pale—it *is* that property.

There are two problems with this objection. First, it assumes that because a universal in the category of quality, such as *pallor*, is a property, so too an individual in that category, such as *this pale*, must be a property. What is wrong with this assumption is that it takes for granted that we have some independent idea of what such an individual, non-repeatable, non-shareable, property could possibly be. Second, the objection assumes that we can learn everything we need to know about the *Categories* by reading the chapters on substance and quality and can pretty much ignore the rest. However common this assumption may be, it is still a mistake. If we look at some of the other categories, non-substantial individuals start looking a lot more like accidental beings.

Consider the category of relatives (*ta pros ti*). It includes such items as a master, a slave, the wing of a bird, the rudder of a boat, a head, and a hand. Presumably fathers and daughters also go into this category. But these do not seem to be dependent entities in the same way that qualities are. It is tempting to say that what Aristotle calls relatives are actually substances, or at least parts of substances, and not ontologically dependent entities. But if we want to get Aristotle right, we should resist this temptation, for he insists that they are not substances. Socrates the man is a substance, but Socrates the father is not.

Notice how smoothly things go, however, if we think of relatives as accidental beings. Socrates the man and Socrates the father are distinct, but coincidental, objects. The first is a substance, the second is a relative. The substance can exist without the relative that depends on it, but not conversely. A father cannot exist if the man that he inheres in does not exist. On this reading the items in the category of *ta pros ti* are not *relations*, like fatherhood or being larger than, but the things that *instantiate* these relations. That is, Aristotle's relatives are *things related*—things that are fathers, or that are larger than something. These things are not substances; rather, they are the accidental beings that coincide with substances.

Consider another non-substance category, that of place. Which things belong to this category? Places, one might at first suppose. But this cannot be correct, for it is not plausible to maintain that a place is incapable of existing apart from the substance that is located at it. Coriscus is in the Lyceum, and he can exist apart from the Lyceum. But surely the Lyceum also can exist apart from Coriscus, indeed, apart from there being any substances at all located there. A more careful look at the example Aristotle gives us when he introduces this category (2a1), however, suggests a different story. For he lists *in the Lyceum* (rather than the Lyceum itself) as an example of an item in this category. This suggests that the members of the category of place are not *places* but *things placed*. (It is actually a misnomer to name this the category of "place"; Aristotle in fact calls it the category of *where*.) So an example of something in this category might be *the one in the Lyceum*. This, of course, is something whose location is its essence, but which happens to coincide with Coriscus for as long as the latter is in the Lyceum, and whose existence depends on that of Coriscus. Once again, the best interpretation of what Aristotle has in mind as an individual in a non-substance category is that it is an accidental being.

What are the consequences of this identification, or near identification, between accidental beings and non-substance individuals for our interpretation of the *Categories*? As I mentioned earlier, the latter have been traditionally understood to be *tropes*, that is, particular instances or bits of properties or relations. One of the main objections to this interpretation has been the philosophical unattractiveness of tropes themselves, as it is difficult to conceive of

what a bit of pallor or fatherhood might be. Trope-theorists seem to be willing to live with this difficulty as part of the price of avoiding any commitment to universals.

But Aristotle himself had no such hostility to universals. In this respect, my understanding of accidental beings is the same as Frank Lewis': an accidental compound is an entity of the form $a + \varphi$, where a is an individual substance and φ is a universal non-substance. The particularity of $a + \varphi$ comes from a, not from φ. For that reason it would be better to say that Aristotle's non-substance individuals are particular exemplifications of properties rather than tropes.[17] For what makes these things individuals, or particulars, is that they inhere in particulars. But if it is the particularity of Socrates that makes the pallor of Socrates a particular, then the key ingredients in this entity, the pallor of Socrates, will just be pallor (a universal) and Socrates. The particularity of the non-substantial particular is contributed by its component substance. What makes the pallor of Socrates distinct from the pallor of Callias, even though the two are indistinguishable in color, is that Socrates and Callias are distinct substances. So the pallor of Socrates is neither a universal nor a trope, but the particular exemplification of pallor in Socrates.

Actually, there is one further complication, and that will lead, as a kind of bonus, to a brief answer to my second question: do these curious entities, accidental beings, turn up at all in a more familiar conceptual framework?

The additional complication is time. For typically a substance will have an accidental property for only a short time, or at one time but not at another. So there are really three key ingredients: a substance, a property, and a time (or a period of time). My proposal is that these three things provide the identity conditions for accidental beings. More formally, we need to revise Lewis' formulation slightly: an accidental being is an entity of the form $a + \varphi + t$, where a is an individual substance, φ is an accident, and t is a time.

Immediately, accidental beings start looking more familiar—they start looking like events. If we follow the lead of Kim (1983, 1991) and Bennett (1988), we will say that "an event is the instantiation, at a time, of a property by a substance" (Bennett 1988, p. 88). An event is thus a particular that has a substance, a property, and a time as its

constituents. The substance, property, and time in question are essential to its being the very event that it is. The lunar eclipse that occurred in North America on February 20, 2008, for example, has the moon as an essential ingredient. Had it been the sun that was eclipsed on that day, or had the moon been eclipsed a day earlier, that would have been a different eclipse.

This may at first not seem to work for accidental beings such as *the red thing* that comes into existence when a lobster is cooked. For a red thing does not seem to be an event. But consider. The red thing exists for precisely as long as its underlying substance—the lobster—is red. It is thus something whose existence begins when the lobster turns red and ends when the lobster either ceases to be red or ceases to exist. That is, its career coincides exactly with the lobster's period of being red. It thus has as its constituents a substance (the lobster), a property (redness), and a period of time. These are precisely the constituents of an event. The only apparent difference is that its temporal constituent is a stretch of time, rather than a point. But even that is only apparent, since most events last for a stretch of time, however short. So an accidental being, such as a red thing, has a strikingly event-like structure. Aristotle himself thought of a color as either a state (*hexis*) or condition (*diathesis*), depending on how long lasting and firmly established it is.[18] But states and conditions are themselves event-like entities.[19] So the red thing in question is the exemplification of redness by the lobster for the duration of its being red.

In conclusion: When non-substantial individuals and accidental beings are conceived of as particular states of substances or events involving substances, they fit perfectly into Aristotle's program of showing how and why primary substances are the basic realities, the things on which ultimately everything else depends. For a universal to exist, there must be instances of it: horse does not exist unless there are horses; pallor does not exist unless there are pale things. Where the universal is in the category of substance, states and events are not yet part of this picture of ontological dependence. There is no need to introduce "horse-things" into the ontology, since a horse-thing would just be a horse, an individual in the category of substance. But for universals in non-substance categories, the situation is different. A universal in the category of quality, such as

pallor, cannot exist unless there are pale things, individual instances of pallor. These pale things are themselves just the states that particular substances are in when they are pale. And these states are particulars, not universals, for each of them has a particular substance as a constituent. A pale thing, or *to ti leukon*, as the *Categories* called it, is not merely a determinate shade of color, such as Ghastly Pale #23, but a particular instantiation of such a shade. What makes it particular is that it has a particular substance as a constituent. And this is why, as Aristotle says (*Cat* 5 2b6), "if the primary substances did not exist it would be impossible for any of the other things to exist."

---

[1] I am grateful to David Keyt for graciously inviting me to contribute this essay to the present volume. David was the Chair of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Washington when I was hired there in 1973, and he has remained my treasured colleague ever since. During these nearly forty years we have read and commented on one another's work, and spent one delightful summer co-authoring a paper.

An earlier version of this essay was presented at the April 2012 meeting of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association as part of a special memorial session celebrating the work of Gareth B. Matthews. Gary and I were friends and colleagues for over forty years, and my debts to him, both personal and intellectual, are enormous. His influence will be evident throughout this essay; I dedicate it to his memory.

[2] I am using "property" here in the modern sense of a characteristic or feature of an object, not in Aristotle's technical sense of an *idion* (Latin *proprium*), i.e., a characteristic or feature that is proper or peculiar to that object.

[3] Translations throughout are from the Revised Oxford Translation of the Complete Works of Aristotle, edited by Jonathan Barnes (Princeton, 1984).

[4] The strengthened principle also appears at *Phys* III.3 202b15: "For not all of the same [predicates] belong to all things whatsoever that are the same, but only to those whose being is the same."

[5] Caveat: Aristotle's solution to these puzzles is only partially successful. For details, see Cohen (2008, p. 13).

[6] In this essay I will not worry about whether it is important to distinguish between individuals and particulars, and will use the two expressions interchangeably.

[7] For more detail on this issue, see Matthews (2009) and Cohen (2012).

[8] This is the position taken by Matthews and Cohen (1968). We called such items as *this white* "unit qualities," and noted that they were indeed "queer

entities" or "philosopher's entities," and that "Aristotelian unit qualities are not embodied in our non-philosophical ways of talking" (p. 647). Rereading these lines now, I can see how even then we were thinking of them along the lines of the accidental beings that we came to call "kooky objects." I still think we were right to say that they are not embodied in the nonphilosophical ways of talking that we mentioned in that paper; but it now seems to me that they are less queer than we then supposed, as I will try to show below.

[9] This connection between the accidental beings of the *Metaphysics* and the things *in a subject but not said of a subject* of the *Categories* is seldom explicitly noted. Lewis (1985, p. 59) comes close when he writes "φ is in *a* if and only if there exists the accidental compound of *a* with the accident φ." But Lewis' biconditional holds where φ is universal (and therefore said-of-a-subject), and so it is noncommittal with respect to *a*'s particular exemplification of φ (which is not said-of-a-subject). For more on this connection, see Cohen (2008).

[10] Here I disagree with Lewis (1985, p. 53), who insists that all such dependencies for Aristotle are immediate, or "one-step."

[11] The intermediate role of accidental beings has been well explored by Code (2010), whose work on this topic has greatly influenced my own.

[12] The translation of the phrase *tauta de mallon phainetai onta* is controversial. Where Ross/Barnes in the Revised Oxford Translation have "these are seen to be more real," Bostock has "these things more clearly are." Although I prefer the former translation, my interpretation does not require it. For even if there is no explicit commitment here to such "degrees of reality," it is still clear, even on the Bostock translation, that Aristotle distinguishes the accidental being *the walking thing* (*to badidzon*) from both the property of *walking* (*to badidzein*) and the underlying substance.

[13] Or at least "more obviously real." See previous note.

[14] Schema 1 appears in Code (2010); Schema 2 is implied by but never explicitly formulated in that paper.

[15] *Phys* VIII 256a13ff, *Met* Z.3 1029a5-7, *Met* Z.15 1040a18.

[16] *Met* Δ.11, especially 1018b34-36 and 1019a2-3; see also *Met* Z.10 1034b20-33, *Met* M.2 1077b1ff.

[17] I am following the distinction between tropes and exemplifications found in Bacon (2011).

[18] *Cat* 8 8b27, 9a31, 9b12-27.

[19] One might object that states and conditions, unlike events, are shareable (two people can be in the same state; one may have a recurring condition). But so long as we restrict ourselves to particular states and conditions, the similarity seems indisputable.

Bibliography

Bacon, John. 2011. Tropes. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta. URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2011/entries/tropes/>.

Bennett, Jonathan.1988. *Events and their names*. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Code, Alan. 2010. Aristotle and existence. Paper presented at the Pacific Division meeting of the American Philosophical Association.

Cohen, S. Marc. 2008. Aristotle's ontology: Kooky objects revisited. *Metaphilosophy* 39:3-19.

Cohen, S. Marc. 2012. Nonsubstantial particulars. A supplementary note to Aristotle's Metaphysics. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta. URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2012/entries/aristotle-metaphysics/supp1.html>.

Kim, Jaegwon. 1983. Events as property exemplifications. in *Action Theory*, ed. Myles Brand and Douglas Walton. Dordrecht: Reidel, 159-177.

Kim, Jaegwon. 1991. Events: Their metaphysics and semantics. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 51:641-646.

Lewis, Frank. 1985. *Substance and predication in Aristotle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matthews, Gareth B. 1982. Accidental unities. In *Language and logos: Studies in ancient Greek philosophy*, ed. Malcolm Schofield and Martha Craven Nussbaum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 223-240.

Matthews, Gareth B. 2009. Aristotelian categories. In *A companion to Aristotle*, ed. Georgios Anagnostopoulos. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 144-161.

Matthews, Gareth B. and S. Marc Cohen. 1968. The one and the many. *Review of Metaphysics* 21:630-55.

Owen, Gwilym Ellis Lane. 1965. Inherence. *Phronesis* 10:97-105.