Erratum

Missing footnotes in Elena Ficara's contribution "The Interplay Between Logic and Metaphysics" (pp. 109–118)

Footnote 1 (p. 109, line 27, after "…Aristotelian lines."):

Hegel famously defends a peculiar interpretation of Aristotle's philosophy, underlining the substantial continuity between Plato's and Aristotle's thought. In particular, he views Aristotle as the philosopher who manages to set the Platonic idea in motion. On Hegel's Aristotelianism see Verra 2007, pp. 349–370. On Hegel and Aristotle see Ferrarin 2001. On the continuity between Hegel's and Aristotle's concept of thinking see de Laurentiis 2002, pp. 263–285 and de Laurentiis 2005.

Footnote 2 (p.112, line 16, after "…nothing to do with truth."):

See for instance Kant's conception of formal logic as the negative condition of, rather than the path towards, truth, in the Critique of Pure Reason [KrV], AA B 84–85.

Footnote 3 (p.112, line 26, after "…(Log&Met 1817, p. 8)."):

Works Cited: Hegel 1992.

Footnote 4 (p.112, line 28, after "…natural metaphysics."):

On the concept of natural logic see Nuzzo 1997, pp. 39–82. Nuzzo explains here (pp. 47–48) that both expressions "natural logic" and "science of logic" are originally used by Kant.

Footnote 5 (p.115, line 27, after "theory of argumentation."):

See Varzi 2009, pp. 13–36, in particular pp. 13–14: "Because all metaphysical theorizing takes place in language … and because logic is to a great extent a theory of language, metaphysics can hardly get off the ground without the help of logic." For an overview about metaphysics in both analytical and traditional philosophy see D'Agostini 2008, pp. 244–270.

Footnote 6 (p.115, line 30, after "…nor merely subjective."):

Macdonald 2005, pp. 8–13, underlines Aristotle's influence on contemporary metaphysics.

Footnote 7 (p.116, line 7, after "…philosophy of logic…"):

Haack 1978; Read 1995; more recently, Beall/Restall 2006; Berto 2006 and D'Agostini 2012.

Footnote 8 (p. 117, line 3, after "…ontological commitments."):

On ontological commitments see the debate between Russell and Quine: Russell 1905, p. 479–493; Quine 1948, p. 1–19. The debate is at the core of recent discussions about the foundations of metaphysics. See Van Inwagen 2009, p. 472–506 and McDaniel 2009, p. 290–319.

Footnote 9 (p. 117, line 13, after "(…cf. Armstrong 2010)"):

Armstrong 2010, 1–5.