

DEFENDING MUSICAL PERDURANTISM

Ben Caplan and Carl Matheson

If musical works are abstract objects, which cannot enter into causal relations, then how can we refer to musical works or know anything about them? Worse, how can any of our musical experiences be experiences of musical works? It would be nice to be able to sidestep these questions altogether. One way to do that would be to take musical works to be concrete objects. In this paper, we defend a theory according to which musical works are concrete objects. In particular, the theory that we defend takes musical works to be fusions of performances. We defend this view from a series of objections, the first two of which are raised by Julian Dodd in a recent paper and the last of which is suggested by some comments of his in an earlier paper.

I. INTRODUCTION

MANY theories take musical works to be abstract objects: for example, kinds or types.¹ Theories that take certain entities to be abstract objects typically face awkward questions. For example, if those entities are abstract objects, which cannot enter into causal relations, then how can we refer to them or know anything about them?² Things are no different with theories that take musical

¹ See, for example, Nicholas Wolterstorff, *Works and Worlds of Art*, Clarendon Library of Logic and Philosophy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980); Jerrold Levinson, 'What a Musical Work Is', *Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 77, no. 1 (January 1980), pp. 5–28 (reprinted in Jerrold Levinson, *Music, Art, and Metaphysics: Essays in Philosophical Aesthetics* [Ithaca, NY: Cornell U.P., 1990], pp. 63–88); Jerrold Levinson, 'What a Musical Work Is, Again', in Levinson, *Music, Art, and Metaphysics*, pp. 215–263; Peter Kivy, 'Platonism in Music: A Kind of Defense', *Grazer philosophische Studien*, vol. 19 (1983), pp. 109–129 (reprinted in Peter Kivy, *The Fine Art of Repetition: Essays in the Philosophy of Music* [Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1993], pp. 35–58); Peter Kivy, 'Platonism in Music: Another Kind of Defense', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 3 (July 1987), pp. 245–252 (reprinted in Kivy, *The Fine Art of Repetition*, pp. 59–74); Gregory Currie, *An Ontology of Art* (New York: Macmillan, 1989); Julian Dodd, 'Musical Works as Eternal Types', *British Journal of Aesthetics*, vol. 40, no. 4 (October 2000), pp. 424–440; Julian Dodd, 'Defending Musical Platonism', *British Journal of Aesthetics*, vol. 42, no. 4 (October 2002), pp. 380–402; Julian Dodd, 'Types, Continuants, and the Ontology of Music', *British Journal of Aesthetics*, vol. 44, no. 4 (October 2004), pp. 342–360.

² In the case of mathematical objects, see, for example, Paul Benacerraf, 'Mathematical Truth', *Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 70, no. 19 (November 1973), pp. 661–679.

works to be abstract objects. If musical works are abstract objects, which cannot enter into causal relations, then how can we refer to musical works or know anything about them? Worse, how can any of our musical experiences be experiences of musical works? Perhaps there are satisfactory answers to these awkward questions.³ But it would be nice to be able to sidestep the questions altogether. One way to do that would be to take musical works to be concrete objects.

In this paper, we defend a theory according to which musical works are concrete objects. In particular, the theory that we defend takes musical works to be fusions of performances. This theory is one on which musical works perdure, so we call it ‘Perdurantism about Musical Works’. In section II, we present Perdurantism about Musical Works. In Sections III–V, we defend Perdurantism about Musical Works from a series of objections, the first two of which are raised by Julian Dodd in a recent paper⁴ and the last of which is suggested by some comments of his in an earlier paper.⁵

II. PERDURANTISM ABOUT MUSICAL WORKS

Musical works *persist*: that is, they exist at more than one time. For example, Vaughan Williams’s *Fantasia on a Theme by Thomas Tallis* existed in 1984, and the *Fantasia* exists now, so the *Fantasia* persists. According to Perdurantism about Musical Works, musical works persist by *perduring*: that is, by having different temporal parts at every time at which they exist. A temporal part of a musical work x at a time t is something that exists only at t , that is a part of x at t , and that overlaps at t everything that is a part of x at t .⁶ For example, the *Fantasia* has a temporal part in 1984, and the *Fantasia* has a distinct temporal part now. According to one version of Perdurantism about Musical Works, both of these temporal parts are performances of the *Fantasia*.⁷ These performances are related, via the appropriate continuity relation for musical works, to other performances of the *Fantasia*.

³ Such answers might begin by arguing that we can causally interact with musical works even if they are abstract objects. See Ben Caplan and Carl Matheson, ‘Can a Musical Work Be Created?’, *British Journal of Aesthetics* vol. 44, no. 2 (April 2004), pp. 113–134, at pp. 115–122.

⁴ Dodd, ‘Types, Continuants, and the Ontology of Music’.

⁵ Dodd, ‘Musical Works as Eternal Types’.

⁶ x overlaps y at t if and only if there is a z such that (i) z is a part of x at t and (ii) z is a part of y at t . For a more careful definition of a temporal part, see Theodore Sider, *Four-Dimensionalism: An Ontology of Persistence and Time* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), pp. 55–62.

⁷ See Peter Alward, ‘The Spoken Work’, *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, vol. 62, no. 4 (Fall 2004), pp. 331–337. A different version of Perdurantism about Musical Works, according to which copies of the score and recordings might also be parts of a musical work, is mentioned in Caplan and Matheson, ‘Can a Musical Work Be Created?’, p. 133.

Although Perdurantism about Musical Works is not a standard view about how musical works persist, it is analogous to a fairly standard view about how persons persist.⁸ According to what we can call ‘Perdurantism about Persons’, persons persist by perduring. For example, Keanu has a temporal part in 1984, and Keanu has a distinct temporal part now. Both of these temporal parts are *person stages*: that is, momentary, person-like objects. These person stages are related, via the appropriate continuity relation for persons, to other Keanu stages.

III. THE OBJECTION FROM PERCEPTION

Suppose that Uma listened to a performance of the *Fantasia* yesterday. According to Perdurantism about Musical Works, Uma heard a proper temporal part of the *Fantasia*, which is not all of it. But one might think that, when Uma listened to a performance of the *Fantasia* yesterday, she heard all of it. Dodd raises this objection:

[I]f a performance is a temporal part of a work, it follows that it is impossible for an audience at such a performance to hear the work in its entirety. Any given performance of the *Fantasia* is but a temporal part of the work, and to have heard the whole piece would have required an audience member to have audited all of its constituent temporal parts.⁹

Let us call this ‘The Objection from Perception’.

In reply to The Objection from Perception, a Perdurantist about Musical Works can bite the bullet and say that Uma did not hear all of the *Fantasia* yesterday. We might say ‘Uma heard all of the *Fantasia* yesterday’, but strictly speaking that is false; what is true is ‘Uma heard all of a performance of the *Fantasia* yesterday’. Had Uma walked out halfway through the performance, she would not have heard all of a performance of the *Fantasia* yesterday. Rather, she would have heard a proper part of a performance of the *Fantasia* yesterday. When we say ‘Uma heard all of the *Fantasia* yesterday’, that is the sort of scenario that we intend to exclude. What distinguishes a proper part of a performance of the *Fantasia* from an entire performance of the *Fantasia* is that

⁸ See, for example, David Lewis, ‘Survival and Identity’, in Amelie O. Rorty (ed.), *The Identities of Persons*, Topics in Philosophy 3 (Berkeley: University of California Press), pp. 17–40 (reprinted [with postscripts] in David Lewis, *Philosophical Papers*, vol. 1 [New York: Oxford U.P., 1983], pp. 55–77); Mark Heller, *The Ontology of Physical Objects: Four-Dimensional Hunks of Matter*, Cambridge Studies in Philosophy (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1990).

⁹ Dodd, ‘Types, Continuants, and the Ontology of Music’, p. 353.

only the latter is related via the continuity relation for musical works to other performances of the *Fantasia*. It would be nice to know which relation, exactly, the continuity relation for musical works is. (We imagine that it will have something to do with structural similarity or causal connections.) But a Perdurantist about Musical Works can say that that question need not be settled before one adopts the view—just as a Perdurantist about Persons can say that the question of which relation, exactly, the continuity relation for persons is (does it have to do with spatiotemporal continuity, psychological continuity, or both?) need not be settled before one adopts the view.

Alternatively, a Perdurantist about Musical Works can say that, in virtue of hearing one of its temporal parts, Uma did hear all of the *Fantasia* yesterday. To motivate her claim that Uma heard all of the *Fantasia* in virtue of hearing one of its temporal parts, a Perdurantist about Musical Works can appeal to Dodd's discussion of his view. On Dodd's view, the *Fantasia* is an abstract type, and the performance that Uma heard is a concrete token of that type.¹⁰ Dodd's view faces a version of The Objection from Perception: when Uma listened to the performance of the *Fantasia* yesterday, she heard a performance (a token), which is distinct from the *Fantasia* itself (the type). Dodd responds to The Objection from Perception by relying on an analogy with what Quine calls 'deferred ostension'.¹¹ In cases of deferred ostension, an occurrence of a demonstrative refers to one object in virtue of being associated with a demonstration that demonstrates another object. For example, if you point at a copy of Quine's *Word and Object* and say 'That book was published in 1960', the occurrence of the demonstrative 'that book' refers to *Word and Object* (the type) in virtue of being associated with a demonstration—namely, your pointing gesture—that demonstrates a copy of *Word and Object* (a token). Similarly, in cases of what we can call 'deferred perception', one perceives one object in virtue of perceiving another object. For example, one might perceive the *Fantasia* (the type) in virtue of perceiving a performance of it (a token). A Perdurantist about Musical Works can say that, if in cases of deferred perception one can hear a type in virtue of hearing one of its tokens, then in cases of deferred perception one can also hear a whole in virtue of hearing one of its parts.

But perhaps appealing to deferred perception allows Dodd to reply to The Objection from Perception without allowing a Perdurantist about Musical

¹⁰ Dodd, 'Musical Works as Eternal Types', 'Defending Musical Platonism', and 'Types, Continuants, and the Ontology of Music'.

¹¹ Willard van Orman Quine, 'Ontological Relativity', *Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 65, no. 7 (4 April 1968), pp. 185–212, at p. 194 (reprinted in Willard van Orman Quine, *Ontological Relativity and Other Essays* [New York: Columbia U.P., 1969], pp. 26–68). See Dodd, 'Types, Continuants, and the Ontology of Music', pp. 353–354.

Works to reply to that objection.¹² For perhaps deferred perception is subject to the following principle.

The Presence Principle

One can perceive all of an entity x at a time t in virtue of perceiving an appropriately related entity y at t only if x is ‘wholly present’ at t .

According to Perdurantism about Musical Works, the *Fantasia* is not wholly present at every time at which it exists, since not all of its temporal parts are located at the same time. So, if it were true, The Presence Principle would prevent a Perdurantist about Musical Works from saying that Uma heard all of the *Fantasia* in virtue of hearing one of its temporal parts. But, if types are wholly present at every time at which they exist, then, according to Dodd’s view, the *Fantasia* is wholly present at every time at which it exists. So, if it were true, The Presence Principle would not prevent Dodd from saying that Uma heard all of the *Fantasia* in virtue of hearing one of its tokens.

But The Presence Principle has not been independently argued for, and it is not clear why a Perdurantist about Musical Works must accept it. More generally, a Perdurantist about Musical Works can say that she is no worse off here than a Perdurantist about Persons is. Perdurantism about Persons faces a version of The Objection from Perception: when Uma looked at Keanu yesterday, Uma saw a proper temporal part of Keanu, which is not all of him. In reply to The Objection from Perception, a Perdurantist about Persons can bite the bullet and say that Uma did not see all of the Keanu yesterday. (We might say ‘Uma saw all of Keanu yesterday’, but strictly speaking that is false; what is true is ‘Uma saw all of a proper temporal part of Keanu yesterday’.) Alternatively, a Perdurantist about Persons can deny The Presence Principle and say that Uma saw all of Keanu in virtue of seeing one of his temporal parts. If either of these replies is available to a Perdurantist about Persons, then a Perdurantist about Musical Works can also reply to The Objection from Perception.

IV. THE OBJECTION FROM SPATIALLY SCATTERED TEMPORAL PARTS

Suppose that two performances of the *Fantasia* occur simultaneously in 1984 in distinct spatial locations. Both performances are parts of the *Fantasia*’s temporal part in 1984 (since the *Fantasia*’s temporal part in 1984 overlaps everything that is a part of the *Fantasia* in 1984, and both performances are parts of the *Fantasia* in 1984). So the *Fantasia*’s temporal part in 1984 is spatially scattered: one part of it—one performance—is in one place, and another part of

¹² Thanks to an anonymous referee here.

it—the other performance—is in another place. But one might think that a performance of a musical work is always a temporal part of that work, never something that is merely a proper part of a spatially scattered temporal part of that work. Let us call this ‘The Objection from Spatially Scattered Temporal Parts’.

In reply to The Objection from Spatially Scattered Temporal Parts, a Perdurantist about Musical Works can bite the bullet and say that, although in normal cases performances are temporal parts, in exceptional cases performances are merely proper parts of spatially scattered temporal parts. But, the objection might continue, a Perdurantist about Musical Works who says that has to explain why spatially scattered performances are parts of the *Fantasia*’s temporal part in 1984. Dodd raises this worry:

[W]e have been given no explanation of the nature of the temporal part that is supposedly composed of, say, a performance in London and another in Sydney. To be sure, a jacket located in London and a pair of trousers found in Sydney may be parts of a scattered object—namely my suit—but it is unclear why (leaving aside purely pragmatic motives) we should count two spatially discontinuous performances as parts of the same thing in [an] analogous way.¹³

In reply, a Perdurantist about Musical Works can say that both performances are parts of the *Fantasia* in 1984, because both are related to other performances of the *Fantasia* via the continuity relation for musical works; and, by definition, the *Fantasia*’s temporal part in 1984 overlaps everything that is a part of the *Fantasia* in 1984. (Again, although one might want to know more about which relation, exactly, the continuity relation for musical works is, a Perdurantist about Musical Works can say that that question need not be settled before one adopts the view.)

But, the objection might continue, the notion of a temporal part of a musical work is parasitic on the notion of a musical work, so it makes no sense to say that the temporal part of a work is sometimes an entity of one kind (a performance), sometimes an entity of another kind (a fusion of spatially scattered performances).¹⁴ In reply, a Perdurantist about Musical Works can say that, even if the notion of a musical-work stage is parasitic on the notion of a musical work, the notion of a temporal part of a musical work is not. The notion of a temporal part of a musical work comes mainly from mereology: the temporal part of a musical work x at a time t is something that exists only at t , that is a part of x at t , and that overlaps at t everything that is a part of x at t . By contrast, the notion of a musical-work stage might be parasitic on the notion

¹³ Dodd, ‘Types, Continuants, and the Ontology of Music’, p. 354.

¹⁴ Thanks to an anonymous referee here.

of a musical work: a musical-work stage is a momentary, musical-work-like entity. So, even if it makes no sense to say that musical-work stages are sometimes entities of one kind, sometimes entities of another, it does not follow that it makes no sense to say that the temporal parts of a musical work are sometimes entities of one kind, sometimes entities of another. And a Perdurantist about Musical Works can say that, although the temporal parts of a musical work are not always of the same kind (sometimes they are performances, sometimes they are fusions of spatially scattered performances), musical-work stages are always of the same kind (they are always performances).

The distinction between stages and temporal parts that the Perdurantist about Musical Works relies on here is not *ad hoc*. Suppose that Keanu enters into a time-travel machine today and travels back to 1984. Younger Keanu—who is nowhere near a time-travel machine—and older Keanu—who is standing beside a time-travel machine—are both person stages: they are both momentary, person-like objects. But neither is a temporal part of Keanu. Rather, each is a proper spatial part of a temporal part of Keanu. (They are both parts of Keanu, because they are related to Keanu's stages at other times via the continuity relation for persons; and, by definition, Keanu's temporal part in 1984 overlaps everything that is a part of Keanu in 1984.) At other times, Keanu's stages are temporal parts; but, in 1984, Keanu's stages are proper parts of his spatially scattered temporal part.¹⁵ Admittedly, time-travel cases are far-fetched. But, as long as they are conceivable, there is independent reason to distinguish stages and temporal parts, which is what the Perdurantist about Musical Works needs.

V. THE OBJECTION FROM MODAL CONSTANCY

According to Perdurantism about Musical Works, the *Fantasia* is a fusion of all of its performances. But one might think that fusions are *modally constant*: no fusion could have had different, or more, or fewer parts than it actually does. If so, then the *Fantasia* could not have had different, or more, or fewer performances than it actually does. But one might think that the *Fantasia* could have had different, or more, or fewer performances than it actually does. Dodd raises this problem for the view that musical works are sets (rather than fusions) of performances:

Sets, unlike types, are *constructed* out of their instances, from which it follows that a set has its members (or lack of them) essentially; and it is this which tells against

¹⁵ See Sider, *Four-Dimensionalism*, p. 101. See also David Lewis, 'The Paradoxes of Time Travel', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 13, no. 2 (April 1976), pp. 145–152 (reprinted in David Lewis, *Philosophical Papers*, vol. 2 [New York: Oxford U.P., 1986], pp. 67–80).

the set-theoretical approach to the ontology of musical works. For while a set of sound-sequence-occurrences has its occurrences essentially, *In This House, On This Morning* does not: the piece could have had a fewer or greater number of occurrences than it has in fact had.¹⁶

If the reason that sets of performances are modally constant is that they are constructed out of performances, and if fusions of performances are also constructed out of performances, then fusions of performances will also be modally constant. Let us call this ‘The Objection from Modal Constancy’.

In reply to The Objection from Modal Constancy, a Perdurantist about Musical Works can adopt a counterpart-theoretic account of *de re* modality, according to which what modal properties a musical work has depends on what non-modal properties its counterparts have in other possible worlds.¹⁷ There are many counterpart relations, and which counterpart relation is relevant depends on the conversational context.¹⁸ In a conversational context in which we use ‘the *Fantasia*’, one counterpart relation—namely, a musical-work counterpart relation—will be relevant; whereas, in a conversational context in which we use ‘a fusion of performances’, another counterpart relation—namely, a fusion counterpart relation—will be relevant, even if the *Fantasia* is identical with a fusion of performances. On this view, it is true that the *Fantasia* could have had different, or more, or fewer performances than it actually does, because in some other possible world a musical-work counterpart of the *Fantasia* has different, or more, or fewer performances than the *Fantasia* actually does. On this view, it is also true that a fusion of performances could not have had different, or more, or fewer performances as parts than it actually does, because in no possible world does a fusion counterpart of the fusion of performances have different, or more, or fewer performances as parts.¹⁹

To some, reliance on a counterpart-theoretic account of *de re* modality is an insuperable cost. But a Perdurantist about Musical Works need not rely on a counterpart-theoretic account of *de re* modality. Instead, a Perdurantist about Musical Works can adopt what we can call ‘Hyper-Perdurantism about Musical Works’, according to which musical works are fusions of performances in this world and their counterparts in other possible worlds, and what

¹⁶ Dodd, ‘Musical Works as Eternal Types’, pp. 424–425; emphasis in original.

¹⁷ See, for example, David Lewis, ‘Counterpart Theory and Quantified Modal Logic’, *Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 65, no. 5 (7 March 1968), pp. 113–126 (reprinted [with postscripts] in Lewis, *Philosophical Papers*, vol. 1, pp. 26–46).

¹⁸ See, for example, David Lewis, ‘Counterparts of Persons and Their Bodies’, *Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 68, no. 7 (8 April 1971), pp. 203–211 (reprinted in Lewis, *Philosophical Papers*, vol. 1, pp. 47–54); David Lewis, *On the Plurality of Worlds* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1986), pp. 254–263.

¹⁹ See Caplan and Matheson, ‘Can a Musical Work Be Created?’, p. 133.

modal properties a musical work has depends on what non-modal properties its parts in other possible worlds have. Think of a musical work's parts in other possible worlds as its *modal parts*. Just as Perdurantists about Musical Works say that a musical work has a distinct temporal part at every time at which it exists, Hyper-Perdurantists about Musical Works say that a musical work has a distinct modal part at every world at which it exists. On this view, the *Fantasia* could have had different, or more, or fewer performances than it actually does, because in some other possible world a modal part of the *Fantasia* has different, or more, or fewer performances than the *Fantasia*'s modal part in the actual world does.

Those who think that reliance on a counterpart-theoretic account of *de re* modality is an insuperable cost are unlikely to be persuaded of the merits of Hyper-Perdurantism about Musical Works. But, fortunately, a Perdurantist about Musical Works need not adopt Hyper-Perdurantism about Musical Works either. Instead, a Perdurantist about Musical Works can reject the claim that fusions are modally constant. In classical mereology, something x is a fusion if and only if there are some y s such that x is a fusion of the y s; and x is a fusion of the y s if and only if each of the y s is a part of x and every part of x overlaps one of the y s.²⁰ Everything is a fusion.²¹ For example, you are a fusion of some subatomic particles, since each of those particles is a part of you and every part of you overlaps one of them. But not everything is modally constant. For example, you are not modally constant, since you could have different, or more, or fewer subatomic particles as parts than you actually do. So not every fusion is modally constant.²²

If we like, we can distinguish thick and thin fusions. *Thin fusions* are the fusions of classical mereology. To be a thin fusion of some parts does not require much: some object x is a thin fusion of the y s just in case each of the y s is a part of x and every part of x overlaps one of the y s. *Thick fusions*, by contrast, are not the fusions of classical mereology. To be a thick fusion of some parts requires

²⁰ See, for example, David Lewis, *Parts of Classes* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991), pp. 72–74.

²¹ For every x , x is a part of x . (Parthood is reflexive.) And, for every x , every part of x overlaps x . (Suppose that y is a part of x . In that case, y is a part of x and—by reflexivity— y is a part of y . So there is a z —namely, y —such that z is a part of x and z is a part of y . So y overlaps x .) So every x is such that there are some y s—namely, x itself—such that each of the y s is a part of x and every part of x overlaps each of the y s. (Some y s are ϕ is usually taken to be true even if there is exactly one y , provided that it has the property that ϕ picks out.) So every x is a fusion.

²² Ben Caplan and Bob Bright make the mistake of taking fusions to be modally constant. (See Ben Caplan and Bob Bright, 'Fusions and Ordinary Physical Objects', *Philosophical Studies* Vol. 125, no. 1 (July 2005), pp. 61–83.) Caplan and Matheson repeat the mistake. (See Caplan and Matheson, 'Can a Musical Work Be Created?', p. 133.) Thanks to John Hawthorne and Kris McDaniel for discussion on this point. We hope that one of us will say more about this elsewhere.

something more: some object x is a thick fusion of the y s only if x is, in some sense, ‘individuated by’ the y s.²³ A Perdurantist about Musical Works can grant that a thick fusion of some parts could not have had different, or more, or fewer parts. But, she can say, she is not claiming that a musical work is a thick fusion of performances, so she is not committed to the claim that a musical work could not have had different, or more, or fewer performances than it actually does.

More generally, a Perdurantist about Musical Works can say that she is no worse off here than a Perdurantist about Persons is. Perdurantism about Persons faces a version of The Objection from Modal Constancy. According to Perdurantism about Persons, Keanu is a fusion of all of his temporal parts. If fusions are modally constant, then Keanu could not have had different, or more, or fewer temporal parts than he actually does. Assuming that temporal parts are *modally inductile* and *modally incompressible*—to use Peter van Inwagen’s phrases²⁴—and hence could not have had longer or shorter durations than they actually do, it follows that Keanu could not have existed for a longer or shorter period than he actually does.²⁵ In reply to The Objection from Modal Constancy, a Perdurantist about Persons can adopt a counterpart-theoretic account of *de re* modality and say that Keanu could have existed for a longer or shorter period than he actually does, because in some other possible world a counterpart of Keanu exists for a longer or shorter period than Keanu actually does.²⁶ Alternatively, a Perdurantist about Persons can adopt what we can call ‘Hyper-Perdurantism about Persons’ and say that Keanu could have existed for a longer or shorter period than he actually does, because in some other possible world a modal part of Keanu exists for a longer or shorter period than the modal part of Keanu in the actual world does.²⁷ Or a Perdurantist about Persons can reject the claim that fusions are modally constant. So, even if he is a fusion of temporal parts, Keanu could have had different, or more, or fewer

²³ Theodore Sider draws a parallel distinction between ‘loaded’ and ‘unloaded’ senses of ‘fusion’ and argues that fusions (in the unloaded sense) are not modally constant. See Theodore Sider, ‘Replies to Gallois, Hirsch and Markosian’, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. 68, no. 3 (May 2004), pp. 674–687, at pp. 676–677.

²⁴ Peter van Inwagen, ‘Four-Dimensional Objects’, *Noûs*, vol. 24, no. 2 (April 1990), pp. 245–255, at p. 253 (reprinted in Peter van Inwagen, *Ontology, Identity, and Modality: Essays in Metaphysics*, Cambridge Studies in Philosophy [Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 2001], pp. 111–121).

²⁵ See, for example, David Wiggins, *Sameness and Substance* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), p. 168.

²⁶ See, for example, Lewis, ‘Counterparts of Persons and Their Bodies’; Harold W. Noonan, ‘The Case for Perdurantism’, in Gerhard Preyer and Frank Siebelt (eds), *Reality and Humean Supervenience: Essays on the Philosophy of David Lewis*, (Lanham, MD: Rowman, 2001), pp. 123–139, at pp. 130–132; Caplan and Bright, ‘Fusions and Ordinary Physical Objects’.

²⁷ See, for example, Brian Weatherson, ‘Modal Parts’, available at <http://tar.weatherson.net/archives/000649.html>.

temporal parts than he actually does and hence could have existed for a longer or shorter period than he actually does. If one of these replies is available to a Perdurantist about Persons, then a Perdurantist about Musical Works can also reply to The Objection from Modal Constancy.²⁸

Ben Caplan, Department of Philosophy, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada R3T 2N2. Email: ben_caplan@umanitoba.ca

Carl Matheson, Department of Philosophy, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada R3T 2N2. Email: matheso@cc.umanitoba.ca

²⁸ For comments and discussion, thanks from both authors to Sam Cowling, other students in the second author's Ontology of Art seminar at the University of Manitoba in Fall 2004, Peter Lamarque, Dave McElhoes, Tim Schroeder, and an anonymous referee. For funding in the form of a Standard Research Grant (410-2004-0702), thanks from the first author to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC).