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ABSTRACT
Any discourse carries commitment to necessarily existing objects or ontology before laying and establishing the ground for communication concordant between actor and reactor. Any intelligent being only able to lock into an interaction by grounding this ontological commitment beneath if there exist an intentionality. This paper intended to reveal the beingness of existence for ontological commitment is only possible with intentionality. The practical linguistic based evidences as ontological stances will be given to strengthen and to further specify the argument.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Analysis of nature should start with its perceivable properties, and proceed from them, rather than starting with any purely mental abstractions or with intuited or a priori data. Human social dynamics are critically dependent on the ability to correctly attribute beliefs, goals, and percepts to other people.

In a discourse as Agustin Rayo[4] stated, think of a sentence’s truth-conditions as demands that the truth of the sentence imposes on the world. A sentence’s ontological commitments are to describe some of the demands that the sentence’s truth imposes on the world-those demands that concern ontology. Ontological commitments carried by a sentence are an aspect of its truth-conditions. Any sentence whatsoever carries commitment to necessarily existing objects. The demands imposed on the world by a sentence’s truth are simply the sentence’s truth-conditions. So one’s understanding of the former should be informed by one’s understanding of the latter.

Although Agustin Rayo[4] work on ontological commitment is to bring the significant to the relative position of the demand assigned to a sentence truth condition in the space of possible demands, but the work could be improvised with framing the object existence and onto-presupposition of an observer who is the determiner or the creator of space of possible demands.

Differ from the existing definitions, in this paper the ontological commitment has been redefined as a process of laying a prior intentional ground, committing ontology into intention by framing the existence and onto-presupposition in a discourse.

2. INTENTIONALITY
An Ontological Commitment allows an actor or a reactor to understand the actions and expressions of an interaction within an intentional or goal-directed framework is called the intentional intentionality(the term is given by Husserl [6]). Only relay of intention make possible two different elements locked into an interaction. Ontological Commitment never takes place or is not possible without intentionality. The spatio-temporal characteristics of objects and events only can be determined and defined under an intentional stance.

This intentionality of spatial characteristic of objects can be postulated with Local Reference Frame (LRF) and Global Reference Frame (GRF) concepts.

The space in the vicinity of an intentional agent(Being) or an actor organized into near, afar and intermediate. This special organization with reference to the self-identified reference point of the agent constitute what can be called a Local Reference Frame (LRF).While all these demonstratives are similar in that they orientate the reactors towards an object in the vicinity (or self-identified reference region of space) of the actor, they differ in that they orientate towards different regions of space.
Example:
i) “That bird” (With reference of personal region of space which is my body the bird is afar from my region).

ii) “This bird” (With reference of personal region of space which is my body the bird is near to my region).

As distinct from LRF, GRF is a frame (the reference region of space is collectively agreed) common to the actor and the reactors.

Example:
i) “The bird” (Under the collectively agreed reference region of space, the bird can be identified).

Only through intentional stance the temporal extension can be realized and measured. But as what Whitehead’s: theory of time presupposed “There can be no time apart from space, and no space apart from time. Space exhibits the order and relations of events within a present while time exhibits the relation of other events to those in a given present. Time is a succession of extended presents which constitute real extended “strata” of nature. There is a sharp distinction between the reality of a present and the reality of a past or future. And no present can be instantaneous; its existence requires its temporal extension” [2].

Whitehead’s idea was backed up by Leibiniz work that is stating “space is nothing but the order of co-existent objects; time nothing but the order of successive events” [10].

Therefore the passage of time without spatial extension is not directly measurable. Intention (as an Observer) will constitute the order and directions of events under the spatial extension to measure the temporal extensions of Time.

Once a thing has started to exist, it never stops and it would be seen as traveling through time, collecting up entities into its ontology as it proceeds.

The phenomena of temporal extension for any intelligent beings are made possible by Ontological Commitment of that being. An intelligent being is ontologically committed if the being is able to conceptualize the intended world structures and then onto presuppose the reality by verbalize the conception using a language.

3. ONTO PRESUPPOSITION

Onto Presupposition can be categorized into two components.
i) Ontology – Atomic axiom or assumption of existence of phenomena. The truth of a phenomenon is assumed cognized by the agent as a prior knowledge. The ontological properties of a indivisible phenomenon will be defined.

ii) Presupposition - Articulation of historical perspective of an agent. Identify the presumption or prior understanding of an agent about a subject matter for a particular context. Let the agent to get hold to its contextual stand on subject matters. Presupposition is knowledge based archival processes.

The analysis on technical incorporation of presupposition and its functionality in the discourse analysis will not be presented in this paper. But the intentional ontological existence of an intelligent Being will be further investigated in the following section.

4. ONTOLOGY

Formal ontology is concerned, not with the specification of the constituents (individuals, properties and relations) in a particular domain or region of the world, but with axiomatization of the most general, pervading categories that partition and shape reality as a whole. The Ontological system is not a classification of elements ordered according to the observer’s own code of values[9]. An Ontology System is a physical system defined by an epistemology associated with an external Observer. It consists of a set of objects and a set of interactions between these and also with a surrounding environment, which includes the Observer [9].

The central tenet of ontological commitment of an intelligent being is to define the existents of element and recognize the relationship between existential presupposition and the truth value of proposition.

Teyvasilayar[14] in his speech linguistics commented that one could not reply in any mode to question regarding a non-existent object. The example he consider is:

“Is the flower in the sky good or bad?”

To say anything at all by way of reply to this question is to commit an error. To say either ‘The flower in the sky is good’ or ‘The flower in the sky is bad’ or even ‘The flower in the sky is neither good nor bad’ as and answer to the question posed will be a linguistic error of some sort.

Therefore existence is a perfectly meaningful predicate [7] that makes a distinction between objects since it ascribes a property that things fail to have [13].

Recognizing existence as a predicate has already obliged us to allow for both existing and non-existing objects.

By contrast, Immanuel Kant had stated existence is not a predicate which can be ascribes to a collective of properties. Existence is not a property of individual. Immanuel Kant argument was “if we can arbitrarily add existence as a defining property for an individual, there seems to be no limit to what we can prove to exist.” [5]

The apparent paradoxicality of non-existence and predicate for existence has been allayed by Lue Schneider by introducing the formal property of mere being or subsistence, defined as counterpart theory which is not confined to an properties of an individual [11].

Let the basic system, be an ordered pair
\[
<\text{D, R}>
\]

Where D is a domain or entities, R is a relation on D.

An object x ∈ D subsists iff there is something identical to it. Let R be a relation and R ⊆ D x D.
The enigma of existence can be resolved only if the entity

How to resolve the enigma of existence?

The enigma of existence can be resolved only if the entity

conforms to an identical structure which is invariable

compound of thoughts like permanence which is a product of

history, firmness and power. Therefore the foundation

of existence is the inner movement of the intention (the mind)

itself[16].

An entity can be only identified and subsist with another entity in a spatio-temporal dimension if there is an intention (an observer). As Whitehead[3] noted, “the way a physical entity is

classified depends on the intention or subjective form of some

perceiving agent (an Observer)".

Only intention will be able to determine an identity of an events or an object state under the spatio-temporal extension because the intention (as an Observer) is the constituent of order for time and the reference for space. If space is “projection” of intra and internal properties of substances and if the property relations of substances lead to spatial relation then the present of intention (as a observer) is a compulsory to subsist, and to recognize the spatial relation of any existence.

“The intention is not a classification of elements ordered according to the observer’s own code of values. It is not an order which results from the quantification of phenomena, nor an order whose elements function like a living organism, nor is it a system of elements. Rather, it is a system of

relations between elements directed towards the achievement of a particular effect, namely: the function of the system (a relational entity)”[9].

Therefore the existence of an entity from ontological commitment perspective is been further extended based on Lue Scheneider work [11] and redefined as below.

Let the basic system, be an ordered pair

\[
< \mathbb{D}, \mathbb{I}, \mathbb{R} > \quad \text{Eq. (3)}
\]

Where \( \mathbb{D} \) is a domain or entities, \( \mathbb{I} \) a set of nonempty finite intentions and \( \mathbb{R} \) is a relation on \( \mathbb{D} \) and \( \mathbb{I} \).

**Definition 1.0:** An entity \( x \) which is \( x \in \mathbb{D} \) under an intention \( I \) (an Observer) which is \( I \in \mathbb{I} \) **subsists** iff there exist something logically identical to \( x \) for that intention (1).

\[
\text{Exist}(x, I) : \exists y \in \mathbb{D}, y \equiv x \quad \text{Eq. (4)}
\]

= : Logically identical to

**Definition 2.0:** Let \( L_1 \) be a local intention such that \( L_1 \in \mathbb{I} \) and integer \( i > 0 \). Let \( G_x \) be global intention such that \( G_x \in \mathbb{I}^o \) and integer \( n > 0 \)

\[
LG(G_x) = \{ L_m \in \mathbb{I} \mid G_x = (L_1, L_2, ..., L_m) \land \forall m \in \mathbb{I} \land m > 0 \} \quad \text{Eq. (5)}
\]

**Definition 3.0:** A relational entity (‘Field’) where \( G_x \in \mathbb{I}^o \) and \( n \geq 1 \) can be defined as

Let \( R^n(G_x) = \{ (a_1, a_2, ..., a_n) \in \mathbb{D}^n | \text{Exist}(a_i, L_1) \land \text{Exist}(a_{i+1}, L_2) \land ... \land \text{Exist}(a_n, L_n) \land \forall l_n \in LG(G_x) \} \quad \text{Eq. (6)}
\]

\( R^n(G_x) \) is a set of relevant states of affairs of such domain which will be called field(\( F \)).

“A field (a relational entity) cannot be substance alone because in these terms it is a relational form. The system implies the totality; that is to say, the principle which holds that observed phenomena constitute a meaningful set and that it is impossible to understand then outside this context. A relational entity (‘field’) comes into ‘actual existence’ from a set of potentials when a realization of it enters the physical time domain. Structural analysis of the phenomenological field of such functions consists of demonstrating that there is an order (‘field’) in the underlying configuration which defines it as a singular and variable entity. The configuration does not belong to the event field, but may be directly or indirectly perceived through it

**Example:** A relational \( R^2(G_x) \) is a field where \( I_1, I_2 \in \mathbb{I} \), \( G_x \in \mathbb{I}^o \) and \( x, y \in \mathbb{D}, n > 1 \) relating

\[
\text{Exist}(x, I_1) R^2(G_x) \text{Exist}(y, I_2) \iff \{ (y, x, G_x) \in \mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{I} \mid \text{Exist}(x, I_1) \land \text{Exist}(y, I_2) \land I_1 \in LG(G_x) \land I_2 \in LG(G_x) \} \quad \text{Eq. (7)}
\]

**Definition 4.0:** If there exist an anti-x entity which is anti-x \( \in \mathbb{D} \), for an entity \( x \) which is \( x \in \mathbb{D} \) under an intention (I) (an Observer) where \( I \in LG(G_x) \) and \( G_x \in \mathbb{I}^o \) then they must exist and be subsisted by a relation y which is \( y \in R^n(G_x) \) (where here \( n=2 \)) called field y for an intention (\( G_x \)). In another word...
there must exist a common field \( y \) to relate an entity \( x \) and entity \( \text{anti-x} \) for an intention \( (G_x) \).

\[ \exists \text{Anti-Exist}(x, I) \land \text{Exist}(x, I) \iff \exists y, \text{Anti-Exist}(x, I) \land \text{Exist}(x, I) \quad \text{Eq. (8.0)} \]

Therefore, there is impossible an entity and anti entity to exist without a common field \( y \) connecting both.

The realization of “Being-in-existence” is possible if only the present of “intentionality” can be admitted into ontological stances.

5. ONTOLOGICAL STANCES

Ontological stance can be defined as all the possible relational stances(fields) that can be realized for an existence of entity under the “pronouncement” of an intentionality. According to Tolkappiyar (3rd B.C. century) [15] a linguist, the logically identical form of any entity to another (by the field) can be linguistically classified into seven fundamental notions of ontological stances, eliminating his 8th classification which is pure linguistic based expression called Vocative. With moderation these seven stances will be used as a concrete evidence to support the argument of intentional existence and will be called as Case-Distinguishers (CD). In order to state that an entity is in a particular-form it is not necessary to know what kind of entity it is or even of what category it is. The CD is independent of identity and category of an entity. The existence of instances of entities with another are purely relational under the direction of an intention (as a field of standing under by the entities).

If there exist something called \( y \) logically identical to \( x \) for that intention \( (I) \) where \( I \in \mathrm{LG}(G_x) \) and \( G_x \in F \), then there must be a field \( R^2(G_x) \) among one of the form of CD.

1. CD 1: Nominative, Agentive & c

**Nominative:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) as an object expressing the subject of an action (verb).

**Agentive:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) as a doer of an action.

*Example:* “The tree is growing”

(The tree is the subject of an action- The tree is “nominatively” or “agentively” identical to itself)

2. CD2: Objective, Factitive, Goal & c

**Objective:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) which will be a recipient of the action of another. The action can be a creation, a destruction, an achievement, a separation, an analogy (similarity) and a possession.

**Factitive:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) which having a sense of receiving a result and taking a complement as well as an object.

**Goal:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) which become goal of an action.

*Example:* “The tree can be destroyed by the man.”

(The tree will be a recipient of the action—The tree is “objectively”, “factitively” or “goaly” identical to another entity)

3. CD3: Instrumental, Causative, Sociative & c

**Causative:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) as a causal agent (instructor or builder) of another.

**Instrumental:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) indicating a means or instrument to another.

**Sociative:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) indicating event of ‘withness’ or ‘commitative’

*Example:*

i) The box was built by that man

(That man is a causal (builder) of another- That man is “causatively” identical to another entity)

ii) The box is made of tree.

(The tree is an instrument to another- The tree is “instrumentally” identical to another entity)

iii) He came with Mr. Mandela

(He is in the event of ‘withness’ – He is “sociatively” identical to another entity)

4. CD4: Accusative

**Accusative:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) in an action or the goal of motion of another. The goal of motion can be donation, “beingness”, qualification etc.

*Example: A man can pour water to a tree.

(The tree is the goal of motion of another – The tree is “accusatively” identical to another entity)

5. CD5: Relative

**Relative:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) in relation to another. The case can be

- the one can be separated or eliminated from another
- the one can be similar or comparable to another
- the one can become boundary of another
- the one is a caused of another

*Example: The fruit can fall off from tree.

(The fruit can be separated from the tree- The tree is “relatively” identical to another entity)

6. CD6: Genitive, Possessive & c

**Possessive:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) in possession or close association of others or to itself. The possession can be

- Composition – dictates the constituent parts which cannot be separated from the entity.
- Aggregation - dictates the constituent parts which can be separated from the entity.

*Example: The beauty of the tree is admirable.

(The tree is in possession of beauty—The tree is “possessively” identical to itself)

7. CD7: Locative of space(place) or time

**Locative of space(place) or time:** Denoting or indicating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) is in locative of space or time

*Example: The birds can build nest on the tree.

(The tree is a place for the nest- The tree is “locatively” or “spatially” identical to another entity)

This Tolkappiyar [15] classification of “objects of affairs in the world or field ” was reflected by John Searle, Dilthey and Husserl with their notion of “Intentionality”.

---

**Example:**

1. **Root:**

   - **Nominative:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) as an object expressing the subject of an action (verb).
   - **Agentive:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) as a doer of an action.

2. **CD4:**

   - **Accusative:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) in an action or the goal of motion of another. The goal of motion can be donation, “beingness”, qualification etc.

3. **CD5:**

   - **Relative:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) in relation to another. The case can be
     - the one can be separated or eliminated from another
     - the one can be similar or comparable to another
     - the one can become boundary of another
     - the one is a caused of another

4. **CD6:**

   - **Possessive:** Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) in possession or close association of others or to itself. The possession can be
     - Composition – dictates the constituent parts which cannot be separated from the entity.
     - Aggregation - dictates the constituent parts which can be separated from the entity.

5. **CD7:**

   - **Locative:** Denoting or indicating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) is in locative of space or time

---

**Notes:**

- **CD1:**
  - Nominative: Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) as an object expressing the subject of an action (verb).
  - Agentive: Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) as a doer of an action.
- **CD2:**
  - Objective: Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) which will be a recipient of the action of another. The action can be a creation, a destruction, an achievement, a separation, an analogy (similarity) and a possession.
  - Factitive: Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) which having a sense of receiving a result and taking a complement as well as an object.
  - Goal: Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) which become goal of an action.
- **CD3:**
  - Causative: Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) as a causal agent (instructor or builder) of another.
  - Instrumental: Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) indicating a means or instrument to another.
  - Sociative: Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) indicating event of ‘withness’ or ‘commitative’
- **CD4:**
  - Accusative: Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) in an action or the goal of motion of another. The goal of motion can be donation, “beingness”, qualification etc.
- **CD5:**
  - Relative: Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) in relation to another. The case can be
    - the one can be separated or eliminated from another
    - the one can be similar or comparable to another
    - the one can become boundary of another
    - the one is a caused of another
- **CD6:**
  - Possessive: Denoting or relating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) in possession or close association of others or to itself. The possession can be
    - Composition – dictates the constituent parts which cannot be separated from the entity.
    - Aggregation - dictates the constituent parts which can be separated from the entity.
- **CD7:**
  - Locative: Denoting or indicating to a case of entity (nouns or pronouns) is in locative of space or time

---

**References:**

1. Tolkappiyar (3rd B.C century) [15]
2. John Searle, Dilthey and Husserl with their notion of “Intentionality”.
6. ACTUAL EXISTENCE

The actual existence is an objective state of existence of an entity not only in the psychological temporal space but in the physical temporal space as well.

The Definition 1.0, \( \text{Exist}(x, I, t) \) is the extension of predicates which not limited to what exists in the actual world, but to what exists in any world. The actual existence is therefore different from existential quantification (“logical or non-actual existence”). Any actual existence of entity can be defined by an observer if the entity is referred using physical temporal reference [8] and we should not forget that the passage of time without spatial extension is not directly measurable.

The time extended ordered system

\[ <D, I, T> \quad \text{Eq. (9)} \]

Where D is a domain space, I a set of intentions and T is a physical time.

**Definition 5.0:** An entity x which is \( x \in D \) has actual existence only if entity x can be referred using physical temporal references for an intention I which is \( I \in I \). The physical temporal will be represented by predicate \( \text{Exist}(x, I, t) \) meaning that x has actual existence at physical time t which is \( t \in T \) for the intention I.

\[ \text{Exist}(x, I, t): \exists y, y \equiv y \quad x \land y \in D \quad \text{Eq. (10)} \]

The notion of identity is a core of defining object subsistence. Identity is related to the problem of distinguishing a specific existence or instance of a certain entity (class) from other existences (instances) of that entity (class) by means of a characteristic property, which is unique for it (that whole existence or instance). An entity may remain same while exhibiting different properties at different times [12]. In order to an entity to exist, that entity must be subsisted by something for an intention (I). After acknowledging the existence of an entity, then that entity will be specifically identified further with collectively or individually ascribed properties.

A rigid property has been defined in Guarino [12] as a property that necessarily holds for all its instances or existences.

- **Rigid properties -** \( \phi \) is a properties that is essential to all its instances. \( \forall x \phi(x) \Rightarrow \phi(x) \)
- **Non-Rigid properties -** \( \phi \) is a properties that is not essential to some of its instances. \( \exists x \phi(x) \land \sim \phi(x) \)
- **Anti-Rigid properties -** \( \phi \) is a properties that is not essential to all its instances. \( \forall x \phi(x) \Rightarrow \neg \phi(x) \)

The rigidity behaviours like rigid, non rigid or anti rigid for an entity, can only be identified based on necessary or optional properties can be held for its various existences or instances.

A.N.Kaplan [0], has corrected Guarino and Welty’s [12] arguments on Identity Condition (IC) or identity criterion for an entity

\( \phi \) be a rigid property and \( \Gamma(x,y,t,t') \) a formula containing x, y are free variables, t, t' are physical time arguments. \( \rho \) is an identity criterion for \( \phi \) if it is a relation of a suitable type such that

\[ \phi(x) \land \phi(y) \Rightarrow (\rho(x, y) \leftrightarrow x = y). \quad \text{Eq. (11)} \]

Finding a \( \rho \) that is both necessary and sufficient for identity is often hard without incorporating existence predicate and time arguments.

We say that \( \phi \) carries the Identity Condition (IC) \( \Gamma \) iff one of the following conditions is verified:\( \Gamma \) is a necessary IC carried by \( \phi \) when (also phrased as “\( \phi \) carries identity condition \( \Gamma \)):

\[ \text{Ex}(x, I, t') \land \text{Ex}(y, I', t') \land x = y \Rightarrow \Gamma(x,y,t,t') \]

Eq. (12)

and is a sufficient identity condition if

\[ \text{Ex}(x, I) \land \phi(x,t) \land \text{Ex}(y, I') \land \phi(y,t') \land \Gamma(x,y,t,t') \Rightarrow x = y \]

Eq. (13)

The Identity Condition for an entity as countered by A.N. Kaplan[1] on Guarino and Welty’s [12] flaw is on entities extensions (denotations) level only and not intensions (connotations) level. The identification of and entity is can be establish for extensions (denotations) level, and collectively can be agreed if rigidity behaviour has been fixed. But for intensions (connotations) level if there is no intention taken into consideration then it is impossible to decipher what has been communicated by another entity.

For example: If an intention (observer) taken into consideration then, \( \phi \) can indicate one of the rigidity behaviours on an entity. The varying intention will determine the entities existential stance subsisted by one of the Case Distinguisher (CD) as a predicate \( \text{Ex}(x, I, t) \). This existential predicate delineate the boundary for a rigidity behaviour (\( \phi \)) of an entity and become deciding factor for the choice of rigidity behaviour (\( \phi \)) of that entity within the contextual aspect.

\[ \text{Ex}(x, I, t) \land \phi(x,t) \land \text{Ex}(y, I,t') \land \phi(y,t') \land \Gamma(x,y,t,t') \Rightarrow x = y \]

The Identity Condition for an entity as countered by A.N. Kaplan[1] on Guarino and Welty’s [12] flaw is on entities extensions (denotations) level only and not intensions (connotations) level. The identification of and entity is can be establish for extensions (denotations) level, and collectively can be agreed if rigidity behaviour has been fixed. But for intensions (connotations) level if there is no intention taken into consideration then it is impossible to decipher what has been communicated by another entity.

There are 2 components in the meaning of expression

i) **Extension** is an object or set of objects referred to, pointed to or indicated by, the expression called denotation. Denotation is a sign of, stand as name or symbol for something. Extensional meaning consists of the members of the class that the term connotes. Let the “\( _e \)” symbol represent extensionally equivalence

Example 1: ‘The morning sun extensionally equivalent to the evening sun’

‘The morning sun’ \( _e \) ‘The evening sun’

Both nouns are identical because both refer to same planet which is sun.

ii) **Intension** is informational content of the expression, as distinct from the set of objects denoted by the expression which is called connotation. Connotation is an idea or feeling which a word invokes in addition to its primary meaning. Intensional meaning consists of the qualities or attributes that the term connotes.
Let the “ =i” symbol represent intentionally equivalence.

Example 1: ‘The morning sun intentionally not equivalent to the evening sun’
‘The morning sun’ ~ =i ‘The evening sun’
Visible around dawn ≠ Visible around sunset
Not mean the same thing but refer to same planet which is sun.

The intensional meaning of an entity serves as the criterion for deciding what the extension consists of. Therefore intension determines extension.

Therefore rigidity behaviours of entities promoted by Guarino[12], are can be used to further classify the prior existing entities only if the Intention of the observer is incorporated to decipher the entities intensions (connotations) and not extensions (denotations) alone.

Definition 6.0: Let φ be a rigid property of concrete things , x,y ∈ D, Gx ∈ F, R2(Gx) is a set of relevant states of affairs or a system,t,t’ ∈ T physical time and Γ(x,y, Gx, t,t’) a formula. We say that φ carries the Identity Condition (IC) Γ iff one of the following conditions is verified: φ carries identity condition Γ when :

(Exist(x, t ) R2(Gx) Exist(y, t’ ) ) ∧φ( x,t ) ∧ φ(y,t’ ) ∧ x=y
⇒Γ(x,y, Gx, t,t’)
and is a sufficient identity condition if

(Exist(x, t ) R2(Gx) Exist(y, t’ ) ) ∧φ( x,t ) ∧ φ(y,t’ ) ∧ Γ(x,y, Gx, t,t’ ) ⇒ x=y

Every cognition evaluation and orientation towards a goal is determined by a purely empirical faculty within the human organism (as an intention). Consequently cognition, evaluation and orientation are only relatively valid in correlation with the intention (in human organism). The subject is no longer linked with its object by the supposition of a universally identical object as identical without the present of intention.

7. CONCLUSION

What we observed in this paper is not the existential entity as it is in itself, but how and inasmuch “the beingness of entities” is defined in the intentionality. Knowledge of ontological commitment would only be possible by laying prior intentional existence to commit ontological stances. Any entity is identical to another in the existence of intentionality (as a field of standing under by the entities). The seven CDs are concrete evidence and classification of ontological stances. The cognition, evaluation and orientation of the existence are only relatively valid and identifiable with the present of intention.
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