

Abstract: There are two sorts of views about the relationship between parts and wholes: Either the parts that compose the whole are literally identical to the whole, or they are not. Most mereologists claim the latter. I, however, will claim that the parts that compose any whole are literally identical to the whole. To support my thesis I will (i) invoke a notion of relative counting and (ii) utilize a logic and language of plurals. My strategy will be to take the arguments against the claim that composition is identity and show why these arguments are ineffective, provided we've got a notion of relative counting and a language of plurals. If I am successful, then I will not only have shown how composition can be identity, but also how a mereologist could plausibly maintain that her thesis is truly ontologically innocent.