

Reviewing your homework:

- The youngest member of Gryffindor is a redhead.
 - There is a youngest member of Gryffindor; and
 - There is only one youngest member of Gryffindor; and
 - That thing is a redhead.
- The president of SUNY Oswego is a woman.
 - There is a president of SUNY Oswego; and
 - There is only one president of SUNY Oswego; and
 - That thing is a woman.

Actually, this would be closer to the logic:

- The youngest member of Gryffindor is a redhead.
 - There is a youngest member of Gryffindor; and
 - **Any youngest member of Gryffindor is that thing;** and
 - That thing is a redhead.
- The president of SUNY Oswego is a woman.
 - There is a president of SUNY Oswego; and
 - **Any president of SUNY Oswego is that thing;** and
 - That thing is a woman.

Elements of our toolkit

- **Intentionality:** being about something. (This term comes from a philosopher named Brentano, who claimed intentionality was the mark of the mental.)
- **Intentional content:** whatever information or semantic value an intentional event or state will have.
- You will mostly be safe assuming that
 - “intentional” is synonymous with “representational”;
 - “intentionality” is synonymous with “representation.”

Elements of our toolkit

- **Indexicals:** elements of our language that change their meaning based upon the context. Examples include “I,” “here,” and “now.”
- **Natural Kind Term:** a term that refers to a kind of material or stuff that occurs in nature. Examples would include: “gold,” “water,” “electrons,” “hydrogen”.... (For contrast, something would not be a natural kind term if it were a proper name – such as “Barak Obama” – or if it referred to a socially constructed thing – such as “democracy.”)

Review: Elements of our toolkit

- **Use/Mention distinction.** Which of these sentences is true?
 1. “Obama” is a name.
 2. Obama is a name.
 3. “Obama” is a vertebrate.
 4. Obama is a vertebrate.

Don’t get sloppy with quote marks!

Use them only for

- quotation,
- scare quotes, or
- to distinguish mention (referring to the language instead of using the language).

Expanding Russell's Theory

- Russell analyzes definite descriptions in such a way that they contain no terms – there are only quantifiers (“There is at least one” and “For all”) and predicates.
- (Russell sometimes proposed that there are primitive names, which we use most properly when we are directly acquainted with the particular referred to.)
- One way to simplify the mystery of reference is to reduce it to a mystery we already also have: predication.
- We could then propose that proper names are like definite descriptions: they refer to a thing by having as their meaning some uniquely true descriptions of the thing.

Expanding Russell's Theory

Two sentences

- The Present kind of France is not bald.
- The present King of France does not exist.

Two problems

- Should we conclude the present kind of France to has hair?
- Subject/Predicate form suggests there is a thing, the Present King of France, which lacks the property of existing

One solution

- To deny the following only denies there is such a thing:
 - There is a present King of France; and
 - Any present King of France is that thing; and
 - That this is bald.
- To deny the following is to deny there is such a thing:
 - There is a present King of France; and
 - Any present King of France is that thing.

Expanding Russell's Theory

Two sentences

- Voldemort is not bald.
- Voldemort does not exist.

Two problems

- Should we conclude Voldemort has hair?
- Subject/Predicate form suggests there is a thing, Voldemort, which lacks the property of existing

One solution

- To deny the following only denies there is such a thing:
 - There is wizard who scarred Harry Potter; and
 - Any wizard who scarred Harry Potter is that thing; and
 - That this is bald.
- To deny the following is to deny there is such a thing:
 - There is wizard who scarred Harry Potter; and
 - Any wizard who scarred Harry Potter is that thing.

Expanding Russell's Theory

- Frege implicitly has a theory like this, in that he assumes that the sense of a term determines the reference. The sense is some kind of criterion true of the thing referred to. (And, all of Frege's examples of senses are definite descriptions.)
- Russell adopts the theory that the meaning of a proper name may be a (presumably single) proposition true of the thing referred to.
- John Searle improves on this view by arguing that the sense of a name is a cluster of representations (mostly) true of the referent.

Searle's Version of the Description Theory

- If a name refers to an object, then there must be some representations (“intentional content”) that the speaker associates with the name and which is true of the referent.
- These representations include lots of information: the context of the speaker (which determines indexicals), wanting to use the term as others in your community do, perceptions, memories, definite descriptions, associations with experts, and so on.
- This is sometimes called the “cluster theory”: there are a cluster of representations associated with the name, and as long as many (most? A few?) are uniquely true of the object, then the name refers to the object.

Causal Theory of Reference

- Kripke identifies what he believes are fundamental problems with the cluster theory
- These include:
 - The descriptions we believe of a thing are typically contingent
 - Our descriptions of a thing might turn out to be true of a different object or kind
 - Our descriptions might turn out false of the thing
 - We often know very little about something we refer to, such that we cannot offer a description uniquely true of that thing

Externalism

- Putnam's Twin Earth argument is meant to establish that the meaning of a referential term is partly determined by factors outside our heads.
- (Note that whereas Kripke avoids talk about meaning, Putnam does not. He is explicitly talking about the meaning of names and natural kind terms.)
- A less weird example is jade. In 1800, we thought jade was a single mineral. Today, we know jade is two minerals (jadeite and nephrite).

Externalism

- Which of the following sentences is true?
 - “Jade is two minerals,” said today.
 - “Jade is two minerals,” said in 1800.
- If we interpret the description theory naively, then we might say
 - In 2013, “jade” means: either nephrite or jadeite.
 - In 1800, “jade” means: that green stone we use to make ornaments of
- It would seem then on the naïve descriptivist theory, the first utterance above is true (it is true to say today that “Jade is two minerals”) and the second utterance is false (“Jade is two minerals” was false -- or at least weird -- in 1800).
- Putnam says, NO! It’s always been true that jade is two minerals.
- For Putnam: the meaning of “jade” was not (only) the description like our examples above, but rather it is (in part) determined by that stuff that we pointed at and identified as jade.

Descriptivist response?

- The descriptivist will need some way to answer, if she wants to keep descriptivism but also claim that it has always been true that Jade is two minerals.
- One out is to use Searle's cluster theory. We might say: even uneducated people might know a lot about jade. They might know that it is:
 - That material commonly used in Chinese art
 - That material that is green
 - That material that is sold in jewelry stores as a precious stone called "Jade"
 - Etc.
- Then, the description theorist might say, "Jade is two minerals" was true in 1800 because it was true that "that material commonly used in Chinese art and that is green and that is sold in jewelry stores as a precious stone called 'jade' and etc." is not one mineral but two.

One Consensus! Externalism

- Interestingly, most philosophers agree on some form of externalism today
- Searle argues that our descriptions include implicitly additional constraints like
 - As the name is used here
 - As the name is used in my language community
 - As the name is used now
- These indexicals allow some externalism into the descriptivism.

An alternative: Radical Externalism

- **Ruth Millikan** argues that Kripke and Putnam mess up: they argue for externalism using internalist arguments (e.g., they do conceptual analysis)
- She argues that we evolved representation systems, and reference is a derived function of these systems. These include an object identification system, which must identify objects sufficiently well to ensure survival.
- A referential concept refers to the kind of thing it was selected to refer to; our intuitions about what is happening is irrelevant; reference need only be sufficient to benefit survival in our ancestors.

NOTE: we'll read Millikan when we discuss Kripkenstein.

The latest variation: Two-Dimensionalism

- David Chalmers has developed a variant theory that one might call an attempt to address the shortcomings of both approaches
- This view is called two-dimensionalism
- The idea is that there are TWO aspects to the meaning of any term
 - The primary meaning of “water” is something like *the clear liquid we drink*. (So both H₂O and Putnam’s X_γZ are water on this meaning.)
 - The secondary meaning of “water” is all the stuff of the same kind as the thing we referred to here with our primary meaning. (So H₂O is water and Putnam’s X_γZ is not water on this secondary meaning.)
 - The primary meaning is like the descriptivist meaning; the secondary meaning picks out something like the causal theorist intends to pick out.

Where the reference debate connects with other issues: examples

- Can we disagree with Aristotle?
Incommensurability of theories.
- “This white board is mostly empty space.”
- Hume on free will: free actions are actions caused by our own desires.
- Kripke’s modal argument and Chalmers’s
Zombie Argument

Can Philosophy of Language answer questions about other things?

- Kripke claimed that his theory of reference, plus our Cartesian intuitions, reveal that science will not explain consciousness
- Chalmers claims that his two dimensional theory of reference, plus our Zombie Intuitions, reveal that science will not explain consciousness

Kripke's Anti-Materialist Argument

- Let pain of kind P be an example of an arbitrary conscious experience.
 - Definition: Materialism about pain events of kind P is the view that necessarily kind P is identical to some brain event (call it B)
1. Semantic/Modal claim: “Possibly $P \neq B$ ” means either
 - a. Our knowledge of P is insufficient to tell that $P = B$, or
 - b. It really is possible that $P \neq B$
 2. Cartesian Intuition: we agree that possibly $P \neq B$.
 3. Special Knowledge Claim: to experience P is to know all there is to know about the experience P.
 4. The Special Knowledge Claim rules out that our knowledge of P is insufficient. (3 denies 1.a.)
 5. Thus, it really is possible that $P \neq B$. (Alternative 1.b.)
 6. But then materialism is false. (Materialism is inconsistent with 1.b.)

Kripke's Anti-Materialist Argument

- The important part of this argument is that Kripke's semantics inform the dilemma between 1.a. and 1.b.
- This philosopher is very suspicious of claims that language and semantics can tell us about non-linguistic facts, but this argument (and the next) are very influential.

Chalmer's Anti-Materialist Argument

- Look back at our discussion of two-dimensional semantics. We need that now to make sense of this argument.
 - Definition: a zombie is a person who has all the functional features of a normal human being (talks and walks and acts normal) but the zombie has no conscious experiences.
1. Zombies are conceivable.
 2. If zombies are conceivable, then they are possible.
 3. If zombies are possible, then materialism about consciousness is false.
 4. Materialism about consciousness is false.

Chalmer's Anti-Materialist Argument

- This argument is valid. Is it sound?
- Premise three just comes from the definition of materialism given before (the claim that materialism is true if and only if the identity claims about mind and brain are necessary).
- Some of us think that premise 1 might be false. That takes some argument....
- Premise two is the most controversial. The idea is that science must explain our primary intensions, or it has failed. But, the claim goes, my primary intensions for all my consciousness terms ("pain," "red," "bitter," etc.) are such that they allow for zombies. That is, nothing about my primary intension of "pain" is inconsistent with pain being wholly independent of any particular brain state.