- Zachary Wolf

# Meaning and reference

- Words vs. concepts
  - Dog and chien mean the same thing.
     What do they mean? DOG
  - Words are in *italics*. Concepts are in ALLCAPS.
- Words and concepts aren't the same thing. But what are concepts?

## Proper names



- The simplest case is proper names.
  - George Washington was the first president.
- The phrase George Washington seems to "point" to a particular individual.
  - It is a rigid designator.
- That "pointing" is called reference.

#### But what about other words?

- Words that aren't proper names seem more difficult.
  - Dogs bark.
- What does dogs mean? It doesn't refer to a particular individual or individuals, but to the category DOG.
- But what is that category? Is it a thing in and of itself?
- This is called the problem of universals.

## The problem of universals

- Aristotle (~350 BCE) asked: Does the category DOGS exist, separate from individual dogs?
- Democritus (~400 BCE) had asserted that the world was made entirely of atoms—tiny, indivisible units of matter.
- The implication of this assertion is that non-physical things do not exist.
  - This is called atomism or materialism.
  - This implies that individual dogs may exist, but the category DOG does not exist apart from the individuals that make it up.

#### (Review of): Materialism, dualism, etc.

- But Plato (~400 BCE) argued that there were two independent spheres of existence, aka Platonic dualism
  - Everyday physical things vs. a higher plane of ideals, or forms
- This later evolved into the Christian division between the profane and the divine, e.g. the body and the soul.
- René Descartes (~1625) argued that the world consists of two distinct substances, mind and body (aka Cartesian dualism)
- But his careful naturalistic reasoning helped make the case for (modern) scientific monism/materialism:
  - "Everything is made of physics."

#### Back to universals

- So if DOG is not a physical thing, what is it?
- Perhaps it is just a name we have for the set of dogs (e.g. William of Ockham, ~300 CE)
  - This is called nominalism (= "name-ism").
- Some have argued that everything exists only in our heads
  - This is called idealism (= "idea-ism")
- While others argued that the things we perceive are real and exist in approximately the form we perceive them to have (realism)

## Berkeley

- Bishop George Berkeley
   (1685-1753) argued that entities do
   not exist unless they are perceived
- Hence the continued existence of objects when nobody is perceiving them can be attributed to the everpresent perception of God



 His conclusion is that all reality is mental—aka subjective idealism or Berkeleyan idealism

### Berkeley on concepts

- Berkeley argued that an object is a "collection of senseimpressions"
- He argued against John Locke's distinction between primary and secondary qualities
  - Primary qualities correspond to "real" physical attributes
  - Secondary qualities are purely "mental"
- One of his key points is that physical objects and mental objects (concepts) are not the same thing and cannot be directly compared
- This is a central issue as we consider the nature of concepts: do they correspond to reality or are they mere psychological biases?

### Sober reading

- Knowledge as justified true belief
  - If you know something "by accident", do you really know it?
- Gettier cases: Is JTB the right definition of knowledge?
  - What if your justification is wrong?
- Analytic vs. contingent knowledge
  - Analytic propositions are true in virtue of the meanings of their terms
  - Contingent propositions must be evaluated based on the state of the outside world—e.g. empirically

### Content, intension, extension

- Frege (1892) distinguished between reference and sense
- In modern philosophy, sense or meaning is sometimes called content or intension
- Two concepts can be co-referent without having the same sense
  - Evening star vs. morning star
  - cordates vs. renates
  - square root of 16 vs. number of Beatles
- Intension (meaning, mental representation) vs. extension (set of things picked out by the intension)

#### Are intensions mental?

- To a psychologist:
  - the extension is in the world (the referent)
  - the intension is in the head (the mental representation)
- But philosophers debate whether the intension is actually "in the head" (called psychologism or mentalism).
   Alternatively:
  - the extension is in the world
  - intension is meaning independent of mental states
- Exactly what this means is still hotly debated—-see Fodor reading