

Analytical Table of Contents

	ONE <i>The Doctrine of Distribution</i>	27
1	The traditional doctrine of distribution is commonly accepted without examination.	27
2	Keynes's formulation needs to be amended, because he confusedly uses schematic letters like "S" to represent both general terms and singular designations of classes.	28
3	What difference is supposed to exist between the relations of denoting and of referring to?	29
4	We cannot coherently take "some man" to refer to some man.	30
5	A person who uses the words "some man" may be referring to some particular man, but what he actually says does not convey this reference.	31
6	An argument of Miss Anscombe's shows that at any rate there could not be just one way that "some man" referred to some man. This robs the doctrine of its intuitive simplicity.	32
7	The idea that speaking of some men leaves us 'in ignorance with regard to the remainder' has been refuted by Keynes himself, and cannot serve to explain the nondistribution of the term "man" or "men".	34
8	"No men" assuredly does not refer to no men or to a	

Analytical Table of Contents

	class consisting of 0 men. We should equally doubt the view that "all men" refers to all men and "some men" to some men.	34
9	In a thoroughgoing class reading of categoricals there is no place for distribution.	35
10	The question whether a predicate term is distributed or undistributed does not really make sense.	36
11	This is specially manifest for the predicate terms of singular propositions.	36
12	The traditional 'proofs' that particular negative propositions have distributed predicate terms contain gross fallacies.	37
13	The rules against 'illicit process' and 'undistributed middle' are unsound.	38
14	A medieval example shows that these rules do not in general supply a workable test for validity.	43
15	Hamilton's quantification of the predicate (apart from his incidental mistakes) would be a natural extension of the doctrine of distribution. But a difficulty about simple conversion exposes a radical defect in the doctrine.	45
16	The doctrine of distribution is thus quite indefensible.	48
	TWO Subject and Predicate	49
17	"Subject" and "predicate" in this work are always linguistic terms. Provisional explanation of these terms.	49
18	It is convenient to say that an expression is a <i>predicable</i> when it can be attached to a subject, a <i>predicate</i> only when it actually is so attached.	50
19	In predicating we are not necessarily making an assertion or statement. Advantages and disadvantages of the term "proposition".	51
20	Names can be recognized from their use in acts of naming.	52
21	Proper names are parts of the language in which they are embedded.	53
22	The role of demonstrative pronouns in simple assertoric sentences.	53
23	A subject may be picked out of a proposition as an expression that could be linked up with an act of naming.	54
24	A proposition may admit of more than one subject-predicate analysis.	54

Analytical Table of Contents

25	The name refers to its bearer regardless of time.	55
26	We got a predicate by removing a proper name from a proposition.	56
27	Names and predicables, <i>referring to</i> and <i>being true of</i> , are irreducibly different.	57
28	The 'Aristotelian' doctrine is confused as regards the notion of 'term', and as to the role of the copula. The two-name theory of predication is demonstrably wrong.	59
29	The modern theory of varieties of copula is equally erroneous.	61
30	Substantival and adjectival terms.	63
31	The problem whether there can be negative terms.	64
32	When can substantial general terms occur as logical subjects?	65
33	A proper name can never be used predicatively.	67
34	The use of proper names as logical subjects seems to involve a subject-use of substantival general terms.	67
35	How does such a term refer to the several objects it can be used to name?	71

THREE *Referring Phrases* 73

36	Explanation of the term "referring phrase". The relation of referring phrases to lists of proper names.	73
37	Russellian and medieval theories of referring phrases and their various modes of reference.	79
38	These theories were unnecessarily complicated by bringing in concepts 'meant' by referring phrases and (in Russell's case) nonrelational 'combinations' of objects.	81
39	The multiply ambiguous term "denoting" is best avoided. <i>Suppositio</i> .	83
40	A referring phrase is only a quasi subject, not a subject.	84
41	Frege's analysis of propositions containing referring phrases.	85
42	The 'scope' of referring phrases.	86
43	The canceling-out fallacy.	88
44	The modes of reference of "some" and "any" phrases.	88
45	Confused <i>suppositio</i> —the mode of reference of "a" phrases.	90
46	Referring phrases do not require namely-riders if their <i>suppositio</i> is confused.	91
47	Confused <i>suppositio</i> and disjunctions of proper names.	91

Analytical Table of Contents

48	A paralogism of Berkeley's explained in terms of confused <i>suppositio</i> .	95
49	The mode of reference of "every" phrases: conjunctive <i>suppositio</i> .	96
50	This kind of <i>suppositio</i> , as distinct from the distributive <i>suppositio</i> of "any" phrases, was not noticed by most medieval logicians, but was so by Russell.	98
51	My explanation fits almost all Russell's examples of referring phrases.	98
52	Russell's attempted explanation of the distinction between "any" and "every" is different, but is anyhow inconsistent with his own examples.	102
53	The distinction between "every" and "any" enables us to avoid fallacies.	104
54	It will, however, be shown that this no more justifies us in accepting the doctrine of <i>suppositio</i> than the fallaciousness of syllogisms with 'undistributed middle' justified our accepting the doctrine of distribution.	104
FOUR <i>The Shipwreck of a Theory</i>		105
55	Truth-conditions for propositions that contain referring phrases formed with the applicative "some", "any", "most", "every", or "a".	105
56	Exposition of the <i>dictum de omni</i> principle.	107
57	By applying the <i>dictum de omni</i> to "most" phrases, we clear up an old puzzle.	116
58	Apparent exceptions to the <i>dictum de omni</i> , where we are dealing with portmanteau propositions.	118
59	A proposition may be an apparent exception because it is not genuinely formed, as it appears to be, by attaching a predicable to a referring phrase as quasi subject. Illustrations with "most", "a", and "every" phrases.	120
60	At first sight the medieval or Russellian type of theory seems to give a very good account of propositions got by filling the blanks of a two-place predicable with referring phrases.	123
61	If, however, we fill up the two blanks with a "some" phrase and an "any" phrase, the rules land us in difficulty.	125
62	Russell and the medievals could dodge this difficulty with supplementary rules.	126

Analytical Table of Contents

63	These rules are awkward and artificial, and no such device would remove a similar difficulty over a pair of “most” phrases.	127
64	The key to our problem is that the order of insertion of the two phrases into the proposition makes a difference.	128
65	William of Sherwood unwittingly attained this conception.	131
66	The fallacies that the referring-phrase theory sought to avoid, and the apparent exceptions to the <i>dictum de omni</i> that it generates, can all be dealt with in terms of the two notions: order of filling up, and scope. We may therefore reject the alleged distinction between “any” and “every”, and between “some” and “a”.	132
67	Our results help us to understand the modern symbolism of quantifiers and bound variables.	134
	FIVE <i>Pronominal Reference: Relative Pronouns</i>	136
68	Further remarks on the relation of bound variables to pronouns in the vernacular.	136
69	Logically and grammatically relative pronouns.	139
70	Defining and qualifying relative clauses. A provisional account of the difference.	141
71	Are complex terms of the form “A that is P” genuine logical units?	142
72	Reasons for denying this: in such phrases we have to split up “that” into a connective (not always the same one) and a logically relative pronoun, and with this the whole appearance of a complex term vanishes like a mirage.	143
73	“Such that” is an all-purpose connective whose ambiguity is resolved contextually.	145
74	Cannot definitions of terms be given in the form “A that is P”? Solution of this difficulty. All names, and all substantival terms, are syntactically simple.	147
75	Proper names and definite descriptions.	149
76	Do relative pronouns ever pick up a reference made by a term used elsewhere? ‘Pronouns of laziness’ may, but others do not.	151
77	A sort of example given by Strawson is no exception.	153
78	We must be cautious over classifying a pronoun as one of laziness.	155
79	Sometimes the work of pronouns answering to bound	

Analytical Table of Contents

	variables is work that could be done by the logical constants of the calculus of relations—which shows how superficial the jargon of “variable” and “constant” really is.	
80	A reflexive pronoun does not have the same reference as its antecedent.	156
81	Walter Burleigh on the <i>suppositio</i> of reflexive pronouns.	158
82	A reflexive pronoun cannot be taken as filling up one blank in a two- or many-place predicable.	159
83	Rather, a reflexive pronoun fills up both places in a two-place predicable, but its own requirement for an antecedent reintroduces an empty place. This account is easily extended to many-place predicables. The matter illustrated by diagrams.	161
84	There are connected puzzles about those uses of bound variables which correspond to the use of reflexive pronouns.	162
	<i>SIX Pronominal Reference: Indefinite Pronouns</i>	165
85	List of the pronouns to be discussed—a miscellaneous lot.	169
86	“Anything, everything, something” and the noun “thing”.	169
87	We might try splitting up “something that is <i>F</i> ” into “some” and “thing-that is <i>F</i> ”; here “thing-that” would be a logically simple sign with the role of transforming a predicable “is <i>F</i> ” into something that can occur in subject position.	169
88	This might be used to explain the systematic ambiguity whereby a substantival general term can shift about between subject and predicate position.	170
89	But to take “thing that is <i>F</i> ” as a sort of complex name is open to some of the objections raised in section 72 to a similar view of “A that is <i>F</i> ”.	171
90	Analyzing away this sort of phrase leaves us once more with unanalyzed occurrences of “anything”, “something”, and the like.	172
91	Are phrases like “any A” and “some A” analyzable in terms of the corresponding “-thing” pronouns and merely predicative occurrences of “A”? Reasons to deny this.	173

Analytical Table of Contents

92	Frege's views on identity and countability.	176
93	An alternative view of unrestricted quantifiers.	177
94	Application of this view to quantifiers that reach into an <i>oratio obliqua</i> clause.	179
95	Quantifiers with proper-name variables and with general-term variables. These two sorts of quantifier relate to the same entities. Proper-name variables can occur in a language that includes no proper names.	183
96	The error of Quine's slogan "To be is to be the value of a variable". Only predicable expressions can fill the blank in "There is —"; and empty proper names, unlike empty predicables, have no place in language used to convey information.	185
97	Empty proper names in <i>oratio obliqua</i> clauses constitute only an apparent exception.	186
98	The forms "For some x , x is F ", "There is something that is F ", "Something or other is F ", "There exists something that is F ", are in very many cases equivalent.	188

SEVEN *The Logic of Lists* 191

99	Lists of proper names; their mode of significance. A proper name is a one-item list.	191
100	The modification of a predicable by an applicative (of a certain class) yields a predicable that can be attached to an arbitrarily long list as subject; the truth-condition of this predication is that a certain disjunction of conjunctions of singular propositions should be true.	192
101	The interpretation of predicates that take lists as subjects, for the degenerate case of one-item lists.	195
102	It is only an incidental effect of applicatives to remove ambiguities in truth-conditions.	195
103	Solution of an old puzzle about <i>suppositio</i> . There is no need to ascribe to a list various modes of reference; one must 'separate the concept <i>all</i> from the truth-function'.	196
104	Generalization of our results to many-place predicables and to lists of arbitrary finite length.	198
105	A substantival general term can take the place of a list as a logical subject; it is by itself a logical subject and does not go with an applicative to form a quasi subject.	200
106	Truth-conditions for categoricals with empty general terms as logical subjects.	202

Analytical Table of Contents

107	What are we to say when the things covered by a general term cannot be listed?	205
108	The applicative “only”: restricted and unrestricted exclusive propositions.	207
109	The pronouns “the same” and “(an)other”.	211
110	Proper and common names.	215

<i>Appendix</i>	219
-----------------	-----

<i>Bibliography</i>	221
---------------------	-----

<i>Index</i>	223
--------------	-----