

Sortals and the Subject-Predicate Distinction

MICHAEL DURRANT

*Reader in Philosophy, University of Wales and
Honorary Senior Research Fellow, Cardiff University*

Edited, with a postscript by

STEPHEN HORTON

Research Associate, Cardiff University

Ashgate

Aldershot • Burlington USA • Singapore • Sydney

Contents

<i>Editor's Preface</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<i>Introduction to the Author by Roger Trigg</i>	<i>xv</i>

Introduction: Aims and Plan of Campaign	1
A. Principal Aims	1
B. Sortals, Names, Descriptions, Predicables, Substantival General Terms, Predicates	5
C. Plan of Campaign	9

I	Sortals, Names and Predicables	13
	A. Sortals: a Detailed Investigation	13
	B. That Sortals are a Distinct Category of Symbol in that they are <i>not</i> Reducible to Names or Predicables/Predicates	24
	C. Considerations on a General Thesis which may arise from the claim that Sortals are <i>not</i> Reducible to Predicables/Predicates	31
	D. Summary of Chapter	36
II	Sortals and Identification	40
	Part I: The Priority of Sortal Identification over both Naming/Referring and Predication	40
	A. Of the Priority of Sortal Identifying over Naming/Referring	40
	B. A Case in which Referring <i>may</i> be taken as prior to Identifying	43
	C. Consideration of a general attack on my thesis that Sortal Identification is prior to Naming/Referring	44
	D. Some general arguments in favour of the thesis that Sortal Identification is prior to Describing or Predicating	49
	Part II: The Contribution of Gareth Evans	52
	E. An introduction to Evans: His concept of 'Demonstrative Identification'	52
	F. That Sortal Identification is logically prior to Demonstrative Identification	53
	G. The Case against Demonstrative Identification (1): the <i>Misconstruction</i> of Demonstrative Sortal Phrases	53

H.	The Case against Demonstrative Identification (2): Consideration of a stronger and weaker thesis as regards its base	56
I.	That Demonstrative Identification (in Evans' sense) rests on, presupposes, Descriptive Identification in his sense and indeed on Sortal Identification	62
J.	In that Demonstrative Identification is to be regarded as a mode of <i>Identification</i> , as opposed to a mode of Reference, it is reducible to Sortal Identification, in the sense of 'Sortal "Picking-Out"', 'Sortal "Discrimination"'	69
K.	Of the relationship of 'Descriptive Identification' to 'Sortal Identification' and 'Predicate Identification'	72
L.	Summary of Conclusions from Part I and Part II	75
	Part III: Thought and Speech	76
M.	Of Evans' general thesis that Identification in Thought is <i>prior</i> to Identification in Speech	76
III	Sortals and the Subject-Predicate Distinction	88
A.	Strawson's Objections to Geach's Explanation of the Subject-Predicate Distinction	88
B.	Strawson's 'Mediating' Criterion for the Subject-Predicate Distinction	94
C.	An Attempted Account of what distinguishes an expression occurring in the role of Logical Subject	102
D.	An Attempted Account of what distinguishes an expression occurring in the role of Logical Predicate	103
E.	A more Precise Account of the Relation between Sortals and the Subject-Predicate Distinction	108
F.	A Contrast with Quine	111
G.	The Issue of a <i>Criterion</i> for the Subject-Predicate Distinction	123
H.	An Account of the Relations between Referring, Identifying and Existence	125
I.	Explanations of the Subject-Predicate Distinction in the sense of Answers to Two Questions	136
IV	General Consequences of the Failure to Acknowledge the Category of the Sortal	148
A.	The Attempted Reduction of Sortals to Predicates and its consequences	148
B.	The consequences of failure to recognise the Sortal as a Principle of Counting and Distinction in its own right <i>and equally</i> those of the failure to recognise principles of Counting and Distinction in their own right formed from 'Matter' terms	151

	C. Some Elucidations and Expansions	153
	D. Summary of the General Consequences of the failure to acknowledge the Category of the Sortal	156
V	Frege: Sortals as 'Concepts'	159
	A. That Frege fails to recognise both the definite and indefinite form of the Sortal as a <i>Distinct</i> and <i>Primary</i> Category of general symbol (expression)	159
	B. Some consequences and difficulties which arise from Frege's failure to recognise the Sortal as a <i>Distinct</i> and <i>Primary</i> Category of general symbol (expression)	165
	C. Is Frege committed to a doctrine of absolutely simple names and correspondingly, absolutely simple particulars, as a consequence of his failure to acknowledge the Category of the Sortal?	169
VI	Russell: Sortals as 'Descriptions'	181
	A. Russell's basic Categories of Symbol	181
	B. That no case can be made for Russell's <i>implicit</i> recognition of Sortals in his Theory of Descriptions	183
	C. Particular Difficulties in Russell's position	187
	D. Consequences of Russell's failure to acknowledge the Category of the Sortal	190
	E. That Russell is committed to a doctrine of <i>absolutely</i> simple, basic Names and concomitantly to a doctrine of <i>absolutely</i> simple or 'pure' particulars	191
VII	Geach: Sortals, Substantival General Terms and General Names	194
	A. Geach's recognition of the category of Substantival General Term does not entail recognition of the category of the Sortal as either basic or distinctive	194
	B. Geach's reduction of Substantival General Terms to Names or Predicables (Predicates) and its difficulties	195
	C. Further criticisms of Geach's thesis that the introduction of Proper Names merely presupposes the introduction of Names	200
	D. The disastrous Consequences of reducing Substantival General Terms and Sortals to Names or Predicables (Predicates)	204
VIII	Strawson: Sortals - Failure to Recognise Their True Nature; His Dual Position	209
	A. The Claim that Strawson recognises the true nature of the Sortal	209

	B.	That Strawson regards predicate expressions as a kind of <i>Name</i> , Sortal expressions as predicates and hence as a kind of <i>Name</i>	210
	C.	That Strawson also treats Sortal expressions as <i>Predicative</i>	215
	D.	A Summary Statement of Strawson's 'Dual Position'	216
	E.	Some <i>General</i> Difficulties for Strawson's 'Category' criterion for the Subject-Predicate-Distinction	217
IX		Strawson: Sortals and Sortal Instantiation	220
	A.	That for Strawson one <i>can</i> raise the Question: 'What Instances a Sortal Universal?'; that Strawson is <i>not</i> committed to either a Doctrine of 'Pure' or 'Relatively Pure' Basic Particulars	220
	B.	The Case for saying that Strawson is committed to either an <i>unintelligible</i> and/or <i>impossible</i> Account or <i>no</i> Account of what constitutes an Instance of a Sortal	225
	C.	Conclusion	228
X		Strawson: Further Consequences of Failure to Recognise the Nature of the Sortal	229
	A.	That to treat Sortals as Predicates (indirectly) leads to the Search for a Basis for the Introduction of 'Particulars in General'	229
	B.	A Second Consequence of the Failure to recognise the Nature of the Sortal: the Search for a <i>Basic Notion of an 'Instance'</i> or <i>Explanation of the Notion of an 'Individual Instance'</i>	250
	C.	A Third Consequence of the Failure to recognise the Nature of the Sortal: the Search for an <i>Underlying Basis</i> for the Subject-Predicate Distinction in the sense of the Search for a certain type of <i>Empirical</i> proposition	252
XI		Quine: Sortals and Canonical Notation	256
	A.	That Quine fails to recognise the Category of the Sortal and analyses Sortals out in favour of the Variables of Quantification and Predicates	256
	B.	Consequences of the Failure to recognise the Category of the Sortal	263
	C.	A Suggested Implication of my Thesis Rejected	268
	D.	Quine's Aims and Claims for the Theory of Canonical Notation	269
		Conclusion	275

Postscript by Stephen Horton	280
A. Introduction	280
B. Theories of Reference	280
C. Formal Logic	285
D. Comparative Philosophy: The Analytic/Continental Divide	288
E. Conclusion	301
<i>Bibliography</i>	307
<i>Bibliography of Other Writings</i>	311
<i>Index of Names</i>	315