XIX PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES: CRIMMINS & PERRY

Problems with the naïve view

(i) straightforward unintuitive consequences. So unintuitive that it might seem that we’ve lost track of the idea that meaning is use.
(ii) if the explanation of the unintuitive consequences is supposed to be in terms of conversational implicature, do we get the standard Gricean features: Cancellability, Nondetachability?

Two theses it would be nice to maintain

(1) Semantic Innocence
(2) Direct Reference (Millianism)

It is possible to maintain these two theses and yet still think that substituting coreferential names in propositional attitude ascriptions can change truth-value. In effect Davidson’s account achieved that; or could have done, depending on quite how the samesayer relation is understood. The trick was to find some other part of the ascription sentence (i.e. other than the complement sentence) whose reference changes when coreferential terms are substituted in the complement sentence. For Davidson this is the complementizer ‘that’. But that approach runs into various problems. Is it possible to attribute the job to some other part of the sentence?

Crimmins and Perry

For Crimmins and Perry the job is done by ‘unarticulated constituents’. Compare sentences like ‘It is three o’clock’ or ‘It is raining’. To determine the full semantic content of these sentences they need to be supplemented with a reference to place. Typically this will be the place of utterance; but it need not be (consider how they might be used in a phone conversation to someone a long way away). We can think of the reference as being achieved by an unarticulated constituent, which, if articulated, would give rise to something like ‘It is three o’clock at p’, where ‘p’ ranges over places. (It is an interesting question, on which Crimmins and Perry remain open, as to whether these ‘unarticulated constituents’ are really present in some way in the sentence.)

The next step is to realize that the reference of such unarticulated constituents can be a linguistic entity. To see how this works it is helpful to start with Crimmins’ discussion (in Talk About Beliefs) of Quine’s famous example

(1) Giorgione was so called because of his size.

Clearly here the term ‘Giorgione’ refers to Giorgione; but equally clearly, substituting the coreferential term ‘Barbarelli’ changes the truth-value of the sentence. Crimmins suggests that ‘so’ functions as a demonstrative denoting a name, so that (1) can be paraphrased as

(2) Giorgione was called that because of his size.
Crimmins points out that whilst in a typical use of (1) ‘so’ will refer to the name ‘Giorgione’ that is used earlier in the sentence, in the right context it need not. Consider the (false!) sentences

(3) Both Giorgione and Titian were known as ‘The Giant’. Giorgione was so-called because of his size; in Titian’s case it was his towering skill that gave rise to the name.

Here ‘so’ is naturally taken as referring to the name ‘The Giant’ which is mentioned in the previous sentence; it seems that it can refer to any name that is made contextually salient (which is what we would expect of a demonstrative). Crimmins and Perry’s idea is that belief reports have much in common with sentences containing ‘so-called’; however, in a belief report the element that would do the work of ‘so-called’ is unarticulated. In essence (and much simplified), the proposal is that a report of the form

(4) Judith believes that Giorgione was a painter

can be understood as expressing the same proposition as is expressed by

(5) Judith believes that Giorgione was a painter by means of that notion and that idea

where the notion in question is a representation of the individual Giorgione and the idea is a representation of the property of being a painter. This gives rise to opacity in the following way. Suppose Judith has two notions of the individual Giorgione, one of which includes the feature that he is called ‘Giorgione’ whilst the other includes the feature that he is called ‘Barbarelli’.

Let us further suppose that she believes the first of these notions (her Giorgione-notion) to concern an Italian landscape painter; and that she believes the second (her Barbarelli-notion) to concern an English conductor. One of these notions will be denoted by the expression ‘that notion’ in (5). Which one? That will depend on which of them is made salient by the context; as with ‘so-called’ there is no simple rule that determines this. However, again paralleling the case of ‘so-called’, a typical way of making a representation salient will be by means of the very words used in the ascription. So typically (5) will be used to ascribe to Judith the belief that the person denoted by her Giorgione-notion has the property of being a painter (I have described this belief meta-linguistically, but this can be avoided). Now we can see how this gives rise to opacity. Suppose we substituted ‘Barbarelli’ for ‘Giorgione’ in (5). The name would still function to denote the same person. However, typically the denotation of ‘that notion’ would change. Rather than denoting Judith’s Giorgione-notion, it will now typically denote her Barbarelli-notion. For Crimmins and Perry the notions and ideas are concrete particulars: the particulars that make up beliefs. But they could think of them as more abstract.