A Criticism of Russell's Theory of Definite Descriptions

Luman Zhan*

College of Engineering, University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI, United States

*Corresponding author: lumanz@ umich.edu

Abstract:

Bertrand Russell's Theory of Definite Descriptions, introduced in his 1905 paper On Denoting, offers a logical framework for analyzing sentences involving definite descriptions, breaking them down into existential and universal quantifiers. While influential, this theory has faced substantial criticism, particularly from P.F. Strawson and Keith Donnellan. This paper critiques Russell's approach by arguing that it overlooks the role of presupposition and context in ordinary language. Strawson emphasizes how presupposition failures in non-referring descriptions result in truth-value gaps, while Donnellan distinguishes between referential and attributive uses of definite descriptions, demonstrating that Russell's theory inadequately accounts for these linguistic nuances. By examining these criticisms, the paper argues that while Russell's theory provides a valuable framework for formal logic, it falls short in accurately reflecting the complexity of everyday language use. This analysis explores the ongoing philosophical debate surrounding the relevance of Russell's ideas and the challenges posed by alternative approaches to definite descriptions.

Keywords: Russell's Theory of Descriptions; definite descriptions; philosophy of language; P.F. Strawson; Keith Donnellan.

1. Introduction

Bertrand Russell (1872-1970) was a British philosopher, logician, and social critic, widely regarded as one of the founders of analytic philosophy. His work has profoundly impacted various fields, including logic, epistemology, and the philosophy of language. One of Russell's most significant contributions is his Theory of Definite Descriptions, introduced in his 1905 paper On Denoting [1]. This theory addresses the logical form of definite descriptions by proposing that these statements can be broken down into existential and universal quantifiers. This approach helps to resolve issues related to reference and meaning, particularly when the described entity does not exist. Russell's analytical approach to language emphasized the importance of logical clarity and precision in the philosophy of language.

There have been heated discussions about the proper analysis of definite and indefinite descriptions in the past 100 years. Some philosophers argue that definite

descriptions are referential expressions, while others believe that they are quantificational or predicational. Also, others try to determine whether 'the' and 'a' play a semantical or pragmatic role in descriptions. These different theories and analyses create a more complicated understanding of the roles of 'the' and 'a' following Russell's Theory of Descriptions [2].

Russell's Theory of Descriptions has a major influence on the philosophy of language by providing a robust framework for analyzing definite descriptions, yet it faces significant challenges from philosophers such as P.F. Strawson and Keith Donnellan, who argue that Russell's formal logic approach fails to address the nuances of ordinary language use. In this paper, I will refute Russell's Theory of Definite Descriptions because it overlooks the role of presupposition in everyday communication language and ignores the significance of context in determining meaning and reference in ordinary language. I will examine criticisms of Russell's theory in detail, evaluate their impact on the validity of Russell's theory, and explore the ongoing relevance of his ideas in contemporary philosophical discourse. I will begin with an exposition of Russell's theory, followed by a detailed explanation of Strawson's, Donnellan's, and others' objections, and a comparative analysis evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of Russell's theory and supporting its criticisms. I will conclude with a summary of the discussion.

2. Criticisms of Russell's Theory

2.1 Russell's Theory of Descriptions

2.1.1 Key Terms

I will begin by defining terms and key parts of Russell's Theory of Definite Descriptions and Strawson's objections. To begin with, for Russell's Theory of Descriptions, it is important to clarify the meaning of definite descriptions and understand how Russell's translation of definite descriptions into logical expressions leads to the assertion that non-referring descriptions are false. Generally, definite descriptions are expressed in the form 'the F,' whereas indefinite descriptions are expressed as 'an F.' However, there are three exceptions to this general rule. One, some expressions may contain these forms, but instead of being descriptions, they are considered predicates. For example, there are cases where 'X is a student' contains the form 'an F' but is considered a predicate instead of a description. Two, there are many cases in daily use where the language of other forms could count as descriptions. For example, possessives like 'my favorite teacher' or proper names like 'Aristotle' could be considered as a description but

are not in the descriptive forms mentioned above. Three, recent discussions ponder whether descriptions like 'the F' and 'an F' are semantical, pragmatic, or even syntactic [2].

2.1.2 Definite Descriptions

For the purposes of this paper, I will only investigate definite descriptions of the form 'the F' and indefinite descriptions of the form 'an F' used by Russell. With this definition of definite and indefinite descriptions, Russell proposed a translation of sentences with definite descriptions into logical forms. Specifically, 'The F is G' could be dissected into 'There is at least one F,' 'There is at most one F,' and 'Every F is G.' This way, 'The F is G' could be expressed as $\exists x(Fx \land \forall y(Fy \to x = y) \land Gx)$. For example, the sentence 'The present king of France is bald' could be converted into 'There is exactly one king of France, and he is bald.' From this, Russell asserts that sentences with non-referring descriptions are false. For example, 'The present king of France is bald' is false as there is no present king of France [2].

2.2 Criticisms of Russell's Theory of Definite Descriptions

2.2.1 P. F. Strawson's Critique

I have just introduced Russell's ideas in his theory of definite descriptions, and now I will argue for Strawson's critique of Russell's theory. Strawson's objections have several different key ideas to be emphasized. First, Strawson argues that sentences with definite descriptions like 'The green tree is very tall' do not necessitate the condition that there exists a green tree. Rather, it presupposes that such a tree exists. If there is no such tree, then the description fails to refer to a real-life object, which is a presupposition failure. As a result, the sentence has a truth value gap, so it would not have a truth value and can be neither true nor false, thus rejecting Russell's claim about such sentences being false [2]. Second, while Russell believes that formal logic could represent daily language usage and solve complex problems by analyzing logical forms of sentences, Strawson points out that Russell's perspective fails to account for nuances in daily language, specifically context. Strawson places an emphasis on the significance of contexts when interpreting the meaning and references of language in daily usage. In the paper Strawson on Intended Meaning and Context, Akman and Alpaslan explore Strawson's views on context's effect on meaning. Strawson's three-fold distinction involves the roles of context in interpreting meaning: the linguistic context, the situational context, and the intentional context. These distinctions clarify the importance of context in affecting the meaning of descriptions [3]. As a result, Strawson objects

to Russell's theory in that it fails to account for the actual complexity of daily language when transforming sentences into logical expressions.

2.2.2 Keith Donnellan's Distinction

Donnellan's criticism of Russell's Theory of Descriptions, on the other hand, centers around the key distinction between attributive and referential use of descriptions. I will first explain this distinction and then explain how this distinction challenges Russell's theory. According to Donnellan's argument that definite descriptions can be used in both attributive and referential ways, both Strawson and Russell's theories contain inaccurate analyses of descriptions [2]. When used attributively, definite descriptions of the form "The F is G" refer specifically to whatever F that is G. On the other hand, when used referentially, "The F is G" refers to a specific individual F that is G. For example, in the sentence "The painter of this portrait must be very talented," the speaker is referring to whoever painted the painting as talented, which demonstrates an attributive use of definite descriptions. However, in the sentence "The woman in the blue dress is beautiful," the speaker refers specifically to the one lady in the blue dress and not any lady in blue, demonstrating a referential use of definite descriptions.

Now that I've explained Donnellan's distinction, I will explain how this distinction supports Donnellan's criticism of Russell's theory. According to Donnellan, Russell's theory only represents the attributive use but not the referential use of descriptions. Russell's theory depends on the existence and uniqueness of the described entity, which is only represented in the attributive use. Under Donnellan's framework, the speaker could refer to the wrong entity but still make a true description, so the description does not necessarily need to rely on the correctness of the reference. For example, the speaker could refer to 'the student doing math homework' when, in fact, the student is doing English homework. However, despite the speaker's wrong perception, the reference could still successfully identify the student whom the speaker wants to talk about. Therefore, Donnellan criticizes that Russell's Theory of Definite Descriptions does not reflect the referential function of descriptions as it relies on the uniqueness and correctness of the description, so cases where the description is wrong but successfully refers to the right entity is not represented [4].

3. Comparative Analysis

3.1 Strengths and Weaknesses of Russell's The-

ory of Definite Descriptions

While this paper aims to argue against Russell's Theory of Definite Descriptions, it is important to recognize the strengths and weaknesses of the theory to comprehend better. According to Karel Lambert, Russell's Theory of Definite Descriptions is strong in its logical precision in analyzing languages. Russell's approach of treating definite descriptions as quantifiers rather than referring expressions avoids ambiguities related to non-existent entities [5]. Also, Russell's theory provides a rigorous and precise system for analyzing language, which contributes to formal logic and mathematical reasoning [6]. This clear framework is extremely valuable in mathematical analysis.

On the other hand, Russell's Theory contains many limitations. According to Lambert, Russell's theory struggles in its application of referential use of descriptions where speakers in daily language could use the wrong descriptions but refer to the right subject [5]. Also, Russell's theory fails to address a presupposition failure, where in daily language use, the truth value of the subject does not exist instead of being true or false [6].

3.2 Support for P. F. Strawson's Criticisms

Now that I have clarified the key parts of Russell's Theory of Definite Descriptions and explained the main ideas of Strawson's and Donnellan's objections, I will offer an argument in support of Strawson's criticism. First, Strawson argues that sentences that refer to non-existent entities reflect a presupposition failure instead of being false. In these cases, the failure of a presupposed condition leads to a sentence with no truth value, so it does not entail that the sentence is true or false. For example, with the example 'The present king of France is bald,' the presupposed present king of France is a nonexistent entity [2]. Similarly, when we mention hypothetical fictional characters such as Harry Potter, we would not consider things that this character does, like defeating the villain Voldemort, to be false [7]. Instead, we place these statements within the context of fictional worlds and not in the real-world setting. Second, Russell's formal approach ignores the role of context in determining the reference and meaning of descriptions, where the intention of the speaker, the general circumstance of the conversation, and the specific wording of the sentence uttered could all have a great impact on the interpretation of descriptions. Russell's theory overlooks the way people actually use language in everyday communication, which is illustrated in the notion of the three-fold distinction mentioned above, where context plays a significant role in determining the specific meaning of descriptions. For instance, in the sentence "The

man drinking a martini is a spy," the intended meaning can differ based on whether the speaker is referring to a specific individual or making a general statement about spies [3]. Therefore, Strawson's arguments offer a strong critique that Russell's theory of descriptions is too limited in its formal statements and false.

After supporting Strawson's and Donnellan's critiques, I will provide Russell and Russellians' counter-arguments for objections to Russell's theory. Russell argued that, despite Strawson's arguments, sentences with non-referring descriptions are false. Russell argued that his theory of descriptions is concerned with logical forms rather than ordinary language. He believed that formal logic could clarify and resolve ambiguities in ordinary language by revealing the underlying logical structure of statements. Russell also adds to his refutation by creating a hypothetical situation where there is a country in which no one can hold public office if he considers the statement that "The Ruler of the Universe is wise" false. In this case, if an atheist wants to hold public office, he could take advantage of Strawson's objection by agreeing with the statement "the Ruler of the Universe is wise," where 'the ruler of the universe' is a non-existent entity to him, deems the statement neither true nor false. However, it is clearly obvious to people that the atheist is being dishonest and evasive [2]. Since an atheist does not believe in the existence of a god or any gods, it would be unreasonable to people that this person would agree with any statement about 'the Ruler of the Universe'; thus, his claim would be considered dishonest. Moreover, Russellians argue that contexts should not be an adequate argument against Russell's theory as even incomplete descriptions can be understood as correct under certain contexts [8]. Therefore, Russellians argue that Strawson's critique of presupposition and the role of contexts in ordinary language use are inapplicable and invalid.

I have just offered a strong defense of Russellians against Strawson's critique, and now I will respond from Strawson's perspective on how such defenses are not persuasive. It is important to note that any theory of descriptions should reflect and improve understanding of practical language use and can hardly be limited to only formal settings. Ignoring ordinary language practices could lead to a disconnection between theory and actual communication. Moreover, with his emphasis on the role of contexts in real-world language use, Strawson creates a more flexible understanding of descriptions that take into account various practical conditions, whereas Russell's theory could only be rigidly limited to logical forms and a formal situation, thus being impractical.

3.3 Support for Donnellan's Objections

After supporting Strawson's argument, I will offer an argument in support of Donnellan's criticisms. Donnellan's distinction shows that Russell's theory is incomplete as it fails to account for the actual use of language in daily use. By recognizing the referential use of definite descriptions and how they work in daily life, Donnellan provides a more complex framework of language usage and communication, which strongly challenges Russell's theory.

However, regarding Donnellan's distinction between attributive and referential uses of descriptions, Russellians argue that Donnellan fails to consider the importance of logical precision in philosophical analysis and misinterprets the scope of Russell's theory. First, Russellians argue that Donnellan's distinction of considering the pragmatic use of language in daily life only introduces ambiguity and paradoxes in logical analysis. At the same time, Russell's theory provides a clear and precise framework for analyzing the logical structure of sentences, providing a rigorous approach to philosophical analysis [9]. Second, Donnellan's distinction misinterprets the scope of Russell's theory. Russell's theory mainly focuses on sentences' logical form and truth conditions instead of the pragmatic and daily use of language. Therefore, instead of concerning the application of daily usage and context, Russell's theory aims to provide a precise system of logical analysis involving definite descriptions [10].

While Russellians strongly argue against Donnellan's distinction, defending Russell's theory, Donnellan provides a persuasive argument against such defenses. First, Donnellan argues that he has different approaches toward language from Russell. While Russell's theory focuses on the logical form and truth values of sentences, Donnellan believes that how language is used in daily communication is crucial for the comprehensive analysis of language and meaning. Second, Donnellan argues that Russell's theory is incomplete and limited in its analysis of language without considering the referential use of definite descriptions and how speakers often referentially refer to entities. Therefore, while the Russellians criticize Donnellan's distinction for misinterpreting the scope of Russell's theory, Donnellan argues that Russell's theory is limited and incomplete in its failure to consider daily language use.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, Russell's Theory of Definite Descriptions fails as it overlooks the importance of presupposition in daily language and the important effect of contexts on altering description meanings. In this paper, I have

explored Russell's theory, outlined Strawson's and Donnellan's objections, and argued why both criticisms offer a more accurate understanding of definite descriptions. While Strawson's objections highlight the importance of presupposition, contextual situation, and speaker intent, challenging Russell's theory by emphasizing ordinary language use and realistic considerations for definite descriptions, Donnellan distinguishes between attributive and referential use of definite descriptions and emphasizes that speakers could refer to a specific entity with wrong descriptions but still make a correct reference.

Exploring the criticisms of Russell's theory of definite descriptions by P.F. Strawson and Keith Donnellan opens up several intriguing directions for future research and philosophical implications. Studying the role of contextual factors in the interpretation of definite descriptions, specifically the effect of different contextual factors on the attributive and referential interpretation of definite descriptions, could provide more insight into the different viewpoints between Strawson, Donnellan, and Russell. Moreover, the debate between Strawson, Donnellan, and Russell provides significant implications for the relationship between semantics and pragmatics and how different approaches affect the interpretation of natural language [11].

References

[1] Blackburn, S. W. Philosophy of language | Summary, Books, Topics, Philosophers, & Facts. Encyclopedia Britannica, 2007.

[2] Ludlow, P. Descriptions. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2022.

[3] Akman, V., Alpaslan, F. N. Strawson on Intended meaning and context. Lecture notes in computer science, 1999.

[4] Cohen, S. M. Donnellan: "Reference and Definite Descriptions," 2008.

[5] Lambert, K. Russell's Theory of Definite Descriptions. Dialectica, 1990, 44(1/2): 137–152.

[6] Speaks, J. Russell's theory of descriptions. University of Notre Dame, 2011-2012.

[7] Duží, Marie. Strawsonian vs. Russellian definite descriptions. Organon F: Medzinárodný Časopis Pre Analytickú Filozofiu, 2009, 16 (4):587-614.

[8] Ramachandran, M. A Strawsonian Objection to Russell's Theory of Descriptions. Analysis, 1993, 53(4): 209.

[9] Speaks, J. Donnellan on the referential/attributive distinction and Russell's theory of descriptions, 2005.

[10] Wettstein, H. Having in mind. Oxoford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

[11] Pérez-Milans, M., Tollefson, J. W. Language policy and planning. Oxoford: {Oxford University Press, 2018.