ELSEVIER

VOLUME NINE

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS

SECOND EDITION

语言与语言学百科全书

（第2版）

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
KEITH BROWN

CO-ORDINATING EDITORS
ANNE H. ANDERSON
LAURIE BAUER
MARGIE BERNS
GRAEME HIRST
JIM MILLER

上海外语教育出版社
外教社 SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

VOLUME NINE

9

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS

SECOND EDITION

语言与语言学百科全书

（第2版）

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

KEITH BROWN

CO-ORDINATING EDITORS

ANNE H. ANDERSON
LAURIE BAUER
MARGIE BERNS
GRAEME HIRST
JIM MILLER

上海外语教育出版社
外教社 SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

语言与语言学百科全书. 9 /(英)布朗(**Brown, k.**)主编.
—上海：上海外语教育出版社，**2008**
ISBN 978-7-5446-0699-8

Ⅰ.语… Ⅱ.布… Ⅲ.语言学－百科全书－英文 Ⅳ.**H0-61**

中国版本图书馆 **CIP** 数据核字(**2008**)第 **036555** 号

图字：09-2007-815

This second edition of Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics 14-volume set, by Keith Brown is published by arrangement with Elsevier Ltd, of The Boulevard, Langford Lane, Kidington, Oxford, OX5 1GB, UK.
This edition is licensed for distribution and sale in China only, excluding Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macao, and may not be distributed and sold elsewhere.
本书由爱斯唯尔出版社授权上海外语教育出版社出版。
仅供在中华人民共和国境内(香港、澳门和台湾除外)销售。

项目总负责：庄智象
责任编辑：孙 玉 孙 静 梁晓莉 许进兴

出版发行：上海外语教育出版社
(上海外国语大学内) 邮编：200083
电 话： 021－65425300 (总机)
电子邮箱： bookinfo@sflep.com.cn
网 址： http://www.sflep.com.cn http://www.sflep.com

印 刷： 上海中华商务联合印刷有限公司
经 销： 新华书店上海发行所
开 本： 889×1194 1/16 印张 51 字数 2361 千字
版 次： 2008 年 5 月第 1 版 2008 年 5 月第 1 次印刷
印 数： 3 000 册

书 号： ISBN 978-7-5446-0699-8/H·0310
定 价： 5000.00 元（全十四册）
本版图书如有印装质量问题，可向本社调换

EXECUTIVE EDITORIAL BOARD/HONORARY EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Keith Brown
University of Cambridge, UK

CO-ORDINATING EDITORS

Anne Anderson
University of Glasgow, Scotland

Laurie Bauer
Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

Margie Berns
Purdue University, USA

Keith Brown
University of Cambridge, UK

Graeme Hirst
University of Toronto, Canada

Jim Miller
University of Auckland, New Zealand

SECTION EDITORS

Keith Allan
Monash University, Australia
Semantics (logical & lexical)

Anne Anderson
University of Glasgow, Scotland
Psycholinguistics

Alex Barber
The Open University, UK
Philosophy & Language

Laurie Bauer
Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
Morphology

Margie Berns
Purdue University, USA
Applied Linguistics

James P. Blevins
University of Cambridge, UK
Syntax

Billy Clark
Middlesex University, UK
Foundations of Linguistics

Östen Dahl
Stockholm University, Sweden
Semantics (grammatical)

Marcel Danesi
University of Toronto, Canada
Semiotics

Peter T. Daniels
Independent Scholar, USA
Writing Systems

Philip Durkin and Kathryn Allen
Oxford English Dictionary, UK
Glossary

Catherine Emmott
University of Glasgow, Scotland
Text Analysis & Stylistics

John Esling
University of Victoria, Canada
Phonetics

Erik Fudge
University of Reading, UK
Religion & Language

John Gibbons
Hong Kong Baptist University, China
Law & Language

Mark Hale
Concordia University, Canada
Historical & Comparative Linguistics

Patrick Hanks
Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Germany
Lexicography

Bernd Heine
University of Cologne, Germany
Typology & Universals

Graeme Hirst
University of Toronto, Canada
Natural Language Processing & Machine Translation

Kurt R Jankowsky
Georgetown University, USA
Biographies

Dennis Kurzon
University of Haifa, Israel
Law & Language

Jennifer Lai
IBM Research, USA
Speech Technology

Elena Lieven
Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Germany
Language Acquisition

Andrew Linn
University of Sheffield, UK
History of Linguistics

Kirsten Malmkjær
Middlesex University, UK
Translation

Lutz Marten
School of Oriental and African Studies
University of London, UK
Countries & Language

Susan McKay
University of Queensland, Australia
Media & Language

Raj Mesthrie
University of Cape Town, South Africa
Society & Language

Miriam Meyerhoff
University of Edinburgh, Scotland
Variation & Language

Jacob L. Mey
University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Pragmatics

Marc Naguib
University of Bielefeld, Germany
Animal Communication

Jon Oberlander
University of Edinburgh, Scotland
Cognitive Science

Sarah Ogilvie
Oxford University Press, UK
Languages of the World

Allan Ramsay
University of Manchester, UK
Computational Linguistics

Françoise Salager-Meyer
Universidad de los Andes, Merida, Venezuela
Medicine & Language

Michael Silverstein
University of Chicago, USA
Linguistic Anthropology

Rosanna Sornicola
Università di Napoli Federico II, Italy
Spoken Discourse

Bernard Spolsky
Bar-Ilan University, Israel
Education & Language

Robert J. Stainton
University of Western Ontario, Canada
Philosophy & Language

Harry Whitaker
Northern Michigan University, USA
Brain & Language

Richard Wiese
University of Marburg, Germany
Phonology

Ruth Wodak
University of Lancaster, UK
Politics & Language

Bencie Woll
University College London, UK
Sign Language

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com

HONORARY EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

Barry Blake
La Trobe University, Australia

Yueguo Gu
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, China

Yukio Otsu
Keio University, Japan

Sally Thomason
University of Michigan, USA

Nigel Vincent
University of Manchester, UK

GUIDE TO USE OF THE ENCYCLOPEDIA

Structure of the Encyclopedia

The material in the Encyclopedia is arranged as a series of articles in alphabetical order. To help you realize the full potential of the material in the Encyclopedia we have provided several features to help you find the topic of your choice: an Alphabetical list of Articles, a Subject Classification, Cross-References and a Subject Index.

1. Alphabetical List of Articles

Your first point of reference will probably be the alphabetical list of articles. It provides a full alphabetical listing of all articles in the order they appear within the work. This list appears at the front of each volume, and will provide you with both the volume number and the page number of the article.

Alternatively, you may choose to browse through the work using the alphabetical order of the articles as your guide. To assist you in identifying your location within the Encyclopedia, a running head line indicates the current article.

You will also find 'dummy entries' for certain languages for which alternative language names exist within the alphabetical list of articles and body text.

For example, if you were attempting to locate material on the *Apalachee* language via the contents list, you would find the following:

Apalachee *See* Muskogean Languages.

The dummy entry directs you to the *Muskogean Languages* article.

If you were trying to locate the material by browsing through the text and you looked up *Apalachee*, you would find the following information provided in the dummy entry:

Apalachee *See:* Muskogean Languages.

2. Subject Classification

The subject classification is intended for use as a thematic guide to the contents of the Encyclopedia. It is divided by subject areas into 36 sections; most sections are further subdivided where appropriate. The sections and subdivisions appear alphabetically, as do the articles within each section. For quick reference, a list of the section headings and subheadings is provided at the start of the subject classification.

Every article in the encyclopedia is listed under at least one section, and a large number are also listed under one or more additional relevant sections. Biographical entries are an exception to this policy; they are listed only under biographies. Except for a very few cases, repeat entries have been avoided within sections, and a given

article will appear only in the most appropriate subdivisions. Again, biographical entries are the main exception, with many linguists appearing in several subdivisions within biographies.

As explained in the introduction to the Encyclopedia, practical considerations necessitate that, of living linguists, only the older generation receive biographical entries. Those for members of the Encyclopedia's Honorary Editorial Advisory Board and Executive Editorial Board appear separately in Volume 1 and are not listed in the classified list of entries.

3. Cross-References

All of the articles in the Encyclopedia have been extensively cross-referenced. The cross-references, which appear at the end of each article, serve three different functions. For example, at the end of *Norwegian* article, cross-references are used:

1. to indicate if a topic is discussed in greater detail elsewhere

> Norwegian
> *See also:* Aasen, Ivar Andreas (1813–1896); Danish; Inflection and Derivation; Language/Dialect Contact; Language and Dialect: Linguistic Varieties; Morphological Typology; Norway: Language Situation; Norse and Icelandic; Scandinavian Lexicography; Subjects and the Extended Projection Principle; Swedish.

2. to draw the reader's attention to parallel discussions in other articles

> Norwegian
> *See also:* Aasen, Ivar Andreas (1813–1896); Danish; Inflection and Derivation; Language/Dialect Contact; Language and Dialect: Linguistic Varieties; Morphological Typology, Norway: Language Situation; Norse and Icelandic; Scandinavian Lexicography; Subjects and the Extended Projection Principle; Swedish.

3. to indicate material that broadens the discussion

> Norwegian
> *See also:* Aasen, Ivar Andreas (1813–1896); Danish; Inflection and Derivation; Language/Dialect Contact; Language and Dialect: Linguistic Varieties; Morphological Typology; Norway: Language Situation; Norse and Icelandic; Scandinavian Lexicography; Subjects and the Extended Projection Principle; Swedish.

4. Subject Index

The index provides you with the page number where the material is located, and the index entries differentiate between material that is an entire article, part of an article, or data presented in a figure or table. Detailed notes are provided on the opening page of the index.

Other End Matter

In addition to the articles that form the main body of the Encyclopedia, there are 176 Ethnologue maps; a full list of contributors with contributor names, affiliations, and article titles; a List of Languages, and a Glossary. All of these appear in the last volume of the Encyclopedia.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF ARTICLES
VOLUME 9

Note: Readers are urged to use the comprehensive name and subject indexes and the Classified List of Entries extensively, since the contents presented here represent only the broad framework of the *Encyclopedia*.

Object-Dependent Thoughts
Objectivity in Moral Discourse
Objects, Properties, and Functions
Occitan
Ogam
Ogden, Charles Kay (1889–1957)
Ohno, Susumu (b. 1919)
Okamoto, Shigeko
Old Church Slavonic
Old English Dictionaries
Old French Dictionaries
Oldendorp, Christian Georg Andreas (1721–1787)
Omaha-Ponca
Oman: Language Situation
Omotic Languages
Oneida
Onions, Charles Talbut (1873–1965)
Onomasiological Theory of Word Formation
Onomasiology and Lexical Variation
Operators in Semantics and Typed Logics
Opie, Peter (1918–1982) and Iona (b. 1923)
Optical Imaging
Optimality-Theoretic Lexical-Functional Grammar
Oracy Education
O'Rahilly, Thomas Francis (1883–1953)
Oral Traditions and Spoken Discourse
Orality
Ordinary Language Philosophy
Organizational Discourse
Origin and Evolution of Language
Origin of Language Debate
Oromo
Orr, John (1885–1966)
Orton, Harold (1898–1975)
Osada, Natsuki (b. 1920)
Ossetic
Osthoff, Hermann (1847–1909)
Otfried von Weissenburg (fl. 9th Century A.D.)
Oto-Manguean Languages
Paget, Richard Arthur Surtees (Bart.), Sir (1869–1955)
Pahlavi
Pakistan: Language Situation
Palau: Language Situation
Palenquero
Paleography, Greek and Latin
Palestine (West Bank and Gaza): Language Situation
Pāli
Pallas, Peter Simon (1741–1811)
Palmer, Harold Edward (1877–1949)
Palsgrave, John (?1480–1554)
Panama: Language Situation
Panel Studies and Language Variation
Pāṇini
Panoan Languages
Papago *See* Tohono O'odham
Papiamentu
Papua New Guinea: Language Situation
Papuan Languages
Paradigm Function Morphology
Paradigm versus Syntagm
Paradoxes, Semantic
Paraguay: Language Situation
Paraok *See* Wa
Parentheticals

Paris School Semiotics
Parkinson's Disease and Language
Parliamentary Discourses
Parsing and Grammar Description, Corpus-Based
Parsing: Statistical Methods
Partee, Barbara H. (b. 1940)
Participatory Research and Advocacy
Particles in Spoken Discourse
Partitives
Part-of-Speech Tagging
Partridge, Eric Honeywood (1894–1979)
Pashto
Passives and Impersonals
Passy, Paul Édouard (1859–1940)
Patañjali (2nd Century B.C.)
Paul, Hermann (1846–1921)
Paulston, Christina Bratt (b. 1932)
Pauses and Hesitations: Psycholinguistic Approach
Pedagogical Grammars: Second Language
Pedersen, Holger (1867–1953)
Pehuenche *See* Mapudungan
Peirce, Charles Sanders (1839–1914)
Perceptual Dialectology
Perfectives, Imperfectives, and Progressives
Perfects, Resultatives, and Experientials
Performance Factors in Spoken Discourse
Performance in Culture
Performative Clauses
Periphrasis
Persian, Modern
Persian, Old
Personal Names
Personality Factors in Spoken Discourse
Peru: Language Situation
Peter Helias (12th Century A.D.)
Petrus de Alliaco (Pierre d'Ailly) (1350–1420)
Petrus Hispanus (ca. 1210–1276)
Pfeiffer, Rudolf (1889–1979)
Philippines: Language Situation
Philosophy of Language, Medieval
Philosophy of Linguistics
Philosophy of Mind
Philosophy of Science and Linguistics
Phoenician
Phoneme
Phonemic Analysis
Phonemics, Taxonomic
Phonetic Classification
Phonetic Pedagogy
Phonetic Processes in Discourse
Phonetic Transcription and Analysis
Phonetic Transcription: History
Phonetically Motivated Word Formation
Phonetics and Pragmatics
Phonetics of Harmony Systems
Phonetics, Articulatory
Phonetics, Acoustic
Phonetics, Forensic
Phonetics: Field Methods
Phonetics: Overview
Phonetics: Precursors to Modern Approaches
Phonological Awareness and Literacy
Phonological Change in Optimality Theory
Phonological Change: Lexical Phonology
Phonological Impairments, Sublexical
Phonological Phrase
Phonological Typology
Phonological Universals
Phonological Words
Phonological, Lexical, Syntactic, and Semantic Disorders in Children
Phonology in the Production of Words
Phonology: Optimality Theory
Phonology: Overview
Phonology–Phonetics Interface
Photography: Semiotics
Phrasal Stress
Phraseology
Phrastic, Neustic, Tropic: Hare's Trichotomy
Phytosemiotics
Piaget, Jean (1896–1980)
Pictish
Pictography: Semiotic Approaches
Pidgins and Creoles: Overview
Pike, Kenneth Lee (1912–2000)
Pima *See* Tohono O'odham
Pitcairn Island: Language Situation
Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara
Pitman, Isaac, Sir (1813–1897)
Place Names
Plagiarism
Planning Strategies and Production of Spoken Discourse
Planudes, Maximus (1260–1310)
Plato and His Predecessors
Plato's *Cratylus* and Its Legacy
Pliny the Elder (23–79 A.D.)
Pluractionals (Distributives)
Plurality
Poetry: Stylistic Aspects
Pokorny, Julius (1887–1970)
Poland: History of Linguistics
Poland: Language Situation
Polarity Items
Police Questioning
Polish
Polish Lexicography
Polish: Phonology
Politeness
Politeness Strategies as Linguistic Variables

Political Rhetorics of Discrimination
Political Speeches and Persuasive Argumentation
Politics and Language: Overview
Politics of Teaching
Politics, Ideology and Discourse
Polotsky, Hans (Hayyim) Jakob (1905–1991)
Polysemy and Homonymy
Polysynthetic Language: Central Siberian Yupik
Pomoan Languages
Ponca *See* Omaha-Ponca
Ponka *See* Omaha-Ponca
Pop, Sever (1901–1961)
Poppe, Nikolai Nikolaevich (1897–1991)
Popularizations
Porphyrios of Tyros (ca. 232/3–301)
Port-Royal Tradition of Grammar
Portugal: Language Situation
Portuguese
Possession, Adnominal
Possession, Predicative
Possession, External
Possible Worlds: Philosophical Theories
Possible Worlds: Stylistic Applications
Post-Bloomfieldians
Postel, Guillaume (1510–1581)
Postmodernism
Poststructuralism and Deconstruction
Potebnja, Alexander (1835–1891)
Pott, August Friedrich (1802–1887)
Pound, Louise (1872–1958)

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com

O

Object-Dependent Thoughts

S Crawford, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Some of our thoughts involve reference to particular individual entities. Philosophers call these kinds of thoughts 'singular thoughts.' *Russell was a great philosopher, you're standing on my foot, I'm tired, that raccoon got into my garbage last night* – these are all singular thoughts because each involves reference to a particular thing: Russell, you, me, and a certain raccoon, respectively. As these examples indicate, singular thoughts are usually expressed by sentences containing proper names (e.g., 'Russell'), indexicals (e.g., 'you' and 'I'), and demonstrative expressions (e.g., 'that raccoon').

Singular Thoughts as Object Dependent

Some philosophers maintain that singular thoughts are *object dependent*, by which they mean that the intentional content of the thought essentially involves the object that it is about, in the sense that the thought content would not be available to a thinker were the object not to exist. More precisely, a singular thought is object dependent just in case its content is such that (1) its existence depends on the existence of the object thought about, and (2) its identity depends on the identity of the object thought about. For example, consider the thought *that raccoon got into my garbage last night*, had by me while spying a particular raccoon skulking in my backyard. According to the doctrine of object dependence, if, counterfactually, no raccoon had in fact been there to be singled out by me, owing perhaps to my delusional or hallucinatory state of mind – let us call this the "empty possibility" – then there would have been no singular thought content for me to entertain. Consequently, my psychological condition in this situation would be different from what it is in the actual situation. Moreover, if, counterfactually, my thought had singled out a qualitatively indistinguishable but numerically different raccoon instead – call this the "duplicate possibility" – then the resulting thought would have had a different content from the content that my thought had in the actual situation. Again, my overall psychological state in this duplicate possibility is different from what it actually is. The implication here for linguistic meaning is that the meaning of sentences containing genuine singular terms (e.g., proper names, indexicals, and demonstrative expressions) depends on the singular terms in question successfully referring to objects. On this view, nonfictional sentences containing nonreferring singular terms, such as empty or bearerless names, are meaningless, in the sense that they fail to express any thoughts.

The doctrine of object dependence is a species of the more general doctrine of *externalism* about thought content, according to which some states of mind are such that we can be in them only if we bear certain appropriate relations to other things in our environment, and thus is opposed to *internalism* about the mind, according to which the contents of our thoughts are never dependent on any relations between us and other things in our environment. (Some philosophers, such as Burge [1982], accept the general doctrine of externalism but reject object dependence.)

Epistemological Consequences of Object-Dependence

It is controversial which, if any, singular thoughts are object dependent. Arguably, first-person thoughts expressed with the indexical 'I' are object dependent: it seems obvious that if I did not exist, then the thought that I now express with the sentence *I'm tired* could not exist; moreover, no one else could have had the very same thought. But the thesis that singular thoughts expressed with proper names and demonstratives are object dependent has seemed paradoxical to some philosophers. For when the idea of object dependence is applied to these other types of singular thoughts, it runs up against a strongly held intuition about the nature of thought content, namely, that we have a kind of direct, noninferential knowledge of the contents of our thoughts, in the sense that we know, just by thinking, whether we are having a thought and, moreover, what thought we are having.

The doctrine of object dependence seems to contravene this intuition about the epistemology of thought.

For, first of all, condition (1) above allows the possibility that a thinker could suffer the illusion of entertaining a thought when he was not in fact doing so. If, unbeknown to me, I am in what we have been calling an empty possibility and am hallucinating a raccoon rather than actually seeing one, it may seem to me that I am having a singular thought, which I might try to express with the sentence *that raccoon got into my garbage last night*, even though I am not. But is this kind of cognitive illusion really possible? It is very tempting to think, against this, that if it seems to me as if I am having a thought with a certain content, then I am. Perhaps I might be mistaken about which object, if any, my thought is about – but how could I be mistaken about whether I was even thinking a thought at all?

Condition (2) has also seemed problematic. Consider what we have called the duplicate counterfactual possibility, in which I see a different raccoon, qualitatively indistinguishable from the one I actually see, and think *that raccoon got into my garbage last night*. In such a case, everything will seem the same to me: the duplicate raccoon does not appear to affect my conscious awareness in any way different from how the actual raccoon affects it. But is not subjective indistinguishability the criterion for sameness and difference of thought content? Opponents of object dependence argue that in order for there to be a genuinely psychological or mental difference between the two cases, this difference must impinge on my conscious awareness in some way. The object-dependent theorist denies this, arguing that it is the product of a mistaken internalist picture of the mind, a picture that the object-dependent theorist urges us to reject in favor of an externalist view. The debate between object-dependent theorists and their opponents is thus linked to a certain extent to the larger debate between internalism and externalism about thought content.

The Central Motivation for Object Dependence

A number of different considerations have been advanced in favor of an object-dependent conception of singular thought, and many involve a synthesis of key ideas of Frege and Russell (Evans, 1982; McDowell, 1977, 1984, 1986; McCulloch, 1989). Advocates of this form of object dependence are often labeled 'neo-Fregeans,' which can be confusing, because object-dependent singular thoughts are also often called 'Russellian thoughts,' so one needs to be aware of differing terminology here.

Perhaps the best way to appreciate the object-dependent theorists' point of view is to begin by noting that they do countenance thoughts that in a certain sense concern particular individuals but that would be available to a thinker were those individuals not to exist. Moreover, there is a straightforward sense in which the contents of these kinds of thoughts would remain unaffected were duplicate objects substituted for the actual ones. Calling these kinds of thoughts object-*in*dependent thoughts, we can say that although they concern particulars, the relation between their contents and their objects is much less direct or intimate than the relation between the contents and objects of object-dependent thoughts (the idea goes back to Russell's seminal distinction [1910–1911] between knowledge by description and knowledge by acquaintance).

The most obvious examples of object-independent thoughts are thoughts that involve definite description concepts, thoughts of the form *the F is G*. Consider the thought *the first man on the moon was an American*. As it happens, this thought is about Neil Armstrong because he was in fact the first man on the moon. But consider now the empty possibility in which the lunar landing was a hoax and the definite description *the first man on the moon* fails to designate anything. The object-dependent theorist holds that even though the thought fails to single out any actual object in the world, the thought still has a content, a content expressed, in part, by the definite description. Similarly, consider the duplicate possibility, in which Neil Armstrong's identical twin is the first man on the moon. Despite the thought's picking out a different man, the content of the thought remains the same – again, that expressed (in part) by the definite description *the first man on the moon*. The crucial point here is that the intentional content of the thought can be specified independently of the object, if any, that it is about.

The object-dependent theorist's idea is this. Thought content is essentially representational: it represents the world as being a certain way; it lays down conditions that the world must meet in order for the thought to be true. That is to say, the content of a thought determines its truth conditions. In the case of a thought employing a definite description concept *the F* (a descriptive thought, for short), the thinker knows what those conditions are without knowing which object, if any, the thought concerns. If I say to you *the first man on the moon was American*, it is not necessary for you to know which object is the first man on the moon, nor even that there is such an object, in order for you to understand what I have said, in order for you to "grasp" the thought I expressed with this sentence. So long as

you understand all the words in the sentence and their mode of combination, you know exactly how the world is represented as being; you know what the thought is "saying" about reality. In other words, you know that the thought is true just in case there is a unique man who was first on the moon and who was American. It does not matter who this man happens to be – Neil Armstrong, his identical twin, or Buzz Aldrin. So long as there is such a man, the thought is true; and if there is no such man – either because no man at all has ever been on the moon or because more than one man stepped onto the moon at exactly the same time – then the thought is false. The representational content of a descriptive thought is thus independent of any object that the content might be about. The truth conditions make no reference to any man in particular.

When it comes to singular thoughts, however, the object-dependent theorist maintains that their representational content is not independent of any object the content is about. On the contrary, the content requires that a certain particular object be picked out. In order to understand or grasp the thought in question, one must know which particular object this is. Consider the foregoing example of a singular thought: *that raccoon got into my garbage last night*, based on my visual experience of a particular raccoon in my backyard (these kinds of singular thoughts are sometimes called 'perceptual demonstrative thoughts'). Now, in having this thought, I am representing the world in a certain way. What way is this exactly? Well, I am not representing the world as merely containing a raccoon that got into my garbage last night, whichever raccoon that might be. The way I am representing the world as being involves that very raccoon. My thought is true just in case that raccoon (the very one I saw) got into my garbage last night; and in order for you to have this thought too, you need to know which particular raccoon is singled out by my perceptual demonstrative 'that raccoon.' Contrast this with the very different case in which I think the descriptive thought *the cleverest and boldest raccoon in the neighborhood got into my garbage last night*. All that it takes for this thought to be true is for there to be a unique raccoon, who is cleverer and bolder than all the rest and who got into my garbage – and you can grasp this thought without knowing which raccoon, if any, that was. If it turns out that there was no such raccoon, then my thought is straightforwardly false. But the truth conditions for my perceptual demonstrative thought make essential reference to the very object it is about. The truth or falsity of this thought of mine turns on the condition of a particular raccoon, namely, that raccoon – so that if there is no such creature, if (say) I am hallucinating, there is nothing in the world to count as my thought being true or false. Consequently, in this empty possibility, my mental episode, whatever exactly its nature, has no truth conditions (for, to repeat, there is nothing *of which* I have judged to have a certain property; nor have I made the mere existential claim that there is *an* object with a certain property). Since thought content is essentially truth conditional, according to the object-dependent theorist, I have not in fact had a singular thought at all, only the illusion of one. Whether considerations like these in favor of object dependence apply equally to other kinds of singular thoughts, such as those expressed with proper names and indexicals (other than 'I'), is a further question.

Criticisms and Rivals

Various criticisms have been leveled at the object-dependent conception of singular thought. Some of these arise from problems that the conception inherits from the general doctrine of externalism, such as its apparent conflict with certain features of self-knowledge (Davies, 1998). Three issues, however, stand out with respect to object dependence in particular.

The first is the question of what is going on, psychologically speaking, in the minds of deluded subjects in empty possibilities who suffer the illusion of entertaining singular thoughts. Their minds are not phenomenological blanks, after all; yet, according to the object-dependent theorist, they are not filled with any singular thoughts. Are such deluded subjects having any thoughts at all? If so, what kinds of thoughts are they having?

The second issue is closely related to the first and concerns the commonsense psychological explanation of the actions of deluded subjects. Normally, we explain agents' actions – my charging into the backyard, say – by attributing singular thoughts to them – the belief that that raccoon got into my garbage last night, for example. But now consider my deluded duplicate who, after hallucinating a raccoon in the empty possibility, engages in the very same type of behavior of charging into the backyard. According to the object-dependent theorist, my duplicate here has no singular thought; that is, he has no belief the content of which is *that raccoon got into my garbage last night*. But, although he is hallucinating, his action is perfectly rational and so is presumably psychologically explicable by ordinary commonsense standards. But how do we so explain his behavior without attributing a singular thought to him (McDowell, 1977; Segal, 1989)? Moreover, if we can explain his behavior without attributing a singular thought to him, then why can we not do the same with me in the

actual situation? But if we can do this with me too, then it looks as if the ascription of object-dependent singular thoughts is 'psychologically redundant' – and that allegedly calls into question their very existence (Noonan, 1986, 1991; Segal, 1989).

The third issue, perhaps the most serious, is that there are powerful rival object-independent conceptions of singular thought, which are free of many of the problems that beset object-dependent theories. There tend to be two different kinds of alternative conceptions.

The first of these conceptions attempts to analyze singular thought content in wholly general or descriptive terms, in such a way that the same content can exist in duplicate and empty possibilities, in the manner of thoughts involving definite description concepts, discussed earlier (Schiffer, 1978; Searle, 1983, 1991; Blackburn, 1984: chapter 9). For example, we might try to analyze the content of the demonstrative expression *that raccoon* as equivalent to the content of the definite description *the raccoon I am seeing now* or *the raccoon causing this visual experience*.

The second approach opposes this kind of descriptive reduction and maintains a genuinely singular conception of singular thought but argues that a distinction between irreducibly singular (or "*de re*") content and object can still be drawn, again, in such a way that, as with the first alternative, the same singular content can exist in both duplicate and empty possibilities (Burge, 1977, 1982, 1983, 1991; Bach, 1987; Segal, 1989). This approach exploits an analogy between the semantics of sentences containing demonstratives and pronouns (*this is red, she is tall*) and the semantics of the open sentences of a logical system (*x is red, x is tall*) – namely, that both kinds of sentences are true or false only under an assignment of values to the demonstratives, pronouns, and free variables in question. The proposal is to treat a sentence such as *that is a raccoon* as like a predicate, or open sentence in the logician's sense, and to think of it as expressing a single content (a "propositionally incomplete" content) that is mentally applied, in different situations, to different objects, and even, in some situations, to no object at all.

These two alternatives each face their own difficulties, however. The first alternative seems to overintellectualize thinking. When I think *that raccoon got into my garbage last night*, I do not appear to be thinking about myself or the present moment or about causation or my own visual experiences, and even if I were doing so in a philosophical mood, it does not seem necessary for a creature to have such sophisticated concepts in order for it to have singular thoughts (McDowell, 1991; Burge, 1991; Searle, 1991). As for the second alternative, it is not clear to what extent it departs from the intuitive principle that thought content is fully representational in the sense of always determining truth conditions. For in the empty counterfactual possibility, in which I hallucinate a raccoon, no value will be assigned to the demonstrative concept in my thought (*that raccoon*), and hence no truth conditions for the overall thought will be determined. The advocates of this second alternative approach thus seem committed to the view that I can have thoughts that possess no truth conditions, something that may give us pause.

See also: Counterfactuals; Descriptions, Definite and Indefinite: Philosophical Aspects; Dthat; Empty Names; Externalism about Content; Frege, Gottlob (1848–1925); Immunity to Error through Misidentification; Indexicality: Philosophical Aspects; Proper Names: Philosophical Aspects; Reference: Philosophical Theories; Russell, Bertrand (1872–1970); Truth Conditional Semantics and Meaning; Two-Dimensional Semantics.

Bibliography

Bach K (1987). *Thought and reference.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Beaney M (ed.) (1997). *The Frege reader.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Blackburn S (1984). *Spreading the word.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Burge T (1977). 'Belief de re.' *Journal of Philosophy 74,* 338–362.

Burge T (1982). 'Other bodies.' In Woodfield A (ed.) *Thought and object.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Burge T (1983). 'Russell's problem and intentional identity.' In Tomberlin J (ed.) *Agent, language, and the structure of the world.* Indianapolis: Hackett.

Burge T (1991). 'Vision and intentional content.' In Lepore E & Van Gulick R (eds.) *John Searle and his critics.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Carruthers P (1987). 'Russellian thoughts.' *Mind 96,* 18–35.

Davies M (1998). 'Externalism, architecturalism, and epistemic warrant.' In Wright C, Smith B C & Macdonald C (eds.) *Knowing our own minds.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Evans G (1982). *The varieties of reference.* McDowell J (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Frege G (1892). 'On Sinn and Bedeutung.' Black M (trans.). In Beaney (ed.).

Frege G (1918). 'Thought.' Geach P & Stoothoff R H (trans.). In Beaney (ed.).

McCulloch G (1989). *The game of the name.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McDowell J (1977). 'On the sense and reference of a proper name.' *Mind 86,* 159–185.

McDowell J (1984). 'De re senses.' *Philosophical Quarterly 34,* 283–294.

McDowell J (1986). 'Singular thought and the extent of inner space.' In Pettit P & McDowell J (eds.) *Subject, thought and context*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
McDowell J (1991). 'Intentionality de re.' In Lepore & Van Gulick (eds.).
Noonan H (1986). 'Russellian thoughts and methodological solipsism.' In Butterfield J (ed.) *Language, mind, and logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Noonan H (1991). 'Object-dependent thoughts and psychological redundancy.' *Analysis 51*, 1–9.
Russell B (1910–1911). 'Knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge by description.' *Proceedings of the aristotelian society, new series 11*, 108–128. [Reprinted in *Mysticism and logic*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1917.]
Russell B (1912). *The problems of philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Russell B (1918). 'The philosophy of logical atomism.' *Monist 28*, 495–527. Reprinted in Russell B (1956). *Logic and knowledge* London: George Allen and Unwin.
Schiffer S (1978). 'The basis of reference.' *Erkenntnis 13*, 171–206.
Searle J (1983). *Intentionality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Searle J (1991). 'Response: reference and intentionality.' In Lepore & Van Gulick (eds.).
Segal G (1989). 'The return of the individual.' *Mind 98*, 39–57.

Objectivity in Moral Discourse

M Timmons, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Does moral discourse purport to be objective? If so, can its objectivist pretensions be justified? Roughly speaking, to say that some form of discourse is objective is to say that there is a single set of truths about whatever subject matter the discourse is about. We can make this rough characterization more precise by formulating a number of related theses – objectivity theses – that collectively capture this idea of objectivity:

Cognitivism: Declarative sentences of the discourse in question are used by speakers to make genuine assertions and function mainly to express the speaker's beliefs. Given that (sincere) belief and assertion aim at representing what is true, such sentences are capable of being true or false.

Truth: Some affirmative sentences of the discourse are true.

Independence: What makes some sentence of the discourse true is that it corresponds to some fact – where the existence and nature of the specific fact to which the sentence corresponds is independent of the attitudes and beliefs that individuals and groups have toward the fact in question. It is common to use the word 'stance' to refer to the beliefs and attitudes of individuals and groups, so using this terminology we may express the independence thesis by saying that for the discourse in question there is a stance-independent reality (realm of facts) that the discourse is about, and the facts comprising that reality are what make certain sentences of that discourse true.

Convergence: Ideally, use of the proper methods of inquiry (which may differ from discourse to discourse) may be expected to lead individuals (at least under suitably ideal conditions) to converge in a great many of their judgments about the subject matter of the discourse in question.

Discourse satisfying these four theses involves sentences that are (or may be) objectively true and hence we may say that the discourse itself is objective. Of course, it is possible for some realm of discourse to feature claims that purport to be objectively true but fail to be so because one or more of the above theses fail to hold in relation to the discourse in question – a possibility to which we shall return below.

Moral objectivism, then, at least as it is commonly understood by philosophers, is the view that all four theses hold in relation to moral discourse: not only does moral discourse purport to be objective, it satisfies the objectivity requirements in question and thus some moral judgments are objectively true. Sometimes this is put by saying that there is a single true morality. As we shall see, some philosophers have denied one or more of the four theses in relation to moral discourse and thus denied that morality is objective.

Determining whether moral objectivism is correct requires an examination of fundamental philosophical questions about the meaning, truth, and justification of moral judgments – questions central to that branch of ethics called 'meta-ethics.' But it also requires an examination of the very notion of objectivity. And here we find two models of objectivity. One of them is inspired by discourse about the physical world

(including ordinary nonscientific discourse about the world as well as scientific discourse) and which I will refer to as the model of 'ontological objectivity' – so called because the central idea is that there is an ontological realm of 'really' existing objects and properties that sentences from a particular discourse purport to be about and which serve to make true certain of those sentences. An alternate, more modest form of objectivity, which I will call 'methodological objectivity,' is less focused on matters of ontology and more focused on methods of reasoning that govern the discourse in question.

In what follows, we begin with a brief characterization of the ontological model of objectivity and then proceed in the next four sections to consider some of the evidence for and controversy about whether moral discourse is ontologically objective. After reviewing the pros and cons of the claim that moral discourse is ontologically objective, we turn to the second model of objectivity – a model that promises to make sense of objectivity without ontology.

Ontological Objectivity

In meta-ethical discussion over the objectivity of moral discourse, discourse about ordinary commonsense objects and their properties as well as scientific discourse – often referred to as descriptive discourse – is taken to be paradigmatic of objective discourse. Roughly, the idea is that descriptive discourse is (or at least purports to be) about a realm of objects and properties in certain combinations (facts) whose nature and existence is independent of our beliefs, conventions, attitudes, and other mental stances we might take toward those facts. Here, the emphasis is on considerations of ontology – on what exists – hence the label 'ontological objectivity.' Moreover, the ontological objectivist typically embraces a strong form of the independence thesis, viz.,

> What makes some sentence true is that it corresponds to some sort of stance-independent fact – where the existence and nature of the fact in question is independent of the actual and ideal stances of individuals or groups.

The significance of this thesis of strong independence (SI) will emerge later on when we turn to methodological objectivity.

So the model of ontological objectivity (using descriptive discourse about objects and properties in the world as an example) clearly involves the first three objectivity theses: descriptive discourse serves to express beliefs (cognitivism), some of which are true (truth) when they correspond to stance-independent facts (independence). Barring epistemological skepticism, we may also expect suitably motivated inquirers, using proper methods of inquiry, to converge in their beliefs about this realm of objective fact since their inquiries are being constrained by an objective, stance-independent reality.

Ontological Objectivity and Moral Discourse

Does moral discourse have the trappings of ontologically objective discourse? Indeed, is it a form of descriptive discourse – discourse about a special subject matter, but nevertheless a discourse that is properly interpreted as representing a realm of objective moral facts? Those who think so often point to a number of 'markers' – features that are deeply embedded in moral thought and discourse – that either reflect or at least seem to support the various objectivity theses. Let us consider some of them in more detail.

Grammatical and Semantic Markers

Perhaps the most obvious markers of objectivity concern matters of grammar and semantics.

O1: Moral sentences such as 'John's lying to Brenda was wrong,' in which a moral term appears, are in the indicative mood and are used to make genuine assertions that express a (sincere) speaker's beliefs.

O2: Moreover, because moral sentences are typically used to make assertions they are truth apt: they are candidates for semantic evaluation in terms of their truth and falsity. Sentences which predicate the truth or falsity of a moral sentence seem to make perfect sense (e.g., 'It is true that John's lying to Brenda is morally wrong,' 'It is false that contraception is morally wrong,' and so on).

O3: Moreover, logically simple moral sentences (e.g., 'It is wrong to steal') can embed in all sorts of logically complex grammatical constructions, most notably truth-functional and quantificational constructions (e.g., 'If it is wrong to steal, then it is wrong to encourage others to steal.') It would seem that such logically complex sentences have truth values that are determined by the truth values of their simpler constituents.

Ontological Markers

The following two markers have to do with the ontological status of the subject matter of moral discourse.

O4: Moral terms that appear in moral sentences (e.g., 'good,' 'right,' 'virtuous,' and their opposites) seem to be used to denote properties that are (or may

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com