I. Administrative
   A. Long essay due Thursday
   B. General Questions?

II. Reflections on Abbott, Chs. 5 & 6
   A. Why attend to proper names and definite descriptions?
      1. Probably a matter of historical accident, although there is a possible explanation for names in connection with the role played by logical constants in logic
      2. Names are the vehicle of reference *par excellence* – they serve to focus our intuitions on the nature of reference, since (as Butch said), they “don’t mean shit”
      3. Descriptions help to focus our attention on the relation between reference and quantification—on “closer” and more “distant” connections between words and the world; they are something of a “boundary object” in theoretical work on reference
   B. Proper names
      1. Pepp’s “foundational question” and “mechanism question”
      2. Different mechanisms: descriptions, clusters of descriptions, causal-historical chains, convention (?)
      3. Problems with the description accounts
      4. The relation between direct reference and rigid designation
      5. The semantic contribution of proper names
6. Problems (e.g., empty names, co-referential names) and solutions: meta-linguistic, hidden indexicals, bite-the-bullet approaches

C. **Definite descriptions**

1. Strawson’s concerns: uses of descriptions; presupposition vs. assertion; incomplete descriptions

2. Referential vs. attributive
   a. Semantic account
   b. Pragmatic account

3. **Key distinctions:**
   a. Reference vs. Quantification/Attribution/Variability
   b. Definiteness vs. indefiniteness: “Bring me the bassoon” vs. “Bring me a bassoon”
   c. Specificity vs. non-specificity: “Mary had lunch with a logician”