Course End Paper

I think the Donnellan reading “Reference and definite descriptions” was probably the most interesting to me because he argues that definite descriptions can be used to refer to objects even if the description itself is not necessarily true of the object. His perspective is different from that of many other philosophers, who argue that definite descriptions must be true of the object in order for the reference to be successful. Donnellan's view allows for a more flexible understanding of reference and how it works in language, while others argue for a more strict and constrained view.

My least favorite reading was probably Putnam’s “Meaning and reference” because he argues that the meaning of a word or phrase is determined by its reference, or the object it denotes in the world. Meaning that words carry no intrinsic meaning, which is hard for me to agree with.

I would be interested in reading a lot more of Russell seeing as he is credited with being the sort of “father of the field” I think that reading more of him could allow me to gain a sense of how the field has progressed over time.