

Saul Kripke Naming And Necessity

Saul Kripke Naming And Necessity

Downloaded from
www.everybodystreet.com by Sawyer &
Cervantes

INTRODUCTION: THE REVOLUTION IN LANGUAGE AND METAPHYSICS

In the landscape of 20th-century philosophy, few works have reshaped fundamental assumptions as decisively as Saul Kripke's **Naming and Necessity**. Originally delivered as three lectures at Princeton University in 1970, this short but explosively dense book overturned decades of orthodoxy about how language connects to the world and how necessity operates in metaphysics. Before Kripke, most philosophers assumed that proper names were secretly disguised descriptions — that "Aristotle" meant something like "the teacher of Alexander the Great and the author of the *Nicomachean Ethics*." After Kripke, that view became nearly impossible to defend. **Saul Kripke Naming And Necessity** introduced concepts that are now standard tools in philosophy of language, metaphysics, epistemology, and even philosophy of science: **rigid designators**, **a posteriori necessities**, and the **causal-historical theory of reference**. This article unpacks those groundbreaking ideas, explains why they matter, and explores their enduring legacy.

BACKGROUND: THE DESCRIPTIVIST THEORY KRIPKE ATTACKED

To understand the force of Kripke's intervention, we must first appreciate the view he opposed. Following the work of Gottlob Frege and Bertrand Russell, most philosophers held a **descriptivist theory of names**. According to this view, the meaning of a proper name is equivalent to a definite description (or a cluster of descriptions) that uniquely picks out the referent. For example:

- "Sir Arthur Conan Doyle" means "the creator of Sherlock Holmes and the author of *The Hound of the Baskervilles*."
- "Venus" means "the morning star."
- "Moses" means "the man who led the Israelites out of Egypt and received the Ten Commandments."

This approach had intuitive appeal: it explained how names could refer to objects, and how we could fix the reference of a name. But it also generated serious puzzles. If a name's meaning *is* a description, then statements like "Aristotle was the teacher of Alexander" would be trivial and necessary – true by definition. Yet clearly, Aristotle could have failed to teach Alexander; he might have died young. Kripke exposed these problems and offered a radically different picture.

THE CORE INNOVATION: RIGID DESIGNATORS

The most famous concept from **Naming and Necessity** is the **rigid designator**. A term is a rigid designator if it refers to the same object in every possible world where that object exists. Proper names, Kripke argued, are rigid designators. The name "Aristotle" picks out the actual man Aristotle in every possible scenario we consider, even if in that scenario he never wrote philosophy or taught anyone. In contrast, a description like "the teacher of Alexander" is non-rigid: in some possible world, someone else teaches Alexander, or no one does. The description

may refer to different individuals across worlds.

Why This Matters for Necessity

Once we accept proper names as rigid designators, a stunning consequence follows: identity statements between two rigid designators are **necessary if true**. "Hesperus (the evening star) is Phosphorus (the morning star)" is a statement Kripke analyzed with great care. Both names rigidly designate the planet Venus. Since they pick out the same entity in every possible world, the identity holds necessarily – yet we discovered it empirically. This led Kripke to his second major contribution.

THE METAPHYSICAL REVOLUTION: NECESSARY A POSTERIORI TRUTHS

Before Kripke, philosophers typically equated "necessary" with "known a priori" (independent of experience) and "contingent" with "known a posteriori" (through empirical observation). Kripke shattered that neat alignment. He argued that there are **necessary a posteriori truths**. Examples include:

- Water is H₂O** – it is metaphysically necessary that water has that molecular structure, but we discovered it through scientific investigation.
- Hesperus is Phosphorus** – necessarily the same celestial body, but astronomers had to observe it.
- Heat is molecular motion** – it is necessary that heat is molecular motion, but we learned this from physics.

Kripke's key insight was that **epistemology** and **metaphysics** are distinct domains. How we come to know a truth does not settle whether that truth holds in all possible worlds. The necessity of "Water is H₂O" stems from the nature of water itself – its essence – not from our method of verification. This reframing had profound implications for philosophy of science, especially regarding natural kinds and theoretical identifications.

Contingent A Priori Truths

Kripke also introduced the counterpart category: **contingent a priori truths**. These are statements known independent of experience but which are not necessary. The classic example is the use of a **reference-fixer**. Suppose we define a standard meter stick: "One meter is the length of stick S at time t." That statement is known a priori (by stipulation) but is contingent – the stick could have been slightly longer or shorter. This further untangled the traditional categories.

ESSENTIALISM AND THE NATURE OF IDENTITY

Naming and Necessity also revitalized **metaphysical essentialism** – the view that objects have essential properties that they could not lose without ceasing to be that object. Kripke argued that for an individual, its **origin** is essential. Queen Elizabeth II could not have come from different parents; her genetic origin is part of her essence. For material objects like tables, the **piece of wood** from which they are made is essential – a table made from a different original block would be a different

table.

Identity and the Necessity of Origin

Kripke's argument for the necessity of origin (sometimes called the "origin essentialism" thesis) relies on the transitivity of identity. If a particular table is made from a particular piece of wood, then any table made from a different piece would not be identical to it – even if it looked exactly the same. This reasoning also applies to biological organisms: if a human being had a different origin, it would be a different person. These claims sparked decades of debate, but Kripke's presentation anchored essentialism as a respectable philosophical position again.

THE CAUSAL-HISTORICAL THEORY OF REFERENCE

Alongside rigid designation, Kripke proposed a **causal theory of reference** for proper names. Instead of a name's meaning being a description, a name refers through an initial baptism (where the object is named) and a **causal chain** of uses that links later speakers back to that original naming event. When someone says "Aristotle," they are part of a historical chain reaching back to the man himself, even if they know no descriptions of him. This theory better explains how we can refer to individuals about whom we are factually mistaken.

The causal theory is not without weaknesses: it struggles with reference change, empty names, and cases where multiple causal chains converge. Still, Kripke's formulation was a powerful alternative to descriptivism and inspired extensive further development by philosophers like Keith Donnellan and Hilary Putnam.

CRITICISMS AND ONGOING DEBATES

No work of this magnitude escapes criticism. Philosophers have challenged Kripke's view on several fronts:

- **Descriptivist responses** (e.g., John Searle, Michael Dummett) argued that names might involve a cluster of descriptions that can be revised piecemeal, rather than a fixed set. This "cluster theory" tries to preserve descriptivism while avoiding its worst excesses.
- **Two-dimensional semantics** (developed by Robert Stalnaker, David Chalmers, and others) attempts to systematically account for both the necessity and the a

posteriority of identity statements by distinguishing between the actual-world intension and the subjunctive-world intension. This framework can partly accommodate Kripke's insights while retaining some elements of descriptivism.

- **Critique of essentialism** (e.g., from Quinean naturalists) questions whether we can make sense of essences without invoking an "essential property" that is just a projection of our linguistic conventions.
- **Rigidity for natural kind terms** – Kripke extended rigidity to terms like "gold," "water," and "tiger," but some philosophers argue that natural kinds are not as sharply individuated as individuals, making the rigid/non-rigid distinction harder to apply.

Despite these critiques, the core ideas of **Saul Kripke Naming And Necessity** have proven remarkably resilient. They remain central to contemporary analytic philosophy.

LEGACY AND INFLUENCE

The influence of **Naming and Necessity** extends well beyond philosophy of language. In **philosophy of mind**, Kripke's arguments about identity and necessity were used in his later book *Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language* (the "Kripkenstein" paradox) and have shaped debates about mind-body identity. In **philosophy of science**, the idea that scientific identifications (like heat = molecular motion) are necessary a posteriori supports scientific realism and influences discussions about reduction, supervenience, and the nature of laws. In **logic**, Kripke's possible-worlds semantics for modal logic (developed before *Naming and Necessity*) is the standard framework for analyzing necessity and possibility. His work unified formal semantics with metaphysical inquiry in an unprecedented way.

CONCLUSION

Saul Kripke's **Naming and Necessity** is a landmark achievement that fundamentally changed how philosophers understand meaning, reference, necessity, and essence. By demonstrating that proper names are rigid designators and that necessity is independent of apriority, Kripke dissolved old problems and opened rich new territories for exploration. The book's compact, lecture-style prose conceals extraordinary depth; it rewards repeated reading and remains as challenging today as it was in 1970. For anyone interested in why words refer the way they do, or what it means for something to be necessarily true, Kripke's arguments are an indispensable starting point – and a continuing source of insight.