October 6, 2020

Notes for Week 8

People wanting to write a paper for the course could decide to write about Rorty only, and get going on it.

Plan:

1. Here is the biggest distinction of the course (I think it is transformative of one's thinking): **object naturalism** (which you know about) and **subject naturalism** (which you've never thought about—as such). This is the main material we must get under our belts to begin the second half of the course.

Subject naturalism is a key reconceptualization of pragmatism of the kind Rorty shares with Wittgenstein.

2. Naturalism/physicalism. **Location/placement problems**.
   Naturalism understood in terms of placement problems (which can be understood in terms of vocabularies). These seem like quite natural problems. (Jackson's Locke lectures, *From Metaphysics to Ethics: A Defence of Conceptual Analysis* 1998, lectures were 1995.)

First formulation of placement problem (Jackson's "location problem") is ontological.
Tell this story as FJ does.

Second formulation is in terms of needing to be able to specify in favored naturalistic vocabulary, what the "truth makers" of claims in other vocabularies are.

3. Radical version of that in terms of *use* of vocabularies: naturalism about that is naturalism enough.
   Note: later I'll recommend "dividing through by naturalism" in this formulation, retaining the key distinction. Not at this point clear what that could be.

Subject naturalism as a still-more-radical alternative.
HP is giving **another route to pragmatism as antirepresentationalism**
(besides Rorty's anti-epistemological, social institution of norms, and antiauthoritarian arguments.
This is the argument from subject naturalism.
Rorty's pragmatism just is subject naturalism about discursive practice.

4. Huw identifies subject naturalism (in NWR) as **Hume**'s approach, and (arguably) **Nietzsche'**s. This is not wrong, but it is not at all the best way into his topic. (Huw is not steeped in the history of philosophy. He came out of the philosophy of physics, about

which more in a later session of the course.). The figure he *should* have mentioned (as he later came to realize) is the later **Wittgenstein**.

Price saw the affinity of his view with **Rorty**'s pragmatism and PMN. Rorty immediately saw (at the very end of his life, but in time to appreciate it in print) that Price's "subject naturalism" was Rorty's pragmatism. The fusing of these programs gives Price's pragmatism historical heft and enriches it.

The invocation of **Hume** is important, though, for it is the link to expressivism of **Blackburn**'s explicitly Humean sort.
Blackburn and Rorty were famously at odds (and I was occasionally caught up in their feud—cf. the *New Republic* tiff).

Huw brought the two strands of thought together (his pragmatism-as-subject-naturalism, now allied with Rorty's pragmatism, and Blackburn's local expressivism), saving the latter from its traditional (in SB) commitment to representationalism about the vocabularies it was not expressivist about (which made SB a patsy for Boghossian's circularity of presupposition objection).

Stray remark: Once Huw and I were asked (separately) who we thought the most accomplished and important contemporary (neo)pragmatist philosopher was. I said he was and he said I was. This is reciprocal recognition!

5. **Subject naturalism** as a way to understand the **later Wittgenstein**.
Everyone agrees that later LW was rejecting the TLP.
Rorty, in his case for LW being a Rortyan pragmatist, claims that it is specifically the global (invidious) semantic *representationalism* of TLP that is rejected.
(Ironically, since the great advance of that work, other than being a final codification of semantic representationalism, is to show how to avoid it *for the very special case **of logical vocabulary***.)

But Huw Price's distinction show just *how* the later LW repudiates semantic representationalism, and makes sense not just of his critique, but of his positive alternative. His verdict: **LW is a subject naturalist**.
Note that he does *not* make this identification of Wittgenstein as a (or even the) paradigmatic subject naturalist in the 2007 paper [in the (2013) Descartes Lectures version of this piece—has a footnote.].

But *I* claim the sense HP's object naturalism/subject naturalism distinction makes of LW is its greatest confirmation,
And I propose to use it as the key to understanding Rortyan pragmatism.
It is Price's great contribution.

Possibly: Bring in the **Heidegger of SZ as subject naturalist** (the naturalism and subjectivism being what he later repudiates). To do this, need to do the reading of "The meaning of Being is the being of meaning." Studying the Being of beings is studying the meanings of the expressions by which we pick them out, without making a language/world distinction, that is, just as vocabularies-in-use. Then: "language is the house of Being." (And Derrida's intent to "dance outside the house of Being.")

It is probably worth talking about how Huw moved this discussion along not just through his intellectual-philosophical contributions, but through his institutional ones. (Cf. The difference the Girona conversations made to Rorty's understanding of McD, and to our mutual understanding generally.).

The series of expressivism-pragmatism conferences Huw held in Sydney—at least 3–in the early teens (starting around 2010?) brought together pragmatists, expressivists (**Blackburn** and **Gibbard**), and semantic minimalists (**Horwich**).

6. Lay out:
a) **object naturalism vs. subject naturalism**,
b) **placement problems** as **presupposing object naturalism** (or at any rate, the closest analogue not being so difficult for subject naturalists),
c) the **priority thesis,** and
d) the dependence of object naturalism on semantic **representationalism**.

Can introduce placement problems with **the "3 'M's"** (Blackburn's term):
Modals, morals, and mathematics.

Of those, the **modals** are perhaps easiest for (object) **naturalists**, but are killer for **empiricists**. Conjecture: the reason empiricism has died, and naturalism has not, is just this, that modality came to be respectable.
(But why? Point out that Kripke, then Lewis, just assume possible worlds are OK. Quine would not (and did not) accept this.)

7. Consider a case: natural numbers from practices of counting (then: adding, etc.)
a). Pick on one of the "3 'M's": mathematics.
This story can begin with **counting**.
If we can get clear about that, subject naturalism (SN) says we should not worry about the metaphysics or ontology of numbers. (Compare: spatio-temporal continuants, w/res to perdurantism etc..).
This should lead us to worry about singular term usage of a distinctive kind, rather than ontology or metaphysics. There are complications as we go beyond nat. nos, as in my "The Significance of Complex Numbers for Frege's Philosophy of Mathematics." But they can still be dealt with in the spirit of trying to understand the practices of deploying this particular kind of vocabulary: first, singular terms in general (cf. Quine's "purporting to refer to just one object," thought of as advice parallel to the old-fashioned grammarian who tells us that a "sentence is what expresses a complete thought."). Fregean "Eigenname." Then we try to understand *numerals*, as a specific kind of singular term.

b). The "3 'M's" rubric does not suitably encompass all the kinds of expressions that we might be puzzled about and want to adopt SN attitudes towards.

What about **intentional** discourse? Here looking at ascriptions of propositional attitudes is what we want to do, to be pragmatists of the SN sort about these locutions.
What about **semantic** discourse?
Wittgenstein in *TLP* woried about whether the picturing relation could itself be pictured. He famously concluded that it could not: it could only be shown, not said.

Here deflationism is the appropriate pragmatist line to take.
(We will talk about semantic discourse—and why it is a *very* special case—in Part Two of the session.)

8. One that is particularly interesting is **abstracta** (what Quine and Goodman were nominalists about, leading (in Goodman's case, appealing to Leonard) to mereology. Here *triangularity can* serve as a paradigm. It is not obvious (it would have to be argued) that the issue of mathematical objects or math discourse is (just) a special case of talk of abstracta.

Tell the story (from **Frege's *Grundlagen*) of abstraction**.
    Philosophers use the terms 'concrete' and (especially) 'abstract' without thinking very much about what they mean. Frege tells us *exactly* what they mean.
    Strictly, abstraction is a way of introducing new sortal terms (and so singular terms), based on the use of old ones, via equivalence relations.
    Explain sortal predicates vs. merely characterizing predicates.
And the difference between mass nouns ('water') and count nouns (sortals, 'cat').
Characterizing predicates ('red') have only circumstances and consequences of application.
Sortal predicates also have criteria of identity and individuation.
The question "Is this the same K as that?" makes sense for sortals (kind terms) K.
    Abstraction is a process that introduces new sortals based on old ones, which inherit their criteria of application and individuation as transforms of the criteria of application and individuation from the old vocabulary.
    Frege's example of introducing *directions* of lines, on the basis of a vocabulary of lines that includes the *relational* predicate "parallel to."
    This method works only because that relational predicate expresses an equivalence relation: it is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive, like identity.
Abstraction treats it as if it *were* identity—but of a new kind of thing.
    Abstractions can be piled on abstractions, in that terms introduced by abstraction can be used to introduce even more abstract terms, w/res to which they are concrete.

Here an important lesson is that abstraction is a method of introducing **new terms**, based on the use of old ones. The idea that there is **a special class of *objects*, *abstract* objects**, correlated with terms introduced this way is not obviously entailed by the existence of a special way of introducing terms. Compare: some terms are introduced by demonstration (deixis), others by indexicals ("I"), others by descriptions. It is at least not *obvious* that there

are different kinds of *things* associated with these different ways of reference-fixing. (Anscombe thinks that "I" *is* special in this way, and does not introduce a *thing* at all.) Perhaps terms that *can* be introduced by abstraction pick out objects that *can* be referred to in other ways. Then there would be no "natural" kind: *abstract* objects. (Frege worries about this as the "Julius Caesar problem."

This would be an occasion to discuss the introduction of singular terms and their sortals (the discussion of singular terms in "The Significance of Complex Numbers..." should be laid alongside the discussion of sortals in my essay on Sellars's nominalism, as part of the same extended treatment in my work of these kinds of problematic discourse).

The way to argue about abstract (and math) would then be in two parts:

i) introducing singular terms and sortals by abstraction, on the basis of (extending) antecedent practices of using other singular terms and sortals. This is a way of projecting one discursive practice into another. As such, it is a kind of paradigm.

ii). Discuss the **paradigmatic use of numerals as requiring more than just their use in counting**.
Take Frege's *Grundlagen* as showing us that we need **to introduce them by abstraction**, where the relevant equivalence relation appealed to in the introduction-by-abstraction is **equinumerosity**, putting in 1-to-1 correspondence.
(Cf. Wright's "neoFregean" philosophy of mathematics.)
To get further in mathematics, need more kinds of abstraction. Not just are the other kinds of numbers not introduced just by abstraction by equinumerosity, but broader notions of abstraction have to be considered: more ways of introducing new singular terms, predicates, functions, and so on, on the basis of old ones.
But math should be thought of as doing this: **mereology** does, **set theory** does, and the sense in which **category theory** is foundational might well be that it is conceptually foundational in generalizing the introduction of new terms, sortals, functions (..., but it is a way of filling in the ellipsis) on the basis of old ones.
[I would dearly love to be able to explain category theory up to Yoneda's Lemma in these terms of generalizing abstraction, with abstraction thought of in terms of regimenting general ways of introducing new expressions on the basis of old ones.]

Two routes to priority thesis of Price:
  a) His: if noncognitivist response to location problems is even an option, then one has admitted priority of linguistic issue.
But also:
  b) Fitting senses, use—so pragmatics--, and ultimately, semantic vocabulary into one's object-naturalist account. This one takes us to issue of semantic minimalism and the argument at the end (15) below.

9. <u>Quinean challenge</u>:

Rorty (in effect) motivates the adoption of **the 'vocabulary' vocabulary** by Quine's arguments against the Carnapian (Kantian) language/theory (meaning/belief) distinction, in TDE.

But **that is *not* the conclusion Quine** himself **drew**.

He treats the arguments of TDE as decisive against using the concept of <u>meaning</u> in scientific semantics. The argument is that the *holism* he sees as necessary for the concept of <u>meaning</u> is incompatible with empiricism, naturalism, and science. Those require semantic *atomism*.

He finds that atomism in giving up concern with meaning, in favor of concern with *reference*.

Everything is to be done *extensionally*, that is, in terms that depend only on reference.

Two ironies:

i) Davidson follow him in this regard, in pushing purely extensional semantic treatments of all expressions. That is what the result of his turning Tarski's theory of truth on its head comes to. He does this even for propositional attitudes (his "paratactic" theory of them).

   But methodologically, DD is the great holist and articulator of the "space of reasons." This is the great tension in Davidson (compare to Quine's, which is between empiricism and naturalism, with the crunch coming over modal claims and laws of nature).

ii) Precisely on the topic of modality, extensionalism is incompatible with the Kant-Sellars thesis about modality. The result is that the extensional move is unsustainable once we take modality seriously. Lewis things a Kripkean extensional semantics for modality (PW semantics) can solve this problem. But it is conceptually broken-backed, since it presupposes a notion of *extensional property* (modally insulated properties) that it uses to define <u>possible worlds</u>.

In the present context, the point is that retreating to the "purely extensional" won't work.

It goes wrong in two related ways.

a) Eventually, at some point, one will need to ask about the senses—give an object-naturalism account of them, too.

b) And the purely extensional account won't work for the reasons of (ii) above.

Here we can ask **a sense/reference question**: is it what we are referring to (talking about) or what we say about it that must be specifiable in naturalistic vocabulary (**locatable/placeable** in physicalistically specifiable world)?

Seems one wants to say: just **referents**.

But then where are **the facts**? Are they referred to by sentences? Or expressed by them?

They do not seem to be vocabulary independent (extension rather than intensions, which are "description-relative").

   In any case, surely **we must *at some point* get the senses into the naturalistic world-picture too**. (Jackson talks about the "dispositions of language-users" as part of the story that will need to be told. He has in mind, though he doesn't says so, those dispositions *specified in*

the vocabulary of the natural sciences. For dispositions to, say, "use expressions correctly," or "use the tilde to express negation" are not going to do for him.)
And that means that **meanings, senses, claimables** must get into even **an object-naturalist** story, even if they come in late in it.

But that means that anyone (an object naturalist) who worries about location/placement problems will have to worry about such problems for specifically *semantic* **facts (vocabularies)**.

To adopt **an error theory** about them, to say that semantic terms don't really refer, entails skepticism about the notion of "truth makers" or "facts."

This is in fact the conclusion Price wants to get to, after observing that semantic deflationism (not quite skepticism, but is from the point of view of object-naturalists) had been thought to strengthen the object-naturalist case by underwriting *declarativism*, which puts every vocabulary in the same box, which one can then, in a second step, label "description" or "representation" to yield semantic descriptivism or representationalism.

I think this path to the centrality of semantic vocabulary in the object-naturalist target area is superior to HP's own "semantic ascent/descent" story. But I should tell his story first, and then follow it up with this (I claim) improvement.

10. On "**subject naturalism, dividing through by the naturalism**" (as a characterization of my pragmatism, in relation to Huw's): (This should be the punchline of the session, even if it doesn't come at the very end, because I leave discussion of semantic deflationism (not "minimalism") until then.)

I think of what I'm doing as turning the crank one more time on the insight behind Huw's introduction of the crucial concept of subject naturalism, as a way of understanding Wittgenstein's pragmatism (and mine: the Ariadne's thread that holds together my work in philosophy of language). For he want to look at two uses of naturalistic *vocabulary*: one on the side of *objects* represented, and another on the side of the practices that *can* be understood as representing/describing them (but at the cost of metaphysical puzzlement about the extravagant ranges of facts and kinds of objects one must envisage), but that *can* be understood in more pragmatic terms, not shoe-horned in Procrustean ways into the representational model. (This is what HP means by "expressivism"—or at any rate, how he wants to adopt and co-opt the vocabulary of metaethical expressivism, as generalized by Blackburn to the "3 'M's".).

But I want to say that we need not use *naturalistic* vocabulary for this dissolutive purpose. We can use a language of norms implicit in social practices in order to specify the discursive practices we will give nonrepresentational accounts of. This is both "dividing through by the naturalism" in subject naturalism and object naturalism, and reuniting Price's line of thought with pragmatism of the Rortyan sort. This is where I am going (what I have been looking for) in synthesizing the two parts of the course: Rortyan pragmatism as antirepresentationalism and Price's subject-naturalistic global expressivism as antirepresentationalism.

The key is this way of:
i) understanding the role of naturalistic *vocabulary* in specifying subject naturalism vs. object naturalism,

ii). Understanding how to "divide through" by the choice of *naturalistic* vocabulary for this purpose.

iii). Substitute a *pragmatist* vocabulary—in a sense that goes beyond just the pragmatism that is implicit in the good, indeed decisive, "subject naturalism" thought to the pragmatism of **social pragmatism about normativity** and the insight into the **normative character of discursive practice** (that meaning is a normative concept, that the pragmatics in terms of which we understand semantics is normative, and so is the semantics, whether we understand it representationally—representation as a normative concept—or in a deflationary pragmatist way (<u>truth</u> and <u>reference</u> as normative concepts, or to be understood in terms of norms governing their use).

Part Two: Semantic Vocabulary

Talk about semantic minimalism or deflationism.
a) The first question here is: why is HP talking about this topic?
Why does it loom so large in both of the main readings for this week?

b) The second question is: exactly what role does it play, as he sees it, in debates about object vs. subject naturalism?

   11. Why is semantic vocabulary of *special* significance in assessing the relationship between object and subject naturalism?

The rarest and most precious thing in philosophy is when you can find a way to do some detailed, close to the ground work on a topic, where there are independent criteria of adequacy on an account, and leverage your results into an argument concerning some large and important philosophical topic.
One paradigm of an attempt to do this is my argument from last week:
Lots of people have written about the semantics of propositional attitude ascriptions (they mattered a lot to Frege in the 1890's essays, where he argued expressions in these contexts have their usual senses as their referents, they mattered a lot to Quine and Davidson because they resisted extensional—referential, representational—semantic treatment). And the distinction between de dicto and de re ascriptions seems to be an important phenomenon to get clear about in discussing propositional attitude ascriptions. But I argued last time that the stakes are higher. Using as a bridge principle the claim that de re ascriptions of propositional attitude are the principal explicitly representational (intentional, in one sense) locutions in natural language—the ones we use to distinguish what we are talking or thinking *about* from what we are saying or thinking (the representational dimension of conceptual content—I argue that getting clear on what these de re locutions *express* permits us to offer a pragmatist account of the representational dimension of discourse.
          Compare: Kantians like Korsgaard and Habermas using detailed arguments from the philosophy of action and the philosophy of language (respectively) to draw significant conclusions in moral and political theory.

A second general sort of craft-wisdom in philosophical writing is knowing when you have a story—a way of conveying some understanding of something—with a beginning, a middle, and a conclusion, that can be told in the 7500 words of a standard essay/lecture.

For Price in the mid-to-late aughts (2006-2008) it was semantic minimalism or deflationism that was to give him a grip on the much larger topic of object naturalism and, so, placement problems.
(A decade before, I had formulated the most sophisticated and technically adequate form of semantic deflationism, recounted in MIE. Two arguments of Boghossian—only one of which does Huw talk about—accordingly come into play. [Here I might talk about the alternative narrative strategy I considered for MIE, which begins with the Boghossian objection about semantic deflationists having no possibility of offering an account of propositional (and so, conceptual) content, because they cannot appeal to truth conditions, and that is the only straw floating: the only idea anyone has had.)

12. Here talk about the "**semantic minimalism**" phrase (I think HP takes this over from Blackburn, or directly from Horwich), and why (at least these days) "semantic deflationism" is a better term.
Price's term "semantic minimalism" was not an idiosyncratic way to talk about the topic when he first was writing about it. But philosophical terminology has continued to evolve. Now "semantic minimalism" is almost always used to refer to a position in the debate about semantic contextualism: the position at the opposite end of the spectrum from Charles Travis's "occasion sensitivity" and denial of the existence of truth conditions. Semantic minimalism is associated with Ernie Lepore and ..... It assigns minimal, invariant truth conditions and relegates everything else to "pragmatics". This is pretty much the opposite of the view (associated for instance with Horwich and me) that Price is addressing. So it is better for us to use "semantic deflationism."

The paradigm, in any case is **Ramsey**'s—followed by **Quine**'s—**disquotationalism**. This becomes **Strawson**'s "**redundancy** theory." In our time, it is **Horwich**'s "minimalism."
I'll argue that the next most sophisticated version is **prosententialism**, followed by my generalized anaphoric view.
Discuss "Expressive vs. Explanatory Deflationism" and Ch. 5 of *MIE*.

13. HP thinks that semantic deflationism has been taken to give aid and comfort to object naturalism.
Q: Why?
A: **Semantic ascent (Quine) and semantic descent**.
Ascent says that nothing new happens on moving up to talk of truth and reference. One just mentions the expressions that are used in ground-level utterances.
The thought is that semantic descent is the same: one adds nothing by using the semantic vocabulary, so concern about the facts, rather than just the use of sentences, the objects, rather than just the use of the singular terms, is an automatic response.

14. But, HP claims, semantic deflationism does not make the representationalist move cheap, easy, or trivial.
    Q: Why not?
    A (My answer, not Huw's):
    i) What deflationism supports is *declarativism*: the commitment to use a uniform semantic model for all declarative sentences.
    ii). What Huw realizes is that this does not entail *descriptivism* (representationalism): the commitment to that semantic model being that of fact-stating, *describing* (or more generally, *representing*) how things actually, objectively are.

15. My issue with Huw is whether he has not rushed from that insight (*declarativism*, a consequence of semantic *deflationism*, does not entail *descriptivism*) to conclude that (properly) rejecting descriptivism as *always* the semantic model to use means rejecting the idea that that it is *ever* an appropriate semantic model to use.

The role semantic minimalism plays in Price's argument is complex.
Principally, he sees it as supporting declarativism.
That is a key premise in one route to global descriptivism.
He argues that that second step is optional.
It (minimalism) is also what he appeals to in defense of global expressivism, understood as the global denial of descriptivism. Here, he is the declarativist.
I want to contest this last move (though I won't say how, this week).
And we can see that HP overplays his hand in the NWR essay, thinking that in showing that declarativism does not entail descriptivism, he has refuted the latter.

I think, and eventually persuaded Huw, that the inferentialist semantic alternative to representationalism is much more important than semantic minimalism in making pragmatism-as-subject-naturalism work.
    But my Kantian-Sellarsian pragmatic metalinguistic version of local expressivism remains at odds with his global antirepresentationalism. He does not want to reintroduce representational locutions in respectable pragmatist terms so as to have a bifurcation of descriptive and nondescriptive vocabularies. That is because he wants to be nondescriptivist about crucial parts of *physics*—which is descriptive-representational on just about anybody's way of dividing up vocabularies. (More on that in another session of the course.). But this *motivation* is not (of course) Price's *argument* for the global character of his antirepresentationalism-as-expressivism.
    Note that Humean expressivism is a way of being (subject) naturalistic. I will take issue with that, for roughly the reasons Beasley retails. The important thing for me about the subject-naturalism/object-naturalism move is not the naturalism. But the Humean-Blackburnian way it works for "the 3 'M's" but is hard to globalize.
Part of Huw's machinery for responding to this emerging situation is his Putnamian distinction between I-representations and E-representations (from his Descartes lectures, which we will *not* read—but I will talk about).

16. Huw has another fascinating argument.
(Note: I would not make this argument in this essay. I would reserve it for another. For I think it detracts and distracts from the principal narrative line. But I would be tempted and don't blame him.).
This is pointing out that *if* you think that reference-representation is an objective relation that one can study scientifically-objectively-naturalistically, because one is *not* a semantic deflationist and *is* an object naturalist, about semantic vocabulary as about all others, and one sees (correctly) that one *cannot,* as an object naturalist, have an *error theory* about semantic vocabulary (that is, take it *not* to *represent* anything, and so to be in principle defective discourse, to be discarded or explained away), because doing so undercuts one's object naturalism (which depends on reference-representation relations referring to or representing something) *then* you are committed to **there being a relation that 'refers' ('represents') stands in to relations of reference and representation that is the *same* relation that 'Fido' stands in to Fido (Fodor's 'horses' to horses).**

> This is a complex, self-referential claim. But Price sees (correctly) that it is absolutely essential to object-naturalism, that is, to applying the descriptive-representational semantic model *universally*. And his claim is *not* that this idea is unintelligible. Rather, he follows Putnam (in his stuff on "internal" and "external" realism) in claiming not that there is no such relation, but that there are, at least in principle, *too many*. The demand for a relation that stands to 'refers' as Fido stands to 'Fido' is not only i) too weak to pick out a unique relation of reference-representation, but ii) too weak sufficiently to constrain relations so as to pick out only relations that are plausibly or colorably *reference* or *representation* relations. Recall that there are infinite number of respects of similarity between the relations between names and what they are names of and relations between 'refers' and *absolutely anything*. Here Putnam imagines someone holding up an uninterpreted sign labeled 'refers', to mediate between words and things, and when asked to interpret it, holds up another sign labeled 'causes' ("in the right way").

17. [I am reminded—and I think there is a real similarity—of Rorty's idea that requiring later heirs of natural science institutions to be able to tell a retrospective story about how the transition to the new institutions was progressive is way too weak to keep out transitions we would not consider cognitively progressive. (And remember my constructive suggestion of a technological constraint that works, in effect, prospectively, not just retrospectively, and could, as a matter of social-conceptual engineering, responsively answer this challenge.)]

Finale:

18. I should use the insight below concerning the ultimate lesson of this course, **how to synthesize Rorty's pragmatism with Price's global expressivism by seeing the key**

insight into Wittgensteinian pragmatism as subject naturalism without a scientistic restriction on the dissolving metavocabulary in which one specifies (and demystifies) discursive practice.

This **is pragmatism as subject naturalism, but "dividing through by the naturalism"** in the sense of substituting other vocabularies for the naturalistic one (specifically, discursive practice thought of in terms of norms implicit in social practice: normative pragmatism). And the theme of my book is to be pragmatism in this sense as motivating the sort of philosophy of language I have done, and as the thread that ties together a surprising number of the specific topics I have addressed: semantic deflationism, discussion of singular terms, sortals, abstracta (in math, but not only there), *both* Frege pieces, Wittgenstein....

This is to be the theme of my Spinoza lectures book (the core of which we read for last week):

How much of my work can be understood as giving generalized pragmatist (SN, dividing through by the N—see below) accounts of the discourse corresponding to different kinds of potentially problematic object-kinds (e.g. "3 'M's" plus abstraction as above, plus intentional discourse, plus semantic discourse...). This is a special perspective on, a special path through my work that has not been obvious to me, and might well not be obvious to others. That is a suitable subject for a valedictory effort, and one that sees it all as suitably responsive to Rorty's pragmatist concerns.