

## Leśniewskian names as class names

Zuzana Rybaříková

Man-Machine Interaction, New Technologies Research Centre,  
University of West Bohemia, Pilsen, the Czech Republic

Native speakers of Polish or Czech could find several traps in English. One of the most common is the problem of definite and indefinite articles. While articles determine nearly every English noun, Slavonic languages as Polish and Czech do not require them. This rather linguistic question is interesting also from a philosophical point of view, as the articles play a significant role in Russell's theory of description. Russell (1905) differentiated between a man, I see (an indefinite description), the man, who married my best friend (a definite description), Maria Theresia (a proper name), and Darth Vader (an empty name). Nonetheless, there are also theories in the philosophy of language that consider all these names the same. For instance, Leśniewski's Ontology, according to which, all previously mentioned examples belong to the semantical category of names (see Urbaniak 2014, 191). This feature was appealing to several scholars (e.g. Henry 1964; Prior 1957, 63–75) but they had to deal with the fact that it is difficult to approximate Russellian and Leśniewskian names.

In my talk, I would like to advocate one of Prior's attempts to approximate Leśniewskian and Russellian names, the concept of class names. Prior (1965) introduced this concept in his paper *Existence in Lesniewski and in Russell*, where he argued that Leśniewskian names resemble Russellian classes, namely:

... ontology is just a broadly Russellian theory of classes deprived of any variables of Russell's lowest logical type. Ontology's so called "names", in other words, are not individual names in the Russellian sense, but class names.

(Prior 1965, 150)

This concept was criticised by Simons (1982, 177–178), who claimed that Prior's concept would be unacceptable for Leśniewski from the ontological point of view since Leśniewski was a nominalist. Furthermore, Sagal (1973, 259–262) pointed out that Prior misinterpreted in his concept both Russell's and Leśniewski's theory.

Nonetheless, there are also researchers, for instance, Ishimoto (1977, 285), who claimed that Prior's class names made Leśniewskian names clear to them. The difference might consist in the focus of each author. While Simons criticised Prior from the ontological point of view and Sagal's objections were based on the philosophy of language, Ishimoto focused on formal logic. From the formal point of view, class names could be an interesting concept, as there is also Lejewski's (1977) attempt for the approximation of Leśniewski's and Russell's systems of logic. Lejewski replaced here Leśniewski's operator 'ε' by the operator for weak inclusion '⊆', which is a part of the theory of classes.

## References

- Henry, D. (1982): Ockham, Suppositio, and Modern Logic. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 5, 290–292.
- Ishimoto, A. (1977): A Propositional Fragment of Leśniewski's Ontology. *Studia Logica* 36, 285–299.
- Lejewski, C. (1977): Systems of Leśniewski's ontology with the functor of weak inclusion as the only primitive term. *Studia Logica* 36, 323–349.
- Prior, A. N. (1957): *Time and Modality*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Prior, A. N. (1965): Existence in Lesniewski and in Russell. *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics* 40, 149–155.
- Russell, B. (1905): On Denoting. *Mind* 14, 479–493.
- Sagal, P. T. (1973): On How Best to Make Sense of Lesniewski's Ontology. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 14, 259–262.
- Simons, P. (1982): On Understanding Leśniewski. *History and Philosophy of Logic* 3, No. 2, 165–191.
- Urbaniak, R. (2014): *Leśniewski's System of Logic and Foundations of Mathematics*. Cham: Springer.