International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2455-2070; Impact Factor: RJIF 5.22
Received: 03-01-2021, Accepted: 02-02-2021, Published: 17-02-2021
www.socialsciencejournal.in
Volume 7, Issue 1, 2021; Page No. 159-162

Naming and necessity: Saul Kripke's enduring impact on semantics

Shiben Kumar Sarkar
Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Abhedananda Mahavidyalaya, Sainthia, Birbhum, West Bengal, India

Abstract
Saul Kripke's *Naming and Necessity* (1972/1980) fundamentally transformed the philosophy of language, semantics, and metaphysics. This review article assesses the work's lasting influence by examining its dismantling of descriptivism, its positive theses of rigid designation and the causal-historical theory of reference, and its distinction between metaphysical necessity and epistemic a priori. The article surveys five decades of critical engagement, including neo-descriptivist responses, two-dimensional semantics, and empirical challenges from experimental philosophy and cognitive science. It also traces Kripke's profound impact on semantic externalism, the metaphysics of essence, and contemporary theories of reference. The conclusion argues that Naming and Necessity remains neither a closed doctrine nor an ongoing research program, but rather a set of questions that continue to shape the core of analytic philosophy.

Keywords: Saul Kripke, naming and necessity, semantics, rigid designation, causal theory of reference, modal logic, philosophy of language

Introduction

The publication of Saul Kripke's *Naming and Necessity* in 1972 (based on three lectures delivered at Princeton in 1970) marked a watershed moment in analytic philosophy [3]. At a time when the philosophy of language was largely dominated by variations of the Frege-Russell descriptivist tradition, which held that the meaning of a proper name is given by a definite description or a cluster of descriptions that a speaker associates with it, Kripke's work delivered a systematic and compelling critique that would permanently alter the landscape [1, 2, 4]. The descriptivist orthodoxy, articulated with particular force by Bertrand Russell and later refined by John Searle, had provided an elegant account of how names connect to objects, how identity statements can be informative, and how reference could be grounded in cognitive content [2, 4, 5]. Within this framework, the sense of a name was thought to determine its referent, and the referent was whatever uniquely satisfied the associated description(s). This approach not only shaped philosophical semantics but also influenced work in logic, epistemology, and the philosophy of science.

Kripke's intervention was radical in both method and substance. Eschewing the prevailing tendency to treat meaning as a matter of conceptual analysis, he deployed rigorous modal logic and disarmingly simple thought experiments to show that descriptivism fails to account for the most basic semantic and metaphysical intuitions. He argued that proper names are rigid designator terms that refer to the same object in every possible world in which that object exists, whereas the descriptions with which they are associated typically designate contingently. From this, he derived the existence of necessary a posteriori truth (such as "Hesperus is Phosphorus" and "Water is H_2O") and a sharp separation between the metaphysical category of necessity and the epistemic category of a priority [3]. In place of the descriptive theory of reference, Kripke proposed a causal-historical picture: a name's referent is fixed by an initial "baptism" and then passed along a chain of communication, independent of the descriptive knowledge that individual speakers may or may not possess.

The intellectual ferment sparked by *Naming and Necessity* has only intensified over the ensuing five decades. Early responses ranged from enthusiastic adoption to pointed criticism. Defenders of descriptivism, such as Searle, sought to modify the theory to withstand Kripke's modal and epistemic arguments [5]. Others, like Keith Donnellan and Gareth Evans, developed hybrid accounts that combined causal and descriptive elements [6, 7]. By the 1990s and 2000s, the debate had given rise to two-dimensional semantics, most prominently advanced by David Chalmers and Frank Jackson, which attempted to reconcile Kripke's insights with Fregean intuitions about cognitive significance [8, 9]. More recently, the discussion has taken an empirical turn, with experimental philosophers and cognitive scientists investigating whether the semantic intuitions Kripke took to be universal are, in fact, cross-culturally robust [10, 11]. At the same time, Kripke's work has provided the foundation for major developments in neighbouring fields: semantic externalism in the philosophy of mind, essentialist metaphysics, and natural kind theory [12, 13, 14, 15].

This review article offers a comprehensive analysis of the enduring impact of *Naming and Necessity*. It begins by reconstructing the descriptivist paradigm that Kripke attacked, then details his central arguments, the modal, epistemic, and semantic arguments that dismantled that paradigm. Next, it examines the positive theses that Kripke advanced: the causal-historical theory of reference, the concept of rigid designation, and the category of the necessary posteriori. The article then surveys the most influential critical responses and refinements, from neo-descriptivism and two-dimensional semantics to recent empirical challenges. Finally, it assesses Kripke's broader legacy in semantics, metaphysics, and philosophy of mind, arguing that his work continues to define the central questions of contemporary analytic philosophy.

The Descriptivist Paradigm and Its Discontents

Before Kripke, the dominant approach to proper names was descriptivism. The tradition drew on Frege's distinction between sense (*Sinn*) and reference (*Bedeutung*) [1]. For Frege, the sense of a name is a "mode of presentation" that determines its reference and accounts for the cognitive significance of statements. Thus, "Hesperus is Phosphorus" is informative because the two names have different senses, even though they refer to the same planet. Bertrand Russell radicalised this view by arguing that ordinary proper names are in fact disguised definite descriptions [2, 4]. According to Russell's theory of descriptions, a sentence such as "Aristotle was a philosopher" is analysed as expressing a complex existential proposition: there exists exactly one individual who satisfies the relevant descriptive condition (e.g., "the teacher of Alexander"), and that individual was a philosopher. In Russell's notation, this becomes ∃*x* (∀*y* (*y* is the teacher of Alexander ↔ *y* = *x*) & *x* was a philosopher). The name itself carries no meaning; it is merely a shorthand for a description or a cluster of descriptions. This approach had the virtue of handling empty names and identity statements within a rigorous logical framework.

John Searle later refined the view into a "cluster theory" [5]. On Searle's account, a name is associated with a loose cluster of descriptions, and the referent is the object that satisfies a sufficient number of them. This modification was intended to handle cases of mistaken belief, for example, if someone believes Aristotle wrote the *Raphael*, that false description does not block reference so long as enough other descriptions in the cluster are satisfied. The cluster theory thus preserved the core descriptivist thesis that reference is determined by the descriptive content that speakers associate with a name.

Kripke's attack on descriptivism was three-pronged, targeting its modal, epistemic, and semantic foundations [3]. The *modal argument* focuses on the fact that descriptions typically express contingent properties, whereas names rigidly designate. If "Aristotle" were synonymous with "the teacher of Alexander," then "Aristotle taught Alexander" would be a necessary truth. But we can easily imagine a possible world in which Aristotle existed but never tutored Alexander. Therefore, the name cannot be equivalent to that description. The *epistemic argument* shows that a speaker can successfully refer using a name without being able to supply a uniquely identifying description. Kripke's example is the layperson who uses "Feynman" to refer to the physicist; the description "the physicist who worked on quantum electrodynamics" might also apply to Julian Schwinger, yet the layperson is still referring to Feynman. Reference succeeds not because of the speaker's descriptive knowledge but because the speaker is part of a causal chain connecting them to the original bearer of the name. The *semantic argument* (or argument from ignorance and error) demonstrates that speakers can be radically mistaken about the descriptions they associate with a name and still refer correctly. Prior to the astronomical discovery that Hesperus is Phosphorus, speakers associated different descriptions with each name, yet they were already referring to the same planet, Venus. These arguments collectively showed that descriptivism could not account for the actual mechanics of reference.

Positive Theses: Causal Theory, Rigid Designation, and Necessary A Posteriori

Having dismantled descriptivism, Kripke proposed an alternative framework that has shaped subsequent research. The causal-historical theory of reference holds that a name's referent is fixed by an initial act of "baptism" (an ostensive or descriptive dubbing) and is then transmitted through a chain of communication [3]. Speakers who use the name intend to refer to the same object as the person from whom they learned it. Importantly, a speaker need not have any uniquely identifying descriptive knowledge of the referent; being appropriately linked to the historical chain suffices. This theory shifted the focus from individual cognitive content to the social and historical processes that anchor language to the world.

Central to this account is the notion of rigid designation. A rigid designator refers to the same object in every possible world in which that object exists. Kripke argued that proper names are rigid designators, whereas most definite descriptions are non-rigid (they can pick out different objects in different worlds). The distinction between rigid and non-rigid designation provided a powerful tool for modal logic and metaphysics, enabling philosophers to speak of *de re* modal properties of objects rather than merely *de dicto* modal properties of descriptions. It also paved the way for a revival of essentialism: if an object has a property essentially, then a rigid designator for that object will designate it in all worlds where it exists, and the property will be true of it in all those worlds.

From these premises, Kripke derived one of his most celebrated conclusions: the existence of necessary a posteriori truth. Because rigid designators pick out the same object in all possible worlds, an identity statement such as "Hesperus is Phosphorus" is necessarily true if true at all. Yet this identity was discovered empirically, not by a priori reasoning. The same holds for theoretical identifications in science, such as "Water is H_2O" and "Heat is molecular motion." By separating metaphysical necessity from epistemic priority, Kripke broke the Kantian identification of the two and opened the door for a new understanding of how science can reveal essential properties of the world [15].

Critical Engagements and Theoretical Refinements

The influence of *Naming and Necessity* is reflected not only in the number of philosophers who adopted its conclusions but also in the sustained critical attention it has received. One major line of response has been the development of neo-descriptivism and two-dimensional **(**2D) semantics. Philosophers such as Frank Jackson and David Chalmers sought to preserve the Fregean insight that meaning is conceptually mediated while accommodating Kripke's points about rigidity and external reference [8, 9]. Two-dimensional semantics posits that expressions have both a primary intension (a descriptive mode of presentation that picks out a referent in the actual world) and a secondary intension (the rigid referent determined by actual-world facts). This framework aims to explain why "Water is H_2O" is both necessary and posteriori: the secondary intension is H_2O rigidly, while the primary intension (e.g., "the clear, potable liquid that fills the oceans") is posteriori. The debate between orthodox Kripkeans and proponents of 2D semantics has generated extensive literature, with critics arguing that the two-dimensional apparatus fails to capture genuine

metaphysical necessity or inadvertently reintroduces descriptivist assumptions [16, 17, 39].

A second area of refinement concerns the causal-historical theory itself. Keith Donnellan and Gareth Evans highlighted cases where the causal chain alone seems insufficient to determine reference [6, 7]. Evans argued for a "hybrid" view, according to which a name's referent is determined by a combination of causal origin and the "dominant" descriptions in the community. Michael Devitt offered a more biologically oriented causal theory, emphasising the role of grounding events and reference-borrowing networks [18]. Later work in the philosophy of language has explored how the social character of language communities, speakers' intentions, and pragmatic factors interact with the causal chain [19, 34, 35]. Moreover, Kripke's later writings have clarified and sometimes modified aspects of his original account, showing his own continued engagement with these issues [34].

In the twenty-first century, the discussion has taken an empirical turn. Experimental philosophers have tested whether the intuitions Kripke relied upon, for instance, that "Gödel" would still refer to the man who proved the incompleteness theorem, even if all associated descriptions were false, are universally shared. Some studies suggest that such intuitions vary across cultures, with East Asian participants showing greater descriptivist tendencies than Western participants [10, 11]. While these findings have been contested on methodological grounds, they have prompted a reassessment of the role of intuition in semantic theorising and have encouraged greater interdisciplinary engagement with cognitive science and psychology [20, 21, 32, 36]. Related empirical work has also examined how children acquire names and the extent to which causal-historical factors are psychologically salient [11, 36]. The debate over the reliability of semantic intuitions has, in turn, influenced broader discussions about philosophical methodology and the role of experimental philosophy [33].

Kripke's Legacy: Externalism, Essentialism, and Modern Semantics

The reverberations of *Naming and Necessity* extend far beyond the philosophy of language proper. Perhaps the most influential offshoot is semantic externalism, developed most famously by Hilary Putnam in "The Meaning of 'Meaning'" [12]. Putnam extended Kripke's causal-historical picture to natural kind terms like "water," arguing that the reference of such terms is determined by the actual microstructure of the world, not by the concepts in speakers' heads. The Twin Earth thought experiment, in which a substance with all the superficial properties of water but a different chemical composition (XYZ) is referred to by Twin Earthlings as "water", - illustrates that "meanings just aren't in the head." This externalist thesis has had a profound impact on the philosophy of mind, giving rise to debates about the nature of mental content, the role of the environment in individuating thoughts, and the possibility of narrow content [13, 22, 23].

In metaphysics, Kripke's work catalysed a revival of essentialism. By arguing that objects have essential properties—such as origins (a wooden table could not have been made of ice) or species membership (an organism could not have originated from a different zygote) he provided a framework for modal metaphysics that influenced philosophers as diverse as David Lewis and Alvin Plantinga [14, 24, 25]. The notion of "origin essentialism" became a central topic, with subsequent debate over whether the necessity of origin holds for all objects and what it implies for the metaphysics of identity [26]. In the philosophy of biology, Kripke's treatment of natural kinds has been both applied and contested, with some philosophers arguing that species are historical entities rather than kinds with intrinsic essences, and others defending a form of "microstructural essentialism" [27, 28, 37, 38]. The broader essentialist revival also prompted investigations into the metaphysics of artefacts and social kinds, extending Kripke's insights to domains he had not originally addressed [29, 30].

Within semantics, the Kripkean framework has become a permanent point of reference. While few today accept the causal-historical theory in its original, unadorned form, the core insights that names are rigid designators, that reference is often determined by social and historical factors, and that there are necessary a posteriori truth are widely accepted as starting points for semantic theorising. Contemporary research explores how these insights apply to a broader range of expressions, including fictional names, artefact terms, and theoretical terms in science [29, 30]. Moreover, Kripke's use of possible worlds and modal logic has been integrated into formal semantics, influencing work on modals, conditionals, and attitude reports [31]. Even the debates that resist Kripke's conclusions, such as those around two-dimensional semantics, have enriched the field by forcing a more precise articulation of the relations among reference, modality, and cognitive significance [8, 9, 16, 17]. The continuing vitality of the discussion is also evident in recent collections and handbooks that revisit Kripke's contributions from both historical and systematic perspectives [33, 40].

Conclusion

Five decades after the Princeton lectures, *Naming and Necessity* remains a philosophical classic. Its enduring impact is not about supplying final answers to the questions it raised, but about permanently reframing them. Kripke showed that a theory of reference could not be merely an extension of a theory of meaning in the Fregean sense; it required attending to the causal and social mechanisms that connect language to the world. By separating necessity from a priority, he liberated metaphysics from the epistemological strictures of logical positivism and opened a space for robust inquiry into the essential properties of objects, kinds, and individuals. The very terms of debate in contemporary philosophy of language—rigidity, the causal theory, and externalism are artefacts of Kripke's intervention.

The critical responses to Kripke's work have themselves become integral to the field. Two-dimensional semantics represents a sustained attempt to reconcile Kripke's insights with the Fregean intuition that cognitive significance matters. The development of hybrid theories of reference acknowledges the complexity that a purely causal account sometimes misses. Empirical work in experimental philosophy and cognitive science challenges the universality of the intuitions Kripke took as data, reminding us that philosophical theories are accountable not only to logical consistency but also to the psychological and social realities of language use. Far from diminishing Kripke's contribution, these developments testify to its generative power: each new challenge or refinement presupposes the framework that *Naming and Necessity* established.

In the end, Kripke's legacy is best understood as a set of commitments and problems that continue to animate research. The commitment to *de re* modality, the insistence

that reference is not exhausted by description, the recognition that the necessary and the a priori come apart, these are now common currency. The problems that remain, how exactly the causal chain operates, whether all-natural kinds have essences, and how to integrate externalist semantics with a plausible theory of cognitive content, are the problems that Kripke's work made visible. In this sense, *Naming and Necessity* is not a monument to be admired from a distance but a living source of philosophical inquiry. As the discipline moves forward, it does so by building on, refining, and occasionally challenging the foundations that Kripke laid, ensuring that his work will remain at the centre of the philosophy of language for generations to come.

References

1. Frege G. The Foundations of Arithmetic: A Logico-Mathematical Enquiry into the Concept of Number. Northwestern University Press, 1980.
2. Russell B. On Denoting. Mind,1905:14(56):479–493.
3. Kripke SA. Naming and Necessity. Harvard University Press, 1980.
4. Russell B. Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy. George Allen & Unwin, 1919.
5. Searle JR. Proper Names. Mind,1958:67(266):166–173.
6. Donnellan KS. Proper Names and Identifying Descriptions. Synthese,1970:21(3–4):335–358.
7. Evans G. The Causal Theory of Names. Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume,1973:47(1):187–208.
8. Chalmers DJ. The Foundations of Two-Dimensional Semantics. In Two-Dimensional Semantics: Foundations and Applications. Oxford University Press, 2006.
9. Jackson F. From Metaphysics to Ethics: A Defence of Conceptual Analysis. Oxford University Press, 1998.
10. Machery E, Mallon R, Nichols S, Stich SP. Semantics, Cross-Cultural Style. Cognition,2004:92(3):B1–B12.
11. Sytsma J, Livengood J. A New Perspective Concerning Experiments on Semantic Intuitions. Australasian Journal of Philosophy,2011:89(2):315–332.
12. Putnam H. The Meaning of 'Meaning'. In Language, Mind, and Knowledge. University of Minnesota Press, 1975.
13. Burge T. Individualism and the Mental. Midwest Studies in Philosophy,1979:4(1):73–121.
14. Salmon NU. Reference and Essence. Princeton University Press, 1981.
15. Soames S. Beyond Rigidity: The Unfinished Semantic Agenda of Naming and Necessity. Oxford University Press, 2002.
16. García-Carpintero M, Macià J. Two-Dimensional Semantics: Foundations and Applications. Oxford University Press, 2006.
17. Soames S. Reference and Description: The Case against Two-Dimensionalism. Princeton University Press, 2005.
18. Devitt M. Designation. Columbia University Press, 1981.
19. Recanati F. Direct Reference: From Language to Thought. Blackwell, 1993.
20. Nichols S, Ulatowski J. Intuitions and Individual Differences: The Knobe Effect Revisited. Mind & Language,2007:22(4):346–365.
21. Livengood J, Machery E. The Folk Probably Don't Think What You Think They Think: Experiments on Causation by Absence. Midwest Studies in Philosophy,2007:31(1):107–127.
22. Fodor JA. Psychosemantics: The Problem of Meaning in the Philosophy of Mind. MIT Press, 1987.
23. Segal GM. A Slim Book about Narrow Content. MIT Press, 2000.
24. Lewis D. On the Plurality of Worlds. Blackwell,1986.
25. Plantinga A. The Nature of Necessity. Oxford University Press, 1974.
26. Forbes G. The Metaphysics of Modality. Oxford University Press, 1985.
27. Boyd RN. Realism, Anti-Foundationalism and the Enthusiasm for Natural Kinds. Philosophical Studies,1991:61(1–2):127–148.
28. Dupré J. Natural Kinds and Biological Taxa. The Philosophical Review,1981:90(1):66–90.
29. Thomasson AL. Realism and Human Kinds. Philosophy and Phenomenological Research,2003:67(3):580–609.
30. LaPorte J. Natural Kinds and Conceptual Change. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
31. Chierchia G, McConnell-Ginet S. Meaning and Grammar: An Introduction to Semantics. MIT Press, 2000.
32. Devitt M. Experimental Semantics. Philosophy and Phenomenological Research,2011:82(2):418–435.
33. Ichikawa JJ. The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Contextualism. Routledge, 2017.
34. Kripke SA. Philosophical Troubles: Collected Papers, Volume 1. Oxford University Press, 2011.
35. Ludlow P. The Logic of Deferred Reference. In Proceedings of the 1995 Eastern Conference on Linguistics. Ohio State University Press, 1995.
36. Machery E. Philosophy within its Proper Bounds. Oxford University Press, 2017.
37. Millikan RG. Language, Thought, and Other Biological Categories: New Foundations for Realism. MIT Press, 1984.
38. Okasha S. Darwinian Metaphysics: Species and the Question of Essentialism. Synthese,2002:131(2):191–213.
39. Stalnaker RC. Assertion. In Syntax and Semantics: Pragmatics. Academic Press, 1978.
40. Yablo S. Coulda, Woulda, Shoulda. In Conceivability and Possibility. Oxford University Press, 2002.