AG lit. review questions: week 2

Indefinite Extensibility

(Q1) What, according to Dummett, is it for a concept to be *indefinitely extensible*?

(Q2) What are some examples of putatively indefinitely extensible concepts?

(Q3) What is their relationship to the paradoxes?

(Q4) Can a theory's quantifiers intelligibly range over every item that falls under an indefinitely extensible concept?

The All-in-One Principle

(Q5) What is the (battery of) principle(s) that Cartwright dubs *the All-in-One Principle*

(Q6) Is the All-in-One Principle compatible with there being an absolutely comprehensive domain?

(Q7) Are there any good reasons to accept the All-in-One Principle?

(Q8) If we reject it, what should we make of 'domain'-talk?

Cartwright vs Dummett

(Q9) What is Cartwright's preferred 'straightforward' response to the paradoxes?

(Q10) Dummett writes:

> [Frege's successors] have accepted the need to specify the domain outright, or to form some conception of it, before interpreting the primitive predicates of a theory as applying to elements of that domain. (p. 439)

Why does he think this necessary?

(Q11) Does Dummett assume the All-in-One principle?

(Q12) If not, what plenitude principles drive indefinite extensibility?

(Q13) Dummett writes:

> Abandoning classical logic will not, indeed, by itself preserve us from contradiction if we maintain the same assumptions as before; but, since we no longer conceive ourselves to be quantifying over a fully determinate totality, we shall have no motive to do so. (pp. 441–2)

What is going on here?