Donnellan's Referential-Attributive Distinction à la Russell

"Keith asserted that Smith's murderer is insane."

- **Attributive**:

  Keith asserted that some insane person is the one and only person who murdered Smith.

  Keith asserted that $\exists x$ (! x murdered Smith $\wedge$ x is insane)

  ['! *Fx*' abbreviates '*Fx* $\wedge$ $\forall y$ (*Fy* $\rightarrow$ *y* = *x*)', i.e., '*x* is *F* and nothing but *x* is *F*']

- **Referential (1)**:

  With respect to the person who murdered Smith, Keith asserted that that person is insane.

  $\exists x$ (! x murdered Smith $\wedge$ Keith asserted that x is insane)

  This is clearly unsatisfactory, since it has the speaker agreeing with Keith about who murdered Smith. We need to give the description wide scope, but without committing the speaker to agree with Smith about Jones being the murderer. So here's a stab at doing that.

- **Referential (2)**:

  With respect to the one and only person Keith referred to as being a murderer of Smith, Keith asserted that that person is insane.

  There is exactly one person that Keith referred to as having murdered Smith, and Keith asserted, of that person, that he is insane.

  $\exists x$ (! Keith referred to x as having murdered Smith $\wedge$ Keith asserted that x is insane)