Quine's Critique of Analyticity in Philosophy: A Brief Analysis.

Sonai Ghosh

University of Gour Banga, Malda, West Bengal, India

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.120800375

Received: 23 Sep 2025; Accepted: 29 Sep 2025; Published: 16 October 2025

ABSTRACT

This article offers a detailed study of W. V. O. Quine's critique of the analytic–synthetic distinction and its consequences for philosophy. The notion of analyticity goes back to Kant, who distinguished analytic truths (true by meaning) from synthetic truths (which tell us something about the world). Logical positivists such as Rudolf Carnap attempted to sharpen this distinction and make it the secure foundation of knowledge. Quine, in his essay "*Two Dogmas of Empiricism"* (1951/1953), argues that the notion of "analytic" is hopelessly circular, and that the boundary between analytic and synthetic cannot be maintained. He proposes instead a holistic view of knowledge: our beliefs form an interconnected web, and any statement—even in logic or mathematics—can be revised in principle. This collapse of the analytic–synthetic line transforms epistemology and philosophy of language, and leads Quine toward naturalized epistemology, integrating philosophy more closely with science.

Keywords: analyticity, synthetic, logical positivism, synonymy, holism, epistemology, philosophy of language.

Objectives of the Study

1. To elucidate Quine's rejection of the analytic–synthetic distinction and show why he considers it untenable.
2. To analyze Quine's arguments: the failure of definitions, interchangeability (salva veritate), semantic rules in formal languages, and confirmation holism.
3. To explore the holistic "web of belief" model and how it undermines the separation between analytic and empirical truths.
4. To examine the philosophical implications of Quine's critique for epistemology, meaning, and philosophy of science.

METHODOLOGY

This study is analytical, conceptual, and critical. It does not involve empirical investigation but critically examines philosophical texts and arguments. The primary texts are:

Immanuel Kant's Critique of Pure Reason (for the original analytic–synthetic distinction)

W. V. O. Quine's *"Two Dogmas of Empiricism*" (first published 1951; reprinted in From a Logical Point of View).

Secondary sources—books, articles, commentaries—help situate and interpret Quine's arguments. A comparative approach—juxtaposing Kant, Carnap, and Quine—ensures clarity in understanding the shifts in philosophy**.**

Statement of the Problem

the distinction between analytic (true by meaning) and synthetic (true by fact) collapses. Key problems arising:

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue IX September 2025

1. Can "analytic" be defined in a non-circular, universal way?
2. Is the analytic–synthetic distinction conceptually defensible?
3. What happens to meaning, knowledge, logic, and scientific theory if we abandon that distinction?

Quine contends that the assumptions underlying both analyticity and reductionism are untenable, forcing a radical reworking of epistemology and the philosophy of language.

INTRODUCTION:

Quine's essay Two Dogmas of Empiricism (1951) is a turning point in twentieth-century philosophy. It challenged two pillars of logical positivism:

1. The analytic–synthetic distinction.

2. Reductionism, the claim that every meaningful statement can be translated into terms of immediate experience.

The first critique—the rejection of the analytic–synthetic divide—is the more radical.

Kant first made this distinction systematic in the *Critique of Pure Reason*. He explained that analytic judgments are those in which the predicate is contained in the subject concept. For example, "All bachelors are unmarried" is analytic, because "unmarried" is already part of the concept "bachelor." Such truths are necessary and known a priori. By contrast, synthetic judgments add something new. "All bachelors are unhappy" is synthetic, because "unhappy" is not part of the concept "bachelor." Its truth depends on experience.[1]

In the twentieth century, logical positivists such as Rudolf Carnap developed this distinction further. Carnap described analytic truths as those true by virtue of meaning and linguistic rules, independent of experience. For instance, "all triangles have three sides" is analytic. Synthetic truths, however, require verification through observation. For Carnap, this division secured mathematics and logic as necessary, while science dealt with empirical truths.[2]

Quine, however, argued that the distinction was flawed. In *Two Dogmas of Empiricism*, he showed that definitions of analyticity rely on circular notions such as synonymy, meaning, or interchangeability of words. Each of these concepts presupposes the very idea of analyticity. Because of this, there is no clear foundation for the analytic–synthetic divide. Instead, Quine proposed a holistic view of knowledge. All beliefs, even logic and mathematics, belong to a "web of belief." Any belief can be revised in light of experience. From this perspective, the sharp distinction between analytic and synthetic collapses.[3]

Analysis of the Study: Quine's Rejection of Analyticity

The two dogmas

Quine begins by identifying two "dogmas" of empiricism: "Modern empiricism has been conditioned in large part by two dogmas. One is a belief in some fundamental cleavage between truths which are analytic, or grounded in meanings independently of matters of fact, and truths

1. [1]Kant, Immanuel. Critique of Pure Reason, trans. Norman Kemp Smith (London: Macmillan, 1929), A6–B10.
2. [2] Carnap, Rudolf. Meaning and Necessity (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), pp. 6–7
3. [3] Quine, W.V.O. From a Logical Point of View (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953), pp. 20–21.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue IX September 2025

which are synthetic or grounded in fact. The other dogma is reductionism: the belief that each meaningful statement is equivalent to some logical construct upon terms which refer to immediate experience. Both dogmas, I shall argue, are ill-founded"[4]

Failure of Definitions to Establish Synonymy

Quine examines three types of definitions to see if they can support analyticity:

1. Lexical definitions record established meanings, such as "bachelor" means "unmarried man." These definitions presuppose synonymy rather than explaining it, because dictionaries report language use but do not justify why terms are synonymous.

2. Explications refine vague concepts in scientific or philosophical contexts. For example, replacing "force" in everyday language with a precise term in physics. Explications alter meaning and therefore cannot preserve the original synonymy.

3. Stipulative definitions assign meaning arbitrarily, like defining a symbol "∆" to represent "unmarried man." Such definitions are invented and do not reflect actual synonymy.

Quine concludes that none of these methods provides a non-circular basis for analyticity: lexical definitions presuppose synonymy, explications alter it, and stipulative definitions invent it.[5]

Interchangeability Salva Veritate:

Quine then considers defining synonymy through interchangeability salva veritate—two terms are synonymous if one can replace the other in any context without changing the truth of statements. For instance, "bachelor" and "unmarried man" may seem interchangeable in:

"All bachelors are unmarried men."

However, this fails in many contexts:

"Bachelor" has eight letters. Substituting "unmarried man" gives a false statement: "Unmarried man has fewer than ten letters."

Idiomatic expressions: "He is a bachelor of arts" becomes nonsensical as "He is an unmarried man of arts"

Quine also points out that co-extensive terms, such as "creature with a heart" and "creature with a kidney," refer to the same objects but are not synonymous. Thus, interchangeability fails to define synonymy independently and presupposes the very notion of meaning it aims to clarify.[6]

Critique of Carnap's Approach:

Carnap tried to define analyticity in a formal language using semantic rules. A statement is analytic in a language if it is true only because of the meanings of the words in that language. For example, "All bachelors are unmarried men" would be analytic in such a system. Quine criticized this approach because it makes analyticity relative to a particular language—analytic-in- does not mean analytic universally. Even in highly formalized languages, semantic rules already assume some understanding of analyticity, which makes the definition circular. Moreover, natural languages are too flexible and vague to support a clear separation

[4] Ibid., pp. 20–22.

[5] Ibid., pp. 26–28.

[6] Ibid., pp. 28–30.

between analytic and synthetic statements. Therefore, Quine concluded that Carnap's method cannot provide a universal, non-circular foundation for distinguishing analytic truths from empirical ones.[7]

Interchangeability in Natural and Intensional Languages:

In normal, or extensional, language, just because two words refer to the same thing does not mean they have the same meaning. For example, "morning star" and "evening star" both point to the planet Venus, but their meanings are different. In intensional language, which includes words like "necessarily" or "possibly," replacing one word with another is more complicated. Doing this substitution assumes we already know which statements are analytic. This leads to a circular problem: we cannot define analyticity using substitution without first knowing what analytic statements are. Quine points out that trying to base analyticity on synonymy or on substituting terms that preserve truth (salva veritate) does not provide a clear, non-circular foundation. In short, Quine argues that the usual ideas about meaning and substitution cannot fully explain what makes a statement analytic.

Confirmation Holism:

Confirmation holism asserts that individual statements cannot be tested in isolation; instead, they are assessed as part of a broader network of interconnected beliefs. According to Quine, empirical evidence does not confirm or refute a single proposition independently. Rather, it interacts with a web of theoretical assumptions, definitions, and auxiliary hypotheses. This implies that any statement, even in logic or mathematics, is potentially revisable if the overall network demands it. Consequently, the traditional analytic-synthetic distinction—where analytic statements are considered immune to empirical testing—loses its foundation. Quine's holistic view emphasizes that scientific and empirical knowledge functions as an integrated system, where revisions can propagate throughout the network to maintain coherence. This perspective challenges the idea of absolute certainty in knowledge, highlighting the dynamic, interconnected, and revisable nature of human understanding.[8]

Importance of the Study

This study is significant as it critically examines Quine's rejection of analyticity, a pivotal moment in modern philosophy. By analyzing Quine's arguments, the research highlights the limitations of the analytic-synthetic distinction, challenging foundational assumptions in epistemology, philosophy of language, and philosophy of science. It illuminates the interconnectedness of knowledge and emphasizes that no statement is immune from empirical scrutiny, thereby promoting a holistic understanding of theory and evidence. The study also traces the influence of Quine on later philosophers, such as Davidson and Putnam, demonstrating its impact on contemporary debates about meaning, truth, and knowledge. Furthermore, the research contributes to philosophical methodology by showcasing critical, conceptual analysis as a tool for interrogating fundamental ideas. Overall, it enhances understanding of the epistemological and linguistic foundations of philosophy, providing a framework for further scholarly inquiry into the dynamic relationship between language, knowledge, and empirical investigation.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Quine's critique of analyticity is a major turning point in twentieth-century philosophy. He challenged the traditional distinction between analytic truths, which are true by meaning, and synthetic truths, which tell us something new about the world. By questioning this distinction, Quine showed that our understanding of knowledge and language is more connected to experience than previously thought.

Quine's arguments are clear and influential. He demonstrated that attempts to define analyticity rely on circular reasoning, making the concept unstable. His idea of confirmation holism further explains that no

[7] Carnap, Rudolf. Logical Syntax of Language (London: Routledge, 1937), pp. 3–4.

[8] Quine, W.V.O., From a Logical Point of View (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), pp 41-42.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue IX September 2025

statement can be tested alone; instead, every belief is part of a larger web of knowledge. This means even logical and mathematical truths are open to revision, depending on the whole system of beliefs.

The philosophical consequences of Quine's work are significant. By blurring the line between analytic and synthetic statements, he linked philosophy more closely with science. His "web of belief" model shows that meaning and truth are judged in relation to the entire network of knowledge. Quine's naturalized epistemology offers a practical, empirical approach to understanding how humans form and revise beliefs.

While Quine's ideas are revolutionary, some criticisms remain, such as challenges in applying holistic revision and limits of naturalized epistemology. Despite this, his work remains influential in modern philosophy, shaping the way we think about knowledge, language, and science. Overall, Quine's critique is both a critique of old ideas and a constructive framework for rethinking epistemology in a more scientific and interconnected way.