

Review of Wittgenstein-a critical reader Hans-Johann Glock (ed.) (2001)(review revised 2019)

Michael Starks

ABSTRACT

The aim of the 17 original papers here is to summarize and analyze Wittgenstein's thought. At the time these were being written, the Oxford/InteleX CDROM (\$2040 on Amazon but available thru interlibrary loan and steeply discounted on the net) with 20,000 some pages of W's nachlass, as well as the various online versions of the nachlass, were not yet available, and only those fluent in German and willing to find and slog thru the incomplete Cornell microfilm were able to examine it. To this day, much of it remains untranslated from the German typescripts and handwritten manuscripts. I note this at the outset as W's untranslated or unpublished writings often shed crucial light on his thought and few to this day have made substantial use of them. In addition, there are huge problems with translation of his early 20th century Viennese German into modern English. One must be a master of English, German, and Wittgenstein in order to do this and very few are up to it. Several of the current authors note unfortunate translation errors in the only available English editions and I have seen similar comments countless times.

As is well known, W's thought changed dramatically between the publication of the *Tractatus* (TLP) in 1922 and the *Philosophical Investigations* (1953). The continuity or lack thereof between his early and late work is the subject of a vast literature and is taken up here by several authors. Ishiguro on the picture theory and Mounce on the logical system in TLP are good, but for me the endless discussions of exactly how he was mistaken in his early work is of as little interest as the mistakes in most previous philosophy. Ammereller on Intentionality is a good, if prosaic, summary of (mostly) the early and middle W on belief and interpretation which, like virtually everyone, totally fails to give an adequate overview of W's pioneering work. In giving the general outline of our innate evolutionary psychology (i.e., roughly our personality) and showing how this describes behavior, W represents a major milestone in human thought. There are unmistakable indications of this even in his early writings (e.g., see

p 40, 49-58 here) and it has been documented by Hacker (e.g., see his paper in *The New Wittgenstein*) and others but without any comprehensive account in book form to date (but see the many recent writings of Daniele Moyal-Sharrock, Coliva etc.). Overall a good book for introducing *W* to a general philosophical audience but now very dated by the recent work of Hacker, Daniele Moyal-Sharrock, Coliva, Hutto, Read and others.

Those wishing a comprehensive up to date framework for human behavior from the modern two systems view may consult my book *'The Logical Structure of Philosophy, Psychology, Mind and Language in Ludwig Wittgenstein and John Searle'* 2nd ed (2019). Those interested in more of my writings may see *'Talking Monkeys--Philosophy, Psychology, Science, Religion and Politics on a Doomed Planet--Articles and Reviews 2006-2019'* 3rd ed (2019) and *Suicidal Utopian Delusions in the 21st Century* 4th ed (2019).

The aim of the 17 original papers here is to summarize and analyze Wittgenstein's thought.

At the time these were being written, the Oxford/Intelelex CDROM (\$2040 on Amazon but available thru interlibrary loan and steeply discounted on the net) with 20,000 some pages of *W*'s nachlass as well as the various online versions of the nachlass, were not yet available, and only those fluent in German and willing to find and slog thru the incomplete Cornell microfilm were able to examine it. To this day, much of it remains untranslated from the German typescripts and handwritten manuscripts. I note this at the outset as *W*'s untranslated or unpublished writings often shed crucial light on his thought and few to this day have made substantial use of them. In addition, there are huge problems with translation of his early 20th century Viennese German into modern English. One must be a master of English, German, and Wittgenstein in order to do this and very few are up to it. Several of the current authors note unfortunate translation errors in the only available English editions and I have seen similar comments countless times.

As is well known, W's thought changed dramatically between the publication of the *Tractatus* (TLP) in 1922 and the *Philosophical Investigations* (1953). The continuity or lack thereof between his early and late work is the subject of a vast literature and is taken up here by several authors. Ishiguro on the picture theory and Mounce on the logical system in TLP are good, but for me the endless discussions of exactly how he was mistaken in his early work is of as little interest as the mistakes in most previous philosophy.

Ammereller on Intentionality is a good, if prosaic, summary of (mostly) the early and middle W on belief and interpretation which, like virtually everyone, totally fails to give an adequate overview of W's pioneering work. In giving the general outline of our innate evolutionary psychology (i.e., roughly our personality) and showing how this describes behavior, W represents a major milestone in human thought. There are unmistakable indications of this even in his early writings (e.g., see p 40, 49-58 here) and it has been documented by Hacker (e.g., see his paper in *The New Wittgenstein*) and others but without any comprehensive account to date.

Rundle's contribution on meaning and understanding, which W classed as dispositions or inclinations and are now commonly called propositional attitudes, is mostly pedestrian and completely misses W's major point that, like most of our psychology, these are public phenomena and not private mental states. Of course, he can be forgiven since hardly anyone interested in behavior (which can be taken to include everyone) has realized this, nor noted that W was the first to discuss it some 75 years ago.

Arrington gives an adequate, if standard, account of W on rule following and Hanfling an exceptional summary of W on thinking. He makes it very clear that W showed dispositions are activities (or potential activities in some uses of the words) which are necessarily public, shared acts—a crucial basic fact rarely understood even by the brightest and the best (see e.g., Chomsky's insistence-- in his more recent writings-- on the internal nature of language). Candlish follows with the best concise account I have seen of W's thoughts on willing.

Schroeder provides a good article on another of W's major advances in understanding how the mind works—the impossibility of private language and

private experience — i.e., just what Chomsky and millions of others have missed. However, he falters in mid-article by failing to get the difference between dispositions (thoughts, beliefs, meanings etc.) which cannot be true or false and carry no information, and judgements of empirical facts which do, and thus fails to fully grasp the private language argument. There is no test for beliefs, thoughts, desires, intentions etc., even for oneself, until they are acted out in the public arena. Anything which is truly private is of no consequence in our social life or our language (thought).

Ter Hark, who has written a book on *W*'s philosophy of psychology (though all of philosophy is psychology) contributes an adequate survey on "The Inner and The Outer" but is not really clear about how our psychology rests on innate, unquestionable axioms and how this is related to the axioms of mathematics.

Bakhurst's review of *W* on personal identity is barely adequate and shows little grasp of *W*'s overall contributions to psychology. Likewise, with Mulhall's "Seeing Aspects."

Frascolla, who has written a rather good book on *W*'s Philosophy of Mathematics, provides a good but hurried article that will be of little use to those not versed in this topic already.

I found Schwyzer's article on Autonomy to be entirely useless — an amazing but common achievement when writing about the greatest contributor to our most fascinating subject — how the mind works.

Grayling does a careful dissection of *W*'s last great work *On Certainty* but misses the fact (as *W* noted many, many times) that all the skeptical views of knowing and certainty are incoherent, depending, as they must, on our innate axiomatic psychology to even state them.

The world's leading *W* scholar for 4 decades, PMS Hacker gives a good summary of *W*'s views on the nature of philosophy, but even he seems to have no clear grasp of the fact that *W*'s "grammar" refers to our inherited intentional

psychology.

The late DZ Phillips contributes one his many articles on faith and ethics in *W* and I found this one as dull as the rest. Like most who write on *W*, he passes up a gold mine by failing to consider the relevance of *W*'s many penetrating comments on machines, animals and alien tribes.

In order to place these articles in the context of current philosophy and psychology I include the table of intentionality from my recent work on the Logical Structure of Rationality (the Descriptive Psychology of Higher Order Thought). It is based on a much simpler one from Searle, which in turn owes much to Wittgenstein. I have also incorporated in modified form tables being used by current researchers in the psychology of thinking processes which are evidenced in the last 9 rows. It should prove interesting to compare it with those in Peter Hacker's 3 recent volumes on Human Nature. I offer this table as an heuristic for describing behavior that I find more complete and useful than any other framework I have seen and not as a final or complete analysis, which would have to be three dimensional with hundreds (at least) of arrows going in many directions with many (perhaps all) pathways between S1 and S2 being bidirectional. Also, the very distinction between S1 and S2, cognition and willing, perception and memory, between feeling, knowing, believing and expecting etc. are arbitrary--that is, as *W* demonstrated, all words are contextually sensitive and most have several utterly different uses (meanings or COS). Many complex charts have been published by scientists but I find them of minimal utility when thinking about behavior (as opposed to thinking about brain function). Each level of description may be useful in certain contexts but I find that being coarser or finer limits usefulness.

The Logical Structure of Rationality (LSR), or the Logical Structure of Mind (LSM), the Logical Structure of Behavior (LSB), the Logical Structure of Thought (LST), the Logical Structure of Consciousness (LSC), the Logical Structure of Personality (LSP), the Descriptive Psychology of Consciousness (DSC), the Descriptive Psychology of Higher Order Thought (DPHOT), Intentionality-the classical philosophical term.

System 1 is involuntary, reflexive or automated "Rules" R1 while Thinking (Cognition) has no gaps and is voluntary or deliberative "Rules" R2 and Willing

(Volition) has 3 gaps (see Searle)

I suggest we can describe behavior more clearly by changing Searle's "impose conditions of satisfaction on conditions of satisfaction" to "relate mental states to the world by moving muscles" —i.e., talking, writing and doing, and his "mind to world direction of fit" and "world to mind direction of fit" by "cause originates in the mind" and "cause originates in the world" S1 is only upwardly causal (world to mind) and contentless (lacking representations or information) while S2 has content and is downwardly causal (mind to world). I have adopted my terminology in this table.

I give detailed explanations of this table in my other writings.

	Disposition*	Emotion	Memory	Perception	Desire	PI**	IA***	Action/ Word
Cause Originates From****	World	World	World	World	Mind	Mind	Mind	Mind
Causes Changes In*****	None	Mind	Mind	Mind	None	World	World	World
Causally Self Reflexive*****	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
True or False (Testable)	Yes	T only	T only	T only	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Public Conditions of Satisfaction	Yes	Yes/No	Yes/No	No	Yes/No	Yes	No	Yes
Describe A Mental State	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes/No	Yes
Evolutionary Priority	5	4	2,3	1	5	3	2	2
Voluntary Content	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Voluntary Initiation	Yes/No	No	Yes	No	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cognitive System*****	2	1	2/1	1	2 / 1	2	1	2
Change Intensity	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Precise Duration	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Time, Place (H+N, T+T)*****	TT	HN	HN	HN	TT	TT	HN	HN
Special Quality	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Localized in Body	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Bodily Expressions	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Self Contradictions	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Needs a Self	Yes	Yes/No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Needs Language	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes/No

FROM DECISION RESEARCH

	Disposition*	Emotion	Memory	Perception	Desire	PI**	IA***	Action/ Word
Subliminal Effects	No	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes/No
Associative/ Rule Based	RB	A/RB	A	A	A/RB	RB	RB	RB
Context Dependent/ Abstract	A	CD/A	CD	CD	CD/A	A	CD/A	CD/A
Serial/Parallel	S	S/P	P	P	S/P	S	S	S
Heuristic/ Analytic	A	H/A	H	H	H/A	A	A	A
Needs Working Memory	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
General Intelligence Dependent	Yes	No	No	No	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cognitive Loading Inhibits	Yes	Yes/No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arousal Facilitates or Inhibits	I	F/I	F	F	I	I	I	I

Public Conditions of Satisfaction of S2 are often referred to by Searle and others as COS, Representations, truthmakers or meanings (or COS2 by myself), while the automatic results of S1 are designated as presentations by others (or COS1 by myself).

- * Aka Inclinations, Capabilities, Preferences, Representations, possible actions etc.
- ** Searle’s Prior Intentions
- *** Searle’s Intention In Action
- **** Searle’s Direction of Fit
- ***** Searle’s Direction of Causation
- ***** (Mental State instantiates--Causes or Fulfills Itself). Searle formerly called this causally self- referential.
- ***** Tversky/Kahneman/Frederick/Evans/Stanovich defined cognitive systems.
- ***** Here and Now or There and Then

One should always keep in mind Wittgenstein's discovery that after we have described the possible uses (meanings, truthmakers, Conditions of Satisfaction) of language in a particular context, we have exhausted its interest, and attempts at explanation (i.e., philosophy) only get us further away from the truth. It is critical to note that this table is only a highly simplified context-free heuristic and each use of a word must be examined in its context. The best examination of context variation is in Peter Hacker's recent 3 volumes on Human Nature, which provide numerous tables and charts that should be compared with this one.

