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The main aim of this paper is that of suggesting that Wittgenstein's notion of logical form -- as it appears in the Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus -- is better understood if it is conceived of as deriving from Russell's notion of logical form -- as put forth, for instance, in Theory of Knowledge --, rather than from Frege's notion of function. Such a prevailing historical aim is associated with a second one, theoretical-exegetical in character: trying to understand what exactly the logical form is in the Tractatus, and what its role is in the context of the picture theory of language."


Abstract: "Frege's notion of concept – the reference (vs. the sense) of a predicate – is here compared with cognate notions in Husserl's Logical Investigations and in Wittgenstein's Tractatus. Their common trait is unsaturatedness or existential dependency: the different treatment of this chief notion of formal ontology is in turn examined comparatively, with regard to the conflicts and the alliances taking tacitly place between the three. In Frege's notion of concept, at any rate, an inner tension arises from its twofold nature of property and of truth-function: saturation and function/argument are too heterogeneous models. Hints for a way out suggested."


"Universals such as red are plausible examples of Tractatus objects, despite 6.3751. This view is linked to the Tractatus' conception of analysis and to its phenomenalism. Facts are composed of universals bound together. The totality of facts forms the solipsistic universe; the universe as it appears. There is no subject to whom it appears; there are only the constituent atomic facts. Appearances change; what was the case is no longer the case. What does not change are the eternally subsisting universals whose changing combinations constitute reality."


The problem of the relations between the orders of signification, truth and logical consequence is central to logic. The way in which these relationships are established goes some way towards determining the logical theory to which the writer subscribes. This problem has been a major issue in the history of logic. In this essay, I propose to show that the problem of these relations is present in the course of the historical development of logic, and that there is no one solution to it. My aim is thus not to offer an answer to the question posed, but to highlight the contrast between different solutions, approaching this issue from the standpoint defended by Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951) in his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Nor do I intend to provide a detailed explanation of Wittgenstein's view, but only to outline it and bring out the contrasts with other possible solutions, solutions which predate it by some considerable time." (Notes omitted)


Raymond Bradley, in his book *The Nature of All Being*, has put forward an essentialist interpretation of the ontology of Wittgenstein's *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus* and aims to develop the modal dimensions that, in his opinion, are implicit in that work. The aim of this paper is to reassess Bradley's interpretation of tractarian names as rigid designators, by examining the tractarian notion of *name* and the Kripkean concept of *rigid designator* in *Naming and Necessity*, with a view to answering the question as to whether an interpretation of tractarian names as rigid designators is possible, and to bringing to light some similarities and differences between the two theories of meaning."


In this paper, I develop some reflections on the interpretation of the notion of Sachverhalt in the Tractatus, with a view to show the complexity of the tractarian view and to point out some tensions. I intend to elucidate this notion in the context of its relation to the notions of Tatsache and Sachlage, and in its relation to the two main theories of the Tractatus, the truth-functions theory and the picture theory. I hope that this elucidation sheds some light on a possible comparison between Wittgenstein's and Husserl's views and I point out some suggestions in this sense in the last part of the paper.


This paper aims to explain how the Tractatus attempts to unify logic by deriving the truth-functionality of logical necessity from the thesis that a proposition shows its sense. I first interpret the Tractarian notion of showing as the displaying of what is intrinsic to an expression. Then I argue that, according to the Tractatus, the thesis that a proposition shows its sense implies the determinacy of sense, the possibility of the complete elimination of nonprimitive symbols, the analyticity thesis and the strong analyticity thesis. The picture theory emerges as what provides the only acceptable account of an elementary proposition, subject to the constraint that a proposition must show its sense. The picture theory and the analyticity thesis then
entail the contingency thesis and the independence thesis which, together with the strong analyticity thesis, imply that all logical propositions are tautologies."


Wittgenstein's *Tractatus* contains some very striking theses. We read, e.g., that "in a sense" we could not be wrong in logic, and that the whole subject matter of the theory of modalities could be reconstructed on the ground of the insights in the mechanism of the linguistic reference. Yet in the light of the last sentences of *Tractatus* the whole semantics turns out to be principally ineffable. In our paper we will try to clarify these matters. We show how these theses could be made plausible in the context of the *transcendental* method of Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*.


"Logical atomism has been construed as both a realist and a nominalist ontology. Despite their different ontological commitments, proponents of both types of atomism have tended to agree that modal operators for necessity and possibility, and thereby strict entailment too, are totally alien to the ontological grammar of logical atomism. The reason for this, apparently, is that any inclusion of modal operators in the ontological grammar of logical atomism, whether that grammar be of the nominalist or realist variants, would represent a commitment to internal properties and relations with material content. And in logical atomism, of course, all internal properties and relations, be they of objects or of situations, are formal and not material in nature. (Cf. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, ([TR]), 4.122).

However, to the contrary, we shall argue that not only are propositional connectives for logical necessity and possibility, and thereby strict entailment too, no more alien to the ontological grammar of logical atomism than are connectives for conjunction and disjunction, but, moreover, that the formal or internal properties and relations of objects and situations in the ontology cannot be adequately represented by the propositional forms of that grammar unless connectives for logical necessity and possibility are included (or definable by others so included) therein. That is, we shall argue that connectives for logical necessity and possibility, together with their proper "logico-syntactical employment" ([TR], 3.327), represent formal, and not material, internal "properties," and, moreover, that these formal, internal "properties" are part of the ontology of logical atomism and cannot be adequately represented without the inclusion of such connectives in the ontological grammar of any formal system purporting to represent that ontology."

Our position and argument, incidentally, applies only to modal operators for logical necessity and possibility. All other modal operators, we agree, because they purport to represent internal "properties" or "relations" with real material content (e.g., causality, and even temporality via tense logic), are strictly prohibited within the metaphysical framework of logical atomism. "Superstition is nothing but belief in the causal nexus" ([TR], 5.1361). "The only necessity that exists is logical necessity" ([TR], 6.37).

Moreover, our concern here shall be with logical atomism as the metaphysical framework for a type of formal ontology. Our concern will not be with logical atomism as the framework for either a theory of meaning or a theory of knowledge. Accordingly, neither the Carnapian theory of *Protokolssätze* nor the Tractarian picture theory of meaning are essential to our present purely ontological considerations. We should note, however, that the Tractarian theory of elementary propositions as pictures contains both a theory of predication and a theory of meaning. It is the theory of predication that is an essential part of the ontology of logical atomism.
In the present chapter we shall limit our formal developments to the level of analysis dealing solely with propositional connectives. Our next chapter will deal with nominalist logical atomism where only individual variables are bindable but where atomism’s theory of predication enters the ontological grammar in a fundamental way. That chapter will also contain a description of several variants of realist logical atomism, one in which material properties and relations of objects are themselves objects, and another where material properties and relations of objects, though indicated by bound predicate variables (as in the first variant of realism), are not themselves objects (values of individual variables) but are nexuses or modes of configurations of objects (as they are in nominalism where they are not indicated by bound predicate variables).” (pp. 222-223 of the reprint)


"Logical atomism, through its theory of logical form, provides one of the most coherent formal ontologies in the history of philosophy. It is a coherence which, whether we agree with the ontology or not, renders the framework important and useful as a paradigm by which to compare and better evaluate the coherence of alternative systems based upon alternative theories of logical form and especially alternative theories of predication.

As the basis of a formal ontology, logical atomism, aside from the differences between its realist and nominalist variants, specifies not only a ‘deep structure’ ontological grammar within which all analysis must ultimately be resolved, but determines as well a logistic for that grammar. Both together constitute the formal ontology and serve to indicate how logical atomism views the fundamental structure of reality. Thus, for example, the grammar serves to indicate the formal as well as the material categories of being acknowledged by the ontology, while the logistic, by regulating the proper ‘logico-syntactical employment’ ([TR], 3.327) of the expressions of that grammar serves to indicate not only the logical ‘scaffolding of the world’ ([TR], 6.124) but supplements the grammar in its presentation of the ontological structure of reality.

The distinction between logical scaffolding and ontological structure is fundamental to atomism and pertains to a distinction between material and formal content that grammar alone is insufficient to represent. It is a distinction that any proposed formalization of logical atomism must account for (through the Doctrine of Showing) in order to be an adequate formal representative of that ontology. It is a distinction, however, or so it will be argued here, that cannot be made without the introduction of modal operators for logical necessity and possibility.

The argument for this last claim was already given in chapter 6, but it was there restricted to the level of logical analysis dealing solely with propositional connectives."

(...)"In what follows we shall be concerned with the problematic extension of these results to the level of analysis involving quantifiers for objects as concrete particulars along with some means for expressing their self-identity and mutual difference. On this level, logical atomism’s theory of predication enters our considerations in a fundamental way. For according to that theory, only elementary predications represent or ‘picture’ a structure with material content, and that content is in all cases external to the constituents of the structure. Such a structure is an atomic situation (Sachlage) and the externality of its content to its constituents consists in both it and its complement being logically possible. The difficulty here is that since objects are quantified over, they are part of the world and therefore contribute to the ontological content of the world (cf. [TR] 5.5561); and in that regard their self-identity and mutual difference or nonidentity, and thereby their total number, would prima facie seem to involve material content. Yet, in atomism, an object’s self-identity or nonidentity with any other object is not an external
condition of that object, (3) and, as a consequence of the dependence of logical space on reality, it is logically impossible for the totality of objects, no less the number of that totality, to differ from world to world. In other words, in logical atomism, if not in other ontologies, identity and difference, as well as objectual quantification, are formal and not material aspects of reality. Here already we begin to see the paradigmatic role of logical atomism, for in most other systems identity and difference, as well as objectual quantification, are also said to be formal in content, though propositions regarding that content are not also said to be either logically necessary or logically impossible. Because our considerations will be restricted to quantifying over objects as concrete particulars and not, for example, over material properties and relations as well, the variant of logical atomism we shall discuss here is nominalistic. Several realist alternatives are sketched in order to highlight the significant theses and/or difficulties of nominalism, though it should be noted that not all forms of nominalism need agree with the special ontological theses of nominalist logical atomism. Finally, it should also be noted that our concern in this chapter is with an adequate formal representation of the ontology of logical atomism and not with its theory of thought, meaning, or philosophy of language. We wish to leave open how these might or must be developed with respect to the system constructed here, especially with regard to how they might or must pertain to the question of its logistic completeness."

(1) The convention adopted here is to use scare-quotes when speaking of what connectives represent as ‘properties’ or ‘relations’. This is done to mark a special philosophical use which is convenient in our informal discussion but which strictly speaking is ontologically misleading. A similar convention applies throughout when we refer to existence (being-the-case) and nonexistence (being-not-the-case) as material ‘properties’ of atomic situations.

(3) That is, an object’s self-identity or nonidentity with any other object is invariant through all the possible worlds of a logical space containing that object. We must distinguish this ontological invariance from the varying semantical relation of denotation (Bedeutung) between an object and a (non-Tractarian) name or definite description of that object. The former must be accounted for within the formal ontology, the latter only within its applications.

References


Wittgenstein's method is that of showing the categories of being through a perspicuous language that mirrors the world. For Wittgenstein there are two categories of being, the category of objects and the category of facts. These categories are radically disjoint: no object is a fact, no fact an object. A perspicuous language facts cannot be named and objects cannot be asserted. A perspicuous language has one and only one name for each object and one and only one proposition for each possible (and in addition one not-so-possible) fact. Material properties and generality are shown to be analyzable; formal properties are seen as not expressible. The unity of reality shows in the general form of a proposition that is given in a manner far clearer and much less ambiguous than Wittgenstein's own version. The Tractarian view of logic and mathematics is developed, and questions are raised concerning it that can be seen to occupy Wittgenstein in his later writings."


"While many books discuss the individual achievements of Frege, Russell, Wittgenstein, and Quine, few books consider how the thought of all four thinkers bears on the fundamental questions of twentieth century philosophy. This book is about existence-identity connections in Frege, Russell, Wittgenstein, and Quine. The thesis of the book is that there is a general form of ontology, modified realism, which these great analysts share not only with each other, but with most great philosophers in the Western tradition. Modified realism is the view that in some sense there are both real identities and conceptual (or linguistic) identities. In more familiar language, it is the view that there are both real distinctions and distinctions in reason (or in language). Thus in modified realism, there are some real beings which can serve as a basis for accommodating possibly huge amounts of conceptual or linguistic relativity, or objectual identities 'shifting' as sortal concepts or sortal terms 'shift.' Therefore, on the fundamental level of ontology, the linguistic turn was not a radical break from traditional substance theory. Dejnožka also holds that the conflict in all four analysts between private language arguments (which imply various kinds of realism) and conceptual "shifting" (which suggests conceptual relativism) is best resolved by, and is in fact implicitly resolved by, their respective kinds of modified realism. Frege and Russell, not Wittgenstein and Quine, emerge as the true analytic progenitors of 'no entity without identity,' offering between them at least twenty-nine private language arguments and fifty-eight 'no entity without identity' theories."


A conjecture on the metaphysical nature of Tractatus objects is put forward and its interpretative adequacy is tested. The clarification of the true import of the metaphor of logical space and the recognition of the theoretical role played by Wittgenstein's explicit claim that the emptiness of logical space is conceivable enable us to account for the thesis that objects are the substance of the world. Once objects are identified with those universal abstract entities which are qualia, and complexes or states of affairs with their concrete instances, some statements of the Tractatus become liable to a consistent reading: that objects are colourless (TLP 2.0232); that space, time and colour are forms of objects (TLP 2.0251); that Leibniz's Principle of the Identity of Indiscernibles, though still holding for complexes, does not apply to objects (TLP 2.0233). Lastly, it is shown how the interpretation of objects as qualia sheds a vivid light on the theme of the relation between objects and time."


52. Goddard, Leonard, and Judge, Brenda. 1982. *The Metaphysics of Wittgenstein's Tractatus*. Bundoora (Victoria): Australasian Association of Philosophy. The ontology of the Tractatus, in terms of which objects are characterized as property-less simples, is coherent provided Wittgenstein is not mistakenly taken to be a constructive atomist building complexes from simples. A geometrical model is given to illustrate this. It is also shown that an ontology like that of the Tractatus removes much of the conceptual puzzlement of modern particle physics and has implications for current debates about realism, possible worlds and rigid designators.


The history of philosophy is full of amazing quirks. One of them is the fact that just two basic ontologies have ruled the roost for the last two thousand years, namely, the Platonic system and the Aristotelian system. But it is even more peculiar that neither system contains the category of state of affairs. The main reason for this neglect seems to be a consideration which has plagued philosophy to this day. There can be no such things as states of affairs, because there simply are no states of
affairs for false sentences. Russell, influenced by Wittgenstein's criticism, tried to escape from this conclusion with his so-called multiple relation theory of judgment. But he does not succeed. Wittgenstein claimed to have avoided Russell's mistake and to have presented a correct view about the nature of judgment in the Tractatus. But a study of the few references in the Tractatus to the ontological status of states of affairs represented by false sentences does not show this."


59. Hamilton, Kelly Ann. 2002. "Darstellungen in the *Principles of Mechanics* and the *Tractatus*: the representation of objects in relation in Hertz and Wittgenstein." *Perspectives on Science: Historical, Philosophical, Social* no. 10:28-68. Ludwig Wittgenstein's conception of the role of objects in our philosophical understanding of the logic of our language is critical for his early philosophy in the Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus. While the important connections between Heinrich Hertz's Principles of Mechanics and Wittgenstein's Tractatus have long been recognized, recent work by Jed Buchwald has deepened our knowledge of the importance of the object-orientation of Hertz's scientific work in a manner that should also deepen our understanding of the nature of objects in the Tractatus. I will argue that there are important ontological links, involving "a certain physical scheme, one that had powerful implications for thinking as well as doing," between Hertz's work and Wittgenstein's early philosophy."


71. ———. 2004. "Wittgenstein's Tractatus and the logic of fiction." In Wittgenstein and Philosophy of Literature, edited by Gibson, John and Huemer, Wolfgang, 305-317. London: Routledge. Wittgenstein's Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus articulates a logic and semantics for all possible languages in which states of affairs (Sachverhalten, Tatsachen) as truth-makers are pictured in sentences under analysis. Wittgenstein considers both existent and nonexistent states of affairs as pictured, respectively, by true and false sentences. This raises the question as to whether the Tractatus constitutes or provides the formal basis for a logic of fiction. I identify four criteria for a logic of fiction, and argue that the Tractatus satisfies only the first three. The remaining criterion has to do with logical analysis of a fictional character's psychology internal narration. These are excluded by Wittgenstein's application of Occam's razor in defense of the general form of proposition in the case of fiction just as they are in nonfictional discourse."


75. Klement, Kevin C. 2004. "Putting form before function: logical grammar in Frege, Russell, and Wittgenstein." Philosopher's Imprint no. 4:1-47. The positions of Frege, Russell and Wittgenstein on the priority of complexes over (propositional) functions are sketched, challenging those who take the "judgment centered" aspects of the Tractatus to be inherited from Frege not Russell. Frege's views on the priority of judgments are problematic, and unlike Wittgenstein's. Russell's views on these matters, and their development, are discussed in detail, and shown to be more sophisticated than usually supposed. Certain misreadings of Russell, including those regarding the relationship between propositional functions and universals, are exposed. Wittgenstein's and Russell's views on logical grammar are shown to be very similar. Russell's type theory does not countenance types of genuine entities nor metaphysical truths that cannot be put into words, contrary to conventional wisdom. I relate this to the debate over "inexpressible truths" in the Tractatus. I lastly comment on the changes to Russell's views brought about by Wittgenstein's influence."

| 83. | Levvis, Gary. 1998. "The so-called (and actual!) Realism of the *Tractatus."* *Grazer Philosophische Studien* no. 54:45-70. David Pears's contention that the *Tractatus* [in: *The false prison - vol. 1 - Chapter 6: The basic Realism of the Tractatus*] is to be understood as advancing a form of metaphysical realism is defended against McGuinness's view that *Tractatus* 1-2.063 is to be treated just as introducing a metaphysical myth that may be employed to bring into prominence salient features of propositions. Starting with a discussion of the involved difficulties, e.g., determining (1) whether Wittgenstein does, in fact, provide an argument for the existence of simple objects, (2) what this object is, and (3) what role the existence of simple objects plays within the Picture Theory of the Proposition, Wittgenstein's argument for the existence of simple objects is reconstructed, augmenting Pears's existing account by providing further details of why Wittgenstein held that determinacy of sense requires the existence of simple objects." |
| 84. | Lokhorst, Gert-Jan C. 1988. "Ontology, semantics, and philosophy of mind in Wittgenstein's *Tractatus.* A formal reconstruction." *Erkenntnis* no. 29:35-75. The paper presents a formal explication of the early Wittgenstein's views on ontology, the syntax and semantics of an ideal logical language, and the propositional attitudes. It will be shown that Wittgenstein gave a 'language of thought' analysis of propositional attitude ascriptions, and that his ontological views imply that such ascriptions are truth-functions of (and supervenient upon) elementary sentences. Finally, an axiomatization of a quantified doxastic modal logic corresponding to Tractarian semantics will be given." |
| 85. | Lombardi, Olimpia Iris. 1999. "¿Qué son los objetos del *Tractatus*?" *Revista de Filosofía (Spain)* no. 12:55-76. In this paper we provide an interpretation of the concept "object", in the context of Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*. We argue that (1) "objects" are logical entities, the nodes of the logical net which is common to all possible worlds; (2) general words are not "names" and, therefore, "objects" are particulars." |
From the Preface: "This study in Wittgenstein Tractatus is substantially as it was written in 1933". Reprinted by Thoemmes Press in 1997.

89. Maury, André. 1977. The Concepts of "Sinn" and "Gegenstand" in Wittgenstein's Tractatus. Amsterdam: North-Holland. It is argued that the Tractatus notion of propositional sense contains an irreducible modal element. An interpretation of Wittgenstein's early notion of "bipolarity" is given. It is further argued that explicit recognition of the modal element helps us to understand the particular form of the Tractatus ontology. Wittgenstein's early views on sense and modality are contrasted with Frege's and Russell's views. Part II is a defense of the view that the Tractatus objects include predicates. The argument is backed up by reference to later unpublished writings by Wittgenstein. The development of his views on names and predicates are examined.


96. Milkov, Nikolay. 2001. "Tractarian scaffoldings." Prima Philosophia no. 14:399-414. Wittgenstein's Tractarian ontology has its historical roots in Russell's programme for constructionalism. There is an essential difference between the constructionalism of Russell and that of Wittgenstein though. Whereas Tractarian ontology is approximately Aristotelian, Russell's logical atomism accepts a Platonic penetration of the autonomous world of logical forms into the autonomous world of facts. Russell's logical constructionalism, more precisely, uses the metaphor of a 'logical skeleton' on which the data of experience are fleshed out. In opposition, in the Tractatus Wittgenstein doesn't speak of a skeleton but introduces the concept of 'logical scaffolding' and also of the 'scaffolding of the world' instead. This terminology reflects a new type of ontology, as well as a new type of logic, radically different from that of Russell. Its most important concepts are that of 'object' and 'state of affairs', both of them used in new, idiosyncratic sense.

97. Miller III, Hugh. 1995. "Tractarian Semantics for Predicate Logic." History and Philosophy of Logic no. 16:197-215. It is a little understood fact that the system of formal logic presented in Wittgenstein's Tractatus provides the basis for an alternative general semantics for a predicate calculus that is consistent and coherent. Essentially independent of the metaphysics of logical atomism. and philosophically illuminating in its own right. The purpose of this paper is threefold: to describe the general characteristics of a Tractarian-style semantics, to defend the 'Fulcrums system against the charge of expressive incompleteness as levelled by Robert Fogelin, and to give a semantics for a formal language that is the Tractarian equivalent of a first-order predicate calculus. Of note in regard to the latter is the fact that a Trachus-style truth-definition makes no appeal to the technical trick of defining truth in terms of the
satisfaction of predicates by infinite sequences of objects, yet is materially equivalent to the usual Tarski-style truth-definitions."


The article is concerned with the status of the ontology of the *Tractatus.* In it I argue 1) that, although the ontology of the *Tractatus* is a metaphysic of language like Kant's metaphysic of experience, it is supposed to set the standard of objectivity, and to yield the firmest conclusions about reality; 2) that Wittgenstein abandoned this ontology when he abandoned the theory of language from which it had been deduced, because it expressed too narrow a view of the possible forms that language may take. The article is an attempt to establish in what way Wittgenstein's later philosophy is more anthropocentric than his early philosophy."


Two volumes.
Contents of the first volume: Abbreviations XI; Part I: Introduction 1; 1. Wide-angle view 3; 2. Close-up: the early system 20; 3. Close-up: the late system 34; Part II: Inside the early system 61; 4. Logical Atomism 63; 5. The basic realism of the *Tractatus* 88; 6. Sentences as pictures 115; 7. Solipsism 153; 8. Review and prospect 192; Bibliography 197; Index 201.

Reading Wittgenstein's *Tractatus* as an extended answer to the question "what must the world be like for the symbolic logic developed by Frege, Russell, and Whitehead to apply to it?" helps elucidate the connection between its theory of language and its ontology. My main argument is to show that the ontology is derived from the logic of *Principia mathematica* taken to its completion. throughout the *Tractatus.* Wittgenstein takes a stance on a number of traditional problems in the history of philosophy, and my aim in discussing some of these is to place the *Tractatus* in broader historical perspective."

The importance of the ontological component of Wittgenstein's *Tractatus* is generally recognized. And most of the contemporary philosophers (analytical at least) believe that the *Tractatus* is primarily a product of the first-rate metaphysical (*) thinker. Does it mean that Wittgenstein's ontology and the role it plays in the *Tractatus* is commonly and completely understood?
Of course, we all know how rich in philosophical theories and insights *Tractatus* is. Let me mention a few of them: the picture theory of language (i.e. the theory of propositions, meaning and logical syntax), a semantical theory of logical truth (with a concept of "tautology", logical atomism, the principle of extensionality), new theory of identity, remarkable philosophy of logic, theory of philosophy as a "critique of language" as well as the *Tractatus* insights into ontology (which I am going to discuss below), epistemology (with the *Tractatus* solipsism and mysticism), religion and ethics. However, many people consider the *Tractatus* to be rather a bundle of theories and/or claims. The reason for that opinion is drawn from the *Tractatus* characteristic, aphoristical style and its lack of (fully developed) arguments. For example, Professor Max Black underlines in *A Companion to Wittgenstein's Tractatus* on the one hand the importance of the ontological component of the *Tractatus* but on the other hand he writes that Wittgenstein's great contributions to philosophical insights mentioned above are logically independent of his views about the nature of the world (p. 27)
The main aim of my paper is to supply evidence that ontology and semantics of the *Tractatus* (as well as further philosophical theories which are to be found therein) are much more coherent and interconnected than it is usually believed. (*) or rather ontological, if we differentiate ontology -- a theory of what and why is possible from metaphysics -- a theory of what and why exists.

(*) or rather ontological, if we differentiate ontology -- a theory of what and why is possible from metaphysics -- a theory of what and why exists.

[1] The modal character of the Tractarian ontology is now commonly recognized [2]. And it is clear that there must be some modal calculus (or, more carefully, calculi) implicit in the Tractatus. In the subjects' literature we may find several papers dealing with the question. Most of them point to Lewis' calculus S5 as the Tractarian modal logic. Is this answer right? Are arguments in its support convincing?

I do believe that:

(1°) the most popular answer mentioned above, even if true, should be argued for more thoroughly than it has been;

(2°) the modality structure implicit in the Tractatus, even when restricted to purely ontological modalities, is more complex than it looks in its usual descriptions, including the best available at the moment. In particular, both the basic role played by the notion of form-fundamental modality of the Tractatus, as I tried to argue in my *Some ontological and semantical puzzles of Wittgenstein's Tractatus* (1984) - and the question of its logic is simply omitted by the writers known to me. However, truth is only one, and if not fully recognized, irrespective of how deeply it is hidden, it sends us words about itself, mainly indirectly, through some inaccuracies and/or inconsistencies in current opinion. This applies to the question under discussion, among others, in the following way: both necessity and possibility operators implicit in S5 or in any similar logic are symmetrical, whereas these two notions in its most frequent Tractarian occurrences are not. Characteristic are also incoherencies which are to be found in claims made by the authors arguing, in fact, along the same line (compare A. Maury 1977 and G. H. von Wright 1972).

In what follows, starting with brief comments concerning D. Kaplan's, G. H. von Wright's and A. Maury's works, I will try to reexamine the problem and to provide some new arguments for a corrected version of von Wright's solution and to extend that solution by basing it on more fundamental theory of the notion of form. This theory, as you will see, provides solid philosophical foundations for relational semantics of intensional logics, foundations which are grounded on the Tractarian ontology."

p. 544

[1] The paper's title clearly paraphrases the title of G. H. von Wright's master essay *Modal logic and the Tractatus* [in G. H. von Wright - *Wittgenstein* 1982, pp. 185-200]. Its ambiguity is intended, two main claims of the paper are thus hinted at. The first one concerns complexity of the modality structure of the Tractatus and points out several modal logics inhering in it. The second one shows the way of basing modal logics on the Tractarian ontology. To do that one reduces the fundamental notions of modal philosophy and relational semantics of modal logics (compatibility, possible worlds and relation of alternativeness) to the notion of form-the basic ontological modality of the Tractatus (comp. J. Perzanowski - *Some ontological and semantical puzzles of Wittgenstein's Tractatus*, 1984).

[2] The paper forms a third part of my bigger work in progress (comp. previous parts *Some ontological...*, cit. and *What is non-Fregean in the Tractarian semantics and why?* 1993) in which, after having articulated the proper place of ontology in the Tractatus, I am trying to formalize it. Due to the limitation of the paper's length it is still a sort of abstract. Its full text, with all arguments developed, is intended to be published elsewhere as *Modal logics and the Tractatus* - in preparation [the essay was never published].
1. Surely the above title is rather dark. Therefore, let me start with a few words of clarification. "Post-Tractatus" means either after "Tractatus" or a natural prolongation of the books' sequence: "Proto-Tractatus", "Tractatus",... . Hence the title of this paper means either the task of developing ontology built up after "Tractatus" clues, by taking its claims and lesson seriously, or clarification of the "Tractatus" text, by explaining notions and providing its claims with well-grounded arguments, trying thus to develop, step by step, a more advanced and better argumented version of Wittgenstein's treatise.

The paper is organized as follows: I start with a general review of the ontology of the Tractatus, putting emphasis on its modalities, particularly on its notion of the form. Semi-formalization of the thesis 2.033, in which the form is defined as the possibility of the structure, leads to isolation of the basic ontological modality - making possible. The formal theory of it, which is the crux of combination ontology, is outlined in the fourth chapter of the paper. Finally, several applications of this general ontology to the starting Tractarian ontology are given."

1. Certainly, of the two title questions the second - why? - is more challenging and important. But also much more difficult.

To answer it we must not only collect and evaluate non-Fregean components of the semantics of the Tractatus, thus comparing them with Frege's semantics - which is rather easy; but we must also go into depth on both semantics, looking at their fundamentals and trying to find their basic conceptual and methodological framework. Such research, however, is much more difficult, partly because it leads us out of semantics into the broader and more general field of ontology, and to very fundamental metaphilosophical questions: to metaphilosophical considerations - because we try to compare two general philosophical theories; to ontological investigations - because of the nature of semantics.

2. Semantics provides language with the objective interpretation establishing connections between linguistic expressions and pieces of the world. To this end, however, it must be, if not arbitrary, developed inside a framework common for a language and the world. Such a framework can be provided only by a discipline more general than a theory of language, including semantics, as well as a theory of the world, i.e. by ontology - the most general theory of being, the theory of all possibilities.

Any proper semantics is indeed based on ontology - Frege's and Wittgenstein's semantics as well.

3. Full and well-motivated discussion of the title questions requires a book rather than a short article. Therefore, I shall limit the discussion to differences in the key-schemes of both semantics, plus very brief and rather cryptic remarks concerning the general framework of this comparison.

I start with a few general remarks concerning the type of philosophy which, to my mind, is common to Frege and the young Wittgenstein. Next, I will proceed to a reconstruction of the semantic diagrams which are basic for the two semantics.
under investigation, emphasizing differences and trying to explain reasons for them." (p. 357)


Hintikka, Jaakko, 71-84. Amsterdam: North-Holland.


It is fairly well known that Wittgenstein's criticisms of Russell's multiple-relation theory of judgment has a devastating effect on the latter's philosophical enterprise. The exact nature of those criticisms, however, and the explanation for the severity of their consequences, has been a source of confusion and disagreement amongst both Russell and Wittgenstein scholars. In this paper, I offer an interpretation of those criticisms which shows them to be consonant with Wittgenstein's general critique of Russell's conception of logic and which serves to elucidate some of the notoriously enigmatic passages of the Tractatus. In particular, I seek to show the continuity of Wittgenstein's criticisms of the theory of judgment with his remarks on Russell's paradox and the theory of types.


The book's main thesis is twofold. It argues that the ontological theory of the Tractatus is fundamentally dependent on its logical and linguistic doctrines: the tractarian world is the world as it appears in language and thought. It also maintains that this interpretation of the ontology of the Tractatus can be argued for not only on systematic grounds, but also via the contents of the ethical theory that it offers. Wittgenstein's views on ethics presuppose that language and thought are but one way in which we interact with reality.


Wittgenstein, in the Tractatus, conceives the world as "the totality of facts." Type-stratification threatens that conception: the totality of facts is an obvious example of an illegitimate totality. Wittgenstein's notion of truth-operation evidently has some role to play in avoiding that threat, allowing propositions, and so facts, to constitute a single type. The paper seeks to explain that role in a way that integrates the "philosophical" and "technical" pressures on the notion of an operation.


Paper written in Polish.


The Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus of Ludwig Wittgenstein is a very unclear and ambiguous metaphysical work. Previously, like many formal logicians, I was not interested in the metaphysics of the Tractatus. However, I read in 1966 the text of a monograph by Dr. B. Wolniewicz of the University of Warsaw and I changed my mind. I see now that the conceptual scheme of Tractatus and the metaphysical theory contained in it may be reconstructed by formal means. The aim of this paper (*) is to sketch a formal system or formalized theory which may be considered as a clear, although not complete, reconstruction of the ontology contained in Wittgenstein's Tractatus.

It is not easy to say how much I am indebted to Dr. Wolniewicz. I do not know whether he will agree with all theorems and definitions of the formal system presented here. Nevertheless, I must declare that I could not write the present paper without being acquainted with the work of Dr. Wolniewicz. I learned very much from his monograph and from conversations with him. However, when presenting in this paper the formal system of Wittgenstein's ontology I will not refer mostly either to the monograph of Dr. Wolniewicz or to the Tractatus. Also, I will not discuss here the problem of adequacy between my formal construction and Tractatus. I think that the Wittgenstein was somewhat confused and wrong in
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* Presented in Polish at the Conference on History of Logic, April 28-29, 1967, Cracow, Poland.


153. Tejedor, Chon. 2003. "Sense and simplicity: Wittgenstein's argument for simple objects." Ratio. An International Journal of Analytic Philosophy no. 16:272-289. This paper puts forward an alternative interpretation of the argument for simple objects advanced in the 2.0s of the Tractatus. In my view, Wittgenstein derives the simplicity of objects directly from his account of possible states, complex objects and senseful propositions. The key to Wittgenstein's argument is the idea that, if there were no simple objects, possible states would not be necessarily possible. If this were the case, however, there would be no senseful language, in Wittgenstein's view. One of the subsidiary aims of this paper is to question the idea that Wittgenstein posits simples because, without them, language would be infinitely analyzable."

154. Voltolini, Alberto. 2003. "Possibilia, qualia e sensibilia." Rivista di Estetica no. 43:127-137. In this paper I will try to show the following two things. First, Wittgenstein's Tractatus logico-philosophicus semantically exiges that Tractarian objects be conceived of as possibilia in the sense of Russell (1903), namely as objects that may exist as well not exist. Second, the Tractatus's general ontological framework suggests to integrate this onto-semantical conception with a view of such objects not as qualia but rather as sensibilia in the sense of Russell (1914), namely as possible sense-data."


More than once Professor Anscombe has expressed doubt concerning the semantic efficacy of the idea of an 'elementary proposition' as conceived in the *Tractatus*. Wittgenstein himself eventually discarded it, together with the whole philosophy of language of which it had been an essential part. None the less the idea is still with us, and it seems to cover theoretical potentialities yet to be explored. This paper is a tentative move in that direction.

According to Professor Anscombe, (*) Wittgenstein's 'elementary propositions' may be characterized by the following five theses:

(1) They are a class of mutually independent propositions.
(2) They are essentially positive.
(2) They are such that for each of them there are no two ways of being true or false, but only one.
(4) They are such that there is in them no distinction between an internal and an external negation.
(5) They are concatenations of names, which are absolutely simple signs.

We shall not investigate whether this is an adequate axiomatic for the notion under consideration. We suppose it is. In any case it is possible to modify it in one way or another, and for the resulting notion still to preserve a family resemblance with the original idea. One such modification is sketched out below.

166. ———. 1982. "A Formal Ontology of Situations." *Studia Logica* no. 41:381-413. A generalized Wittgensteinian semantics for propositional languages is presented, based on a lattice of elementary situations. Of these, maximal ones are possible worlds, constituting a logical space; minimal ones are logical atoms, partitioned into its dimensions. A verifier of a proposition is an elementary situation such that if real it makes true. The reference (or objective) of a proposition is a situation, which is the set of all its minimal verifiers. (Maximal ones constitute its locus.) Situations are shown to form a Boolean algebra, and the Boolean set algebra of loci is its representation. Wittgenstein's is a special case, admitting binary dimensions only."
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1.1. The Axioms; 1.2. Some Consequences; 1.3. W-Independence; 1.4. States of Affairs;
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2.1. The Semigroup of SE*-Sets; 2.2. The Lattice of Minimal SE*-Sets; 2.3. Q-Spaces and V- Sets; 2.4. V-Equivalence and Q-Equivalence; 2.4. V-Classes and V-Sets;
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4. References

The paper applies the theory presented in "A formal ontology of situations" (Studia Logica, vol. 41 (1982), no. 4) to obtain a typology of metaphysical systems by interpreting them as different ontologies of situations.
Four are treated in some detail: Hume's diachronic atomism, Laplacean determinism, Hume's synchronic atomism, and Wittgenstein's logical atomism. Moreover, the relation of that theory to the "situation semantics" of Perry and Barwise is discussed.

Book written in Polish.


"How is Wittgenstein's later philosophy related to his earlier one? Despite much discussion there is little clarity on that. So let us give it again some consideration."

(...) Philosophy of language oscillates between the two poles of metaphysics and psychologism; (...). The main representative of the former trend is Frege, and the Tractatus follows closely in his wake. The Philosophical Investigations, on the other hand, are the expression of a dramatic departure from Frege and towards psychologism. Language is now viewed by Wittgenstein not in its logical capacity as the medium of thought and the bearer of truth-value, but instrumentally as a means of communication. Its relation to reality fades out, and its connexion with feeling, thinking, and doing comes massively to the fore.
Psychologism and positivism go hand in hand. Metaphysics, though not condemned as a vice as in pure positivism, is viewed as a malaise to be cured. Thus Wittgenstein's later philosophy turns into a kind of psychotherapy, exerting itself to bring metaphysics to a stop. What for? This is never made clear, as if it were a matter of course. But it is not." (pp. 80-81)
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In Wittgenstein's "Tractatus", thesis 5 is the Principle of Extensionality: all propositions are truth-functions of their clauses. This, however, has been often thrown into doubt. There are - it is said - compound propositions whose truth-value does not depend on that of their clauses. The usual example given are the so-called intensional contexts, like "John thinks that p", or "John says that p". And indeed, the truth-value of "p" is patently immaterial here to that of the whole proposition which it is part of.

Wittgenstein's retort are the following much discussed theses, adduced here in a translation of our own:

5.54 In the general propositional form, propositions occur in one another only as bases of truth-operations.
5.541 At first sight it seems that a proposition might occur in another also in a different way. Particularly in certain propositional forms of psychology, like "A believes that p is the case", "A thinks p", etc.

For taken superficially, proposition p seems here to stand to the object A in some sort of relation.

(And in modern epistemology - Russell, Moore, etc. - these have actually been construed that way.)

5.542 However, "A believes that p", "A thinks p", "A says p" are clearly of the form "'p' says p"; and this is not correlating a fact with an object, but a correlation of facts by correlating their objects.

The objection is met here in two steps. Firstly, it is pointed out that a proposition of the form "John says that p" is actually of the form "'p' says that p". The idea is this: the proposition "John says that Jill has a cat" means: John produces the sentence "Jill has a cat", the latter saying by itself that Jill has a cat. In such a way propositions get independent of the persons producing them, and communicate some objective content. It is surely not by John's looks that we come to know about Jill's cat, but merely by his words. Whom they stem from, is irrelevant.

In his second step Wittgenstein follows Frege's interpretation of indirect speech, but with modifications. He points out that the formula "'p' says that p" is equivalent to some compound proposition in which neither the proposition "p" as a syntactic unit, nor anything equivalent to it, does occur although there occur all the logically relevant constituents of "p" separately.

(...) The distinction between abstract and concrete states of affairs is not drawn explicitly in the "Tractatus". But it fits well thesis 5.156, if we expand that thesis by a few words of comment, added here in brackets:

5.156(d) A proposition may well be an incomplete image of a particular (concrete) situation, but it is always the complete image (of an abstract one).

The circumstance that in 5.156 not "states of affairs", but "situations" are mentioned, is of no consequence in our context. We assume that states of affairs are just atomic situations, and so the distinction between "concrete" and "abstract" applies to both.


In this paper I approach some central problems concerning the Tractarian objects, e.g., the picture theory, the internal and external properties of objects, and the debate whether properties and relations should be included as the Tractarian objects, from a study of configurations of objects. I argue that a detailed study of configurations of objects offers us new insights and helps us reach solutions to some of the important disputes concerning the characteristics of objects, e.g., the dispute whether the Tractarian objects include properties and relations."