• 科学技术文化研究 •

分析哲学的生命与时代

The Life and Time of Analytic Philosophy

约瑟夫 • 艾格思 /Joseph Agassi

（特拉维夫大学哲学系，以色列特拉维夫，69978）
(Department of Philosophy, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel, 69978)

摘　要：罗素终其一生将实在论的形而上学作为所有哲学中最重要的主题。他以极为细致的论证，驳斥以指谓为意义的理论，导致了这种形而上学的危机。这让维特根斯坦放弃了所有形而上学的表述。它让波普尔采纳了弗雷格以真值为意义的观点及爱因斯坦关于科学为精密的日常思维，科学理论是可检验、暂定的真理，总是可以供人们改进的观点。以此，罗素让自己置身于分析哲学的中心，对立于该思想流派的公认主张：该主张将常识作为世界观的基础并选择了经验主义某种语言的变体，目的是期望在没有陷入形而上学泥潭的条件下既保留逻辑又支持实在论。这种期望的可能性正在衰减，而波普尔提供的实在论以及波普尔与其门徒提出的种种哲学问题的解决方案则正在获得公众的注意。波普尔传世之作的特殊魅力在于，它理所当然地肯定实在论的形而上学，并根据科学的议程对它的多种版本进行争辩。

关键词：罗素　维特根斯坦　波普尔　实在论的形而上学　分析哲学　分析哲学的生命与时代

Abstract: All his life, Bertrand Russell took realist metaphysics as the most important item in all philosophy. The refutation of the theory of meaning as denotation, he argued in great detail, led to a crisis in this metaphysics. This led Ludwig Wittgenstein to give up all articulation of all metaphysics. It led Popper to adopt Frege'sview of meaning as truth-value and Einstein's view of science as refined everyday thinking and of its theories as testable, putative truths, always given to improvement. This way Russell is at the center of analytic philosophy. This is contrary to received opinion within this school of thought that takes commonsense as the basis of a worldview and opts for some linguistic variant of empiricism in the hope that it would this way preserve logic and uphold realism without landing in a metaphysical morass. This hope is waning and realism that Popper has offered as well as solutions to diverse philosophical problems that he and his disciples have proposed are gaining public notice. The special attraction of the Popper heritage is that it takes realist metaphysics for granted and debates the diverse versions of it that are on the agenda ofscience.

Key Words: Russell; Wittgenstein; Popper; Realist metaphysics; Analytic philosophy; The Life and Time of Analytic Philosophy

中图分类号：N0　　**文献标识码：**A　　DOI:10.15994/j.1000–0763.2016.01.018

Bertrand Russell considered naïve realism the starting point in philosophy. He considered it outdated and scientific realism its proper replacement (Russell, 1940; Baldwin, 1995). It is an expression of his commitment to science as a world-view and as a realist metaphysics. Here Russell differed greatly from Ernst Mach, his great predecessor in the empiricist school. Mach viewed science as a sort of very mundane and pedestrian affair and the world-view that

收稿日期：2015年5月12日

作者简介：约瑟夫 • 艾格思（大陆通常译为约瑟夫 • 阿伽西）（1927– ），特拉维夫大学与约克大学哲学荣休教授。他的主要研究兴趣包括科学哲学、形而上学与政治哲学。Email: agass@post.tau.ac.il

Joseph Agassi (1927-)is Emeritus Professor of philosophy at Tel Aviv University and York University. His main research interests include philosophy of science, metaphysics and political philosophy. Email: agass@post.tau.ac.il

science imparts as nothing but the sum total of all its extant theories. He also viewed scientific theories as the merest sum-total of all experience. His picture of the world thus ended up—quite unintentionally, no doubt—in nothing but a heap of impressions subjectively well-ordered, allegedly for the sake of mental economy and no more. It is no surprise, then, that in the eve of his life he groped towards some extra-scientific unifying principle. By contrast, Russell viewed science as exciting, declaring the very scientific venture no less than Promethean madness (Russell 1931, Chapter 4). Nevertheless, he shared with Mach the view of science as based on perception, of perception as comprising Locke-style sense-data, and thus also Hume-style neutral monism. This created a profound rupture in Russell's outlook. It made him view a large part of his stunning philosophical output as scarcely philosophy; he offered it as the mere reflections of a concerned citizen. His philosophy, he suggested, has logic as its core, his idea that relations are as real as attributes, and his theory of definite description of 1905 which, he makes clear, is what he wished to be remembered by.

Perhaps Russell's view of the reality of attributes and of relations does not square with his neutral monism. If neutral monism ascribes reality to nothing but sensations, then at least relations are not real. Yet, as W. T. Stace has noted in his essay on Russell's neutral monism (Schilpp 1944, 355, note 1), Russell identified his neutral monism with his scientific realism. As Einstein has noted in his remarks on Russell's theory of knowledge (Schilpp 1944, 291), Russell was ambivalent about his own realistic metaphysics. Let me take for granted here that at a certain stage it became clear that a thorough sensationalism is not consistent with realism. The question was, then, how was Russell's philosophy to be remedied in a realist vein?

The program for this remedy included the demand to stick to Russell's logic (including his theory of definite description or a variant of it) and to seek an empiricist version of realism. Two different versions (or rather classes of versions) of this program are extant: Ludwig Wittgenstein's and Karl Popper's. Popper's version takes science as its base and as an extension of commonsense; it breaks away from traditional empiricism as it denies that science rests on observations / observation-reports, but it does not admit any traditional alternative to empiricism; rather it takes science to be the trial and error of the common or garden variety, only systematically and vigorously applied. It is clear that his version raises quite a few problems; it is not clear how successful he was in attending to them; and, more important, whether attending to them is a wise policy. The success of the Popper school may be judged differently by different critics; the recognition of its significance is rising today, mainly due to its advantage over its earlier alternative becoming increasingly obvious. The topic of the present essay, then, is its earlier alternative, due to Wittgenstein—in its original version and in its extant variants. In all of its variants, Wittgenstein's version of the program to rectify Russell's philosophy takes commonsense as the basis of a worldview, and opts for some linguistic variant of empiricism, in the hope that it would preserve logic and uphold realism without landing in a metaphysical morass, thus equating its commonsense with its linguistic variant of empiricism.

The present presentation of Russell in the center of the heritage of analytic philosophy is quite unconventional. Books were written against it, such as David Pears' study of Russell and the British philosophical tradition. Of the contributions of the cohorts of Wittgenstein's fans, some represent clinging to the traditional (Lockean, Humean) empiricist theory of perception that leads to neutral monism, and so despite themselves their contributions are more in the wake of Russell than of Wittgenstein.Other contributors added little that the leadership of theWittgenstein school found admissible; still others were even less advanced than Russell. As an example, let me mention the contributions of Otto Neurath, the individual who was a follower of Karl Marx and of Ernst Mach, and who enters the present picture because, as a natural leader and organizer, he was the second and last leader of the celebrated Vienna Circle, the group most closely linked to analytic philosophy outside Oxbridge. Here is the place, perhaps, to mention that legends illustrate the disagreements between Wittgenstein and the Vienna Circle, and of Neurath's disagreements with Wittgenstein. But as there is little or no literature as to these disagreements. There is little to say here about these matters.

This is possibly not very surprising. The output of Wittgenstein was very meager and of a very questionable quality. Current fashion includes the venture to doctor and revamp this meager output. This venture is but a symptom of deep despair, perhaps even the death-throws of the last and unhappy remains of a once imposing movement which once partook in the exciting view of science as a Promethean madness. To see what the movement offered we may go to its heyday. In the middle of the twentieth century Jeffrey Warnock suggests (Warnock 1959) that English philosophy is the same as analytic philosophy, and that its initiator was not Wittgenstein but George Edward Moore. The book was soon forgotten (perhaps because Warnock is an important academic whom it is unpleasant to consider a Chauvinist). His argument may still be of some interest. He argued that analytic philosophy attends more to

commonsense than to language, and that it goes to Moore as he was the paragon of a commonsense philosopher. This is not true, since the linguistic turn is what is specific to the modern, analytic variant of empiricist and/or commonsense philosophy. Also, Moore violated commonsense when he ascribed certitude to all commonsense observations: commonsense almost never relinquished all doubt (or, as Daniel Defoe has put it, "nothing is certain except death and taxes"). Moore had ascribed certitude to observations because he endorsed sensationalism. Russell admired him and his commonsense; he also admired his amazing *naiveté*; but he thought very little of his output: admiring his intellectual autonomy and commonsense, he thought little of his defense of commonsense, as of what he generally had to say—if he had anything to say that was more characteristic of him than of anyone else. No insult is meant in this aside: Moore did not claim to have asserted any new theory. Still, Russell's dismissal of Moore's output is sad, as at least his lectures on metaphysics, though not unusual in content, may be taken as serious philosophy; being realist and in the empiricist tradition they are traditional; yet they are very succinct. Russell thought little of them because he took the ideas they perpetrated as trivially true. They are not trivially true; indeed, they are plainly false. By any version of commonsense, things are observed in a realist mood and observers usually trust what they see, though not too much, as Russell repeatedly stressed. This a very simple and undisputed observation. Like all repeatable observations, it may be overturned, or it may be made more precise and then tested again and perhaps overturned and replaced by a more precise observation. Yet for now it can be taken as a matter of fact, well in the manner that is customary in science. And so, the causal perception theories that share this observation are scientific, like those of Russell, like those of Oswald Külpe, J. J. Gibson and their schools; perception theories that contradict it are scientific and refuted, or metaphysical and irrefutable—depending on their exact wordings. What perception theory Wittgenstein endorsed in his young days is under debate; what matters here is that he (presumably) rejected it in his mature days.

The sensationalist theories of perception are rooted in the view of science as inductive. Inductivism and metaphysical realism are thus inconsistent with each other, as Einstein has noted (*loc. cit.*). The alternatives to it (that diverse psychologists from Külpeto Gibson have shared) are rooted in the view of science as trial and error, as exemplified by the methodology of Popper, who wrote against the analytic tradition as practiced then by Vienna Circle and by most English philosophers. Popper took pain to distance his views from those of his analytic peers by repeatedly denying that metaphysical expressions are meaningless. He criticized them on logical grounds and on historical ground. Some metaphysical doctrines, such as atomism, follow from scientific ones; they became scientific as a result of rendering them more specific. This refutes their demarcation of science as a language—as the language of science so-called; he declared that his demarcation of science is within some given language. His peers never did him the courtesy of admitting this fact, much less answering his criticism. Rudolf Carnap, the most prestigious member of the Vienna Circle, and Carl G. Hempel, its last heir, never withdrew their presentation of his view as the (Wittgenstein-style) pertaining to the language of science. To put it differently, science differs from the language of science, as the negation of a scientific theory is within language but not within science: in the language of science (Popper's) refutability is identical with (Wittgenstein's) verifiability. The ascription of Popper the demarcation of the language of science makes him a Wittgenstein follower, as do all those who complain (as Vienna-circle leader Moritz Schlick did) about Popper's refusal to allow perception to function as verification of sorts. Popper's protests that he had never considered any idea of Wittgenstein seriously was never acknowledged by his contemporary Wittgenstein-followers; this is a disgrace.

What Popper shared with his analytic peers for a time was an unfriendly attitude to metaphysics: he saw science as distinct from metaphysic and quite independent of it. Even while admitting its possible heuristic value for science he refused to admit that the contributions of metaphysics to science are better recognized appreciatively. Later on he did make this amend.

Commentators often ascribe to Popper the view of the empirical as the testable. This is an exaggeration: it was William Whewell who proposed this idea (less clearly and concisely than Popper, but let this ride). Popper's own lasting contribution to philosophy is his (Socratic) equation of empirical testability with empirical refutability. Traditionally and by a scientific consensus, testability was a necessary but not sufficient characteristic of a scientific theory: only a theory that has passed severe tests is scientific. This view is now advocated by some members of the analytic school of philosophy, notably today's leading analytic philosophers, Adlof Grünbaum, Jaakko Hintikka and Hilary Putnam. This leaves them with the question, what is the status of once confirmed and now refuted theory like Newton's theory of gravity. They systematically overlook this question. The only reasonable answer to this question within the analytic tradition is that of Richard von Mises (1939): it is rescued

from its refutation by viewing it as mathematical and so as untestable *à la* Poincaré. It is no accident that this view has escaped the public exposure that it deserves.

Tradition deemed all the refuted testable hypotheses unscientific. Also, tradition allowed that some empirically confirmed hypotheses are not scientific: they are parts of applied mathematics and of folk wisdom. One cannot but admire Popper's penetrating view of the empirical as the refutable (so that scientific status cannot be taken away by refutations), but his view of everything empirical as scientific is an error, and one too close to the Wittgenstein-style philosophizing that he rightly abhorred. He corrected this error (but he never took it back quite explicitly). Science, he said later in his career, is the set of testable explanatory hypotheses. To enhance this excellent view he even narrowed down (again, alas, not sufficiently explicitly as a change of opinion) the set of explanations to those that we judge as contributions to the search for the truth about the cosmos, no less. Science then is what Bertrand Russell viewed (1931) an admirable Promethean madness: it aims at a cosmology, at a world-view. This is where Popper rose to the level of Russell, but also where he remained somewhat less clear than he usually was. The conflation of the similar but different ideas, that empirical character is refutability and that everything empirical is scientific, and that science explanatory and that it is cosmological in intent—all this invites some attention, but it is worth it, as it amounts to the marvelous idea that all science is cosmology. Also, the idea that empirical character is refutability is wonderful on many accounts. For science to be cosmology the idea must be postulated that it is governed by some metaphysics (as Einstein suggest repeatedly). In a way this is farewell to analytic philosophy; in another way it is its natural extension. The admission of metaphysics as the pivot of science is a grand synthesis, much to Einstein's taste.

Einstein also said (Einstein 1954, 270), do not listen to what scientists say they do: look at what they do. Anti-metaphysics was established already in the scientific revolution, but the revolution itself rested on a new metaphysics: it constituted an interplay between three different unifying ideas: heliocentrism of Copernicus, inductivism of Francis Bacon and mechanism of Descartes. The first is the assertion that the sun is the center of the universe. It entailed a radical revolution, as Galileo said and as Alexandre Koyré explained centuries later. It made metho-dology abstract, as Pierre Duhem has asserted. The most forceful idea of Copernicusis more basic than all these: it is the observation that as ancient thinkers disagreed, the reliance on their authority is questionable(Copernicus 1543, Letter to Pope Paul III). Inductivism summoned the new authorityof the independent human intellect. It goes well with the mechanist metaphysics, which demands attention to details first and to totalities only after the exhaustive study of the details. This way a basic agreement between the ideas of Bacon and of Descartes on method stood out despite differences on details. Neither sat well with the cosmology of Copernicus. Already Galileo was cognizant of the rift between astronomy and mechanics and he tried hard to unify them. His efforts were not sufficient, or else Newton's system would not have been the victory that it was. The struggle to have a unified system was masked by the exaggerated claim that science is already in possession of a complete system. And a complete system is a metaphysics. Even the thinkers most hostile to the speculative method of metaphysics (Sir Francis Bacon, Immanuel Kant, Auguste Comte, Ernst Mach) agreed that science will be completed one day to include a scientific metaphysics. As against this, Russell used logic to show that all metaphysical systems are unavoidably full of holes.

Russell's use of logic to generate philosophical conclusions is the root of analytic philosophy. He had two significant ideas in this context. The general one was the conclusion that the very idea of a metaphysical system is defective.The second is his theory of definite descriptions. It came as his replacement of the theory of meaning of Gottlob Frege that assumed the existence of a Platonic Heaven.The theory of definite description is limited to the meanings of nouns and of noun phrases; Russell admitted (Russell 1940, Conclusion) that he failed to develop a general theory of meaning; nevertheless he deemed it a great success.

Whereas Russell struggled in effort to develop a realist metaphysics, Wittgenstein replaced his effort with the most sweeping, revolutionary idea: all metaphysical assertions are essentially ungrammatical, it is merely confused talk.(He nevertheless endorsed scientific realism; Wittgenstein 1922, §5.64).This revolutionary idea was a great challenge, yet it was taken to be an expression of a total triumph. This is a joke. This joke became the hallmark of the analytic school. Nowadays, when this joke is no longer in fashion, the representatives of the school find it hard to jettison it; they suggest that it never was the creed of the analytic school. Their major argument for their suggestion that the joke was never taken seriously is that it is not serious (Stadler 2003, xii).

Russell's critique of the traditional views behind both metaphysics and logic led him to efforts to provide an alternative to these traditional views. Traditionally, logic was supposed to play the role of the great unifier of science with metaphysic: already Aristotle presented logic as a theory

of both (Bar-Am 2008, Ch. 5). His is his view of science as a natural classification: it was supposedly a scientific metaphysics, a streamlined deductive system that explains all facts with certitude. Logic was also, of course, a theory of the ideal language, of the essence of language, as reflecting that metaphysics, and as a theory of language it was also a theory of meaning—of meaning as denotation. Today the resilience that the poor and confused Aristotelian logic had to its very demise seems amazing. Yet this amazing resilience explains the rise and educational value of analytic philosophy (Wisdom, 1947). And viewing it as a powerful unifying idea makes it very attractive indeed. And the obvious errors that it contains were disregarded on the basis of the excuse that logic requires good judgment. This could change only after the development of two new ideas: that mathematics must be utterly rigorous, and that rigor can be achieved by utter formality. To this end now formal logic was developed as mathematical logic (Segre 1994, Preface). This idea rendered every reference to judgment in a classical logic textbook a poor excuse. Hence, the idea could triumph only after the excuse was totally overruled. Was it ever? The jury is still out on this question.

George Boole and Gottlob Frege, who have made the first successful advances in modern logic, had little or nothing to say about either metaphysics or the philosophy of the empirical sciences. Boole was attracted to Kant's epistemology, to be precise, but he declared that its critical examination requires much empirical research in the workings of the intellect. He developed Boolean algebra partly to clarify Aristotelian logic so as to establish it as a logic of classes alone (not of terms, much less of essences) and partly to develop an interim theory of probability, as an interim philosophy of science, which, he proposed, needs no elaboration. Frege was even less concerned with epistemology. He ignored not only physics, but even geometry, which he deemed a body of synthetic *a priori* valid truths but did not examine this idea. He was amazingly single minded, showing in the present context concern for the foundations of arithmetic alone.

To begin with, Frege developed the idea, already adumbrated by Augustus de Morgan, that a logic of sets should be supplemented with the logic of relations. This idea was of a great metaphysical import, as Russell noted in some detail in his path-breaking 1900 book on the metaphysics of Leibniz. The tremendous import of logic for metaphysics is crucial here. Recent studies of Russell's early philosophy led to the emphasis on the import of the role of relations in the philosophy of his immediate predecessor Francis Herbert Bradley, and of Bradley's despair of reason because relations are not catered for by (Aristotelian) logic. To a large extent Russell was aided here by Moore. With his aid relations acquired ontological status.

The rise of modern logic was indebted to developments in mathematics in two ways. The first was the growth of the recognition of the need for rigor and formality in mathematics; the second was the growth of abstract algebra (beginning with the idea of Joseph Lagrange about abstract coordinates and getting established with the success of group theory whose elements are not explicitly specified). The great innovations of both Boole and Frege were their discoveries of logic as calculi. In addition, Frege developed his theory of meaning. This theory has these days a standard presentation that comes with no background—in a kind of a splendid isolation.The story of the background to Russell's alternative to it is likewise lacking. The result is that logic is taught these days formally, without reference to its background in the history of mathematics and without reference to any theory of meaning; the history of mathe-matics thus fell into a lamentable neglect and then meaning is delegated to introductory courses in philosophical analysis, where the idea of formal calculi is fatuously ignored, and where the reign of analytic philosophy is unchallenged (mainly due to the militant ignorance of it that opponents of analytic philosophy are proud of). The nearest to a historical background to analytic philosophy is then the mere mention of John Stuart Mill, who (like everyone else at the time) subscribed to the ancient, defunct theory of meaning in total ignorance of its being already outdated.

Frege’s new theory of meaning rests on his refutation of the ancient theory of meaning as reference: that theory prevents us from saying that the assertion of the identity of the morning star with the evening star is a statement of fact, not of synonymy. He thus introduced a discussion of empirical synonymy that in later generations won excessive import. That its import is indeed exaggerated is demonstrable by the fact that Fregedid not have to introduce it at all, as he could discuss instead, say, the diversity of terms that denote nothing. (He probably avoided this discussion from the wish to avoid the discussion of the reality of the empty class, as it was then in dispute.)

Why was Frege’s refutation not previously noted? Because the difficulty concerning the identity of the morning star and the evening star was taken care of by the demand for good judgment, and the difficulty concerning terms devoid of reference was obscured by the traditional view that terms denoting nothing are metaphysical and thus meaningless. (This is also how the critique of traditional logic from existential import was thwarted.) Frege

showed this erroneous, and at once he took recourse to the metaphysics of meaning minus reference, of the sense that resides in Plato's Heaven. Alexius Meinong, who was a follower of Hume, then became an ardent advocate of Platonism, noting that the terms that have denotations occupy a small part of Plato's Heaven.

The reason, then, that Frege had to face the terms that have no reference is that Boolean algebra is extensional and so has but one empty class, though intensionally(as Meinong had emphasized) there are many empty classes, of course. Extensionalism is of course very troublesome in logic to this very day, as is its consequence, the Frege-Russell demand that only existing things be given proper names. Yet it was extensionalism that killed essentialism, as Wisdom has noted (Wisdom, 1947), and with the demise of essentialism the days of the theory of judgment as a part of logic were numbered: the very idea of formal logic, as expounded by Frege and by David Hilbert, amounts to the rejection of any demand for any judgment. Frege himself found this hard to follow, as he made a serious error (noted by Baker and Hacker 1984, 333, 379) when he denied validity to inferences with contradictory premises or with tautological conclusions. Russell corrected this error, though he, too, was not as clear about the matter; only the explicit general theories of inference made this tolerably clear, and these came decades after Russell finished his work, mainly with the work of Alfred Tarski in 1935, work that destroyed analytic philosophy by rendering it impossible to have one ideal language (that could possibly be identified with the language of science; Agassi, 1987).

The dismissal of all metaphysics as confusion is an easy exercise. It was dome repeatedly. Wittgenstein offered a new technical tool for doing so, first by taking the new logic more-or-less as it is for a paragon of clarity the like of which was never known before, and second, using it for specific ends with specific tools that belong to the new logic in impressive manners. The first of these tools was forged when Russell abolisheda philosophical problem by clearing a major confusion within logic. The confusion that Russell demolished was due to the demand for good judgment, a demand that has already been presented here as a sign of defeat. It is this. By the canons of the classical theory of meaning, inconsistent terms have none, as they denote nothing. Russell bumped hard into this as he was busy getting rid of his paradox.To that end he declared the paradoxical sentence ungrammatical; he showed then that by simple formal considerations contradictions are meaningful: the negation of the meaningful is meaningful and of the meaningless meaningless. This simple point was often missed even by some leading analytic philosophers, as they confused meaninglessness in Russell's technical sense with meaninglessness in some ordinary sense (irrele-vance or inanity or even absurdity). This point stayed central with Wittgenstein to the end of his life. As his prime disciple John Wisdom (not to confuse with his previously mentioned distant cousin) observed, Wittgenstein enjoined his disciples repeatedly to avoid contradicting meta-physicians when arguing with them, since endorsing the negation of a metaphysical assertion entails that it has meaning, whereas Wittgenstein advocated all his life the view of metaphysical assertions as meaningless, as pseudo-assertions.

In 1905 Russell considered a great success his theory of definite descriptions that took the meaning of names and of descriptions as denotation: in it meanings do not depend on a Platonic Heaven; he suggested then that this way he overcome Plato's metaphysics by logic. This was done prior to the proposal of an alternative theory of meaning, i.e., of denotation plus connotation. This was done twice later on within the classical analytic tradition. First, it was done by Russell in his announcement, in 1927, in the preface to the German edition of his *Problems of Philosophy*, of all places, the theory of meaning as use. This move is clearly behaviorist, and he gave it up when he wrote his *Inquiry into Meaning and Truth* of 1940, where he admitted inability to avoid Platonism all the way. Second, it was done by Waismann a little later, when he announced the verification theory of meaning, which he said he had found in Wittgenstein's *TractatusLogico-Philosophicus*, written soon after the World WarI. Whether his attribution is right is contested by diverse people. The matter is encumbered by the historical fact that at the time Wittgenstein denied that total verification is possible, as did Schlick, and the rest of the Vienna Circle at one time or another. Rather than view this as a declaration of bankruptcy, a casuist discussion of its exact meaning pursued.

The casuistry is avoidable, and Russell did avoid it. As he has reportedlater, one of his motives in developing logic was his wish to find out how exactly scientific theories are verified. He was deeply disappointed to learn from his own contributions to logic that the verification of scientific theories is plainly impossible; he also argued against any theory of meaning as rooted in experience, claiming that even were verification possible, one would have to comprehend a theory before trying to verify it. This criticism is still overlooked, under the pretext that anyway verification is dead. But when one advocates the view that verification is impossible one thereby rejects the idea that meaning a method of verification, perhaps also offer an alternative.

Such a move was indeed attempted. In 1936 Carnap offered a variant of it in his *Testability and Meaning*, a text that inspired hundreds of studies, especially of the meaning of dispositional terms which, Popper had observed in his *Logik der Forschung* of 1935, make verification impossible (since observations that employ them entail refutable predictions: an observation report involving glass can be tested by attempting to break it). The study of dispositional terms, moreover, has brought to the agenda subjunctive conditional statements (as the unfolding of a dispositional term is the subjunctive mood: the term "x is soluble in water" means that were x to be placed in water it would dissolve). Today subjunctive conditionals are the subject-matter of a large-scale industry, led by Saul Kripke (1972), who has revived essentialism on the basis of the hypothesis that native verbal intuitions or common sensereflect the true natural classifi-cation of things. (This is not accurate, as he admits, in Chapter 1, p. 67, that common sense may make small errors, such as considering the whale a fish, but he declares these errors marginal and so permissible to overlook.) The classification that he recommends, being a natural classification, entails solutions to traditional problems of metaphysics. The rubber stamp example here is the body-mind problem: it is decidable, says Kripke, by common sense that humans do and robots do not belong to the same natural class as dogs and cats do. Amazingly, he nevertheless considers himself a disciple of Wittgenstein (while he follows Edmund Husserl).

Still, admittedly, the revelation of natural intuition as reflected in ordinary use of language—common sense—is the task that a whole school of philosophy undertook to explore, the school known as ordinary language philosophy that operated under the banner of Wittgenstein on the assumption that commonsense intuitions are not metaphysical. At about the same time Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf made the same observation about the theories implicit in ordinary language (Whorf *et al*., 1956) considering these metaphysical. What is at issue is the fact that in different times and places common sense differs. This is Russell's major criticism of the ordinary language school of thought. And, of course, he preferred the views of the world that contemporary science offers over any common sense. How then should science consider common sense? The proposal to admit it as the best there is and the proposal to overlook it altogether as opposed to science both must give way to the proposal to improve it in the light of science.

Where does this leave the analysis of ordinary language? We can take a cue, perhaps, from Russell's theory of definite descriptions that was the first analysis proper, as it was neither the dismissal nor the admission of ordinary locutions: he presented them as in need of elucidation. "I thought your yacht is larger than it is" is Russell's immortal paradigm: taken literally it is absurd, but everyone understands it as intended: the size of your yacht is smaller than the one I ascribed to it before I saw it. The example is right, of course, but is the idea that it illustrates important? Is it important to accept ordinary locutions but to interpret them properly? Russell thought so: his theory of denotation is an elucidation of troublesome expressions in a satisfactory manner. And, he reports, only after his discovery of this theory did he find a way to handle his paradox, since he solved it by rendering more precise the idea of a class membership.

When Russell declared after his "On Denoting" of 1905 that logic is a complete substitute for metaphysics—meaning Platonism—it was a battle cry. He realized that it was an error. In 1916 he wrote a famous letter to his lover Lady Otteline Morell that Wittgenstein had convinced him of the impossibility of a victory and he referred to the bitterness that this conviction had elicited in him.

Wittgenstein, however, forged ahead. The outcome was his first book, his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Russell wrote his famous introduction to it, praising it for all that he could praise, but finally he declared it crazy. They could not discuss it: communication between them broke down, and they parted company. The Vienna Circle took that same book as their bible, properly or improperly understood. Coffa's posthumous *To the Vienna Station: The Semantic Tradition from Kant to Carnap* is recognized as the most authoritative history of that period. It declares the ideas of Tarski and Popper as the end of that tradition. Usually this honor goes to Gödel, as he proved the undecidability of some well-formed formulas. But Coffa is right: Tarski and Popper proved the very indifference of meaning to decidability. This is the demise of the analytic tradition. Why then did that tradition not end there and then? Because philosophers like Schlick and Neurath were more concerned with public relations than with the truth (Agassi 2008, 211, 218, 327). How long should we and our students pay for this their folly?

This folly has led sooner or later to the utter neglect of all studies of world-views in favor of those that the students of subjunctive conditionals claim to find within ordinary verbal intuitions or common sense. These claims are made in neglect of science and of the role that science plays in the forging of new intuitions. (Think of the change of spatial intuitions due to Copernicanism that space travel has rendered ordinary; think of allegations regarding differences

between the genders that are now hopefully discarded.) These days all philosophers except for a few philosophers of science neglect science. This discourages attempts to inte-grate science within a world-view. Admittedly, there are indications—who knows how reliable—that some sense of proportion is being reestablished and the casuistry of the heirs of analytic philosophy on all of its variants is waning. This should not suggest that all is well now; nor is this the issue. The issue is this: the problems that are on the agenda of philosophy are many, and we want to organize public discussions about the most interesting ones among them in the hope that this will be sufficiently interesting and inviting the fresh minds that are still engaged by perennial philosophy, by the cosmological problems that engage humanity permanently.

（致谢：感谢关理煊先生与周柏乔先生对本文摘要的翻译做出的校对与建议。）

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agassi Joseph (2008). *A Philosopher's Apprentice: In KarlPopper's Workshop*, second edition, Amsterdam: Rodopi.

_____ (1987). "Whatever Happened to the Positivistic Theory of Meaning?", *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie*, 18: 22-29.

Baker, Gordon P. and Hacker, Stephan (1984). *Frege, logical excavations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Baldwin, Thomas (1995). *Introduction to Russell*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bar-Am, Nimrod (2008). *Extensionalism: The Revolution in Logic*, New York: Springer.

Carnap, Rudolf (1936). "Testability and Meaning", *Philosophy of Science* 3(4): 419-471.

Alberto, Coffa J. and Wessels, Linda (1991). *The Semantic Tradition from Kant to Carnap: To the Vienna Station*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Copernicus, Nicolaus (1543). *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium*, Norimbergae: Apud Ioh. Petreium.

Einstein, Albert (1954). "On the Method of Theoretical Physics", The Herbert Spencer Lecture, delivered at Oxford, 10 June1933; in Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, New York: Random House, 1954, 270–276.

Kripke, Saul (1980). *Naming and Necessity*, New York: Basil Blackwell.

Mach, Ernst (1905, 1976). *Knowledge and Error*, Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Mises, Richard von (1939). *Positivism: a Study in Human Understanding*, New York: George Braziller.

Pears, David Francis (1972). *Bertrand Russell and the British Tradition in Philosophy*, London: Fontana Library.

Popper, Karl R. (1959). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, London: Hutchinson.

_____ (1935). *Logik der Forschung*, Vienna: Julius Springer Verlag.

Russell, Bertrand (1948). *Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits*, London: G. Allen & Unwin.

_____ (1944). "My Mental Development" and "Repliesto criticisms", in Schilpp, Paul Arthur ed., *The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell*, La Salle: Open Court, 1944.

_____ (1940). *An Inquiry into Meaning and Truth*, London: G. Allen & Unwin.

_____ (1931). *The Scientific Outlook*, London: G. Allen & Unwin.

_____ (1912). *The Problems of Philosophy*, New York: H. Holt and Company.

_____ (1905). "On Denoting", *Mind* 14(56): 479-493.

_____ (1900). *A Critical Exposition of the Philosophy of Leibniz*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schilpp, Paul Arthur (1949). *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*, La Salle: Open Court.

_____ (1944). *The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell*, La Salle: Open Court.

Segre, Michael (1994). "Peano's Axioms in Their Historical Context", *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, 48: 201-342.

Stadler, Friedrich (2003). *The Vienna Circle and Logical Empiricism: Re-evaluation and Future Perspectives*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Warnock, Jeffrey(1959). *English Philosophy since 1900*, London and New York: Oxford University Press.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee, Carroll, John B., Levinson, Stephen C. and Lee, Penny (1956). *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, New York: Wiley.

Wisdom, John Oulton (1947). *The Metamorphosis of Philosophy*, Cairo: Al-Maaref Press.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1922). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, London: Kegan Paul.

［责任编辑　孟建伟 郝苑］