Saving Rule Following from Skepticism in Later Wittgenstein[*]

İkinci Dönem Wittgenstein'da Kural Takibinin Septisizmden Korunması

YURDAGÜL KILINÇ ADANALI
Necmettin Erbakan University

Abstract: Whether the later Wittgenstein succeeded in destroying "the mythologized" and abstract theories of rule following is still a matter for debate. The question is important because it grounds Wittgenstein's position against a Platonist, idealistic, conventionalist, relativist and even skeptical views regarding the concept of rule following. It has been argued that Wittgenstein's views on rule following does not succeed in giving a comprehensive theory. Some even argued that Wittgenstein's views even leads to a skeptical conclusion that there are no rules to be followed. In this article, I argue that when Wittgenstein rejects necessary conditions that determinate the application of rules, he does not slip into a skeptical position. Rather, he introduces a concept of rule following based on practice, rejecting classical objectivist approaches. Through this concept, in fact, Wittgenstein wants to overcome certain dichotomies such as objectivity/subjectivity, society/individual, and mind/body. His views on rule following emphasizes the role of individual in following a rule and thereby his or her moral responsibility.

Keywords: Rule-following, skepticism, normativity, criterion, moral responsibility.

---

[*] This paper is partially based upon my master thesis *How to Follow a Rule: Practice Based Rule Following in Wittgenstein*, which is fulfilled at the METU.

✉ Yurdagül Kılınç Adanalı, *Öğr. Gör.*
Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Fakültesi Felsefe Bölümü
42140, Meram, Konya, TR | yurdagulkilinc@gmail.com

Introduction

Language is a rule-based system and a proper understanding of language entails a comprehensive investigation of its grammar. However, we are not concerned here with the kind of grammar that linguists have in mind, when they say that language is a rule- governed system. It is rather the philosophical aspects of grammatical rules not examined or explained in ordinary grammar books. A native speaker does not need to consult grammar each time she speaks, since she already has an intuitive grasp of grammatical rules. Most people, however, if asked to formulate the rules which they use, would be hard pressed to know what to say. They might perhaps offer examples, but these examples are not rules and they do not explain to us how to follow a rule. If rule following is not properly understood, then the lack of understanding may generate confusions concerning logical and grammatical aspects of linguistic practice, and this may have further implications for the relations between external grammatical rules and their mental representations. This article discusses some of these confusions as pointed out by Ludwig Wittgenstein and examines how he tried to "dissolve" them.

Despite the fact that rules are discussed extensively throughout the history of philosophy, the concept of rule following as a philosophical problem has become prominent mainly because of Wittgenstein's treatment of this topic in his *Philosophical Investigations* (1958a). Although Wittgenstein does not give an explicit definition of what a rule is, his analysis presupposes a basic understanding of this concept. He insists that philosophy should not be concerned with hidden structures or foundations of language, since he thinks that there is nothing to be discovered or explained metaphysically (1958a:§126). It is not the task of philosophy to go beyond grammatical rules which underlie the usage of words and sentences in ordinary language; it is, rather, to investigate and clarify how these rules are used or applied in speech.

Contrary to Wittgenstein, if we accept that there is an independent reality beyond the actual application of rules in language, then two possibilities arise: [i] either language reflects reality in the same way a mirror reflects an image or [ii] language becomes arbitrary and it lacks any intrinsic link with reality. In the former case, language follows reality and

changes along with it. If language reflects reality, then there is no need for any extra-linguistic means to understand and explain reality. However, if language turns out to be arbitrary, as some would have argued, then it cannot be taken as a reliable linguistic tool in understanding and explaining reality as it is, and we may need other ways of investigating the world, for example, conceptual analysis. Both positions have significant implications about us, language and reality. If language mirrors reality directly and inevitably, then we face an arduous task of matching words with the world. This also takes out the individual freedom from the equation. If language, on the other hand, is arbitrary, this disconnects words from the world, and cuts off us from reality as far as the language concerned. There are, however, two main problems with these positions: [i] if language is necessary, then how can we explain linguistic error? [ii] If language is arbitrary, then how can we achieve truth?

I believe these problems were at the background, when Wittgenstein claimed that rules are not conceived independently of human linguistic practices. He proposed an external justification which grounds rules non-transcendentally, and in fact he saw no justification for rules beyond rules themselves. It is true that we justify our linguistic actions by appealing to rules, but justification of linguistic practice cannot be achieved by assuming a transcendental status for the rules that ground these actions.

Rules do not correspond to reality, that is, they are not means through which we reach at reality. Indeed, they are part of the reality so far as the language is a part of the world. For some authors this view of Wittgenstein leads to skepticism. In contrast, I will argue that Wittgenstein rightly makes a distinction between "in accordance with a rule" and "following a rule." Following a rule is not just matter of doing what accords with the rule; one must also do it because the rule requires it. The rule must be one's reason for acting. This means that following a rule involves understanding the rule and grasping what it requires. One can act in accordance with a rule, doing what the rule requires without understanding it. So, for Wittgenstein, "accordance with a rule" brings rule skepticism as a threat to possibility of correct and meaningful speech not his concept of rule following.

1. Rule-Following

In *Philosophical Investigations*, Wittgenstein considers language as a game which does not operate necessarily according to well-defined rules. When one speaks, one does not have to employ well defined grammatical rules in speaking, since these rules do not follow any given structure of the world. Yet, the rules imply that language is a practice and is a part of human behavior that governed by social regularities (Alpyağıl, 2002: 133). The idea of a rule resting on the association of words with transcendental forms or ideas is incoherent for him, since it is a mythologized concept of rule and furthermore it is not clear how the mind grasps these forms or ideas and follows accordingly (Wittgenstein, 1958a: §218-219). The distinction between correct and incorrect applications of words cannot be made *a priori* by invoking abstract or transcendental concepts, since there is no realm beyond and outside language and its actual usage (Baker and Hacker, 1985:12).

In contrast to Platonism, Wittgenstein does not invoke a connection between rules and words which permits infinitely many applications and contains a whole series of possibilities in linguistic practice (Rees, 1967: 333). He rejects Platonic position due to its commitment to transcendental abstract entities such as ideas, concepts or meanings independently of human practice of language. The individual mind cannot have an access to a transcendental ideal world and neither can it find a structure in language that reflects that the forms of this world. Rather, if there is such a structure, it is practical and dynamic relations of people in certain regularities and patterns of action over time (Verheggen, 2003: 285).

Many modern commentators of Wittgenstein point out the sharp contrast between early and later Wittgenstein and argued that the model of an ideal language that is the main project of *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* is rejected by later Wittgenstein since he no longer believed that language is governed by a set of specifically defined rules or logical syntax. In the *Tractatus*, language is compared to a model with exact meanings and fixed rules (Wittgenstein, 1961). The idea is that it is possible to draft an artificial language which represents abstract conditions underlying every natural language. Later Wittgenstein, however, objects

to the idea that ordinary usage is determined by specifically define and fixed rules. He claims that we use language without prior definitions or fixed rules. Rules do not mirror the logical forms of reality and one should look for "the harmony between thought and reality...in the grammar of the language" (Wittgenstein, 1974: §162). He does not deny, however, the existence of linguistic rules and rules of usage people commonly apply in their daily communication and interaction, but he rejects the possibility of isolating and describing them at an abstract level independently of their actual usage in specific contexts. Thus, a rule does not count as a standard of correctness independently of linguistic practice. Rather it is a matter of its use in a certain context, in a certain practice, and in a certain language which is interwoven with the world (Aliy, 2005: 167). If that is how it is, then the crucial question regarding the rule following is "how can we apply a rule?"

This question brings us to two main issues: first whether there is any need for interpretation between a rule and its application, and second whether there is or can be a criterion for the application of a rule.

2. Is There any Gap between Rule and Its Application?

There can be many interpretations for the application of a rule, some of which are mutually coherent and furthermore, any action or application can be characterized both in a way that accords with a given rule or conflicts with it. And this constitutes the source of the paradox; in other words, even if the application of a rule is correct, there can be an interpretation of this application that contradicts to it. The paradox stems from the idea that grasping a rule always involves an interpretation and interpretation works both ways, in accordance with the rule and in contrast to it. The second problem with the application of a rule and the interpretation provided for it is its regression. It is true that we may provide an interpretation, but how do we know that this interpretation corresponds to the meaning of that word? Can this interpretation also have "a meaning" which requires a further interpretation? If so, this interpretation will require another interpretation. That is, if a rule needs to be supplemented with another interpretation, then the interpretation of the rule needs a further interpretation and so on. So, the appeal to interpreta-

tions leads to an infinite regress. Thus, one may never know whether the interpretation of a rule is correct or not.

To avoid these problems, Wittgenstein rejects the idea that all instances of rule following must involve interpretations. He does not, however, deny that rules guide actions. Since a rule can be interpreted in many and sometimes contradictory ways, interpretation can be conceived as prescribing any course of action whatsoever. In fact, his critique of interpretation is an attack on the assumption that interpretation is an inner process (Delice: 2013, 104). Wittgenstein denies that following a rule involves an inner process of interpretation and claims that if we do not give up interpretation as mediator between rule and its application, then "whatever is going to seem right to me is right. And that only means that here we cannot talk about 'right'" (Wittgenstein, 1958a: §258). In order to avoid these two problems, the requirement of a "mysterious" mediation between a rule and its application must be given up.

Interestingly enough, Saul Kripke takes Wittgenstein's remarks on problem of interpretation to establish a skeptical conclusion. According to him, first, there is no criterion how we distinguish correct from incorrect applications. Second, the justification of understanding and rule-governed behavior is ambiguous; we can only justify a rule with a community consensus (Williams, 1999: 162). So, for Kripke, rule following consists in doing as community does: "Ultimately we reach a level where we act without any reason in terms of which we can justify our action. We act unhesitatingly but blindly" (Kripke, 1982: 87). In that regard, community determines what justifies rule following actions. Since meaning is determined by appealing to communal practice, Kripke assumes that Wittgenstein agrees with the skeptic that there is neither an "internal" nor an "external" fact which guarantees any meaning (Kripke, 1982: 69). Kripke's view involves one important point: he thinks that, for Wittgenstein, meaning and rule following have a correlation with a community. Meaning is possible because we are living in a society and the community determines the correctness of an application.

However, does Wittgenstein really accept community standards as *correct*? Can we say that Wittgenstein believes in that there is homogeneity in the application of a concept in a community? If we take community

as a standard, then we should accept that disagreements would arise in the community. If that is the case, then we have to accept that each culture is enclosed within its standards of correctness. Consequently, meaning becomes completely culture-dependent. Is this the relativist account which Wittgenstein adheres?

If we consider communities as bedrock, since all of them will be enclosed within their rules, this would cause a problem of communications: how can different communities understand each other? As Wittgenstein points out, "the common behavior of mankind is the system of reference by means of which we interpret an unknown language" (Wittgenstein, 1958: §206). Nevertheless, the basis of rules does not depend upon our verbal agreement on the nature of things; on the contrary, it depends on human practice, because this is common to all mankind. So, we can understand each other regardless of our cultural differences. If this is true, then meanings arise from our acting in the world. Grammatical rules and their applications are merged in a melting pot or rather they emerge together in a social context. This implies that Kripke's account is mistaken, because rule-application cannot be justified by appealing to the community. We cannot say that "this is blue" is correct by appealing to a community, but by only consulting to the examples of "blue" in a linguistic community. What is important here is that the agreement of the color with the sample determines the usage of this concept. Of course, there is an agreement in community, but this agreement belongs to the framework.

3. Criterion: How do You Know That So and So is the Case?

The second discussion concerning the concept of rule following is related to the criterion of its application. Although Wittgenstein uses the term criterion in a somewhat different, technical way, his views indicate that its meaning may ultimately be derived from everyday usage. He claims that no mental picture, image or concept, could serve as our ultimate criterion for whether a descriptive expression "fits" an object. If we do not relate a word to the observable characteristics of an object in the external world through some mediating mental picture, how is, then, the connection between a word and an object is established? The answer is

not by some "mysterious" relation, but by all particular connections that consist in the actual usage of a word in a language.

Wittgenstein says that criteria are specified by giving an answer to the question *"How do you know that so and so is the case?"* The answer consists in giving a criterion for saying that "so and so is the case" (Wittgenstein, 1958b:24). This means that there may be more than one criterion for each case. Whether or not a word is correctly applied may depend upon various criteria which may be present and may even conflict with one another. Which criteria are relevant to the use of a term in one case depends on its actual uses. Therefore, a criterion "determines" the meaning of words and sentences by the usage. If one does not know the criterion for the use of an expression, then she does not understand its meaning. A term has no meaning until it is connected with the characteristics of the objects which it applies to. Thus, criterion for the use of an expression is central to its meaning, and it is mentioned in any definition of that expression. Wittgenstein writes "one cannot guess how a word functions, has to look at its use and learn from that" (1958a:§109). Then to learn the use of a sign we look to ordinary language to discover the function it has, or the purpose it serves there. In that sense, the rules of usage are not only public, but are also a part of our application.

A person cannot follow a rule unless he or she is in conformity with a common way of acting that is displayed in the behavior of everyone who has had the same training, instruction, and guidance. This means that the concept of rule following implies practice of rule followers which Wittgenstein called *form of life*: "the speaking of language is part of an activity or form of life" (1958a: §23).

Some authors argued that form of life as a background and criterion for rules leads to skeptical conclusions, since there is no normativity for rules in form of life. They further asserted that a rule should be normative so that it may let us evaluate the use of concepts and practical regularities. Since mere regularity in practice is not sufficient for the manifestation of a rule, Wittgensteinian rule-following cannot be a normative theory (Medina, 1998, 295). Despite the claims, Wittgenstein's views on rule following cannot be considered as skeptical because of his account of normativity, which will be explained in the following section.

4. Normativity

The notions of correctness and incorrectness play an essential role in the concept of normativity. I argue that this goes for Wittgenstein's concept of rule following as well. Rules involve various concepts and certain complex practices that govern meaning and use. They not only report phenomena, but also embody a way of acting within the world. Furthermore, these practices require the possession of various norms that relate to certain skills such as teaching, explaining, criticizing and justifying (Wittgenstein 1958a: §197-202). If rules do not function in guiding, criticizing, etc. an action, they cannot be considered as rules in any sense. Furthermore, rules must be repeatable, and not something which is done only once, since a language is normative insofar as its rules can be both correctly and incorrectly applied repeatedly in a form of life. The origin of norms, then, lies in their agreement to form of life that creates standards. This relation between normativity of rule following and form of life implies that private language has no normativity (Rızvanoglu, 2016: 24). If meanings are determined by one person, then there is no intelligible way to understand rightness or wrongness of an action (Wittgenstein, 1958a: §202). Unless a rule has various applications, it cannot actually possess a normative value; a language whose rules are applied only once is not a genuine language. This means that rule can possess a normative value, only if it has various applications. That is, practical regularities have to be accompanied by expression of acceptance, or rejection, or criticism. Of course, mere regularity in practice is not sufficient for the application of a rule. Wittgenstein's account of normativity cannot be reduced to mere regularities, since the normative attitudes are an essential competent of continuing practices.

Wittgenstein moves the discussion toward the ground of grammar that establishes the possibilities for continuing practices. The rules are realized or manifest in practice and are not held as external objects for determining meanings. Rather the relation between a rule and its application is internal, and its instantiation is in practice. There are no external standards for the justification of grammatical rules since they are standards for the correctness of using an expression: "Grammar describes the use of words in a language. So it has somewhat the same relation to the

language as a description of a game, the rules of a game, have to the game" (Wittgenstein, 1974: §23). This is a considerable principle that there is no such thing as justifying grammar by reference to reality. Rules of grammar are not suitable to any external justification and cannot be true or false by reference to reality, since the rules of grammar are antecedent to truth or falsity. That is why the rules are considered as arbitrary (Alpyağıl, 2003: 100). They describe the framework within which ascriptions of truth or falsity can meaningfully be made. Since any rule cannot meaningfully articulate without grammar, grammar is to be seen as a framework of rules. Therefore, grammatical rules are standards for the correct use of an expression which determine its meaning: to give the meaning of a word is to specify its grammar (Wittgenstein, 1969: §61-62). "Correct" here does not necessarily mean "true," since one may use a term in accordance with rules without saying something true. The "truth" of a grammatical proposition consists not in stating how things are, but in accurately expressing a rule, that is, grammar governs but do not determine (O'Neill, 2001: 1). However, this does not mean that Wittgenstein abandoned the idea that language is rule-governed. This becomes clear when we stop comparing language to a calculus and began to see it as a game:

> As long as we remain in the province of the true-false games a change in the grammar can only lead us from one game to another, and never from something true to something false. On the other hand if we go outside the province of these games, we don't any longer call it "language" and "grammar" and once again we do not come into contradiction with reality. (Wittgenstein, 1974: §68)

Therefore rule following has two dimensions: on the one hand, there is a form of life, which provides a background for rule following, and on the other, there are individuals who interact with others in a form of life. Individuals are free to give a new meaning to concepts or rules; however, this does not mean that they have no responsibility over the application of a rule correctly. By rejecting private language, Wittgenstein avoids subjectivity, and by rejecting external criteria for rule following, he avoids objectivity. So, Wittgenstein's view of rule following advocates a position neither of pure subjectivity nor of pure objectivity. It may be said there is

a balance concerning subjective and objective aspects of linguistic acts in Wittgensteinian account. Moreover, even though there are no necessary rules that force people to act in certain ways, we still have the concept of correct application: doing right thing in action, not just in theory. This is what Wittgenstein means by practice or "praxis" when he uses the term. So, he develops a theory of practice that does not reduce the normative to the empirical or psychological. On this account, what grounds the normativity of a practice is an agreement in action. The source of normativity does not spring from a set of symbolic rules belonging to an autonomous domain, independent of actual uses; it is rather immerged in practice or praxis.

5. Moral Responsibility and Rule Following

When we suggest that praxis is the fundamental phenomenon for the concept of rule following, it seems we may set up a relation between rule following and responsibility in a moral sense. Here, I do not claim that Wittgenstein provides a new moral theory. It is fair to say that he is not constructing a theory of moral judgment. Since his concept of rule following does not dismiss normativity, I believe there must be a link, however indirect, between rule following and moral responsibility. To establish that link, first I will show the conceptual interdependence of rule following, practice, and responsibility. Second, I will examine whether Wittgenstein's concept of rule following imply moral responsibility for individual as it stands in opposition to the Platonist and Tractarian concepts of rules.

It is reasonable to suppose that there is a moral aspect in every step of rule following, since the concept of rule following implies both that there is individual freedom in actions and that there is a need for evaluation of the application of rules with regard to their correctness. In replying to the question "what is it to follow a rule" Wittgenstein says that "it would be more correct to say not that an intuition was needed at every stage but that a new decision was needed at every stage" (Wittgenstein, 1958a: §186). This answer stresses the need for "decision" that implies that there is a relation between normativity of rule following and responsibility of individual. When we see the concept of rule following from this

point of view, we may conclude that Wittgenstein's thoughts have some implications for moral evaluation.

It is possible to talk about an application of a rule as correct or incorrect, since the concept of rule following would have no meaning unless normative values are assumed. The fact that rule following activities are not always determined by rules, and they rely on practices for their meaning, and they can be performed correctly or incorrectly, etc., all these suggest that there are some aspects of Wittgenstein's concept rule following that need to be studied further from a moral point of view. In that regard, rule following is a special sort of activity; it may involve decisions that do not appeal to a rule as a set of formulated instructions. Moreover, when making decisions in new cases, the lack of precision involved in rule following suggests that a type of flexibility is needed to solve problems. The lack of precision in rule following may make application of a rule easier particularly in problematic contexts, where our decisions involve complex scenarios, have certain consequences or even made in the face of moral dilemmas. Thus, we need moral responsibility as an ingredient in reaching to a suitable application through correct decisions.

Another implication concerning moral responsibility takes place in difference between being in accordance with a rule and following a rule (Baker and Hacker, 1985: 155). When one follows a rule, she accords to it; on the other hand, when one accords to a rule, she may or may not follow it. The difference between following a rule and merely according to that rule has implications concerning moral responsibility of individual. One can follow a rule only if she has the freedom of not following it. Thus, only free individuals can follow rules and only they can fulfill epistemically normative activities such criticism, justification, and so on. That is, rule following is manifest in the manner in which individual uses rules, refers to rules in acting, evaluates and corrects what others do (Baker and Hacker, 1985: 45). This means that only individuals, who are free and capable of acting, can follow rules and give reasons for their actions; machines or robots, for example, are not free and cannot give reasons for their actions. (Wittgenstein, 1958a: §193) We can generalize that people as oppose to machines can both accord and follow rules; machines on the other hand can only accord to rules. Therefore, the only way we can

meaningfully speak of rule following is reserved to human beings, because following a rule is praxis and only human beings can have praxis. In addition, only human beings can pursue which beliefs, decisions, and actions are required to follow a rule. This internal connection between rule following and praxis has an important implication for moral responsibility.

Then, what does it mean to conceive of rule following as a moral responsibility? We learn to engage in complex practices through learning, practice, and respond creatively to new situations and make mistakes, and learn from them. We learn to be good and to do well; we come to a form of life that values these activities and supports us in fulfilling them. Practices provide a framework of social expectations that establish norms to determine what judgments and actions are appropriate. Even if we are entirely freeing acting, we could not have been capable of required praxis without interacting with others. In this sense, moral responsibility develops with practices in a form of life. These practices identify actions and events that correspond to certain concepts. Hence, they enable individuals to act and judge with responsibility. Then, moral responsibility is also a normative enterprise for the concept of rule following. It is normative because it is concerned with how we ought to follow a rule and be in a relation to one another (O'Day, 1998: 61).

When moral responsibility is viewed as an important component of the concept of rule following, deeper dimensions of the rule following are revealed. One is that each act, even the simplest one, has the features of learning, understanding and teaching. It can be questioned how these features affect the development of one's own character and identity. In that regard, there is a need for moral responsibility for acquiring and performing the right acts. Similarly, we should consider the influence of our acts upon others who might observe or become aware of it. Another dimension of moral responsibility relates to human existence, since without rules there can be neither society nor culture (Sidnell, 2003: 429). That is to say, we cannot imagine that a society in which there are no recognizable rules, judgments, justifications and criticisms. These two dimensions guide actions and provide a ground on which practice become regular and predictable. Further they involve one's self-perception and that of others in the process of how we reflect upon them and decide

what to do particularly what we do have consequences for others (Arici, 2015: 70).

We are born into a world in which we learn from others how to act in certain ways in certain circumstances, and we teach others how to act when it is our turn to convey this information. Even if one becomes autonomous in one's choices eventually, the capacity to be such a free and autonomous individual is grounded in our relations with others. This interrelation is as much social as individual in an obvious way; we communicate with others as a way of clarifying what we intend to, would, should do. Clarity means that we work with moral responsibility until we reach a decision about what action is right. Thus, the ability to act with moral responsibility is realized in individual's relations to others.

Since all practices are never entirely private or personal, they are learned, and taught in a social context; they are part of a shared form of life. It is only through experiences of interacting with others that we master the abilities of rule following. Nevertheless, this does not mean that practices share necessarily a single common feature. Rather, they involve different responses, choices, and actions as situations demand. It is obvious that there is a balance in rule following concerning personality and sociality. That is, rule following does not only concern an individual but that individual in fundamental respects with other people as well. This makes us as responsible individuals. Here moral responsibility emerges from how we treat others, how they treat us, and how we treat each other. This network of relations represents the inseparability of rule following and of moral responsibility.

Conclusion

In this article, I argued that even though Wittgenstein rejects necessary criteria for rule following, he does not support a skeptical or relativist position. Based on preceding considerations, Wittgenstein's concept of rule following can be summarized in five points:

First, the idea of rule resting on the association of words with transcendental concepts is incoherent, since it is unclear how the mind grasps these concepts. This view only produces a "mythologized" concept of rule.

Second, since a rule can be interpreted in countless ways, and interpretation can be conceived as prescribing any course of action whatsoever, this makes interpretation unnecessary at best and contradictory at worst. Rejecting that rule following must involve an interpretation does not mean to deny that rules guide an action.

Third, the rules of usage are not only public, but also a part of the world and us as language users. A person cannot follow a rule unless she or he is in conformity with a common way of acting that is displayed in the behavior of others who have the same training, instruction, direction, and guidance, etc.

Fourth, individuals can interpret rules freely. However, this does not mean that they have no constrains or that they are dismissed of responsibility of applying a rule correctly. Since practices are not entirely private and personal, they are part of a shared form of life; they are learned, practiced and taught in a given society.

Fifth, it is obvious that we must strike a balance in following rules between private and public, between individual and social. This makes us as morally responsible individuals. Here moral responsibility emerges from how we treat others, how they treat us, and how we treat each other. This network of relations represents the inseparability of rule following from moral responsibility in Wittgensteinian context.

References

Arıcı, M. (2015). Zihinsel Alanda "Ben Hissi" Neye Karşılık Gelir? *Dört Öğe*, 7, 65-76.

Aliy, A. (2005). Wittgenstein Felsefesinde Din Dili ve Dinî İman. *Çukurova Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1, 158-176.

Alpyağıl, R. (2003). Gramer Olarak Teoloji: Din Felsefesinde Yeni Bir Ufuk. *Tezkire*, 31-32, 89-105.

Alpyağıl, R. (2002). *Wittgenstein ve Kierkegaard'dan Hareketle Din Felsefesi Yapmak*. İstanbul: Anka Yayınları.

Baker, G. P. & Hacker, P. M. S. (1985). *Wittgenstein: Rules, Grammar, and Necessity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Delice, A. (2013). Kural, Anlam ve Yorum Üçgeninde Wittgenstein. *FSM İlmî*

Araştırmalar: İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi, 2, 101-118.

Kripke, S. A. (1982). *Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Medina, J. M. (1998). Wittgenstein in Transition: Meaning, Rules and Practices (PhD. Thesis). Evanston: Northwestern University.

O'Day, K. (1998). Normativity and Interpersonal Reasons. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 1 (1), 61-87.

O'Neill, M. (2001). Explaining 'The Hardness of the Logical Must': Wittgenstein on Grammar, Arbitrariness and Logical Necessity. *Philosophical Investigations*, 24 (1), 1-29.

Rees, D. A. (1967). Platonism and the Platonic Tradition. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. New York: Macmillian Publishing Co.

Rızvanoğlu, E. (2016). Wittgenstein'ın Özel Dil Eleştirisi Bağlamında Kartezyen Geleneğe Itirazı. *Posseible*, 8, 22-32.

Sidnell, J. (2003). An Ethnographic Consideration of Rule-Following. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute Incorporating Man*, 9 (3), 429-445.

Verheggen, C. (2003). Wittgenstein's Rule Following Paradox and the Objectivity of Meaning. *Philosophical Investigations*, 26 (4), 285-310.

Williams, M. (1999). *Wittgenstein, Mind and Meaning: Toward a Social Conception of Mind*. London: Routledge.

Wittgenstein, L. (1958a). *Philosophical Investigations* (trans. G. E. M. Anscombe). New York: Blackwell Publishers.

Wittgenstein, L. (1958b). *The Blue and Brown Books* (ed. R. Rhees) New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Wittgenstein, L. (1961). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (trans. C. K. Ogden). London: Routledge & Keagan Paul.

Wittgenstein, L. (1969). *On Certainty* (trans. Denis Paul & G. E. M. Anscombe). New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Wittgenstein, L. (1974). *Philosophical Grammar* (trans. A. Kenny). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Öz: İkinci dönem Wittgenstein'ın "mitolojik" ve soyut kural teor-
ilerini ortadan kaldırmakta başarılı olup olmadığı hala tartışılagelen
bir konudur. Sorun mühimdir, zira kural takibi kavramı ile alakalı
olarak Wittgenstein'ın Platonik, idealist, konvansiyonalist, göreci
ve hatta şüpheci görüşlere karşı duruşunu temellendirmektedir.
Wittgenstein'ın kapsamlı bir teori ortaya koymakta başarısız
olduğu ve hatta takip edilecek hiçbir kuralın mevcut olmadığı gibi
septik bir sonucuna vardığı uzun süredir iddia edilmektedir. Bu
makalede, kuralın uygulamasını belirleyen zorunlu şartları reddetse
dahi Wittgenstein'ın kural mevzusunda septik veya göreci olma-
dığını iddia etmeye çalışacağım. Bilakis Wittgenstein, pratik
temelli bir kural takibi kavramı geliştirir ve klasik nesnel yak-
laşımları reddeder. Aslında o kural takibi kavramı ile felsefi
tartışmalardaki nesnellik/öznellik, toplum/birey ve zihin/beden gibi
temel bazı dikotomileri aşmak ister. Buna ilaveten bireyin kural
takibindeki rolünü ve dolayısıyla ahlaki sorumluluğunu vurgular.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kural takibi, septisizm, normativite, kriter,
ahlaki sorumluluk.