WITTGENSTEIN ON FORMS OF LIFE AND THE IMMEDIACY OF HABIT

Marilena Andronico
University of Ferrara
marilena.andronico@unife.it

ABSTRACT: Though Wittgenstein conceived of forms of life as the given that has to be accepted, his analyses are not what we might expect: they are not descriptions of empirical facts. On the contrary, they are grammatical investigations, primarily concerned with the normative dimension of our concepts. In this paper I elaborate on the notion of the given, trying to show that it includes linguistic habits characterized by the immediacy (or blindness) of rule following. This allows the philosopher to conceive of language-acquired habits as "having become nature to us", thus as a constitutive part of the given, without eliminating the normative dimension of linguistic habits by reducing them to non-linguistic entities, whether physical or mental. The last point highlights the difference between Wittgenstein's and William James's conception of the role of experience (*Erlebnis*) in concept formation.

Keywords: Ludwig Wittgenstein; forms of life; habit; second nature; William James

Preface

In this paper, I will be dealing with Wittgenstein's views on the unmediated nature of habit (or of some habits). I will try to show how such views affect his conception of the given (*das Gegebene*) as presented in the second part of the *Philosophical Investigations*, e.g. where he states that "What has to be accepted, the given, is – one might say – *forms of life*." (PPF, §345)[1] This will require some preliminary reflections on the notion of a form of life. Wittgenstein scholars know that much ink has been spilled on the issue of forms of life; I myself have been dealing with it on several occasions (e.g. Andronico 1998). Thus, what I am going to say will not appear entirely new. However, I hope it will help to throw some light on a vaguely circumscribed notion, which has been misunderstood in several ways (though most often in a foundationalist way, be it of a naturalistic or of a transcendentalist bent).

---

[1] For abbreviations of titles of Wittgenstein's works, see the Bibliography.

Forms of life

In the *Philosophical Investigations*, the phrase *form of life* occurs five times: twice at the beginning (§19 and §23), then about midway in the First Part (§241), then twice in the Second Part, that is in PPF, §1 and §345. The phrase occurs less than 10 times in the whole Wittgensteinian corpus. Therefore, one might be led to think that this is a somewhat marginal notion, surely not as crucial as the repeatedly employed notion of a language game. Not so. The first two occurrences belong in a sequence of remarks that appear to have a programmatic tone: in other words, these are remarks by which Wittgenstein introduces the object of his reflections, the tools he is going to employ in carrying them out, some aspects of the methods he will adopt, and some indications concerning the results he hopes to achieve. Synthetically, and not without some simplification: the object consists of language and the activities into which it is woven (PI, §7), or again, language understood as a "spatial and temporal phenomenon" (PI, §108); the tools are language games (PI, §§130-131); methods include the comparative method (PI, §130 and §132) as well as the imaginative method (PI, §19); the result the philosopher aims to achieve is a perspicuous, or clear presentation of the state of language (PI, §122), which engenders a therapeutic effect, i.e. the dissolution of some (individual) philosophical problem and the fading out of philosophical disquiet (PI, §124 and, most of all, §133). Within such programmatic context, the phrase 'form of life' shows up to characterize both the object of inquiry and the imaginative side of the comparative method: in PI, §23, Wittgenstein points out that "The word 'language-game' is used here to emphasize the fact that the *speaking* of language is part of an activity, or of a form of life", while in PI, §19 he states that "…to imagine a language means to imagine a form of life".

Again in PI, §23, Wittgenstein explicitly brings in the plurality of language games alongside the connection of language game and form of life: there is a multiplicity of language games, as well as "countless kinds of use of the

things we call 'signs', 'words', 'sentences'. And this diversity is not something fixed, given once for all; but new types of language, new language-games, as we may say, come into existence and others become obsolete and get forgotten". As there are many language games, and as "the *speaking* of language is part of an activity, or of a form of life" (Ibid.) to the point that imagining a language game amounts to imagining a form of life, we can conclude that the notion of a form of life must also be understood in the plural: a multiplicity of activities, or forms of life, corresponds to the multiplicity of language games.

In general, we can say that when Wittgenstein introduces the notion of a form of life in the *Investigations*, he is explicitly presenting the anthropological point of view from which he will be carrying out his research on language from the 1930s on; or rather, his research on the meaning of some linguistic expressions. For his research persists in being, in the first place, semantic in nature. By taking up the anthropological stance, Wittgenstein is forever forsaking the viewpoint and style of analysis that had characterized *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*, where, in his own words, language had been seen as "a formal unity" (PI, §108), or as "a non-spatial, atemporal non-entity" (PI, §108). That stance consists in looking at the meaning of a linguistic expression taking into account, in addition to the linguistic context of its occurrence, the overall circumstances of its use, including, beside acts of language, the material and non-material circumstances in which they take place. It is as if Wittgenstein intended to give prominence to the fact that human life goes on *with* language and that people live *in* language: "Language – he points out in the *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics* – relates to a *way* of living" (RFM, VI §34); our concepts, which take form and body in language, "correspond to a particular way of dealing with situations" (RFM, VII §67). In the *Investigations*, just next to §23, the anthropological stance is clearly presented in §25:

It is sometimes said: animals do not talk because they lack the mental abilities. And this means: "They do not think, and that is why they do not talk." But - they simply do not talk. Or better: they do not use language - if we disregard the most primitive forms of language. - Giving orders, asking questions, telling stories, having a chat, are as much a part of our natural history as walking, eating, drinking, playing. (PI, §25)

That language is part of our natural history means that it is integral to the human species-specific endowment; but it also means that its workings and the practice of it are made possible by facts that involve both non-human nature and certain features of our psychophysical constitution. Thus, Wittgenstein's writings contain many remarks about the relation between language and natural history, both human and non-human, i.e. features of our natural environment. For example, "if our memory functioned differently, we could not calculate as we do" (RFM, IV §24); or again, "If we only saw one of our primary colours, red say, extremely seldom and only in tiny expanses, if we could not prepare colours for painting, if red occurred only in particular connections with other colours, say at the very tips of leaves of certain trees, these tips gradually changing from green to red in the autumn, then nothing would be more natural than to call red a degenerate green" (RPP, I §47), in other words, we would possess a different concept of red: *not* of a primary color. Similarly, "if our footrules were made of very soft rubber instead of wood and steel … we should not get... *that* measurement which we get with our rigid rulers. [...] It can be said: What is here called 'measuring' and 'length' and 'equal length', is something different from what we call those things." (RFM, I §5). Such remarks seem to suggest that "It is as if our concepts involved a scaffolding of facts" (RPP, II §392 – Z §350). However, this formulation is in quotes, as if Wittgenstein were not entirely happy with it. Instead, he chooses to describe his interest in the connection of language, concepts, and facts of nature by the following words: "What we are supplying are really remarks on the natural history of man: not curiosities however, but rather observations on

facts which no one has doubted and which have only gone unremarked because they are always before our eyes" (RFM, I §142).[2] Indeed, Wittgenstein's anthropological stance and interest in forms of life, as described so far, can easily lead us to believe that he was after the natural causes of our use of language, or even that he meant to ground the latter in the former (in its "basis in nature"). Such was not his intention. In fact, on several occasions he appears to be aware of (and worried by) the possibility that his inquiry may look like natural science in disguise:

> If we can find a ground for the structures of concepts among the facts of nature (psychological and physical), then isn't the description of the structures of our concepts really disguised natural science; ought we not in that case to concern ourselves not with grammar, but with what lies at the bottom of grammar in nature? (RPP, I §46)

and his answer is:

> Indeed the correspondence between our grammar and general (seldom mentioned) facts of nature does concern us. But our interest does not fall back on these *possible* causes. We are not pursuing a natural science; our aim is not to predict anything. Nor natural history either, for we invent facts of natural history for our own purposes. (RPP, I §46; Cf. PPF xii §365 and §366)

In order better to understand Wittgenstein's worry, let me emphasize from the beginning a peculiarity of his philosophical approach, namely that the anthropological stance does not in any way override interest in *grammar*. 'Grammar' is here used equivocally for both the set of rules that govern the several uses of language and the remarks and descriptions the philosopher produces concerning such rules. Mentions of facts of

nature are mostly background with respect to the aims of philosophical analysis, i.e. untying the knots, the conceptual muddles that arise when "we are entangled in our own rules" (PI, §125). This side of Wittgenstein's reflection is undoubtedly hard to grasp and has often originated controversial interpretations.[3] Another way of trying to describe it is to insist that for Wittgenstein, interest in natural facts affecting our concepts does not suppress or replace interest in the rules that constitute and shape them. Such rules are alive in language, whether they are explicitly formulated or implicitly acquired.

Anyway, only by grasping this side of Wittgenstein's reflection can we come to understand how, among language games and the related forms of life, we do not just find natural patterns of action but forms of behaviour and activities we would not hesitate to describe as "cultural". Relying on a different dichotomy, beside forms of behaviour that are innate, or natural developments of innate psychophysical properties (e.g. walking, eating), other forms of behaviour are mentioned that are acquired in social situations thanks to education and training:

> The behaviour of humans includes of course not only what they do without ever having learned the behaviour, but also what they do (and so, e.g. *say*) after having received a training. (RPP, I §131)

---

[3] From Conway (1989) to Moyal-Sharrock (2007), Wittgenstein's interest in forms of life has been read as an attempt to ground the meaning of words in certain relevant facts of our psychophysical nature (or so I believe such contributions can be understood). In a recent restatement of her view, Moyal-Sharrock sees Wittgenstein's forms of life as conditioning, not grounding or justifying world pictures and language games (2015, 38). I believe this reading is more in tune with Wittgenstein's texts. For a recent survey of interpretations of the notion of form of life, see Boncompagni (2015).

Moreover,

> If we teach a human being such-and-such a technique by means of examples, - that he then proceeds like *this* and not like *that* in a particular new case, or that in this case he gets stuck, and thus that this and not that is the 'natural' continuation for him: this of itself is an extremely important fact of nature. (Z, §355)

Now, all or most of this becomes clear if we keep in mind that there are two senses, or two uses of the word 'nature' in Wittgenstein: on the one hand, the word is used for prelinguistic, instinctual forms of behaviour (such as avoiding pain or caring for a suffering person); on the other, it refers to forms of behaviour that have been acquired in language and by way of language, and that "have been turned into nature for us." In the *Remarks on the Philosophy of Psychology*, speaking of our classification system, Wittgenstein remarks:

> We're used to a particular classification of things. – With language, or languages, it has become second nature to us" (RPP, I §678).[4]

And then he adds:

> These are the fixed rails along which all our thinking runs, and so our judgement and action goes according to them too (RPP, II §679; Z, §375).

For the sake of presentation, 'nature' or 'natural' in the latter sense could be replaced by the phrase 'second nature', following the English translators of these remarks.[5] However, Wittgenstein does not use the German equivalent ('zweiter Natur') nor is it clear to me whether doing so would really simplify the presentation of his views or might instead complicate it and make it misleading.[6] Leaving the terminological issue aside, what

matters is emphasizing that in these remarks Wittgenstein is talking about an activity – classifying – which is largely learned (as shown by the fact that cultures differ in their types of classification), and he is describing it as a habit of speaking and thinking that "has become nature to us", i.e. that shares something with prelinguistic, possibly innate forms of behaviour and activities.

Rules

I believe that to understand what is shared by both kinds of activities we must consider the outcome of Wittgenstein's rule-following considerations. To begin with, the notion of "following a rule" is related to the notion of habit or custom: following a rule is a practice (PI, §202), i.e. a way of behaving or acting (in a wide sense). We properly speak of acting according to a rule when one and the same action is performed several times (more than once) so that, thanks to repetition, a habit is established:

> It is not possible that there should have been only one occasion on which only one person followed a rule. It is not possible that there should have been only one occasion on which a report was made, an order given or understood, and so on. – To follow a rule, to make a report, to give an order, to play a game of chess, are *customs* (usages, institutions). (PI, §199)

Now, every custom is a regularity (of behaviour), hence to every custom a rule is attached. However, this should not be understood to imply that every custom is inherently normative. Walking the dog every day, in the same park at the same hour, may be someone's custom; but there needn't be anything normative about it. It would be peculiar to insist that it is "wrong" for that person to walk the dog at a different hour, or in a

---

[4] The original German is as follows: "Sie ist uns mit der Sprache, oder den Sprachen, zur Natur geworden."
[5] The English translators are C.G. Luckhardt and M.A.E. Aue.
[6] The phrase 'second nature' could hint at a philosophical theory of the relationship between "first"

nature (or nature *stricto sensu*) and second nature, such as we find in McDowell (1996). However, saddling Wittgenstein with an interest in the construction of such a theory would be a misunderstanding.

different park.[7] By contrast, *linguistic* customs have normative force. 'Dog', 'park', and 'same' - English words that draw their meaning from the practice of using them in a certain way - *are* to be used in that way (i.e., according to the rule that is implicit in their regular use): it is *right* to use them so, while using them differently is *wrong.* In contrast with other behavioural routines, what I here called "linguistic customs" or habits necessarily involve normativity of the rules they induce.

Secondly, as is well known, following a rule does not require any interpretive mediation;[8] not in the sense that accompanying thoughts are somehow precluded, but in the sense that no such thoughts are either required or sufficient for rule following:

> Following a rule is analogous to obeying an order. One is trained to do so and one reacts to an order in a particular way (PI, §206).

and

> When I follow the rule, I do not choose – I follow the rule *blindly* (PI, §219).

What an acquired linguistic habit shares with a natural, prelinguistic form of behaviour is just such blindness or quasi-instinctiveness; it is the action's immediacy (or the immediacy of application of the rule). As Wittgenstein puts it in the *Remarks on the Philosophy of Psychology* I, §§125-126, even when we want to express a feeling, a very peculiar one as the "feeling of unreality", we *spontaneously* employ a technique of using words such as "feeling" and "unreality" in their ordinary meanings*.* That a linguistic technique has been learned is not incompatible with spontaneity of its employment. We could now accept the English translation of *Remarks on the Philosophy of Psychology* (II, §678) and use the

phrase 'second nature', realizing that 'second' hints at learning and training and whatever in language is acquired by following rules, whereas 'nature' hints at immediacy and the quasi-instinctive application of rules, once they have been acquired.[9]

Now, as this concerns language, it concerns the articulation of our conceptual apparatus. Semantic habits are conceptual habits. Analysing a concept coincides with analysing the application of a word: "We do not analyse a phenomenon (for example, thinking) but a concept (for example, that of thinking), and hence the application of a word" (PI, §383). Thus, the notion of second nature extends to the realm of our ordinary concepts, what Wittgenstein later called a "picture of the world" (OC, §94), "the substratum of all my inquiring and asserting" (OC, §162).

The given (*das Gegebene*)

Perhaps we can now understand why Wittgenstein, while accepting (like other philosophers) a distinction between the natural and prelinguistic and what is acquired by way of education into language – let us say, a distinction between nature proper and second nature – does not deem useful for his purposes to carry out an investigation by which both levels of human life are in each case distinguished and kept separate. Inquiries aiming to clarify the meanings of linguistic expressions (particularly those which tend to originate conceptual confusions and philosophical maladies) differ, in his mind, from scientific investigations exactly because they neither put forth hypotheses to be confirmed or disconfirmed nor make predictions; hence, they do not aim at determining, for a given conceptual formation embedded in language, which part of it is naturally given and which is acquired by training or education. Investigations of meaning are rather like attempts at drawing maps of our uses of words and concepts,

---

[7] Hence, while I agree with Roberta Dreon's claim that rules, in Wittgenstein, are best understood in terms of habits (2015, 103), this should not be taken to imply that every habit has normative force.

[8] I am referring to PI, §201, and the ensuing, vast debate in connection with Saul Kripke's reading of it in his (1982).

[9] For a discussion of both the "blindness" of rule following and its possible limitations, see Boncompagni (2016, 175).

describing forms of life and language games together as they both constitute the *given* which the description applies to. It is, I believe, in this light that we should read some remarks we find in the *Philosophical Investigations* and, with some variations, in the *Remarks on the Philosophy of Psychology*. Concerning forms of life as the given of analysis, the remark of *Investigations Part II*: "What has to be accepted, the given, is – one might say – *forms of life*" (PPF, §345) is clarified by being read alongside the following text from *Remarks on the Philosophy of Psychology Part I*:

> Instead of the unanalysable, specific, undefinable: the fact that we act in such-and-such ways, e.g. *punish* certain actions, *establish* the state of affair thus and so, *give orders*, render accounts, describe colours, take an interest in other feelings. What has to be accepted, the given – it might be said – are facts of living. (RPP, I §630)[10]

Here Wittgenstein invites us to switch from a certain conception of the given to another: from the given conceived as what is 'specific', 'undefinable', 'unanalysable' to the given conceived as forms of life or facts of living. This should be clarified. We could imagine that forms of life, conceived as the given, are to inherit the properties usually attached to the entities a philosophical theory assumes as given: properties such as metaphysical simplicity and absolute impenetrability to analysis (e.g., these were some of the properties of *Tractatus* objects). However, with forms of life this is not the case: that punishing certain actions, or describing colours are "the given that has to be accepted" does not mean that they are limits, physical or metaphysical, our attitude towards which can only be one of acquiescence. It only means that *within a certain kind of inquiry* they play the role of irreducible elements which circumscribe the domain of inquiry. As we know, anthropological contexts are particularly singled out, in that observing and describing them contributes to clarifying the

meaning of certain expressions of language. Concerning language games, Wittgenstein puts forth similar claims: like forms of life, language games are what is specific,[11] what is primary, something we just have to take account of (PI, §655) or that has to be accepted (PPF, §161). According to him, only by looking at language games in this light can we resist the temptation to *explain* them from non-grammatical perspectives. Not that doing so would be impossible or forbidden. E.g., we might provide evolutionary explanations of our language games (in terms of their adaptive value), or we might explain them "by means of our experiences [*Erlebnisse*]", as Wittgenstein critically remarks (PI, §655). In so doing, however, we would altogether miss the sense-conferring role of language games that is, instead, highlighted by taking them as primary. When he claims that the given we have to accept are forms of life, or that we should look at language games as something primary, Wittgenstein is both expressing his antireductionist worries and putting forth a radically *sui generis* notion of the given. Antireductionism goes hand in hand with the rejection of any conception of philosophical inquiry as modeled upon scientific inquiry; more generally, Wittgenstein's antireductionism rejects any explanation of something in terms of something else, any reduction of an *explanandum* to an *explanans* as relevant to philosophy. The presentation of the state of our language – which aims to show how we get entangled in our own rules – draws no benefit from switching from one level of reality to another, for problems of meaning that involve terms at one level show up again, unchanged, as involving terms and concepts at the other level. The word 'cube' means the picture of a cube, but how is the picture to be interpreted, what does it *mean*? (Cf. PI, §139). The word 'no' stands for a certain nod of our head, but what does that gesture mean? Does it mean 'no'? (Cf. PG, I §5 and PG, IV §46).

Concerning the *sui generis* notion of given, or the

---

[10] In a footnote, we find 'forms of life'(*Lebensformen*) as a variant.

[11] For an analysis of Wittgenstein's notion of 'specific' as meaning 'undefinable' or 'unanalyzable', see Schulte (1993, 50-52).

given *tout court*, let me stress again that its being regarded as on a par with what is conceived as undefinable, specific, and unanalysable does not by itself make it purely and simply given, the way we tend to say that the data of perception, or of consciousness are pure and simple. As the given we have to accept is constituted by forms of life and language games, its ingredients are both facts of nature and facts that, with language, have become nature for us (or in other words, both first and second nature come into it). It involves both immediate natural reactions and linguistic habits, where the latter, though acquired, are so deeply embedded in the texture of our experience that they have come to possess the same immediacy as the former. As I remarked earlier, the philosopher is mostly interested in the latter component – linguistic habits – as they bring in the normative dimension of rules, which does not reduce to facts of extralinguistic nature, whether physical or mental.

As pointed out by Boncompagni (2016), Wittgenstein's interest in forms of life motivated Goodman's (2002) likening of William James's empiricism to Wittgenstein's naturalism. Boncompagni challenges such parallelism by emphasizing – as I do – that for Wittgenstein references to natural facts include "not only biological characteristics of human life, but also cultural and historical facts", so that "the core of his investigations is not what exists, but the grammar of concepts." For this reason, she insists, "Wittgenstein's approach is not only far from empiricism, but also from naturalism (unless one categorizes the latter in a very peculiar way)" (2016, 255-257). My suggestion at this point is that, having interpreted forms of life as anthropological contexts – natural as well as cultural – and having identified such contexts with the given to which grammatical investigations apply, we are licensed to categorize Wittgenstein's anthropologism as a kind of naturalism, namely as naturalism extending to second nature. Though the core of Wittgenstein's investigations is the grammar of concepts, and though the methods such investigations employ are not those of science, the

given to which the investigations apply does not transcend nature.

Let me conclude by a qualification concerning the notion of experience that is involved in the notion of a linguistic (and conceptual) habit that has become nature for us. In particular, I would like to focus on the irreducibility of the normative not just to facts of nature but to the mental realm as well, where 'mental realm' is understood in a wide sense, including not only thoughts and concepts but also the psychological experiences that could be associated with them. As is well known, here one of Wittgenstein's targets were William James's views concerning our psychological life as presented in the *Principles of Psychology* [henceforth PP]. Wittgenstein did appreciate James's insistence on bodily processes being an essential ingredient of what we mean by an emotion (such as sadness).[12] What he rejected in James was what he saw as conceptual psychologism, i.e. the reduction of conceptual content to sensations, or emotions, or experiences.[13] Nor would he have countenanced the psychological "sense of sameness" on which such reduction is grounded (see PP I, 459-60). Sameness, for Wittgenstein, is an inherently normative notion: "The use of the word 'rule' and the use of the word 'same' are interwoven" (PI §225). Contrary to what James appears to be taking for granted (as in PP I, 459), application of the notion of sameness is not (and cannot be) reduced to experiencing a sense of sameness, or to a portion of the mental stream "knowing" that it means the same as another portion:

---

[12] Such appreciation is apparent in the *Brown Book*, p.103. On Wittgenstein's reading of James on emotions see Schulte (1995, 249-250), among others.

[13] He may have had in mind texts like the following: "New conceptions come from new sensations, new movements, new emotions, new associations, new acts of attention, and new comparisons of old conceptions, and in no other ways." (PP I, 467) – "Conceptions...translate the process of our perceptual experience, which is naturally a flux, into a set of stagnant and petrified terms." (PP I, 467-8).

"Before I judge that two images which I have are the same, surely I must recognize them as the same". And when that has happened, how am I to know that the word "same" describes what I recognize? Only if I can express my recognition in some other way, and if it is possible for someone else to teach me that "same" is the *correct* word here. (PI §378, it. added)

More generally, as stated in a remark I already quoted,

The point is not to explain a language-game by means of our experiences, but to take account of a language-game (PI, §655).

Wittgenstein is here trying to describe and clarify what is going on when we use such words as 'intention', 'memory', or when we use a phrase such as 'reporting a desire or an intention we experienced in the past.' Even in such a context he rules out that bringing in an experience (*Erlebnis*) conceived as something separate from, and independent of any language game may help us to carry out our analytic task. In fact, according to Wittgenstein even this kind of experiences – the *Erlebnisse* - are linguistically articulated and have their life and their meaning in the language games they belong to:

The concept of experience (*Der Begriff des Erlebnisses*): Like that of happening, of process, of state, of something, of fact, of description and of report. Here we think we are standing on the hard bedrock, deeper than any special methods and language-games. But these extremely general terms have an extremely blurred meaning. They relate in practice to innumerable special cases, but that does not make them any *solider*; no, rather it makes them more fluid. (RPP, I §648)

Speaking of *Erlebnis* or experience does not bring us in touch with some rock-solid ultimate foundation, concerning which agreement is universal. On the contrary, in Wittgenstein's view, what we are faced with is the use of a word, and a pretty vague use at that. Hence, the kind of philosophical work he recommends here will once more consist of looking at a large number of special cases: at the different language games where the word occurs, with meanings that, though related with one another, may still differ in each case, depending on the practices and forms of life with which the several uses are intertwined.

A question naturally arises here, and Wittgenstein himself is the first to ask it:

But weren't there all these appearances – of pain, of wishing, of intention, of memory, etc., before there was any language? (RPP, I §165)

Or again:

"So if someone has not learned a language, is he unable to have certain memories?" Of course – he cannot have linguistic memories, linguistic wishes or fears, and so on. And memories and suchlike in language are not mere threadbare representations of the *real* experiences; for is what is linguistic not an experience? (PI, §649)

For Wittgenstein, language as a characteristic feature of human life, hence of human experience, does not leave the other domains of such experience unaltered, in two distinct ways: first, it is in language that they take their shape, their physiognomy; secondly, it is in language that they are expressed – we speak of them in language. This is why in philosophy it is impossible – better, it doesn't make sense – to try and keep distinct (e.g.) experience *proper* (say, of a memory) from its verbal articulation within a language game (the one it is "at home" in). Consequently, philosophical inquiry into experience is itself bound to be concerned with the meanings of words we use to describe experience and talk about experiences.

Bibliography

Andronico, Marilena. 1998. *Antropologia e metodo morfologico*. *Studio su Wittgenstein*. Napoli: La Città del Sole.

Boncompagni, Anna. 2015. "Elucidating Forms of Life. The Evolution of a Philosophical Tool." *Nordic Wittgenstein Review*. 4 (Special Issue October):155-175.

Boncompagni, Anna. 2016. *Wittgenstein and Pragmatism*. *On Certainty in the Light of Peirce and James*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Conway, Gertrude. 1989. *Wittgenstein on Foundations*. Amherst. NY: Humanity Books.

Dreon, Roberta. 2016. "Understanding Rules as Habits. Developing a pragmatist anthropological approach." *Paradigmi*. *Rivista di critica filosofica*. 34 (3):103-117.

Goodman, Russell B. 2002. *Wittgenstein and William James*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

James, William. 1950. *The Principles of Psychology* (1890), 2 vols., New York: Dover Publications, Inc.

Kripke, Saul. 1982. *Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

McDowell, John. 1996. *Mind and World*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Moyal-Sharrock, Danièle. 2007. *Understanding Wittgenstein's* On Certainty. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moyal-Sharrock, Danièle. 2015. "Wittgenstein on Forms of Life, Patterns of Life, and Ways of Living." *Nordic Wittgenstein Review*. 4 (Special Issue October): 21-42.

Schulte, Joachim. 1993. *Experience and Expression*. *Wittgenstein's Philosophy of Psychology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Schulte, Joachim. 1995. "Emotion: Remarks on Wittgenstein and William James". In *Wittgenstein*: *Mind and Language*, edited by Rosaria Egidi, 249-262. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1958. *The Blue and Brown Books*. Oxford: Blackwell. [BB]

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1961. *On Certainty*. Oxford: Blackwell. [OC]

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1974. *Philosophical Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell. [PG]

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1978. *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics*. Oxford: Blackwell. [RFM]

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1980. *Remarks on the Philosophy of Psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell. [RPP]

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1981. *Zettel*. Oxford: Blackwell. [Z]

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 2009. *Philosophical Investigations*. (*Part I*) Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. [PI]

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 2009. *Philosophy of Psychology - A Fragment.* (*Part II* of *Philosophical Investigations*). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. [PPF]