

Table of Contents

NOTE BY THE EDITORS	5
<i>Martin Gustafsson, Lars Hertzberg, Yrsa Neuman</i>	
INVITED PAPER	
Wittgenstein and What Can Only Be True	9
<i>Cora Diamond</i>	
ARTICLES	
Surveyable Representations, the "Lecture on Ethics", and Moral Philosophy	41
<i>Benjamin De Mesel</i>	
Gordon Baker, Wittgensteinian Philosophical Conceptions and Perspicuous Representation: the Possibility of Multidimensional Logical Descriptions	71
<i>Oskari Kuusela</i>	
Wittgenstein and Hacker: Übersichtliche Darstellung	99
<i>Beth Savickey</i>	
Being Humans When We Are Animals	125
<i>Pär Segerdahl</i>	
INTERVIEW	
Wittgenstein's Philosophy of Mathematics: Felix Mühlhölzer in Conversation with Sebastian Grève	151
FROM THE ARCHIVES	
Wittgenstein and World War I: some additional online sources	181
<i>Alfred Schmidt</i>	
BOOK REVIEWS	
A Champion for Ordinary Language Philosophy – <i>When Words Are Called For</i> by Avner Baz	187
<i>Don S. Levi</i>	
Rectifying Misconceptions of Wittgenstein and Phillips – <i>Contemplating Religious Forms of Life</i> by Mikel Burley	191
<i>Hugo Strandberg</i>	

Note by the Editors

The third volume of *Nordic Wittgenstein Review* closes with this issue. The first year of two issues has shown that there are plenty of good articles out there wanting to be published, and that there is even more of them than there is room for in this journal, at least while our print policy sets limits. As with our previous three issues, this one exceeds our planned number of pages.

We thank our authors for their work and for their benign collaboration, and all those reviewers who have contributed hours of their expertise in support of this journal.

A fact which journal owners must take into account is that publications are becoming more and more important for the career of researchers. This means that it is not enough for a journal to publish papers, but these need to be made visible in different ways: indexed but also subject to bibliometric measurement (to improve possibilities for tenure in parts of the world where such measures are applied in advancement processes). NWR is still a very young journal, but aims at becoming a journal which also takes these kinds of needs of the authors into consideration. Indeed one of the central motivations for starting up this journal was to provide a venue for Wittgenstein researchers in which their papers would be sure to be reviewed by actual peers: scholars who know Wittgenstein and can give the submitted papers a fair judgment.

The community service involved in keeping up academic communication channels is rewarding. It provides a fantastic vantage point to receive and process the papers behind the scenes and to come into contact with the authors and their ideas. And while trying to find and match reviewers to these papers, to discover all of that expertise to be found out there, in more or less surprising combinations within a single researcher or within a research environment.

While it is the most exciting viewpoint imaginable, at other times the editing work done by academic peers when it comes to both journals and book series feels as underpaid or unpaid as it is, as a

bureaucratic hobby, a task stealing time from all the other things one should be doing. When authors feel pressured to get their publications out in print, the editors are the target of their demands. When reviewers are stressed and lose their temper, the editors have to choose either to communicate the unnecessarily mean message on to the author and make the journal contact an unpleasant one, or carry out the questionable task of cleaning up the review. Without these tasks, having to reply to impatient inquiries about the publication or review schedule (available on the website), and to handle spiteful reactions to other researchers' work, the editing work would be all the more pleasurable. Fortunately, the unpleasant instances are few and far between, but we nevertheless encourage the community to be patient with us and our editing colleagues.

The peer review system applied by NWR is double-blind, combined with a Preprint Open Review procedure. It was devised and audited within the EU-funded research project Agora - Scholarly Open Access Research in European Philosophy (2011-14). This two-stage peer review system has aroused much interest in publishing circles and outside of them: it is very popular with the authors. The additional Preprint Open Review takes more time for the editors to administer than a traditional double-blind peer review but it seems that its merits by far outweigh the extra hours it demands. Not only do the peer review procedures need to be administered, but for a quality journal they need to be administered well. During our years with this journal we have carried out many discussions about how the procedure is handled in the best and fairest way for both the authors and the community and we have learnt very much. We hope that other journal editors, despite pressured schedules, will also find themselves in a situation in which their peers and colleagues take the time to remember, discuss and implement the values which should be at the forefront in academic publishing. A fair quality peer review procedure is not accomplished and upheld automatically.

The crucial part is that played by the reviewers. During NWR's few years of existence, almost two hundred reviews have been provided by scholars who care about their research community.

These reviews take time to write and the reading too takes time. Not all papers are ready enough to be all pleasure to read. We hope that the reviewers find participating in this process rewarding, that they sometimes receive a paper which inspires them, or that they see how they can help an anonymous author who is struggling and perhaps does not get all the help he or she needs in her own environment.

Our reviewers are top quality researchers. However, the reviewing task is not always straightforward, and therefore, we have tried to help them use their time wisely by providing guidelines for the review. Still, there is a limit to how much guidance one can give. We have discussed whether more specified forms would help, but the editorial board have agreed that prose needs to be at least allowed although in this form, the review statements do not always become the most constructive, nor communicative to the author and the editors for the further process. We are continually trying to improve our processes, so please do not hesitate to discuss them with us.

We thank Professor Emeritus Lars Hertzberg (Åbo Akademi University) for his year as an editor of the journal and invite him to reflect on this past year with NWR:

One striking discovery arising from this comparatively short experience concerns the great diversity that obtains within the world of what can, in one sense or another, be called Wittgensteinian philosophy. First of all this concerns areas of interest: on the one hand, there is exegesis of Wittgenstein's writings, on the other hand, there are critical investigations purporting to try out Wittgensteinian approaches to issues not directly addressed in his work; among the contributions submitted on the exegetical side, furthermore, there are studies emphasizing the early, middle or late work, or encompassing the whole. This having been said, it should be pointed out that wanting to distinguish between exegesis and critical work is like trying to draw a line in water: the task of figuring out what a great philosopher may have meant is inextricably intertwined (though not, of course, identical) with the effort to form one's own conception of what is a meaningful way of doing philosophy.

Again, even among those who work around a given set of questions in a Wittgensteinian tradition, opinions seem to diverge to quite a surprising degree. It has not been uncommon for one and the same

contribution to receive ratings almost at the opposite ends of the scale. This may, of course, induce headaches in the editors who have to reach decisions concerning publication; from a wider perspective, however, these divergent approaches can only be considered a sign of vitality. Even while seeming to follow in Wittgenstein's footsteps you may find yourself moving in all sorts of different directions. At the very least these experiences belie the accusation, sometimes heard, that Wittgensteinian philosophers constitute a tightly knit clan walking in step to His Master's drumbeat.

The editors for Vol. 4 (2015) will be Martin Gustafsson (Åbo Akademi University) and Anne-Marie Søndergaard Christensen (University of Southern Denmark), with Yrsa Neuman (Åbo Akademi University) as the editor-in-chief.

Åbo/Turku, Finland,
December 2014

Martin Gustafsson, Lars Hertzberg, Yrsa Neuman

- *The Nordic Wittgenstein Review*
www.nordicwittgensteinreview.com
- *The Nordic Wittgenstein Society*
www.nordicwittgensteinsociety.org
- *Agora – Scholarly Open Access Research in European Philosophy (2011-14)*
www.agora-project.org