



Research Paper

The limits of thought in the work of Schopenhauer and Wittgenstein

Alfredo Olmos Hernández

College of Bachelors of the State of Hidalgo, Mexico

Reyna Romyna Olmos Hernández

College of Bachelors of the State of Hidalgo, Mexico

Corresponding Author: Alfredo Olmos Hernández

ABSTRACT: *In this paper we will philosophically analyze the idea that the human being has the ability to imagine anything, so we seek to answer the questions: is thought infinite? Can a human being really think anything? In order to answer these questions, an analysis of the ideas of Arthur Schopenhauer and Ludwig Wittgenstein will be carried out.*

KEYWORDS: *Thought, Popper's worlds, language, representation*

Received 03 July, 2022; Revised 13 July, 2022; Accepted 15 July, 2022 © The author(s) 2022.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. INTRODUCTION

The human being has started from the idea that he has the ability to imagine anything, that thought has no limits, the same imagination has been seen as something that allows the person to explore the subatomic world, the confines of the universe, the unconscious world, etc. That is why it has been taken for granted that man actually has the ability to think anything.

This certainty has been embodied in the great philosophical systems, which have started from analyzing whether what we observe is true (Empirism), whether reason is the only one that can show us reality (Rationalism), whether both are needed (Idealism of Kant) or analyze the development of an idea, starting from its origin as a perception, its development, culminating in self-awareness where an idea manages to develop the concept of an idea (Hegel's Idealism) these and other philosophical systems have focused in the fact of answer the question: Is what we perceive real? And in all of them the idea has been taken for granted that the mind has sufficient capacity to create by itself an artificial world that could seem real to us, thus deceiving our perception.

And it is precisely this idea that we want to analyze at this time. Is our mind really capable of completely creating reality, such as to deceive our senses? Can the human being think anything? In order to answer this, the thought of Arthur Schopenhauer and Ludwig Wittgenstein will be analyzed.

These two thinkers have been chosen because in their work they proceed to analyze the limits of representation, for Schopenhauer every man takes the limits of his own field of vision for the limits of the world, while Wittgenstein establishes the premise that limits of my language are the limits of my world.

Both thinkers share the fact that their theories mark limits with respect to their own world. A world that corresponds to the subjective ideas of each individual; that is why, from the analysis of the theories of the limits of the world in these two thinkers, it is possible to determine the limits of thought. And answer the questions Can the human being thinks an original idea? Is there a limit to what a person can think? And if so, what is this limit?

So we seek to answer some questions such as: if people with outstanding intelligence are born in less favored communities, why don't they develop outstanding original ideas?

II. METAPHYSICS OF THE THREE WORLDS OF POPPER

In order to begin with the analysis of the theories that mark the limits of the world of representation of the individual, it is necessary to address the metaphysics of Popper's three worlds.

Karl Popper establishes the existence of the three worlds that are interrelated with each other, from the union and relationship of these is how human freedom arises. The three worlds are:

- World 1, material world: consists of what is captured by the senses, are the objects, states and physical processes; stones, water, plants, animals, etc.
- World 2, subjective immaterial: consists of the individual's psychic states and processes, such as desires, memories, beliefs, dreams, etc.
- World 3, objective immaterial: it is a product of thought and manifests itself in a social and cultural way, through myths, theories, norms, etc.

These three worlds are in relationship and mutual dependence because world 1 is perceived by world 2, while world 2 acts on world 1. World 2 produces world 3, while world 3 is caught by world 2. And world 1 refutes world 3, while world 3 describes and predicts world 1. [2], [7] and [8]

Once these three worlds have been identified, it remains to be determined in which of these three thought is produced, this being the world 2. Therefore, in order to identify the limits of thought (if they exist) it is necessary to observe world 2.

The psychic states and processes of the individual are what could be defined as thought, so from this moment on world 2 will be considered as the set of thoughts of the subject. From what follows that the limits of world 2, are the limits of thought.

III. THE LIMITS OF THE WORLD IN SCHOPENHAUER'S WORK

Arthur Schopenhauer in his book *the world as a will and representation* takes up the philosophy of Kant who had distinguished between what we perceive through the senses (phenomenon) and the things themselves (noumenon)

Schopenhauer begins his work with the sentence "The world is my representation" from which he deduces that all phenomena are objects for a subject, perception is representation. We only know the phenomena that are the product of our representation.

Schopenhauer does not regard the phenomenon and the noumenon as distinct entities, but as the same world experienced differently. Being the best way to show it with our bodies, which are manifested in two ways: as objects (representation) and from within (will) in this way he interprets the phenomenon as representation and the noumenon as a universal will of which the individual is only a part.

From this he concludes that the subject's vision is limited by the individual observations he can make of the vast universe (representation) and his contact with the universal will, of which the individual will is only a small part. Therefore the worldview of the human being does not include things he has not perceived, nor will that universal he has not experienced. Every man confuses the limits of his own field of vision with the limits of the world. [4], [6] and [9]

Analyzing Schopenhauer's work, for the purposes of this article, it is necessary to reinterpret his theory in terms of Popper's three worlds. The objects that are perceived by the senses (representation) are the world 1. Whereas that which cannot be grasped by the senses (will) in terms of Popper's worlds can be analyzed as world 3. Finally the individual worldview corresponds to world 2.

So the vision of the human being (world 2) is limited to the contact that the subject has had with things (world 1) and the universal will that he has experienced (world 3) since it has been observed that world 2 is the set of thoughts of the individual. It can be observed that thought is limited to the contact that the person has had with the objective and material immaterial worlds.

IV. THE LIMITS OF THE WORLD IN WITTGENSTEIN

Ludwig Wittgenstein in his book *Tractatus logico-philosophicus* takes up the theory of the representation of Schopenhauer through his pictorial theory of meaning, which starts from the isomorphism that exists between language and the world; to each thing corresponds a name, and to each atomic fact, an atomic proposition.

For the first Wittgenstein language is composed of propositions about the things of the world that can be true or false. While the world is the totality of facts, being the combination or connection of things. In this way the propositions are figures of facts and any proposition that does not figure facts is a proposition that does not make sense, so the language is limited to statements of facts about the world. Hence the sentence "The limits of my language are the limits of my world"

This first Wittgenstein limits language to statements about the world and focuses solely on formal language, while the second Wittgenstein takes into consideration the study of common language through his

theory of language games. In which the meaning of words is defined in the way in which it is used, "The meaning of a word is its use in language".

With this theory Wittgenstein gives many uses to language, abandons his idea that it only serves as a representation of the world and gives a new meaning to words. [1], [3] and [5]

To analyze the work of Wittgenstein in relation to the establishment of the limits of thought, we will start from the work of the stages of his work, to equate it with the theory of the three worlds of Popper.

The first Wittgenstein establishes an isomorphism between the material world and language, therefore explains an isomorphism between world 1 and language, by declaring that the limits of my language are the limits of my world, explains to us that the individual can only formulate prayers about the material things with which he has had contact.

This is restricting the ability of language, for a person is able to think of non-existent beings such as unicorns, centaurs, etc. And he is also able to make propositions about these insistent things in the material world. So the relationship between world 1 and language is not isomorphism, but is actually a monomorphism because anything in the material world can be associated with a word and any fact an atomic proposition. But not every word of language can be associated with a thing of the world.

To avoid restricting language and preserving the pictorial theory of language, it is necessary to establish an isomorphism between world 2 and language, associating each individual idea with a word and each set of ideas with a proposition. In this way the subject has the ability to express everything he thinks and convert everything he receives from his environment by language into thought.

Establishing this isomorphism is of vital importance because with this, the subject picks up elements from world 1 and world 3 to be able to make prayers regarding what things he has perceived. So taking up the sentence "the limits of my language are the limits of my world" it must be that the limit of language, is the limit of thought, so the person is only able to think, what he is able to say.

V. THE LIMITS OF THE THOUGHT

It has been suggested that from establishing an isomorphism between thought and language, it is possible to determine the limits of thought, from the limits of language. Similarly it has been seen that the thought of the individual corresponds to the world 2 of Popper, so that the thought perceives the material world and captures the objective immaterial world.

Likewise a correspondence of Schopenhauer's representation with world 1 and will with the world has been established 3. So thought is formed from the contact that the individual has with the things of the material world and with the absolute concepts of the world objective immaterial.

Thought occurs when the individual perceives a material thing or an absolute concept, hence he can think of things that do not exist in the real world. Each idea can be assigned a word in language, so the subject can only think what he can express in his language. Thought is limited by the language it uses, as well as by the experiences (whether material things or absolute concepts) with which the person has been in contact.

Thus if we analyze Russell's expression of "the king of France is nail" in world 1 and world 3 has no meaning, because in France there is no king, nevertheless the person who enunciates this prayer can think about this and give meaning to the phrase. The individual is thinking something that does not exist in the material world. The reason I can think about this, is because it has the absolute concepts of king, France, bald. Since the person has these ideas is able to create a new idea from the combination of other ideas from world 1 or world 3.

So the original ideas arise from the combination of ideas from world 1 or world 3. For a person to come up with an original idea must be in contact with material things, which generate ideas of things (phenomenon) or perceiving absolute concepts that your social group has accepted (good, bad, beautiful, ugly, etc.) so that with these ideas he can develop your own ideas that find their meaning from their relationship with previous ideas.

It follows that thought has the same limits as language, and these are limited by the material things or absolute concepts that the subject has perceived. Returning to the original questions of can the human being know anything? The answer is negative, the human being can only think about things related to his previous experiences. A person who has not had access to a basic education cannot think of the moons of Jupiter, binary stars, bacteria, etc. He can only think of this, if he has had contact either by world 1 or world 3.

While the reason that in ancient times could be thought of non-existent things likes a centaur, it is because who first imagined it already had the idea of man and horse coming from the world 1.

The original questions are answered in a negative way, by establishing that thought has a limit, and this is the experiences of the subject. From this is easily deduced the sentences of Schopenhauer and Wittgenstein from the limits of the world.

VI. CONCLUSION

By way of conclusion we have that unfortunately the thought is not infinite, but it possesses a limit, which are the experiences that the person has had (the material things he has perceived through the senses, or the absolute concepts that have been transmitted to him through language) so the more experiences the person has, the more variety his thinking will have. The more isolated he is from the world, the less his thought.

Similarly, we observing the correspondence of language with thought, it can be deduced that limiting the use of language limits the thought of the person.

In future research it is proposed to formally demonstrate the existing correspondence between thought and language, to give a definition of the world 2 of Popper with the concept of the thought, to analyze the thought in the development of a conversation, studying how thought is transmitted through language, as well as giving a formal structure to language.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Steel, J. J. (1999). Wittgenstein, the ostensive definition and limits of language. *Theorem: International Journal of Philosophy*, 5-17.
- [2]. Burbano, J. P. S. (2019). Metaphysical theory of Popper's three worlds. *Episteme. Journal of Socioterritorial Studies*, 11(2).
- [3]. Hadot, P. (2007). Wittgenstein and the limits of language. *Lingua*, 2, 70.
- [4]. Ordóñez García, D. (1996). Baroja and Schopenhauer: narrative implications of the world as representation. *Annals of Spanish Literature*, N. 12 (1996); pp. 139-159.
- [5]. Pérez, M. L. B. (2005). An approach to some perspectives on the limits of language (Wittgenstein, Gadamer, Lévi-Strauss and Foucault). *Contributions from Coatepec*, (8), 11-24.
- [6]. Planells Puchades, J. (1988). Representation and expression in the philosophy of Schopenhauer:(on the meaning of the phenomenon and the thing itself).
- [7]. Pradenas, A. (1998). Why Not World 4? Moebio tape. *Journal of Epistemology of Social Sciences*, (3).
- [8]. Ríos, I. B. (2015). The function and scope of the Theory of the Three Worlds in Popperian philosophy. *Hermeneutics Intercultural*, 151-181.
- [9]. Schopenhauer, A. (2013). The world as will and representation II: complements. *The world as will and representation II*, 0-0.