

GROVER MAXWELL

The Ontological Status of Theoretical Entities

That anyone today should seriously contend that the entities referred to by scientific theories are only convenient fictions, or that talk about such entities is translatable without remainder into talk about sense contents or everyday physical objects, or that such talk should be regarded as belonging to a mere calculating device and, thus, without cognitive content—such contentions strike me as so incongruous with the scientific and rational attitude and practice that I feel this paper *should* turn out to be a demolition of straw men. But the instrumentalist views of outstanding physicists such as Bohr and Heisenberg are too well known to be cited,* and in a recent book of great competence, Professor Ernest Nagel concludes that “the opposition between [the realist and the instrumentalist] views [of theories] is a conflict over preferred modes of speech” and “the question as to which of them is the ‘correct position’ has only terminological interest.”¹ The phoenix, it seems, will not be laid to rest.

The literature on the subject is, of course, voluminous, and a comprehensive treatment of the problem is far beyond the scope of one essay.

FROM Herbert Feigl and Grover Maxwell, eds., *Scientific Explanation, Space, and Time*, vol. 3, *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1962), 3–15.

* Niels Bohr and Werner Heisenberg, along with Max Born and other pioneers of quantum physics in the 1920s, were proponents of the so-called Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics, which remains the orthodox textbook account to this day. Its elements include Bohr’s doctrine of complementarity, the insistence that the wave function contains a complete description of reality, and a profound reluctance to say anything about the properties of quantum systems when they are not being observed or measured. As Maxwell says, Bohr and Heisenberg were instrumentalists (though opinions are sharply divided over what, exactly, Bohr’s position was), and their views had a considerable influence on the development of logical positivism and logical empiricism. For a good account of Heisenberg’s version of the Copenhagen interpretation, see Werner Heisenberg, *Physics and Philosophy* (New York: Harper and Row, 1958).

I shall limit myself to a small number of constructive arguments (for a radically realistic interpretation of theories) and to a critical examination of some of the more crucial assumptions (sometimes tacit, sometimes explicit) that seem to have generated most of the problems in this area.²

■ | The Problem

Although this essay is not comprehensive, it aspires to be fairly self-contained. Let me, therefore, give a pseudohistorical introduction to the problem with a piece of science fiction (or fictional science).

In the days before the advent of microscopes, there lived a Pasteur-like scientist whom, following the usual custom, I shall call Jones. Reflecting on the fact that certain diseases seemed to be transmitted from one person to another by means of bodily contact or by contact with articles handled previously by an afflicted person, Jones began to speculate about the mechanism of the transmission. As a “heuristic crutch,” he recalled that there is an obvious *observable* mechanism for transmission of certain afflictions (such as body lice), and he postulated that all, or most, infectious diseases were spread in a similar manner but that in most cases the corresponding “bugs” were too small to be seen and, possibly, that some of them lived inside the bodies of their hosts. Jones proceeded to develop his theory and to examine its testable consequences. Some of these seemed to be of great importance for preventing the spread of disease.

After years of struggle with incredulous recalcitrance, Jones managed to get some of his preventative measures adopted. Contact with or proximity to diseased persons was avoided when possible, and articles which they handled were “disinfected” (a word coined by Jones) either by means of high temperatures or by treating them with certain toxic preparations which Jones termed “disinfectants.” The results were spectacular: within ten years the death rate had declined 40 per cent. Jones and his theory received their well-deserved recognition.

However, the “crobes” (the theoretical term coined by Jones to refer to the disease-producing organisms) aroused considerable anxiety among many of the philosophers and philosophically inclined scientists of the day. The expression of this anxiety usually began something like this: “In order to account for the facts, Jones must assume that his crobes are too small to be seen. Thus the very postulates of his theory preclude their being observed; they are *unobservable in principle*.” (Recall that no one had envisaged such a thing as a microscope.) This common prefatory remark was then followed by a number of different “analyses” and “interpretations” of Jones’ theory. According to one of these, the tiny organisms were merely convenient fictions—*façons de parler*—extremely useful as heuristic devices for facilitating (in the “context of discovery”) the thinking

of scientists but not to be taken seriously in the sphere of cognitive knowledge (in the "context of justification"). A closely related view was that Jones' theory was merely an instrument, useful for organizing observation statements and (thus) for producing desired results, and that, therefore, it made no more sense to ask what was the nature of the entities to which it referred than it did to ask what was the nature of the entities to which a hammer or any other tool referred.³ "Yes," a philosopher might have said, "Jones' theoretical expressions are just meaningless sounds or marks on paper which, when correlated with observation sentences by appropriate syntactical rules, enable us to predict successfully and otherwise organize data in a convenient fashion." These philosophers called themselves "instrumentalists."

According to another view (which, however, soon became unfashionable), although expressions containing Jones' theoretical terms were genuine sentences, they were translatable without remainder into a set (perhaps infinite) of observation sentences. For example, "There are crobes of disease X on this article" was said to translate into something like this: 'If a person handles this article without taking certain precautions, he will (probably) contract disease X; and if this article is first raised to a high temperature, then if a person handles it at any time afterward, before it comes into contact with another person with disease X, he will (probably) not contract disease X; and . . .'

Now virtually all who held any of the views so far noted granted, even insisted, that theories played a useful and legitimate role in the scientific enterprise. Their concern was the elimination of "pseudo problems" which might arise, say, when one began wondering about the "reality of supraempirical entities," etc. However, there was also a school of thought, founded by a psychologist named Pelter, which differed in an interesting manner from such positions as these. Its members held that while Jones' crobes might very well exist and enjoy "full-blown reality," they should not be the concern of medical research at all. They insisted that if Jones had employed the correct methodology, he would have discovered, even sooner and with much less effort, all of the observation laws relating to disease contraction, transmission, etc. without introducing superfluous links (the crobes) into the causal chain.

Now, lest any reader find himself waxing impatient, let me hasten to emphasize that this crude parody is not intended to convince anyone, or even to cast serious doubt upon sophisticated varieties of any of the reductionistic positions caricatured (some of them not too severely, I would contend) above. I am well aware that there are theoretical entities and theoretical entities, some of whose conceptual and theoretical statuses differ in important respects from Jones' crobes. (I shall discuss some of these later.) Allow me, then, to bring the Jonesean prelude to our examination of observability to a hasty conclusion.

Now Jones had the good fortune to live to see the invention of the

compound microscope. His crobes were "observed" in great detail, and it became possible to identify the specific kind of *microbe* (for so they began to be called) which was responsible for each different disease. Some philosophers freely admitted error and were converted to realist positions concerning theories. Others resorted to subjective idealism or to a thoroughgoing phenomenalism, of which there were two principal varieties. According to one, the one "legitimate" observation language had for its descriptive terms only those which referred to sense data. The other maintained the stronger thesis that *all* "factual" statements were *translatable* without remainder into the sense-datum language. In either case, any two non-sense data (e.g., a theoretical entity and what would ordinarily be called an "observable physical object") had virtually the same status. Others contrived means of modifying their views much less drastically. One group maintained that Jones' crobes actually never had been unobservable in principle, for, they said, the theory did not imply the impossibility of finding a means (e.g., the microscope) of observing them. A more radical contention was that the crobes were not observed at all; it was argued that what was seen by means of the microscope was just a shadow or an image rather than a corporeal organism.

■ | The Observational-Theoretical Dichotomy

Let us turn from these fictional philosophical positions and consider some of the actual ones to which they roughly correspond. Taking the last one first, it is interesting to note the following passage from Bergmann: "But it is only fair to point out that if this . . . methodological and terminological analysis [for the thesis that there are no atoms] . . . is strictly adhered to, even stars and microscopic objects are not physical things in a literal sense, but merely by courtesy of language and pictorial imagination. This might seem awkward. But when I look through a microscope, all I see is a patch of color which creeps through the field like a shadow over a wall. And a shadow, though real, is certainly not a physical thing."⁴

I should like to point out that it is also the case that if this analysis is strictly adhered to, we cannot observe physical things through opera glasses, or even through ordinary spectacles, and one begins to wonder about the status of what we see through an ordinary windowpane. And what about distortions due to temperature gradients—however small and, thus, always present—in the ambient air? It really does "seem awkward" to say that when people who wear glasses describe what they see they are talking about shadows, while those who employ unaided vision talk about physical things—or that when we look through a windowpane, we can only *infer* that it is raining, while if we raise the window, we may "observe directly" that it is. The point I am making is that there is, in principle, a

continuous series beginning with looking through a vacuum and containing these as members: looking through a windowpane, looking through glasses, looking through binoculars, looking through a low-power microscope, looking through a high-power microscope, etc., in the order given. The important consequence is that, so far, we are left without criteria which would enable us to draw a nonarbitrary line between "observation" and "theory." Certainly, we will often find it convenient to draw such a to-some-extent-arbitrary line; but its position will vary widely from context to context. (For example, if we are determining the resolving characteristics of a certain microscope, we would certainly draw the line beyond ordinary spectacles, probably beyond simple magnifying glasses, and possibly beyond another microscope with a lower power of resolution.) But what ontological ice does a mere methodologically convenient observational-theoretical dichotomy cut? Does an entity attain physical thinghood and/or "real existence" in one context only to lose it in another? Or, we may ask, recalling the continuity from observable to unobservable, is what is seen through spectacles a "little bit less real" or does it "exist to a slightly less extent" than what is observed by unaided vision?

However, it might be argued that things seen through spectacles and binoculars look like ordinary physical objects, while those seen through microscopes and telescopes look like shadows and patches of light. I can only reply that this does not seem to me to be the case, particularly when looking at the moon, or even Saturn, through a telescope or when looking at a small, though "directly observable," physical object through a low-power microscope. Thus, again, a continuity appears.

"But," it might be objected, "theory tells us that what we see by means of a microscope is a real image, which is certainly distinct from the object on the stage." Now first of all, it should be remarked that it seems odd that one who is espousing an austere empiricism which requires a sharp observational-language/theoretical-language distinction (and one in which the former language has a privileged status) should need a theory in order to tell him what is observable. But, letting this pass, what is to prevent us from saying that we still observe the object on the stage, even though a "real image" may be involved? Otherwise, we shall be strongly tempted by phenomenalistic demons, and at this point we are considering a physical-object observation language rather than a sense-datum one. (Compare the traditional puzzles: Do I see one physical object or two when I punch my eyeball? Does one object split into two? Or do I see one object and one image? Etc.)

Another argument for the continuous transition from the observable to the unobservable (theoretical) may be adduced from theoretical considerations themselves. For example, contemporary valency theory tells us that there is a virtually continuous transition from very small molecules (such as those of hydrogen) through "medium-sized" ones (such as those of the fatty acids, polypeptides, proteins, and viruses) to extremely large

ones (such as crystals of the salts, diamonds, and lumps of polymeric plastic). The molecules in the last-mentioned group are macro, "directly observable" physical objects but are, nevertheless, genuine, single molecules; on the other hand, those in the first-mentioned group have the same perplexing properties as subatomic particles (de Broglie waves, Heisenberg indeterminacy, etc.). Are we to say that a large protein molecule (e.g., a virus) which can be "seen" only with an electron microscope is a little less real or exists to somewhat less an extent than does a molecule of a polymer which can be seen with an optical microscope? And does a hydrogen molecule partake of only an infinitesimal portion of existence or reality? Although there certainly is a continuous transition from observability to unobservability, any talk of such a continuity from full-blown existence to nonexistence is, clearly, nonsense.

Let us now consider the next to last modified position which was adopted by our fictional philosophers. According to them, it is only those entities which are *in principle* impossible to observe that present special problems. What kind of impossibility is meant here? Without going into a detailed discussion of the various types of impossibility, about which there is abundant literature with which the reader is no doubt familiar, I shall assume what usually seems to be granted by most philosophers who talk of entities which are unobservable in principle—i.e., that the theory(s) itself (coupled with a physiological theory of perception, I would add) entails that such entities are unobservable.

We should immediately note that if this analysis of the notion of unobservability (and, hence, of observability) is accepted, then its use as a means of delimiting the observation language seems to be precluded for those philosophers who regard theoretical expressions as elements of a calculating device—as meaningless strings of symbols. For suppose they wished to determine whether or not 'electron' was a theoretical term. First, they must see whether the theory entails the sentence 'Electrons are unobservable.' So far, so good, for their calculating devices are said to be able to select genuine sentences, provided they contain no theoretical terms. But what about the selected "sentence" itself? Suppose that 'electron' is an observation term. It follows that the expression is a genuine sentence and asserts that electrons are unobservable. But this entails that 'electron' is *not* an observation term. Thus if 'electron' is an observation term, then it is *not* an observation term. Therefore it is not an observation term. But then it follows that 'Electrons are unobservable' is not a genuine sentence and does not assert that electrons are unobservable, since it is a meaningless string of marks and does not assert anything whatever. Of course, it could be stipulated that when a theory "selects" a meaningless expression of the form 'Xs are unobservable,' then 'X' is to be taken as a theoretical term. But this seems rather arbitrary.

But, assuming that well-formed theoretical expressions are genuine sentences, what shall we say about unobservability in principle? I shall

begin by putting my head on the block and argue that the present-day status of, say, electrons is in many ways similar to that of Jones' probes before microscopes were invented. I am well aware of the numerous theoretical arguments for the impossibility of observing electrons. But suppose new entities are discovered which interact with electrons in such a mild manner that if an electron is, say, in an eigenstate of position, then, in certain circumstances, the interaction does not disturb it. Suppose also that a drug is discovered which vastly alters the human perceptual apparatus—perhaps even activates latent capacities so that a new sense modality emerges. Finally, suppose that in our altered state we are able to perceive (not necessarily visually) by means of these new entities in a manner roughly analogous to that by which we now see by means of photons. To make this a little more plausible, suppose that the energy eigenstates of the electrons in some of the compounds present in the relevant perceptual organ are such that even the weak interaction with the new entities alters them and also that the cross sections, relative to the new entities, of the electrons and other particles of the gases of the air are so small that the chance of any interaction here is negligible. Then we might be able to “observe directly” the position and possibly the approximate diameter and other properties of some electrons. It would follow, of course, that quantum theory would have to be altered in some respects, since the new entities do not conform to all its principles. But however improbable this may be, it does not, I maintain, involve any logical or conceptual absurdity. Furthermore, the modification necessary for the inclusion of the new entities would not necessarily change the meaning of the term ‘electron.’⁶

Consider a somewhat less fantastic example, and one which does not involve any change in physical theory. Suppose a human mutant is born who is able to “observe” ultraviolet radiation, or even X rays, in the same way we “observe” visible light.

Now I think that it is extremely improbable that we will ever observe electrons directly (i.e., that it will ever be reasonable to assert that we have so observed them). But this is neither here nor there; it is not the purpose of this essay to predict the future development of scientific theories, and, hence, it is not its business to decide what actually is observable or what will become observable (in the more or less intuitive sense of ‘observable’ with which we are now working). After all, we are operating, here, under the assumption that it is theory, and thus science itself, which tells us what is or is not, in this sense, observable (the ‘in principle’ seems to have become superfluous). And this is the heart of the matter; for it follows that, at least for this sense of ‘observable,’ there are no a priori or philosophical criteria for separating the observable from the unobservable. By trying to show that we can talk about the *possibility* of observing electrons without committing logical or conceptual blunders, I have been trying to

support the thesis that any (nonlogical) term is a *possible* candidate for an observation term.

There is another line which may be taken in regard to delimitation of the observation language. According to it, the proper term with which to work is not ‘observable’ but, rather ‘observed.’ There immediately comes to mind the tradition beginning with Locke and Hume (No idea without a preceding impression!), running through Logical Atomism and the Principle of Acquaintance, and ending (perhaps) in contemporary positivism.* Since the numerous facets of this tradition have been extensively examined and criticized in the literature, I shall limit myself here to a few summary remarks.

Again, let us consider at this point only observation languages which contain ordinary physical-object terms (along with observation predicates, etc., of course). Now, according to this view, all descriptive terms of the observation language must refer to that which has been observed. How is this to be interpreted? Not too narrowly, presumably, otherwise each language user would have a different observation language. The name of my Aunt Mamie, of California, whom I have never seen, would not be in my observation language, nor would ‘snow’ be an observation term for many Floridians. One could, of course, set off the observation language by means of this awkward restriction, but then, obviously, not being the referent of an observation term would have no bearing on the ontological status of Aunt Mamie or that of snow.

Perhaps it is intended that the referents of observation terms must be members of a *kind* some of whose members have been observed or instances of a *property* some of whose instances have been observed. But there are familiar difficulties here. For example, given any entity, we can always find a kind whose only member is the entity in question; and surely expressions such as ‘men over 14 feet tall’ should be counted as observational even though no instances of the “property” of being a man over 14 feet tall have been observed. It would seem that this approach must soon fall back upon some notion of simples or determinables vs. determinates. But is it thereby saved? If it is held that only those terms which

* Logical atomism is the doctrine held by Bertrand Russell and Ludwig Wittgenstein in the early decades of the twentieth century, although both later abandoned it. Logical atomism holds that all meaningful propositions of any degree of complexity are truth-functional compounds of atomic propositions. Atomic propositions have no truth-functional structure and refer directly to nonlinguistic atomic facts. Russell’s principle of acquaintance asserts that every proposition we can understand must be composed entirely of elements with which we are acquainted, where acquaintance is the immediate and infallible apprehension of an object. By identifying atomic facts with sense data, the logical positivists argued that acquaintance with them is necessary both for understanding what propositions mean and for having any empirical knowledge.

refer to observed simples or observed determinates are observation terms, we need only remind ourselves of such instances as Hume's notorious missing shade of blue.* And if it is contended that in order to be an observation term an expression must at least refer to an observed determinable, then we can always find such a determinable which is broad enough in scope to embrace any entity whatever. But even if these difficulties can be circumvented, we see (as we knew all along) that this approach leads inevitably into phenomenalism, which is a view with which we have not been concerning ourselves.

Now it is not the purpose of this essay to give a detailed critique of phenomenalism. For the most part, I simply assume that it is untenable, at least in any of its translatability varieties.⁷ However, if there are any unreconstructed phenomenologists among the readers, my purpose, insofar as they are concerned, will have been largely achieved if they will grant what I suppose most of them would stoutly maintain anyway, i.e., that theoretical entities are no worse off than so-called observable physical objects.

Nevertheless, a few considerations concerning phenomenalism and related matters may cast some light upon the observational-theoretical dichotomy and, perhaps, upon the nature of the "observation language." As a preface, allow me some overdue remarks on the latter. Although I have contended that the line between the observable and the unobservable is diffuse, that it shifts from one scientific problem to another, and that it is constantly being pushed toward the "unobservable" end of the spectrum as we develop better means of observation—better instruments—it would, nevertheless, be fatuous to minimize the importance of the observation base, for it is absolutely necessary as a confirmation base for statements which do refer to entities which are unobservable at a given time. But we should take as its basis and its unit not the "observational term" but, rather, the quickly decidable sentence. (I am indebted to Feyerabend, *loc. cit.*, for this terminology.) A quickly decidable sentence (in the technical sense employed here) may be defined as a singular, nonanalytic sentence such that a reliable, reasonably sophisticated language user can very quickly decide⁸ whether to assert it or deny it when he is reporting on an occurrent situation. 'Observation term' may now be defined as a 'descriptive (non-logical) term which may occur in a quickly decidable sentence,' and 'observation sentence' as a 'sentence whose only descriptive terms are observation terms.'

Returning to phenomenalism, let me emphasize that I am not among

* Hume allowed that we can form the idea of a particular shade of blue even though we have never seen it by filling in the gap (so to speak) between the shades of blue that we have perceived. This apparently contradicts Hume's empiricist principle that every simple idea is copied from a preceding simple impression. See David Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Section II.

those philosophers who hold that there are no such things as sense contents (even sense data), nor do I believe that they play no important role in our perception of "reality." But the fact remains that the referents of most (not all) of the statements of the linguistic framework used in everyday life and in science are *not* sense contents but, rather, physical objects and other publicly observable entities. Except for pains, odors, "inner states," etc., *we do not usually observe sense contents*; and although there is good reason to believe that they play an indispensable role in observation, *we are usually not aware of them when we* (visually or tactilely) *observe physical objects*. For example, when I observe a distorted, obliquely reflected image in a mirror, I may seem to be seeing a baby elephant standing on its head; later I discover it is an image of Uncle Charles taking a nap with his mouth open and his hand in a peculiar position. Or, passing my neighbor's home at a high rate of speed, I observe that he is washing a car. If asked to report these observations I could quickly and easily report a baby elephant and a washing of a car; I probably would not, without subsequent observations, be able to report what colors, shapes, etc. (i.e., what sense data) were involved.

Two questions naturally arise at this point. How is it that we can (sometimes) quickly decide the truth or falsity of a pertinent observation sentence? and, What role do sense contents play in the appropriate tokening of such sentences? The heart of the matter is that these are primarily scientific-theoretical questions rather than "purely logical," "purely conceptual," or "purely epistemological." If theoretical physics, psychology, neurophysiology, etc., were sufficiently advanced, we could give satisfactory answers to these questions, using, in all likelihood, the physical-thing language as our observation language and *treating sensations, sense contents, sense data, and "inner states" as theoretical* (yes, theoretical!) *entities*.⁹

It is interesting and important to note that, even before we give completely satisfactory answers to the two questions considered above, we can, with due effort and reflection, train ourselves to "observe directly" what were once theoretical entities—the sense contents (color sensations, etc.)—involved in our perception of physical things. As has been pointed out before, we can also come to observe other kinds of entities which were once theoretical. Those which most readily come to mind involve the use of instruments as aids to observation. Indeed, using our painfully acquired theoretical knowledge of the world, we come to see that we "directly observe" many kinds of so-called theoretical things. After listening to a dull speech while sitting on a hard bench, we begin to become poignantly aware of the presence of a considerably strong gravitational field, and as Professor Feyerabend is fond of pointing out, if we were carrying a heavy suitcase in a changing gravitational field, we could observe the changes of the $G_{\mu\nu}$ of the metric tensor.

I conclude that our drawing of the observational-theoretical line at

any given point is an accident and a function of our physiological makeup, our current state of knowledge, and the instruments we happen to have available and, therefore, that it has no ontological significance whatever. . . .

Notes

1. E. Nagel, *The Structure of Science* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1961), Ch. 6.
2. For the genesis and part of the content of some of the ideas expressed herein, I am indebted to a number of sources; some of the more influential are H. Feigl, "Existential Hypotheses," *Philosophy of Science*, 17:35-62 (1950); P. K. Feyerabend, "An Attempt at a Realistic Interpretation of Experience," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 58:144-170 (1958); N. R. Hanson, *Patterns of Discovery* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958); E. Nagel, *loc. cit.*; Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (London: Hutchinson, 1959); M. Scriven, "Definitions, Explanations, and Theories," in *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, Vol. II, H. Feigl, M. Scriven, and G. Maxwell, eds. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958); Wilfrid Sellars, "Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind," in *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, Vol. I, H. Feigl and M. Scriven, eds. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956), and "The Language of Theories," in *Current Issues in the Philosophy of Science*, H. Feigl and G. Maxwell, eds. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961).
3. I have borrowed the hammer analogy from E. Nagel, "Science and [Feigl's] Semantic Realism," *Philosophy of Science*, 17:174-181 (1950), but it should be pointed out that Professor Nagel makes it clear that he does not necessarily subscribe to the view which he is explaining.
4. G. Bergmann, "Outline of an Empiricist Philosophy of Physics," *American Journal of Physics*, 11:248-258; 335-342 (1943), reprinted in *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*, H. Feigl and M. Brodbeck, eds. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953), pp. 262-287.
5. I am not attributing to Professor Bergmann the absurd views suggested by these questions. He seems to take a sense-datum language as his observation language (the base of what he called "the empirical hierarchy"), and, in some ways, such a position is more difficult to refute than one which purports to take an "observable physical-object" view. However, I believe that demolishing the straw men with which I am now dealing amounts to desirable preliminary "therapy." Some non-realist interpretations of theories which embody the presupposition that the observable-theoretical distinction is sharp and ontologically crucial seem to me to entail positions which correspond to such straw men rather closely.
6. For arguments that it is possible to alter a theory without altering the meanings of its terms, see my "Meaning Postulates in Scientific Theories," in *Current Issues in the Philosophy of Science*, Feigl and Maxwell, eds.

7. The reader is no doubt familiar with the abundant literature concerned with this issue. See, for example, Sellars' "Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind," which also contains references to other pertinent works.
8. We may say "noninferentially" decide, provided this is interpreted liberally enough to avoid starting the entire controversy about observability all over again.
9. Cf. Sellars, "Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind." As Professor Sellars points out, this is the crux of the "other-minds" problem. Sensations and inner states (relative to an intersubjective observation language, I would add) are theoretical entities (and they "really exist") and *not* merely actual and/or possible behavior. Surely it is the unwillingness to countenance theoretical entities—the hope that every sentence is translatable not only into some observation language but into the physical-thing language—which is responsible for the "logical behaviorism" of the neo-Wittgensteinians.