



GAUHATI UNIVERSITY
Institute of Distance and Open Learning

B.A. First Semester
(Regular Course)

Paper: PHI-RC-1016

General Philosophy
(Medium: English)

GAUHATI UNIVERSITY
Institute of Distance and Open Learning

UG-PHI-I-01

B.A. First Semester
(Regular Course)

PHILOSOPHY

Paper: PHI-RC-1016
GENERAL PHILOSOPHY
(Medium- English)



Contents:

- Unit 1: Definition, Nature and Scope of Philosophy; Branches of Philosophy; Relation of Philosophy with Science and Religion**
- Unit 2: Substance, Causality, Freewill; Theories of Universal: Nominalism, Conceptualism, Realism**
- Unit 3: Problem of knowledge: Empiricism, Rationalism, Criticism, Idealism, Realism**
- Unit 4: Relation of God and the World: Deism, Pantheism, Panentheism, Proofs for Existence of God: Ontological, Cosmological**
- Unit 5: Theories of Truth: Correspondence, Coherence, Pragmatic. Mind-Body Problem: Interactionism, Parallelism, Pre-Established Harmony**

Contributors:

Dr. Banajit Sharma Dept. of Philosophy, Bongaigaon College	Unit- 1
Dr. Ramala Sarma Dept. of Philosophy, Nowgong College	Unit- 2
Dr. Padmadhar Choudhury Dept. of Philosophy, Gauhati University	Unit- 3
Dr. Mausumi Bhattacharjya Dept. of Philosophy, Gauhati University	Unit- 4
Dr. Nabanita Barua Dept. of Philosophy, Gauhati University	Unit- 5

Course Coordination:

Prof. Amit Choudhury	Director, IDOL, Gauhati University
Dr. Shakuntala Bora	Associate Prof., Dept. of Philosophy, G.U.

Content Editor:

Dr. Urmimala Hazarika (Unit: 1)	Dept. of Philosophy, Pandu College
Dr. Pranati Devi (Unit: 2)	Dept. of Philosophy, B. Barooah College
Dr. Maina Sarma (Unit: 3)	Dept. of Philosophy, B. Barooah College
Dr. Sucharita Dey (Unit: 4)	Dept. of Philosophy, B. Barooah College
Dr. Madhuchanda Chaliha (Unit: 5)	Dept. of Philosophy, Handique Girls' college

Language Editor:

Mrs. Jahnabi Nath (Unit: 1)	Dept. of English, PDUAM, Behali
Mr. Uttam Boruah (Unit: 2)	Dept. of English, PDUAM, Behali

Cover Page Designing:

Bhaskar Jyoti Goswami	IDOL, Gauhati University
-----------------------	--------------------------

ISBN: 978-81-942689-1-8

October, 2019

© Copyright by IDOL, Gauhati University. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise. Published on behalf of Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University by the Director, and printed at Gauhati University Press, Guwahati-781014.

Unit 1

DEFINITION, NATURE AND SCOPE OF PHILOSOPHY; BRANCHES OF PHILOSOPHY; RELATION OF PHILOSOPHY WITH SCIENCE AND RELIGION

Contents:

- 1.0 Introduction**
- 1.1 Objectives**
- 1.2 Definition of Philosophy**
- 1.3 Nature and Scope of Philosophy**
- 1.4 Branches of Philosophy**
 - 1.4.1 Epistemology**
 - 1.4.2 Metaphysics**
 - 1.4.3 Axiology**
- 1.5 Philosophy and Science**
 - 1.5.1 Relationship between Philosophy and Science**
- 1.6 Philosophy and Religion**
- 1.7 Summing Up**
- 1.8 Model Questions**
- 1.9 References & Suggested Readings**

1.0 Introduction:

Philosophy is generally regarded as the most perplexing and abstract subject. Therefore, it is not an easy task to define philosophy and give a unanimous characterization to satisfy everyone. Normally it is believed that philosophy is not something of common people's interest. Common belief is that philosophical discussion is restricted to a creamy academic segment. The underlying truth is that, one may be or may not be aware of one's philosophical position, but nearly everyone has some philosophical views. And to be precise, a philosophical view is nothing but one's world view regarding life and the universe.

It is a sustained effort of man as the rational being to attain a clear and consistent conception of the world system and his relation to both the- seen and the unseen world. Philosophy is a result of this sustained effort. Philosophy has been defined variously by different philosophers. At the same time, its scope has been analyzed differently by different thinkers.

Therefore, it is not an easy task to explicate an all-persuasive scope and limitation of philosophy. But more or less, three branches of philosophy can be taken for consideration to cover any sort of philosophical discussion. To have an introductory understanding of the nature of philosophy, one is to comprehend its relationship with science and religion.

1.1 Objectives:

This unit is an introductory unit for the learners of philosophy. In this unit attempt is made to make the students get acquainted with the basic concepts of—

- what is philosophy
- what are the branches of philosophy
- how is philosophy related to its branches
- how is philosophy related to science
- how is philosophy related to religion

1.2 Definition of Philosophy:

The word '*philosophy*' is derived from two Greek words- '*philos*' and '*sophia*'. The Greek words '*Philos*' means '*love*' and '*sophia*' means '*wisdom*'. As such, the word '*philosophy*' literally means '*love of wisdom*'. Philosophy seeks to arrive at wisdom. For attaining wisdom, philosophical investigation constructs and depends on rational argument. It should be mentioned here that there is an important distinction between knowledge and wisdom. The word *wisdom* has a deeper meaning than knowledge which we ordinarily use in day to day life. Knowledge is defined as the acquisition of data and information. Knowledge means the fact of knowing about something; general understanding or familiarity with a subject, place, situation etc. Wisdom is defined as the practical application and use of knowledge to create value. It is an intangible quality gained through our experiences in life. Socrates, the Greek philosopher said that one cannot be wise but can be a lover of wisdom.

In the pre-Socratic period, Pythagoras, for the first time used the word "*philosopher*" which etymologically stands for 'a lover of wisdom'. Therefore, instead of saying someone as wise, the word *philosopher* should

be preferred to refer to *a seeker of wisdom*. Philosophers clarify concepts and analyze and test propositions and beliefs, but their major task is to analyze and construct arguments. According to Socrates, “the unexamined life is not worth living.” A philosopher examines the various aspects of life and the world as a whole. For some, the scientific interest is dominant, for some the religious, for others the moral, and for still others, the esthetic interests are supreme. Philosophers are men with different experiences, who possess different sorts of knowledge. They react differently to the abstract arguments and results of the special sciences. In other words, a philosopher leaves no aspect of life untouched by his inquiry.

Philosophy is the comprehensive study of the nature of life and the universe. It aims at a clear, critical and comprehensive conception of reality. It is the wide-ranging view of life and the universe as a whole. It is a set of views or beliefs about life and the universe, which are often held uncritically. Philosophy, therefore, has two functions: Interpretation and Evaluation. Philosophy interprets the various facets of our life and the world as a whole and evaluates it from diverse perspectives. Philosophical problems are eternal problems. These problems are eternal not because they cannot be solved. These problems are eternal in the sense that all ages have their own interpretation regarding the nature of life and the universe.

Stop to Consider

The etymological meaning of philosophy is ‘love of wisdom’. Knowledge and wisdom are not same. The etymological meaning is not sufficient to know the meaning of the term philosophy. As such, philosophy has been defined differently by different philosophers down the ages. Philosophy is not a fragmented study of any particular aspect like other discipline. It is a comprehensive study of life and the world.

1.3 Nature and Scope of Philosophy:

Philosophical reasoning is closely allied with scientific reasoning, in that both build hypotheses and look for evidence to test those hypotheses with the hope of coming closer to the truth. However, scientific experiments take place in laboratories and have testing procedures through which to record objective or empirically verifiable results. The laboratory of the philosopher is the domain of ideas. It takes place in the mind, where imaginative thought

experiments occur. It takes place in the study room, where ideas are written down and examined. It also takes place wherever conversation or debate about the perennial questions arises, where thesis and counter example and counter-thesis are considered.

Philosophy is a comprehensive attempt to assess and interpret the eternal problems of life and the world by scientific and rational synthesis. Philosophy begins with wonder at the phenomena and mysteries of the world. It pursues a rational investigation of those phenomena and mysteries. It is a rational attempt to look at the world as a whole. It seeks to combine the conclusions of the various sciences and human experience into some kind of consistent world view. It is not a particular analysis of something but the world view of reality. Nature of philosophy can be understood from the following points:

1. It is an attempt to find some way out to solve the problems of life and the world. From time immemorial man has been seeking answers to questions like what is life, from where does it originate, what is death, where are we going to, what happens to a man after death, how does life get bonded with body or matter and how is the world related to these problems etc. It is not an easy task to get the answer to these questions. Yet, philosophy seeks to find the answers to these.
2. Philosophical interpretations and assessments are not dogmatic. They are purely rational and based on reason. A philosopher is to give sufficient logical justification for admitting as well as rejecting a view. He cannot choose anything arbitrarily. Rational thinking of any sort has two functions- evaluation and interpretation. Philosophy, therefore, seeks to evaluate and interpret life and the universe.

Self Asking Question:

Which nature of philosophical study attracts you the most? (Give your answer in 50 words.)

.....
.....
.....

3. Philosophy is the synthetic knowledge of various sciences. Scientific knowledge is a partial and fragmented knowledge. When all the

fragments of scientific knowledge are united, then philosophical knowledge takes its own shape. Scientific knowledge is theorized to reach the conclusion of our philosophical enquiry. C. D. Broad has rightly said in this context, *Its object is to take over the results of the various sciences, to add to them the results of the religious and ethical experiences of mankind, and then to reflect upon the whole. The hope is that, by this means, we may be able to reach some general conclusions as to the nature of the universe, and as to our position and prospects in it.*

4. Philosophical knowledge is a comprehensive knowledge. It is not the knowledge of a particular object. It is the world view to know the nature of particular as well as the nature of the whole.
5. Philosophy is a second order activity. It is not concerned with a thing how it appears to be or by what way one knows it. In contrast, it is the study to know what lies behind. Philosophy is not about things but about the thinking of things.

Philosophy is the experience of asking such grand questions about life, about what we know, about what we ought to do or believe in. It is the process of getting to the bottom of things, asking those basic questions about ideas that, most of the time we simply take for granted, never think of questioning, and probably never put into words. Dr. Caird remarks in his "Philosophy of Religion", *There is no province of human experience, there is nothing in the whole realm of reality, which lies beyond the domain of philosophy, or to which philosophical investigation does not extend.*

Philosophy is the free activity of critical thought, and is applicable to any problem which thought can raise. Therefore, the scope of philosophy covers everything that can be included in the sphere of thinking. It covers religion, society, culture etc. It covers mind and matter, self and God, space and time, as well as the second order studies of biotic and abiotic communities, environment and man's relation to it. It studies natural sciences in context of the thought generated by the studies. Every individual discipline, therefore, has a philosophical thought. It covers the phenomenal as well as the noumenal world. Most importantly, under the scope of philosophical studies there are three main branches. In the following section there is a brief outline of these branches and their relationship with philosophy.

Stop to Consider

The scope of philosophy is very broad. It is an attempt to find some way out to solve the problems of life and the world. This attempt is not made dogmatically. In contrast, it is the free activity of critical thought, and is applicable to any problem which individually or socially can be grasped. No aspect of human thought is left aside in a philosophical discussion. It covers both the noumenal world and the phenomenal world. It is the synthetic knowledge of various sciences.

1.4 Branches of Philosophy:

Philosophy consists of three branches:

- (1) Epistemology,
- (2) Metaphysics, and
- (3) Axiology.

Epistemology is the theory of knowledge. Ontology or Metaphysics is the theory of Being or Reality. Axiology is the theory of values. Moreover, the scope of philosophy covers society, religion and other areas of thinking. In this section a brief introduction of the three main branches of philosophy are explained:

1.4.1 Epistemology:

Epistemology is the scientific study of knowledge: its nature, its requirements, and its limitations. The word 'Epistemology' is derived from two Greek words 'episteme' (knowledge) and 'logos' (science). Epistemology literally means 'the science of knowledge.' It is an enquiry into the nature, origin, validity and extent of knowledge.

Epistemology is concerned with the limits or scope of knowledge: What sort of knowledge can we obtain and what sort of knowledge we cannot. Epistemology is concerned with the sources of knowledge. Knowledge, in other words, can be said to be adequately explicated only in relation to its sources. The classical basic sources of knowledge are perception, memory, consciousness, and reason. These can be called the *basic sources* because these sources yield knowledge without positive dependence on the operation of some other source of knowledge. Epistemology is not concerned with

the function of knowledge. Some of the problems of epistemology are: What is knowledge? What are the sources of the origin of knowledge? What are the limits of knowledge? Is knowledge attainable at all? What is the relationship between the knower and the known? Is the knowledge of the knower possible? Can the object of knowledge be known? What is the process of knowledge? What is ignorance? What is reason? How is experience possible? What is truth? How does error occur? Etc.

Self Asking Question

Write 10 questions which you consider to be epistemological questions.

.....
.....
.....

Epistemology studies the varieties of knowledge. *A priori* and *a posteriori* are two of the original terms in epistemology. *A priori* literally means “from before”. *A posteriori* literally means “from what comes after”. Bertrand Russell, a British philosopher, draws a distinction between ‘Knowledge by Acquaintance’ and ‘Knowledge by Description’ in connection with the knowledge of things.

Epistemology is the entrance of philosophical enquiry. It is the basis or the preliminary phase of philosophy. Philosophy must justify itself regarding the possibility of its enquiry by epistemology. According to Dr. Caird, without a prior criticism of the organ of knowledge, it may be possible that in any given case, it may be entering on forbidden ground. The epistemological enquiry is necessary at the beginning of the philosophical enquiry. As it deals with the conditions, range and limits of genuine knowledge, it may be looked upon as the foundation on which the super-structure of philosophy has to be raised.

But one thing must be kept in mind that though epistemology is intimately related to philosophy, these two are not the same. There are certain differences between philosophy and epistemology. For example, philosophy is the comprehensive study of the nature of life and the universe. Epistemology is just a part of this comprehensive process. In comparison to the vastness of the study of a philosophy, the scope of epistemology is very restricted.

Secondly, the scope of philosophy covers both the phenomenal and the transcendental world. It comprises everything, including the visible world as well as the concepts like God, soul, space, time, value etc. On the other hand, epistemology is concerned with knowledge and all else related to the extent of knowledge.

Thirdly, philosophy, as it is mentioned earlier, performs two functions namely, interpretation and evaluation. Epistemology, on the other hand, is concerned merely with the phase of interpretation.

Finally, the difference between philosophy and epistemology is like the difference between part and whole. Epistemology is a branch of philosophy and both are related organically as limb of a body is related to the body.

Stop to Consider

Epistemology, the branch of philosophy that studies everything about knowledge, is considered as the entrance of any sort of philosophical discussion. Though there is a tendency on the part of some thinkers to define any sort of philosophical question in terms of epistemological question, the domain of philosophy is much larger than that of epistemology. There are certain philosophical schools, like phenomenology, that evolved in the last century that wish to solve philosophical problems without any sort of epistemological presupposition. But to be noted that epistemology is an indispensable part of philosophy.

1.4.2 Metaphysics:

Metaphysics is a systematic body of knowledge which is concerned with fundamental questions about the nature of noumena or of the ultimate reality. It means the study which aims at an understanding of the nature and relation of realities underlying phenomena. The word '*Metaphysics*' is derived from the two Greek words: '*meta*' (after) and '*physika*' (physics). Thus the literal meaning of the term metaphysics is "what comes after physics".

Metaphysics is study of the ultimate substance or reality. It seeks the highest or most ultimate causes, principles that are eternal and unchanging. According to Ted Honderich, "Metaphysics is the most abstract and in some views, 'high-falutin' part of philosophy, having to do with the

features of ultimate reality, what really exists and what it is that distinguishes that and makes it possible” (*The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, p. 590). It attempts *to tell the ultimate truth about the world*. It is a study that goes beyond the phenomenal world. It is to be clarified that metaphysics does not ignore concrete reality or the world that we experience in our day to day life. When it is said that it studies about the noumenal world, it means that metaphysics studies ‘being as such’ that involves looking at being in its specific instances or determinations. Metaphysics, as defined by Bradley, is *an attempt to know reality as against mere appearance, or the effort to comprehend the universe, not simply piecemeal or by fragments, but somehow as a whole*.

Metaphysics is also known as ‘*Ontology*.’ The term ‘*ontology*’ is derived from two Greek words: ‘*onto*’ (being) and ‘*logos*’ (discourse or science). Hence, ‘*ontology*’ means the ‘*Theory of Being*’ or ‘*the Science of Pure Being*’. It enquires into the nature of ‘reality’. Ontology is considered as the most vital part of philosophy. Some of the questions discussed here are as follows: What is the nature of reality? Whether reality is one or two or many? What is the nature of the matter as it is in itself? Does reality present in appearance? What is an absolute reality? What is God? What the soul? What are space, time and causality? What is substance? Is there any freedom or we are totally determined? Etc. Briefly speaking, metaphysical enquiry covers the philosophy of self, eschatology or the enquiry of what happens after death, cosmogony, cosmology and ontology.

Philosophy and metaphysics are intimately related. In the early Greek philosophy, metaphysics and philosophy were deemed to be the same and not differently seen from each other. There was a tendency to see basic philosophical problems as metaphysical problems. Metaphysical tendency lies in the fact that there lies the world that transcends sense experience. It is the study of reality or a principle that goes beyond what can be known by sense experience. In the history of philosophy, for the first time the term ‘metaphysics’ was associated with Aristotle, although discussion of metaphysical questions was found before him (for example, in the pre-Socratics and Plato). Aristotle described metaphysics what he himself called ‘first philosophy’ as a science of ‘being as being’ and as distinct from those sciences which study only a part of being. The rationalists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by contrast, expanded the scope of metaphysics. They took it to be concerned not merely with the existence and nature of God, but also with the distinction between mind and body, the immortality

of the soul, and freedom of the will. Kant, a prominent German philosopher, thought that there can be a legitimate kind of metaphysical knowledge. Its aim is to delineate the most general structures at work in our thought about the world. It is to be noted that philosophical problems are basically the problems of understanding life and the world. Philosophy is a deep study because of metaphysical problems is part of it.

Self Asking Question

You have come to know how epistemology is related to philosophy. You have also come to know how metaphysics is related to philosophy. On the basis of your understanding prepare a note on the relationship between epistemology and metaphysics. (Give your answer in 50 words.)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

But there are some important distinctions between the two. For instance, firstly, there is not a single realm which is not covered by the scope of philosophy. Philosophy is a comprehensive study of the entire universe. But metaphysics is just a part of this complete study.

Secondly, philosophical enquiry covers both the phenomenal as well as the transcendental world. But the study of metaphysics, as its name suggests, covers merely that study which is beyond the world of physics.

Thirdly, the knowing process culminates in philosophical knowledge. For philosophical knowledge, there are certain philosophical methods which are adopted in philosophy. It is a self-sustaining process. Metaphysics, on the other hand, has to depend on epistemology to solve its problem. It, by itself, cannot hold any enquiry independently.

Finally, the difference between philosophy and metaphysics, and the difference between philosophy and epistemology, is like the difference between part and whole. Metaphysics is a branch of philosophy and both are related organically as a limb of a body is related to the whole body.

Stop to Consider

Metaphysics is the study of the ultimate substance or reality. It seeks to know what lies behind the world of experience. To know the ultimate nature of thing it goes beyond our senses. As such, knowing about God, Spirit, Space, Time etc are some of the metaphysical topics. Of course, there are certain philosophical schools that are sceptic regarding the very possibility of metaphysical knowledge. For example, logical positivism is a school of thought that considers metaphysical judgements as meaningless. But metaphysical enquiry has its significance and stands as an integral part of philosophical discourse.

1.4.3 Axiology:

It has already been mentioned that philosophy performs two functions: firstly, the interpretation of life and the world and secondly, evaluation of it. The second function, that is, evaluation or determination of value is concerned with the branch of axiology. Axiology, therefore, is that branch of philosophy which studies the nature of value. Value is determined on the basis of some ideals. The ideals of life are the highest values. One gets self-realization and self-development through value.

‘Axiology’ is derived from the Greek word *axios*, which means *value* or *worth*. Values are understood as the proper objects of practical attitudes. What are the values which man should observe in life? Axiology seeks to find the answer to this question.

Axiology is, therefore, a study or science of value. It studies basically the nature, scope, source and kinds of value. It is concerned with three eternal values : truth, goodness and beauty. Correspondingly, it seeks to provide a theoretical account of the nature of values, respectively known as logical, ethical or aesthetic. As a matter of fact, axiology has three main divisions:

- a. Ethics
- b. Logic and
- c. Aesthetics

Ethics is the theory of value which deals with how one ought to live, with the idea of the “Good”, and with concepts such as “right” and “wrong.” It is the rational and critical examination of our thinking about the conduct of life.

Ethics and axiology are used synonymously in philosophical conversation. It is also known as moral philosophy that refers to the systematic effort to understand moral concepts and justify moral principles and theories. Specifically, “moral” comes from the Latin word *mores* and “ethical” from the Greek “*ethos*” referring to the study of conduct. Moral philosophy studies key ethical concepts like the nature of good, bad, right, wrong, moral, immoral, duty, obligation etc. It explores possible sources of moral obligation such as God, human reason, or the desire to be happy. It seeks to establish principles of right behaviour that may serve as action guides for individuals and groups.

Logic is a normative science. Truth is the ideal or norm of logical enquiry. Logic studies about the validity or invalidity of argument and their guiding methods and principles. The basic building block of logic is an argument. Philosophizing is seeking a proper argumentation. Proper argumentation helps one in proper evaluation.

Aesthetics is the philosophical study of art. It considers the problem of the nature of the work of art’s existence and that of the relation between aesthetics and moral value. It discusses the nature and criterion of beauty. It is not about factual information to be gained from things perceived. It is commonly held to be a style of perception which is concerned with the immediate qualities of the contemplative experiences.

Axiology is an indispensable part of philosophy. Along with interpreting life and world, evaluation is also equally important for the perfection of the cognitive process. Ethical theory clarifies relevant concepts, constructs and evaluates arguments, and guides us on how to live our lives. Ethics studies about the nature of the highest good. In such a situation, spirit, God, ultimate-reality etc. become intermixed and it becomes difficult to distinguish between ethical enquiry and philosophical enquiry. Both philosophy and axiology are entangled in such a way.

The study of ethics is important in philosophy for it helps one understand that human beings are rational. Moreover, some philosophers are of the view that moral thinking culminates and perfects in the belief of God, Spirit etc. Therefore, philosophy and axiology have an intimate relationship.

Stop to Consider

Axiology is related to evaluation and not with descriptive part of a state of affair. In the popular vocabulary, the word ethics is more used to mean axiology. It is a practical science because in our day to day affair we frequently use good or bad as a mark of the evaluation of the activities we perform. Practical ethics is a popular trend of thought in contemporary philosophical world.

1.5 Philosophy and Science:

Science is a systematic way to study the world in which we live. The word “science” comes to us from the Latin word *scire* which means “to know.” It is a systematic, well-organized and disciplined enquiry into some particular department or branch of the world, an attempt to understand the nature and operation of the phenomena of some special class.

For example: the subject called physics deals with a particular department. Likewise Chemistry, Botany, and Zoology – each of these departments deal with a particular branch. Thus, science is a study of a definite section or portion of the universe. A scientific enquiry may deal with the matter, life, mental phenomena etc. Correspondingly, we find various sciences. But philosophy, as it is mentioned earlier, deals with the whole world.

Science or scientific investigation possesses some characteristics. Say for example, science is a departmental knowledge. It is a particular subject matter of a field of knowledge considered apart from one another. The knowledge of science is certain. Science does not depend on any imaginary or fantasy world. Scientific knowledge is a disciplined and systematic knowledge. It is not the collection of some un-organized facts. It is well-organized knowledge. It deals with the phenomenal aspect of things. Phenomenal aspect of thing implies a thing as it appears to the human experience. It does not transcend the sensual world. Science is a proper knowledge of the phenomenal world. Science is based on observation and inductive reasoning. Therefore, scientific enquiry aims at discovering general truths regarding phenomena within its own scope. Scientific knowledge is verifiable. Without verification, an enquiry cannot be treated as scientific enquiry. Because of the empirical nature of science, it can be verifiable.

1.5.1 Relationship between Philosophy and Science:

Philosophy and sciences are closely connected. According to Weber, *the sciences without philosophy are an aggregate without unity, a body without a soul; philosophy without the sciences is a soul without a body, differing in nothing from poetry and its dreams.* The following points will give us a clear picture of the relationship between science and philosophy:

1. Each of science and philosophy supplies something that the other wants in order to be complete and satisfying as knowledge. Philosophy combines the results of all sciences and thereby explains the connections of the different departments of nature. In other words, philosophy synthesizes the postulates and conclusions of different sciences.
2. Both science and philosophy deal with the world of our experience. Both science and philosophy are based on the facts of common experience.
3. The foundation of both science and philosophy lies in experience. Both have their root in man's curiosity of the universe. Both science and philosophy apply the methods of induction and deduction and analysis and synthesis.
4. Both philosophical and scientific enquiries have the common requirements of labour, persistence and sincerity.
5. Moreover, both have the same aim of quenching the thirst of knowledge. Knowledge has also instrumental value. Both science and philosophy aim at fulfilling the aim of reaching knowledge for human welfare.

Self Asking Question

What is the difference between a philosopher and a scientist? Do you think that a scientist can be a philosopher? (Give your answer in 70-80 words.)

.....

.....

.....

.....

There is a group of thinkers who regard philosophy as fundamental unlike science. This group believe philosophy as to be an imaginative or esthetic insight, as is poetry or painting, or they believe that it is a different sort of intellectual procedure from the research which gives us the special science. There are certain differences between philosophy and science.

1. The scope of philosophy is much wider than the scope of science. There is not a single realm which is not covered by the scope of philosophy. Science is limited to some branches of the world of experience.
2. A particular science deals with a particular department of the world. Science, therefore, is only fragmentary and sectional knowledge. But philosophy gives a synoptic view of the universe. The conclusion of philosophical enquiry is complete and not partial.
3. Science is concerned with facts only. The knowledge of facts can never go beyond the sensible world. Philosophy, on the other hand, transcends the sensible world and enquires into the ultimate nature of reality.
4. According to Herbert Spencer, "*Knowledge of the lowest kind is un-unified knowledge; Science is partially-unified knowledge; Philosophy is completely-unified knowledge.*" Science, he argues, means merely the family of the Sciences—stands for nothing more than the sum of knowledge formed of their contributions. Philosophy is the fusion of these contributions into a whole; it is knowledge of the greatest generality.
5. Methods of science and philosophy are different. The method of science is to observe and describe the facts as they appear. The method of science is empirical with its inductive generalization from observed fact to the unobserved fact of the same class. But the method of philosophy is both empirical and speculative. Being speculative, philosophy enters behind the phenomenal world and goes to the basic reality.
6. Science treats facts purely from the objective point of view and as such interpretative. The subjective impact on interpreting a fact is overlooked. Philosophy, in contrast, considers the subjective view point as well to view the world. It interprets as well as evaluates.

Stop to Consider

Does philosophy contradict science? Does scientific knowledge oppose philosophical conclusion? The answer of both these two questions is “no”. Science does not mean laboratory work only. Similarly, philosophy is not just an armchair thinking. Though there are certain differences between the two, at the core of their existence, both science and philosophy get mixed and it simply becomes challenging for one who wants to dissect which one is science and which one is philosophy.

1.6 Philosophy and Religion:

The term religion is derived from the original Latin word *religare* meaning “to bind”. This derivative meaning traditionally makes a great sense because traditionally it was believed that religion deeply binds a society. Religion is based on the faith in the ultimate unity of man and God. In other words, it suggests the unification of two objects, the finite and the infinite. Religion is a state of mind that seeks to unite man, a finite creation with the Divine, or to an infinite considered as a state of perfection. Religion is taken in this sense as an attitude of awe towards God or some supernatural powers. The aim of religion is to achieve a particular relationship with the object of worship according to one’s faith.

Definition of religion is given in diverse ways. Galloway defines religion as “Man’s faith in a power beyond himself where he seeks to satisfy emotional needs and gains stability of life, and which he expresses in acts of worship and service.” This definition makes it clear that in religion there is a faith in a power beyond man. According to Paul Tillich, religion is “the state of being grasped by an ultimate concern, a concern which qualifies all other concerns as preliminary and a concern that in itself provides the answer to the question of the meaning of our existence”. Similarly, William James defines religion as “the feelings, acts, and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine”. This definition gives emphasis on the divine element in religion. Similar definition is offered by Martineau: “Religion is a belief in an Ever-living God, that is Divine Mind and Will ruling the universe and holding Moral relations with mankind.”

On the other hand, according to a section of thinkers, religion is the faith in conservation and realization of value. A moral code as defined by a particular

religion is usually believed to be essential to that religion's practice. But neither the practices nor principles of morality should be identified with religion. Sometimes God is considered as the highest value and realization of this value becomes the central motive of religion.

There is a close relationship between philosophy and religion. For example, epistemology and religion are inter-related. The study of religion may be done from a theological perspective or philosophical perspective. If it is done from a philosophical perspective, it needs epistemological support. The epistemological study of religion is an attempt to solve philosophical problems about knowledge which arise from religion. If one enquires about the possibility of mystical knowledge or knowledge by revelation or about the proof of the existence of God then one is to proceed through the epistemology of religion.

Philosophy is an enquiry to satisfy man's understanding, while religion seeks knowledge for the sake of understanding. The aim of philosophy is to construct a coherent synthesis of the governing principles of knowledge. Religion needs the method of philosophy in order to make an objective analysis of religious concepts to satisfy the human mind. There arises a branch of philosophy considering the relationship between philosophy and religion, namely, Philosophy of Religion. Philosophy of religion is "a philosophical discipline which reflects on issues arising in connection with religious beliefs and practices" (*The New Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought*, p. 745). Philosophy of religion is the second order activity of religious thinking since it does not directly involve with any specific religious belief. Still, it is to be noted that "Philosophers of religion may focus on the beliefs of a specific religion, but they will not proceed in their inquiries from the *assumption* that these beliefs are true, even though they may, in fact, accept them as a personal matter" (*Philosophy: The Power of Ideas*, p. 397)

The philosophy of any subject means careful reflection upon that subject. To be conscious of God is religion, to analyze that consciousness is the philosophy of religion. If there is a general philosophy of knowing, it includes religious knowledge as well as all other kinds. Indeed religion is as comprehensive as philosophy. For the religious consciousness in its true and complete form, nothing is irrelevant, nothing is without its own unique and individual value. Religion and philosophy alike are views of the whole universe.

No doubt this or that philosophy would conflict with this or that religion. The religion of first person is inconsistent with the philosophy of the second person. But the second person's own religion and his philosophy are fully consistent with one another; they are indeed identical. On the other hand, since religion, on its intellectual side, is a theory of the world as a whole, it is the same thing as philosophy; the ultimate questions of philosophy are those of religion too. In Indian philosophical system, there is hardly any difference between the aim of a philosopher and of a religious man. Both aim at moksha or liberation.

Though philosophy and religion are interrelated, there are some major differences between the two. Philosophy seeks to interpret the world. Religion seeks to do the conservation of values in the world. Philosophy is the comprehensive study of the universe and therefore it seeks to give a total picture of the world. Here, one can experience a detached and unemotional attitude towards everything. On the other hand, in religion, a man aims at having a personal relation with God. As such a religious attitude is filled with fear, hope, despair, faith etc.

Philosophical methods are mainly intellectual and its activities are basically reflective. Religious methods and activities, on the other hand, are emotional. Religious activities include prayer, worship, propitiation etc. which are emotional in nature.

Stop to Consider

No other branch of thought studies about the nature and origin of religion as philosophy do. Study of religion in philosophy is not the study of religious texts of Hinduism, Islam or Christianity. A student of philosophy needs to know about religion for, firstly, philosophy is all comprehensive and secondly, a critical mind of philosophical thinking can only properly seek the answer related to the existence of God, and on the basis of that man's position in the greater realm of things.

1.7 Summing Up:

It is a tough job to define philosophy. Philosophy is the comprehensive view of the life and the universe as a whole. It is a set of views or beliefs about life and the universe, which are often held uncritically. The

word '*philosophy*' literally means '*love of wisdom*'. Philosophy springs from many factors like wonder, doubt, curiosity and spiritual urge etc. Philosophy consists of three branches: Epistemology, Metaphysics, and Axiology. Epistemology is the study of knowledge. Metaphysics is the study of reality. Axiology is the study of value. Besides, the scope of philosophy covers many things including science, religion, society etc.

Science is a systematic, well-organized and disciplined enquiry into some particular department or branch of the world. Philosophy and the sciences are closely connected. Both science and philosophy deal with the world of our experience. Both science and philosophy are based on the facts of common experience. But the scope of philosophy is much wider than the scope of science. Unlike science, religion is based on the faith in the ultimate unity of man and God. Religion and philosophy alike are views of the whole universe. Philosophy seeks to interpret the world comprehensively. On the other hand, in religion, a man aims at having a personal relation with God. Philosophy of religion is the second order activity of religious thinking and studies religious beliefs critically.

1.8 Model Questions:

1. What is philosophy? Explain the nature and scope of philosophy.
2. What is metaphysics? How is it related to philosophy?
3. What is epistemology? Explain the relationship between philosophy and epistemology.
4. What is axiology? Explain the nature of axiology.
5. What are the branches of axiology? Explain each of them.
6. Is there any relationship between philosophy and science? Add your comment.
7. Distinguish between:
 - a. Philosophy and science
 - b. Philosophy and Religion
 - c. Epistemology and metaphysics
 - d. Philosophy and epistemology
 - e. Metaphysics and philosophy

8. Write short notes:
 - a. Epistemology
 - b. Metaphysics
 - c. Axiology
 - d. Religion
 - e. Philosophy and science

1.9 References & Suggested Readings:

1. Law, Stephen. 2007. *Eyewitness Companions Philosophy*. London: Dorling Kinderslay, Limited
2. Loux, Michael J. 1998. *Metaphysics: A Contemporary Introduction*. New York: Routledge
3. McGinn, Colin. 1993. *Problems in Philosophy: The Limits of Inquiry*, Oxford: Blackwell
4. Moore, Brook Noel and Kenneth Bruder. 2008. *Philosophy: The Poer of Ideas*. New York: MC Graw Hill
5. Osborne, Richard. 1992. *Philosophy for Beginners*. New Delhi: Orient Longman
6. Russell, Bertrand. 1959. *The Problems of Philosophy*. London: Oxford University Press.
7. Taylor, A. E. 1978. *Metaphysics*, London: Oxford University Press
8. Velasquez, Manuel. 2007. *Philosophy*, New Delhi: Cengage Learning

-----x-----

Unit 2
SUBSTANCE, CAUSALITY, FREEWILL; THEORIES
OF UNIVERSAL: NOMINALISM,
CONCEPTUALISM, REALISM

Contents:

- 2.0 Introduction**
- 2.1 Objectives**
- 2.2 Substance**
 - 2.2.1 Modern thinkers' views**
 - 2.2.2 Contemporary views**
- 2.3 Causality**
 - 2.3.1 Nature of cause and causal connection**
 - 2.3.2 Theories of causality**
- 2.4 Freewill**
 - 2.4.1 Determinism**
 - 2.4.2 Indeterminism**
 - 2.4.3 Self-determinism**
- 2.5 Nominalism**
 - 2.5.1 Western views**
 - 2.5.2 Indian views**
- 2.6 Conceptualism**
 - 2.6.1 Western views**
 - 2.6.2 Indian views**
- 2.7 Realism**
 - 2.7.1 Western views**
 - 2.7.2 Indian views**
- 2.8 Summing Up**
- 2.9 References and Suggested Readings**
- 2.10 Model Questions**
- 2.11 Answer to Check Your Progress**

2.0 Introduction:

Substance, causality, free will and universal are some of the important concepts of philosophy. These concepts are more complicated than they appear as they have been defined differently by different philosophers. Substance is associated with the problem of what exists, particularly, what

exists by itself underlying the changes that occur in things. Philosophers are of different answers to the question ‘what exists?’ and hence are different views on substance. Causality is another knotty problem of philosophy. The simple meaning of causality is the relationship between two events— antecedent (cause) and consequent (effect). Now if there is any power or essence in the cause that helps it to produce the effect or if it is merely constant conjunction of cause and effect is the question that divides the philosophers into different camps. Free will, in humans, is the ability to choose from alternatives or to act in certain situations without any restraint. This problem, however, is not free from controversy, for the proponents of determinism deny free will. On the other hand, indeterminists are not ready to accept any determination in performing the action. Here we shall discuss these two views first and then discuss self-determinism to understand how it reconciles the two opposing views, determinism and indeterminism.

This unit also throws light on the concept of Universal, a thorny problem in the history of Philosophy. In nature, we have both sensuous and conceptual knowledge. Sensuous knowledge presents things in particular space and time. But conceptual knowledge presents things without any note of particularity. It is the sort of knowledge without which we cannot think of particular things. We perceive particular things, but to think and talk about them we have to use general concepts. These general concepts are formed by taking into account the characteristics of a group of particulars shared in common. This is the backdrop to the concept of Universal. Universal is/are the common characteristic(s) shared in common by a group of individuals. Now regarding the nature of this common characteristic, some questions are pertinent here: Is it substance which exists in its own right? Is it quality? Is it just a word? Or is it simply a concept of mind? As philosophers are not of the same opinion regarding the nature of universal, we have several theories of universal, viz., realism, nominalism, conceptualism, and idealism. Here, we shall briefly discuss both Western and Indian versions of nominalism, conceptualism and realism. And to get these problems, we shall take the easiest possible way so that we can untie the knots without much trouble.

2.1 Objectives:

This unit presents a brief discussion on some of the important metaphysical problems like substance, causality, free will, and the problems of universal. At the end of reading this unit, you will be able to —

- explain the nature of substance and its various interpretations by different thinkers.
- give an account of the concept of causality
- explicate free will and determinism
- comprehend the nature of universal
- compare and contrast the theories of universal

2.2 Substance:

We have a common belief that the world consists of independent things like trees, pots etc. possessing individual qualities and standing in a certain relation to each other. These things are said to be substances. Substance is a permanent thing that remains identical throughout different changes in its conditions and qualities. It, in other words, is the ‘that’ of a thing as differed from the ‘what’ or qualifications. Now the question arises: What is the relation between the thing and its qualities? The thing is more than the aggregate of its qualities. It is said that the substance, though is beyond the qualities, is the bearer of them. This, however, leads to a difficult question whether there is any quality-less substance. This question has invited many thinkers to deal with the problem.

2.2.1 Modern thinkers’ views:

Descartes, a rationalist thinker, defines substance as something that exists by itself independent of anything else. But, he said that the qualities cannot exist by themselves. They depend on the thing of which they are qualities. For Descartes, there are three substances: mind, matter and God. God alone is independent. Thus God is absolute substance, but mind and matter are relative substances. For, they are created by God and hence are dependent on Him. According to Spinoza, God is the only substance. Substance, God and nature are three different names of the same reality. It is the totality of reality, which has infinite attributes. However, we know only two of them, mind (thought) and matter (extension). All things are modifications of this substance and are parts of it. Leibnitz agrees with Descartes and Spinoza holding that substance does not depend on anything else for its existence. He, however, says that thought and extension cannot exist in a substance. Substances are many centers of activity or force that

retain their independence by acting against other centers. These centers are 'monads'. They are un-extended thought forces independent of one another.

The empiricists deny the reality of substance. For the qualities or states of things being the ones that can only be perceived; the existence of an identical thing like substance cannot be accepted. Locke speaks of two qualities of things- primary and secondary. The mind is the abode of secondary qualities. Now the primary qualities, which are objective, cannot exist by themselves. Locke admits substance as the unknown substratum of the primary qualities. A substance is simply 'We Know-Not-What'. Berkeley rejects the material substance which Locke said to be unknown. For an unknown thing is meaningless to us. A substance, according to Berkeley, is nothing but a cluster of sensations. He, however, admits the substantiality of mind. Hume agrees with Berkeley in rejecting material substance and in regarding matter as a bunch of possible sensations. But he denies the spiritual substance or mind of Berkeley. Hume rejects mental substance for the same reason for which material substance is rejected. Thus for the empiricists, a substance is merely changing qualities or states without any identical thing behind them.

Kant walks on a middle passage between rationalist and empiricist views. He holds that substance is neither an objective entity nor simply a bunch of sensations. To experience the changing qualities, we have to presume the existence of a permanent thing. Hence Kant views substance as an a priori category of understanding which our mind generates from within and according to which mind interprets changes of states or qualities. Hegel gives a concrete notion of substance. For him, a thing cannot stand without its qualities, nor can the qualities without a thing. In every reality, its existence (that) and its nature (what) are inseparable aspects. Everything is a that-what enterprise. Substance is thus an active unity which realizes itself in changing states or qualities.

STOP TO CONSIDER

For the rationalist thinkers, substance has an independent existence apart from anything else. Empiricists, on the other hand, deny the independence of substance. For them, these are merely changing qualities or states without any identical thing behind them. Kant, however, says that there must be some permanent substance behind the changing qualities. Substance is an a-priori category of understanding which is created by the mind from within and it helps the mind interpret the changes of states or qualities.

2.2.2 Contemporary views:

Samuel Alexander and Bertrand Russell view substance from the scientific point of view. For Alexander, the immediate contents of our perception are the appearances of the things or ‘sensa’. These appearances are spatio-temporal entities, which are physical. A substance is nothing but the fusion of appearances. Spatio-temporal entities are events and events are the changes in time.

It is difficult to find a precise definition of a substance by Russell. However, a view of him on substance can be given, though it cannot be claimed to be a full-fledged one. For Russell, there is nothing called permanent metaphysical substance, but there are some quasi-permanent things like trees, rocks etc. The world is a continuum of changing events. Thus the so-called thing is a mass of events changing every moment. But Whitehead says that there must be a background that will stand as permanent support to the changing states. For, every change entails another in a continuous series, of which they are aspects. Hence, according to Whitehead, both the thing and the changing qualities are real.

Logical positivist A. J. Ayer denies the reality of substance as abstracted from qualities. He validates his statement by the method of logical analysis. In ordinary language, according to Ayer, we use words like thing or substance to determine the meaning of it. But this does not necessitate a logical distinction between the thing and its sensible qualities. For, using words to refer to sensible appearances does not necessarily mean that the thing is a simple entity termed with a noun-word. The thing can be defined by the totality of sensible appearances or properties. These properties are interrelated. Over and above this interrelation, there is no entity called substance to which these properties can relate.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- Q1:** What are the two relative substances according to Descartes?
- Q2:** How many substances are there according to Spinoza?
- Q3:** What is substance according to Kant?
- Q4:** A substance is simply ‘we know-not-what’ — who said this?
- Q5:** State whether the following statements are true or false (True/False)

- a) Descartes defines substance as that which exists by itself independent of anything else.
- b) A substance, according to Berkeley, is nothing but a cluster of sensations.
- c) According to Whitehead, both the thing and the changing qualities are real.

2.3 Causality:

Things of the world are variously related. Some relations are accidental, while others are regular. The relation between thunder-storm and death is accidental, whereas the relation between fire and burning is regular. It is on the basis of the second type of relationship, we believe that there are dependable regularities in nature. This regularity of connections between occurrences is necessary to put the various objects of knowledge into a system. We believe that things do not take place or change abruptly. They act in a certain manner. Every event has a cause. Thus causality is a fundamental category of understanding in constructing a system of knowledge. Now regarding the nature of cause or causal relation, there are different opinions. Let us discuss them in the following sections.

2.3.1 Nature of Cause and Causal Connection:

The term cause is used in various senses. Commonly, by cause, we understand a force or power which produces the effect. This is the popular notion of cause. This view has a pretty close alliance with that of physical science. However, physical science improves upon this view. They define causality in the light of the theory of conservation of energy. According to this theory, the total amount of energy is constant, i.e., it neither increases nor decreases. It only changes its form, e.g., one kind of energy transforms into another without losing any quantity. Thus cause differs from effect in quality only, not in quantity. But the popular view of cause is opposed by some thinkers. They hold that we do not see any power or activity in the physical world. Causal power is never perceived to produce any effect. Rather cause and its effects are mere events or occurrences. Only a uniform sequence is perceived between them on the basis of which it is anticipated that the same sequence will prevail in future as well. Hence causation is a

uniform or invariable sequence between two events, cause and effect. Hume too favours this view. J. S. Mill says that mere invariability or a regular association of events cannot constitute the concept of causality. He adds unconditional with invariability. That is, the cause should be taken to be the whole conjunction of conditions that are necessary and sufficient for the effect. Thus Mill's view goes well with the theory of necessary connection. He holds that cause should not depend on any other condition to produce the effect. Mill defines cause "as the sum total of positive and negative conditions taken together" where positive conditions are present and negative conditions absent. According to Kant, causality is an a priori category of understanding. It is evolved by the mind from within and is applied to the sensible things to make them intelligible.

2.3.2 Theories of Causality:

Aristotle's view of causality is known as the doctrine of four causes. Aristotle defines cause in four different senses and thus he admits of four kinds of causes. In the first sense, the cause is that from which the thing arises. It is the material cause. For example, clay is the material cause of pot. In the second sense, the cause is the form of the model of things. It is the formal cause. The form or shape of the pot is the formal cause of the pot. In the third sense, the cause is the agent of the change brought about. It is called an efficient cause. Here the potter is the efficient cause of the pot. In the last or fourth sense, the cause is the end or goal of a thing. It is the final cause. Here the purpose served by the pot is the final cause of the pot.

Hume's view on causality is known as the regularity theory of causality. Being an empiricist he says that all knowledge is derived from experience. And experience does not give us any power in the cause or any necessary connection between cause and effect. When a ball 'A' hits another ball 'B', the latter one moves. Unlike the supporters of necessary connection, Hume says that there is no power or force in ball 'A' that causes the ball 'B' move. What we apprehend is merely a succession of events. A thing is constantly or regularly followed by another thing. The thing that precedes is called cause and the thing that follows is called effect. Thus the cause is nothing more than the invariable antecedent of an event, and the causality is nothing but the uniformity of succession of events. We see constant conjunction between fire and burning, and hence we conclude that fire is the cause of burning. There is no necessary connection between these two events. Hence

Hume's view is also known as the theory of constant conjunction. This view is, however, criticized this point that if regularity is the only relationship between cause and effect, the day would become the cause of night and vice versa. Again, if causality is a mere succession of events then no human action would ever arise from a motive or a character. There will be no relation between volition and behaviour.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- Q6:** Give Mill's definition of cause.
- Q7:** How many causes are there according to Aristotle?
- Q8:** What is Hume's theory of causality known as?
- Q9:** Name one supporter of the theory of necessary connection.

SELF ASKING QUESTIONS

Do you consider the regularity theory of Hume to be plausible? Give reasons.

.....
.....
.....

2.4 Freewill:

In the non-human material world, everything goes with the strict law of necessity. Every activity or movement in nature is determined by antecedent causes. Non-human things (beings) do have little scope to exercise their freewill. In the world of human life, however, we often think that man is free. He is free to choose his own course of action. Freewill, on the other hand, means the ability to choose among alternatives or to act in a certain situation without any kind of restraint. But this freedom of will is not admitted by all. Some seriously question it. For them, humans are not free agents who can act on their own choice. Hence the question still stands valid: are we free to choose between alternative lines of action?

2.4.1 Determinism

According to this view, there is no freedom of will. Whatever happens in this world including human choices is bound up by the strong hold of eternal

laws. There is no room for freewill anywhere as everything is under the spell of necessity.

Metaphysical theories of universal mechanism and abstract monism endorse determinism or fatalism. Every effect is determined by its antecedent cause and hence there is no freewill or spontaneity. If volition is not determined by its previous circumstances, it would be just like a miracle, which is impossible. Thus everything in this material world is governed by the law of causation. Every event is absolutely determined and predictable. Abstract monism of Spinoza stresses on strict determinism. He admits only one ultimate reality behind the manifold of appearances and holds that everything follows necessarily from the one reality. Again, psychological analysis of volition attests the validity of determinism. It states that our choice is regulated by our motives where the strongest motive wins. And the strength of the motive is partly determined by the external environment and partly by our bodily and mental conditions. From a moral point of view, absolute indeterminism is unacceptable. For complete indeterminism makes an action arbitrary and impersonal. If our action does not follow from our nature and thus arbitrary, how can we be responsible for our action at all? From a theological standpoint, if God is omniscient, there can be no freewill. He presets our future courses of action. Thus there is no scope for human freedom. The Indian concept of Law of Karma is, in a sense, determinism or fatalistic. For, according to this doctrine, our action is predetermined by our previous actions.

2.4.2 Indeterminism:

Indeterminists reject absolute determinism. For them determinism is not a sound therapy. They argue that mechanical determination is not true in all cases. It may be true in cases of animals and other beings. But in human life, freedom and teleology are necessary. Indeterminists argue that even the principles of uniformity of nature and law of causation cannot be said to be self-evident. For, the emergence of new occurrences would invalidate the truth of the uniformity of nature and determinism. Again, scientists say that we cannot know with certainty what sort of law will hold between two events. Thus we do not know what will cause what or what will follow what. Heisenberg's theory of indeterminacy and the unpredictability of the behavior of electrons provide us a solid ground for not having faith in total determinism.

Against the abstract monism of Spinoza, indeterminists state that Spinoza reduces humans into mere puppets in a puppet show where the thread is controlled by the one Reality, God. Being dependent upon God, humans do not enjoy any freedom. This makes one's moral life impossible. For morality cannot be applicable where no freedom is allowed. When an individual does not have any freedom to act according to his will, it is a big question if he is ever made responsible for his action.

Again, divine omniscience does not necessarily mean that man is not a free agent. When it is said that God knows the future, it does not imply that He infers the future from previous conditions which He himself determines beforehand. For God, past, present and future do not stand in three different periods of time. Rather they all are present to Him in one eternal Now. Hence he need not necessarily determine the future beforehand.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Freewill means the ability to act in certain situations without any external control. But it is a big question if there is really freedom of will. While indeterminists support absolute freedom, the determinists deny freewill outright. These two views, being in polar opposites, seem unable to answer the questions that arise in regard to freewill and determinations. Now to know if self-determinism can handle the problem, let us go through the following section.

2.4.3 Self-determinism:

Self-determinism strikes a balance between total determinism or fatalism and absolute determinism. Self-determinism is against the extremity of both determinism and indeterminism. For, total determinism and extreme indeterminism are impossible in human life. None of them can work meaningfully. We need freedom of will so that we can take responsibility for our actions. But it does not necessarily mean that we should exercise this freedom without any determination. There must be some determination and that should come from within. It is self-determination. We ourselves determine our actions. We are determined, but not externally. As the action is caused by ourselves, we are free. Then, as our action is determined by our personalities and characters, which again are determined by environment, our action is determined. Hence, it is neither extreme determination nor absolute indeterminism.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q10: State whether the following statements are true or false (True/False)

- a) Metaphysical theory of universal mechanism supports determinism or fatalism.
- b) Spinoza is not a determinist.

Q11: Define freewill.

Q12: Write one difference between determinism and indeterminism.

SELF ASKING QUESTIONS

Can there be really freewill? Write your view.

.....
.....
.....

2.5 Nominalism:

It is said earlier that Nominalism is a theory regarding the nature of universal. Nominalism states that Universal is the observed similarity among the things of a group. It thoroughly denies the objective metaphysical universals. There is not any identical thing which resides in a group of particular objects at the same time. Nominalism thus defines Universal in terms of resemblance or similarity such that the particulars are required only to resemble each other in being called by the same name. Hence this theory is also called the resemblance or similarity theory. William of Ockham, Hobbes, Berkeley Hume and the Buddhists are the supporters of this theory.

2.5.1 Western Views:

The Western theory of Nominalism finds its fullest expression in the hands of some empiricist thinkers. They stress on the observance of the particulars and the avoidance of abstract speculation. They hold that the problem of universal can be worked out simply by the observed resemblance among various particulars. This view has its origin in the philosophy of William of Ockham. His theory is popularly known as the principle of Ockham's razor. For him, it is wastage of time to employ a number of principles when it is possible to use a few. He holds that universals are nothing but mental fictions. They are terms or signs standing for an individual thing or a group of things,

but they cannot exist by themselves; for what exists must be individual and a universal cannot be treated in that way.

Nominalism in its extreme form holds that there is nothing common to a class of particulars called by the same name. On an extreme nominalist view, chairs are chairs only because they are called 'chair'. A moderate form, advanced by Thomas Hobbes, holds that each of the things is called by the same name as the others because it resembles the others in some other way apart from being called by the same name.

Berkeley develops his view of general ideas or universals by criticising Locke's view. He refutes Locke's contention that the mind is capable of framing abstract general ideas of things. He says that we do not have any power to imagine a hand devoid of particular shape and colour. It means we cannot abstract a general quality common to many things, e.g., 'motion' from moving bodies. Berkeley, however, does not deny general ideas altogether. According to him, general ideas, when considered in themselves, are particulars, but become general by being made to represent or stand for all other particulars of the same kind. A universal is a particular which stands for other particulars. Universality, says Berkeley, consists in the relation that a particular holds to other particulars represented by it. Berkeley is said to be an imagist, because in his view an image is considered as representing all particulars of the same sort.

Hume supports Berkeley's view that all general ideas are particulars used in a representative way. He maintains that corresponding to every general word there must be a particular mental idea. While Berkeley holds that a word becomes general by its relation to a particular but representative idea, Hume states it the other way around. For him, a particular idea becomes general by being added to a general term. While Berkeley rests content with the assertion that an idea becomes general by standing for all ideas of the same sort, Hume goes a step further and gives an account of how a particular idea represents others. He says it is done through customs or habit, by the association of ideas and the association of words. At any given time, a man has only one particular idea before his mind, but because of the similarity that he experiences, the one particular idea gets associated with others of the same kind, which are not avoidable actually on the part of the mind at that time and which is remembered by the stimulus of a suitable experience or a suitable word. Thus the possession of a general idea or concept becomes a mental disposition, the readiness engendered by custom,

to have some idea belonging to a given kind, when the suitable stimulus occurs.

2.5.2 Indian Views:

In Indian camp, the Buddhist supports Nominalism. The severest criticism against realism comes from Buddhism. They approach the problem of universals from the standpoint of absolute difference. They reject conceptualism too. According to the Buddhist, reality consists of momentary things which are absolutely separate and disparate. All concepts of identity and similarity are imaginary. All notions of class-concepts are the constructions of thought (apoha) and so they have no objective foundation. The Buddhist nominalism is called apohavada. The Buddhist distinguishes between two orders of reality – (i) the ultimate (paramartha) and the empirical (samvriti). Unique particulars or unique point-instants (sva-laksana) come under the first category, while the world of universals (samanya-laksana) comes under the latter. Unique particulars are given in our pure sensation or in indeterminate perception, but the universals are given in the understanding or determinate perception. The universals are constructed by the understanding to comprehend the flowing reality, the unique point-instants. But that understanding fails to apprehend the real, as the real is always non-relative and non-conceptual. The so-called universals ‘cow’, ‘horse’ etc. do not represent any positive entity which inheres in different particulars. They are mere names with negative connotations. Thus the universal ‘cow’ is ‘not non-cow’. Though the universals or the conceptual knowledge is ultimately unreal, they are not practically useless. They have pragmatic use as they form the basis of classifications and generalisations, which are useful in our day to day life.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q13: State whether the following statements are true or false (True/False)

- a) Nominalism believes in objective metaphysical universals.
- b) Buddhist nominalism is called apohavada.
- c) Berkeley is called imagist.

Q14: Name the philosopher associated with the principle of Ockham’s razor.

2.6 Conceptualism:

Conceptualism is the theory according to which universals are not real things but only general ideas. The conceptualists use the term 'concept' for universal. A Universal is the concept in mind about the common and essential properties of the things possessed by them. The concept or general idea is formed by taking into account the common and essential properties of individuals constituting a class and excluding the variable and accidental properties. Conceptualism regards generality as an essential feature of both experience and language. This theory concentrates on the questions like 'How are mental concepts formed?', 'How can mental concepts be general if the facts of experience from which they are formed are particular?' and 'How can words be general in their significance?' To the question 'How are words general?', Nominalism answers economically without interposing concepts between words and what words stand for. The conceptualism states that a word is general or meaningful because there is a corresponding general concept in the mind. Nominalism, on the other hand, asserts that meaningfulness of a word can be stated without postulating a separate mental entity called a concept. In other words, conceptualism asserts the existence of a concept along with the name. But Nominalism denies the necessity of the concept and states that the universal is merely the name.

2.6.1 Western Views:

John Locke is the representative of conceptualism in Western philosophy. Locke rejects both the Platonic and the Aristotelian realism. He rejects the Platonic theory on the ground that all existing things are particulars. No universal can exist separately like the Platonic Form. He rules out the Aristotelian realism on the ground that our experience does not give any 'real essence' which is common to all the members of species. In his positive account of universal, Locke defines universal as a concept, a purely mental entity. He says that there is no universality in things outside the mind. He formulates the theory of universals with the help of his doctrine of 'nominal essence' or general ideas. For Locke, the universal is the nominal essence, i.e., a general idea or a concept. It differs from the real essence in the sense that it is made by the mind and not discovered by it. It is not an essence in the external world but an essence in the world of thought. It is not same with the word, for it is the concept for which the word stands. General words are formed by the process of abstraction from particular ideas; it is

the particular idea regarded in a distinctive way. That is to say, a general idea is regarded as representing more than one individual each of which corresponds to that abstract idea.

2.6.2 Indian Views:

Among the schools of Indian Philosophy, the Jainas and the Advaitists support conceptualism. The Jainas criticise the realism of Nyaya-Vaisesika. They deal with the problem of universals from their non-absolutistic standpoint. They hold that concepts and words have their basis in the outside reality. But they do not regard the absolute universals as the basis of the concepts and words. For, according to them, there are neither absolute universals nor absolute particulars. The universal and the particular are not two separate realities, but are the related aspects of the same intricate reality. Though the Jaina position on universals is described as conceptualism, a deeper study will reveal the fact that there are three trends in Jaina thought, viz., moderate realism, conceptualism and nominalism.

The Advaitist approaches the problem of universals from the standpoint of absolute identity. He believes in only one ultimate reality, i.e., Brahman. So he rejects the plurality of eternal and ultimate universals advocated by the realists. For such a concept of plurality of ultimate universals contradicts his very fundamental standpoint. He admits the necessity of the objective basis of universal concepts, but for this purpose he does not think it necessary to postulate an ultimate plurality of eternal and ubiquitous universals as is done by the Nyaya-Vaisesika. He says that one ultimate universal Being (Sattva) manifesting in different particulars is sufficient to provide this objective basis. The Advaitist admits two grades of reality: the ultimate and the empirical. The ultimately real is the self-identical indeterminate Brahman, or the universal Being, which is given in all experience. The empirically real are universals and particulars. Thus in the empirical level, two sub-grades of reality are found. The universal possesses a higher degree of reality than the particulars as it unites the particulars. The universal Being is the only reality of which the diverse particulars are the appearances. Thus, from the Advaitic point of view, particulars are related to universals just as appearances are to reality.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q15: State whether the following statements are true or false (True/False)

- a) Locke is the supporter of conceptualism.
- b) According to Advaita, Brahman is the ultimate universal Being (Sattva).

Q16: Name the Indian schools of thinkers that support conceptualism.

Q17: Universal is the nominal essence. Whose view is this?

2.7 Realism:

Realism holds that universal exists independent of the knowing mind. It has objective reality. It is the essence that is equally present in all the members of a class. However, this theory has different versions. While some realists regard universals to be substantive, some others hold them to be adjectival even though they all agree on the core notion of realism. Thus we have supporters of this theory from different corners, viz., Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Bertrand Russell, G. E. Moore, S. Alexander, Nyaya-Vaisesika and Mimamsa.

2.7.1 Western Views:

In Western philosophy, Plato and Aristotle are the champions for realism. Plato advocates extreme realism. For him, a universal is substantive, an entity which exists in a non-temporal, non-spatial world without depending on mind. Universal is not affected by whatever happens to the particulars in the phenomenal world. Although the existence of the particulars in the universals logically depends upon the existence of the universals in the particulars, the other way around is not true. Even if there is not an example of perfect square anywhere, perfect squareness exists in the transcendental world of universals. To Plato, a universal is a model to which particular things approximate.

Aristotle rejects the mysterious world of substantive universals. He advocates a moderate form of realism. According to him, a universal is not substantive. It is a property which belongs to particulars. While Plato treats universals as nouns, Aristotle treats them as adjectives. There is a logical interdependence between the universals and the particulars. Just as there

can be no chairs, unless each chair possesses the property of being a chair, so no such property can exist unless there are chairs. While Plato says that the universal 'chairness' exists beyond the world of particulars, for Aristotle 'chairness' does not have existence beyond the particulars. It exists as the property of the particular.

Medieval thinkers St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas support Platonic and Aristotelian versions of realism respectively. Contemporary philosopher Russell advocates almost the same realistic theory as that of Plato with certain modifications. According to Russell, the universals are eternal and immutable entities. The essence of the universals lies in the fact that they are opposed to the particulars. He holds that proper name stands for particulars. Except proper names, all words- substantives, adjectives, prepositions and verbs stand for universals. G.E. Moore also admits the existence of universals. According to S. Alexander, there is no such thing as a particular or a universal. He regards all things to be individuals. An individual is a particular which is determined by its universal. Every individual possesses particularity which separates it from other particulars of the same kind. And it also possesses universality which changes its particularity into individuality.

2.7.2 Indian Views:

In Indian philosophy, the Nyaya-Vaisesika deals with the problem of universals first. The Nyaya-Vaisesika advocates extreme realism and approaches the problem from pluralistic standpoint. Universal is called samanya or jati. Samanya does not mean 'genus'. It is a class-concept or class-essence. It is by virtue of possessing this class-essence that things are referred to as belonging to one and the same class. Thus samanya is the basis of general concepts and common designations of things. The universal inheres in the particular which is its substratum, while the particulars exist as the substrata of properties. Universal and particulars are different. While universal is eternal, particular is subject to change and destruction. But they are intimately related, like the container and contained are related. Man-ness cannot be apprehended by itself; it is possible only through a particular man. This relation is called samavaya (inherence).

The Mimamsa strongly supports the extreme realism of the Nyaya-Vaisesika. The Prabhakara Mimamsa theory of universals is almost the same as that of the Nyaya-Vaisesika. Kumarila Mimamsa, on the other hand, holds that

the universal is akrti through which the particular is specified or characterised. But he denies the absolute difference between universal and particular. When we experience the particular, the consciousness of the universal is latent and again when we think about the class-essence or universal, the consciousness of its particularity is latent. The universal and the particular are both identical and different. Thus he replaces the Nyaya-Vaisesika relation of inherence (samavaya) by identity-in-difference (bhedabheda). In the judgement 'this is horse', there is identity and difference between the 'horse' (universal) and the 'this' (particular). As the term 'this' refers to 'horse', they are identical. But as the term 'this' does not mean 'horse', they are different.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Regarding the question what the common characteristics are that bring certain things under a group or class, we have different theories, three of which are Nominalism, Conceptualism, and Realism. Nominalism denies any kind of objective essence. This theory defines a universal in terms of particulars and the relation of resemblance between them. Conceptualism holds that a universal is the concept in mind about the common and essential properties of the things possessed by them. According to realism, universal is the essence that is equally present in all the members of a class.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q18: State whether the following statements are true or false (True/False)

- a) According to Plato, universal is a property which belongs to particulars.
- b) Plato said that universal is substantive.
- c) Nyaya-Vaisesika states that there is a samavaya (inherence) relationship between universal and particular.

Q19: What is the term used for universal by the Mimamsa?

SELF ASKING QUESTIONS

Which theory of universal do you think to be the best and why?

.....
.....
.....

2.8 Summing Up:

So far, we have discussed the topics of substance, causality, free will, and the theories of universal, viz., nominalism, conceptualism, and realism. Substance deals with the problem of what exists or what underlies the various changes that occur in things. Under this column, we have briefly outlined the views of thinkers ranging from modern to contemporary. Causality is the relationship between two events, cause and effect. Now regarding the question if there is any power or essence in the cause that helps it to produce the effect, we have different opinions and thus several theories on it. Freewill is the freedom to act according to one's own dictate. In this section, we have discussed the theories of determinism, indeterminism, and self-determinism. Universal is the common characteristic(s) which is/are shared in common by a group of individuals. Now regarding the nature of these common characteristics we have many opinions and thus have discussed theories of nominalism, conceptualism and realism in both their western and Indian versions.

2.9 References and Suggested Readings:

Chakravarty, S. P., An Introduction to Philosophy, J. N. Ghose & Sons, Calcutta, 1979.

Masih, Y., A Critical History of Western Philosophy, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1994.

Sarma, R., Theories of Universals, N. L. Publications, Guwahati, 2013.

2.10 Model Questions:

A. Objective questions

Q1: What is the only substance admitted by Spinoza?

Q2: What is the absolute substance according to Descartes?

Q3: Monad is substance. Who is associated with this view?

Q4: Write one difference between constant conjunction and necessary connection.

Q5: Abstract monism endorses determinism. Is it true?

Q6: Name some supporters of realism.

Q7: Is Hume a nominalist?

Q8: Who is associated with the theory of Ockham's Razor?

B. Short questions

Q1: Write a short note on Spinoza's substance.

Q2: What is necessary connection?

Q3: Define indeterminism.

Q4: State how self-determinism reconciles determinism and indeterminism.

Q5: What is Ockham's Razor?

Q6: Write a brief note on apohavada.

Q7: Why is Nominalism called the Resemblance or Similarity theory?

Q8: Write the difference between Platonic and Aristotelian realism.

Q9: Define nominal essence.

Q10: What is Russell's view on universal?

C. Long questions

Q1: What is substance? Discuss the different views on substance.

Q2: Explain critically regularity theory of Hume.

Q3: What is freewill? Is freedom of will compatible with determinism? Explain.

Q4: Define universal. Discuss the theory of realism.

Q5: Explain conceptualism as a theory of universal.

Q6: Elucidate Nominalist view of universal.

2.11 Answer to Check Your Progress:

Ans to Q no 1: Mind and matter.

Ans to Q no 2: One

Ans to Q no 3: According to Kant, substance is the a priori category of understanding which our mind generates from within and according to which mind interprets changes of states or qualities.

Ans to Q no 4: John Locke.

Ans to Q no 5: a) True b) False c) True

Ans to Q no 6: Mill defines cause as the sum total of positive and negative conditions taken together where positive conditions are present and negative conditions absent.

Ans to Q no 7: Four.

Ans to Q no 8: Regularity theory of causality.

Ans to Q no 9: J. S. Mill.

Ans to Q no 10: a) True b) False

Ans to Q no 11: Freewill is the ability to choose among alternatives or to act in certain situations without any kind of restraint.

Ans to Q no 12: Determinism denies freedom of will, while indeterminism supports absolute freedom.

Ans to Q no 13: a) False b) True c) True

Ans to Q no 14: William of Ockham.

Ans to Q no 15: a) True b) True

Ans to Q no 16: The Jainas and the Advaitists.

Ans to Q no 17: John Locke.

Ans to Q no 18: a) False b) True c) False

Ans to Q no 19: Akrti.

-----x-----

Unit 3

PROBLEM OF KNOWLEDGE: EMPIRICISM, RATIONALISM, CRITICISM, IDEALISM, REALISM

Contents:

- 3.0 Introduction**
- 3.1 Objectives**
- 3.2 Theories of Knowledge**
- 3.3 Origin of Knowledge**
 - 3.3.1 Rationalism**
 - 3.3.2 Empiricism**
- 3.4 Critical Theory of Kant**
- 3.5 Nature of the Reality**
 - 3.5.1 Realism**
 - 3.5.2 Idealism**
- 3.6 Summing Up**
- 3.7 References & Suggested Readings**

3.0 Introduction:

The problems of knowledge generally deals with questions like ‘What is knowledge? How knowledge is possible? Or what are the sources of knowledge? Is there any limitation of knowledge?’ These are the central issues of the theories of knowledge. The particular branch of philosophy which discusses about the sources of knowledge, nature and scope of knowledge is called as Epistemology. Different philosophers have put forwarded their justifications and theories regarding these questions and consequently many schools of thought like Rationalism and Empiricism are developed. These two theories of Epistemology primarily deal with the issue of the origin and justification of knowledge.

The Problem of Reality is basically concerned with the issue of the existence of objects or about the nature of the objects of knowledge. It deals with questions like whether the object of knowledge is mind dependent or exists independent of mind. Regarding these issues two theories are developed namely, Realism and Idealism.

3.1 Objectives:

This unit will make you understand, —

- different Problems associated with Knowledge
- empiricism as a school of thought
- rationalism as a school of thought
- critical Theory of Kant
- realism as a theory about the nature of the object of knowledge
- idealism as the theory about the nature of the object of knowledge.

3.2 Theories of Knowledge:

With respect to the question of the sources of knowledge there have been different theories propounded by many philosophers. Their primary question is ‘What are the sources of knowledge?’ It is the central issue of epistemology. Different philosophers put forward their justification. There are two major theories- Rationalism and Empiricism. Rationalism has been developed as a school of thought or in a methodical way after Rene Descartes (1596-1650). Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677) and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz (1646-1716) are known as the prominent followers of rationalism. Empiricism, as a school of thought has been developed after John Locke (1632-1704), George Berkeley (1685-1753) and Hume (1711-1776) they are well known as the primary exponents of empiricism in the 18th century Western Philosophy.

‘What is the nature of Reality?’ or ‘What is the nature of the object of knowledge?’ this is another central problem of philosophers. In this context, basically two theories are developed, namely, Realism and Idealism.

3.3 Origin of Knowledge:

What is the source or origin of knowledge? How can certain knowledge be gained? To this question some philosophers argue that reason is the only source of knowledge from which one can achieve certain knowledge. This is the view of Rationalism which demands that knowledge is a priori. Again some philosophers argue that knowledge is possible only through sense experience. This is the view of Empiricism which asserts that knowledge is

not a priori, but only a posteriori which can be gained only after sense experience.

3.3.1 Rationalism:

Rationalism is a school of thought which deals with the problem of the origin of knowledge and asserts that reason is the only source of certain knowledge. The rationalist philosophers hold that knowledge gained through reason is complete and certain, hence not a subject matter of doubt. The knowledge which is gained through reason can provide us with the knowledge of external appearance of things as well as about God and self. Rationalism holds that the knowledge of sense experiences is not of the inherent or sole nature of things. The absolute knowledge must be certain, universal and beyond doubt. Sense experience cannot provide universal and certain knowledge. The knowledge of sense experiences is particular, not universal. So, the rationalists granted reason or intellect as the only source of certain knowledge and denied sense experience as the source of certain knowledge.

Rationalism asserts that reason furnishes some a priori or innate notions in our minds. These notions are self-evident and therefore are indubitably true. The absolute knowledge is founded on the a priori or innate notions. Rationalism holds that our knowledge is a priori that occurs solely in our minds independently of sense experience. The a priori knowledge that mind can achieve is both necessary and universal. Rationalism is also a method of thinking which involves a deductive and abstract way of reasoning.

In the history of Rationalism, Greek philosophers Socrates and Plato were renowned as the rationalist philosophers. According to Socrates, reason is the only source of knowledge. Knowledge can be formed through the general concepts of mind and these innate notions are formed of reason. Plato also considered that true knowledge cannot be achieved from sense experience. The universal knowledge is consists of reason or idea. The objects of sense experience are particular and are the appearances of the universal notions of knowledge. True knowledge is necessary, universal and certain. Only reason can furnish this kind of complete knowledge.

In the modern era of rationalistic history, the philosophers who are mainly referred to as rationalists are, Rene Descartes (1596-1650), Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677) and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz (1646-1716).

Stop to Consider:

- Rationalism admits 'reason' as the only source of knowledge. Knowledge is a priori, not a posteriori.
- Reason provides the universal knowledge, not the particular knowledge. Hence, the knowledge provided by rationalism is certain.
- Rationalism holds that knowledge of sense experience is based on particular experience, hence is not absolute and certain, only doubtful.
- Reason furnishes some innate ideas or a priori notions in our mind which are self-evident and indubitably true.
- Rene Descartes, Spinoza and Leibnitz are the prominent rationalist philosophers in the Modern Western Philosophy.

Rene Descartes:

Rene Descartes is regarded as the father of Modern Western Philosophy. He establishes rationalism in a special place in western philosophy. The knowledge that is achieved in reason is the certain knowledge. According to Descartes, there are three types of notions or ideas in our minds. These are: Adventitious Idea, Factitious Ideas and Innate Ideas. The ideas which come in our mind through sense experience are called Adventitious Ideas. These are the ideas of the external things. The ideas which our minds create independent of any external sense experience in association with other contents of the mind are called Factitious Ideas. These ideas are imaginative and hence, are vague. Descartes holds that there are some pre fabricated ideas or notions in our minds. These notions are a priori independent from any external sense experience. These a priori notions are the notions of universality, idea of eternity, ideas of God, notions of morality, the notions of causality etc. These ideas are not founded in sense experience. God imprinted these notions in our mind by birth. Knowledge is derived from these innate ideas through the faculty of reason or intellect. These innate ideas are self evident and certain notions.

For Descartes, truth is whatever is clear and distinct. He asserts that probable knowledge is no knowledge; knowledge can only consists of necessary propositions. The criterion of clearness and distinctness is typical of rationalistic theory of truth. Descartes was a mathematician. He asserts that

in geometry to achieve the certain truth one starts out from a small number of axioms and definitions and by means of deduction reaches the conclusion. This deduction process is involved in reasoning process. He wishes to apply this geometrical method in metaphysics for the purpose of making it an exact science. Here, he needs first an axiom from which he can deduce a series of consequences. He argues that sense experience often deceive us. He started to doubt everything in order achieve the certainty. He went on doubt in everything but he never maintained that there is no possibility of knowledge. But he applies doubt as the method to achieve certainty. His very doubt reveals it to him that “to think is to exist”. Hence it is certain that I exist. I think therefore I exist, Cogito, ergo sum. I think or I doubt is the only proposition indubitable or beyond doubt. This method of doubt in Rene Descartes is known as Cartesian Doubt method.

Descartes accepts three realities or substances whose existence has been proved. I think, therefore– 1) I exist- the ego; 2) that god exists. The certainty of God’s existence is a matter of the greatest importance as on it all truths, all certitudes, all positive knowledge are depended. God is the infinite substance on which everything depends and which itself depends on nothing; 3) I should know myself and never know the not me, it enables me to destroy the barrier raised by doubt between thought and external thing. It includes that the corporeal world exists.

Hence the three realities are the ego (the self), God and matter. God is the only absolute substance and mind and matter are the relative substances. Thought is the attribute of the mind and extension is the attribute of matter. Descartes develops a theory of dualism holding that mind and body are distinct substances. Mind is immaterial with various mental activities like rational thought, imagination, feeling and wiling etc. Matter conforms to the laws of physics in mechanistic ways. Mind and body are causally inter-act with each other. The place of interaction is the part of the brain known as the pineal gland. Hence, the mind body problem in Descartes is known as Interactionism.

Stop to Consider:

- According to Rene Descartes, knowledge consists in the innate ideas through reason, which are self-evident and certain.
- Descartes employs 'doubt' as the method to reach at certainty. He observes that everything can be doubted except the existence of the doubting mind.
- The process of doubting denotes the existence of the thinking mind. Hence, he establishes 'Cogito Ergo Sum' which means I think, therefore I exist.
- Descartes asserts the existence of three substances, God, Mind and matter. God is the absolute substances and mind and body are the relative substances.
- For Descartes, mind and body are the two distinct substances, but they causally inter-act with each other. Therefore, his theory of mind body relation is known as Interactionism.

Spinoza:

Spinoza is a follower of rationalism who grants that reason or mind is the only source of pure knowledge. He also accepts the innate ideas of mind. According to Spinoza, the purpose of philosophy is to achieve the pure and certain knowledge of things and only mind can provide the certainty of knowledge. Reason can know directly the truth. For him, all knowledge is formed within our mind. He grants that substance, quality and mode- these are the main innate ideas. All the other truths can be deduced from these innate ideas. He assumes that substance is that which exists in itself and is conceived by itself. Attribute is that which the intellect perceives as constituting the essence of the substance. Mode is the modifications of the substance, i.e., which exists in and is conceived by something other than itself. Spinoza accepts God as the only substance which exists in itself. God alone is the substance; substance being the only being, and not dependent on anything is absolutely free because it is determined solely by itself. God is the cause of the universe as the apple is the cause of its red color, God is not the temporal creator of the world. God and universe designate one and the same thing: Nature, which is both the source of all beings and the totality of these beings is considered as its effect.

Substance consists of infinite attributes. Each of the attributes expresses in its way the essence of God. Human intellect can know only two of these: extension and thought. The cosmic substance is an extended and thinking thing. It forms both the substance of all bodies or matter, and the substance of all minds. Spinoza holds that mind and body are not the opposite substances. But they are two different ways of conceiving one and the same substance. These attributes of substance are not dependent on each other. The two realms are parallel. Hence the mind body theory of Spinoza is known as parallelism.

The modes or modifications of extension are motion and rest; the modifications of thought are intellect and will. Movement, intellect, and will, i.e., the entire relative world (*natura naturata*) are modes or modifications of substance. These modes are infinite like the attributes which they modify. While the substance is the absolute, eternal, and necessary cause of itself; the mode is contingent, passing, relative and merely possible. As modes are specifications of attributes, the characteristics of attributes are shared by modes as well. For example, each attribute is complete in itself. Modes also form a complete system so that modes of one attribute cannot be explained by modes of another attribute, but by other modes of the same attribute.

Stop to Consider:

- Spinoza accepts three innate Ideas- Substance, Attribute and Mode. Substance is that which exists in itself.
- Substance consists of infinite attributes of which human intellect can know only two of these: extension and thought, i.e. body and mind respectively.
- Spinoza's theory of mind-body relation is called parallelism.
- According to Spinoza, mind and body are the two different attributes and are not dependent on each other. But they run parallel.
- Spinoza mentions the modes or modifications of extension are motion and rest; and the modifications of thought are intellect and will.

Leibnitz:

According to Leibnitz, pure knowledge is derived only from reason. All the ideas are innate ideas of the mind. He regards mind or spirit as 'monad'. Monads are spiritual and each monad is independent of each other. Leibnitz holds these spiritual monads are windowless. Each monad constitutes a separate world, independent of all other beings. None has windows by which anything can enter or depart. The ideas are inherent within mind and in cooperation with intellect mind develops knowledge. Leibnitz's universe contains only God and the non-composite, immaterial, soul-like entities called monads. According to him, space, time, causation, material objects, are all illusions. To explain the universe and unity Leibnitz offers the theory of pre-established harmony. He argues that things seem to cause one another because God designed a pre-established harmony among everything in the universe. He explains the synthetic principle in the analogy of monads and in the notion of pre-established harmony. Although each monad differs from other, there is an analogy and a family resemblance between them. He mentions that these monads are quantitatively alike, but qualitatively different from each other. Monads reflect the universe in different degrees; some monads reflect it better than others. Numbers of monads are infinite and each monad is different from the other in degrees of clearness and distinctness of perception.

According to Leibnitz, God is the highest monad which regulates the soul by the body or the body by the volitions of the soul as a watchmaker constantly regulates one clock by the other. The harmony between the movements of the body and the states of the soul is the effect of the creator's perfect work, just like the uninterrupted agreement between two well-constructed watches results from the skill of the mechanic who has constructed them. God is Monad of Monads who is infinite and absolute. On the other hand the created monads are finite and relative. This Monad of Monads i.e., God is distinct from the universe. Leibnitz proves the existence of God by the principle of sufficient reason. This sufficient reason for the existence of the universe cannot be found in the succession of contingent things, i.e., of bodies and in souls. He suggests that sufficient reason is a priori proof. It means an argument from causes to effect in itself where no analytic explanation is needed which can be contradictory if denying. Leibnitz explains an a priori proof as a proof that reflects the causal

order. Thus a sufficient reason would be a proof that is both a demonstration and an explanation of the highest monad of god.

Stop to Consider:

- Leibnitz theory is known as 'monadology', he regards mind or spirit as 'monad'.
- Monads are independent to each other and windowless in which nothing can enter or depart.
- There is an analogy and family resemblance among the monads.
- According to Leibnitz, monads are numerous in number and all are spiritual. Monads are quantitatively alike but qualitatively different from each other.
- God is the ultimate or highest monad, which designed a pre-established harmony among everything in the universe.

Check your Progress:

- **What are the basic ideas of Rationalism?**

Ans: Rationalism is a school of thought which deals with the problem of the origin of knowledge and asserts that reason is the only source of certain knowledge. The rationalist philosophers hold that the knowledge which is to be gained through reason is complete and certain. Hence the knowledge that reason provides are not subject matter of doubt. Rationalism asserts that reason furnishes some a priori or innate notions in our minds. These notions are self-evident and therefore are indubitably true. The absolute knowledge founded on the a priori or innate notions. Rationalism is defined as the theory which holds that our knowledge is a priori that occurs solely in our minds independently of sense experience. The a priori knowledge that mind can achieve are both necessary and universal. Certain rational principles exist in logic, mathematics and metaphysics that are essentially true that denying them leads to contradiction. Rationalism is the method of thinking which involves a deductive and abstract way of reasoning. It asserts that there is a knowledge that is innate or exists within our minds from the time we born.

- **What is the method Descartes applied in the process of achieving certain knowledge?**

Ans: Descartes is a rationalist philosopher and maintains that reason is the source of certain knowledge. He asserts that probable knowledge is no knowledge; knowledge can only consist of necessary propositions. Truth must be distinct, clear and indubitable. Descartes was a mathematician. He asserts that in geometry to achieve the certain truth one starts out from a small number of axioms and definitions and by means of deduction reaches the conclusion. This deduction process is involved in reasoning process. He wishes to apply this geometrical method in metaphysics for the purpose of making it an exact science. Here, he needs first an axiom from which he can deduce a series of consequences. Describes argues that knowledge received through sense experience often deceive us. He started to doubt everything in order to understand or achieve the certainty. He doubted everything but does not maintained that there is no possibility of knowledge. He applies doubt as the means to certainty. His very doubt reveals it to him and he says that I doubt that is absolutely true. To think is to exist, hence it is certain that I exist. I think therefore I exist, Cogito, ergo sum. I think or I doubt is the only proposition indubitable or beyond doubt. This method of doubt in Rene Descartes is known as Cartesian Doubt method.

- **What is substance in Spinoza?**

Ans: As a rationalist, Spinoza, holds that the purpose of philosophy is to achieve the pure and certain knowledge of things and only mind can provide the certainty of knowledge. Reason can know directly the truth through innate ideas. He grants that substance, quality and mode- these are the main innate ideas. All the other truths can be deduced from these innate ideas. He assumes that substance is that which exists in itself and is conceived by itself. Attribute is that which the intellect perceives as constituting the essence of the substance. Mode is the modifications of the substance, i.e., which exists in and is conceived by something other than itself. Spinoza accepts God as the only substance which exists in itself. God alone is the substance, substance being the only being, and not dependent on anything is absolutely free because it is determined solely by itself. God is the cause of the universe as the apple is the cause of its red color; not as the father who is the cause of his child's existence. The father is the external and transient cause of his son who has a separate existence of his own. The God is

not the temporal creator of the world. God and universe designate one and the same thing: Nature, which is both the source of all beings and the totality of these beings considered as its effect.

Substance consists of infinite attributes. Each of the attributes expresses in its way the essence of God. Human intellect knows two of these: extension and thought. The cosmic substance is an extended and thinking thing. It forms both the substance of all bodies or matter, and the substance of all minds. Spinoza holds that mind and body are not the opposite substances. But they are two different ways of conceiving one and the same substance. These attributes of substance are not dependent on each other. The two realms are parallel. Hence the mind body theory of Spinoza is known as parallelism.

The modes or modifications of extension are motion and rest; the modifications of thought are intellect and will. Movement, intellect, and will, i.e., the entire relative world (*natura naturata*) are modes or modifications of substance. These modes are infinite like the attributes which they modify. While the substance is the absolute, eternal, and necessary cause of itself; the mode is contingent, passing, relative and merely possible. As modes are specifications of attributes, the characteristics of attributes are shared by modes as well. For example, each attribute is complete in itself. Modes also form a complete system so that modes of one attribute cannot be explained by modes of another attribute, but by other modes of the same attribute.

- **Explain the concept of 'monad' in Leibnitz.**

Ans: According to Leibnitz, pure knowledge consists in innate ideas of the mind. He regards mind or spirit as 'monad'. Monads are spiritual and each monad is independent of each other. Leibnitz holds these spiritual monads are windowless. Each monad constitutes a separate world, independent of all other beings. None has windows by which anything can enter or depart. To explain the universe and unity Leibnitz offers the theory of pre-established harmony. He argues that things seem to cause one another because God designed a pre-established harmony among everything in the universe. He explains the synthetic principle in the analogy of monads and in the notion of pre-established harmony. Although each monad differs from other, there is an analogy and a family resemblance between them. He mentions that these monads are quantitatively alike, but qualitatively different from each other.

Monads reflect the universe in different degrees; some monads reflect it better than others. Numbers of monads are infinite and each monad is different from the other in degrees of clearness and distinctness of perception. According to Leibnitz, God is the highest monad which regulates the soul by the body or the body by the volitions of the soul as a watchmaker constantly regulates one clock by the other.

3.3.2 Empiricism:

Empiricism is a school of thought regarding the problem of the origin of knowledge which granted sense experience as the ultimate source of knowledge. All possible knowledge is derived only from sense experience. Knowledge is a posteriori which is to be gained only after sense experience. Empiricism asserts that all concepts are applicable to things that can be experienced. Also the rationally acceptable beliefs or propositions are knowable only through experience. According to empiricism, the learning process of man is based on observation and perception; it demands that knowledge is possible only in sense experience. The mind is not furnished with a set of concepts in advance of experience, means a priori knowledge before sense experience is not possible. Empiricism is also known as experimental method that search for knowledge by observation and experiment. Empiricism emphasizes on the role of empirical evidence in the formation of ideas, rather than innate ideas or traditions.

In the history of Western philosophy, Greek Atomists and the Sophists claims that knowledge is the experience of the senses. There is no abstract and absolute notion about knowledge previously in mind. Knowledge is derived only in sense experience. For the sophists knowledge is particular and man's sense experience is the only measurement of all truths.

Francis Bacon (1561-1626) established empiricism in a systematic manner in the period of transition from the Renaissance to the early modern era. Bacon developed a system of empiricism or natural science that possesses the characteristics of induction, explanation, experimentation and observation etc. For bacon, knowledge as well as experience must be based on facts that could be observed and experimented.

Thus, the philosophical empiricists hold no knowledge to be gained or deduced unless it is derived from one's sense based experience. The empiricists view is commonly contrasted with Rationalism, which accept that knowledge is derived from reason independently of the senses.

John Locke (1632-1704), George Berkeley (1685-1753) and Hume (1711-1776) are well known as the primary exponents of empiricism in the 18th century Western Philosophy.

Stop to Consider:

- Empiricism holds that sense experience is the only source of knowledge. There is no knowledge in reason prior to sense experience.
- Hence, knowledge is a posteriori, not a priori. The learning process is dependent only on perception and observation.
- Empiricism emphasizes on the empirical evidence, observation and experiment in the formation of ideas. Hence, it is also called as Experimental method.
- John Locke, George Berkeley and David Hume are regarded as the prominent empiricist philosophers of Modern Western Philosophy.

John Locke:

According to John Locke, sense experience is the only source of human knowledge. There are no pre notions or innate ideas in human mind before sense experience. All knowledge are a posteriori. Locke strictly criticizes the doctrine of innate ideas of Descartes. He has refuted the innate ideas by offering his argument that if there are innate ideas which are universal then these ideas must similarly be present in everybody's minds. But in fact, these concepts are absent in the mind of child, insane people etc. They seem unknown to the relation of causality, the notion of infinity, eternal, ideas of god etc. which are accepted as absolute and universal innate ideas. Even these all innate ideas are not accepted by everyone in the same way and are different in different mind. Again Locke argues that there are some notions which can be present similarly in all human minds. For example, the idea of fire, heat, sun etc. are same in all minds. But these are not innate ideas rather are achieved through experience.

According to Locke, at the time of birth, human mind is a *Tabula rasa*, a blank tablet. Mind is a white paper where the experience derived from sense impressions as person's life proceeds are written. He asserts that there is nothing in the intellect which was not previously in the senses. Locke

maintains two sources of our ideas, sensation and reflection. Sensation helps the mind to acquire the knowledge about the determinations of the external world. Reflection is used to receive information of the internal world of mind like, pleasure, pain etc. Sensations are broken down into primary and secondary qualities. Primary qualities are necessary for the object to be what it is. Primary quality specifies an object as it is. For example, an apple is an apple because of the arrangement of its specific or atomic structure. Secondary qualities are the sensory informations which we can perceive from its primary qualities. For example, an apple can be perceived in various colors, sizes and taste. But still it is defined as apple only because of its primary quality. Hence, the primary quality defines what an object exactly is and its secondary quality defines its attributes. Primary qualities of an object are not related by definition to perceivers, e.g., size, shape, motion, solidity of an object etc. Again secondary qualities are defined by the individual perceiver, e.g., smell, taste, sound, temperature etc.

A distinction is made between simple and complex ideas in both sensation and reflection. A simple idea is referred as a being in itself uncompounded which contains nothing in itself. It is regarded as an unanalyzable simple datum of knowledge. Simple ideas are the elements of thought that are passively received through sensation and reflection. Complex ideas are built from simple ideas. Complex ideas are formed by the mind, by comparing and combining from simple ideas. John Locke has divided complex ideas into three classes- modes, substance and relations.

Stop to Consider:

- Empiricist John Locke denies the universality of innate ideas. He argues that innate ideas are not universal as the concepts of God, eternity, causality etc. are not same in all human minds.
- Locke asserts that man's mind is a blank paper in birth. Later on Sense experience writes knowledge on our mind.
- Locke mentions two sources of our sense experience- sensation and reflection.
- In both Sensation and reflection, there are simple and complex ideas. Simple ideas are the unanalyzable simple datum of

knowledge received through sensation and reflection. Complex ideas are formed by the mind by combining the simple ideas.

- Locke distinguishes between primary and secondary qualities of a thing. The primary qualities of a thing are mind independent whereas the secondary qualities are mind dependent.

Berkeley:

George Berkeley regards that sense experience is the only source of pure knowledge. All our ideas and knowledge are due to experience. Berkeley's empiricism defends two metaphysical theses: Idealism- which claims that everything that exists either in a mind or depends on a mind for its existence; next is Immaterialism- which claims that matter does not exist. The object which can be perceived through personal mind has existence only. The existence of things depends only in perception. If anything is beyond perception then that has no existence at all. From this his famous quotation is developed that "esse est percipi"- to be is to be perceived. According to Berkeley, perception is mind dependent. The reality consists of mind and its perception. Berkeley holds that the essence of anything in principle consists of ideas only. Ordinary objects are only collections of ideas. The sensation is relative and mental. Perception is mind dependent, subjective states and mental. All perceptions are regarded as variable and relative to human perceivers.

Berkeley idealism is known as Subjective Idealism that means nothing exist, apart from consciousness. This consciousness exists in a single individual mind. Berkeley argues that the existences of other spirit are known by the effects only and these effects produce the effect on the perceiver. These effects are referred as ideas, and ideas are like the furniture of an individual mind. Berkeley holds that there are no material substance, only finite mental substances and an infinite mental substance, namely, God.

According to Berkeley, ideas are the immediate objects of knowledge in a fundamental sense. Ideas are the objects of knowledge and there must be something that knows or perceives them and exercises diverse functions like willing, imagining, remembering about them. Berkeley called this as 'mind' or 'spirit'. Hence, mind as knower is distinct from ideas which is things known.

Berkeley refutes the distinction between primary and secondary qualities of Locke. He argues that it is not possible to abstract a primary quality, i.e., shape from a secondary quality i.e. color. Again secondary qualities are only the ideas in the mind; hence these are also primary qualities.

Stop to Consider:

- Berkeley admits two main themes: Idealism and Immaterialism. Idealism holds that everything exists only in mind and immaterialism holds that matter does not exist.
- As an Empiricist, Berkeley propounded “esse est percipi”, that means to be exist, it has to be perceived.
- Berkeley’s theory is known as Subjective Idealism as he maintains that sensation is individual’s mind dependent and subjective state.
- Berkeley regards that both primary and secondary qualities of things are mind dependent and if something is not in the awareness of mind then that has no existence.

David Hume:

David Hume denies the a priori concepts of knowledge and asserts reason as the slave of passion. The origin of all knowledge is experience only. All the contents of thinking are derived from outward and inward impressions. Hume denies all the existence, beyond experience. Hence, he denies the concepts of mind, substance, god, soul, relation of causation etc. as rationalistic way because one cannot experience these.

In Hume’s empiricism, there is no place of subjects which are not of sense experience. Hume distinguishes our perception into two types: Impressions or Ideas. When our sense comes into contact with the themes of sensation then an impression is imprinted in our mind. Impressions are lively perceptions, when we hear, or see, or feel, or desire etc. Impressions include all our sensations and passions and are more forceful and lively than ideas. Ideas are the faint images of impressions in thinking and reasoning and the less lively perceptions. Ideas are only copies of similar impressions. A blind man can form no notion of color which he does not experience. Hume, thus, regards that all our ideas are derived from sensations.

Hume argues that inductive reasoning and belief in causality cannot be justified rationally. Contrary to it, causality and induction result from custom and mental habit. Causality is attributed only to the experience of 'constant conjunction' of events in a time. Because we can never actually perceive that one event causes another, but we always perceive that the two causes and effects are always conjoined. To draw any causal inferences from past experience it is necessary to presuppose that the future will resemble the past, a presupposition which cannot itself be grounded in prior experience. Hence, for Hume all our thoughts succeed each other in a certain order of resemblances, contiguity in time or place and causality.

Hume maintains that the features or properties of an object are all that really exist, and there is no actual object or substance of which they are the features. For example, an apple is identified by all its properties of color, size, shape, smell, taste etc. and is impossible to envisage without these all. Hume applies the same argument to people. The self is nothing but a bundle or collection of interconnected perceptions linked by the properties of constancy and coherence.

Stop to Consider:

- David Hume distinguishes our perception into two- Impression and Ideas.
- Impressions are the direct and distinct knowledge through sensation and Ideas are the copies of similar impressions which are not distinct.
- Hume rejects the universal concept of causality. Causality, for him is only the experience of 'constant conjunction' of events in a time.
- Hume maintains that all our thoughts succeed each other in a certain order of resemblances, contiguity in time or place and causality.
- Hume regards self as a bundle or collection of interconnected perceptions linked by the properties of constancy and coherence.

Check Your Progress:

- **Mention the basic ideas of Empiricism.**

Ans: Empiricism is a school of thought regarding the problem of the origin of knowledge which granted sense experience as the only and ultimate source of knowledge. All possible knowledge are

derived only from sense experience. Knowledge is a posteriori which are to be gained only after sense experience. Empiricism asserts that all concepts are applicable to things that can be experienced. Also the rationally acceptable beliefs or propositions are knowable only through experience. According to empiricism, the learning process of man is based on observation and perception; it demands that knowledge is possible only in sense experience. The mind is not furnished with a set of concepts in advance of experience, means a priori knowledge before sense experience is not possible. Empiricism is also known as experimental method that search for knowledge by observation and experiment. Empiricism emphasizes on the role of empirical evidence in the formation of ideas, rather than innate ideas or traditions.

- **How Locke has refuted the universality of the innate ideas of Rationalistic philosophers?**

Ans: As an empiricist, John Locke refuted the innate ideas that rationalism mentioned. According to Locke, sense experience is the only source of human knowledge. There are no pre notions or innate ideas in human mind before sense experience. All knowledge is a posteriori. Locke strictly criticizes the doctrine of innate ideas of Descartes. He has refuted the innate ideas by offering his argument that if there are innate ideas which are universal then these ideas must similarly be present in everybody's mind. But in reality it is seen that these concepts are absent in the mind of child, insane people etc. They seems to be unknown to the relation of causality, the notion of infinity, eternal, ideas of god etc. which are accepted as absolute and universal innate ideas. Even these ideas are not accepted by everyone in the same way and are different in different mind. Again Locke argues that there are some notions which can be present similarly in all human minds. For example, the idea of fire, heat, sun etc. are same in all minds. But these are not innate ideas rather are achieved through experience. Locke maintains that human mind is a tabula rasa, which means a blank paper where later on sense experience writes.

- **What does Berkeley mean by the phrase “esse est percipi”?**

Ans: George Berkeley regards that all our ideas and knowledge are only due to sense experience. According to Berkeley, only the object which can be perceived through personal mind has

existence. The existence of things depends only in perception. If anything is beyond perception then that has no existence at all. From this his famous quotation is developed that “esse est percipi”- to be is to be perceived. According to Berkeley, perception is mind dependent. The reality consists of mind and its perception. Berkeley holds that the essence of anything in principle consists of ideas only. Ordinary objects are only collections of ideas. The sensation is relative and mental. All perceptions are regarded as variable and relative to human perceivers. Perception is mind dependent, subjective states and mental. All the knowledge and ideas are derived from the subjective experience or perception of individual mind. Hence, Berkeley is also known as Subjective Idealist.

- **What is Impression and Idea in Hume’s philosophy?**

Ans: Empiricist David Hume denies the a priori concepts of knowledge and asserts that the origin of all knowledge is experience only. He mentions reason as the slave of passion. All the contents of thinking are derived from outward and inward impressions. Hume denies all existence, beyond experience. Hence, he denies the concepts of mind, substance, god, soul, relation of causation etc. because one cannot experience these. In Hume’s empiricism, there is no place of subjects which are not of sense experience. Hume distinguishes our perception into two types: Impressions or Ideas. When our sense comes into contact with the themes of sensation then an impression is imprinted in our mind. Impressions are lively perceptions, when we hear, or see, or feel, or desire etc. Impressions include all our sensations and passions and are more forceful and lively than ideas. Ideas are the faint images of impressions in thinking and reasoning and the less lively perceptions. Ideas are only copies of similar impressions. A blind man can form no notion of color which he does not experience. Hume, thus, regards that all our ideas are derived from sensations.

3.4 Critical Theory of Kant:

Kant’s theory of knowledge is regarded as Critical Theory, as he places human reason under criticism. Kant was dissatisfied with the dogmatic acceptance of rationalism and empiricism. While Rationalism holds that only

reason is the source of certain knowledge, Empiricism asserts that sense experience alone can provide certain knowledge. According to Kant, whether it is reason or sense experience, it alone cannot make knowledge possible or certain. Hence, according to Kant, knowledge is not that which sense experience provides and not also that which are in reason without any sense perception. For Kant, knowledge must always involved new information. Kant's attempt is to make a dualism between rationality and sensibility. Sensation receives information of the external world. This sensory information is meaningless unless understanding constructs them properly. While sensation supplies matter for knowledge, understanding gives its form. Kant gives equal status to both the faculties of reason and sensation.

Kant asserts that both percepts and concepts jointly construct knowledge. Knowledge is produced from the joint efforts of both sensation and understanding. Any idea taken by itself is not knowledge. The ideas like man, earth, heat etc. are to be combined with other ideas to produce knowledge. Knowledge is constituted by judgments. Judgment involves subject and predicate. For example, 'Man is a rational being' and 'the earth is a planet' etc. Thus all knowledge is formulated into propositions. All knowledge is judgment, but not all judgment is knowledge.

There are two propositions or judgments- analytic and synthetic. Analytic judgments are those of which the predicate involves nothing new information about the subject. For example, all unmarried are bachelor. Here the predicate is already included in the subject hence it cannot give new information about the subject. Again synthetic judgments are those of which the predicate adds something new information about the subject. For example, the earth is a planet. Here, the idea of planet produces something new information about the subject of earth that earth is a planet. Kant has mentioned that knowledge must involve new information. Hence synthetic judgment constitutes knowledge.

Again, Kant points out that not every synthetic judgment is necessarily scientific knowledge. To constitute real scientific knowledge, a judgment must be true in all cases and the relation between the subject and predicate must be necessary, not accidental. 'It is cold' is a synthetic judgment, but also a accidental case as it may be hot tomorrow. As not a necessary proposition, it is not scientific judgment. Kant argues that in order to be necessary or scientific judgment, a judgment must be based on rasion basis. It must be a judgment a priori, which is necessary, but not accidental or

contingent. For example, Bodies are extended. This is a judgment which is true and will be true tomorrow and evermore. For Kant, a judgment must be rooted in reason as well as in observation. It must be a judgment a priori as well as synthetic. Hence, according to Kant, knowledge is synthetic a priori judgment. Kant asserts two faculties of knowledge, one of which furnishes the materials of knowledge and is called the sensibility or intuitive reason and the other fashions them, or makes concepts of them i.e., the understanding faculty.

Stop to Consider:

- Kant denies the partial acceptance of reason and sensibility as the source of knowledge.
- Kant's attempt is to make a dualism of sensibility and rationality.
- Sensibility provides the contents of knowledge and reason shapes these into knowledge.
- Knowledge must involve new information. i.e. knowledge is synthetic. Again, to be knowledge it must be certain and necessary, not accidental. Hence, knowledge needs to be a priori.
- Therefore, in Kant, knowledge is synthetic a priori expressed in judgment.

Self Assessment Question:

- **Find out the differences between Rationalism and Empiricism.**

Ans: Rationalism and Empiricism are the two different theories about the origin of knowledge. Here are the differences among their primary ideas:

Rationalism holds reason as the only source of knowledge. On the other hand, empiricism maintains that only sense experience can provide the certain knowledge.

Rationalist philosophers prescribe the innate ideas of man which are certain and universal concepts from which all other knowledge are derived. Empiricist philosophers deny the universality and certainty of the notion of innate ideas. They hold that all knowledge including the ideas of reason also is obtained from sense experience.

Rationalism admits that the knowledge of world is identical with the realm of mathematics. Mathematics deals with necessary truths and by the process of deduction it proves the certainty of knowledge. But Empiricist maintains that mathematics deals with necessary truths but the concrete world of experience contains both necessary facts of reason and the contingent facts of experience.

- **Rationalism as a school of thought has been developed after Rene Descartes in the medieval period. The notion of reason was also placed in the Greek notion of Socrates and Plato's philosophy. Explain the role of reason in the philosophy of Socrates and Plato.**

Ans: Rationalism is a school of thought which maintains that only reason is the ultimate source of certain knowledge. Rationalism as a methodical school of thought has been developed in the medieval period after Rene Descartes. But it is seen that in the history of philosophy, Greek philosophers Socrates and Plato were renowned rationalist philosophers. The concept of reason played an important role in Socrates and Plato's thought. According to Socrates, reason is the only source of knowledge. Knowledge can be formed through the general concepts of mind and these innate notions are formed by reason. Socrates asserts that the wisdom and the distinction between right and wrong lie in people's reason, not in society. He maintains that knowledge is rigid and certain and every single concept has a fixed definition. Socrates denies the particular sense experience and the sense experience provides doubtful knowledge. He says that to be knowledge it should be certain and universal. Only reason or ideas can provide certain and universal knowledge. Socrates searches for method of general, commonly held truths that shape beliefs and scrutinizes them to determine their consistency with other beliefs. Knowledge is nothing other than a concept or a truth that is universal. Socrates identifies virtue with knowledge. For him virtue is the knowledge of what is good or right and knowledge of what is bad or wrong.

Plato also considered that true knowledge cannot be achieved in sense experience. The universal knowledge is consists of reason or idea. The objects of sense experience are particular and are the appearances of the universal notions of knowledge. True knowledge is necessary, universal and certain. Only reason can furnish this

kind of complete knowledge. Plato draws a distinction between knowledge, which is certain and mere true opinion, which are not certain. The mere opinions are derived from sensation. On the other hand, the certain knowledge lie in the innate ideas of mind. He also makes a distinction between world of ideas and world of objects. For him, the world of ideas is the real, universal and certain world. On the other hand, the world of objects is the illusory, particular and hence doubtful. The world of particular is the appearance of the world of ideas or world of universal.

Hence, both Socrates and Plato placed an important role to reason in their theory of knowledge.

- **Kant does not accept reason and sense experience as an unaccompanied source of knowledge. He tries to establish knowledge as a unite process of reason and experiment. Do you agree that Kant is successful in forming a dualism of reason and sense regarding knowledge?**

Ans: Kant does not admit the bias acceptance of rationalism and empiricism regarding the origin of knowledge. While Rationalism holds that only reason is the source of certain knowledge, Empiricism asserts that sense experience alone can provide certain knowledge. According to Kant, whether it is reason or sense experience, it alone cannot make knowledge possible or certain. Kant's attempt is to make a dualism between rationality and sensibility. Sensation receives information of the external world. This sensory information is meaningless unless understanding constructs them properly. While sensation supplies matter for knowledge, understanding gives its form. Kant gives equal status to both the faculties of reason and sensation.

Knowledge produced from the joint effort of both sensation and understanding. Any idea taken by itself is not knowledge. The ideas like man, earth, heat etc. are to be combined with other ideas to produce knowledge. Knowledge is constituted by judgments. Judgment involves subject and predicate. For example, 'Man is a rational being' and 'the earth is a planet' etc. Thus all knowledge is formulated into propositions. All knowledge is judgment, but not all judgment is knowledge.

There are two propositions or judgments- analytic and synthetic. Analytic judgments are those of which the predicate involves nothing new information about the subject. For example, all unmarried are bachelors. Here the predicate is already included in the subject hence it cannot give new information about the subject. Again synthetic judgments are those of which the predicate adds something new information about the subject. For example, the earth is a planet. Here, the idea of planet produces something new information about the subject of earth that earth is a planet. Kant has mentioned that knowledge must involve new information. Hence synthetic judgment constitutes knowledge.

Again, Kant points out that not every synthetic judgment is necessarily scientific knowledge. To constitute real scientific knowledge, a judgment must be true in all cases and the relation between the subject and predicate must be necessary, not accidental. 'It is cold' is a synthetic judgment, but also a accidental case as it may be hot tomorrow. As not a necessary proposition, it is not scientific judgment. Kant argues that in order to be necessary or scientific judgment, a judgment must be based on rational basis. It must be a judgment a priori, which is necessary, but not accidental or contingent. For example, Bodies are extended. This is a judgment which is true and will be true tomorrow and evermore. For Kant, a judgment must be rooted in reason as well as in observation. It must be a judgment a priori as well as synthetic. Hence, according to Kant, knowledge is synthetic a priori judgment. Kant asserts two faculties of knowledge, one of which furnishes the materials of knowledge, is called the sensibility or intuitive reason and the other fashions them, or makes concept of them i.e., the understanding faculty.

Hence, from this discussion it can be said that Kant is succeeded in making a dualism between reason and sensation.

3.5 Nature of Reality:

Knowledge is regarded as the outcome of the relation between the knower and the object of knowledge. Philosophy enquires about what is the nature of the object of knowledge. Whether the object of knowledge is mind dependent or exists independent of mind. Regarding these questions two

theories are developed- Realism and Idealism. Realism holds that the objects of knowledge are independent of the mind and exist in the external world of mind. On the other hand, for Idealism the objects of knowledge are mind dependent and there is no knowledge outside mind.

3.5.1 Realism:

According to Realism, there is the existence of external world independent of the knowing mind. The objects need not to dependent in any way on the knowing mind for its existence. One may know or may not know a thing, but that has its existence in itself. For example, a man may not be aware about the existence of Taj Mahal in Agra. But it does not mean that Taj Mahal does not exist just because the man is not aware of its existence. Hence, any individual's awareness or non-awareness does not determine the existence of an external thing. According to the realists, there is no internal relation between knowledge and the object of knowledge, but only is externally related. There are commonsense view and scientific view about the notion of realism.

The commonsense view of realism holds that there is a world of physical objects like, house, trees, river, mountain, chair, house etc. which we can learn about directly through our sense organs. The nature of the known external objects is similar to the way the knower knows it as they reflect exactly before us as they are. Our organs of sense perception are reliable and they directly perceive the external things exactly. Durant Drake (1878-1933) used the term Naive Realism in his book 'Invitation to philosophy' where he explains that the object of knowledge along with its qualities like color, taste, smell, extension etc. has its own existence independent of the individual's knowing mind. It is the common sense view of common people about the external objects without examining philosophically. It is also called as natural realism as individual obtain the knowledge of the objects as a result of the direct contact of sense and object and the objects reflect exactly they are.

There is another form which is a modification of commonsense realism which regards that all perception is a result of awareness of inner representations of the external objects. It is called as Representative Realism or Scientific Realism. Representative realism analyses the nature of the external objects and its relation to the knowing mind. In his book 'An Essay Concerning

Human Understanding', John Locke explains the relationship between the knower and the external objects in a scientific manner. Locke maintains that individual cannot know the object directly. One can know only the copy or images or representations of an object. One can know the object only through the qualities that the object possesses. But Locke maintains that all the qualities are not mind independent, some are dependent on the consciousness of the knower. The primary qualities are mind independent and are objective qualities of the objects. For example, extension, weight, motion etc. Again the secondary qualities are mind dependent or subjective qualities of the mind, e.g., the color, taste, smell of an object.

Stop to Consider:

- Realism admits the existence of objects in external world independent of the mind.
- Realism involves two views- Commonsense view and Scientific View.
- Commonsense Realism asserts that the things are presented in our knowledge directly as they are. Scientific Realism maintains that perception is the result of awareness of inner representation of the existence of the external objects.
- Durant Drake is a prominent commonsense Realist. He used the term Naïve Realism for commonsense realism.
- John Locke is prominent Scientific Realist which he named as Representative Realism.

3.5.2 Idealism:

Idealism holds that the existences of objects of knowledge are totally mind dependent or awareness of mind. It holds that the relation between the knower and the object of known is internal, not external. The object of knowledge has no mind independent existence. According to Idealism, the object of knowledge with all its qualities depends for its existence on the knowing mind. The objects which are not related to mind is not known and hence are not subject of knowledge. Plato, George Berkeley, Hegel, Immanuel Kant can be regarded as the followers of Idealsim.

Plato's epistemology considers that the world is the expression or copy of mind. He asserts that the external world is the apprehension of the abstract

universal idea. He distinguishes the world of objects from the world of ideas. According to Plato, physical objects are particulars and destructible. Hence these are not absolute and not real. Only ideas are real, universal and eternal. The particulars of external world are only the reflections of ideas. Plato regards that universals are eternal and spiritual. The sensible world is the appearance or shadow of the spiritual world. Hence, knowledge is dependent on the knowing mind.

The idealists hold that objects only exist as long as they are being perceived. If an object is not being perceived it does not exist. George Berkeley (1685-1753) asserts that 'to exist is to be perceived' (esse est percipi). Something has existence only when it is perceived by sense organs. According to Berkeley, all objects are bunch of qualities. All qualities, both primary and secondary qualities of things are the subjective states or ideas of our mind. All the experiences or feelings of hot, cold, darkness, sweet, sour, smell, heaviness, weight etc. in the objects are only the experience of the sensible mind. Hence, all experience is subjective and there is no objective existence of bodies outside the individual mind. As giving the highest preference on the subjective mind, Berkeley's view on idealism is considered as Subjective Idealism.

G. W. F. Hegel (1770-1831) admits that all objects are identical with some absolute idea. To be able to know the object of human reason or consciousness, there must be in some sense an identity of thought and being. Hegel asserts that the ultimate reality is Absolute Idea or Thought or Mind. There is internal relation between the Absolute Reality and the world of things and minds. The Absolute Reality manifests its own being in and through the diversity of this world. Hegel's idealism accepts the reality of the objective world and the Absolute manifests through the finite objective world. In Hegel's theory thought and reality are at bottom identical. Hence, Hegel's Idealism can be considered as Objective Idealism.

Stop to Consider:

- Idealism asserts that knowledge of everything is totally mind dependent.
- Idealism is to be divided into two- subjective Idealism and Objective idealism.

- Subjective Idealism holds that the existence of things is determined through the subjective perception of individual. Empiricist George Berkeley is the propounder of Subjective Realism.
- Absolute Idealism holds that all knowledge of objects are identical with some absolute idea. G. W. F. Hegel is the advocator of Absolute idealism.

Check Your Progress:

- **What is the realistic view regarding the nature of object of knowledge?**

Ans: According to Realism, the nature of the object of knowledge is external. There is the existence of external world independent of the knowing mind. The objects need not to dependent in any way on the knowing mind for its existence. One may know or may not know a thing, but that has its existence in itself. For example, a man may not be aware about Taj Mahal of Agra. But it does not mean that Taj Mahal does not exist just because the man is not aware about that. Hence, any individual's awareness or non-awareness does not determine the existence of an external thing. According to the realists, there is no internal relation between knowledge and the object of knowledge, but only is externally related. There are commonsense view and scientific view about the notion of realism.

The commonsense view of realism holds that there is a world of physical objects like, house, trees, river, mountain, chair, house etc. which we can learn about directly through our sense organs. It is the common sense view of common people about the external objects without examining philosophically. It is also called as natural realism as individual obtain the knowledge of the objects as a result of the direct contact of sense and object and the objects reflect exactly they are.

There is another form which is a modification of commonsense realism which regards that all perception is a result of awareness of inner representations of the external objects. It is called Representative Realism or Scientific Realism. One can know only the copy or images or representations of an object. One can know the object only through the qualities that the object possesses.

- **How Scientific realism differs from Naïve Realism?**

Ans: Naïve Realism is another name for commonsense realism. Naive realism holds that there is a world of physical objects like, house, trees, mountain, river, chair, house etc. which we can learn about directly through our sense organs. The nature of the known or external objects is similar to the way the knower knows it as they reflected exactly before us as they are. Our organs of sense perception are reliable and they directly perceive the external things exactly. It explains that the object of knowledge along with its qualities like color, taste, smell, extension etc. has its own existence independent of the individual's knowing mind. It is the common sense view of common people about the external objects without examining philosophically. It is also called as natural realism as individual obtain the knowledge of the objects as a result of the direct contact of sense and object and the objects reflect exactly they are.

On the other hand, scientific realism is a modification of commonsense realism which regards that all perception is a result of awareness of inner representations of the external objects. It is also called as Representative Realism. Representative realism analyses the nature of the external objects and its relation to the knowing mind. John Locke is regarded as the propounder of Scientific realism. He explains the relationship between the knower and the external objects of known in a scientific manner. Locke maintains that individual cannot know the object directly. One can know only the copy or images or representations of an object. One can know the object only through the qualities that the object possesses. But Locke maintains that all the qualities are not mind independent, some are dependent on the consciousness of the knower. The primary qualities are mind independent and are objective qualities of the objects. For example, extension, weight, motion etc. Again the secondary qualities are mind dependent or subjective qualities of the mind, e.g., the color, taste, smell of an object.

- **What does idealism say about the nature of object of knowledge?**

Ans: Regarding the nature of the object of knowledge, Idealism holds that the existences of objects of knowledge are totally mind

dependent or awareness of mind. It holds that the relation between the knower and the object of known is internal, not external. The object of knowledge has no mind independent existence. According to Idealism, the object of knowledge with all of its qualities depends for its existence on the knowing mind. The objects which are not related to mind is not known and hence are not subject of knowledge. Plato, George Berkeley, Hegel, Immanuel Kant can be regarded as the followers of Idealism.

- **What are the different views of Idealism?**

Ans: The idealists hold that objects only exist as long as they are being perceived. There are two main views on Idealism. One is the Subjective Idealism advocated by George Berkeley (1685-1753). He asserts that 'to exist is to be perceived' (*esse est percipi*). Something has existence only when it is perceived like seen, felt etc. by sense organs. According to Berkeley, all objects are bunch of qualities. All qualities, both primary and secondary qualities of things are the subjective states or ideas of our mind. All the experiences or feelings of hot, cold, darkness, sweet, sour, smell, heaviness, weight etc. in the objects are only the experience of the sensible mind. Hence, all experience are subjective and there is no objective existence of bodies outside the individual mind.

Another view is the Absolute Idealism advocated by G. W. F. Hegel (1770-1831). He admits that all objects are identical with some absolute idea. To be able to know the object of human reason or consciousness, there must be in some sense an identity of thought and being. Hegel asserts that the ultimate reality as Absolute Idea or Thought or Mind. There is internal relation between the Absolute Reality and the world of things and minds. The Absolute Reality manifests its own being in and through the diversity of this world. Hegel's idealism accepts the reality of the objective world and the Absolute manifests through the finite objective world. In Hegel's theory thought and reality are at bottom identical.

3.6 Summing Up:

The basic queries of the theories of knowledge are ‘What is knowledge? What are the sources of knowledge? Is there any limitation of knowledge? What is the nature of the objects of knowledge?’ etc. Epistemology is the branch of philosophy that mainly concerns with these queries. Rationalism and Empiricism are the two theories of Epistemology which deals with the issue of the origin of knowledge.

What is the source or origin of knowledge? Rationalism argues that reason is the only source of knowledge from which one can achieve certain knowledge. Rene Descartes, Baruch Spinoza and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz are known as the prominent followers of rationalism which demand that knowledge is a priori. Rationalism is the method of thinking which involves a deductive and abstract way of reasoning. Empiricist philosophers argue that knowledge is possible only through sense experience. Empiricism asserts that knowledge is not a priori, but only a posteriori which can be gained only after sense experience. Empiricism, as a school of thought has been developed after John Locke, George Berkeley and David Hume. According to empiricism, the learning process of man is based on observation and perception; it demands that knowledge is possible only in sense experience. Empiricism emphasizes on the role of empirical evidence in the formation of ideas, rather than innate ideas or traditions. ‘Critical Theory’ is another theory which demands knowledge as the joint construction of reason and experience. Immanuel Kant is the founder of Critical theory of knowledge. Kant argues that knowledge should be informative as well as certain. Experience supplies new information and reason ascertains its certainty; and this knowledge is expressed in judgment. Hence, for Kant knowledge is synthetic a priori judgment.

Again, another problem is what is the nature of the objects of knowledge or reality? Whether the object of knowledge is mind dependent or exists independent of mind? Regarding to these question two theories are developed- Realism and Idealism. Realism holds that the objects of knowledge are independent of the mind and exist in the external world of mind. One may know or may not know a thing, but that has its existence in itself. On the other hand, for Idealism the objects of knowledge are mind dependent and there is no knowledge outside mind. According to Idealism, the object of knowledge with all of its qualities depends for its existence on the knowing mind. The objects which are not related to mind is not known and hence are not subject of knowledge.

3.7 References & Suggested Readings:

Berkeley, George, *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, 1710

Descartes, Rene, *Discourse on Method*, 1637

Descartes, Rene, *The Meditations*, 1641

Drake, Durant, *Invitation to Philosophy*, 1933

Hume, David, *An Enquiry Concerning human Understanding*, 1748

Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 1781

Locke, John, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, 1690

Masih, Y., *A Critical History of Western Philosophy* (Greek, Medieval and Modern), Motilal Banarasi Dass Publishers Private Limited, Delhi

S.J. Copleston, Frederick, *A History of Philosophy, Modern Philosophy: From Descartes to Leibnitz*, Vol. IV

S.J. Copleston, Frederick, *A History of Philosophy, Modern Philosophy: Hobbes to Hume*, Vol. V

Thilly, Frank, *History of Philosophy*, Surjeet Publications

Warburton, Nigel; *Philosophy-The Basics*; Third Edition; Routledge-Taylor & Francis Group Publishing

-----×-----

Unit 4

RELATION OF GOD AND THE WORLD: DEISM, PANTHEISM, PANENTHEISM, PROOFS FOR EXISTENCE OF GOD: ONTOLOGICAL, COSMOLOGICAL

Contents:

- 4.0 Introduction**
- 4.1 Objectives**
- 4.2 Relation of God and the World**
 - 4.2.1 Deism**
 - 4.2.2 Pantheism**
 - 4.2.3 Panentheism**
- 4.3 Proofs for the existence of God**
 - 4.3.1 Ontological Proof**
 - 4.3.2 Cosmological Proof**
 - 4.3.3 Moral Proof**
 - 4.3.4 Teleological Proof**
- 4.4 Summing Up**
- 4.5 References & Suggested Readings**
- 4.6 Model Questions**
- 4.7 Answer to Check Your Progress**

4.0 Introduction:

Discussion on the two topics comprising the present unit, namely, “Relation of God and the World” and “Proofs for the existence of God” comes under one of the fundamental branches of Philosophy known as ‘Philosophy of Religion’. Philosophy analyses as well as critically evaluates most basic concepts and beliefs of human beings. Different areas of philosophy direct their attention on important areas of human thought and life. Religion, being an integral aspect of human life, is also an important area of attention for the philosophers. Philosophy of religion is the critical examination of basic religious concepts and beliefs. The concept of God or the Absolute is the most important, most universal and central concept of religion and as such an important matter of concern for the philosophers.

With regard to the relation of God and the world, there are primarily three theories—Deism, Pantheism and Panentheism. The primary question with which these theories are associated is—what type of relationship God, the creator holds with the world, i.e. His creation? In other words, the question has been one of transcendence and immanence. Is God transcendent to the world? Or is He immanent in it? The manner in which this question has been answered gives rise to the theories explaining the relationship between God and the world.

The matter with regard to the existence of God is also a matter of paramount importance in Philosophy. The question whether people can have any reason to believe that God or some ultimate reality exists is central to Philosophy of Religion. Various philosophers and theologians have offered numerous proofs for the existence of God. In the history of Philosophy, there are four proofs for the existence of God—Ontological, Cosmological, Moral and Teleological.

4.1 Objectives:

After going through this unit, you will be able to—

- *analyse* the notions of Deism, Pantheism and Panentheism
- *describe* the concept of Deism
- *explain* Pantheism
- explain Panentheism
- *to differentiate* amongst Deism, Pantheism and Panentheism
- *explain* the ontological proof
- *describe* the features of the cosmological proof
- *describe* the moral proof
- *describe* the teleological proof
- *an attempt* is made to differentiate among the proofs.

4.2 Relation of God and the World:

4.2.1 Deism:

Deism is that metaphysical theory which attempts to explain the relationship between God and the world in terms of transcendence. It was the predominant religious philosophy of British thinkers. It was introduced by

Herbert of Cherbury and was greatly popularized by Sir Isaac Newton and was accepted by Charles Darwin. According to this theory, God is completely external or transcendent to the world. In Deism, God is considered as perfect, infinite, eternal, omnipotent, omniscient and the absolute reality. As God is perfect, He has also created the world as a perfect machine. Just as a machine being perfect requires no supervision, similarly the world being perfect does not require the divine supervision. After creating the world, God is retired from the world like an absentee landlord.

Deism believes that God is the First Cause of the world. He has created the world out of nothing by His will at a particular point of time. After creation, the world runs independently of Him with the secondary causes like will, forces and energy. Similarly, God created men, invested them with free will and set them to work to realize their goal. God will intervene when some problems arise in His creation.

The relationship between God and the world is explained by this theory in terms of the analogy of the watchmaker and the watch made by him. The relation of the watchmaker with the watch comes to an end when the watch has been finally made. Similarly, the relation of God with the world comes to an end when the world has been finally created.

In short, according to Deism, the world is an independent reality outside of God and that the will of men enjoy absolute freedom. However, on certain occasions, the world depends on God and His intervention is necessary.

Stop to Consider The key concept of Deism in explaining the relationship between God and the world is transcendence. In the deistic counterpart, God is considered as external or transcendent to the world. In other words, He is living outside the world. He has created the world at a particular point of time. After creating the world he is retired from the world like an absentee landlord. However, he will intervene when some problems arise in the world.

Check Your Progress1.

Define Deism.

4.2.2 Pantheism:

Pantheism conceives of the relationship between God and the world in terms of immanence. According to this theory, God is wholly immanent in

the world. The word ‘pantheism’ comes from two Greek words ‘pan’ and ‘theos’ meaning ‘all’ and ‘God’ respectively. Therefore, etymologically pantheism means that all is God. More commonly it means that the world is God and God is the world. Thus, pantheism makes God and the world identical. There is no difference between the two. God is everything and everything is God. A tree is God, a rock is God, an animal is God, you are God and I am God etc.

Pantheism is opposite of deism. In deism, the key-concept in explaining the relationship between God and the world is transcendence while in case of pantheism it is immanence. In pantheism, God is said to be imminent in the world in the sense that God pervades the whole world as its indwelling spirit. Immanence of God also means that God is the primordial stuff of which everything is the modification.

There is confusion between pantheism and omnipresence of God. God’s omnipresence means He is present everywhere. There is no place in the universe where God is not present. This is not the same thing as pantheism. God is everywhere, but He is not everything. God is present inside a tree and inside a person, but that does not mean that a tree or a human person is God.

According to pantheism, the natural world is divine and as such we do not need to look beyond the world for the proper object of ultimate respect.

Stop to Consider

The key concept in pantheism in explaining the relationship between God and the world is immanence. According to this theory, God is completely immanent in the world. He is inside the world. He is in everything comprising the natural world. Infact, in pantheism, God is identified with the world. God is the world and the world is God. God is immanent in the world in two senses—He is immanent in the sense of being pervaded in the whole world as its indwelling spirit and secondly, He is immanent in the sense that He is the primordial stuff of which everything is the modification.

Check Your Progress: 2

How does Pantheism explain the relationship between God and the world?

4.2.3 Panentheism:

Panentheism tries to explain the relationship between God and the world in terms of both immanence and transcendence. This theory considers God as both immanent and transcendent. As such it is a reconciliatory theory of both deism and pantheism. Panentheism literally means all is in God as ‘pan’ means ‘all’, ‘en’ means ‘in’ and ‘theos’ means ‘God’. This theory asserts that God is immanent in the world as He is ever-present in every movement of the world and is intimately connected with it. Again, God is transcendent to the world since the world follows from and is in God, but not God. Hence, God though immanent in the world is also transcendent to the world.

Panentheism states that the world exists in God, but it is not identical with God. God is beyond and above the world. He permeates the world and yet above in it. Unlike pantheism which holds an identity between God and the world, Panentheism maintains a distinction between the two. Panentheism emphasizes God’s presence in the world without losing the distinct identity of either God or the world. It asserts that physical world is in God, but the latter is greater than the former. The world is part of God, but not all of God. In pantheism, the universe with everything included in it is equal to the Divine, but in panentheistic counterpart, god and the world are not ontologically equivalent.

Stop to Consider

Panentheism conceives of the relationship between God and the world in terms of both immanence and transcendence, that is, God is both transcendent to and immanent in the world. In other words, He is inside the world and yet beyond the world. He is immanent in the world by being present everywhere in the world. He is transcendent to the world as the world follows from God and is in Him, but not God. So unlike pantheism, panentheism does not accord equal ontological status to God and the world.

Check Your Progress: 3

What is the metaphysical position of Panentheism with regard to the relation between God and the world?

SAQ (Self-Asking Question)

How do you differentiate among the theories explaining the relationship between God and the world?

.....
.....

4.3 Proofs for the existence of God:

4.3.1 Ontological Proof:

The ontological proof attempts to prove the existence of God from the very idea of God.

This proof was first given by St. Anselm, a medieval English Philosopher and Theologian. In modern period, Descartes has advanced a new formulation of this argument.

To begin with St. Anselm, he, first of all, has defined God as thus-”God is a being than which nothing greater can be conceived.” By ‘greater’ Anselm means more perfect, the highest and the supreme. He asserts that existence is necessary to the concept of such a being. If He did not exist, He would not be as great as if He did exist and by definition, He is the greatest being that can be conceived. Therefore, God must exist. According to Anselm, the most perfect conceivable being must exist in reality as well as human understanding. He said that God is a necessary existence, so it is impossible to conceive of Him not existing. ‘It means that : To think otherwise leads to self-contradiction.’

Descartes has given a new version of the ontological argument. He has defined God as the most perfect being and he, in his ontological argument, tries to prove God’s existence as the cause of the idea of the most perfect being. Descartes considers existence as a quality, an attribute or a predicate. He asserts explicitly that existence refers to perfection. Perfection means to him the attributes of power, goodness, knowledge and also existence. Descartes’ formulation of the ontological argument is: the idea of God is that of a perfect being; a perfect being lacks no positive quality; existence is a positive quality. Therefore, God does not lack existence; He exists. According to Descartes, while the ideas of all other things imply only the possibility of their existence, necessary existence is inseparable from the concept of the most perfect being. Thus without the existence of god we cannot think of Him.

Stop to Consider

The ontological argument tries to prove God's existence from the very concept of God. According to Anselm, the concept of God is that of a being than which nothing greater can be conceived. By greater Anselm means that God is the most perfect, the highest and the supreme and asserts that existence is necessary to the concept of such a being. Descartes conceived of God as the most perfect being and existence as a quality or predicate or attribute. Accordingly he asserts that the most perfect being cannot lack any quality. Existence, being a quality, is necessary to God. Existence is inseparable from God.

Check Your Progress: 4

How does the ontological proof try to prove God's existence?

4.3.2 Cosmological Proof:

The cosmological proof begins with the idea of the world as an effect. Then it postulates God as its first cause. The cosmological proof argues as follows: 'the world is a system of effects which have their causes; these causes again are effects of their causes and so on.' But we must stop at a point and suppose the existence of an absolute First Cause which is self-existent and self-caused and independent of any other cause. Otherwise, there will be infinite regress. The cosmological proof assumes God as this absolute First Cause of the world.

The classical formulation of the Cosmological proof is advanced by St. Thomas Aquinas. In his book "Summa Theologica", Aquinas has given "Five Ways" of the cosmological proof. For him, God's existence can be proved in five ways.

The first way is based on the fact of motion or more generally from the fact of change to a prime mover or unmoved mover. According to Aquinas, natural things are in motion. But they did not put themselves into motion. If every moving thing were moved by another moving thing, then there would be no first mover; if no first mover exists, there would be no other mover and in such a situation, nothing would be in motion. Because things are in motion, therefore, it is necessary to have a first mover who is not moved by another thing and this is God.

The second way is based on the nature of causation. In the sensible world, nothing can cause itself. But if everything were caused by something else, there would be no first cause and without a first cause, there would be no first effect and consequently no effect at all. So we must admit a first cause which is God.

The third way is based on the contingent nature of things. Things in our experience may exist or may not exist. But if everything were like this, once there would have been nothing at all. Therefore, there must exist something the existence of which is necessary. This is God.

In the fourth way, Aquinas argues for God as the cause of perfection in anything. It is the fact that all natural things possess degrees of goodness, truth, nobility and all other perfections. Therefore, there must be that which is the source of these perfections, namely, pure goodness, pure truth and so on. This source is God.

The fifth way is predicated on the observation that natural things act for an end or purpose. In other words, they function in accordance with a plan or design. Accordingly, an intelligent being exists by which things are directed towards their end. This intelligent being is God.

Descartes has offered another version of the cosmological proof. In this proof, Descartes tries to prove God's existence as the cause of the God-idea. The innate idea of God is that of an infinite, independent, omnipotent, omniscient and absolutely perfect being. What is the cause of this idea? The idea of God which Descartes takes to be objectively valid would be caused only by something having the same reality and perfection. Hence, God Himself is the cause of His Idea. So God must exist.

Stop to Consider

The cosmological proof attempts to prove God's existence by considering Him as the First Cause of the Universe. The world is a system of effects which have their causes; these causes again are effects of their causes and so on. But we must stop at a point and suppose the existence of an absolute First Cause which is self-existent and self-caused and independent of any other cause. Otherwise, there will be infinite regress. The cosmological proof assumes God as this absolute First Cause of the world.

Check Your Progress: 5

What are the 'Five Ways' of St. Anselm?

4.3.3 The Moral Proof:

The moral proof for the existence of God is put forwarded by Immanuel Kant. He has regarded the existence of God as a postulate of morality. The highest good as conceived by Kant is virtue in harmony with happiness. Our moral consciousness demands that virtue ought to be rewarded with happiness. But it often found that the virtuous are not properly rewarded and the vicious are not adequately punished in this world. That is why, Kant argues that there must be a Supreme Being or God who will reward the virtuous with happiness and punish the vicious with suffering in future life. God is the Moral Governor. Otherwise there will not be moral justice. According to Kant, virtue is within our control. But happiness is not. A person can make himself virtuous but he cannot make himself happy because being happy depends upon outward favorable conditions upon which he has not any control. But God can make the virtuous happy in future life because He is the controller of the realm of spirits and the realm of nature.

Thus, in Kant's moral argument, the existence of God is shown as the postulate of morality. In the absence of a God, it is impossible to attribute a moral order to the universe. Without the existence of a moral order, the moral laws will have no objectivity. Kant argues that if moral values have any validity, men should be rewarded or punished according to their merits or demerits. But in reality, we can see exactly a different picture as there is no essential conformity between action and reward. Therefore, it becomes necessary to presume the existence of God who will restore order in another life after death by rewarding the virtuous and punishing the vicious. Hence, the existence of God is a moral postulate without which reality or objectivity can be attributed to moral values.

Stop to Consider

The moral proof argues that if there is no God, then the validity of moral laws will be lost. The moral laws demand that virtue should be rewarded with happiness and the vicious should get punishment. But in reality we can see opposite picture as the virtuous are found to be unhappy while the vicious are leading a happy life. Therefore, it becomes necessary to presume the existence of God who will restore order in

another life after death by rewarding the virtuous and punishing the vicious. Hence, the existence of God is a moral postulate without which reality or objectivity can be attributed to moral values.

Check Your Progress: 6

What is the moral proof?

4.3.4 The Teleological Proof:

The teleological proof attempts to prove the existence of God by empirical means. This proof infers the existence of God from the marks of design in the world as its intelligent designer. This proof argues that the world is full of unity, order and harmony and as such it must be designed by an infinite, intelligent Designer or Divine Architect and this intelligent Designer is nothing else but God.

The teleological proof maintains that the universe is not mere aggregates of events, rather it is an organized whole in which there is order, harmony and discipline. For example, there is orderly design pervading in the entire phenomenal world such as there are thousands of nerve cells functioning properly in the complex living organism. So also there is order in the lives of plants and animals. Aquatic animals possess scales instead of lungs which enable them to take breath under water. These evidences certainly lead us to believe in the existence of an Intelligent Designer who makes the universe go in order.

William Paley's analogy of watch conveys the essence of the teleological proof. He asks us to suppose that I see a rock lying on the ground while walking in a desert. It is convincing to me that by the natural process, the rock is formed. But if I see a watch lying on the ground, I cannot reasonably account for it in a similar way. A watch consists of a complex arrangement of wheels, cogs, axles, springs and balances etc. all operating accurately together for measurement of time. Thus, we can very well postulate an intelligent designer who has manufactured the watch. Similarly, Paley argues, the world is a complex mechanism which is being designed by a Supreme Designer and that Designer is God.

Stop to Consider

The teleological proof demonstrates the existence of God on the basis of the order, harmony and design prevailing in the world. In the world around us we can see harmony and order pervading everywhere. The teleological proof argues that such harmony and design must be designed by an intelligent designer who is none other than God.

Check Your Progress: 7

How does the teleological proof demonstrate the existence of God?

SAQ (Self-Asking Question)

How do you differentiate among the proofs for the existence of God?

.....
.....
.....

4.4 Summing Up:

The present unit has made a discussion on two most important topics of philosophy of religion. One is the theories explaining the relationship between God and the world while the other is the proofs advanced in favour of the existence of God.

So far as the theories with regard to the relationship between God and the World are concerned, they try to deal with the same in terms of immanence and transcendence. God is believed as the Supreme Being who creates the world, preserves as well as maintains it. Now what sort of relation God has with His creation? Does He transcend the world? Or Is He immanent in it? Deism goes for explaining the relation in terms of transcendence and in this theory God is completely external or transcendent to the world. God is the most Perfect Being. Being Perfect, He has made the world perfect and left the world by letting it to run independently. Pantheism has explained the relationship between God and the world in terms of immanence because in this theory God is completely immanent in the world. It identifies God with the world. The world or nature as the totality of everything is identical with God. Panentheism, being reconciliation between Deism and Pantheism, tries to explain the relationship between God and the world in terms of both

immanence and transcendence. As such you will find in this theory that God is both immanent and transcendent to the world. Being ever-present in every movement of the world, God is immanent in it. Again, God is transcendent to the world because the world follows from God and is in Him, but you must remember that the world exists only as his manifestation.

So far as the proofs for the existence of God are concerned—ontological, cosmological, moral and teleological—the ontological proof attempts to prove the existence of God from the very concept of God. The very idea of God is the idea of the most perfect being and such a being cannot lack existence. Existence is necessary to such a being. The cosmological proof begins with the idea of the world as an effect and then it postulates God as the First Cause of the world. The moral proof tries to prove God's existence as the postulate of morality. The teleological proof consists in inferring the existence of God from the order, harmony and design prevailing in the world as its Intelligent Designer.

4.5 References & Suggested Readings:

Banerjee, N. N., *Western Philosophy*, Prakashan Kendra, Lucknow, 1993.

Masih, Y., *Introduction to Religious Philosophy*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, Delhi, 2002.

Mohapatra, A.R., *Philosophy of Religion*, Sterling Publishers Private Limited, New Delhi, 1990.

Sinha, J. N., *Introduction to Philosophy*, New Central Book Agency (P) Limited, Calcutta, 2000.

Peterson, M., Hasker, W., Reichenbach, B., Basinger, D., *Philosophy of Religion* (2nd Edition), Oxford University Press, New York, 2001.

4.6 Model Questions:

A) Very Short Questions

1. Who has introduced Deism?
2. According to Deism, God is transcendent /immanent in the world.
3. What is the meaning of the word 'Pantheism'?

4. Pantheism is the opposite of Deism/ Panentheism.
5. What is the key concept in Pantheism in explaining the relationship between God and the world?
6. _____ considers God as both immanent and transcendent.
7. The ontological proof for the existence of God was given by St. Anselm/ St. Thomas Aquinas/ Immanuel Kant.
8. Who has given the “Five Ways”?
9. _____ regards the existence of God as a postulate of morality.
10. Name the proof which has inferred the existence of God from the marks of design in the world as its Intelligent Designer.

B) Short Questions (Answer within 150-200 words)

1. What is the deistic position with regard to the relationship between God and the world? Explain briefly.
2. Can Pantheism be identified with God’s omnipresence?
3. How does Panentheism reconcile between Deism and Pantheism?
4. How does St. Anselm try to prove the existence of God?
5. What are the “Five Ways” of St. Thomas Aquinas?
6. What is the moral proof for the existence of God?
7. How does the teleological proof try to demonstrate God’s existence?

C) Long Questions (Answer within 300-500 words)

1. Explain Deism as a theory of the relationship between God and the world.
2. How does Pantheism explain the relationship between God and the world? Explain.
3. How do you distinguish between Deism and Pantheism? Explain.
4. “God is both transcendent to and immanent in the world”. Explain the theory associated with this view.

5. Discuss the ontological proof for the existence of God.
6. Discuss the cosmological proof for the existence of God.
7. Discuss the moral proof for the existence of God.
8. Discuss the teleological proof for the existence of God.

4.7 Answer to Check Your Progress:

Answer to Q 1: Deism is that metaphysical theory which attempts to explain the relationship between God and the world in terms of transcendence. According to this theory, God is completely external or transcendent to the world. In Deism, God is considered as perfect, infinite, eternal, omnipotent, omniscient and the absolute reality. As God is perfect, He has also created the world as a perfect machine. Just as a machine being perfect requires no supervision, similarly the world being perfect does not require the divine supervision. After creating the world, God is retired from the world like an absentee landlord.

Answer to Q 2: Pantheism conceives of the relationship between God and the world in terms of immanence. According to this theory, God is wholly immanent in the world. More commonly it means that the world is God and God is the world. Thus, pantheism makes God and the world identical. There is no difference between the two. God is everything and everything is God. A tree is God, a rock is God, an animal is God, you are God, I am God etc. God is immanent in the world in two senses—He is immanent in the sense of being pervaded in the whole world as its indwelling spirit and secondly, He is immanent in the sense that He is the primordial stuff of which everything is the modification.

Answer to Q 3: Panentheism conceives of the relationship between God and the world in terms of both immanence and transcendence, that is, God is both transcendent to and immanent in the world. In other words, He is inside the world and yet beyond the world. He is immanent in the world by being present everywhere in the world. He is

transcendent to the world as the world follows from God and is in Him, but not God. So unlike pantheism, Panentheism does not accord equal ontological status to God and the world.

Answer to Q 4: The ontological argument tries to prove God's existence from the very concept of God. According to Anselm, the concept of God is that of a being than which nothing greater can be conceived. By greater Anselm means that God is the most perfect, the highest and the supreme and asserts that existence is necessary to the concept of such a being. Descartes conceived of God as the most perfect being and existence as a quality or predicate or attribute. Accordingly he asserts that the most perfect being cannot lack any quality. Existence, being a quality, is necessary to God. Existence is inseparable from God.

Answer to Q 5: In his book "Summa Theologica", Aquinas has given "Five Ways" of the cosmological proof. For him, God's existence can be proved in five ways.

The first way is based on the fact of motion or more generally from the fact of change to a prime mover or unmoved mover. According to Aquinas, natural things are in motion. But they did not put themselves into motion. If every moving thing were moved by another moving thing, then there would be no first mover; if no first mover exists, there would be no other mover and in such a situation, nothing would be in motion. Because things are in motion, therefore, it is necessary to have a first mover who is not moved by another thing and this is God.

The second way is based on the nature of causation. In the sensible world, nothing can cause itself. But if everything were caused by something else, there would be no first cause and without a first cause, there would be no first effect and consequently no effect at all. So we must admit a first cause which is God.

The third way is based on the contingent nature of things. Things in our experience may exist or may not exist. But

if everything were like this, once there would have been nothing at all. Therefore, there must exist something the existence of which is necessary. This is God.

In the fourth way, Aquinas argues for God as the cause of perfection in anything. It is the fact that all natural things possess degrees of goodness, truth, nobility and all other perfections. Therefore, there must be that which is the source of these perfections, namely, pure goodness, pure truth and so on. This source is God.

The fifth way is predicated on the observation that natural things act for an end or purpose. In other words, they function in accordance with a plan or design. Accordingly, an intelligent being exists by which things are directed towards their end. This intelligent being is God.

Answer to Q 6: The moral proof argues that if there is no God, then the validity of moral laws will be lost. The moral laws demand that virtue should be rewarded with happiness and the vicious should get punishment. But in reality we can see a opposite picture as the virtuous are found to be unhappy while the vicious are leading a happy life. Therefore, it becomes necessary to presume the existence of God who will restore order in another life after death by rewarding the virtuous and punishing the vicious. Hence, the existence of God is moral postulate without which no reality or objectivity can be attributed to moral values.

Answer to Q 7: The teleological proof demonstrates the existence of God on the basis of the order, harmony and design prevailing in the world. In the world around us we can see harmony and order pervading everywhere. The teleological proof argues that such harmony and design must be designed by an intelligent designer who is none other than God.

Answer to Self-Asking Questions:

Answer to Q No 1: The theories concerning the relationship between God and the world are basically three—Deism, Pantheism and Panentheism. All the theories agree among them

with regard to the point that God is the creator of the universe. According to these theories, God is the Supreme Being who creates the universe preserves as well as maintains it. But they differ among themselves with regard to the question—what type of relation God has with His creation? Does He transcend the world? Or is He immanent in it? With regard to this, the theories have upheld different viewpoints. According to Deism, God is wholly transcendent to the world while the Pantheistic position is that God is wholly immanent in the world; infact, there is no difference between God and the world. On the otherhand, Panentheism holds that God is not only transcendent to the world, but also immanent in it. Thus, with regard to the relationship between God and the world, Deism is completely opposed to Pantheism while Panentheism can be considered as a reconciliation of Deism and Pantheism.

Answer to Q No 2: So far as the proofs for the existence of God are concerned—ontological, cosmological, moral and teleological—the ontological proof attempts to prove the existence of God from the very concept of God. The very idea of God is the idea of the most perfect being and such a being cannot lack existence. Existence is necessary to such a being. The cosmological proof begins with the idea of the world as an effect and then it postulates God as the First Cause of the world. The moral proof tries to prove God’s existence as the postulate of morality. The teleological proof consists in inferring the existence of God from the order, harmony and design prevailing in the world as its Intelligent Designer.

-----x-----

Unit 5

THEORIES OF TRUTH: CORRESPONDENCE, COHERENCE, PRAGMATIC. MIND-BODY PROBLEM: INTERACTIONISM, PARALLELISM, PRE-ESTABLISHED HARMONY

Contents:

- 5.0 Introduction
- 5.1 Objectives
- 5.2 Correspondence Theory of Truth
- 5.3 Coherence Theory of Truth
- 5.4 Pragmatic Theory of Truth
- 5.5 Interactionism
- 5.6 Parallelism
- 5.7 Pre-established Harmony
- 5.8 Summing Up
- 5.9 References & Suggested Readings
- 5.10 Model Questions
- 5.11 Answers to Check Your Progress

5.0 Introduction:

Truth has been a topic of discussion in its own right for thousands of years. Most often truth is used to mean being in accord with fact or reality, or fidelity to an original or standard. Truth is also sometimes defined in modern contexts as an idea of “truth to self”, or authenticity. The aim of a science is to discover which of the propositions are in its domain are true. The philosophical question is not what is true? But rather, what is truth? Mainly in Philosophy the importance of this question stems from the variety and depth of the principles in which the concept of truth is deployed. The aim of a science is to discover which of the propositions are in its domain are true. The philosophical question is not what is true? But rather, what is truth? Mainly in Philosophy the importance of this question stems from the variety and depth of the principles in which the concept of truth is deployed. Moreover, a huge variety of issues in philosophy relate to truth, either by relying on theses about truth, or implying theses about truth. It would be

impossible to survey all there is to say about truth in any coherent way. Instead, this essay will concentrate on the main themes in the study of truth in the contemporary philosophical literature. Truth is usually held to be opposite to falsehood, which, correspondingly, can also suggest a logical, factual, or ethical meaning. The concept of truth is discussed and debated in several contexts, including philosophy, art, theology, and science. Some philosophers view the concept of truth as basic, and unable to be explained in any terms that are more easily understood than the concept of truth itself. To some, truth is viewed as the correspondence of language or thought to an independent reality, in what is sometimes called the correspondence theory of truth. Various theories and views of truth continue to be debated among scholars, philosophers, and theologians. Language is a means by which humans convey information to one another. The method used to determine whether something is a truth is termed a criterion of truth. There are varying stances on such questions as what constitutes truth: what things are truth bearers capable of being true or false; how to define, identify, and distinguish truth; what roles do faith and empirical knowledge play; and whether truth can be subjective or is objective: relative truth versus absolute truth.

The mind-body problem is an ongoing problem in the philosophy of mind and in metaphysics, concerning the nature of the relationship between the mind, or consciousness, and the physical world. The mind-body problem asks a number of questions: Are the mind and body separate substances or elements of the same substance? What is their relationship to each other? What is consciousness? And how can consciousness arise out of ordinary matter? These questions arises when mind and body are considered as distinct, based on the premise that the mind and the body are fundamentally different in nature. There are a number of responses to the mind-body problem, though none have universal acceptance. The problem was addressed by René Descartes in the 17th century, resulting in Cartesian dualism, and by pre-Aristotelian philosophers, and in earlier Asian traditions. A variety of approaches have been proposed. Most are either dualist or monist. Dualism maintains a rigid distinction between the realms of mind and matter. Monism maintains that there is only one unifying reality, substance or essence in terms of which everything can be explained.

5.1 Objectives:

After going through this unit you will be able to know—

- The correspondence theory of truth which states ‘truth is fidelity to objective reality’.
- The coherence theory of truth which regards truth as coherence within some specified set of sentences, propositions or beliefs. This theory is contrasted with the correspondence theory of truth.
- The pragmatic theory of truth which states that if an idea works then the idea is true. On the other hand if it does not work then it is false.
- From this unit you will also able to know about the various theories of mind body problem like interactionism according to which mind and body are two independent substances, yet they interact.
- Parallelism according to which there is just one reality and everything of the universe is a modification of this reality.
- Pre-established harmony of Leibnitz which states that every “substance” affects only itself, but all the substances (both bodies and minds) in the world nevertheless seem to causally interact with each other because they have been programmed by God in advance to “harmonize” with each other.

Stop to Consider:

‘Truth’ involves both the quality of “faithfulness, fidelity, loyalty, sincerity, veracity”, and that of “agreement with fact or reality”. Correspondence theories emphasise that true beliefs and true statements correspond to the actual state of affairs. This type of theory stresses a relationship between thoughts or statements on one hand, and things or objects on the other. It is a traditional model tracing its origins to ancient Greek philosophers such as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. This class of theories holds that the truth or the falsity of a representation is determined in principle entirely by how it relates to “things”, by whether it accurately describes those “things”.

The mind-body problem was brought up in antiquity, and can be seen in the works of Plato, though its modern formulation can be credited to Rene Descartes, who also presents a dualist response. Dualism

maintains a rigid distinction between the realms of mind and matter. Monism maintains that there is only one unifying reality, substance or essence in terms of which everything can be explained.

5.2 Correspondence Theory of Truth:

The correspondence theory of truth is one of the most widely held theories of truth. This theory says that truth is “fidelity to the objective reality”. Truth is the agreement between the statement of the fact and actual fact or between the judgement and the situation the judgement claims to describe. Truth has to do with the assertions or claims that we make about things. If I state that India is bound on the north by China, Nepal and Bhutan, my statement is true not because it agrees with other statements previously made, or because it works, but it corresponds to an actual geographical situation. The correspondence theory of truth simply states that truth consists in the agreement of a proposition with a fact. Apparently this theory is very close to our common sense understanding of the nature of truth. But there is much controversy around the meanings of ‘agreement’, ‘fact’ etc.

The correspondence theory is to be found in Plato’s dialogue “The Sophist”. In Aristotle’s book *Metaphysics* also we find a clear exposition of the correspondence theory of truth. Aristotle wrote as follows, “To say of what is that it is not, or of what is not that it is, is false; while to say of what is that it is, and of what is not that it is not, is true.” Empiricist philosophers are generally the supporters of the correspondence theory of truth. In the British empiricist tradition we find philosophers proving support to it. Locke, Russell, Moore, Wittgenstein (in his book *Tractatus*) and J.L.Austin are some of the leading supporters of this theory of truth.

Locke stated that correspondence means the relation between the copy and the original. The proposition or what he calls an idea is the copy of which the original is the external object. Correspondence in this context stands for the relation between copy and the original when the former is idea and the latter is the object. According to Locke, the philosophical object consists of secondary qualities and primary qualities and the substratum or the substance which holds the qualities together. Locke says that whatever we know we rely upon the sense organ. What is given in our sense organ is not the whole object, nor even a part of it, but something called an ‘idea’, which is caused by object and which is a copy or representation of object.

Our knowledge is true when the ideas of which knowledge consists correspond to the object which they represent. True knowledge is the correspondence between the representative and the represented. Just as a photograph is a copy of the original and it bears a resemblance to the original and for that reason is a true or correct photograph. So, ideas are copies of the original object and are true when they represent or resemble the original. What we come in contact are not the real existing objects but only the ideas which are the effects produced in our mind by the objects. These ideas represent the real world by virtue of their resemblance or correspondence with the real. Therefore the truth of our ideas or knowledge consist in their correspondence to the external world.

Russell has given a new interpretation of the correspondence theory of truth. According to Russell correspondence stands for a one – to- one correspondence between the proposition and external object. Russell holds that here it is important to define what we mean by fact, because according to this theory correspondence to fact constitutes the nature of truth. Moreover it is necessary to know what is the nature of correspondence which must subsist between belief and fact in order that the belief may be true. Russell also holds that one element in proposition must correspond to one element in the external world. But this view has certain limitations and because of these limitations Russell had to modify his version of the correspondence theory. Russell says that correspondence is to be understood in the sense of structural similarity. A proposition is a true proposition because of the structural similarity between the proposition and the fact corresponding to it. Wittgenstein in his picture theory also advocates the notion of structural similarity.

According to Wittgenstein if there is ‘a state of affairs’ corresponding to the components and structure of a proposition then the proposition is true. A proposition is to be a logical picture of reality. Propositions become true by picturing or modeling reality. In this way Wittgenstein actually presented a new version of the correspondence theory of truth. Wittgenstein wrote, “A picture represents a possible situation in logical space... a picture agrees with reality or fails to agree; it is correct or incorrect, true or false... the agreement or disagreement of its sense with reality constitutes its truth or falsity.” Wittgenstein stated that a statement, to be true, must have some kind of structural isomorphism with the state of affairs in the world that makes it true. For example, “A cat is on a mat” is true if, and only if, there

is in the world a cat and a mat and the cat is related to the mat by virtue of being on it. If any of the three, the cat, the mat, and the relation between them which correspond respectively to the subject, object, and verb of the statement is missing, the statement is false. Wittgenstein's picture theory is presented in his *Tractatus* primarily as a theory of meaning. But we may view it as a version of the correspondence theory of truth.

In 1950 J.L. Austin gave a new version of the correspondence theory of truth. Austin's version does not rely either on an atomist metaphysics or on an ideal language; the correspondence relation is explicated, not in terms of a structural isomorphism between proposition and fact, but in terms of purely conventional relations between the words and the world. Austin holds that there need not be any structural parallelism between a true statement and the state of affairs that makes it true. It is only necessary that the semantics of the language in which the statement is expressed are such as to correlate whole-for-whole the statement with the state of affairs. A false statement, for Austin, is one that is correlated by the language to a state of affairs that does not exist. According to Austin there are two conventions which are relevant to truth. One is descriptive convention and the other is demonstrative convention. Descriptive conventions correlates sentences with the types of situations to be found in the world. On the other hand demonstrative conventions correlate sentences with historic situations to be found in the world. Austin wrote, "A statement is said to be true when the historic state of affairs to which it is correlated by the demonstrative convention is of a type with which the sentence used in making it is correlated by the descriptive conventions." It is a distinctive version of the correspondence theory of truth.

Criticism:

The correspondence theory of truth is criticised on various grounds. One objection against this theory is that the correspondence theory of truth must inevitably lead into scepticism about the external world, because the required correspondence between our thoughts and reality is not ascertainable. It is typically pointed out that we cannot step outside our own minds to compare our thoughts with mind-independent reality. So the objection continues on the correspondence theory of truth, this is precisely what we would have to do to gain knowledge. We would have to access reality as it is in itself, independently of our cognition, and determine whether our thoughts

correspond to it. Since this is impossible, since all our access to the world is mediated by our cognition, the correspondence theory makes knowledge impossible. Since scepticism is unacceptable, the correspondence theory has to be rejected.

The correspondence theory of truth has not succeeded in giving us an adequate conception of fact. Particulars and events have locations in space and time. But facts do not have any location in space and time. Therefore there is a clear difference between fact and them. The correspondence theory of truth could not provide a proper account of the nature of truth, simply because it could not give an adequate conception of fact.

Check Your Progress I:

1. What is truth according to the correspondence theory of truth?
2. What do you understand by isomorphism?
3. What are the conventions that are related to truth as mentioned by Austin?

5.3 Coherence Theory of Truth:

Coherence theory of truth states that the truth of any (true) proposition consists in its coherence with some specified set of propositions. The coherence theory differs from its principal competitor, the correspondence theory of truth, in two essential respects. The competing theories give conflicting accounts of the relation that propositions bear to their truth conditions. According to one, the relation is coherence, according to the other, it is correspondence. The two theories also give conflicting accounts of truth conditions. According to the coherence theory, the truth conditions of propositions consist in other propositions. The correspondence theory, in contrast, states that the truth conditions of propositions are not propositions, but rather objective features of the world. Although the coherence and correspondence theories are fundamentally opposed in this way, they both present a substantive conception of truth. That is, both coherence and correspondence theories hold that truth is a property of propositions that can be analysed in terms of the sorts of truth-conditions propositions have, and the relations of propositions stand in to these conditions.

The coherence theory of truth asserted that the truth of a judgement is determined by its fittingness with other judgements belonging to a system.

So outside of and independently of a system there cannot be any true judgement. In other words for being true a judgement must fit into coherent system with other judgements. But coherence admits of degrees. Therefore it follows from this theory that a judgement can be more or less true. According to coherence theory of truth no judgement is absolutely true because we never attain a completely coherent system. But some judgements are truer than other judgements because they approach nearer to this ideal. It seems that coherence stands for some relation amongst judgements by virtue of which they form a system. The system is such that if anyone of them is accepted the others cannot be denied without contradictions. In other words coherence appears to stand for that particular relation by virtue of which one judgement is supported by another judgement, and no single judgement is independent of other judgements. Thus judgements are said to be coherent when there exists a relation of mutual entailment such that any one of them is deducible from the rest. No one of them can be true if any one of them is false. This is one way in which philosophers like Woozley have interpreted the idea of coherence.

Stop to Consider:

The coherence theory of truth regards truth as coherence within some specified set of sentences, propositions or beliefs. It is the “theory of knowledge which maintains that truth is a property primarily applicable to any extensive body of consistent propositions, and derivatively applicable to any one proposition in such a system by virtue of its part in the system”. Coherence theories of truth claim that coherence and consistency are important features of a theoretical system, and that these properties are sufficient to its truth. “Truth” exists only within a system, and doesn’t exist outside of a system. According to another version by H. H. Joachim (the philosopher credited with the definitive formulation of the theory, in his book *The Nature of Truth*, published in 1906), truth is a systematic coherence that involves more than logical consistency. In this view, a proposition is true to the extent that it is a necessary constituent of a systematically coherent whole.

Two principal lines of argument that have led philosophers to adopt a coherence theory of truth. Early advocates of coherence theories were persuaded by reflection on metaphysical questions. More recently, epistemological and semantic considerations have been the basis for

coherence theories. Early versions of the coherence theory were associated with idealism. Walker (1989) attributes coherentism to Spinoza, Kant, Fichte and Hegel. Certainly a coherence theory was adopted by a number of British Idealists in the last years of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth such as Bradley. Idealists are led to a coherence theory of truth by their metaphysical position. Idealists do not believe that there is an ontological distinction between beliefs and what makes beliefs true. From the idealists' perspective, reality is something like a collection of beliefs. Bradley and Brand Blanchard identified truth with verifiability which involves the further assumption that verification is holistic. It is a system of beliefs that is consistent and "harmonious".

Another important version of coherence theory is presented by Dummett and Putnam, which involves the assumption that there is for each proposition, some specific procedure for finding out whether one should believe it or not. Here a proposition is true only if it would be verified by the appropriate procedure. Consequently, a belief cannot be true because it corresponds to something which is not a belief. Instead, the truth of a belief can only consist in its coherence with other beliefs. A coherence theory of truth which results from idealism usually leads to the view that truth comes in degrees. A belief is true to the degree that it coheres with other beliefs.

One epistemological argument for coherentism is based on the view that we cannot "get outside" our set of beliefs and compare propositions to objective facts. A version of this argument was advanced by some logical positivists including Hempel (1935) and Neurath (1983). This argument, depends on a coherence theory of justification. The argument infers from such a theory that we can only know that a proposition coheres with a set of beliefs. We can never know that a proposition corresponds to reality. The coherence theory of truth mainly involves the following factors—

1. According to the coherence theory of truth no judgement, by itself, can be true. In other words, an isolated judgement cannot be true. A judgement in order to be true must enter in to a system. Only when a judgement enters in to a system it can be true.
2. All the judgements belonging to such a system must be consistent with one another. In other words the judgements belonging to such a system must be such that none of them contradicts any of them. This factor of consistency is of great importance.

3. The consistency that we have mentioned must be characterised by mutual support. Every judgement belonging to a coherent system should support and be supported by every other. If any judgement is taken away or denied then the rest will perish. It is to be noted here that the idea of mutual support is here taken in a special sense. It does not always mean entailment or deducibility. A judgement may support another judgement but it may not necessarily entail the other.
4. The fourth factor is the factor of forming a harmonious whole. All the true judgements must form a system and this system must exhibit harmony. It cannot be the case that we have harmonious true judgements but the system formed by these judgements is not characterised by the presence of the factor of harmony.
5. The system formed by the true judgements must be a comprehensive system. If it is not characterised by comprehensiveness then one system of true judgement may come into conflict with one another system of true judgements. So, ultimately there can be one comprehensive system of true judgements.
6. All the marks of coherence cannot be fully satisfied. In order that the system of coherent judgements be comprehensive we have to exhaust all judgements. But forming such a comprehensive system is not possible for the human mind. Therefore we cannot have a judgement which is completely true. A system of judgements may be more harmonious or less harmonious, more comprehensive or less comprehensive. Consequently a judgement can be more true or less true. The coherence theory of truth thus entailed the doctrine of degrees of truth. According to this doctrine no judgement can be absolutely true, again no judgement can be absolutely false. There cannot be any absolute truth or absolute falsity and our judgements fall within these two extremes. The doctrine of the degrees of truth is supported by Bradley, the distinguished neo-Hegelian philosopher. We can say that the whole Hegelian tradition of philosophy is committed to the coherence theory of truth.

Criticism:

The strength of the main argument for the coherence theory of truth is its claim that facts are concept involving entities just like propositions. The

weakness of this theory is that it under plays the role of reality itself in constituting facts. We are responsible only for the conceptualization of the facts. The raw data have to come from outside us. The facts are what they are, independently of our believing them to be so. Perhaps the best-known objection to a coherence theory of truth is Bertrand Russell's. He maintained that since both a belief and its negation will, individually, cohere with at least one set of beliefs, this means that contradictory beliefs can be shown to be true according to coherence theory, and therefore that the theory cannot work. However, what most coherence theorists are concerned with is not all possible beliefs, but the set of beliefs that people actually hold. The main problem for a coherence theory of truth, then, is how to specify just this particular set, given that the truth of which beliefs are actually held can only be determined by means of coherence.

Check Your Progress II:

1. What is the meaning of degrees of truth?
2. What is the factor of consistency mentioned in the coherence theory of truth?

Self Asking Questions I:

Is there any difference between correspondence theory and coherence theory of truth? Give reasons in support of your answer. (within 80+40 words)

.....
.....
.....

5.4 Pragmatic Theory of Truth:

Pragmatism is known for its conception of truth more than for any of its other contributions to philosophy. It is the belief that a proposition is true when acting upon it yields satisfactory practical results. The three most influential forms of the pragmatic theory of truth were introduced around the turn of the 20th century by Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey. Although there are wide differences in viewpoints among these and other proponents of pragmatic theory, they hold in common that truth is verified and confirmed by the results of putting one's concepts into practice.

The American philosopher, logician and scientist Charles Sanders Peirce (1839–1914) is generally recognized for first proposing a “pragmatic” theory of truth. Peirce’s pragmatic theory of truth is a by-product of his pragmatic theory of meaning. According to Peirce, “Truth is that concordance of an abstract statement with the ideal limit towards which endless investigation would tend to bring scientific belief, which concordance the abstract statement may possess by virtue of the confession of its inaccuracy and one-sidedness, and this confession is an essential ingredient of truth.” This statement stresses Peirce’s view that ideas of approximation, incompleteness, and partiality, what he describes elsewhere as fallibilism and reference to the future, are essential to a proper conception of truth. For Peirce, the importance of truth rests not on a “transcendental” connection between beliefs on the one hand and reality on the other, but rather on the practical connection between doubt and belief, and the processes of inquiry that take us from the former to the latter:

Though the movement began with Peirce, it turned in a different direction with William James according to whom, “The true is the name of whatever proves itself to be good in the way of belief, and good, too, for definite, assignable reasons.” In an essay on the conception of truth, James declares that “true ideas are those that we can assimilate, validate, corroborate and verify. False ideas are those that we cannot.” Ideas that tell us which of realities is to expect are to be regarded as true ideas. We can say that if an idea is useful then it is true. James wrote that truth in science is that which gives us the maximum possible sense of satisfaction. While rejecting the idea that truth is static, James asserts that “truth happens to an idea. It becomes true, is made true by events.” If by following an idea we can obtain certain experiences which are useful and valuable for us then the idea becomes true, if not the idea becomes false. He illustrates this by a man who is lost in the woods and is starving. He sees a cow path and reasons that it should lead to a farmer’s house. If it does, he saves himself. For James the idea has practical results. True ideas thus possess a practical value for us and we should have them for their practical value. The practical value of true ideas is the practical importance of their objects to us. The objects are not practically important at all times.

True ideas, James states that, are like tools. They make us more efficient by helping us do what needs to be done. James wrote, “Any idea upon which we can ride, so to speak; any idea that will carry us prosperously from any one part of our experience to any other part, linking things satisfactorily,

working securely, simplifying, saving labour; is true for just so much, true in so far forth, true instrumentally”.

Stop to Consider:

William James’s version of pragmatic theory, is often summarized by his statement that “the ‘true’ is only the expedient in our way of thinking, just as the ‘right’ is only the expedient in our way of behaving.” By this, James meant that truth is a *quality*, the value of which is confirmed by its effectiveness when applying concepts to practice and thus, ‘pragmatic’. Truth for us is simply a collective name for verification-processes, just as health, wealth, strength, etc., are names for other processes connected with life, and also pursued because it pays to pursue them.

Following James, Dewey is also of the opinion that truth or rather truths must be made. This does not mean that we can declare truth to be what we want it to be, but it is more like an investigation that succeeds in solving some great problem or need. Truth for Dewey is also that which works though this does not imply any working truth. Truth is that which satisfies the condition of inquiry. To be more precise, the final basis of warranted assertability for Dewey is verifiability. Dewey accepted Peirce’s idea that “truth is the opinion which is fated to be ultimately agreed to by all who investigate. Dewey reserves the term “true” only for claims that are the product of controlled inquiry. This means that claims are not true before they are verified but that, rather, it is the process of verification that makes them true: truth and falsity are properties only of that subject-matter which is the *end*, the close, of the inquiry by means of which it is reached. Again, Dewey insists that only “judgments”— not “propositions”—are properly viewed as truth-bearers. For Dewey, “propositions” are the proposals and working hypotheses that are used, via a process of inquiry, to generate conclusions and verified judgments. As such, propositions may be more or less relevant to the inquiry at hand but they are not, strictly speaking true or false. Rather, truth and falsity are reserved for “judgments” or “the settled outcome of inquiry.”

It should be clear from the above that ‘truth’ is not used by the pragmatist in the sense of reality, as is very often done by other schools. It is not conceived as that which knowledge attains or grasps, but as an adjective of knowledge

that works in life. Moreover, it is not a fact independent of human application and evaluation. It is the product of human estimation of the usefulness of knowledge. Just as a thing is called theory or light, long or short to express the effects of human measurements, similarly knowledge or belief is called true or false to express the effect of human valuation of it. By itself it would neither be true nor false. So even as a quality, truth is relative to human purpose and valuation. Truth is, therefore man made. The purpose of evaluation is the verification of knowledge in practice and truth is the product of this verifying process. Truth emerges when a belief is verified, that is found to be sound and reliable in practice. Verification of the belief is thus equivalent to the truth of the belief.

Criticism:

The pragmatic theory of truth faces certain difficulties. Pragmatists reject the concept of Absolute truth. They make truth subjective and relative. Every belief or idea which works is not necessarily true. It may be the case that a belief which is not true may work well or it may be the case that a belief that works badly is true. For example, a mother may tell a child that an evil spirit may enter into their house. As a result the child may go to sleep. But even though the idea turns out to be practically successful in the sense of making the child asleep, yet it does not imply that it establishes the existence of evil spirit. So, practical success is one thing and truth is another thing.

The ideas often work because they are basically true. Truth of our judgements leads to success of our activities. Pragmatism reduces truth to a personal and private affair. What works for one man may not work for another man. There are many ideas whose truth can never be denied, though none of these ideas leads to successful consequences. For example, knowledge of starvation on the part of a man of broken legs, cannot lead him to any fruitful activity to fetch food. Philosophers generally are of the opinion that the truth of a belief is not completely assimilable to the practical use to which that belief can be put.

Check Your Progress III:

1. What is truth according to the pragmatic theory?
2. What is William James view on truth?

5.5 Interactionism:

There are various philosophical theories purporting to explain the relation between mind and body. Out of all these theories the one which is closest to common sense is interactionism. Interactionism is a dualist position in the philosophy of mind which argues that mind and body are separate, but that there is causal interaction between the two. *Cartesian dualism*, the position of Rene Descartes is the most famous example of interactionism. He regards mind and matter as two heterogeneous substances. Mind is unextended while matter is extended. Matter is unconscious while mind is conscious. Matter including body is subject to mechanical law, while mind is subject to purpose and teleology. According to Descartes mind and body are two separate and independent substances. Yet they interact and there is a causal relation between the two. These interaction between the two substances which are entirely different and heterogeneous takes place through the pineal gland. The mind works upon the body and the body works upon the mind. There is a mental causal series and bodily causal series. Elements belonging to the mental causal series work upon the bodily causal series and vice versa. So, interaction takes place between these two causal series. Descartes began with the programme of methodical doubt. When this doubt was reserved then Descartes satisfied himself absolutely that the self, the body and God exist. Descartes concluded that there are thinking things and extended things. Man has both a mind and a body. As a body man is an extended thing and as a mind man is a thinking thing. So, man is composite of both mind and body. The problem is one of explaining the relation between mind and body and here Descartes introduced this idea.

The whole direction of the thought of Descartes was towards dualism. Dualism is the philosophical theory that there are two different kinds of substances in the world. A substance is known by its attributes. We know clearly and distinctly two attributes—thought and extension. Thought is the attribute of mind. It is the spiritual substance. Extension is the attribute of body. It is the corporeal substance. In the philosophy of Descartes, a substance is defined as “an existent thing which requires nothing but itself to exist.” In other words, according to Descartes a substance is that which is independent and self-caused. Each substance is completely independent of the other. The mind as a substance is completely independent of the body and the body as a substance is completely independent of mind. When we are to know anything about the mind we need not make any reference

to the body. Similarly if we are to know anything about the body we need not make any reference to the body.

Thus Descartes put forward a kind of uncompromising dualism. But if thought and extension, mind and body are so cut off from each other then how can we account for living things? Descartes believed that there is no reason for attributing mental powers to animals. According to Descartes animals are not endowed with mind in the sense in which human beings are endowed with minds. Animals are regarded by Descartes to be automata. It is purely governed by mechanical laws. In an animal we do not find a combination of mind and matter. So only in the level of man the problem about the relation between mind and matter arises. Man have two principles of motion. One is physical and other is mental. So only in the level of man, the problem of the relation between mind and body arises. The question is—In what way a relationship is established between the human mind and the human body?

Stop to Consider:

For Descartes, minds and bodies are distinct kinds of “substances”. Bodies, he held, are spatially extended substances, incapable of feeling or thought; minds, in contrast, are unextended, thinking, feeling substances. Descartes believed that mind exerted control over the brain through the pineal gland. His posited relation between mind and body is called Cartesian dualism or substance dualism. He held that mind was distinct from matter, but could influence matter.

Descartes maintains that in man mind and body form a single system of mutually interacting components. In his, *The passions of the soul*, Descartes expresses how mind or soul acts upon the body. He says, “The action of the soul consists in this that, simply by willing it, makes the small gland, to which it is closely united, move in a way requisite for proving the effect aimed in the volition.” According to Descartes, mind or soul sits in the pineal gland of the brain and acts upon the animal spirit to cause an action for; mind is closely united to the pineal gland. This gland is the principal seat of the soul, and the place in which all our thoughts are formed. Descartes explains that “When we desire to imagine something we have never seen, this desire has the power of causing the gland to move it in the manner requisite to drive the spirits towards the pores of the brain by the opening of which

pores this particular thing may be represented; thus when we wish to apply our attention for some time to the consideration of one particular object, this desire holds the gland for the time being inclined to the same side. Thus, finally, when we desire to walk or to move our body in some special way, this desire causes the gland to thrust the spirits towards the muscles which serve to bring this result.” It is a familiar fact that if we think that it is too dark to read we go to switch on the light and here our mind acts upon the body. In other words, mental phenomena act upon the body. Likewise, physical phenomena acts upon the mind i.e., a physical injury on the foot or in any parts of the body causes pain in the mind. Hence, the interaction between the body and the mind can be explained simply as - mind reacts upon the body and the body reacts upon the mind or consciousness. According to Descartes, only brain can immediately affect the mind and on the other hand, mind affect the body only through the brain. The hypothesis of interaction is confined to the human realm alone. It is not extended to cover the animal world. Descartes thought that animals are endowed with bodies alone. Therefore the question of interaction does not arise in their case. In his *Meditation - VI*, Descartes wrote, “I take note that the mind is immediately affected not by all parts of the body, but only by the brain or rather perhaps only by one small part of it viz, by that part in which the *sensus communis* is said to be.”

But this explanation of the mind body relation as found in interactionism is not philosophically satisfactory. The solution that Descartes proposed is nothing other than a fictitious solution to a fictitious problem. One prominent critic of Cartesian dualism as well as his interactionism is Gilbert Ryle. Gilbert Ryle argued that the mistake that Descartes committed when he advocated his dualism is a part of a bigger mistake. That bigger mistake is called category mistake. Category mistake arises when something is put within one logical category when in fact it belongs to another logical category. In the particular case of Cartesian dualism category mistake takes one special form. In the language of Ryle, “It represents the facts of mental life as if they belonged to one logical type or category, when they actually belonged to another”. Thus according to Ryle, the dualism of Descartes is based on a fallacy. Interactionism presupposes dualistic hypothesis and therefore interactionism itself is defective. As a solution interactionism is an unsatisfactory solution to a problem which is basically a pseudo problem. Descartes thought that the interaction between mind and body takes place through the mediator of the pineal gland. But the pineal gland is after all a

part of the human being, which in turn is a part of the human body. As a result we cannot understand how the pineal gland, which is a part of the human body can serve as the mediator between mind and body. Descartes defined the mind and body wholly independent of each other and thereby he ruled out the possibility of their actual interaction.

Check Your Progress IV:

1. Is there any interaction between mind and body?
2. What is category mistake?

5.6 Parallelism:

Parallelism as a theory of mind body relation arose as a reaction against the interactionism of Descartes. According to parallelism, mind and body are not two independent substances, but rather they are the parallel manifestations of one basic reality, God. Mind and matter are the correlative aspects, internal and external, of one and the same substance namely God, which is in itself neither mind nor matter, but appears in its two parallel attributes of thought and extension. The foremost advocate of parallelism was Spinoza, whose theory resulted out of the attempt to solve the philosophical problems arising out of dualism and interactionism.

In Spinoza's parallelism we find an attempt to solve the mind- body problem within a monistic framework. Descartes could not solve the mind body problem because his attempted solution was rooted in his dualism. Once dualism was abandoned by Spinoza a new way to solve the mind body problem emerged. For Spinoza, there is only one substance and that substance is God or Nature. Everything logically follows from substance. Substance is that which exists in itself and conceived through itself. According to Spinoza, substance possess an infinite number of attributes. Spinoza wrote, "By attribute, I mean that which the intellect perceives as constituting the essence of substance." God is defined by him as a substance consisting of infinite attributes. But the human mind is capable of apprehending just two attributes —— thought and extension. Thought and extension are two independent attributes of substance. They are independent in the sense that thought can be understood without reference to extension and extension can be understood without reference to thought.

Stop to Consider:

Parallelism suggests that although there is a correlation between mental and physical events there is no causal connection. The body and mind do not interact with each other but simply run alongside one another, in parallel, and there happens to be a correspondence between the two but neither causes the other. That is to say that the physical event of burning your finger and the mental event of feeling pain just happen to occur simultaneously — one does not cause the other.

Spinoza did not think that the mind and body are distinct entities, rather two aspects of the same reality that is a “complete, holy deterministic system”. Spinoza used his theory of attributes to constitute the ontological equivalence of the mind and body. He states, “The idea of mind and body are one and the same individual conceived now under the attribute of thought, now under the attribute of extension” in which “a mode of extension and the idea of that mode are one and the same thing, though expressed in two ways”. In this way, Spinoza stated that there is no causal relation between two entities that are part of the same reality because one does not determine the other when in fact they are simultaneously in action. Concerning the union of the subparts of this monism Spinoza believed that the human mind is the idea of the human body as it is found in God. These outlined notions are substantially contradictory to Descartes’ beliefs. While Descartes asserted the distinct duality of the mind and body, Spinoza described their connection like the analogy of two sides of a coin. Despite belonging to the same school of philosophy Descartes and Spinoza have conflicting views on the subject of the relationship between the mind and body.

In his parallelism Spinoza affirmed that there is only one order of Nature. To this order both mind and body belong. Man is a single mode. It is only because we are to consider man as a mode of extension that we speak of his body. Again when man is considered as a mode of thought then we can speak of his mind. Thus mind and body are parallel to each other. According to Spinoza, corresponding to everybody there is an idea. Using this special terminology Spinoza said that the body is the idea of the mind and the mind is the idea of the body. In Spinoza’s metaphysics thought and extension are two ways of looking at the substance, two sides of the same coin. Therefore we should be somewhat cautious in the use of the word parallelism. It may give rise to the impression that Spinoza is talking about two independent realms one is mind and the other is body. But as a matter of fact Spinoza is

not here talking about two independent reals running parallel to each other. This factor is to be kept in mind while analysing Spinoza's parallelism. Parallelism of Spinoza seeks to reserve the real identity of substance and at the same time it seeks to explain the apparent duality of attributes. According to Spinoza, the structure within which the mind and the body operate is the same. Man is the mode of God's attributes of thought and extension.

Parallelism no doubt has certain important features. But the critics are of the opinion that parallelism failed to solve the vexed mind body problem. Parallelism is simply a statement of the apparent fact of the invariable association between mind and body. But this theory does not explain why mind and body should correspond. Moreover this theory states that mental activity always accompanies physical activity. But in the process of evolution the mind is a late emergent. How can we meaningfully talk about the correspondence between the mental and the bodily during the period when the mind has yet to emerge? Explaining its limitations J.A. Shaffer wrote in his book *The Philosophy of Mind* as follows ——"The only trouble with such a view is that there is no reason at all to believe it. There is no reason to believe there is some third thing which underlies both the physical and the mental and can explain the sequence of events in such." In the parallelism of Spinoza this third something is substance or God or Nature. But Shaffer pointed out that Spinoza did not offer any evidence to show that such a thing could explain the sequence of mental and physical events. This is indeed a very serious drawback of the parallelism of Spinoza.

Check Your Progress V:

1. What is attribute according to Spinoza?
2. Is mind and body are two independent substances in Spinoza's parallelism?

Self Asking Questions- II:

Do you believe that there is a difference between Descartes and Spinoza's view regarding the mind-body problem? Give reasons in support of your answer. (within 80+40 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....

5.7 Pre-established Harmony:

G.W. Leibnitz' doctrine of pre-established harmony forms one of the most unique parts of his philosophy. Through this Leibnitz doctrine offers a creative non-dualist solution to one of the most difficult problems of modern philosophy: the union of mind and body. Leibnitz tries to overcome the problem by arguing for pre-established harmony between mind and body. According to him, God established the harmony between mind-body at the time of creation. In other words, God pre-adjusted them to each other in such a way that they always correspond to each other. Leibnitz's novel solution to this mind-body problem suggests that the interaction between our minds and our bodies that seems so obvious to us is, in reality, an illusion, although "well founded." According to Leibnitz, from the moment of creation, God has coordinated our bodies and our minds in such a way that they only appear to causally interact. At just the moment that I form an intention to move my leg, my leg moves of its own accord. At just the moment that the ball collides with my hand, my mind independently comes to experience pain. According to Leibnitz, my mind and my body are, like two causally independent but synchronized clocks. The appearance of causal interaction between them is an illusion founded on a harmony pre-established by God.

For Leibnitz monads the spiritual atoms or active perceiving forces make up the mind and body. Thus mind and body may be regarded as two clocks which once constructed and set to the same time go on keeping the same time without either of them acting upon the other. Leibnitz spiritualizes mind and body and considers them to be composed of monads. Monads are spiritual atoms or active perceiving forces. Monads are self-centred, self-contained and self-active substances of different degrees of complexity. The mind is a self-conscious higher monad whereas the body is a cluster of lower unconscious monads. The mind and the body correspond to each other, because God established a harmony between them, adjusted them to each other after creation. Their correspondence is due to pre-established harmony.

According to Leibnitz reality is constituted by unities and these unities are called by him monads. Every monad is a centre of force and every monad is conscious. Every monad is an unextended, spiritual, immortal and metaphysical atom. Leibnitz stated that every monad is independent and isolated. He also stated that every monad is windowless, that means no

influence can enter into a monad and no influence also goes out of it. Every monad contains the seed of its own history within itself. Monads are active, but their activities are fully guided by their inner principles. In the philosophy of Leibnitz it is clearly stated that every monad is hermetically sealed up within itself. Leibnitz asserts that 'monads' are immaterial entities lacking spatial parts. But inspite of the isolation and independence of the monads they function harmoniously. This harmony is called pre- established harmony.

Stop to Consider:

For Leibnitz, monads cannot be extended in space because they have no shape and size. Monads are something like force or energy. Each monad is independent of other monads and monads do not have any causal relation to each other. Monads are not only independent and different but they also contain the source of their activity or energy within themselves. Though all monads are different from each other yet there must be some relation between all the monads which make up the universe, some explanation, for their orderly action. Leibnitz finds such kind of explanation in his idea of pre - established harmony.

The monads are conscious soul-unities. Being isolated soul-unities monads cannot receive anything external to them. Every monad is in process of evolution and realizes its nature with an inner necessity. It is not determined from without; it has no windows through which anything can enter. Leibnitz stated that every monad has the ability to mirror the universe in its own way. The monad having perfect consciousness and perfect ability to mirror the universe is called the monad of monads. He is God. Leibnitz somewhat inconsistently draws a distinction between the creator monad and the created monads. God, according to him, is the creator monad. He imparted harmony to the other monads at the time of creation itself and hence this harmony is pre-established harmony. The monads exhibit harmony through God. In the philosophy of Leibnitz God is called the binding principle and monads exhibit harmony through this binding principle. God sees a unity in the monads.

While explaining the problem of the relation between mind and body Leibnitz asserts that in creating mind and body God has arranged from the very beginning such a way that the two shall go together. The relation between soul and body is a harmony pre -established by God. There is a parallelism

or concomitance between the mental and physical states and in this sense the body is the material expression of the soul. According to Leibnitz, “Souls act according to the laws of final causes, by means of desires, ends and means. Bodies act according to the laws of efficient causes or motions. And the two realms are in harmony with one another.” All monads act together like the parts of an organism, every one of which has its function to perform. Everything is causally related. The basic properties of monads are a function of their perceptions and appetites. Each monad perceives all the other monads with varying degrees of clarity, except for God, who perceives all monads with utter clarity. Leibnitz’s main theses concerning causality among the created monads are these: God creates, conserves, and concurs in the action of each created monad. God has arranged this universe in such a way that it works without interference from Him. Every state in every monad follows as the effect of the preceding state in that monad, and acts in union with the states of all the other monads. There is a complete harmony in the universe.

Criticism:

The doctrine of pre-established harmony is actually the extension of the parallelism of Spinoza which tries to solve the problem of mind and body. However in criticism it can be said that the doctrine of pre-established harmony is only an assumption to explain the order in the world. No monad can go beyond itself and cannot perceive the whole of infinite number of monads in their mutual relation. But this is possible only for a perceiver outside the series of the monads. Again Leibnitz comes in conflict with his desire to establish the supremacy of God and regards him as the creator of the monads. If God is the creator of monads, then monads become finite and created and cease to be self-contained units. If the monads are allowed to be eternal, independent and self-contained units, then God as a creator becomes unnecessary. Leibnitz chooses to be inconsistent by taking God as a creator of the pre-established harmony.

Check Your Progress VI:

1. What is monad?
2. Write about Leibnitz’ concept of pre-established harmony?

5.8 Summing Up:

In this unit two important topics have been discussed. One topic is about theories of truth and the other topic deals with the mind - body problem. The concept of truth is one of the central concept of philosophy. The correspondence theory states that there is a correspondence between what is true and what makes it true. What is true may be a belief or a proposition or a statement or a sentence and on the other hand what makes it true is something that belongs to reality. According to the coherence theory the truth of a proposition consists in being the part of a comprehensive system. In this system the true proposition is consistent with every other proposition. The pragmatic theory of truth states that if an idea works then the idea is true and if it does not work then it is false. For the pragmatic philosophers workability is the criterion of truth.

The mind-body problem is an important problem in the philosophy of mind and in metaphysics, concerning the nature of the relationship between the mind, or consciousness, and the physical world. Interactionism of Descartes asserts that mind and body are two separate and independent substances. Yet they interact and there is a causal relation between the two. These interaction between the two substances which are entirely different and heterogeneous takes place through the pineal gland. Parallelism of Spinoza holds that mind and body are not two independent substances, but rather they are the parallel manifestations of one basic reality, God. Leibnitz through his doctrine of pre-established harmony asserts that the doctrine of windowless ness of monads has completely ruled out the interaction among monads. The problem of mind body relation as it appears in Descartes cannot arise in Leibnitz. Leibnitz employed his famous analogy of clocks giving the same time. They do not mutually influence one another. But they give the same time. Similarly mind and body run parallel to each other or more accurately monads run parallel to each other.

5.9 References/ Suggested Readings:

1. Copleston Frederick, A History of Philosophy, Vol IV, An Image Book, published by Doubleday, Newyork, 1993.
2. Leibnitz, G.W, Monadology, Rare books club, 2012.
3. Masih, Y, A Critical History of Modern Philosophy, Motilal Banarsidas, New Delhi, 1990.

4. O' Connor D.J (ed), A Critical History of Western Philosophy, New York 1964. 4
5. Pitcher, G, Truth, Prentice Hall, 1964.
6. Russell Bertrand, A History of Western Philosophy, Union paper Backs, London, 1987.
7. Sinha, J.N, Introduction to Philosophy, New Central Book Agency (p) Ltd, Calcutta, 2000.
8. Thilly Frank, A History of Philosophy, Central Book Depot, Allahabad, 1975.

5.10 Model Questions:

1. Explain and examine the correspondence theory of truth.
2. Write the difference between correspondence theory and coherence theory of truth.
3. Explain William James' view about the pragmatic theory of truth.
4. Critically examine interactionism of Descartes as a theory of mind body problem.
5. How does Spinoza tries to solve the mind-body dualism? Explain.
6. Explain the coherence theory of truth.
7. Examine Leibnitz' doctrine of Monad.
8. Write short notes on the following——
 - (a) Pineal gland
 - (b) Category Mistake
 - (c) Coherentism
 - (d) Pre-established harmony.
 - (e) Spinoza's concept of Attribute.

5.11 Answers to Check Your Progress:

Check Your Progress- I:

1. Ans: According to the correspondence theory of truth, truth is “fidelity to the objective reality”. Truth is the agreement between the statement of the fact and actual fact or between the judgement and the situation the judgement

claims to describe. Truth has to do with the assertions or claims that we make about things.

2. Ans: Isomorphism means structural similarity. Russell in his version of the correspondence theory of truth states that correspondence is to be understood in the sense of structural similarity. A proposition is a true proposition because of the structural similarity between the proposition and the fact corresponding to it. Wittgenstein in his picture theory also advocates the notion of structural similarity.

3. Ans: J.L. Austin gave a version of the correspondence theory of truth. In his version he states that there are two conventions which are relevant to truth. One is descriptive convention and the other is demonstrative convention. Descriptive conventions correlates sentences with the types of situations to be found in the world. On the other hand demonstrative conventions correlate sentences with historic situations to be found in the world.

Check Your Progress- II:

1. Ans: The concept of the degrees of truth arises in relation to coherence theory of truth. The coherence theory of truth entailed the doctrine of degrees of truth. According to this doctrine no judgement can be absolutely true, again no judgement can be absolutely false. There cannot be any absolute truth or absolute falsity and our judgements fall within these two extremes. The doctrine of the degrees of truth is supported by Bradley, the distinguished neo-Hegelian philosopher.

2. Ans: According to the coherence theory of truth no judgement, by itself, can be true. A judgement in order to be true must enter in to a system. Only when a judgement enters in to a system it can be true. All the judgements belonging to such a system must be consistent with one another. In other words the judgements belonging to such a system must be such that none of them contradicts any of them. This factor of consistency is of great importance in coherence theory of truth.

Check Your Progress- III:

1. Ans: The Pragmatic Theory of truth determines whether or not a belief is true or not based on whether it has a useful (pragmatic) application in the

world. If it does not, then it is not true. In other words according to the pragmatic theory of truth workability is the criterion of truth. If an action leads to successful activity then it is true otherwise it is false.

2. Ans: William James asserts that true ideas are those that we can assimilate, validate, corroborate and verify. False ideas are those that we cannot. We can say that if an idea is useful then it is true. Further James asserts that truth happens to an idea. It becomes true, is made true by events. If by following an idea we can obtain certain experiences which are useful and valuable for us then the idea becomes true, if not the idea becomes false.

Check Your Progress -IV:

1. Ans: Interactionism is a dualist position in the philosophy of mind which argues that mind and body are separate, but that there is causal interaction between the two. *Cartesian dualism*, the position of Rene Descartes is the most famous example of interactionism. He regards mind and matter as two heterogeneous substances. Mind is unextended while matter is extended. Matter is unconscious while mind is conscious. According to Descartes mind and body are two separate and independent substances. Yet they interact and there is a causal relation between the two. These interaction between the two substances which are entirely different and heterogeneous takes place through the pineal gland. The mind works upon the body and the body works upon the mind. There is a mental causal series and bodily causal series. Elements belonging to the mental causal series work upon the bodily causal series and vice versa. So, interaction takes place between these two causal series.

2. Ans: The concept of category mistake was offered by Gilbert Ryle while criticising Cartesian dualism. Gilbert Ryle argued that the mistake that Descartes committed when he advocated his dualism is a part of a bigger mistake. That bigger mistake is called category mistake. Category mistake arises when something is put within one logical category when in fact it belongs to another logical category. In the particular case of Cartesian dualism category mistake takes one special form. In the language of Ryle, "It represents the facts of mental life as if they belonged to one logical type or category, when they actually belonged to another".

Check Your Progress V:

1. Ans: Spinoza in his theory of parallelism states that substance possess an infinite number of attributes. Spinoza wrote, “By attribute, I mean that which the intellect perceives as constituting the essence of substance.” God is defined by him as a substance consisting of infinite attributes. But the human mind is capable of apprehending just two attributes —— thought and extension. Thought and extension are two independent attributes of substance. They are independent in the sense that thought can be understood without reference to extension and extension can be understood without reference to thought.

2. Ans: Parallelism is a theory which is related to mind body problem holds that mind and body are not two independent substances, but rather they are the parallel manifestations of one basic reality, God. According to parallelism, although there is a correlation between mental and physical events there is no causal connection. The body and mind do not interact with each other but simply run alongside one another, in parallel, and there happens to be a correspondence between the two but neither causes the other.

Check Your Progress -VI:

1. Ans: According to Leibnitz reality is constituted by unities and these unities are called by him monads. Every monad is a centre of force and every monad is conscious. Every monad is an unextended, spiritual, immortal and metaphysical atom. Leibnitz stated that every monad is independent and isolated. He also stated that every monad is windowless, that means no influence can enter into a monad and no influence also goes out of it. Every monad contains the seed of its own history within itself. Monads are active, but their activities are fully guided by their inner principles. In the philosophy of Leibnitz it is clearly stated that every monad is hermetically sealed up within itself.

2. Ans: Leibnitz tries to overcome the mind- body problem by arguing for pre-established harmony between mind and body. According to him, God established the harmony between mind-body at the time of creation. In other words, God pre-adjusted them to each other in such a way that they always correspond to each other. Leibniz’s novel solution to this mind-body problem suggests that the interaction between our minds and our

bodies that seems so obvious to us is, in reality, an illusion. According to Leibniz, from the moment of creation, God has coordinated our bodies and our minds in such a way that they only appear to causally interact. The appearance of causal interaction between them is an illusion founded on a harmony pre-established by God. For Leibniz monads the spiritual atoms or active perceiving forces make up the mind and body. Leibniz spiritualizes mind and body and considers them to be composed of monads. Monads are spiritual atoms or active perceiving forces. Monads are self-centred, self-contained and self-active substances of different degrees of complexity. The mind is a self-conscious higher monad whereas the body is a cluster of lower unconscious monads. The mind and the body correspond to each other, because God established a harmony between them, adjusted them to each other after creation. Their correspondence is due to pre-established harmony.

Self Asking Questions:

SAQ I: Yes there is a difference between correspondence theory of truth and coherence theory of truth. The coherence theory differs from its principal competitor, the correspondence theory of truth, in two essential respects. The competing theories give conflicting accounts of the relation that propositions bear to their truth conditions. According to coherence theory, the relation is coherence, according to the correspondence theory, it is correspondence. The two theories also give conflicting accounts of truth conditions. According to the coherence theory, the truth conditions of propositions consist in other propositions. The correspondence theory, in contrast, states that the truth conditions of propositions are not propositions, but rather objective features of the world. Although the coherence and correspondence theories are fundamentally opposed in this way, they both present a substantive conception of truth. That is, both coherence and correspondence theories hold that truth is a property of propositions that can be analysed in terms of the sorts of truth-conditions propositions have, and the relations propositions stand in to these conditions.

SAQ II: Despite belonging to the same school of philosophy Descartes and Spinoza have conflicting views on the subject of the relationship between the mind and body. According to Descartes mind and body are two separate and independent substances. Yet they interact and there is a causal relation between the two. These interaction between the two substances which are

entirely different and heterogeneous takes place through the pineal gland. This view is known as interactionism. On the contrary, Spinoza did not think that the mind and body are distinct entities, rather two aspects of the same reality that is a “complete, holy deterministic system”. Spinoza used his theory of attributes to constitute the ontological equivalence of the mind and body; he stated, “the idea of mind and body are one and the same individual conceived now under the attribute of thought, now under the attribute of extension”. In Spinoza’s parallelism we find an attempt to solve the mind- body problem within a monistic framework. According to parallelism, mind and body are not two independent substances, but rather they are the parallel manifestations of one basic reality, God. Mind and matter are the correlative aspects, internal and external, of one and the same substance namely God, which is in itself neither mind nor matter, but appears in its two parallel attributes of thought and extension.

-----x-----