

GROUP – A
WESTERN PHILOSOPHY
(40 marks)

Chapter – 1
CONCEPT OF PHILOSOPHY
(4 marks allotted)

MCQ – 1X2 = 2

SAQ -- 1X2 = 2

(a) Nature of Philosophy: The word 'Philosophy' is originated from two Greek words 'Philos' and 'Sophia'. The meaning of the first word is love and the meaning of the second is wisdom. So, etymologically the word means love for wisdom. From this view point philosopher is a person who has love for wisdom or higher knowledge. Philosophy is very difficult to be defined without any doubt or controversy. There are so many definitions of philosophy given by different philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Paulsen, Herbart Spencer, Fichte, Kant, Comte, Russell, Ayer and many others in different times. Some of the important definitions are given below.

- (i) Philosophy is the Knowledge of reality; it is the knowledge of the universal, unchangeable, eternal. – Plato
- (ii) Philosophy is the science which investigated the nature of being as it is in itself.– Aristotle
- (iii) Philosophy is the sum total of all Scientific Knowledge. – Paulsen
- (iv) Philosophy is the synthesis of the sciences. –Herbert Spencer
- (v) Philosophy is the science of Knowledge. – Fichte
- (vi) Philosophy is the science and criticism of cognition. – Kant
- (vii) Philosophy is the science of sciences. – Comte
- (viii) Philosophy is the logical study of the foundations of the science.—Russell
- (ix) Philosophy is the theoretical discussion about the absolute conscious self.--- Hegel
- (x) Philosophy is the criticism of language. -- Ayer

(b) Main branches of Philosophy: Philosophy is an all-round discussion about life and world. These discussions are made in different branches of Philosophy. These branches have separate subject matters and different viewpoints. Primarily Philosophy has three main branches: (i) Epistemology, (ii) Metaphysics

and (iii) Axiology. Axiology can again be subdivided into three branches: (a) Logic, (b) Social Philosophy and (c) Ethics.

Epistemology: –Epistemology is a branch of philosophy in which all aspects related to knowledge are discussed. These include the nature, possibility, origin, conditions, limits, validity and many other aspects of knowledge. The word epistemology is derived from two Greek words ‘Episteme’ and ‘Logos’. The meaning of the first is knowledge and the meaning of the second is science. So, etymologically the word epistemology means science of knowledge.

The main functions of Epistemology are: (i) making the term ‘knowledge’ or ‘knowing’ clear; (ii) differentiate knowledge and belief, (iii) find out necessary and sufficient conditions of knowledge, (iv) determine the source, limit and validity of knowledge, (v) discussing the role of sense experience, reason, intellect etc. as the source of knowledge.

For preparing a human mind ready for philosophical discussions epistemological maturity acts as a pre-condition. Kant has put stress on epistemology while giving definition of philosophy. To him, “Philosophy is the science and criticism of cognition.” Similarly Fichte has defined Philosophy following Kant as “Philosophy is the science of knowledge.”

But epistemology cannot be considered synonymous with Philosophy. Rather we have to consider epistemology as an essential part of philosophy. For getting philosophical knowledge of higher kind we have to deal with epistemological knowledge seriously. This acts as the pre-condition of philosophical knowledge.

Metaphysics: – It is a branch of philosophy which deals with the nature of reality and other objects of transcendental world. The nature of reality and its relation with matter, mind, life etc. are discussed in this branch of philosophy. The word ‘Metaphysics’ is derived from the combination of two Greek words ‘Meta’ and ‘Physics’. The first word means beyond and the second word means physical world. So, etymologically it means the discussion beyond the physical world.

For knowing the nature and function of Metaphysics, we have to distinguish Reality or Noumenon and Appearance or Phenomenon. Every object of this external world has two aspects: one is the external appearance of the object and the other is the real form of object. The first form is changing and

temporary; but on the other hand the nature of reality is unchanging and permanent.

Metaphysics tries to determine the nature of reality and its relation with this world, and different objects of this world. Some philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Hegel, Bradley consider Metaphysics as identical with philosophy. On the other philosophers like Hume, Comte etc. consider that metaphysics is impossible. Recent philosophers like Ayer, Carnap consider metaphysics as nonsense. From a third view we see that philosophers like Spencer, Hamilton consider that the world of metaphysics is unknown and unknowable.

But none of this view can be regarded as totally correct. Metaphysics is a main branch of philosophy which tries to find out the real nature of the world and life in the light of metaphysics. The scope of philosopher is higher than the scope of metaphysics. We find the discussion of reality and an additional discussion of the nature of external objects, different aspects of knowledge in metaphysics.

Ethics:– The word ‘Ethics’ is derived from the Greek word ‘Ethos’ which means character – this again is related to social custom, rituals, habits etc. So, etymologically the word means science related to human character or behaviour. Ethics is a normative science which judges good or bad, right or wrong of actions or behaviours of men.

William Lillie said that, ethics is the normative science of the conduct of human beings living in societies, which judges this conduct to be right or wrong, to be good or bad, or in some similar ways. Ethics is a normative science as it scientifically discusses good or bad aspects of human actions on the basis of certain ideal or standard. Ethics admits three pre-suppositions like freedom of will, individual soul and rationality.

Philosophy and Ethics are closely related to each other. These are complimentary to each other. The explanation of the nature of human soul is necessary while judging the value of human behaviour. Moreover, for discussing the nature of individual soul ethics admits the existence of God or supreme reality. In this way ethics is related to philosophy. Philosophy is dependent upon ethics as philosophy deals with the nature of supreme reality.

But in reality ethics is a part of philosophy though one is complementary to the other. Moral life of man and his ultimate aim are the subject matter of ethics. On the other, the whole world, God, soul, life, mind, matter etc. are

subject matters of philosophy. So, the scope of philosophy is greater than that of the scope of ethics.

Social Philosophy: – Social philosophy is a branch of philosophy which systematically discusses individual as well as society from the view point of philosophy. It tries to find out the aim of society and social life of individual and to determine its ideal and value. According to Gisbert, social philosophy is the meeting point of Sociology and Philosophy. Ginsberg thought that social philosophy does not analyse social events, rather it tries to evaluate them synthetically. Social philosophy synthetically evaluates different aspects of sociology from philosophical and all-round view point.

Social science discusses a social aspect of human being living in the society. Social philosophy is the synthesis of all social sciences. The knowledge of social philosophy is partial. But social philosophy unifies different social sciences and puts light upon the whole aspect of human beings. From this view point it is said that social philosophy is the co-ordination between social science and philosophy. Recently it is said that for knowing human beings as social beings we have to consider different social relations.

But the view points of sociologists are viewpoints of scientists. Sociologists are objective and descriptive. But the viewpoint of social philosophy is formative, descriptive and evaluative. Social philosophy not only discusses various concepts of social change, social relation and other aspects of social life, but evaluates them from the view points of some standards or ideals. For this reason sociologist Ginsberg mentioned two aspects of social life. These are (i) critical and (ii) synthetic aspects of social life. From critical viewpoint social philosophy discusses main principles of social sciences and tries to find out the truth of the methods followed in social sciences. Besides, from synthetic viewpoint social philosophy evaluates the nature and value of social ideals.

Logic: -- Logic is a branch of philosophy which deals with the formal laws of thought and with the methods of distinction between valid and invalid argument. Logic is a science of thought about inference expressed in language. Its main function is to formulate some laws to test the validity of arguments. According to Copi, Logic is the study of the methods and principles used to distinguish good from bad reasoning. Mill considered logic as the science about methods of reason necessary for justifying instances.

The word 'Logic' is originated from a Greek word 'Logike'. The word is the adjective of the word 'Logos'. The meaning of the word 'Logos' is thought. So, etymologically logic means science of thought. But the word 'thought' is too wide. Thought includes mental processes like perception, inference, imagination, memory etc. But all mental processes are not the subject matter of logic. Argument and its different aspects are the subject matter of logic and argument is inference expressed in language.

Logic is the science about the validity of thought expressed in language. The bearer of thought is language. The language is composed of propositions or sentences and these compose arguments. Inference is a kind of mental process through which we go from known to unknown. When this inference is expressed in language it is called argument. Argument has two parts: (a) premise and (b) conclusion. We express the known fact through premise and we express the unknown fact through conclusion. In our thought process we follow some laws of thought. We try to follow these laws for making our thought valid. We keep these laws before our thought process and in these way we try to make our thought valid or we try to distinguish between valid and invalid.

Logic and philosophy cannot be synonymous, but the former is a part of philosophy. Logic deals with argument and its different aspects. But philosophy deals with all round view about the world. So, in this way logic and philosophy can be considered as part and whole. While discussing different aspects philosophy considers different rules of logic. Logic supplies different materials for philosophical discussions.

Exercise

- **Find out the correct alternative:**

- 1) The word 'Philosophy' is originated from two _____ words.
(i) Greek (ii) German (iii) English (iv) French
- 2) Philosophy deals with _____ world.
(i) External (ii) Internal (iii) Both external and internal (iv) Logical
- 3) _____ has described philosopher as lover of wisdom.
(i) Plato (ii) Aristotle (iii) Kant (iv) Russell

- 4) According to _____ Philosophy originates from doubt.
 (i) Plato (ii) Kant (iii) Descartes (iv) Russell
- 5) _____ deals with the definition, type, conditions, validity of knowledge.
 (i) Epistemology (ii) Metaphysics (iii) Logic (iv) Ethics
- 6) _____ considers Philosophy and Metaphysics as synonymous.
 (i) Plato (ii) Locke (iii) Kant (iv) Russell
- 7) The writer of the book Metaphysics is _____ .
 (i) Plato (ii) Aristotle (iii) Kant (iv) Copi
- 8) _____ is the father of modern western philosophy.
 (i) Bacon (ii) Kant (iii) Descartes (iv) Locke
- 9) _____ is the writer of the book 'Critique of Pure Reason'?
 (i) Locke (ii) Descartes (iii) Hume (iv) Kant
- 10) In _____ we find the discussions of the main principles of thought of men.
 (i) Epistemology (ii) Metaphysics (iii) Logic (iv) Ethics
- 11) Greek philosopher _____ used the term 'Philosophy' for the first time.
 (i) Socrates (ii) Plato (iii) Parmenides (iv) Aristotle
- 12) According to _____ philosophy is the science and criticism of cognition.
 (i) Locke (ii) Hume (iii) Kant (iv) Copi
- 13) Philosophy and Science are _____ to each other.
 (i) Complimentary (ii) Supplementary (iii) Contradictory (iv) Identical
- 14) The inventor of Symbolic Logic is _____ .
 (i) Aristotle (ii) Copi (iii) Boole (iv) Mill
- 15) According to _____ Philosophy is the meeting point of social science and philosophy.
 (i) Mackenzie (ii) Ginsberg (iii) Gisbert (iv) Frankana
- 16) According to _____ , metaphysics is not possible.
 (i) Aristotle (ii) Locke (iii) Hume (iv) Russell
- 17) _____ is the science of reasoning as expressed in language.
 (i) Epistemology (ii) Metaphysics (iii) Logic (iv) Ethics
- 18) According to _____ Philosophy is the science of knowledge.

(i) Descartes (ii) Hume (iii) Kant (iv) Fichte
19) The writer of the book 'Language, Truth and Logic' is

_____.
(i) Plato (ii) Aristotle (iii) Kant (iv) Ayer
20) The principle of Verification is forwarded by _____.

(i) Kant (ii) Bacon (iii) Ayer (iv) Russell

• **Answer the following questions very short:**

1. How does the word 'Philosophy' originate?
2. What is the feature of philosophical knowledge?
3. How do the Western Philosophers distinguish between 'appearance' and 'reality'?
4. How does Aristotle define Philosophy?
5. What is the definition of Philosophy according to Kant?
6. What is the nature of Philosophy according to Logical Positivists?
7. Who considers that 'Philosophy begins with wonder'?
8. Name some philosophers who consider Philosophy and Metaphysics as synonymous.
9. What are the subject matters of Epistemology?
10. How does the word 'Metaphysics' originate?
11. What is the definition of Social Philosophy?
12. Name some subject matter of meta-ethics.
13. What is the difference between scientific and philosophical knowledge?
14. Who is the writer of the book 'The Republic'?
15. Who is considered as the first philosopher of western philosophy?
16. Who considered philosophy as completely unified knowledge?
17. What is the meaning of 'Ethics'?
18. What is the definition of Logic?
19. What is the difference between Social Philosophy and Sociology?
20. Point out some of the subject matter of Social Philosophy.

Chapter – 2

NATURE AND THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE

(10 marks allotted)

MCQ – 1X2 = 2

DAQ – 1X8 = 8

Introduction: Philosophy tries to determine the nature of world and life and also tries to evaluate them. So, philosophy is the love for knowledge. For discussing philosophy we have to know what knowledge is, what the nature of knowledge is, what is the source of knowledge, what is the limit of knowledge etc? Generally knowledge means the relation of the mind of the knower with the object of knowledge. Plato in his book Theaetetus said that perception is not knowledge and knowledge is not true belief. To him knowledge actually has two features: (i) knowledge is infallible, (ii) the object of knowledge is eternal and unchangeable. So, the object of knowledge is eternal ideas according to Plato. Knowledge is not identical with belief. Belief can be true or false, but knowledge cannot be false.

(a) Three principal uses of the verb 'to know': The word 'knowledge' can be used in different senses like identification, ability, become aware, acquaintance, skill etc. But John Hospers in his book An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis has mentioned three different senses of the word 'know'. These are (i) knowledge by acquaintance, (ii) knowledge by ability and (iii) Propositional knowledge. These are discussed in the following manner:

(i) Knowledge by acquaintance: In some cases the word 'know' is used in the sense of acquaintance. In these cases we must know the person directly. For example, when we say 'I know Rambabu' then it would be that case of knowledge by acquaintance. In this case we have to say that I have much information about Rambabu. But in this case I may not have all information about him. But I may know the person without having much information about him.

This kind of knowledge has following features: (a) this knowledge always depends upon sense perception; (b) we may not have much information about a person or thing, though we must have information which are necessary for knowing the person or thing; (c) If we have much information about a person but I do not direct acquaintance with him we cannot say that we have knowledge by acquaintance.

(ii) **Knowledge by ability:** The word 'know' is used in the sense of ability or capacity. Gilbert Ryle in his book 'The Concept of Mind' has used the word 'know' in the sense of power or ability to act in some action under necessity. When we say that 'I know how to swim' then it means that I know the process of swimming or I have the knowledge how to swim. This knowledge is called 'knowing how'.

This kind of knowledge has following features: (a) knowledge by ability involves the power or capacity to perform an action; (b) this knowledge involves propensity; (c) this knowledge presupposes some informative knowledge; (d) repeated practice or exercise is helpful or necessary for this kind of knowledge.

(iii) **Propositional Knowledge:** This is the most important use of the term 'knowledge'. In this case we find the mention of a proposition as the subject of knowledge. The proposition is expressed as true in this type of knowledge. This knowledge is called 'knowing that'. Here the knowledge is expressed in the form 'I know that'. For example, 'I know that Descartes is a rationalist'. In this case the subject matter of knowledge is the proposition 'Descartes is a rationalist' and I claim that the proposition is true.

Propositional knowledge has following features: (a) this knowledge is a kind of certain mental state which is different from doubting, believing, imagining, hoping, memorizing etc.; (b) the proposition which is claimed to be known must be true; (c) the claim about the truth of the proposition of this knowledge must have sufficient arguments to support; (d) this kind of knowledge is different from belief as belief may be true or false, but propositional knowledge must be true.

(b) **Propositional Knowledge:** Propositional knowledge means knowing the fact expressed in the proposition as true. In this proposition the subject matter is a proposition. For example, 'I know that the earth moves round the sun.' In this case the proposition 'the earth moves round the sun' is taken as true. Generally propositions become true or false. But the proposition used in propositional knowledge cannot be false because in that case it will not be propositional knowledge. Propositional knowledge is expressed in the form 'I know that

.....'Gilbert Ryle has mentioned propositional knowledge as 'Knowing that' in his book 'The Concept of Mind'.

(c) Conditions of propositional knowledge: While discussing the issue of conditions of propositional knowledge we will distinguish between Sufficient, Necessary and Necessary-sufficient Conditions.

Sufficient Condition: If two events are related in such a way that if the first occurs then the second occurs, but if the first does not occur then also the second may occur, then the first event will be the sufficient condition of the second. For example, rain is the sufficient condition of wet of soil because if it rains then there will be wetting of soil and if there is no rain then also there may be wet of soil.

Necessary Condition: If two events are related in such a way that if the first does not occur then the second does not occur, but if the first occurs then also the second may not occur, then the first event will be the necessary condition of the second. For example, oxygen is the necessary condition of fire because if there is no oxygen then there will be no fire and if there is oxygen then also there may not be fire.

Necessary-sufficient Condition: : If two events are related in such a way that if the first occurs then the second occurs, but if the first does not occur then the second does not occur, then the first event will be the sufficient condition of the second. For example, presence of wet fuel is the necessary-sufficient condition of the presence of smoke.

(d) Rationalism – Origin of knowledge according to Descartes, Spinoza and Leibnitz

* **Descartes' view of knowledge:** According to Descartes, knowledge through experience is not universal, certain and correct. So, he considered reason or intellect as the primary source of our knowledge. Only through reason we can get the reach of certain knowledge. From the natural light of reason we can get sure and certain knowledge. Descartes has mentioned three kinds of ideas: (a) Adventitious ideas, (b) Fictitious idea and (c) Innate ideas. The first kind of idea is originated from external world through sense experience. We add our imagination with the first kind of ideas and thus we get the second kind of ideas. The third kind of ideas are rational and prior to our experience. As Descartes has admitted fictitious and adventitious ideas besides his innate ideas he is considered Moderate Rationalist. To him 'some ideas are innate'.

As a mathematician Descartes thought that mathematical knowledge is the best kind of knowledge because this knowledge is universal and certain. He also tried to make the philosophical knowledge universal and certain like mathematics. By following the method of mathematics Descartes has employed the deductive method to draw sure and universal knowledge of soul, god and world necessarily from some primarily true principles. Paulsen has considered this kind of rationalism of Descartes Mathematical Rationalism. Descartes has established the principle 'I think, therefore, I am' (Cogito Ergo Sum) and from this principle he has tried to establish the existence of the world and substance.

But in reality mathematical knowledge is not identical with philosophical knowledge. The first is abstract, but the second is concrete. So, the method of mathematics cannot be same as philosophy. Besides, the innate ideas of Descartes are not admitted by all philosophers. Locke has criticized the existence of innate ideas and according to him there is nothing in the intellect which was not previously in the senses.

Descartes' view of the nature and origin of knowledge becomes the **subject of criticism** for the following reasons: (i) the admission of two kinds of ideas cannot be admitted from the view point of rationalism because these two are dependent upon our experience.

(ii) Descartes has considered mathematics as the basis of philosophical knowledge. But in reality these two types of knowledge cannot be same and similar. The first is certain, but the second is probable.

* **Spinoza's view of knowledge:** Like rationalist Descartes Spinoza also thought that some innate ideas present in our mind are the source of knowledge. According to Spinoza, the idea of God is innate idea. God is the only self-dependent substance. Consciousness and extension are the two qualities among innumerable qualities of God. Material substance and human soul are expositions of extension and consciousness respectively. After admitting the idea of God Spinoza deduced the existence of human soul and material substance with the help of his geometrical method. Spinoza has mentioned three levels of knowledge: (a) systematic rational knowledge which is the basis of fundamental rules of physics and geometry; (b) demonstrative knowledge which can understand substance as the basis of total world; in this level of knowledge we get a relation of equity between world and substance; (c) sensitive knowledge is obscure, separate, incomplete and systemless. Though

Spinoza has put stress upon rational knowledge and demonstrative knowledge consistently with the principle of rationalism, he has also admitted sensitive knowledge. For this reason Spinoza is also considered Moderate Rationalist.

Spinoza's view of the nature and origin of knowledge becomes the **subject of criticism** for the following reasons: (i) Spinoza's admission of sensitive knowledge is not consistent with the rational principle because this kind of knowledge is originated through experience.

(ii) Application of the geometrical method of Spinoza in philosophical discussions cannot be considered tenable. These two subjects have two different kinds of objects of discussion. So, these two types of discussions cannot be equated with each other.

* **Leibnitz's view of knowledge:** Leibnitz has a different view than Descartes and Spinoza. He thought that only universal and necessary knowledge are known through reason. To him, sensitive knowledge and rational knowledge are not different from each other. Sensitive knowledge is less obscure and reliable than rational knowledge. Sense is an undeveloped form of reason. Leibnitz has admitted innumerable number of living conscious atoms or 'Monads' and thought that one monad is different and independent from another monad. All ideas remain implied in these monads. According to him, all our ideas are innate. Those ideas are not clear which presuppose unclear monads. Those unclear ideas are sensations or innate ideas. These unclear ideas gradually become clear and distinct. The ideas of colour, smell etc are examples of these. Besides these vague sensations Leibnitz admitted other abstract ideas. These ideas are very distinct. But sensations have a role for these to become knowledge. For this kind of difference Leibnitz has admitted two kinds of propositions: (a) necessary and truths of reason and (b) truths of facts. The truths expressed in geometrical axioms or knowledge expressed through analytic statements is expressed in the first types. On the other hand, the knowledge which is related to external world is called truths of facts. For example, chaina rose is red. Leibnitz has distinguished between these two types of propositions and evaluated the distinction between internal sensation or truths of objects and truths of reason from the view point of reality. Leibnitz thought that no knowledge is possible without reason. External sensation can never be the reliable source of universal and necessary knowledge. For this Leibnitz has corrected Locke and said, 'there

is nothing in the intellect which was not previously in the senses except the intellect itself.' Leibnitz said that all ideas are innate.

Leibnitz's view of the nature and origin of knowledge becomes the **subject of criticism** for the following reasons: (i) Leibnitz's admission of necessary and truths of reason can reasonably be admitted by rationalist, but the admission of truths of facts cannot be admitted from the view point of rationalism. This is completely dependent upon sense experiences.

(ii) Leibnitz has considered all ideas innate. But this cannot be admitted. There must be other ideas than that of innate ideas in our world of knowledge. No ideas about the truths of facts can be called innate because these are always dependent upon experience.

(d) Empiricism – Origin of knowledge according to Locke, Berkeley and Hume

* **Locke's view of knowledge:** According to Locke, we are not born with any innate ideas in our mind. He has put forwarded some arguments to criticize the theory of innate ideas of Descartes.

(i) Locke said that if there could be anything like that in reality it could be equally present in everybody's mind. But the ideas of God, eternity and perfection do not remain present in child or idiots.

(ii) Some ideas might be universally accepted or those might remain present in everybody's mind. But from that it cannot be said that those ideas are innate. In reality these ideas can be originated in a different way.

(iii) If there could have anything like innate ideas then these could remain present in everybody's mind. But different people of different religion express different opinion regarding the nature of God, or people of same religion express different opinion in different times. Regarding the nature of other innate ideas except the idea of God people have different opinion. From this it is proved that there is no innate idea.

To present the positive aspect of his view Locke has said that at the time of birth our mind remains a tabula rasa or blank slate. Ideas come to our minds through sensations. Sensations give us knowledge about the external world and reflections give us knowledge of mental actions. No such idea is possible which is neither originated through sensation nor reflection. According to Locke, mind remains inactive while accepting ideas, especially simple ideas. Mind becomes active after the projection of external ideas on the screen of mind and mind creates complex ideas by comparing and combining various ideas. Therefore,

according to Locke, all ideas are derived from experience, no ideas are prior to experience. For this he said, 'there is nothing in the intellect which was not previously in the senses'.

According to Locke, knowledge is the agreement and disagreement among ideas. Locke has mentioned three kinds of knowledge: (i) Intuitive knowledge: - this knowledge is rational and necessary. For example, 'red is red' – this is intuitive knowledge because relation of identity is expressed in this knowledge. (ii) Demonstrative knowledge: - this kind of knowledge is gained through many ideas and by applying deductive arguments. Mathematical knowledge is an example of this knowledge. This knowledge is also rational and necessary. (iii) Sensitive knowledge: - In case of this knowledge we observe similarity or difference between our ideas and real objects. This knowledge is related to the knowledge of the existence of external objects. From this above classification of knowledge we can consider Locke moderate empiricist.

Locke's view of the nature and origin of knowledge becomes the **subject of criticism** for the following reasons: (i) Locke thought that at the time of acceptance of ideas our mind remains inactive. But this view is not admitted by psychology. As per modern psychology sensations cannot create ideas without the active role of mind. (ii) Locke's classification of knowledge is not consistent with the empiricist principle. He has put intuitive knowledge at the highest level; he has put demonstrative knowledge after that; but these two levels of knowledge are attainable through reason. The only knowledge which can be attained through experience is sensitive knowledge. He put it at the lowest level. This is very much inconsistent with the empirical principle.

* **Berkeley's view of knowledge:** Locke has only admitted concrete ideas of particular substances. But he admitted that though abstract ideas have no material reality we form such abstract ideas. By following this view of Locke Berkeley said that if perceptual knowledge of anything is not possible then the mind cannot form the idea of that thing. We have no power in our mind to form such idea because abstract, formless universal ideas cannot be perceived. In Berkeley's opinion our thought cannot deny the scope of perceptual experiences. Our thought and ideas are limited within the ideas of man and substance. No thought of formless universal is possible. Abstract universals are only names. General ideas can live neither in external nor in internal places. Whenever we consider the universal of man then we can think either of any particular man or

woman and consider those individual as representative of that class or universal. No abstract ideas can be formed without any particular object or individual. For this Berkeley has denied abstract general ideas in place of general ideas. For example, to form the abstract idea of triangle we present a particular triangle before our mind as the representative of all objects of the class. Only particular ideas are the objects of our thought. Universal ideas do not exist because no mental image corresponding to these ideas are not possible. Berkeley has admitted mind or soul and the existence of God. For this reason Berkeley is considered moderate empiricist.

Berkeley's view of the nature and origin of knowledge becomes the **subject of criticism** for the following reasons: (i) Berkeley has said that our thought can never supersede the scope of sense experience. But this view is not acceptable. Through our thinking process we can sometimes cross the scope or limit of our sense perception. (ii) According to Berkeley, universal has no existence because we cannot form any mental image similar to that universal. But in reality this argument is insufficient and untenable. We must admit the existence of an entity like universal to forward the process of our knowledge.

* **Hume's view of knowledge:** Hume for the first time has admitted the extreme form of empiricism. To him, the only object of direct knowledge is impression. When our sense organ comes in contact with any object then our mind receives an impression of that object. Hume has considered this impression. When this impression becomes hazy and obscure then it will become idea. According to Hume, no idea is possible without impression. So, he said that impressions and ideas are sources of all knowledge. The difference between impression and idea is that of vivacity and distinctness. Impressions are more clear and distinct than ideas. As no impression of soul, substance and God is possible through any sense organ, so no idea is possible. The existence of these objects is not possible as their knowledge is not possible. According to Hume, substance is the combination of real and probable sensations. For this reason he does not admit any substance as the container of sensations. Similarly he said that mind or soul is the mental events like thought, emotion, will etc which we can know. Besides, we can know the world through our experience. As the creator of all these, we do not need to admit God.

According to Hume, knowledge is possible only when some separate and isolated sensations are connected through some laws of Association. Hume

has admitted three kinds of laws of Association: - contiguity, similarity and cause and effect. If there are similarities between two ideas they become connected. If two events are connected in respect to spatio-temporal contiguity they become connected. Again, if two events are related as cause and effect they become connected. No innate ideas or a priori form of reason are necessary for the combination of two events. According to Hume, there is no material necessity between cause and effect. Hume has divided our knowledge into two types: (i) knowledge concerning matters of facts and (ii) knowledge concerning relations of ideas. The first kind of knowledge is dependent upon experience. These propositions are a posteriori. On the other hand, the second kind of knowledge is independent upon experience. These propositions are a priori. The first kind of proposition does not have necessity, but it has novelty. But the second kind of proposition has only necessity, but it does not have novelty.

Therefore, it can be said that by denying the existence of substance, soul and God Hume has given a complete and consistent representation of empiricism. He said that the object which does not have sensation cannot have knowledge. Even Hume has admitted the existence of universal knowledge as necessary affirmation because sensation does not give us such knowledge. To him, all knowledge is probable. In this way Hume's view has reached to scepticism.

Hume's view of the nature and origin of knowledge becomes the **subject of criticism** for the following reasons: (i) Hume has committed mistake by considering 'sensation' and 'idea' separate and 'isolated'. If we do not admit that isolated sensations and ideas are contained in a permanent mind we cannot explain the connection among the sensations and ideas. Even there must be a permanent mind to explain the principles of association. Unless this permanent mind is there, these principles cannot become active. (ii) Hume's admission of 'knowledge concerning relations of ideas' is against the principle of empiricism because this kind of knowledge is dependent upon reason.

(e) Kant's critical view about origin of knowledge in brief

* **Kant's view of knowledge:** Kant has reconciled the views of rationalists and empiricists and established view of Critical theory. According to Kant, knowledge must have two features: universality and novelty. Scientific knowledge must have universal and certain and with that it must have novelty. Kant has tried to find out whether there is any possibility of a third kind of proposition except a priori

universal proposition and a posteriori synthetic proposition. So, the basic question of Kant is 'if there is any possibility of synthetic a priori proposition?'

Kant thought that, knowledge like objects of universe has two sides: matter and form. Matter of knowledge is gathered through experience. Sensations obtained through experience are the components of knowledge. But if isolated sensations are collected then these do not become knowledge. If these isolated sensations are systematically arranged or if these received 'form', then that become knowledge. Reason gives this form of knowledge. So, according to Kant, knowledge becomes possible by the joint combination of reason and experience. This kind of knowledge is the expression of universal and novelty at the same time. Kant has commented this kind of knowledge 'synthetic a priori' knowledge.

According to Kant, the world of science and experience cannot be established on the two kinds of knowledge a priori analytic and a posteriori as admitted by rationalist and empiricist. He has tried to establish a third kind of proposition which is a priori synthetic. In sciences, particularly in physics, we find a kind of proposition which is universally and necessarily true. These propositions are universal, so a priori and expression of novelty or synthetic. For example, the proposition 'all events have cause' is necessarily true. It cannot be conceived that events are taking place, but there are no cause. The statement is synthetic, because the idea of 'cause' does not contain the idea of 'event'.

Kant thought that mind does not accept external sensations as they presented before us. Mind imposes forms of reasons and categories of understanding on them to form knowledge. Many philosophers previously thought that mind accepts components of knowledge passively and for this passivity we observe objects as they are in appearance. But according to Kant, external objects are perceived as per forms and categories of mind. These forms and categories are pre-conditions of knowledge without the application of which knowledge is not possible. For this reason Kant thought that without the analysis of these forms and categories philosophical discussions are not possible. So, according to Kant, the main method of philosophical analysis is the critical analysis of these forms and categories of knowledge. Mainly for this reason Kant's philosophical discussion is called Critical method.

By analyzing the various pre-conditions of knowledge Kant has shown that metaphysics is not possible though there are realities. As our minds have active role in case of knowledge our world of knowledge is different from that of

world of reality. Empiricists dogmatically discarded realities and rationalists have accepted realities dogmatically. According to Kant, we can only know the phenomenal world covered with different forms and categories of minds, but the world of realities remains unknown and unknowable.

Kant's view of the nature and origin of knowledge becomes the **subject of criticism** for the following reasons: (i) The main objection against the Critical theory of Kant is that the contradiction between the world of realities and phenomenal world is not rational. Two objects like reality and appearance are not isolated from each other; realities become phenomenal and phenomenon becomes real. Therefore, if phenomenal objects are logically called knowable then realities cannot be logically called 'unknowable'.

(ii) According to Kant, two components of knowledge – matter and form are opposite to each other as the source of the first is supernatural entity and the source of the second is mind. But the question is: how can the rational form of mind be applied on the different types of sensations? If the two become similar then only one can be applied to another. But according to Kant, knowledge is originated from two actions of opposite nature. Kant has created a problem creating a difference between the matter and form of knowledge.

(iii) Kant has created a dualism by making a unnecessary distinction between sensible and supernatural entities. Kant has failed to realize the truth that supernatural entity expresses itself through sensible objects. If we know only the phenomenal objects then it can be said that object has a reality behind it.

Exercise

- **Find out the correct alternative:**

1) The object of real knowledge according to Plato is

_____.

- (i) Form (ii) Matter (iii) Both form and matter (iv) None of form and matter

2) The writer of 'An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis' is

_____.

- (i) Kant (ii) Russell (iii) Ayer (iv) Hospers

- 3) 'I knew late Sunil Gangyopadhyay' – here the word 'know' is used in _____ sense.
- (i) Knowing how (ii) Ability (iii) Knowing that (iv) Logical
- 4) The writer of the book 'The Concept of Mind' is _____ .
- (i) Russell (ii) Hospers (iii) Ryle (iv) Stace
- 5) Among the knowledge by acquaintance, knowledge by ability and Knowledge by proposition _____ is the most fundamental.
- (i) Knowledge by acquaintance (ii) Knowledge by ability
(iii) Knowledge by proposition (iv) Knowledge by inference
- 6) Propositional knowledge has _____ conditions.
- (i) One (ii) Two (iii) Three (iv) Four
- 7) The conditions the presence of which make knowledge possible is called _____ conditions.
- (i) Sufficient (ii) Necessary (iii) Necessary-sufficient (iv) Logical
- 8) The _____ condition of Propositional knowledge is Truth condition.
- (i) First (ii) Second (iii) Third (iv) Fourth
- 9) The second condition of Propositional knowledge is _____.
- (i) the proposition must be true (ii) the knower must believe the truth of the proposition
(iii) there must be arguments in support of the believe (iv) the proposition may be true or false
- 10) The denial of synthetic proposition is _____ proposition.
- (i) Analytic (ii) Contradictory (iii) Contrary (iv) Negative
- 11) Philosopher _____ has used the word 'know' in the sense of 'knowing how'.
- l) The proposition 'All effects have cause' is a _____ proposition.
- (12) Synthetic a priori (ii) Synthetic a posteriori
(iii) A priori analytic (iv) A posteriori
- (13) The rationalism of _____ is mathematical rationalism.
- (i) Descartes (ii) Spinoza (iii) Kant (iv) Leibnitz
- (14) The rationalism of _____ is formal rationalism.
- (i) Descartes (ii) Spinoza (iii) Kant (iv) Leibnitz
- (15) _____ is called extreme empiricist.
- (i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Mill

(16) According to _____ knowledge through sense experience is uncertain.

(i) Rationalists (ii) Empiricists (iii) Phenomenologists (iv) Critical Philosophers

(17) According to _____ knowledge is perception of agreement and disagreement among ideas.

(i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Kant

(18) _____ has admitted the possibility of Synthetic a priori statement.

(i) Locke (ii) Hume (iii) Leibnitz (iv) Kant

(19) According to _____, no ideas without impression.

(i) Locke (ii) Hume (iii) Leibnitz (iv) Kant

(20) According to _____, necessary knowledge is not possible. (i)

Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Mill

*** Answer the following questions (not more than 200 words):**

1. Explain the different meaning of the word 'knowledge' with example.
2. What is Propositional knowledge? What are different features of Propositional knowledge?
3. Explain different conditions for Propositional knowledge with example.
4. What is the difference between Strong sense and Weak sense of knowledge? Explain with example.
5. Distinguish between the following pairs:
 - (i) Necessary and Contingent Statement
 - (ii) A Priori and A Posteriori Statement
 - (iii) Analytic and Synthetic Statement
 - (iv) Universal and Particular Statement
6. How does Locke define Knowledge? Critically discuss the view of Locke.
7. Explain critically the view of Berkeley regarding the nature and origin of knowledge.
8. Explain Hume's view of knowledge critically. Can he be called extreme empiricist?
9. Explain critically Descartes' view about the nature and origin of knowledge.
10. What is the nature of innate ideas? How does Locke criticize innate ideas?

11. What is the nature of monad according to Leibnitz? Explain critically.
12. What is the difference between extreme rationalism and moderate rationalism? Explain.
13. What is the difference between extreme empiricism and moderate empiricism? Explain.
14. Explain the critical theory of Kant about the nature and origin of knowledge?

Chapter – 3

SUBSTANCE

(6marks allotted)

MCQ -- 1X2 = 2

SAQ -- 1X4 = 4

(a) Concept of Substance: The idea or concept of substance is important to form the knowledge about life and world. The word 'Substance' is originated from the Latin word 'Substantia' which means that which stands behind or underlying. So, etymologically the word means something which becomes the container or substratum of quality or action.

Substance is something that we see or that we touch. We believe that the external world is made with many objects or substances. Common people consider objects like houses, trees, chair, table, wood, stone and many other things as Substance. These objects are independent to each other and all of them have specific features of their own. But these qualities cannot be thought flying in air. These qualities must have a container or substratum. These containers are considered as substance by common people. This view is called Common Sense view of Substance. From this view some features of substance can be illustrated in the following manner:

(i) Substance is the substratum of qualities: We perceive all objects through its qualities. A piece of sugar has qualities like whiteness, sweetness square form etc. But none of these qualities are independent. These qualities cannot exist without any container. So, for thinking about any composition or combination of qualities we have to think about a container or substratum.

(ii) Substance is the source of action or force: We can sense some force or action in all our actions or objects. When a fan runs we can see its force or action. We a moving ball hits another static ball the second becomes moving. We consider that the force or movement of the first ball makes the second ball moving. This action or force or movement actually comes from the container or substratum.

(iii) Substance is an unchangeable entity: We find different changes in the qualities of substance. But among these changes the container or substratum does not change. It remains unchanged. A man becomes changed with the change of time or his age, but he remains the same man at the end of

his existence. So, we can say that an object or substance remains the same though different changes take place in and around it.

(iv) Substance is a formation of unification: Substance is a formation of unification among different diversities. There can be no pure substance without qualities. Similarly there can be no qualities without substance. There is an inseparable relation between substance and qualities. Substance is a unification of many as it becomes the container or substratum of qualities and actions.

But some questions are raised regarding the commonsense view of substance. What is the relation of substance with its qualities? Is substance the combination of qualities or something extra? What is the real nature of substance? Is substance one or many? How can we know substance? The answers of these metaphysical questions are not found in the commonsense view of substance. So, this view cannot be regarded satisfactory.

(b) Different views of Substance – Aristotle, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Locke, Berkeley, Hume

(i) View of Aristotle regarding the nature of Substance: Aristotle's view of substance is the developed form of Plato's view. Plato considered substance as universal. He admitted two worlds: the first is the world of Ideas and the second is the world of appearance. But Aristotle criticized this view and said that universal cannot exist without particular. He used the term 'substance' in the following ways:

a) Substance is self-dependent. Substance does not depend upon any other thing for its existence. From this feature Universal cannot be Substance. So, according to Aristotle –

b) Substance is individual or concrete object. Aristotle said that, no qualitative feature of substance can be regarded as substance as individual is different from qualities qualitative word can be used as the predicate of a sentence. From this point Aristotle thought that –

c) The word denoting substance must be the subject of a sentence; it can never be the predicate of a sentence. For this Aristotle said –

d) Substance is the substratum or container of all qualities or actions. If this is said then substance has to be said 'permanent entity' because quality or action is changeable. So, no explanation of change without substance-reality can be received. For this Aristotle said –

e) Substance is an unchangeable reality underlying changes. According to Aristotle, humanity or manliness cannot exist without admitting individual man as its container. Besides, particular also cannot be substance because particular or individual man cannot exist without manliness. For this Aristotle said –

f) Substance is the combination of universal or particular. Universal is not substance and particular is not substance as well. In Aristotle's philosophy this is the primary sense or meaning of the term 'Substance'.

(ii) View of Descartes regarding the nature of Substance: Descartes has said that substance is something which exists without depending upon other. So, according to him, substance is self-dependent. In this sense substance is infinite and for this it is one and unity. Descartes has considered this substance 'God'. Substance can be known only through the natural light of reason.

If self-dependence is the definition of substance then no other substance can be admitted except God because no substance of this universe cannot be said independently self-dependent. But Descartes has admitted two more substances in addition to God. These are 'soul' and 'matter'. According to Descartes, the essence of soul is thinking process and the essence of matter is extension. But for distinguishing soul and matter with God Descartes has divided substances into two types: primary or independent and secondary or dependent. God is an independent substance because God is only completely self-dependent. But soul and matter are relative substances and these are created by God. For this reason Descartes has considered these two substances created substances.

In a special sense Descartes can be said a dualist philosopher because he has admitted two separate and opposite substances like matter and soul. Matter and soul has two essential features like extension and thought respectively. But these two have some secondary features. Descartes has considered these 'secondary features' 'modes' or 'accidental qualities'. These accidental qualities sometimes lie in these substances and sometimes these do not lie there. Position, form, motion etc are accidental qualities of matters and will, feeling etc are accidental qualities of souls.

As Descartes has admitted self-dependence as the definition of substance so he cannot admit anything other as substance except God. But he has admitted matter and soul except God. This indicates a self-contradiction in

Descartes' view. For this Spinoza has made this dualism into monism. Besides, Descartes has considered these two substances separate and contrary to each other. This had created a complication in Descartes' view. The way in which these two substances are connected as described by Descartes is not satisfactory.

Descartes' view of substance becomes the **subject of criticism** for the following reasons: (i) As Descartes has admitted self-dependence as the definition of substance, he should not admit any other substance except God. But he has admitted two more substances: matter and soul. It has created a contradiction in Descartes' view.

(ii) Descartes has considered soul and matter as distinct and isolated from each other. This has created a complication in his discussion. There can be no interaction between these two substances as they are contradictory to each other. But in our daily life we find these interactions between mind and body. Descartes has tried to explain these interactions through his admission of pineal gland. But this admission is not tenable to explain this interaction.

(iii) View of Spinoza regarding the nature of Substance: Spinoza defines substance thus: 'by substance, I mean that which is (exists) in itself and is conceived through itself; in other words that of which a conception can be formed independently of any other conception.' The definition of substance given by Spinoza shows that substance is self-dependent and the concept of substance can be formed without the help of any other concept. Certain deductions follow necessarily from the definition of substance given by Spinoza. As for example, Substance is its own cause – *causa sui*. Substance is infinite, one, eternal, unchangeable. Substance is absolutely free. Substance is the absolutely indeterminate being. Substance being infinite, nothing exists out of it.

Having made the following deductions from the definition given by Spinoza, he concludes that the substance must be one and this infinite, eternal, self-dependent substance is God. Spinoza admits the Cartesian definition of substance, but he points out that if Cartesian definition of substance is admitted, substance can only be one and not three. Substance cannot depend upon any other thing. But according to Descartes matter and mind are two substances which are dependent on God. Spinoza holds that matter and mind are not two substances; they are two attributes of God. They are the two different ways of conceiving one and the same substance, two different names

for one and the same thing. Matter and mind or more technically, thought and extension are the two parallel manifestations of the same substance, God. According to Spinoza, God is not a transcendental personal spirit, like the God of religion. He is the immanent indwelling cause of the world. God is the permanent substratum of all things, mental and material. Whatever is, is in god. Nothing can be conceived without the concept of God. According to Frank Thilly, 'God is in the world and the world in Him. He is the source of everything that is (pantheism). God and the world are one.' In Spinoza's philosophy the world, God and Substance designate one and the same thing. So according to Spinoza, there cannot be more than one substance.

Spinoza's view of substance becomes the **subject of criticism** for the following reasons: (i) Spinoza has denied the monistic nature of this world by admitting one and identical substance. But in reality we cannot deny the variety of objects and nature of this universe.

(ii) If we admit the claim of Spinoza that there is only one substance as supreme reality then we cannot admit or explain the question of individual-liberty.

(iv) View of Leibnitz regarding the nature of Substance: Leibnitz has not admitted the views of Descartes and Spinoza. To him, if we admit self-dependence as the definition of substance then we have to conclude monism of Spinoza. But from this view point of monism we cannot explain the diversity, particularly the freedom of individual. So, according to Leibnitz, we have to admit self-activity as the definition of substance in place of self-dependence. Self-activity means becoming active without depending upon others. So, Leibnitz defined substance as something which becomes active without depending upon any other thing.

Leibnitz described substance as partless because whatever has parts has origin and destruction and substance does not have origin and destruction. That which has no part cannot have origin and destruction. As substance is permanent, it cannot have origin and destruction. So, Leibnitz considered that substance must be considered partless. Compound objects are composed of various parts. These objects destroy with the destruction of parts. Compound objects are self-active. They become active due to the effect of external factors. Substance cannot be like this.

According to Leibnitz, substance cannot be one and infinite. Substance is many and innumerable. From this point of view Descartes is dualist, Spinoza is monist and Leibnitz is monist. Following the atomism of the Greeks Leibnitz has considered substance as 'similar to atom'. But these atoms are not material atoms; these are living conscious atoms or spiritual monads. Leibnitz considered these monads as the main cause of the nature of this universe. Monads have following features: (i) Monads are simple and indivisible. These are spiritual, conscious and active objects. (ii) No influence from outside can enter inside these monads as these monads are windowless. One monad cannot influence the other. Every monad is self-sufficient. (iii) Every monad is infinitely powerful. Every monad has the power to reflect the universe in its own womb. (iv) Monads are always active. But all monads are not equally active. Leibnitz has divided monads according to power of reflection. There are three levels of monads: (a) unconscious, (b) conscious and (c) self-conscious. God is, according to Leibnitz, 'Monad of all monads' or highest monad.

Leibnitz's view of substance becomes the **subject of criticism** for the following reasons: (i) The existence of Monads as admitted by Leibnitz is not perceptible. We can think about the existence of these monads, similarly we can think about their non-existence. So, we cannot know the existence of these monads either through experience or through reason.

(ii) Leibnitz is a pluralist. He has admitted the existence of many substances or monads. But the question is: how can we explain the relation among these monads? Leibnitz has said that God has explained the consistency among these monads with His supreme reason and for this purpose he has forwarded 'the doctrine of pre-established harmony'. But in reality this is a hypothesis, it is not a proved aspect.

(v) View of Locke regarding the nature of Substance: Locke has understood the idea of substance as the substratum of qualities. To him, when we know any substance directly through external perception we cannot know anything other than qualities. But these qualities do not become placed independently. A substratum or container of these qualities must be admitted. So, substance is the substratum of qualities. Locke has described substance as unknown and unknowable because we cannot know any such thing when we know different qualities.

According to Locke, the idea of particular substance means combination of ideas as well as container of these qualities. Locke has put more stress upon combination of qualities while describing clear and distinct idea of particular idea. Locke has mentioned two kinds of substances: Cognitive and Incognitive. According to him, though soul substance cannot be the object of perception, but as the unknown and unknowable container of mental processes the existence of soul has to be admitted. Locke said that though the existence of God cannot be known through perception, the existence of God has to be admitted as the substratum of qualities like omnipotence, omnipresence etc.

Locke has admitted two qualities of substance: primary qualities and secondary qualities. Primary qualities lie in the object in reality. These qualities are objective. Extension, form, volume etc are examples of primary qualities. Secondary qualities on the other hand are subjective. These qualities do not lie in the object, rather these lie in the human mind. Colour, taste, smell etc are examples of secondary qualities. Primary qualities do not differ from man to man, but secondary qualities differ from man to man.

Locke's view of substance becomes the subject of criticism for the following reason: (i) Locke was an empiricist and he has admitted additional container or substratum of qualities as unknown and unknowable. But we cannot admit such substance from the view point of empiricism.

(ii) The distinction between primary and secondary qualities as made by Locke cannot be admitted because these qualities cannot be separated from each other from the view point of modern psychology.

(vi) View of Berkeley regarding the nature of Substance: Berkeley has denied the existence of material substance, but has admitted the existence spiritual substance. According to Berkeley, the existence of a thing consists in its being perceived. As material substance cannot be perceived by the mind it cannot be real. Locke's unknown and unknowable substratum underlying and supporting the primary qualities revealed in sensations is a meaningless abstraction, for such substratum cannot be perceived by the mind. Berkeley does not acknowledge the existence of any substance in the material world, only qualities are perceptible. According to Berkeley material substance is the sumtotal of some sensible qualities or sensations. But only mind can perceive sensations. So the existence of mind or self must be admitted. If existence consists in being perceived, then the existence of the perceiving mind cannot be

denied. Regarding the nature of mind or self Berkeley denies self or mind as a simple, indivisible, indestructible, incorporeal active being which can perceive and produce ideas. Berkeley holds that we can know our self through immediate self-consciousness. This immediate self-consciousness is not similar to ideas or sensations. We have ideas of sensible qualities or sensations but we have a notion of mind or spirit. Notion is non-sensuous apprehension or intuition. Mind or self cannot be known as an object. So, Berkeley denies the existence of material substance but acknowledges the existence of self or mind or soul-substance.

Berkeley's view of substance becomes the **subject of criticism** for the following reasons: (i) According to Berkeley, the existence of everything depends upon perception. But this view is not admitted by neo-realist philosophers. According to them, it cannot be believed that an object becomes existent only if it becomes perceptible and if it is not perceptible then it is not existent. To them, an object can be an object of perception as it exists in reality. The existence of object does not depend upon the knower.

(ii) Berkeley has not admitted the existence of substance, but he has admitted the existence of qualities. Berkeley has not admitted the existence of substance as it does not become the object of perception. But the explanation of qualities cannot be explained without the admission of substance.

(vii) View of Hume regarding the nature of Substance: According to Hume, sense experience is the only source of knowledge. The existence of anything cannot be admitted which is not known through sense experience. According to Hume, the content of the mind is perception. Hume divides perceptions into impressions and ideas. Impressions are the immediate data of experience. By an impression Hume means, 'any sensation, passion or emotion as it makes its first appearance in our minds.' By impressions Hume refers to actual external and internal sensations. An idea is a faint copy of an impression. Every idea is the image and copy of an impression. The difference between an impression and its idea consists in the 'greater force, vividness of the former'. According to Hume impressions and ideas are the only contents of the mind.

Hume denies the existence of **material substance**. He argues that any genuine idea must be derived either from the impressions of sensation or reflection. If substance were a genuine idea, it would also be derived either from any one of these two sources. If impressions of sensations be thought to be the

source of substance, then it will be found that sense impressions can never give us the knowledge of material substance. It can simply give us knowledge of qualities like colour, smell, taste, temperature etc. If it is said that the idea of a material substance is derived from the impressions of reflection then it can be found that the impressions of reflection are impressions of passions and emotions, none of which denotes a substance. So a material substance has no existence in reality. A substance is a collection of certain simple ideas always found combined and to this combination we give a name to recall it according to our requirements. So for Hume the notion of substance is a fiction of the mind. It is a product of human imagination. There is no existence of any permanent material substance underlying these qualities.

Hume also denies the existence of **spiritual or mental substance** as an infinite, eternal, simple, undivided and permanent substance. According to him, all our ideas are derived from impressions. Neither external nor internal impressions can give us any knowledge of soul substance.

Hume has denied the existence of unknown and unknowable substratum as described by Locke because such a substratum underlying the mental states and processes can never be found. The self in Hume's view, is nothing more than the sum of our mental states and processes. It is nothing more than 'a collection of ideas which flow on in a continuous and regular stream'. There is no existence of any permanent and abiding soul-substance that gives unity among the discrete mental states and processes.

So, according to Hume we find that the self is nothing more than a series of mental states. The idea of unchanging permanent self underlying mental states is a figment of imagination. There is no existence of a permanent and abiding spiritual substance. The self is the sumtotal of changing mental states, and nothing more.

Hume's view of substance becomes the **subject of criticism** for the following reasons: (i) Hume has considered material substance as the combination of qualities and he has considered soul as the flow of mental actions. But if we do not admit extra existence of material substance we cannot explain that no object is identical.

(ii) Philosophers have doubts whether only on the basis of sense experience we can have the knowledge of combination of qualities. According

to some, no experience of containerless qualities is possible. Besides, only with the help of sense experience or sensations we cannot name a substance.

Exercise

- **Find out the correct alternative:**

1. John Hospers has mentioned _____ different senses of the word 'knowledge'.
(i) Two (ii) Three (iii) Four (iv) Five
2. In his philosophy _____ has mentioned two worlds: external world and internal world.
(i) Plato (ii) Aristotle (iii) Locke (iv) Descartes
3. According to _____ the objects of the external world is the mere imitation of the universal reality.
(i) Aristotle (ii) Plato (iii) Descartes (iv) Leibnitz
4. According to _____ the external world is mere imitation of the world of universal.
(i) Aristotle (ii) Plato (iii) Descartes (iv) Leibnitz
5. _____ is a dualist philosopher.
(i) Aristotle (ii) Plato (iii) Descartes (iv) Leibnitz
6. According to _____, substance is a combination of universal and particular.
(i) Aristotle (ii) Plato (iii) Descartes (iv) Leibnitz
7. According to _____, substance is individual or concrete object.
(i) Aristotle (ii) Plato (iii) Descartes (iv) Leibnitz
8. From the theory of substance of Descartes theory of _____ is deduced.
(i) Interactionism (ii) Parallelism (iii) Identity (iv) Phenomenolism
9. According to _____, god is the only substance.
(i) Plato (ii) Descartes (iii) Spinoza (iv) Berkeley
10. According to _____, matter and soul cannot be regarded as substance.
(i) Aristotle (ii) Plato (iii) Descartes (iv) Spinoza
11. _____ has tried to implement geometrical method in philosophy.

(i) Aristotle (ii) Spinoza (iii) Descartes (iv) Leibnitz

12. _____ is a pluralist philosopher.

(i) Aristotle (ii) Plato (iii) Descartes (iv) Leibnitz

13. _____ is a supporter of monism.

(i) Aristotle (ii) Spinoza (iii) Descartes (iv) Leibnitz

14. According to _____, extension and consciousness are the two main qualities among innumerable qualities of God.

(i) Aristotle (ii) Plato (iii) Descartes (iv) Leibnitz

15. According to _____, substance is self-active.

(i) Aristotle (ii) Plato (iii) Descartes (iv) Leibnitz

16. _____ has considered God as 'Monad of all monads'.

(i) Aristotle (ii) Plato (iii) Descartes (iv) Leibnitz

17. _____ has given the equation 'Substance= God = Nature'.

(i) Aristotle (ii) Plato (iii) Descartes (iv) Spinoza

18. According to _____, substance is regarded as 'partless'.

(i) Aristotle (ii) Plato (iii) Descartes (iv) Leibnitz

19. According to _____, the knowledge of substance is indirect knowledge.

(i) Plato (ii) Descartes (iii) Locke (iv) Hume

20. According to _____, qualities like extension, form, shape etc are primary qualities.

(i) Plato (ii) Descartes (iii) Locke (iv) Hume

21. The name of _____ is associated with the doctrine of pre-established harmony.

(i) Locke (ii) Hume (iii) Spinoza (iv) Leibnitz

22. _____ has denied the distinction between primary and secondary qualities.

(i) Locke (ii) Hume (iii) Spinoza (iv) Berkeley

23. According to _____, substance is a combination of qualities.

(i) Locke (ii) Hume (iii) Spinoza (iv) Berkeley

24. According to _____, soul is the combination of sensations.

(i) Locke (ii) Hume (iii) Spinoza (iv) Berkeley

25. _____ has forwarded the principles of association to explain the unity of mental acts.

(i) Locke (ii) Hume (iii) Spinoza (iv) Leibnitz

• **Answer the following questions very short:**

1. What are the features of knowledge according to Plato?
2. Give two features substance from popular view point.
3. Which philosopher is known as pluralist?
4. Which portion of brain is mentioned by Descartes to explain the relation of mind and body?
5. How does Spinoza explain extension and thought?
6. How does Leibnitz explain God?
7. How does Spinoza place his equation of substance?
8. How does Locke define substance?
9. What is the definition of substance according to Descartes?
10. How does Leibnitz define substance?
11. What is the consequence of Spinoza's theory of substance?
12. How many substances are admitted by Descartes?
13. What is monad according to Leibnitz?
14. Which philosopher is called dualist?
15. Which philosopher has introduced the Doctrine of Pre-established Harmony?
16. How many monads are admitted by Leibnitz?
17. Give two features of substance according to Aristotle.
18. What is the basis of the doctrine of substance of Leibnitz?
19. Which rationalist philosopher is known as pantheist?
20. How many complex ideas are admitted by Locke?
21. What is the consequence of Spinoza's view?
22. Which rationalist philosopher is called monist?
23. Give some features of monad as forwarded by Leibnitz?
24. Which world is real according to Plato?
25. What is the nature of external world according to Plato?
26. Why do we call Descartes dualist?
27. Which philosopher has forwarded the interaction between mind and body?

28. How many monads are admitted in Leibnitz's philosophy?
29. Which rationalist philosopher is called pantheist?
30. How does Leibnitz identify God?

Chapter – 4

CAUSALITY

(10 marks allotted)

MCQ – 1X2 = 2

DAQ – 8X1 = 8

(a) General notion of Causal Relation: according to ordinary human conception, causal relation is an internal relation. In reality we believe that no events take place without any cause. If the condition of occurrence of cause and effect occurs in future the same cause will cause the same effect. Therefore, from the viewpoint of common people cause is a kind of force which actively produces effect and causal relation is a relation of producer and product. By analyzing the common view of cause we get the following features of cause: (a) cause is an event prior to effect; (b) effect will necessarily occur if cause occurs; (c) cause produces the effect.

Science also identifies cause as force being consistent with the ordinary or common notion of cause. With the help of the law of conservation of energy science says that there is no quantitative difference between cause and effect, only there is difference of quality. The relation of cause and effect is universal and necessary.

Therefore, causal relation is very much important in case of science and ordinary world. In case of science when we infer any unknown event from any known event then we are bound to take the help of the event of causal relation. The conclusions of inferences become universal in some cases and in some cases they are expressed as forecast of particular events. In both these cases we require the use of the concept of cause-effect.

The common sense view of causality has some limitations. As per this conception we can explain the causal relation among material objects. But this view cannot explain the causal relation between material body and spiritual mind. In the common sense view we cannot get the explanation how material energy becomes transformed into mental energy.

(b) Entailment theory of Causal Relation: Among the rationalist philosophers Descartes, Spinoza etc believe that there is a necessary relation between cause and effect. This view of rationalism is called necessary theory or Entailment theory of cause. It is considered that necessary theory of causation is based upon the common sense view of cause. Besides, among the views of Locke and Berkeley causal relation is considered necessary relation. Locke considered cause such an active force which necessarily produces effect. Similarly Berkeley described mental force or energy as divine force or power and said that God is the only cause and everything of this universe is the effect created by God.

According to necessary or Entailment theory of cause there is always a necessary relation between cause and effect. If the relation between cause and effect is described only with the help of succession then we cannot explain the repetition of same effect after the occurrence of same cause. In that case we only can say that the event of death as effect follows the event of taking poison as cause. We will never be able to say that 'taking poison is the cause of death'. For this we have to say that the relation between cause and effect is universal and necessary. Rationalists considered this necessary relation between cause and effect the Entailment relation. According to them, in valid deductive inference there is a relation of necessity or Entailment. Almost similar kind of necessary relation prevails between cause and effect. In valid deductive inference the conclusion necessarily follows from the premise and if the premise is true then the conclusion can never be false. This necessary relation between the premise and the conclusion is called the relation of Entailment. Similarly the rationalists said that this like the Entailment relation between the premise and conclusion similar relation of Entailment can prevail between two events. But Entailment relation of logic and Entailment between cause and effect in our daily life are not identical, there is Entailment like relation between cause and effect. According to rationalism, the relation between cause and effect is like that of the relation between the premise and conclusion of a valid deductive argument. Descartes, Spinoza, Broad, Brand Blanshard, Ewing etc are some of the supporters of the Entailment theory of Causation.

Ewing has forwarded two arguments in support of the theory of Entailment: (i) In case of valid deductive argument we can infer the conclusion necessarily from the premise, similarly we can infer the effect from the cause. The statement which expresses the cause is the premise and the statement

which expresses the effect is called the conclusion. Ewing said that if there could not be this kind of necessary relation between cause and effect, then we could not infer the effect from the cause.

(ii) Maintaining consistency with theory of succession or regularity if it is said that 'there is no necessary relation between cause and effect, there is only relation of regularity', then we cannot get any scientific explanation of cause and effect. If it is admitted that the reason of occurrence of effect is kept within the cause then only we can get reasonable explanation of cause and effect. So, if cause is responsible for effect then we must admit that there is any necessary relation like logical entailment between cause and effect.

In case of logical entailment there is no temporal difference between cause and effect, but there must be temporal difference between cause and effect. For this reason rationalists said that the relation between cause and effect is not Entailment relation, but the relation is like entailment relation. In support of their view about cause and effect the rationalists at least said that there is a similar entailment relation like entailment between cause and effect.

For the following reasons the theory of Entailment relation between cause and effect has been criticized from various corners: (i) As cause and effect are two separate events we cannot get the effect by analyzing the cause. As the analytic propositions can only claim universal truth and as the causal statements are not analytic, so we cannot get the effect from our analysis of the idea of cause. Our bodies are nourished for drinking milk. By observing these facts it cannot be said that we will get the idea of 'nourishment' (effect) from the idea of 'drinking milk' (cause). From this view point empiricist Hume said that, as the idea of effect cannot be received from our analysis of cause, so there is no necessary relation between cause and effect.

(ii) The supporters of Entailment relation considered cause and effect identical. But in reality these two facts indicate two different meanings. Reason may mean 'as' or 'because' and in that case it may not mean 'cause'.

(iii) The main defect of Entailment theory is that this theory cannot explain the exact nature of causal entailment. Supporters of entailment theory only said that there is a relation like logical entailment between cause and effect. But in this way we cannot get any positive explanation of causal entailment only by saying 'there is similarity between logical entailment and causal relation'.

(c) Hume's Empirical View of Causal Relation: – In western philosophy Locke, Berkeley and Hume are the main supporters of empiricism. But Hume's view is different from that of the views of predecessors Locke and Berkeley. Being consistent with the principles of empiricism Hume said that there is no necessary relation between cause and effect, rather there is relation of constant conjunction between cause and effect. He has tried to prove this view from two angles. Negatively he has tried to refute the relation of necessity between cause and effect. Positively they have placed the relation of constant conjunction or regular succession between cause and effect.

(i) Denial of Necessary Connection between cause and effect: Negatively Hume said that causal relation is not necessary relation. By criticizing the common sense view of causation Hume said that there is no material necessity between cause and effect, rather there is mental necessity between the two. Hume's argument can be placed in the following manner: (i) According to Hume, the knowledge about the real world in our daily life is only originated through sense experience. In this experience we get the cause and effect as two separate events. We see that cause is the universal unchangeable antecedent of the effect and effect is the universal unchangeable consequent of the cause. In addition to this we do not get any idea of 'power' or 'force' in the cause or we do not get any knowledge of 'necessary relation' among cause and effect in our experience. For this reason Hume said that it is meaningless to admit the real existence of what is not got in our experience.

(ii) Hume thought that the knowledge of necessary relation cannot be received through any rational or a priori reasoning. Only if two events are totally different then only we can get the knowledge of necessary relation through the help of a priori reasoning. Hume said that only in cases of mathematical propositions we can get identity of two propositions, because mathematical propositions are analytic and imagination of its opposite involves contradiction. But no events of our daily life are totally identical. It is true that drinking milk causes nourishment, but there is no harm in thinking its opposite. In reality if we analyse one idea between the two then cannot get the idea of the other because there is no causal relation between these two events. So, Hume said that if there could have any necessary relation between them in reality then we could have received the idea of the effect by analyzing the idea of the cause.

(ii) Causality as constant conjunction and regular succession: From the positive side Hume thought that there is a relation of constant conjunction or regularity between the cause and effect. When we observe two events to be repeatedly connected to one another, then the event which always becomes prior to the other is the cause and the event which always occurs after is the effect. So there is a relation of succession between cause and effect. Cause occurs first and effect occurs later on.

According to Hume, the traditional necessity which we speak to between cause and effect does not remain present in the material world; it remains present in the mental world. Hume considered this necessity as a kind of 'custom breed expectation'. In our experience we observe the repeated presence of fire and burning together and thus these two events are connected in such a way that when we observe the first one we expect the presence of the second.

(d) Evaluation of Hume's theory: From various corners Hume's view of causation is severely criticized: (i) There may be relation of regularity or constant conjunction between two events, but from this those two events cannot be considered causally connected. For example, we can hear the sound of prayer in a mosque in Murshidabad at 4am in the morning and at the same time we can hear a prayer in a mosque in Kolkata. But from this we cannot conclude that the prayer in Murshidabad is the cause of the prayer in Kolkata.

(ii) Hume's view of causation cannot explain complex events like economic disaster or war as no relation of constant conjunction can be shown in these cases. For example, Hitler's attack on Poland is considered as an important cause of Second World War. But these two events cannot be said to be related with constant conjunction. For this reason Mill said that cause should be considered unconditional universal antecedent without considering it only universal antecedent. According to Mill, if we consider cause as universal antecedent of the effect then we have to consider day as the cause of night and vice versa. But there is no real causal relation between the two.

(iii) Kant has criticized the view of Hume regarding causation and said that the idea of causation is a priori; it is not empirical or a posteriori. The idea of causality acts as the basis of our experience as an a priori idea of knowledge. So, we do not get the knowledge of causality through our sense experience because this knowledge remains present in our mind prior to our sense experience.

Exercise

- **Find out the correct alternative:**

1. The _____ theory Causal relation cannot explain the Causal relation between material body and conscious mind.
(i) Commonsense (ii) Entailment (iii) Regularity (iv) Identity
2. Generally _____ philosophers are supporters of Entailment theory of Causal relation.
(i) Rationalist (ii) Empiricist (iii) Critical (iv) Intuitionist
3. In valid _____ argument the conclusion necessarily follows from the premise.
(i) Inductive (ii) Deductive (iii) Commonsense (iv) Mathematical
4. According to _____, like two propositions entailment relation is there in cases of relations between two events.
(i) Empiricism (ii) Rationalism (iii) Critical Philosophy (iv) Phenomenolism
5. Descartes, Spinoza, Broad, Blanshard etc are the supporters of _____ theory of Causation.
(i) Regularity (ii) Entailment (iii) Identity (iv) Interactive
6. According to _____ effect can be inferred from cause as there is necessary relation between cause and effect.
(i) Hume (ii) Kant (iii) Ewing (iv) Leibnitz
7. According to _____ philosophy, Causal relation is not Entailment, like-entailment.
(i) Empiricist (ii) Rationalist (iii) Intuitionist (iv) Critical
8. According to _____, cause is an 'active force' which necessarily produces effect.
(i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Ewing
9. According to _____, God is the only cause and everything in this universe is His effect.
(i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Ewing
10. _____ said that there is no 'material necessity' in Causal relation, there is 'mental necessity'.
(i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Ewing

11. According to _____, the traditional necessity between cause and effect lies in our mental world.
(i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Ewing
12. _____ thought that the traditional necessity between cause and effect is nothing but mental breed expectation.
(i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Ewing
13. According to _____, if there could have any necessity between cause and effect then we could have received the idea of effect by analyzing the idea of cause.
(i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Ewing
14. The _____ theory of Causation cannot explain complex events like economic disaster or war.
(i) Entailment (ii) Regularity (iii) Identity (iv) Commonsense
15. According to _____, Cause should be considered unconditional, universal antecedent without considering it only universal antecedent.
(i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Mill
16. According to _____ theory, memory cannot be explained.
(i) Regularity (ii) Identity (iii) Entailment (iv) Interactive
17. According to _____, the idea of Cause and Effect is a priori, not a posteriori.
(i) Locke (ii) Hume (iii) Mill (iv) Kant
18. According to _____, the knowledge of cause and effect remains present in our mind prior to our sense experience.
(i) Locke (ii) Hume (iii) Kant (iv) Mill
19. In case of _____ entailment there is no temporal difference between premise and conclusion.
(i) Logical (ii) Temporal (iii) Causal (iv) Interactive
20. _____ said that the knowledge of necessary relation cannot be obtained through a priori reasoning.
(i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Ewing
21. The basis of the Causal relation of _____ is Commonsense view.
(i) Rationalism (ii) Empiricism (iii) Critical theory (iv) Intuitionism
22. If the premise of valid deductive argument is _____ then the conclusion can never be false.
(i) True (ii) False (iii) Uncertain (iv) Certain

23. According to _____, the law of causal relation is a 'form of law'.

- (i) Locke (ii) Hume (iii) Kant (iv) Mill

24. According to _____, the necessary relation between cause and effect is originated from custom breed expectation.

- (i) Rationalism (ii) Empiricism (iii) Critical theory (iv) Idealist

25. According to _____, cause and effect are two separate events.

- (i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Mill

• **Give the answer of the following questions (within almost 200 words)**

1. Describe the commonsense view of Causal relation critically. Mention some features of Cause in this regard.
2. What is the meaning of Entailment? Explain critically the rationalist view of causation.
3. Discuss the Entailment theory of Causal relation critically.
4. Critically evaluate Hume's view of Causation.
5. What is the meaning of regularity of causation? Explain critically Hume's theory of Causation in this regard.

Chapter – 5

REALISM AND IDEALISM

(10 marks allotted)

MCQ – 1X2 = 2

DAQ -- 8X1 = 8

(i) Realism: Knowledge always expresses relation between knower and knowing object. But the question is: What is the nature of knowing object? Whether the knowing object has existence independent to knowledge or, its existence dependent upon knowing or unknowing of the knower? On the basis of this question philosophers are divided into many categories. According to a portion, the object of knowledge has existence independent to knowledge of value. The object of knowledge is no way dependent upon knowledge. Object comes to us only as they appear to us in the external world. These philosophers are known as realists.

(a) Notion of Realism: Among the realist philosophers some believe that the existence, quality and all features are independent to our knowledge. We directly get those objects in our knowledge. This view is known as Naïve Realism. On the other hand some realists believe that among the qualities of the object only primary qualities are existent independent to our mind. Besides, we do not get objects directly in our experience. Our knowledge of objects starts indirectly through the knowledge of the ideas of the objects. This form of realism is known as Representative realism or scientific realism. Locke is the main propounder of this kind of realism.

Following are the basic tenets of Realism: (i) In our external world many objects have independent existence which become the object of our knowledge. But for that we cannot say that the existence of those objects does not depend upon the knowing or unknowing of the knower. So, according to realism, the existence of objects in no way is dependent or influenced by knowledge, rather knowledge is influenced by objects.

(ii) Realists think that there is no internal relation between the object and knowledge. An object can exist without being the subject matter of knowledge. For this realists believe in the external relation between object and knowledge

and said that an object can independently exist without being the subject matter of knowledge.

(iii) Realists preach the plurality of realities. As per this view in the external world many external objects are independently existent.

(iv) According to realism, we can know the external objects either directly or indirectly. But whatever be the process of knowing, knowledge cannot create its object; rather object creates the knowledge. For this realists say that objects are not consequent to knowledge, rather knowledge is consequent to object.

(v) According to realism, sometimes we know such objects which do not have existence in reality. These happen in cases of illusory perceptions. From this angle also it can be said that knowledge and its objects are not identical.

(vi) According to realism, there are many objects which are unknown to us, which are not discovered yet. From this realists conclude that when we know any object then only that object cannot be existent, even when we do not know that object that may be existent.

* **Naïve Realism:** This kind of realism takes for granted that there is a world external to and independent of mind. It also holds that world is full of independent objects possessing qualities. The mind exactly knows the things of the world and its qualities as they are in themselves. The physical objects and their qualities are known in their true character by our sense organs. Our consciousness is like a searchlight which reveals the things in their exact form and the mode of our knowing does not in any way bring about any change in the nature of the things perceived or known. The existence of objects and their qualities do not depend on their being known by any mind, finite and infinite. Objects or things of the world have extra-mental reality. The independent existence of the object is not in any way lost by the fact of their being known by any mind. Though things of the world exist independently of all knowledge, they are directly presented to consciousness and not through any images or copies of the objects. Our ideas of the objects are exact copies of external real things much in the same sense in which pictures are copies of the originals or in which images in a mirror reflect their causes.

This view is known as commonsense view. Common people think that there is a world of things, existing outside and independent of mind. They also believe that this world will exist all the same whether there is any mind to perceive it or not. Commonsense also takes for granted that we perceive this world directly

and we perceive this world as it is in itself. As these contentions are the object of popular belief, Naïve realism is also called Popular realism.

This realistic view of the common people or Naïve realism is found to have many shortcomings. Some of its major inconsistencies may be stated below.

(i) This theory fails to explain cases of erroneous perceptions. If in perception things are revealed to us in their true character, then, how is it that we take a piece of rope to be a snake? This is a case of illusion. Besides, how is it possible to see a disembodied ghost or apparition when there is none present nearby in the darkness of night? This is also a case of erroneous perception, known as hallucination having no objective or sensory basis but caused by subjective factors. In dreams also, we have many experiences which prove false in waking state. So in dream there is no real perception. Naïve realism cannot explain erroneous perceptions, like illusions, hallucinations and dreams.

(ii) If we analyse our ordinary case of perception, we find a thing may appear tasteful to one perception, but may appear tasteless to another. So the view of the naive realists, that all qualities are seated in the objects does not seem to be correct. This also proves that what we perceive does not depend on the nature of the object but on the mind that perceives. Hospers observes, "As long as the content of perceptions depends so much on the nature of perceiving organ, and as long as we are unable to shed our perceiving organs as we do spectacles to try out other ones, how can we be so sure that we are perceiving things as they are?"

(iii) Perceptions also vary according to change of circumstances. The size of an object varies if perceived from different perceptions. A stick looks bent when half-immersed in water but looks straight when taken out of it.

For these above reasons Naïve realism or Commonsense realism is proved to be an unsatisfactory theory.

* **Representative Realism:** The branch of realism which considers independent existence of objects and the branch which admits the knowledge of objects as indirect through ideas or images are called Representative realism or Scientific realism. John Locke was the main supporter of this view. Representative realism has following features: (i) many objects are there in the external world; (ii) the existence of external objects does not depend upon our sense organ; (iii) in our sense experience we do not get the object directly, but we get the idea or image of the object; (iv) if we get the idea of primary qualities then that will be similar

to the features of the object and if we get the idea of secondary qualities then that will not be similar to the features of the object; (v) the qualities or features of the objects are sensible, not the knowledge of objects.

(b) Main tenets of Locke's Representative Realism: Locke showed that naïve realism cannot properly explain false perception, hallucination, dream etc. For this he tried to explain these events and he tried to put his view on the basis of contemporary scientific thoughts. This view is called 'Representative realism' because as per this view we cannot get the objects directly, we get the objects indirectly through ideas or images. Through these images we can know the objects. This theory is called scientific realism because this view is based upon contemporary scientific thinking.

According to Locke, our mind is like a visible screen on which ideas or images of objects are reflected. We know objects through these ideas. When these ideas or images become consistent or similar to the objects then our knowledge becomes true; when these objects do not become similar or consistent with the objects then our knowledge becomes false.

Locke divided the qualities into two types: primary and secondary. The qualities which really remain present in the object are called primary qualities. For example, extension, form, volume etc are examples of primary qualities. Primary qualities are objective, because these qualities are really images of the object. On the other hand, the qualities which do not remain present in the object in reality, rather these qualities are imposed upon the object by human mind. For example, colour, smell, taste etc are examples of secondary qualities. These qualities are subjective because these qualities remain present in human mind and become different man to man.

Locke said that we get the idea or image of qualities through our sense organs. These ideas differ twice as primary and secondary qualities. The ideas of primary qualities are similar to the objective features, but the ideas of secondary qualities are different from objective features. Locke said that as the qualities cannot be positioned in the vacant place, so, there must be some container of these qualities. This container or substratum is substance.

Though representative realism is an improved form of realism, it has following shortcomings: (i) Locke's representative realism cannot judge the truth or falsity of knowledge. According to Locke, if the object has similarity with its idea then the knowledge will be true and if the object is not similar to its idea

then the knowledge will be false. But in reality if the object is not perceived at least once then it is not possible to know whether the object is similar or consistent to the idea or not.

(ii) Many philosophers have considered Locke's view as 'iron curtain theory' because here it is said that only ideas can be known directly and the object does not directly come in contact with our sense organs. In this view a curtain of iron is imagined which cannot be overcome. There is no scope of knowing what is there on the opposite side.

(iii) Regarding the distinction of primary and secondary qualities as forwarded by Locke, Berkeley has said that like the secondary qualities primary qualities also are dependent upon the knowing mind, condition and distance of sense organs etc. So, if secondary qualities become ideas of mind for being dependent upon sense organs, then the primary qualities will be the ideas of minds. Besides, primary and secondary qualities are inseparable with each other. One cannot be known without the other.

(iv) Many philosophers said that subjective Idealism is the ultimate consequence of representative realism. If we cannot get immediate knowledge of external objects and we can get only ideas of mind then it cannot be said the external world is existent. For this our knowledge will become confined within the ideas of mind. From this source Berkeley has established his Subjective Idealism later on. For this it is said that Locke's representative realism has helped the creation of Berkeley's Subjective Idealism.

Locke and Berkeley's opinion about the distinction between Primary and Secondary qualities: Locke has divided the qualities of objects into two types: primary and secondary qualities. The qualities which actually remain present in the object are primary qualities. Extension, motion, form, volume etc are examples of primary qualities. Primary qualities are objective because these are really the nature of the objects and remain present in the objects in reality. The existence of these qualities does not depend upon the perception of any individual mind. On the other hand, there are some qualities which do not remain present in the objects in reality; rather these are imposed by the individual minds in the objects. These are secondary qualities. Colour, sound, taste, smell etc are examples of secondary qualities. Secondary qualities are subjective because these remain present as the qualities of our minds or sensations. These qualities are different from man to man. The distinction

between primary and secondary qualities as made by Locke was admitted by the contemporary scientists of Europe. For this reason Locke's view is called Scientific realism.

Locke has put forward following arguments in support of the distinctions between primary and secondary qualities: (i) according to Locke, as the primary qualities are objective these qualities do not differ from man to man. But secondary qualities differ from man to man. For example, a green mango can be sweet to one, but the same mango can be sour to another. From this it is understood that the quality of 'taste' is secondary quality and that is subjective. But the form, size etc of the mango is not different to everyone. So these qualities are primary qualities.

(ii) Locke thought that primary qualities do not become different to a same person in different time. But the secondary qualities become different to a person in different times. For example, if a person is given 'sweet', his favourite food, continuously after a period of time that would become tasteless to him. From this it is proved that the quality of 'taste' is subjective.

(iii) the secondary qualities as admitted by Locke cannot remain present without sense organ, but the primary qualities can be there without the sense organs. Colour, sound etc cannot become existent without the senses of sight and ear respectively. But the primary qualities can become existent without sense organs. So, primary qualities are objective and secondary qualities are subjective.

(iv) The primary qualities are not changeable, but the secondary qualities are changeable. For example, if butter is heated then its colour would change. But the primary qualities change in no way. So, it can be said that the secondary qualities do not remain present in the objects; rather these remain present in individual mind.

Berkeley has criticized the above views of Locke with the help of the following arguments: (i) according to Berkeley, if the secondary qualities become the ideas of minds for being dependent upon sense organs then the primary qualities are also subjective because the primary qualities are also perceptible through sense organs. For example, a circular coin is really circular though it appears different to different persons from different angles. So, qualities shape, size and form etc are also dependent upon sense organs and changeable.

(ii) Berkeley said that like the secondary qualities primary qualities also differ from man to man. For example, a certain object may appear light to a person and the same object may become heavy to another person. From this it can be said that primary qualities like 'weight', 'volume' etc may become different from man to man.

(iii) According to Berkeley, like the secondary qualities the primary qualities also become different to a person in different times. For example, a kite goes high up on the sky gradually and becomes small to smaller. From this it is proved that primary qualities like 'form', 'volume' etc are subjective.

(v) Berkeley thought that primary qualities and secondary qualities are inseparably related to each other. Without the one the other cannot be perceived. For example, the colour of an object cannot be perceived without the form of that object; besides colourless pure form cannot be perceived.

On the basis of the above arguments Berkeley concluded that there is no difference between primary qualities and secondary qualities. He considered both these qualities dependent upon perception and mind. Idealist Berkeley concluded that primary qualities and secondary qualities are nothing more than ideas of minds.

(ii) Idealism: According to Idealism there is no existence of any external object independent to mind and knowledge as the object of knowledge. Knowable objects are naturally dependent upon knowing minds. In Idealism nothing independent to mind or knowledge is admitted. No parts of the material world or mental world are composed with unconscious components. Mind or consciousness is the actual reality.

In Western Philosophy we find two forms of Idealism: Subjective Idealism and Objective Idealism. The propounder of the first is Berkeley and the propounder of the second is Hegel. As per the first Idealism, the reality of object depends upon the knowledge of man. As per the second Idealism, both the material world and the mental world are mutually dependent parts of a supreme consciousness. As Berkeley has established his Idealism from the view point of epistemology his idealism is known as Epistemological Idealism. On the other hand, Hegel has tried to establish his idealism from the view point of Metaphysics. So, his idealism is known as Metaphysical Idealism.

(a) Notion of Idealism: The main tenets of Idealism can be explained in the following way: (i) The relation between the object and knowledge is internal relation. So, there can be no independent existence of object without knowledge. Whenever we know any object we know it in relation to its knowledge. Therefore, object has no independent existence without its knowledge.

(ii) According to Idealism, all objects are dependent upon knowledge. If we discuss about any object it becomes the object of our knowledge. In reality the imagination of thought or object independent to knowledge is an impossible event.

(iii) The Idealists criticized the Empiricist view that 'objects form the knowledge' and said that 'knowledge makes the objects'. Objects are influenced and controlled by knowledge. The formation of object becomes possible by following the consciousness or ideas of the knowledge.

(iv) As Idealists believe in the existence of a supreme reality they are known as Monists. According to Idealists, mind or consciousness is the supreme reality. In some cases we can doubt about the existence of the knowing objects, but we cannot doubt about the existence of mind or knowledge.

(v) According to Idealism, object and consciousness are identical. Object is the creation of consciousness. There can be nothing existent without the consciousness of the object. But according to Subjective Idealism, object is the consciousness of human mind; as per Objective Idealism, object is the consciousness of the universal mind.

(vi) The Idealists are supporters of Coherence theory of Truth. Being consistent with Coherence theory Idealists said that when a particular proposition becomes consistent with some other pre-established propositions, then that particular proposition will be considered true and if it does not become consistent it will be false.

(b) Berkeley's Subjective Idealism: "Esse Est Percipi": In Western philosophy Berkeley is the first and foremost propounder of Subjective Idealism. According to Subjective Idealism, the existence of object depends upon knowing mind and traditional object or features of object are mere ideas of knowing mind.

As a consequence of the epistemological view of Locke Berkeley has established his Subjective Idealism. Locke said that we can only perceive the ideas of mind and through these ideas we can indirectly infer the existence of

objects. But Berkeley said that if we know the ideas of mind in place of the objects, then there is no logical ground of saying that there are objects behind these ideas.

In his view Locke has distinguished between primary and secondary qualities and admitted the existence of substance as the unknown and unknowable substratum of primary qualities. But Berkeley said that if we know the ideas of our minds then it is meaningless to admit the existence of any substance as the substratum of these qualities. Besides, Berkeley has denied the distinction between primary and secondary qualities and said that all qualities are secondary and all qualities are mental. Like secondary qualities primary qualities also are dependent upon the mind of the knower, the condition of the sense organ, distance etc. Moreover, the colour or smell of an object cannot be perceived without the form of that object. Besides, the perception of pure colourless form of an object is not possible. So, both these qualities are mental and dependent upon perception. If all qualities are mental, then there will not be any external and extra-mental existence of material substance as the 'substratum' of primary qualities. Everything will be converted to the ideas of mind. So, there is nothing like substance, whatever is that is only mind and the ideas of mind.

According to Berkeley, as without perception no knowledge is possible so whatever has quality of being perceived is true or real. Knowable objects are only collection of some qualities and those qualities are ideas of our minds. From this it can be said that the external world is mainly the world of ideas. So, Berkeley concluded 'Esse est Percipi' or, the meaning of being exist is being perceived as ideas of any particular mind. Whatever is known can be only existent. So, whatever is called substance or features of substance is nothing but the ideas of our minds.

When Berkeley said that when anything has existence it means that it is only perceptible then he only said about the sensible objects. For this it can be said that Berkeley's full dictum is: 'Esse est percipiout percipere'. So, existence means knowledge or knower. Therefore, according to Berkeley, existent objects are two types: known objects and knower or mind.

If we have to say as per the opinion of Berkeley that 'existence' means 'knowledge' then the continuity of the object cannot be explained. For solving this problem Berkeley has introduced the existence of God in his philosophy. To

him, the continuous existence of object is not only dependent upon the perception of individual mind. As finite animal when we do not perceive any object, it becomes existent as the matter of perception of God. God as infinite, omnipotent and omnipresent can perceive everything. Whenever anything becomes the object of our perception, then that becomes existent as the idea of God. From this view point Berkeley said that all object exist as the ideas of God and our perception is the idea of God's mind perceived from a limited view point.

Berkeley's Subjective Idealism is severely charged with the following criticisms: (i) Among the modern philosophers Moore, Alexander, Russell, Perry etc have severely criticized Berkeley's Subjective Idealism. Moore in his essay '*Refutation of Idealism*' has said that Berkeley could not make the distinction between the process of sensation and its object. Sensation is a mental process because without process of sensation is not possible without mind. But the object of sensation may be possible without mind. Moore said that if there is no difference between the process of sensation and object of sensation then we cannot differentiate between two sensations.

(ii) British philosopher Alexander said that whenever we know any object we know it known object. But from this it cannot be said that no object can exist without being perceived.

(iii) Neo-realist Perry has forwarded some arguments against Berkeley. Among his criticisms the most important is Fallacy of ego-centric predicament. Knowledge always presupposes a knower. If we want to know any object we must know it previously because we cannot know anything about an object or we cannot form a statement about an object which is not known. From this Berkeley concluded that whatever is not known cannot be existent. In his theory if Berkeley said that 'its existence cannot be known' without saying 'it cannot have existence' then no fallacy took place in his theory. But his theory has committed the fallacy of ego-centricity not for saying so.

(iv) Russell in his criticism has said that the invalidity of Berkeley's theory could be understood if it is placed in the form of an argument. In support of his Subjective Idealism Berkeley's argument is: idea is such whose existence depends upon minds; objects are ideas; therefore, object is such whose existence depends upon minds. Russell said that in this argument the word 'idea' is used in two sentences in two different senses. In the first sentence the

word 'idea' is used as sensation-process. But in the second sentence the word is used as the object of sensation. If a same word is used in a single argument twice in two different senses then the meaning of the term becomes obscure and the argument does not remain valid.

Role of God in Berkeley's philosophy: According to Berkeley, 'any object is existent' means it is perceived by anyone. But for admitting this, an abnormal consequence has to be admitted. If the existence of external object depends upon the ideas of our minds then it has to be said that an object will not be there if its idea is not in the mind. Thus if we admit Berkeley's view then we have to say that the existence of all objects are momentary. They do not have continuous existence. Thus in Berkeley's philosophy we can become assured about the existence of human mind and the ideas of these minds. If the independent existence of the external world is dependent upon me in this way and if my mind becomes the only certain substance then Berkeley's opinion will be Solipsism. But Berkeley did not deny that whatever seems to be existent in the real world has continuous existence. So, though Berkeley admits that the existence of the world is not dependent upon the idea of our mind, he has tried to establish the continuous existence of reality. The existence of God helps the continuous existence of God and makes the view of opinion of Berkeley free from Solipsism.

According to Berkeley, God created different ideas in our minds. God influenced our minds by whatever I perceive. But I do not create the ideas of those objects in our minds what we call natural substances. As these are 'ideas' these must be ideas of any mind. But these are not created by me or not by the minds. Therefore, these must be supported to any other minds. This mind is not our finite minds, so Berkeley considered this as divine Infinite mind. The world is supported in the idea of the mind of God. The perception of God is universal. Through this universal perception the world gets a continuous existence.

Though Berkeley is admitted as Subjective Idealist, he has not admitted the external existence of sensible objects. When we do not perceive the world then also the world remains existent. He has not considered this statement meaningless.

Then also Berkeley's conclusion cannot be considered realists. 'There is a book on the table' – the realistic meaning of this that if a person enters in a room then he will see the book on the table. But Berkeley does not want to say

that. To him, 'there is book on the table'- means when a person is not perceiving this object then also it becomes the object of God's mind.

Though Berkeley considered the existence of sensible object as dependent upon mind, then also dependence of mind is of two kinds. The existence of objects depends upon human mind and upon the mind of God. Though the existence of object depends upon human minds Berkeley considered that reality relative existence or reality. The existence or reality which is established through the perception of God is called universal reality or existence. The world remains universally present before the mind of God. But whatever the dependence of the object for being existed it expresses dependence upon any mind. Therefore, Berkeley's philosophy is an idealistic philosopher.

Evaluation of the view: For explaining the problem of the continuity of objects Berkeley has admitted the existence of God. But a question rose whether he can admit the existence of God as an empiricist philosopher. As per the basic status of empiricism nothing like God can be admitted because entities like God are not the object of sense perception. So, the admission of God as made by Berkeley is very much inconsistent with the basic principle of Empiricism.

But if Berkeley could not take the help of the hypothesis of God for this purpose then the whole world would become the idea of human mind. This would follow the conclusion of Solipsism 'only I and my ideas are existent'. For this reason many philosophers said that necessary consequence of Berkeley's idealism is Solipsism.

Exercise

- **Find out the correct alternative:**

1. According to _____ the object of knowledge has existence independent to knowledge.
(i) Empiricism (ii) Rationalism (iii) Realism (iv) Idealism
2. According to _____, there is existence of many external objects.
(i) Empiricism (ii) Rationalism (iii) Realism (iv) Idealism
3. According to _____, there is no internal relation between object and its knowledge.
(i) Empiricism (ii) Rationalism (iii) Realism (iv) Idealism

4. According to _____, we can know external objects either directly or indirectly.
 (i) Empiricism (ii) Rationalism (iii) Realism (iv) Idealism
5. The realism of Locke is known as _____ realism.
 (i) Scientific (ii) Popular (iii) Unscientific (iv) Simple
6. According to _____, object is not consequent to knowledge; rather knowledge is consequent to object.
 (i) Empiricism (ii) Rationalism (iii) Realism (iv) Idealism
7. According to _____ realism, qualities like colour, taste, smell etc. which we know are actual qualities of objects.
 (i) Scientific (ii) Popular (iii) Representative (iv) Neo
8. According to _____ our mind is like a search light.
 (i) Empiricism (ii) Rationalism (iii) Realism (iv) Idealism
9. _____ Realism is also known as 'Common sense view'.
 (i) Scientific (ii) Popular (iii) Representative (iv) Neo
10. _____ Realism cannot give explanation of illusory perception or hallucination.
 (i) Scientific (ii) Popular (iii) Representative (iv) Neo
11. According to _____ Realism, our mind is like a visible screen on which the idea or impression object is reflected.
 (i) Scientific (ii) Popular (iii) Representative (iv) Neo
12. According to _____, when ideas or impressions assemble with the objects then our knowledge becomes true.
 (i) Locke (Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Mill ii)
13. According to _____ realism, we do not directly get the objects through our sense experience; rather we get the ideas or images of those objects.
 (i) Scientific (ii) Popular (iii) Representative (iv) Neo
14. According to _____ realism, we know the objects through their ideas or images.
 (i) Scientific (ii) Popular (iii) Representative (iv) Neo
15. The main propounder of Scientific realism is _____.
 (i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Mill
16. _____ has denied the distinction between primary and secondary qualities.

- (i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Mill
17. _____ has considered both primary and secondary qualities subjective.
- (i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Mill
18. Realists are generally considered _____.
- (i) Monists (ii) Pluralists (iii) Dualists (iv) Interactionists
19. The way of Subjective Idealism is widened by _____.
- (i) Naïve realists (ii) Representative realists
(iii) Objective Idealists (iv) Intuitionists
20. According to _____, all qualities are secondary qualities.
- (i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Mill
21. According to _____, object and its consciousness are not different.
- (i) Realism (ii) Idealism (iii) Critical theory (iv) Phenomenologist
22. According to _____ there is no existence of abstract material substance.
- (i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Descartes (iv) Spinoza
23. According to _____ the world is the expression of the supreme reality.
- (i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Mill
24. According to _____, primary qualities are also subjective.
- (i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Hume (iv) Mill
25. The view of _____ is called Epistemological Idealism.
- (i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Bradley (iv) Hegel
26. According to _____, the primary qualities are nothing other than ideas of minds.
- (i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Bradley (iv) Hegel
27. The view of _____ called Metaphysical Idealism.
- (i) Locke (ii) Berkeley (iii) Bradley (iv) Hegel
28. According to Idealism, the _____ existence of object depends upon the perception of minds.
- (i) Metaphysical (ii) Phenomenal (iii) Actual (iv) Logical
29. The supporters of _____ believe in the monistic reality.
- (i) Realism (ii) Idealism (iii) Critical theory (iv) Phenomenologists
30. 'The existence of objects depends upon the knowing minds.' – this is the view of _____.

(i) Realists (ii) Idealists (iii) Critical philosophers (iv) Phenomenologists

• **Answer the following questions (answer within almost 200 words):**

1. What is Realism? What are the basic tenets of realism? Mention the different forms of realism in this regard.

2. What is Naïve realism? Are the basic tenets of Naïve realism satisfactory? Discuss critically.

3. What is representative realism? Who is the founder of this realism? Discuss the basic tenets of this realism critically.

4. What is Naïve realism? What is representative Realism? Make a comparative analysis of the two realisms.

5. How does Locke distinguish between primary qualities and secondary qualities? What are the criticisms of Berkeley against this distinction of Locke?

6. What is Idealism? What are the types of Idealism? Mention the basic tenets of Idealism.

7. Critically elaborate the subjective Idealism of Berkeley.

Or, 'Esse est percipi' – Who is the supporter of this view? Explain this view critically.

8. Explain the role of God in the Subjective Idealism of Berkeley. Can this admission of God be justified in Berkeley's philosophy?