

Lokāyata

Journal of Positive Philosophy
Vol. XI, No.01 & 02, September 2020



(ISSN: 2249-8389)

Special Issue on
Problems in Analytical Philosophy

Chief-Editor:
Dr. Desh Raj Sirswal

Guest-Editor:
Dr. Mudasir Ahmad Tantray




CPPIS
Pehowa(Kurukshetra)

Lokāyata: Journal of Positive Philosophy (ISSN 2249-8389)

Lokāyata: Journal of Positive Philosophy is an online bi-annual interdisciplinary journal of *the Center for Positive Philosophy and Interdisciplinary Studies (CPPIS)*. The name Lokāyata can be traced to Kautilya's *Arthashastra*, which refers to three *ānvīkṣikīs* (logical philosophies), Yoga, Samkhya and Lokāyata. Lokāyata here still refers to logical debate (*disputatio*, "criticism") in general and not to a materialist doctrine in particular. The objectives of the journal are to encourage new thinking on concepts and theoretical frameworks in the disciplines of humanities and social sciences to disseminate such new ideas and research papers (with strong emphasis on modern implications of philosophy) which have broad relevance in society in general and man's life in particular. The Centre publishes two issues of the journal every year. Each regular issue of the journal contains full-length papers, discussions and comments, book reviews, information on new books and other relevant academic information. Each issue contains about 100 Pages.

© Centre for Positive Philosophy and Interdisciplinary Studies, Pehowa (Kurukshetra)

Chief-Editor:

Dr. Desh Raj Sirswal, Assistant Professor (Philosophy), Post Graduate Govt. College, Sector-46, Chandigarh.

Editorial Advisory Board:

Dr. Ranjan Kumar Behera (St. Joseph University, Virgin Town, Ikishe Model Village, Dimapur, Nagaland).

Dr. Merina Islam (Department of Philosophy, Cachar College, Silchar, Assam).

Dr. Dinesh Chahal (Department of Education, Central University of Haryana, Mahendergarh).

Dr. Manoj Kumar, (P.G. Department of Sociology, P.G.Govt. College for Girls, Sector-11, Chandigarh).

Dr. Sudhir Baweja (University School of Open Learning,, Panjab University, Chandigarh).

Dr. K. Victor Babu (Institute of Education, Mettu University, Metu, Ethiopia).

Dr. Jayadev Sahoo (Jr. Lecturer in Logic & Philosophy, GM Jr. College, Sambalpur, Odisha).

Dr. Rasmita Satapathy (Department of Philosophy, Ramnagar College, West Bengal.)

Dr. Pankoj Kanti Sarkar (Department of Philosophy, Debra Thana Sahid Kshudiram Smriti Mahavidyalaya, Paschim Medinipur, West Bengal).

Mrs. Chetna Gupta (Department of Philosophy, SPM College, University of Delhi).

Dr. Kamal Krishan (Department of Hindi, P.G.Govt. College for Girls, Sector-11, Chandigarh).

Declaration: The opinions expressed in the articles of this journal are those of the individual authors, and not necessary of those of CPPIS or the Chief-Editor.

In this issue.....

Sr. No.	Title of the Paper & Author	Page No.
1.	Philosophical Grammar: Wittgenstein and Chomsky: Dr. Mudasir Ahmad Tantray	4-21
2.	Necessity and Analyticity: Not an Equation : Dr. Soma Chakraborty	22-29
3.	Rejection of Metaphysics: An Analytical Study: Tariq Rafeeq Khan	30-34
4.	Rationality and Religious Consciousness: An Analytical Approach to Morality : Ifrah Mohi ud din Rather	35-42
5.	Reflections on Wittgenstein's metaphysical approach to Unanalysable : Dr. Bhaskar Bhattacharyya	43-48
6.	Contribution of Logical Positivism to Philosophical Analysis: Jeuti Devi	49-52
7.	Wittgenstein's Notion of 'The Philosophical Self': Dr. Manoranjan Mallick	53-59
8.	Analytical and Normative Inquiry of the Nature and Purpose of Philosophy : Rajan	60-65
9.	Analytic Position of Women in Society: Suyasha Singh	66-71
10.	कृत्रिम भाषा में संकल्पनाओं के प्राकृतिकरण की संभावनाएं प्रशान्त वर्मा एवं भावना	72-77
11.	Contributors to this issue	78

Philosophical Grammar: Wittgenstein and Chomsky

Dr. Mudasir Ahmad Tantray

Abstract

This paper attempts to show the real nature of Universal Grammar. Universal grammar is separate part of human mind which makes language learning possible and generative. Universal grammar is the symbolic and systematic rules inside our mind. These rules help us to classify, analyze, differentiate, assimilate, understand and recognize human language. This paper determines the real nature of philosophical grammar and discusses the modular and non-modular approach of it. I shall examine the critical approaches of Wittgenstein and Chomsky and their comparison to investigate the philosophical grammar.

Key Words: Philosophical Grammar; Wittgenstein; Chomsky; Analytical Philosophy; Universal Grammar;

Introduction

Philosophical grammar is also known by many names like scientific grammar, universal grammar and general grammar. This type of grammar resides in the rules of every subject matter and things. Grammar is the set of rules and philosophical grammar is the set of grammar which is universal in human mind. Rationalist philosophers, Descartes, Spinoza and Leibnitz argued that human mind have certain rules, norms and axioms which helps him in understanding, doubting and reasoning. Thus, universal grammar according to rationalist philosophers could be examined deductively. The structure of universal grammar for the knowledge of sound, meaning and form could be innately scrutinized and functions naturally with the data. While, on the other hand, Empiricists philosophers like, Locke, Berkeley and Hume argued that Universal grammar exists in things not in mind. This set of rules and norms could be understood inductively with respect to acquired truths. John Locke assumed that human mind is a *Tabula Rasa*, blank slate on which ideas lead their impressions. So, in this sense universal grammar could be acquired from the classification and differentiation of things. However, Immanuel Kant produced the argument that rules exists in the mind but can work only if we could acquire idea through sense perception.

Wittgenstein believed that universal grammar exists in the propositions in which we are making our thinking possible. When we speak or utter any proposition, we utter it in symbolic language and then this proposition represents our thoughts. Our observation, experiences or impressions are universally wired with universal grammar but Wittgenstein does not believe that there is separate module for universal grammar as Chomsky did. He termed that it is the propositional attitudes which describe the nature of universal grammar. Everyone could see, observe, hear, think, smell and taste, so, everyone could use his/her universal grammar ability to analysis, rectify, clear and classify thoughts.

The connection between 'language and reality' is made by definitions of words, which belongs to grammar. A gesture language used to communicate with people who have no word-language in common with us. Do we feel there too the need to go outside language to explain its signs? It looks that the correlation between objects and names is a part of the symbolism. It gives the wrong idea if you say that the connection is a psychological one. A proposition shows the possibility of the state of affairs it describes. 'Possible' here means the same as 'conceivable'; representable in a particular system of propositions. The proposition 'I can imagine such and such a colour transition connects the linguistic representation with another form of representation; it is a proposition of grammar, so, the sense of a

proposition and the sense of a picture, the different grammar of the expressions; ‘This picture shows people at a village inn’ and ‘This picture shows the coronation of Napoleon’ are two examples. The rules of grammar are arbitrary in the same sense as the choice of a unit of measurement. The rules of grammar cannot be justified by showing that their application makes a representation agree with reality, i.e., the analogy between grammar and games. In order to get clearer about the grammar of the word ‘understand’, let’s ask: when do we understand a sentence? When we’ve uttered the whole of it? Or while uttering it? - Is understanding, like the uttering of a sentence, an articulated process and does its articulation correspond exactly to that of the sentence? Or is it non-articulate, something accompanying the sentence in the way a pedal note accompanies a melody?

A grammar is an organization of rules that produces an infinite class of ‘potential percepts’, each one with its phonetic, semantic and syntactic aspects; the class of structures that comprise the language in question. The percepts themselves are first order constructs; we decide their properties by testing and observation. The grammar that causes the configuration of percepts is a second order construct. To study it, we must abstract away from the other factors that are concerned in the use and understanding of language and think on the knowledge of language that has been internalized in some manner by the language user.¹

Chomsky on Philosophical Grammar

Noam Chomsky is one of the most influential linguists of the twentieth century and still today. He dominates the scene of theoretical linguistics. He is most famous for his unique linguistic philosophy. He has revolutionized the discipline of linguistics with his much-talked-about theory of Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG), in which he emphasizes the mental capacity of generating sentences with the use of unconscious knowledge of language which he calls Universal Grammar (UG). He says, TGG attempts to specify ‘what the speaker actually knows’ (Chomsky, 1965: 8). He asserts that human brain is biologically programmed to learn language, so language faculty is innate. For him, mind works during the course of learning a language. These innatist and mentalist views made his theory distinct, placing him in head on collision with behaviorism, which was much in fashion during the first half of the twentieth century. Chomsky dealt a serious blow to behaviorism, after which stimulus-response theory of language learning was abandoned, giving a boost to cognitive psychology. This paradigm shift in the history of linguistics is recognized as Chomskyan Revolution. Chomsky’s particular kind of philosophy is also known as Chomskyan Hierarchy.

The philosophical grammar or general grammar is also known as scientific grammar and this concept was influenced by Cartesians conceptions (Chomsky, *The Mind-Body Problem*, 2011). The organization of rules that identifies the sound meaning relation for a given language can be called the ‘grammar’ or to use a more technical term, the ‘generative grammar’ of this language. To say that a grammar ‘generates’ a definite set of structures is merely to say that it specifies this set in an exact way in this sense, we might say that the grammar of a language generates an unbounded set of ‘structural descriptions’, each structural description being an abstract article of some kind that establishes a particular sound, a particular meaning, and whatever formal properties and patterns serve to intercede the relation between sound and meaning.²

The grammar was immediately the set of propositions which the linguist put together and characterizes that entity is called a language. Generative grammar has completely a different concern. From the point of view of generative grammar, language may not even subsist. In fact, in my view it is very indistinct what the idea of languages refers to. Language is not one of the things in the real world; that is, it isn’t a thing out there. Whatever it is, it is something class of derived complex idea, may be

no notion: in fact, it doesn't seem to be a linguistic notion or at least not linguistically definable. However, there is something in the real world, namely what is in your head and what is in my head, more or less common between your head and my head, this makes this discussion possible. That is something in the real world, but it is not a language, we don't have a language in our heads. Rather, what we have in our heads is some sort of system of rules that determines the properties of expressions over an indefinite range.³

Chomsky judges that UG is special device of human brain which can help people learn language quickly. It is an unconscious and potential knowledge which exists in human brain without learning and determines the existing appearance of human language (Ren Hulin, 2014). Grammar exists in the world, as components of steady states attained. As for languages, one may possibly think of them as determined by grammars, or in some other way, but in any event they are clearly at a further remove from real mechanism of the brain than the grammars represented in these mechanisms. Likewise, the theory of universal grammar is not the study of general properties of language, but rather universal grammar is assumed component of genetic endowment.⁴

Chomsky squabbled that the clarification of a productive faculty like language demands that we admit the existence of complicated set of formal processes inside the head of the person. In particular, Chomsky postulated the existence of a mentally represented set of rules is called a generative grammar that underlies speakers, grammaticality judgments. A key feature of a generative grammar is that it specifies recursive rules for how words and phrases can be accumulated into sentences, thus explaining how speakers with finite minds are able to form judgments of the grammaticality of any of an infinite number of sentences.⁵

Generative grammar is an idea which dates back 2500 years. It didn't have to be discovered in the late 1940; it goes back to Paninean tradition which developed for centuries.⁶ According to Fodor, 'the fact that understanding a language is an intellectual achievement provides at least some reason for regarding as mental processes the data-processing that it requires'. Objections also might be raised against saying that these alleged mental events are 'unconscious'. It is possible to maintain that to entertain the notion of an unconscious mental process is either to indulge in incoherence or to implicitly suggest that we reduce 'mental'. Fodor explains that he calls these processes 'unconscious' because 'they cannot be reported by the subject'.⁷

Wittgenstein on Philosophical Grammar

According to Wittgenstein, philosophical grammar is the set of rules which can be represented and used deductively. There are different types of norms, rules and axioms which determines the nature of thing. So, different types of rules designate different types of languages. Wittgenstein gave the example of a chess game, as the rules of the chess determines the type and nature of game, similarly, rules of language determines the nature and mechanism of a language. Grammar as in example 'the geometry of negation', we would like to say: 'Negation has the property that when it is doubled it yields an affirmation'. But the rule doesn't give a further description of negation, it constitutes negation. Geometry no more speaks about cubes than logic does about negation. It looks as if one could infer from the meaning of negation that 'p' means p. What does it mean to say that the 'is' in 'The rose is red' has a different meaning from the 'is' in 'twice two is four'? Here we have one word but as it were different meaning-bodies with a single end surface: different possibilities of constructing sentences. The comparison of the glass cubes. The rule for the arrangement of the red sides contains the possibilities, i.e. the geometry of the cube. The cube can also serve as a notation for the rule if it belongs to a system of propositions. 'The grammatical possibilities of the negation-sign'. The T-F

notation can illustrate the meaning of 'not'. The written symbol becomes a sign for negation only by the way it works - the way it is used in the game. If we derive geometrical propositions from a drawing or a model, then the model has the role of a sign in a game. We use the drawing of a cube again and again in different contexts. It is this sign that we take to be the cube in which the geometrical laws are already laid up. My earlier concept of meaning originates in a primitive philosophy of language. - Augustine on the learning of language. He describes a calculus of our language, only not everything that we call language is this calculus. As if words didn't also have functions quite different from the naming of tables, chairs, etc. - Here is the origin of the bad expression: a fact is a complex of objects. In a familiar language we experience different parts of speech as different. It is only in a foreign language that we see clearly the uniformity of words. If I decide to use a new word instead of 'red', how would it come out that it took the place of the word 'red'? The meaning of a word: what the explanation of its meaning explains. (If, on the other hand by "meaning" we mean a characteristic sensation, then the explanation of meaning would be a cause.) Explanation can clear up misunderstandings. In that case understanding is a correlate of explanation.

It seems as if the other grammatical rules for a word had to follow from its ostensive definition. But is this definition really unambiguous? One must understand a great deal of a language in order to understand the definition. The words 'shape', 'colour' in the definitions determine the kind of use of the word. The ostensive definition has a different role in the grammar of each part of speech. So how does it come about that on the strength of this definition we understand the word? What's the sign of someone understands a game? Can't he learn a game simply by watching it being played? Learning and speaking without explicit rules. We are always comparing language with a game according to rules. The names I give to bodies, shapes, colors, lengths have different grammars in each case. The meaning of a name is not the thing we point to when we give an ostensive definition of the name. What constitutes the meaning of a word like 'perhaps'? I know how it is used. The case is similar when someone is explaining to me a calculation 'that I don't quite understand'. 'Now I know how to go on.' How do I know that I know how to go on? Is the meaning really only the use of the word? Isn't it the way this use meshes with our life? The words 'fine', 'oh', 'perhaps' ... can each be the expression of a feeling. But I don't call that feeling the meaning of the word. I can replace the sensations by intonation and gestures. I could also treat the word (e.g. 'oh') itself as a gesture. A language spoken in a uniform meter, relationships between tools in a tool-box. 'The meaning of a word: its role in the calculus of language.' Imagine how we calculate with 'red'. And then: the word 'oh' - what corresponds now to the calculus? Describing ball-games. Perhaps one will be unwilling to call some of them ball-games; but it is clear where the boundary is to be drawn here? We consider language from one point of view only. The explanation of the purpose or the effect of a word is not what we call the explanation of its meaning. It may be that if it is to achieve its effect a particular word cannot be replaced by any other, just as it may be that a gesture cannot be replaced by any other. - We only bother about what's called the explanation of meaning and not about meaning in any other sense. Aren't our sentences parts of a mechanism? As in a pianola? But suppose it is in bad condition? So it is not the effect but the purpose that is the sense of the signs (the holes in the pianola roll), their purpose within the mechanism. We need an explanation that is part of the calculus. 'A symbol is something that produces this effect.' - How do I know that it is the one I meant?' We could use a colour-chart: and then our calculus would have to get along with the visible colour-sample. 'We could understand a penholder too, if we had given it a meaning.' Does the understanding contain the whole system of its application? When I read a sentence with understanding something happens: perhaps a picture comes into my mind. But before we call 'understanding' is related to countless things that happen before and after the reading of this

sentence. When I don't understand a sentence - that can be different things in different cases. 'Understanding a word' - that is infinitely various.

One of the great eighteenth century rational grammarians portrayed that 'general grammar' as a deductive science concerned with 'the immutable and general principles of spoken or written language' and their consequences; it is 'priori to all languages', since its principles 'are similar as those that direct human reason in its intellectual operations'. John Stuart Mill later uttered the same leading idea that 'the principles and rules of grammar are the means by which the forms of language are made to correspond with the universal forms of thought. The structure of every sentence is a lesson in logic. The generative grammar of a particular language (where 'generative' means nothing more than 'explicit') is a theory that is concerned with the form and meaning of expressions of this language. Language faculty is the basic component of the human mind. Universal grammar is characterization of the genetically determined language faculty, one may think of this as 'language acquisition device', an innate component of the human mind that yields a particular language through interaction with the presented experience, a device that changes experience into a system of knowledge attained: knowledge of one or another language.⁸

Structural and descriptive linguistics, behavioral psychology, and other contemporary approaches be predisposed to view a language as collection of actions, or utterances, or linguistic forms (words, sentences) paired with meanings, or as system of linguistic forms or events. In Saussurean structuralism, a language (langue) was taken to be a system of sounds and an associated system of concepts; the notion of sentence was left in a kind of midpoint, perhaps to be lodged within the study of language use.

Comparison

Universal Grammar: According to Chomsky, Universal Grammar (UG) is the system of principles, conditions, and rules that are elements or properties common to all languages – the essence of human language. All human beings share part of their knowledge of language. UG is their common possession regardless of which language they speak. The rules of UG provide the basic blueprint that all languages follow. (Chomsky, 1976: 29; Cook & Newson, 1996: 1-2; Fromkin, Rodman and Hyams, 2007: 25) UG theory attempts to clarify the relatively quick acquisition of the mother tongue on the basis of minimum exposure to external input. Learning would be impossible without universal language-specific knowledge. Chomsky says: It is reasonable to suppose that UG determines a set of core grammars and that what is actually represented in the mind of an individual even under the idealization to a homogeneous speech community would be a core grammar with a periphery of marked elements and constructions. (Chomsky, 1982: 8) Chomsky says that human babies are born with the core linguistic sense common to all language, which helps them to acquire any specific language from the environment. According to Chomsky, the language faculty is part of our biological endowment, and as such it is largely genetically determined. Neuropsychologist Eric Lenneberg in his *Biological Foundations of Language* (1967) lends support to Chomsky's view. He says the capacity to learn a language is indeed innate, and, like many such inborn mechanisms, it is circumscribed in time. If a child does not learn a language before the onset of puberty, the child will never master language at all, as claimed in the critical period hypothesis. The proposal of universal grammar puts Chomsky in the core of rationalist tradition. Chomsky's proposal bears an affinity with the concept of archetype theorized by noted Swiss psychiatrist Carl Jung. According to Jung, human beings are born with certain inherited modes of functioning rooted in collective unconscious, referred to as archetypes. Archetypes are conceived as innate neuropsychic center possesses the capacity to initiate, control, and mediate the

common behavioral characteristics and typical experiences of all human beings. According to Chomsky, although grammars differ from one another, their basic forms – deep structures – are universal; that is, at the deepest neuropsychic level, there exists a universal or archetypal grammar, on which all individual grammars are based.

This paper attempts to bring out a comprehensive outline of Wittgenstein's philosophical grammar and draw the limits of such a grammar vis-a-vis the empirical grammar and their logical counterparts in linguistic theory. My main contention is that philosophical grammar is not bound by the empirical constraints which appear in the structure of a nonphilosophical linguistic grammar. Wittgenstein distinguishes between two sorts of grammar, the one of the traditional linguistic variety to be called the empirical grammar and the other one of the logical variety to be called philosophical grammar. Traditional descriptive grammar concerns parts of speech (such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, etc.). It examines forms of pluralizing nouns, regularities and irregularities in the conjunction of verbs and so on. All the above problems seem to have nothing to do with philosophy. Philosophy is concerned with philosophical grammar. As Moore puts it, grammar is a sort of thing one teaches small children at school e.g. we do not say 'Two men was in the field but' and 'Three men were in the field'. And what has that to do with philosophy? According to Wittgenstein, the above example has nothing to do with philosophy. It only tells what people do in a particular language. It only describes the particular grammar e.g. English grammar. It has nothing to say about what grammar is all about or what one does in following a grammatical rule. Philosophical grammar is concerned with the latter issues in that it is a reflection on grammar itself. Philosophical grammar therefore, is a reflection on grammar. In this sense philosophical grammar is more general and comprehensive than traditional grammar. It contains no information as to how a particular grammar works but concerns itself with the general issues relating to the availability of grammar as such. We may say here that there are not two kinds of grammar but two approaches to the study of grammar. They represent two kinds of interests in the rules of a language determined by different purposes. Philosophy is concerned with rules of grammar, i.e. rules for the use of expressions. It sheds light upon these problems. So, the range of its concern is wider and more comprehensive. Philosophy thus concerned with rules is philosophical grammar itself. Philosophical grammar is as wide as the concept of rule itself. A grammarian in a narrower sense concerns himself with a particular natural language or languages and its forms and structure. A philosopher of language, on the other hand, is typically concerned with forms shared by many languages. Of course, it precludes language-specific enquires like to syntactic structure of sentences of a particular language, e.g. English, Sanskrit, etc. Philosophy does not aim at producing a universal grammar; it even does not aim at producing a grammar at all. Rather it aims at resolving philosophical issues concerning grammar, its structure and limits. The grammarian classifies parts of speech into noun, adjective etc, and states rules for them. The philosopher will typically concern himself with different classifications, e.g. sensation words, words for feelings, emotions, moods, attitudes etc. The philosopher can resolve conceptual puzzles concerning these words and resolve confusions arising out of their (miss) uses. He can clarify our knowledge of the world by arranging and contrasting the different rules for the use of perception words.⁴ An example of the philosopher's concern is: 'I see better, more distinctly than you' makes sense but, 'I feel pain better, more distinctly than you' makes no sense. What is philosophically important here is the rules of use (grammar) of the words 'see' and 'feel'. Grammarian's interest fall outside the interests of the philosophers, since while the latter's interest includes issues of more general kind, the former's interests do not go beyond what is interesting for a particular language or all languages taken together. The more complex problems concerning the nature and limits of language do not concern the empirical grammarian. For Wittgenstein, philosophical grammar is an account book of

language (PG). It determines the limits of sense by examining the nature of rules. The philosopher is primarily interested in the limits of sense in so far as they are determinable by examine the rule-structure of the languages concerned. Wittgenstein's notion of philosophical grammar is aimed at solving the problems of the limits of sense. Wittgenstein, in a general way, may differentiate philosophical grammar from empirical grammar in the following ways: Firstly, philosophical grammar is concerned with rules for the use of words just as ordinary grammar is, except that where ordinarily grammar specifies and classifies those rules, philosophical grammar examines their structure. Philosophical conclusions about rules affect the very concept of language we have. Philosophical grammar does not discover anything new. It only puts language in a certain logical perspective. Secondly, the important difference between grammarians' interest in the use of words and philosophers' lies in their purposes. Though grammarians may concern themselves with meaning, they hardly raise questions, about whether meanings are at all possible, whereas philosophers do raise fundamental questions about the possibility of meaning e.g. whether meaning is extensional or intentional or whether meaning itself is an ontological entity, etc. Thus the grammarians' distinction between syntax and semantics which separates meaning from the structure of language is hardly binding for the philosophers. Philosophers do see the whole problem as one. Wittgenstein clearly thinks that there is no essentially dividing line in the patterns of the use of words between the so called syntax and semantics. For him the study syntax involves the study of the semantical questions and vice versa, as the philosophers' goal is to study the whole of language. Lastly, Wittgenstein takes grammar as covering, in the widest sense, all the conditions and methods necessary for comparing the propositions with reality. Philosophers' interest is in the language-world relations; therefore, for him, grammar must take into how language, though autonomous and self-contained, is yet related to the world. Language becomes a significant phenomenon only against the backdrop of the phenomenal world of which it itself is a constituent. The signs are spread over the world. So the study of the signs is a study of the world. What is, however, philosophically significant is that for grammar studies 'the harmony between reality and thought to which indeed a form of our language corresponds'. Philosophical grammar studies primarily the question of sense as we have indicated earlier. Hence the distinction of sense and non-sense is fundamental for philosophical studies of grammar. There is a distinct idea of grammatical nonsense. The sentences, 'Green ideas are 'idle', 'Socrates is identical', etc. are philosophically nonsense, though they may appear as well formed. Philosopher's major concern with grammar lies in detecting well concealed form of nonsense. It is this nonsense which pervades language and the philosopher's task is to bring them to light. Wittgenstein writes, the results of philosophy are the uncovering of one or another piece of plain nonsense and of bumps that the understanding has got by running its head up against the limits of language. These bumps make us see the value of the discovery. Chomsky has formulated two distinct types of sentential structures. These are surface structure and deep structure. Surface structure, according to Chomsky, is the observable grammatical structure of a sentence. The phonological component of a generative grammar operates on surface structure. This is a product of syntactic rules and is responsible for the phonological representations of the sentence. Depth structure is distinct from phonological representation. It is associated with the underlying grammatical form of sentences. Depth structure accounts for the grammatical relations which are not observable on the surface structure. It explains how the infinite sentences of the natural language are generated. Thus Chomsky's generative grammar has a stake in the concept of depth structure of sentences. Chomsky has given an interesting example to support the above point: (i) 'John is eager to please.' (ii) 'John is easy to please.' Both the sentences have the same surface structure. They have the form 'Noun + Verb + Adjective + infinitive'. But there is an underlying grammatical difference between the two. We cannot

paraphrase (i) in the following way. (i) 'It is eager to please John'; though we can paraphrase (ii) as (ii) 'It is easy to please John'. Thus the sentences (i) and (ii) are different though. Their surface structures are alike because they have different deep structures. Chomsky's theory explains the similarity of the surface structure in terms of the operation of transformational rules which convert the deep structure into the respective surface structures. Surface structures are derivatively linked with the depth structures.

The distinction between surface structure and deep structure is introduced in the transformational model of grammar. This distinction is a part of the syntax of language. According to Chomsky, syntax is logically prior to semantics. In other words, meaning depends on the structure of the sentences. The semantic component of language depends upon the deep structure postulated by the grammarian. The transformational generative grammar has the following model built into it. In this model the base rules generate the fundamental grammatical relations of the language and produce deep structure of the sentences. There are transformational rules which convert the deep structures into surface structures. The phonological and morphological component operates on those structures to produce 'phonological representations. Besides, the amalgamation rules operate to produce semantic interpretation. The surface structure of language resulting in semantic interpretation accounts for meaning. Meaning (semantics) is thus linked with the depths-structure (syntax).

Chomsky demonstrates in his contribution to the scientific study of language that there is an exhibition of the (much discussed) competence/performance distinction. In *Aspects of the theory of syntax* a fundamental distinction is drawn between what speaker actually 'the ideal speaker-hearer' knows by virtue of which he or she has mastery of language, and what a (speaker or hearer) does. A study of the former yields a theory of competence; of the latter a theory of performance. A grammar of a language is an open statement of competence. Consequently, we make a fundamental distinction between competence (the speaker-hearer knowledge of his language) and performance (the actual use of language in concrete situations).⁹ Chomsky presupposed that the relation which exists between mind and language or among the above levels is certainly not a logical relationship of induction or deduction but of particular level. All the levels are linked together. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the study of this particular human achievement, the ability to speak and understand a human language, may serve as a evocative model for question into other domains of human competence and action that are not quite so amendable to direct investigation. By studying the properties of natural languages, their structure, organization, and use, we may hope to gain some understanding of the specific characteristics of human intelligence.

Logically, there is a natural order of thoughts that is mirrored by the order of words, when we speak of a grammar as generating a sentence with a certain structural description. We mean simply that the grammar plans this structural description to the sentence. The term 'generate' is known in the sense intended here in logic, particularly in theory of combinatorial systems. The notion 'acceptable' is not to be confused with 'Grammatical' acceptability is a concept that belongs to the study of performance, where as grammaticalness belongs to the study of competence. Chomsky pointed out that a native speaker's knowledge of his language must have a generative character. Since there is no rule limiting the length of grammatical sentences, there must be an indefinitely large number of sentences that native speakers could produce and understand. It is unthinkable that this set of grammatical sentences could be mastered them, once at a time. Some kind of generative system must lie at the heart of linguistic competence. Chomsky implied that cautious analysis of that generative system could disclose much about the cognitive architecture of the human information processing system. The knowledge system

expands as children learn to shape their innate and universal grammar to the local requirements of the particular language community into which they happen to have been born. The basic design features of human languages are universal.¹⁰

According to Chomsky, children study their native language with remarkable ease and speed, despite the fact that children are rarely explicitly instructed in their language and their linguistic experience consists of little more than a fairly limited set of examples of often degraded adult speech. Thus, Chomsky maintained that there is a gap between the learning target achieved by the child, i.e. the child's mature linguistic competence, and the small inputs available to the child. He argued that the only way to bridge this gap is to postulate that the child antecedently possesses extensive innate knowledge of language and brings this knowledge to the language learning task.¹¹

Chomsky's conception of how difficult it is to arrive at a theory of grammar can perhaps best be conveyed if we paraphrase a famous saying of Kant's: 'To write the theory of the grammar of an ordinary language is surely the most difficult of all scientific undertakings. Thus far no such theory of grammar has been set forth.' For what we really have in the way of so-called theories of grammar is an enormous mass of factual material, furnished with numerous more or less artificial ad hoc rules which afford us no view of the inner structure and operation of language. That is to say, these rules, in the best of cases, report only the surface structure of a grammar and not its deep structure. These words immediately call to mind Wittgenstein's distinction between surface grammar and depth grammar. In the execution of the program, however, there is an essential difference between the two thinkers. Wittgenstein's concern is to eliminate those philosophical confusions which have their root in the fact that we are misled by the surface grammar of language and neglect the depth grammar. His deliberations are aphoristic in character and hence, from the standpoint of a systematic theorist like Chomsky, remain more or less those of an amateur. According to Chomsky, both surface structure and deep structure are to be provided in a systematic form by a generative and transformational grammar. A grammar of this sort consists in a system of rules. The rewriting rules are the fundamental ones. They allow us to produce sentences with the simplest structure. The starting-point of the derivation is always one and the same letter (initial symbol) flanked on the left and right by the boundary symbol. The result of a derivation is a sentence with the simplest structure. All sentences of this kind can be derived in this manner. Subsuming the expressions of this sentence under the appropriate grammatical categories furnishes us with the grammatical surface structure. On the other hand, the end-result of a derivation (i.e., the concrete sentence) together with the derivation tree constructed for it - and called 'phrase marker' by Chomsky - provides us with a glance into the deep structure of the utterance. In this way each of the simplest statements obtains a corresponding structural description. Sentences of a more complex and involved character are generated by a second class of rules, the rules of transformation. The end-results of applying the first class of rules (the rewriting rules) become the point of departure for the application of the second class. Again it is a derivation tree - this time called transformation marker - that affords us an insight into the grammatical deep structure of the complex statement. Given a natural language L and a grammatical theory of L, this theory is to be regarded as adequate in Chomsky's sense only if it enables us, by means of the two kinds of rules, to generate all the meaningful sentences of L from the initial symbol. The fact that he works with systems of rules has given rise at times to the erroneous view that what Chomsky is after is an axiomatization of linguistics according to the mathematical model. Such an interpretation rests on a basic error. Chomsky's systems of rules are comparable rather to the so-called Post systems. But the application of rewriting and transformation rules involves peculiarities for which no analogues can be given in logical calculi. For instance, the rules, as Chomsky conceives them, must be applied in an ordered sequence. Again, certain

rules are not 'context-free'; the way they are applied to a linguistic expression depends on the context in which this expression is embedded. These few indications will have to suffice. However, we must at least illustrate briefly the task and power of a theory of grammar, which Chomsky is engaged in constructing. For example, compare the two English sentences: (a), I persuaded a specialist to examine John. (b), I expected a specialist to examine John. If by grammar one understands what is ordinarily so designated - namely, surface grammar - then these two sentences have the same grammatical structure. Yet in their grammatical deep structure they differ altogether. It is characteristic that, to the extent we are familiar with the usual grammatical procedures; we must resort to auxiliary semantical ideas or representations if we are to grasp at all the difference in structure between these two sentences. We construct, say, the following two statements, obtained from the first two by transforming one part from active to passive: (c) I persuaded John to be examined by a specialist. (d) I expected John to be examined by a specialist. Now we confirm that whereas (b) is synonymous with sentence (d), the sentence (a) is not synonymous with (c). This is the way we determine structural differences - we make clear the 'meaning content' of the statement in intuitive fashion and in addition utilize the concept of synonymy, which belongs to intensional semantics. An adequate generative and transformational grammar would permit us to obtain this result without auxiliary considerations of that sort. The last piece of the derivation trees would be of the same kind in both instances, and this would show that the surface grammar is the same. On the other hand, the underlying 'stories' - the full derivation trees that are involved - would be essentially different and would reflect the differing grammatical deep structure.

The theory of generative grammar, both particular and universal, points to a conceptual lacuna in psychological theory that I believe is worth mentioning. Psychology conceived as 'behavioral science' has been concerned with behavior and acquisition or control of behavior. It has no concept corresponding to 'competence,' in the sense in which competence is characterized by a generative grammar. The theory of learning has limited itself to a narrow and surely inadequate concept of what is learned, namely a system of stimulus-response connections, a network of associations, a repertoire of behavioral items, a habit hierarchy, or a system of dispositions to respond in a particular way under specifiable stimulus conditions. Insofar as behavioral psychology has been applied to education or therapy, it has correspondingly limited itself to this concept of 'what is learned'. But a generative grammar cannot be characterized in these terms. What is necessary, in addition to the concept of behavior and learning, is a concept of what is learned, a notion of competence, that lies beyond the conceptual limits of behaviorist psychological theory. Like much of modern linguistics and modern philosophy of language, behaviorist psychology has quite consciously accepted methodological restrictions that do not permit the study of systems of the necessary complexity and abstractness. One important future contribution of the study of language to general psychology may be to focus attention on this conceptual gap and to demonstrate how it may be filled by the elaboration of a system of underlying competence in one domain of human intelligence.

Wittgenstein's most basic conception of grammar is that it consists in rules which govern the use of words and which thereby constitute meanings or concepts. Thus, he identifies grammar in general with the 'rules for use of a word' or to cite a more specific example, he says of mathematics, which he understands to be an important part of grammar, that 'in mathematics we are convinced of grammatical propositions; so the expression, the result, of our being convinced is that we accept a rule'. And since, famously, he believes that a word's use may (generally) be equated with its meaning, he holds that the rules for use of words which make up grammar 'determine meaning (constitute it)' that

‘the meaning of a sign lies . . . in the rules in accordance with which it is used/in the rules which prescribe its use’ or to cite a more specific example, the mathematical part of grammar again, he says that ‘mathematics forms concepts’. Wittgenstein maintains, in an important and persistent analogy, that ‘grammar . . . has somewhat the same relation as one to the language as . . . the rules of a game have to the game’. Hence in his notorious characterization of linguistic practices as ‘language-games’, grammar plays the role of the rules which govern these ‘games’ in contrast to the moves that are made within them.

Conclusion

Philosophical grammar determines the phonetic, semantic and syntactic structure of the propositions. It classifies, analysis, distinguishes, synthesis and grades different types of languages. Chomsky believes that child’s mind is endowed to different types of language and it is natural faculty to learn language. Our mind at the time of learning languages, functions innately. The rules of grammar are abstract in the same meaning as the selection of a unit of measurement. The rules of grammar cannot be acceptable by screening that their application makes a demonstration agree with reality, i.e., the analogy between grammar and games. Universal grammar is the natural faculty of generating sentences with the use of unconscious data of knowledge of language. Chomsky argues that Universal Grammar is special component of human brain which can help people understand language fast. It is an unconscious and potential knowledge which exists in human mind without observation and shows the existing form of human language. Thus, Wittgenstein argued that philosophical grammar is the natural rules which exist in our thoughts and we only represented things through these rules. Rules designate the quantity, quality, relation and co-existence of things.

Wittgenstein and Chomsky argued that universal grammar is the set of rules in our mind. Language represents our thoughts symbolically and universal grammar functions as a device to choose and distinguishes different types of grammars. Humans are born with special capacities for language. Wittgenstein and Chomsky articulate that language learning is natural. Language is not taught rather it is caught. If we don’t expose child in linguistic environment, then he or she shall acquire language symbolically and will make rules innately. However, it remains better that child should be put in sophisticated and good environment.

Universal grammar helps the child in developing productivity, creativity and reasoning in language. It also generates different phonetic, semantic and syntactic components. Just like birds are designed naturally to fly, similarly, humans are designed naturally to speak language. Thus, it is job of analytical philosophy to clear and analyze universal grammar, meaning, form, language and thought. Even, thoughts have their own language mechanism. So, it appears that Universal grammar is a set of rules, axioms, laws or form which is either innate, or acquired. There are also other views that universal grammar is nothing but rules which designates learning of a language deductively. So, we cannot observe this special faculty for language classification and recognition but we can easily understand from the thesis that a Chinese speaker can learn English, Kashmiri speaker can learn Chinese, Sanskrit speaker can learn English, Arabic speaker can learn Japanese and so on.

Notes:

1. N. Chomsky, *Mind and Language*, 3rd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 150.
2. Chomsky, *Mind and Language*, pp. 91-92.
3. See N. Chomsky, *Modular Approaches to the study of the Mind*, California: San Diego, 1984, p. 26.
4. See Noam Chomsky and *Language Descriptions*, ed., J. O. Askedal, I. Roberts, T. Matsushita, p. 68.
5. Kelby, Mason. Chandra Sekhar Sripada. Stephen Stich: *Philosophy of Psychology*, Routledge Companion to Twentieth century philosophy (London: Routledge), p. 9.

6. See 'Of Minds and Language: A Dialogue with Noam Chomsky in the Basque Country, Edited by M. P. Palmarini, J. Uriagereka & P. Salaburu, Oxford: Oxford university press, 2009, p. 379. This statement is also cited by 'Lele and Singh(1987). Editors note)
7. Stephen N. Thomas, *The Formal Mechanics of Mind*, Hassocks: The Harvester Press, (1978), p. 226.
8. See Noam Chomsky, *Knowledge of Language: its Nature, Origin, and Use*, Edited by R. N. Anshen, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1986, pp. 1-3.
9. See Colin Biggs, 'Chomsky and Artificial Intelligence', N. Chomsky, *Critical Assessments*, Edited by Carlos. P. Otero, Vol. 4: *From Artificial Intelligence to Theology: Chomsky's impact on Contemporary Thought: Tome I*, London: Routledge, 1994, p. 69.
10. See G. A. Miller, 'The place of language in a scientific psychology', N. Chomsky: *Critical Assessments*, Edited by Carlos. P. Otero, Vol. 4: *From Artificial Intelligence to Theology: Chomsky's impact on Contemporary Thought: Tome I*, London: Routledge, 1994, pp. 347-49.
11. K. Mason, et. al., *The Philosophy of Psychology*, Routledge Companion to Twentieth-century Philosophy (London: Routledge), pp. 10-12.

References:

1. Akmajian, A., Demers, R., Farmer, A., & Harnish, R., 2010. *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication* (6th edition), Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
2. Alston, W. P. (1964). *Philosophy of Language*, New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Ltd.
3. Anscombe, G.E.M. (1959). *An Introduction to Wittgenstein's Tractatus*. London: Hutchinson.
4. Arendt, H. (1971). *Thinking*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
5. Arrington, R. L. (2001). *Thought and its Expression*. (S. Schroeder, Ed.) New York: Palgrave Publishers Ltd.
6. Askedal, J. O. Roberts, I. Matsushita, T. (2010). *Noam Chomsky and Language Descriptions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benajmins Publishing Company.
7. Ayer, A. J. (1936). *Language, Truth and Logic*. London: Penguin Books
8. Baghranian, Maria, (1998). *Modern Philosophy of Language*, Washington: Counterpoint.
9. Beakley, B., & Ludlow, P. (2006). *The Philosophy of Mind*, 2nd ed., Cambridge: MIT Press.
10. Beaney, M. A. (2013). What is Analytic Philosophy, In M. Beaney (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Analytic Philosophy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
11. Bezuidenhout, Anne L., (2006). "Language as Internal", in Lepore and Smith (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Language*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
12. Biggs, C. (1994). 'Chomsky and Artificial Intelligence', N. Chomsky, *Critical Assessments*, Edited by Carlos. P. Otero, Vol. 4: *From Artificial Intelligence to Theology: Chomsky's impact on Contemporary Thought: Tome I*, London: Routledge.
13. Bijani, H. & Nahvi, A. (2012). Modularity of Mind and Second Language Acquisition, *Theory and Practices in Language Studies*, 2 (8).
14. Black, M. (1964). *A Companion to Wittgenstein's Tractatus*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
15. Bloom, S. P. (1990). Natural Language and Natural Selection. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 13, 708, 709.
16. Boole, G. (1948). *The Mathematical Analysis of Logic*. New York: Philosophical Library.
17. Borchert, D. M. (2006). *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (2nd ed., Vol.4.) New York: Thomson Gale.
18. Bova, A. (2009). Interpretation of psychological concepts in Wittgenstein, In V.A. Munz, K. Puhl and J. Wang (Eds.), *Language and World. Proceedings of the 32nd International Wittgenstein Symposium* (pp. 64-65).
19. Bracken, H. M. (1994). chomsky's Cartesianism . In C. P. Otero, *Noam Chomsky Critical Assessments, Vol.II: Philosophy: Tome II* (p. 892). New York: Routledge.

20. Butterfield, J. (1986). *Language, Mind and Logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. Carnap, R. (1947). *Meaning and Necessity: a Study in Semantics and Modal Logic*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
22. Carnap, R. (2009). *Logical Syntax of Language*, in ed., Pierre Wagner, Palgrave: Macmillan.
23. Carruthers, P. (1996). *Language, Thought and Communication: An Essay in Philosophical Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
24. Chalmers, D. J. (1996). *The Conscious Mind: In search of a Fundamental Theory*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
25. Chomsky, N. (1959). A Review of B. F. Skinner's Verbal Behavior, *In Language*, 35, 1, 26-58.
26. Chomsky, N. (1969). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge: The MIT Press.
27. Chomsky, N. (1971). *Selected Readings*, Edited by J. P. B. Allen & P. V. Buren, London: Oxford University Press.
28. Chomsky, N. (1974). *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*. 6th ed., Paris: Mouton & Co.
29. Chomsky, N. (1976). *Reflections on Language*. Glasgow: Walliam Collins.
30. Chomsky, N. (1980). *Rules and Representations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
31. Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Dordrecht: Foris.
32. Chomsky, N. (1984). *Modular Approaches to the study of Mind*. California: San Diego State University Press.
33. Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of Language: its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York: Praeger.
34. Chomsky, N. (1987). *'Of Minds and Language: A Dialogue with Noam Chomsky in the Basque Country*, Edited by M. P. Palmarini, J. Uriagereka & P. Salaburu, Oxford: Oxford university press. This statement is also cited by 'Lele and Singh (1987). Editors note)
35. Chomsky, N. (1988). *Language and Problems of Knowledge*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
36. Chomsky, N. (1994). *Critical Assessments*, Edited by Carlos. P. Otero, Vol. 4: From Artificial Intelligence to Theology: Chomsky's impact on Contemporary Thought: Tome I, London: Routledge.
37. Chomsky, N. (1995a). Language and Nature. *Mind*, 104, 10.
38. Chomsky, N. (1995b). *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
39. Chomsky, N. (2000). *New Horizons in the Study of Language and Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
40. Chomsky, N. (2002a). *Cartesian Linguistics*. New Zealand: Cbereditions.
41. Chomsky, N. (2002b). *On Nature and Language*. (A. B. Rizzi, Ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
42. Chomsky, N. (2004). *The Generative Enterprise Revisited*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
43. Chomsky, N. (2006). *Mind and Language*, 3rd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
44. Chomsky, N. (2007). On Mind and Language. *Biolinguistics*, Vol. 1.
45. Chomsky, N. (2011). *Excerpt from 'Language and Problems of Knowledge'* (Vol. II). (S. Crawford, Ed.) New York.
46. Chomsky, Noam, 1957/2002, *Syntactic Structures*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
47. Chomsky, Noam, 1966, *Cartesian Linguistics*, New York: Harper and Row.
48. Chomsky, Noam, 1969, "Linguistics and Philosophy", in *Language and Philosophy: A Symposium*, Sidney Hook, (ed.), New York: New York University Press, 51–94.
49. Chomsky, Noam, 1976, *Reflections on Language*, London: Temple Smith. Chomsky, Noam, 1977, *Language and Responsibility*, New York: Pantheon Books Mathews, P.

- (1993). Chomsky's Philosophical Grammar. In *Grammatical Theory in the United States: From Bloomfield to Chomsky* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, pp. 184-252).
50. Cinque, C. (1994). "On the connections between Chomsky's work in linguistics and cognitive science, and his social views and attitudes", *Noam Chomsky: Critical Assessments*, ed. C. P. Otero, Vol. III: Anthropology: Tome II. London: Routledge.
 51. D'Agostino, F. (1986). *Chomsky's System of Ideas*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 52. Davidson, D. (1975). *Thought and Talk, Mind and Language*, ed., S. Gutterplan, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 53. Derra, A. (2008). Explicit and Implicit Assumptions in Noam Chomsky's Theory of Language', *Forum Philosophicum*, Tom. 13, 1.
 54. Dummett, M. A. E. (1975). *What is a Theory of Meaning, Mind and Language*, Samuel Guttenplan, ed., Oxford, Clarenton Press.
 55. Eco, U. (1984). *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
 56. Fernandes, C. (2005). The Wild Man in the Wings: Noam Chomsky, *Overland* (180), 41.
 57. Fodor, J. (1975), *The Language of thought*. (New York: Cravell).
 58. Fodor, J. (1983). *Modularity of Mind*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
 59. Fodor, J. A. (1981). The present status of the innateness controversy, In *Representations: Philosophical Essays on the Foundations of Cognitive Science*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 60. Fodor, Jerry (2001). 'Language, Thought and Compositionality'. *Mind and Language*, 16.
 61. Frege, G. (1956). *On Sense and Reference*. In *Philosophical Writings of Gottlob Frege*, ed. and Trans. M. Black and P. T. Geach. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
 62. Fromkin, V. A. (1991). Language and Brain: Redefining the Goals and Methodology of Linguistics, 'The Chomskyan Turn', ed., Asa Kasher (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991).
 63. Gabriel, R. (2010). *Brain, Cognition and Language*, In L. Scliar-Cabral (Ed.), *Psycholinguistics: Scientific and Technological Challenges*, Porto Alegre: Edipucrs.
 64. Gamut, L.T. F. (1991). *Logic, Language and Meaning, Introduction to Logic*, Vol. 1, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 65. Glock, H. (2006). Truth in the Tractatus. *Synthese*, 148 (2), 345-368. Retrieved April 7, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/201186694.
 66. Glock, H. J. (1996). *A Wittgenstein Dictionary*. Oxford: Routledge.
 67. Glock, H. J. (2001). *Wittgenstein and Contemporary Philosophy of Mind*. (S. Schroeder, Ed.) New York: Palgrave Press Ltd.
 68. Glock. H. J. (2008). The Development of Analytical Philosophy: Wittgenstein and After. The Routledge Companion to Twentieth Century Philosophy, In Dermot Moran (Ed., New York: Routledge,
 69. Grayling, A. C. (1988): *Wittgenstein*. Oxford: Oxford university press
 70. Gregory, R. L. (1987). *The Oxford Companion to the Mind*. (O. L. Zangwill, Ed.) New York: Oxford University Press.
 71. Groome, D. (1999). *An Introduction to Cognitive Psychology: Processes and Disorders*. London/New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
 72. Gunderson, K. (1971). *Mentality and Machines*. 2nd ed., (London: Croom Helm.
 73. Guttenplan, S. D. (1994). *A companion to the Philosophy of Mind*. Oxford: Blackwell.
 74. Guzeldere, O. F. (1997). Consciousness: A Philosophical Tour, In Y. M. Masao Ito (Ed.), *Cognition, Computation and Consciousness* (p.4). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

75. Hauser, M. D, Chomsky, N. Fitch, W.T. (2002). The Faculty of Language: What is it, Who has it, and How did it Evolve? *Science's Compass, Review: Neuroscience*, 289, (22) 1577.
76. Hawkins, S. L. (2014). William James & the "Theatre" of Consciousness, In C. U. M. Smith & H. Whitaker (Ed.), *Brain, Mind and Consciousness*, New York: Springer Dordrecht.
77. Hawthorne, M. M. (1994). Introduction: Philosophy in Mind. In M. M. Hawthorne, ed., *Philosophy in Mind: The Place of Philosophy in the Study of Mind*. (p.7). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
78. Heil, J. (1998). *Philosophy of Mind; A Contemporary Introduction*. London: Routledge.
79. Hintikka, J. (1994). Logical Form and Linguistic Theory in C. P. Otero (ed.), *Noam Chomsky Critical Assessments, Vol. I: Linguistics: Tome II*, London: Routledge.
80. Jackendoff, R. (1995). *Languages of the Mind: Essays on mental representation*. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press
81. Jacqueline, D. (2009). *Philosophy of Mind: The Metaphysics of Consciousness*. London: Continuum.
82. Kampf, L. (1994). A Review of Chomsky, Cartesian Linguistics. *Noam Chomsky Critical Assessments, ed. C. P. Otero, vol. II: Philosophy: Tome II*, London: Routledge.
83. Kant, I. (1881). *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. F. M. Muller, London: Macmillan and Co.
84. Kant, I. (1987). *Critique of Judgment*. Trans. W. S. Gregor, Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.
85. Karlsson, F. (2008). Early Generative Linguistics and Empirical Methodology, *Handbook on Corpus Linguistics*, M. Kyto and A. Ludeling, (eds.), Vol. 1, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
86. Kasher, A. (1991). *The Chomskyan Turn*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
87. Keenan, E. L. (1994). Linguistics and Logic, *Noam Chomsky Critical Assessments, ed. C. P. Otero, vol. II: Philosophy: Tome II*, London: Routledge.
88. Keil, P. B. (2001). Thinking about Language. In P. B. Keil, *Mind and Language*. Vol. 16. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
89. Kim, J. (2011). *Philosophy of Mind*. 3rd (ed.), Boulder: Westview Press.
90. Kolb, B., & Wishaw, I. Q. (1980). *Human Neuropsychology*. 2nd ed., New York: W. H. Freeman & Company.
91. Laurence, S. (2003). Is Linguistics a Branch of Psychology, In A. Barber (Ed.), *Epistemology of Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
92. Laurence, S. Margolis, E. (2002). Radical Concept Nativism, *Cognition: Elsevier*, 86.
93. Lazar, J. W. (2014). Problems of Consciousness in the Nineteenth Century British and American Neurology. In H. W. C. U. M. Smith, *Brain, Mind and Consciousness in the History of Neuroscience* (Vol. 6, p. 149). New York: Springer Dordrecht.
94. Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. Discourse on Metaphysics. Trans. Jonathan F. Bennett. 2004. 1.
95. Losee, J. (2001). *A Historical Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*. 4th ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
96. Lowe, E. J. (2000). *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Lyons, J. (1976).
97. Margolis, E. & Laurence. S. (2012). In Defense of Nativism, *Philosophical Studies*, Springer.
98. Mason. K. Sripada, C. S. Stich, S. *The Philosophy of Psychology: Routledge Companion to Twentieth-century Philosophy* (London: Routledge).

99. Matthews, P. H. (1994). Language as a Mental Faculty: Chomsky's Progress, in C. P. Otero (ed.), *Noam Chomsky Critical Assessments, Vol. II, Philosophy: Tome II*, New York: Routledge.
100. May, R. (1994). "Syntax, Semantics and Logical Form", in C. P. Otero (ed.), *Noam Chomsky Critical Assessments, Vol. I: Linguistics: Tome II*, London: Routledge.
101. Miller, G. A. (1994). 'The Place of Language in a Scientific Psychology', *N. Chomsky: Critical Assessments, Edited by Carlos. P. Otero, Vol. 4: From Artificial Intelligence to Theology: Chomsky's Impact on Contemporary Thought: Tome I*, London: Routledge.
102. Monti, M. M. (2013). The Role of Language in Structure-Dependent Cognition. In Mody. M. (ed.), *Neural Mechanisms of Language*, New York: Springer.
103. Okasha, S. (2002). *Philosophy of Science: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
104. Otero, C. P. (1994). *Noam Chomsky: Critical Assessments, Vol. II: Philosophy: Tome II*. New York: Routledge.
105. Peregrin, J. (2012). *Linguistics and Philosophy*. In T. F. Ruth Kempson (Ed.), *Handbook of Philosophy of Science: Philosophy of Linguistics* (Vol.14, pp. 20-21). Oxford: Elsevier B.V.
106. Pinker, S. (1997). *The Language Instinct: How the Mind Works*, London: Penguin Books.
107. Plourde, J. (2016). States of affairs, Facts and Situations in Wittgenstein's Tractatus. *Philosophia* 44, pp. 181-185.
108. Preti, C. (2001). *On Fodor*. Canada: Wardsworth Thomson Learning .
109. Putnam, H. (1975). "The Meaning of 'Meaning'," In *Mind, Language and Reality*, Vol.2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
110. Quine, W. V. (1960). *Word and Object*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
111. Quine, W. V. (1975). Mind and Verbal Dispositions. In S. Guttenplan, ed., *Mind and Language*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
112. Ren Hulin, X. N. (2014). A Study of Chomsky's Universal Grammar in Second Language Acquisition. *International Journal on Studies in English Language & Literature*. , 2 (12), 2.
113. Rey, G. (1997a). *Contemporary Philosophy of Mind*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
114. Robert, D. R. (2009). *Cognitive Systems and the Extend Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
115. Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton/New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
116. Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Version 1.0, London/New York: Routledge, 1998.
117. Schalley, C. G. (2010), Semantic Analysis, In N. I. Damerau, (2 ed., pp. 95-96). *Handbook of Natural Language Processing*, New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
118. Schneider, S, (2011). *The Language of Thought*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
119. Schroeder, S. (2010). A Tale of Two Problems: Wittgenstein's Discussion of Aspect's Perception. In J. Cottingham & P.M.S. Hacker (ed.), *Mind, Method, and Morality: Essays in Honour of Anthony Kenny*, Oxford: OUP.
120. Sellars, W. (1997). *Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind*, with an Introduction by Richard Rorty, and Study guide by Robert Brandom, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

121. Silverman, J. F. (2006). *Cognitive Science: An Introduction to the Study of Mind*. London: Sage Publications.
122. Skorupski, J. (2005). Later Empiricism & Logical Positivism, In S. Shapiro (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Mathematics and Logic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
123. Smith, B. (1989). Logic and the Sachverhalt. *The Monist*, 72 (1) 52-69.
124. Soames, S. (2010). *Philosophy of Language*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
125. Sorin, A. (2013). *Software and Mind: The Mechanistic Myth and its Consequences*, Canada: Andsor Books.
126. Sosa, A. P. (2001). *A Companion to Analytical Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
127. Steinberg, J. R. (2007). Leibniz, Creation and the best of all Possible Worlds. *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*. 62 (3), p. 123-33.
128. Stephen Burwood, P. G. (1999). *Philosophy of Mind*. London: Taylor & Francis Group.
129. Stepic, A. I. & Ognjanovic, S. (2015). Logics for Reasoning about Processes of Thinking with Information coded by p -adic Numbers, *Studia Logica: An International Journal for Symbolic Logic*, Vol. 103, No.1.
130. Sterelny, K. (1991). *The Representational theory of Mind: An Introduction*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
131. Tantray, Mudasir A. & Khan, T. R. (2018). How Mind, Logic and Language, have evolved from Medieval Philosophy to early Modern Philosophy: A Critical Study. *Worldwide Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 4(5), 222-229.
132. Tantray, M. A. (2016). *A Study on Proposition and Sentence in English Grammar*. *The International Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, 4 (2), 20-25.
133. Tantray, Mudasir A. (2015). Propostion: The Foundation of Logic. *International Journal of Society and Humanities*, 7 (1) 115-120.
134. Tantray, Mudasir A. (2017). A critical relation between mind and logic in the philosophy of Wittgenstein: An Analytical Study. *Lokayata Journal of Postive Philosophy*, 7(2).
135. Tantray, Mudasir A. (2018). Wittgenstein on “Critique of Language”. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 6 (1), p. 5-9.
136. , Mudasir A. (2018). A Critical Relation between deduction and family resemblances in Wittgenstein’s Philosophy. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 5 (11), 344-351.
137. Thomas, S. N. (1978). *The Formal Mechanics of Mind*, Hassocks: The Harvester Press.
138. Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a Language; A Usage-Based Theory of Language Acquisition*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
139. Turing, A. (1950). *Computing Machinery and Intelligence*, *Mind*, (59).
140. Urnson, J. O., & Ree, J. (1989). *The Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophies*. London: Unwin Hyman Ltd.
141. Vicente, F. M. (2010). What the! The role of inner speech in Conscious Thought. *Journal of Conscious Studies*.
142. Werry, C. (2007). Reflections on Languages: Chomsky, Linguistic discourse and the Values of Rhetoric self-consciousness. *Language and Sciences (Elsevier)*, 29, 69.
143. Wilshire, B. (2002). *A Critique of Analytical Philosophy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

144. Wilson, R. A. (1999). 'Logic and the Sciences of the Mind', *The MIT Encyclopedia of the Cognitive Sciences*, ed. by R. A. Wilson and F. C. Keil, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
145. Wittgenstein, L. (1960). *The Blue and the Brown Books*. Oxford: Blackwell.
146. Wittgenstein, L. (1961). *Notebooks*, Ed. by G. H. Von Wright, & G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans. by G. E. M. Anscombe, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
147. Wittgenstein, L. (1967). *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
148. Wittgenstein, L. (1969). *On Certainty*, (G. E. Wright, Ed., & D. P. Anscombe, Trans.) Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
149. Wittgenstein, L. (1974). *Philosophical Grammar*, In ed., R. Rhees, Trans. A. Kenny. Oxford: Blackwell.
150. Wittgenstein, L. (1977). *Remarks on Colour (1950-1951)*, In G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans. by L. L. McAlister & M. Schattle. Oxford: Blackwell.
151. Wittgenstein, L. (1980). *Remarks on the Philosophy of Psychology*, Vol. I & II (1947-48), In G. H. Von Wright, & H. Nyman, Trans. C. G. Luckhardt & M. A. E. Aue. Oxford: Blackwell.
152. Wittgenstein, L. (2001). *Tractatus-Logico-Philosophicus*. Oxford: Routledge.

Necessity and Analyticity: Not an Equation

Dr. Soma Chakraborty

Abstract

Most of the western philosophers are of the opinion that all necessary propositions are analytic and all analytic propositions are necessary. The pre-Kantian philosophers like Leibnitz and the post Kantian positivists equate necessity with analyticity. But Kant shows that no such equation between necessity and analyticity holds good. In this paper an attempt is made to examine the question whether all necessary proposition are analytic. The claim here is that the question between necessity and analyticity was not conclusively established by Kant's critics and that Kant has rightly pointed out that all analytic propositions are necessary but not vice-versa. In other words necessity-analyticity equation is untenable.

Key Words: Necessity; Analyticity, Proposition; Leibnitz; Kant

Let us start with the identity view of Leibnitz who is represented as the most prominent ancestor of the widely held contemporary doctrine that all necessary truths are analytic.¹

Leibnitz distinguishes between 'truths of reason' and 'truths of fact'. For Leibnitz, 'truths of reason' are necessary, whereas 'truths of fact' are contingent. According to Leibnitz, 'a necessary proposition is a proposition whose contradictory is impossible.'² So, for Leibnitz, if 'p' is impossible then 'not-p' is necessary. Let us consider an example of 'truths of reason', i.e. a necessary proposition.

"All bachelors are unmarried men."

This is a necessary proposition, because the contradictory of the above proposition is self-contradictory. The contradictory proposition of the above proposition is —

"Some bachelors are not unmarried men."

This proposition is self-contradictory and the contradiction involved in it can be proved thus:

1. Some bachelors are not unmarried men.
2. Some bachelors are married men. [1, D.N.]
3. Some unmarried men are married men. [1, Definition of bachelor & law of synonym]

Symbolically—

1. $(\exists x)(\sim Mx \cdot Mx)$
2. $\sim Ma \cdot Ma \dots \dots \dots 1, E.I.$
3. $Ma \cdot \sim Ma \dots \dots \dots 2, Com.$

So, it is proved that the contradictory of the proposition "All bachelors are unmarried men" is self-contradictory. Hence, the proposition "All bachelors are unmarried men" is a necessary proposition. This proposition is also analytic, because the above mentioned Leibnizian criterion

of necessary truth is identical with the Kant's criterion of analytic truth. For Kant, an analytic proposition is that of which the contradictory is self-contradictory. So, it is clear that like necessary propositions analytic propositions are also demonstrable by the law of contradiction. Therefore, we can say that for Leibnitz, all necessary propositions are analytic. In this connection it should be mentioned here that Leibnitz does not explicitly distinguish between a-priori and a-posteriori, and between analytic and synthetic. But as the Leibnizian criterion of necessity coincides with Kantian criterion of analyticity, Leibnitz can be regarded as the pioneer of the view that there is an identity between necessity and analyticity.

Kant, however, is against the view that there is an equation between necessity and analyticity. Kant makes a two-fold distinctions—(i) distinction between analytic and synthetic propositions; (ii) distinction between a-priori and a-posteriori propositions. Both these distinctions are fundamental in the sense that a proposition which is analytic cannot be synthetic and that there is no such proposition which is neither analytic nor synthetic. Fundamentality of the a-priori a-posteriori distinction also be understood in the same way. Following Kant, let us consider the distinction between analytic propositions and between a priori and a posteriori propositions in turn.

For Kant, an analytic proposition³ is that in which the predicate concept is already contained (although covertly) in the subject concept. A synthetic proposition⁴ is that in which the predicate concept lies outside the subject concept, although it otherwise stands in connection with it. Examples of these two kinds of propositions are respectively, “All bodies are extended” and “All bodies are heavy.”

The predicate concept in an analytic proposition is contained in the subject concept in the sense that it is identical with at least one of the logical constituents of the subject concept. Analysis of the subject concept of the body yields two simpler concepts: the concept of extendedness, and the concept of substantiality. These are the logical constituents of the subject concept. The predicate concept of extendedness is identical with one of these.

In the synthetic proposition the predicate concept lies outside the subject concept in the sense that it is not identical with anyone of the logical constituents of the subject concept. Thus the concept of heaviness is not anyone of the logical constituents of the concept of the body.

Kant was aware that the above definitions of analytic and synthetic propositions are applied only to the categorical propositions. So he gives another definition of analytic and synthetic propositions applicable to any kind of propositions. The second types of definitions of analytic and synthetic propositions are as follows:

An analytic proposition is that of which the denial leads to a contradiction. A synthetic proposition is one of which the denial does not lead to a contradiction.

Thus the denial of the analytic proposition “All bodies are extended” is “Some bodies are not extended”, and this is reducible to the contradiction “Some extended substances are not extended”. But the denial of the synthetic proposition “All bodies are heavy” is not reducible to a contradiction.

Now let us consider the distinction between a priori and a posteriori propositions. This distinction is epistemological. For Kant, empirical knowledge is defined as that which is derived from experience and is called a posteriori, because of its dependence upon experience. A-priori knowledge, on the other hand, is defined as that which is absolutely independent of all experiences. According to Kant, “we shall understand by a priori knowledge, not knowledge independent of this or that experience, but knowledge absolutely independent of all experience.”⁵

The Kantian criteria of a priori knowledge⁶ are strict universality⁷ and necessity. Strict universality, for Kant, means validity under all actual or possible circumstances. It does not depend upon its external logical form. The proposition “All swans are white” is universally quantified, but it is not universal in the strict Kantian sense, whereas the proposition “ $2+2=4$ ” is not universally quantified and yet it is universal in the strict Kantian sense.

Necessity is another criterion of a-priori knowledge. For Kant, a necessary proposition is such that what is stated by it cannot be otherwise. This means that it is a proposition of which the opposite or the contradictory is impossible.

From the above discussion it is clear that as necessity is one of the two criteria of a priori knowledge so the propositions which express a-priori knowledge can be regarded as necessary propositions. Now the question arises whether necessity can be identified with analyticity. Here Kant’s answer is negative. Unlike those philosophers who believe in the equation between necessity and analyticity, Kant says that all analytic propositions are necessary, but from this, says Kant, it does not follow that all a priori or necessary propositions are analytic. What follows by conversion is simply that some a priori or necessary propositions are analytic. Actually Kant accepts the possibility of synthetic a priori propositions. For Kant, there are propositions which are synthetic and at the same time a priori or necessary. So, it is clear that, for Kant, there is no identity between necessity and analyticity. Now the question naturally arises: How are synthetic propositions a priori possible?

But before we discuss the answer of this question it should be mentioned here that, the vast majority of the post Kantian philosophers, however, deny the possibility of propositions which are both a priori and synthetic.⁸ They reject the Kantian view on the ground that the propositions which Kant regards as synthetic a-priori (necessary) are really not so. But for Quine, this method of refutation of Kant cannot be regarded as satisfactory. Indeed, if the propositions regarded by Kant as synthetic a-priori (necessary) turn out, on scrutiny, to be not so, it does not follow that synthetic a-priori propositions are impossible. If the Kantian view is to be refuted conclusively, what needs to be shown is that all a-priori, i.e. necessary propositions must, in principle, be analytic.

Now the question is whether the analytic thesis of the a-priori, according to which all a priori or necessary propositions must in principle be analytic, has been conclusively established by Kant’s critics. Quine claims that he has provided a conclusive defense of the analytic thesis of the a-priori, i.e. necessary. Let us examine Quine’s claim mentioned above. Quine starts with the notion of an a-priori proposition, and proceeds, by way of certain argument steps to conclude that such a proposition must be analytic. Thus he argues as follows:

- i) An a-priori statement is one that is necessary.

- ii) A necessary statement is one that is true in virtue of itself. For a necessary statement is opposed to a contingent one, which is true in virtue of something else.
- iii) A statement which is true in virtue of itself is true in virtue of either its constituent words alone or the meanings attached to the words. For a statement is composed of certain words with meanings attached to them.
- iv) No statement is true in virtue of its constituent words only. For e.g., the statement “Every lie is a falsehood” has to be regarded as true or false according as the word “lie” is taken to mean “false statement made with intent to deceive” or “statement believed false made with intent to deceive.” So whether a statement is true or false does not depend on its constituent words alone.
- v) So a statement, which is true in virtue of itself, is true in virtue of the meanings of its constituent words.
- vi) A statement which is true in virtue of the meanings of its constituent words is analytic.
- vii) Therefore, an a-priori statement is analytic.

Thus Quine rejects the possibility of synthetic a-priori proposition and in this way he also proves that there is an equation between necessity and analyticity. For Quine, “all and only necessary truths are analytic.”⁹

A little reflection will show that the above defence of the analytic thesis of the a-priori does not really contradict the Kantian view that an a-priori judgment (proposition) can be synthetic. Let us consider the second step in Quine’s argument, where he says that a necessary statement is one that is true in virtue of itself. This is a quite non-Kantian construal of the notion of necessity. Kant, by a necessary proposition, does not mean a proposition which is true in virtue of itself. This can be shown as follows:

A synthetic a-priori proposition is, for, Kant, a-priori, and so necessary. Now a synthetic a-priori proposition, which is necessary is not however, true in virtue of itself, according to Kant. For he clearly maintains that such a proposition is certifiable only by reference to a third something=X

Since, then, Quine in his defence of the analytic thesis of the a-priori exploits a sense of necessity which is not adopted by Kant, it is clear that Quine has failed to offer a conclusive refutation of Kant, that is, he fails to show that all necessary truths are analytic.

Now let us consider an objection by Robinson against Kant’s notion of necessity. Robinson argues that the Kantian sense of necessity is not clear, and is indeed a confusion of the following four clear senses of necessity:

1. **The Compulsory belief sense:** In this sense a proposition is necessary to a person who is compelled to believe it for some reason or other.
2. **The Aristotelian or apodictic sense:** In this sense necessary proposition is a modal proposition containing such an apodictic expression as ‘must’, ‘necessary’, ‘cannot’ etc.
3. **The Leibnizian or analytic sense:** In this sense a true proposition is necessary if it is analytic.
4. **The Universal sense:** In this sense a necessary proposition is one which is unrestrictedly universal. For if absolutely every S is p, and then it is necessary that any S is p.

Robinson maintains that the Kantian sense of necessity is not precisely identical with any one of the above mentioned four clear senses of necessity. Thus —

- a) The Kantian sense is not identical with the compulsory belief sense. For Kant, if a proposition is necessary then one is compelled to believe it. This shows that for him compulsory belief is a consequence of necessity and not its defining mark.
- b) The Kantian sense again is not identical with the apodictic sense. For, although some of Kant's necessary propositions are apodictic, he also admits many other necessary propositions which are not apodictic, e.g. '7+5=12'.
- c) The Kantian sense is moreover distinct from the analytic sense of necessity. For Kant, all analytic propositions are necessary, but all necessary propositions are not analytic. Thus synthetic a-priori propositions are necessary, but not analytic.
- d) The Kantian sense is also distinct from the universal sense. For Kant intends to distinguish between necessity and strict universality.

Robinson concludes that the Kantian sense is just a muddle of the above mentioned four senses of necessity. Thus some of Kant's necessary propositions are psychologically compulsory, some are apodictic, some are analytic and some are universal.

Robinson's criticism, however, is not fair. The Kantian sense of necessity is tolerably clear. According to Kant, a necessary proposition is one of which the opposite (i.e. contradictory) is impossible, i.e. either logically impossible or transcendently impossible. A proposition is logically impossible if it is self-contradictory. Thus the proposition "Some bachelors are not unmarried" is logically impossible, because it is equivalent to the self-contradictory proposition "Some unmarried men are not unmarried." A logically possible proposition is, however, transcendently impossible if it is un-constructible, that is, descriptive of a state of affairs that cannot be exhibited in space or time or otherwise rendered intelligible to us. Thus the proposition "two straight lines enclose a space" is transcendently impossible because a two-sided figure is not constructible in space.

So we see that for Kant a necessary proposition is one of which the contradictory is either self-contradictory or un-constructible.

A necessary proposition of which the contradictory is self-contradictory is for Kant analytic, while a necessary proposition of which the contradictory is un-constructible is for him synthetic a-priori. Thus Kant has not identified a-priori necessity with logical or analytic necessity.

Now let us consider the problem how are synthetic propositions a-priori and hence necessary possible?

According to Kant, synthetic a-priori (necessary) propositions are contained in all theoretical sciences of reason as principles. For Kant, pure mathematics, pure natural science and metaphysics are the theoretical sciences of reason. Let us take an example from mathematics to show that all mathematical propositions are at the same time synthetic and a-priori and therefore necessary.

In this connection it should be mentioned here that the a-priority or necessity of mathematical propositions¹⁰ was not questioned by any pre-Kantian philosopher. The controversial point is whether such propositions are analytic or synthetic. Philosophers, who believe in the question between necessity and analyticity, argue for the analyticity of the mathematical propositions. Kant, however, holds that they are synthetic.

In section V of the Introduction to the 'Critique of Pure Reason' Kant begins his discussion with arithmetic. His famous example is the proposition " $7+5=12$ ". He seeks to show that this proposition is synthetic on the following grounds.

- i) The concept of 12 is not already contained in that of $7+5$. In thinking of $7+5$ we are simply thinking of the union of the two numbers, 7 and 5, and in this thought the concept of 12 is not by any means contained. If we analyze the concept of $7+5$, we get only the simple concepts of 7, 5, addition and a unitary number. Clearly the concept of 12 is not one of these. So this proposition is not analytic. It is then synthetic.
- ii) This proposition cannot be established except by appealing to some intuition. Corresponding to the concept of 7, we may take seven dots which are the relevant intuitions. Similarly, we may take five dots which are the intuitions corresponding to the concept of 5. Then we count the dots and the counting brings us to the number twelve. Counting is a synthetic operation of combining unit to unit. The proposition in question is synthetic because of this need to appeal to intuition.
- iii) The synthetic character of an arithmetical proposition will be clearer if we take larger numbers. For then the results cannot be achieved merely by logical analysis and without arithmetical calculations in concrete.

Now an objection raised by Ayer is to be considered. Before we discuss the objection it needs to be mentioned here that Kant's actual account suggests two criteria of analyticity and so of syntheticity, namely, the containment criterion and the contradiction criterion. Ayer calls the first of these two criteria psychological and the second logical and he contends that Kant's employment of these two criteria generates confusion. The alleged confusion is that a proposition which is synthetic according to the one criterion is analytic according to the other. Thus he points out that, the proposition ' $7+5=12$ ' has been shown by Kant to be synthetic by employing the containment criterion, that is, by appealing to the fact, as Ayer puts it, "that one can think of the sum of seven and five without necessarily thinking of twelve..."¹¹ But this proposition, Ayer says, turns out to be analytic, according to Kant's logical criterion, that is, contradiction criterion. Ayer argues that this proposition cannot be denied without contradiction. He observes, "...the symbolic expression ' $7+5$ ' is synonymous with ' 12 ', just as... the symbol 'eye-doctor' is synonymous with 'oculist'."¹²

Here it should be mentioned that Ayer is one of the logical positivists and it is already mentioned that the pre-Kantian philosophers like Leibnitz and the post-Kantian positivists equate the necessity with analyticity. Like other logical positivists, Ayer also believes in the equation between necessity and analyticity. That is why he denies the possibility of synthetic a-priori or necessary propositions; and so he tries to show that the necessary propositions which are, for Kant, synthetic, are not synthetic at all, but analytic. Ayer says, "For while it is true that we have a-prior knowledge of necessary propositions, it is not true, as Kant supposed that any of these necessary propositions are synthetic. They are without exception analytic propositions..."¹³ To prove this point Ayer raises his above objection against the Kantian explanation of the arithmetical proposition " $7+5=12$ ".

But Ayer's objection is not satisfactory. Actually Ayer's criticism of Kant is based on a total misunderstanding. Although Kant has employed his criterion in his attempt to show the syntheticity of the proposition " $7+5=12$ ", it is not because he is afraid that the proposition will turn to be analytic according to his contradiction criterion. Surely, Kant would not admit that the denial of this proposition leads to a formal contradiction. In other words, he would not admit that the expression " $7+5$ " is

synonymous with the expression “12”. It is Kant’s clear contention that these two expressions differ in their meaning. His letter of November 25, 1788, to Johann Schultz makes it clear that the expressions “7+5” and “12” and other such expressions, exhibit only extensional agreement and not intentional identity. They denote the same number, but have different connotations of meanings. In view of their extensional agreement, they are no doubt interchangeable *salva veritate*, but then, for him, interchangeability *salva veritate* does not constitute synonymy. Since Ayer takes synonymy to consist in interchangeability *salva veritate* and since Kant does not take this view, we can say that Ayer’s criticism of Kant is based on a misunderstanding. Accordingly, it is rather Ayer’s confusion as to the nature of Kant’s view which is responsible for his change of confusion against Kant. So far as Kant is concerned, the proposition “7+5=12” even when it is judged by the contradiction criterion, is synthetic, because its denial is not logically impossible, i.e. does not involve a formal contradiction, although the denial is otherwise impossible in the sense that the state of affairs projected by it cannot be exhibited in the pure intuition of time. Thus Kant proves the syntheticity of the necessary proposition “7+5=12”, taken from mathematics. In a similar way it also can be proved that not merely the mathematical propositions, but any proposition taken from any branches of theoretical sciences is synthetic a-priori and hence necessary.

From the discussion so far it is proved by Kant that there are propositions which are both synthetic and a-priori or necessary. So we can conclude that necessity and analyticity cannot be understood as identical. In other words, necessity-analyticity equation is not tenable.

Notes:

- 1) Pap, Arthur, *Semantics and Necessary Truth*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958, pg. 7.
- 2) Ibid
- 3) An analytic proposition is purely ‘explicative, it makes explicit in the predicate what is implicit in the subject concept. So it gives no materially new information.
- 4) A synthetic proposition is ‘ampliative’. Its predicate concept is added to the subject concept on the basis of an intuition which is a source of new information.
- 5) Immanuel Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason*, Translated by N. K. Smith, Macmillan St. Martin’s Press, 1970, pg. 43.
- 6) A priori knowledge, for Kant, can be pure or non-pure. A priori knowledge is called ‘pure’ when it does not contain any empirical admixture, e.g. “two plus two is four”. An a priori proposition however is non-pure if it consists of an empirical concept or concepts, e.g. “Every event has a cause.”
- 7) Strict universality is distinguished from comparative or inductive universality. An inductively or comparatively universal proposition is based on the non-observation of any actual exception, but it logically admits of a possible exception.
- 8) Schlick, the founder of the Vienna Circle, observes: “...synthetic propositions seem...to constitute a logical impossibility.” *Semantics and Necessary Truth* by Arthur Pap, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958, pp.94-95.
- 9) The A priori and the Analytic by A. Quinton in *Philosophical Logic*, edited by P. F. Strawson, Oxford University Press, 1968, p.110.
- 10) Kant actually uses the term ‘judgment’ in his book *Critique of Pure Reason*. But in this paper the term ‘proposition’ is used for judgment.
- 11) ‘The a priori’ in *Language, Truth and Logic* by A. J. Ayer, Penguin Books Britain, 1971, p.104.
- 12) ‘The a priori’ in *Language, Truth and Logic* by A. J. Ayer, Penguin Books Britain, 1971, p.113.
- 13) ‘The a priori’ in *Language, Truth and Logic* by A. J. Ayer, Penguin Books Britain, 1971, p.112.

References:

- 1) 'The A priori' in *Language, Truth and Logic*, Penguin Books, 1971.
- 2) Grayling, A.C., 'Necessity, Analyticity and the A priori' in *An Introduction to Philosophical Logic*, Blackwell Publishers, 1982.
- 3) Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Pure Reason*, Translated by N. K. Smith, Macmillan St. Martin's Press, 1970.
- 4) Kant, Immanuel, Kant's letter to Schultz November 25, 1788 in *Philosophical Correspondence, 1759-99*, edited and translated by Zweig, University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- 5) Kant, Immanuel, *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, Edited by Gary Hatfield, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- 6) Pap, Arthur, *Semantics and Necessary Truth*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.
- 7) Quinton, Anthony: 'The A priori And the Analytic' in *Philosophical Logic* Edited by P. F. Strawson, Oxford University Press, 1967.
- 8) Russell, Bertrand, *History of Western Philosophy*, Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group), London and New York, 2000.

Rejection of Metaphysics: An Analytical Study

Tariq Rafeeq Khan

Abstract

The tendency of the refutation of metaphysics is very prominent in the history of philosophy. With the time different philosophers eliminated metaphysics on different basis. Of them Kant evidently affirmed that metaphysics as a science is impossible. He held that thing in itself is supersensible and there is no means to know it. However the argument offered by the logical positivists in rejecting metaphysics is rather new. Its rejection is based on the analysis of language. In this paper we shall try to examine the arguments put forwarded by the logical positivist, particularly A.J. Ayer, in rejecting metaphysics. To do this we should take different arguments given by Prof. Ayer in his book language Truth and Logic. There are ample reasons to think that the arguments which Ayer himself put forwarded in this book in rejecting metaphysics is sufficient arguments which can be taken against the logical positivism itself.

Introduction

In the history of western philosophy different philosophers dominated at different times. In the first half of twentieth century a new trend of philosophy came into existence known as logical positivism. With the establishment of Vienna Circle in 1928, this trend of philosophy came into existence. With the chairmanship of Moritz Schlick, a group of philosophers and scientists with a little philosophical knowledge were prevalent at that time. They declared this philosophy as unscientific, speculative and non empirical. Thus based on science and experience they tried to give a new turn in philosophy and thereby they expressed their reaction against all speculation. Speculative philosophy in the past, according to them, looked all kinds of truth and validity. So, they wanted to introduce a new type of philosophy abandoning all speculation in philosophy. It is difficult task to say what is metaphysics is. But still there are certain conceptions about it. Philosophy of ancient and medieval period thought that Metaphysics has to be defined by its subject matter, as it is found in other disciplines of science. They thought that metaphysics is a science which studies 'being as such' or 'the first principle of the universe' or 'things which are unchangeable.' But this definition of metaphysics is no longer acceptable because there are many philosophical problems such as, the problem of free will or the problem of mental and physical, which are not related to the first principle or unchanging things but still these are now considered as the problems of metaphysics

The traditional disputes of philosophers are, for the most part, as unwarranted as they are unfruitful. The surest way to end them is to establish beyond question what should be the purpose and method of a philosophical inquiry. And this is by no means so difficult a task as the history of philosophy would lead one to suppose. For if there are any questions which science leaves it to philosophy to answer, a straightforward process of elimination must lead to their discovery. We may begin by criticizing the metaphysical thesis that philosophy affords us knowledge of a reality transcending the world of science and common sense. Later on, when we come to define metaphysics and account for its existence, we shall find that it is possible to be a metaphysician without believing in a transcendent reality; for we shall see that many metaphysical utterances are due to the commission of logical errors, rather than to a conscious desire on the part of their authors to go beyond the limits of experience. But it is convenient for us to take the case of those who believe that it is possible to have

knowledge of a transcendent reality as a starting point for our discussion. The arguments which we use to refute them will subsequently be found to apply to the whole of metaphysics.

One way of attacking a metaphysician who claimed to have knowledge of a reality which transcended the phenomenal world would be to inquire from what premises his propositions were deduced. Must he not begin, as other men do, with the evidence of his senses? And if so, what valid process of reasoning can possibly lead him to the conception of a transcendent reality?

Rejection of Metaphysics

Logical Positivism featured an unique distinction in the criticism of metaphysics in the contemporary period of analytical philosophy, from which 'metaphysics' seemed to have received the most hard-line attack, after David Hume. It was David Hume, the thoroughgoing sceptic, who by this empiricistic theory of knowledge, committed 'metaphysics' to flames since it contains nothing but sophistry an illusion, as he opined. Hume's distinction of knowledge into 'relation of ideas and matters of facts' was the basis for such outright rejection of metaphysics. Logical Positivism stood for the philosophy of a group of thinkers called 'Vienna Circle' who all resolutely set up a group, joint campaign against 'metaphysics' or philosophy as a speculative enquiry of some sort, having all learnt from the background of science and mathematics, and all working on the borderlands of science, mathematics and philosophy. Almost all the exponents of this anti-metaphysical movement essentially belonged to a wider movement of the "Unity of Science" or "Scientific Empiricism" which often shaded off into scientific philosophy or philosophy of science.

Logical positivists approached metaphysics on purely analytical and linguistic ground and consider the question of its possibility from the standpoint of the logic of language or the criterion of meaning. The fundamental question that now arises: In what sense metaphysics has been condemned by the logical positivists? Why they consider metaphysics impossible? How do the statements about 'metaphysical' become senseless, devoid of any cognitive meaning? How do the metaphysicians commit the violation of the logic of language and render statements into meaningless nonsense? By 'metaphysics' the logical positivists mean any theory of Reality beyond or behind what can be grasped by experience. As Prof. A.J. Ayer puts it in an article entitled, "Demonstration of the impossibility of Metaphysics", in *Mind*, July, 1934, "The fundamental postulate of metaphysics" is that there is "a super (or hinter) phenomenal reality". He further points out that "it is the aim of metaphysics to describe a reality lying beyond experience and, therefore, any proposition which would be verified by empirical observation is *ipso facto* not metaphysical".

The above contention of Prof. Ayer provides a clue to the nature of 'metaphysical' which metaphysics claims (or pretends) to describe and question. 'Metaphysical' is understood to mean "trans-phenomenal empirical reality" that necessarily transcends our means of representation or experience. Hence, metaphysical statements about these 'super (or hinter) phenomenal reality' are *ipso facto* not subject to the conditions of meaningful representations or of 'experience' and, as such, are not meaningfully determinable either as true or false by reference to 'empirical verification' or logical conditions of verifiability by facts of experience. All meaningful representations or statements in the view of the logical positivists are required, as fundamental requisites, to be verifiable by observation directly or indirectly or by at least some conditions of verifiability by experience (in principle), if there are to be meaningful at all. These are to be analysed into simple statements expressing what is called "observation sentences" that bear the reports of the immediate experience. As all experiences and so the statements required to be verified for their truth and falsity, these ultimately must depend on the method of verification (or conditions of) by facts of experience.

What is not subject to such 'principle of verification' or the conditions of verifiability by experience and so, not subject to determinability either as true or false is *ipso facto* not a genuine statement expressing a proposition at all and, hence, it is determinable on such count as "senseless nonsense and pseudo devoid of cognitive meaning". It is also, in this sense of the criterion of significance, "counter-syntactical" being a product of the commission of logical errors or as it is otherwise called "violation of the logic of language". It would be seen that on lines of the logical positivists' analysis, metaphysical statements are turned out to be "senseless, pseudo and counter-syntactical", as the metaphysicians in their pretension to state "trans-phenomenal reality" and to produce significant statements which they claim to be 'certain and objectively true', render statements which express no genuine proposition at all but only "a meaningless combinations of words or signs they have used in their language by commission of logical errors - that is, violating the logic of language. They fail to understand the rules of language - syntactical and semantics, fail to discriminate between the superficial structure and "the deep structure of language" and, thus, fail to assign meaning to the component expressions in their language which ultimately terminate all statements "pseudo and meaningless nonsense".

Logical Analysis and Rejection of Metaphysics

In his famous (Carnap, 1932) Carnap claims that it is only now, thanks to the development of logic during recent decades, that logical analysis reveals the alleged statements of metaphysics to be pseudo-statements. As is evident from (Carnap, 1930-1931), this development concerns primarily formal logic. What is new in Carnap's criticism of metaphysics is that his rejection of metaphysics is claimed to be a matter of logic. As Philipp Frank put it: "People who have always had an aversion against metaphysics felt an almost miraculous comfort by having their aversion justified by 'logic'." (Frank, 1963: p 159).

In all his anti-metaphysical writings it is logical analysis that passes judgment on metaphysics and, therefore, we have to find out what exactly Carnap has in mind when he uses this term. The term logical analysis has, as Carnap himself admits, a quite broad meaning, and this has fundamental consequences for his rejection of metaphysics. The terms "logic" and "logical analysis" are taken by Carnap, in several places, to include both formal logic and applied logic, or epistemology. For instance, in (Carnap, 1930-1931: p. 133): "Logic is the method of philosophizing. Logic is understood here in the broadest sense. It comprehends pure, formal logic and applied logic or the theory of knowledge." The fact that logical analysis covers both formal and applied logic, or epistemology, has far reaching consequences for the status of Carnap's criticism of metaphysics. This fact comes to the fore, for instance, in two different kinds of pseudo-sentences, which have their origin in respectively formal logic and epistemology. It may be useful to say a few words about formal logic. To Aristotle and Kant, for instance, formal logic is a discipline that has no subject matter of its own and only takes into consideration the so-called formal aspects of our thinking and knowledge. Quite generally, most philosophers and logicians seem to agree that formal logic, lacking any special subject matter, is characterized by relevance to all science, partiality toward none (Quine, 1970: p. 98), in short, by "topic-neutrality" (Quinton, 1967: p. 123). Since for Carnap formal logic consists of analytical sentences that supposedly do not give any information about extra- logical reality, we may assume that Carnap subscribes to the conception of logic just described.

In general, the postulation of real non-existent entities results from the superstition, just now referred to every word or phrase that can be the grammatical subject of a sentence, there must

somewhere be a real entity corresponding. For as there is no place in the empirical world for many of these 'entities', a special non-empirical world is invoked to house them. To this error must be attributed, not only the utterances of a Heidegger, who bases his metaphysics on the assumption that, 'nothing' is a name which is used to denote something peculiarly mysterious, but also the prevalence of such problems as those concerning the reality of propositions and universals whose senselessness, though complete.

Among those who recognize that if philosophy is to be accounted a genuine branch of knowledge it must be defined in such a way as to distinguish it from metaphysics, it is fashionable to speak of the metaphysician as a kind of misplaced poet. As his statement has no literal meaning, they are not subject to any criteria of truth or falsehood: but they may still serve to express or arouse emotion and thus be subject to ethical or aesthetic standards. And it is suggested that they may have considerable value, as means of moral inspiration, or even as works of art. In this way, an attempt is made to compensate the metaphysician for his extrusion from philosophy.

It is true, however, that although the greater part of metaphysics is merely the embodiment of humdrum errors, there remain a number of metaphysical passages which are the work of genuine mystical feeling; and they may more plausibly be held to have moral or aesthetic value. But as far as we are concerned, the distinction between the kind of metaphysics that is produced by a philosopher who has been duped by grammar and the kind that is produced by a mystic who is trying to express the inexpressible, is of no great importance: what is important to us is to realize that even the utterance of the metaphysician who is attempting to expound a vision are literally senseless; so that henceforth we may pursue our philosophical researches with as little regard for them as for the more inglorious kind of metaphysics which comes from a failure to understand the working of our language.

References:

1. Ayer, A. J., (1936): *Language Truth and Logic*, Penguin Books (1st Edition).
2. Hume, David (1748). *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*.
3. Loux, M. J. (2006). *Metaphysics: A Contemporary Introduction* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
4. "Metaphysics" (1913). *Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company..
5. Pears, D. F. (1965): *The Nature of Metaphysics*, Macmillan, New York,.
6. Stace, W. T. (article in *Mind*, 1935): *Metaphysics and Meaning*,.
7. Weinberg, J. (1936) : *An Examination of logical Positivism*, Routledge & Kegan Paul,
8. Wittgenstein, L. ., (1922): *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus*, New York, London: Kegan Paul.
9. Alston, W. P. (1964). *Philosophy of Language*, New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Ltd.
10. Beaney, M. A. (2013). What is Analytic Philosophy, In M. Beaney (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Analytic Philosophy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
11. Black, M. (1964). *A Companion to Wittgenstein's Tractatus*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
12. Borchert, D. M. (2006). *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (2nd ed., Vol.4.) New York: Thomson Gale.
13. Carnap, R. (1947). *Meaning and Necessity: a Study in Semantics and Modal Logic*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
14. Carnap, R. (2009). *Logical Syntax of Language*, in ed., Pierre Wagner, Palgrave: Macmillan.
15. Frege, G. (1956). *On Sense and Reference*. In *Philosophical Writings of Gottlob Frege*, ed. and Trans. M. Black and P. T. Geach. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

16. Glock, H. J. (2008). The Development of Analytical Philosophy: Wittgenstein and After. The Routledge Companion to Twentieth Century Philosophy, In Dermot Moran (Ed., New York: Routledge,
17. Grayling, A. C. (1988): *Wittgenstein*. Oxford: Oxford university press
18. Kant, I. (1881). *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. F. M. Muller, London: Macmillan and Co.
19. Kant, I. (1987). *Critique of Judgment*. Trans. W. S. Gregor, Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.
20. Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. Discourse on Metaphysics. Trans. Jonathan F. Bennett. 2004. 1.
21. Skorupski, J. (2005). Later Empiricism & Logical Positivism, In S. Shapiro (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Mathematics and Logic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
22. Soames, S. (2010). *Philosophy of Language*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
23. Tantray, Mudasir A. & Khan, T. R. (2018). How Mind, Logic and Language, have evolved from Medieval Philosophy to early Modern Philosophy: A Critical Study. *Worldwide Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 4(5), 222-229.
24. Tantray, M. A. (2016). *A Study on Proposition and Sentence in English Grammar*. The International Journal of Humanities and Social Studies, 4 (2), 20-25.
25. Tantray, Mudasir A. (2015). Propostion: The Foundation of Logic. *International Journal of Society and Humanities*, 7 (1) 115-120.
26. Tantray, Mudasir A. (2017). A critical relation between mind and logic in the philosophy of Wittgenstein: An Analytical Study. *Lokayata Journal of Postive Philosophy*, 7(2).
27. Tantray, Mudasir A. (2018). Wittgenstein on “Critique of Language”. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 6 (1), p. 5-9.
28. Tantray, Mudasir A. (2018). A Critical Relation between deduction and family resemblances in Wittgenstein’s Philosophy. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 5 (11), 344-351.
29. Tantray, Mudasir A. (2018). How mind, logic and language have evolved from medieval philosophy to early modern philosophy: A critical study. *Worldwide Journal of Multidisciplinary research and development*, 4 (5), 222-229.
30. Wittgenstein, L. (1967). *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Rationality and Religious Consciousness: An Analytical Approach to Morality

Ifrah Mohi ud din Rather

Abstract

This paper tries to explain and investigate the knowledge and understanding of morals or ethical standards. Ethics is the study of freedom of will and choice. In the same sense, epistemology is the study of ‘How we know or understand this will or choice in order to make ethical standard. There is an intense relation between ethics and epistemology while the former deals with *ought*, *ideal* and especially with the formulation of criteria for norms, latter deals with the justification of theories that lay stress or imply sources for the knowledge of morality i.e. what is right or wrong, good or bad, truth or falsehood, valid or invalid, ‘is’ and ought i.e. “whatever is ethical depends upon the epistemic criteria”. In this paper, I have used two approaches to determine what is right or wrong i.e. rational approach and theological approach/ religious perspective. These two approaches act as the sources of origin of the knowledge of morals or moral statements. While rational view defines norms or laws of the ethics by reason or by logical way. However, the theological view exemplifies norms or character on the basis of three metaphysical entities i.e. God, Man, and Society. This paper exemplifies the evolution of morals with respect to rational and theological exploration. It also tries to evaluate the morals on the knowledge of a-priori and a-posteriori truths. Moreover the social aid of the evolution of the morality as well as rational, empirical, intuitional and religious has been enlightened with the norms of the methods of ethics.

Keywords

Ethics, morality, reason, theology, religion, society, knowledge, norm, experience, intuition, logic, good, and bad.

Objectives

1. To explore and examine rational and theological sources about the knowledge of morals.
2. To analyze the relation between epistemology and ethics
3. It tries to clarify and demonstrate the difference between knowing values/norms and scientific matter of fact. It also explains the role of epistemological theories to know the origin of morality.

Introduction

Ethics is the normative science which is also called regulative science. Ethics investigates certain uniformities or laws which govern them. It is different from positive science which deals with the facts. However, normative science is concerned with values and positive science is concerned with observation and induction. Epistemology is the philosophical discipline that inquires into the nature of knowing morals, its origin, validity and limits of knowledge. Epistemology is the science of understanding and ethics is a normative study of this understanding of morality. Ethics is the science of character, customs, freedom of choice and moral behavior. Ethics provides us the knowledge of morals and this knowledge has its source in reason, intuition, and society and in tradition or religious in scriptures. The knowledge of morals, source of moral consciousness, and limitation of ethical understanding has been interpreted and clarified in many ways by the moralists in contemporary era. These concepts are the most important and crucial domain which discusses moral issues according to

the norms of those standards which are palpable within the time scale of different relative modes. Out of the three concepts of God, Man, and World, ethics deals with the concept of man, his choice and acceptance. In ethics there is a hot controversy among the hedonists and intuitionists, rationalists and theologians, determinists and indeterminists, absolutists and relativists. While hedonists believe that what is right or wrong of an action depends on the consequence and so far as intuitionists are concerned what is right or wrong depends on the motive of the agent towards the action. There are three ideals of human life; truth, goodness and beauty: logic interprets intellectual values, aesthetics interprets aesthetic values, and ethics interprets judgments of moral values. Truth is the ideal of knowledge, good is the ideal of will and freedom and beauty is the ideal of feeling or emotion. According to Socrates, moral judgments are modes of reason as well as forms of knowledge.¹ As we know that normative science studies what ought to be and positive science studies what is? One is axiomatic and other is factual. In modern philosophy most of the interest is exerted by moralists, academicians, professors, theologians in delivering lectures on the field of ethics to develop discipline among students and to make people's character as well as to enlighten them with moral knowledge. But it is a matter of confusion that ethics is a normative science and this type of science cannot make up people with moral knowledge or we can say like that 'as by studying aesthetics (which is a normative science) does not enhance beauty of the agents; same is the case with the normative nature of ethics which cannot build morality of the agents. So by ethics we cannot craft morality in immoral agents. There is a long debate today on ethical knowledge by logicians, theologians and rationalists on this issue "whether delivering lectures on ethics can compose or build morality among people or it is a barren thing to do on and then why we are organizing seminars, debates, seminars, guest lectures and workshops on the area of ethics to enlighten and develop morality in students and as well as in people. This type of approach I have discussed in my discourse with analysis. Sidgwick remarks that the question what is moral effect of thinking is highly probable that one will not choose to act rightly.

Ethics and epistemology

Epistemology or the theory of knowledge is a branch of philosophy which investigates the nature, scope, quality, limits, and validity of knowledge. There is a close relationship between ethics and epistemology, without epistemology morality is barren and without ethics, epistemology is meaningless and non-existent. What is moral knowledge? How good it is? Just as the metaphysics tries to discover what knowledge is and how it differs from mere opinion. Same is the case with epistemology; it tries to establish normative criteria for what is to count as moral knowledge. Epistemology formulates a distinction between opinion and genuine knowledge. Ethics encompasses both individual behavior, as a personal ethics, and the large question of the good life; what sort of behavior leads to the most enjoyable existence? Do I have a duty to others? What is it? Ethical questions of this kind are as old as Western philosophy and are explored at great length by Aristotle. We find him wrestling with such questions as: what is good life? How do we achieve it? To what extent does it depend upon living in a good society? Moral questions involve questions of right and wrong, good and evil. According to Aristotle, morality functions best when it fulfills its purpose and it is according to nature. A good horse for example embodies all the qualities that we look for in a horse similarly, a good human being should embody these characteristics that flow from the essential nature of what it means to be human. For Aristotle reason is essential. To be good human beings means we should act in accordance with reason². It is written that 'as physics deals with the laws of nature and ethics deals with the laws of free moral action. For physics laws must apply to nature as an object of experience, while ethical laws must apply to human wills as effected by desires and instincts which can be known only by experience.³

Knowing or understanding moral judgments

Moral concepts are the presuppositions of ethics. It depends on the choice of the individual what he recognizes well for him and for others; and sometimes it is not the agent which postulates morality but the societal regulations. Immanuel Kant postulates three types of morality i.e. freedom of will (choice or will which determines what is right or wrong), immortality of soul (virtues or moral judgments are traits for the soul) and existence of God (what we do is only the duty to obeys God's will). Moral judgments include the propositions about duties, obligations, emotions, descriptions, prescriptions, virtues, rights etc. moral judgments are the judgments of values. There is no conflict in moral judgments in what we recognize as right and what we recognize as factual which are judgments having no moral worth. The statements which are having moral worth and the statements having legal or factual value are as under.

1. Do not cut forests
2. Implant trees in your surroundings and in forests to maintain its glory.
3. Do not harm others by words, deeds and thoughts.
4. Thou shalt not lie, kill, assault, and steal.
5. Do not pollute water, soil and air.
6. Do not suck thumb.
7. To grow or to keep beard.

In the above statements 1, 6, 7 are not ethical or moral judgments but either factual or legal and at some times religious, because there is no freedom of will in which agent is responsible to the actions but to the government or to the religious sanctity i.e. God. The statements 2, 3, 4, 5, are moral judgments which are normative in character and with regard to these statements the moral agent is free to decide according to the standards of the deeds. In certain conditions these moral concepts or statements become relative. if we take the moral judgment do not harm others by words, deeds and thoughts is a relative concept it is applicable only for the person who is truthful and honest in his words deeds and thoughts but not applicable to the person who is using harsh and abusive words drinking alcohol playing gambling receives bribe and also for the person who is a mean, jealous and pessimistic. Chastity and modesty is a moral judgment both in Indian context and Western perspective but what it connotes here in India is not the same in the Western world, to pay charity to beggars is moral judgment; but in various countries it is against their morality and law to give charity to beggars because their way of paying charity to others is different. So we can argue that all moral judgments are legal but all legal judgments are not moral. Moral statement is an action or duty on which one is of having free will. Free will or choice is not an ordinary choice or freedom; it is the freedom with responsibility and accountability for oneself and for others. Free will does not mean that an individual is free to do each and every thing. It means indeterminism in which an agent is free within the boundaries of passion, society, self, religion, culture and also linguistic limits. No government can impose laws on moral agent.

Sources of the knowledge of Ethics

Ethics is the science of human conduct which enlightens human beings with the validity of moral laws, customs or habits. Moral consciousness is the consciousness of right and wrong. Moral consciousness is the awareness or information of moral quality as well as values of voluntary actions of a person's behavior. However it involves cognitive or intellectual; effective or emotional; conative or volitional

factors. Ethics deals with the volitional part of the moral act. So there are many resources or foundations from which we derive morality. The most essential and morally sanctioned are: Reason, Authority/Religion, Intuition and Social norms/society.

Reason

Reason is the presupposition for ethical judgment or moral thinking. In ethics there are many philosophers who regard reason as the source for moral knowledge, while some ethical philosophers believe that reason is either the element in human mind or it is the thesis which we derive from experience and customs with the help of abstraction, analysis and argumentation. Some of the ethicists accept that the element of reason in mind is created and operated by the will of God. Hence in such a case, knowledge of moral statements in the domain of rationalism depends upon the deductive system of the nature, world or man⁴. According to Immanuel Kant, "Reason is the element in human cognition". Reasoning is scientific way of apprehending ethical knowledge. According to Masud ul Hassan; 'understanding raises man's dignity. Those who do not use the intellect are like a herd of goats, deaf, dumb and blind. No better than lowest of beasts. The ideal of intellect is to know truth from error, as an ideal or basic value for man's wisdom means the knowledge of faith, ideals and values.'⁵ According to Kant, the a-priori or pure part of ethics is concerned with the formulation of moral principles with such term as 'ought', 'duty', 'good', 'evil', 'right', and 'wrong'. This a-priori part of ethics may be called metaphysics of morals. Kant's doctrine of a pure knowledge rests mainly on the assumption that mind or reason as he calls it-functions actively in accordance with principles with which it can know and understand. He holds that such rational principles can be manifested not only in thinking as such (which is studied in logic), but also in scientific knowledge and in moral reason. We can separate out these rational principles and we can understand how they are necessary for any rational being, so far as he seeks to think rationally about the world and to act rationally in the worlds. If we believe that reason have no activity and no principles of its own. It implies in contrast to Kant that mind is merely a bundle of sensations and perceptions; there can be for us no a-priori knowledge, but we are hardly entitled to assert this without considering the arguments on the other side.⁶ Many philosophers have argued that rationality is unique to human being who means that our ability to reason sets us apart from all other creatures and gives us the unique capacity to attain wisdom or knowledge. Some ethicists contend, however, that some nonhuman creatures are also rational, or at least that they are capable of certain behaviors usually associated with rationality for example, symbolic communication (language), or solving practical problems. But, despite this contention, the idea of rationality remains central to our conception of philosophical activity. This is especially true insofar as rationality is associated with logical thinking.⁷ According to Descartes 'thinking' and 'knowing' are the certain things of which human being are inclined. It is our duty and obligations to know things' what they are? And 'How they are'? Descartes placed the question 'what can I know'? Was a very determined pursuit of certainty in the answer at the centre of western philosophy for three hundred years?⁸ Aristotle rightly said that "reason is the mean/source which prescribes what is right or wrong, virtue or vice. He further said that the function of reason is to attain truth."⁹

Theology

Theological approach to morals studies the religious source of knowledge to ethics. Theology (science of God) plays a vital and crucial role to define and derive the moral knowledge either from the will of the God or from the metaphysics of the religious scriptures and texts. From theological point of view

moral knowledge and understanding is mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, and books of the religious catalogue. This moral consciousness is derived from the interpretation of the religious dialogue which according to some philosophers provides the philosophical source to ethical code. Moral consciousness or moral knowledge is innate in human beings as like Descartes and Leibnitz held. While other maintained that moral knowledge exists in the intellect of approaching these regulative actions or customs as per Locke and Hume. The deterministic approach to morals holds that we determinate by the nature and environment which means that we are not free to take moral judgments in the same manner indetermination holds that we are free to regulate moral knowledge and condition can abstract conscience to perform moral judgments: in theology the judgments of value are according to what is in the nature of scriptural knowledge one cannot go beyond. The Theo -centric philosophy in the religion of Islam, judicial, Christian and Vedas accept the centric ethics e g, canards of Judaism one’s own standard of religion. What is ethical in the religion of Islam is what ethical judgment taken from the scriptures holy faith and jurisprudence commands persist for us in scripture is morally good for us and what he prohibited for us is bad. Thus for these philosophers who are accepting theological view argues that goodness and bad of actions depends on the will of God. Same is the case with the Vedas. The highest good “Summum, Bonum of life” is what is in the authority of Vedas. The other God Theo-centric religions believes that the value or moral judgments are considered as good or bad by their Prophets or trustworthy persons of their faith. So faith is emphasized and recommended as the value for moral knowledge. There are philosophers who are both Theo-centric as well as rationalistic in the west, i.e. continental rationalist philosophers and British empiricists and critical philosophers like Kant, further more in the Muslim Philosophy: Asharites who accepts faith for determining moral concepts and brought reason to subordinate the Theo-centric account for the knowledge of morals. Asharities like Al-Gazali derived the moral consciousness from tradition with the help of reason or intellect but there is hot controversy between the philosophers of faith (theologian) and the philosophers of reason where from the former account of vision. Moral concepts like duty, obligation, customs, choice, norms, virtues, character, behavior, generosity, pleasure, etc are derived from the tradition of the religions and from the latter; the moral knowledge or consciousness of the same concepts depends on the consequence or causation or rational argumentation of their act of performing.¹⁰ As far as the scriptures of religion or tradition is concerned there are three sources of knowledge.

- (i) Knowledge by inference (logical knowledge)
- (ii) Knowledge by perception and reported perception or observation
- (iii) Knowledge by personal experience or intuition

Likewise there are three types of errors

- (i). The error of reasoning.
- (ii). The error of observation.
- (iii). The errors of intuition.

Intuition

Intuition is the source from which we derive the moral knowledge. Intuition is explored in different senses. It is the inner knowledge of morals without using one’s experience or immediate knowledge without observation. Those moral statements or morals which are derived from the axioms, laws and standards of what is good and bad are intuitional in character. Intuition according to Al-Gazali is the

proper activity of reason. Thought is a form of activity imposed upon reason by the necessity of sense in a world of time and space and the finite as well as temporal nature of thought is conditioned by these limitations. Thus thought and intuition are originally interrelated.¹¹

Intuition, according to Descartes, is the undoubting conception of an unclouded and attentive mind, can spring from the light of reason alone. It is undoubted immediate apprehension of a self evident truth by reason. God imparts certain innate ideas on the mind at the time of birth. The ideas of causality, infinity, eternity, perfect being of God and the like are innate ideas.

About intuition John Dewey opines, every act of knowledge is in same sense of others, the recognition of something self related, or in individual for it involves the synthetic return of the relation into the context known. Perception memory, imagination, conception etc each of these is an act of intuition and consequently the recognition of something self related.¹²

People who do not make proper use of their intelligence, the Quran condemn them as beasts. The worst of breasts, in the sight of Allah are the deaf and the dumb who do not understand.¹³

An intuition is the immediate apprehension of an object by the mind without the intervention of any reasoning process. A moral intuition is, accordingly one that apprehends some moral object immediately without there being any reasoning about it. There are three possible objects of moral intuitions.

- (i) Perceptual intuitionism/ individual intuitionism: it is type of intuitionism in which we can know directly that one particular act, such as assassination of Caesar by Brutus, is right. To have this type of intuition does not imply that political murder would be right in any other case. It deals with intuitions about individual actions.
- (ii) Dogmatic intuitionism/General intuitionism: in this type of intuitionism, we may know directly without reflection that a certain class or kind of actions is right or wrong; for example telling the truth is always right. The theory which holds that this is the only way of knowing the rightness or wrongness of actions is called by Sidgwick as 'dogmatic intuitionism'. This type of intuitionism deals with the intuitions about classes of actions.
- (iii) Universal intuitionism: in this type of intuitionism, we may know directly some moral principle by which we can judge actions to be right or wrong. We may know intuitively for example that any action which treats a man merely as a means is always wrong. This type of intuitionism deals with the universal principles of ethics.¹⁴

Social customs

Society is the source of morality from its two ends, on the one hand the society formulates its own moral standard and on the other, society copies moral standards from the people who differentiate from each other due to their caste, creed and religion. Social value gives us the knowledge of the morals. Society is the one of the fundamental basis of validity, nature and limits of knowledge of the morals. What is good or bad (normative) is decided on the social criteria. Although social values and ethical values are dissimilar i.e. all values in the society can't be signed in the standard of ethics, because it has a special cause; society is a positive entity and morals are normative. As per the criteria of my paper society is governed by two main poles; religion and reason. The sanction of moral statements or morals are formulated on the customs and faith of the people to their deity. All social knowledge cannot

provide us ethical knowledge, only those social customs or societal regulations can become the moral that studies

Experience

Experience is the valid source of knowledge. Through this aid of knowledge we can apprehend morals or norms. Religious consciousness and rational enquiry, both provides us the criteria which can fit within the standard of morality. What is good or bad, right or wrong, virtue or vice, truth or falsehood, can be well determined on the schema of, when we observe the norms of orthodox people and the norms of the people who are using their reason and experience. the ethical philosophers who accepts experience as the source of moral knowledge are known as empiricists or hedonists. According to them, what is right or wrong depends on the experience or consequence of the moral standards.

Conclusion

Epistemology is a significant branch of philosophy which study the about faculties of knowing, this field plays a lucid part to explain and determine the knowledge of morals, i.e. 'How we know about morals, moral statements, standards, norms and also about values, obligations, choice. What knowledge makes something ethical (deals with values; good and bad) and factual (deals with facts and scientific ideals). Ethics is science of understanding free will and choice. Epistemology describes the method of debating ethical issues that rely on the theories of idealism, realism, rationalism, empiricism, criticism and intuitionism. Despite these epistemology theories which studies about the morals, we have also other sources of knowing morality i.e. social view and theological view point. The epistemological, rational and theological question to morality are: How we know them?, is morality innate or acquired?, what is the origin of morality, limits of knowledge of morality, Does moral issues depends upon society, Are they the creations of religious beliefs, is morality intuitional, What is the role of morality in the formulation of knowing new and old religious beliefs and social institutions. What is difference between statement of facts and statements of values? All these questions are clarified in this research paper with suitable examples. Thus morality exists only when there are agents of morality. It means that morality exists only if we are known about it. So epistemology has a great deal with ethics. Rationalism, empiricism, and intuitionism extended the role of understanding morality as in their own methodology and nature. Two things are reasonably exaggerated in this paper one is that reason or rationality extended the knowledge of the morals to its apex. It studied both the a-priori and a-posteriori judgments in the area of morality; also it makes us aware about the causational and consequential nature of ethical issues, second is that the 'theological or religious' approach to debate on the ethical issues. As rational part explained the role of reason and religious part explained the role of faith.

Notes:

1. Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, P. 206.
2. David Stewart, H. G. Blocker: Fundamentals of Philosophy, 6th Ed. (New Delhi: Pearson, 2006), p.19.
3. H. J. Paton: The Moral Law, (New Delhi: Surjeet Publication, 2004), p. 13.
4. Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics
5. Masud ul Hassan: History of Islam, (New Delhi: Adam Publishers, 1995), p. 146-47.
6. H. J. Paton: The Moral Law, (New Delhi: Surjeet Publications, 2004), p. 14.
7. Michael. F. Wagner, An Historical Introduction to Moral Philosophy, (Englewood Cliffs, N. j: Prentice Hall, 1991), p.8.
8. Bryan Magee: The Story of Philosophy, (London: Dorling Kindersley Ltd, 1998), p. 84.
9. Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, P. 180-182.
10. Seyyed Hossein Nasr: Islamic Philosophy from its Origin to the Present: Philosophy in the land of Prophecy, (New York: State University of New York Press, 2006.), p.93-103.

11. Ghazali: Ihya-al-Ulum, Vol. III, P. 26
12. John Dewey, Psychology, P. 238.
13. The Quran (31:22)
14. Willaim Lillie, An Introduction to Ethics, (Delhi: Surjeet Publicatipons, 2007), p.118.

References:

1. Benn, A. W. (1923). History of Modern Philosophy. London: Watts & Co.
2. Brooke, N. Moore., & B. N., Kenneth, B. (2005). Philosophy. The Power of Ideas, 6th Ed. (New Delhi: Tata Mcgraw Hill), 215.
3. Casullo, A. (2003). A Priori Justification. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Chisholm, R. M. (1987). Theory of Knowledge. 2nd Ed. New Delhi: Prentice Hall.
5. Isik, H. H. (2014). Ethics of Islam, 10th Ed. Istanbul: Hakikat Ktabevi.
6. Joseph, H. W. B. An Introduction to Logic. New Delhi: Surjeet Publication.
7. Khan, T. R & Tantray, Mudasir A. (2018). Impact of Religious Pluralism on the World: An Analytical Approach. *Lokayata: Journal of Positive Philosophy*. Vol. VIII, No. 02, September.
8. Lillie, W. (2007). An Introduction to Ethics, (Delhi: Surjeet Publicatipons), p.118.
9. Mackenzie, J. S. (2000). A Manual of Ethics. New Delhi. Surjeet Publication.
10. Magee, B. (1998).The Story of Philosophy, (London: Dorling Kindersley Ltd), p. 84.
11. Masud ul Hassan. (1995). History of Islam, (New Delhi: Adam Publishers), p. 146-47
12. Nasr, S. H. (2006). Islamic Philosophy from its Origin to the Present: Philosophy in the land of Prophecy, (New York: State University of New York Press), p.93-103
13. Passmore, J. (1957). A Hundred Years of Philosophy. oxford: Oxford University Press.
14. Paton, H. j. (2004). The Moral Law, (New Delhi: Surjeet Publications, 2004), p. 14.
15. Sigwick. H. (1993). The Methods of Ethics. New Delhi: S. B.W. Publishers.
16. Stewart, D., & Blocker, H.N. (2006). Fundamentals of Philosophy. 6th Ed. (New Delhi: Pearson).
17. Tantray, Mudasir A. (2015). *Role of Logic (reason) in Koran and Hadith*, IICU, First Islamic studies congress -2015 edited by Dr. Naseem Gull DAR,
18. Tantray, Mudasir A. (2017). Role of Philosophy to Examine values of Traditional Societies and Modern Societies: An Ethical Study. *International Journal of Society and Humanities*. vol-10, No. 1, 28-32.
19. Tantray, Mudasir A. (2018). Reason, Authority and Consciousness: An analytical approach to Religious pluralism, *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 6 (1), 832-834, 2018
20. Tantray, Mudasir A. (2018)., Hegel's Idealistic approach to philosophy of history, *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 6 (1), 102-106.
21. Tantray, Mudasir A. and Dar, Atequllah. (2016). Nature of Philosophy, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*. Vol. 4, Issue 12.
22. Urmson, J. O., & Ree, J. (1989). The Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophies. London: Unwin Hyman Ltd.
23. Wagner, M. F. (1991). An Historical Introduction to Moral Philosophy, (Englewood Cliffs, N. j: Prentice Hall, 1991), p.8
24. Weber & Perry. (2007). History of Philosophy; Trans: Frank Thilly. New Delhi: Surjeet Publication.

Reflections on Wittgenstein's metaphysical approach to Unanalysable

Dr. Bhaskar Bhattacharyya

Abstract

This paper attempts to explore Wittgenstein's metaphysical tendency towards unanalyzable. According to him, the concept of unanalyzable is nothing but the last or final residue of analysis, which cannot be further analysed. It also entails the hidden form of language, which Wittgenstein names as logical or pictorial form of language. Wittgenstein's picture theory tries to divulge this hidden or mystical form of language. Wittgenstein clearly states that there must be elementary proposition or unanalysable which consists of nothing but names that directly denote some objects. However, later Wittgenstein abandons this metaphysical tendency of language and accepts the anti-metaphysical approach through the ordinary language analysis. Thus, he writes in *Philosophical Investigations*- "we must bring words back from their metaphysical to their everyday use." (P.I:116)

Keywords: Wittgenstein; Unanalysable; Metaphysics;

I

Wittgenstein's metaphysical concept of unanalysable can be derived from his sayings in his masterpiece *Tractatus logico Philosophicus*. 2.161 (TLP): There must be something identical in a picture and what it depicts, to enable the one to be a picture of the other at all. 2.17 (TLP) What a picture must have in common with reality, in order to be able to depict it- correctly or incorrectly- in the way it does, is its pictorial form. 4.221(TLP) It is obvious that the analysis of propositions must bring us to elementary propositions which consist of names in immediate combination. 5.134 (TLP) One elementary proposition cannot be deduced from another.

These sayings of Wittgenstein in *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus* derive the metaphysical tendency embedded in the concept of unanalysable or elementary proposition. Wittgenstein, through these sayings, focuses on the hidden structure of language or logical form of language, which is not further analyzable like atomic proposition. All propositions are analysed into ultimate proposition i.e., elementary proposition. This kind of proposition focuses on the inarticulate structure of propositions. He called it by different names like pictorial form, pictorial relationship, representational form and logical form. The logical form is the common structure of all propositions. Every proposition is analysed into that form, which can depict the logical form, the essence of all propositions. Wittgenstein tried to bring the essence of language or proposition through the picture theory of meaning. Therefore, his earlier philosophy is labeled as essentialism. This undoubtedly leads to the metaphysics of language in his early philosophy. Thus, his metaphysics of language is inherent in logical or pictorial form of language that can be explored through the concept of unanalysable or elementary proposition.

An elementary proposition is the limit of analysis, that is, it is incapable of any further analysis. However, it can be analysed into its constituent parts but these components are not themselves propositions.

"An elementary proposition consists of names. It is a nexus, a concatenation of names."¹

"A name cannot be dissected any further by means of definition, it is a primitive sign."²

Wittgenstein is here in perfect agreement with Russell in not regarding either 'cow', and 'square' on the one hand or 'Socrates' on the other to be logically proper names, since, while a cow or a square is obviously capable of being defined, Socrates and other so called proper names are also but concealed, abbreviated or truncated definitions. Hence, none qualify for being called a name must not allow any possibility of being defined except by ostensive definition, i.e., by pointing out a thing like 'this'. It follows, therefore, that a name must denote something observable. It must also be simple without any part or component.

"A name means an object"³

"Objects are simple"⁴

In addition, an elementary proposition is a concatenation of such names that denote simples. But it is quite interesting to note that although Wittgenstein was speaking of names as observables, definable only by pointing at the object as 'this', still he kept himself carefully away from citing any example either of a simple or of an elementary proposition. He insisted on their existence because he saw the a-priori logical necessity of their existence, and he was contended with it. Finding actual examples was the task of an empirical investigation in which he, being a formal logician, was not interested. However, Russell tried to explain what an "object- word" is: "First: their meaning is learnt by confrontation with objects which are what they mean, second: they do not presuppose other words. Third: each of them, by itself, can express a whole proposition; you can exclaim 'fire' but it would be pointless to exclaim 'than'."⁵ Objects words have meaning independent of their occurring in a sentence. It is through them that language is connected with non-linguistic occurrences.

Elementary propositions consist of names, which denote simples. Therefore, Wittgenstein's analysis of propositions asserts that there ought to be simple things, which the names denote.

The analysis of proposition into simpler kinds is based upon two assumptions. (A) It gives the real meaning of the proposition. (B) The meaning of a term is what it denotes. However, the second assumption does not mean that the phrases like 'the golden mountain' also denote some real thing. On the contrary, here Wittgenstein accepts the Russellian way of analysis of descriptive phrases. On this view, the terms of a proposition signify something indirectly, that is, via the terms of the simpler propositions into which it is analysed. Therefore, the meaning of the terms of the complex proposition is dependent upon the meaning of the terms of the simpler proposition. These terms of the simpler proposition may be thought to be analyzable to still simpler terms. However, this process cannot go on ad infinitum. Because in that case the ordinary terms mean nothing. Hence, Wittgenstein thinks that there must be some residue in the process of analysis, namely elementary propositions which consist of nothing but names that directly denote some objects. They are not further analyzable.

As regards the complex such as 'a person or 'a table' designated by a term Wittgenstein says that they are not logically proper names because they invite description or definitions. This is what Wittgenstein means indeterminateness of a proposition's sense. This indeterminateness is characterized by the indefiniteness concerning the exact description of the complex. It is indeterminate in the further sense that the description is always general and so it is not possible to determine which particular individual is referred to by the complex. So, propositions in their ultimate analysis must consist of only simples, otherwise they will be indeterminate. Wittgenstein maintains- 'What a proposition expresses, it expresses in a determinate manner, which can be set out clearly; a proposition is articulated.'⁶

Wittgenstein from his analysis of language comes to conclude that there must be simple things that are objects, denoted by the names that constitute elementary proposition. Otherwise, the elementary propositions would mean nothing and since the meaning of all propositions (language in general) depend upon the meaning of the elementary propositions, no proposition would have any meaning at all.

Wittgenstein through his analysis of propositions makes clear that elementary propositions are the ultimate analysis of propositions, which do not require any further analysis. The regress of analysis comes to an end in elementary proposition, which denote the simple objects. Concerning the simple object, Wittgenstein seems to endorse the technique of classical and modern philosophers. The classical philosophers like Thales, Anaximenes, Parmenides regard the simple object as the ultimate analysis of things etc. Modern philosophers also like Descartes, Leibnitz, Locke, and Hume put enormous emphasis on reaching out simple object out of complex things.

“To understand a proposition means to know what is the case if it is true.”⁷

A proposition then can have meaning even though it does not correspond to any fact (a false proposition, for instance). But, the constituents of a proposition, viz. names cannot have meaning unless they represent some objects. Here, Wittgenstein distinguishes between ‘Bedeutung’ of a name and ‘Sinn’ of a proposition. These two words are translated as ‘meaning’ and ‘Sense’ respectively. However, these two words were not inventions of Wittgenstein, they were used by Frege earlier, but Wittgenstein has fixed their uses to names and propositions strictly separately so that a name cannot have ‘Sinn’ nor can a proposition have ‘Bedeutung’.

Thus, a proposition describes, and not names, a situation. The sense of a proposition is the situation it describes. A proposition is a ‘logical picture’ of the situation. The ‘situation’ and ‘the state of affairs’ may be either actual (existent) or merely possible (non-existent). A false proposition depicts a possible situation, a non-existent state of affairs.

A state of affairs is the objective counterpart of an elementary proposition-the latter depicts or describes the former. States of affairs are, therefore, unanalysable basic entities. They consist entirely of simple objects. A state of affairs is an atomic situation, there can however be non-atomic or molecular situations. “A state of affairs (a state of things) is a combination of objects (things).”⁸

These combinations of objects or things may either exist or not exist. Existent combinations are associated with positive, and non-existent ones are associated with negative facts. An existing state of affairs is identical with a positive atomic fact; and the world is the totality of these atomic facts only.⁹ While, a negative atomic fact is a state of affairs that does not exist. It is exemplified by the negation of an elementary proposition- ‘S is not P’. If true, this proposition asserts the non-existence of the state of affairs that ‘S is P’.

The totality of existing states of affairs determines which states of affairs do not exist. A non-existent states of affairs is a non-actual arrangement or combination of existent objects. It cannot however refer to ‘non-existent’ objects, because a name that does not denote an existent object is meaningless, so any talk of non-existent object is impossible. Hence, “all possible or conceivable worlds must consist of precisely the same objects that this actual world of ours consists of.”¹⁰ The only difference between the actual and any possible world is the difference in arrangements of the same stock of materials.

II

Wittgenstein, through the concept of unanalysable has put a demarcation between ideal language or artificial language or logical language and colloquial language. He in his *Tractatus* insists on the former, because his view is that ordinary language creates puzzlement and ambiguities. Again natural language or ordinary language deals with the diverse functions of language or language games. Thus, it cannot express the logical form of language. Hence, Wittgenstein feels that an artificial language or symbolic language is required to disclose the inward form of thought, which is regarded as the essence of proposition. He writes “In order to understand the essential structure of proposition, we should consider, hieroglyphic script which depicts the facts that it describes.”¹¹ And, he again says- ‘A proposition shows how things stand if it is true. And it says that they do so stand.’¹² And regarding the relation between the proposition and the states of affairs Wittgenstein asserts, “a proposition communicates a situation (state of affairs) and so it must be essentially connected with the situation. And the connection (between the proposition and the state of affairs) is precisely that it is its logical picture.”¹³ Russell in this connection writes- “The logical picture of a fact, Wittgenstein says, is a *Gedanke*. A picture can correspond or not correspond with the fact and be accordingly true or false, but in both cases it shares the logical form with the fact.”¹⁴ Wittgenstein holds that the logical form of propositions becomes prominent through analysis. He asserts that logical picture makes clear the relation between the proposition and the state of affairs. In addition, it can bring out the true or false picture of propositions. The logical form is the common structure of all propositions. Every proposition is analysed into that form, which can depict the logical form, the essence of all propositions. Warnock in this context writes that the account of language Wittgenstein gives in the *Tractatus* is.....intended to be an exposition of the essence of language; an account of its concealed foundation; an excavation, so to speak, to its deepest level.”¹⁵

Wittgenstein in his *Tractatus* stops the process of using natural language. Because he supports only one functions of language in his earlier philosophy i.e., to extract the logical form. He, therefore, corroborates the logical analysis of language. Because it represents the logical picture of the world. He believes that propositions are analysed into elementary propositions that represent structure of the facts or the states of affairs.

Russell also employs logical analysis of language to arrive at the final residue, i.e., atomic propositions or unanalysable which represent the structure of the world. Russell’s belief is that when a proposition corresponds to a fact then the corresponding proposition is true. Otherwise, the proposition will be false. Russell’s approach to get the picture of reality or unanalysable through analysis is known as logical atomism. Therefore, there is a similarity in this context between Russell and Earlier Wittgenstein. Because both put importance on logical analysis of language to focus on the logical form of Propositions, which, they thought, represented the reality or unanalysable.

Wittgenstein’s technique of analysis asserts that the logical analysis of language is the strategy through which philosophical problems can be resolved. The proper task of philosophy is to clarify the logical form of language, which is considered the hidden form of language or can be viewed as unanalyzable. Because it removes the puzzlement and confusions rooted in philosophy. Thus, he writes –“Philosophy aims at the logical clarification of thought. Philosophy is not a body of doctrine but an activity.”¹⁶ Therefore, it is clear that Wittgenstein was a staunch advocate of logical analysis in order to bring out the logical form, which is unanalyzable. His main purpose in his *Tractatus* is to excavate this form of language. Logical analysis indicates the pictorial form of language. Because it can depict the

hidden form of language. Thus, his view is that when we fail to make a relation between the picture and the fact then philosophical problems emerge. That is why; he talks about the importance of logical form of propositions. R.C. Pradhan significantly mentions- “The goal of philosophical critique is the discovery of the real logical form of language. The logical form is the most important aspect of language that has to be brought into the open by analysing language.”¹⁷

It can be asserted that propositions cannot represent or focus the logical form unless it is analysed by the logical analysis of language. Logical analysis of language reflects the logical form or hidden structure of proposition that is unanalysable. Therefore, he shows that it is the panorama of all propositions. Wittgenstein’s technique of logical analysis of language can eliminate the philosophical problems engendered by linguistic confusions. Thus, his technique to dissolve the philosophical problems can be regarded as the therapy. Therefore, his philosophy is called therapeutic.

Like Russell, Wittgenstein also clarifies that philosophical problems emerge due to not understanding properly the logical form of language. He divulges that philosophical problems can be resolved through grammatical investigation. He asserts that philosophical problems emerge because certain kinds of philosophical statements are clothed in misleading grammatical forms. According to Russell, “we must examine the grammar of the statement. We will find, in some cases, that when we reformulate the statement in terms of its ‘logical form’, the problem will be solved.”¹⁸ Wittgenstein too in his earlier work lays much emphasis on grammatical similarity or surface grammar. His assertion is that philosophical problems are engendered by surface grammar. Because surface grammar insists on the similar or uniform structure of propositions, i.e. uniform structure of propositions, i.e., uniform grammatical form. Wittgenstein, therefore, states that “Most of the propositions and questions to be found in philosophical works are not false but non-sensical...Most of the propositions and questions of philosophers arise from our failure to understand the logic of our language.”¹⁹

But later Wittgenstein discredited the role of logical language. Instead of logically perfect language, he advocates ordinary language. He holds that it will be wrong to say that language follows some fixed rules. Hence, later Wittgenstein makes a distinction between surface grammar and depth grammar. Surface grammar tries to focus on uniform appearance or structure of a sentence, which leads to logically perfect language. However, later Wittgenstein changes this style of philosophizing in the context of language and views that language is instrument and has diverse use. Here, his view is that philosophical problems emerge when ‘language goes on holiday.’ By this metaphorical sentence, he implies that when words are to be used from the outside of ordinary context, then philosophical problems come to light. Hence, it can be emphatically asserted that Wittgenstein’s later work encompasses around the circle of ordinary language. Therefore, he significantly writes that -“we must bring words back from their metaphysical to their everyday use.”²⁰ (P.I:116)

References:

- 1) Wittgenstein, L., *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. by D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1961)4.22
- 2) Ibid.3.26
- 3) Ibid.3.203

- 4) Ibid.2.02
- 5) Russell, B.,*An Enquiry into Meaning and Truth* (Allen and Unwin, London, 1919) p.23
- 6) Wittgenstein, L., *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. by D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London,1961) 3.251
- 7) Ibid .4.024
- 8) Ibid .2.01
- 9) Ibid .2.04
- 10) Pitcher, G.,*The Philosophy of Wittgenstein* (Prentice-Hall of India Private Ltd, New Delhi, 1975) p.49
- 11) Wittgenstein, L., *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. by D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London,1961) 4.016
- 12) Ibid .4.022
- 13) Ibid. 4.03
- 14) Wittgenstein, L., *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. by D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London,1961) p.xii.
- 15) Warnock, G.J.,*English Philosophy since 1900* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1958) p.66
- 16) Wittgenstein, L., *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. by D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London,1961) T.4.112
- 17) Pradhan, R.C.,*The Great Mirror- An Essay on Wittgenstein's Tractatus* (Kalki Prakash, New Delhi, 2002) p.503
- 18) Russell, B.,*Logic and Knowledge* ed. R.C.March (Allen and Unwin, London,1965) p.41-56
- 19) Wittgenstein, L., *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. by D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1961) 4.003
- 20) Wittgenstein, L., *Philosophical Investigations*, trans. by G.E.M.Anscombe, P.M.S. Hacker &Joachim Schulte (Blackwell Publishing 2009) Sec:116

Contribution of Logical Positivism to Philosophical Analysis

Jeuti Devi

Abstract

Logical positivism is an extreme version of the analytic philosophy. The logical positivists deal with logical and epistemological problems. The group of logical positivists includes the thinkers from a wide range of fields such as physics, mathematics, sociology etc. Logical positivists are supposed to have brought a revolution in the circles of philosophy by showing their dissent against speculative philosophy that had been prevalent in traditional philosophies. Logical positivism has been characterized by the method of logical analysis of language. Wittgenstein's *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus* was a text of great importance for positivists. The Tractatus introduced many doctrines which later influenced logical positivism. Analysis is the only adequate tool to deal with the types of problems encounter in philosophy. This paper has made an attempt to discuss about the contribution of Logical positivism in philosophical analysis.

Key Words : Logical positivism; Analytical Philosophy, Metaphysical Statement, Pseudo proposition

Objectives

The main aims and objectives of this study are as follows—

1. To analyse the concept of analytic philosophy.
2. To analyse the concept of logical positivism.
3. To explain the contribution of logical positivism in philosophical analysis.

Methodology

The study has adopted the qualitative method with the help of secondary sources. The data's are collected from books, journals and internet sources.

Introduction

Analytic philosophy is a branch of philosophy that came to dominate English speaking countries in the 20th century. In the United Kingdom, United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand Scandinavia, the majority of university philosophy departments today identify themselves as 'analytic' departments. Analytic philosophers aim for argumentative clarity and precision, draw freely on the tool of logic and often identify, professionally and intellectually more closely with science and mathematics.

The term 'analytic philosophy' can also refer to a broad philosophical tradition characterized by an emphasis on clarity and argument and a respect for the natural sciences. The more specific set of development of early 20th century philosophy that were the historical antecedents of the broad sense: e.g. The work of Bertrand Russell, Ludwig Wittgenstein, G.E.Moore, Gottlob Frege and logical positivists. In narrower sense, analytic philosophy is identified with specific philosophical commitments, such as the logical positivists principles that there are not any specifically philosophical truths and that the object of philosophy is the logical clarification of thought.

Ethics in Analytical Philosophy

Philosophers working in the analytic tradition have gradually come to distinguish three major branches of moral philosophy---

1. Meta ethics -whose function is the investigation of moral terms and concepts.
20th century Meta ethics has two roots. The first is G.E. Moore's investigation into the nature of ethical terms (e.g. good) in his Principia Ethical (1903), which identified naturalistic fallacy. The second is logical positivism and its attitudes that statements which are unverifiable and meaningless.
2. Normative ethics whose function is the examination and production of normative ethical judgments.
The first half of the 20th century was, marked by scepticism toward and neglect of normative ethics. Related subjects, such as social and political philosophy, aesthetic and philosophy of history, moved to the fringes of English language philosophy during this period.
3. Applied ethics whose function is the investigation of how existing normative principles should be applied in difficult or borderline cases, often cases created by the appearance of new technologies or new scientific knowledge.

Logical Positivism

Logical positivism is an extreme and radical version of the analytical approach to philosophy. During the late 1920s ,30s and 40s ,RUSSELL and Wittgenstein's formation was developed by a group of philosophers in Vienna and Berlin , who were known as the Vienna Circle and Berlin Circle respectively, into a doctrine known as Logical Positivism. Logical positivism used the formal logical methods to develop an empiricist account of knowledge. Philosophers such as Rudolf Carnap and Hans Reichenbach, along with the other members of the Vienna circle, claimed that the truth of logic and mathematics were tautologies and those of science were verifiable empirical claims.

According to logical positivism, there are two cardinal features of their philosophy, on one hand to promote the reasoning concerning 'science and mathematics' and on the other hand to eliminate 'metaphysics' from the sphere of philosophy.

Contribution of Logical Positivism in Analysis

Logical positivism is also known as Logical Empiricism. It is a strange admixture of HUME'S empiricism, Comte's positivism and logical analysis of Moore, Russell, Whitehead and Wittgenstein. These philosophers has two principal aims—

1. Establishment of science on a solid foundation.
2. Showing the meaninglessness of metaphysics.

To fulfil these two ends, they adopted the method of logical analysis, specially the logical analysis of language. Logical positivism is differed from Hume's empiricism. Hume made a psychological analysis was based on the rule of logic.

Logical positivism holds the view that they are, as philosophers not concerned with the truth or falsehood of scientific statements. They are chiefly interested in logical and epistemological problems. The common claims of all the members of the school was that they regard language as the only subject

matter of philosophy and its method is analysis, though their types of analysis were different from one philosopher to another.

The attitude of the logical positivists to metaphysics depends on their interpretation of the term 'meaning'. Wittgenstein in his book *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus* has discussed this. According to logical positivists, every assertive sentence is based on some experienced facts. Analysis of such statements leads us to some significant assertion called proposition. All propositions consist of some elementary proposition. If we analyse the proposition "it is a line of red colour", we shall get three elementary propositions-1. It is a line, 2. It is a coloured line and 3. It is red. The elementary proposition of this type is called the meaning of particular facts. These are called atomic facts. By a fact is meant "what the case is", that which makes a proposition true. Every proposition asserts a relation between the subject and the predicate. If this relation really exists between the words then it is true, otherwise it is false or meaningless. The proposition 'the sky is blue' can be true if it is experienced as blue.

If all propositions are analysable into elementary simple propositions and if these propositions picture the atomic facts of the world, it follows that the ultimate objectives of the propositions are empirical facts. Hence, a proposition which does not refer to any experienced facts is not a proposition. It is a non-sensical expression, it is a pseudo proposition.

Logical positivism stands in glaring contradiction to actual scientific proof, there is no doubt that logical positivism is credited with posing a number of interesting problems which are common to philosophers as well as scientists. Logical positivism, as a school of thought, is for contradicting on a number of interesting problems that occupied the minds of the philosophers as well as the scientists. Logical positivism can be credited with the development of logic of scientific cognition and investigation of specific problems of logic of science.

Logical positivism was anti-metaphysical. They held that nothing can be learned about the world. According to the logical positivists, metaphysics is a theory of reality beyond our experience and they tried to prove the non-sensical nature of metaphysics through the theory of verification. Logical positivism's implication of metaphysics is that the metaphysical statements picture no such entity which can be found in sense experience. In religion, for example, it would render suspect about the statements that 'God exists' which being metaphysical, would be strictly speaking meaningless.

As the logical positivists established their principle on verification of meaning and refutation of metaphysics, they divided the propositions into two types-Analytical proposition and empirical Proposition. Mathematical and logical propositions are analytical and tautologous, while the statements which could be directly and indirectly verified and be meaningful are empirical. Metaphysical statements which include the concepts of God, soul, life etc do not fall into these two categories, since they are beyond experience, therefore they are meaningless.

The central doctrines of this school were developed by a group of philosophers, scientists, and logicians centre in Vienna who came to be known as the 'Vienna Circle'. Among the members of this group, Rudolf Carnap, and Moritz Schlick have perhaps had the most influence on Anglo- American philosophy.

In response to criticism of verification, A.J. Ayer proposed a weak version. In "Language, Truth and Logic", he defines the distinction between 'strong' and 'weak' verification. In the strong sense, a proposition is said to be verifiable, if and only if its truth could be conclusively established by

experience. Again the weak sense of verification states that “a proposition is verifiable if it is possible for experience to render it probable.”

Conclusion

From the above discussion we have come to know the contribution of logical positivism in philosophical analysis. Logical positivism spread throughout almost the entire western world. It is the logical positivism which has made the whole philosophical trend to reject the non-sensical questions about the universe. Logical positivism was immensely influential in the philosophy of language.

Logical positivism stands in glaring contradiction to actual scientific proof. There is no doubt that logical positivism is created with posing a number of problems that are common to philosophers as well as scientists. Logical positivists can be credited with the development of logic of scientific cognition and investigation of specific problems of logic of science.

The downfall of logical positivism is largely attributed to be the internal contradictions that are prevalent in its own structure and also its inadequacy in understanding the genuine nature of the scientific investigation.

The view of logical positivism corresponds to the commonsense view. Some philosophical views like metaphysical views are totally meaningless in our life. No logical answer is possible for this type of views.

References:

1. Chakravarty, Dilip Kumar,(1996),Problems of Analytic Philosophy, Omsons Publication New Delhi.
2. Devi Sabitri,(2013),Outlines of Logical Positivism, EBH Publisher, Guwahati
3. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logical-positivism>
4. <http://www.wisegeek.com/what-is-logical-positivism.htm>
5. Sanyal ,J.(1995) Guide to General Philosophy, Sribhumi Publishing Company, Calcutta
6. Sinha Jadunath,(2004) Introduction to Philosophy, New Central Book Agency(p) Ltd Kolkata
7. Thilly ,Frank(2001),A History of Philosophy,Central Publishing House, Allahabad

Wittgenstein's Notion of 'The Philosophical Self'

Dr. Manoranjan Mallick

Abstract

This paper aims at exploring the metaphysical significance of self by redefining it as the philosophical self in contrast to psychological self. Wittgenstein has not really rebuffed the idea of seeing 'I' or self as psychological or empirical but calls attention to another dimension of self, i.e. viewing it as metaphysical. The self which philosophy talks about has reference only with metaphysical self. The notion of metaphysical self becomes very crucial in Wittgenstein's philosophy as it gives primacy to what is higher in life and what lies outside the world. The metaphysical self is viewed as the higher self, which cannot be captured within the network of the facts in the world. 'I' has no place in the world as it cannot be identified with a physical body. 'I' being a metaphysical 'I' in philosophy has only grammatical function. The grammatical 'I' dispels the illusion that it is merely affiliated with human body, and mind. Wittgenstein's notion of philosophical 'I' symbolizes the self which is different from ordinary use of 'I'.

Keywords: Wittgenstein; Philosophy; Psychology; Self; World

I

Wittgenstein doesn't deny the psychological aspect of self but resists any attempt to reduce self as a psychological entity. The subject matter of psychology is of no concern to philosophy. "Psychology is no more closely related to philosophy than any other natural science" (TLP#4.1121). Hence, philosophy is concerned only with metaphysical self not with psychological self. Wittgenstein redefines the self as 'philosophical self' by making an intriguing claim that the 'self is not *in* the world rather *with* it'. "The philosophical self is not the human being, not the human body, or the human soul, with which psychology deals, but rather the metaphysical subject, the limit of the world--not a part of it" (TLP#5.641). It is the philosophical self which cannot be equated with psycho-physical life. This is evident in Wittgenstein's emphasis on the higher aspect of self which he calls deeply mysterious (NB, 80). "It is not the case that there is a higher self in addition to the lower self. But it means that we must be able to see the self from higher point of view for understanding the self in the world" (Pradhan 2009: 168). It is not correct to say that there are two distinct types of self or subject thinking self and metaphysical self. It would be more appropriate to see them as two aspects of the self.

Wittgenstein makes it very clear by drawing a distinction between 'empirical self' and 'metaphysical self'. The empirical self is identified with psycho-physical self as the combination of mind and body or soul. The self, that is part of the world, is the psychological self which is different from the metaphysical self which remains transcendental. And the self as a phenomenon is of interest only to psychology (TLP#6.423). But the metaphysical subject is the willing subject, which is not a part of the world but stands over the boundary of the world. Wittgenstein makes use of the eye analogy to clarify his point. Here, 'I' is compared with an 'eye' and the world is compared with the visual field of an eye. 'I' cannot be found in the world as it is not part of the world. It is like an eye which cannot be part of its own visual field. Wittgenstein's notion of the willing subject identifies with the metaphysical 'I' which

is not situated anywhere in world rather it is the limit of the world (*TLP#5.632*).¹ When the self or 'I' ceases to exist, and all that is left is the world. Here, Wittgenstein's notion of the solipsistic world i.e. the-limit-of-the-world seems to coincide with pure realism that there is an existence of world which is independent of the subject. Self or 'I' has limited view of the world and in that sense, the world is mine. This way, self or 'I' is brought into view with solipsistic claim that 'the world is my world.'²

It has transcendental character and cannot be identified with 'Ego'. This conceptual duality between 'empirical self' and 'metaphysical self' is significant and is to be noticed in philosophy. As Pradhan writes, "The empirical self is not completely denied as it is significant only in so far the empirical world is concerned" (Pradhan 2002: 303). The metaphysical self is the real self. It is the higher self that cannot be captured within the domain worldly facts. In this way, self cannot be reduced only to a thinking or empirical self in the domain of philosophy. Wittgenstein emphasizes on metaphysical self or 'I' in order to understand the higher order of life and the world from philosophical perspective. The self or 'I' is not an object in the world (*NB*, 80) as an experiencing subject. In that extent, Wittgenstein says, "all experience is world and does not need the subject" (*NB*, 89). Thus, necessity of the experiencing subject is completely denied because subject is not affiliated with any individual or human body.

Wittgenstein finds Cartesian subject as illusory because there is no such thing as the subject that thinks or entertains ideas (*TLP#5.631*). There are no such things as thoughts and ideas floating as independent

1. The main contention of Wittgenstein's solipsism is that the world remains independent of the self which is metaphysically located outside it. The self or 'I' shrinks to a point without extension, and there remains world coordinated with it. By 'world' Wittgenstein is referring to 'physical world', the world which is extended in space. This extended world is coordinated with the non-extended point which is the self of the solipsist. The coordination between the two is made possible only through the world being *my world* i.e. the-limit-of-the-world. This is the co-ordination of physical world with something which is non-physical, the self (Chandra 2002: 63). My world gets metaphysical status only within the framework set by the self. When the world is seen as a limited whole, as *my world*, the willing subject finds a transcendental moral sphere to interact with the world.

2. By claiming that 'the world is my world' (*TLP#5.62*) Wittgenstein commits to a solipsistic position. Though such position would have severe limitations when analyzed in our material mode of speech (Cook 1994: 55-56) but Wittgenstein recognizes and highlights the inherent merit in solipsist's point of view. In his attempt to bridge this apparent incompatibility he undertakes a philosophical journey from idealism to solipsism and from solipsism to realism. Finally, he ends up propounding a unique notion of solipsism without a solipsistic self and tries to resolve this incompatibility. He further argues that solipsism coincides with pure realism (Mallick & Sirola 2015: 111). This is quite contrary to the classical stand on solipsism which holds that the solipsism is a consequence of subjective idealism; and subjective idealism is incompatible with realism.

items in the world (Chandra 2002: 68). Self does not think and experience. The Cartesian self is located in the mind. Wittgenstein refutes that if there is mind, there is also a subject or self to whom the mind or the mental phenomena are attributed. The self is not essentially bound up with the mental phenomena. Revoking the analogy of eye he writes,

Where *in* the world is a metaphysical subject to be found? You will say that this is exactly the case of the eye and its visual field. But really you do *not* see the eye. And nothing *in the visual field* allows you to infer that it is seen by an eye. (TLP#5.633)

How do I, the person come in? How, for example, does a person enter into the description of the visual sensation? If we describe the visual field, no person necessarily comes into. We can say that the visual field has certain internal properties, but its being *mine* is not essential to its description. That is, it is not an intrinsic property of a visual sensation, or a pain, to belong to someone. There will be such thing as *my* image or someone else's. (WL, 22)

The self or 'I' has no location in spatio-temporal world and in this sense, Wittgenstein's notion of self seems to disappear from the world.

Wittgenstein's anti-Cartesian position rests on the assertion that 'I' itself cannot be part of the world but is the presupposition of the existence of the world. It is like an eye which does not belong to its visual field but is its presupposition. 'I' loses its uniqueness when it is seen as part of the world. 'I' remains independent of the world the way eye remains independent of its visual field. The 'I' is viewed as the locus of transcendental position, the limits of the world. It makes the world a limited whole.

Wittgenstein claims that if we write a book with the title '*The world as I found it*' then all that it would contain is a full description of *the world* with reference to our body. The description of the world would exclude any description of self. There is no need to introduce self or 'I' while we describe the world. Similarly, it is not necessary to introduce any individual body while we talk of 'I' or self. Self does not require a location in individual's body. No significance is given to human body above the bodies such as plants, beasts, tables, stones, etc. In Wittgenstein's words:

If I wrote a book called *The World as I found it*, I should have to include a report on my body, and should have to say which parts were subordinate to my will, and which were not, etc, this being the method of isolating the subject, or rather of showing that in an important sense there is no subject; for it alone could not be mentioned in that book (TLP#5.631).

Self is the owner of the world but does not own the experiences in the world. It shows that self has a metaphysical limit which doesn't necessarily come into picture in any description of the world. 'I' objectively confront every object but not the 'I' (NB, 80). In this sense, 'I' is not a physical entity and hence, is not a matter of factual investigation. If the self is a part of the world and counted as equal to other members in the world like human body, animals, plants, stones, etc. then its uniqueness cannot be recognized. Emphasizing on self as metaphysical Wittgenstein aims at attaining the uniqueness of 'I' or self which cannot be equated with other physical entities.

II

Further, in his later writings, Wittgenstein examines how grammar of linguistic usage plays an important role to understanding the metaphysical aspect of self. His solipsistic position gets a grammatical justification. The self, as a grammatical notion 'I', is not reducible to any worldly items. It

does not contain a reference to either a physical or a mental entity. The word 'I' appears as having totally unique grammar.

Wittgenstein rejects the traditional solipsistic notion of 'I' as an experiencing subject. The solipsist says, "I have pain" which shows the monopoly of ego or its concentration in 'I' or self. On the other hand, Wittgensteinian notion of self demands for vanishing of the ego. In accordance with his notion of self, Wittgenstein suggests for bringing a grammatical change in our usages of 'I' where 'I' should not be confused with objects in the world. 'I' doesn't have a place in the world and cannot be used for describing a personal experience. Instead of solipsist's notation, "I have real toothache", Wittgenstein proposes the change in the expression that "There is a real toothache." Wittgensteinian solipsism is not looking for a notation in which the ego has a monopoly, but one in which the ego vanishes. In the above example, the solipsist expression describes one's personal feeling of toothache and may help a doctor to understand the patient's status. But such expressions may cause serious confusions in philosophy as the word 'I' is viewed as metaphysical subject. In that sense, the 'I', being not part of the world, is indescribable.

Wittgenstein's understanding of the self differs from traditional view of solipsistic self. Wittgensteinian solipsistic mood can only be grasped in its linguistic terms. He points out that the grammatical form of 'I' misleads us by viewing it as a physical entity.

We could have a language from which "I" is omitted from sentences describing a personal experience. (Instead of saying "I think" or "I have an ache" one might say "It thinks" (like "It rains"), and in place of "I have an ache" "There is an ache here". Under certain circumstances one might be strongly tempted to do away with the simple use of "I". (WL, 21)

The suggestion is to avoid the simple use of 'I' which may confuse its metaphysical status with material mode of speech. It would be a mistake to refer 'I' as a physical entity in the world. 'I' is redundant in the statements like, "I am in pain", "I am awake", "I am happy", "I am poor". Wittgenstein sees 'I' is bereft of ego. Pain, awakening, sleep, happiness, etc., cannot be ascribed to an 'I'. 'I' is not the owner of experiences.

Wittgenstein's fundamental aim is to deny the ontology of self and proposes the notational change in which 'I' doesn't stand for a particular person. The 'I' has grammatical role in our everyday usages though it is not experiential one.

One of the questions which come up in discussion of memory is the following: Can I and my body be indentified? It might be argued that "I" is not used to refer to my body because two persons might have the same body. I want to say that realizing that the word "I" does not mean the same as "my body", i.e. that it is used differently, does not mean that a new entity besides the body, the ego, has been discovered. (WL, 60)

'I' does not require a location in an individual body. We do talk of 'I' but no individual body is seen to be a possessor of it; we don't require to introduce it. Since 'I' is not affiliated with human body and mind, it does not necessarily come into picture in any description of individual's own feelings, images, and thoughts. It is the 'I' which does not entertain ideas or experiences. The solipsist's use of the material mode of speech such as "I have pain", "I am thinking", "I believe it will rain", etc., are unintelligible for Wittgenstein. The traditional solipsist is deceived by the fact that, "in the cases in which "I" is used as subject, we don't use it because we recognize a particular person by his bodily characteristics; and this creates the illusion that we use this word to refer to something bodiless, which,

however, has its seat in our body. In fact *this* seems to be the real ego, the one of which it was said, *Cogito, ergo sum*" (BB, 69). 'I' cannot come and situate itself within the place of experienced world as 'I' transcends the experienced world.

'I' as a non-grammatical subject is monopolizing ego in the physical world. It can be abolished by the use of grammatical 'I'. It becomes a non-mental, non-physical entity.

The kernel of our proposition that that which has pains or sees or thinks is of a mental nature is only, that the word "I" in "I have pain" does not denote a particular body, for we can't substitute for "I" a description of a body. (BB, 74)

The word 'I' is a class by itself (Chandra 2002: 76). The word 'I' does not refer to owner of experience of 'pain' in the expression, "I am in pain" unlike its use in "I have a cigar" (WL, 21). It is not necessary to avoid the use of the word 'I' in all cases because sometimes the word 'I' is not used as an experiencing subject. In the expression, "I have a cigar" the word 'I' does not possess the monopoly of ego and it is not used as subject of experience. In this case, the monopoly of ego is not found in the use of 'I' since I can give my cigar to somebody else, I can sell it, I can throw it away, others may have same cigar, etc. In this case, the word 'I' is used as owner of the object 'cigar', which can be objectively verified. It is possible to segregate the owner 'I' from the object 'cigar' because 'cigar' is a secondary experience being associated externally with 'I'. A cigar can have an owner, "because it can lack one. It makes sense to speak of ownership only where it makes sense to speak of none" (Hacker 1986: 219). If anyone can own something like 'cigar' then she/he can disown it too. Wittgenstein's idea of ownership can be understood in terms of transferable ownership.

On the other hand, when someone says, "I have pain", the ego monopolizes 'I' and becomes the only subject of experience of 'pain'. This 'pain' cannot be shared with others as others cannot experience 'my pain'. That way, the experience of 'pain' cannot be owned or disowned like a cigar. Also it cannot be transferred to others and cannot be objectively verified. "If the experiences are not the kind of things of which the ownership is transferable, then they are not the kind of things that can have owners" (Chandra 2002: 78). If my pain cannot be transferred to someone else, it can also not be owned by me. I alone know when 'I have pain' and thereby, I can ascertain only my own experience of pain. "It makes no sense to speak of an owner, because it makes no sense to speak of an unowned pain" (Hacker 1986: 219). One cannot conceive of the possible existence of sensation 'pain' without associating it with a personal pronoun. It is a primary experience associated with an individual's body. The primary experiences are internally embodied with an individual.

The primary experience such as 'pain' is only to be accessible to a person who is in pain. I verify "I have pain" by a direct comparison of the concept 'pain' as a datum with reality. The verification does not require the identification of an owner (Hacker 1986: 220-21). It would be nonsensical to ask, how do you know that you have pain? "The primary is compared directly with reality, it is not possible to 'have it' and not to be 'conscious of it'" (Hacker 1986: 221). The primary experiences are associated directly with the person, so it is not question of whether 'to cognize them' or 'not to cognize them'. "'I' in the context of primary experience is an eliminable expression. Its elimination would of course not be more correct, but would enable one to grasp the logical essentials of the form of representations of facts of personal experiences (PR, §65). That is why, 'I' has to be eliminated when primary experiences are expressed. Therefore, the statement such as 'I have pain' has no significant use because 'I' does not delimit a place within a logical space but merely indicate primary experiences (Hacker 1986: 219).

The notion of 'I' according to Wittgenstein is not identified with bodily or thinking self. The 'I' cannot be used to substitute for a person in the world. It is completely distinguished from things in the world.

Hence, error arises when 'I' is identified with a person to make a statement like "I am in pain", "I have toothache", etc. "When I say 'I am in pain', I do not point to a person who is in pain, since in a certain sense I have no idea *who is*" (PI§404). Here, it is not important to inquire for whom this 'I' stands for? 'I' is a class by itself. It cannot be personified to be somebody in pain. The 'I' only has a grammatical role in the language.

To say, "I have a pain" is no more a statement *about* a particular person than moaning is... The word 'I' does not mean the same as "L. W." even if I am L. W., nor does it mean the same as the expression "the person who is now speaking." But that doesn't mean: that "L. W." and "I" mean different instrument of our language. (BB, 67)

It clearly shows that the word 'I' cannot be substituted for any person even if I am the one. The word 'I' also does not mean same as a name which is used to identify a person for others. As said above the word 'I' and the name L. W. are not same because the first person pronoun 'I' is used as a subject and the name L. W. stands for an object, person. Names and designations are subject to change. A person can have different names and designations for her/his identification as a person in different circumstances. However the word 'I' cannot change and it does not point to any person. The word 'I' and the name L. W. are different linguistic instruments.

III

Wittgenstein agrees with traditional solipsist's intent but he finds their notion of self quite primordial. He says, "What the solipsist *means* is quite correct; only it cannot be *said*, but makes itself manifest" (TLP#5.62). Disagreement is with the material mode of speech where self is identified with 'ego' or person. In saying 'I alone exist' or 'Only my experiences are real,' such sentences appear to have genuine negations, i.e., they appear to allow that it is conceivable that there is something beyond immediate experience (Cook 1994: 58). Language is not conceivable if it does not represent this world (PR,§80). Names are given to objects in our immediate experiences which can only be conceived of. Therefore, the very idea of things beyond immediate experience is a delusion (NB, 51). Solipsists fail in theorizing the *a priori* claim that 'I alone exist'.

Self as a combination of human body *and* soul or as a combination of human body *and* mind does not attain the purpose for which the idea of self is philosophically introduced. So, there really is a way in which there can and must be a mention of 'I' in a metaphysical *sense* in philosophy. The self is metaphysically related with the world and manifests itself by seeing the world as *my world*. It is the philosophical self which does not belong to the world but it is the-limit- of-the world. It is the realization of the higher consciousness where there is no scope of looking at the empirical contents and identifying with them. Only in this sense, the self becomes eternal and realizes the higher order of life and the world. In order to understand the higher order of life and the world, it is required to understand the transcendental vision of reality rather than empirical vision alone. So, the notion of the philosophical self subject comes at the center to establish the primacy of 'the higher.' The philosophical self, for Wittgenstein, is the willing subject which serves the purpose of human existence and its meaning in life. This purpose can be realized when the willing subject is viewed as the limit of the world. Will, as an attitude of the subject, brings the willing subject into philosophy. The will as bearer of ethics, morally interacts with the world at metaphysical level making the world ethically meaningful. The self can change the meaning of the world with the change in the attitude but not the facts in the world. The self determines the ethical status which provides meaning to the world. Depending on the attitude of self the same world may appear good or bad. Subsequently, good or bad will result in making it happy or unhappy.

Abbreviations

TLP: *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*

PI: *Philosophical Investigations*

NB: *Notebooks 1914-1916*

BB: *The Blue and Brown Books*

WL: *Wittgenstein Lectures: Cambridge, 1932-35*

PR: *Philosophical Remarks*

References:

Chandra, Suresh, *Wittgenstein New Perspectives* (New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research, 2002).

Cook, John W., *Wittgenstein's Metaphysics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Hacker, P.M.S., *Insight and Illusion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

Mallick, M & Sirola, V.S., "Privacy of Moral Perspective", in *Journal of Indian Council of Philosophical Research (JICPR)*, 32:1, January (New Delhi: Springer, 2015).

Pradhan, R.C., *Language, Reality and Transcendence: An Essay on the Main Strands of Wittgenstein's Later Philosophy* (New Delhi: Overseas Press, 2009).

_____, *The Great Mirror: An Essay on Wittgenstein's Tractatus* (New Delhi: Kalki Prakash, 2002).

Wittgenstein, L., *Philosophical Investigations*, English edition edited by G.E.M. Anscombe (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953).

_____, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, with an introduction by Bertrand Russell with English translation by D.F. Pears & B.F. McGuinness (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961).

_____, *Notebooks 1914-16*, Edited by G.H. von Wright and G.E.M. Anscombe with translation by G.E.M. Anscombe (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961).

_____, *The Blue and Brown Books*, Edited with a preface by Rush Rhees (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975).

_____, *Philosophical Remarks*, Edited by Rush Rhees with translation by R. Hargreaves and R. White (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975).

_____, *Ludwig Wittgenstein and the Vienna Circle: Conversations Record* by Friedrich Waismann, Edited by B.F. McGuinness (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979).

_____, *Wittgenstein Lectures: Cambridge, 1932-35*, Edited by A. Ambrose (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979).

Analytical and Normative Inquiry of the Nature and Purpose of Philosophy

Rajan

Abstract

For the thinkers of antiquity, ‘the mere word Philo-Sophia - the love of wisdom – was enough to express this conception of philosophy. In the Symposium, Plato had shown that Socrates, the symbol of the philosopher, could be identified with Eros, the son of Poros (expedient) and of Penia (poverty). Eros lacked wisdom, but he did know how to acquire it.’ⁱ But now to define and analyse the philosophy and its disciplines has become a herculean task because the world has moved forward a lot, now philosophy and its disciplines are not alone to find and solve the problem of the world. It is a challenging thing for philosophy and philosophers to preserve the legacy which has been given to us, so many opponent disciplines have come up with some challenging allegations like philosophy is dead, philosophy is obsolete, philosophy is for those whose heads are in the clouds and time to kill etc. so it is also a task of thinkers to preserve their disciplines legacy without losing their path, so we will try to interpret and preserve the legacy of philosophy and its main approaches through critical analysis, , reason and logic which behold the true spirit of philosophy. There can be two ways to understand something one is what it is? And another can be why do need that or through what purpose of that thing? So based on this assumption this paper aims to analyse the nature and purpose of philosophy and concludes that it is an analytical and critical inquiry and way of life.

Key words – Philosophy, Analytical, normative, Nature, Way of Life

*A thirsty ambition for truth and virtue, and a frenzy to conquer all lies and vices which are not recognized as such nor desire to be; herein consists of the heroic spirit of the philosopher.*ⁱⁱ

Philosophy as an Analytical Inquiry and A Way of Life

In the analytic speculation, the central concern mostly locates in the field of philosophy of language, mind and epistemology; few thinkers will handle the problem about the metaphysics and ethics directly. Based on the first criticism, many philosophers inside or outside the analytic tradition think that the problems concerned by analytic thinkers are too trivial and academic, which betray the soul of progressive philosophy which is a by-product of the philosophy of antiquity -- to answer the basic, ultimate questions of metaphysics, ethics and aesthetics logically and rationally and not merely preaching, that’s why it is considered ‘*as a way of life*’. Some argue that analytic philosophy has too relied on the methodology of formal logic, language analysis while our understanding of the world is not so much way exhausted by that form of logic. The criticisms above are very common in the continental tradition, but some inside the analytic thinking also hold them as well. Despite this criticism analytical philosophy doesn't lose its value, it has given so much to the philosophical world with its unique methodology and philosophization for an instance, its logical method or technique to attain conceptual clarity is a new phase of thinking. The lacuna which we find in it can be fillup with the help of philosophy of antiquity so that both ‘method and matter’ become rich with the help of each other. To anyone familiar with the modern way of doing philosophy, it may seem quite strange that philosophy itself, as a whole, or any philosophy—a discipline of philosophical, however comprehensive—could all by itself constitute, for its adherents, a total, all-consuming way of life. “Philosophy” modern time

represents itself as a rigorous academic philosophy, as opposed to work of consolation and service of humanity, including ones that are spoken to contain and advocate a “philosophy as a way of life.” By contrast with such more popular conceptions of philosophy, philosophy in the strict and narrow usage is taken for an enterprise of reasoned analysis of language and words, antagonistic argumentation, rigorously disciplined which give no place for ethics of care or any other positive and essential emotion. It should not be an essence of philosophy as Henry David Thoreau penned “To be a philosopher is not merely to have subtle thoughts, nor even to found a school...it is to solve some of the problems of life, not only theoretically, but practically.”ⁱⁱⁱ

Modern-day crisis for philosophy is quite critical. Some today consider philosophy to be a superfluous task, valuable only to those with their “head in the clouds” and time to kill. This view may be partially attributable to the growing interest that contemporary philosophers have with producing ideas intended only for their fellow academics. “...modern philosophy appears above all as the construction of a technical jargon reserved for modern specialists.”^{iv} But it is a crisis which so many thinkers have exploded so many times in the history of philosophy. Stoic philosophers, when philosophy was considered to be a way of life, when one of the main tasks of Philosophy was to moulds the soul towards goodness from any wrongdoing and evil; philosophy for them was a way to orders our life, guides our moral standards, shows us what we ought to do and what we ought not to do, and focus on the being good (virtue ethics) rather than discussing what one should do in particular time and situation. “There are indeed mistakes made, through the fault of our advisors, who teach us how to debate and not how to live. There are also mistakes made by students, who come to their teachers to develop, not their souls, but their wits. Thus, philosophy, the study of wisdom, has become philology, the study of words.”^v These words sound true at the current time when the philosophy of ethics has strongly lost its sight due to the domination of some philosophies such as logical positivism, analytical philosophy, and linguistic trend etc. the question which strongly demands the attention of the wise people of the world has somehow lost its the strength of vowing the intellectual.^{vi}

In contrast, to present way of philosophizing, the philosophy of antiquity was concerned not with just mere speculation of a word through permutation and combination, but with the attainment of the wisdom of life for the sake of instigating a transformation of self as well as the society and the world. “Modern philosophers are “artists of reason”, says Hadot while ancient philosophers were “artists of life”.^{vii} Philosophy, as it is practised today, is abstract, theoretical, and detached from life, just one academic subject among others. Greek and the Roman philosophical world was something quite different in all sort of conception related to philosophy and its nature, argues the French philosopher Pierre Hadot. Philosophy was a normative inquiry and a way of life. Not merely a subject of study and parroting, philosophy was considered an art of living, a practice aimed at overcoming life suffering and shaping it also, and remaking the self-according to an ideal of wisdom, Knowledge and understating; “Such is the lesson of ancient philosophy: says Hadot in his book philosophy as a way of life an invitation to each human being to transform himself. Philosophy is a conversion, a transformation of one's way of being and living, and a quest for wisdom.”^{viii}

Thinking and philosophization guide and transform lives and the direction determines the distinction and quality of the life of the people of the different period. The philosophy of antiquity has never been welcomed as a dry exercise. The seers preach what they live. Thoughts must be disinterested and independent from different allegiances of mind: otherwise, they may misguide the thinking. The openness of thoughts and thinking useful for uncovering wisdom within must dawn in a self-conscious activity. Since discriminating knowledge of what to do is good and what is harmful and

hence to be avoided is determined by philosophical reflection, escaping the light of philosophy, not only individual but social, political and ethical life also cannot run properly. "We should exercise ourselves with realities, not with dialectical speculations, like a man who has devoured some textbook on harmonics but has never put his knowledge into practice. Likewise, we must not be like those who can astonish their onlookers by their skill in syllogistic argumentation, but who, when it comes to their own lives, contradict their teachings."^{ix}

Some thinkers proclaim that the techniques, method and predilections of analytic thinking are not only unhistorical but anti-historical, and primarily against textual commentary. Analytic philosophy might not be uninformed, but it usually tries to seek a very high degree of consistency, clarity and precision of formulation and argument, and it often seeks to be informed by, compliment with natural science. One of the big problem occurs with analytic philosophy, in my opinion, with its occasional contextual blindness.it shouldn't fail in checking them. This thing needs to be taken into account, but despite having this strength analytic philosophy might have some pros and cons which need to be addressed for the service and spirit of philosophy like there must be some philosophical material which it will analyse. History of philosophy, metaphysics, and descriptive ethics is that material which deserves to be mean (philosophical material) to be analysed. the paper concludes that although the history of philosophy might not be conducive to analytic thinking, even though we can argue that history of philosophy, metaphysics and descriptive and normative ethics is capable to tell us the essence of philosophy and it' major discipline otherwise strawman fallacy dominates (what source give any particular method to decide what philosophy and it's discipline ought to be?). We should take a history of philosophy including all its disciplines into account according to which we are "edified" by learning of the "great philosophical arguments", and which can be explored and analysed further for the development of philosophy.

Now one may argue that if philosophy is about knowledge and when it's objectivity is debatable, but here if we will to discuss daily life issues and forget about epistemology, it should be called just 'cafe', or 'self-help therapy' why call it philosophy ? It's a good and interesting point. Epistemology is a part of philosophy, and it has crucial role to play in knowing and understanding. Unfortunately, philosophy is reduced to it by some thinkers a. To quote, Richard Rorty, epistemology was in 17th century. Philosophy has not always been like we perceive it today. Vienna circle eliminated metaphysics and philosophers like Richard Rorty are taking anti-epistemological stand. Ethics has already been reduced to emotions and excluded from philosophy by David Hume's analytic synthetic distinction. Now, we have only two options; either to declare philosophy is dead or proceed further without epistemology and imagine "philosophy as conversation of mankind as mention by Rorty.

To answer this allegation we can try that The major difference between philosophy and other disciplines is that philosophy is a second order of enquiry, thus we can't say that the job of philosophy is to tell what's Real, we cannot forget epistemology while doing philosophy, because epistemology is not a part of philosophy but it is a method of doing philosophy, it gives us pursuit a direction. Without epistemology one can get away with saying anything, but in Philosophy if we say something, we must know how you know it. We can't say something is philosophy just because Plato or Aristotle said it, their work is diverse and not everything they said is philosophy. So the option we are giving that philosophy is dead or we proceed further without epistemology and imagine "philosophy as conversation of mankind", is problematic, thus are not the only two options. Obviously, philosophy

should be reduced to epistemology but philosophy cannot leave epistemology either, epistemology is a method to do philosophy, without it philosophy will lose its one essence. So question remains, if we are discussing our daily life problems, and friendship, relationship, etc., then everyone does it, and there are experts from field of psychology and other fields who do it better according to their specialization. So what is peculiar about this act of discussing practical issues that we should call it philosophy?

If we retrospect we find that Philosophy as second order discipline comes after Wittgenstein's declaration that there are no true philosophical problems. It is a kind of death certificate for philosophy. But what about this 'There is only one really serious philosophical problem,' Camus says in the stranger, "and that is suicide. Deciding whether or not life is worth living is to answer the fundamental question in philosophy".^x If there are no true philosophical problems then what's left for philosophy except to be the hand maiden of other disciplines. Psychologists don't dig deeper into concepts. They are primarily concerned with unconscious. They focus on soothing rather than understanding. Difference between philosophies as psychology resurfaces again and again in philosophical approaches. There is a clear cut distinction between philosophy and psychology e. g. psychology is concerned with emotion while philosophy is concerned with reason etc.

Philosophy sometimes is seen not only an inquiry of the truth about things but as the exploration and elaboration of various perspectives on the nature of reality. Philosophy presents us with ways of seeing how things fit together consistently and the status that individuals and humanity, in general, occupy in the overall scheme of things. Most of us favour some very general picture of what the world is like, nearly all of us philosophise because we have some sort of beliefs, norms and values by which we live our lives and also justification or like to think we do or feel uncomfortable when we don't do this activity. "Philosophy also represents or imbibes the capacity to represent as a way of life," since Philosophy was conceived as a love of wisdom, and wisdom does not merely cause us to know: it makes us 'be' in a different way, to look at the actual nature of reality. Seers, sages, scholars preached what they practised and practised what they thought. Their philosophization is not merely a formal knowledge but also for the harmony and flourishing, for the cultivation of the individual and the social world also to the extent of wisdom or even to the liberation.

It is the bonafide nature of the reality which gives acceleration to the problem solution of the world and life with proper reasoning and philosophical arguments. Since philosophical reflections also aim at conceptual clarification, interpretation and lastly wisdom, the question of risk against philosophy does not hold merit. It is only by taking human aspirations that philosophy fulfils in view that the question of future of philosophy is warrantable. so we need to be emphasised over the applied and normative nature of philosophy which ought to be its bonafide nature since it helps humanity to live not just forced to survive reluctantly. Human is rational as well as social being so harmony and flourishing ought to be its primary requirement. At last, we would quote Cicero "*unless the soul is cured, which cannot be done without philosophy, there will be no end to our miseries.*"^{xi} Thus we can imagine and wonder about the importance of applied and normative nature of philosophy.

Another lacuna which we find in the analytical philosophy or positive philosophy's rejection of metaphysics and ethics and since the 70s in the 20th century, there was a so-called naturalism movement inside the analytic thinking. The naturalist philosophers suspect the traditional disciplines of philosophy especially those which are most close to human life. The basic idea of naturalism is, philosophy is continuous with science. So, if there is no distinction between philosophy and science,

we should refer to science if we want to get the truth in philosophy. This assumption has done so much damage to metaphysics, ethics and aesthetics by attracting the idea of radical realism and evolutionism etc. if we simply ask if there is no division between science and philosophy, then what will be the difference between the work of science and philosophy. Then the modern allegation philosophy dead seems sound. And if we want to tackle such kind of allegations then only metaphysics, ethics and aesthetics etc. discipline can help us to save that.

Sometime Analytic trend seems a bit like the medieval Scholastics because of their common focus on rigorous analysis. Both are large-scale represents delineated among many different practitioners who specialize in a particular area. Both are effectively subordinated to particular discipline; the Scholastics subordinate to theology, the analytics to natural science. The latter one is a little tenuous, though, since some analytic thinker used to repudiate scientism. The classical analytic philosophy of the 20th century was very much subordinated to science, though, as found in Quine's approach that "only Philosophy of science is philosophy enough. This approach seems quite radical and a threat to the future of philosophy which need to be addressed by the thinkers.

For instance, Moving from Anthropocentrism to Cosmo centrism has always been considered a good philosophical approach which analytical trend solely misses. As far as ethical, metaphysical and socio-political arguments are considered Contemporary thinking scenario including analytical approach adds further weightage with anthropological/biological evidence due to its inclination towards natural sciences, as seen in quine's dictum. Well, One more interesting dimension might go with a famous argument (with a hint of evolutionism) that "Every Cosmo centrism is (in a way) a refined form of (thereby leads to) Anthropocentrism only". This sense can be traced in those trends whose arguments focus on or derived out from the influence of the natural sciences phenomena. The analytical trend is one of those trends; it unintentionally justified almost all wrong acts done by a human in the name anthropocentrism like environmental destruction. Thus it somehow can be traced that how the scientism is a threat to ethics and morality which need examine carefully.

Rationality, ethics of justice, analysis, is good but it also has a limit and some lacuna which leaves us incomplete. For instance, metaphysics, aesthetics, Ethics of care which gives enough importance to emotions, instincts, curiosity, wonder, and suffering and other aspects of the universe need to be accepted in philosophization. : And the crisis which we can felt about how anthropocentric arguments are quite dominating in the present scenario is genuine to arise, and one of the main reasons behind this would be scientific castism with which so many analytical thinkers like to associate the philosophy. The way it treats to metaphysics, dogmatic faith in sensory experience, consider matter only the foundation of everything and surprisingly consider a matter to be pointless, aimless. How this dogma defines life from a matter which is pointless and meaningless? They are thus failing in one of the basic duties of philosophy, which is to keep all one's assumptions under review and be willing to seriously question even the most basic of them. So the question and problem which analytical philosophy excludes to address are not so much useless and pointless.

To conclude, we can reach to one consistency which is that philosophy is an analytical inquiry because of its purpose which is to clear concepts and set consistency in ideas and thoughts and also a way of life, not in sense of preaching but in its rational and logical approach. As Bertrand Russell felt the crisis "Philosophy, throughout its history, has consisted of two parts inharmoniously blended: on the one hand a theory as to the nature of the world, on the other an ethical or political doctrine as to the

best way of living. The failure to separate these two with sufficient clarity has been a source of much confused thinking.^{xii} , this crisis can be overcome through a holistic approach in which we consider inquiry ,method and lived life experience equally important . It will make the philosophical wisdom flourish. Philosophy as used to be conceived as a love of wisdom, and wisdom does not merely cause us to know and inquire: it makes us 'be' in a different way, to look at the actual nature of reality through lived and rational experiences. We should be artist of reason, analysis and logic but also the 'artist of life' which is possible when we take philosophy in holistic sense.

End Notes and References:

- i. Hadot, Pierre, and Arnold I. Davidson.. *Philosophy as a way of life: spiritual exercises from Socrates to Foucault*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 110n15, attributed to Epicurus. 1995
- ii. *Socratic Memorabilia*, J. Flaherty, trans. (Baltimore: 1967), p. 147.
- iii. Thoreau, Henry David. *Walden Civil Disobedience and Other Writings*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2008, p. 61.
- iv. Hadot, Pierre, and Arnold I. Davidson.. *Philosophy as a way of life: spiritual exercises from Socrates to Foucault*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 110n15, attributed to Epicurus. 1995,p.275
- v. Lucius Seneca, *Letters from a Stoic*,letter-49
- vi. The idea that ethics should pay special attention to definitions was greatly encouraged by Moore, who in his *Principia Ethical* (1903) advanced a set of views about goodness: it was a non-natural, simple quality that could not be defined.(see – Williams, Bernard *ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* , , Taylor & Francis, 2011 ,page -126)
- vii. Ibid.
- viii. Hadot, Pierre, and Arnold I. Davidson. *Philosophy as a way of life: spiritual exercises from Socrates to Foucault*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 110n15, attributed to Epicurus. 1995,p.275
- ix. Ibid ,p-267
- x. Knopf ,Allred A., *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, New York:, 1955,p-1
- xi. Cicero, Marcus Tullius, and J. E. King.. *Tusculan disputations*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1966,III. p-13.
- xii. Russell, Bertrand ,*History of Western Philosophy* ,Simon and Schuster, 30-Jun-2008,p-834

Analytic Position of Women in Society

Suyasha Singh

Abstract

The history of philosophy has deviated the notions of truth, justice, and rationality to an androcentric approach. Analytic feminism has tried to establish a normative analysis to highlight the oppression of feminist politics and justify the claims of truth and falsity in the exercise of rights by women. This univocality must highlight the dimensions of this holistic approach towards their treatment as most of the factors are male-biased. Representing them as naïve with no rational quality in the political structure is but in principle they are denied reason to be oppressed and accept the 'malestream' rule. Ludwig Wittgenstein in 'On certainty' terms epistemic project to be a form of life. Feminists have tried to expose these beliefs of moral deliberations which furthers the ethical questioning. To precede this, Social identity is necessary to establish epistemic credibility. This paper attempts to be a reflexive stance for the analysis of evaluative principles. It will try to elaborate on how oppression occurs when the agent is oppressed relative to their social position. This makes it difficult to draw a universal position of 'women'. Analytic philosophy constitutes excessive argumentation and critical acceptance of certain values.

Keywords: Analytic Feminism, Normative, Universal, Moral

Introduction

In Greek origins, metaphysical principles invoked positive male and negative female attributes. This was distinguished based on possession of reason. The reason has been posed as a normative analysis that was shaped by masculinity. The male attribute is defined as 'natural', 'intuitive' and 'stable' whereas feminism judgments are rarely counted as immanent. This highlights the male/female and reason/emotion dichotomy. This is tried to be established as ideal knowledge. It ignores the fact that women are upholders of ethical principles in the family and that is how they work for unity.

According to Ann Cudd, the analytical feminist philosophy consists of contesting sexism and androcentric. It works across its boundaries in moral, political, and legal philosophy. But such insistence has been objected based on its not being subjective in nature and in being too objective. These issues create confinement in defining women. It is termed as not being feminist enough. Sylvia Burrow states "feminist anger as a political and epistemological response to oppression and a way for women to assert their rightful place in society."¹

Burrow asserts a very important patriarchal notion. This emotion displays various kinds of offensive interpretations such as being that time of the month, moody, weak, frail, loud, etc. Women through dialogues must resonate with the act that they are characterized by such emotions because the other group feels soft enough to let them go and regress their progress. This collective authority must be followed by moral responsibility and not as interpretations by the oppressors. For the comfort of men, women are expected to agree with these imposed qualities and do not live for themselves.

Earlier women were defined in terms of 'Substantialism', an idea there was a thing in women that could constitute them as women. But speaking in reality, women are connected by a relation. Being a woman is thus a relation external to individuals and individual women is external to the category. Assignments and identifications to her define her as a woman. It is difficult to give identity to

women. Identities are changing as history is changing along with future changes. Henceforth, they are a disjunctive set of beliefs².

To bring a subjective change it has to be implemented in a psychological sense. It has to be done socially, legally, economically, politically.

Theoretical and Practical Position

There are many attitudes and beliefs which exist in an individual without outside expression. This individualistic mindset is shaped by one's own 'situatedness' in a social and cultural backdrop. Sandra Harding's *Standpoint Theory* which is a feminist theoretical perspective suggests that knowledge is something which stems out from a person's social position³. An error is made when certain definitions are represented universally. Such prefixes commit the fallacy of 'cultural essentialism.' There is a shared set of beliefs in the definition of a 'woman' which entails unwanted implications. These errors are caused by biased sociological, psychological, cultural, and political constructions. Time and again feminists have called for a better integration as practices then formed could create a sense of distrust for the respective community. Their upheaval will be marked by resistance as those customs will always give them a subordinate status.

One of the popular reasons given to marginalize women is their physiological weakness. Cultural depictions in movies, literature, etc. describe situations where women always need the help of men to get through normal and tough situations of everyday life. Ex:

This box is too heavy for a lady to lift.

Accidents occur whenever a woman is driving.

When women are subjected to such treatment, these kinds of apprehensions get attached to a girl's mind very early in her life. She is always surrounded by instructions of patriarchal norms who can quote her to be 'inauthentic' if she tries to break out from that circle. The derogatory statements directed towards women which are misogynistic in nature attributes 'position' to them. They also give birth to stereotypes in society which in return influences this nature of behavior towards the other group. In this case, *Positioning theory* is used by others to locate women which also draws moral implications for them.⁴ It also dwindles the fact of subjectivity.

The main issue that arises while building upon this thought is that people ground a social construct where these interactive practices are continuously created. Feminist researchers require an understanding of such categorizations on which these assumptions are based. To elucidate this idea, *Speech act theory* is used by Positionist theorists to understand that utterances state things.⁵

Langton proposes that there are forms of silencing corresponding to each of these sorts of speech acts. A person is locutionarily silenced if she is prevented from speaking, or intimidated into not speaking. A person is illocutionarily silenced if she is unable to carry out the acts that she intends to carry out in speaking. A person is perlocutionarily silenced when her speech cannot have its intended effects.⁶

The social world proposes to understand the communicating and controlling in its roles. She fears that such scenarios lead to the silencing of women during abuses hurled on them like sexual assault. At a time of understanding the *intention of the female speaker*, it is misinterpreted. When she asks for basic equality the audience dismisses them on the grounds of their oppressed state.

Discriminatory Writings

In terms of discrimination in literature, for example, we start by reading a book. We have certain expectations while reading it. Whatever thoughts we extract out from it, they have reminiscence of those who came before us or wrote with their standpoint. For Lorraine Code, this is a form of the heritage of norms that are passed on to us.⁷ She says that it is important to put the epistemic agent in the epistemic analysis to understand well its dimensions in the social world. In this sense, virtue epistemology requires an ethical dimension. Miranda Fricker talks about testimonial injustice where people with lesser credibility are heard less.⁸ She suggests that when faced with such domination, people must develop an 'oppositional epistemic agency' to resist such values. There are certain other characteristics of this quotient. Sometimes, the speaker becomes more favorable on others molds her statement to fit in which defeats the entire purpose of confrontation. Agreeing with the oppressor would give advancement to their already held beliefs which would be more difficult to demolish.

An individual's perspective is shaped by their social location. Henceforth, their world sets limits to their knowledge as it is a biased belief. This also affects the 'epistemic' position. Ex: a slave has an epistemic position concerning his master. He is unable to carve out a position for himself as it is difficult to possess a dual vision.

Gramsci's cultural hegemony, explains the conditioning of women which brings about their particular set of conduct.

The ruling class manipulates the culture of society. The universally valid dominant ideology justifies social, political, and economic status quo as natural and inevitably beneficial for every social class rather than as artificial social constructs that benefit only the ruling class.⁹

Joan Callahan lays down certain notes where it becomes essential to resist such dominant structures. According to Callahan, there are four conditions for an idea to be a feminist (theory or political movement is T):

1. T begins with the realization that women and other underrepresented beings as a group have been and are still in a subordinate position about men and other privileged groups.
2. T offers accounts of the sources of that subordination.
3. T is an activist in just the sense that it always involves a commitment to bringing that subordination to an end.
4. T offers strategies for overcoming that subordination.¹⁰

For Callahan, all these accounts stay independent of each other. One of the ways of forming cultural identity to form justice is to assert it among people in the social landscape. For women to exercise their freedom, it is necessary to create a balance between internal desires and external forces. The historical construction of the latter made by patriarchal institutions has to be resisted since these conditions are unsympathetic to their expressions.

Written accounts played a major role in misguiding people on the concept of women's culture. They are misguided as the writers do not have gone through of those first-hand experiences and are depicting merely based on account of an eyewitness. Expressions such as these give rise to racist and casteist speeches which also play a major role in their subordination. Women not only suffer because of the label of women but their journey becomes much more regressive as they have their belongingness to the nation, the community they belong to. The term 'Sex' constitutes of anatomical properties and 'Gender' constitutes social and cultural factors. Sally Haslanger uses the term analytical project where

the meaning of terms gender and women could be used to fight injustice. She posits that the world is socially constructed masculine so it is essential to make it less sexist¹¹. The most sought out framework is to manage everything on the intrinsic properties of patriarchy but it should be done on relational properties. Women are mostly oppressed on the factor of gender-based on their biological approach. Different properties are attributed to both male and female and the injustice lies that they are very much context-dependent. Those instantiations are based on biasness. Bell hooks say that those in the margins have to be given importance as being both in the privilege and resistance¹².

On the other hand, sometimes even women indulge in a stereotyped conversation about men on their talk on the sexuality of women. This all depends on the majoritarian cases we hear/ read or experience about sexual harassment cases based on an *illocutionary* act. But women generally do not have evidence against making it a subjective conversation. These are assumptions based on normative values placed on male heterosexuality. But there are other factors which put male heterosexuality on higher pedestals like marriage, inheritance, promotions at public and private workplaces.

These concepts also do injustice to transsexuals and homosexuals. There is an issue for transsexuals who identifies themselves as 'women' but are denied the right for it since they do not possess reproductive extensions. They face domination in virtue of the non-functional body features. The dividedness in their thoughts is subjected to a lot of criticism and ridicule. They are still not accepted in the essence of societal culture because their 'sexuality' does not adhere to the patriarchal rule. This does not apply to women but men as well. They too are expected to adhere to their definitional characteristics which are strong and aggressive. They are not expected to express themselves but just remain as a symbolic head. So, the term women cannot be included in any sense. This means that a single meaning cannot be applied here. The promotion of women in legal and institutional equality will help to close the gap of conflict between men and women. Contemporary society needs to accept this relativistic nature to be more 'inclusive' for everyone rather than just remain in an exclusive scenario.

Autonomy

The belief which is mostly imposed is that the reason to do something is based on the assertiveness to do it. This exhibits that authority is a form of social construction. If women do not resist the demeaning attitude directed towards them, then it legitimizes the actions of the perpetrators. To overcome this, it becomes necessary to implement self-determination. To exercise autonomy, an individual is influenced by inside and outside factors.

Internal factors relate to her actions in autonomy and external include social practices. Social influences form a foundational character and the influence of parents helps inculcate the perspective of authenticity. The moral framework helps in nurturing relationships with other....habits develop with practice and time. It is a kind of a comfort zone to escape from unpleasant setup.

They possess moral autonomy to do so since they should act as a moral obligation. In the gar of patriarchy, women sometimes make adaptive choices rather than authentic ones. They are also caused by infused gender hierarchy caused by expectancy and giving preferential treatment to men. This is based on income and power distribution. Women's work choices are directed mainly with a 'care' attitude. Therefore, the moral and political dynamism is based on moral and political choices made in day to day lives. Susan Babbitt argues that it is important to put one's well-being as the first choice. She claims that

When we consider the social dimensions of knowledge, it turns out that interdisciplinary research directed at social justice must involve epistemology and metaphysics, for there are

questions about what we know and how to organize what we know. Without tackling metaphysical and epistemological issues, we risk losing track of categories that help make injustice visible rather than invisible¹³

However, I do not advocate for an extreme approach rather a middle ground for the existence of women and men's proficiencies. There is a commitment by liberal feminism to term this issue into a universal human right. It is important to find a balance between individual and community as their association will produce a common good. The autonomy of individuals without community association is misleading and bare and vice-versa. The liberalist approach tries to reconcile these competing conceptions for a good life.

Conclusion

There is a strong historical layout of a male-female dichotomy. To construct a perspective on a social, political, psychological, and legal basis, it is necessary to grasp the situation of the 'other.' Deprivation of this will lead to a loss of authenticity with the moral implication in the functioning of society. Here, language plays a crucial role to understand the intention of the speaker and audience and shapes each other's thoughts. To safeguard the 'autonomy' of women it is necessary to strike a chord between her internal 'values' and external 'onuses.' Patriarchy subordinates both men and women as they are expected to behave in their defining characteristics. Non-resistance of unjustified actions legitimizes the norms. So, an objective value attached to particular sex is to accept its 'authenticity' without adulterating with interference.

Notes & References:

1. Anita Superson and Samantha Brennan, "Feminist Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition," *Hypatia* 20, no. 4 (2005): 3. Accessed July 6, 2020. www.jstor.org/stable/3810884.
2. Naomi Zach, "Can third wave feminism be inclusive," in *The Blackwell Guide to Feminist Philosophy*, ed. Linda Martin Alcoff and Eva Feder Kittay (Victoria: Australia, 2007), 204-205.
3. Sandra Harding, *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1991), 138-139.
4. "What is Positioning Theory," Positioning Theory Conference, University of Buffalo, accessed June 3, 2020, <http://www.buffalo.edu/clari/positioning-theory/background.html>
5. Sue Wilkinson and Celia Kitzinger, *Constructing Identities: A Feminist Conversation Analytic Approach to Positioning in Action*, accessed July 17, 2020, 158. https://www.academia.edu/297086/Constructing_Identities_A_Feminist_Conversation_Analytic_Approach_to_Positioning_In_Action
6. Rae Langton. "Speech Acts and Unspeakable Acts." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 22, no. 4 (1993): 296-298. Accessed July 17, 2020. www.jstor.org/stable/2265469.
7. Lorraine Code, *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and Construction of Knowledge*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 196.
8. Miranda Fricker, *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 1.

9. Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, ed. Joseph A (New York City: Columbia University Press, 1992), 235-238.
10. Joan Callahan, *Reproduction, Ethics, and the Law*, (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1996), 186.
11. Sally Haslanger, "Feminism and Metaphysics: Unmasking Hidden Ontologies", *APA Newsletter on Feminism and Philosophy* (Spring 2000), 4.
12. Bell Hooks, *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*, (Boston: South End Press, 1999), 112-117.
13. Anita Superson and Samantha Brennan, "Feminist Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition," *Hypatia* 20, no. 4 (2005): 7. Accessed July 6, 2020. www.jstor.org/stable/3810884.

Bibliography

- Callahan, Joan. *Reproduction, Ethics and the Law*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1996.
- Code, Lorraine. *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and Construction of Knowledge*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991)
- Fricker, Miranda (2009). *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Prison Notebooks*. ed. Joseph A. New York City: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Haslanger, Sally. "Feminism and Metaphysics: Unmasking Hidden Ontologies", *APA Newsletter on Feminism and Philosophy*. Spring 2000.
- Harding, Sandra. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Hooks, Bell. *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*, Boston: South End Press, 1999.
- Langton, Rae. "Speech Acts and Unspeakable Acts." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 22, no. 4 (1993): 293-330. Accessed August 6, 2020. www.jstor.org/stable/2265469.
- Superson, Anita and Samantha Brennan. "Feminist Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition." *Hypatia* 20, no. 4 (2005): 3. Accessed July 6, 2020. www.jstor.org/stable/3810884.
- University of Buffalo, "What is Positioning Theory." Positioning Theory Conference. Accessed June 3, 2020, <http://www.buffalo.edu/clari/positioning-theory/background.html>
- Wilkinson, Sue and Celia Kitzinger. *Constructing Identities: A Feminist Conversation Analytic Approach to Positioning in Action*. Accessed July 17, 2020. https://www.academia.edu/297086/Constructing_Identities_A_Feminist_Conversation_Analytic_Approach_to_Positioning_In_Action
- Zach, Naomi. "Can third wave feminism be inclusive." In *The Blackwell Guide to Feminist Philosophy*, edited by Linda Martin Alcoff and Eva Feder Kittay, 204-205. Victoria: Australia, 2007.

कृत्रिम भाषा में संकल्पनाओं के प्राकृतिकरण की संभावनाएं

प्रशान्त वर्मा एवं भावना

सारांश

भाषा हमारे विचारों का वाहक होती है। जिस प्रकार, हमारे विचारों का होना स्वाभाविक है, उसी प्रकार हमारी अभिव्यक्ति भी एक स्वाभाविक प्रक्रिया है। इस आलेख में न केवल इस प्रक्रिया को भाषा के द्वारा सरलता से समझने की कोशिश की गई है बल्कि अलग अलग भाषा में हमारे विचारों के स्थापन की प्रक्रिया पर भी बल दिया गया है। भाषा के द्वारा हमारे विचारों के प्रतिपादन में संकल्पनाएं एक महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका निभाती है। आलेख के द्वारा प्राकृतिक एवम् कृत्रिम भाषा में संकल्पनाओं की संभावनाओं की भी समीक्षा करने की भी चेष्टा की गई है।

अभिव्यक्ति हमेशा ही भाषा की केंद्रबिंदु रही है, भाषा विज्ञान ने इसे विशेष महत्व भी दिया है, ये भी एक कारण रहा होगा जिससे भाषाओं का विस्तारीकरण अभिव्यक्ति को ध्यान में रख कर ही होता आया है, अगर अभिव्यक्ति को एक प्रक्रिया के रूप में समझा जाए, तो संकल्पनाओं के बिना इस प्रक्रिया के बारे में बात करना असंभव प्रतीत होता है। संचार को सरल बनाने हेतु भाषा विज्ञान निरंतर भाषाओं में नई तकनीक का प्रयोग करता रहता है, जैसे संकेत, तस्वीरें, आवाजें इत्यादि। किसी भी विषय के बारे में बातचीत करने से पहले यह आवश्यक हो जाता है कि उसे उचित प्रकार से समझ लिया जाए। वास्तव में जब हम किसी वस्तु को देखते हैं तो हमारा दिमाग उसकी एक तस्वीर बना लेता है, जब हम दुबारा उस वस्तु को देखते हैं, तो यह तस्वीर हमें उस वस्तु के वास्तविक अस्तित्व को समझने में मदद करती है, असल में इस तस्वीर को ही संकल्पना कहते हैं।

संकल्पनाएं अभिव्यक्ति का एक अभिन्न अंग हैं और इसी प्रकार अभिव्यक्ति भाषा का। प्राकृतिक रूप से संचार के लिए भाषा को एक माध्यम के रूप में देखा जा सकता है, परंतु अक्सर संचार की प्रक्रिया को सरल बनाने के लिए भाषा, कृत्रिम संसाधनों को भी प्रयोग में लाती है।

इस आलेख के द्वारा तीन महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्नों की संभावनाओं की समीक्षा करने की चेष्टा की गयी है –

- 1) संकल्पनाएं क्या हैं?
- 2) कृत्रिम भाषा में संकल्पनाओं का क्या स्थान है?
- 3) क्या कृत्रिम भाषा में संकल्पनाओं का प्राकृतिकरण संभव है?

दर्शनशास्त्र एवं संकल्पनाएं

संकल्पनाओं को समझने के विभिन्न तरीके हो सकते हैं, ठीक उसी प्रकार जैसे उनके होने की कोई निश्चित प्रणाली तय नहीं की जा सकती है। संकल्पनाएं उन अमूर्त विचारों की तरह हो सकती हैं, जो हमारे मस्तिष्क में उत्पन्न होती रहती हैं, या मानव अनुभूति का एक इकाई मात्र हो सकती हैं। तत्व शास्त्र दृष्टिकोण से, पहला प्रश्न यह उठता है कि संकल्पनाएं क्या हैं?

सत्ता मीमांसा इसे दो प्रकार से देखता है।

1. संकल्पना एक अमूर्त वस्तु की तरह हो सकती है।
2. संकल्पनाओं का प्रतिनिधित्व केवल मानसिक विचारों से हो सकता है।

ये कहा जा सकता है कि अमूर्त विचारों के रूप में संकल्पनाओं का प्रभाव, मस्तिष्क, मतों, अवधारणाओं एवम् भाषा पर बहुत स्वाभाविक है। इन्हें हमारे विचारों एवं मतों की नींव के रूप में भी देखा जा सकता है। संकल्पनाएं अनुभूति की पहली इकाई होती हैं। यहां पर एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न यह उठता है कि क्या अनुभूति का होना संकल्पनाओं के द्वारा ही संभव है? औपचारिक दर्शन संकल्पनाओं को एक मॉडल, स्कीमाया कैटेगरी के रूप में भी देखता है। हालांकि अनुप्रयुक्त दर्शन इसे केवल विचारों तक ही सीमित कर देता है। उपर्युक्त प्रश्न तक पहुंचने से पहले, यह समझ लेना आवश्यक है कि संकल्पनाएं वास्तव में क्या हैं?

प्रकृतिवाद के अनुसार, संकल्पना एक मानसिक प्रतिनिधित्व हैं, जिसका इस्तेमाल भाषा के द्वारा किसी वस्तु के वर्गीकरण को निरूपित करने के लिए किया जाता है। ये कहा जा सकता है कि यह एक संकेत या संकेतों का एक समूह है जो मस्तिष्क में प्राकृतिक रूप से उत्पन्न होते रहते हैं। असल में, दैनिक जीवन में जिन तत्वों से हमारा सामना होता है उनका अनुमान लगाने में संकल्पनाएं हमारी मदद करती हैं। वास्तव में विचारों, मतों, धारणाओं, संदेह आदि का गढ़ा जाना, यहां तक कि उन्हें स्वीकार करना भी संकल्पनाओं के बिना संभव नहीं है।¹ इन तमाम गतिविधियों से होकर ही विषय को समझा जा सकता है इसलिए निश्चित ही यह कहा जा सकता है कि अनुभूति का होना संकल्पनाओं द्वारा ही संभव है। हालांकि यह कहना उचित नहीं होगा कि संकल्पनाएं निरूपण का प्रतिरूप हैं, वो मानसिक प्रतिनिधित्व का एक उपसमुच्चयमात्र हैं, जो अनुभूति की तमाम प्रक्रियाएं जैसे स्मृति, वर्गीकरण, विचारों के निर्माण, सीखने और समझने आदि को सरल बनाते हैं। संकल्पनाएं अक्सर हमारी दीर्घकालीन स्मृति में होती है, जो किसी वस्तु या विषय से त्वरित सामना होने पर, उनकी अनुभूति की प्रक्रिया को हमारे लिए सरल बनाती हैं। संकल्पनाओं का स्वतंत्र अस्तित्व नहीं होता, संभव है कि एक संकल्पना से होकर दूसरे तक पहुँचा जा सकता है। वास्तव में संकल्पनाएं अचेतन स्मृति से उन विषयों तक का सफर तय कर रही होती है, जिनका अनुभव दैनिक जीवन में किया जाता है। महान दार्शनिक अरस्तू कहते हैं कि कई बार स्वप्न में हम अपने दैनिक जीवन की क्रियाओं को अतीत से जुड़ी संकल्पनाओं से जोड़कर देखते हैं। ऐसी संकल्पनाएं अमूर्त होती हैं।

अमूर्त संकल्पनाएं

भाषा विज्ञान के अनुसार संकल्पनाओं का अमूर्त होना स्वाभाविक है। अर्थ विज्ञान का मानना है कि संकल्पनाएं मानसिक प्रतिनिधित्व न होकर मानव मस्तिष्क में अमूर्त विषयों का एक स्थाई श्रेणी हैं। अगर सरल शब्दों में समझा जाए तो संकल्पनाएं एक अमूर्त वस्तु का भौतिक चित्रण करती हैं। अमूर्त संकल्पनाओं को हम एक उदाहरण के द्वारा समझ सकते हैं, कलम एक वस्तु के रूप में, कलम, "एक वर्ग" जो कि इस पूरे समूह का प्रतिनिधित्व करती है उससे भिन्न होगा, प्लेटो के दर्शन के अनुसार, सेंसिबल सत्ता और इंटेलिजीबल सत्ता आपस में अलग हैं, यानि एक वस्तु का सुंदर होना, "सुंदरता" के आईडिया से जो कि इन वस्तुओं का वर्गीकरण करता है, उससे भिन्न होगा। ऐसी संकल्पनाएं जिनका, शाब्दिक प्रतिनिधित्व निर्धारित किया जा सके, उन्हें लेक्सिकल संकल्पनाएं कह सकते हैं।²

संकल्पनाओं का प्राकृतिकरण

अगर संकल्पनाओं के प्राकृतिक पहलुओं पर विचार किया जाए तो यह समझ जा सकता है कि संकल्पनाएं विचारों को वास्तविक सत्ता के रूप में प्रस्तुत करती हैं, जैसे वो वास्तव में कोई वस्तु, व्यक्ति, जानवर, पेड़ पौधे इत्यादि हों, प्राकृतिक रूप से संकल्पनाएं वास्तविक सत्ता के वैचारिक प्रतिनिधि का कार्य करती हैं। अमूर्त विचार जैसे, भाव (खुशी, दुख, संदेह, क्षोभ, घृणा, हास्य आदि) भी संकल्पनाओं के ही अधीन आते हैं। यह समझा जा सकता है कि संकल्पनाएं किसी वस्तु के अमूर्त होने प्रतीक मात्र है। उदाहरण, जब हम आसमान में चंद्रमा (एक संकल्पना) को देखते हैं तो यह मानते हैं कि आसमान में कोई चमकती सी गोलाकार वस्तु है। असल में संकल्पना किसी वस्तु के होने का प्रतीक है, यहां चंद्रमा की एक संकल्पना प्रतीकात्मक है, चंद्रमा के होने का।³

निगमनात्मक संकल्पनाएं

कांट मानते हैं कि मानव मस्तिष्क में जो संकल्पनाएं उत्पन्न होती हैं वो प्रायः शुद्ध एवम् निगनात्मक होती हैं। उनकी उत्पत्ति हमारे अनुभव, स्मृतियों, विचारों से न होकर हमारे मस्तिष्क में ही होती है। ऐसी संकल्पनाओं को कांट कैटेगरी का नाम देते हैं। कांट के अनुसार ऐसी 12 कोटियाँ हैं जो किसी विषय के प्रति हमारी समझ को प्रभावित करते हैं। सामान्यतः ये कोटियाँ विषय की गुणवत्ता, संख्या, लक्षण आदि के बारे में जानकारी देती हैं।⁴

संकल्पनाओं की प्रतीकात्मकता

फ्रेगे के अनुसार किसी भी भाषा में शब्दों का विश्लेषण दो चीजों के आधार पर किया जा सकता है—

- 1) वह किस चीज का बोध कराती है?
- 2) उसका प्रसंग क्या है?

फ्रेगे के अनुसार, किसी भी भाषा में शब्द का बोध उसकी अवस्था को बताता है, जैसे उस शब्द को प्रस्तुत किया जाता है। फ्रेगे कहते हैं, अगर हम उपर्युक्त मानकों के आधार पर संकल्पनाओं को समझते हैं तो हम निश्चित ही यह कह सकते हैं कि संकल्पनाएं (बोध के रूप में) अपनी एक सत्तात्मक पहचान रखते हैं।

संकल्पनाओं की संभावना

अगर हम संकल्पनाओं के बारे में बात कर सकते हैं तो निश्चित ही हम संकल्पनाओं की संकल्पना के बारे में भी बात कर सकते हैं, जैसे उनका प्रयोग, उनका अस्तित्व आदि। विटेंगेस्टीन कहते हैं, हम एक औजार पेटी में रखे औजारों के बारे में सोच सकते हैं, ऐसा करने पर हम ये पाएंगे की अलग अलग औजारों के विषय में सोचने पर हमारा ध्यान उनके कार्यों एवं प्रासंगिकता पर केंद्रित होता है, जो आपस में भिन्न है। ठीक इसी प्रकार संकल्पनाओं का निरूपण करने वाले शब्दों की प्रासंगिकता भी एक समान नहीं है। अगर हम दो या अधिक संकल्पनाओं की तुलना करते हैं तो संभव है कि उनमें बहुत थोड़ी या ना के बराबर समानता हो।⁵

पदार्थ एवम् संकल्पनाएं

किसी पदार्थ को पहचान पाने की व्यावहारिक क्षमता इस बात पर निर्भर करती है कि उसे कितने तरीकों से पहचाना जा सकता है। अगर अलग-अलग तरीकों को, परिस्थिति और आवश्यकता के अनुसार प्रयोग में लाया जा सकता है तब ऐसे में यहां ये समझना भी आवश्यक हो जाता है कि किन्हीं दो संकल्पनाओं के एक जैसे यानि एक समान होने के क्या मायने हो सकते हैं? हम यह कैसे कह सकते हैं कि कोई दो व्यक्ति किसी संकल्पना को समान दृष्टि से देख सकते हैं और इससे पहले क्या यह संभव हो सकता है?

एक उदाहरण के द्वारा इसे समझने की कोशिश करते हैं, दो व्यक्ति, जिन्होंने एक जैसे जूते खरीदे और उनके फीतों को बांधने की कोशिश करते हैं, दोनों ही अपने अपने तरीके से इसे करते हुए लगभग एक ही नतीजे पर पहुंचते हैं। क्या हम कह सकते हैं कि दोनों के द्वारा प्रयोग में लाई गई क्षमता एक ही है, क्योंकि दोनों एक ही नतीजे पर पहुंचते हैं? अक्सर समान क्षमता का निर्धारण समान नतीजों के आधार पर किया जाता है। यहां इस बात को समझना महत्वपूर्ण हो जाता है कि एक विषय को दो अलग-अलग संकल्पनाओं के माध्यम से किस प्रकार समझ सकते हैं? हम कह सकते हैं कि विषय का समान होना यह निर्धारित नहीं कर सकता कि उस विषय तक पहुंचने वाली संकल्पनाएं भी समान हैं। इस प्रकार हम यह कह सकते हैं कि हर संकल्पना अनेक संकल्पनाओं के बीच एक संकल्पना है।⁶

भाषा में संकल्पनाओं का स्थान

किसी भी विषय को समझने एवम् समझाने के लिए हमें एक भाषा की आवश्यकता होती है। वह भाषा ही है जो विषय विभिन्न पक्षों पर प्रकाश डालती है। भाषा वास्तव में विषय की समझ को हमारे लिये सरल बनाती है। किसी

विषय तक पहुंचने के लिए भाषा अनेक प्रकार के साधनों को उपयोग में लाती है। संकल्पनाओं का होना उनमें से एक है। किसी विषय के अलग-अलग पहलुओं को समझने के लिए उस वस्तु की संकल्पना का होना आवश्यक हो जाता है। हम कह सकते हैं कि किसी वस्तु जानने और समझने से पहले हम अपने दिमाग में उसका चित्रण करते हैं, ऐसा हम तब भी करते हैं, जब हमें किसी दूसरे व्यक्ति के समक्ष इसे व्यक्त करना हो। ऐसा करने के क्रम में भी हमारा मस्तिष्क पहले एक संकल्पना को गढ़ता है, जिसे वह भाषा के माध्यम से दूसरों तक पहुंचाता है। यहां यह संभव है कि संकल्पनाओं की विवेचना भी हमारा मस्तिष्क अलग-अलग तरीके से करता है। यह कहा जा सकता है कि भाषा एक प्राकृतिक माध्यम है जो संकल्पनाओं की वास्तविकता को सहज बनाती है, यह ठीक उसी प्रकार है जैसे प्रकाश के होने से हम किसी व्यक्ति या वस्तु के वास्तविक रूप को देख पाते हैं। जैसे ही हम किसी विषय के बारे में सुनते, पढ़ते या लिखते हैं, हमारा दिमाग पहले उसे अन्य विषयों से अलग पृथक करके देखता है और उसका एक सटीक चित्रण करता है, जिसे भाषा अभिव्यक्ति के द्वारा हम तक पहुंचाता है।

कृत्रिम भाषा में संकल्पनाएं

भाषा एक सिद्धांत पर कार्य करती है। प्रत्येक भाषा की एक संरचना होती है, जैसे लिपि को पढ़ा जाता है, वैसे ही भाषा का उच्चारण होता है। अलग-अलग, प्रांतीय एवम् राष्ट्रीय भाषा अलग-अलग सिद्धांतों पर आधारित होती हैं। प्रायः जब हम एक भाषा का दूसरे भाषा में अनुवाद करते हैं तो वह उसके सिद्धांतों के आधार पर ही होता है, यह संभव है कि एक योजनाबद्ध तरीके से किसी भाषा की संरचना और अर्जन को नियोजित करके हम एक कल्पित भाषा का निर्माण करे। किसी भी अन्य भाषा की तरह ऐसी भाषाएं भी एक सिद्धांत की तहत ही कार्य करती हैं। उदाहरण के तौर पर हम कंप्यूटर द्वारा इस्तेमाल की गई भाषा जैसे, जावा, पायथन आदि को समझ सकते हैं। इन भाषाओं का एक निर्धारित कोड या प्रोग्राम होते हैं जो इन्हें किसी अन्य भाषा से अधिक समावेशी बनाता है। एस्पेरांटो, नोवियाल जैसी कई ऐसी कृत्रिम भाषाएं भी हैं जो कई अन्य यूरोपीय भाषाओं के मदद से बनाई गई थीं। महान भाषा वैज्ञानिक नोआम चोम्स्की कहते हैं प्रत्येक भाषा की अपनी एक क्षमता होती है, जो उसमें अंतर्निहित होती है। चोम्स्की का मानना है कि किसी भी भाषा का अर्जन चरणों में होता है। हर भाषा एक "फ्री क्रिएशन" होती है। यहां तक कि उनकी विवेचना का आधार भी यही होता है, परंतु कोई भी भाषा एक निश्चित सिद्धांत के अभाव में कार्य नहीं कर सकती है। चोम्स्की इसे व्याकरण कहते हैं।

भाषा विज्ञान के कई सिद्धांत यह मानते हैं कि हम किसी भाषा को नकल के द्वारा सीख सकते हैं, यह वैसा ही है जैसे छोटे शिशु किसी भाषा को सीखना शुरू करते हैं। चोम्स्की इस सिद्धांत का खंडन करते हैं। उनका मानना है कि भाषा को सीखना या समझना बहुत स्वाभाविक होता है और यह एक चरणबद्ध तरीके से होता है। असल में हमारा किसी भाषा को सीखना भी एक पैटर्न की तहत होता है। चोम्स्की कहते हैं कि कई बार हम किसी शिशु को केवल व्याकरण या भाषा के स्वरूप की शिक्षा दे कर भाषा नहीं सिखा सकते। यह कहना कि भाषा का ज्ञान हमारे स्वभाव में होता है, पूरी तरह से उचित नहीं होगा। व्याकरण एवं भाषा के स्वरूप को समझना किसी भी भाषा का एक चरण हो सकता है। इसके अलावा कई ऐसे कारक हैं जो इस प्रक्रिया को प्रभावित करते हैं। भाषा सृजन के स्वरूप को एक प्रक्रिया के रूप में समझा जा सकता है। हम कह सकते हैं कि हमारा मस्तिष्क पहले किसी भाषा को सीखने के लिए निर्धारित सिद्धांत, व्याकरण, नियम आदि को पहले समझता है। इसके पश्चात हमारा मस्तिष्क उसकी संकल्पनाओं का चित्रण करता है, जिससे वह इसे विषय से जोड़ कर देखता है और अंत में हम विषय के बारे में अपनी समझ को भाषा के द्वारा अभिव्यक्त करते हैं। केवल हमारा मस्तिष्क ही नहीं, बल्कि हमारे द्वारा निर्मित, कंप्यूटर, रोबोट आदि जो संचार के लिए कृत्रिम भाषा को प्रयोग में लाते हैं, इसी कार्यप्रणाली का उपयोग करते हैं। निश्चित ही हम कह सकते हैं कि संकल्पनाओं को समझे बिना किसी भी भाषा को समझना सरल नहीं होगा।⁷

संचार के लिए भाषा की आवश्यकता केवल मानवों को ही नहीं होती, आपस में संचार या बातचीत को सरल बनाने के लिए पशु, पक्षी भी संकेतों का प्रयोग करते हैं। भाषा को मुख्य तौर पर एक आवश्यकता के रूप में देखा जा सकता है। हालांकि हम यह कह सकते हैं कि मानव में भाषा को समझने और विकसित करने की क्षमता अन्य

जीवों के मुकाबले कई अधिक होती है। मानव न केवल नई भाषाओं का निर्माण कर सकते हैं बल्कि उन्हें कई रचनात्मक तरीकों से प्रयोग में भी ला सकते हैं। असल में भाषा का विकास केवल संचार के लिए ही हो यह आवश्यक नहीं, मनुष्य भाषा के माध्यम से न केवल एक दूसरे के विचार एवम् अनुभवों को साझा करता है बल्कि अपने आसपास के वातावरण की समझ को भी विकसित करता है।⁸

यह सही है कि हम अपनी मातृभाषा को बड़ी ही सरलता से समझ लेते हैं, किन्तु यह भी सही है कि हम किसी भी नई भाषा को समझने या विकसित करने की क्षमता भी रखते हैं। ऐसा इसलिए क्योंकि आनुवंशिक रूप से ही हममें भाषा के बुनियादी ढांचे की समझ होती है, जिसका आधार संकल्पनाओं के बिना बनाना संभव नहीं है। भाषा वैज्ञानिकों का मानना है कि भाषाएं कितनी भी अलग क्यों ना हों, उनमें कुछ तत्व समान होते हैं, हम कह सकते हैं कि प्रत्येक भाषा का एक व्याकरण होता है, जिसे हम अलग अलग अंगों में तोड़कर समझ सकते हैं। हम इसे ऐसे समझ सकते हैं कि भाषा कितनी भी कठिन हो हम उसे एक निश्चित व्याकरण या शब्द व्यवस्था के द्वारा ही समझने की कोशिश करते हैं।

उपसंहार

यदि हम आलेख के शुरुआत में उठाए गए तीन प्रश्नों को पुनः देखें तो हम हम पाएंगे, हमारे तीनों प्रश्न एक दूसरे का हिस्सा हैं, सरल शब्दों में समझा जाए तो एक ही प्रक्रिया का हिस्सा हैं, और वह प्रक्रिया है अभिव्यक्ति की और जिस प्रकार भाषा अभिव्यक्ति का माध्यम है, उसी प्रकार संकल्पनाएं संचार का। भाषा कोई भी हो संकल्पनाएं उसका नींव होती है। हम यह भी कह सकते हैं कि विकास के दृष्टिकोण से हर भाषा हमारे द्वारा ही निर्मित है, जैसे जैसे भाषा विकसित होती है, संकल्पनाओं का भी विकास होता है, परन्तु कल्पित होते हुए भी जिस प्रकार भाषा को सीखना हमारे लिए सहज एवम् प्राकृतिक होता है, उसी प्रकार भाषा के निर्माण में संकल्पनाओं की भूमिका भी स्वतः सिद्ध है।

यह ऐसे समझा जा सकता है, आप जब इस आलेख को पढ़ेंगे आपका मस्तिष्क उसे समझने का प्रयास करेगा, असल में यह भी एक संचार की प्रक्रिया है और हमारी और आपकी समझ का आधार ही संकल्पनाएं हैं।

टिप्पणियाँ:

1. Heaney, Michael. 2013. "Frege and the German background to analytic philosophy." In *The Oxford handbook of the history of analytic philosophy*. Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX26DP.
2. Fennel, John. 2019. "Classical empiricism and the problem of a priori." In *A critical introduction to philosophy of language*, 40. London: Routledge.
3. Mendola, Joseph. 2008. "Language truth and inference." In *Anti externalism*, 254-255. New York: Oxford University press.
4. पॉल गुयेर. 2010. "द डिडक्शन ऑफ कैटेगिरी." द कैम्ब्रिज कम्पैनियन टू कान्ट क्रिटिक ऑफ प्योर रीजन में, 118. न्यूयॉक: कैम्ब्रिज यूनिवर्सिटी प्रेस.
5. आरिफ अहमद. 2010. "मीजर फॉर मीजर." विट्गेन्स्टाइन फिलोसोफिकल इन्वेस्टिगेशन में, 49-52. मेलबोर्न: कैम्ब्रिज यूनिवर्सिटी प्रेस.
6. आरिफ अहमद. 2010. "डिडक्टिव ईनफरेंस एंड एस्पेक्ट परसेप्शन." विट्गेन्स्टाइन फिलोसोफिकल इन्वेस्टिगेशन में, 218. मेलबोर्न: कैम्ब्रिज यूनिवर्सिटी प्रेस.

7. Chomsky, Noam. 1999. "The mirror of mind." In *Idea and Ideal*, 42-47. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
8. फ़ैबियो गिरोनी. 2018. "हाऊ टू नो डेट वी नो." द लीगेसी ऑफ कान्ट इन सेलर्स एंड मेलास्सौक्स में, 107–109. न्यूयॉर्क: राउटलेज.

Contributors to this Issue

Dr. Mudasir Ahmad Tantray, Assistant professor at Govt. M. A. M College Jammu.

Dr. Soma Chakraborty , Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, East Calcutta Girls' College, WB.

Mr. Tariq Rafeeq Khan, Assistant Professor at Govt. Degree College Boys, Pulwama.

Mr. Ifrah Mohi ud din Rather, Pursing Masters in English Language and Literature at Islamic University of Science and Technology Awantipora J&K.

Dr. Bhaskar Bhattacharyya, Sr. Assistant Professor, Philosophy, School of Social Sciences, K. K. Handiqui State Open University, Assam.

Ms. Jeuti Devi , Assistant Professor, St John College, Dimapur and Research scholar, Cotton University, Guwahati.

Dr. Manoranjan Mallick , Assistant Professor, P.G. Department of Philosophy, Utkal University, Vani Vihar, Bhubaneswar, Odisha.

Mr. Rajan, Research Scholar, Dept. of Philosophy and Religion, BHU, Varanasi.

Ms. Suyasha Singh, Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy, University of Delhi.

प्रशान्त वर्मा शोधार्थी दर्शन शास्त्र विभाग, दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय

भावना परास्नातक, दर्शन शास्त्र विभाग , दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय

Instructions to the Contributors

Lokāyata: Journal of Positive Philosophy (ISSN 2249-8389) welcomes contributions in all areas of research proposed by the Centre. All articles are sent to experts who evaluate each paper on several dimensions such as originality of the work, scientific argument, and English style, format of the paper, references, citations and finally they comment on suitability of the article for the particular Journal. In case of review articles the importance of the subject and the extent the review is comprehensive are assessed. Prospective authors are expected that before submitting any article for publication they should see that it fulfills these criteria. The improvement of article may be achieved in two ways (i) more attention to language (ii) more attention to the sections of the article.

Format of Submission: The paper should be typewritten preferably in Times New Roman with 12 font size (English) and Kruti Dev (10) with 14 font size (Hindi) in MS-Word 2003 to 2010 and between 2500 to 3000 words. They should be typed on one side of the paper, **double spaced** with ample margins. The authors should submit the hard copy along with a CD and a copyright form to be sent to the editorial address.

Time Line: The last dates of submission of the manuscript are as follows:

For April to September Issue: 31st August every year.

For October to March Issue: 31st January every year.

Reference Style:

Notes and references should appear at the end of the research paper/chapter. Citations in the text and references must correspond to each other; do not over reference by giving the obvious/old classic studies or the irrelevant. CPPIS follows *The Chicago Manual of Style, 16th Edition*. *The Chicago Manual of Style* presents two basic documentation systems: (1) notes and bibliography and (2) author-date. Choosing between the two often depends on subject matter and the nature of sources cited, as each system is favored by different groups of scholars. The notes and bibliography style is preferred by many in the humanities. The author-date system has long been used by those in the physical, natural, and social sciences. CPPIS follows the first system i.e. Notes and Bibliography.

You can visit the following link to download our “**CPPIS Manual for Contributors and Reviewers**” for further instructions:

<http://cppispublishations.wordpress.com>

CPPIS, Pehowa (Kurukshetra)

Centre for Positive Philosophy and Interdisciplinary Studies (CPPIS) Pehowa is a joint academic venture of *Milestone Education Society (Regd.) Pehowa* and *Society for Positive Philosophy and Interdisciplinary Studies (SPPIS), Haryana* (online) to do fundamental research in the field of Humanities and Social Sciences.

SPPIS Newsletter

The Centre also circulates a Newsletter, which includes new information related to events, new articles and programme details. One can register himself on the below given address and will get regular updates from us.

Link for registration:

<http://positivephilosophy.webs.com/apps/auth/signup>

All contributions to the Journal, other editorial enquiries and books for review are to be sent to:

Dr. Desh Raj Sirswal,
Chief-Editor, *Lokāyata: Journal of Positive Philosophy*,
Centre for Positive Philosophy and Interdisciplinary Studies (CPPIS),
Pehowa, Distt. Kurukshetra (HARYANA)-136128 (India)
Mobile No.09896848775, 08288883993
E-mail: cppiskkr@gmail.com, mse.02@gmail.com
Website: <http://lokayatajournal.webs.com>

“My objective is to achieve an intellectual detachment from all philosophical systems, and not to solve specific philosophical problems, but to become sensitively aware of what it is when we philosophise.”
- Dr. Desh Raj Sirswal

