Chapter 1
The Nature of Philosophical Inquiry

Fig. 1.1 Messier 81 (NASA, JPL)

1.1 Ideas of Interest from “Nature of Philosophical Inquiry”

1. How is philosophy provisionally defined in this chapter? Contrast this definition with a definition of the term from an unabridged dictionary or an encyclopedia.

2. In what ways does Alexander Calandra’s “Barometer Story” illustrate a philosophical approach to a practical problem? What do you think are some of the differences between investigating methods for solving a problem and applying a method for solving a problem?

3. Compare and contrast the disciplines of philosophy and science. Provide some specific examples of typical problems illustrating the differences.

4. Characterize each of the three main branches of philosophy. Formulate a brief example of your own illustrating a typical problem from each branch.
5. Can the existing things making up the world be accurately represented by language? Is language inherently flawed to represent reality precisely? Do you think the particular language used by an individual affects that individual’s perception of reality?

1.2 Characterization of Philosophy

One reasonably good beginning characterization of philosophy is that philosophy is the sustained inquiry into the principles and presuppositions of any field of inquiry. As such, philosophy is not a subject of study like other fields of knowledge. *Any* given field of inquiry can have philosophical roots and extensions. From the philosophy of restaurant management to the philosophy of physics, philosophy can be characterized as an attitude, an approach, or perhaps, even sometimes a calling, to ask, answer, or comment upon certain kinds of questions. These questions involve the nature, scope, and boundaries of practically any field of interest in the humanities, arts, and sciences. Philosophy is often concerned with the assumptions upon which a field of inquiry is based, and these questions directly relate to the results discovered in that field of inquiry. In general, then, philosophy is both an activity involving thinking about these kinds of ultimate questions and an activity involving the construction of sound reasons or insights into our most basic assumptions about understanding our lives and our place in the universe.

Quite often, simply asking a series of “why-questions” can reveal these basic presuppositions. Children often ask such questions, sometimes to the annoyance of their parents, in order to get a feel for the way the world works. Asking an exhaustive sequence of why-questions can reveal principles upon which life is based. As a first example, let us imagine the following dialogue between two persons as to why one of them is reading an art history book. The character Samantha is playing “devil’s advocate.”

*Samantha:* “Why are you reading *Art through the Ages*?”

*Stephen:* “It’s an assigned book in my art history class, one of my college courses.”

*Samantha:* “Why are you taking art history?”

*Stephen:* “Well, it fulfills the humanities elective.”

*Samantha:* “Why do that elective?”

---

1 Occasionally, a major aspect of philosophy is its role as a metadiscipline. Just as, for example, philosophical psychology is a metadiscipline, so likewise is philosophy of philosophy a metadiscipline—a study of a study, so to speak. Nevertheless, “anti-philosophies,” such as those rejecting the use of reasoning and logic, are not metaphilosophies but are normally considered part of philosophy.
At this point in the dialogue, a growing resemblance to the insatiable curiosity of some children is beginning to be unmistakable. We continue with the cross-examination.

*Stephen:* “I have to fulfill the humanities elective in order to graduate.”
*Samantha:* “Why do you want to graduate?”
*Stephen:* “What? Well, you need a degree to get a decent job paying a decent salary.”
*Samantha:* “Well, why, then, do you want that?”

Undoubtedly, now the conversation begins to appear artificial to many college-age persons because the goal of graduating college is about as far as they have thought life through, if indeed they have thought that far. And so for such persons this is where the questioning would normally stop. Many other persons, however, see beyond their university studies to more basic ends, such as Stephen’s desire for an interesting vocation with sufficient recompense, among other things. Even so, we have not yet arrived at the kind of basic presuppositions we are alluding to for Stephen’s life, so we continue with Samantha’s questioning.

*Stephen:* “What do you mean? A decent job which pays well will enable the resources to enjoy life where I can have a life of some significance.”
*Samantha:* “Why do you want a life like that?”
*Stephen:* “Huh? Are you serious?”

When why-questions finally seem gratuitous, very often, we have reached one of those ultimate fundamental unquestioned assumptions. In this case, a basic principle by which Stephen lives his life seems to be based on seeking happiness, which he more or less equates with enjoying a life of some significance. So, in a sense, although he might not be aware of it at the moment, he believes he is partly working toward this goal by reading art history. Of course, this choice of a means to obtain happiness could be mistaken or perhaps even chosen in ignorance—in which case he might not be able to capture what he wants out of life. If the thought occurs to you that sometimes we might make excellent, knowledgeable choices yet not achieve what we desire, but still have a full, rich, and absorbing life, then you are already thinking philosophically.

If we assume that Samantha is genuinely asking questions here with no ulterior motives, then it is evident that her why-questions expose a basic presupposition upon which Stephen bases his life. Perhaps, she thinks the quest for a well-paying job is mistaken or by itself is insufficient for an excellent life. Indirectly, she might be assuming that other fundamental values are more important. If the questioning were to continue between Samantha and Stephen, it quite possibly could go along the lines of questioning these and other presuppositions upon which a life of excellence can be based.
In philosophy more generally, these kinds of why-questions are often about the assumptions, presuppositions, postulates, or definitions upon which a field of inquiry is based, and these questions can be concerned with the meaning, significance, or integration of the results discovered or proposed by that field of inquiry.

For example, the answer “Gravity” is often thought to be a meaningful answer to the why-question, “Why do objects fall toward the center of the earth?” But for this answer to be meaningful we would have to know what gravity is. If one were to answer gravity is “a kind of force,” or “an attraction” between two objects, then such a paraphrase gives no insight into the nature of the phenomenon, because the paraphrase is viciously circular.

Many scientists hold the view, in the words of legendary physicist and Nobel Laureate Richard Feynman, “If we know the rules, we consider that we ‘understand’ the world.” In our example, the classical rules for gravity are:

... every object in the universe attracts every other object with a force which for any two bodies is proportional to the mass of each and varies inversely as the square of the distance between them.

... an object responds to a force by accelerating in the direction of the force by an amount that is inversely proportional to the mass of the object...

Yet, there must be more to understanding gravity than this. Consider a mentalist who stands before a door and concentrates deeply. Suppose the door opens, and no one, neither scientist nor magician, is able to see how the mentalist accomplishes the opening of the door.

We ask the mentalist, “How did you do that?”

The mentalist responds, “Smavity.”

---

Our characterization here omits what are sometimes termed “anti-philosophies” such as postmodernism, a philosophy opposing the possibility of objective or truthful understanding of the world, and existentialism, a group of philosophies dismissing the notion that the universe is in any sense systematically rational, coherent, or intelligible. The characterization of philosophy proposed in the text is provisionally used as a stalking horse for our first approach to the discipline.

Richard P. Feynman, et. al., The Feynman Lectures on Physics, (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1963), I: § 2-1.

Ibid, § 7-1.
We reply, “What is ‘smavity’?”
The mentalist says, “Smavity is a force—an attraction between me and the door.”

Further suppose a team of physicists on the scene observes the foregoing, performs an extensive series of experiments, and concludes:

Following the mentalist’s commands, the door moves with a measured force proportional to the mass of each varying inversely as the square of the distance after adjusting for the masses of relevant other objects.

Fig. 1.3 Gravity Wave Measurements in the Upper Atmosphere over North America (NASA. JPL)

And, let us continue our thought-experiment by supposing the same results are obtained by independent researchers under enough different circumstances to rule out deception or coincidence. Thus, the charge of non causa pro causa cannot be made. From a philosophical point of view, even

5 Often scientists are perturbed at the simple mindedness of thought-experiments like this one. However, such examples are preferred by philosophers because they avoid the unnecessary complexity of applicable examples such as citing the teleportation of information with paired photons over 100 kilometers by quantum entanglement.

6 Non causa pro causa, literally translated as “no cause for a cause” is one of a variety of fallacies more generally named “False Cause.” From the fact that one state of affairs occurs after a previous state of affairs, we are normally not justified
though we “know the rules” in the case of smavity, we do not “understand”
the phenomenon. Elsewhere, Feynman writes:

I learned very early the difference between knowing the name of something
and knowing something.

Philosophy also involves discovering novel or different assumptions or presup-
positions as reasons for the explanation of natural phenomena. For example, the ques-
tioning of the fifth postulate of Euclid, the so-called parallel postulate, led to the
development of non-Euclidean geometries which either assume the extension of paral-
lel lines move away from each other (Bolyai-Lobachevskian geometry) or assume they
move closer and closer until they intersect (Riemannian elliptic geometry). Albert Einstein used the latter geometry for
the general theory of relativity. He expressed his supposition for the applica-
tion of non-Euclidian geometry in this manner:

[A]s far as the propositions of mathematics refer to reality, they are not
certain; and as far as they are certain, they do not refer to reality.

A similar example is Galileo’s questioning of
Aristotle’s assumption that heavier bodies fall
faster than lighter bodies of similar shape.
It was Galileo’s test of this hypothesis from
the Tower of Pisa which led to more mod-
ern theories of gravitation—assumptions which
helped to establish new fields of knowledge.

The application and reinterpretations of the re-
sults and discoveries from different fields of
inquiry often properly belong to the domain
of philosophy as well—even though the in-
vestigators have no formal philosophic train-
ing.

on the basis of that single occurrence to conclude that the first causes the second
to occur. In actual scientific practice, it is often difficult to distinguish between
coincidence and causation.

9 Yet, Aristotle’s view makes some sense in that heavier bodies of the same shape
do fall faster when air resistance is a factor.
1.2 Characterization of Philosophy

These types of philosophical why-questions can be drawn from virtually any field of study. For example, within the compass of aesthetics, Plato, Joshua Reynolds, and Arthur Danto understand art as the representation of an ideal form of beauty, whereas Author Schopenhauer, John Stuart Mill, Walter Pater, and George Santayana view art terms of its moving emotional affects. And Francis Hutchenson and Clive Bell view art as something unique—not reducible to any other forms of intellectual or emotional experience. So when William Morris creates decoration or Henri Matisse paints geometrical abstractions or Andy Warhol draws Brillo boxes, the philosophical question naturally arises, “So, why is this art?,” since these works do not seem to represent any of the definitions or artistic assumptions expressed in the viewpoints previously maintained.

Many of these kinds of foundational questions are specifically investigated in the philosophy of the discipline under study. Since philosophical questioning covers so much territory, some people characterize a philosophical problem as any question that does not have a well-established method of solution, but that definition is undoubtedly too broad.

This spirit of the nature of philosophical inquiry can be clarified by the following excerpt from the Alexander Calandra’s apocryphal story of the barometer problem in a physics examination. This oft-quoted account illustrates striking ingenuity for creative problem solving; ultimately, however, his account catalogs admittedly standard, though clever, methods of thinking. Philosophical thinking begins when we are frustratingly confused as to how to go about seeking an answer to a question when no methods of solution yet exist. After conceptual reframing of the problem at hand, ingenious proposals can end with the wide variety of solutions, as those summarized here by Alexander Calandra in his barometer story.

1.2.1 Alexander Calandra’s Barometer Problem

Some time ago I received a call from a colleague who asked if I would be the referee on the grading of an examination question. He was about to give a student a zero for his answer to a physics question, while the student claimed...
he should receive a perfect score and would if the system were not set up
against the student. The instructor and the student agreed to submit this to
an impartial arbiter, and I was selected.

I went to my colleague’s office and read the examination question, “Show
how it is possible to determine the height of a tall building with the aid of a
barometer.”

The student had answered, “Take a barometer to the top of the building, attach a long rope
to it, lower the barometer to the street and then bring it up, measuring the length of the rope.
The length of the rope is the height of the building.”

I pointed out that the student really had a
strong case for full credit since he had answered
the question completely and correctly. On the
other hand, if full credit was given, it could
well contribute to a high grade for the student in his physics course. A high grade is sup-
pposed to certify competence in physics, but the
answer did not confirm this. I suggested that
the student have another try at answering the
question. I was not surprised that my colleague
agreed, but I was surprised that the student
did.

I gave the student six minutes to answer the ques-
tion with the warning that the answer should show
some knowledge of physics. At the end of five min-
utes, he had not written anything. I asked if he
wished to give up, but he said no. He had many
answers to this problem; he was just thinking of the
best one. I excused myself for interrupting him and
asked him to please go on. In the next minute he
dashed off his answer which read, “Take the barometer to the top of the
building and lean over the edge of the roof. Drop that barometer, timing its
fall with a stopwatch. Then using the formula $S = \frac{1}{2} (at^2)$, calculate the
height of the building.”

At this point I asked my colleague if he would give up. He conceded, and
I gave the student almost full credit.
In leaving my colleague’s office, I recalled that the student had said he had many other answers to the problem, so I asked him what they were. “Oh yes,” said the student. “There are a great many ways of getting the height of a tall building with a barometer. For example, you could take the barometer out on a sunny day and measure the height of the barometer and the length of its shadow, and the length of the shadow of the building and by the use of a simple proportion, determine the height of the building.”

“Fine,” I asked. “And the others?”

“Yes,” said the student. “There is a very basic measurement method that you will like. In this method you take the barometer and begin to walk up the stairs. As you climb the stairs, you mark off the length of the barometer along the wall. You then count the number of marks, and this will give you the height of the building in barometer units. A very direct method.”

“Of course, if you want a more sophisticated method, you can tie the barometer to the end of a string, swing it as a pendulum, and determine the value of ‘g’ at the street level and at the top of the building. From the difference of the two values of ‘g’ the height of the building can be calculated.”

Finally, he concluded, there are many other ways of solving the problem. “Probably the best,” he said, “is to take the barometer to the basement and knock on the superintendent’s door. When the superintendent answers, you speak to him as follows, ‘Mr. Superintendent, here I have a fine barometer. If you tell me the height of this building, I will give you this barometer.’”

At this point I asked the student if he really did know the conventional answer to this question. He admitted that he did, said that he was fed up with high school and college instructors trying to teach him how to think, using the “scientific method”...  

1.3 Main Divisions of Philosophy

The difference is between philosophy and the sciences may well be wondered. The following excerpts from the entry “Philosophy” in the author-

---


11 This question is taken up in more detail in our reading from Bertrand Russell’s *Problems of Philosophy* in chapter ?? “Bertrand Russell, “Enlargement of Self.”
The Nature of Philosophical Inquiry

In distinguishing philosophy from the sciences, it may not be amiss at the outset to guard against the possible misunderstanding that philosophy is concerned with a subject-matter different from, and in some obscure way transcending, the subject-matter of the sciences. Now that psychology, or the observational and experimental study of mind, may be said to have been definitively included among the positive sciences, there is not even the apparent ground which once existed for such an idea. Philosophy, even under its most discredited name of metaphysics, has no other subject-matter than the nature of the real world, as that world lies around us in everyday life, and lies open to observers on every side. But if this is so, it may be asked what function can remain for philosophy when every portion of the field is already lotted out and enclosed by specialists? 

The approach being suggested, namely that of synoptic philosophy, is further explained as follows:

Philosophy claims to be the science of the whole; but, if we get the knowledge of the parts from the different sciences, what is there left for philosophy to tell us? To this it is sufficient to answer generally that the synthesis of the parts is something more than that detailed knowledge of the parts in separation . . . It is with the ultimate synthesis that philosophy concerns itself; it has to show that the subject-matter which we are all dealing with in detail really is

---


13 The discipline of psychology in the 19th century was designated as mental philosophy. Eds.
1.3 Main Divisions of Philosophy

a whole, consisting of articulated members. Evidently, therefore, the relation existing between philosophy and the sciences will be, to some extent, one of reciprocal influence. *EB*

A. S. Pringle-Pattison, the author of this entry, is pointing out the unifying and systematizing methods of philosophy for other disciplines. The coherence of the whole is made possible by consistent fundamental principles. He continues:

The sciences may be said to furnish philosophy with its matter, but philosophical criticism reacts upon the matter thus furnished, and transforms it. Such transformation is inevitable, for the parts only exist and can only be fully, i.e. truly, known in their relation to the whole. A pure specialist, if such a being were possible, would be merely an instrument whose results had to be co-ordinated and used by others....

This task of co-ordination, in the broadest sense, is undertaken by philosophy; for the philosopher is essentially what Plato, in a happy moment, styled him, συνοπτικός the man who takes a “synoptic” or comprehensive view of the universe as a whole. The aim of philosophy (whether fully attainable or not) is to exhibit the universe as a rational system in the harmony of all its parts; and accordingly the philosopher refuses to consider the parts out of their relation to the whole whose parts they are. Philosophy corrects in this way the abstractions which are inevitably made by the scientific specialist, and may claim, therefore, to be the only “concrete” science, that is to say, the only science which takes account of all the elements in the problem, and the only science whose results can claim to be true in more than a provisional sense. *EB*

This conception of philosophy accords with, but is considerably narrower than, the depiction made more recently by the American Philosophical Association:

> Philosophy is fundamentally a matter of the cultivation and employment of analytic, interpretive, normative and critical abilities. It is less content- and technique-specific than most other academic disciplines. The basic aim of education in philosophy is not and should not be primarily to impart information. Rather it is to help students to understand various kinds of deeply difficult intellectual problems, to interpret texts regarding these problems, to analyze and criticize the arguments found in them, and to express themselves in ways that clarify and carry forward reflection upon them.*[4]*

These foundational and unifying aspects of philosophy form the characteristics of our beginning study of philosophical inquiry in this introductory set of readings. It is paramount to point out however that this starting point does not capture “the be-all and end-all” of philosophy.

Commencing about the time of the 6th century B.C.E. in the Western world, all arts and sciences are considered part of philosophical inquiry. The

---

role of philosophy in the development of scientific inquiry in particular is indicated by recognizing that the first thinkers in nearly all fields of knowledge were assumed to be doing some form of philosophy. The various sciences developed from the philosophical speculations and investigations of these early thinkers. For example, Aristotle’s writing essentially founds biology as a science in a work made available in Latin by Albertus Magnus in his *De Animalibus*; Isaac Newton entitles his 1687 work establishing the foundation of classical physics *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica*; John Dalton’s 1808 *New System of Chemical Philosophy* re-introduces atomic theory; Auguste Comte’s 1826 multi-volume *Cours de Philosophie Positive* projects the development of sociology; and in 1867, William Thompson unifies physics in his and Peter Tait’s *Treatise of Natural Philosophy* Not surprisingly, many of the works of the early founders of sciences have some form of the word “philosophy” as part of the title.

In 17th and 18th-century England and the American Colonies, the curriculum of many colleges divides among three central areas: mental philosophy (mathematics and logic), natural philosophy (the natural sciences), and moral philosophy (ethical, social, and political studies). In 1835, Oxford Professor R. D. Hampden describes moral philosophy as including the facts and laws of human nature, ethics, natural theology, rhetoric, social relations, politics, history, and education, among others—in a word, moral philosophy was seen as “the philosophy conversant about human things”\(^\text{15}\). The curriculum at some colleges in the United States as late as the first years of the 20th century was constituted by subjects in either moral or natural philosophy. The Ph.D., the doctor of philosophy degree, originating in the early 19th century in Germany, was the first degree in the Western world to require publication of original research in the humanities or sciences. Even today, the Ph.D., the doctor of philosophy degree, is offered as a research degree in many countries in virtually all of the different disciplines in the arts and sciences, including the discipline of philosophy.

Traditionally philosophical questions are grouped into three or four areas which are very briefly characterized below with several examples. Given the nature of philosophical inquiry, as indicated above, these traditional areas are, of course, interdependent. Each kind of philosophical inquiry has characteristics implicitly entailing other areas; indeed, philosophical problems are rarely, if ever, limited to just one branch of the discipline. Indeed, as we will see, the central issues in these traditional divisions of philosophy have changed to a significant degree as the special disciplines have emerged from

\(^{15}\) Renn Dickson Hampden, *A Course of Lectures Introductory to the Study of Philosophy* (London: B. Fellowes: 1835), 38. The term “psychology” supplanted “mental philosophy” in the mid to late 19th century; Auguste Comte introduced use of the term “sociology” in mid 19th century.
their first conception by early philosophers.

The major branches of philosophy are designated epistemology (theory of knowledge), metaphysics (theory of reality), and axiology (theory of value). Since the term “axiology” is a rarely used outside of the discipline of philosophy, and axiology consists almost entirely of the studies of ethics and aesthetics, many reference books simplify the divisions of philosophy into four main branches rather than the three mentioned above: (1) epistemology, (2) metaphysics, (3) aesthetics, and (4) ethics.

### 1.3.1 Epistemology: The Study of Knowledge

Epistemology as a discipline includes the subjects of the nature of knowledge and the extent of knowledge, given its possibility. The question as to whether or not something can be known with absolute certainty and the question as to whether or not some things are unknowable, are central concerns of epistemology. The challenge of skepticism, a doctrine essentially implying no statement can justifiably be known beyond any doubt whatsoever, is a recurrent problem in the historical development of epistemological theories.

(1) **Epistemology** (theory of knowledge): the inquiry into what knowledge is, what can be known, and what lies beyond our understanding; the investigation into the origin, structure, methods, and validity of justification and knowledge; the study of the interrelation of reason, truth, and experience.

As an arresting example of a straightforward epistemological problem, consider the lottery paradox, an argument occasionally used to support skepticism, the doctrine that genuine knowledge is impossible. Some persons believe nothing in this life can be certain, anything is possible, and nothing is "for sure." Even if we do not accept radical skepticism, supposedly on this view, the best that we can do as human beings is to justify our beliefs in terms of their probability. This would imply we could be justified in believing something is true if it is highly probable, but we would not be justified in believing something if it has a very low probability of being true. Of course, this kind of justification cannot lead to certainty or knowledge in a deductive sense.\(^{16}\)

Let’s examine these assumptions more carefully in the following context. Suppose we, with thousands of other persons, enter a fair-ticket lottery. Since

---

\(^{16}\) A valid deductive argument is one in which the conclusion follows necessarily from its premise or premises, and the conclusion can be known to be true with absolute certainty, if the premise or premises are known to be true with absolute certainty.
the probability of our winning the lottery is quite low, on the above assumption, we would be fully justified in believing that we will not win.

What’s more, since all ticket-holders have exactly the same chance to win as we do, on the grounds of the same assumption, we would be fully justified in believing that none of these persons, considered individually, will win either. Thus, taking both of these beliefs together, we are justified in concluding that no one will win, since the probability of any person having the winning ticket is quite low.\footnote{17}

Of course, we know at the same time that the so-defined ”reasonable” belief is mistaken because, by definition, in a fair lottery, one ticket is selected to win. The ”lottery paradox” is intended to illustrate the point that knowledge in an absolute sense cannot result directly from experimental or empirical evidence alone, since any conclusion would be probable because it would arise from probable premises. Hence, on this view, all statements based on experience are fallible.

Another perplexing example illustrating an epistemological issue is Bertrand Russell’s Five-Minute World Hypothesis. Russell points out that our remembrance of an event occurs entirely in the present moment, and consequently the memory is neither physically nor logically connected to the event itself. Suppose the universe were suddenly created \textit{ex nihilo} five minutes ago, just as the world actually existed five minutes ago in all of its limitless detail—people, places, and things complete with memories, historical and geological records, and so forth.\footnote{18} At the moment of creation, the universe would have all the evidence of being billions of years old already "packed in" during the creation process. How then could it ever be proven that the creation of the universe did or did not occur five minutes ago rather than prior to that time?

The hypothesis initially seems wildly implausible, yet if there is no logically necessary connection between our memory and the past, then on what basis could anything about the past be proven beyond doubt? By the conditions imposed, we cannot appeal to any existent evidence before that time.

\footnote{17} Note how the structure of this argument can be seen as a \textit{reductio ad absurdum}. This type of argument, also sometimes called “reduction to absurdity” or “reduction to the impossible,” is characterized as the refutation of a contention on the grounds that some statements result in contradictory or, at least, exceedingly implausible conclusions.

without begging the question; in other words, we would be assuming the very facts for which we are trying to account. Certainly the Five-Minute World hypothesis is inconsistent with many of our other beliefs. If the hypothesis were true, we would have to give up these other beliefs in order to avoid logical inconsistency and cognitive dissonance. What’s more, extending this reasoning to shorter and shorter periods, we cannot in principle obtain any evidence which could disprove the even more radical supposition that the universe is being constantly recreated moment by moment. In fact, as we will see later in this text, some persons who believe in predestination eschew the notion of causality altogether and believe God recreate the universe moment by moment as “the Sustainer” of the universe.

Many times in philosophy, proposed solutions to imaginatively formulated problems such as these lead to amazing shifts in perspective which lead to new hypotheses and by which the nature of the universe can be re-envisaged.

1.3.2 Metaphysics (Ontology): the Study of Reality

(2) Metaphysics or Ontology (theory of reality): the inquiry into what is real as opposed to what is appearance either conceived as that which the methods of science presuppose or that with which the methods of science are concerned; the inquiry into the first principles of nature; the study of the most fundamental generalizations as to what exists. *EB*

The terms metaphysics and ontology are traditionally used interchangeably, but recently, ontology is more often thought of as a part of metaphysics. Where ontology emphasizes the fundamental kinds of existence and being (what kinds of things exist), metaphysics describes the meanings or implications of the existence of those entities (the characteristics of those existent things). For example, the existence of gravity is an ontological conclusion of the metaphysical theory of the laws of gravity.

Our ability to distinguish between what is real and what appears to be real is essential to living well in everyday life. Our understanding what is real is only partially constructed from sensory information. Since the way ordinary things appear to be is often not the way those things really are, philosophers try to elucidate the characteristics of reality—what it is that exists independently of what we perceive it to be. And philosophers have constructed radically different answers to this question.
On the one hand, G. W. F. Hegel, for example, writes, “To comprehend what is, this is the task of philosophy, because what is, is reason.” The conviction that reality ultimately consists only of minds and thoughts is called idealism. On the other hand, Friedrich Engels writes:

[T]he material, sensuously perceptible world to which we ourselves belong is the only reality; and that our consciousness and thinking, however supersensuous them may seem, are the product of a material, bodily organ, the brain. Matter is not a product of mind, but mind itself is the highest product of matter.

Engels’ conviction that reality ultimately consists only of matter in motion is a philosophy termed materialism or physicalism.

Moreover, if we were to believe that matter and thought were separate, unique substances, as when Rene Descartes writes, “I was the first to consider thought the predominant attribute of immaterial substance, and extension the predominant attribute of material substance,” we would be endorsing a mind-body dualism as a metaphysical position. Finally, the belief that there are three or more essential kinds of substances such as mind, body, and soul is a metaphysical pluralism.

One type of ontological problem is the well-known difficulty of finding a “criterion of individuation” in sorting kinds of things. Suppose we are to separate potatoes into two baskets—one basket for large potatoes and one basket for small potatoes. For the most part, we wouldn’t expect many problems with such a straightforward task.

Very large potatoes would be placed in the basket for the large potatoes, and tiny potatoes would be placed in the basket for the small potatoes. But what do we do about a potato that seems to be sized somewhere between large and small, one that is short and wide, one that is long and thin, or one

---

We could set up a criterion of “potato-ness” by means of a precising or an operational definition distinguishing between “large” and “small”—perhaps by measuring volume, weight, or length in order to precisely mark the difference. Would such a criterion thereby entail that a medium potato does not exist?

If we admit existence of medium potatoes, then our "potato criterion" must be revised to reflect the “newly discovered entity” called the “medium potato.” However, as you may have guessed by now, our sorting problem has doubled in difficulty. We now need one criterion distinguishing large from medium and another criterion distinguishing medium from small potatoes. Ontologically, new problems arise. Shall we admit the existence of medium-large and medium-small potatoes? If so, lamentably, our problem propagates itself on and on in the same manner.

At this point, in our simple potato-sorting problem, many other metaphysical questions are arise. Are the kinds of things that exist in the universe independent of the concepts used to describe them? Or do our concepts determine the kinds of things we can know to exist? Do the mere actions of perceiving and thinking limit the content of our ideas? This intractable problem of how we could possibly make sense of a reality existing independently of our ideas is one Immanuel Kant especially faced.\footnote{Immanuel Kant explains the \textit{noumenon} as a “limiting concept” … “not to be thought as object of the senses but as a thing in itself” in \textit{The Critique of Pure Reason}, trans. Norman Kemp Smith (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1965), B 310-311; A 254-255.}

Many times metaphysical problems are arise from problems of language use—consider, for example, the well known Zen questions, “Where is the wind when it’s not blowing?” or “Where does my lap go when I stand up?” Similarly, in a sense, the fundamental question of metaphysics and ontology is often taken to be “Why is there something rather than nothing?” Yet to answer this question it would seem that we would have to know what nothing “is.” But how can we deny that something exists without first affirming it as the subject of the sentence? Moreover how can we affirm that nothing doesn’t exist without somehow referring to it in the first place? Willard Van Orman Quine refers to this paradoxical argument as “Plato’s Beard”: “Nonbeing must in some sense be, otherwise what is it that there is not?”\footnote{Willard Van Orman Quine, \textit{From a Logical Point of View} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953), 1.} These kinds of problems lead many philosophers to agree with Ludwig Wittgenstein when
he famously writes, “Philosophy is a battle against the bewitchment of our intelligence by means of our language.”

1.3.3 Axiology: The Study of Value

Axiology (theory of value): the inquiry into the nature, criteria, and metaphysical status of value. Axiology, in turn, is divided into two main parts: ethics and aesthetics. EB

Although the term “axiology” is not widely used outside of philosophy, the problems of axiology include (1) how values are experienced, (2) whether values differ in kind (3) to what extent standards of value are subjective, and (4) in what sense values can be said to exist. Axiology then is the subject area which tries to answer problems like these:

1. How are values related to interest, desire, will, experience, and means-to-ends?
2. How do different kinds of value interrelate?
3. Can the distinction between intrinsic and instrumental values be maintained?
4. Are values ultimately rationally or objectively based?
5. What is the difference between a matter of fact and a matter of value?

There are two main subdivisions of axiology: ethics and aesthetics. Ethics involves the theoretical study of the moral valuation of human action—it’s not just concerned with the study of principles of conduct. Æsthetics is usually thought of as involving the conceptual problems associated with the relationships among our feelings and senses with respect to the experience of art and nature. Each of these subdivisions are briefly characterized below.

First . . .


25 The term gained currency in the wake of Eduard von Hartmann’s *Grundriss der Axiology* published in 1908, which was intended to unify the theory of value in a variety of fields, including economics and logic. Hartmann, who wrote a multivolume work on the unconscious in 1869 greatly influenced the psychologist C. G. Jung.
1.3 Main Divisions of Philosophy

(a) *Æsthetics*: the inquiry into feelings, judgments, or standards concerning the nature of beauty and related concepts such as the tragic, the sublime, or the moving—especially in the arts; the analysis of the values of sensory experience and the associated feelings or attitudes in art and nature; the theories developed in *les beaux arts*. EB

Certainly, one of the fundamental questions of æsthetics, if not the central question, is the question of beauty. Is the experience of beauty a result of reasoned evaluation, emotional assessment, or some combination of these two kinds of abilities? Or, perhaps, æsthetic judgement is a unique, irreducible human faculty. As a branch of philosophy in general, aesthetics is an inquiry into the possibility of laying the foundations of criticism in the arts.

Gustav Fechner, an early psychologist, asked 228 men and 119 women which of the rectangles similar to those displayed in Figure 1.11 are æsthetically the most pleasing.26 As you observe the shapes, which figure do you judge to be the most pleasing?

Fechner’s experiment has been repeated with various changes in methodology many times over the years with conflicting results. In the original experiment, the rectangle with the ratio of 21:34 was preferred, with the rectangles adjacent in Figure 1.11 being rated highly also. The ratio of 21:34 turns out to be close to the “golden rectangle,” a shape well known to art and architecture students as being based on the golden ratio or “divine proportion.” And that proportion is approximated by rectangle B in Figure 1.11, the sides of which Euclid defined in 300 B.C.E.:

A straight line is said to have been cut in extreme and mean ratio when, as the whole line has the same proportion to the greater part, as the greater part has to the lesser.

Notice in the accompanying Figure 1.12 of the golden ratio with accompanying examples based on it, how the reciprocal of this ratio involves the same sequence of digits following the decimal point. This ratio is the golden ratio and is ubiquitous in art and nature. Investigators have framed the golden proportion within Leonardo da Vinci’s *Mona Lisa*, Salvador Dali’s *Sacrament of the Last Supper*, and numerous other paintings. The number appears in computing plant and animal growth and has intriguing relationships with

---

27 Euclid, *The Elements of Euclid* trans. Claude-François Millet Dechales (James and John Knapton, 1726), 244.
proportions in architecture and sculpture. On the basis of these kinds of evidence a few philosophers think beauty might determinable in terms of mathematical relationships.

Most other philosophers of art think it more likely that the ubiquitous occurrence of these ratios is a result of prosaic numerology and merely depict the creative invention of manipulated numerical coincidences. Otherwise, they claim, how could these mathematical observations possibly account for fact that truly remarkable artists break the canons of past artistic works?
1.3 Main Divisions of Philosophy

(b) **Ethics**: the inquiry into the nature and concepts of morality, including the important problems of good, right, duty, virtue, and choice; the study of the principles of living well and doing well as a human being; the moral principles implicit in mores, religion, or philosophy. *EB*

Often, the terms “ethics” and “moral philosophy” are used interchangeably; however, the terms “ethics” and “morality” are usually not used interchangeably in philosophy even though colloquially they often mean much the same. Many philosophers reserve the term “morality” for describing the code of conduct of a society, group, or individual. So, philosophy views morality as a descriptive term used in the social sciences such as anthropology or sociology that explains how people (or animals) actually behave, as opposed to how they ought to or should behave. Thus, morality in philosophy is often said to be a non-normative term in the sense that it does not prescribe how behavior ought to be or how it should be valued—it merely describes the kinds of things people do.

However, in the social sciences, sometimes the terminology gets confusing when the scientific researcher concludes that the way most persons behave in a group is the manifestation of how they *ought* to behave—so, on this view, “what is done” by most persons in the society becomes a standard or an ethics of right and wrong as to “what ought to be done.” Consequently, philosophers usually maintain that morality differs from culture to culture, whereas a social scientist might maintain equally that ethics differ from culture to culture. The stronger belief that ethics ought to differ from culture to culture is doctrine which implies some form of the philosophy of moral relativism. For example, if an anthropologist claims that some kinds of conduct are considered right in Inuit society while those same kinds of conduct are be considered wrong in Ju/'honasi culture, then a universal moral code is not being practiced by both societies.

Unfortunately, however, the distinction between ethics and morals is not entirely maintained in philosophy, for some philosophers use the term “morality” in a normative sense implying that morality and ethics are synonyms in...
that they refer to codes of conduct all rational persons should universally follow. In this usage, “moral theories” and “ethical theories” would be essentially synonymous ways of referring to the same kinds of theories.

As a philosophical problem in ethics, consider this example analyzed by J. O. Urmson in his well-known essay, "Saints and Heroes":

We may imagine a squad of soldiers to be practicing the throwing of live hand grenades; a grenade slips from the hand of one of them and rolls on the ground near the squad; one of them sacrifices his life by throwing himself on the grenade and protecting his comrades with his own body. It is quite unreasonable to suppose that such a man must be impelled by the sort of emotion that he might be impelled by if his best friend were in the squad.

Did the soldier who threw himself on the grenade do the right thing? If he did not cover the grenade, probably several soldiers would be killed. His action undoubtedly saved lives; certainly, an action which saves lives is a morally correct action. One might even be inclined to conclude that saving lives is a duty. But if this were so, wouldn’t each of the soldiers have the same moral obligation or duty to save his comrades?

Surely this cannot be a correct assessment of the situation because if it were morally obligatory for each one of them to fall on the grenade, each should then have to fight off the others in order to perform his moral obligation to get to the grenade first.

What would you conclude about this example? Would it be our duty to save lives in this situation ceteris paribus, or would we be “going beyond the call of duty” in such a case? Does our right to self-preservation supersede our obligation to save the lives of other persons? Would the number of lives involved in the instance make an ethical difference? What if sacrifice of self were to save the world from nuclear destruction?

Admittedly, these brief descriptions and examples do not adequate reflect the synoptic nature of philosophy, and they are not uniquely typical philosophical problems. Even so, they are problems with the possibility of being intellectually grasped without the attendant dangers of confusion by emotional prejudice, and they involve the same sorts of issues as the more socially controversial philosophical problems often involving a plethora of side-issues of emotive significance and persuasive definitions such as euthanasia, geno-

---

1.4 Additional Fields of Philosophy

Other studied fields of philosophy are not directly subsumable under only one of the main branches of philosophy discussed above (i.e., metaphysics, epistemology, or axiology). The most significant of these other important fields include philosophy of life, philosophy of religion, philosophy of language, philosophy of mind, philosophy of science, social and political philosophy, and the history of philosophy. Just as the subjects of the traditional branches are interrelated so likewise the problems in these other fields of philosophy are not completely discrete either. Virtually any division of philosophy named has its share of linguistic, logical, epistemological, and metaphysical aspects.

For example, one of the fundamental problems of vagueness in the philosophy of language stems from the sorites paradox attributed to Eubulides of Miletus, a harsh critic of Aristotle. Is one grain of wheat a heap? No? Two grains or three grains? No? As we add grains one by one it will be impossible to say precisely how many grains finally produce a heap. It would be natural to think we could answer the question by a stipulative definition: a “heap” is “a pile of some arbitrary number of grains,” but in practice this strategy raises other more difficult problems.

Logically, an argument along the following lines seems valid:

If one grain is not a heap, then two grains are not either.
If two grains are not a heap, then three grains are not either.
...  
If $X$ grains are not a heap, then $X + 1$ grains are not either.

Therefore, $X + 1$ grains are not a heap (i.e., no number of grains constitute a heap).

But in logic, an argument with true premisses and a false conclusion cannot be valid. From considerations like these, aspects of the sorites paradox are a problem for philosophy of language, epistemology, logic, and metaphysics. The related question of how many lies told by someone are sufficient to imply that that person is a liar reflects similar problem for ethical inquiry as well.

In our introduction to philosophical thinking in ensuing chapters, we will consider a few epistemological, ontological, and axiological features of four main areas of interest: (1) the philosophy of life, (2) the philosophy of religion, (3) ethics, and (4) epistemology. Although our approach is not comprehensive, it is reasonably representative of philosophical inquiry. The readings are
intended not only to illustrate the complex interrelation of these main areas of concern but also to provide a foundation for future investigations of these and other philosophical problems.

In order to make the most of our present opportunity to do some philosophy, the texts seek to proceed along the lines of the principle of charity.

That is, the initial consideration of each philosophical point of view, doctrine, or theory is an attempt to set aside, provisionally and temporarily, preconceptions about the arguments and beliefs presented—especially when our habitual reaction would be to disagree with the new and different ideas advocated. While suspending our own beliefs and tolerating for the moment ambiguity or possible inconsistency, we can obtain a sympathetic understanding of the presentation. In this manner, our experience might be broadened and our own thinking enriched. Once the ideas are well understood, however, and only then, can they be meaningfully analyzed, critiqued, and evaluated. Philosophical inquiry might not be the be-all and end-all of life’s activities, yet, to paraphrase Socrates, the examined life is indeed well worth living.
1.5 Related Ideas

"Aesthetics," Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy  Barry Hartley Slater understands the discipline as the philosophy of art which investigates theories of beauty. He explores questions of the definition of art and beauty, the nature of aesthetic experience and attitudes, and the varieties of art criticism.

"Epistemology," Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy  David A. Truncellito investigates the difficult questions of the nature and justification of knowledge and whether there are limits to knowledge or indeed if knowledge itself is at all possible.

"Ethics," Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy  James Fieser first outlines main issues in moral philosophy: objectivism vs relativism, egoism vs altruism, emotion vs reason; second describes major divisions: virtue ethics, duty ethics, and consequentialist theories; and third characterizes controversial, specific moral issues.

"Geometry and Experience"  Albert Einstein addresses the Prussian Academy of Sciences on the application, visualization, and modern interpretation of elliptical geometry upon which his general theory of relativity rests.

"Metaphysics," Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy  Peter Van Inwagen contrasts the metaphysics of early philosophers, the science of being, with the metaphysics of current philosophy, such as free will and dualism. After illustrating some representative problems, he concludes metaphysics is an “impossible enterprise.”

1.6 Topics Worth Investigating

1. Contrast the characterization of philosophy in section 1.2 with Ludwig Wittgenstein’s definition in the Tractatus:

Philosophy is not one of the natural sciences. (The word ‘philosophy’ must mean something whose place is above or below the natural sciences, not beside them.) Philosophy aims at the logical clarification of thoughts. Philosophy is not a body of doctrine but an activity. A philosophical work consists essentially of elucidations. Philosophy does not result in ‘philosophical propositions’, but rather in the clarification of propositions. Without philosophy thoughts are, as it were, cloudy and indistinct: its task is to make them clear and to give them sharp boundaries.

Specifically, based on the characterization of philosophy in section 1.3 “Main Divisions of Philosophy,” what might Wittgenstein mean by suggesting philosophy is below the natural sciences?

2. Compare the import of why-questions and how-questions with respect to Albert Einstein’s understanding of the meaningfulness of ethical questions:

Scientific statements of facts and relations, indeed, cannot produce ethical directives. However, ethical directives can be made rational and coherent by logical thinking and empirical knowledge. If we can agree on some fundamental ethical propositions, then other ethical propositions can be derived from them, provided that the original premises are stated with sufficient precision. Such ethical premises play a similar role in ethics, to that played by axioms in mathematics. This is why we do not feel at all that it is meaningless to ask such questions as: “Why should we not lie?” We feel that such questions are meaningful because in all discussion of this kind some ethical premises are tacitly taken for granted. We then feel satisfied when we succeed in tracing back the ethical directive in question to these basic premises.  

Evaluate whether ethical statements have an empirical basis, an evaluative basis, or a logic relation with a normative presupposition.

3. Sometimes the distinction between science and philosophy is made by noting that philosophy attempts to answer the question “Why?” and science attempts to answer the question “How?” What do you think are the essential difference between a “why-question” and a “how-question”? Is there a difference in the kinds of answer which would satisfy each kind of question? Is the difference between why-questions and how-questions similar to the difference between arguments and explanations?

4. Bertrand Russell writes:

I believe the only difference between science and philosophy is, that science is what you more or less know and philosophy is what you do not know. Philosophy is that part of science which at present people choose to have opinions about, but which they have no knowledge about. Therefore every advance in knowledge robs philosophy of some problems which formerly it had . . .

Clarify as best you can, Russell’s understanding of the relations between science and philosophy.

---

5. Leibniz in his *Discourse on Metaphysics* §IX[^12] is credited with the idea of the Identity of Indiscernibles which holds that no two substances or things exactly resemble each other, *i.e.*, have exactly the same properties. Instead, identical things must have all identical properties.

But how does one discover the identical idea in two different works of art? In aesthetics, unlike ontology, how does one know the same artistic idea is represented in two differentiated works? What could be the criterion of individuation of a work of art?

The following two images are those respectively used by New English Teas, a tea wholesaler, and Temple Island Collections, a souvenir shop.

![Fig. 1.15 Defendant: New English Teas (left); Claimant: Temple Island Collections (right) (2012 EWPCC)](image)

Both photographic works show a London bus crossing the Thames at Westminster bridge with the Palace of Westminster in the background. The pictures are clearly not identical—nor is the former a copy of the latter.

But the claimant Temple Island Collections charged New English Teas with copyright infringement. In the case in England and Wales Patents County Court[^33] where the reasoning is explained in some detail, Judge Birss concluded that the intellectual creation in the photographic work pictured on the left above infringed upon the copyright of the photographic work on the right above. Since the photographer of the photograph on the left was aware of the photography on the right when the picture was made, the judge ruled against him while recognizing “how different ostensibly independent expressions of the same idea actually look.” The legal decision

[^33]: Temple Island Collections Ltd v New English Teas Ltd & Anor [2012], England and Wales Patents County Court EWPCC 1 (12 January 2012).
was based on a "qualitative assessment of the reproduced evidence."

From the standpoint of aesthetics, explain how we can know when the identical artistic idea is present in two different works of art when the representations present have no physical dimension or proportion in common.

6. In section 1.2 of this chapter Richard Feynman was quoted as writing “If we know the rules, we consider that we ‘understand’ the world.” Note the use of the scare quotes indicate he is not referring to understanding in its conventional sense. He writes elsewhere “What I am going to tell you about is what we teach our physics students in the third or fourth year of graduate school... It is my task to convince you not to turn away because you don’t understand it. You see my physics students don’t understand it either. That is because I don’t understand it. Nobody does.” 34 On this view of scientific understanding, explain in some detail what it would mean to understand genuinely a natural phenomenon such as gravity. Give reasons for why or why not you think this kind of understanding might be related to philosophical understanding. In any case, what would be the essential features of a philosophical understanding of a natural phenomenon such as gravity?

7. Science is often distinguished from philosophy by science’s emphasis on empirical inquiry. Both why-questions and how-questions occur in science. However, the National Research Council emphasizes:

Many “why” questions cannot be addressed by science... Students often ask “why” questions. In the context of school science, many of these questions can be changed into “how” questions and thus lend themselves to scientific inquiry. Such change narrows and sharpens the inquiry and contributes to its being scientific.

Analyze differences between how-questions and why-questions from a grammatical point of view. What kinds of why-questions can be changed into how-questions? What kinds of why-questions are peculiarly philosophical? What kinds of why-questions are deconstructed into scientific how-questions? How should the question “Why is there something rather than nothing?” be regarded? As a specific example, what is the difference between inquiring into the origin of the universe and inquiring into the purpose of the universe?

8. In some ways the ontological investigations of contemporary science enrich the traditional investigations of metaphysicians. One case in point is

the grounding of idealism and materialism in information theory. Some researchers theorize consciousness is a form of information, and other scientists envisage information as the basic entity from which the universe is composed. As an example of the former, Giulio Tononi proposes consciousness as the capacity of any system to connect and utilize information:

The integrated information theory (IIT) starts from phenomenology and makes use of thought experiments to claim that consciousness is integrated information. Specifically: (i) the quantity of consciousness corresponds to the amount of integrated information generated by a complex of elements; (ii) the quality of experience is specified by the set of informational relationships generated within that complex. Integrated information (Phi) is defined as the amount of information generated by a complex of elements, above and beyond the information generated by its parts.\[36\]

As an example of the latter, the physicist John Archibald Wheeler argues quantum physics is rooted in information theory; this metaphysics has the catchphrase “it from bit” implying reality is based on information processing.\[37\] More recently, quantum information theory has emerged:

Quantum theory can be derived from purely informational principles. In particular, it belongs to a broad class of theories of information processing that includes classical and quantum information theory as special cases.\[38\]

From a philosophical point of view, speculate what it would mean for information to be the foundation of both matter and mind.\[39\]

9. If everything in the universe were to grow proportionally one-thousand times larger, how would we ever know it? What is the relevance of the law of gravitation to the problem? The speed of light? Hint: Such a change would lead to other observable physical changes in the world based on the non-proportionality of problems of scale.\[40\]

---


10. Which is more fundamental: beauty in nature or beauty in art? Is a sunset beautiful because it is “just like” a painting or is a painting beautiful because it is “just like” a sunset. Consider the two examples in Figure 1.16:

![Sunset comparison](image)

Fig. 1.16 On left: *Sunset*, by J. M. Turner (Tate) (left); *Trondheim Sunset*, by Minto (Wikipedia Commons) (right)

First, analyze the difference of beauty in nature and beauty in art; next, analyze the similarity of beauty in nature and in art. With respect to Fechner’s analysis discussed in 1.3.3, are the relative dimensions of the two pictures relative to their aesthetics?

11. Under your personal ethics, thoroughly explain whether or not a person has the obligation to be a hero in circumstances where one’s life is in danger? Does a person have a duty to be a saint or to sacrifice what we have to help others? Under what circumstances should the needs of another be put before our own? In your analysis, consider the following specific example:

On the evening of March 13, 1964, a young woman was assaulted and stabbed to death in front of her home in the Kew Gardens district of Queens, New York. The victim was twenty-eight years old. Her name was Kitty Genovese. . . . The events took place in the full view (and hearing) of most of the residents of the victim’s immediate neighborhood. Over thirty persons acknowledged, after the event, that they had observed what was going on. The murder itself took well over half an hour to accomplish, during which time the murderer took himself off for a brief interim and then returned some quarter of an hour later to complete the job. The victim’s screams were fully audible for the whole period she was under attack as were her cries for help during the period of the murder’s absence. But no one went to her aid.

---

Provide a convincing argument as to whether or not coming to the aid of Kitty Genovese would have been heroic, saintly, morally obligatory or unnecessary.

12. As explained in this chapter, in the 18th century, most of the subjects studied in today’s liberal arts colleges were divided between the disciplines of moral and natural philosophy. George Turnbull, a Scottish philosopher, argued in his *A Treatise on Ancient Painting* that paintings are experiments in both of these disciplines:

> Philosophy is rightly divided into natural and moral; and in like manner, Pictures are of two Sorts, natural and moral: The former belong to natural, and the other to moral Philosophy. For if we reflect upon the End and Use of Samples or Experiments in Philosophy, it will immediately appear that Pictures are such, or that they must have the same Effect. What are Landscapes and Views of Nature, but Samples of Nature’s visible Beauties, and for that Reason Samples and Experiments in natural Philosophy? And moral Pictures, or such as represent parts of human Life, Men Manners, Affections, and Characters; are they not Samples of moral Nature, or of the Laws and Connexions of the moral World, and therefore Samples or Experiments in moral Philosophy?

Evaluate the validity of Turnbull’s claims. Based on your understanding of the nature of philosophy, provide arguments as to whether his claims are a rationalization in the attempt to legitimize the intellectual nature of painting or whether his claims constitute an actual justification for a number of complex sciences inherent in the art of painting.

---