

Quote (1) "The metaphysician believes that he travels in territory in which truth and falsehood are at stake. In reality, however, he has not asserted anything, but only expressed something, like an artist."
(Rudolf Carnap, "The Elimination of Metaphysics through the Logical Analysis of Language")

To fully assess the validity of this quote, we must first seek to analyze it. If we accept that the meaning of a word is its use in the language, a metaphysician must be a person who occupies him or herself with seeking answers or truths regarding existence of space and time, and in extent to clarify the meaning terms such as being and knowing. This quote can therefore be taken as an objection to the roles that metaphysical philosophers have given themselves throughout time. One can claim that the importance and validity of metaphysical philosophy is proven faulty due to the fact that all philosophers have different answers to the same questions. Carnap uses the reason for this to argue that the metaphysician is no different from an artist in how his product is the result of his individual mind and personal perception.

The second part of the quote is all the more intriguing. It leads the mind towards epistemology and the question of how to acquire knowledge and what knowledge we can trust, and seems to clearly question the degree to which we can trust results in metaphysical contexts, knowing that the different theories of acquiring knowledge differ so greatly, and the results often even the more. The theories upon metaphysics vary with philosophical systems used by the philosopher, something which becomes evident regarding the differences between the rationalists and empiricists for example. This taken into consideration, how can we differ metaphysical philosophers and their theories from the individual works of art that derive from any one artist's mind? Can we say that a philosopher's work is not valid, simply because it differs from the work of another philosopher?

The problem seems to lie in that one cannot agree on a philosophical system, this in turn leading to answers differing so greatly from one another that they cannot even be united with an effort. Main theories of acquiring knowledge are formed, but even between followers of the same epistemology there are differences, for example Locke, Berkeley and Hume on the one side, and Descartes, Leibniz, Spinoza and Nietzsche on the other. So what is it that differ these philosophers? They have the same material to deduct their evidence from, and thus following a strict logical argumentation, should they not end up with the same answers? Why do they not? To answer this question we must look to their methods. An excellent example that explains this would be Descartes method, with his extreme rationalism, that due to personal belief suddenly inducts the existence of God and claims it as evident. This proves

the power of the individual philosopher mind. This is how we can answer the above posed question "...how can we differ metaphysical philosophers and their theories from the individual works of art that derive from any one artist's mind?" Descartes logical flaw proves that if we analyze the philosopher's methods, it might sometimes indeed come down to a point where the philosopher personally has taken a stand, a point from with he has built his argumentation and system around. It seems that the mind can be a factor in a philosopher's argumentation, and that it is therefore hard to hold one argumentation over another. The defect in the argumentation is to make a property universal without complete evidence that all philosophers are affected by their mind, and that therefore none can have more right than the other.

The obvious lingual shortcoming of this quote might be Carnap boldly stating the conception of "travelling in territory in which truth and falsehood are at stake" to be universal with all metaphysical scientists. One could of course discuss the meaning of the word believe, but the scarce frames of this essay taken into consideration, it is more relevant to assume that the meaning of the word here is the same as the way it is used in the language, which is thinking something without knowing whether or not it is true. One could also in this context question the motivation Carnap would claim to be spawning such a belief, however it is more interesting to question the motivation that Carnap himself has to state such a claim. In his argumentation he tries to eliminate metaphysics as a whole, but in doing this he makes the mistake of putting all philosophers on equal footing. Considering how almost all philosophers worth mentioning have theories differing from one another, Carnap forces us to ask; can we say that a philosopher's work is not valid, simply because it differs from the work of another philosopher? And if so, how will we ever be able to find the truth? The most obvious answer immediately seems to be no, seeing as if this were true, a philosopher logically could never present the absolute truth. As there exists no thing that a philosopher can not present logically, this would lead to the conclusion that truth itself does not exist. Hence, we can conclude that one of the philosophers might have the right theory, and furthermore we cannot exclude the work of any one philosopher to be the ultimate answer. This taken in regard, all philosophers in presenting metaphysical theories might be presenting the truth, and so all metaphysical philosophers must be in a territory where truth and falsehood are at stake.

In conclusion, Carnap's statement is lingually invalid, as the metaphysician does indeed "travel in territory in which truth and falsehood are at stake", evident the moment he is

Sebastian Breivik Soleim

Bergen Handelsgymnasium, 2010-11-02

described as a metaphysician. Carnap does however make a valid point in questioning the validity of the different methods and epistemologies, pointing out that at some point, the mind must play part in the argumentation of a philosopher, or they would all indeed come to the same conclusion. Hence, it is not possible to decide which philosopher's theory holds the most truth.