The Limitation of Knowledge

By

Emmanuel E. Etta (PhD)
Department of Philosophy and Leadership Studies
University of Calabar
emmanueletta@unical.edu.ng
emmanuelefemetta@gmail.com;
orchid.org/0000-0001-5713-0373; +2348030673828.

Prof. Offiong Okon Asukwo
International Bible Training College
Port Harcourt Campus

Dr. Joseph Essien
Department of Philosophy and Leadership Studies
University of Calabar
&
Dr Apeh Colombus,
Department of Theater and Media Studies,
University of Calabar

Abstract

Some people believe that knowledge is power, while others believe that it is applied knowledge that is power. This differentiation questions the source and the limitations of knowledge. As this work observes, these limitations are the possible obstacles that hinder the growth and stability of knowledge. It is the belief of this work that a critical examination of the different limitations, hindrances and obstacles to human knowledge be examined without any prejudiced mind. This work contends that language is a major part of the problem of acquisition and transmission of knowledge. This work therefore, suggests that even though language poses certain problems to the acquisition of knowledge, it also serves as one of the major means of conveying or transmitting knowledge. Hence, the work adopts the critical evaluation, logical reasoning and qualitative methods of research to screen what is classified as knowledge.

Introduction

In contemporary Anglo-Saxon countries, epistemology is defined as the theory of knowledge. It concerns itself with the analysis of what is meant by the term 'Knowledge' itself and raises questions about the limits and scope of human knowledge, the reliability of human knowledge, and what constitutes the justification for holding a knowledge (Browaeys, 2004, I). The Encyclopedia Encarta 97, as quoted in Browaeys, argues that the theory of knowledge has sometimes a critical vocation, when it suggests determining the limits or the borders of the possible knowledge (2004, 4).

Epistemology is drawn from Greek word – 'episteme', which means "Knowledge Science", and 'logos', which means "study of". It is the branch of philosophy concerned with the study of the nature, scope and limitations of human knowledge. In this light, Dortier Browaeys avers that, philosophy does not necessarily claim to reveal the ultimate truth, rather, it wanders about the conditions of the knowledge, its forces and its limits (2004, 3). This is why a third perennial question in philosophy according to Greco, John regards the scope or extent of our knowledge. Its further deals with what kinds of things can we know, and what kinds of things are impossible to know. Traditionally, knowledge is seen as a justified true belief (Gettier, 121-123) which implies that whatever stands as truth must have self-justification mechanism. But when one is epistemically naïve, he will not be able to question the origins, nature, and dependability of our information (Christian 161) which may tantamount to unwillingness to explore the limit of our claim to knowledge. It is this background to epistemic awareness, that informs the understanding of what we know and how we know it. This is an exceedingly important part of epistemic awareness in coming to understand more clearly what we don't know.

Empirically, our senses suffice as a source of knowledge, but John Locke opines that our senses, seem manipulate us into believing on what is not true. Our language for him, reinforces this deception, for a built-in language deception is to be expected (Christian 178). However, language for Pimaro Jr., M. T. et al, is not merely a medium of communication but a constitutive mechanism that structures human cognition, mediates knowledge, and regulates epistemic authority. Language shape what can be known, who is recognized as a knower, and how

knowledge is validated (111). Language captures and crystallizes our perceptions, whether or not those perceptions are correct (178). This is why we humans labour under drastic sensory limitations (179). In other words, language is not merely a communicative tool but a mechanism that can obscure, exclude or distort knowledge (Pimaro Jr., et al 116).

From the definitions of epistemology, it is obvious that the search for truth or certainty, is equally guided by the consciousness and facts of borders or limits of human knowledge. Now, there are various ways in which limitations to knowledge acquisition can occur. These different perceived obstacles, hindrances or limitations to knowledge are explored in this work. A critical exposition will be articulated, thereafter, the paper shows how language contributes to the problem of limitation of knowledge and how it can also aid in solving the problem.

Knowledge Defined

The concept of knowledge is a concomitance of human activities, because it comes as a result of daily human physical, social, mental, political, moral and aesthetic exercises. Thus, as human live on, they constantly gather certain quantity of experience, directly through our personal perception and indirectly acquiring collectively experience communicated to us by the human milieu through our environment. These experiences according to Ekarika do not remain hanging like that, but are reduced to a unit, as a basis of knowledge of those facts communicated by the community in which we live. It in turn, becomes the basis of explanation for the facts of our acquired and personal knowledge (7). Here, the explanation or interpretation of the data of our experience constitutes and determines the background to all further knowledge and human understanding. On this note, knowledge is here conceived as the discovery of reality. This discovery is made initially through the senses. The material perception through the senses is then apprehended by the intellect (that is, the essential and universal nature of objects) which come in contact with the senses. (15). For Ozumbaa, knowledge mean the fact of understanding, information acquired through learning or experience (16). Thus, "to know" has implicit meaning in the requirement of certainty, assurance and indubitability. It justifies our claims to knowledge and the genesis of the traditional concept of knowledge (17). For Marie-Joelle Browaeys, knowledge is an act of someone who makes an effort to capture an object by thoughts and to

form a proper representation of this object and the understanding resulting from this action. He also quotes the Larousse dictionary as defining knowledge in general to mean the capacity to know; the way of understanding and of perceiving. It is again the self-awareness (3). However, it is noteworthy to stress here, that gaining self-awareness (knowledge) is not instantaneous, rather, time is a determinant factor. It is in view of this fact that, there is in human nature, a state of epistemic naivety, a condition in which we have not yet begun to question the origins, structure and dependability of our information. With time, the fundamental operations of information processing system we call "the mind", having examined the sources, nature and accuracy of our knowledge, begins to develop epistemic awareness, which is more informed understanding of what we know and don't know (Christina 161). One can deduce at this point that knowledge is acquired or attained through proper development and maturity of the mind. This is when the human mind is able to examine and reflect critically and effectively on received information. For Joseph Omoregbe, knowledge and belief, though closely related are not the same thing, whereas knowledge always involves belief, but belief does not always involve knowledge. Again, knowledge must be based on conclusive evidence, but belief is not based on conclusive evidence. And although we always have reasons for our beliefs, these reasons are not conclusive and therefore leave room for believing or not believing (136). More so, belief is generally based on an assumption.

Limitation of Knowledge

In philosophy, a discourse on epistemology will not be complete, should the Sophists not have been historically captured. This is in view of their role in Western Philosophy, a Sophist was used to describe anyone who was eminent for knowledge and again because they claimed to be embodiment of knowledge (Azuza 2011, 69).

Protagoras of Abdera is remembered for his views that truth is relative. His famous dictum says that "man is the measure of all things, of the things that are that they are, and of the things that are not, that are not".

Concerning the knowledge of the gods he has this to say "about the gods I have no way of knowing either whether they exist or do not exist, nor what kind they

are in form, for many are the things that hinder knowledge, the obscurity of the object and the fact that the life of man is short" (70). Divination suffices here, this is because it is the means through which the divine speak with humans, offering insight, guidance and solutions to community and individual (Odey, E. A. et al 391).

According to Dominique Vinck, the knowledge object, is not simply an object to be known, nor is it the opposite of subject, as in the Cartesian view of thought as opposed to things. It refers more to a whole material assembly, a sort of clay from which knowledge is made (online). Joseph A. Leighton defines an object, as any specific situation or element in experience which yields conscious meaning or reflective significance for a thinking self. While the object of knowledge for him, involves the consciousness of the distinction between the idea of an object and the object that warrants the idea (online). It is therefore not unusual that knowledge according to Marie-Joelle Browses is defined as an act of someone who makes an effort to capture an object by thoughts and to form a proper representation of this object and the understanding resulting from this action. This is more so why in philosophy; we speak about theory of knowledge which is a system to explain the connection between the thoughts and the outside world. It follows therefore as Backelard holds as quoted by Browaeys, "that for the philosopher, methodologies, so different, so mobile in the various sciences, originated nevertheless from an initial method, a general method which has to inform all knowledge, which has to treat all objects in the same way (Online).

From our definition of knowledge, and the role of the philosopher, obscurity of an object of knowledge, characteristically is normal within the scope of an epistemic discourse. So empirically, it takes experience of John Locke's (sensation and reflection) processes for (obscurity – state of being difficult to understand) to overcome. Here, experience is needed to write the knowledge of such an object on the clean state of the mind (knower). From the point of view of innatism, in which case all men are born with innate knowledge, it is possible to overcome the difficulty in understanding as may be manifested by an object of knowledge. Plato's theory of pre-existence is also considered here, on the basis that if the human soul had existed in the world of ideas, where it new the real nature of things, what is needed at moment where objects seem to be obscure, is the capacity

to remember. By obscurity of the object, it f means a state of being in the dark. Being in the dark is being unknown. Wittgenstein (quoted in Pimaro Jr. et al) had argued, that language facilitates the acquisition of knowledge by supplying the conceptual frameworks and structures through which individuals interpret and relate to the environment. He however observed that, linguistic tools are, in themselves, relatively simple, but that philosophers often obscure this simplicity through linguistic misuse and the formulation of pseudo-problems (115). Here, Kant opines that, we can experience all endowing the unorganized or formless stuff of sense with the organizations or forms involved in ordering or judging. In other words, it is as if, Kant says we were born with blue spectacles attached to our eyes. For Kant, blueness would be a necessary condition of seeing. And that the forms contributed by the Knower (space, time, the cause – effect relation are necessary conditions for experience and understanding (Randall and Buchlor 230-231).

One of the things that hinders knowledge according to Protagoras, the Sophist, is the fact that the life of man is short. This position only presupposes a condition of knowledge guided only by man's rational ability, where at death, all rational speculations stop automatically. But even at such instance, it is possible considering deterministic principle or revelation, that a person may have known all that his/her creator wished that he/she should know before his/her death. Again, except where the limitation to human knowledge concerns only the living, otherwise according to Marcia Carteret, those who are dead may not be seen physically but are alive in a different world and/or can reincarnate in new birth. This is the premise on which ancest worship is based, and on understanding that the course of life is cyclical not linear (online). Plato corroborates the above, thus, "that death is not evil to a good man and more so, to a philosopher because it provides him a passage to go and be with the goods and as a philosopher (a lover of truth) to return to the bosom of truth and knowledge (Asouzu 74).

Plato's argument is further supported by Bert-Hamminga, who opines that in traditional African view, knowledge is not acquired by labour, but "given" by the ancestors (online).

Heraclius of Ephesus is credited with the saying, that "the world is an ever living fire, characterized by measures of it kindly and measures going out. All things are an exchange for fire and fire for all things. This led to his ideas about change or flux. All things he argues are in a state of flux. Things are ever changing, nothing ever remains the same. He is also credited with the saying that we cannot step into the same river twice because fresh waters are ever coming upon us. This means that things are steadily undergoing changes, nothing ever remains the same (Asozou 59).

The position of Heraclitus (that is) all things being in a state of flux, suggest that nothing can be grasped since things change, they cannot be known because before we know them, they have changed (79). This tantamount to limitation of knowledge), in regards to physical things in view of their fleeting ephemeral and changeable character. Plato corroborates the fact that physical things limits knowledge, by positing that, physical things are mere copies, fake or imitation of their originals (prototypes or archetype) in the world of forms (which for him is transcendental existence with fixed, permanent and reliable reality) (77). In other words, to know a fake imitation of an object, amounts to knowing nothing of the original.

In his early work within the modern period, of philosophy, Francis Bacon argued that the impediment in the path of knowledge are prejudices that have come to grip and crippled the power of the human intellect thereby making it difficult for man to freely exercise his liberty in thought to explore the unbounded field of knowledge. He identified four idols that have taken over the mind of men. There include, the idols of the tribe, cave, theatre and market place (Uduigwomen and Ozumba 105).

Bacon noted further, that man through his ability to abstract in language, uses the liberty to abuse instead of sharpen communication. The above for him, constitute the major problems and inhibitions of knowledge (106).

One of the most basic themes of Locke's epistemology is that since we cannot know everything, we would be well-advised to observe and respect the extent and limitations of human knowledge. It follows therefore, that applying the human

faculty of reason to the pursuit of knowledge, properly defined, reveals the limitations within which we must work. Here, we cannot achieve knowledge of things such as infinity or substantial real essences for which we lack clear positive ideas. More so having ideas will not be enough to secure knowledge, as in the case of human actions, they are obscure, confused or imperfect. Furthermore, given faculty memories, we may also fail to achieve knowledge because we are incapable of tracing long chains of reasoning through which two ideas might be demonstrably linked.

Accordingly, awareness of our limitations, Locke proposed should forestall haste, laziness and despair in our natural search for truth about the most vital issues into which human knower's can fruitfully inquire. Locke avers also that "Finally, in the effort to achieve philosophical or scientific certainty, our efforts to employ reason are commonly undermined by the misuse or abuse of language (Essay iv xvii 9-13 online).

In his consideration of the notion of substance, Locke ask the question, how is it that we can perceive a material object as a unity – as a chair, a star, a man and not merely as a tumble of qualities, hardness, brownness, smoothness in an undiscriminated mass? He reasoned that the qualities of an object are not all that goes to make it up, rather, there must be something which, so to speak holds the qualities together. This he called the substance of the object which is the substratum of the qualities. The substance for Locke cannot itself be merely a collection of qualities but leads to another substratum to which they belong; if this in turn were nothing but qualities, a further substratum would be necessary. But this cannot go on indefinitely, and in general the confusion of substance with qualities, which in Locke's view reduces to absurdity. A substance unlike a primary quality, cannot be directly perceived; and we can say no more about it than that there must be such a thing. What I am we cannot say (Randall and Buchler 219).

We must in Locke's opinion, assume not only material but spiritual substance. This spiritual substance which for Locke, he knows not what constitute a limitation to knowledge. However, substance in Kant becomes one of the forms with which judgment organizes its data. So, whereas Locke had required supposition of an

unknowable stuff to hold qualities together as a unity, Kant makes substance a form of order, one of the conditions of experiencing being that qualities co-exists in this or that order (Randall & Buchler 231).

In Kant's epistemology, the world or existence is divided into the world of experienceable things, which Kant calls the world of phenomena or appearances. While the real world, unknowable is the world of noumena or things-in-themselves (Randall and Buchler 231). This real world according to Kant exist absolutely independent of human mind. But the real world cannot be known by us as it is in "itself" (230). He opines that God, the soul and human immorality belong to the real world, the world which is the object of faith and not of knowledge. The real world, though unknowable, is a necessary assumption (231).

Now, is the real world really unknowable as Kant claims? This is because Plato corroborates Kant's bifurcation of the world into two, physical and transcendental existence for Plato, and phenomena and noumena for Kant. The fact that Kant sees God, the soul and human immortality, as belonging to the real world, which is the object of faith, tantamount to saying that, the real world is the seat of knowledge, which he claims is not of knowledge. This is a more reasonable positions, as it agrees with Plato's epistemology and metaphysics where the unchanging, fixed and permanent reality, can only be found in the other world realm, where real things exist (world of ideas or reliable reality forms). Semantically, it would be correct to say that both Kant and Plato used forms and transcendental to refer to the real world. It follows therefore that, Plato's theory of immortality of the soul and the theory of pre-existence holds water. Here, Plato posited that, the soul of man had existed in the world of ideas before being born into the physical realm and that all learning took place in the previous world, all that happens now is that we are reminded of what we had known before (Azouzu 77). The emphasis is that in both Kant and Plato's epistemology, humans suffer limitation as per achieving knowledge in either the physical or transcendental realm.

In like manner, Herbert Spencer argued that, ultimate scientific ideas are all representations of realities that cannot be comprehended, because the scientist investigations bring him face to face with an insoluble enigma and he ever more clearly perceives it to be an insoluble enigma. Here, the scientist learns at once the

greatness and the littleness of his human intellect, that is, its power in dealing with all that comes within the range of experience, its impotence in dealing with all that transcends experience. More so, the scientist more than any other, truly knows that in its ultimate nature nothing can be known (Durant 275).

The Role of Language

According to Dortier, in philosophy, we speak about theory of knowledge which is a system to explain the connections between the thoughts and the outside world (3). To corroborate Dortier's idea, (Morin quoted in Browaeys) opined that, "Conscious of the risk of error, because, knowledge is perceived from the subjectivity of the knowing who, by means of language and thought translates, reconstructs and interprets the outside world" (6).

Amitai Etzioni, argues in line above therefore, that once we fully accept our intellectual limitations, we can improve our personal decision making as well as our public policies (https://issues.org/amitai). Awareness of our limitations, Locke proposed, should forestall haste, laziness and despair in our natural search for the truth about the most vital issues into which human knowers can fruitfully inquire (https://www.philosophypages.). "A guide to Locke's Essay", points out that in the effort to achieve philosophical or scientific certainty, our efforts to employ reason are commonly undermined by the misuse or abuse of language (Essay iv xvii 9-13) (online). Hans Siggaard Jensen agrees that: "The guiding thread throughout the history of the concept of knowledge has been linguisticness, the ways in which we were able to recognize or express cognition in languages" (online). This can further be associated with Francis Bacons, who identified certain basic distempers of learning and warned that if they were not decisively uprooted, philosophy would not be able to make any progressive leap. These distempers he classified as fantastical learning, delicate learning and contentious learning (Uduigwomen & Ozumba 105). This work upholds the first distempers which he calls, fantastical learning, that is the practice in intellectualism that emphasizes the use of high flown words that are ambiguous as a limitation to knowledge.

This idea was further boasted and expanded during the contemporary period in/of the history of Western Philosophy. Specifically the emergence of analytic philosophy. According S. E. Stumpf, what unifies all analytic philosophers is their

agreement concerning the central task of philosophy, which they say, is to clarify the meaning of language. In view of the above therefore, Wittenstein opined in his "Tractatus Logico-Philosophical", that the object of philosophy is the logical clarification of thoughts, so that, the result of philosophy is not a number of philosophical propositions, but to make propositions clear (417).

The question is, why is it necessary? It is because, the new assumption was that the philosopher can render a genuine service by carefully unpacking complex problems whose origin is found in the in-precise use of language. Here, scientists themselves, it was fell, had discussed their findings in language that was often misleading and in certain ways ambiguous. Moreso, scientific language contained ambiguities of logic and the clarification of these logical ambiguities was required. It was assumed also, that rigorous linguistic analysis could prevent the use or abuse of language was that it would cause us, as A. J. Ayer suggest to draw false inferences or ask spurious questions or make nonsensical assumptions (418).

In the same vain, Gilbert Ryle wrote about "Systematically Misleading Expression", in which philosophical analysis consists in inquiring about what it really means to say so and so (418).

Besides the commitment of the analytic philosophers, a careful examination of culture as "a way of life" encompassing the whole "complex spiritual material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or social group" (Ljungman, et.al 5). Culture according to E. B. Taylor as quoted in Marshall Soules, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, customs and many other capabilities and habits acquired by members of society (online). Here, one can assert undeniable that culture, then expresses the totality of the way of life of a people and the acquisition over time of knowledge of one's proximate whole, either subjectively or objectively, intrinsically or extrinsically (Anakwue 170). It will suffices again that, "every culture is seed for the development of philosophical thought (168). And to also accept as reasonable the argument by philosophers, that culture like nature, was basically at the core of philosophy, being the "background, basis, preoccupation and inspiration of the philosopher's mission (170).

Nexus between Language and Culture

According to Kelsey Holmes, language is one of the most important parts of any culture. It is the way by which people communicate with one another, build relationship, and create a sense of community. This account for why many philosophers have rejected the idea that non-human animals do not possess rights. Here, Descartes (quoted in Etta, Ojong and Ncha), argued that animals do not think or use language and because of that they do not have reason (5 of 18). Communication is a core component of any society and language is an important aspect of that. To sum-up the relationship between culture and language, Khaled Hosseini posits that "if culture was a house, then language was the key to the front door to all the rooms inside" (Online). Language here thus becomes according to Odey, Etta, Edet et al, obtained by active engagement in community life, consistent with Vygotsky's propounded the socio-cultural theory that underscores the significance of social contact in cognitive development (572)

The essential business of language, according to Wittgenstein, is to assert or deny facts. Given the syntax of a language, he maintains that, the meaning of a sentence is determined as soon as the meaning of the component words is known. What is clear at this point is that, language becomes a tool that helps to reveal hidden truth or knowledge. An ideal language is thus realistic if and only if it would be that, there should be one name for every simple, and never the same name for two different simples (X), Now, can such restrictions in the use of language be possible, I think we can only use the ideal as a springboard for perfection, rather than imagine to achieve the ideal in a complex world such as ours. This position agrees with Wittenstein that everything, therefore, which is involved in the very idea of the expressiveness of language must remain incapable of being expressed in language and is therefore inexpressible in a perfectly precise sense (XXI).

However, W. T Jones (1975) submits that, though both books (The- Tractatus and Philosophical investigations) are concerned with the nature or language and with the nature of meaning. Wittgenstein's view of the relation between language and reality changed profoundly (365). Wittgenstein in his Tractatus believed that it is possible to achieve an isomorphism (that is, human action characterized by intentionality) between an ideal language and the very thing itself, whereas Wittgenstein in his philosophical investigations concluded that the notion of an

ideal language is an illusion and the quest for isomorphism is doomed to fail. He explains that, by the time he wrote philosophical investigations, he Wittgenstein had decided that this picture of language as picture of reality was mistaken. The picture was inadequate, not merely because it failed to correspond to reality, but because the concept of language as being a picture of the facts was at best appropriate only for very small part of the whole domain of language and meanings (367). In other words, the world has other vast areas of object which language cannot describe. The skeptical implication is, is there anything in the physical that language cannot name? The answer may be yes and no. It is yes in view of certain limitation original to human nature, with respect to God's divine plan. No can only serve an answer for the things in the physical, which were not created by man. Or the things man refuses to name due to ignorance or want of an appropriate name.

It means, it is through language that objects (physical realities) are known and identified. Thus, to be clear about the kinds of existence there are in the world, is to be clear about the ways in which we talk to about them. This implies that we u se words through language to decide on what is real.

Joumana Medley, argues that, the saying "language shapes reality should be less vague by now. For him, comparing linguistic elements is an efficient way to gain insight into different cultures, as well as to learn things about our own that we might not have realized before (2). Put differently, we use our language to create things in the physical world. Hence reality is fashioned through language and through such language, the reality which exists in any culture is revealed to us. This also aids us in knowing things that ordinarily would not have been known to us. Robert H. Thousless in a similar argument, points to the fact that we use words, both in thinking and in communication, for such various purposes as describing the reality outside us or our own thoughts and feelings and for directing our own and other people's actions (86). It can therefore, not be doubted that language or words positions the reality outside, in its correct perspective through describing or giving a true picture of the objective world. Still in line with this view, that is, the relationship between language and reality, Terence Mckenna, avers that we replace the unknown with the known through the substitution of words and that by the time a child is two or three, he or she has completely created a cultural

mosaic of words that interposed between him or her and reality adding that reality from that point on, is only unconfirmed rumor brought through the medium of language.

Language, he explains is the stuff of the world, not quarks or wave-packets or neutrinos, but language. Everything is made of language. It is true that language is the stuff of the world, or that everything is made of language. This is because even the things that were created by God, were named by man, with his language and it is by such names that each existing thing is identified or known till date. So far as our physical world is concerned, anything imagined or created is known to exist authentically, when named and identified by such names otherwise, it may never be noticed or deemed to ever exist or real. It suffices therefore as B. Abanuke, posits, that reality can be considered as describable or quantifiable. It can be viewed as capable of being expressed. It can be talked about. And reality as seen from this angle, is not the object of thought but as the object of language. Based on this, language ought to express what has been contemplated of the real, therefore language analysis can be viewed as a vital prerequisite for proper expression (24). In other words, we cannot talk about the real without some sort of verbal expression (language). This implies invariably that it is language that locates reality and makes it what it is both as mental state or a physical existing thing.

Language as earlier argued is a product of the human mind, and has the power to structure physical objects to conform to what the mind perceives as being real. Put differently, language is a means of expressing and describing the outside, the picture of the real, as it is in human thought. This is why language can be said to shape reality, and is used to name the objects in the physical word. For instance, when a new item is invented by an individual, and he or she refuses to let the public know the name of the item produced, it means that the item will only be described by the producer, and also known by him/her in the absence of the item in question. This is because no other person will have an idea of the language with which such as item is named, but with a proper knowledge of the name of the item, one can describe and identity it in the midst of other items, even in the absence of the producer. In the same vain, just like thoughts in one's mind are made public by expressing them through language, language on the other hand helps to give an individual a mental representation of an object, which would not

have been known, thus language gives insight into the unknown. The relationship between language and reality is thus complimentary. It is one that exists between thoughts or ideas and their object of knowledge. Language reveals our object of knowledge, and also helps to identify, communicate or express what is known about such object. It implies also that any object of knowledge already exists in one's thought, and as well has an already existing language with which it can be expressed. This is the local language spoken either by a community of people or coin and used by an inventor.

The explanation above shows that language and thought are complementary. This complementary role arises from the fact that language is necessary in any thought process, hence thinking is not possible without a language. Language stimulates certain images or ideas in the hearer or reader according to Jekins. Learning a new language goes with learning the frame of reference for meaning and thought that goes with such language. Learning the language of the local culture helps to mould our thought patterns into the proper thinking expected and required in the new culture. Here, language gives a unique internal insight into the thought world of the people who speak that language. This thought-world for him, is the realm in which concepts are set and decisions are made (1). Omoregbe supports this view, by arguing that rationality is the power of thinking, but that thinking is inseparable from language, for thinking is done in and through a language. There can be no thinking without a language, because according to him, language is not just a vehicle through which thought is conveyed, but that the relationship between language and thought is much more than that of being a means through which thought is conveyed. Rather, thought cannot be formed except in a language (37). In fact, it approves John Zerzan's argument that language is the determinant organizer of cognition. It follows therefore that, whereas language serves as the medium by which thoughts or ideas and knowledge are transmitted, thought itself is not possible without language. Based on this, Isaac E. Ukpokolo argues, that people have the capacity at birth to construct, understand and communicate thought symbols primarily by using language (21). This position, though it parades the rationalist concept of innatism, it suffices largely due to accumulation of experiences, which also influence one's mental construct.

J. H. Randall and J. Buchler, in a critical submission explain that the general position that language is an impediment to knowing, that it obstructs, distorts, or is basically inadequate for genuine understanding, is by no means rare in the history of philosophy. This position is reflected in the everyday and seemingly innocent view that such-and-such a reality is indescribable or indefinable, a criticism raised against language by some philosophers who see language as a natural enemy of knowledge or as barrier to the deepest and most fundamental characteristics of the world. Others, he maintains, see language as merely a precarious and tricky part of the business of knowing but however subject to control (123). Explaining further, they present the case that, a common position is that only certain kinds of language obstruct knowing. Here, while one group argue that figurative and literary language is the chief enemy and that literalness and precision alone count in the attainment of knowledge, the other is that linguistic literalness and restrictiveness is an impoverishing and oversimplifying force in the struggle for human expression. They however observe that certain philosophers hold frankly that, knowledge is possible only because of language, mainly because we cannot be said to know what we cannot express in language (123). This argument is true in the sense that any idea, thought or knowledge not communicated, cannot be said to exist, none the less being useful; since the essence of knowledge is basically to solve existential problems, it follows that any knowledge that cannot be expressed, automatically fails to realize its fundamental purpose. Besides, it enables accumulated knowledge to be transmitted forward.

Works Cited

Abnaki, B. A. New Essay on African Philosophy. Nsukka: Spritan Publishers. 1994.

Anakwue, N. Chukwudike. The African Origins of Greek Philosophy: Ancient Egypt in Retrospect. https://upjournals.co.za/index.php/phromimon Vol.18.. Accessed 12/7/2025

Anakwue, Nicholas Chukwudike. The African origins of Greek Philosophy: ancient Egypt in Retrospect.

Asouzu, I. I. Philosophy and Logic Today. Jochrisam Publishers. Calabar. 2011.

Browaeys Marie-Joelle. Complexity of epistemology: Theory of knowledge or philosophy of science. M. J. Browaeys @nyenrode.nl 2004

Browaeys, Marie-Joelle. Complexity of epistemology: Theory of Knowledge or philosophy of

science. www.chaoforum.com/docs/niews/cofE.pdf. Accessed 12/7/2025

Carteret, Marcia. "Cultural aspect of Death and Dying" www.dimensionsofculture.com.2010. Accessed 12/7/2025

Christian, J. L. Philosopy: an Introduction To The Art of Wondering. California: Santa California, 1986.

Durant, Will. The Story of Philosophy Simon and Schuster. New York. 1961

Ekarika, J. P. Introduction To Philosophy (vol.1), Venice: Uniongrafica, 1986.

Etta, E. E., Ojong, L. O., Ncha, G. B. "Peter Singer's Speciesist Notion of Animal Conservation Vis-a-Vis Genetic Manipulation" in Studia Ecologiae ET BIOETHICAE. Vol.23. Doi: http://doi.org/10.21697/drn.5837_5_of_18. Accessed 15/9/2025.

Etzioni, Amitai. The limits of knowledge: Personal and Public https://issues.org/anitai. Accessed 15/92025.

Felso. Limitation of knowledge and Religious knowledge https://www.123philosophy.com. Accessed 11/11/2025.

Gettier, E. L. (1963). Is Justified True Belief K11owledge? Analysis, Vol 23(6), June 1963 pp 121-123. Accessed 17/11/2025

Hamminga, Bert. "Epistemology from the African point of View". www.ingenta.connect.com, 2008.

Holmes, Kelsey. Language: The Essence of Culture. https://greenheart.org https://upjournals.. Accessed 18/11/2025

Jenkins Orville Boyd "Dealing with Cultural Differences: Constrasting the African and Europeans Worldviews. http://strateavleader.org/langlern/pdf/dealdifbooklet.odf. Accessed 18/11/2025

Jensen, Hans Siggaard. A history of the concept of Knowledge in Zagreb International Review of Economics & Business. Vol.3 No. 2, pp. 1-16. Croatia: 2000. Accessed 18/11/2025

Jones, W. T. A History of Western Philosophy: The Twentieth Century to Wittgenstein Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers. New York, 1975.

Leighton, Joseph A. The object of knowledge in "The Philosophical Review" Vol. 16 No 6. Pp.577-587 2022. https://www.Jstor.org. Accessed 18/11/2025

Ljungman, Cecilia M. et.al. Sida's work with Culture and Media (Sida Evaluation 04/38) Edita Sverige AB. Sweden: 2005.

Marc, Alexandre. Community Participation in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage in Ismail Serageldin and J. Tabortott. Culture and Development in Africa. Washington D. C. Library of Congress cataloging-in-publication. 1992.

Mckenna, Terence. "Ordinary Language, Visible Language, Virtual Reality" <file;///c:/documt: and settings/care/desktop/ordinarylanguage, visible language and virtualrealty.

Medley, Joumana, "Thinking in Tongues" http://www.bing.org/thinkingintongues.htm. Accessed 18/11/2025

Odey, E. A., Adams, P. A. and Otora, O. A. et al "Divination as a Moral Compass and Physical Imagery of God in African Traditional Religion" in Architecture Image Studies. Vol. 7 (1), 391-398. Doi: https//doi.org/10.6275/ais.v7ii.851. 2026.

Omoregbe, J. Knowing Philosophy, Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers Ltd. 1990.

Omoregbe, J. Knowing Philosophy. Lagos: Joja Press Limited, 1990.

Ozumba, G. O. A Concise Introduction to Epistemology. Calabar: Jochrisam publishers. 2001.

Primaro Jr., M. T. And Edor, J. E. Et al, "Linguistic Norms And The Struggle For Epistemic

Authority" in Analele Universitatii din Craiova, Seria Filosofie. No.56 pp.108-147. 2025.

Randall, John Herman, Buchler, Justus. Philosophy: An Introduction Barns & Noble books. New York: 1971.

Soules, Marshall. Notes Toward a Definition of Culture. https://www.media-studies.ca/articles/culture.htm. Accessed 18/11/2025

Stumpf, S. E. Socrates to Sartre: A History of Philosophy. McGraw-Hill Books Company. New York: 1966.

The Language Doctors. Language and Culture Relationship - A Detailed Guide. https://thelanguagedoctors.org. Accessed 18/11/2025

The Limit of Knowledge in A Guide to Locke's Essay. http://www.philosophypages.com/. Accessed 18/11/2025

Thouless, R. H. Straight and Crooked Thinking. London: Hodderand Stoughton. 1930.

Uduigwomen, A. F. and Ozumba, G. O. A Concise Introduction to Philosophy and Logic (E.d). Centaur Publishers. Calabar: 1995.

Ukopokolo J. E. Philosophy Interrogates Culture: A Discourse in Philosophical Anthropology. Ibadan: Hope Publications, 2004.

Vinck, Dominique. That obscure knowledge object in Revue danthropologie des connaissances https://www.cairn-int.2007. Accessed 18/11/2025

Wikipedia, Creating a knowledge sharing culture http://www.gurteen.com

Wikipedia, The Gree Encyclopedia. "Rationality" www.http://en.wikipedia.org. Accessed 8/12/2025

Zerzan, John. "Language: Origin and Meaning." http://www.primitivism.com/language/ Accessed 18/11/2025