

On The Biology of 'Philosophy': Auditing the Natural Characteristics of 'Philosophy' Through Biological Codes – Vitalism & Mechanism

Dr. David Khomdram¹

¹Assistant Professor Department of Philosophy Imphal College, Manipur University, khomdram2100@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

We are all familiar with the phrases 'philosophy of history', 'philosophy of biology', etc. and we serve our purpose to analyze them in virtue of the code that every philosopher is familiar with, and this code has become more of a creed. Many names are available for this practice, such as; critical evaluation, theory or theoretical structure, the range of questions, methods or principles, etc. Now, if we overturn the phrase as in 'philosophy of history' to 'history of philosophy', it seems that we found something concrete, something Natural, which partially or absolutely transcends some of the intentions of philosophy. At the same time, every philosopher would insist that the term 'history' itself and its meanings are inherently groomed by philosophy itself. But indulging in this overturning, we believe, we could yield other possibilities that were almost blind to us until now. Thus, in this paper, we try to observe philosophy from the dilated lens of biology, ascertaining the true nature of philosophy; as being fundamental as life itself; as being a living world. This process, at the same time, also reciprocate to the capability of the methodology inherent in the theoretical biology, on its part to analyze and explicate the natural features of subjects like philosophy. Hence, we attempt to prove that philosophy is also the other name for Nature, by putting, and reiterating, it under the lens of biology.

Keywords: Vitalism; mechanism; biology; Nature; life; organism.

1. INTRODUCTION

Speaking of biology, the term, and its scientific characteristics will inevitably compel us to relay the functioning organs, their fundamental functions, chemical reactions, and the principle of physics working behind the very conception of being alive. This gives us the first impression that, if we speak about the biology of something, then this 'something' needs to be a living one; alive and not dead. Now contemplating on the idea of being alive, we presume, and always indulge, into the notion of sustaining certain natural occurrences, and processes. There cannot be such statements like 'biology of aluminum', or 'biology of H₂O, etc. because whatever the intentions may be, it does not simply suit the context. Now the anatomy of being alive needs to be analyzed so that a certain amount of ambiguity is clarified to our satisfaction, or precisely to our rational satisfaction.

To the question 'what is philosophy?' or 'what do you mean by philosophy?', there are equally as many answers as it is in the question 'who is a man?', 'how do we define a man?', or 'what do we understand from the phrase 'the idea of a man'?'. A teacher of academic philosophy, most of the time, encounters the situation where he/she is simply embarrassed to interpret 'philosophy' as 'love of wisdom'. This situation arises when someone who is not familiar with the discipline/subject philosophy, comes to us for the sake of knowledge, for an understanding of the subject, etc. and which is very natural for such a situation to arise. This embarrassment is not because there is the lack of the content to explain, or it lacks the potential to give the audience a proper ambience of the subject. But there is the problem of vastness, capable of putting most of the things into its connotations. Similarly, there is an awkward feeling to claim that philosophy is about everything. But the philosopher does not intend to hesitate to introduce the entire history of philosophy, like un-boxing the Pandora's Box, releasing everything which will gulp down the seeker or learner to the last atom. Again, as there are types of learners/seekers, there are also means and methods to unveil the 'about(s)' of philosophy. Therefore, there is always the dilemma of whether to settle the situation by simply uttering the phrase 'love of wisdom', or should one start with how Socrates refuted the Sophists, and wind up with the modern way of philosophizing, or to the freedom and liberty of any individual to propose their own tenable philosophy.

The essence of biology, or the nature and scope of biology, predominantly is to discover the mystery of the workings of nature. This 'nature' specifically denotes, like said earlier, the living organism, functioning by accommodating other natural processes. If we are to assert something like 'biology of philosophy', and

if we intend to put a meaning against it, then we are also alluding that 'philosophy' should be alive naturally. The phrase should not be misunderstood as adopting the method of biological research in philosophizing on any topic, because this would insinuate another phrase; 'biological research is one way of philosophizing'. Such insinuation will ultimately end up in absurdity, although there can be some kind of accommodation of fact-finding process which relies on biological method, or the fact of biology itself as a part of philosophizing on a particular topic. Our approach here can be stated indirectly as, 'Neither it will satisfy the philosophizing on biology, nor is it purely the philosophy of biology'. There may be some kind of adoption and application of the theories and principles which will remain instrumental to our objective, and of course, some crisscross blending in the line of our discourse. We are of course indebted to the huge, monumental works dedicated to the philosophy of biology starting from Aristotle, through Darwin, and up to the thinkers of our time, etc. But our true ambition is to situate 'philosophy' within the subject matter of biology.

THE ARGUMENT:

That being said, we aimed at presenting the 'philosophy in general' in its entirety, both reachable and explicable, through one of the windows available, and that is the biological approach. When we say 'biological approach', it does not mean to apply some biological method in order to explain the philosophical 'queues'; like applying the biological methods on explaining some non-biological things, etc. On the other hand, the Philosophy of biology normally implies and involves certain reasoning on the study of a living organism, a thinking on life generally, or the methods and procedure involved and applied for the sake of their study, also a 'thinking' on means and method that study life in general. Rather, we are studying the 'philosophy', as philosophy in general, through its biological character. Or, whether it does or does not possess the biological character, we are definitely dissecting 'philosophy', as we dissect a living organism, studying the life – that is philosophy; the life incorporating most of the aspects of the biological characteristics. While refraining ourselves from the methods of popular analytic philosophy, we intend on observing the underlying character, and establishing the biological character in it(philosophy), for the sake of better understanding and also for the sake of promoting it, without a single speck of doubt, on its significance, on the role it plays, both on epistemic, metaphysical, and ethical aspects of a 'natural life'.

If we go on insisting that there can be something called the biology of philosophy, then we also need to affirm that this so-called 'philosophy' is alive. The idea of being alive, in all its aspects, we simply called 'life'. The notion of 'life' invites humongous definitions from numerous disciplines, and each definition essentially, wholly or partially, contributes to the meaning and understanding of life. From the most primitive society to the most advanced ones, has their own exegesis of life. In these expansions of meanings, each and every one of the understandings, should always accommodate the responsibilities of multiple scientific and non-scientific laws that make the 'life' possible. These resulted in the emergence of the concepts such as 'vitalism' and 'mechanism' as the two principal theories of life or living organism. In the Dictionary of Biology, the modern biological or mechanical interpretation of 'life' understood as a living organism is reported as;

“LIFE: -Complex physico-chemical systems whose two main peculiarities are (1) storage and replication of molecular information in the form of nucleic acid, and (2) the presence of (or in viruses perhaps merely the potential for) enzyme catalysis. Without enzyme catalysis a system is inert, not alive; however, such systems may still count as biological (e.g. all viruses away from their hosts). Other familiar properties of living systems such as nutrition, respiration, reproduction, excretion, irritability, locomotion, etc., are all 'dependent in some way upon their exhibiting the two above-mentioned properties.'”(M Abercrombie, 1990, p. 327)

On the other hand, Aristotle would insist that 'life' or 'animality' is known to be alive because of the existence of the soul. Aristotle writes, “The knowledge of the soul admittedly contributes greatly to the advance of truth in general, and, above all, to our understanding of Nature, for the soul is in some sense the principle of animal life.” (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 402a1-402a9) Again, he writes;

"But, all the same, in each of the bodily parts there are present all the parts of the soul, and the souls so present are homogenous with one another and with the whole; this means that the several parts of the soul are inseparable from one another, although the whole soul is divisible. It seems also that the principle found in plants is also a kind of soul; for this is the only principle which is common to both animals and plants; and this exists in isolation from the principle of sensation, though there is nothing which has the latter without the former.”(Aristotle, 1995, pp. 411b19-411b31) “That is why the soul is an actuality of

the first kind of a natural body having life potentially in it. The body so described is a body which is organized". (Aristotle, *De Anima (On the Soul)*, 1995, pp. 412a27-412b9)

Aristotle's vitalism -though vitalism is not restricted to Aristotle alone -and the modern scientist's mechanism, though there are theoretical conflicts between them, they seem to explain the hallmark of being alive. We are not delving into the discourse which will expose a better definition of life. From a philosopher's point of view, although they are binary opposites, both of them represent the most general, and satisfactory explication of the necessary condition(s) of a living organism as opposed to the state of being dead.

Therefore, for philosophy to become the subject matter of biology, it needs to satisfy either of the affections or both. This will be the prerequisite for advancing our inquiry. When we attribute the sense of living, upon something, in either of the two senses, it will be completely excluded from the domain of non-living things, and if this happens, then we also need to denounce it as being an attribution to some other thing. That being said, now philosophy cannot be a piece of thought, compiled through words and sentences, engraved upon some human mind, or on some piece of paper. Now what remains to be seen is whether philosophy is alive or not. To the question of whether philosophy is alive or dead?, most will definitely reply 'alive'. This sense of alive is purely teleological, or rather the sense of alive that we mistakenly attribute to a machine. Will it be engrossed with absurdity if we conclude that philosophy is alive from a biological point of view? We are very straight here, and we do not intend to bring here the linguistic play on the meaning of being alive. That being said, we are also not depriving ourselves of the critical thinking in terms of reasoning, and going by the face value, which is highly superficial; so determined by some state of ignorance.

First, there is the necessity to observe whether the law of biology precedes the organism, or is it the opposite. This 'law' here is the necessary parameters that can categorize a thing as living or non-living. If the law precedes the organism, then there is the sense of 'making'; a sense of creation, and a projection of some kind of end, which also presupposes the prime mover and its agenda. On the other hand, if the organism precedes the law, then the law arises out of necessity through accidents. This preceding by the organism, is another version of the theory of the accidental universe. Or is it entirely natural that everything is drowned in the confusion as to, which precedes the other? This explanation, in terms of absolute naturality, acknowledges and embraces at the same time the natural, spontaneous life process, and also the gradual revelation of the working principles behind the life process. This point of view does not matter the opposition between the earlier two theories. When the word 'natural' is uttered, it implicates most of the conflicts as being inherent within the larger structure of nature itself. This means both the organism and the law cannot be identified beyond the realm of Nature, or rather it ceases to exist beyond. That being said, Nature also accommodates other inanimate things in her lap, and other principles related to those things, etc.

WHY BIOLOGY?

Now, thinking about philosophy, can we easily accommodate philosophy within the domain of 'nature'? Or, is it purely a product of the physics and chemistry that occurs in the human brain? Let us skip the part where we are tempted to argue that the product of the brain, too, is a part of 'Nature', because this will lead to a vicious circle. Accommodating philosophy in the domain of 'Nature', or recognizing philosophy as a natural process is also reminding, to ourselves, that there cannot be a precise understanding of the nature of philosophy as purely determined by the artificial structure constructed within the human brain. Again, one cannot ensure philosophy, as purely natural, in the sense that it pre-exists human thought; human thought, as the product of the mechanism that persists in the human brain. Another reason is our endeavor to rely on functional laws involved in biological explanations, rather than the causal explanations.

Here comes the biological process in rescue, to deliver us from the bewilderment. Thus, we dissect philosophy to unveil what lies within. It is evident in *De Anima* that Aristotle was aware of the two possible explanations of life/ living organism - 'vitalism' and 'mechanism'. He writes.

"Hence a physicist would define an affection of soul differently from a dialectician; the latter would define e.g. anger

as the appetite for returning pain for pain, or something like that, while the former would define it as a boiling of

the blood or warm substance surrounding the heart." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 403a26-403b19)

The only possible allegation could be the nomination of the 'soul' as vital to life, or he used it synonymously with life itself. Other than that, Aristotle's conception of biology was grand and accurate. Accurate in the sense that he ventures most of the terrain reasonably and, at the same time, also acknowledging all the possible variations that could systematically be introduced into the more detailed versions of it. In Isaac Asimov's words, "Aristotle was two thousand years ahead of his time" (Asimov, 1964, p. 7).

Philosophy, being the subject matter of biology, for us, through close observation, both the principle of vitalism and mechanism seems to be at work. This means philosophy can be explained, approached, and practice through vitalism. On the other hand the mechanistic principle, its accidental nature is not alien to philosophy. These are just plain statements emerging out of plain observation. What remains to be seen are the constituent parts of the composite structure.

"But if men and animals and their several parts are natural phenomena, then the natural philosopher must take into consideration flesh, bone, blood, and all the other homogeneous parts; not only these, but also the heterogeneous parts, such as face, hand, foot; and must examine how each of these comes to be what it is, and in virtue of what force." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 640b18-640b29)

These natural phenomena, for most, are how a philosopher learns to identify philosophical problems in order to philosophize on a certain topic. What is intriguing for us is, whether philosophy recognizes the principle of homogeneity or heterogeneity in the animals, or are they been preexisting before the thought ever arises? The preexisting philosophy in terms of wisdom is evident in all the functioning of these parts of the organisms. For instance, if philosophy is the name given to the inquiry seeking the truth behind anything, or the true nature of the truth that has been given to us unconsciously, then philosophy is also the truth that runs a system; as when it means when we state that 'the truth for Socrates is the truth of reason', the truth of Plato is the truth of the ideas, and this can be restated as the philosophy of Plato is the 'theory of ideas'. If philosophy is the inquiry to know the function of the heart, then the function of the heart, that is pumping blood meant to supply blood throughout the body, is also the philosophy of the heart. If there is a distinction between a pure function and idle philosophy, then this will miss the fact that the term 'function' or 'functioning' presupposes some kind of philosophy, a philosophy of some end or duty. On the other hand, the term philosophy always stands for some kind of function which has the intention of revealing the truth. If there is the strong conviction that philosophy is only the product of some kind of chemical reaction bound by some physical laws inside the human brain, then this will ultimately lead to the unnaturalness of philosophy or the artificiality of philosophy. This is because the meaning of artificial is solely relevant to the human ingenuity on unnatural things, generally transcending the laws of Nature, or reacting against it, in this modern time. Again if we insist that philosophy is human ingenuity, then this will contradict the exploratory character of philosophy in terms of discovering the truths or reality(s).

Mr. A writes a novel and subsequently, Mr. A's hard work pays, and his reputation rose up to a certain level. Now Mr. B being a philosopher, or any kind of critical reader, point out the philosophy of Mr. A as being inclined towards the existential tendency with the likes of Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Sartre, etc. This entails that Mr. A was writing under the influence of the existential philosophy. But this fact might be unaware to Mr. A himself. Either he was exposed to similar situations as plots and sentiments, or he constructed them out of his own wit. This construction is not the construction of the abstract wit/wisdom, but the plots and characters and their relations to establish a situation. This implies that philosophy might be natural rather than artificial, although the realization may be a product of intense reasoning - and even this cannot be generalised. Again, if the whole enterprise started with Mr. A as a philosopher, and thus follows his novel with the right strategies, then his philosophy must have some kind of natural bearings on some other things. For instance, Kierkegaard's existential philosophy has its natural bearing on faith and its related events exemplified in the case of Abraham and Isaac, etc.

The natural phenomena called philosophy:

Russell, in the introduction to his book *History of Western Philosophy*, contends that philosophy is the conception of life and the world, and at the same time he also marked the beginning of philosophy from Thales. He writes, "The conceptions of life and the world which we call 'philosophical' are a product of two factors; one, inherited religious and ethical conceptions; the other, the sort of investigation which may be called 'scientific', using this word in its broadest sense." (Russell, 1995, p. 13). On the other hand, he claimed that "Philosophy begins with Thales, who, fortunately, can be dated by the fact that he predicted an eclipse which, according to the astronomers, occurred in the year 585 B.C." (Russell, 1995,

p. 25). For Russell, being philosophical means conceptions of life and the world in a certain way, and Thales was the one, who, for the first time, acts philosophically because he sees life and the world in a certain way. 'Conception', which is also an act performed by the mind as thought, is part of the natural function of the mind. Therefore, in the philosophy of the mind, we generally observe the reality of the 'mind' whose essence is generally 'thought' or the act of thinking, and this includes the other multiple functions of the mind. Again, if we discard the philosophy of mind; of positing an identity and attributes to some substance 'mind', then we are on the side of claiming that reasoning is the product of the mechanical theory. Either way, what we infer from this is, that conception is a function of, generally, a living being, or more precisely, in a more scientific way, a function of reasoning; which could be either a function of mind or the mechanics. Thus the philosophy of mind or living being is also an inquiry into the truth of 'it', and the truth is the very function, such as conception, etc. which we and Russell found, and the truth itself is also the philosophy. Mathematically, 'the truth of the mind' is equal to 'the philosophy of the mind'. Hence, the truth or philosophy is not ascribed by some external process, or by some artificial process, rather it is the Nature that only remains to be realized at some point in time.

To further elaborate, in the context of Indian philosophy, the general terminology which represents philosophy is 'darsāna'. John Grimes provides the meaning as; "sight; vision; to have auspicious sight of; to see a great or holy being, either human or divine; sensation; apprehension; intuition; a philosophical school..."(Grimes, 1996, p. 109). S. Radhakrishnan in his book *Indian Philosophy*, rightly observed the sense that carries with the term. Radhakrishnan, like Grimes, also knew that darśāna as philosophy is not confined to the critical expositions, logical surveys, or systems. He writes, "Perhaps the word is advisedly used, to indicate a thought system acquired by intuitive experience and sustained by logical argument." (Radhakrishnan, 2008, p. 20). He further observed the various senses the 'term' carries with it. It is so vague that it almost curls up being as practice in terms of seeking the truth; the ultimate truth. But he writes, "Philosophically 'darsāna' is putting the intuition to proof and propagating it logically." (Radhakrishnan, 2008, p. 21). This means rendering of reality in logical terms. But when it fails, Radhakrishnan writes, "When we realize the inadequacy of a conceptual account to reality, we try to seize the real by intuition....then we get the pure 'being'....from which we get back to the logical realm of thought..... 'Darsāna' as applicable to this last means..... It is the one word that stands for all the complex inspiration of philosophy by its beautiful vagueness." (Radhakrishnan, 2008, p. 21). This account of the 'term' also embraces any scientific account of reality. Now, that being said, it has repeatedly been uttered that philosophy as 'darsāna', is about the exposition of truth, and grasping it through all possible means. When the Indians complemented the procedure with 'intuition', it has become clearer that the truth itself is purely 'Natural', in the sense that it dwells in the domain which is sometimes immune to the conceptual account of reality. This further means that the ability for the logical exposition is deferred to some later time, and this situation is very natural since it is the historical fact; a mystery at a certain time becomes a case of knowledge at another time. Now, this way of knowing the truth in its fullness, when a conceptual endeavour is reinforced by intuition, is popularly known as monism. Sometimes the school of monism will completely discard the way of logic, but taking the two simultaneously will be more applicable generally. Hence, philosophy as 'darśāna' is seeking the truth, and on the other hand, the 'monism', which is the account of that truth, is also the name of the philosophy which asserts that truth is everything as one. Thus philosophy is indistinguishable from the truth that it seeks. Once the truth is found, it becomes the philosophy.

Biology And Philosophy (Aristotle and Darwin)

That being said, if philosophy is truly Natural, then it should be under the purview of, at least, some of the natural sciences. This means, that one or more natural science(s) should be able to study it in their own laboratory, and this is meant in their most general sense. It should be observable, at least, in principle from their point of view. Therefore, we need to find out which branch of natural science can accommodate philosophy in their line of research. Here we start with biology.

This also means philosophy must be qualified enough to be part of Aristotle's *De Anima*, *Historia Animalium*, *De Partibus Animalium*, *De Generatione Animalium*, etc. the biology of William Harvey, the taxonomy of Carolus Linnaeus, the anatomy of Andreas Vesalius, Lamarck's zoology, and Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* and its theory of evolution, etc. In the opening of his book, Darwin writes;

“When we look to the individuals of the same variety or sub-variety of our older cultivated plants and animals, one of the first points which strikes us, is, that they generally differ much more from each other, than do the individuals of any one species or variety in a state of nature.” (Darwin, 2010, p. 12)

It doesn't matter what follows this line, but the intriguing part of this line is that it truly pictured the fundamental characteristic of philosophy. The feud between an empiricist and idealist sitting on the same bench is much more intensive and powerful than two soldiers from two warring nations pointing their guns against one another. The soldiers must be identical in so many ways, for instance, both of them, at least, must be hoping to end the war as soon as possible. But on the other hand, the idealist or the empiricist must be hoping, as we are writing this paragraph, to construct a more sound theory which can glorify itself as the ultimate theory against all odds. Again, Darwin adds, “One of the most remarkable features in our domesticated races is that we see in them adaptation, not indeed to the animal's or plant's own good, but to man's use or fancy.” (Darwin, 2010, pp. 31,32). Thus arises, the principle of selection, which according to Darwin is not hypothetical. He observed, “The key is man's power of accumulative selection: nature gives successive variations; man adds them up in certain directions useful to him. In this sense, he may be said to make for himself useful breeds.” (Darwin, 2010, p. 32). Therefore, for Darwin, the cause of change that happens ultimately rests in human power which is manifested in the principle of 'selection'. This conclusion made by Darwin gives us another picture of philosophy. When we speak of idealism and empiricism, the adaptation that occurred in these theories is not for their own sake, but for the sake of man, not only generally, but also particularly as in the case of personal expediency or prudence, and this could be an irrefutable truth. One instance of a very immature and narrow sense could be the competition between the idealist and the empiricist, and their race towards triumphant. Other senses would include the application of the theories in explaining the world and its manifold aspects. Now, in this race, the rest of the others as audience or spectators will lend their hand in support of the one which benefits them in one way or the other, both personally and generally.

Darwin again talks about Natural Selection that happens in the natural state. He claimed that it is far more powerful than man's effort to preserve the best. He compared Nature's work of selection to that of the work of art. He writes.

“Owing to this struggle for life, any variation, however slight and from whatever cause proceeding, if it be in any degree profitable to an individual of any species, in its infinitely complex relations to other organic beings and to external nature, will tend to the preservation of that individual, and will generally be inherited by its offspring. The offspring, also, will thus have a better chance of surviving, for, of the many individuals of any species which are periodically born, but a small number can survive. I have called this principle, by which each slight variation, if useful, is preserved, by the term of Natural Selection...” (Darwin, 2010, p. 59)

When Nature chooses the right philosophy, it goes with the welfare of all. This selection by Nature in Darwin's terms is, “...daily and hourly scrutinizing, throughout the world, every variation, even the slightest; rejecting that which is bad, preserving and adding up all that is good; silently and insensibly working...” (Darwin, 2010, pp. 78-79). In the vast history of philosophy, for instance, starting from the days of Socrates, the situation of Athens when dominated by sophistry, creating problems in decision-making in the Hall of the Senate; and Senates being represented by different people from different backgrounds, the necessity of the universality of the truth of human reasoning emerges against homo mensura, through Socrates. Again, Russell observed the rise of the Stoics as, “Stoicism, unlike the earlier purely Greek philosophies, is emotionally narrow, and in a certain sense fanatical; but it also contains religious elements of which the world felt the need, and which the Greeks seemed unable to supply.” (Russell, 1995, p. 260). In 1498, during the Italian Renaissance, when Savonarola dominated Florence, Machiavelli thinks that all armed prophets have dominated and conquered whereas the unarmed ones remained victims. This led to the composition of *The Prince* and its associating philosophy.¹ Thus, we can see Thomas Hobbes, Rousseau, Locke, Kant, Marx, etc. being called upon by Nature in the exact time and place. Darwin writes, “Man often begins his selection by some modification prominent enough to catch his eyes, or to be plainly useful to him. Under nature, the slightest difference of structure or constitution may well turn the nicely balanced scale in the struggle for life, and so be preserved.” (Darwin, 2010, p. 78). Now recapitulating the selection of philosophy by man, and comparing with the Natural selection, certain philosophies are hung on their walls and filled their library with books related to their

¹See *The Prince* by Machiavelli, Niccolo

choices, or live a life in accordance to that no matter what happens around them, whether there is a tsunami or world war, no matter how one's neighbour suffer as long as one is safe and healthy. But it seems that Natural selection is entirely different from such a state in terms of the magnitude of the changes that it brings, and its impact across time. Darwin observed.

"Man can act only on external and visible characters: nature cares nothing for appearances, except in so far as they may be useful to any being. She can act on every internal organ, on every shade of constitutional difference, on the whole machinery of life. Man selects only for his own good; Nature only for that of the being which she tends. Every selected character is fully exercised by her; and the being is placed under well suited conditions of life." (Darwin, 2010, p. 78)

Aristotle in *Historia Animalium* contends that "Animals differ from one another in their modes of subsistence, in their actions, in their habits, and in their parts." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 487a11-487a13). Thus he writes, "Of the parts of animals some are simple: to wit, all such as divide into parts uniform with themselves, as flesh into flesh; others are composite, such as divide into parts not uniform with themselves, as, for instance, the hand does not divide into hands nor the face into faces." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 486a5-486a9). This understanding of parts, when applied in the domain of philosophy, is also the cause of most of the dialogues that emerge among different schools. A close examination of Aristotle further gives this, "Of animals, some resemble one another in all their parts, while others have parts wherein they differ. Sometimes the parts are identical in form, as, for instance, one man's nose or eye resembles another man's nose or eye, flesh flesh, and bone bone...." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 486a15-486b4). This is how we place the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle side by side; we find the two are not much apart as a whole. But the squabbling between the two philosophers will never end. While Plato will deprive the 'idea' from the particulars, on the other hand, Aristotle will attribute it to the particulars. But both agree with the principle of reason, the truth of inference, and such, etc.

Again, Aristotle points out the differences in philosophies due to their habitation when he writes, "Differences are manifested in modes of subsistence, in habits, and in actions as follows: some animals live in water and others on land. And of those that live in water some do so in one way, and some in another..." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 487a14-487a28). He added, "Of animals that live on land some take in air and emit it, which phenomena are termed 'inhalation' and 'exhalation'; as, for instance, man and all such land animals as are furnished with lungs." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 487a29-487a34). The philosophy that originated in Europe can be easily distinguished from the philosophy that originated in the Indian subcontinent. Both have different cultures with different interpretations of life. While the philosophy that persists in Europe can further be subdivided into a plethora of styles and perspectives. Similarly, the Indian subcontinent too, is not deprived of the differences. We can extend our observations on some of the characters; exhibited by philosophers and philosophies of the world through some of the lines from Aristotle's *History of Animals*.

a. "And of land animals many, as has been said, derive their subsistence from the water; but of creatures that live in and inhale water none derives its subsistence from the land." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 487b1-487b3).

b. "Some animals at first live in water, and by and by change their shape and live out of water, as is the case with river worms—for out of these the gadfly develops." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 487b4-487b5).

c. "Of land animals some are furnished with wings, such as birds and bees, and these are so furnished in different ways one from another; others are furnished with feet." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 487b18-487b23). "Again, many animals move by walking as well as by swimming." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 487b31-487b31).

d. "Some are gregarious, some are solitary, whether they be furnished with feet or wings or be fitted for a life in the water; and some partake of both characters. And of the gregarious, some are social, others independent." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 487b32-488a2). "Man partakes of both characters." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 488a6-488a6).

e. "Also, some are carnivorous, some graminivorous, some omnivorous: whilst some feed on a peculiar diet, as for instance the bees and the spiders (for the bee lives on honey and certain other sweets, and the spider lives by catching flies); and some creatures live on fish. Again, some creatures catch their food, others treasure it up, whereas others do not." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 488a15-488a19).

f. "Some creatures provide themselves with a dwelling, others go without one.." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 488a20-488a24). "Some are nocturnal, as the owl and the bat; others live in the daylight." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 488a25-488a25).

g. “Furthermore, some are combative, others defensive.”(Aristotle, 1995, pp. 488b8-488b10). “Some are good-tempered, sluggish, and not prone to ferocity, as the ox; others are quick-tempered, ferocious and un-teachable, as the wild boar; some are intelligent and timid, as the stag and the hare; others are mean and treacherous, as the snake; others are free and courageous and high-bred, as the lion; others are thorough-bred and wild and treacherous, as the wolf.”(Aristotle, 1995, pp. 488b11-488b19).

h. “Further, some are crafty and mischievous, as the fox; some are spirited and affectionate and fawning, as the dog; others are easy-tempered and easily domesticated, as the elephant; others are cautious and watchful, as the goose; others are jealous and self-conceited, as the peacock. But of all animals man alone is capable of deliberation.”(Aristotle, 1995, pp. 488b20-488b24). “Many animals have memory, and are capable of instruction; but no other creature except man can recall the past at will.”(Aristotle, 1995, pp. 488b25-488b26).

In the case of (a), in the Indian context, for instance, the philosophy of metaphysical monism which is considered to be more or less independent, sometimes becomes a point of reference for other philosophies to flourish – like qualified monism. Marx, being trained in Hegelian philosophy, moves out of it, or from philosophy itself, while still relying on the dialectics, goes for something very political and practical, like those animals who moved out of the water in (b). As it is mentioned in (c), some philosophies are capable of working on multiple terrains in terms of their practicability, applicability, etc. and some are confined or stuck on a few terrains. Point (d) shows that some philosophy is bound to the individual while others reach out to the society at large and becoming - political. Some philosophies arise out of their own, or due to some other factors which are non-philosophical, while other's modes of thinking/other modes of thinking, which can be classified as a school of philosophy, actually feast on other philosophies for their survival. The former finds their ground to philosophize on the state of our existence and its influencing factors, while the latter function to reconstruct or deconstruct those philosophies. This is not the function of critical reviewing or observation. These phenomena are indicated in (e). The case of (f) is interesting because some philosophers never cited a line from another book to support their argument. I have seen this in the books written by Ludwig Wittgenstein. Though he reasoned with other preceding arguments and their structures, etc. he never intends to shelter under their roof. The sense of nocturnal and daylight animals is irrelevant when inscribe in the domain of philosophy if it is taken to their livelihood in those particular times. But some philosophies surface in the daylight in the form of treatises, dialogues, etc. and others remain in the dark inherent in the arts and aesthetics in the form of plots, in the form of manifold characters, within the blank verses, within the statues and monuments, hidden conceptually, waiting to be realized later. Again, what we see in (g) does not require some keen observation, because every student of philosophy is familiar with this. Here we can see the outright character of a particular philosophy when it comes into conflict with other ways of conceptions, or insights. For instance, the Positivists were ferocious enough to discard any other way of contemplation which does not subside to their prescribed methods. Again, the Pragmatists think it is nonsense to even indulge in an ideal path for a period of time; long enough to make them and others bored. Similarly, other mentioned characters are also undeniably perceptible in the domain of philosophy. This comparison, in terms of observation, is not perfect and it is highly contextual, although some are very general, and the significance lies in the possibility to recreate philosophy as a matter of biology. Many things can go wrong in these observations but also picking a few applicable areas has become a virtue in modern research. In the entire observation, it seems that Aristotle stationed 'man' as a being which is capable of accommodating and practising the 'contradictory' qualities. I believe that every philosopher's ambition is to establish a philosophy which should necessarily represent the 'man' in Aristotle's biology. Aristotle writes, “Of natural bodies some have life in them, others not; by life we mean self-nutrition and growth and decay. It follows that every natural body which has life in it is a substance in the sense of a composite.” (Aristotle, *On the Soul*, 1995, pp. 412a12-412a17). This part of the biology, which is very much essential, is partially true in the case of philosophy, because, though the part of self-nutrition and growth is true, the decaying of philosophy is not entirely true except in some uncanny situation of interpretation. How old a particular philosophy may be, and there may be gargantuan development on the same philosophy, we cannot simply digest the word decay here, because philosophy is not a linear process, but rather a composite of past, present, and future, and also the compositeness on the dimension of geographical differences, etc. If 'decay' is specifically meant for the procedural stage of the law of conservation of nature, then it cannot be denied in the domain of philosophy. We cannot skip the transitional stages in the history of philosophy.

Aristotle again points out another aspect of the 'biology'; "Animals, then, are composed of homogeneous parts, and are also composed of heterogeneous parts. The former, however, exist for the sake of the latter. For the active functions and operations of the body are carried on by these; that is, by the heterogeneous parts, such as the eye, the nostril, the whole face, the fingers, the hand, and the whole arm." (Aristotle, 1995, pp. 646b11-646b26). If, for instance, 'reason' is the homogeneous part of philosophy, then the part such as 'metaphysics', 'ethics', 'epistemology', etc. should be the heterogeneous parts. There can be nothing truer than the fact that the 'reason' exists for the latter. Again, in the process of studying philosophy, philosophy is introduced to us through the functionality and the scope of these heterogeneous parts.

The Conclusion:

Now, as we have conducted certain observations on the 'philosophy' through the lens of biology, and we, to a certain extent, successfully presented the biology of philosophy, though not perfect, we are also presenting a new [old] method of the acquisition of the 'philosophy'. Due to the constraints in space here, our privilege of exposition is limited to few biological researches and its instances as observation. What is more important is the possibility to juxtapose two disciplines, which most believed to be entirely different in all their aspects; including methods, principles, etc. One might question if 'philosophy' can be seen through a microscope. But our reply is what we see in the microscope is naturally the same as 'philosophy'. Philosophy is in the organism, or it is the organism itself, because, as far as we have seen, we cannot distinguish between 'philosophy' and other subject matter of biology on the ground and factors which actually determine their existential proof. Erwin Schrodinger, in his short and classic work 'What is Life?', he attempts to unveil the principles and functions of physics and chemistry inherent in biology.² His attempt was not to devalue anything but to make others realize the working principles at its core. He observed that a complex organ like the brain, in order to present a high-quality thought, as composed of atoms ultimately, must be governed by some consistent well ordered, strict physical laws. He writes, "First, a physical organization, to be in close correspondence with thought (as my brain is with my thought) must be a very well-ordered organization, and that means that the events that happen within it must obey strict physical laws, at least to a very high degree of accuracy. Secondly, the physical impressions made upon that physically well-organized system by other bodies from outside, obviously correspond to the perception and experience of the corresponding thought, forming its material, as I have called it. Therefore, the physical interactions between our system and others must, as a rule, themselves possess a certain degree of physical orderliness, that is to say, they too must obey strict physical laws to a certain degree of accuracy." (SCHRODINGER, 1967, pp. 9-10)

As Schrodinger has remarked, there cannot be a perfect reason which will completely segregate one discipline from another. But we are not entirely relying on this kind of proposition to benefit ourselves for the sake of our paper here. The biological nature of 'philosophy' that has been reflected upon the necessary instances, also enables us to conclude that, the necessity of biology and other natural sciences which has immaculately been proved by human history, does not forfeit something called philosophy, necessarily out of them naturally, despite the attempts made by the exponents of these sciences to exclude philosophy out of their domain. The enigmatic nature of philosophy as being part of the Nature, as the phantom force that internally aspires these sciences, can be, simply or practically, explain through their own methods. If philosophy is observable through their lenses, then it falls into the same category of the things that have been dealt with in those sciences. Now that philosophy is highly natural, and has been treated in the previous paragraphs as an organism characteristically, then, presuming 'philosophy' as a subject matter of biology, at least in terms of its status, is also certifying that it is inevitable to include in the general requirement of human knowledge as a part of education - in the broadest sense of the term. When Russell asked, "Is there any knowledge in the world which is so certain that no reasonable man could doubt it?" (Russell, *The Problems of Philosophy*, 1980, p. 1) we also doubt, in the same intensity, the knowledge that says, 'philosophy cannot be a branch of knowledge that deals with the practical reality of life because it dwells in the idle theoretical domain', despite the fact that it is impossible to dissociate philosophy from any kind of epistemic ground. The truth is, we breathe philosophy, we consume philosophy, and it is the fuel that is in constant combustion to put the body in motion. In Aristotle's words.

“To sum up, then, and repeat what I have said, inasmuch as an animal is capable of appetite it is capable of self-movement; it is not capable of appetite without possessing imagination; and all imagination is either calculative or sensitive. In the latter all animals partake.” (Aristotle, *De Anima (On the Soul)*, 1995, pp. 433b27-433b30)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aristotle. (1995). *De Anima (On the Soul)*. In Aristotle, *The Complete Works of Aristotle* (J. A. Smith, Trans.). UK: Princeton University Press.
2. Aristotle. (1995). *De Partibus Animalium (Parts of Animals)*. In Aristotle, *The Complete Works of Aristotle* (W. Ogle, Trans.). UK: Princeton University Press.
3. Aristotle. (1995). *Historia Animalium (History of Animals)*. In Aristotle, *The Complete Works of Aristotle* (d. W. Thompson, Trans.). UK: Princeton University Press.
4. Aristotle. (1995). *On the Soul*. In Aristotle, *The Complete Works of Aristotle* (J. A. Smith, Trans.). UK: Princeton University Press.
5. Aristotle. (1995). *The Complete Works of Aristotle*. United Kingdom: Princeton University Press.
6. Asimov, I. (1964). *A Short History of Biology*. New York: The Natural History Press.
7. Darwin, C. (2010). *On the Origin of Species*. Noida: Maple Press.
8. Grimes, J. (1996). *A Concise Dictionary of Indian Philosophy : Sanskrit terms defined in English*. New York: State University of New York Press.
9. M Abercrombie, M. H. (1990). *Dictionary of Biology (Eight ed.)*. London: Penguin.
10. Machiavelli, N. (2009). *The Prince*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
11. Radhakrishnan, S. (2008). *Indian Philosophy, Vol-1*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
12. Russell, B. (1995). *History of Western Philosophy*. Routledge: Canada.
13. Russell, B. (1980). *The Problems of Philosophy*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
14. SCHRODINGER, E. (1967). *What is Life?* New York: Cambridge University Press.