



NOTION OF IDEAS: JOHN LOCKE

Sumit Kr Nayek

HPHS, Huria, Purba Bardhaman, W.B

ABSTRACT

The connection between philosophy and epistemology runs so deep that saying they're essentially the same thing isn't really going too far. Epistemology, which is basically the study of knowledge, focuses on understanding what knowledge actually is, where it comes from, and what its limits are. People have been arguing about how we get knowledge for thousands of years, and John Locke was one of the key thinkers who jumped into this debate. He's often called the father of empiricism and was the first major British philosopher to really champion this way of thinking.

KEYWORDS: *Idea, Simple idea, Complex idea,*

Locke had a completely different take from the rationalists of his time. While they believed people are born with certain built-in ideas, Locke said that's nonsense. Following in the footsteps of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, and other medieval thinkers, he argued that everything in our minds originally came through our senses. According to Locke, all our ideas and knowledge come from what we experience through our senses and from thinking about those experiences. But here's the tricky part - Locke said we don't actually know things directly. Instead, we know ideas about things. So the big question becomes: how do we get these ideas in the first place? Locke's answer was that objects in the world basically stamp impressions on our minds, creating mental copies or images that represent the real things out there.

Most people accept that knowledge can be certain, though there are always skeptics who question everything. But skepticism as a philosophy doesn't really hold up because it ends up contradicting itself. Once we accept that we can have reliable knowledge, the next obvious question is how we actually get it. What are the different ways we acquire knowledge, and which one is most important? Locke, like other empiricists, put all his chips on sense experience and reflection, making ideas the direct objects of what we know. The real puzzle is figuring out how, in Locke's view, our senses are the main source of knowledge and how ideas properly represent reality, especially since he also said we can't know things directly - only our ideas about them. Given all the heated debates about how we primarily gain knowledge, this discussion aims to shed more light on Locke's thoughts about ideas being what we immediately know and how they represent the real world.

This exploration focuses specifically on empiricist theory as Locke understood it, particularly looking at how sensation, reflection, and ideas work together in getting us true knowledge. The approach here is straightforward explanation, concentrating on Locke's view that ideas are both what we directly know and

how we represent reality. This kind of study matters a lot because it adds to our overall understanding of knowledge and specifically addresses philosophical doubts about whether we can really justify what we claim to know through experience.¹

John Locke believed that we can actually gain real knowledge and that it's not just an illusion. He disagreed with skeptics by showing how our senses help us learn about the world. When Locke talked about knowledge, he kept coming back to one main concept - ideas. This idea of "ideas" was really the foundation of everything he thought about how we know things, which he wrote about in his famous book "Essay Concerning Human Understanding." In fact, he used the word "idea" so much in his writing that he actually apologized to readers for repeating it so often. If you want to get what Locke was all about when it came to knowledge, you really need to understand what he meant by "ideas" and how he used this concept. Locke knew how central this was to his thinking, so right at the start of his Essay, he explained that an idea is basically whatever your mind is focused on when you're thinking. He said he used this term to cover things like mental images, concepts, or anything else the mind works with during thought.²

For Locke, an idea is simply what your mind deals with when you think, and he used "thinking" to mean pretty much any mental activity. He believed that ideas are what the mind naturally works with. Ideas can mean two different things - they can represent something that actually exists in the real world around us, or they can be more like universal concepts or logical content. Locke thought that everything we know comes from what we experience through our senses, and our knowledge is really just knowledge about ideas themselves. What we're directly aware of and what we actually know, according to Locke, are ideas and nothing but ideas. He figured that when we're satisfied with our experiences, it means we only know our ideas that come from sensation (from the outside world) or reflection (from our own mental processes).



To him, knowledge was basically just recognizing how our ideas connect, agree, or disagree with each other. This means we can only know as much as we can perceive these relationships between ideas.

Even though empiricism focuses on experience, Locke pointed out that we don't directly experience objective reality - instead, what we immediately experience are ideas. When Locke said knowledge is limited to ideas, he wasn't talking about Plato's perfect forms or anything like that. He meant ideas that come from real objects we encounter - they're like mental copies of those objects. Looking at how Locke used the word "idea," you can pick out several different meanings. First, he used it for what modern philosophers might call sense-data or the actual content of our experiences. Second, he talked about what he called simple ideas of sense. Third, he meant mental images, whether we're remembering something or imagining it. He also used "idea" when talking about characteristics or properties in general, not just things we can sense. In this way, idea meant general properties or concepts. Basically, anything we're aware of, whether it's an action or an object, counts as an idea by definition.

Since these different types of ideas work differently, they can't all represent the world to us in the same way. That's why Locke made a distinction between primary and secondary qualities, which is another important part of his theory. One thing Locke firmly rejected was the notion of innate ideas. He didn't think we're born with any principles or ideas already in our minds, independent of what we experience through our senses. As one scholar put it, Locke believed that there are no innate ideas - our minds start out like a blank slate with nothing written on it. All the impressions we end up with, which Locke called ideas, come from our experiences in the world.³

When rationalists discuss innate ideas, empiricists like Locke push back, arguing that ideas aren't built into us from birth but come from knowledge we gain through other means. Since Locke believes ideas aren't innate at all, this raises an obvious question: where do our ideas actually come from? Looking at what his rationalist opponents believed, Locke points out that they claimed there are certain built-in principles in our minds - basic concepts that are essentially stamped on us from the moment we're born and that our souls carry into the world. Locke disagrees with this view completely. He argues that you can't say an idea exists in someone's mind if they've never actually known it or been aware of it.

Instead, Locke suggests that our minds start out like a blank slate with nothing written on it. We only get ideas through experience. He puts it this way: imagine the mind as a blank piece of white paper with no marks or ideas on it at all. How does it get filled up? Where do all the building blocks of reasoning and knowledge come from? His answer is simple: experience. Once Locke establishes that experience is where knowledge comes from, he breaks experience down into two parts: sensation and reflection.

He believes all our ideas come from these two sources. Through sensation, we experience the outside world, and by reflecting on those experiences, we have an internal experience. You can't have the internal experience without first having the external one. Reflection is basically the mind paying attention to what it's doing, but it can only start doing things once it has ideas coming in from the outside through our senses. This means that when it comes to the raw materials that make up knowledge, sensation is more important.

Locke acknowledges that our minds can take these basic materials and work them into complicated forms. The end result might look completely different from the original sensations and reflections it came from, but no completely new materials were added - they were just rearranged and reshaped. At the start of his Essay, Locke makes it clear he's not trying to figure out the physical or biological aspects of how sensation works. He's not interested in examining how our bodies or spirits move to create sensations through our organs or ideas in our minds. Instead, he takes a more straightforward approach, accepting things as they are. The basic fact he accepts is that we get ideas from sensation.⁴

Since our ideas depend on sensation according to Locke, he describes it this way: our senses interact with specific objects we can sense, and they bring different perceptions of things into our minds based on how those objects affect them. It's through sensation that we get ideas like yellow, black, sweetness, cold, soft, hard, bitter, heat, and all other qualities we can sense. Besides sensation, we also have reflection, which is another part of experience. One scholar describes reflection as a mental activity that creates ideas by noticing previous ideas that our senses provided. Reflection includes things like perceiving, thinking, doubting, believing, reasoning, knowing, willing, and all the other mental activities that produce ideas that are different from what we get when external things affect our senses.

When Locke looks at how our ideas work, he breaks them down in a pretty straightforward way. He starts by separating ideas into two main types: simple and complex ones. Simple ideas are basically the building blocks - they can't be broken down any further and come to us through our senses and inner thoughts. Once we've got these basic ideas, our minds can store them, bring them back up, and mix them together in different ways. These simple ideas are like the raw ingredients for everything we know, and we just take them in without really doing anything to them. Locke puts it pretty clearly when he says that these simple ideas are as plain as day to us. Each one is pure and uniform - you can't split it up into smaller pieces. Think about a white lily that smells sweet. Even though the flower has both whiteness and a sweet smell mixed together, your mind actually picks up the idea of "white" and "sweet" separately because they come through different senses - your eyes see the white and your nose smells the sweetness.



These simple ideas like colors, hot and cold feelings, and tastes can't be divided up. But complex ideas are different - they're made when you combine simple ideas together. Sometimes when you mix simple ideas, you end up with things that don't even exist in real life, like ghosts, UFOs, or something impossible like a square circle. One scholar, Omoregbe, explains it this way: simple ideas are basically the impressions that real things leave on our minds - like copies or snapshots of what's out there. These ideas are directly caused by actual things and they look like what caused them. So Locke believes there's a real connection between the simple ideas in our heads and the actual things they represent. When you take two or more of these simple ideas and put them together, you get a complex idea.

Locke says complex ideas fall into three categories: modes, substances, and relations. The cool thing is that our minds actively create these complex ideas by using simple ideas as building materials. So while we passively receive simple ideas, we actively construct complex ones. This all ties into Locke's view that our minds do three main things with ideas: they combine them, compare them, and pull out abstract concepts from them.⁵

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Ijeoma Ene, John Locke's theory of ideas: a critical appraisal, IJHSSR, vol-7, 2021*
2. *Richard Falckenberg, A History of Modern Philosophy, Kolkata: Progressive Publishers, 2012.*
3. *Y. Masih, A Critical History of Western Philosophy, Delhi: Motilal Banarasidas Publishers, 1993.*
4. *J.N. Sinha, Introduction to Philosophy, Kolkata: New central book agency pvt, ltd.,2016.*
5. *Dr. Abdul Hai Talukdar, Adhunik Paschatya Darsaner Itihas (Bengali Version), Dhaka, Bangladesh: Ananya, 2011.*
6. *Swapna Sarkar, Paschatya Darsan Samikkha(Bengali Version), Kolkata: Progressive Publishers,2015.* 7. *Dr. Kalyan Ch. Gupta, Paschatya Darsaner Itihas(Bengali Version), Kolkata: Mitram,1993.* 8. *Jaydev Vedalankar, Bharatiya Darsanastra ka itihas(Hindi Version), Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation, 2012.*
7. *Mascia C. A History of Philosophy (4th Edition). New Jersey: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1964.*
8. *Omoregbe J. A Simplified History of Western Philosophy. Lagos: Joja Press Ltd, 1991.*
9. *Stumpf SE. Philosophy: History and Problems (3rd ed.)U.S.A: Mcgraw-Hill Book Camp, 1977.*

¹ Cf. *Ijeoma Ene, John Locke's theory of ideas: a critical appraisal, IJHSSR, pp.73-74*

² Cf. *Ijeoma Ene, John Locke's theory of ideas: a critical appraisal, IJHSSR, pp.73-74*

³ Cf. *Ijeoma Ene, John Locke's theory of ideas: a critical appraisal, IJHSSR, pp.74-75*

⁴ Cf. *Ijeoma Ene, John Locke's theory of ideas: a critical appraisal, IJHSSR, p.75*

⁵ Cf. *Ijeoma Ene, John Locke's theory of ideas: a critical appraisal, IJHSSR, p.76*