

Approaching the Concept of Knowledge: A Synthesis of Sextus Empiricus, David Hume, and Edmund Gettier's Theories of Knowledge

Edward John C. Ponce, Jr.

Abstract: Throughout the history of philosophy, many have questioned and argued about what knowledge is, how to attain knowledge, and if certainty is even possible. Some epistemological systems have not yet answered all questions that raise inquiry while others have some flaws within their methods. This makes synthesizing structures important in creating a stronger one that is better as a whole compared to each of them if taken individually. Taking Gettier, Sextus, and Hume's theories into the picture, one would see differences in their approach to knowledge. For instance, Sextus would see suspending one's judgment as an end to attain *ataraxia*, which is mental tranquility and calmness, because there is no absolute argument that has no equally reasonable rebuttal. David Hume focuses more on how one forms ideas through impressions, considering reality as sequence of events without causality. And lastly, Gettier defined knowledge as justified true belief, or beliefs that need true premises. Although different from one another, these systems can coexist because each considers the notion that everyone has an abundance of habitual knowledge and beliefs. In using their explanations on acquiring knowledge, one would understand a new and different view on the concept of knowledge and truth. With Sextus' Pyrrhonist system, which included the ten modes of suspension of judgment, he proved that perception is unreliable. While Gettier showed that one can be logically correct but his premises can actually be false. Hume then, disproved causality with his problem of induction. With these reasons as premises, one can see why the suspension of judgment is fair; for everyone should see and realize that they all constitute the idea of not taking things for granted, which is a principle of skepticism. They all imply the idea that man's grasp for knowledge is not enough. In fact, their systems, unlike the dogmatic ones, are the most flexible lines of thought which can still be applied today. They support continuous search and verification of knowledge, which is reasonable and definitely applicable to scientific research and a liberal way of dealing with social issues. This synthesis offers an approach which looks on all perspectives, the pros and cons of an issue, which should be used by everyone.

Keywords: Epistemology, Justified True Belief, Problem of Induction, Pyrrhonism

Introduction

Skepticism is predicated upon the idea that man's grasp for knowledge is not enough. As Grayling describes it, "skepticism is a healthy feature of all inquiry, prompting careful examination of evidence and argument, reminding us not to take too much on trust and to inspect the credentials of the sources and nature of knowledge claims"¹. Sextus Empiricus, David Hume, and Edmund Gettier have all exposed the inconsistencies of man's conception of knowledge. Although they did not come from the same era, all of them constitute a common notion: that there is a problem with society's established beliefs on knowledge. They have proven the weakness of man's judgment, from Sextus' ten modes as guide to *ataraxia*, Hume's discredit of induction, and to Gettier's problem with justified belief on propositional knowledge. All these systems can be synthesized into one strong form of skepticism. This form of epistemology is the one which constitutes a great reason for not trusting man's judgment, and seeing the suspension of judgment as an end. This is a system which is open to all possibilities, without the use of a narrow dogma which drains away people's desire to continuously seek knowledge.

Epistemic questions on knowledge

People answer questions promptly and quickly when asked, implying that they know the answer without even determining whether there is certainty. Epistemology dwells on these matters which center on the nature of knowledge. According to Pojman, there are three forms of knowledge: *propositional*,

competence, and knowledge by acquaintance.² *Knowledge by acquaintance* is one's assertion of familiarity of something, wherein a person has direct and personal experience of an object or a person. *Competence knowledge* is the performance of knowledge or the knowhow, this meant being able to assert that one can perform to show his or her knowledge (i.e. cooking a special recipe). Lastly, the *propositional knowledge* which asserts a proposition or another person's assumption of something which has truth value (i.e. I know that Manila is the capital of the Philippines).

Most philosophers dwell on matters that inspect the definition and nature of propositional knowledge which consists of statements that should correspond to facts to be considered true. But what makes a proposition true? What is truth? How do we obtain and determine that a proposition is true? These questions shall be answered by Sextus' pyrrhonism.

Propositional knowledge starts with a statement and proposing something means the person initiating it believes it is true, that is why belief became another element on propositional knowledge. Questions like "*Are beliefs necessary for propositional knowledge?*" and "*What conditions should we consider on beliefs that would prove its validity?*" arise. Because of these, justification became another issue on epistemology. Believing truly became an important factor on propositional knowledge. Justification is a standard and a normative act that would determine whether a set of beliefs is knowledge or not. When a person believes on something and that belief turned out to be true, is it knowledge immediately? Gettier would provide insights upon this issue on his inquiry on justified true beliefs.

Assuming that people already know the nature of truth and how they can determine beliefs that are knowledge from those that are not, how can they obtain knowledge? Is it through one's senses or intellect? This question dwells on the issue of knowledge acquisition. David Hume's empiricism and standpoint towards the process of how human beings acquire ideas and concepts try to answer this issue. In philosophy, where people seek for truth and wisdom, understanding knowledge is central to establishing what is right or wrong and determining the bigoted beliefs from reasonable beliefs. Answering these questions is essential for every person to have a good understanding of knowledge which people usually take for granted.

Sextus Empiricus' Pyrrhonism

Sextus says that *skepticism* originated in the hope of attaining mental peace or calmness.³ Pyrrhonists believe that the suspension of one's judgment is essential to attain *ataraxia* or 'mental peace'. This mental tranquility, as argued by Sextus, was not achieved by other philosophers who have already made a stance in their search for truth (i.e. the Stoics with their logic, the Epicureans with their simplicity, and Hedonists with their pleasure). Sextus made a clear distinction when he divided people's end in their philosophical research into three: 1) the dogmatists, who have already claimed that they have found the truth (i.e. Aristotle, Epicurus and the Stoics); 2) the academics, who claimed that it is a search for inapprehensible and that there is no truth or that it can never be found and; 3) the skeptics who continued to search for truth and knowledge unendingly. As perfectly elaborated by Sextus, a pyrrhonist does not make any positive assertions that anything he says is wholly true but rather reports accurately on each thing as his impression of the very

moment. This form of skepticism is a continuous search and examination for knowledge and truth with the help of doubting and indecision.

The whole argument of their epistemology is based upon the premise "to every argument an equal argument is opposed."⁴ They thought knowledge is provisional according to the perception and impressions of the society or an individual's view. Pyrrhonism is unique because it does not deny the possibility of an absolute knowledge. In fact, it is searching for the absolute. It is just that to every thesis, there is an antithesis that they both want to know. What they are doing is to attain moderation. They hate dogmas which are affirmations of beliefs without being assented. It shows that pyrrhonism is an attitude. This is clear with what an expert on ancient philosophy, According to Dr. Hankinson,

"Skepticism is an umbrella-term; and a wide variety of methods and attitudes can be found sheltering under it. In its original Greek sense a *skeptikos* is simply someone who looks, or examines (*skopein, skeptesthai*) ; and although Sextus does not bother to labour this point in the introductory paragraphs of 'Outlines of Pyrrhonism (PH), he does insist that the sceptic, no less than the members of the Dogmatic schools (and indeed the Academics) is a search after something. What divides them is their attitudes, expectations, and reactions to the search. So, while the Dogmatists think that they've found what they are looking for, and hence abandon the search in complacent contentment, and while the academics conclude (precipitately in Sextus' opinion) that nothing can be found (this reading is controversial: Chapter V, 75-8, 85-6), the sceptics just keeps on searching (PH 1 1-3). Indeed the verb 'to search' (*zētein*) gives rise to one of their other names: the Sceptics are, on their own account at least, Zetetics."⁵

Skepticism is an ability to place an antithesis in whatever manner to be able to see the equality of force in the objects and arguments opposed. With the proper tools, one can see these two opposing arguments and find suspending one's judgment reasonable, and upon that 'aha' moment, you can attain mental tranquility. It is on appearances and judgments that people base their propositions. And from these appearances of objects that one perceives with their senses, one creates thought which turns into judgment as he infers. Now, one can formulate an antithesis by using appearances against appearances, judgments against judgments and appearances against judgments. Sceptics do not deny judgment, they only use antithesis as conflicts to the thesis. As Sextus defines the next move, suspension of judgment, a cessation of mental processes in consequence of which we neither deny nor affirm anything, one can attain *ataraxia* or the "undisturbed and calm state of soul".

Pyrrhonists do not hold any opinion but report their feelings because they pay high regards to appearances which means that they still follow a line of reasoning in a manner consistent with appearances. From this, they base their ways of living in accordance with customs, laws, institutions of one's country and their own feelings. The logic behind this reliance on appearance is that they ought to believe that it is the guidance of nature unto human beings like in cases of becoming hungry which leads us to eat and thirst which urges us to drink. To prove their point, the Pyrrhonists came up with the ten modes to attain *ataraxia*. To every belief or assertion, there is a flaw with (a) the subject judging; (b) the object judged; or (c) both subject and object. These modes would help people to have better understanding of the "antithesis" that Sextus speaks of.

The Ten Modes

The order from which the ten modes would be presented is based on their class which makes it easier to summarize or interpret their meanings. Given that, the first four modes would be kept on their places as they are all grouped with the idea of showing flaws with the subject judging, the seventh and tenth mode would immediately follow for both exposes flaws with the object being judged, and the fifth, sixth, eighth, and ninth would come last as all of them constitute flaws for both the subject and the object on the event of judgments being made.

(1) *The subject judging (first to fourth modes)*

The first four modes are essentially arguing that one's judgment over a subject is questionable, that there are existent flaws with the subject who is judging. Nature or essence is only arbitrary, which constitutes the idea that there is no one standard of being human or animal that one can know absolutely. It is because different people and animals have differences in terms of perception. Same objects produce different impressions on different animals because they have different origins and forms. Some were born as eggs like birds, while some were born alive like humans.

Even between the species of human beings, differences are evident. Preference of humans vary, their decision depends on pleasure and displeasure which roots sensation and sense impressions that guide one's perception of a thing. Then so, human beings have different viewpoints and perspectives on a given object or issue, which paved way to contradictory accounts they denounce.

Consistency of one's judgment is another issue. The vagueness of the difference between senses

make one's judgment cloudy because people can't feel some things and their senses are limited. Man's senses are limited because their senses are influenced by one another. For instance, one can appreciate a sculpture by touch or by sight. When one tastes an apple and says it is sweet, is there something that he misses? Surely at some point, people would disagree on what the 'essential' characteristic of an object is. One object gives humans different impressions which constitute different forms. Impressions are taken by one's different senses (i.e. sight, touch, and taste) and this is why the blind man's impression of an apple is very different with another man's appreciation of the very same thing. Sextus made it clear that the 'compounding' is the conflict, that there is a problem in determining every characteristic of an object.

Moreover, the conditions and moods of people are continuously changing with the circumstances making it hard to judge something. When someone is under the influence of alcohol, this can pave way to reckless judgment due to overconfidence. Even in cases of being hungry, almost any food seems to be delicious. The point is that there is so many discrepancies on one's judgment because of the state people are in. These discrepancies are irresolvable because you cannot just prefer one sense impression over the other. In doing so, a criterion has to be met by proofs. But such criterion is inexistent, and if there is, it is based on proofs. And Sextus argues that the mere fact that both of them, the preferred sense-impression's proof and the criterion, need each other to prove both is circular and is untrustworthy. There is room for doubt because there is great possibility to just invent a standard based on a real life event which is arbitrary and not necessarily true. Due to all of these conflicts

with the subjects judging, suspension of judgment is the only way according to Sextus.

(2) *The object judged (Seventh and tenth modes)*

In the point of view of the object judged, the seventh and tenth modes generally talk about how the composition of an object being judged is hard to understand due to the conjunction of their composition and parts. Some objects of the same kind may vary if each is inspected. There is categorical conflict in terms of determining an object's nature or state of being because one can see a conflict in terms of judgment over the object as it differs in quantity or size. Take medicine for example. Too much of it can be harmful to one's body while the right amount is considered good. But given the same amount to a different person with different needs at that moment, one account may say that it is good for one's health, while the other might say otherwise. The same principle may apply to poisonous substance, very minimal amount may seem tolerable and safe to human beings while too much lead to being poisonous. Therefore, it is hard to provide a nature or an absolute characteristic to external objects.

In cases wherein the object of judgment is an act, Sextus argues that it is greatly influenced by societal customs and traditions. Habits, or customs, are common acceptance of men in a society. These customs, which people view as right, are social norms which everyone tries to comply to. There are institutions and laws passed out there, who tries to impose unto society what is right and wrong. This influence, by the law and customs, greatly affects one's judgment in reality. People in the Philippines might see divorce as not good because people here are conservative, while in United States, it is very much acceptable and is pretty much a

norm. Sometimes, people tend to unconsciously generalize and judge on a particular issue, without knowing that their judgment is clouded by culture, norms and laws, which are arbitrary. This is pretty much evident with myths, which people in the past view as reasonable to believe on, even with its lack of proof that it is possible or realistic. People tend to say something is taboo or wrong just because it is prohibited by law, but ask them why it is in principle wrong, their answer may not suffice. How can the society say that when you are eighteen, you are automatically mature enough to make decisions for yourself, there are people out there who are as young as fourteen, but they are more mature than adults in their twenties. The point is, these norms are arbitrary, and using them as basis on one's stance or judgment is not sufficient. Given that there are conflicts on the objects people judge, why suspension of judgment is needed.

(3) *Both subject and object (Fifth, sixth, eighth, and ninth modes)*

The view on the perspective of the object and subject's flaws, the fifth, sixth, eighth, and ninth modes, talks about the conjunctions of ideas and their vulnerability on getting mixed up. Our judgments can be arbitrary because people create their own standards to justify or prove something. This is due to the fact that the objects' impression greatly relies on the one looking at it, and it is relative to the eye of the beholder, like beauty and art which constitutes different opinions on when something is beautiful. That is why Grammy Awards and the likes are widely seen as the standard for popular vote of what beauty but not entirely limited to it.

Moreover, people have different perspectives which make judgments inconsistent, with the

likes of seeing optical illusions on different angles or perspectives. And with cases of rare events, the conditions may appear weird or alien to everyone just like eclipses in the past which paved way to myths. People value gold more because of its rarity. Society finds deeper meaning in meteor shower because of its rarity, unlike sun which is constantly near earth. If one would look at solar eclipse, it is so rare that research of it comes by slower. One can create myths for an occurrence which cannot be easily explained. Humanity may not experience a new phenomenon yet, because it ceases to happen every hundred billions of years. The point is that there is some extent of arbitrariness on society's characterization of an event or how people value something just because of its rarity, astonishment is much higher in those scenarios, interpretations or attempts to explain those phenomenon should not be taken for granted, that is why suspension of judgment is the safest and most dignified way of assessment.

In short, Sextus wants people to understand that with all these ten modes,⁶ suspension of judgment is needed to calm our desire for knowledge without making an assumption. It is a continuous verification and search for truth which is progressive, because after all, what our minds can conceive and inquire to is limited.

Hume's concept of human understanding

In human understanding, Hume speaks of two forms of knowledge, the 'relation of Ideas' and 'matters of fact'. 'Matters of fact' is based on one's sense experience while 'relation of ideas' is based on how one correlates ideas. Before anything else, one should look into the most basic concept of Hume on matters of fact which is impression. Impressions are memories of a thing which comes from experience (i.e. impressions on a painting by Picasso). It is said

to be internal when it is subject to reflection of previous expressions, which in short, speaks of past memories like reminiscing previous experiences of seeing someone else's face. On the other hand, an impression is external when it comes from an actual perception of things or what one feels at present. The main difference is determined by one's vivacity, or the "freshness" of experience, of a thing, which Hume greatly values. This is why Hume thinks that external impressions are more legitimate and credible than the internal, because he considers the latter as weak impressions with lack of vivacity.

Looking into the concept of 'relations of idea', this form of knowledge, as Hume argues, is only considered true when in contact with the source of impression. For one's idea of a thing comes from sensation or former impressions. If one would imagine the idea of a winged horse or what people call Pegasus on the fictional story of Hercules, it is generally the combined impressions of wings and horses. It does not mean that if one can imagine or formulate an idea, it will eventually become true. There are three types of ideas which society regards as reliable according to Hume; these are resemblance, contiguity, and causality. Resemblance speaks of idea which has its connection from its source or original perception. One can think of a photograph which resembles the real person in it. Contiguity is a type of idea which seeks connection between two different ideas in terms of their continuity like having the idea of a baby whenever one hears cries or thinking of what husbands feel in relation to a newborn baby. It generally exposes the conjunction of time and space in terms of human perception. Causality speaks of the relation one imagines between two experiences just like a child thinking that lightning causes thunder, or people thinking

that chicken pox causes fever because it almost always happens consequently. All of these 'association of ideas' are considered as arbitrary by Hume.

The problem of induction

Hume generally tries to prove that induction is only a form of probability and that causality is arbitrary. He argues that there is no certainty in matters of fact, while there is in relations of idea. This is evident when Hume says:

All the objects of human reason or enquiry may naturally be divided into two kinds, to wit, *Relations of Ideas* and *Matters of Fact*. Of the first kind are the sciences of Geometry, Algebra, and Arithmetic; and in short, every affirmation, which is either intuitive or demonstratively certain. *That three times five is equal to the square of the two sides*, is a proposition, which expresses relations between these figures. *That three times five is equal to the half of thirty*, expresses a relation between these numbers. Propositions of this kind are discoverable by mere operation of thought, without dependence on what is any where existent in the universe. Though there never were a circle or triangle in nature, the truths, demonstrated by Euclid, would for ever retain their certainty and evidence.

Matters of fact, which are the second objects of human reason, are not ascertained in the same manner; nor is our evidence of their truth, however great, of a like nature with the foregoing. The contrary of every matter of fact is still possible; because it can never imply a contradiction, and is conceived by the mind with the same facility and distinctness, as if ever so conformable to reality. *That the sun will not rise tomorrow* is no less intelligible a proposition, and implies no more contradiction, than the affirmation, that it will rise. We should in vain, therefore, attempt to demonstrate its falsehood. Were it demonstratively false would imply a contradiction, and could never be distinctly conceived by the mind.⁷

This shows that one's knowledge of matters of fact is nothing but a probability at its best. Here is where the problem of induction arises. While certainty can be found in knowledge of relation of ideas, the way people acquire matters of fact is only through experience, where they use vivacity and impression. While these matters of fact are used and translated to a causal inference, Hume thinks that people make use of experience as a basis, not reason. That is why Hume believes that causality is only arbitrary. As Beauchamp further expounded:

Though the rationalists did not articulate their beliefs about causation in careful and detailed arguments, the following are the pivotal rationalist beliefs that Hume rejects:

1. Causes contain their effects.
2. Causes entail their effects, just as premises entail conclusion
3. Causes entail their effects because there is a necessary connection between them.⁸

All that people know are impressions, and with keen observation, one would see that nature is continuously changing. There is no repetition of exact event that would make us sure that an induction from the past would happen again. It is nothing but an approximation. It is evident in measuring objects. In the realm of mathematics, everything is exact, but when applied it becomes an approximation. Induction, for Hume, is nothing but a probability which affects the society today because of customs and habits which asserts knowledge.

The Gettier Problem

Is justified true belief knowledge? According to Martin, "to understand Gettier's reasoning, you'll need a tiny bit of background about his two assumptions . . . in Gettier's words, is that

beliefs are entailed by other justified beliefs are themselves justified."⁹ Edmund Gettier wants to prove that knowledge is not justified true belief. What people believe as true may not be so because one may infer with an assumptive premise. People use conditions that are set to create a parameter wherein their belief is justified.

In status quo, most people believe and use, consciously and unconsciously, the tripartite definition of knowledge which states that "propositional knowledge, i.e. knowledge that p, has three necessary conditions: justification, truth and belief."¹⁰ This can be elaborated by saying that the tripartite definition of knowledge asks a person to have reasonable evidence, belief in the proposition, and the proposition being real or true. This is very much evident on law trials in United States where the judgment in courts are based on the jury's vote influenced by belief upon the proposition that the accused is guilty or should be acquitted and justified by the evidence given by the prosecutor which they think is already "beyond reasonable doubt". The problem is the idea that a propositional knowledge may have false premises or assumptive conclusions that has no necessary logical links.

The point of Gettier is that the premises people set to create an inference or belief is unreliable and sometimes does not really fit. Truth is only arbitrary in these cases. What the foreseen future should not be limited to what they thought and inferred for how an event would happen. There are cases where it becomes false or true because of luck. Propositional knowledge, which constitutes our beliefs, is unreliable and cannot be knowledge. Having your proposition true does not necessarily suffice that you know it. If there is no

propositional knowledge, how can one assert knowledge now?

Skepticism as the unifying tool for Sextus, Hume, and Gettier's theories of knowledge

As Grayling defines scepticism, it is a "set of considerations which jointly challenge us to justify our claims to knowledge."¹¹ It makes people wary of the vulnerabilities of humans to error or illusion. "Skepticism is the view that we lack knowledge."¹² In proving the proposition given in the concept of skepticism, Hume's discredit of induction by refuting causality is the necessary premise one can hold on to. With the help of Sextus' ten modes, it even proves furthermore on how weak one's sense perception and judgments are. Moreover, Gettier even argued that one's beliefs cannot be true even to the extent of propositional knowledge; skepticism spreads because of false premises and assumptive induction.

Now, the next step is to suspend one's judgments to attain *ataraxia* as encouraged by Sextus. Given that people would suspend one's judgments, how then should they approach propositions, matters of fact, and judgments? Here is where calculated risk comes in. Even though there is a skeptical notion of assessing judgments, one should still see matters of fact as probabilities. The only different act is the continuous verification of these "knowledge". Each and every one should start looking at the 'for' and 'against' of an issue. Same as the issue of Philippine divorce, one should consider the ideas of the Catholic Church being trampled and at the same time the situations of women being violated and the possibility of mistaken or unprepared marriage. What this synthesis forwards is a liberal attitude and mindset which promotes a compromise.

What is the nature of knowledge?

Even though there is no absolute knowledge that can be known because of human being's limits on grasping knowledge, there still is a relative knowledge which may exist in status quo. Knowledge can now be defined as a probability measured by continuous verification which may or may not be necessarily true.

Knowledge, as given by Hume's epistemology, is rooted from a person's ideas instilled on his or her mind. These ideas can be Matters of fact which comes from one's experience which creates an impression. This means that the process by which people acquire knowledge is through gathering impressions from sense experience and translating it to matters of fact and create relation of ideas.

Knowledge should also have justification that would suffice one's beliefs. If the justification of beliefs as knowledge is questioned by Gettier's problem, this system is in line with the epistemology of Hume when he conceded that this knowledge is only from experience, which can be unreliable. Moreover, Sextus explicitly implied that truth can never be grasped by people, which is why continuous verification and search for it is needed, looking into the lens of the affirmative and negative is important to meet the end which is suspension of judgment. This synthesis does not assert that knowledge is absolutely true; it is just that it is most probable. That is why; it is open for a negative proposition of an established truth in the society, which is beneficial to the progress of knowledge.

Concluding Remarks

In an advanced world, a time when people are starting to be more liberal and open-minded,

one's view on knowledge should keep up too. An open-minded approach on knowledge which stays away from dogma is an effective tool for the progress of sciences. If one would look at the medieval ages, the Church was in question because it slowed the progress of science due to their dogmatic ways. Moreover, looking at both sides creates a bigger picture where one can consider all key players that would be affected on an issue. Being close-minded on a particular stance paves way to a blind spot that can hamper progress.

Furthermore, the limits of a human being cannot be overlooked; one must admit that their opinion or discovery might be accepted right at present but may be wronged in the future. Take homosexuality for instance, there was a time in the past when it is accepted by the Greeks, but it was condoned by the Church in the medieval ages that today, we are just starting to accept Homosexuality. Inconsistency is evident in this one that is why people should not consider the present time's norms as absolute. The goal is to attain the calmness of the mind, *ataraxia*. This is achieved, when each person thinks that he or she realizes that they are open or flexible to changes. They would be blessed with the knowledge of being aware of man's incapacities and imperfections in grasping knowledge. This synthesis constitutes a reasonable dogma-free stance, a continuous search for knowledge which eminently shows true passion for knowledge.

³ Samuel Enoch Stumpf, *Socrates to Sartre: a history of philosophy*, 6th Ed. (Singapore: McGraw-Hill Co, Inc, Singapore, 1999), 111.

⁴ Sextus Empiricus, *Selections from the Major Writings on Scepticism, Man, and God*, tr. Sanford Etheridge, ed. Philip P. Hallie (Indiana: Avatar Books of Cambridge, Indiana, 1985), 32.

⁵ R.J Hankinson, *The Sceptics* (1995: Routledge, London),13.

⁶ See also: Sextus Empiricus, *Selections from the Major Writings on Scepticism, Man, and God*, tr. Sanford Etheridge, ed. Philip P. Hallie (1985: Avatar Books of Cambridge, Indiana) p.31-72

⁷ David Hume, *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* ed. Tom L. Beauchamp (1999: Oxford University Press Inc., New York) p.108

⁸ Ibid, p.26

⁹ Robert Martin, *Epistemology: A beginner's guide*. (2010: Oneworld Publications, UK), 23.

¹⁰ Jonathan Dancy and Ernest Sosa ed., *A Companion to Epistemology*. (1993: Blackwell Publishers, UK), 509.

¹¹ A.C. Grayling, *Ideas that Matter*. (2010: Orion publishing, London), 461.

¹² Jonathan Dancy and Ernest Sosa ed., *A Companion to Epistemology*. (1993: Blackwell publishers, UK), 457.

¹ A. C. Grayling, *Ideas that Matter* (London: Orion Publishing, 2009), 461.

² Louis Pojman, *What can we know?: An introduction to the theory of knowledge*. (California: Wadsworth publishing, Co., 1995), 2.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Empiricus, Sextus: *Selections from the Major Writings on Scepticism, Man, and God*, tr. Sanford G. Etheridge, ed. Philip P. Hallie (1985: Avatar Books of Cambridge, Indiana).

Gettier, Edmund: "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?" In *Epistemology Contemporary Readings*. Ed. Michael Huemer (1963: Routledge, London).

Hume, David: *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* ed. Tom L. Beauchamp (1999: Oxford University Press Inc., New York).

Secondary Sources

Dancy, Jonathan, and Ernest Sosa, ed.: *A companion to Epistemology*. (1993: Blackwell Publishers, UK).

Hankinson, R.J.: *The Sceptics* (1995: Routledge, London).

Grayling, A.C.: *Ideas that Matter*. (2010: Orion publications, London).

Martin, Robert: *Epistemology: A beginner's guide*. (2010: Oneworld Publications, UK).

Pojman, Louis: *What can we know? An introduction to the theory of knowledge* (1995: Wadsworth Publications, California).

Stumpf, Samuel Enoch: *Socrates to Sartre: a history of philosophy*, 6th Ed. (1999: McGraw-Hill Co, Inc, Singapore).