

《为什么哲学总是越解释越模糊》

Why Philosophy Becomes More Vague the More It Explains

中文版

哲学自诞生以来，一直被赋予一个宏大的任务：

通过解释，让世界变得更清晰。

然而讽刺的是——

越是伟大的哲学体系，

在解释世界时反而变得越模糊。

这并不是哲学家的失败，

也不是思维能力的欠缺，

而是哲学在尝试接近世界的过程中，不可避免地遇到一种深层悖论：

每一次解释，看似接近了真理，

却同时扩大了需要解释的空间。

哲学不是在厘清世界，

而是在不断发现世界的“模糊性源头”。

为什么会这样？

下面说的三点不是结论，只是观察。

一、解释依赖语言，而语言并不透明

语言不是透明的媒介，它像一层薄膜：

- 显示一部分
- 遮蔽一部分
- 改变一部分

当哲学试图用概念描述经验时，它必须把：

- 多维转成二维
- 连续转成离散

- 流动转成固定
- 模糊转成清晰
- 活的直觉转成死的符号

于是我们得到的不是“世界”，
而是世界的投影。

而一个投影，越放大越模糊，这是必然。

二、解释本身会制造新的盲点

哲学的每一个解释，都像一束光：

- 照亮前方
- 但制造新的阴影

当你为世界建立一个解释框架时：

- 什么被包含
- 什么被排除
- 什么被默认
- 什么被忽略

都会随之确定。

于是：

解释越多，盲点越多。
盲点越多，模糊感越强。

这并不是错误，而是结构特性。

三、解释试图解决问题，但解释本身也是问题的一部分

哲学常常假设：

“解释是中立的。
解释可以接近世界本身。”

但事实上：

**解释不是旁观者，
它是参与者。**

解释会：

- 改造问题
- 重写问题
- 强化问题
- 甚至创造原本不存在的问题

**这就是为什么哲学越深入、越复杂，
就越像是在与自己产生的迷雾搏斗。**

**哲学家越努力把世界说清楚，
世界就越显示出一种不可驯服的模糊性。**

四、哲学不是模糊，而是模糊是哲学的对象

**如果把哲学的任务理解为“消除模糊”，
那它当然失败了。**

但如果把哲学理解为：

**描述模糊为何存在、模糊如何形成、模糊有哪些边界——
那么模糊本身，就是哲学正在研究的东西。**

**哲学越解释越模糊，
不是因为它找错方向，
而是因为它正带着全人类面对那块无法清晰的区域。**

**哲学不是指向答案的灯塔，
而是照亮“答案无法出现的原因”。**

英文版

Since its origin, philosophy has been entrusted with a grand mission:

**to clarify the world through explanation.
Yet the irony is unmistakable—
the greater the philosophical system,
the more ambiguous it becomes as it attempts to explain.**

**This is not a failure of philosophers,
nor a flaw in human thought.
It is the inevitable consequence of a deeper paradox:**

**Every attempt to explain reality appears to bring us closer,
yet also expands the space that remains unexplained.**

**Philosophy does not eliminate ambiguity.
It reveals where ambiguity originates.**

Here are not answers, but structural observations.

1. Explanation relies on language—yet language is not transparent

Language is not a neutral medium.

It is a filter that:

- **reveals some aspects,**
- **conceals others,**
- **and distorts the rest.**

When philosophy uses concepts to describe experience, it must convert:

- **multidimensional → flattened**
- **continuous → discrete**
- **fluid → fixed**
- **intuitive → symbolic**

**What emerges is not the world itself,
but a projection of it.**

And projections, when enlarged, always blur.

2. Every explanation illuminates... and creates new shadows

Each philosophical explanation is like a beam of light:

- **it clarifies,**
- **it selects,**
- **it excludes,**
- **and it unintentionally generates new blind spots.**

Thus:

**The more explanations we have, the more blind spots we create.
And the more blind spots we create, the more ambiguous things appear.**

**Ambiguity is not a flaw—
it is a structural feature.**

3. Explanation aims to solve problems, yet becomes part of the problem

Philosophy often assumes:

**“Explanation is neutral,
and through it we can reach reality as it is.”**

**But explanation is never neutral.
It is participatory.**

Explanation:

- **reshapes questions,**
- **reinforces assumptions,**
- **amplifies uncertainties,**
- **and even creates problems that did not originally exist.**

**Thus the deeper philosophy goes,
the denser the fog becomes—
not because the world is unclear,
but because explanation itself generates new layers of ambiguity.**

**Philosophy strives for clarity,
and in doing so, reveals the limits of clarity.**

4. Philosophy is not vague—vagueness is what philosophy studies

**If philosophy's purpose were to eliminate ambiguity,
then it would indeed have failed.**

But if we understand philosophy as the investigation of:

- **why ambiguity exists,**
- **how it forms,**
- **where its boundaries lie—**

**then ambiguity is not a failure of philosophy,
but its subject matter.**

**Philosophy becomes more ambiguous the more it explains
not because it loses precision,
but because it approaches the region
where precision itself reaches its structural limit.**
