International Journal of Philosophy
2026, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 148–152
https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijp.20261404.12

SciencePG
Science Publishing Group

Research Article

Creation, Interpretation, and Expression Generated from Hypothesis: Philosophers Search for Origins, Scientists Investigate After Origins -A Evidence-Based Paradigm

Sudarsan Saha*

Department of Gynae and Obstetrics, ICARE Institute of Medical Science and Research, Haldia, India

Abstract

This analytical review examines a recurring epistemological asymmetry between philosophical inquiry and scientific investigation: philosophy frequently asks what an entity, process, or order ultimately means and from where it originates, whereas empirical science ordinarily investigates observable consequences, mechanisms, relations, and conditions after a phenomenon has become accessible to measurement. The distinction is useful but should not be treated as an absolute division. Both disciplines formulate hypotheses, interpret evidence, revise concepts, and confront underdetermination. The central argument of this paper is that creation, interpretation, and expression can be represented as stages in a hypothesis–evidence–explanation cycle rather than as exclusive territories of philosopher or scientist. Historical and contemporary examples from metaphysics, philosophy of science, cosmology, evolutionary theory, quantum theory, and philosophy of mind are used to test this framework. The review distinguishes ontological questions about origins from methodological questions about evidence and from semantic questions about interpretation. It argues that scientific evidence can constrain philosophical hypotheses without by itself settling metaphysical questions, while philosophical analysis can clarify concepts and assumptions without replacing empirical investigation. A more productive paradigm is therefore dialogical: hypotheses generate questions; observations and experiments constrain explanations; conceptual analysis identifies hidden assumptions; and interpretations connect models to claims about reality. The paper concludes with a research agenda for interdisciplinary epistemology that preserves methodological boundaries while encouraging reciprocal correction.

Keywords

Epistemology, Hypothesis, Metaphysics, Philosophy of Science, Scientific Method, Origins

1. Introduction

Questions about creation and origin occupy a distinctive position in human inquiry. To ask how something occurs is not identical to ask why there is something rather than nothing, what counts as an origin, or what conceptual framework makes a causal explanation intelligible. Philosophy has historically pursued such questions through metaphysics, logic, epistemology, and conceptual analysis. Science, by contrast, develops publicly testable models of phenomena through ob-

*Correspondence: saha.sudarsan@rediffmail.com (Sudarsann Saha), sudarsanjournal1@gmail.com (Sudarsan Saha)

Received: 25 September 2026; **Accepted:** 19 October 2026; **Published:** 31 October 2026

Copyright: © The Author(s), 2026. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

servation, measurement, experimentation, mathematical representation, and systematic comparison.

The contrast should nevertheless be stated carefully. Scientists also ask questions about origins: cosmology investigates the early universe; evolutionary biology investigates the emergence and diversification of life; geology reconstructs the history of Earth; and neuroscience investigates the development of cognitive capacities. Philosophers also examine mechanisms, evidence, models, and scientific practice. The useful distinction is therefore not 'philosophers before origin, scientists after origin' as a literal rule, but as a heuristic for examining different modes of questioning.

This review develops that heuristic into an evidence-oriented epistemological framework. It asks whether creation, interpretation, and expression can be understood as successive but interacting phases of inquiry: hypothesis formation, evidential constraint, model construction, interpretation, and expression. The aim is not to declare one discipline superior, but to clarify where their methods overlap, where they differ, and where confusion between them generates controversial claims.

2. The Conceptual Problem: What Does 'Origin' Mean

'Origin' is an ambiguous concept. It may mean a first temporal event, a causal source, a structural condition, a logical ground, an explanatory starting point, or the point at which a scientific description becomes reliable. These meanings should not be conflated. A cosmological model may describe an early physical state without answering a metaphysical question about why that state exists. Likewise, a biological account of diversification may explain mechanisms of change without resolving every philosophical question about purpose or value.

This distinction illustrates a central epistemological principle: the scope of a conclusion is limited by the question and method that generated it. An empirical result can strongly support a causal or statistical proposition while leaving a different ontological proposition underdetermined. Conversely, a conceptual argument may establish implications among premises without providing empirical evidence that the premises describe the physical world.

The phrase 'creation' also has multiple uses. In ordinary language it may refer to intentional production; in cosmology it can refer to an early state or transition; in biology it can refer loosely to emergence; in metaphysics it may designate dependence of contingent reality upon a fundamental ground. A rigorous paper must therefore specify which sense is intended before comparing philosophical and scientific explanations.

3. Hypothesis as a Bridge Between Philosophy and Science

A hypothesis is not merely a guess. In science it is normally a provisional proposition or model that can generate testable consequences. In philosophy, hypotheses may function differently: they can be premises in an argument, interpretive proposals, thought-experiment assumptions, or candidate metaphysical explanations. The same word therefore masks different standards of assessment.

A productive interdisciplinary model distinguishes four questions. First, what is being proposed? Second, what evidence would support or challenge it? Third, what inferential rule connects evidence to conclusion? Fourth, what remains unresolved after the argument? This framework prevents a common error: treating a plausible philosophical interpretation as though it were an experimentally established fact, or treating an empirical correlation as though it automatically settled a metaphysical thesis.

Scientific inquiry illustrates iterative hypothesis testing. Popper emphasized falsifiability and critical testing, while later philosophy of science demonstrated that actual research involves auxiliary assumptions, model comparison, historical context, [19] and theory-laden observation. Kuhn's account of paradigms further showed that scientific communities work within conceptual frameworks that shape what counts as a significant problem. These insights do not weaken science; they help explain how scientific knowledge is produced and revised.

4. Philosophical Search for Origins

Philosophical inquiry into origins includes metaphysical arguments about causation, contingency, necessity, identity, substance, time, and explanation. From Aristotle's search for causes to contemporary debates over grounding and explanation, philosophers have asked what it means for one fact to depend upon another. Such questions often concern conditions that are not directly observable.

The strength of philosophical analysis lies partly in its ability to expose conceptual presuppositions. For example, before asking for the first cause, one must clarify whether causation is assumed to apply to the totality of reality, whether 'first' is temporal or explanatory, and whether an infinite regress is impossible. [2] These are not experimental questions in the narrow sense.

Yet philosophical origin claims can become problematic when they are presented as empirical discoveries without empirical support. Metaphysical arguments may be logically interesting while remaining compatible with several empirical models. The appropriate conclusion is therefore often conditional rather than absolute: if certain premises are accepted, certain explanatory consequences follow.

5. Scientific Investigation After and Around Origins

Science is not confined to a period 'after origin.' Modern

cosmology attempts to reconstruct extremely early physical conditions from observations such as cosmic background radiation, large-scale structure, and the expansion history of the universe. Evolutionary science reconstructs common ancestry and mechanisms of biological change using fossils, comparative genomics, developmental evidence, and population-level observations. In each case, the scientific question is constrained by what evidence can discriminate among models.

The scientific treatment of origins therefore demonstrates both power and limitation. Models can be extraordinarily successful at explaining patterns while still leaving open deeper questions about why the governing laws, initial conditions, or mathematical structures have the forms they do. A scientific theory need not answer every philosophical question to be scientifically successful.[23]

This distinction also protects against a false dichotomy. Scientific theories may have philosophical implications, but implications are not identical to direct empirical results. Moving from 'the data are consistent with model X' to 'reality is ultimately X' requires additional philosophical reasoning.

6. Interpretation and Expression

Between hypothesis and conclusion lies interpretation. Data do not speak without concepts, instruments, statistical assumptions, models, and background knowledge. Scientific expression is consequently structured by mathematical and linguistic representations. Philosophical interpretation examines how such representations acquire meaning and what they legitimately allow us to claim. [17].

The problem of interpretation is especially visible in quantum theory. The formalism generates highly successful predictions, yet different interpretations can associate different ontological pictures with substantially the same empirical structure. This illustrates underdetermination: empirical adequacy may not uniquely determine metaphysical interpretation.

Interpretation also operates in the humanities. A philosophical text can support multiple readings, but not every reading is equally defensible. Arguments, textual evidence, historical context, and conceptual coherence constrain interpretation. The broader lesson is that expression should preserve the distinction between observation, inference, and interpretation.

7. Evidence, Controversy, and Underdetermination

Evidence does not have a single philosophical function. It may confirm, disconfirm, constrain, discriminate, or render a hypothesis unnecessary relative to alternatives. Bayesian approaches emphasize changes in rational confidence; Popperian approaches emphasize severe tests; inference-to-the-best-explanation emphasizes explanatory virtues; [7] and contemporary model-based approaches examine how representations connect evidence to phenomena.

These approaches disagree about the exact logic of scientific confirmation, but they converge on an important practical point: evidence must be connected to claims by explicit inferential rules. A controversial paradigm becomes scientifically or philosophically useful when those rules are visible and open to criticism.[18, 20]

Underdetermination is unavoidable in many frontier questions. Several hypotheses can sometimes accommodate the same observations. This does not imply that evidence is useless. It means that additional evidence, improved models, simplicity considerations, causal understanding, or conceptual clarification may be required. Nor does underdetermination justify accepting any hypothesis without discrimination.

8. Where Philosophy and Science Intersect

The relationship between philosophy and science is historically intimate. Philosophy of science examines explanation, laws, causation, confirmation, realism, models, measurement, and scientific practice. Science supplies case studies that can challenge philosophical assumptions, while philosophy can identify conceptual ambiguities and clarify methodological commitments.[16]

The intersection is especially important in questions concerning consciousness, time, cosmology, quantum foundations, artificial intelligence, and the status of mathematical entities. None of these domains is adequately described by a simple hierarchy in which one discipline asks the questions and the other merely supplies answers.

A better representation is a feedback loop. Philosophical questions can motivate hypotheses; scientific evidence can narrow the space of acceptable interpretations; conceptual analysis can reveal hidden assumptions; and new scientific theories can generate new philosophical problems. This reciprocal process is the central paradigm proposed by this review.

9. A Proposed Evidence–Interpretation Paradigm

The proposed paradigm contains six stages: [1] formulation of a question; [2] explicit hypothesis or conceptual proposal; [3] identification of admissible evidence; [4] testing, comparison, or logical analysis; [5] interpretation with stated assumptions; and [6] expression of the conclusion with calibrated uncertainty.

The first two stages belong to both disciplines, although their standards differ. The third and fourth stages are especially prominent in empirical science but have analogues in philosophy, such as textual evidence, counterexamples, formal proofs, and argumentative validity. The fifth stage is central to both, because data and arguments require interpretation. The sixth stage is essential to responsible scholarship because it prevents conclusions from outrunning evidence.[21, 22]

The paradigm also introduces a 'boundary statement' at the end of every major claim: what does the evidence establish, what does it make plausible, [9] and what remains a metaphysical or conceptual possibility? Such calibration can reduce unnecessary controversy while preserving legitimate disagreement.

10. Critical Analysis of the 'Before Origin/After Origin' Contrast

The proposed contrast is illuminating only if treated as a heuristic. Philosophers do not possess privileged access to origins, and scientists do not merely investigate consequences after origins. Both disciplines can investigate origins, but they do so with different methods and aims. [15]

The philosophical contribution is strongest when it clarifies meanings, evaluates arguments, examines assumptions, and explores implications that exceed immediate measurement. The scientific contribution is strongest when questions can be operationalized and confronted with reproducible evidence. Problems arise when either method is extended beyond its warrant.

Thus, the controversy is not a competition for ownership of truth. It is a problem of epistemic jurisdiction and translation. A claim should be assessed according to the kind of claim it is. Empirical claims require empirical support; logical claims require valid reasoning; semantic claims [10] require conceptual and linguistic analysis; and metaphysical claims require explicit premises and argument, while recognizing that empirical findings may constrain them.

11. Implications for Future Research

Future work should develop interdisciplinary protocols for distinguishing levels of explanation. One useful project would compare how philosophers and scientists use terms such as origin, cause, emergence, explanation, evidence, reality, and model [13]. Another would examine case studies in cosmology and consciousness where empirical findings and metaphysical interpretations are frequently conflated.

Research could also benefit from structured 'claim maps' that label each proposition as observational, inferential, conceptual, mathematical, or metaphysical. Such maps would make disagreements more transparent. Digital scholarship could assist by tracing how a conclusion depends upon datasets, models, assumptions, and interpretive choices [12, 14].

Finally, philosophical education for scientists and methodological education for philosophers may improve interdisciplinary communication. The goal is not to merge the disciplines into one method, but to make their interfaces more explicit and intellectually accountable.

12. Conclusion

Creation, interpretation, and expression generated from hypothesis form a continuous epistemic process rather than a strict division between philosophy and science. Philosophical inquiry can investigate origins, meanings, grounds, and assumptions [11]; scientific inquiry can investigate mechanisms, regularities, histories, and testable consequences. Neither domain automatically settles every question posed by the other.

The evidence-based paradigm proposed here replaces the simple 'philosopher before origin, scientist after origin' contrast with a reciprocal cycle of hypothesis, evidence, analysis, interpretation, and expression. This preserves the distinctive strengths of both disciplines while limiting category errors. The most defensible interdisciplinary position is [8] therefore not that philosophy or science possesses the final word on creation, but that each can place principled constraints on the claims made by the other.

The unresolved questions are not failures of inquiry. They identify the frontier where evidence, reasoning, interpretation, and conceptual innovation must continue to interact. A mature philosophy of inquiry should therefore welcome scientific correction without reducing philosophy to science, and welcome philosophical criticism without treating it as a substitute for evidence.

Author Contributions

Sudarsan Saha: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Software, Validation, Visualization

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

[1] Aristotle. (1984). The Complete Works of Aristotle (J. Barnes, Ed.). Princeton University Press.

[2] Popper, K. R. (1959). The Logic of Scientific Discovery. Hutchinson.

[3] Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. University of Chicago Press.

[4] Quine, W. V. O. (1951). Two dogmas of empiricism. The Philosophical Review, 60(1), 20–43.

[5] Sellars, W. (1956). Empiricism and the philosophy of mind. In H. Feigl & M. Scriven (Eds.), Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science (Vol. 1). University of Minnesota Press.

[6] Hempel, C. G. (1965). Aspects of Scientific Explanation. Free Press.

[7] van Fraassen, B. C. (1980). The Scientific Image. Oxford University Press.

[8] Cartwright, N. (1983). How the Laws of Physics Lie. Oxford University Press.

[9] Duhem, P. (1954). The Aim and Structure of Physical Theory. Princeton University Press.

[10] Feyerabend, P. (1975). Against Method. New Left Books.

[11] Ladyman, J. (2002). Understanding Philosophy of Science. Routledge.

[12] Godfrey-Smith, P. (2003). Theory and Reality: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science. University of Chicago Press.

[13] Frigg, R., & Hartmann, S. (2020). Models in science. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

[14] Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (2024). Scientific realism; scientific explanation; metaphysics; philosophy of cosmology. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.

[15] NASA. (2024). Cosmology and the universe: observational resources and background materials. NASA Science.

[16] Planck Collaboration. (2020). Planck 2018 results. Astronomy & Astrophysics, 641, A6.

[17] Einstein, A. (1916). The foundation of the general theory of relativity. Annalen der Physik, 49, 769–822.

[18] Darwin, C. (1859). On the Origin of Species. John Murray.

[19] Mayr, E. (2004). What Makes Biology Unique? Cambridge University Press.

[20] Nagel, E. (1961). The Structure of Science. Harcourt, Brace & World.

[21] Putnam, H. (1975). Mathematics, Matter and Method. Cambridge University Press.

[22] Chalmers, D. J. (1996). The Conscious Mind. Oxford University Press.

[23] Blackburn, S. (2016). The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.