After tremendous and decisive success, Aristotelian logic strengthened the established stance of authority to dominate the intellectual universe. Even though Aristotle's highly comprehensive and wide theory of logic varies from current methods in fundamental respects, this has greater influence beyond as a cultural artifact. It offers a different perspective on reasoning and remains to offer crucial perspectives into current challenges and problems. Aristotle does not regard logic as a distinct, self-contained topic to be studied in distinction from various parts of scientific investigation. Researchers cannot explore all of the specifics of this comprehensive methodology but can draw down the big concept in a manner that reveals the framework’s overall direction. The objective of logic, according to him, would be not to establish that humans could very well acquire understanding. The goal of logic is to develop a cohesive framework that enables humans to analyze, categorize, and critique reasoning. The purpose of this paper is to analyze logic as a means to arrive at knowledge from the thinking of Aristotle.

According to Aristotle, “Every term indicates substance or quantity or quality of relationship or place or time or state or the doing of something or the underdoing of something.” Terms are the essential pieces of a phrase that unite to produce a statement and are categorized per the types of data collected. These classifications, as described by Aristotle are categories, that are made up of independent components, distinct objects toward which numerous characteristics or attributes can be given. Each material is made up of interconnecting elements that form a complete whole. Statements are merely occasions in which something is said. A statement is merely a means to build reasoning to obtain knowledge, as Aristotle expounds reasoning that is aimed to represent whatever occurs in the universe.  Now for an example, The brave 6 feet man, who is riding a horse is wearing armor, is practicing sword fight with a smaller man at the bank of the river, right at the dawn. The whole sentence is a statement, which is describing a particular scenario that is taking place, and terms are the elements that are used to describe the whole statement. To categorize the elements as terms, Aristotle has introduced categories as ways of describing elements as categories which are in this particular sentence; substance (man ), quantity ( 6 feet), quality ( brave), relationship (smaller), place ( river bank) time (dawn), posture ( riding a horse ), state (wearing armor ), doing something ( practicing sword fight). These categories indicate various types of the presence or distinct explanations of presence and activity. Moreover, the statement can be analyzed in two parts, subject and predicate, the subject here is the 6 feet man himself, and the elements that are defining this man also his activity such as brave, riding horse fall under predicate. The substance is by far the most essential category. Each material is made up of interconnecting elements that form a complete entire. Substances are divided into two categories. A primary substance is a self-contained item made out of material and defined by its shape. Secondary substances, on the other hand, are bigger groupings, that which these particular individuals belonged.

Logic and argument go hand in hand. An argument that is a collection of circumstances that supports an inference is known as valid reasoning. Arguments have two-part; premise and conclusion. The conclusion is supported by premises, which are essentially justifications to accept the conclusion itself. A particular argument may have more than one or even one premise. A conclusion is the part of an argument that expresses whatever the interlocutor is attempting to and, there can only be one conclusion in an argument, and it succeeds the premises. Furthermore, Aristotle's reasoning is known as categorical logic because it connects groupings of categories. The most frequent approach of putting premises for a convincing argument is using syllogisms. A logical argument in which the conclusion derives from the validity of two premises is known as a syllogism.

On the other hand, Inductive and deductive arguments are the main forms of arguments. The antecedents of a deductive argument are a set of generic assertions that are used to suggest a specific circumstance as the inference and, an inductive argument is the other way around. A deductive argument is considered to be legitimate when it is written in such a way that it is unlikely for the premises to be accurate while the conclusion remains wrong. A deductive argument is considered to be faulty if it is not supported by evidence. A logical argument is legitimate when the premises are accurate as well as its conclusion is accurate. A deductive argument is flawed without any evidence. For example:

Premise 1: The capital is the heart of a country.

Premise 2: Dhaka is the capital of Bangladesh.

Conclusion: Dhaka is the heart of Bangladesh.

This argument is correct since two of the premises are accurate, the conclusion has to be accurate; it is contradictory for all of the premises to be accurate and the conclusion to be incorrect. Thus, it is valid. Moreover, the argument's legitimacy is due to anything other than what the debate is concerning; rather due to a certain cognitive link connecting Dhaka and Bangladesh. The form of the reasoning is what establishes its validity. In the first premise, the repeating term "capital" is dispersed first, whereas, in the second premise, it is dispersed second. The term "country" is used at the ending of the first premise and at the finish of the conclusion to refer to Bangladesh. The third phrase, "Dhaka," is dispersed in a specific fashion; it appears first in the second premise and last in the conclusion.

Whenever the conclusion does not logically flow given the premises, the argument is invalid. It makes no difference if the premises are accurate or not. It is also debatable if the conclusion is correct. It is impossible that the premises to be accurate while the conclusion is incorrect. If that's the case, the argument is not valid. To evaluate the soundness of an argument, first, create an identical argument with the identical structure as the one being tested, but with true premises as well as a false conclusion. It is demonstrated that the original argument is flawed if the argument is created. For example:

Premise 1: Fishes are animals.

Premise 2: Some animals can fly.

Conclusion: Fishes can fly.

Here, both of the premises are accurate, however, the conclusion itself is not accurate. Therefore, the argument itself is not valid.

According to Aristotle, “It is impossible for there to be proofs of everything.” A first principle is a fundamental premise from which no additional deductions may be made. The concept of first principles, as defined by Aristotle, is a set of initial premises without which no subsequent premises can be established. Because there are no premises, he believes that induction is the best way to get at the first principle. The term inductive reasoning refers to the rationalization that relies on particular assertions, such as observable connections, to reach a broad assumption. Induction is a term used to describe this process. Induction begins using a collection of assumptions, most of which are founded on the personal encounter or empirical data. For example, the sun rises in the east. This is fundamental knowledge gained through the observation of human eyes.

To conclude, Aristotle believes that knowledge is the understanding about what is valid, and this validity should be explained in a manner that demonstrates it should be accurate, that it is inescapably correct. The reasoning is meant to acquire knowledge and argument is the fuel to apply reasoning to reach the knowledge as truth.