Three Major Philosophical Distinctions (notes)

Notes of: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5caXLeKE5QI>

Video 1: Three Major Philosophical Distinctions

Let's study some Distinctions. First, we need some definitions:

*Metaphysics*: the study of what is and what exists.

*Epistemology*: the study of thought and how we create and gather information from the metaphysical reality we are in.

*Language*: how we choose to phrase and organize our epistemology and metaphysics in a shared system.

In each of these 3 major philosophical categories of inquiry, there exists distinctions:

1. Necessary and Contingent
2. A Priori and A Posteriori
3. Analytic and Synthetic

Without much detail for now, there is a common notion of distinguishing these into two groups:

1. Necessary, A Priori and Analytic
2. Contingent, A Posteriori and Synthetic

But there also exist counter arguments for these classifications:

* Saul Kripke’s “Naming and Necessity”
* Willard Quine’s “Two Dogmas of Empiricism”

Video 2: Necessary and Contingent Distinction

*Definition of truth*: Facts about the way that the world is. Not the statements we make about the world or our thoughts about it.

*Necessary truth*: Something that cannot be false. The denial of which would lead to a logical contradiction.

*Examples*:

* The sky is either blue or not blue.
* 2+2=4
* All wives are married women.

*Contingent truth*: Something that can be false. Logically could have been different. p=>q makes p a contingent truth: p may be true or not, it is not given from the premise.

*Examples*:

* George Washington was the 1st President.
* The #1 fear in the US is public speaking.
* It often rains in Seattle.

*Difference*: One must hold for all cases while the other must hold for at least one case.

*Extension*: the negation in a necessary truth makes it impossible that p: ◻~p, while negating this turns it from impossible to possible: ~◻~p<=>◊p. The negation in a contingent makes it not be true in all cases: ◊~p, while negating this makes it not to be the case that it is not true in all cases: ~◊~p, which simply means that it is necessary for it to be true in all cases: ~~◻~~p<=>◻p

Video 3: A priori and A Posteriori Distinction

*Definition of knowledge*: justified true belief. In its most basic terms it's something in your head that means and follows from what you know.

*A priori knowledge*: something that can be known without experience or sense data.

*Examples*:

* If Socrates has more wine than Plato, and Plate has more wine than Aristotle, then Socrates has more wine than Aristotle.
* Five is a prime number.
* Brothers are male siblings.

*A posteriori knowledge*: something that can only be known with sense experience.

*Examples*:

* Socrates has a glass of wine.
* My dog likes chicken.
* It often rains in Portland.

*Difference*: One may be gained through analytic thinking (to say that some statement p implies some statement q (like five is a prime number is: ∃5=>P5)) while the other can be gained to even form concrete truth values for propositions in the world we live in (like my dog likes chicken is Cd).

*Extension*: a priori knowledge is in my opinion dependent on your way to reason, while a posteriori depends on your way to collect knowledge.

Video 4: Analytic and Synthetic Distinction

*Statement*: The content of a sentence that affirms or denies something. Must be true or false. It simply is some conclusion about something.

*Analytic statements*: A statement true by definition, the predicate concept is contained in the subject (by this we mean that the predicate concept (unmarried men) is contained in the subject (bachelors)).

*Examples*:

* Bachelors are unmarried men.
* Salmon are fish.
* Triangles have three sides.

*Synthetic statements*: True by experience, the predicate concept is not contained in the subject (the predicate concept (unhappiness) is not contained in the subject (bachelor)).

*Examples*:

* Everything with a heart has a kidney.
* All bachelors are unhappy.
* It often rains in Vancouver.

*Difference*: I would say that analytic must be true in all worlds, as in all worlds, Salmon are fish, while synthetic is true in our world, there can exist a world where bachelors are happy, but that's simply not our world.

*Extension*: analytic statements are used in regards to not knowing which world we are in, while synthetic only make sense if we know which world we are in (or at least which ones we are not in).

Video 5: three Major Distinctions Final

Let’s now put this all together.

If we look at the statement, “bachelors are unmarried men”, we see that this is both necessary, a priori and analytic. And the synthetic version: “bachelors are unhappy” is both contingent, a posteriori, and synthetic.