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**Answer to the Question No 1**

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.

**Answer to the Question No 3**

 Plato is an early Greek thinker whose writings proceed to impact and shape current intellectual ideas. He is a thinker from a political and socially upper-class household in Greece. The Forms are his term for the flawless vision. He claims that without knowing the Form of the Good, it is impossible to comprehend what's perfect, and therefore all additional knowledge might be useless. The Form of the Good is much more substantial than the other Forms: this is the most basic and genuine object that occurs the source of the Forms, and the account of the known universe meaningful pattern. It resembled a heavenly language, or divine reason, that formed a cult subject for subsequent branches of thought that evolved beneath Plato's impact.

Plato was affected by a culture of skepticism, which included his mentor Socrates' skepticism, who has been the central figure in Plato's dialogues. Several of the earliest Greek thinkers recognized that humans exist in a reality where real, everlasting, unchangeable truth is difficult to come by. Plato states via Socrates that the physical universe is untrustworthy since it is changing. Plato, on the other hand, argued that it was hardly the complete story. He challenges this notion via three steps:

“1. Clarify the distinction between opinion and knowledge

2. Show that we do have (access to) knowledge

3. Explain the nature of the objects that we can be said to know”

Authenticity is the initial basis of differentiation separating knowledge and opinion, since whereas knowledge has constantly been accurate by nature, opinion is both accurate and wrong, and its accuracy can change. While knowledge and opinion might both be of what is factual, just the subject of knowledge is required. Statistics and academic evidence are the foundations of knowledge. The truth is remembered or constructed by the intellect and acknowledged by the majority when one knows. The opinion is merely what one person thinks, and it may or may not be embraced by the majority. This is a personal opinion, not a judgment. Regarding knowledge to be comprehensive, it is based on reasoning. The opinion is related to experience and conceptual reasoning; knowledge can use them as a foundation for the right reasoning, but it cannot rely simply on them. When a foundation for a sound viewpoint is presented, it becomes knowledge.

Plato's forays into the semantics as well as metaphysics of concepts are primarily motivated by a desire to preserve understanding. He thinks believes the Forms, which dwell outside of spatial and temporal, are more substantial than the actual universe. The Forms have enormous epistemological consequences. It results in a denial of deductive reasoning, as stated above since this physical universe cannot provide us with actual understanding. Plato appears to believe that individuals can comprehend the Forms and hence comprehend anything. That is no way to determine what the right solution is to an ethical issue. Plato's epistemology, on the other hand, implies that there are proper solutions to ethical difficulties. We may examine moral statements using such flawless frameworks. However, the forms' reasoning begins with the essence of the object, rather than with the basis of understanding. The forms' reasoning begins with the essence of the object, rather than with the basis of understanding.  For example little boy, little ship, and a little table. The boy, the ship, and the table have almost zero in relation to each other. They do not have features in common. The only major resemblance is that they are all little. According to Plato, this is a form of smallness. On the other hand, “Titanic” is the name of a specific ship. It distinguishes this ship from all the other ships. However, the term “ship” is common among all the ships. This is the one thing common among all the ships. Many languages may have different terms dedicated to this, but the underline meaning is all common among them. The meaning is the physical appearance of the ship. According to Plato, this is the common form among them. The purity term basically defines the form itself. These are the epistemological, metaphysical, and semantic approaches towards the forms.

The divided line, as per Plato, is split into two equal sections, both of which are then separated in a similar proportion. The end conclusion is a multiple-row fragment. The metaphysical category, which relates to tangible reality, is on the left, while the condition of consciousness of the individual who is in connection with part of reality is on the right. It's called epistemology. This is delving into specific components that mirrored on the part of the regarded kind's reality. Metaphysics is where we get in contact with the real world, and Epistemology is how humans come in contact with the real world. It is separated into two parts: the nonmaterial world, which is made up of forms, and the physical realm, which is made up of reality that we can see. Notwithstanding their materiality, two components are considered real by Plato. Epistemology, on the other hand, is separated into two categories: knowledge and opinion. Opinion is a mental condition that involves the perception of reality through sensations. The visuals are at the bottom of the metaphysical line. These are physical artifacts that are a direct mirror of the actual world, such as photos, paintings, and photographs. In relation to these visuals, the opinion refers to our mental frame as a result of feeling the images. The actual things are located above this. This is not imagining, but rather perceiving the thing, which is also a mental state about the item. By moving up to one level, we enter the intangible side. Now the opinion is over, this falls under knowledge. Reasoning and understanding are two of the division here. The reasoning resonates with the lower forms and understanding resonates with the higher forms of the metaphysical side. The lower parts are remotes to the common forms, as discussed before as “ship” rather than the “titanic” itself. Above this are the higher forms in the metaphysis side in contrast to the understanding of epistemology. This portion is regarded as high though such as morals justice and others. Through this, Plato talks about the higher forms such as the forms of beauty, forms of justice, forms of morals, forms of virtue. All these are dictated by the idea of simply what is good and what is bad. Above all is the form of the good which is the highest form. According to Plato, human existence is directly proportional to the form of good. It is an individual‘s purpose to gain the form of good. Therefore, it is regarded as the highest point of the divided line.

To conclude, Plato regarded the form of the good as the highest. He regarded it as the purpose of human life to achieve goodness through virtues and morals. For this, it is needed to understand the forms as a whole by gaining knowledge through reasoning. Knowledge is regarded as the truth.