

## Lesson 3 Philosophy

Plato, "The Allegory of the Cave" (Republic) - pp. 69-75

1. Why do you think the Form of the "Good" is considered by Plato to be the ultimate illuminating idea that helps understand truth and reality? I think the form or the "Good" is considered this way because when the light goes off in a person's head of what good is the same understanding of the idea could go off for someone else. Meaning, two people may have the same ultimate illuminating idea of what good is at different times but the truth of what the good is remains the same because it's absolute.

2. Recount and explain Plato's Allegory of the Cave. How does it relate to knowledge? How does it relate to levels of reality? The allegory of the cave relates to knowledge and the levels of reality in helping us to understand that once knowledge is obtained one can not return to the ignorance that was once before them. Once the prisoners in the cave were led out of darkness and saw the world they could only go back to help their former cell mate into the light. The ignorance would be considered the shadows of reality because it comes and goes meaning you may be knowledgeable in one thing and ignorant in another. The trees the prisoners visualized on the wall of the cave were not the same from outside the cave. The visible reality would be considered knowledge because what the prisoners saw in the cave versus outside of the cave brought them knowledge of the world outside of the cave. The ordinary objects would be the cave no matter how you slice it, it's still a cave and doesn't change.

3. Explain in your own words the levels of reality represented by Plato's divided line. The level of reality is as follows "a bed" is an ordinary object used out of necessity and something we can touch making it a part of our ordinary reality. Having the ability to see the bed is a part of our visual reality and is subjective from person to person. The shadow of the bed is a lesser reality because when the light is off the shadow is no longer visible. The shadow of the bed moves with the bed and in the darkness the bed still exist whereas the shadow does not.

Aristotle, "Individual Substance" (Categories) - pp. 76-79

1. In your own words and referencing the reading, explain the main point Aristotle makes in describing a primary, basic, "substance" as the fundamental basis of reality. Aristotle believed that the primary substance is the most real thing. The creation of an individual thing is based on the tangible reality of another. The formation of a tangible idea is based off other tangible realities. A lamp could not be created unless the items which made the lamp were first created and the lamp's creator had the idea to put all these items together to formulate the lamp and call it lamp.

2. What does Aristotle mean when he says that a substance cannot be "said of" or "said in" a subject? Look up the concept of a "predicate" online. How might you rephrase Aristotle's point by saying a substance can never be a predicate? Substance can not describe a thing because it is the thing. Take this

sentence for example (The curtain is yellow) The curtain is the substance and yellow is the predicate. The attributes of the curtain may change (length, height, texture) but it remains to be a curtain. Humans as a substance do not have matters of degree.

3. Why do you think Aristotle picks out primary substance as the basic building block of reality, and not the parts, or atoms, or matter, or any other smaller thing that might make up a substance? I think that Aristotle didn't choose to use atoms, parts, and matter in his analogy because these items would not be considered substance since they are just particles, they are out in the world, but they are not from the eternal/heavenly realm. An atom and mass can be more or less of what it is because nature doesn't work like that.

Aristotle, "Four Types of Explanation" (Physics) - pp. 413-415

1. List and explain in your own words the four main reasons (sometimes called "causes") for why a substance is what it is according to Aristotle.
  - Material cause: The physical items that make something what it is i.e. bones, tissues, muscles are some of the ITEMS that make up a human
  - Formal Cause: Defining asset and nature of the form, organizing it's matter to create the substance
  - efficient cause: A powerful source that made the item, a dynamic force that took the material and made something out of nothing.
  - Final Cause: The creation, the purpose of a thing exists in nature weather it is used or not.

2. Take the example of a table. How would you explain why a table is what it is, in terms of the four main types of explanation according to Aristotle. The table is made up of four components according to Aristotle (1) The legs, top, nuts and bolts are the material that makes up the table, then items are put into formation to create the design which is called the formal cause. The carpenter would be considered the efficient cause that takes the items and creates the table and the final cause it that the table is there for usage, weather it is used to its maximum potential or not it was still created with purpose and has reached it's final cause.

3. What does Aristotle say about the fourth cause of things, and how it even exists in nature? How does nature show this cause? Do you agree or disagree that there is a true purposefulness in nature? Why? I agree that the fourth and final cause. We are all made with a purpose even if we do not fulfil our purpose when we were formed, God had a purpose in mind for us. Just as the table is formed by a powerful source so are humans and animals. It is very purposeful that the things created in nature exists for the circle of life to continue.