

Asa Hunte
Alliance University
Intro to Philosophy
February 16th, 2023

Plato, "The Allegory of the Cave"

1.

I think Plato considers the "good" the ultimate illuminating idea for truth and reality because good and bad are how we understand the world around us. Even in building experience as an infant, we categorize things into good and bad from what we can comprehend. The "good" serves as a light to all things we look at to understand the nature of things and what we base our understanding on

2. Plato's allegory of the cave talks about man being chained in a dark cave limited to his surroundings. He makes sense of the world through what he sees or rather, the world he is limited to. When he is freed from these shackles, he is able to step into the light and even though he is not able to immediately see all that is in the light, he is able to gradually adjust and see all the things withheld from him before. He is unable to bring this new revelation to his peers however since they would label him as crazy for bringing them knowledge beyond their understanding. The way this relates to knowledge is that we all start out in the cave, unable to fully comprehend the things around us due to limited understanding. It is through aging and experience that we are able to leave the cave and gain a better view of the world we were missing out on. The way this relates to levels of reality is the cave and shadows are our understanding of the world in physics and geometry. Once we are able to go past this, we are able to comprehend something greater beyond the realm of physics and geometry in things that we cannot comprehend with our 5 senses, but with the soul.

3. The first line that was cut into equal parts is things that we cannot interact with but still see how physical objects have an effect on and create them. Shadows and reflections are byproducts of the physical world around us. We cannot touch them, but we can change them by merging our shadows with the shadows of other things or making our reflections move by way of movement, the second line that was split is things that can interact with the first line but with these, we are able to touch these things as well as be touched by them.

Aristotle, "Individual Substance"

1. Aristotle says the main point in substance is that it is a definition of matter and used to describe things we perceive around us. It cannot be quantified unless you speak of a specific attribute of the substance such as is this animal larger in size than this other animal?

2. What Aristotle means here is that a description of a human or animal cannot be the subject when describing it and putting the subject in the predicate place. Essentially what this means is that a concept cannot by itself be a subject and depends wholly upon the subject. It's like saying this hungry is man instead of this man is hungry. It makes no sense because hungry is a concept and needs a subject to go with it

3. I think Aristotle picks primary substance as the basic building block of reality to make it better understood to anyone who might not be educated that is reading his idea. It's much easier to understand if Aristotle references things a commoner sees and interacts with every day in their day to day life. It's another thing to reference a form of matter that not everyone may be familiar with since it may confuse the reader.

Aristotle, "Four Types of Explanations"

1. The four causes can be explained to be a more complex version of who, what, where, and why except most of it would be whys and whats. Who would be the formal cause asking what are the properties of this thing and what is it made of. The efficient cause would fall under the why category as it is questioning what caused this thing to change or move. An example of this would be asking why did this cup fall to the ground and an answer would be that you let go of it and gravity pulled it down to earth. The material cause is a why cause as it questions the property of something like why is the concrete hard and the answer to such would be that the concrete was wet when it was made but as it dried and it lost moisture, the materials inside got closer together and became more compact. The last cause which is the final cause falls under the why category and this cause is meant to describe that which is the sake for which something is done as Aristotle put it. To put this into perspective, you could ask the question, why do weasels hunt so much and the answer would be that they need to hunt constantly to stay alive since their metabolism requires it.
2. Why is the table so sturdy? This would be a material cause. The answer to this would be that the table was fitted with nails and a few other materials so as to keep it together. For the efficient cause, the question could be asked why does the table not move? The answer to this would be that its legs keep it from moving unless an outside source influences it. For a formal cause, the question asked here would be, why is this table called a table? To answer this, one would simply have to specify what the definition of a table is that is, does it have a number of legs as well as a large flat surface on top with which to store things and with this, the question would be answered of why is this a table. The final cause would be something along the lines of, why does the table break after a few years of use and the answer to this would be that the material the table is made from breaks down over time and if not the whole table, parts of the table must be replaced in order to ensure it can still be used.

3. Aristotle says the fourth cause of things is a cause leading to an end and this can be seen anywhere in Nature. Nature shows this case in the way that bees go around pollinating flowers unintentionally but in doing so, they gather nectar to make honey for their hive which is the end cause. I agree that there is a purposefulness in nature because the synchronicity with which nature works together is too well put for it to have occurred randomly. Food chains and ecosystems are proof of the order in which nature follows and these things cannot occur at chance. The purposefulness in nature is survival or reproduction and I think I can say for almost certain that this is present in every genus of the animal kingdom in the way they all obtain sustenance and seek to reproduce.