

Page No. _____
Date _____

Unit - I Pre-socratic Philosophy

* Characteristics / Features

- ① The Presocratics were 6th and 5th century BCE Greek thinkers who introduced a new way of inquiring into the world and the place of human beings in it. They were recognised in antiquity as the first philosophers and scientists of the western tradition. This article is a general introduction to the most important Presocratic philosophers and the main themes of Presocratic thought. They are:-
- ① The Presocratic Philosophers are Zeno, Pythagoras, Democritus, Anaxagoras, etc and they are also the sciences.
- ② Pre-Socratic Philosophy is also known as early Greek Philosophy.
- ③ Pre-socratic philosophers were mostly interested in cosmology, the beginning and the substance of the universe.
- ④ Pre-socratic Philosophy were also inquires the working of the natural world as well as human society, ethics and religion.
- ⑤ Pre-socratic explanations are based on natural law rather than the actions of gods.
- ⑥ It found fertile ground in the ancient Greek world because of the close ties with the neighbouring civilization.

⑦ It exhibits three significant features, they were internal, systematic and economical.

⑧ The Pre-socratic Philosophers rejected traditional mythological explanations of the phenomena they saw around them in favour of more rational explanation insisting analytic and critical thought.

⑨ The most important features of Pre-socratic Philosophy was the use of reason to explain the universe.

⑩ The Pre-socratic Philosophers shared the intuition that there was a single explanation that could explain both the plurality and the singularity of the whole and that explanation would not be direct actions of the gods.

* Doctrine of Being Zeno and Parmenides

Parmenides held that multiplicity of existing things, their changing forms and motion, are but an appearance of a single eternal reality called 'Being', thus giving rise to the Parmenides' principle that, "all is one". From this concept of being, he went on to say that all claims of change or of non-being are illogical. There is no such thing as non-being, so every thing is a state of being.

In the question "what is being"? the Parmenidean answer that there is being and nothing else besides being appears to have the

merit of truth, even if it is tautological truth. what is, is; and what is not, is not. But what Parmenides question in fact contains in a non-tautological demand for the characteristics of what is, to which the answer that being is one, unchanging and eternal is appropriate. Since the objects we perceive are many, changing and transient, they do not belong to the realm of being.

Parmenides is posing constraints on language and on thought, a limit on what can be spoken of or thought about, we cannot speak or think about things that are not real that do not exist. That means that much of what goes by the name of speaking or thought really won't count as such for Parmenides.

Zeno was famous for the Parmenides whereby, in order to recommend the Parmenidean doctrine of the existence of the one, he sought to controvert the commonsense belief in the existence of the many distinguishable qualities and ~~things~~ things capable of motion. Zeno sought to defend Parmenides by attacking his critics; Parmenides rejected Pluralism and the reality of any kind of change, for him all was one indivisible, unchanging reality, and any appearances to the contrary were illusions to be dispelled by reason and revelation. Not surprisingly, this philosophy found many critics, who rejected the suggestion, after all it flies in the face of some of our most basic beliefs about the world. In response to this criticism, Zeno did something that may sound obvious, but which

had a
that is
show th
logical
views
things
every
ingin
that m
nothing

* Py

Q. A
as-

Ans

ne
the
he
m
o
t

Page No. _____
Date _____

had a profound impact on Greek Philosophy that is felt to this day. He attempted to show that equal absurdities followed logically from the denial of Parmenides' views. Can you think that there are many things? Then you must conclude that everything is both infinitely small and infinitely big, we think that motion is infinitely divisible! It follows that nothing more.

* Pythagoras

Q. According to Pythagoras mention any two opposites as the constituent of world

Ans. Pythagorean Philosophers believed that numbers were the elements of all beings and the universe as a whole was composed of harmony and numbers. The Pythagoreans used mathematics for solely mystical reasons, devoid of practical application. They believed that all things were made of numbers. The number one (the monad) represented the origin of all things and the number two represented matter. The four basic elements of matter, earth, air and fire are the basic elements of Pythagoras. These elements also made up the human body. A central belief of Pythagoras and his followers was that "everything is number". To the Pythagoreans a number was a quality that could be expressed as a ratio of two integers (a rational number). The Pythagorean used music as an example of the beliefs.



OPPO K10

© Noorin

Everything is numerical and counted according to Pythagoras because in his teachings focused on the significance of numerology, he believed that numbers themselves explained the true nature of the universe. For him things are numbers, this was extracted from the idea that if something as philosophical as music could be explained in numbers could not everything. He believed everything was constructed through a variety of mathematics.

The teachings of Pythagoras revolved around the idea that when considering the deepest level, reality is essentially mathematical in nature. He believed there was a system of principles existed behind numbers -

- (i) Limited and unlimited (ii) odd and Even
- (iii) unity and Plurality (iv) Right and left
- (v) male and female (vi) In rest and in motion
- (vii) straight and curved (viii) light and darkness
- (ix) good and evil (x) square and oblong

* Democritus

Q. What is atomism according to Democritus?

Ans The theory of Democritus hold that everything is composed of 'atoms'. which are physically but not geometrically, indivisible, that between atoms, there lies empty space, that atoms are indestructible and have always been and always will be in motion, that there is an infinite number of atoms and of kinds of atoms.

Page No. _____
Date _____

Democritus, along with Leucippus and Epicurus proposed the earliest views on the shapes ~~solidness~~ of and connectivity of atoms. They reasoned that the solidness of the material corresponded to the shape of the atoms involved. Using analogies from human sense experiences, he gave a picture or an image of an atom that distinguished them from each other by their shape, their size and the arrangement of their parts. Moreover, connections were explained by material links in which single atoms were supplied with attachments, some with hook and eyes, others with balls and sockets.

The Democritean atom is an ^{inert} solid that interacts with other atoms mechanically. In contrast, modern, quantum-mechanical atoms interact that is electric and magnetic atoms ~~interact that is~~ force fields and one from from inert.

Democritus held that originally the universe was composed of nothing but atoms ~~then~~ churning in chaos - until they collided together to form larger units - including the earth and everything on it. He surmised that there are many worlds, some growing, some decaying, some with no sun or moon, some with several. He held that every world has a beginning and an end and that a world could be destroyed by collision with another world.

Page No. _____
Date _____

Unit - II Heraclitus - Doctrine of Flux
and Logos

Heraclitus flux doctrine is a to ways things are both the same and not the same over time. He depicts two key opposites that are interconnected, but not identical. 'All is flux' nothing stays still, is a fragment from the writings of ancient Greek philosopher, Heraclitus immediately this statement conjures notion of movement and flow, but also brings into question identity. How does one thing maintain identity through change while another thing does not? Heraclitus thinks that the answer to both questions is found in "the logos", which is a Greek word with multiple meanings, it can be an explanation, a word or linguistic meaning, science, rationality and the principle of exchange between them. No man ever steps in the same river twice, for it's not the same river and he's not the same man. There is nothing permanent except change. Logos is a rational divine intelligence, which today is sometimes referred to in scientific discourse as the mind of God.

Flux means everything is constantly changing and opposite things are identical, so that everything is and is not at the same time. In other words, universal flux and the law of identity of opposites entail a denial of the law of non-contradiction. Which means that all things are ever changing, sea water is good for fish, but bad for humans. Heraclitus flux doctrine is a special case of the unity of opposites, pointing to ways things are both the



same and not the same over time.

Logos refers to a rational divine intelligence (which today is sometimes referred to in scientific discourse as the 'mind of God'), logos is derived from Greek word, reason or plan. Logos is the rational explanation in contrast to a mythological explanation. A well-designed logos is the divine reason implicit in the cosmos ordering it and giving it form and meaning.

Parmenides - Nature of being

Q. Explain the nature of being as advocated by Parmenides.

Ans. Parmenides held that the multiplicity of existing things, their changing forms and motion, are but ~~an~~ an appearance of a single eternal reality called Being, thus giving rise to the Parmenides principle that "all is one", from this concept of being, he went on to say that all claims to change or of non-being are illogical.

The philosophy of Parmenides is based around the concept of status, which means that the universe is in constant balance, that things either exist or do not exist, and they cannot change. Everything exists as part of an unchanging nature, what we may observe as transformations are merely illusory appearances.

The notion being is the philosophic notion that denotes something that is existing, the totality of really existing.

Page No. _____
Date _____

things, the existing reality non-being is the other philosophic notion that denotes absence of something, all-things non-existent in reality, non-existent reality.

Xenophanes had declared 'All is one'. This was the starting point of Parmenides. How could he establish this truth? He like the rest of the people found that the world of sensible things is always becoming. Things come into the world and the next moment they perish. They are as much one as also they are not. What can we say about this flux? Heraclitus declared that flux alone is real. For Parmenides it appeared self-contradictory to hold that a thing which is passing away to be real. What is the point involved in saying that the real is permanent and unchangeable.

For Parmenides, one alone is real. Any multiplicity and changes are unreal. This distinction is a matter of intuition and at most a postulate of his philosophy. But in real life changes and plurality of things are palpable. What can we say about them? For Parmenides plurality and changes are given by the sense. At most they can be called "mere appearances". But what is the reason for regarding them as appearances. Quite obviously they are and yet they cease to be.

If the world of senses is illusory, then how do we know the one? Of course, through thought. Hence, Parmenides makes a distinction between the appearance to thought. In one way Parmenides teaches the primacy of thought, then in another

Unit - IVPlato Justice in state and Individual

Q. Explain Plato's theory of Justice?

Ans. Justice is, for Plato, at once a part of human virtue and the bond, which joins men together in society. It is the identical quality that makes good and social, Justice is an order and duty of the parts of the soul. It is to the soul as health is to the body.

Plato defined Justice as having and doing what is one's own. In other words, everybody does their own work. Mind is stated to be just when every part of it functions in its own sphere under the overall guidance of reason, which is the pilot of mind and soul.

According to Plato Justice found in Individual does not lie in a man's external actions, but in the way he acts within himself. He does not allow each part of himself to perform the work of another, or the parts of his soul to interfere with one another. He regulates with what is really his own and rules himself.

The Justice of the Individual and that of the state, exhibit a relation of mutual dependence. Only in the state can citizens acquire personal Justice, but only if they are personally just can the citizens adequately perform their social function and so bring about the Justice of

the polis.

According to Plato, Justice is not a legal concept but a moral one. Plato categorises Justice at two levels - individual justice and social justice. Many people regard the state as both a means and an end. According to them, there is no conflict of interests between the interests between the interests of the individual and the state. The state is a means as it aims at the welfare of the people and at the same time it is an end also because it is a supreme and a sovereign institution.

Thus, for Plato Justice is the quality of individual soul, in virtue of which men aside the irrational desire to taste every pleasure and to get a selfish satisfaction out of every object and accommodated themselves to the discharge of a single function for the general benefit and state is that it protects the fundamental human rights of its people. This enables them to live in dignity and work to improve their lot. Examples of such rights include natural rights, economic rights, legal rights and political rights. Justice is that in individual life, and in social life, means each individual and each class is in its proper place. And each class according to prevalence of one of his capacities places in the social and moral hierarchy, Justice is a quality an indispensable quality of moral life.

Aristotle - Nature and change

Q. Discuss Aristotle Philosophy of nature?

Ans. According to Aristotle, nature is a principle or cause of being moved and of being at rest in that to which it belongs primarily, in virtue of itself, and not accidentally. Nature, is an inner principle of change and being at rest. This means that when an entity moves or is at rest according to its nature reference to its nature may serve as an explanation of the event. We have to describe how to what agency - the preconditions for that process of change or of being at rest are present, but one we have provided an account of these preconditions, we have given a complete account of these process. The nature of the entity is in and of itself sufficient to induce and to explain the process once the relevant circumstances do not it.

Nature as inner principles of change and rest are contrasted with active powers or potentialities which are external principles of change and being at rest, operations on the corresponding internal passive capacities or potentialities, when a change, or a state of rest, is not natural, both the active and the passive potentiality need to be special natures, then, in a way do double duty. Once a nature is operative, neither a future active nor

Page No. _____
Date _____

a further passive capacity needs to be invoked. Even so, as will be clear from Aristotle's discussion, this general thesis will require a host of qualifications. because natures - bodies - the active and passive potentialities - are ultimate grounds in causal explanations, Aristotle sets out how they are integrated with the doctrine of causation.

Q. What is change according to Aristotle?

Ans. Aristotle says that change is the actualising of a potentiality of the subject. That actualisation is the composition of the form of the thing that comes to be with the subject of change. One of the biggest problems that ancient Greek philosophers dealt with was the problem of change - why and how do objects change?

Aristotle accepted that objects change. This is consistent with his view that physical objects are fully real and are the only things that fully exist. Change occurs to real things, thus change is real. We still need an explanation of how objects change. So, Aristotle needed to come up with an explanation. His theory is ingenious. We combine several concepts into an account of change that significantly influenced the medieval and early modern world; potential and actuality, and the four causes will discuss each in turn.



Page No. _____
Date ____/____/____

Every object has a form (set of qualities) but every object is also made of matter; matter is nothing in and of itself. Matter is pure potential but devoid of actuality. It is characterless, devoid of form, and only becomes an object when form takes hold of it to create a substance. eg - the sculptor takes matter and changes its form from a lump of marble into a finished statue.

change, for Aristotle is a matter of potentiality and actuality. All objects that we perceive in the world have potentiality and actuality objects all have actually because we can perceive them. But every object also has potentiality - the potential to change and become something else or more.

thus, we only find things that have been actualised into what they are now. they are actualised but also contain the potential to actualise into something else.

sex-pleasure, for it is disturbing, fleeting and follows from crude images. Democritus teaches the cultivation of true friendship. The ideal of Democritus resting as it does on materialism teaches the steadfastness and tranquillity of the inward soul, which ideal has been taught by the *Gita* also.

THE SOPHISTS

The Sophist Epistemology (Protagoras)

For Sophists Knowledge is perception.

In perception there is the motion from the external object towards the sense-organ. And yet again there is also a corresponding motion of the sense-organ towards the motion of the external object. Hence there is a double motion, one from the external thing and another from the sense-organ of the

percipient. But quite obviously perceiving is not the object perceived, and, yet again perceiving is quite different from the perceiving subject. Thus perception is the product of both the object moving towards the subject, and the subject moving towards the object. This perception alone is knowledge. Thus Man is the measure of all things, of what is, that it is; of what is not, that it is not.

Knowledge means that which is true for all and for all the movements of human life. And yet for all practical purpose perception alone is knowledge. This knowledge is *relative* to different men at different times. Hence the famous saying of Protagoras *Homo Mensura*, i.e., man is the measure of all things. In other words, what appears to me is true for me and what appears to you is true for you. Hence there is no knowledge. Which is valid and acceptable to all men universally. The conclusion of *homo mensura* not only shows the relativism of knowledge, but also its universality as impossibility. This is known as scepticism. In others respects, it also means all statements are true and none are false. It is not self-contradictory to say that the same object is x as it appears to me, and, is not x as it appears to you, because I may be talking about one object and you might be speaking about a different object. But from this very statement, it appears that there is not *anyone* object about which two persons can communicate. And this is what Gorgias holds that no knowledge is possible, and even if knowledge be available it cannot be communicated.

Nihilism (Gorgias)

perception, and, perception is true for the perceiver. It cannot be shared with anybody at all. 'My knowledge' which two persons can perceive alike. Hence, perception which nothing can go out and into which cannot be communicated.

Every

The sophists were interested in truth. They concentrated on the logic of proof and refutation. They had developed the theory of refutation.

This table is black.

Either, the predicate 'black' is quite different from its subject term 'table' which it is not. So it is false. Similarly, 'The table is white'. Hence, we are permitted to say, 'The table is not white'. Therefore, we cannot communicate anything at all. Therefore, we cannot communicate anything.

nothing at all. Therefore, we cannot know anything at all.

SOCRATES

The Method of enquiry of Socrates was *conversational*. Conversation invariably was limited to ethical subject-matter, for Socrates was trying to know his ownself. This self for him was essentially ethical. Naturally the subject-matter of conversation included the nature of justice, virtue, knowledge, temperance etc. The conversational method of Socrates took the form of what is known as 'dialectic'. The dialectic method is an art of argument by skilful questions and answer (Meno 85 d). The answer to the question has to be answered in the fewest possible words which should be precise and to the point. Again, Socrates's mother was a midwife and helped in the delivery of the child which was already there in the womb of the mother. So Socrates claimed that real knowledge of justice, virtue, eternal ideas are already present in man. This knowledge is dormant, waiting to be recollected by skilful questioning. Socrates had in his mind, the immortality of individual souls, their perfect knowledge of ideas in their previous births and in their pristine glory. Socrates regards the soul to be immortal.

Socrates makes a sharp distinction between perception and conception. By conception is meant universal idea of a class. Now for Socrates there is an absolute gulf between perception and conception. So the observation of a number of particular things cannot yield the conception of cowness or horseness. Socrates accepted that knowledge is through concept. Perceptions of things simply suggest concepts which are already sleeping in each man. *The promptings of perceptions simply serve to excite our previous knowledge of eternal varieties by recollection.*

In relation to Ethics, Socrates laid down three propositions:

1. Virtue is knowledge through concepts. So nobody does wrong knowingly. Therefore, vice is ignorance.
2. As virtue is knowledge, so virtue can be taught.

3. Virtue is one.

The Idea of the Good is one single reality which underlies all that is called virtue or good. Once one gets this knowledge of the good or its glimpse, one cannot do wrong. Only in this sense, virtue is knowledge, and, the knowledge of the good is virtue. In this interpretation, there is an echo of the advaitic teaching that the knower of Brahman himself becomes Brahman, and goes beyond both good and evil. Aristotle himself was a biologist and for him knowledge meant ordinary knowledge of subject-object type. From his standpoint certainly a mere knowledge of what is conventionally regarded as good or evil, does not issue into its corresponding action. But for Socrates knowledge meant the glimpse of the Supreme Source of good and this changes, moulds and transforms the total personality of the seeker.

OBJECTIVE TYPE QUESTIONS

1. Who among the following is known as the

(c) Thales

(d) Plato

(a) Zeno

(c) Democritus

12. Who holds that the world is made of atoms?
to be hylozoist

(a) Zeno

(c) Frank

13. According to the Milesians, the basic stuff is ..

(a) water

(c) air

14. Anaximander

1. form

3. infinity

Codes