

“THE THEORY OF UNIVERSAL: A SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PLATO AND ARISTOTLE.”

*A dissertation submitted to Department of Philosophy, University of Hyderabad in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the award of the degree of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY IN PHILOSOPHY

Under the Guidance of
Dr. B. Ananda Sagar
Assistant Professor

Submitted By
Saumya Ranjan Mallick
Regd. No: 17HPhL06



**Department of Philosophy
School of Humanities
University of Hyderabad
Hyderabad-500046
Telangana, India
June 2019**



Department of Philosophy
School of Humanities
University of Hyderabad
Hyderabad- 500046
India

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitle “**THE THEORY OF UNIVERSAL: A SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PLATO AND ARISTOTLE**” submitted by Mr. Saumya Ranjan Mallick. bearing Regd. No. 17HPL06 in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Master of Philosophy in Philosophy is a bonafide work carried out by her under my supervision and guidance which is a plagiarism free thesis.

The thesis has not been submitted previously in part or in full to this or any other University or Institution for the award of any degree or diploma.

Dr. B. Ananda Sagar
(Supervisor)
Department of Philosophy
University of Hyderabad

Head,
Department of Philosophy
University of Hyderabad

Dean,
School of Humanities
University of Hyderabad



Department of Philosophy
School of Humanities
University of Hyderabad
Hyderabad- 500046
India

DECLARATION

I, Saumya Ranjan Mallick hereby declare that this thesis entitled “**THE THEORY OF UNIVERSAL: A SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PLATO AND ARISTOTLE**”, submitted by me under the guidance and supervision of Dr. B. Ananda Sagar is a bonafide research work which is also free from plagiarism. I also declare that it has not been submitted previously in part or in full to this university or any other university or institution for the award of any degree or diploma. I hereby agree that my thesis can be deposited in Shodhganga/INFLIBNET.

Saumya Ranjan Mallick
Regd. No- 17HPL06
Department of Philosophy
University of Hyderabad

Acknowledgment

Facing both God and my Guru, whom should I bow to first? First I bow to my Guru because he is the one, who showed me the path to God. In the presence of Guru, Knowledge flourishes, Sorrow diminishes, Joy wells up without any reason, Abundance dawns, and Talent manifests.

The success of this work is as a result of comments, advice and discussions from my supervisor Assistant Professor, Dr. B. Ananda Sagar, during the period of my research, Department of Philosophy, School of Humanities, University of Hyderabad, for his untiring guidance and supervision as well as endless encouragement, inspirations, blessings and very durable mental support on my research work would not be fulfilled even if I all other fulfilments. I am very much indebted to him. I wish him as well as his family for good and healthy life, peaceful life, successful life and long life ahead.

Indeed, I am very much indebted to thank my co-guide Prof. P. K. Basu, Department of Philosophy, school of Humanities, University of Hyderabad, for his concern and untiring guidance and supervision as well as endless encouragement, inspiration, blessings, and valuable help and strong mental support on my research work. As the narrative goes “well began is half done” the first foundation stone was laid by my beloved sir, and through his priceless and erudite/scholarly guidance I am able to see this dissertation in its present form. Without whom my research work would not have been possible even if I had all other fulfilments. I wish him as well as his family for healthy life, happy life, peaceful life, successful life and life ahead.

I wish to express my profound sense of gratitude to Lord Jagannath, all the God and Goddesses for their great mercy on me.

I am extremely thankful to my grandfather's Late Harekrushna das, Kumar rabar mallick and Rangelata mallick.

I am so much indebted to my parents Smt. Manorama mallick and Shri Sudarsan mallick for their blessings, care, inspiration, incomparable moral support and unfathomable love. I wish to them a good health, happy, peaceful life and long life.

My sincere thanks to Prof. Prajit K. Basu (HoD), Dr. B. Ananda Sagar, Prof. Ramesh Chandra Pradhan, Dr. Kavita Chauhan, Prof. C. B. Barhma, Dr. Venusa Tinyi, Prof. Ganesh Das, Prof. Sachindra Raula, Prof. D. M. Praharaj, Prof. Sarat Chandra Panigrahi, Mr. Bijaya Kumar Nayak, and all others. I wish them healthy, happy and peaceful life forever for their encouragement, moral support, mental peace and endless blessings.

I would also like to acknowledge the University of Hyderabad, Department of Philosophy, IGM Library, Reading Room, Computer centre, Atmosphere of University for providing facilities and ideal atmosphere to conduct the study. I thank all teaching and non-teaching staff of the University of Hyderabad for their kind co-operation. I especially, thanks library madam who has given me sufficient book facility from time to time.

At last but not the least, I would like to thank all others who have directly or indirectly helped me to learn new things in life.

SAUMYA RANJAN MALLICK

Dedicated to my Late. Grand Father and Grand Mother.

CONTENTS

CHAPTERS	TITLE	PAGE. NO.
Chapter-1	Plato's Theory of Universal.	1-21
Chapter-2	Aristotle criticism on Plato's form.	22-40
Chapter-3	Nominalism	41-51
	Conclusion	52-53
	Bibliography	54-58

CHAPTER 1

PLATO'S THEORY OF UNIVERSALS

Introduction:

In this chapter, in which I am going to explore on Universals in general and Plato's view of universals. First of all, we have to understand what is universal? It is also called a form or ideas. Whatever we are able to know through our sense organ are not the pure form of reality, here we are only able to see the appearance of the form, not the reality (form or universals). In metaphysics, the universals are the reality, and the particular objects are the appearance because particulars exist for a moment and it always makes changes in its appearances but universals remain unchanged. Universals are present everywhere, universals in complex are many, some of them are like, class universals, quality universals, etc. let us understand this first, suppose for an example, if we excluded the manness from the man then are no existence of man in particular, because we know the particular by the help of universals.

In other word, if we exclude all the qualities from a table then the table does not exist at all. we exclude the qualities in the sense, we detach all the essential things which is very much important for the existence of the table, like, hardness, softness, thickness, like this all the things are coming under it. We can modify the table into different shape and size but we cannot able to change or modify the form or the universals of the table which is already in exists in our mind, the picture of the table which is in our mind has become same in everyone's mind. Because whenever a carpenter makes a table, the universals of the table or the idea of table, already exist in his mind, for that reason he is able to make the table, maybe the looks (physical appearance of the table) of the tables are different and it may depend in its physical appearances but the form or ideas are remaining same and one. In other words in a general point of view, if we try to understand the universals, whenever in a meeting or in a class the speaker is talking about some particular object or some living being, like an example of an

elephant, though the elephant is not present in there physically, the first thing which is coming into everyone's mind is the essence or the idea of an elephant and this form or idea is applicable for all the elephants because it shared a common quality for all the elephants and this common quality is called the universal which is the same for all. The most important thing in here is that, universals are not dependent on particular but in the same case the particular are depended on it, the reason behind it is universals do not exist in space and time but the particular is exists in the spatiotemporal world for their existence. Here we can understand that universals but equals for all, it means, which is present everywhere and for every particular object. If we take an example of 'horse', then in this world we can find verities of horses are present but the horseness which is present in all the horses are common to all. the appearance of the horses are to be different but the horseness which we called the universals are the same for all. The essence of the horse (horseness) is called the universal and the horse which is present in this world are particulars. Now we will see what is Plato's theory of universals.

Universal from Plato's point of view:

"Universals must not be identified, even by analogy, with anything that is particulars, for to do this would be to make them no longer universals."¹ Universal is in a hierarchical order, just like lower to higher in a certain order but the relationship between particular and universal is different from the previous one. The highest reality should be in the highest level just like God. If we take a broader sense of universals like 'coloredness' in this 'yellowness' is a property of yellow things, and it is also universal. Here the problem is we will not able to recognised the property which is in the blue things. These would not be particular, if we analyse a million shades of blue things. Though, even they actually do not have the property of blue objects but blue is still a property, Which is shared a common quality in every object. The blue thing still have the property of blueness. And it (blue shade) is still called a universal, it is also different from the particular thing (blue objects). "Similarly, you cannot go material thing to living thing to animal to mammal to dog to collie-dog to Lassie; every step except the last one is acceptable: each is a universal, falling under a more inclusive universal; but being a collie-dog (having the properties of collies) is still a property; however, 'lassie' is not the name of a property but of a particular dog. Being a collie, being a dog, being an animal, etc., are properties of this particular creature; lassie is not a property of this particular creature".²

¹ Plato, T.(1974). *Republic*, (2nd), London, Harmondsworth Penguin. pp.256.

² Plato, T.(1988). *Work of Plato*, (Vol.2), Jaipur, Printwell publication. Pp.252.

Each and every ideas has a unitary bonding in itself. Like the idea of blackness is present all the black objects, it shares a common quality in all objects, the idea of blackness or the essence of black is one but it's distribute its quality in many black objects. If there are so many ideas then we have chose the higher or the highest idea, like there are many idea of justice but we should chose the highest one which is appropriate for all idea of justice. The universal itself is absolute like God, and it is also the highest or supreme idea. Ideas should be biasfree for that reason it is present in out of the kingdom of space and time.

Let us discuss about form or universals in Plato's point of view, universals are forms or ideas, there are two worlds according to him, one is ideal world, where the reality of everything is exists and another one is the world of particulars, in where the copied things are exists. It means, the ideal world is the exemplars in this particular world. In his point of view, the tableness of the table is exists in ideal world and in this world the particular table is present. It is called particular because it is based in time and space, and it can be destroy. But the form according to him, is not destroyable or cannot be changeable because we cannot do so.

By the help of our sense organ we can only know the particular object but we are even not able to know the form without the reason or proper knowledge. The form is not be changed even the destruction of the particular object. according to him the transcendental world is the real world is the real world and each and every object is present in there before the existence of the particulars in this world. For Plato, ideas are outside of mind and exists in other world, and not in the object, for that reason he is called a objective idealist philosopher. According to him, our soul has the knowledge of everything, whatever is exists in this world and when the time will come we are become aware about it. Here there can be a question is to be raised, how we can get the knowledge about reality or form? According to him, intellect or soul is the mediator in between these two world and it will help to know the particular things. For him the form of everything is present in the real or actual world, like for an example the actual human being is present in the world of form and we all are the copied form of the actual form. We the individual being are born and die one day but the form is not so, because form is eternal and indubitable. For him, the form is one which is called good. Which is we can say it is the forms of form. And God is the highest reality because all the goodness is present in God. Let understand the form in a better way.

"The soul, in Plato's system is the mediator between the world of ideas and the world of sense. The human soul is similar in kind to the world soul. It is the cause of the body's

movements and in it the human reason dwells.”³ It helps both in the world of sense and world of ideas, soul helps to recollect the idea from the world of ideas, where the actuality of everything is present. The knowledge of everything we already have, the soul is helps us to remember all this ideas in a perfect time because the soul is remember everything but it is in a forgotten mode. The form of everything is immortal, because it has no time no space at all for his existence.

“The theory of recollection restarted as knowledge of the forms in soul before birth in the body. In the argument for the immortality of soul based on the recollection theory of knowledge, Socrates claims that we have knowledge is associated by seeing such things as equal sticks and stones”.⁴ The idea of soul is immortal is the main part of *Phaedo*. For proving the souls immortality, Socrates given four arguments. The theory stated the idea of forms. In the immortal soul knowledge is to be associated with it, the soul which is also sustain death is not an empty or void life force, intellect also included in it.

“The argument that knowledge is got through recollection depends on there being a difference between the things we see (equal sticks and stones) and the things we know (Equality itself). To convince us of this difference, Socrates offers the following argument”.⁵ The souls are always bears life, it is also not die, it is imperishable necessarily, souls are also immortal and unbreakable but the forms are unchanging and eternal it is point out by Socrates first argument. Then Plato introduces the analogy of fire and cold, this fire and cold is completely opposite from each other just like the opposite charges of two magnets. The second theory of recollection, this theory define that, the soul is exist before the body. The third is affinity argument. This argument define that our soul is invisible, immortal and incorporeal but our body is visible, mortal and corporeal. Soul is to be live even after the death of the body. The fourth one is the argument from form of life, it is also define form. The soul can never be destroyable and it never be die.

“This doctrine is not the Theory of Forms, but the ‘Doctrine of Recollection’, to the effect that what we call ‘learning’ is really recollecting things we already knew. The only piece of metaphysics this theory directly involves is the claim that the soul existed before embodiment. But the theory of recollection is going to be connected closely with the theory of forms in the

³ Plato, T.(1974). *Republic*, (2nd), London, Harmondsworth Penguin. pp.269.

⁴ Plato, T(1931). *Dialogues of Plato tr. Into English with analyses and introductions*, London, Oxford University Press, pp.319.

⁵ Ibid, pp.319

Phaedo.”⁶It is explain in Phaedo that ‘the philosopher more than other man frees the soul from association with the body as much as possible’. Body and soul are two different entities. The body is a burden to achieving the truth that’s the way philosophers frees himself from the material body. Therefore in Phaedo it is maintained that the soul is exist before the body and while after death of the body. Here there is a question arises how we will able know the form?

In this Plato is discuss about how we can know the form with the help of knowledge. The name of the dialogue is, “Education the pursuit of the forms. Imparting grace, and making the soul of him who is rightly educated graceful, or of him who is ill-educated, ungraceful; and also he because who has received this true education of the inner being will most shrewdly perceive omissions or faults in art and nature, and with true taste, while he praises and rejoices over and receives into his soul the good, and becomes noble and good, he will justly blame and hate the bad, now in the days of his youth, even before he is able to know the reason why; and when reason comes he will recognise and salute the friend with whom his education has made him long familiar.”⁷ Socrates divided the educational system in to two stages. This is the discussion among Socrates and his colleagues, Adeimantus and Glaucon, on education. They advocated that all the guardians should be cultivated in these four types of virtue, they should be aware about it, these four virtues are: wisdom, justice, courage and temperance. They also recommend the second one that guardians awareness should be in gymnastics because to live a happy and a good life. Through the physical training one should be prevent the illness and weakness. Through it one should be always feel better and stay happy. According to Socrates, male and female guardians both should be inclined the same education. Therefore no discrimination will be held amongst them. In other words Socrates wants to develop all the aspect of a child, for the betterment of their future. And he also gave his equal importance to both the male and female, no discrimination between them. According to him, to know the form, one should know himself first. For knowing himself, one should must be educated and by the help of education, it is more easier to achieve the existence of form. Through education we are all able to know the forms. Here we have to know what are the problems should be there to know the forms.

⁶ Dancy, M R, T(2004). *Plato's introduction of Forms*, New York, Cambridge University Press, pp.10-11.

⁷ Plato, T.(1974). *Republic*, (2nd), London, Harmondsworth Penguin. pp.256,257

This is on “Cratylus: The problem of knowing the forms.”⁸ The main subject of Cratylus is “correctness of name”. according to Socrates work of an artist is the first creation of the word. An artist tries to picturise his thought or essence through the help of colour, like for an example, to express the words we use some letters which is also containing sounds to explicit the essence of words subject. He said that there are some different letters for different things, that also intends the real essence of that things only. Here the theory of forms of Plato, also makes an presentation of form, like for an example, no matter what a table is made out of, it is still called a “table”, and hence it is also the form of a table. In this respect according to Socrates “so mustn’t a rule-setter also know how to embody in sounds and syllables the name naturally suited each thing? and if he is to be an authentic giver of names, mustn’t he, in making and giving each name, look to what a name itself is? And if different rule setters do not make each name out of the same syllables, we mustn’t forget that different blacksmiths, who are making the same tool for the same type of work, don’t all make it out of the same wood-the tool will be correct, whether it is made in Greece or abroad. Isn’t that so?”⁹ But according to Plato, the material things are changeable but the form remain unchanged. In Plato’s point of view, we are using different name to recognise the different object but the form of an particular object remain same. Here there can be a question arises is that, what is the thing is to be present there or helps to make the connection in between the particular object and the universals.

This is all about the form which is make the connection in between the universals and the particular. Parmenides, “third man argument”¹⁰ Firstly Plato, introduced the third man argument in his dialogue. Aristotle also briefly discussed about it. Here the name of this argument or the central point is ‘man’ as example to refute the Plato’s theory. Here Aristotle wants to says that an individual ‘man’ is called ‘man’ because the ‘man’ is carried the essence or form of ‘man’. Here there is a question arises is that “how the individual man and the form or concept ‘man’ are the same (man). Here there is a third form is to be required.

In here there are plurality of things which is known as F: according to third man argument all principles are contradicted to each other (A,B,C) is a expectation that there is a plurality of large things. “I suppose this is what leads you to suppose that there is in every case a single Form: when several things seem large to you, it seems perhaps that there is a single Form which

⁸ Sedley David, T(2003). *Cratylus: The problem of knowing the form*. New York, Cambridge University Press
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cratylus_\(dialogue\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cratylus_(dialogue))

⁹ Ibid

¹⁰ Plato, T.(1974). *Republic*, (2nd), London, Harmondsworth Penguin.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Third_man_argument

is the same in your view of all of them. Hence you believe that Largeness is a single thing.”¹¹ There is a form of largeness which is called (L1), A,B and C are the large by the virtue of participating. Here L1 is large by self-affirmation. We can add a new plurality of large things with L1. L1 is participating with L2 by one over many, which is a form of largeness. But there is non-self-participating because L1 is not similar to L2. Here L1 and L2 are the two forms of largeness. “Things can be said to be in many different senses”.¹² L2 is also large therefore we are able to add the new one with it. Through virtue of participating of A,B,C,L1 and L2 are large, by one-over-many, We can also in here add a new plurality of large things with L2. there is a form which is also large. In L3 both L1 and L2 are participated in that case and by non-self-participating. Hence L1,L2,L3 are the three forms of largeness in here. Through above repeatable of reasoning shows us that there are infinite number of forms of largeness, which is also many. Each and every form participating infinite number of forms. In here according to Plato whatever the things participating of many things that things also must itself be many.

Plato argues that the ‘third man argument’ is a dependent argument, it is not an independent argument. He said that in each and every case there must be something common, if the two things are similar to each other. Hence in particular man and in universal man there must be something common between them and this is also known as the ‘third man argument’. There should be a form in between the universals and the particular. Because the universals is present in an another world and the particular have his own world, so to relate these two world there should be an another form needed. Here there should be a doubt raised is that, how does the universals are participate in universals, and for which reason we are able to know the particular object as it is.

In This we will taking about how the universals is participate in the particular object. “Parmenides: participatory solution unity problem. Things partake of archetypal like and unlike, one and many, etc. the nature of the participation (third man argument). Forms not actually in the thing. The problem of their unknowability.”¹³ This dialogue is a discussion amongst Socrates, Parmenides, and Zeno. Zeno argued with the plurality said that ‘the things

¹¹ Vlastos Gregory, T(1954). *The Third Man Argument in the Parmenides*, North Carolina, Duke University Press, pp. 320.

¹² Ibid.335

¹³ Plato, T.(1974). *Republic*, (2nd), London, Harmondsworth Penguin.
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parmenides_\(dialogue\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parmenides_(dialogue))

are many' and then Zeno said that if things are many then they would be both like and unlike, in this situation things can't be like or unlike simultaneously. Things should be either be like or be unlike.

But according to Socrates, if we can make the distinction between the sensible things in one hand, and the form in the other hand, then sensible take part in the other hand. According to him both things like and unlike, singularity and plurality can be possible in simultaneously. Unity and plurality is to be possible also. According to him I am one unity but I can take part in plurality also. Thus simultaneous one thing is both like and unlike, one and many etc.

Here Parmenides asked a question to Socrates, that in which type of form you are ready for identify? And Socrates said that, I am very sure the existence of mathematics, unity, plurality, beauty, goodness but one thing I am not sure about, the thing is forms of man, water and fire. But he is close to conclusive.

Parmenides gave some arguments against this theory. According to him particulars are many but the forms are one, like for an example, there are many types of 'cows', but the form 'cow' is one, this is in one hand and in the other hand, the form is many.

Form is a thought which is existing in a soul, on this statement Parmenides replied, form is that a thought must be a thought of something forms are archetype in many cases or instances then Parmenides replied that, if the many cases are like the forms the forms are like their cases. "The relation may be regarded as metaphorical to the extent that the statements "this partakes of greenness" or "greenness inheres in this" are synonymous with the statement "this is green". But for Plato both forms of statement express a relation between the pre-existent entity greenness and the particular concerned. This relation is never adequately defined by Plato. This metaphorical statement we can satisfactorily translate by saying that flatterers employ rhetoric or that rhetoric is a species of flattery. But no such translation may be rendered for the participation in forms of particulars. Such a relation must in fact exist no matter how difficult it may seem to be to explain." ¹⁴ from the above explanation it is clear that the universals are exists and it is exists in ideal world, but we will see in the next line how the universals is understood by mind.

¹⁴ Runciman Garrison Walter, T(1959). *Plato's Parmenides*, U.S., Department of the Classics, Harvard University, pp.92.

In “Theaetetus: Universals understood by mind and not perceived by senses. McDowell 1976:227-8 suggest that this swift argument “contradicts the most characteristics exposition of the Theory of Forms, which indicate that the title ‘knowledge’ should be reserved for a relation between the mind and the forms untainted by any reliance on perception”.¹⁵ In this dialogue, there are three definitions of knowledge, the first one knowledge as true judgement, the second one is knowledge is nothing but perception and the last one is knowledge is true judgement with an account but here is a problem. The problem is that all the above three definitions are not satisfactory to be knowledge. The definition of knowledge was discussed between Theaetetus and Socrates. In here Socrates asks to Theaetetus that he cannot detect what knowledge is? And he is also anxious for a simple formula for it. Theaetetus answers to Socrates that, he has no idea about it, at that time Socrates tells to help him. Socrates assert that he has designed his career after his midwife mother. She delivered child and for his part, Socrates tells through ‘midwifery’ is that when a young man agonies of trying to give to a thought. Socrates acknowledges that his philosophical work as midwifery

Theaetetus said that knowledge is sense perception for Socrates it is very problematic to understand that “knowledge is sense perception”. According to Socrates knowledge is not sense perception because if it is then why the same wind for one individual is cold and for the other individual it is not. In here he introduced Heraclitean flux (according to Heraclitus “you are not able to step twice in to the same river”) to defence the wind objection because sense perception is not the knowledge.

At last Socrates concludes by agree with Theaetetus that knowledge is true judgement, but according to Plato in his dialogue he said that “Justified true belief is knowledge”¹⁶ not the sense perception. In the next dialogue we will see how the knowledge of everything is already present in our soul.

Plato in, “Meno : The discovery (or “recollection”) of knowledge as latent in the soul, pointing forward to the theory of forms. “This is begins abruptly with a question of Meno, who asks, ‘whether virtue can be taught’ Socrates replies that he doesn’t as yet know what virtue is? and has never known anyone who did. ‘then he cannot have met Gorgias when he was at Athens.’

¹⁵ Plato, T(1921). *Theaetetus: Universals understood by mind and not perceived by senses*, U.S., Harvard University press. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theaetetus_\(dialogue\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theaetetus_(dialogue))

¹⁶ Plato, T(1921). *Theaetetus: Universals understood by mind and not perceived by senses*, U.S., Harvard University press. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theaetetus_\(dialogue\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theaetetus_(dialogue))

Yes, Socrates had met him, but he has a bad memory, and has forgotten what Gorgias said. Will Meno tell him his own notion, which is probably not very different from that of Gorgias? ‘O yes nothing easier: there is a virtue of man, and of a child; there is a virtue of every age and state of life, all of which may be easily describe’.”¹⁷ In this Meno said that according to Gorgias virtue is varies from person to person. Virtue is different for different age groups of people, for women there are different virtue, for children there is different virtue, for old man there is different virtue, but still Socrates said that there must be some common virtue which is appropriate for all.

“Socrates returns to the consideration of the question ‘whether virtue is teachable,’ which was denied on the ground that there is no teacher of it.”¹⁸ Hence virtue cannot be taught because it is not based on any particular kind of thing, it is also varies from person to person. Virtue is different for different peoples point of view and it is also indeterminate. There are no satisfactory definition of virtue. But in Socrates point of view virtue is goods and it is not teachable at all. Here there can be a question arises, if we are not collecting the knowledge from our sense organ then from which source we are getting the right knowledge of everything? Plato replies, through his theory of recollection, before our soul come to this body the soul has to go through the ideal or transcendental world once, because the reality of everything is already exists in the transcendental world. And while we were born we were in a forgotten state, and we were also unaware about everything in this world, when the situation has come we were about the things, for that reason, we are knew everything and when the perfect time come we remain aware about such things and this is called recollection of ideas. Everything is in us, even the form of beauty also.

In this we will see what the archetype of beauty. According to Plato, in Symposium: “The archetype of beauty”.¹⁹ This dialogue text by Plato, where there is a group of people organised a party and Socrates also present in there. They people make a speech in praise of Eros (God). This speech competition was judged by Dionysus. “If you mean to ‘beauty’ of a kind infinitely higher than anyone, which I see in you. And therefore, if you mean to share with me and to exchange beauty for beauty, you will have greatly the advantage of me; you will gain true beauty in return for appearance, like Diamond, gold in exchange for brass. But look again,

¹⁷ Dancy, M R, T(2004). *Plato's introduction of Forms*, New York, Cambridge University Press, pp.209-240.
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meno>

¹⁸ Dancy, M R, T(2004). *Plato's introduction of Forms*, New York, Cambridge University Press, pp.209-240.
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meno>.

¹⁹ Dancy, M R, T(2004). *Plato's introduction of Forms*, New York, Cambridge University Press, pp.284-287.

sweet friend, and see whether you are not deceived in me. The mind begins to grow critical when the bodily eye fails, and it will be a long time before you get old.”²⁰ To understand this Socrates starts a story, in that story Eros is not a God, it is a kind of spirit that connects between humans objects of desire and humans. The desire of things makes love beautiful or wise. To express the love breeding and multiplication is the medium, its might be physical love and exchanging or breeding of ideas the greatest knowledge according to Diotima ‘form of beauty’. Only through appearance we can know the beauty without this we are not able to know the beauty at all. Through reason we are also able to know the form of beauty.

Why Plato is called a Realist:

“The Platonic view is often called ‘realism’ (in one of the many senses of that overworked word), because Plato held that universals in some sense really exist. Reality consists of particulars like particular chairs, particulars instances of blue and also of universals, which the particulars exemplify. There is this blue shade and that blue shade, but there is also the universal, blueness, of which the particular shades are instances. There is this cat and that cat, but there is also the universals, ‘being a cat’, or ‘cathood’, which particulars cats exemplify. There is often no word for the universal that sound natural or idiomatic, so the suffixes ‘ness’ and ‘hood’ are often added: thus manhood, cathood, blueness, straightness.”²¹ In these above lines Plato tries to give a small introduction on universals. Now I am going to discuss about Plato, that how he is an idealist and a realist at the same time.

The famous Greek philosopher Plato was an idealist as well as realist philosopher. He is an idealist because, according to him ideas are only entities which exist and they are real. Except the ideas nothing is real for him and ideas are the highest reality for him. He is a Realist because, ideas are independent of particular objects. Ideas in ordinary sense it is completely ‘subjective’, but in Plato’s point of view it is purely ‘objective’. “The theory of the objectivity of concepts”²² is called Plato’s theory of Universals. Plato is an objective idealist because for him ideas are present in the other world not in this world. Objective means it is not present in the particular object, like subjective idealist, it is different from it and it is always present outside of the object not inside of it. If we see in Plato’s point of view, the objective ideas are the only reality and which is exists in other world and this world is copy of that real ideal world. “The universals can approached in various ways like there are a number of blue things like this

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Hospers John, T.(2002). *Introduction to philosophical analysis*. New Delhi: Allied. pp.355

²² Sengupta Ira, T.(2012). *A short history of western philosophy*. Kolkata: New Central Book Agency. pp.7

shirt, that chair, the ocean, the sky. They are different in many ways, but they are all alike in being blue. They all have common characteristics: blueness. Now the blue things are particulars but the property blueness, which they all share, is a universal. The particular things and particulars are blue not the blueness. Different particulars share a common property blueness, thus we have two kinds of entity in the world one is particular and another is properties and proper names refer to particular things like 'George Washington' to a particular man; 'Washington D.C' to a particular city and so on. But if general words are the names of properties, these properties must exist as well as the things having them. These general properties are universals."²³ He has discussed about the two worlds theory, one is the world of Ideas and the other one is the world of Particulars, the universal world is the real world according to Plato and the particular world is the copy of the universal world. Things are presents in its real form in the universal world not in the particular one. To know the real form we have to aware about what is reality in metaphysics.

The concept of reality is a very important metaphysical concept, since the very beginning of philosophy, many philosophers have discussed about it and given their arguments in favour of reality and against of it also. "Those who accepted the existent of the world independent of mind they known as realist and those who don't accept the existent of the external world and independent of mind they are antirealist. Plato and Aristotle both are realist philosopher because according to them reality is mind independent. But according to John Locke, George Berkeley, and David Hume reality is not mind independent, it is mind dependent."²⁴ According to in these three Empiricist philosophers view, we get the knowledge through our experience and experience is not mind independent, it is in it. But according to Plato's point of view we get the knowledge of reality through reason which is mind independent. Here I will go with realists not with anti-realists because reason gives us the knowledge which is certain and unchanged. But experience is not provided us the knowledge which is always be true or unchanged. If we will see this in rationalism point of view, then "rationalist arguments deal principally with epistemology claiming that reason is source of all knowledge and that everything that can be known, must be intelligible and rationally explicable, but realists arguments deal principally with ontology claiming that there is such a

²³ Hospers John, T.(2002). *An Introduction to philosophical analysis*. New Delhi: Allied. pp.354

²⁴ Ibid.

thing as truth and that all beliefs can be tested against a reality that is knowable”²⁵ Here I want to explore what is reality according to Plato and where the reality exist?

What is Universals on realists point of view:

“The virtue, the shape, and the colour are all universals. Because different people can exemplify the same virtue at the same time; different automobiles can simultaneously exemplify the same shape; and different houses can, at a given time, exemplify literally the same colour. Universals, by contrast, are construed as repeatable entities and particulars is that each occupies a single region of space at given time.”²⁶

Plato here introduced his famous theory the ‘Theory of knowledge’. The necessity of the theory of knowledge in here is to find out the reality. According to Plato true knowledge rests only with those who can assimilate the reality which is always true, which is also behind the world of everyday experience. According to him we couldn’t perceive the universal world. For him perception is not taken in to account of knowledge. For him reason is the only way to get knowledge. Without reason there will be nothing taken into account of knowledge. There is a another important part of Plato’s philosophy is “the theory of knowledge”, it also links with ‘the theory of ideas’. The method of proving knowledge and ideas are also called the ‘dialectic method’. Here there can be a question arises what is knowledge and what is not knowledge in Plato’s point of view.

According to Plato perception, opinion, and belief are not the knowledge. Through these whatever we got is not knowledge. For him knowledge is that which is indubitable, real infallible and always true. But perception is not gives us true knowledge always, like, sometimes we perceive the rope as snake, colours are seems different in different conditions, the large water bodies are looks very beautiful in a far distance and whenever we are nearer it seems ferocious. “This objection says that the mind makes use of a range of concepts which it could not have acquired, and which do not operate, through the senses; ‘existence’, ‘sameness’, ‘difference’. So there is a part of thought, and hence of knowledge, which has nothing to do with perception. Therefore knowledge is not perception.”²⁷ Perception is varies

²⁵ Kimble Chris, T.(2008). *Empiricism, Realism and Rationalism*. London: York University Press. pp.12
<http://www.chris-kimble.com/Courses/sdm/Presentations/SDM3.pdf>

²⁶ Kraut, Richrd, T.(2004). “Plato”, *The Stanford Encyclopedia* (Fall 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.),
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/plato/>.

²⁷ Kraut, Richrd, T.(2004). “Plato”, *The Stanford Encyclopedia* (Fall 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.),
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/plato/>

from person to person also, whatever I perceive that doesn't mean that the other one is perceive the same thing; it may be changed. If the perception is knowledge then truth will be subjective, what is true for others that mayn't be true for me also. And then there will be no distinction between truth and falsity. Plato realised that if knowledge is comes through perception then there is no need to discussion, argumentation etc. according to him 'knowledge is more than perception', simple perception is not taken in to account of knowledge.

Plato eradicate those things which is based on simple belief and opinion, according to him, these are not taken into consideration of knowledge. Even true belief or opinion is not the knowledge, because of lack of evidence, and it doesn't based on reason. It is only taken in to account of knowledge while there has proper evidence and rational point of view. Suppose I believe upon that 'it will be very hot morning tomorrow' and gave my opinion. But still it is not taken in to account of knowledge, because it is an assumption, I have no proper evidence behind of my statement, and there is no reason behind it, for that according to Plato it is not knowledge. Knowledge should be always true, and the knowledge is based on ideas, reality, forms and concepts.

Here the question arises that what is called knowledge? According to Plato "justified true belief is knowledge"²⁸ he also took Socratic view point that "all knowledge is knowledge through concepts". Concepts are not subjective it is objective. The concept 'man' is unchanged but the human being may come and go, it is changed. Because of this knowledge for Plato is 'knowledge through concept is knowledge' nothing else. For Plato knowledge is "the correspondence of thought and reality or being". Plato also gave his own view on knowledge.

Plato in his book '*The Republic*' divided knowledge is in four grades. The first one is, the knowledge which is comes through the imagination is called the lower level of knowledge. Imagination is based on the dream images and some particular things and beings in the world. It can be understand in a very better way if a take an example like, suppose I imagine that there is a 'Golden Mountain' but in actual case, there is nothing like that. For that it is not knowledge.

The second one is an another level of knowledge, which is also the higher one from the first one. This level of knowledge completely based on opinion and perceptual belief; like, the particular table is the copy of the idea 'table'. In here we got the knowledge of table from the concept table. Here particular is the copy of the universal one (concept). According to Plato

²⁸ Plato, T.(1991). *Theaetetus*, Oxford, Oxford Clarendon Press. pp.67.

these above two are not properly fulfilled the criteria of knowledge, therefore these two are not called knowledge.

It is an another higher level of knowledge which is completely based on geometry and mathematics. In the mathematics and geometry we using our intellect or understanding to and it is also self-evident. We can take an example of 'Triangle' because the triangle has three angle.

The fourth level of highest knowledge is purely reason based. Here we got the 'table' in general point of view or the idea or form 'table'. This is the reality and it cannot be falsified. We can take an example to understand properly, like ' $2+2=4$ '. It is purely reason based because if we plus two twice then we will be definitely get four not anything else. Reason based knowledge is also certain and not change into context to context.

In that time it was essential to prove these four grades of knowledge and also what is the real form of knowledge for that reason Plato uses his famous theory "the allegory of cave"²⁹, in his book "*Republic*". In this he already proved that how the allegory of cave is justify the reality or the real knowledge.

In Plato's accounts, there are so many peoples are present, those who are living in illusion or oblivion, it is like they are living in a cave, and in front of them there is a wall of oblivion, for that reason they are not able to see the real world or reality. And they also pretend that illusory world as real world or real thing, but in actual case that is not so. Through this theory, Plato, wants to introduce them with the reality and he also wants to take out these people from the illusory cave to real world or reality. For this reason he introduced his famous theory 'the allegory of cave', which is intended to explain that the human being can think, speak and imagine etc. without any knowledge of his realm of forms or without any proper understanding about an object. But in Plato's book the *Republic*, it is define in a very unique way to understand the reality easily.

"According to Plato's *Republic* in a figure how far our nature is enlightened or unenlightened behold! Human beings living in a underground den, which has a mouth open towards light and reaching all along the den; here they have been from their childhood, and have their legs and necks chained so that they cannot move, and can only see before them, being prevented by the chain from turning round their heads. Above and behind of them a fire

²⁹ Plato, T.(1974). *Republic*, (2nd), Harmondsworth, Harmondsworth Penguin. pp.373.

is blazing at a distance, and between the fire and the prisoners there is a raised way; and you will see, if you look, a low wall built along the way, like the screen which marionette players have in front of them, over which they show the puppets.”³⁰

In the Plato’s ‘allegory of cave’ there are prisoners in the cave and they also chained in that cave, even they couldn’t turn their head and legs, they can only see the things which is projected in front of them on the front wall. And in between of the prisoners and the fire there is a parapet or barrier along which, different types of animals doing various types of activities in there, like they walk, run, etc., the prisoners only can see the shadows which is projected in front of them on the wall. They don’t know exactly what is to be going on behind of them. They were completely unable to see the real objects that which is passed behind them. Whatever they hear and see that are only the shadows and the echoes which is cast by objects only. The prisoners are thinks only that thing which is projected on the wall and they took that thing as the real one and even still they unaware about the thing. Which is the real cause of the shadows, the prisoners would mistaken in their own appearance of reality. Here there can be a question arises that, if the shadows which is seen by the prisoners is not real, then what is the real one and reality?

Whenever the prisoners were talking about anything they are only talking about the shadows which is projected on the wall, not the real one but they thought that this is the real one. If someone said that “I saw a cat” then what it refers to be? According to Plato in his line (515b2) “whatever they think and expressed that are only the names which is in their mind, which is also in their past experience of that particular thing not the actual one”³¹. “If the prisoners are released and disabused of their error. At first, when any of them is liberated and compelled suddenly to stand up and turn his neck round and walk and look towards the light, he will suffer sharp pains; the glare will disturb him, and he will be unable to see the realities of which in his former state he had seen the shadows; and then conceive someone saying to him, that what he saw before was an illusion, but that now, when he is approaching nearer to being and his eye is turned towards more real existence, he has a clearer vision, what will be his reply? And you may further imagine that his instructor is pointing to the objects as they pass and requiring him to name them, will he not be perplexed? Will he not fancy that the shadows which he formerly saw are truer than the objects which are now shown to him?”³² The

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid, pp.374

³² Plato, T.(1974). *Republic*, (2nd), London, Harmondsworth Penguin. pp.374.

above sentences gave us a clear picture of the people, those who were in the cave. And I am going to simplify what the cave people thinks about the real world.

When one of them is able to escape from that cave and see the objects in real form then he realised and said to his other prisoner friends that whatever we saw in here is not real, we are getting mistake and the real things are present in out of the cave. In here Plato wants to describe the understanding which is reflective also and it is necessary for us to achieve. Our ability of thinking and speaking about the things, which is based on 'forms'. The objects through which we perceive the form is participate in it.

Hence the 'allegory of cave' represents that the prison and chains are our body and the senses. These are the things which forbid us from reaching the truth, which is called the world of ideas. As they pull us to the sensible objects world, which is the shadows of the real ideas. Reality is only known by through our reason. To know the reality we have to know the real form of an objects. According to Plato, philosophers have special ability to figure out the 'Form' and if these type of individuals ruled over a state then the state would be beneficial because that states people are get an opportunity to step out from the darkest cave to lighter cave and also know the reality easily.

In here there is a question arises is that what is the universals? what is Platonic form of idea? Or what is platonic form? "It is accepted in Plato's famous book '*The Republic*', that whenever a number of individuals have shared a common character then they have also a equivalent form or idea and it is also called universal"³³. Through an example we can understand clearly about platonic form or idea. Like take an example in here about a 'perfect triangle', Plato says that the 'perfect triangle' is present outside of the world, it present in the transcendental world not in this world. All the things in this world are the copy of the transcendental world. The perfectness of everything is present in the transcendental world or the idea of form. This world is imperfect and that world is perfect one. According to Plato here the question arises, is the perfect triangle exist or not? According to him in our mind if we perceive the idea of perfect triangle then the idea of triangle is to be exist. The thing or property which can be conceivable is intended to be a form. "Ideas are in ordinary sense it is purely subjective but in Plato's point of view it is purely objective."³⁴ In ordinary sense ideas are subjective because ideas are present in the object but in Plato's point of view ideas are purely

³³ S.J Copleston Frederick, T.(1962). *A history of philosophy*, New York, Bantam Doubleday Dell. pp.164.

³⁴ S.J Copleston Frederick, T.(1962). *A history of philosophy*, New York, Bantam Doubleday Dell. pp.165.

objective because ideas present in the another world, ideas are not in the object, it is separate from the respective object. “According to Plato perfect virtue, perfect goodness, perfect justice do not exist in this world; that is, no particular situation perfectly exemplify these qualities. Nor is there in this world any such thing as a straight line or a perfect circle. Plato believed that there was such a thing as in adequate or imperfect exemplification of universals, and he thus was primarily concerned with universals that were not exemplified in particulars experienced by us. Even if there is no example of a perfect circle anywhere, perfect circularity exists, but only in the realm of universals, timeless and unchanging.”³⁵ The perfectness of everything is present in the transcendental world or the world of ideas. So hence, whatever we are following, using, seeing, perceiving, etc. in this particular world is not the perfect one, the perfectness of each and everything is in ideal world or the real world. So, to giving any kind of justification on universals is not appropriate or even not be possible, because we are living in a copied form of world and the real world or universal is present in the transcendental world, for that it is impossible to give any kind of justification on it. Now I am going to explore what is the metaphysical realists views on Ideal or transcendental world.

According to ‘metaphysical realists’ there are two types of objects one is called universals and the other one is called particulars. Particulars are those which is occupies space and time. For the particulars these two things are must be needed, except these two there are some other things also. Particulars for example like table, pen, cycle, individual beings etc. universals is that which don’t need any space and time to exist, completely opposite of particulars for example like manness, tableness, etc. according to realist universals are not many like particulars, universals are only one, there is only one universal. “Realists claim that where objects are similar or agree in attribute, there is some one thing that they share or have in common; nominalists deny this. Realists call these shared entities universals; they say that universals are entities that can be simultaneously exemplified by several different objects; and they claim that universals encompass the properties things possess, the relations into which they enter, and the kinds into which they belong.”³⁶ In the above discussion, it is clear that, realists agree that there is universals but in other case nominalist doesn’t agree that there is universals. In realists point of view, the entities which is continuously represent in the same

³⁵Hospers John, T.(2002). *An Introduction to philosophical analysis*. New Delhi: Allied. pp.355.

³⁶ Loux Michael J, T.(2002). *Metaphysics a contemporary introduction*, London, London: Routledge, pp.17.

thing, that is called universals. Universals are also several kinds, here I am going to explore, what are these.

Kinds of universals:

There are many kinds of universals but mainly we were taken in to account three kinds of; universals in qualities and characteristics likes, properties, type or kind, relations etc. for example the cow or cowhood is a universal and the property red or redness and the relation betweenness or being between. These are the universal type-cowhood, property-redness or relation-betweenness. Let us discuss about these three kinds of universals briefly, first of all we will discuss about the ‘cowhood’, it is also called universals because the it is a common quality which is present in all the cow, the cows might be different in shape, size and colour but the common qualities which is shared in all cows are the same for that reason an cow is to pretend an cow. Now we will move towards the second one, which is called ‘property’, the reason it is called an universals is everything has some properties and that properties are called universals, because in a table there are some properties like tableness, hardness, thickness etc. for that reason it is also called universals. Now we will move towards the third one which is ‘betweenness’, it is called universals because the relationship between the table and tableness is also called the universals.

There are some characteristics of ideas, the first one is “ideas exist by themselves”³⁷ for that it is called substance. Though qualities depend on substance but the substance does not depend on qualities. Ideas are the ultimate realities and self-determined. Ideas are don’t need anything for his existence.

The second one is “Ideas are universals”³⁸ like the idea of ‘cat’ is not refer to a particular ‘cat’ but it is refers to a general concept of ‘cats’.

The third one is “Ideas are not things but thoughts”³⁹ Here ideas are not subjective, it is completely objective because ideas are not present in the things, ideas are present in the another world or the world of ideas. It is also not depends upon individual mind, it is mind independent according to Plato.

³⁷ Sengupta Ira, T.(2012). *A short history of western philosophy*. Kolkata: New Central Book Agency, pp.7.

³⁸ Ibid.7

³⁹ Ibid.8

The fourth one “Ideas are the class-essence”⁴⁰ of the things and beings: it refers to a essential and common qualities of a group of particulars as a whole like ‘Animal’ in here animality is the class essence of all animal groups. Under this animal class so many animals comes up, like tiger, elephant, rat, dog etc. all are in animal class.

The fifth one is “Ideas are not in space and time”⁴¹ ideas are not in the realm of space and time, it is beyond of it. If it is in space and time we can perceived through our sense organ then it is not called to be an idea. Ideas are only known by reason, without reason we couldn’t able to know the ideas.

The sixth one is “Ideas are permanent or unchangeable”⁴² the particular things and beings are come and go but the idea of that particular thing is remain same or unchangeable. Ideas are never be changeable it is unchanged.

The seventh one is “Ideas are known by thought or reason alone”⁴³ Without reason we wouldn’t able to know the ideas, through sense perception we are able to know the particulars only not the universals.

The eighth one is “Ideas are many”⁴⁴ in the sense there are many kinds of ideas like of relations, ideas of qualities, ideas of class etc.

“Ideas are related to each other in a hierarchical system”⁴⁵, all ideas are cognize with one idea, which is also absolute idea that is called the idea of the good. Ideas are connected with each other, it is a unity in diversity. Ideas locate in the object in the sense ‘cowness’ of a ‘cow’ is residing in it. Maness, blueness, catness, all are known by our reason. Through the help of sense organ we are able to know the appearance only of an object, but through reason we know the ‘ideas’ of that thing.

“Plato does not have single consistent view throughout his works, there are two principal views that he presented. ‘Archetype’ (copied one from the original) on the view that pervades all Plato’s dialogues, the relation is like that of an original to a copy or imitation, or like that of a model to the things drawn or copied from the model. ‘Participation’ Plato also used in this connection another metaphor, that of participation. The particular participate in the

⁴⁰ Ibid.8

⁴¹ Sengupta Ira, T.(2012). *A short history of western philosophy*. Kolkata: New Central Book Agency, pp8.

⁴² Ibid.8

⁴³ Ibid.9

⁴⁴ Ibid.10

⁴⁵ Ibid.11

universal.”⁴⁶Hence in archetype all the particulars which are present in this world are the copy of the universals which is present in other world, which is called world of idea. And in participation, all the particular objects are participating in the universals object like all the blue objects are the participation of one blueness. To prove the theory of universals, Plato has been taken so many attempt, analogy of vision is one of them.

To clarify the theory of ideas Plato introduces the “**Analogy of Vision**”⁴⁷. Here he wants to explore the difference between clear intellectual vision and confused vision of sense perception. Objects are more visible clearly in sunlight and in good lightening condition and where there is no sufficient lightening condition the objects are blurred vision, nothing is visible. In here the sunlight which makes reveal the things is represent to wisdom which is consists of goodness and eye represents the soul. Here we got the confused vision from twilight and complete ignorance from the darkness. When there is enlightenment there is the world of ideas also.

Conclusion: There are four sub-chapters which I already discussed about Plato’s form briefly on the above lines. The theory of Plato’s form is purely objective, which is shows that ideas are present in the other world and this world is the world of particulars. The theory of allegory of cave is implies that if you want to know the reality then you have to get out from the cave of illusion and know the reality which is present in outside. All the dialogues of Plato indicating towards the different analogy of Forms. Hence the Plato’s theory of universals shows us that, knowledge is known through by reason and reality is unchanged.

⁴⁶ Hospers John, T.(2002). *An Introduction to philosophical analysis*. New Delhi: Allied, pp.356

⁴⁷ Plato, T.(1974). *Republic*, (2nd), London, Harmondsworth Penguin. pp.374.

CHAPTER 2

Aristotle criticism on Plato's form:

“Plato's pupil Aristotle dissatisfied with Plato's 'two worlds' theory. There is, said Aristotle, no second realm apart from particulars inhabited wholly by universals: Plato's realism in that sense was mistaken; the 'realm of universals' is a metaphysical fiction. Even if a second realm were granted, it would not be a realm of universals but only of super-particulars, more perfect (in some way) perhaps than the particulars who are acquainted with in sense experience, but particulars nonetheless; and there is no evidence that any such realm of super-particulars exists. Nevertheless, Aristotle too was a realist about universals: he held that universals, as well as particulars, really exist, that they are 'out there' and not in our minds, and that existence is in no way dependent on minds, or our own process of conceptualization, they would exist just as they do now even if there were no minds to apprehend them.”⁴⁸ In Aristotle's point of view, Plato's second world is friction of metaphysics, because Aristotle, doesn't accept Plato's second world theory. There was a very big reason behind Aristotle's unacceptance of Plato's theory of universals. One of the reason is, there has no valid judgment on Plato's theory (theory of universals).

According to Aristotle, Plato's two world theory is failed to explain what it intends to explain? Aristotle claimed that Plato is failed to explain that how we have the objective knowledge of the world, Because of difficult to understand Plato's two world theory, the permanence and objectivity realm of the forms do not explain the material world perfectly. Aristotle puts his logic to criticize Plato's theory. According to Aristotle there is no second world where there is the universals are to be present, universals are present inside of an object but outside of our mind, and also it is not depended on mind for his existence because the 'redness' of flower is present inside of the flower, not in outside, if it is present in outside of

⁴⁸ Hospers John, T.(2002). *Introduction to philosophical analysis*. New Delhi: Allied. pp.360.

that flower, we would not be able to see the flower as it is, it might be the flower (particular) is somewhere and the flowerness (universal) is somewhere. According to Aristotle, if the universals world is present then it will be called 'super particulars' and the super particulars are not to be proved by anything, there was no proper evidence to prove it. Hence Plato's two world theory is rejected by Aristotle because the second world is not necessary to prove the existence of universals. But yes for Aristotle there are universals and particulars are exist, because he is a realist philosopher. He is not an idealist like Plato, because for him there is no second world, universals and particulars are present in the same realm. According to Plato, universals are very much needed to from the metaphysical point of view, to understand our experience, and epistemologically needed to explain our experience. In this sense universals are need to understand particulars, by introducing second world he complicate the problem by.

Aristotle rejects Plato's notion of imitation. According to Plato's point of view, the material objects are those which one is present in this world, and which is also perceived by us, is the imitation of the forms. The real form of the material objects are present in the objective world and these material objects which is perceived by us in this world is the imitation or copied of the real form. These things are virtue in this regards the world of forms and material objects and its order is certain (it means, forms are the virtue, and the virtue of material objects are present in the world of ideas). According to Aristotle, it is impossible to says that all the material things are imitation. He says that the form is present in the object, not in the outside or other world, because for an example; an object is white, here the whiteness of an object is not present in outside of the object, it is inside of the object. Here he rejects the Plato's form which is present in outside, and he says that the Plato's theory of imitation and participation are a metaphysical kind of things. Form cannot be explain in the transcendental world.

Then Aristotle, targeted the Plato's idea of universal essences. For Plato, the essence of objects are universal and not subjective but objective realities and they exist outside of the object, not inside of it. They are out of the realm of time and space and permanent and the objects which we are related physically in our day today life in this world are the copies of the real or eternal essences. According to Aristotle, essences are inherently present in the things, and it is not apart from it. Aristotle firstly criticised the Plato's 'idea of universal' because Plato said that the universal or essence of an object is present outside of the world, in the transcendental world and exist apart from an object. The object which we perceive is the copied one of the real one which is present in the world of idea. In here Aristotle strongly criticized Plato's view of transcendentalism because according to him essence and forms are intrinsically

related to each other, it would not be separate. In this case, Aristotle's view, it seems to be more relevant than Plato's transcendental world. Because, for an example, 'if we saw a dog', the only reason we recognise the dog as a dog, is the dogness is present in that dog. If we take this thing, in Plato's sense, we will find only the copied dog, because according to him, universals are already present in another world and the particular dog, which is we are able to see is the duplicate version, not the original. In Aristotle point of view, the transcendental world is not exist in anywhere. So the world of transcendental is not showing any valid reason to prove the universal, according to Aristotle.

In Aristotle's sense "There could be no universals without particulars (no common properties with nothing to have the properties), any more than there could be there could be particular without universals (no things without properties). The two are logically dependent on one another-not, as in Plato, particulars depending on universals but universals existing serenely independent of all particulars. Universals exist only in things, not, as in Plato, prior to things...no universals apart from properties actually shared by existing particulars. In the case of unicorns, centaurs, and so on, then, there is such a thing as the concept unicornhood."⁴⁹ From the above explanation it is clear that no need of anything to introduced anything in between the particular and universals, but Plato did so, for that reason Third Man Argument (TMA, this is a famous Plato's dialogue from 'Parmenides') is also rejected by Aristotle. "As Russell says, Aristotle considered them as common nouns and not as objective realities and things. Any name capable of universal application to the members of the class represents a universal. Opposing Plato's theory, which posits them as abstract original forms to which objects 'participate', Aristotle initiates the third man argument. This argument aims at criticizing Plato's theory of ideas, which according to Aristotle states that, a man is a man because he resembles or participates in the idea of man in the world of essences."⁵⁰ Aristotle says that, if a man, who is the copied form of the transcendental world's man, then there must be so many transcendental world, where the ideal man and the ordinary man are similar to each other in both the cases. It is always needed another form of man, to demonstrate the affinity in between the ideal man and an ordinary man (TMA) and thus the theory of universal is exist everywhere and forever. Now we will see how Aristotle criticised Plato's third man argument.

Aristotle criticizing Plato's famous dialogue the third man argument. In this dialogue (TMA) Plato said that, there must be a common form in between two material objects which is

⁴⁹ Hospers John, T.(2002). *Introduction to philosophical analysis*. New Delhi: Allied. pp.360.

⁵⁰ Russell, Bertrand: T.(2004), *History of Western Philosophy*, London, Routledge Classics.

also joint participation. We can take an example in here, like yellow book or yellow bird, these two yellow objects are the copies of the real yellow colour form, which is yellowness, here the objects are different but they are shared a common yellow colour which is the form. The commonality between them is yellowness. It will repeatedly need a different form, when someone asks for a recognised form in two copies of such things.

“opposing Plato he maintains that the phenomenal world is not unreal and argues that both form and matter coexist in the world of objects. Their coexistence is responsible for the existence of the world we live. Aristotle asserts that ideas don’t and cannot exist apart from things. On the other hand, they are inherent or immanent in things. The idea is the form of the thing, and cannot be separated from it except by abstraction. It is the essence of the particular and with it constitutes an indivisible whole.”⁵¹ For him the phenomenal world is real world and he also argues with Plato that form and the matter are exist in this phenomenal world, the concurrence between matter and form is very much needed for the existence of the world. If form and matter is separate from each other then the world is not possible. According to Aristotle, if the cow is present in this world then the cowness must be present in this world because without cowness the cow is not possible. Hence, the form and matter are inherently related to each other. The absence of one, the other one is not possible. Hence, it is clear that there is no need of the third man argument, because form and matter are not separate from each other, they are congenitally related to each other. For this reason there is no need to use the term commonality or third man argument in this case, it is clearly unnecessary for Aristotle.

Concept of Matter:

“Aristotle’s concept of matter is unique, according to him matter is coexistent with form and different forms design matter differently in the process of evolution of objects. Aristotle also maintains that matter has no reality apart from the form, as matter without the idea is also an abstraction like idea apart from particular object.”⁵² The matter alone has no sense without the form, but form is independent and matter is dependent, matter is always depends upon form but form is not. The matter has the shape, size, length, breadth but the form has nothing. It is more better to understand through an example of horse, to understand the concept of form and the relationship between form and matter. Let us acknowledge the matter and form of black

⁵¹ Zeller, Eduard, T.(1881), *A History of Western Philosophy*, London, Longmans, green and co.

⁵² Ibid.

horse, the form of horse is present in the black horse, black is a category of horse. The horseness is present in the black horse not outside. We concluded that a black horse is the combination of horse and horseness, just like matter and form. Here the form is completely independent, it does not depend upon any particular objects. And, if anyone raise the question like, where does the particular objects takes place? The answer is, in the material world or this physical world, and the form is also present in the matter.

“He rejects Plato’s view, which considers essences alone as real and the material world as illusion.”⁵³ To understand clearly, we have to take atomist view point. According to the view of atomists, everything is made up of the combination of atoms. They are trying to find out the reality, and world is the combination of atoms, according to them the atoms have no natural qualities and properties. Here Aristotle raised the question that, if the properties and qualities are not present in there and it is only illusion, then without the qualities and properties, the sensible world is not credible. Aristotle concluded that everything which is exists, which is also have the ability to become something, like for an example of eggs become a chicken. Like this matter is changed but the form is remain unchanged.

According to Aristotle, form is also changeable, he took the form in a positive way, that with the matter form is changed, just like water into ice-cube. The form of water is not similar to ice-cube. “One important aspect of Aristotle’s metaphysics is his conception that all change is evolution. The form of an object changes when it evolves into another thing. Aristotle here provides a teleological explanation of the universe in terms of the matter-form relationship. Though the forms are eternal and non-perishable and here Aristotle subscribes to the Platonic view, he maintains that they are nevertheless not transcendent. According to him matter too is equally real and eternal. Aristotle adopts a middle path and affirms that all change is not illusion. Change is not blind, but purposeful and meaningful.”⁵⁴ According to Aristotle form and matter cannot be independent from each other, they are intrinsically related to each other. When an object change in to another thing the form must be changed, like milk into paneer, seeds into tree, food into energy, everything has a definite purpose like above example, like that the form of an object is become change. According to Aristotle, the whole universe is based in the relationship of form and matter. His point of view is that the form is not transcendent, like Plato but it is also immanent. If there are no matter then the presence of form is not knowable because for him like form, matter is also eternal and also real. Aristotle

⁵³ Zeller, Eduard, T.(1881), *A History of Western Philosophy*, London, Longmans, green and co.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

criticized Plato's view that all change is illusion because according to Plato, this world is not the real world and here no knowledge is achievable. For that Aristotle proved in above lines that how the world is not illusion, how the matter is eternal, how the form is changeable and how the change is persistent and essential.

According to Aristotle, there is no common or logical connection between material world and transcendental world. According to Plato through real knowledge one can reach the realm of forms easily. He does not explain that how to reach in that kingdom of forms. In Aristotle view point, this is not a clear or distinct idea that to accepted. According to him ideas are not separate from the things, it is inside the things and if ideas are apart from the things then it would not be a real substances or beings, It is also uncriticized. This theory is most explanatory theory according to Aristotle. Because it is briefly discussed every aspect of forms.

It is very troublesome to validate this statement both commonly and accurately. For sole thing, "Plato was essentially a thinker with one question, while Aristotle was a man of many. First, consider the problem of perception. What do our sense tells us about reality? According to Plato, very little. Sensible things are always in flux and there is no knowledge of them. This is Aristotle statement of the flux philosophy."⁵⁵ According to Aristotle knowledge must be indubitable, stable, unchanged and always true. And we can not taken in to account the sensible objects as knowledge because it is always changeable, changeable things are not provided the right knowledge, hence this sense knowledge is non sensical.

Aristotle's main objection to Plato's theory is that "to serve as ideals, the ideas must be individual, whereas in order to be objects of knowledge, unless that word is given some strange sense, they must be universal or general."⁵⁶ The main cause of rejection of it? by Aristotle is, that, this theory was predicted by Plato, there was no proper evidence before this theory to prove it. Prediction, assumption, foreseen are not taken into account of knowledge, knowledge must be certain or unchangeable. Knowledge should be true in every situation. "The existence of ideas is not really demonstrated by the arguments used for that purpose by the Platonists."⁵⁷ The real meaning of the above line is, Plato, has already tried to prove the existence of ideas in a different manner like, argumentation. But he is not successful to prove it. And the second thing is the purpose, it means to prove the form in a valid manner. Here then the another things is comes out, Weather the ideas are exists or not, is not expressed by

⁵⁵ Grene, Marjorie: T(1985), *A portrait of Aristotle*, Sussex: Harvester press, pp.41,42.

⁵⁶ Allan J.D., T(1970), *The Philosophy of Aristotle*, (2nd ed), London, Oxford University Press, pp.14.

⁵⁷ Ibid, pp.14

arguments, which is used by Platonists. Likewise the arguments which is used by Platonists is not strong at all or they may not be fulfil the criteria of consequence which is required. And the ideas of negation would be proved by them, which is called not-good, the artificial things are denied by the Platonists. Hence according to Aristotle the ideas are not proved perfectly by Platonists, arguments are not enough to prove the validity or invalidity of an idea. There are some more things to needed.

“The ideas, if viewed as perfect individuals, as Plato’s doctrine requires, are merely duplicates of things met with in ordinary experience.”⁵⁸ According to Plato through our ordinary experience we got the idea of duplicates or the unreal ideas of an objects, things and beings. Plato’s main aim is to viewed the perfect or real individual, which Is also the requirement of Plato’s doctrine of ideas. Through human knowledge you can count the things by their number, which is also easily made. Forms or the ideas are the repeated essence of particular things which it intends towards. Whenever there is a essence of an object is talked we mean that the intrinsic nature of an object from which the clear properties are to be derived, in definition the ideas are not inherent because its position is outside of it not inside, and ideas are participate in different objects. According to Aristotle, these things are metaphorical because for him the essence of an object is inside not outside.

In another case “The doctrine of ideas provides us with permanent patterns, and with multitude of changing things, but not with a cause of growth or becoming.”⁵⁹ Here Plato’s ideas are removing and briefly explained the visible world what it is? The things and the objects are changed day by day but the ideas are remain same. According to Aristotle, ideas are present in the object but the ideas are same as it is, ideas are static not changed but the objects may change. “Plato’s form of beauty is at once a notion of beauty and an ideal of beauty.”⁶⁰ In Plato’s point of view the essence of beauty is present in everywhere. The human being may come and go but the idea of beauty is remain unchanged or same. We all are the representor of idea of beauty, the essence of beauty is not perceivable but we can know the beauty through an objects. We cannot depict the circularity in general but we can depict the particulars only because particulars are known by us only not the universal one. Here according to Aristotle “All form is correlative to another element, which he terms matter; it is often abstracted from matter and this process is essential to science; but unmixed form is inconceivable and can have no place

⁵⁸ Allan J.D., T(1970), *The Philosophy of Aristotle*, (2nd ed), London, Oxford University Press, pp.16

⁵⁹Ibid, pp.16

⁶⁰Ibid, pp.16

in the nature of things.”⁶¹ According to Aristotle there is a co-relation between ‘form’ and ‘matter’, where there is form there is matter and where there is matter there is form, there is an intrinsic relationship between form and matter. Hence form is not outside of matter, it is inside of matter. And the form which is unmixed, is not conceivable because in here form is not exist in the matter. In Plato’s point of view ‘form’ is present outside of this world (transcendental world) and matter is the archetype of form and form is not inside of the matter it is completely outside of matter but Aristotle proved that ‘form’ couldn’t exist outside of matter it is inside of matter, through this we are able to know an object as an object. In other words, he is also criticized Plato’s view of divine administration of the lower world in a significant manner.

“what Aristotle wished to criticized was Plato’s view of the divine administration of the lower world. This work was the foundation of his later system of physics, just as the work on the ideas was his first essay in epistemology and metaphysics. Here Plato was impressed by Persian religious belief, which is said that all the planets and sun were admire as divine beings. And secondly, he shows that the earth is the centre, these are also appears in the later dialogues of Plato.”⁶² According to Aristotle celestial region is ‘divine’ in some sense not in all sense. Which is also modified by later researchers. He believed in qualitative change because according to him the physical substance of anything is different from the lower region. In simply we can say the physical object is distinct from the spheres where the object exists.

In here, it is obvious to raise the question that, does Aristotle believe in God and divine power? “Aristotle supposes even in his final system, as seen in the metaphysics, that the influence of the highest deity or ‘first mover’ is felt more directly in the outer region of the cosmos than in the region round the earth and most directly of all by the sphere furthest from us, which carries the fixed stars.”⁶³ He says that sphere carries the fixed stars because, it is the highest one from all. According to him, everything is possible through the sphere nothing can be impossible. Everything is formed by sphere. Aristotle doesn’t maintain that, the action which is done by the human beings is to be guided by God and the lower physical world is controlled by divine power. In this respect, Aristotle is distinct from Plato. From the above discussion it is clear that Aristotle, is not talk about the existence of divine power, then in here, there can be a question arises that, who coined about the existence of the divine power?

⁶¹Ibid, pp.17

⁶² Allan, J.D., T(1970), *The Philosophy of Aristotle*, (2nd ed), London, Oxford University Press, pp.18.

⁶³ Ibid, pp.19

“Plato must first have developed his familiar proofs that divine power exists.”⁶⁴ According to Plato divine power is exist, without the divine power the world is not possible, world is possible because of divine power and the world is not lifeless matter. According to Plato, universals are not exists in the realm of time and space. Here is the question arises, is there was any time when God formed this world (physical world)? Aristotle replied in his later physics that our physical world never had a beginning and it can never be destroyed by anything. According to him, physical world is completely different from everything, it is the uncountable one. “Plato’s chief speaker in the laws, the Athenian, maintains that every event in the lower world is perceived by Gods.”⁶⁵ According to the chief speaker of Plato, whatever is to be occurring in this physical world (lower world) is to be perceived by God. Here Plato fails to understand what is the psychological power of divine being? And what is the object which is called pure reason based and beyond space and time? Here there is an another problem is that, what is the distinction between the world’s supreme governor and the agents. The writer of the *Epinomis* came back to the same question with a lot less preserve and alert. He clear up that there are daemons in the higher air-rational beings, there are senses similar to ours and can noticed the particular, along with it can also be transfer to fury or compassion with human beings. He said that daemons can observe the particular and can regulate the sympathy with human being. Here we have to know, what Aristotle thinks about divine power and demons?

“For Aristotle, it is plain that his mature doctrine leaves no place at all for a divine creator, or for daemons who inspect and influence human action. The supreme being is a mind, engaged in ceaseless contemplation, not of the world, or even mathematical or logical truth, but of the nature of mind itself.”⁶⁶ For him, there are no place for divine creator and demons, and mind is everything (supreme being) mind can do everything. “The Persian astrology, which come into Hellenistic thought by other avenues is to be rejected by Aristotle.”⁶⁷ “Although it has been admitted that Aristotle’s fundamental criticism of the Platonic theory of forms, that the theory involves the chorismos, is justified, and that the Platonic theory cannot stand by itself but needs to be supplemented by Aristotle’s doctrine of the immanent form (which we consider abstractly its universality), we have not given an altogether sympathetic treatment of Aristotle’s criticism. “How, then,” it might be asked , can you say that Aristotle’s statements concerning what Plato taught must be taken seriously? If Aristotle’s account of what Plato

⁶⁴ Ibid, pp.19

⁶⁵ Allan J.D., T(1970), *The Philosophy of Aristotle*, (2nd ed), London, Oxford University Press, pp.20.

⁶⁶ Ibid, pp.22

⁶⁷ Ibid

taught is correct, then his criticisms of the Platonic theory were perfectly justified, while if his criticisms misrepresent the Platonic theory, then he either deliberately misrepresented that theory, then he either deliberately misrepresented that theory or he did not understand it”⁶⁸.

Aristotle on Form:

Aristotle’s theory of form is quite different from Plato’s theory of form. Form is maintain a major role in both of the thinkers point of view. Both Plato’s and Aristotle’s work on metaphysics that depends upon form. After the analysis of Plato’s form, Aristotle reached out a conclusion that he rejects Plato’s form. “Aristotle view was that a universal is something that is identical in each of the particulars in which it occurs. Blueness is something identically present in all blue things, by virtue of which they are blue (they all contain a piece, as it were, of the very same thing, blueness); and that blueness is as objectively present an existent as is the thing that has it. Similarly, doghood is a property that is identically present in all dogs, and it is so whether or not anyone forms the concept doghood. Universals belong in things, in external reality, but they belong to things as objectively existing properties of things, not as archetypes or anything else that can exist apart from the things in which they occur. It is rather like (though the analogy should not be pressed) the identity a cookie-cutter gives to the cookies: all the cookies, no matter how numerous they may be or how many different kinds of dough they may be composed of, possess the same form by virtue of the fact that the form is imposed on them by the same cookie-cutter. A universal is a property that is identically present in all the particulars that instantiate it and does not exist apart from such instantiation.”⁶⁹ Aristotle writes, “a thing comes to be from its privation, or from its subject which we call the matter in the general point of view.”⁷⁰ In Aristotle’s point of view, a form is that which means “whatever the shape in the noticeable thing ought to be called.”⁷¹ Here is the question arises is that, can be the form apart from matter? According to Aristotle, “it is not possible to make a table without woods. Here woods are the matter and table is the form.”⁷² Here there can be a question arises, is that where does the form exists?

In the point view of Aristotle’s philosophy, the universals is the only reality which is present in the objects itself, like an example, a cat’s cattiness is present in that cat. The very

⁶⁸ S.J Copleston Frederick, T.(1962). *A history of philosophy*, New York, Bantam Doubleday Dell, pp.198.

⁶⁹ Hospers John, T.(2002). *Introduction to philosophical analysis*. New Delhi: Allied. pp.361.

⁷⁰ Aristotle, T.(1960), *Metaphysics translated by Richard Hope*, New York, Columbia University Press, pp.289

⁷¹ Ibid, pp.290

⁷² Ibid, pp.291

first and foremost question of philosophy is: “what is reality? What is substance?”.⁷³ Basically in Aristotle’s point of view, the universal quality of an object is present in the same object, it is not outside, that means a cow’s cowness is resides in that particular cow. According to Aristotle, universal’s are the only one reality which is present in the particulars only. Here there are two things arises one is reality and the other one is substance. At first substance are free from all the things, it doesn’t rely on anything else and it is also self sufficient for his own existence. Hence neither substance is a predicate or predicate is substance, but yes predicate is used by substance, like “elephant is big”. Here elephant is the substance or it is also called subject and ‘big’ is the predicate. Here the predicate bigness is completely depends upon the substance elephant, here we conclude that substance are not the Plato’s universals, it is also different from each other. Hence, Aristotle’s substance is different from Plato’s universals. Universal is applicable to all in a class and has also usual predicates. For example, the idea or form of a table is same for all the tables. This is tableness which is also predicate and it cannot be subsist without table. Hence, substances are not universals and universals are not substances. And the substance is something, which is completely different from particulars.

Aristotle says, “particulars are not substances. A substance must be a compound of the two; it must be the universal in the particular.”⁷⁴ The subject part is called substance and the later part is called particular, like cow and cowness. Here cow doesn’t exist without cowness, likewise cowness doesn’t exist without cow. Silver can’t exist without its qualities like whiteness, heaviness, etc. and these are cannot exists separately from the silver. Both the qualities and the silver are depends upon each other. A substance is the combination of two things one is called universal and other one is called particular. Thus, we can say a single objects to be a substance. A silver is called to be a silver when all the qualities of silver is in it.

Here I am going to explore, what is universals, in different philosophers points of view, and which part of the substance is called universal. “Aristotle is against of Plato when he denies that the universal can exist independently of the particulars, but he agrees with Plato that the universal is the real. When Aristotle says that the universal is not substance, he means, as against Plato, that it is existent. But universal is real, though not existent. As B. Russell observes: This much may be taken as proved but Aristotle’s own doctrine is far from clear. It was this lack of clarity that made possible the medieval controversy between nominalist and

⁷³ Sengupta Ira, T.(2012). *A short history of western philosophy*. Kolkata: New Central Book Agency, pp.15.

⁷⁴ Sengupta Ira, T.(2012). *A short history of western philosophy*. Kolkata: New Central Book Agency, pp.15

realist.”⁷⁵ Both Plato and Aristotle accepted that the universals are the real one. In Aristotle’s point of view, an universal is not the substance but yes in substance there is one part is called universal as we proved in our above lines. According to the realists, universals are the real one, but it is just a name in nominalist point of views, this is also a controversy between them. Plato doesn’t mention in anywhere on his about the properties, but for Aristotle, universals are properties. In this sense Plato’s acceptance of his theory weak here, in this regard to relation properties.

Aristotle’s theory of causation:

The main reason of introducing the theory of causation is, in these four causes there is one cause which is called formal cause, and how all the causes is interlink with each other we will see. According to Aristotle, in general, there are four types of causes, they are like material cause, efficient cause, formal cause and final cause. These four causes are work concurrently. Reason produces its result through the mechanism of cause in its own way, and cause is not similar to reason, it is separate from each other. His theory, provides the broad notion of cause, which is combine two principles of teleology and mechanism in this respective way. “In this wide sense Aristotle finds that there are four kinds of causes: the material cause, the efficient cause, the formal cause and the final cause.”⁷⁶ The difficulty of transformation is the metaphysical problem for Aristotle. In general point of view, we people are think that if there has some transformation then there must be some cause behind it and if there has some cause then there must have some effector consequence. Here the consequence is one but the causes are many. But according to Aristotle everything is coming under these four causes, nothing is beyond of it. Whatever the causes happening in this world is coming under these four types of causes. Here the material cause means from where the thing made up and the physical properties of a thing. The efficient cause is the cause of progress and change. The formal cause is the form or an essence of the particular thing, which is also called the idea or concept. The final cause is the end or ultimate thing. “After the philosophy of Pythagoreans, who cannot be said to have contributed very much, came the philosophy of Plato, who evolved the doctrine of the forms, but placed the forms which are the cause of the essence of things, apart from the things of which they are the essence. Thus Plato, according to Aristotle, used only two causes,

⁷⁵ Ibid

⁷⁶ Sengupta Ira, T.(2012). *A short history of western philosophy*. Kolkata: New Central Book Agency, pp.15,16

that of the essence and the material cause.”⁷⁷ The formal cause and the material cause are accepted, and the rest two causes are present inherently in formal and material cause.

Aristotle’s theory of matter and form:

Aristotle’s doctrine of matter and form is the depletion of four causes into two, which is in Aristotle’s language matter and form. He manifest the sole conception of form, from the intermixture of formal cause. All the above three causes are one, which is called form, according to Aristotle. Now let see how the all above three causes are one and equal to formal cause.

According to Aristotle’s theory of causation, “The formal cause and the final cause are the same, and the efficient cause is the same as final cause.”⁷⁸ These causes are similar to each other because the idea or essence of a thing is similar to formal cause and the final cause is the materialization of the idea or the end portion. The efficient cause and final cause is similar to each other because efficient cause is the cause of flattering and flattering is pointing towards the end. Here there can be a question raised, is that, is the form is separate from matter? If it is not, then why the form is not separate from matter? And what are the issues?

According to Aristotle, “From the particulars; and in this he thought rightly is not separating them. This is plain from the results, for without the universal, it is not possible to get knowledge, but the separation is the cause of the objections that arise with regard to the ideas. Strictly speaking, therefore, there is an objective foundation in things for the subjective universal in the mind. The universal “horse” is a subjective concept, but it has an objective foundation in the substantial forms that inform particular horses.”⁷⁹ There are no single knowledge is possible without the help of universals, universal is the key to get right knowledge because knowledge should be true for every time, not for a while, knowledge should be free from biasedness. If we talk about the separation which is the real issues in here, there is a subjective universal in the mind this is the real reason for an objective foundation in things, like an example of “dog” is a universal subjective concept which has an objective foundation, and the particular dog is the objective foundation of the universal dog, which is in it. Here the objective foundation means, the foundation of universals is from the particulars or in the object. Hence, form and matter are the two doctrines of Aristotle’s philosophy. Essentially we cannot separate form and matter, these are indivisible, but yes it may possible by line of thinking but

⁷⁷ S.J Copleston Frederick, T.(1962). *A history of philosophy*, New York, Bantam Doubleday Dell, pp.290

⁷⁸ Sengupta Ira, T.(2012). *A short history of western philosophy*. Kolkata: New Central Book Agency, pp.16,17

⁷⁹ S.J Copleston Frederick, T.(1962). *A history of philosophy*, New York, Bantam Doubleday Dell, pp.302

in reality they are impossible to separate. If in the world, there is no matter and no form, then nothing is to be possible and nothing is to be alive. Now I am going to interpret what is the form in Aristotle's point of view.

Aristotle says, "Form is the universal and matter is the particular. Universals according to him, exists only in particulars."⁸⁰ For an example, Just like in a man, man is the particular and manness is in man which is called universal also, universal is in particular. Each and every human being is a amalgam of form and matter. And the same each and every human being is the combination of universal and particulars are not able to alive without universal but universals can alive. For him, "matter is a relative conception In the sense that what is matter in relation to something may be form in relation to something else. Likewise, shape and form are not the same."⁸¹ In Aristotle's point of view, matter always contained in the form, where there is matter there is form, where there is form there is matter. Form incorporates organisation and form is not entirely shape. A Form can consists of all the qualities of a thing, like for an example, In a table there are hardness, thickness, softness etc. An object cannot be alive in the absence of qualities. Similarly qualities are not able to alive without objects. Hence both the qualities and the matter are essential. "Lastly the matter is absolutely formless."⁸² It means, if we take individually only matter then it has no form at all. Without form the essence of matter is nothing. Solely matter has no qualities. Consequently matter is the probability of all the things, nevertheless it is literally nothing. If we take an example of a "ball", if the idea of ball is not exist then how could be the particular ball be exists, it is not possible, like that particular solely has no form without universals.

Here Aristotle tries to prove that, how the things and beings are changed in a certain time period. "Aristotle distinguishes between potentiality and actuality. Potentiality is matter and actuality is form."⁸³ Actuality is the intensity to which something has fulfilled its final cause, purpose, end, goal etc., and according to Aristotle, potentiality is how much more it has to be completed. Once the potential is fulfilled, it is automatically actualised, it can be no more. Here actuality and potentiality is just like the relation between Banyan tree and Banyan seed, which is also called actuality and eventuality. The banyan tree is the actuality or reality of the banyan seed and the banyan seed is the potential or prospect of banyan tree. Hence the link between

⁸⁰ Sengupta Ira, T.(2012). *A short history of western philosophy*. Kolkata: New Central Book Agency, pp.17

⁸¹ Ibid

⁸² Ibid

⁸³ Sengupta Ira, T.(2012). *A short history of western philosophy*. Kolkata: New Central Book Agency, pp.17

actuality and potentiality is alike to the link between form and matter, it is the real relationship: whatsoever the things are present in this world is the combination of form and matter and nothing beyond of it. Here, through the help of these two relative terms like actuality and potentiality, Aristotle tries to prove that how the form is present in the matter. Hence the ending point is already present in the beginning point.

From the above discussion, one should must be ask the question that, if the form is unchanged and constant, which is proved by Plato and Aristotle, then how the Banyan seeds turned into Banyan tree in a certain time period? Here the form is not changed, because if it is then Banyan seeds become turned into mango tree not the Banyan tree. For this reason Aristotle introduced actuality and potentiality. In this point of view, Banyan seeds has the potentiality to become the Banyan tree, and this process is going on. Seeds has its own actuality and tree has its own actuality also. Form is remain stable.

God:

According to Aristotle's conception of God, "There are only two exceptions, to this general rule, viz, the lowest state of pure matter, and the highest state of pure form-which Aristotle calls the concept of God. As formal cause He is the idea and lastly as efficient cause, God is the ultimate cause of all becoming. He is the first mover, but He is himself unmoved. He is form of form and God is form without matter."⁸⁴ According to Aristotle, God is the complete one and also the highest one, without him nothing is real and He is solely real. He is the only one which is entirely genuine because God is the unmixed form. "That there is a at least one such unchangeable being which causes motion while remaining itself unmoved"⁸⁵. According to Aristotle, God is the first mover, He moves everything and He is still unmoved. God is the real idea through formal cause. Without God no change is happens in the world, every change is done by them and he is the real cause, hence He is unmoved. In Aristotle's point of view God is the ultimate "form of form"⁸⁶, hence form is the idea, thought and universal or "God of Aristotle is not an individual God."⁸⁷ God is universal according to Aristotle, according to him, God is not subjective idea but yes it is objective idea and it is also absolute idea. "Plato claimed that absolute thought is real and objective and therefore, it exist. Aristotle avoids this

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ S.J Copleston Frederick, T.(1962). *A history of philosophy*, New York, Bantam Doubleday Dell, pp.291.

⁸⁶ Ibid

⁸⁷ Ibid, pp.18

error and says that absolute thought is absolutely real, but it doesn't exist."⁸⁸ Here there can be question arises, is that, how can be absolutely real and it is not exist? In this point of view, for Plato, there has a transcendental world and everything is real in there including absolute thought. But according to Aristotle, there has no transcendental world, everything is present in this world, and absolute thought is real, but we can't say that, where does it exist particularly. For Aristotle there is no other world in this sense Aristotle rejects Plato's theory. To prove the existence of form Aristotle introduced God.

"The supreme mover can have no extension in space. It could not be infinite, for there is no such thing as an infinite magnitude. It couldn't be finite, for since it operates for ever, it must possess infinite force. Aristotle doesn't explicitly say in the physics that one such mover will suffice to explain the observed phenomena; and this is a point which is taken up in the theological part of his metaphysics"⁸⁹. Aristotle's God is not spiritual God, in here it means different. He took the God as form, the prime mover which can move everything and itself become unmoved.

According to Aristotle, God is the unmoved one but it can move everything in this world. It intends that form is totally unmoved, it cannot be changed at all but the matter can be change, matter can changes its form but form itself can not be change. Thus in his point of view form can change the matter but matter can not change the form. For him, God is the "unmoved mover"⁹⁰. "The first unmoved mover, being the source of all movement, as final cause, is the ultimate cause why potentiality is actualised, i.e. why goodness is realised"⁹¹. Hence we concluded that, here God means the form, which is unmoved, never be change and it can change every material things. If we take an example of 'man', here manness is the form or God which is unmoved but yes the man can moved by the manness and hence manness is the form or concept of man, which is in Aristotle's language is called unmoved mover or God and also called supreme mover. The supreme mover or the God have no extension at all and it is also infinite.

Comparison between Plato and Aristotle Form: Both the philosophers were given there views on Form in his own way and they are able to allocate everything through the form. The most common thing they used to classify all the things is form but the way they taken in to

⁸⁸ Ibid

⁸⁹ Allan J.D., T(1970), *The Philosophy of Aristotle*, (2nd ed), London, Oxford University Press, pp.39.

⁹⁰ Sengupta Ira, T.(2012). *A short history of western philosophy*. Kolkata: New Central Book Agency, pp.18.

⁹¹ S.J Copleston Frederick, T.(1962). *A history of philosophy*, New York, Bantam Doubleday Dell, pp.311.

account the form is very different. Mainly Plato and Aristotle said about this, and I am going to explore what are those things?

According to Frederick Copleston, “In *the Republic* it is assumed that whenever a plurality of individuals have a common name, they have also a corresponding idea or form. This is the universal, the common nature or quality which is grasped in the concept, e.g. beauty. There are many beautiful things, but we form one universal concept of beauty itself: and Plato assumed that these universal concepts are not merely subjective concepts but that in them we apprehend objective essences”⁹². In Plato’s point of view, when the essence of an object is shared a common qualities on so many similar objects at a time, that is called universals. According to Plato, particulars are only boorish depictions of their form and he also elaborate this line through the concept of beauty. In his point of view there are so many beautiful things are present in this world like red rose, rainbow, mountain and so on. In Plato’s point of view, all these beautiful things are physical or depends upon the observer and it also varies, these physical beauties are temporary period of time. But Plato talked about the form of beauty which is neither physical nor temporary, the form of beauty is beyond the arena of time and space and also eternal. In Plato’s point of view, the form is objective one not the subjective one because the form of beauty is neither present in this world nor in the beautiful objects, it is present in the transcendental world, which is beyond the realm of space and time. Let see what are the Copleston’s point of views on this.

In Frederick Copleston’s point of view, “Are the objects of mathematics substances, or universals, or the transcendental ideas of being and unity? No replies Aristotle, they are not: hence his polemic against the Platonic theory of ideas. The argument for Plato’s theory that it makes scientific knowledge possible and explains it, proves, says Aristotle, that the universal is real and no mere mental fiction; but it does not prove that the universal has a subsistence apart from individual things. According to Aristotle, the forms are only a purposeless doubling of visible things. They are supposed to explain why the multitude of things in the world exist. But it doesn’t help simply to suppose the existence of another multitude of things, as Plato does. Plato is like a man who, unable to count with a small number, thinks that he will find it easier to do if he doubles the number. The forms are useless for our knowledge of things. They help in no wise towards the knowledge of the other things (for they are not even the substance of these, else they would have been in them.) this seems to be an expression of Aristotle’s

⁹² Ibid, pp.164.

interest in the visible universe, whereas Plato was not really concerned with the things of this world for their own sake, but as stepping-stones to the forms”⁹³. Now, we will see what is the Aristotle’s views on Plato.

But according to Aristotle, Plato’s view is illogical and have no sense at all because nothing is present beyond the arena of time and space, everything is in it. In Aristotle’s point of view, “defining an object’s form was through the objects purpose, which it has been given by the designer”⁹⁴. A table is called a table because it has been inclined to have the action (function) of a table. Here he concluded that the form is present in the object. To recognised the objects both Plato and Aristotle use form, Plato holds that the form is essential to achieve the knowledge. According to Aristotle’s form is essential because we used alone study the objects and invent the functions of the form. Aristotle’s form is not objective, it is completely subjective because form is present in the object not outside of it.

Frederick Copleston says, “The Forms are useless when it comes to explaining the movement of things. Even if things exists in virtue of the forms. The forms are supposed to explain sensible objects. But they will themselves sensible”⁹⁵. According to Aristotle forms itself is motionless and it is also the objects of this world not the objects of transcendental world as Plato. If the objects are the transcript of form then it would be motionless. Forms are sensible in itself according to Aristotle. “Plato tries to explain the relation by the use of terms such as “participation” and “imitation”, but Aristotle retorts that to that they (i.e. sensible things) are patterns and the other things share in them, is to use empty words and poetical metaphors”⁹⁶. Here Plato wants to bring the relationship between form and matter through participation and imitation. But according to Aristotle form is the intrinsic quintessence of the sensible thing, according to him, if there is no intrinsic form then there is no actual mean of participation. In Plato’s point of view, participation means, objects are participate in the form and imitation means this world is the imitation world and transcendental world is the real one but according to Aristotle there is no such transcendental world. “All things cannot come from the forms in any of the usual senses of ‘form’. The forms will be individual objects like those other objects of which they are the forms, whereas they should be not individuals but universals”⁹⁷. Here again Aristotle says against Plato’s view, that it is a metaphorical view and it has no sense at

⁹³ S.J Copleston Frederick, T.(1962). *A history of philosophy*, New York, Bantam Doubleday Dell, pp.291,292

⁹⁴ Stace. T.W., T(2014), *A Critical History of Greek Philosophy*, New York, The Macmillan Company, pp.261-268.

⁹⁵ S.J Copleston Frederick, T.(1962). *A history of philosophy*, New York, Bantam Doubleday Dell, pp.292,293

⁹⁶ S.J Copleston Frederick, T.(1962). *A history of philosophy*, New York, Bantam Doubleday Dell, pp.294

⁹⁷ Ibid, pp.294,295

all because if the transcendental world is not exist then in there how the form is exist? And Plato doesn't says that where is the another world is present. Here Aristotle's view is more stringer than Plato.

Conclusion: Aristotle has correctly described his position on forms and criticized the Plato's theory of universal in his own way, and proved that form exist in real and actual things. From the above discussion I conclude that form is a coordinate of matter. It is beyond the bounds of possibility to split form from matter. It would be illogical to say "Y is a form but has no matter" as it would be to say "Rama is a husband but has no wife." From the above discussion of comparison between Plato and Aristotle form, I reached a conclusion is that form is constant in every situation but matter is changed and hence form is present.

Nominalism

Introduction to Nominalism:

In this chapter, I am going to explore how nominalism refutes the theory of universals. William of Ockham is a nominalist philosopher, in his point of view, the universals and the essence of the things are not exist, only the particular things is to be exists. Belief in metaphysical realism is nothing but called the universal essences, the reason is, we would not see, touch, and sensualise the universal essences but still it exists, though it has no physical appearance. There are several kinds of metaphysical realism are made to provide a reliable or secure base to knowledge. But the problem is Ockham, is not accept the metaphysical realism. He asserts that, “the universal essences are concepts in the mind. The word nominalism comes from the Latin word *nomina*, meaning name. Earlier nominalists such as French philosopher Roscelin, had advanced the more radical view that universal essences are just names that have no basis in reality. Ockham developed a more sophisticated version of nominalism often called ‘conceptualism’ because it holds that universal essences are concepts caused in our minds when we perceive real similarities among things in the world.”⁹⁸ “The fundamental contention of Nominalism is that all things that exist are only particulars.”⁹⁹ “The term ‘Nominalism’ stems from the Latin *nomen*, “name”. for example, John Stuart Mill once wrote, that “there is nothing general except names”. In metaphysics, nominalism is a philosophical view which denies the existence of universals and abstract terms and predicates. There are at least two main versions of nominalism. One version denies the existence of universals, things that’s can be instantiated or exemplified by many particular things like (strength, humanity). The other version specifically denies the existence of abstract objects, objects that do not exist in space and time.”¹⁰⁰ According to Nominalist theory, there is nothing which can be called universals only

⁹⁸ Adams, Marilyn McCord, T(1987). *William Ockham*. 2 vols., Notre Dame, Ind., University of Notre Dame Press. <https://www.iep.utm.edu/ockham/#H3>

⁹⁹ Armstrong M. David., T(1978), *Universals and Scientific Realism: Nominalism and Realism*, U.S., Cambridge University Press, pp.12.

¹⁰⁰ Feibleman, James K., T(1962), *Foundation of Empiricism*, U.S., Springer Publication, pp.211.

particulars are present, universals are only the name according to Nominalism. Nominalism opposes the presence of universals, the particular material objects solely personify the universals. According to Nominalism, those things are not present in the realm of space and time are not taken in to account, so for that reason universals are not present according to Nominalism. Hence the first and the second version of Nominalism says that there is no existence of universals and no abstract objects is to be present. Here, there can be a question arises that what is that thing which accepted by nominalist?

All most all nominalists has been accepted that the thing which is present in the space and time are the real one and those things are not present in the arena of space and time are not taken in to account by nominalists, only the particulars are the real one. In here the question is asked by nominalism is that, how could One particular object is related to another particular object, the answer is given by the realists is that, they share a common property in between them. And in here there can be a query raised is that, how a thing is present in everywhere at the same time? On this account, both the realists and the nominalists given their own views on it. In nominalist point of view, there are nothing exists except particulars, and it is also the only reality. But according to realists point of view, there are something which is present with the particulars, and besides of particular there is universal is present. Particular has no existence without the universal. Realist doesn't refused that there is no particular but with that there are both universal and particular are exists, according to realist.

“Nominalists deny that there is any genuine or objective identity in things which are not identical.”¹⁰¹ Therefore according to Nominalists objective identity in things are identical and it is possible to detect the genuine or objective identity in things. “Nominalism is the philosophical view that abstract concepts, general terms, or universals have no independent existence but exists only as names. It also claims that various individual objects labelled by the same term have nothing in common but their name.”¹⁰² From the above lines it is seems like that Nominalism rejects the universals and the abstract object , the first one is sustain that universals and second one sustain that there are abstract objects. In realism point of view, there are universals, and according to Plato's point of view there are abstract objects. Hence according to the first one everything is particular and particular objects are exist and according to the second one all things are concrete and concrete objects are also present in nominalist

¹⁰¹ Armstrong M. David., T(1978), *Universals and Scientific Realism: Nominalism and Realism*, U.S., Cambridge University Press, Pp.12.

¹⁰² Goodman, N., T(1986), *Nominalism*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, pp.159-161.

point of view. Hence nominalism is doesn't depend upon anything it is completely independent. Nominalism is against of realism in both the above cases, it is not support realism so that it is anti-realism.

Here there can be a question arises that what is nominalism? If we say In traditional ways, the rejection of universals is called the Nominalism. "Nominalism in a broader way, namely as encompassing positions implementing strategies. For nominalism has nothing against properties, numbers, propositions, possible worlds, etc., as such. What Nominalism finds uncongenial in entities like properties, numbers, possible worlds and propositions is that they are supposed to be universals or abstract objects. Thus the mere rejection of properties, numbers, possible worlds, propositions etc., doesn't make one a nominalist to be a nominalist, one needs to reject them because they are supposed to be universals or abstract objects. Rejecting properties, propositions possible worlds, numbers, and any other items is not sufficient for being a Nominalist about them: to be a Nominalist one must reject them on account of their being universal or abstract objects."¹⁰³ Generally the abstract object is doesn't exist in the realm of space and time, its beyond of that. Nominalism is not accepted the existence of universals and abstract objects, in both the cases. According to nominalist there are no reality is present, neither in abstract objects nor in universals, they both are false. Nominalism is refutes that neither there is any universals nor there is any abstract objects, because in realism point of view, there are universals is present and in Platonism point of view, there are abstract objects is present, both the universals and abstract objects are not the same thing, they are different from each other. Universals are embodied by different objects or entities, but in abstract objects case, it is beyond the realm of space and time.

Here there can be a question arises that what is an abstract object? Though there has no specific definition of abstract object, but yes we can say that the abstract objects are non-spatiotemporal and causally inert objects and "it is assumed that only spatiotemporal entities can enter in causal relations."¹⁰⁴ It is clear that, abstract objects are those who have no existence in space and time and it is also dormant. In other word we can say, nominalism is reject the non-spatiotemporal and dormant objects because according to nominalist these things are no physical existence. Nominalists are also not agree with the similarity in between abstract entities and individual entities, because in his point of view these two terms are completely different from each other, like wise one is universals, which have no existence of its own and

¹⁰³ Goodman, N., T(1986), *Nominalism*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, pp.159-161.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., pp.159-161

another one is particular, who have the existence, and it is accepted by nominalists also. We can also say that universals are rejected by nominalism theory because, it is a mind independent entity, though nominalism is based on experience. Our sense organs are leading a very major role for experiencing anything, in here there is a problem which raised by nominalism upon universal is that, “no sense can be made of what exactly these universals are”¹⁰⁵, the existence of universal is not based on space and time, it is something different, is that, it is beyond the arena of space and time. The another thing is that, the universal is separate from particular things according to nominalism. Let see how nominalism deals with the term generality.

Generality, is a term which is used by universals, on that, according to nominalism, where there is predicate term, there must be general term, there are no common nature in between them, they are individually present. In nominalist point of view, predicate is simply predicate nothing else. In here there can be a question arises, is that, if the term generality is so and so for nominalism, then how could nominalism deals with the colour ‘yellow’ in different individual objects like yellow house, yellow banana, yellow mobile, etc? This questions answer is given by nominalist in epistemological point of view, though epistemology is accepted by nominalism. Through the sense perception, we get the knowledge of yellow things. In the past experience, we relate the particular things, and then it is very easier to get the knowledge of yellow things. This is the way, how nominalism is avoid the existence of universals. Here there is a question arises, is that, if one should rejects the universals that means he is a nominalist or not? According to David Armstrong (1978; 1997) “is a believer in universals, and so he is not a nominalist in the sense of rejecting universals, but he believes that everything that exists is spatiotemporal, and so he is a nominalist in the sense of rejecting abstract objects. And there are those who, like Quine at a certain point of his philosophical development (1964; 1981), accepts sets or classes and so are not nominalists in the sense of rejecting abstract objects and yet reject universals and so are nominalists in the sense of rejecting universals.”¹⁰⁶

Kinds of Nominalism:

“There are some of the nominalism which are ranging from intense to almost realist. One of the intense is predicate nominalism, according to this, for an example, there are two ‘dogs’ like ‘Bruno is a dog’ and ‘Stain is a dog’, in these two statements both the dogs are simply because the predicate ‘is a dog’ is in both the cases and it is also provides the similarity of attributes in

¹⁰⁵ Shottenkirk Dena, T(2009), *Nominalism and Its Aftermath*, New York, Springer, pp.5.

¹⁰⁶ Goodman, N., T(1986), *Nominalism*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, pp.159-161.

our day today life, like the above cases. “The main criticism of this view is that it does not provide a sufficient solution to the problem of universals.”¹⁰⁷ The predicate nominalism is not giving the sufficient conditions to taking an account of same predicate which is present in a group of things. According to resemblance nominalism the ‘dog’ is used in both the dogs, because the reason is Bruno and Stain resemble an exemplar dog intently sufficient to be classed together with it, as member of kind. Some of the resemblance nominalists accepted that the relation of resemblance is universals also. But yes there are some other resemblance nominalists are there, those who don’t accept this view, and according to them resemblance nominalism is a particular. Many nominalists also argues that it is not atrocious. Class nominalism is based on their properties relationship, like two particular white ball is analogous to their properties of ‘balls’ and ‘white’. “A version of class nominalism that sees some classes as ‘natural classes’ is held by Anthony Quinton. Conceptualism is a philosophical theory that explains universality of particulars as conceptualised frameworks situated within the thinking mind. The conceptualist view approaches the metaphysical concept of universals from a perspective that denies their presence in particulars outside of the minds perception of them. Another form of nominalism is trope nominalism. A trope is a particular instance of a property, like the specific greenness of a shirt.”¹⁰⁸ These are the various types of nominalism and they rejects universals.

All Nominalists are agrees that things are exists in the world by particulars and only particulars and we are able to know the things through particulars, particulars are leading a major role. There are five major solutions which is attempted by nominalists. These are like predicate nominalism, concept nominalism, class nominalism, mereological nominalism and resemblance nominalism. Now I am going to simplify these nominalism, one by one.

First of all I would like to introduced predicate nominalism. “According to predicate nominalism, an object’s possession of the property, being white, is completely determined by the fact that the predicate ‘white’ applies to this object. Given a class, such as the class of white things, the predicate Nominalist seeks to give an account of its unity by saying that each member of this class has the same relation to the same predicate: the predicate ‘white’. But the two sameness of a particular, rather they are sameness of sort, kind or type.”¹⁰⁹ The same

¹⁰⁷ Feibleman, James K., T(1962), *Foundation of Empiricism*, U.S., Springer Publication, pp.214

¹⁰⁸ Feibleman, James K., T(1962), *Foundation of Empiricism*, U.S., Springer Publication, pp.214.

¹⁰⁹ Armstrong M. David., T(1978), *Universals and Scientific Realism: Nominalism and Realism*, U.S., Cambridge University Press, pp.17-21.

relation is to be prevailed in between the predicate 'white', and each and every white things. This type of predicate is appropriate for all the predicate-type of white, not in this single use, but it has multiple usages. And it is also true that "Predicate nominalism simply turns into Resemblance Nominalism."¹¹⁰ According to the predicate nominalism, the white object's whiteness, is represent by their exceptional relationship to tokens to the predicate-type white, and it is directly indicate to the predicate type 'white'. Hence, the predicate nominalist is not able to eradicate the type notion of falling under from his analysis, but since he stated to give a reductive analysis of all type-notions, his account is became turned to involved in circularity, according to his notion everything is comes in a circular manner. The predicate nominalist is not able to solve this problem, for this reason he just shift in to one notion to another, like an example of, a man who have no money, but he ordered the food and eat, to avoid the bill he again and again ordered some more food. Predicate Nominalism doing like that. Instead of solving the problem he is just shifting from one to another.

Secondly, I would like to discussed about concept nominalism, it is also just like predicate nominalism. In predicate nominalism, the theory nominalism is based on predicate, like that in concept nominalism is the theory is based on mental entities. For the problem of universals, we can say these two Nominalism are the subjective solution. In predicate Nominalism case, the universals is present in human beings words but in concept Nominalism case the universal present in human beings mind, so in both the cases universal is present in different ways and human being is also the measure of all the things. Predicate Nominalism is using the perceivable and sensualise things, which we are using through our language, but in concept nominalism case "by contrast, has a mentalist bias. However, I think that an adequate theory of concepts as mental entities can be developed, and that it is concepts which underlie and give life to predicates rather than the other way about. But in any case, the Concept Nominalist need do no more than take as primitive the notion of a concept as a mental entity and that of a thing falling under a concept. Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, are often taken to be Concept Nominalists."¹¹¹ In first case it is imply that, the whiteness, which is present in the human beings mind is completely autonomous from the existence of white things, they both are not dependent. Concept Nominalism is not provided the something, which is makes the white thing do applicable for whiteness. In the second case, it inquiry two atrocious bottomless regress, in

¹¹⁰ Ibid., pp.17-21.

¹¹¹ Armstrong M. David., T(1978), *Universals and Scientific Realism: Nominalism and Realism*, U.S., Cambridge University Press, pp.25-27.

here the first one is the concept type, in which, all the white things are coming under one whiteness, the second one is the concept token, if all the things coming under the whiteness then the concept nominalists must be “run out of actual tokens of concepts-types to perform the required unification of classes of particulars. The Concept Nominalist faces a problem about causality. The causal order of the world depends upon the properties of things.”¹¹² The next one we will see the class nominalism.

The third one is Class Nominalism, it is not based on theory of properties because it is based on a certain class. Quine says, “that the identity-conditions for classes are “crystal-clear” while the identity conditions for properties are “obscure”.”¹¹³ Instead of a certain properties here we are using a certain class, there are lots of things can be coming under one class. Now we will see, how class nominalist is analyse the classes from aggregates, for example, Indian cricket team is a made up of players, and players are not found anywhere except the Indian cricket team. Here Indian cricket team is not themselves players, but yes, ‘X is a cricket player’ is analysed by the Class Nominalist as ‘X is a existing member of the class of players’, and this is a player class also. Now we can acknowledge the result on this analysis is that, if the classes are known by the aggregate of their members of that particular class, then the aggregate of whole Indian cricket team is known by the aggregate of all players. Thus, the class of all Indian cricket team is known by the class of all players, now it is proved that, players are the members of that particular class. Hence, the class nominalist characterized three things, the first one is the class of Indian cricket team, the second one is the class of players, and the third one is the aggregate of Indian cricket team is equals to the players. “Classes and aggregates are distinct in things.”¹¹⁴ Now we will see what is Mereological Nominalism.

The fourth one is Mereological Nominalism. “At this point we may take brief note of the heroic doctrine which I have called Mereological Nominalism. It tries to give an account of what it is for a thing to have a property not in terms of classes but of aggregates. a is F if and only if a is a part (proper or otherwise) of the aggregate of all the Fs. Bochenski appropriately calls it the ‘bit’ theory. a is F because it is a bit of the great F thing. The theory must be distinguished from that crude version of the theory of Forms which puts a bit of the Form F in each particular

¹¹² Ibid., pp.25-27.

¹¹³ Ibid., pp.25-27.

¹¹⁴ Armstrong M. David., T(1978), *Universals and Scientific Realism: Nominalism and Realism*, U.S., Cambridge University Press, pp.29,30

which is F, an over-literal form of universalia in rebus. Mereological Nominalism admits only particulars, standing to each other in the relation of part and whole.”¹¹⁵

The fourth one is Resemblance Nominalism. “The Resemblance Nominalism however, requires that degree of resemblance be objective. Given three particulars, a, b and c, he must maintain that it is an objective question, simply a matter of the way that the world is, whether a resembles c more than, less than or to the same degree as b resembles c. only so can he hope to build up objective resemblance-classes.”¹¹⁶ Resemblance Nominalism is based on particulars, through this, it is easier to see everything for resemblance nominalism. In resemblance nominalism, in a same category, one thing is look like an another thing. If we try to give the combining theory of the black thing, by giving our statement that each and every one of them resembles every other one, that a more firmly then any of them resemble anything else, then here the problem is arises. Now we are also using the same formula to uniting the yellow things, then here is the question arises is that, what then separates black things to yellow things? To solve this problem, paradigm particulars gave their view point, is that, black things have the appropriate resemblance to this thing and yellow things also have a suitable resemblance to that. In this case and the above all cases, we have noticed that, how the nominalism is rejecting the universals by different nominalist theory. Nominalism is clearly avoid the theory of universals. Now we will see, by how and what is the reason behind the rejection of universals by nominalism.

How Nominalism rejects the theory of Universals:

If we say in general, nominalism is not all about to the elimination of abstract objects and universals. Someone who believe in particulars or concrete objects, is to be called a Nominalist. According to Michael Jubien, “Sometimes Nominalism is identified with those positions exemplifying strategy. But this seems to be based on the thought that what makes a position nominalist is the rejection of properties, number, proposition, etc. in this entry, however, I shall understand Nominalism in a broader way, namely as encompassing positions implementing strategies above. For nominalism has nothing against properties, number, propositions, possible worlds propositions, is that they are supposed to be universals or abstract objects. Thus the mere rejection of properties, numbers, possible worlds, propositions, etc., does not make one a nominalist- to be a nominalist one needs to reject them because they are supposed to be

¹¹⁵ Ibid., pp.34,35

¹¹⁶ Ibid., pp.45,46

universals or abstract objects. Michael Jubien, for instance, rejects propositions, but he admits properties and relations construed Platonistically; his reasons for rejecting propositions have nothing to do with their alleged abstract character. It would be odd to call Jubien a nominalist about propositions.”¹¹⁷ It is clear from the above discussion is that, To be a nominalist, one should eliminate the abstract objects and universals.

Now we will see how the realism is differentiate from the nominalism. “The endless controversy over universals illustrates Moore’s statement. Philosophers often assume that the problem of universals involves nothing more than the necessity of choosing between realism and nominalism. This basic dichotomy has produced series of ambiguous propositions and false propositions. It has been claimed that the realistic interpretation of universals is antiscientific, that it is the product of Christian superstition. It has been asserted that nominalism provides the only available scientific interpretation of universals.”¹¹⁸ And it also true that, some of the philosophers are accept and reject the theory of nominalism because, they thought that Nominalism is consolidated with scepticism (who doubts everything), some are also thought it is also homogenously related with solipsism (only me and my ideas are exists). It is also true that so many controversies has been already happened with both nominalism and realism, and there are very little actions are taken to solve this disputes. And in my point of view, there may be a individual solution, and that must be implemented on the concepts of universals, if this could be happen then so many problems is to be solved, which is also reduced the disputes in between nominalism and realism.

Here I am going to explore what are the different philosophers views on nominalism. “One misinterpretation of nominalism commits it to the view that universals are arbitrary marks produced by the mind, that universals have no foundation in return natura. John Dewey tells us that for nominalists meaning are adventitious and arbitrary. A. E. Base asserts that if you reject universals and treat abstractions as mere names, then you are a nominalist. Father Bittle claims that for the nominalist there is no foundation in the things themselves which would justify the intellect in forming universal ideas. A. E. Taylor identifies nominalism with the view that a universal signifies either an arbitrary fiction of my mind or nothing at all. Now Ockham does assert that nothing universal exists in any manner outside the mind. But to deny that universals exist in the independent world doesn’t prevent universal concepts from designating particulars

¹¹⁷ Jubien, M., T(2001), *Propositions and the Objects of Thoughts*, Dordrecht, Netherlands, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp.48-54.

¹¹⁸ Crockett Campbell, T(1950), *The Journal of Philosophy*, U.S., Journal of Philosophy, PP.752,753.

that do possess objective, independent existence. Durand, another fourteenth-century nominalist also denies the objective reality of universals, but his basis for this denial is the conviction that nothing exists in the external thing except the individual or the singular. In short, to deny that resemblance denotes a common nature is not to deny the reality of determinate resemblances. To deny that universal words designate universal things doesn't commit one to the assertion that linguistic data are sufficient to explain the origin and application of universals. The nominalistic tradition is not responsible for the view that the problem of universals is merely a syntactical question. There is no logical reason, of course, why a nominalist couldn't assert that a linguistic rule determines the significatory function of universals. In point of fact, however, most nominalists have believed that they speak to others in order to express their thoughts and attitudes about entities which exist independent of the language they use."¹¹⁹ It is very clear that from the above discussion, nominalism rejects the universals by its various aspects. Universals are never be accepted by nominalism, because according to nominalism everything is present in this world in a particular form, not present in abstract form. In nominalism point of view, everything is present in this spatiotemporal world, and there is no such things which is present beyond the existence of space and time and in his point of view, we are aware about everything by the help of predicate not by universals. If we ask a question like, if everything is present in predicate form then, how the one particular table is alike with other particular table? Here nominalism replied, table is not alike with other table, it is the resemblance of one in to other, and it is also going on in to many table. Now we can say that, Nominalism is not support the theory of universals, but there are some philosophers who does not accept the theory of nominalism and we can say they are against of it.

According to Russell, "if we wish to avoid the universals whiteness and triangularity, we shall chose some particular triangle, and say that anything is white or a triangle if it has the right sort of resemblance to our chosen particular. But then the resemblance required have to be a universal."¹²⁰ In his point of view, here is the main problem occurred with resemblance nominalism. On the explanation it is also clear that the existence of universals, because when there are so many white things or white pair of things and triangular shape objects then there must be some commonality in every pair of objects. And in here we can see the existence of universal. Now it is showing our foolishness, if we says that, one particular object is resemble to other. If we say show then we should be accepted that resemblance is a kind of universals

¹¹⁹ Crockett Campbell, T(1950), *The Journal of Philosophy*, U.S., Journal of Philosophy, pp.754.

¹²⁰ Russell, Bertrand., T(1979). *The Problems of Philosophy*, London: Oxford University Press.

because resemblance now in here share a common qualities in between each and every object. And hence it is clear that we have to accept the existence of universals because resemblance nominalism is not providing the satisfactory evidence to prove himself against universal.

If the resemble nominalism is universals and it justify his existence is valid then it must be share a common qualities and all the things are similar to each other in certain qualities and attributes but these things are not happen in resemblance nominalism. For that reason it is not qualify as universals. Nominalism should not be universals because universals has the qualities, essences, attributes and commonness but for nominalism only the particulars has the real existence, without particulars nothing can be exists according to nominalism. But if we see in real case, without universals there is no existence of particulars because they are also interdependent. It seems like without universals there is no particular because whenever we talk about any particular object the first thing which is coming in to our mind is the essence of that thing. without the essence the particular thing that object is not exists. Let see some views on rejection of nominalism, according to John Dewey, “for nominalists, meaning are adventitious and arbitrary, in A. M. Base view is that, if you reject universals... and treat abstractions as mere names, then you are a nominalist. Father Bittle claims that for the Nominalists, there is no foundation in the things themselves which would justify the intellect in forming universals ideas. In the view point of A. E. Taylor identifies nominalism with the view that a universal signifies either an arbitrary fiction of my mind or nothing at all.”¹²¹

According to nominalism, the particular has the only existence, and nominalists also tries to prove through their different viewpoints, like predicate, resemblance, type token etc., but in here there is a question arises is that, how is the particular objects has its own existence? Though the particular objects are spatiotemporal and it is also proved that those things which are coming in to the arena of space and time they were need something for their existence. Therefore it is annoying to say that particulars are exists without the universals, because if we see in deeply we will see that universals are the base or we can say the root of every particular things.

Conclusion:

From the above explanation, I have concluded that Nominalism in both the sense is a kind of anti-realism, it is also rejects the corporality of the theory of universals and abstract objects.

¹²¹ Crockett, Campbell., T(1950), *The Confusion over Nominalism*, U. S., Journal of Philosophy, pp. 753.

According to nominalism only the particular things are exists and this is the reality also. Nominalism rejects the existence of propositions, numbers, properties, possible world etc. because these are presumed to be universals and Nominalism doesn't accepts universals.

Conclusion:

From the above explanation, I concluded that the theory of universal exists. Both Plato and Aristotle accept this theory that it is real, but they both take this theory in a very different way. In Plato's point of view, the form couldn't exist in this world but according to Aristotle, the form exists in this world, not in the world of ideas but in things. Here I am supporting Aristotle's form because his notion of form is more clear than Plato. If we see in Plato's theory of universals then there are somethings those have no valid argument behind it like two world theory, when it is asked to Plato that where does the second world exist then he doesn't give any appropriate judgment on it. But in Aristotle case, the attributes of the objects are present in it, like the cat's catness is in the cat, and all the cats share this catness. If we see Plato's theory, we will find the form exists independent from the matter and matter is the shadow of the real form, but in Aristotle sense, matter and form are not independent they both depend upon each other for their existent. Matter and form are inherently related to each other, it couldn't exist separately because if it so then there will be nothing is called an object. It is not possible physically to detach the form from matter but yes it can be possible in thought and we can separate the form from matter. If we take the form of beauty in both the philosopher's point of view, then we will find that they both are right in saying that beauty is infallible and eternal but in the sense of Plato, the form of beauty is exists in an ideal world and here only copied form of beauty that we have. According to Aristotle, the essence of beauty is present in already exists. This phenomenal world is more than enough to provide a perfect place to the existence of form in the object. For Aristotle, everything which is in this world are coming under the process of evolution, and everything has their own potentiality and actuality, for that all beautiful objects.

For Plato, to bring a relationship in between two objects the third man argument or third form is needed but for Aristotle, the third form is unnecessary because in the objects the form is reason also if we separate the form from the matter it is very difficult to run the process of evolution. If this world is copied and imitation then the process of evolution should not be possible and the most important thing the change is not happen. Form as its independent

existence in Plato's sense but in Aristotle sense, matter has no existence without form they both are also interdependent, though the form is independent of matter, for the existence of form the matter is needed and only through the matter we are become aware about form. Plato doesn't provide the path that how to reach the and how to achieve the form, he doesn't provided any satisfactory answer of this question because for him one can't be reached the world of ideas because it is exists but beyond the world of space and time. For Aristotle form is exists in the object, that one can determined. For Plato ideas are individual, if it is so then, what is real for me is might not be real for anyone else and the ideas are varies from person to person. In Aristotle sense, ideas should be equal for all, it should be indubitable, and the highest or absolute idea is God. If we see the nominalism point of view, it is completely reject the theory of universals. Essence are very essential for the existence of everything, but for nominalism universals are only the name. For nominalism the existence of thing is depend upon class, resemblance, predicate. But they are not provided any satisfactory reason, that how they reject the universals. Hence it is clear that universal is distinct idea and it is also exists in everything and we will not differentiate the form from the matter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

- Aristotle. (2009). *The Basic Works of Aristotle*. New York, NY: Modern Library.
- Aristotle. (2013). *The Metaphysics*. North Chelmsford, MA: Courier Corporation.
- Barnes, J. (2000). *Aristotle: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford Paperbacks.
- Crubellier, M., & Laks, A. (2009). *Aristotle's Metaphysics Beta: Symposium Aristotelian*. Oxford, England: OUP Oxford.
- Fine, G. (1993). *On Ideas: Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's Theory of Forms*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Lear, J. (1988). *Aristotle: The Desire to Understand*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, F. A. (1991). *Substance and Predication in Aristotle*. Cambridge, England: CUP Archive.
- Pappas, N. (2013). *The Routledge Guidebook to Plato's Republic*. London, England: Routledge.
- Pappas, N. (2013). *The Routledge Guidebook to Plato's Republic*. London, England: Routledge.
- Peterson, S. (2011). *Socrates and Philosophy in the Dialogues of Plato*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Plato, Ferrari, G. R., & Griffith, T. (2000). *Plato: 'The Republic'*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Plato, & Gallop, D. (1999). *Phaedo*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, USA.

- Plato. (2003). *Plato's Parmenides*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Plato. (2003). *Plato's Parmenides*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Plato. (2012). *Republic*. London, England: Penguin UK.
- Plato. (1979). *The Republic of Plato*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Politics, V. (2004). *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Aristotle and the Metaphysics*. London, England: Psychology Press.
- Vlastos, G. (1995). *Studies in Greek Philosophy: Socrates, Plato, and their tradition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- White, N. P. (1976). *Plato on Knowledge and Reality*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing.
- Witt, C. (1989). *Substance and Essence in Aristotle: An Interpretation of Metaphysics VII-IX*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Armstrong, D. M. (1978). *Nominalism and Realism: Volume 1: Universals and Scientific Realism*. Cambridge, England: CUP Archive.
- Gosselin, M. (2012). *Nominalism and Contemporary Nominalism: Ontological and Epistemological Implications of the work of W.V.O. Quine and of N. Goodman*. Berlin, Germany: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Guigon, G., & Rodriguez-Pereyra, G. (2015). *Nominalism about Properties: New Essays*. London, England: Routledge.
- Shottenkirk, D. (2009). *Nominalism and Its Aftermath: The Philosophy of Nelson Goodman*. Berlin, Germany: Springer Science & Business Media.

Secondary sources:

- Allen, R. E. (2012). *Plato's Euthyphro and the Earlier Theory of Forms: A Re-interpretation of the Republic*. London, England: Routledge.
- Bechler, Z. (1995). *Aristotle's Theory of Actuality*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

- Bostock, D. (2006). *Space, Time, Matter, and Form: Essays on Aristotle's Physics*.
Oxford, England: Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Dancy, R. M. (2004). *Plato's Introduction of Forms*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Galluzzo, G. (2012). *The Medieval Reception of Book Zeta of Aristotle's Metaphysics (2 Vol. Set): Vol. 1: Aristotle's Ontology and the Middle Ages: The Tradition of Met., Book Zeta // Vol. 2: Pauli Veneti Expositio in Duodecim Libros Metaphisice Aristotelis, 'Liber VII'*. Leiden, Netherlands: BRILL.
- Jacobs, J. A. (2004). *Aristotle's Virtues: Nature, Knowledge & Human Good*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- Kirby, J. (2011). *Aristotle's Metaphysics: Form, Matter and Identity*. London, United Kingdom: A&C Black.
- Schipper, E. W. (2013). *Forms in Plato's Later Dialogues*. Basingstoke, England: Springer.
- Allen, R. E. (Ed.). (2012). *Plato's Euthyphro and the Earlier Theory of Forms: A Re-interpretation of the Republic*.
- Cairns, D. (Ed.). (2007). *Pursuing the Good: Ethics and Metaphysics in Plato's Republic: Ethics and Metaphysics in Plato's Republic*.
- Lloyd, A. C., & Lloyd, A. C. (Eds.). (1981). *Form and Universal in Aristotle*.
- Riley, M. W. (Ed.). (2005). *Plato's Cratylus: Argument, Form, and Structure*.
- Aristotle, & Sachs, J. (2001). *Aristotle's On the soul: and, On memory and recollection*.
Green Lion Pr.
- Fine, G. (1993). *On Ideas: Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's Theory of Forms*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

Fine, G. (1993). *On Ideas: Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's Theory of Forms*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

Jordan, R. W. (1983). *Plato's Arguments for Forms*.

Web sources:

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cratylus_\(dialogue\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cratylus_(dialogue))

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Third_man_argument

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parmenides_\(dialogue\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parmenides_(dialogue))

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theaetetus_\(dialogue\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theaetetus_(dialogue))

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theaetetus_\(dialogue\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theaetetus_(dialogue))

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meno>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meno>.

<http://www.chris-kimble.com/Courses/sdm/Presentations/SDM3.pdf>

<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/plato/>.

<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/plato/>

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/ockham/#H3>

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/form-matter/>

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nominalism-metaphysics/>

The theory of Universal: A special reference to Plato and Aristotle.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

4%

SIMILARITY INDEX

3%

INTERNET SOURCES

1%

PUBLICATIONS

2%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

[epdf.tips](#)

Internet Source

1%

2

[en.wikipedia.org](#)

Internet Source

1%

3

[eltalondeaquiles.pucp.edu.pe](#)

Internet Source

<1%

4

[www.academia.edu](#)

Internet Source

<1%

5

Submitted to Arizona State University

Student Paper

<1%

6

Submitted to CSU, San Francisco State University

Student Paper

<1%

7

[www.scribd.com](#)

Internet Source

<1%

8

[stanford.library.sydney.edu.au](#)

Internet Source

<1%

9	Frendo, Anthony J.. "H. J. Franken's Method of Ceramic Typology: an Appreciation", Palestine Exploration Quarterly, 1988. Publication	<1 %
10	Submitted to Singapore University of Technology and Design Student Paper	<1 %
11	etd.lib.metu.edu.tr Internet Source	<1 %
12	Submitted to Saint Johns University Student Paper	<1 %
13	Submitted to University of Colorado, Denver Student Paper	<1 %
14	Submitted to University of Wales, Lampeter Student Paper	<1 %
15	Jiyuan Yu. "The Structure of Being in Aristotle's Metaphysics", Springer Nature, 2003 Publication	<1 %
16	Submitted to St. Petersburg College Student Paper	<1 %
17	Submitted to CSU, Sacramento Student Paper	<1 %
18	Submitted to IU,Bloomington Student Paper	<1 %

19	ddd.uab.cat Internet Source	<1 %
20	Submitted to Herricks High School Student Paper	<1 %
21	iqbalcyberlibrary.net Internet Source	<1 %
22	Submitted to University of Southern California Student Paper	<1 %
23	Submitted to SUNY, Binghamton Student Paper	<1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches

< 14 words

Exclude bibliography On