

BASIC PHILOSOPHY AND LOGIC

EDITED BY

OSITA NNAJIOFOR, Ph.D.

&

KIZITO I. OKOLI

CONTENTS

Foreword

Preface

Dedication

SECTION A

Chapter One: *Understanding Philosophy*

OsitaNnajofofor, Ph.D.

Chapter Two: *Branches of Philosophy*

Ogochukwu A. Okpokwasili

Chapter Three: *Methods of Philosophy*

Chinyere C. Emedo, Ph.D.

Chapter Four: *Schools of Thought in Philosophy*

Basil A. Okonkwo, Ph.D.

Chapter Five: *History of Philosophy*

Kelechi Ezeani, Ph.D.

Chapter Six: *African Philosophy*

Jude Onebunne, Ph.D.

Miriam Alike, Ph.D.

Chapter Seven: *Philosophy, Culture and National Development*

Anthony A. Mbah, Ph.D.

SECTION B

Chapter Eight: *Introduction to Logic*
Kizito I. Okoli

Chapter Nine: *Argument*
ChineduIfeakor, Ph.D.

Chapter Ten: *Theory of Syllogism*
ChidimmaEzeador, Ph.D.

Chapter Eleven: *Logical Fallacies*
Henry Okeke, Ph.D.

List of Contributors

OsitaNnajiofor, Ph.D.

Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
NAU, Awka

Chinyere C. Emedo, Ph.D.

Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
NAU, Awka

Basil A. Okonkwo, Ph.D.

Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
NAU, Awka

Kelechi Ezeani, Ph.D.

Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
NAU, Awka

Jude Onebunne, Ph.D./Miriam Alike, Ph.D.

Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
NAU, Awka

Anthony A. Mbah, Ph.D.

Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
NAU, Awka

Chinedulfeakor, Ph.D.

Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
NAU, Awka

ChidimmaEzeador, Ph.D.

Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
NAU, Awka

Henry Okeke, Ph.D.

Lecturer, Faculty of Law
NAU, Awka

Ogochukwu A. Okpokwasili
Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
NAU, Awka

Kizito I. Okoli
Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
NAU, Awka

Foreword

PREFACE

Philosophy is a systematic reflective thinking on life. It always deals with human knowledge, and the elevation of the mind. There is not a single philosophy that could be excogitated except in relation to life, society, existence, and universe. The need for systematic and reflective thinking becomes imperative because of the myriads of problems confronting man and the universe today. This is why the advice of Socrates that an unexamined life is not worth living is germane in our contemporary world. Many are merely in the rat race of life without pausing one day to reflect on what life holds for them. They allow life to happen to them and not how they will happen to life and contribute meaningfully to their world by engaging their mind through logical, critical and systematic reflective thinking on life. This why to philosophize is not just to speculate about life and reflect on nature but rather an engagement with love, intense desire, and strong enthusiasm in the investigation of causes underlying reality in order to build up a system of values by which society may live. It is this desire to build a system of values that spurred the curriculum planners in National University commission (N.U.C) to introduce philosophy and logic as a mandatory course for fresh university students throughout the nation.

This book Basic Logic and Philosophy holds the promise of repositioning and developing the rational faculties of our students and exposing them to the underlying principles of existence. To the intent that these principles will help them to cope effectively with their daily challenges both in private and public lives. It is with strong enthusiasm, love of knowledge and intense desire to impact knowledge that our erudite lecturers from the Department of philosophy under the auspices of the General studies unit NnamdiAzikiwe University, Awka, have carefully crafted this work. This book is prosaic, seamless and easy to understand for undergraduates from all walks of life. The use of simple English is intentionally applied to engender readability and comprehension to every student. Equally, any general reader will find this work informative, instructive and thought provoking. Basic philosophy and Logic has two sections, section A is an introduction to Philosophy which embodies seven (7) chapters while Section B is the introduction to Logic which embodies logical appurtenances like: introduction to logic, argument, theory of syllogism and fallacies.

In chapter one, Osita Nnajofofor welcomed the students and armed them with the basic understanding of philosophy by defining different notions of philosophy i.e. the popular/ layman and professional notions of philosophy. He went ahead to clarify who actually should be called a true philosopher. He didn't miss to trace the origin of philosophy.

In chapter two, Ogochukwu Okpokwasili wrote on the branches of Philosophy. She sees Philosophy as a discipline that studies human origin, ideas, nature and all things through its branches. These branches are classified into epistemology, Ethics, Logic and Metaphysics. She reminded us that metaphysics has two branches which are Axiology and Aesthetics.

In chapter three, Chinyere Emedo adumbrated the methods of philosophy. She is of the opinion that methods reflect the various techniques or procedure applied in tackling issues of life and reality confronting human beings within their environment. She opines that method of Philosophy emphasize on the various problems encountered in philosophical activities and how to solve them. She notes that there are five methods used in carrying out academic activities in philosophy which are: Analytic method, Hermeneutic method, Phenomenological method, Dialectic and Dialogic method.

Chapter four shows the dexterity of Basil Okonkwo in handling Philosophical schools of thought. He sees a school of thought as a particular idea or set of ideas or doctrine held by a specific group. He proposed that any idea that a group strongly believes in be it through practicing this idea in their everyday life or fighting for its adoption can be considered a school of thought. He enumerated idealism, Realism,

Rationalism, empiricism, existentialism, pragmatism, Humanism and Utilitarianism as some schools of thoughts in our contemporary epoch.

In chapter five, Kelechi Ezeani discussed the origin and History of Philosophy. He observed that the history of philosophy is as old as man and defines it as the Philosophical evolution or development of Philosophy from time immemorial to this present epoch. He classified this history into four periods, namely: Ancient period, Medieval period, Modern period, and Contemporary periods. These periods were segmented for the convenience of readers.

In Chapter Six, Miriam Alike and Jude Onebunne tackled the topic 'African Philosophy'. They observe that African philosophy is born out of African philosophical tradition. It is said to be born of frustration by Africans as a result of debate whether Africans have the rational capacity to do philosophy. They outlined the epochs in African philosophy to include, Ethno- philosophy, national/ ideological school, Philosophical sagacity, Hermeneutical school, literary school, professional school, and conversational schools.

In Chapter seven, Anthony Mbah discussed Philosophy, Culture and National Development. These concepts are essential to the development and growth of any nation, society or country. Mbah sees Philosophy as a discipline that is *adrem* for better understanding of man and his environment for growth and national development. He sees philosophy as the mother of all sciences which seeks remedies through its different channels of inquiry in discovering, addressing and improving human conditions through human capabilities for efficient and sustainable decent standard of living.

In chapter Eight, KizitoOkoli introduces the student proper into Logic and defines it as the concern on the nature and methods of thinking. He traced the history of logic back to Aristotle where he observed that his thoughts are spread across six works collectively known as the *organon*. He enlightened us on the three laws of thought of Aristotle which are Principle of identity, Principle of non-Contradiction, Principle of excluded middle. He concludes that Logic is both art and science of inferential thinking.

In chapter Nine, ChineduIfeakor takes on Argument. He sees argument as a discourse which logically deduces one proposition from others. Arguments he contends, deals with propositions. We have inductive and deductive argument. According to Ifeakor, a deductive argument is sound if all the premises of the argument are true and argument is also valid otherwise the deductive argument is unsound.

In chapter Ten, ChidimmaEzeador treats the theory of syllogism. She sees syllogism as an argument containing two premises and a conclusion. She also notes that a categorical syllogism consists of three categorical propositions in which two serving as premise and one serving as conclusion. There are four kinds of categorical syllogism: universal affirmation, universal negative, particular affirmation and particular Negative. She concludes that categorical proposition has both a quality and a quantity. The quality is either affirmative or negative depending on if class inclusion is affirmed or negated (denied) by the proposition.

Lastly, in chapter Eleven, Henry Okeke handles the topic, Logical Fallacies. He sees fallacy as a type of argument that seems to be correct but contains a mistake in reasoning. He classified fallacies into formal and informal fallacies. He distinguished fallacies of relevance and fallacies of ambiguity. Fallacies of relevance include argument ad baculum, argumentum ad hominem, argumentum ignoratiam, argumentum ad misericordiam, argumentum ad populum, argumentum ad verecundiam, ignorantiamElenchi, PetitioPrincipii. Fallacies of ambiguity include fallacy of equivocation, fallacy of composition, fallacy of division, fallacy of amphiboly, fallacy of accent.

Worthy of note is that the authors as listed by chapters here, simplified their works to be students friendly and oriented. Hence, the book is Philosophy-made-easy, targeted to widen the horizon of both students and non-students of the discipline.

Dr. OsitaNnajiofor
G.S.T 103 Coordinator

DEDICATION

To all members of Staff and Students of General Studies, NnamdiAzikiwe
University, Awka- Nigeria.

CHAPTER ONE

UNDERSTANDING PHILOSOPHY

Osita Nnajiofor Ph.D.

Introduction

The state of man's helplessness in the face of nature laid the foundation for the emergence of philosophy on earth and with this, man started to fend for himself and find meaning for life. So, the desire to understand what the world was like; what it is going to be like in future are the problems which necessitated the development of philosophy.¹

Philosophy therefore is an art that involves a lot of creativity and critical reasoning in order to navigate in the murky waters of everyday living. These tools of philosophy have made it an indispensable part of educational system because of its ability to sharpen the human reasoning potential. It has also helped to probe into any area of human knowledge and experience in search of questions that may seem perplexing to many people. Philosophy also reminds the students that knowledge is possible and that he or she is even more equipped to grasp it but the only requirement from him or her is the élan to pursue it.²

Philosophy also offers answers (not an answer) and solutions (not a solution) to questions and issues culminating from myriads of logical arguments and counter-arguments from philosophers.³

Notions of Philosophy

It is a general assumption that Philosophy like other disciplines in the social science and humanities has no universally accepted definition. This is as a result of the fact that many philosophers explain them from their own school of thought, ideological, cultural, religious and sociological background. This has generated a lot of confusion especially from non-philosophers who are disturbed why philosophers are fraught with many disagreements, arguments, and counter arguments. The answer to this confusion is not far-fetched because truth of reality requires serious intellectual struggles and contentions for its emergence. It also involves a kind of intellectual engagement which leads an individual to the attitude of knowing how to ask fundamental questions about man and the world around him.

The Populist Notion of Philosophy.

Just as the name sounds, the populist notion of philosophy designates a layman's or commonsensical understanding of philosophy. For many people, at the mention of philosophy, what readily comes to mind is their world outlook of existence and reality. Here, people generally use philosophy to characterize a person's attitude to life. Most often we hear make remarks like "my philosophy of life" the philosophy of this school, "our philosophy" etc.

We can imply that by attitude, we mean the general pattern or habitual way of response of the person to events. Here, we use it to designate someone's expressed or observed world-view. This worldview may be the sum total of the person's assumptions, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices which are partly inherited and partly acquired in the process of living.

Philosophy can also be seen as the reason for one's action; a theory of action, the reason behind the action of someone. The danger of clothing every tom, dick and harry with this robe of philosophy simply because of one's attitude and beliefs merely makes philosophy an all comers affair. It then means that if everyone becomes a philosopher then no one is a philosopher in the real sense.

Professional Notion of Philosophy

Philosophy in a professional sense is when the discipline of philosophy is taught in the universities and other higher institutions of learning. Philosophy here engages scholar's attention in attempting to solve problems that are important to all of us either directly or indirectly by critically examining and evaluating the views and beliefs about man and the universe.

Put differently, we conceive philosophy as an academic discipline when scholars devote their time and energy to engage in a rational investigation of certain fundamental problems about the nature of man and the world he lives in. Hence when we philosophize in this sense, we engage in meaningful, critical and systematic thinking that is free from all forms of biases either racial, economic, religious and political entanglements.

Definition of Philosophy

Etymologically, philosophy is derived from two Greek words: 'philo' (or philein) and 'sophia' which means "love of" and "wisdom" respectively.⁴

This is to say that philosophy etymologically means, "Love of wisdom". This is however the oldest definition of philosophy. A traditional scholastic definition holds that philosophy is the science in which natural reason seeks an understanding of all things by the knowledge of their first principles (scientiarum per ultima causas).⁵

Philosophy can also be seen as the system that makes the process of rational and critical reflection possible. In other words, philosophy is a reflective investigation into the nature of things. As Ezeani puts it, “to philosophize is to think, and to think is to question. To philosophize is to ask questions and question the answer to the question and continue the process until one arrives at the ultimate answer- the truth... through the process of critical questioning and reflection the philosopher attempts to confront his or her existence, assumptions and also contribute to the development of thoughts.”⁶

Another scholastic view holds that philosophy is the critical and organized investigation of the ultimate causes or principles of reality by the unaided power of natural reason. While particular science quests for proximate causes, philosophy investigates the ultimate, fundamental and basic reasons, causes, principles or meanings. For instance, while Geography studies the structure of the earth, philosophy will be interested in investigating the way of the earth, that is, the meaning of the earth, the ultimate cause and purpose of the earth.⁷

Kwasi Wiredu defines Philosophy as the function, indeed a duty of philosophy in any society to examine the intellectual foundation of its life, interrogating and evaluating the foundations of our beliefs and actions.⁸

Having seen how some contemporary philosophers defined philosophy, it becomes imperative and instructive to see how the ancient philosophers defined philosophy. Plato defined philosophy simply as the ‘science of the idea’.⁹ Philosophy for Plato is simply the descent from the knowledge of universal ideas to a contemplation of particular imitations of those ideas.

Aristotle on the other hand defines philosophy in the terms of essence where philosophy is “the science of universal essence of what is actual”¹⁰. Aristotle implies that philosophy is the study of particular phenomena to the knowledge of the essences.

John Dewey on his part sees philosophy as the ‘criticism of criticism’ which operates “to free men’s minds from biases and prejudices, and to enlarge their perception of the world about them.”¹¹

Finally, Wittgenstein defines philosophy as the logical clarification of languages.¹² While Bertrand Russell conceives philosophy as the as a critical and rigorous intellectual activity, a no man’s land between science and religion.¹³

From the above definitions, we can critically observe that the common feature and indices that will guide one in demarcating the definition given by a layman from that of a professional philosopher are features like; criticality, rigorosity, analyticity, logicity, systemicity, coherence, profundity and consistency.

The Philosopher

A philosopher is a scholar who attempts to confront his or her existence, assumptions and also contribute to the development of thoughts through the process of critical questioning and reflection. This existential definition is what guides a philosopher in reflecting his essence and purpose in life.

An ethical dimension of a philosopher was unraveled by Brain Leiter, who sees a philosopher as a moral entrepreneur... it is somebody who creates new ways of evaluating things - what's important, what's worthwhile – that changes how an entire people understand those things.”¹⁴ So, to philosophize was not just to speculate about life and reflect on nature, but also to be engaged with love, intense desire, and strong enthusiasm in the investigation of causes underlying reality in order to build up a system of values by which society may live. The German Egyptologist Hellmut Brunner while translating the “inscription of Antef,” which gives the definition of a “philosopher,” has this to say..

[He is the one] whose heart is informed about these things which would be otherwise ignored, the one who is clear-sighted when he is deep into a problem, the one who is moderate in his actions, who penetrates ancient writings, whose advice is [sought] to unravel complications, who is really wise, who instructed his own heart, who stays awake at night as he looks for the right paths, who surpasses what he accomplished yesterday, who is wiser than a sage, who brought himself to wisdom, who asks for advice and sees to it that he is asked advice. (Inscription of Antef, 12th Dynasty, 1991–1782 bc)¹⁵

The reference to being deep into a problem indicates that philosophical thinking is a critical undertaking. Philosophy is not concerned with what is apparent, obvious, shallow, or insignificant. Thinking deep means dealing with substantial issues. And what a philosopher does in life, he must do within reasonable limits, not at all being subject to radical or extreme views. A philosopher champions moderate views or judgments, as he or she loves truth (maat). A philosopher is one who is rigorous and futuristic in his or her thinking in order to leave a lasting imprint for generation to come. They are not really much troubled by mundane pursuit but are devoted to leaving their name on the sand of time. This is what informed Philosophers like Imhotep, Hor-Djed-Ef, Kagemni, and Ptah-Hotep in the Old Kingdom of Egypt (2686–2181 bc) to build the first philosophical tradition in world history. This is why after many years after their demise; these precious words were spoken about them.

Their wisdom or philosophy did them credit, because a thousand years after they had passed away they were still remembered with reverence:

Books of wisdom (i.e. philosophy) were their pyramids,

And the pen was their child . . .
Is there anyone here like Hor-Djed-Ef?
Is there another like Imhotep?
They are gone and forgotten,
But their names through their writings cause them to be remembered.
(Papyrus Beatty IV, Verso)¹⁶

You too can become a great philosopher through your diligence and writings. May your pen be your power to do exploit and may these books of wisdom be your mighty intellectual fortress and strong tower.

Origin Of Philosophy

Philosophy can be said to have started among all peoples and cultures at unknown times. So we can simply say that there is no place one can say it began and from there spread to other places. For the sake of convenience, we can safely say that western philosophy started with Thales of Miletus at a Greek port city. He lived between 624 and 546 B.C.¹⁷

We said convenience because every culture lived by some logic and rationality from time immemorial. When some authors write that philosophy began in the western world, they are trying to tell a particular history of philosophy. They do so because of written advantage which western written history provides as against the unwritten history of Africa and other third world continents. It is on this conviction that we can safely say that the origin of philosophy is traceable to Africa in Egypt which was the cradle of human civilization in the then world. Egyptologist like George James and Innocent Onyewuenyi in their works *Stolen Legacy* and *The African Origin of Greek Philosophy* respectively are the propagators of this idea.

.

References

1. Okafor Paschal&Igwe P.K. “Philosophy of education, An introduction”.(Umunze, Annyco Publication. 2008), p.2.
2. NdianefoIfechi“Basic logic and philosophy, An introduction”, (Enugu, Agmasum Printers & Publishers), p.xv.
3. Obi Chidiebere, *Meaning, Origin and Function*. In Basic Philosophy and Logic , Umeh F et al (Ed) (Awka, Anchor Book Publisher Africa), p.3
4. Richard Popkin and Avrum“Stroll, Philosophy made Simple” (London; Allen, 1969) p.xiv.
5. Okafor F.C “Philosophy of Education and the third world perspective” (Enugu: Star Publishing Coy).
6. Ezeani, Emefiena. “Philosophy as Intelligent and Pragmatic Questioning”(London, Veritas Lumen Publishers, 2005), p.11 & 7.
7. Obi-Okogbuo; “Philosophy and Logic; A New Approach to Critical Thinking”, (Owerri; Advanced Graphic, 2007)
8. Ndianefo -----
9. Turner, William. “Aristotle” (New York: The Catholic Encyclopedia. Vol. 1. Robert Appleton Company, 1970).
10. Ibid .
11. Ibid
12. Ibid

13. Ibid

14. Obi Chidiebere -----p.9

15. Samuel E. Stumpf, "Philosophy: History and Problems" (New York: McG Raw-Hill inc 1975) p.5

16. TheophileObenga*Egypt: Ancient History of African Philosophy*. In Wiredu K [ed] "A Companion to African Philosophy", (Blackwell Publishing),p.35

17. Ibid

18. Obi Chidiebere-----p.11

CHAPTER TWO

BRANCHES OF PHILOSOPHY

Ogochukwu A.Okpokwasili

Introduction

Philosophy as an academic discipline or human activity, concerns itself with the examination of fundamental principles of reality. The task of philosophy has always been to critically re-think all the ideas, in various areas of the human endeavors which underline the human person or group actions and practices. These ideas are seen in all aspects of human life; be it religious, political, moral, educational, cultural or what have you. These ideas are what inform our beliefs which ultimately form our philosophy. Philosophy studies human origin, ideas, nature and all things through its branches which are classified into four main branches namely: Epistemology, Ethics, Logic and Metaphysics and two Sub branches: Axiology and Aesthetics. Some Philosophers consider Aesthetics as one of the main branches of Philosophy but in this work, we are going to discuss it as a sub-area. For clarity sake, let's take a closer look at these branches of Philosophy.

Main Branches of Philosophy

1. Metaphysics

Metaphysics as a branch of philosophy deals with abstract entities. Things that are incomprehensible to the ordinary man as they deal with things beyond the physical world. Etymologically, the term “metaphysics” was coined by Andronicus of Rhodes (first century B.C.E) when he was editing Aristotle's works on physics¹. He divided the writings into two, namely:

1. The works on physics known as “ta physica” in Greek. This means the works about natural bodies.
2. The works that came after the study of physics called metaphysics or ta meta ta physica which means, the works that came after the works on natural bodies. This means that in Greek words, metaphysics could as well be called metaphysika.

Generally speaking, Metaphysics described as the study of things beyond the physical world. This means that one only gets to have an understanding of metaphysics after one has gotten knowledge of natural bodies. Aristotle called metaphysics the “first philosophy” because it investigates what he considers to be the most basic kind of reality which is ‘substance’.

Substances in Philosophy are those things that exist in their own right example a tree and not in something else. Metaphysics is further divided into two namely, Ontology and Cosmology.

- a. Ontology: This is that branch of metaphysics that studies concepts such as existence, being, becoming and reality in its entirety². Reality in this sense is referred to as Being. Being in philosophy means anything that exists.
- b. Cosmology: Cosmology is the study of the universe. Ancient Greek philosophers like Thales, Anaximander and Anaximenes were called “Cosmologists” because they laid so much emphasis in the study of the universe and the origin of things.

It is to be noted that the person who creates or develops metaphysical theories by studying metaphysics is called a Metaphysician. Metaphysical study is conducted using the method of deduction from an already existing knowledge. Mathematical knowledge which has been considered to be a special kind of metaphysics has this kind of foundation and mathematical knowledge gives a coherent account of the structure of the universe, also capable of explaining our everyday and scientific perception of the universe, and being free from contradictions. When ‘universe or cosmos’ is mentioned, the ‘world’ is meant. There are two main positions about the universe that Metaphysicians study and they are:

- a. Metaphysical realism: Metaphysical realism claims that the objects studied by metaphysics exist independent of any observer so that the subject is the most fundamental of all sciences.
- b. Metaphysical anti-realism: Metaphysical anti-realism claims that the objects studied by metaphysics exist inside the mind of an observer, so the subject becomes a form of introspection and conceptual analysis.

Early Philosophers in their study of cosmos or universe were metaphysicians though they never used the term metaphysics by themselves. For example, Socrates was known for his dialectic or questioning approach to philosophy rather than taking a positive metaphysical doctrine. Plato was famous for his theory of forms. Platonic realism is considered to be a solution to the problem of universals; what particular objects have in common is that they share a specific form which is universal to all others of their respective kind. **Metaphysics** is the branch of Philosophy whose topics in antiquity and the Middle Ages was the first causes of things and the nature of being. Metaphysics deals with the first principles of the natural order and the ultimate generalizations available to the human intellect³. It attempts questions like:

- a. What kinds of things exist and what are their types, particular or general things?
- b. How is existence possible?
- c. How can we explain the change in objects? Example can the baby still retain the identity of himself or herself as he or she grows older or will the identity change?
- d. How can we explain our ideas of things?

- e. What is time?
- f. What is spirit, soul and mind? Are they made up of the same stuff and what is the relationship between them.

2. Epistemology

Epistemology was said to be coined from two ancient Greek words “Episteme” and “Logos”. Episteme means knowledge and logos means reason.⁴ This is the branch of philosophy concerned with the certainty of human knowledge. Theory of knowledge is the branch of Philosophy concerned with knowledge or the validity of human knowledge. Epistemology studies the nature, scope, and limits of human knowledge. Epistemology investigates the origin, structure, methods, and integrity of knowledge. Epistemology shows how human minds relate to reality and how these relationships are either true or false. It is simply concerned with the Justification of human Knowledge. Philosophy through its various Philosophical schools has made contributions to this branch of philosophy, though in an unequal manner. Many Philosophers like Rene Descartes believe that our knowledge comes from reason because of human ability to reason. Other Philosophers, who are called Epistemologists like David Hume, believes that all our knowledge comes from human experience. Man acquires knowledge as he comes in contact with his world. The Pre-Socrates Philosophers did not pay much attention to the notion of knowledge. The Sophists in the fifth century B.C. took seriously the critical question of knowledge. Epistemology is thus, the attempt to justify the claim that knowledge is possible and to assess the part played by the senses and reason in the acquisition of it. It asks fundamental questions like:

- a. What do we know?
- b. What are the foundations of our claims to knowledge?
- c. What are the justifications for our beliefs?
- d. What are the sources of our knowledge?

There are three ways by which Epistemological findings and discussions are structured. They are Belief, Truth and Justification. The notion of **belief** is the feeling one has or the overall attitude one exhibits when one has the strong conviction that something is true or false. This has to do with the strong convictions about things that exist or happen in the universe. Philosophers use the term belief to affirm or negate the happenings in the universe. For one to believe in something, one must have adequate knowledge of that thing, so knowledge should be equated with one's belief. Example, that one has the belief that fishes live inside the water means one already has knowledge of that and as such can speak authoritatively about that. Knowledge precedes belief; all belief does is to help us have a firm stand.

Truth is the statement of things as they are and not as they appear to one's individual experience but as they appear to everyone. Truth is what everyone should have in common; an evidence of

something that is transparent to all. Greek philosophers' ideas about truth are seen by some as consistent with correspondence theory of truth. Epistemology as a branch of philosophy is out in search of certainty and that certainty is 'truth'. In other to verify whether what we hold to be true about a certain knowledge, the question we often ask is: how true is this? The truth is that not all beliefs constitute knowledge because many a times, what constitute our belief might not be solely true. This ultimately means that some of our beliefs are true, while others are false. As we try to acquire knowledge, we are trying to increase our stock of *true* beliefs and this is where truth comes in. The search for truth is the search for certainty and this actually helps to be justified in our belief. Philosophy as an enterprise is saddled with making all complex facts about life easier for us to understand. It explains, examines and interprets scientific investigations with a view to solving the complexities of the universe as a whole and unravels the mystery called universe. This it does through systematic and prolonged investigations and this leads to the justification of our knowledge. Skepticism as opposed to epistemology is the belief that the human mind is incapable of comprehending anything called knowledge. Simply put, it is the view that knowledge of whatever type is impossible. The skeptics maintain that any claim to knowledge is based on a shaky foundation as too many forces might be obscuring the certainty of such knowledge. Skeptics' positions are not based on empty grounds as they proved through so many arguments that knowledge is impossible. The various arguments of the skeptics is simply that there is always room for doubt to the truth of what we claim to know as they might be filled with so many errors. The skeptic continues to argue that since we lack direct access to facts about the external world we lack a solid ground for the **justification** of our knowledge.

Sources of human knowledge

Philosophers are concerned with the sources of human knowledge. As it is common with every Philosophical debate, to rise for and against opinions. Philosophers divided themselves into two groups so as to ascertain the basic sources of human knowledge. Eboh was able to highlight more on the sources of knowledge when he divided them into two; 'Rationalists' and the 'Empiricists'⁵. Rationalists believe that the only true knowledge is knowledge gotten from reason. This reason possesses innate ideas of all reality. The proponent of this school of thought is the French philosopher, Rene Descartes. The Empiricists also believe that the only way to knowledge is through sense experience. John Locke was the chief proponents of this school of thought.

3. Ethics

The word ethics was derived from the Greek word "ethos" which means "custom" or "character". Ethics as a branch in philosophy deals with the morality of all human action. When we begin to ask questions on what we should do and how to do it, we are asking ethical questions. The word morality means almost the same thing with Ethics. Etymologically, the word morality was

derived from a Latin word “Mos” which has the same exact meaning with the Greek word “ethos”⁶. It also has its singular meaning to be “custom” and its plural meaning to be “character”. Ethics simply is a study of how we should live our lives. This live we are expected to live must be in accordance with “human nature”. Ethics asks such questions like:

- a. What should I do?
- b. Should I tell the truth?
- c. What is the relationship between ethics and human nature?
- d. What are the criteria for determining which actions are good and which one is bad?
- e. Should we live as moral agents?

Nevertheless, Philosophers have different opinions of what ethics is. Aristotle understands it as the study of how to live well. Aristotle’s thoughts on ethics can be found in his “Nicomachean Ethics”. St Augustine equates his own notion of Ethics with our Lord Jesus Christs ultimate command in Mathew 23:7 which says that it is our love for God that will show us how to live a moral life. Immanuel Kant holds that the highest good is “goodwill” and that ethics is “the study of this goodwill”. Ethics as a moral philosophy has close connection with theology. No wonder St. Thomas Aquinas sees the goal of any man desiring to live a moral life to be united with God forever in heaven.⁷ Ethics is therefore concerned with one’s personal responsibilities towards one’s behavior. Philosophers who are experts in ethics are called ‘Moral philosophers’.

4. Logic

Logic as a branch of philosophy deals with recognizing principles that will help to distinguish between correct reasoning and incorrect reasoning. Reasoning on its own part is any argument in which assumptions or premises are laid down. In our everyday conversations, we usually hear “what is the logic behind this or that statement? This helps us to view good or bad thoughts or discussions as logically correct or incorrect. Logic is said to be the science of the formal principles of reasoning or correct inference. Historically, logic was said to have originated from the ancient philosophy of Aristotle which was later developed by the stoics and medieval scholastic philosophers. In the late nineteenth century, the theory witnessed an explosive growth which has not dwindled till date. Aristotle sees logic as the “tool or instrument” of philosophy. Aristotelian logical treatise is known as “Organon”.⁸ Logical statements often time starts with a reliable ‘premise’ which is followed by a ‘conclusion’ drawn from the premise. Logic asks the following questions:

- a. What is reasoning?
- b. How can we distinguish between correct and incorrect reasoning?
- c. What is the relationship between Logic and philosophy?
- d. How do we reason?

Sub-branches of Philosophy

1. Axiology

Axiology is the study of value in things. It investigates the nature of value, the criteria for its application and its metaphysical status. Humans are known to see value in things therefore, Axiology comes in for instance on the discourse of man, to investigate the metaphysical stand and value on the subject, man. The term "value theory" is used instead of "axiology" in recent contemporary discussions and also seen in the study of Economics. . Axiology asks the following questions:

- a. What is the Nature of value? Is value a fulfillment of the desires of the subject, is it pleasure, one's preference, a behavioral disposition, or a human interest?
- b. What are the Criteria for our value in things, if there are standards for value, how is it applied?
- c. What is the ontological status of value and how are they related to facts?
- d. What is the worth of human value?

2. Aesthetics

Aesthetics is the study of value in arts or the inquiry into feelings, judgments, or standards of beauty and related concepts like music etc. Philosophy of art is concerned with philosophical judgments of our sense of taste, beauty and emotion. We tend to define our concept of beauty from our own perspectives. The study of aesthetics in philosophy helps us to define different aspects of beauty from philosophical perspectives. It also examines our individual taste and attempts to provide answers about these things in a philosophical manner. Aesthetic Philosophy studies beauty and art. Aesthetics asks the following philosophical questions:

- a. Is art an intellectual or representational activity?
- b. How do we find something beautiful?
- c. Does art represent sensible objects or ideal objects?
- d. Is artistic value objective?
- e. Is it merely coincidental that many forms in architecture and painting seem to illustrate mathematical principles?
- f. Are there standards for taste?
- g. Is there a clear distinction between art and reality?

The branches of philosophy as we have looked into above are the various ways through which philosophy is studied, easily assimilated and appreciated.

References

1. Chisholm Roderick, "The Foundations of Knowing", (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota press, 1982), p.45.
2. Stanley Rosen "Philosophy" 101- selections from the works of the western world greatest thinkers"(New York : Graymercy Press, 2000), P.577
3. Samuel Enoch Stumpf and Donald Abel "Elements of Philosophy, an introduction" (Mc Graw Hill , New York 2000), p.21-30, P346-388
4. Descartes, René, "Descartes: Selected Philosophical Writings, translated by J. Cottingham, R. Stoothoff, and D. Murdoch, with an Introduction by John Cottingham, Cambridge", (Cambridge University Press 1988), P67
5. Ben OkwuEboh "Basic issues in theory of knowledge", (Nsukka Nigeria: Fullado publishing company,y 1995),P 7-9
6. Immanuel Kant "Critique of pure reason", (New York: St Martin's press,1968), P90
7. Philip Kitcher. "Apriori knowledge. The philosophical review", v. 86 (1980), P 3-2
8. Hillary Kornblith, "Inductive inference and its natural ground", (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press 1993) P7

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS OF PHILOSOPHY

Chinyere C. Emedo Ph.D.

Introduction

Human activities across the globe, has systematic ways of carrying them out. This, however, is what is meant by the term method. Method derived its root meaning from methodus - Latin, methode - French, and methodos - Greek. Method (singular), methods (plural), signifies a system, ways, or manners of doing things, or saying something. Method reflects the various techniques or procedures applied in tackling issues of life and reality confronting human beings within their environments. Method, for example, is used in different activities such as in establishing a family, breeding and training children. It is used in academic activities, such as teaching, learning, and research in different disciplines of study. There are thus, the scientific methods as are used both in the natural and social sciences activities, mathematical methods are used in tackling issues in arithmetic and computer programming etc. There are also different methods of carrying out philosophical activities. This, however, is the main area of concern of this chapter. Methods of philosophy basically emphasize on the various problems encountered in philosophical activities and how to solve them. These include teaching, learning and research as are distinct from other fields of study. There are five methods used in carrying out academic activities such as research in philosophy namely: Analytic method, Hermeneutical method, Phenomenological method, and Dialectic and Dialogic methods. To make the study more understandable, the methods shall be discussed separately

Analytic Method (Analysis)

Analysis (plural; analyses) has its root from the Greek words "ana meaning - breaking up" or "an untying", throughout, "a lysis - "loosening". Analysis is a philosophical method which assesses complex system of thought by breaking them into minute component parts where relationship are thereby brought into focus. Analysis is a general method that reflects the critical feature of philosophy as not only applied in philosophy, but in other academic fields. Hence, researchers, in carrying out research can use combined methods such as conceptual analysis, hermeneutic analysis, phenomenological analysis etc. Analytic method, though, was not specifically mentioned by the philosophers of antiquity, but it was used by them in their different

writings and discourses, for example; the Pythagoreans applied it in carrying out mathematical activity. Aristotle applied in his works on logic, Isaac Newton and Rene Descartes applied it differently in their philosophies such as physics and meditation etc. Analysis as a method of philosophy is a recent development. It began with Gotlob Frege in 19th century, and latter progressed to the 20th century Cambridge philosophers namely: George Edward Moore, Bertrand Russell and Ludwig Wittgenstein. Analysis as a problem solving method was used by the logical positivists or logical empiricists in Vienna Circle in 30th century. The method, however, is according to Ayer, "aims towards elucidating and clarifying the ambiguities contained in our daily language usages."¹

Hermeneutic Method

Hermeneutics is derived from the Greek word Hermeneuin - meaning "to utter", "to explain", "to interpret" "to translate". Hermeneutics is historically traced to the Greek god "Hermes", who served as a messenger interpreting between the gods and the mortals. Hermeneutics is the method of philosophy that enhances understanding through interpretation. It references to theory and practice of interpretation, where interpretation involves understanding that can be justified. It describes a body of historically diverse methodologies for interpreting texts, objects, concepts and theory of understanding. Hermeneutic method, doesn't play role only in philosophy, but in disciplines whose subject matter demands interpretative approaches, characteristically because, the disciplinary subject matter concerns the meaning of human intentions, beliefs, and actions or the meaning of human experience as preserved in the arts and literature, historical testimony and other artifacts. Hermeneutic method of philosophy is traditionally, used in theology, jurisprudence, human sciences like medicine. It is applied also in social sciences and humanities. Hermeneutics, Seebohm says is, "sometime, described as the auxiliary study of arts, methods and foundations of research that appropriate to some respective disciplinary subject matters."² There are, according to Zimmerman (1994) nine (9) facts one must know about Hermeneutics. They are as follows:

- (1) Hermeneutics is all about interpretation in fields of study, such as interpreting plays or novels, it is used in day to day life actions of our friends or figure out what a job termination, for example, means in the context of our life story.
- (2) Hermeneutics is the art of understanding and of making oneself understood. It goes beyond mere logical analysis and general interpretative principles.
- (3) The concept of hermeneutics has its root from the Greek language Hermeneuin - meaning "utter", "to explain", "to translate", and was first used by thinkers who discussed how divine messages or mental ideas are expressed in human language.

(4) Hermeneutics method of philosophy as a discipline is interested in analyzing, for example, how people's cultural traditions, languages and nature as historical beings make possible.

(5) Hermeneutic thinkers argued that; understanding is the interpretative act of integrating particular things such as words, signs and events into a meaningful whole; we really understand an object, word or fact when it makes sense within our own life context and thus speaks to us meaningfully.

(6) Hermeneutics as a detailed and systematic examination of human understanding began with Hans Georg Gadamar (German Philosopher). According to Gadamaru, perception of reality is not primarily theoretical but practical. We do not asses objects neutrally from a distance; rather, they show themselves to us as we move around in an already existing totality of meaningful relations.

(7) Modern hermeneutics ask questions on how digital revolutions changed the conditions for understanding texts. For example, text encodings are already an interpretation and diverse parameters representing texts through a particular preselected focus.

(8) Plato (327 - 374 BCE) used hermeneutics in dealing with poets as the "hermeneutics of divine", and his student Aristotle (384 - 322BCE) wrote the first extant treatise on hermeneutics, in which he showed how spoken and written words were expressions of inner thoughts.

(9) Hermeneutic thinkers claimed that our consciousness has been shaped in such a way that we imagine ourselves as "islands" of awareness floating in the grand ocean of life. The Canadian thinker Charles Taylor labeled this spacious self-contained consciousness as a disengaged self.³

Phenomenological Method

Phenomenology is one of the methods of philosophy used in solving numerous problems of life and reality. The concept derives its root from the Greek words *phainemonon* - meaning "thing appearing to view" based on *phainein* - "to show", and *logos* (-logy) -meaning "the study of". Phenomenological method of philosophy focuses on the results emanating from the relational contacts between the subject (observer) and the object (environment). This involves the process whereby intuition stresses itself on appearance to become conscious of the essence of reality. Phenomenology according to Edmund Husserl is, "the reflective study of the essence of consciousness as experienced from the first person's point of view. This takes the intuitive experience of whatever presents itself in phenomenological reflexion (phenomenon) as its starting point and tries to extract from it, the essential features of the experiences and the essence

of that which is experienced."⁴ Phenomenological method of philosophy though, has been practicing in many guises, but has gained ground in the early 20th century in the works of Edmund Husserl (the father of phenomenology). Husserl's phenomenology though, has been criticized, yet, it has influenced other philosophers, hence the establishment of versions of phenomenology such as, existentialist phenomenology, which members include: Maurice Merleau - Ponty, Jean Paul Sartre etc: hermeneutic phenomenology has its members as: Martin Heidegger, Hans Georg Gadamer, Paul Ricoeur etc. Other versions of phenomenology include: sociological version and theological version. Phenomenology is the process by which human mind struggles to reach out to the stuff of the things of the world by studying them as they are. To achieve this, two steps must be followed: the first step is what Husserl called "phenomenological epoche". This means bracketing, or setting aside all the presuppositions, prejudices, or biases which the mind entertained about the consciousness of things of the universe to study them as they appear to it, after which Husserl says, one should proceed to the second step, which he called "eidetic reductionism". Here, according to Husserl, the noema, which is the ideal or mental contents of object experienced, is reduced to noesis which is the real (essence, physical nature) contents of the object

Dialectic Method

This philosophical method is regarded as the "back and forth" movement between two opposing propositions. It is basically used in discovering a new knowledge through the process of identification and reconciliation of the contradictions ingrained in the existing knowledge. Dialectic method works using the instruments of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. Thesis for example, is taking to be the existing knowledge or proposition, antithesis is the contradicting proposition, and synthesis is the outcome or result from the reconciliation of the two opposing propositions. The outcome (synthesis), in turn forms another thesis, the process continues ad infinitum. What this method is saying in summary is that acquisition of knowledge is a continuous process, that nothing can be said to have been fully discovered, acquired, or known as far as human existence is concerned. Elaborating on the origin and application of dialectic method of philosophy, the New World Encyclopedia states:

The concept of "dialectic" owes much of its initial prestige to its role in philosophy of Plato, where it figures as the logical method of philosophy in the Socratic dialectical method of cross - examination. This was given new life by 'Hegel', whose dialectically dynamic model of nature and history made it a basic aspect of the nature of reality. In the mid - nineteenth century, the concept of "dialectic" was appropriated by Marx and retooled in a non - idealist manner, becoming a crucial notion in their philosophy of dialectical materialism. Thus, this concept, for a time to be, plays a prominent role on the world stage and in the world history. Today, dialectics can also refer to how understanding of how one can, or should perceive the world (epistemology) an assertion of the interconnected, contradictory nature of the world outside

their perception of it (ontology), or a method of presentation of ideas or conclusion.⁵

The first philosopher in history of philosophy to adopt the tools of thesis, antithesis and synthesis, was the German philosopher F, W, G Hegel. The synthesis which according to him is the product of reconciliation of two opposites, invariably, becomes a thesis, and attracts contradiction. The process continues repeating itself until final perfection is reached.

Dialogic Methodist

The concept dialogic comes from the words; dialogikos - Greek, and dialogos - Latin. This is literally translated as conversation, or discourse. Dialogic method characteristically involves communication or interaction between two or more people to sort out issues. The method focuses on the use of conversation or shared dialogue to explore the meaning of something. Dialogic is the antonym of monologic which refers to the system whereby one entity gives a piece of information to others without explaining and clarifying the meaning through deliberation, or discussion. Dialogic, as a conversational method portrays the nature of man as an interactive being. In this scenario, the speaker speaks, and the listener interprets meaning to the words uttered. The process is normally based on the previous information presented. Dialogic method is use in literary theory and analysis as well as in philosophy. It is also applied to bring change in form of peace and resolution when there is conflict, such as in families, and communities, in work places, between friends etc. Dialogic method is as old as human reasoning. Though, it has been applied in diverse ways by philosophers of the past including our forebears, but it is recently developed and introduced in the contemporary philosophy by Prof Haris Ike Odimegwu. Dialogics, Odimegwu says," is derived from dialogue which means conversation or discourse between two or more persons with the intention, desire, and hope of ultimately arriving at a common position or mutual understanding."⁶

References

1. Ayer, J. A., Language Truth and Logic. London, England: Penguin Classics Ltd, 1936, ISBN 97801418604.
2. Seebohm, T. M., Hermeneutics: Methods and Methodology, Springer, 2007, p.55.
3. Zimmerman, Jens, Hermeneutics: A Very Short Introduction, Oxford: University Press, 2013, P.2.
- 4.https://www.newencyclopedia.org/entry/dialectic#history_of_the_dialecticAccessed 4/10/20
5. Husserl, E., in Stumpf, S. F., McGraw Hill, New York,1989, Pp. 490.497.
6. Odimegwu, H. K., Integrative Personhood, Zurich: LIT Verlag GmbH & Co, KGWien,(2008), p.106.

CHAPTER FOUR

PHILOSOPHICAL SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

Basil A. Okonkwo Ph.D.

Introduction

Philosophy has a number of well-defined schools of thought. A school of thought is a particular idea or set of ideas or doctrines held by a specific group. Any idea that a group strongly believes in, be it through practicing this idea in their everyday life or through fighting for its adoption, can be considered a school of thought. It can also be seen as the perspective of a group of people who share common characteristics of opinion or outlook of a philosophy, discipline, belief, social movement, economics, cultural movement, or art movement. It is important to be aware that a philosopher may belong to several schools. For example, Sartre is a phenomenologist, a Marxist, and an existentialist. In this work, eight important schools of philosophies Idealism, Realism, Rationalism, Empiricism, Existentialism, Pragmatism, Humanism and Utilitarianism will be reviewed. This work aims at giving the meaning, nature and basic tenets of the above schools of thought, as well as some prominent philosophers of the different schools.

Idealism

Idealism is a merger of two root words 'ideal' and the suffix 'ism'. The word idea is from the Greek word "tidos" which means being independent of the senses and an essence, but it is also existence and reality.ⁱ In English, idea is a little different from what it means in Greek. In English it means concept, principle that directs the actions of people. Idealism is therefore the philosophical position which claims that ideas are the primary source of knowledge. That is, objects cannot be said to exist independently of the mind.ⁱⁱ It distrusts the veracity of the senses and so breaks the contact they provide with external reality, elaborating itself systematically upon combinations of ideas.

In the history of western philosophy, the first trace of what can be called Idealism is seen remotely in the philosophy of Anaxagoras of Clazamone who attributed to the mind (nous) the function of controlling the seeds of matter. Dario Composta writes "for the reason (Anaxagoras) provided a mind (nous) which not only imprints a rational movement on the seeds, but dominates them throughout the development as well."ⁱⁱⁱ His attempt was a remarkable shift from the materialistic view of the cosmos towards an overarching intelligent mind as the principle of the cosmos.

Idealism attained its height in the works of the founder of the Academy, Plato who gave a dualistic description of things- a sensory world and the world of ideas. The world of ideas is the principle of whatever exists in the sensory world. The works of Aristotle are not bereft of idealism. The active intellect impresses upon the possible intellect the universal ideas of anything in the spatio-temporal realm. The works of Plato had lasting influence in the idealism-system as it was furthered through the works of John Locke, David Hume, George Berkeley, Immanuel Kant (Although quite different from Plato's) and ultimately in the absolute idealism of George Hegel. In the contemporary era of philosophy, idealism has become not only a philosophical theme but has pervaded socio-political and cultural spheres.

There are two basic forms of idealism: Moderate Idealism and Absolute idealism.

Moderate Idealism is the view that although ideas are the most basic things but physical objects also exists.^{iv} In moderate Idealism, idea exists alongside the physical objects in the external world from which impressions about the world is made and ideas are subjectively and subsequently formed.

Absolute idealism on the other hand is championed by G.W.F Hegel. He sees every existent reality as a great manifestation of the absolute idea. That is, every particular ideas are only real as part of the whole^v. From the above descriptions of absolute idealism, it can be deduced that absolute idealism is a universal set which contains simpler sets that coherently and logical follow. Another meaning of absolute idealism is that the physical realities of the world are ideas and nothing more.

Realism

Realism is the doctrine that is associated with the study of the world we live in. It is the Philosophical or Epistemological theory that what we perceive or know are the objects as they are presented to us in experience.^{vi} The contention of Realism is that objects of our sensual perceptions are real in themselves, whether the mind perceives it or know it or not. The basic tenet of realism is that reality and knowledge of things can be acquired independent of the mind that perceives them. In other words reality is extramental and not intramental, that is, it exists outside the mind and not within the mind as ideas. In this sense, there is a demarcation between the knower and things known. It is in opposition to Berkeleynan theory of *esse est percipi* (to be is to be perceived) which virtually equates existence with perception such that an object cannot be said to exist if there is no body or some 'mind' to perceive it. For realism, objects exist on their own even when there is no one to know. By implication, it is not only what is known that exists; there is a huge possibility of unknown existing objects.

Realism as a philosophy is traceable to Aristotle, the famous student of Plato, (384-322 BC). He is acclaimed to be the father of realism just as Plato is believed to be the proponent of idealistic tradition in Western Philosophy. The ideas proposed by Aristotle can be classified as classical realism. Classical realism suggests that matter is real and that it is separate from our perceptions.

You may not see it, hear it, or feel it, but it nevertheless exists. But the fundamental question to ask is: is there a true reality, which exists outside of human perception or is reality only what we perceive? For Realism, there is a true reality, and things exist whether humans perceive them or not. Furthermore, realism is antithetical to Idealism. It upholds that the view that matter is real and not shadows or “copies” of the real which exist in the spiritual/immaterial world. There are different strands of realism; we have naive realism, transcendental or ultra-realism and scientific realism.

Naive realism is the most common belief about perception, probably universal in childhood. It holds that we perceive things exactly the way they are. That is, nothing exists beneath what we perceive. So, appearance for the naive realists is equal to reality. In this sense, G. E. Moore (1925) conceives perception as simply a common sense analysis of knowledge acquisition^{vii}. He claims that what we mean when we see physical things is simply of sense data. His use of the phrase "actually see" and the notion of "direct apprehension" suggest that 'sense data' are things over which there is no possibility of doubt.

Transcendental or ultra-realism is otherwise referred to as Plato's beard or forms. It is Plato's approach to understanding reality. Ozumba sees it as a theory which holds that the physical things are not real.^{viii} The physical things in Plato's view are copies of the original or real things in the world of forms. These forms are perfect, permanent, transcendental, immutable and pure. The mind only get to know them through a rigorous intellectual, process, for their knowledge will give meaning to the physical objects in the physical world. Scientific realism is a theory that upholds the efficacy of scientific gadgets such as microscopes and telescopes in understanding the real nature of things which goes beyond the grasp of the naked eyes. It is the view that reality is beyond what we see or that there are certain perceptual realities that are only knowable to the scientific enterprise. Hence, there is a basic difference between a casual observer and a scientist.

Rationalism

The term rationalism is from the Latin word “ratio” which means “reason”. Rationalism is a school of thought in Epistemology that holds reason above all to be the primary and only reliable source of knowledge. Lamprecht defines rationalism as the principle that human reason is the final authority in all matters of opinion and conduct.^{ix} It is a school of thought that holds that knowledge is derived through logico-mathematical reasoning.^x Knowledge that is derived through reason is called a priori knowledge that is knowledge gotten independent of experience of any form. Over the years, many Philosophers have spoken in favour of rationalism. There were elements of rationalism in the teachings of Socrates and Plato in the ancient period but rationalism became a full fledge epistemological theory with the teachings of the continental rationalists. Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz^{xi} Though their approaches differ, they still have some meeting points in their analysis and arguments. The central principles in their philosophy are as follow:

The emphasis on the doctrine of innate ideas: the doctrine of innate ideas stipulates that man possesses certain natural intellectual equipment that exists prior to experience. These principles and concepts are born in us; present in our minds at birth, as part of our natural human endowment.

The rationalists are united in the belief that genuine knowledge comes through the mental processes of intuition and deduction. Intuition refers to a direct and immediate knowledge of something while deduction is the derivation of further truths or knowledge from the intuited ones through inference. The rationalists affirm the existence of self-evident truths. This refers to axiomatic propositions that are clear, distinct and self-affirming. Rationalism as an epistemological theory has contributed to the growth of knowledge, in modern philosophy and in other disciplines through the recognition of reason as the primary and sufficient source of knowledge. As earlier mentioned, the argument calls to doubt, the reliability of perceptual evidence on the ground that such reliance is prone to mistakes or errors. But does it mean that we can in no case rely on our perceptual information, even after a thorough check? Hence the assumptions of the rationalists seem to be extreme. Reason indeed is a source of knowledge but not all knowledge can be derived through reason alone.

Empiricism

Etymologically, the word empiricism is a derivative of "empirical" which means physical or sensual. It is a view that all knowledge with the exception of logic and mathematics are derived from experience. Miller sees it as "the theory that all knowledge of actual existing things is delivered through the five senses"^{xii}. This for him implies that the five senses (sight, sound, touch, taste and smell) are the foundation of all our knowledge. This is in opposition to the rationalists' notion of innate ideas as the source of our knowledge. The main proponents of this view include; John Locke, George Berkeley, David Hume etc.

Central principles of Empiricism

1. Rejection of innate ideas. The empiricists are united in rejection of the rationalists' postulation of innate ideas. They claim that there are no such things as ideas before experience. All our ideas of the past, present and future are all products of sense experience. There is nothing in the mind that was not initially in the senses.
2. The metaphor of tabula rasa or blank tablet. The empiricists as a follow up of their rejection of innate ideas described the mind as an empty slate devoid of any mark prior to experience. According to them, there was nothing inscribed on the mind from birth. That is, the mind is at birth a blank tablet, devoid of any inscription. This implies that anything written in the mind is written by the five senses.

3. The primacy of sense experience. Sense experience is, according to the empiricists, the basic of human knowledge. Whatever is not given to us in experience is not knowledge. All knowledge is a posteriori in nature, meaning derived and circumscribed by sense perception.

Existentialism

Existentialism is a philosophical movement that first emerged during the mid-20th century, in the wake of World War II. The existentialists argued that our purpose and meaning in life came not from external forces such as God, government or teachers, but instead is entirely determined by ourselves. They argued that while life was absurd, irrational and uncontrollable, it was up to us to find our own individual path towards a higher purpose.

The very term existentialism is controversial. In its most specific use, it refers to the philosophy of the twentieth century French philosopher, Jean-Paul Sartre who used it to self-designate his own thought. However, Sartre himself thought his thinking developed the philosophy of Martin Heidegger in *Being and Time*. Heidegger, a twentieth century German philosopher, in turn thought his work was a further development of Edmund Husserl's phenomenology. However, Heidegger did not consider himself an existentialist philosopher. Existentialism is another historical category of philosophy, such as empiricism, rationalism, realism, or idealism. As such, it is defined by some common threads, though considerable variations may exist from one philosopher to the next. As the term itself indicates, existentialists are primarily concerned with existence – not existence at large but with human existence. One of its fundamental ideas is that the “old” categories used in philosophy to give human existence meaning are no longer useful. Modern science is of no use either, as human existence cannot be reduced to facts. Husserl's observation that “only facts can follow from facts” exemplifies this belief. Hence, the categories of “human essence,” “individuality,” “body-mind,” or any other category drawn from traditional philosophy cannot help understand what it means to be myself. The common themes/concepts of existentialism are authenticity, alienation, the absurd, nothingness, boredom, and angst/fear). Other key Existentialist philosophers includes; Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900), Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980), Simone de Beauvoir (1908-1986), Albert Camus (1913-1960)

Pragmatism

Pragmatism is a philosophical movement that includes those who claim that an ideology or proposition is true if it works satisfactorily. In the popular usage, "pragmatic" is associated with "practical" and this is seen as contrasting with the "theoretical". The pragmatic ideas arose out of dissatisfaction with all the other options in philosophy available in their day: rationalism, empiricism, Kantianism and Hegelianism. Pragmatists approached the world with a sense of openness and in the spirit of Experimentalism. Pragmatism originated in the mid-19th century: from Greek *pragma*, *pragmat*- ‘deed’.. Its origins are often attributed to the philosophers Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey. In 1878, Peirce described it in his pragmatic

maxim: "Consider the practical effects of the objects of your conception. Then, your conception of those effects is the whole of your conception of the object". We have five (5) **Principles of Pragmatism** namely:

Pluralism: Philosophically, the pragmatists are pluralists. According to them there are as many worlds as human beings. The ultimate reality is not one but many. Everyone searches truth and aim of life according to his experiences.

Utilitarianism: Pragmatists are utility is the test of all truth and reality. A useful principle is true. Utility means fulfilment of human purposes. The results decide the good and evil of anything, idea, beliefs and acts. Utility means satisfaction of human needs.

Changing Aim And Values: The aim and values of life change in different times and climes. The old aims and values, therefore, cannot be accepted as they are. Human life and the world is a laboratory in which the aims and values are developed.

Individualism: Pragmatists are individualists. They put maximum premium upon freedom in human life. Liberty goes with equality and fraternity. Everyone should adjust to his environment.

Experimentalism: Pragmatists are experimentalists. They give more importance to action than ideas. Activity is the means to attain the end of knowledge. Therefore, one should learn by doing constant experimentation which is required in every field of life.

Pragmatism is an approach that evaluates theories or beliefs in terms of the success of their practical application. It has significantly influenced non-philosophers, notably in the fields of law, education, politics, sociology, psychology, and literary criticism, but this work deals with it only as a movement within philosophy

Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism promotes that an action is right if it leads to happiness. The Maxim of utilitarianism holds that an action is good if it results in the happiness of the greatest number of people in the society or a group. The utilitarian ideas can be traced back to at least to the ancient Greeks. The "hedonist" philosophy of Epicurus, for example held that pleasure is the source of happiness and pain on the other hand is the source of pain. Utilitarianism is an ethical theory based on the principle of utility, the principle of the greatest good, or the principle of the greatest happiness. According to utilitarianism, utility is the moral standard; it is the criterion or yardstick with which good actions are distinguished from bad actions. By utility, the utilitarians mean pleasure or happiness (which for them means the same thing). This means that those actions which produce or tend to produce pleasure are good while those that produce or tend to produce pain are bad. Pleasure or happiness, is the only one thing that has intrinsic value. For something to have an intrinsic value implies that it is simply good in itself.

Jeremy Bentham(1746-1832), the father of Utilitarianism in his book "Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation" claims that man is by nature a pleasure-seeking and a pain-avoiding animal, that pleasure and pain are the two guides of all human actions^{xiii}. According to him also, nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think. John Stuart Mill(1806-1873) after reflecting on Jeremy's idea published his own work titled "Utilitarianism", in 1863 where he is of the view that the creed which accepts as the foundation of morals utility or the greatest happiness principle holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness^{xiv}. By happiness is intended pleasure, and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain, and the privation of pleasure.

Humanism

Man, even with his rational faculty cannot fully understand all that is to life. Through the history of man's existence up until now, man has been in a search for the meaning of life and how to live well with fellow men and nature. This search for the meaning of life and harmonious living has brought about so many varied ideas about existence. One of these varied ideas about life and existence is the concept of "humanism". Throughout recorded history there have been non-religious people who have believed that this life is the only life we have, that the universe is a natural phenomenon with no supernatural side, and that we can live ethical, meaningful, and fulfilling lives on the basis of reason and humanity. They have trusted to the scientific method when trying to understand how the universe works, made their ethical decisions based on a concern for the welfare of human beings and other sentient animals, and sought to make a positive contribution towards building a better society. Today, people who share these beliefs and values are called humanists and this combination of attitudes is called humanism.

Humanism is a philosophy of life that considers the welfare of humankind rather than the welfare of a supposed God or gods to be of paramount importance. Humanism maintains there is no evidence a supernatural power ever needed or wanted anything from people, ever communicated to them, or ever interfered with the laws of nature to assist or harm anyone. Humanism's focus, then, is on using human efforts to meet human needs and wants in this world. History shows that those efforts are most effective when they involve both compassion and the scientific method – which includes reliance on reason, evidence, and free inquiry.

Conclusion

From the foregoing, we have established that a philosophical school of thought is the perspective of a group of people or philosophers who share common characteristics of opinion or outlook of a philosophy. The history of Western philosophy reveals in detail the concentrated activity of a multitude of serious and able thinkers reflecting upon, reasoning about, and considering deeply the nature of their experience, and in the process, different schools of thought emerged. The schools of thought as explained in this work developed from previous ones as a modification or

as a refuter of previous thoughts, for example Empiricism against rationalism. it is important to point out at this juncture that a philosopher may belong to several schools. For example, Sartre is a phenomenologist, a Marxist, and an existentialist. Furthermore, we can deduce from this work that the different schools of thought reviewed have their strengths and flaws, and they still retain validity till date.

References

- ¹Dario Composta, "History of Ancient Philosophy," (1990): p.178.
- ¹Kyrian A Ojong and Adekunle A Ibrahim, "Fundamental Problems of Epistemology," *Calabar: Jochrisam Publishers* (2011): p.24.
- ¹Composta, "History of Ancient Philosophy," p.78.
- ¹Ojong and Ibrahim, "Fundamental Problems of Epistemology," p.24.
- ¹Ojong and Ibrahim, "Fundamental Problems of Epistemology," p.24.
- ¹Godfrey O Ozumba, *A concise introduction to epistemology* (Jochrisam Publishers, 2001), p.91.
- ¹George Edward Moore, "A defence of common sense," (1925).
- ¹Ozumba, *A concise introduction to epistemology*, p.91.
- ¹Sterling Power Lamprecht, "Our Philosophical Traditions a Brief History of Philosophy in Western Civilization," (1955): p.231.
- ¹Ozumba, *A concise introduction to epistemology*, p.50.
- ¹Ojong and Ibrahim, "Fundamental Problems of Epistemology," p.134.
- ¹Ed L Miller, "Questions That Matter: An Invitation to Philosophy. 2d shorter ed," (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 1998).
- ¹Bentham Jeremy, "An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation," *London: T* (1789).
- ¹John Stuart Mill, "Utilitarianism; On Liberty; Representative Government; Edited by HB Acton," *London: JM Dent & Sons* (1972).

CHAPTER FIVE

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Kelechi O. Ezeani Ph.D.

Thales

Thales of Miletus (C624 – 546BC) was an early pre Socratic philosopher, a mathematician and also an astronomer. History has it that around may 28,585 BC, that a mystery appeared in the sky, there was an intense darkness covering the whole sky. This was the period of intense battle between the Lydian and the Medians in the west sea shore of Asian Minor. The warriors on both side of the battle were puzzled and started asking questions. The question on everyone's lips was 'was this a sign from the gods'. The soldiers unable to answer the question took to their heels. Prudence and not might won the battle that day. In the same region, at exactly the same time all these things was happening, a middle aged man was watching the whole scenario with keen interest. He was a merchant and an Engineer and will later be given the name 'a wise man'. The name of this great and intelligent man was 'Thales'. He was considered the father of western philosophy. What really occurred that particular day was an 'eclipse of the sun' and Thales was said to have predicted it before it happened so all the credit of the discovery was attributed to him.

Before the advent of Greek Philosophy, the poets took centre stage in Greek culture. They told tales of the god, tales of the past, tales of how traditions and cultures come into play. They even tried answering questions about the mysteries of existence surrounding us. They told stories about the gods who dictates all the affairs in the universe. The gods were so many that there is a different god for everything.

One of Greeks important poet was called Homer. He was vast in the knowledge of Greek culture and traditions that nine dares to question him. His poems gave various conceptions of the universe.

Homer and his fellow poets gave four notions on how things are ordered in the universe..

1. Some events in the world are caused by human or divine agents.
2. Things happen randomly a times and without purpose.
3. Fates of both mortals and the gods are as a result of an unyielding moral order that all is subject to including the god Zeus.
4. The gods respond to that moral order and judge morals accordingly.

Returning to the object of our discussion Thales, his prediction of the eclipse ushered in a new world order discarding that of the gods taking centre stage in everything that we do. Thales watching carefully events and how they unfold in the universe was able to deduce that it was as a result of a consistence, impersonal natural order. He introduced science into the real of the study of things.

Thales and his two philosophers are called the Milesian Philosophers.

Anaximander

He was a Pre-Socratic Greek philosopher who also lived 610 BC in Miletus, a city in Ionia. He belonged to the Milesian school and was also said to have been influenced by the teachings of his master Thales. He was a younger contemporary of Thales and his successor at the Milesian school where he counted other notable philosophers like Pythagoras and Anaximenes amongst his students'. He was also an Astronomer like his master and has written so many things on it. He was well known and published a book on *The Evolutions of The World*. Thales has already predicted water to be the origin of things, his contemporary Anaximander denies it. According to Anaximander, the ultimate reality must be an eternal, imperishable source out of which everything is made of and out of which everything must return to. He calls this 'Apeiron' and according to him it is Boundless, it is also the Infinite or the Indefinite. It is also without boundaries or division and fills up space. Anaximander sees it as a reservoir out of which all things are produced or made from.

When confronted with the problem of change, he was able to deduce that the world we are in is made up of two warring opposites each competing with each other relentlessly example cold versus heat, cold versus hot etc. Everything according to Anaximander comes from the Boundless and happens as they separate from each other which is why they are in constant war. According to him, the earth is resting on nothing. The earth is spherical in shape it cannot go one way or another. Anaximander ushered us into the realm of abstract thought.

Anaximenes (545 BC)

The details of his life were obscure as he left no writings of his own. What was gathered about him was from the references made by Aristotle in his own work and other writers of Greek philosophy. He was a younger contemporary of Thales and as such a member of the Milesian philosophers. He was credited to have been the first revolutionary thinker. As with his fellow Milesian philosophers, he was also concerned about the stuff out of which everything was made of. He was not satisfied with the explanations given by his friends on the "original stuff" of things and went ahead to give his own solution to the problem. He suggested that the original stuff out of which everything was made of was "Air". Air according to him can be found in almost everything as it is central to nature itself. When confronted with the problem of change, he used two basic principles to account for it.

1. Rarefaction or expansion
2. Condensation or compression.

Air when rarefied becomes warm and eventually turn to fire. As air is condensed it becomes colder and eventually changes to wind, water and earth. According to him, man and animal all take in Air in order to live and reason that air could at the same turn into flesh and blood. This explanation was so vague and is like taking us back to the quest.

Pythagoras

Pythagoras was a Greek philosopher who made his own contributions in mathematics, astronomy and music. The Pythagorean theorem in mathematics was attributed to him. Little was known

about him except that he lived somewhere between 570 and 495 B.C. He was born in the island of Samos near Ionian coast and later migrated to Croton in southern Italy. Pythagoras left no writing of his own most of what was known about him were by the writings of his followers who depicted him as a God. He was influenced by the teachings of Thales and Anaximander when he was between 18-20 years of age. In (35 BC) Pythagoras, he was said to have traveled to Egypt and learnt so much about the Egyptian culture and tradition including their religion and these was said to have influenced his belief.

The Pythagorean teachings were more of religious teachings. They believe that the true aim of religion should be purification which ultimately leads one to salvation. They believed in the immortality of the soul . At death, the soul migrates into another body where it continues living another cycle of existence. This process continues and he calls it 'wheel of birth'. The only way one can be free from this wheel of birth is through purification of the soul. Pythagoras was regarded as a god by his followers and as such all their writings were of him that it is hard to separate his teachings from that of his followers. The Pythagoreans taught that there was order and unity in the universe. He went further to say that this order was Mathematical in nature. On his demise, they wrote biographies of him crediting him as one who has the gift of second sight. They even said that he has a golden thigh and was also the son of Apollo. Those other philosophers noted the change on things but did not dwell so much on it but his beliefs on change started to stir the minds of other philosophers. One of those great minds was the man Heraclitus.

The Pythagoreans

The Pythagorean movement was started as a Philosophical, mathematical and musical movement. The movement has its name rooted in its founder's name whose name was Pythagoras. Pythagoreanism originated in the 6th century, BC based on the teachings and beliefs of its founder. The Pythagoreans believed that everything consists of Numbers. This group was more religious than they were philosophers and believed that man is a "TRIPARTITE" making up the soul, spirit and body. They believed that the soul does not die with the body but continues to live on. It can even live in the body of an Animal. Their religious group was known as *Orphism*.

Heraclitus

This fact of change impressed a young man by the man Heraclitus who was the son of a noble family in Ephesus. He concluded that the "original stuff" out of which everything was made of was "FIRE". Fire according to him was forever changing. Since everything is constantly changing he concluded that change was the fundamental characteristics of the whole universe. The forever changing fire then is the material of the universe. "You cannot step into the same lives twice, He wrote, for fresh water is forever flowing into it, there is nothing permanent or stable. The only constant thing or stable thing in the universe is CHANGE. We may think that we see things that do not change in the universe, but we are fooled according to him, the most stable thing in the universe changes as well. The universe is nailed by strife, the moment something is made, strife begins to break it up, for Heraclitus, and nothing is permanent.

ELEATIC SCHOOL

The reputable founder of the Eleatic school was Xenophanes. He was regarded as a tutelary founder, a patron of the school because he held fast to the view of the motionless one. But the real founder of the school was Parmenides in the fifth century BC in the ancient town of Elea. The main doctrines of the Eleatics evolved in opposition to the theories of early philosophers. They maintained that the true explanation of things lies in the conception of a “UNIVERSAL UNITY BEING”. This universality of being cannot be recognized by the sense. It can only be recognized through ideas and only by the mind.

Parmenides (451 – 449 BC)

He was a Greek philosopher from the colony of Elea. Parmenides was notable for the slogan “What is, is and What is not, cannot be”. He was also credited to having said that “out of nothing, nothing comes. While Zeno was reputed to have been the founder of the Eleatic school, the real founder of the Eleatic school from a philosophical and historical view point was Parmenides. At age 65 he had a conversation with the young ‘Socrates of Athens. He drew up laws from his native city of Elea and began by being a Pythagoreans but later abandoned it for his own teaching. Parmenides wrote in verse. He held fast to the notion of “the Being”, the one is and that Becoming, change is illusion. According to him’ “if anything comes to be, then it comes either out of being or out of not being”. If it comes to be then it already is in which case it does not come to be. If it comes out of “Not being” then it is nothing since out of nothing comes nothing.

THE SOCRATIC ERA

The Sophists

The sophists thrived in what could be called the Socratic Era. The earlier Greek philosopher were called Cosmologians because they paid so much attention to the origin of the cosmos (the world) but they ended up with a lot of cosmologies as they could not agree on one thing as the original stuff out of which every other thing was made of.

These groups of philosophers sprang up and decided to shift attention from the cosmos to man . In this era, man was thought of as a *Subject* rather than an *Object*. The Sophist’s were *Intelligent People*, who knew so much about the Greek culture and tradition.

They were known as itinerant teachers who use their knowledge to make money for themselves. They could also be seen as orators. They were skilled in Rhetorics and taught their eager listeners same so that they can use it to defend themselves in lawsuit etc

Among the first group of philosophers that sprang up were the ‘*Sophists*’. There Sophist’s were *Intelligent People*, who knew so much about the Greek culture and tradition.

Socrates

Socrates was born in Athens in ancient in 499 BC. Socrates committed himself to the examined life, and he developed a powerful method of examination called dialectic. Dialectic (from the

Greek *dialektos*, "dialogue") is a form of examination in which the questioner asks probing questions in order to help the other person think more deeply and systematically about some significant issue. In the Greek culture of Socrates's time, the answer to the major issues in life were provided by mythology. Mythology consisted of traditional stories about heroism, friendship, the gods, the purpose of life, and so on. These stories were accepted as true, even though no one had witnessed the events described in them and even though the lessons of the stories were not always consistent with each other. The Greeks felt no need to provide a critical justification for the answers given by the myths, or to confront the inconsistencies. The myths went unquestioned because they had the authority of a long and venerable tradition.

There was no need to inquire about the answer to the most important issues in life, because they were already available. Socrates' mission was to help people understand that they had been relying on these traditional answers to the big issues, and to see that they must investigate these topics themselves.

Socrates held that we should strive for human excellence (*arête*, which can also be translated "goodness" or "virtue"), and that an essential part of attaining human excellence is to inquire what it is. He spent much of his life talking with his fellow Athenians about such virtues (excellences) as courage, justice, and piety. Socrates' interlocutors (dialogue partners) often claimed that they already knew what a particular virtue was and were eager to offer a definition. Upon examination, however, Socrates found that they were unable to understand or explain their own statements. Through probing and critical questioning, Socrates would show the person that the definition given had implications that were inconsistent with that person's other beliefs. The person would then typically modify the original definition to avoid the inconsistency. Socrates would then show that the new definition led to further inconsistencies. The process would continue and the conversation would end with the interlocutor's once-confident beliefs shaken.

B. POST-SOCRATICS

Plato

When Socrates died, Plato was in his late twenties, having been his pupil for about eight years. A member of an aristocratic Athenian family, Plato would have been just old enough to have fought in the Peloponnesian war, as his brothers Glaucon and Adeimantus certainly did. At the age of 40 he went to Sicily and became an associate to the Dion, the brother-in-law of the reigning monarch. Dionysius I; during this visit he made the acquaintance of the Pythagorean, philosopher Archytas. On his return to Athens he founded a philosophical community, the Academy in a private grove beside his own house. Here a group of thinkers, under his direction shared with each other their interest in mathematics, astronomy, metaphysics, ethics and mysticism.

The best known of Plato's doctrine to be found in Plato's dialogues is the Theory of ideas or world of Forms. He was of the belief that 'authentic' existence is not possible in this cosmological world, but in the world of forms. Plato said that the forms are separate from concrete things, that they have an independent existence. On how we can know the forms, he posited three different ways through which the mind discovers the forms. First is by recollection.

He pointed out that before the soul was united with the body it was acquainted with the forms. Hence; people now recollect what their souls knew in their previous state of existence. Secondly, we arrive at the knowledge of forms through the activity of dialectic. Thirdly, through the power of desire, love (eros) which lead people step by step from the beautiful object to the beautiful thought and the very essence of beauty itself. Plato eventually stated simply that it is conversation that leads to the forms. This is because conversation involves more than seeing. The eye can see only particular things while thought (mind) sees the universal. When he was sixty years old he was invited back to Sicily by Dion's nephew, who had now succeeded to the Throne as Dionysius quarreled with each other. A third visit as a royal adviser was equally abortive, and Plato returned home disillusioned in the year 347 at about 80 years.

Aristotle

After the Athenians Socrates and Plato, the next great philosopher was a Macedonian. Aristotle was born fifteen years after Socrates' death in the small colony of Stagira. He was the son of Nicomachus, court physician to the king Amyntas, the grandfather of Alexander the Great. After the death of his father, he migrated to Athens in 367 at the age of 17 and joined Plato's Academy. He remained for twenty years as Plato's pupil and colleague and it can correctly be said that on no other occasion in history was such intellectual power concentrated in a single institution. He later found his own school known as the Lyceum. His works cut across various areas of philosophy. He invented formal logic. He said that there is a connection between logic and science. For Aristotle, logic is the study of the thought for which words are signs. He aptly described logic as "the analysis of language, of the process of reasoning, of the way language and reasoning are related to reality.

In the same vein, he invented metaphysics. Metaphysics deals with knowledge at the highest level of abstraction. Abstraction entails knowing what is universal instead of what is particular. Every science has its own level of abstraction in as much as it deals with the first principles and causes of its own subject matter. Whereas, the sciences concern themselves with such question as "what is such-and such a thing like and why?" Metaphysics asks a more deep and general question; "what does it mean to be anything whatsoever"? Aristotle made metaphysics, "the science of any existent, as existent". "It is indeed the study of being and its "Principle" and "cause

MEDIEVAL PERIOD.

The medieval period of philosophy spans the period around the eleventh up to the later part of the fourteenth centuries. This period witnessed a seeming decline in Philosophy and theology. The known thinkers of the medieval period were mainly theologians who saw no difference between theology and philosophy. They sought to use philosophy to justify their religious truths. Certain problems were introduced into philosophy during this period. For instance, there was the question concerning the relationship between reason and faith, the question concerning

relationship between philosophy and theology, and proofs of God's existence which were not raised by the philosophers of the classical ancient period. Notable figures of the medieval period were Al-Farabi, Avicenna,, Averroes, St. Anselm, St Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, William of Ockham, Duns Scottus, and some others. But it was Augustine Tagaste who laid the foundation for the emergence of the medieval period.

St. Augustine

He hailed from Tagaste in North Africa. He was concerned with justifying the belief in the existence of God. He opined that truth and God in nine sense are within man, but since God is eternal He also transcends man. His proof of God's existence is that since every effect has a cause, the universe as an effect must have a cause. This cause must be God. In another argument, Augustine says that the universal conviction of mankind that God exists is proof of God's existence. If God does not exist how the whole human race did become convinced of his existence? In his moral philosophy, St. Augustine teaches that man has natural desire for happiness. For him, the human heart is restless and will remain restless until it finds the happiness that it seeks. The happiness which the human heart restlessly seeks is God. Augustine pointed out that God made man in such a way that man can never achieve this happiness which he craves for anywhere else unless he focuses his attention and his whole heart on God.

St. Augustine considered the problem of evil in the world as a problem of utmost importance. Since God created all things and God is infinitely good, how then do we explain the existence of evil in a world that a good God created? This was the problem. Augustine opined that evil could not have come from God because God is infinitely good. According to him, moral evil has no other origin than man's free will. He can choose to turn to God or to turn away from him, to do good or to can claim ignorance of the fundamental moral principles. The problem of evil in the world has been one problem which has bothered the minds of philosophers from the classical ancient times up till this contemporary period.

Augustine's explanation of evil as man's exercise of his free will is limited because it does not take into account natural evils such as earthquakes, storms, volcanic eruptions etc which has nothing to do with man's free will. Augustine has a very interesting position concerning the concept of time. Time, according to Augustine, is an elusive concept, he says that although we talk of the past, present and future, neither the past nor the future really exists, for the past is gone and the future is not yet, nor the present is only a passing moment. What, therefore, do we mean by time? What do we mean by the past, the present and the future? What we call past is nothing other than the human mind as it remembers. The future is simply the human mind in its expectations. The future too has no objective existence outside the mind which expects. And the present is the human mind as it considers. It is the reference point for both the past and the future. It is the human mind which in the present passing moment **remembers** and expects,

thereby constituting the past and the future. In sum, what Augustine is saying is that time is a mental phenomenon. Time exists only in the mind.

St. Anselm

He is renowned for the ontological proof of God's existence and he argues that God is "Something which nothing greater can be conceived". Thus, if there exists, beyond doubt, something than which something greater cannot be thought in understanding, it must also exist in reality. This, thing is God and only a fool will say that there is no God. Anselm's ontological argument has been criticized because it attempts to define God into existence. Anselm defines the word "God" as meaning "a thing than which nothing greater can be conceived". Then, he argues that this concept of a greatest being cannot be conceived not to exist, in other words, he argues that when we spell out the definition of "God" as "a being than which nothing greater can be conceived", we will find that the definition includes the characteristics "necessarily existing". But the problem here then is that if the existence of God can be proved in this way, then the existence of a perfect horse or a perfect island, or a necessarily perfect Ox, or a mosquito than which none greater can be conceived can equally be proven.

St. Thomas Aquinas

He dismissed St. Anselm's ontological proof of God's existence as wrong, invalid and confusing. He provided different arguments for the existence of God. They are,

- i. The argument from motion
- ii. The argument from efficient cause
- ii. The argument from necessary versus possible being
- iv. The argument from degrees of perfection; and
- v. The argument from the order of the universe.

The first three of these are variation of the same argument and we shall examine them together. In each case, Aquinas begins with some facts about the world. The first argument takes off from the fact that things about the world around us; the second from the fact that event that is observed to take place is made to happen, or caused, by something else that precedes it and the third, from the fact that there are, at least something in the world whose existence is not necessary which is in metaphysical language "possible". Aquinas then reasons that the observed motion, or event or possible thing, is the last in a chain of motion or causes of possible things, and he asserts that such a chain cannot reach back endlessly to prior motions. Somewhere, the chain must end with a mover that is not merely possible but necessary. That first mover, cause, or necessary being is God. Although, Aquinas' cosmological argument has also attracted severe criticism, it is accepted as valid and decisive by many theological and philosophers of religion. On the question of the relationship between theology and philosophy, where St Augustine saw no difference between theology and philosophy. Aquinas maintained that there is a difference in the methods

which Philosophy and theology employ. Theology stresses faith in God and interprets all things as creatures of God whereas philosophy draws its conclusion from its rational description of the essence of things.

Abu Nasr AL Farabus (AL Farabi)

He was popularly known as the “second Aristotle” because he introduced Aristotle’s logical works to the Muslim community. He studied and taught in Baghdad – the reputed center for Islamic learning and culture. Not only that he commented on Aristotle’s logical works and on Porphyry, he wrote treatise on the intellect, intelligible, soul unity and the One.

AL-Farabi was the true Islamic neo-Platonist who identified the ‘One of Plotinus with the Islamic God. He described the hierarchy of reality and how things emanated by a necessity of nature from the first being or the first intellect through a series of nine other intellects.

Farabi also maintained that logic was a preparatory stage and an introduction to philosophy which he divided into physics, metaphysics and ethics or the practical aspects of morality. In line with Aristotle, AL-Farabi distinguished between essence (form) and existence (matter). Matter is the common denominator of all things. The form is the shaping force which provides materials to its specific purpose or shape, finished reality of a matter, the actuality of matter. It makes a thing what it is.

AL-Farabi distinguished four meaning of intellect, these are:

- (i) The intellect in potency with regards to knowledge it can acquire.
- (ii) The intellect in actuality with regards to the knowledge while acquiring it.
- (iii) The acquired intellect, this is the intellect considered as already possessed of that knowledge.
- (iv) Final, the active agent, that is, the active intellect.

God is a substituting spatial entity that creates, provides and controls the visible and invisible world. This active intellect confers form, matter and intellect or created creatures. It is believed to be immutable and it eternally radiates intelligible forms and intellects to any material object without carrying in whatever matter that may receive them. AL-Farabi belonged to the mystical school, and his philosophy has a religious image. He believed that the highest task of man was to know God, his creator and as man is enlightened by God, he must strive to resemble the Almighty in goodness. In political affairs, he was Internationalist, Universalist and forecaster of the United Nations Organization (UNO), as he felt the possibility of a world-wide society embracing all the nations of the earth. His metaphysics based on Aristotle’s influenced Avicenna who has a world-wide reputation for understanding Aristotle’s metaphysics which he confessed to have read about forty times without understanding it. AL-Farabi’s explanation assisted him to understand the proper direction of Aristotle’s metaphysics.

Abual AL-Husayn (Avicenna)

The “third Aristotle” (980-1037) Avicenna was born at Bekhara in Persia, the most powerful nation in integrity that dominated Greece until Alexander the Great, the son of Philip of Macedonia, defeated Cyrus the philosophers was a physician more known in the western world by his medical research than philosophy, he highlighted the medical works of Aristotle Galen and I Hippocrates. Avicenna was mostly reputed for his scholastic astern in the Islamic world as a great supporter of neo-Platonism. At 16, he was a practicing doctor who started also in his early age to write. He wrote about 100 books and his philosophical works were known as ‘**sufficiencia**’ which comprised logic, physics, mathematics, psychology and metaphysics. His main works were: “The Book of Healing of the Soul” or “The Book of Salvation” and “The Canon of Medicine”. They were printed in Rome in 1593. He was termed the “third Aristotle” because he adopted Aristoteanism and a small amount of Neo-Platonism. His concept of “Aristotileanism and a small amount “Neo-Platonism of intermediaries in Creation” was utterly rejected by the Christian philosophers such as Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great etc. Avicenna’s metaphysics based on Aristotle’s view, distinguished between necessary and contingent beings. The existence of a contingent being is externally caused. There cannot be infinite causes and if there were, there would be no reason for the existence of anything. The uncaused being, a necessary being or eternal unmoved substance received its essence from itself. That is to say, that it exists by virtue of its essence as the self-existing being or first mover for Aristotle. Avicenna also distinguished between potentiality and actuality in line with Aristotle who has maintained that potentiality was a principle of change into another. This principle exists either in the agent (action potency) or in the patient (passive potency). Aristotle defined potency to mean a course of movement or change which is in another thing than the thing moved or in the same thing qua other. We have a hierarchy of potency and act. In the lower level, we have pure potentiality which deprived of form and “Prime matter” known as the principal of individuation. In the upper level, we have pure act or the necessary being, with absolute goodness.

Based upon this notion, Avicenna concluded that God – the necessary being was a creator; radiate the above qualities to His creature through the theory of emanation and this fact explains the Qu’ranic view the God is the fact explains the giver, all knowing, forbearing, forgiving merciful, the supreme one, the most High, gracious, self-sufficient. The Qu’ran maintains that God is compassionate, who “knows best all that you do” and he is powerful and mighty. Avicenna’s metaphysics regarding intelligence or angels is based upon Aristotle’s theory of the movers of the spheres such as heavens, star, earth etc. It is believed that there are many movers of the different intelligent spheres, but the first mover of the spheres is God and He moves them by inspiring spiritual qualities of love and desire on them. Avicenna’s Islamic conception of God’s omnipotence and creation as involving the theory of emanation tends toward pantheism, though he tried to disassociate himself from it before his death in 1037 at Homadan, by accepting the distinction between essence and existence in all beings.

Muhammed Ibn Rused (Averroes)

He belonged to the western group of Islamic philosophers. Averroes was born after the council of Clermont in 1075 when Pope Urban II called western Christians the lost grounds. Averroes studied theology, the Islamic jurisprudence, medicine, mathematics and philosophy. He was a “kaddi” or judge at service in Cordova and a medical doctor to the caliph of Al Mansur. After this, he went to Morocco where he died in 1198. The study of Greek philosophy as a critical and rational enterprise was forbidden during the Islamic period in Spain because philosophy was asserted to be superior to religion and theology. Averroes dedicated himself to the study and interpretation of the pagan thinker. Aristotle, who though, was one of the best representations of the pagan thinker – Aristotle, who though, was one of the best representatives of human intelligence but failed to tell the world of inquires whether the divine God created the universe, whether God is the provider, whether he should be loved or worshipped or prayed to. Averroes’ dedication, loyalty and true interpretation of Aristotle’s philosophy made the faithful Muslim theologians suspect his philosophical ideas which were directly opposed to the orthodox Muslim theology. To escape from being labeled a heretic and to avoid the wrath of the Muslims. Averroes tried to reconcile his view with the Muslims by what he termed “Double Truth” a theory concerning his views which could be true philosophically and theologically false. The theory means that truth is understood for pictures. These pictures can be used to tell the same truth in theology to the illiterates. Double truth theory does not mean that one thing can be true in philosophy but false in theology or vice-versa. For instance, both Averroes and Aristotle deny immortality of the soul, God’s Christian or Islamic, believed in the immortality of the soul. God’s creative acts, His knowledge of the things created the would – be created and his providence of the contents of the universe. Averroes’ “double truth theory” believes that views are true in their various ways or disciplines since he recognized the one eternal truth which can be comprehended through revelation and reason or philosophy. Averroes maintains that theology and religion are fideistic and consequently, inferior to philosophy which is thoroughly equipped with reason to grasps even theology. Like many reputed philosophers. Averroes believed that it is the philosophy who can interpret theology and judgment when there is conflict between the two disciplines. It is not proper for the philosopher to maintain the other way as some theologians, like Chazali and Maimonides had held. For them, philosophy should be theology. Averroes influenced the catholic philosophers in the middle Ages though he was condemned and forced to leave the Islamic Spain by both the church and the Islamic clerics and his views and writing on the unification of philosophy and religion (c.1160), were banned.

Moses Ben Mainmonides (or Mainon Ibn Abdullahi)

Moses Mainmonides, sometimes known as Moses Cordova, was born in Cordova in Spain but was expelled from Spain at the age of thirteen with his family. He migrated to many parts of the Mediterranean regions. Though Mainmonides admired Aristotle, yet he was critical of the

philosophers who challenged the Jewish religion. To make his sad feelings manifest against them, he wrote the biblical commentary, “the Guide to the perplexed or the Guide for the Doubting” which was addressed to the philosophers who had lost faith in the Jewish religion notwithstanding that it was written in the spirit of Aristotelians. The work contained the summary of the Jewish philosophies and was biblical anthropomorphisms, divine attributes, exposition and criticism of the Kalam that is, the Muslim scholastic theology, and the use of attempt to establish the existence of God, the views which influence Aquinas. He rejected the doctrine of Aristotle’s eternity of the world and God and the world including the problems of divine providence, evil teleology and rationality of the precepts of the Torah. Teleology as a theory opposes the mechanistic theory, which maintains that matter and motion are the only reality unlike the four causes of Aristotle and the scholastic.

In arguing for the existence of God, he noted that man would not know God as he is in His entirety. It is futile for man according to Maimonides, to give any positive attribute to God because He is not as we human beings think and know about Him. Maimonides, no doubt, has promoted the Jewish speculative scholastic philosophy of Aquinas, Albertus, Magnus and modern philosophy of Baruch Spinoza (1632-1 1677). Spinoza’s philosophy is centered on nature, conceived as one, eternal and infinite substance and was regarded as the cause of all things. This self-existing and self-caused nature (God for the religious) permeates and penetrates every nature. His analysis of the Bible as a critical philosophy in the tradition of Hobbes and Descartes was condemned by his fellows Jews in the Jewish community in Amsterdam in 1656.

MODERN PERIOD

The advancement of physics, astronomy and mechanics was accompanied and aided by the development of mathematics. In philosophy, the two main schools of thought, namely, empiricism and rationalism were influenced respectively by the empirical and mathematical methods during the renaissance. Hence in post-renaissance modern philosophy, we find the two great traditional currents, continental rationalism and the British empiricism. The continental rationalists (Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz) adopted the mathematical method and believed that reason alone, using the mathematical method can attain clear, distinct and certain knowledge. The British empiricists (John Locke, George Berkeley and David Hume) based their philosophies on sense experience (sense perception). They thereby followed in the footsteps of Francis Bacon.

Rene Descartes (1596-1650)

Born in 1596 in France, Descartes, Europe’s father of modern philosophy, was educated at a Jesuit College. He was a mathematician, scientist and philosopher; he was of course primarily a philosopher who sought to lay a new foundation for philosophy with the mathematical method. His main philosophical works include his well-known meditation, “Discourse on Method” and “Principles of Philosophy”. He died in 1650. Descartes was highly impressed by the

mathematical method. He was impressed by the fact that truths attained by means of the mathematical method are clear, certain and undisputable. Descartes felt that the uncertainty and confusion we find in philosophy were due to the fact that in the past, philosophy was founded on doubtful and shaky grounds. He, therefore, resolved to give philosophy a new beginning, to reconstruct philosophy on a new and firm foundation with the mathematical methods as its basis. He decided to set aside all the philosophical confusion and uncertainties of the past. Descartes rejected Aristotle's logic because, he says, it does not lead to new knowledge but only serves to explain to others what is already known. He based his own logic on intuition and deduction. According to him, there are two ways in which the mind clearly and distinctly grasps an object without any fear of error and without the illusions of the senses, for it springs from the light of reason alone.

Methodic Doubt: To begin with, everything which was previously known but which could be put to doubt is to be set aside. In other words, anything previously known but which could be doubted should be doubted and rejected for the time being. This process of doubting and rejecting everything (previously known and believed) will continue until one comes to any truth which one is impossible to doubt. The senses are unreliable they sometimes deceive us, and therefore, we will not be sure that what we perceive with the senses is true. We cannot be sure that we really have a body, that we have hands, eyes, legs etc because we could be dreaming and when we are in dream we seem to have things which in reality we do not have. At present, we are not sure of anything. We doubt everything that we used to know or believe. We are not even sure any more that two plus two is four ($2+2=4$) because it is possible that an evil spirit is deceiving us. Therefore, we also doubt mathematical proposition. We doubt everything we used to know or believe, and at present we are not sure of anything as true.

Cogito Ergo Sum: But in the process of doubting everything, Descartes noticed that he is thinking, and when he tries to doubt that he is thinking, he finds that he is only confirming it, for to doubt, itself involves thinking. It is therefore, impossible for him to doubt that he thinks, and since to think implies to exist, it follows therefore that he exists; thus his principle of "Cogito Ergo Sum", meaning I think, therefore I exist. Descartes have now discovered a truth that is not subject to doubt, any attempt to doubt it only confirms it since doubt in itself is a confirmation of the fact that he is thinking and therefore, exists. Even if an evil spirit is deceiving him it also confirms that fact of his existence because he had to exist for him to be deceived. That I exist therefore is a truth the certainty on which is beyond the possibility of any doubt. He accepted this as the first principle of the philosophy he was seeking, he however, went further to say that Cogito Ergo sum (I think therefore I exist), only shows that he is a thinking being. "It does not imply that I have a body since thinking does not itself involve having a body. All I am sure of, therefore, is I am a thinking being. I am not sure whether or not I have a body because it is not necessary that I must have a body for me to think. The only truth I know for certain is that I am a thinking being, who exists as a thinking being; that I have a body is yet to be proved beyond the

possibility of doubt before I can accept it. I am also not sure whether or not anything else exists in the world besides me. These have to be proved beyond the possibility of doubt

Arguments for the Existence of God: Descartes based his arguments for the existence of God on the very idea of God as an infinite being. By the name God I understand a substance which is infinite, independent, all knowing, powerful, and by which I myself and everything else that exists have been created, and did this idea of an infinite being come into my mind? Where did it come from? It could not have originated from me because I am a finite being and cannot be the author of the being that put this infinite idea in my mind. Therefore, an infinite being exists; God exists. Moreover, how could I who have the idea of an infinite being exist if the infinite being itself does not exist? In other words, I am not the author of my being; I depend on another being for my existence. If this other being on whom I depend on another being for my existence also depends on another, and the other in turn depends on another and so on. We are bound to one another and so on, we are all bound to another that is infinitely perfect. This is God.

Benedict Spinoza (1632-1677)

He was born of Jewish parents in Amsterdam in 1652. Although brought up in the traditional Jewish religion, Spinoza soon developed his own idea of God, which was unacceptable to the Jewish religious community. When he was twenty-four years old, he was ex-communicated from Jewish community. He left and went to live a solitary life in another town where he devoted his time to studying and writing, and where he died in 1677.

Epistemology: Spinoza distinguished between three degrees of knowledge. The first degree of knowledge is inadequate knowledge of confused ideas about something. This is the kind of knowledge we get from any individual thing in isolation and it is the kind of knowledge we derive from sense perception. It is not a complete knowledge of the essence or the real nature of anything since it isolates things from the totality of which they are only parts. This first degree of knowledge is at the level of the senses. The second degree of knowledge is the level of reason. This is the level of scientific knowledge. Such knowledge is abstract and logically related, and it is general knowledge derived from logical deduction. The third and the highest degree of knowledge is intuitive knowledge. It is the knowledge that derives from the adequate idea of certain attributes of God to the knowledge of the essence of things. On this degree of knowledge, all things are seen and known as existing in God, derived from him and form parts of him; modifications of him. According to Spinoza, this is the highest achievement of the human mind.

Ontology: His main work is entitled “Ethics” and it contains the core of Spinoza’s Philosophy which like that of the stoics is pantheistic and deterministic. There is, according to him, only one substance in reality, and it is infinite, eternal, and divine. All things proceeded from this one substance by necessity as its extension, and we can think of it either under the attributes of

thought or under the attributes of extension. This means that God or nature present itself and is known as spirit and matter (thought and extension).

There is no finality; no purpose in the universe, the idea of purpose in nature is, according to Spinoza, simply a human invention. All things and events in the universe follow necessarily from the divine nature as modifications of God and this include human actions. It is obvious that in this kind of universe there can be no such thing as human freedom or free actions. Spinoza categorically denies human freedom and free actions and claims that belief in human freedom is due to ignorance. Since man is part of nature, since he is not a kingdom within a kingdom, not an isolated being but part of a whole, how can he be free or autonomous? How can his actions be free when as part of nature, he is subject to the casual laws of nature?

According to Spinoza, men claim to be free when they are ignorant of the causes of their desires and actions. Hence belief in human freedom amounts to a confession of ignorance. “Men think themselves free in as much as they are conscious of their volitions and desires, and because they are ignorant of the cause by which they are led to wish and desire”. Man’s part of nature, says Spinoza, he is subject to the laws of nature, and all his actions, like everything else in the universe, are governed by and determined by the laws of nature and are the effects of certain natural causes. But men do not always know what these causes are and therefore cannot claim that their actions are free; “we are part of the universal nature and we follow her order” (like Naturam and the naturaNaturata) are one and the same the thing and known under the attributes of thought and extension, spirit and matter, so are the attribute of spirit and matter. Consequently, man’s mental activities are just subject to, and determined by, the usual laws of nature as decision, choices, reflection and the likes are determined by some natural causes and governed by the laws of nature.

Ethics: Spinoza explains the notions of good and bad as what satisfies desires and what frustrates desires. In other words, when something satisfies our desire, we say it is good, and we append the word bad to whatever frustrates our desire. According to Spinoza, whether we call a thing good or bad depends on our causal laws of nature, for the judgments about the goodness or badness of actions depends on our emotion which are determined by natural causes, and are therefore not free.

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz

Leibniz, the third great continental rationalist was the son of a professor of philosophy. He discovered the infinitesimal calculus without known that Isaac Newton had discovered it. Leibniz later founded a learned society, the Prussian: he is also a religious man, a Christian who tried to bring about a reunion of Catholics and Protestants.

Epistemology and Metaphysics: Leibniz was not only a mathematician, but also an eminent logician and he based his metaphysical theory on this logical analysis. By defining a term we reduce it into parts, and these parts can be further reduced by definition. The term continues to be broken up into smaller parts in this way until it is eventually broken up into such parts that can no longer be broken up by any further definition. We then arrive at the indefinable terms which form the basis of our thought.

Leibniz distinguishes between two kinds of truth, namely, truth of reason and truth of fact. The truth of reason is a necessary proposition, which cannot be denied without involving oneself in self-contradiction.

But truth of fact is a contingent proposition which is not necessarily true and which can be denied without contradiction. All propositions about the existence of anything are, if they are true, truth of fact. All such propositions are contingent propositions, which could be about the existence of God. Such a proposition is necessarily true and is therefore a truth of reason. The existence of God, according to Leibniz, cannot be denied without self-contradiction because the very concept of God implies his existence. There are two basic principles in Leibniz philosophy. Namely, the principle of contradiction and the principle of sufficient reason. Both are based on Leibniz's idea of necessary truths. The principles of contradiction (which is also the principle of identity) states that all analytic propositions are true, while the principle of sufficient reason states that whatever exists must have a sufficient reason for its existence, and whatever happens has a sufficient reason for happening. There is a third principle, namely, the principle of perfection according to which God always acts for the best because he is infinitely perfect. He, therefore of necessity makes it necessary for him to perfect) of things. His infinite goodness makes it necessary for him to choose and to form only the best of things. Leibniz points out that although God necessarily does only the best and most perfect of things, His actions are free actions.

Monads: Monads in Leibniz's Philosophy are the substance which forms the basic elements of which all things are made. A monad is a substance and a substance is a complete being which is the subject of several predicates. Substances or monads are unextended, immaterial and simple. They are without size, shape, and quality and are indivisible. In fact they are spiritual souls out of which everything in the universe is made. The whole universe will be seen to be made up of monads i.e spiritual souls, without size, without shape, without quantity. The monads are the basic units of all things. Indeed, the term monad is derived from the Greek word, *Monas* which means unity. Every monad, says Leibniz, is a unit of its own, without any relation with another monad. Each monad is a self-contained and windowless entity, which develops on its own form, within and according to its inner principle of activity. The monads are also the basic principle of activity. The monads are also the basic principle and source of force and activity in the universe. Each monad is a subject which contains all its predicates. The monads do not interact, one monad does not act on another or influence one another: each is on its own, self-contained without any

link with other monads. This means that there is really no causality in the universe. What is considered as causality is really not causality but the effect of the harmonious system of the universe.

Arguments for the Existence of God: Leibniz tries to prove the existence of God with arguments. His arguments are not really new but restatement of some traditional arguments already used by some earlier philosophers. One of them is “the ontological argument” first used by St. Anselm. According to this argument, the very notion of God implies that He exists. God by definition is an infinitely perfect Being. This means that He has all perfection (so the argument goes) and it follows that He his existence.

John Locke

John Locke, the father of British empiricism, was born in 1632. He studied at Oxford University where he subsequently lectured for a while.

Epistemology: He rejects the theory of innate ideas. All ideas, according to him, come from sense experience; there are no innate ideas; man is not born with any idea in his mind. The theory of innate ideas holds (in general) that man is born with certain ideas on his mind, and as soon as he reaches the age of reason he comes to know these ideas spontaneously without having to learn them explicitly. These ideas are said to be the primary principles of reason, for example, that a whole is greater than its part; that a thing is and cannot be at the same time, the principle of identity or the principle of non-contradiction. There are also said to be the basic moral principles, for example, that kindness is good, that injustice is wrong, that kindness is good that cruelty is bad etc. But Locke rejects this theory, arguing that if these ideas were really innate, they would be known by both children and idiots because they have minds. If man is born with these ideas in his mind, he would know them right from the beginning even as a child. How can ideas be in the mind without the mind knowing them? As regards the basic moral principles, Locke argues that they are not known to men. Moreover, all men do not have exactly the same moral principles; hence there are so many differences in the moral practices of different people. All these show, according to Locke, that there are no innate ideas.

All human ideas and knowledge derived from sense perception and reflection. However, the immediate objects of human knowledge are, according to Locke, ideas that we have about them. But how do we come about this knowledge of things? Locke’s answer is that thing impress (or impose) themselves on our minds, leaving in them their images, copies which represent them. Ideas are, therefore representation of things. He distinguishes between two-kinds of ideas, namely: simple ideas and complex ideas.

Simple ideas are the impressions that things make on our minds; they are the copies of or presentations which things leave in our minds when they impress themselves on our minds.

Simple ideas are, therefore, directly caused by these and these ideas resemble their causes and correspond to them. Thus, Locke affirms that there is correspondence or resemblance between simple ideas in our minds and the things they represent when two or more simple ideas are combined into one, we have a complex idea. Complex ideas, therefore, are combinations of circumstances of time and space and all other particularizing factors (such as height, colour, and size) have been removed, stripped of these particularizing traits. We cannot know what things are in themselves, we can only know what substance is. In other words, we cannot know substance because we cannot perceive it. If we do not perceive substance, how do we know of its existence? According to Locke, the idea of substance is formed by the supposition that there must be a substratum (i.e. substance) from which simple ideas or qualities come to us and impress themselves on us. We cannot imagine how these simple ideas can subsist by themselves. We therefore, assume that there must be a substratum in which they exist and from which they come to us, and it is this substratum that we call substance. But we neither perceive it nor do we know what it is in itself. The idea of spiritual substance is also immaterial substratum sustaining the simple ideas of thinking, reflecting, doubting, etc. There must be an immaterial substratum that is the source or the support of these.

Primary and Secondary Qualities: Locke distinguishes between primary and secondary qualities. Primary qualities are those qualities which are really in things and inseparable from things, e.g. solidity, extension, figure, motion and rest. The secondary qualities on the other hand, are those qualities which are not really in things but are only powers in things with which they impress themselves on our senses and thereby produce simple ideas in us. Examples of such qualities are color, taste, sound, odor etc. Language, words, ideas and knowledge are, according to Locke, closely related. In fact they are interrelated. Language is the means by which man communicates. Language itself is made up of words, and words are signs of ideas, i.e. signs which signify ideas. There are, according to Locke, three degrees of knowledge, namely, intuitive knowledge, demonstrative knowledge, and it is attained by intuition. The second degree of knowledge, that is, the knowledge acquired through natural science. It is not unquestionably certain, like knowledge of the first degree. Scientific knowledge is based on experiment and demonstration and it has many restrictions that hinder it from unquestionable certainty. This, according to Locke, is due mainly to our inadequate knowledge of the nature of things.

The third degree of knowledge is of particular things as they exist. This is sensitive knowledge, acquired through sensation. Our knowledge of our own existence is intuitive knowledge, and is unquestionably certain. Our knowledge, according to Locke, not only derives from sense experience, but is also circumscribed within sense experience. Human everything claimed by us as authentic, true and certain that is so. How, then, are we to decide what is actually revealed by God as distinct from mere claims of revelations? This, according to Locke, should be decided by reason. Whatever is contrary to reason cannot be revealed by God.

CONTEMPORARY PERIOD

When we talk of the contemporary period in philosophy, we are talking of an era marked by a reaction of philosophy of man against the excesses of the philosophy of ideas. By philosophy of ideas, I mean the type of philosophizing which concentrates on abstract universal concepts and devotes itself to classification in terms of ever more comprehensive categories to such an extent that particulars are given subordinate place and are regarded as objects of philosophical reflection only in so far as they can be subsumed under universal ideas and philosophy of things means the kind of philosophical thought which assimilates itself to natural sciences and regards man objectively as an object among other objects. But for the purpose of this book, we shall deal with the existentialists whose thought dominated other philosophies in the contemporary period.

Soren Kierkegaard

Many themes of contemporary philosophy were first expressed in the writings of Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855). He was trained in Hegel's philosophy and was not impressed by it. So, his philosophy is basically an attack on Hegel's dialectics. For the purpose of this write-up, we shall briefly discuss Soren Kierkegaard under the following topics, namely;

- (i) Notion of existence
- (ii) Criticism of Rational knowledge
- (iii) Description of Man's existential situation
- (iv) Three stages of existence

Notion of Existence: For Kierkegaard, the term 'existence' means or implies being, a certain kind of individual, an individual who strive who considers alternatives who chooses, who decides and who above all, commits himself. So, existence for Kierkegaard is a category relating to the free individual. To exist, for him, means realizing oneself through free choice, between alternatives, through self-commitment. It means becoming more and more an individual and less and less a mere member of a group. This could also be said to mean transcending universality in favor of individuality. According to Kierkegaard "... do not think the Absolute thought instead of being involved in decisions and commitments".

Kierkegaard drew the distinction between the spectator and the actor arguing that only the actor is involved in existence. The spectator can be said to exist, but the term existence does not properly belong to inert or inactive things, whether these be spectators or stones. He illustrates this distinction by comparing two kinds of men in a wagon, one who holds the reins in his hands but is asleep and the other who is fully awake. In the first case, the horse goes along the familiar road without any direction from the sleeping man, whereas in the other case the man is truly a driver. In one sense, it can be said that both men exist but Kierkegaard insists that existence must refer to a quality in the individual namely: "his conscious participation in an act". Only the conscious driver exists. So, only a person who is engaged in conscious activity of will and choice can truly be said to exist.

Criticism of Rational Knowledge: Kierkegaard revolted against the rationalistic emphasis in Greek wisdom which he charged had permeated philosophy and Christian theology. His argument was that Greek philosophy had been too greatly influenced by a high regard for mathematics. Although, he did not want to reject the assumption that the mode of thought characteristic of science could be successfully employed when trying to understand human nature, mathematics and science, according to him, have no place for the general. Platonic philosophy emphasizes the universal, the form, the Good. Plato's whole assumption was that if one knew the Good, he would do it. Kierkegaard thought that such an approach to ethics was a falsification of man's real predicament. What Kierkegaard is saying is that when a person has knowledge, he is still in the predicaments of having to make a decision. According to him, the grand formulations of philosophical systems would come to nothing unless we pay attention to the individual.

Obviously, there are problems that can be solved by mathematics and science and by ethics and metaphysics. But over and against such universal or general problems stands life making demands upon the individual. At this critical moment, general or universal thoughts do not help. Kierkegaard employed the Biblical story of Abraham to portray the typical perplexed condition of man. For example, what universal rule would guide Abraham to answer the question "What kind of knowledge can help Abraham decide whether to obey God or to sacrifice his son?"

Description of Man's Existential Situation:

He distinguished between man's present state, that is, what he is now and what he ought to be or what he is essentially. According to Kierkegaard, there is a movement by man from his essence to existence. This movement is best explained in the doctrine of the fall in the scripture. He maintained that man tries to do something to overcome his finitude and by so doing aggravates his problem by adding guilt and despair to his entails his relation to God and his alienation from God. Until man actualized his essential self in God, says Kierkegaard, his life is full of anxieties. Three stages of Existence: He classified existence into three stages. The first stage is described as the aesthetic stage. This stage is characterized and governed by sense, impulse and emotion. Here there is an absence of defined universal moral standards and determinate religious' faith. Rather, there is the presence of desire to enjoy the whole of emotive and sense experience. He strives after infinity. The second obligations, the voice of universal reason and this gives form and consistency to his life. The ethical man takes account of his human weakness, but he thinks that it can be overcome by strength of will or commitment. The third stage is the religious. Here man is faced by the act of faith by relating oneself to God. Just as despair forms the antithesis to the aesthetic stage which is overcome by ethical stage, so also consciousness of sin forms the antithesis to ethical stage and this antithesis is overcome by the act of faith by relating to God.

Edmund Husserl

Edmund Husserl was born in the year 1859 and died in the year 1983 at a town called Freiburg in modern day Germany. He influenced the writings of philosophers like Merleau-Ponty and Jean Paul Sartre. The finished works of these philosophers bears the exact thought of his phenomenology. Husserl was known as the father of phenomenology. His philosophy was based on internal convictions that modern philosophy has lost its entire touch. This was reflected in his major work *Philosophy and The Crisis of The European Man*. This crisis according to him arose as a result of philosophy losing focus of what should have been its major concern which is to provide the best possible answers to man's problems, concerns for highest value ETC.

Husserl described the crisis as the seeming collapse of human reasoning and his life objective was saving human reason. This serves as the background of his phenomenology.

Husserl was opposed to natural sciences which according to him was the key to the crisis of western man. According to him the natural sciences have over the years developed a faulty attitude in western man by believing that nature is basically physically and also no room for spiritual realm of knowing, valuing and judging. The natural sciences believe that nature consists of everything.

This is a complete departure from the background of Greek philosophy. He wanted to give philosophy a firm stand and in doing that he has to go behind all presuppositions to that which one cannot doubt or question. In ordinary life we, we make all sorts of existential assumptions, for instance the existence of physical objects independently of consciousness. We must therefore rescind from or bracket this attitude. It is all about finding a firm knowledge which cannot be doubted. What gave the term phenomenology to Husserl as the basis of his philosophy was his refusal to go beyond the only evidence or data available, namely the data available to consciousness and the data derived from appearances. Husserl's unique point is that phenomena or whatever is, is ultimately contained in the very subjective whereby what is, is present to consciousness.

According to Husserl consciousness must be consciousness of an object. Thus, Husserl consciousness must point to something or some object. Thus, Husserl believed that the essence of consciousness is something meant, constructed, reconstituted, that is intended by me. It designates the active involvement of the ego in creating our experience. A discerning mind would ask how Husserl arrives at his notion of intentionality of consciousness. The concept of intentionality is "Phenomenological epoche" means to "bracket" all phenomena, all the elements of experience, by refusing to assert whether the world does or does not exist. To bracket all these phenomena means only to look upon them without judging whether they are realities of appearances, and to abstain from rendering any opinion, judgment or valuation about the world. So, the meaning and the being of things are primordially constituted in and through

consciousness, and this is the act of intentionality which Husserl held to be the characteristic property of our consciousness.

Thus, Husserl maintained that we must not make assertions about that which we do not ourselves see. By so doing, he limits the scope of his philosophy to the realm of experience. This is why his phenomenology is called “transcendental phenomenology”. Hence, Husserl focused his philosophy which he called Phenomenology upon the individual saying that true philosophy should seek its foundation exclusively in man and more specifically in the essence of his concrete worldly existence.

Martin Heidegger

The recall of philosophy to the thought of “being” is principally represented in contemporary German thought by the enigmatic thinker, Martin Heidegger. His focus was on individual existence. According to him, the individual can be considered in three aspects, namely,

1. The “Unwelt” which means, the individual experience of his world as a surrounding environment.
2. The “Mitwelt” where means the experience of fellow men, and
3. The “Eigenwelt” where the individual becomes aware of himself as a distinct and subjective existence.

Here, man comes face to face with his existential anguish and anxiety at life’s experience. Man is seen as a being that comes in to the world without his consent and in the world, he is confronted with his own nothingness.

According to Ukpong, “The anxiety factor helps us to be aware of our existence. An awareness of existence involves the individual in confrontation with I care, dread, which give human existence its meaning as distinct human being”.

According to Heidegger, “the whole of western philosophy has forgotten being and immersed itself in the study of beings”. The idea of being meant either in empty and indeterminate concept obtained by thinking away all the determinate characteristics of being, or the Supreme Being in the hierarchy of beings, as that which is veiled by beings and as that which grounds the duality of subject and object that is presupposed by the study of beings is passed over and forgotten; it remains hidden and veiled. He, therefore, asks what is the meaning of Being? For him, this is not a grammatical question; it is to ask for an unveiling of the being of beings. The very fact that man can ask this question shows, for Heidegger, that he has ‘perfective sense of being’. In his work “Being and Time” Heidegger sets out to give a Phenomenological-ontological analysis of man as the being who is able to raise the question and who is thus open to Being. What he calls fundamental ontology thus becomes an existential analysis of man as “existence”.

Though, Heidegger's aim is to bring being to show itself, as it were, he never really gets further than man and in as much as man's finitude and temporality are brought clearly to light, he tends to give the impression that Being is essentially finite and temporal. In his later writing, we hear a great deal about man's openness to Being and of the need for keeping it alive but it can hardly be it in that he succeeded in unveiling Being. Nor indeed, would he claim to have done so. In fact, although Heidegger proclaims that the world in general and philosophers in particular have forgotten Being, he seems unable to explain clearly what they have forgotten or why the forgetfulness should be as disastrous as he says it is. Heidegger located the cause of human anxiety in man's awareness of his finitude when, for example, I confront death, nor death in general, but my death. It is only man who experience nothingness. Human finitude therefore, is not simply a matter of temporary ignorance or some shortcomings or even error. Finitude is the very structure of the human mind, and words such as guilt, loneliness and despair describe the consequences of human finitude. The ultimate principle of being, says Heidegger, is "will". He concludes therefore that our basic understanding of the large question of being is achieved through the existential analysis of the person. Heidegger was concerned chiefly with Being, and with the existence of the person only as a means of understanding being.

Jean Paul Sartre

Sartre was born in Paris in 1905 and was active in the Resistance Movement. His name became identified with existentialism because he took to the writings of his contemporary German philosophers especially, Heidegger. His version of existentialism is a product of mixture of three contemporary modes of thought of Marx, Husserl and Heidegger. What these three strands of thought had in common for Sartre was their concern about man's active role in forging his own destiny. The basic principle of Sartre's existentialism is based on his notion that "existence precedes essence" this means, according to Sartre, that man first exists, confronts himself, emerges in the world and defines himself afterwards. In contrast with some other things man first exists and then makes his essence. Human freedom precedes the essence of man and makes it possible. Here we have the belief which Sartre tells us, is common to all existentialists, namely that existence precedes essence. Man is not already made. He makes himself. His course is not pre-determined. He makes himself not in the sense that he created himself out of nothing but in the sense that what he becomes depends on himself; on his own choice.

In his lecture on "Existentialism and Humanism", Sartre explains that in his view there is no God who created man according to some ideal of human nature so that each human being exemplifies human essence. Obviously, all atheists would agree with this opinion. But we are concerned with man himself, not with the question of whether or not he was created by God. Sartre maintains that in man, existence precedes essence. Indeed, even if we take literally what Sartre says, it is clear that human beings have a certain common essence or nature namely that they are beings which makes themselves to be what they become Sartre's main contention is clearly that man is wholly free, that whatever he does is the result of free choice, and that what he becomes depends

entirely on him. What Sartre wants to argue is that man is simply that which he makes of himself. He sees man as something, which moves itself towards a future, and it is conscious that it is doing so.

Sartre distinguished between two different modes of being namely: (i) being-in-itself and (ii) being-in-the-world. By being in-itself, he means a being that is dormant, inactive and unconscious subject that defines its essence in existence which is authentic existence (which therefore differentiates him from the existence of a stone). The most important consequences of placing existence before essence in human nature is not only man creates himself but that man is responsible for what he is, every responsibility for man's existence is placed upon man.

References

Anthony Kenny, A New History of Western Volume 1, Ancient Philosophy, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Plato, The Republic, Hertford size Wordsworth Edition, 1997.

Copleston, A History of Philosophy, American Newman Press Maryland, 1962.

Stumpf, S. F. Philosophy, History and Problems 2nd Edition, London, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Omuregbe, J. A. Simplified History of Western Philosophy, Lagos, Joja Press Ltd 1999.

Uduigwuomen A, and Ogbinaka, K. (ed.) Philosophy and Education, Lagos, Obaroh and Ogbinaka Publishers Ltd, 1999.

Taylor, C. W. (ed). Routledge History of Philosophy from the Beginning to Plato London, RoutledgeHistory of Philosophy from the beginning to Plato, London, Routledge, 1997.

Furley, D. (ed.), Routledge History of Philosophy from Aristotle to Augustine, London, Routledge, 1997.

Kahn, C.H., Plato and the Socratic Dialogue, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Ogugua, D., in Ike Odimegwu et al (eds). Basic Logic and Philosophy, Awka, Fab Anieh Nig. Ltd, 2012.

CHAPTER SIX

AFRICAN PHILOSOPHY

Jude Onebunne Ph.D.

Miriam Alike Ph.D.

Introduction

It's worthy of note that no known discipline or culture is devoid of philosophical influence. Taking cognizance of its *mainbranches* and other *appliedareas*, philosophy cuts across every learning and teaching to be known as *materscientia*, mother of sciences or mother of all knowing. Obenga, T. (1990: 51), in his philosophical discourse writes: "*Philosophy has nourished science. It preceded the sciences. Science (Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics, Political Science, Aesthetics, Logic, Biology, Sociology, etc.), was born of philosophy*". No wonder then that medieval philosophers, influenced by the religious innuendoes of their time, (based on the chronological coincidence of medieval philosophical tradition and relationship with the historical figure of Jesus, as well as the dominating power and influence of His teaching), regarded philosophy as *ancillatheologiae*, the servant or handmaid of theology.

The place of philosophy in every facet of human enterprise is very unique. It is neither by chance nor fate, rather by calculated implication that designated high institutions of learning offer PhD, that is *Doctor of Philosophy*, in all areas of human learning as the highest degree one can attend in academics. Hence, the nature and place of philosophy in learning and living, societal influence and general directives, is unquestionable. Maritain (2005:72) maintains that philosophy is the highest of the human *sciences*, that is, of the sciences which know things by the natural light of reason. But there is a science above it. For if there be a science which is a *participation* by man of the knowledge proper to God himself, obviously that science will be superior to the highest human science. Such a science, however, exists and it is theology. The word *theology*, from *theo* and *logos*, meaning the science of God.

It is worthy of note that Philosophy is as old as the *homo cogitans*, the thinking man. Philosophy according to Maritain (2005: 74) is the "*highest human sciences, that is, of the sciences which know things by the natural light of reason*". In the chequered history of humanity especially with regard to scholarship, Philosophy, *presumably* western philosophy, dates to Socrates and his Ionian scholars of whom, ancient history as well as contemporary history, proved that *all Greek Philosophy often referred to as Ancient Philosophy had an Oriental source*. Obenga, T. (1990:1) reiterated this age-long hidden but necessary facts when he writes that the Ancient Greek philosophers "having studied in Africa of Pharaonic period went back to Athens to philosophize". We must note that Ancient Egypt, of Black Pharaonic era, has known to be the mother and cradle of civilization through an old inscription that read thus: *thirty centuries before*

Greeks presented an orderly conception of life, in language suggestive of a tradition already several centuries old. With regard to Africa, one notes that we are dealing with philosophy that was dated alongside the oldest ancient civilization of Egypt. Onyewuenyi, I. (1993), supported this age long view of Egypt's philosophy predating the Greeks in his book: *The African Origin of Greek Philosophy: An Exercise in Afrocentricism* and other African Philosophers in their authorships had the same view with these titles: George, G. M. James (1992). *Stolen Legacy: Greek Philosophy is Stolen Egyptian Philosophy*. Philosophy has come to stay as a human enterprise and a discipline since ages. The history of philosophy, therefore, is replete with possibilities dating thus:

*From Ancient Time (7th Century Before Christ: BC – 5th Century Anno Domino: AD);
Through the Medieval Movement (6th Century BC - 16th Century AD);
Across the Modern Period (17th Century AD – 20th Century AD) and
Unto the Contemporary Moment (20th Century – till date).*

This history is equally reckoned with different philosophical traditions as:

- a. Western Philosophical Tradition
- b. Oriental/Eastern Philosophical Tradition
- c. Abrahamic (Judeo-Islamic) Philosophical Tradition
- d. African Philosophical Tradition.

In our context, therefore, African Philosophy is a philosophy borne out of African philosophical tradition. As result of this, African Philosophy becomes part of African civilisation opening doors to great civilizations and development.

A Return to the debate on the existence of African Philosophy

According to Iroegbu, P., (1995, 129), “no author has to my knowledge declared that there can be no African Philosophy”. The problem has been in Iroegbu's perspective has to do with: *the bulk of material called African philosophy by their authors, readers or researchers genuinely philosophy and genuinely African philosophy?* However, one may be tempted to ask if all the tradition-based narratives in the texts of P. Tempels, A. Kagame, and J. Mbiti as well as the political thoughts of S. Senghor, K. Nkrumah, J. Nyerere, N. Azikiwe really philosophic in a sense or a mere collection of stories? However, no serious mind will doubt the philosophical dexterity and critical status of authors and scholars like Pauline Hountondji, Theophilus Okere, Kwasi Wiredu, Peter Boudunrin, Odera Oruka and Panteleon Iroegbu to mention but a few.

Amidst the continued debate on the existence of African Philosophy, Okere, T., however, argues on the conditional possibility of African philosophy with his *philosophemes*. For him, therefore, African philosophy as a human enterprise is fundamentally *African* and *Philosophical* in accordance to genuine scientific exigencies and within the bounds of Africa's societal and trad-

cultural milieu. Hence, African philosophy, having permeated different cultures and traditions, has gathered a lot of *philosophemes* as Okere opined.

KwasiWiredu, having contrasted the traditional thought patterns with the already existing western philosophical texts branded the much lauded African philosophy *Folkphilosophy*. Peter Boudunrin sees in the Bantu Philosophy (of Tempels and Kagame) and Mbiti's work a mere justification of belief system devoid of philosophical rigour. Odera Oruka was apt in distinguishing and grading philosophical works or rightly put, works on *AfricanThoughts* done before him as: *Ethno-Philosophy*, *Philosophical Sagacity*, *Nationalist Ideological Philosophy and Professional Philosophy* - of which Hountondji, Bodunri and Wierdu's works excelled as professional philosophy and others were collection of worldviews. In line with the above, one can conclude with Hountondji that African philosophy is still before us, not behind us. That is, it is yet to come according to Wiredu and Boudunrin. More so, Okere was very sure that there can be and there is already African philosophy given his reference to Philosophy as essentially the hermeneutics of culture, as there exists a reservoir of cultural *philosophemes* in Africa. Other later contemporary philosophers like WilliwamAmo, K. Gyekye, H. Maurier, K.C. Anyanwu, C. Onyewuenyi, C.B. Okolo, P. Iroegbu, and I.M. Osuagwu readily accept the Okerean conditions that *there is African Philosophy* as philosophy as such. The criteria for African philosophy and being an African philosopher, however, should not be limited to authorship irrespective of continental boundaries like Hountondji and some philosophers may argue. Omeregbe, J. in Boudunrin (1985, 5), was very succinct in declaring that, "when there is reflection on the fundamentals questions about man or about the universe (whatever form this reflection may take) there is philosophy".

Hence, with the foregoing, the history of contemporary philosophy saw great rise in African philosophical enterprise, within and beyond African continent. Acknowledging this sublime fact, Oguejiofor, J.O. (2003) submits to the envisaged problem thus, "although African philosophy has become a part of the world philosophical heritage that can no longer be neglected, no comprehensive history of it is available". His problematic possibility, however, was that of methodological moments for African philosophy rather than a challenged impossibility. The implication of Oguejiofor's bold statement is that there is a philosophy that is African or in Africa to be historically articulated and pieced together. If there is no philosophy, there will be no need for its history as such. The existence of a philosophy therefore necessitates a history. Oguejiofor was very particular with regard to the prospect and possibility of articulating such history of African Philosophy. Equally, Osuagwu, I.M., amidst other astute authors like: Iroegbu, P. and Chimakonam, J., has done great scholarly job with the following titles: *A Contemporary History of African Philosophy*, *Amamihe Lecture Series, Vol. IV*, (Enugu: Snaap Press Ltd.), 1999; *African Historical Reconstruction*, (Owerri: Assumpta Press Ltd.), 1999 and *Early Medieval History of African Philosophy*, *Amamihe Lectures, Vol. II* (Enugu: Snaap Press Ltd., 2001).

However, the main critical question with regard to African Philosophy that has come to stay, like Chinese or Jewish Philosophy, borders more on the existing doubt over the origin of philosophy in ancient Greeks against the Afrocentric view that philosophy started in Ancient Egypt of Africa as the cradle of civilization. Many scholarships have attested to this fact thus: Nwala's *Igbo Philosophy*, Onyewuenyi's *African Origin of Greek Philosophy*, Obenga's *African Philosophy: The Pharaonic Period, 2780-330BC*, Okafor's *Igbo Philosophy of Law*, Hountondji's *African Philosophy, Myth and Reality*, James Georg's *Stolen Legacy*, Blyden E., *The Negroes in Ancient History*, to mention but a few.

Amidst these African scholarships with regard to the origin and proper history of African philosophy, how can one continue to question the possibility of African philosophy? How can one still regard African philosophy, which has become a part of world philosophical heritage and has informed philosophers of the ancient era of western philosophical tradition, a mere ethno-philosophy in a derogatory sense, that is, a cultural assemblage of beliefs, patches of wisdom and systems of thought. Can such reductionism be related to Muslim philosophy or Indian philosophy?

Definition of African Philosophy

Beyond special areas of philosophy as well as the main or minor branches of philosophy, African Philosophy as a unique discipline is of African philosophical tradition. It is a discipline that is defined by the conceptual understanding of African and philosophy. In other words, our definition ought to be

African and philosophical. Philosophy is philosophy in spite of the epochs, traditions and historical figures involved in the act of such philosophical enterprise. African philosophy is not an exception to the nitty-gritty that produced and retained Asian philosophy, Islamic philosophy and Western philosophy. The LCM amidst these philosophical engagements across the ages and traditions is philosophy. That is to say that philosophy is the point of discussion.

African philosophy is philosophy as it is done in and for Africa and others. It is a philosophical tradition that is African within the mainstream of philosophy as a systematic study. African philosophy is the critical and universalizing interpretation of the culture and the worldview of African people by philosophers within and outside African continent. It is philosophy done within African philosophical tradition designating the corpus of African philosophical writings. However, African philosophy like other philosophical traditions has an historical development along the path of human consciousness, critically encountering such realities. This is against some philosophers' views and philosophical currents trying to demean and oppose the existence of African philosophy. African philosophy is a critical enterprise in complete *philosophicality* and *Africanity*. According to Osuagwu, I., (1999: 31) "African philosophy is a particular regional contextualization, reflection and expression of the universal of and by its philosophicality, it is a universalization, a universal vocation, ordination, destination and determination of and in the

African particular”. The era of engaging oneself on the possibility of African Philosophy has gone. We are in the era of practical appreciation of African philosophy through a methodological approach that will locate African philosophy within the comity of philosophical traditions and epochs as well as *philosophico-historical* figures. Gone are the days when philosophers were in doubt of anything like African philosophy not minding that history is replete with the fact that the acclaimed first Ionia philosophers having studied in Egypt of Black African Continent went back to philosophize. By this documented fact, African philosophy, like other philosophical traditions: Italian philosophy, Chinese philosophy, Asian philosophical traditions, remains philosophy as such. African philosophy, therefore, is a systematic study within the limits of the *Africanity* of philosophy and *philosophicality* of African realities and heritage.

African philosophy has been very much neglected, rejected and denied on the grounds of its lack of genuine *scientificity*, authentic *Africanity* and systematic *philosophicality*. However, through continued studies and sustained researches, African philosophy finds stability with its *Africanity* and more, its philosophicality. It is no more a question of, is there an African philosophy? Can there be African metaphysics? The emphasis on the question shifts rather from “can there be African philosophy” to the issue of possibility as it regards to historicity and method in African philosophy, principles, issues and special areas in African Philosophy.

African philosophy, as a human enterprise, is fundamentally *African* and *Philosophical* in accordance to genuine scientific exigencies and within the bounds of Africa’s societal and tradocultural milieu. African philosophy has over the time permeated different cultures and traditions. Philosophy as the critical worldview of the people or *ethnos* remains according to Okere, T (1983:18) the hermeneutics of culture. The [Cambridge English Dictionary](#) states that culture is “the way of life, especially the general customs and beliefs, of a particular group of people at a particular time.” To philosophize, therefore, is to interpret the way of life of the people embedded in their belief system and customs. Philosophy, therefore, is fundamentally an interpretation of culture. It is the clarification and an explanation of the way and life of a people. As a human enterprise, philosophy elucidates on the realities confronting the human society as well as his environment. Within the culture of the people, as *ethnos*, exists raw philosophical materials for critical engagement which OkereTheophilus refers as *philosophemes*. However, Onebunne, J. (2019a, 22) asserts thus: “*philosophemes* is a concept used by TheophilusOkere which represents those cultural materials, data or givens that we use in philosophizing. It is the cultural and natural realities which are veritable products for philosophical enterprise”. In the words of Okere, T. (1983, 120) then:

We assert, however, that in black African there exists a reservoir of cultural *philosophemes* from which any future philosopher can inspire himself or borrow his share of philosophical raw material. In such a culture a philosopher can plant his root and from inside it, and as forming part of it,

develop a philosophy with his culture as non- philosophical background.

The Philosophicality and Africanity of African Philosophy

Makumba, M. (2014:29) maintains that philosophy is a universal enterprise with element of *Africanness* understood as coming from Africa. *Africanness* addresses the issue of African identity as inevitable in defining African philosophy. Kanu, I., (2015:17), however, reiterates on the universality of philosophy as a fundamental basis for African philosophy. In Akan philosophy, Bantu Philosophy, Chinese philosophy, Eastern philosophy, Indian philosophy and African philosophy for example, Kanu, A. (2015:20) maintains that “while the idea of philosophy that is attached speaks of its universality, the other speaks of its diversity and contextuality which makes it substantive. Thus, African philosophy is universally substantive.” However, both Makumba and Kanu speak of the *Africanness* and philosophiness of African Philosophy. Osuagwu, I. M (1999, 28) in his criteria for the scientific philosophicality and scientific Africanity of African Philosophy was very apt to note thus:

African philosophy is at the same time African and philosophical. In and by these terms, we are searching, on the one hand, for the genuine philosophicality, i.e., formal scientific philosophy, of the said African enterprise, and on the other hand, for the authentic scientific Africanity of that scientific philosophy. These two basic scientific criteria make African philosophy to bear the characteristics marks of its particularity and universality.

Philosophicality simply places African Philosophy at par with *philosophia*, which is love of wisdom. To this extent, African philosophy remains according to Oguejiofor *part of the world philosophical heritage* with one philosophical monoculture though from African *weltanschauung*. Philosophicality nevertheless prunes African philosophy of the old socio-cultural bias of existence and mere sceptical influence with any pseudo-philosophical orientation. However, by this singular application of philosophicality, African philosophy becomes philosophy *qua* philosophy irrespective of the philosophical traditions and or philosophers’ postulations as long as it expresses the needed *love for wisdom* and maintains the search for knowledge with an unaided reason as the most basic instrument. African Philosophy in this perspective is philosophy *per excellence* considering its contribution to world philosophical heritage and even to western ancient philosophers like Socrates and other known philosophical figures, periodization and traditions. If Socrates was regarded as a philosopher *per se* alongside western philosophical tradition, then the tradition that produced him, which is the Egyptian African philosophical tradition must have elements of such uncompromising philosophical innuendoes.

Equally, *Africanity* is a veritable characteristic in defining African philosophy as such. Scientific *Africanity* is a complementary principle in the definition of African philosophy. *Africanity* is a criterion that defines African philosophy properly with some parameters. According to Osuagwu, I.M. (2001, 24): “by its *africanity*, it is a particular that is to say, a particular reflection, concentration, concretization, contextualization...” *Africanity* tries to solve the controversy and the project of African philosophy by going beyond the boundaries of the geographical Africa. Within the geographical context, *Africanity* expresses what it takes for any philosophy to be qualified, identified, and differentiated as specifically and typically African. It contextualizes African experiences, life and reality within the realm of philosophy. For Osuagwu, I. M. (2001, 26) therefore:

Scientific *Africanity* refers to a set of African parameters or factors which include nature and culture, persons, places, times, events, doctrine, text and methods involved in philosophic enterprises so designated. These factors and many more constitute the common requirements by which a given subject matter is said to be African.

Borrowing an impressive idea from J. Kinyongo, Osuagwu, I. M. (1999, 28) writes that “African philosophy is carried on at the same time according to philosophy’s general scientific exigencies and Africa’s particular natural and cultural factors. In this cooperation, and mutual integration, philosophy and *Africanity* look into each other to detect, engage and determine the scientifically valid and available in themselves”.

Definitional Universality of African Philosophy

The definition and universality of African Philosophy against oddities of credibility and doubts of existence per chance is resolved in the *philosophicality* and *Africanity* of African Philosophy. African philosophy, therefore, has a share in the mainstream of philosophical traditions growing as a human enterprise as a result of critical interpretation of tradition and cultural realities. Okere, T. (1983, 38) asserts that “all philosophy is essentially an historical and time bound interpretation of being”. In this line of thought, however, there are ethno-philosophical foundations to philosophy as critical engagement of which African philosophy or Chinese philosophy is no exception. This is far beyond referring African philosophy as *Sage* or mere *Cultural* philosophy. Amidst all sorts of bizarre and false ideas on the capability of African man to philosophize, questioning the depth of their philosophy, one can boast of African philosophical scholarship as well as African authorship. However, Iroegbu (1994, 116) an optimistic contemporary African philosopher was very pertinent in defining African philosophy as:

The reflective inquiry into the marvels and problematics that confront one in African world, in view of producing systematic explanation and sustained responses to them. It is an inquiry with two aspects: *philosophical* and *African*.

Iroegbu, P. was very *premier* in giving this succinct definition. In this definition one can read a *kind* defence of African philosophy against being labelled mere folk, cultural or *ethno*-philosophy. The background at the time of this definition has to do with questioning and searching for the conditional possibility of African philosophy with regard to historicity and methodology. This is why for Iroegbu, P., (1994:116) African philosophy is a *philo-sophia*, a *quest for (African) wisdom*. However, Iroegbu was academically astute enough to reiterate that “African philosophy is philosophy done in an African context...different aspects and complexities of existence that challenge him as an African person. In this respect, every philosophy is contextual philosophy”. By this very act, I strongly add that every philosophy to worth the salt is ethno-philosophical, relatively cultural and appropriately traditional to the philosopher. Alluding to this Iroegbu, P., (1994, 122) was vehemently bent on this general understanding of philosophy as: the global participation of all realities and entities in the general fact and understanding of being as being whether in African, Asian or Western philosophy. Summarily, Iroegbu, P., (1994, 122) gave ten areas of any contextual or ethno-philosophical basic foundation for genuine philosophical enterprise thus: *Geo-environmental, Socio-cultural, Episteme, Mythico-religious, political-moral, Historic, Ethnic –linguistic, Existential, Phenomenologico-pragmatical and ontological*. For Iroegbu, P., (1994:122), therefore, these philosophical concepts alone “are what we generally call the African philosophical *philosophemes*: raw materials for philosophical reflection, questioning, responses, analysis and eventual synthesis”. In this statement of fact, Iroegbu, P., however, continues to echo his teacher OkereTheophilus who had earlier conceived the idea of *philosophemes* as deposit of conceptual data or realities for philosophical enterprise. In favour of African philosophy, OkereTheophilus (1983, 70) was first in positing the *possible possibility* of African philosophy when he opined thus:

If philosophy is to be auto-generated from a culture, if it is to represent an articulated self-expression of man within his culture, one has to look for a different metacategory, more pertinent to Igbo culture than Being. Perhaps the notion of life, perhaps even the Igbo conception of “Uwa” (literally the world, but really englobing both the cosmos, nature, and destiny), could take over the role of Being. This need not imply that an Igbo cannot understand the notion of Being or a philosophy based on this notion. It means, however, that a philosophy original to this culture would not take its orientation from a concept so strange to it.

Periodization of African Philosophy

African philosophy has a beautiful history that is shrouded in controversies and conspiracies of lies. It started with total denying of African philosophy until the question *can there be African philosophy* unto the era of *identifying African philosophy with mere records of facts* thereby derogatorily seen it as Sage philosophy and other unpleasant nuances. However, the work of Okere having acknowledged such existence of African Philosophy talks of the possibility. African philosophy, therefore, presupposes a history of systematic history African philosophy and based on this history we talk of its periodization. Many Philosophers have attempted greatly in giving the periodization of African Philosophy that started according to Jonathan Chimakonam in *Onuma* (that is 'Frustrated' by colonialism and racialism as well as the legacies of slavery, they were jolted onto the path of philosophy) as against wonder of the Ancient Greek Philosophy. Jonathan Chimakonam had his own Periods of African Philosophy between 1920 and 1990 as Early Period, Middle Period, Later Period and New Era. Osuagwu, I and Iroegbu, P were astute in doing so by dating theirs as far back as 17th century in Europe. Iroegbu, P., (1994: 123) x-rayed different epochs of African philosophy. Equally, Osuagwu was popularly detailed in positing historical method which nevertheless takes care of the reason why philosophy is *wonder* (for the western philosophy) and *Onuma* (for African Philosophy according to Jonathan Chimakonam). In the words of Osuagwu, I (1999:39) "not until we have a reasonable alternative, we shall, it has been declared, adopt the existing European system of historical dating and classification of African Philosophy." Hence, the classification is:

a. The Ancient African Philosophy

It is the philosophy developed in Egypt and Alexandrian arising from the reality that confronted thinkers with regard to their worldview. It can be called *Ancient Egyptian period*. This form of thinking predates even ancient Greek philosophical thinking. Ancient African Philosophers of the nascent period include Ptah-Hotep, the first known philosopher in History (2800 B.C.), hundreds of years before Greek Thales of 700 B.C.; Imhotep, a black Egyptian who was called god of medicine by the Greeks, lived 2000 years before Hippocrates. Hypatia is the first know woman philosopher, astronomer and mathematician who lived in Alexandria between 370-415AD. It is worthy of note that ancient Greeks like Homer, Herodotus, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle acknowledged Egyptian influence on their language, science, philosophy mathematics, etc.

b. The Medieval African Philosophy

This period is divided into: i) Early medieval period. It was a period around 6th C with more of Christian mediation by thinkers like Origen (often regarded as founder of Christian Theology), Clement of Alexandria and St. Augustine. It was era of African catholic thinkers. ii) Later medieval period of 10th C: It was the Islamico Arabic Phase of African thinkers with figures like: IbuKhaldum (alongside the spread of Islam in the

North Africa), William Amo (a Ghanaian philosopher who lived and lectured in Germany in the 17th C.)

c. The Modern African Philosophy

This period covers Africa as well as all philosophers from within and on African issues who are of European and American diaspora, from about 18th to 19th century. According to Iroegbu, P., (1994, 126) the earliest works on African philosophy were those of Placide Tempels, Alexis Kagame, John S. Mbiti, Bolaji Idowu, Geoffrey Pallinder, John Taylor, Dominique Zahan as well as the political thoughts of Julius Nyerere, Kwame Nkrumah, Leopold Senghor, Kenneth Kaunda, Nnamdi Azikiwe, O. Nkombe, T. Tshiamalenga,

d. The Contemporary African Philosophy

This era saw a lot of rich diversity of *doctrines, currents, literature and authorship* within and beyond the continental shores of Africa in response to the ever proclaimed possibility of African Philosophy. Philosophers in this era dwelt more on the possibility and modality of articulating African Philosophy with regard to its history and the method. Such proponents are Paulin Houtondji, T. I. Okere, W.A. Hart, Kwasi Wiredu, Peter Bodunrin, Odera Oruka, Kwame Gyekye, K.C. Anyanwu, Henri Maurier, Innocent Onyewuenyi, C.B. Okolo, Joseph Omoregbe, Pantaleon Iroegbu, Innocent Osuagwu, etc

Branches of African Philosophy

Since we have a reasonable alternative, that is, the existing European system of classifying branches of Philosophy, we have no need manufacturing one than follow their categorization. Iroegbu, P., (1994:138), however, gave 12 main branches (as against minor or applied areas of philosophy) of into which basic African philosophy would develop and be studied as Logic (Ezemezu Logic for Jonathan Chimakonam), Metaphysics (cum Theodicy), Epistemology, Ethics, Cosmology, Anthropology (Philosophical and Cultural), Socio-Political Philosophy, Axiology, Aesthetics, Hermeneutics/Linguistic Philosophy, Psychology and History of African Philosophy. Iroegbu, P. (1994:138) nevertheless gave sub-branches of African philosophy to the above 12 as Philosophy of science, law, art, etc.

Schools of Thought in African Philosophy

There are different philosophical positions or systems of thought as well as well-defined philosophical systems that are very peculiar to African Philosophy. Often times such schools of thought with their different views lead to different movements relating to African Philosophy and its influence on the society. Some of these schools of thought according to Jonathan Chimakonam are: Ethno-philosophy School, Nationalist School, Philosophic Sagacity,

Hermeneutic School, Literary school, Professional school and Conversational School. These schools of thought often are like philosophical movements and more of socio-political movements for the emancipation of continental Africa like Africanism, Socialism, Leopold Sedar Senghor's Negritude, Kwame Nkrumah's Consciencism, and Julius Kambarage Nyerere's *Ujamaa*. Equally Chimakolam Jonathan gave other African philosophical Movements thus: Excavationism, Afro-constructionism/Afro-deconstructionism, Critical Reconstructionism/Afro-Eclecticism and Conversationalism. However, these theories are movements as they represent a strand of thought amidst great assumptions.

a. Ethno-philosophy School

Ethno-philosophy is neither a branch of philosophy nor an applied philosophy of any philosophical tradition rather a complimentary than a derogatory aspect in the understanding of one particular philosophical tradition or philosophy that is Africa by origin, praxis and practice. By various African historical methodologies of (deconstruction, deduction, construction and reconstruction), the basic problems and project of authentic African philosophy like other philosophical traditions is assured and guaranteed. In favour of much opposition against African philosophy, Onyewuenyi, I.C. (1993, 2) writes: "the history of Africa, as presented by European scholars has been encumbered with malicious myths". Osuagwu, I.M. (2010, 28) reiterates his opinion thus: "the major argument is that Africans lack the natural faculty and cultural capacity of reason, and so could not have formally philosophized or historicized". Ethno-philosophy defined as such is philosophy that is based on the works of ethnographers, sociologists and anthropologists, interpreting our African world views as well as our myths and folklores as constituting part of African philosophy. In spite of outstanding vagaries of criticisms, ethno-philosophy etymologically is from *ethnos* and *philosophia*. Hence, it is the *philosophy* of the *ethnos*. It is *ethnosphilosophy*. Ethno-philosophy, therefore, is the tribal, communal response, cultural view or customary critical view of a people.

b. Nationalist/Ideological School

According to Jonathan Chimakonam, the concern of this school was nationalist philosophical jingoism to combat colonialism and to create political philosophy and ideology for Africa from the indigenous traditional system as a project of decolonization. Thoughts of members of the Excavationism movement like Kwame Nkrumah, Leopold Sedar Senghor and Julius Nyerere in the early period can be brought under this school.

c. Philosophic Sagacity

Jonathan Chimakonam maintains that there is also the philosophic sagacity school whose main focus is to show that standard philosophical discourse existed and still exists in traditional Africa and can only be discovered through sage conversations. It is through an interaction with an elderly informed man can such knowledge be attained. The chief proponent of this school was

the brilliant Kenyan philosopher Odera Oruka who took time to emphasize that Marcel Griaule's similar programme is less sophisticated than his. Other adherents of this school include Gail Presbey, Anke Graness and the Cameroonian philosopher Pius Mosima. But since philosophical sagacity thrives on the method of oral interview of presumed sages whose authenticity cannot be independently verified, what is produced distances itself from the sages and becomes the fruits of the interviewing philosopher. So the sage connection and the tradition became defeated. Their enterprise falls within the movement of Critical Reconstructionism of the later period.

d. Hermeneutical School

Another well-known school is the hermeneutical school. Every philosophy, right from the dawn of the history of philosophy, be it of the Ancient period of Western philosophical tradition or the Ancient period of African philosophical tradition, emanates from the peoples' appreciation of environmental realities around them. Whatever is around a people becomes the primary source of their critical views and appreciation. Philosophy as the critical worldview of the people or *ethnos*, remains according to Okere, T (1983:18) the hermeneutics of culture. Jonathan Chimakonam maintains that the best approach to studying African philosophy is through interpretations of oral traditions and cultures as well as the emerging philosophical texts. Theophilus Okere, Okonda Okolo, Tsenay Serequeberhan and Ademola Fayemi Kazeem are some of the major proponents and members of this school. The confusion however is that they reject ethno-philosophy whereas the oral tradition and most of the texts available for interpretation are ethno-philosophical in nature. The works of Okere and Okolo feasted on ethno-philosophy. This school exemplifies the movement called Afro-constructionism of the middle period.

e. Literary School

African literature is a form of literature that originates from Africa and deals on African issues. It is mostly told by Africans or those who have in-depth knowledge about African cultures, traditions, values and literary styles. Africans naturally leave their lives with stories. Before the advent of writing, African events were internally stored in the human brain and were often related from one generation to another with the help of an oral artist. African literature springs from an in-born love of telling a story, of arranging words in pleasing patterns, of expressing in words some special aspects of our human experiences. Over the years, Africans have been able to pass their messages, unravel mysteries and entertain themselves through their own *orature* or oral literature. Some of the peculiar features of African literature are: African literature is imaginative, expresses thoughts and feelings and sometimes deals with true life stories or are stories told to teach humans lessons. According to Jonathan Chimakonam, the literary school's main concern is to make a philosophical presentation of African cultural values through literary/fictional ways. Proponents like Chinua Achebe, Cheik Anta Diop, Ngugiwa Thiong'o, Wole Soyinka to name a few have been outstanding. Yet critics have found it convenient to

identify their discourse with ethno-philosophy from literary angle thereby denigrating it as sub-standard. Their enterprise remarks the movement of Afro-constructionism of the middle period.

f. Professional School

The most controversial is the one variously described as professional, universalist or modernist school. It contends that all the other schools are engaged in one form of ethno-philosophy or the other, that standard African philosophy is critical, individual discourse and that what qualifies as African philosophy must have universal merit and thrive on the method of critical analysis and individual discursive enterprise. It is not about talking, it is about doing. Some staunch unrepentant members of this school include Kwasi Wiredu, Paulin Hountondji, Peter Bodunrin to name a few. They demolished all that has been built in African philosophy and built nothing as an alternative episteme. This school champions the movement of Afro-deconstructionism and the abortive Critical Reconstructionism of the middle and later periods respectively.

g. Conversational School

This emerging school thrives on fulfilling the yearning of the professional/modernist school to have a robust individual discourse as well as fulfilling the conviction of the traditionalists that a thorough-going African philosophy has to be erected on the foundation of African thought systems. They make the most of the criterion which presents African philosophy as a critical tradition that prioritizes engagements between philosophers and cultures and projects individual discourses from the thought system of Africa. Those whose writings fit into this school include Pantaleon Iroegbu, Innocent Asouzu, Bruce Janz, Jennifer Vest, Jonathan Chimakonam and Ada Agada to name a few. Their projects promote partly the movements of Afro-eclecticism and fully the conversationalism of the later and the new periods respectively.

Methodological Moments in African Philosophy

This has to do with method in African philosophy. African philosophy as systematic study is not possible without a method. Methodological approach, therefore, is very fundamental in understanding and *doing* philosophy. In a very strict sense, *no method no philosophy*. A part of the problem we have in philosophy is method and that is why without it anything goes. Without method in any philosophical enterprise, there are many things that cannot stand the litmus test of science nor assume the nature of philosophy. Hence, there are confusions in the boundaries of philosophy because there is neither one method nor specified methodological instrument used in the approach. Method remains the principal tool for philosophizing. Method, however, retains prominence in the practice and doing of philosophy. If method directs us proportionately to our target and focus, history as a method keeps us abreast with the past for a better present and opportune future. However, there are general methods of philosophy as: Socratic Method, Dialectics, Phenomenological Method, Referencing, Methodic Doubt, Analysis, Dialogics, Hermeneutics and Historical Method

Jonathan Chimakonam preferred (a). The Communitarian Method (This method speaks to the idea of mutuality, the type found in the classic expression of ubuntu and communalism. Some of the thinkers who employ this method include; IfeanyiMenkiti, Mogobe Ramose, Kwame Gyekye, Thaddeus Metz, FainosMangena, Leonhard Praeg, Bernard Matolino, Michael Eze, and so forth); (b). The Complementarity Method (This method was propounded by Innocent Asouzu and it harps on the idea of missing link. it complements and is in return complemented because no variable is self sufficient. Scholars here are MesembeEdet, Ada Agada, Jonathan Chimakonam and a host of others) and (c). The Conversational Method (This is a formal procedure for assessing the relationships of opposed variables in which thoughts are shuffled through disjunctive and conjunctive modes to constantly recreate fresh thesis and anti-thesis each time at a higher level of discourse without the expectation of the synthesis. It is an encounter between philosophers of rival schools of thought and between different philosophical traditions or cultures. Proponents are Jonathan Chimakonam, Victor Nweke, MesembeEdet, FayemiAdemolaKazeem, Ada Agada, Pius Mosima, and a host of others).

African philosophy as a cognate branch of philosophy appreciates and applies an already established method of philosophical enterprise like Analysis, Hermeneutics, Dialogue and Socratic Method. Nevertheless, beyond these, African philosophy with regard to her long years of historical exigencies has suffered *structured* underdevelopment that relegated Africa and her history to the background of presumed ignorance. Africa as a continent in her chequered history has equally suffered portioning and appropriation which climaxed in the *abhorrent* Slavery, *bedevilled* colonization, repugnant neo-colonization, disgusting capital flight and other forms of contemporary-brain-drain amidst political quagmire and leadership failure thereby enthroned corruption and enshrined as such in the lifestyle of our political juggernauts thereby leading to a kind of socio-economic malaise and developmental stagnation. Recently, African continent seems to have woken up from centuries of deep slumber of dilapidated historical excursus. The history as we evoke it is the status of time (date) and space (place) of events or issues with regard to human experiences.

Historical Method as Basic and Fundamental for African Philosophy

Added to the known and acceptable methods of philosophy there is this fundamental methodic approach of doing African philosophy that borders on recovering from the past and asserting her existence which is *HistoricalMethod* with four related moments of *Deconstruction*, *Reduction*, *Reconstruction* and *Construction*. We must note that all formal methods of philosophy of the early western philosophical tradition can be in one way or the other apply in the cognate moments of historical period. Such four methodological moments are possibly applicable in our contemporary era if we can make a meaningful scholarship out of the philosophical traditions of ancient, medieval, modern and contemporary periods of African philosophy. There is, therefore, a dire need to demonstrate the existing epochal traditions of philosophy by reconstructing and

constructing a proper philosophical enterprise that give credence to African philosophy amidst being proclaimed the cradle of ancient civilization that nevertheless included philosophy. These historico-methodological moments are great foundational possibility and manifest condition for African philosophical scholarship.

African Philosophico-Historical Deconstruction

As the concept implies, it entails a dismantling of an already existing scholarly structure. According to Osuagwu, I. M. (2001: 45), “This form of dismantling operation is synonymous with task of criticism”. Historical deconstruction may take form of critical analysis, philosophical appraisal or significant evaluation. To deconstruct entails a form of diminution or lessening by way of reducing an existing edifice. A good knowledge of the historical account of African continent shows that deconstruction method should be the most fundamental and valuable approach in tracing the damaging effects of the remains of the portioning and partitioning of Africa. We need to deconstruct the harmful effects as well gather the scattered consequences of slavery and colonialism in African soil from all over the continents of the old and new world order. Deconstruction method is needed to reform or modify as a way to reconstruct and then rebuild whatever colonization took over from where slavery stopped with stories of stolen legacies and how Europeans have continued to under-develop Africa. Deconstruction as a method is simply a moment of restoration for necessary reconstruction, must begin from where abolishment of slavery stopped unto decolonization.

African Philosophico-Historical Reduction

By reduction, Osuagwu, I (2001:46) meant that African history gets back and takes recourse to the origin of its philosophy in order to obtain things in their purity prior to their corruptions in the course of history”. Equally, Osuagwu, I., (1999:77) maintains that Reduction is understood as the tracing of philosophy back to its origins, foundations and principles in the remote, recent and immediate past. Historical reduction entails leading back to the establishment origins and doctrines. By reduction, one is indirectly reducing and lessening something especially when it entails lowering something of a sort. It entails a rebuilding, renovation, restoration, reform and even modernization. To this extent it presumes deconstruction. As African historic-reduction method tries to concise and abridge facts about the African philosophy

African Philosophico-Historical Reconstruction

Reconstruction presupposes deconstruction and or reduction, that is a form of ongoing dismantling of a structure. Reconstruction is synonymous with rediscovery, reestablishment or restoration. It entails recreating from a given. According to Onyewuenyi, I.,(2001:24)

reconstruction is a process of restoring what was wrongly done, calculatedly or mistakenly destroyed. It presupposes a form of destruction. He articulates it thus, “since the 1950s and 1960s when African nations began agitating for their independence from colonial domination, African scholars have begun a restoration project, which is an attempt to restore what slavery and colonization had taken away. They have initiated the resuscitation of African history and of all aspects of African culture as they were known before the colonial experience”. Reconstruction spells out critical evaluation and Analysis, a kind of phenomenological epoche. It entails picking up from the scratch of the litters and debris of knowledge across human history of knowing. Reconstruction refers a period following a deconstruction.

African Philosophico-Historical Construction

Moment of construction is equally moment of building or creating. It, however, entails a form of creativity and novelty, something new from an already existing material knowledge. Construction is possible because of the historical deconstruction, reduction and reconstruction. It is pertinent to note that the historical moments in African philosophy is properly addressed in the very form of proper historical construction. In line with Martin Heidegger in *The Basic Problem of Phenomenology* asserts that construction in philosophy is necessarily deconstruction, that is to say a deconstruction of traditional concepts carried out in a historical recursion (reduction) to the tradition. And this is not a negation of the tradition or a contradiction of it as worthless, quite the reverse, it signifies precisely a positive appropriation of tradition. It is very pertinent to note that the methodological moments of deconstruction, reduction and reconstruction are primarily and essentially constructive. These historical-methodological moments are complementary as they complete each other in the philosophical enterprise.

Challenges to African Philosophy as philosophy

African Philosophy has come to stay as *part of world philosophical heritage*. It's no more a problem of *can there be* and even *the possibility* but that of the normal difficulty in genuine African philosophizing. Iroegbu, P., (1994:133) gave three major difficulties in African Philosophy as:

a. Education

The contact with the west interfered greatly with being genuine African. Most of the African philosophers are limited in their education and as consequence, a limited Weltanschauung. African as a continent is very peculiar. African must be acknowledged as part of world educational heritage as such, hence the need for philosophy of education. African Philosophy of education is most *adrem* for the nation in developmental crisis after these years of slavery and colonization. Such an African philosophy of education will definitely address and attend to African problems from African point of view. This why African Philosophy of Education, as an applied discipline, is the application of

African critical wisdom and other African philosophical issues on African education as a process of leading one out of ignorance and consequently leading same person into knowledge. African philosophy of education is for credible African education.

b. Receding African Past

The fundamental economic problem of Africa has a lot to do with the continued economic exploitation of the continent and her people by a strategized foreign policy that is inimical to African literary development. This exploitation which started with the great exploration of African continent, via colonization, civilization and Christianization and remained through unjust institutions established in the name of neo-colonialism and capital flight are forces against genuine African philosophy

c. Language

Language is a system of coherent and intelligible sounds organized by human thoughts and used by a group of humans for purposes of communication. There is connection between language and thought. Hence, man by this remains *homoloquens*. For *UcheAzikiwe*, language could be said to be a means of social control; it is a collection of motor responses. It functions symbolically and so is used for verbal communication. Again only human beings had evolved a communication system with the properties of natural language. If you wish to destroy a people you first of all destroy their language. And until the language of a people grows, their science and technology remain an illusion. Iroegbu, P.,(1994:134) maintains that “the linguistic expression of a people is definitional of their essential being and acting. Language is the soul of culture, the heart of the environment and spirit that motivates and directs a people’s life.” African philosophy greatest challenge in our time is using foreign language that is alien to Africa to do African philosophy.

References

- Bodunrin, Peter O. 1985. ed. *Philosophy in Africa*. Ile-Ife: University of Ife Press.
- Hountondji, Paulin. 1996. *African philosophy: Myth and reality*. 2nd ed. Trans. H. Evans. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Iroegbu, Pantaleon. 1994. *EnwisdomizationandAfricanphilosophy*. Owerri: International University Press.

- Iroegbu, Pantaleon. 1995. *Metaphysics: Kpimofphilosophy*. Owerri: International University Press.
- Jonathan Chimakonam. In Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. *History of African Philosophy*. <https://iep.utm.edu/afric-hi/>. Retrieved 20/10/2020
- Kanu, A. I. 2015. *African philosophy: An onotologico-existential hermeneutic approach to classical and contemporary issues*. Jos: Augustinian Publications
- Maritain, Jacques. 2005. *An introduction to philosophy*. London: Continuum.
- Makumba, M. M. 2014. *Introduction to African philosophy*, Nairobi: Paulines Publications.
- Onyewuenyi, Innocent C. 1993. *The African origin of Greek philosophy: An exercise in Afrocentricism*. Nsukka: University of Nigerian Press.
- Obenga, Theophile. 1990. *African philosophy: The Pharaonic period, 2780-330BC*. Paris: L' Harmattan.
- Oguejiofor, Obi J. 2003. *Problems and prospects of a history of African philosophy*. In American Catholic Philosophical Association Quarterly, ed. Wood e. Robert. Vol. 77, No. 4. 477-498.
- Okere, Theophilus I. 1983. *African philosophy: A historico – hermeneutical investigation of the conditions of its possibility*. Lanham: University of American Press.
- Onebunne, Jude I. 2019d. *Method: A definitive demand in African Philosophy*. Awka: Fab AniehNig Ltd.
- Onebunne, Jude I. 2019a. *Being as belongingness: Expanding the hermeneutics of African metaphysics of to be*. Awka: Fab AniehNig Ltd.
- Osuagwu, Maduakolam I. 1999. *A contemporary history of African philosophy, Amamihe Lecture Series, Vol. IV*. Enugu: Snaap Press Ltd.
- Osuagwu, Maduakolam I. 2001. *Early medieval history of African philosophy, Amamihe Lectures, Vol. II*. Enugu: Snaap Press Ltd.
- Osuagwu, Maduakolam I. 2010. *A modern history of African philosophy, Amamihe Lectures, Vol. III : Focus on Anton Wilhelm Amo, an African Philosopher in 18th Century German Diaspora*. Enugu: Snaap Press Ltd.
- Unah, Jim. 2016. *On Being: Discourse on the Ontology of Human Being*. Lagos: Foresight Press.
- Wiredu, Kwasi. 2004. *Philosophy and African culture*. Cambridge: CUP.

CHAPTER SEVEN

PHILOSOPHY, CULTURE AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Anthony A. Mbah, Ph.D.

Preamble

The word culture, national development and philosophy can be said to be an important concepts when the success, growth and development of any nation, society or country is at play. This is because the three concepts are inter-twin and contains the basic elements that foster societal change. The first concept (Philosophy) and the Second (Culture) welcomes the Third (National Development). In every discipline, there is a model through which the subject matter of the discussion is tailored. Philosophy being a science of all sciences is no exception because all the methods of other disciplines are derived from it. Philosophical principles of systematic, articulates, critical and comprehensiveness is paramount in the discussion of this topic: Philosophy, Culture and National Development.

The Conceptual Analysis of Philosophy, Culture and National Development

The clarification of concepts since ancient times has interested theorists, scholars, philosophers' e.t.c in a bid for avoidance of ambiguity and vagueness. This is seen in the Plato's early dialogues which portray Socrates raising questions about definitions. He argued

In the Euthyphro, what is "piety"? which is questions that seem at once profound and elusive; the key step in Anselm's " Ontological Proof" for the existence of God is the definition of God and the same holds of Descartes's version of the argument in his Meditation V. The Frege-Russell definition of number and Tarski's definition of truth have exercised a formative influence on a wide range of contemporary philosophical debates.¹

In philosophy, different kinds of definitions are often in play, and definitions can serve a variety of different functions, to enhance precision and clarity, solving epistemological, ethical, logical and metaphysical problems.

Philosophy, what does it mean?

Philosophy from etymological perspective is said to have come from two Greek words "Philein" which means to love and "Sophia" which means wisdom. Or "Philos"- Love of or friend of, "Sophia"-wisdom.² To the Greeks philosophy meant love of wisdom and a philosopher was regarded as a lover of wisdom. According to Plato and Aristotle, the genesis of philosophy is as a result of "wonder" for them it is through that wonder that men begin and originally began to Philosophize."³ Plato further emphasized this stand in his work titled "Republic" when he noted that "there is no other beginning of philosophy than "Wonder."⁴ In support of the above assertion, Joseph, O. Eneh noted that philosophy irrespective of the country, nation, or epoch be it African, Indian, Western, Indian, Islamic, Oriental, e.t.c is as a result of human nature to Astonishment, puzzlement, curiosity, wonders about man, his existence and destiny, the existence of God, other beings and the material things in the universe, the purpose and uses of things in existence for man's development. According to Ene:

Human nature, wonder and curiosity to enquire are the arch or origin of philosophy for man regardless of his place and time of existence. Man has a natural desire and curiosity to investigate or enquire into things around him. His wonders and puzzlement about the universe and its objects principally are the factors leading him to philosophize. Man is eager to know things around him in order to liberate himself from ignorance and fear of the surroundings. The nature of man is to seek knowledge of himself, his world-views and the cause of things and universe for better living and humanization of man.⁵

The idea of philosophy can be grouped in two ways, "Loose and Academic Sense" the loose sense of it is lay man's misunderstanding about the meaning of philosophy where philosophy is understood in its loose or non-academic or non-professional meaning of the term by saying that "philosophy does not connote something 'mystical', 'mysterious', 'difficult', 'esoteric', reserved for the massive intellects only: Others think of philosophy as a subject which deals with matters out of the world, in a spiritual realm. Others still call philosophy "people's world-view" or one's moral guide" ⁶

For them philosophy connotes many things in a loose manner as a guiding principle to people in various professions and institutions. Mbaegbu noted that this could be one of the reasons various institutions and professionals like lecturers, masons, medical practitioners, lawyers, teachers, etc; constantly remind us that their "philosophy" is this or that. Some institutions of learning, namely, colleges, high schools, etc; have "philosophy." For example the Philosophy of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, as contained in its pledge is "Discipline, Excellence and Self-Reliance" it is hoped and expected that when the above vision has been achieved, graduates of the University will be Disciplined in behaviour, Excellent in knowledge and Self-Reliant in their choosing careers for the national development in keeping with the Motto of the University; "Discipline, Excellence and Self-Reliance".⁷ This loose way of talking about philosophy is nothing but the

motto or the guiding principles of these professionals and institutions which the members of such professionals or institution reverend.

On the other hand, philosophy in its academic sense is a critical investigation or enquires into the reality. This was also asserted by Chukwudum B. Okolo when he noted that:

Philosophy in its academic or professional meaning is a critical enterprise, something dynamic, a quest, a search, indeed, one would even define it. as a spirit of evaluative exploration or inquiry into all areas of human experience, of the world in which we live, of man himself and his place in the universe...In its widest range, so to speak, philosophy tries to give a coherent and systematic account of the multifaceted universe of being and knowledge; of what is, and how man knows it. In short, philosophy carries out a critique of daily experience in quest of truth of all existence as is rationally possible for man.⁸

For Immanuel Kant, philosophy asks four fundamental questions: "What can I know?" "What I ought to do?" "What can I hope for?" and "What is man." For Kant, philosophy concerns itself with the problems of knowledge of the universe, the question of social/ moral relationship, beliefs and that of self-knowledge.⁹

From the above definitions or views of philosophy from non-professional to professional or academic, it is clear that philosophy is for better understanding of man and his environments for growth and national development.

What is Culture?

According to the Latin origin, culture means cultivating, bringing up, educating, developing, respecting.¹⁰ Edward Burnett Tylor in the first paragraph of his *Primitive Culture* noted that Culture . . . is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.¹¹

Tylor made it clear that culture, so defined, is possessed by man alone. This conception of culture served anthropologists well for some 50 years. With the increasing maturity of anthropological science, further reflections upon the nature of their subject matter and concepts led to a multiplication and diversification of definitions of culture. In *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions* (1952), U.S. anthropologists A.L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn cited 164 definitions of culture, ranging from "learned behaviour" to "ideas in the mind," "a logical construct," "a statistical fiction," "a psychic defense mechanism," and so on.¹² The definition or the conception of culture that is preferred by Kroeber and Kluckhohn and also by a great many other anthropologists is that culture is an abstraction or, more specifically, "an abstraction from behaviour." Leslie A. White in the work "The Concept of Culture" noted that the issue is not really whether culture is real or an abstraction, he reasoned; the issue is the context of the scientific interpretation.¹³

Culture in its broad sense of the word is a system of programs, modes of upper biological living activities of the human (including actions, activities and communication). That system has been formed and developed throughout the historical process and helps in maintaining and improving the social life in all its aspects. Such programs, modes of activities have been incorporated by knowledge, standards, habits, ideas, and ways of action, thoughts, doctrines, trust, target, objectives, and value orientations. Such things are diverse and abundant and have been accumulated for a long time, formed the social experiences one incorporated factor of culture.

Culture and Philosophy

Culture is the source of fostering the systems of philosophy, the philosophical thoughts, and is the condition and material, the origin and condition for development of philosophy. A nation may have no own system of philosophy, but it cannot exist without its own culture. Culture is the necessary conditions, requisites for existence of each nation in both aspects of the material and spiritual life. According to that meaning, culture is also the requisites for the existence and development of system of philosophy, culture and national development.

Development of culture creates meanings, contents, modes of adjusting activities of the people, creates new genetic code systems, in order to preserve and impart such meanings, contents and modes of adjusting from some certain things. The society development connects closely with the formation of new modes of activity, therefore makes appear new programs, new modes along with new cultural genetic codes. In the development process, the disintegration, combination, exclusion, supplement among the new and old, modern and traditional systems, modes also take place.

Development and Human Development

The term development could be used interchangeably with evolution depending on the contexts in which it is being used, either positively or negatively to refer to situations, trends, or issues. Human development can be simply defined as a process of enlarging choices. Every day human beings make a series of choices some economic, some social, some political, some cultural. If people are the proper focus of development efforts, then these efforts should be geared to enhancing the range of choices in all areas of human endeavour for every human being. Human development is both a process and an outcome. It is concerned with the process through which choices are enlarged, but it also focuses on the outcomes of enhanced choices. According to Ekei:

The term “development” in international parlance encompasses the need and the means by which nations provide better lives for their people. Development here includes not only economic growth, although that is crucial, but more importantly, the human development. Through this effort, health, nutrition, education, clean environment, etc, are provided. The basic attraction associated with the

concept of development has boosted interest and aspiration of well meaning people, and civilized nations towards human development.¹⁴

This increased aspiration has made the issue of human development to assume a greater emphasis than any other kinds of development, physical or material. Human development has then become a significant value of no mean magnitude. Together with the pursuit of human rights, human development has become a value worth living for, and dying for. This desire to develop human being as to occupy his proper position in the scheme of things has enhanced nations' deliberate policies and action-plans towards human development.

Looking at the concept of development from African perspective, Anikpe A. Mbah noted that it can be seen from the African understanding of human nature. Being-with-others, implying that man in Africa is a being that realizes himself within the community in the midst of others.¹⁵

It is clear therefore that development and improvement are synonymous. When something has been made to wear a new look from what it was before, we can say that a development has taken place. The words "growth" and expansion" are coterminous with development, and they suggest positive development. These words equally denote progress being made from one stage to another, which do not denote negative development like retardation, degeneration or decline. Development in a wider context deals with socio-economic and political life of the society; it connotes the fulfillment, realization or actualization of goals and objectives, hopes and aspirations of that society. The process of actualization begins when a society recognizes its inadequacies, and sets goals for itself, and decides to make deliberate efforts to remedy perceived deficiencies in order to attain desired goals. In this regard, Nyerere views development as having an emancipator goal, i.e., it liberates man from shackles of ignorance, superstition and oppression in all its ramifications.

Consequently, all forms of development have to some extent a reasonable dose of educational process. For that reason, the development of the intellectual frontiers of the individual cannot be left untouched. By extension therefore, the development of the individual's intellectual capacity and capability empowers him socially, economically and politically; thereby giving him not only a sense of self-fulfillment, but also a sense of belonging and commitment to the overall development of society which is the goals of philosophy through its branches.

National Development

National development when simply put means to advance a nation. "It involves the socio-cultural factors and the development of the cognitive affective and psychomotor aspects of nation building"¹⁶, Okonkwo associated development to positive growth of a peoples livelihood economically, politically, culturally, technologically, educationally, and socially interwoven and intermingled to form a whole".¹⁷

Philosophy and National Development

Philosophy from antiquity, has championed the cause of human development. Ancient philosophers like Socrates, Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle, not only formally initiated what is

today regarded as the 'mother of all sciences', but led the inroad into humanity's cognitive development. Egypt as the cradle of human civilization is African philosophic claim. Inquiry into reality, a human specific ability, is essentially motivated by the ultimate need for human development. Thus, the quest for the meaning of being and ultimate reality necessitates the traditional- philosophical areas of inquiry like metaphysics, epistemology, logic, ethics and other specialized areas.

Philosophy is essentially an epistemic endeavor in so far as it thrives on the quest for knowledge of which crucial purpose is human development. For philosophy, man is essentially a rational animal. His rationality requires development through education. If knowledge acquisition (education) remains a vital aspect of human development, enquiry into the meaning, nature, source, subject and object of knowledge constitute a more basic human developmental apparatus. The lingering debate between rationalism and empiricism remain attempts at addressing staring epistemological issues. Beaming its critical search light on education, philosophy addresses

...questions in and about pedagogy, education policy, and curriculum, as well as the process of learning, to name a few. For example, it might study what constitutes upbringing and education, the values and norms revealed through upbringing and educational practices, the limits and legitimization of education as an academic discipline, and the relation between educational theory and practice¹⁸

With the lens of ethics, philosophy looks at man's development "human development" which takes cognizance of the moral aspect of man and thrives on multifarious values spread across all facets and spheres of human existence and endeavour. Philosophy champions enquiry into varieties and degrees of values defining and refining, describing and prescribing as well as multiplying human developmental value options. Together with theories of values, ethicists are concerned about human conducts in terms of stipulation of moral norms towards a stable humanity. Utilitarianism, theories of justice, ethical pragmatism, theories of equality, rights and freedom are part of many philosophical attempts at developing the moral aspect of man.

On explaining the relevance of metaphysics to human development, Jack Powell in ChukwuemekaNweke "Philosophy and the Pillars of Human Development" noted that:

The term "metaphysics" applies to a branch of philosophy focused on defining reality. The goal of metaphysics is to help those who study it understand reality and the world around them, and to help them achieve enlightenment. Oftentimes people turn to metaphysical studies when they are unhappy with something in their lives or when something is not working as they like it.¹⁹

He further stated that:

The two main questions all metaphysicists ask regularly are "What are there?" and "What is it like?" The goal of these two questions is to gain clarity on major philosophical questions, such as the meaning of life and what happens after a person dies. Answering these questions requires a different process for each individual, but the process is personal and involves reflection and Self-discovery "Human development".²⁰

Metaphysics is very crucial for the development of the rational and spiritual aspects of man. Various ontologies, theism, and aspects of medieval philosophy are metaphysical strands found in philosophy of religion. The dichotomy and reconciliation between faith and reason, the sacred and the secular are aspects of man's spiritual concern which philosophers of various strata have grappled with and attended to.

Philosophy considers critical thinking very vital to the development of the cognitive aspect of man. With studies in logic, philosophy champions humanity's project of valid reasoning. Man cannot claim to be operating at the zenith of his rationality in fallacious reasoning. Thus, studies in basic philosophy and logic remain an essential intellectual initiation into the world of higher institutions of learning. To enhance the socio-political facet of human development, philosophy basically recognizes man as both a social and political animal and harbours numerous socio-political theories which attend to his socio-political concerns in differing existential situations. In the bid to resolve the inherent conflict within human society, philosophy delves into the study of the social and political nature of man and his relationship with others. In recognition of the dynamism of humanity and for an organized and stable society, philosophy, in its prescriptive nature, multiplies political options for feasible and reliable governance. Development is the socio-political and economic wellbeing of the people. This can be discussed on the basis of a state structure. A state with a proper democratic principles and leadership is in process of an authentic development, which critically accompany all its social institutions, economic structures, and educational training into different philosophical goals or agenda. Philosophy therefore, is a set of idealistic goal, the pivotal force, or framework for the national policy formulation and evaluation of public policy.

Conclusion

The examination of the concept "Philosophy, Culture and National Development", were made by establishment of the nexus between philosophy, culture and national development. Culture and philosophy as a channel for human and national development were made and it is observed that Philosophy concerns itself with human existence, which undoubtedly deals with the deepest problem and issues of man and his development. Philosophy being the mother of all sciences seeks remedies through its different channels of inquiry like ethics, logic, metaphysics, epistemology and other applied areas in discovering, addressing and improving human conditions through human capabilities for efficient and sustainable decent standard of living,

human security and right, gender equality, environmental sustainability, participation in political and community life which is seen as the stage of human and national development.

References:

1. Anikpe Anthony Mbah, "Philosophy and Its Quest for Human Development" *NnamdiAzikiwe Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 8 N0. 1, 2016. Pp. 14-15.
2. Celestine ChukwuemekaMbaegbu, "Philosophy: Historiography, Ontological Status, Essence and Scienticity" *NnamdiAzikiwe Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 2 N0. 1 2009. P. 6.
3. Ibid. p.1
4. Ibid.
5. Joseph O. Eneh, *Philosophy and logic for Beginners*, (Enugu: Snaap Press Ltd; 2001), p.11
6. Celestine ChukwuemekaMbaegbu, "Philosophy: Historiography, Ontological Status, Essence and Scienticity" *NnamdiAzikiwe Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 2 N0. 1 2009. P. 7
7. Ibid
8. Chukwudum B. Okolo, *Problems of African Philosophy and One Other Essay*, (Enugu: Cecta Nig. Ltd, 1992), pp.9-10
9. Celestine ChukwuemekaMbaegbu, "Philosophy: Historiography, Ontological Status, Essence and Scienticity" *NnamdiAzikiwe Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 2 N0. 1 2009. P. 7
10. Luong Dinh Hai, "Culture – Philosophies – Philosophical Systems (Philosophy Emerging From Culture: A Vietnamese Perspective) in *Culture & Philosophy A Journal for Phenomenological Inquiry*. 2009. P.113
11. Leslie A. White, the concept of culture <https://www.britannica.com/topic/culture> accessed 19/01/2023
12. Ibid
13. Ibid
14. John Ekei, "Philosophy, "Human Development and National Question"<http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ujah.v18i2.1> accessed 23/01/2023
15. Anikpe Anthony Mbah, "Human Nature and Development: A perspective from African Philosophy", *NnamdiAzikiwe Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 13(1), 2022. P. 7
16. Stanley T. Ihuagwu and Hope Amolo, "Religious Education as a Tool for the Attainment of Social Reconstruction for National Development" *The Humanities and Nation Building*, Faculty of Arts, NnamdiAzikiwe University, Awka. Fab, AniehNig, Ltd, 2013. P. 140
17. Ibid

18. Anikpe Anthony Mbah, "Philosophy and Its Quest for Human Development" p.24
19. Ibid. p.23
20. Ibid. p.24

CHAPTER EIGHT

INTRODUCTION TO LOGIC

Kizito I. Okoli

Man's quest for truth is a natural inclination. Things within and outside of him are not issues that can be handled by mere waving of two hands, instead, they require not just thorough investigation but correct reasoning for better understanding. It is this process of separating the wheat from the chaff that Logic is seen as the instrument, a tool and life wire of Philosophy.¹

What is Logic?

Logic is that branch of Philosophy that concerns itself with the nature and methods of thinking. Just as Philosophy means different things for different persons, definitions of Logic exist as there are different logicians. Some Philosophers have argued that one cannot define logic but instead, can only show it by doing it or teaching others how to do it. Many believe that logic and mathematics are the same and this is considered to be true because one can also think of logic as the study of the ultimate foundations of mathematics. This definition may create fear in the mind of students but should not be so because it is only at advanced level of Logic that its equation with mathematics takes place.² The good news is that logic is easy but thrives on a distant walk which the related steps should be practiced for proper mastery.

Etymologically, logic is derived from the Greek word Logikos which means word and can be translated variously as reason, intelligibility or ordered thought. Aristotle defines logic as a tool for analyzing human thought; the thinking on thinking. For Thiroux, it is the study of rules of correct thinking while for Richard Bodkin, logic is simply the science of proof and truth.³ Gottlob Frege asserts that to discover the truth is the task of all sciences; this basically falls on logic, to discuss the laws of truth. We saw in Socrates Ebo that there cannot be any thinking without reasoning; there cannot be any reasoning without logic.⁴ If reasoning is orderly, we say it is logical and rational, if disorderly, we say it is illogical and irrational.

Looking at this, one can agree with Irving Copi that logic is the study of methods and principles used to distinguish correct from incorrect reasoning.⁵ A curious mind would ask at this point: So one who fails to study logic will not be able to reason at all? This is definitely not so. John Locke made us know that God did not make humans barely two-legged and called Aristotle to make them rational. As old as the origin of Man, humans have always reasoned, argued and thought about issues as it affects their lives. When we reason about any matter, we produce arguments to support our conclusions and this implies that in logic, we make all efforts to understand the structure of the human thought and find out fallacies or contradicting statements. (Ome&Amam, 2004), observes that whatever way the mind arrives at its conclusion is not in any way, the interest of the logician but instead, his primary concern is to note if there is a flow of reasoning in the whole exercise. His question is always: does the conclusion reached, follow from the premises assumed? If the premises provide adequate grounds for accepting the conclusion; if asserting the conclusion to be true also then the reasoning is correct, otherwise, it is incorrect.⁶ The above definitions considers logic as important as it identifies when an argument is good and when it is bad, thereby aiding the individual to make only valid arguments. Logic helps one to describe things with precision and avoid misunderstanding or incorrect positions.

Our intention in this chapter is therefore to simplify logic in a way that both students and Non-students of Philosophy can apply it in their daily lives. We will be discussing this topic under the following sub-headings: What is Logic? Brief history of Logic, Values of Logic, when logic does not work, Natural and Scientific Logic, Logic as a Science and Art and finally, Laws of thought. Our aim is to share an interest on the flow of reasoning and see to the obvious benefits that can come out of it. Other facets of Logic including inductive and deductive arguments will be discussed in subsequent chapters under arguments and syllogism.

Brief History of Logic

The origin of Logic can be traced back to the works of Aristotle who lived during the 4th century BC. His thoughts on logic are spread across six works collectively known as the *Organon* which means the instrument. Aristotle wanted to establish rules which would allow Greek citizens to distinguish arguments which are formally valid from those which are invalid and therefore wrong. Aristotle is the father of logic and was the first to develop a system within which the principles of reasoning could be precisely formulated. He was the first great Logician who approached reasoning as an activity in which we first identify classes of things and then recognize the relation among these classes. The stoics, especially Chrysippus, began from here to develop what is known as predicate Logic.⁷

Christian and Islamic Philosophers such as Boethius (480- 524AD), Avicenna (980- 1037), Thomas Aquinas (1225- 1274) and William Ockham (1287-1347) further developed Aristotle's Logic in the middle ages, reaching a high point in the mid-fourteenth century, with Jean Buridan. The period between the fourteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century saw largely decline and neglect, and at least one historian of logic regarded this time as barren.

Francis Bacon (1561-1626), fielded in the needed new knowledge sought in the modern centuries. The intellectual world was provided with a new knowledge in Bacons *NovumOrganon*, published in 1620.⁸ His inductive method is aimed at codifying the procedures used by scientists when investigating all natural things. Since the time of Bacon, the whole question of induction has been fully discussed by writers of logic.

Values of Logic

To answer the question: why do we study logic? is to create another fundamental enquiry: why is truth important? Logic is like a safety line that allows us to move unerringly from one truth convincingly to another. Logic teaches us many things and one of it is to recognize good and bad arguments as nearly every undertaking in life will ultimately require that one evaluates an argument. Consider when confronted with a question: should I buy this car or the other? Should I apply to a University or college of Education? Did that scientific experiment show what scientists claims it did? Should I cast my vote for an APC, PDP or LP Presidential candidate in the forth coming Nigeria's general election? Or maybe should I support a candidate that is not known but who promises to reduce the rate of taxation? The human life is a long parade of choices and when we try to make an attempt to these questions especially in discussions with others, we only have one tool; an argument. We must therefore think and reason properly before we make our choices. The ability to think, articulate and evaluate choices remains very useful in our work, personal life or even our deepest reflections.

As a student, nearly every discipline; sciences or humanities relies upon arguments and it is through logic that one can best evaluate arguments on any of them. Not applying logic makes one prone to bad reasoning, manipulation by deceivers, errors in thought, inefficiency and lack of clarity and precision. Frederick Douglas gave a wonderful summary on the values of logic; he pointed out that we should be knowledgeable of how much a person can be deceived and that is just how far she can be deceived. The limits of tyrants are also prescribed by the reasoning abilities of those they aim to oppress. This tells us that what logic is concerned with is how to recognize good reasoning and avoid deceit.⁸ You are only free as your powers of reasoning enable you.

Limitations to Logical Reasoning

Logic as already established is practiced and applied like Mathematics to solve existential problems. Although many scholars have argued that there come situations when logic appears less useful. To them, when there is no problem, logic is therefore not applicable but this raises more questions like: can there ever be for man, situations of no existing problem? Continue with me! To them also, logic does not thrive when emotions are placed ahead of critical thinking.⁹ A clear example is a mental picture of couples that fight everyday while the man allows the wife to win always with the sole belief that women thinks emotionally while men thinks logically.

Thorsten Altenkirch strongly advised that logic should not be used in all situations because such concrete reasoning is usually very ineffective. An example for her point refers to the story of the Italian police inspector who investigated Amanda Knox and tried to play Sherlock Holmes; the consequences were disastrous.

In the wisdom of Luke Shoe, Logic is most useful under Naturalistic Epistemology. However, when you add religious Epistemology or subscribe to religious teachings and belief to your world and perspectives, Logic becomes unnecessary or less useful. For instance, let us look at Naturalistic knowledge illustration. That is, if I die today, you will not see me living the next day. This of course squares with reality but let us take on religious beliefs; that is, if I die today, you will either see or not see me living the next day. This is because God might desire to resurrect me from the dead.¹⁰

In all of this, those who argue that logic does not work at all times is simply ignorant of the fact that one becomes a Philosopher the very moment he describes his reasons for lack of interest and indifference in becoming one. One therefore becomes a logician, the very moment he thinks and demonstrates the reasons why he feels he does not need logic. This is because our knowledge of Natural logic for instance is about our everyday existence and this cannot stop. Little wonder Jesse Pollard opined that even when you think you are not using logic, you still are but maybe, unconscious of the level or type of logic you are using; maybe, you are not aware that you switched from scientific to natural logic.¹¹ A clear instance is the man discussed above who chose to let the wife win over their misunderstandings; he must have thought about it and underwent some rigorous reasoning processes to ascertain that it is better to make the choice he made. This is logic!

The emphasis on the limitations of logic as seen in Gödel's *theory of incompleteness* and Munchhausen *trilemma*, shows that application of formal logic to life existing issues always may not possibly work but it is proven that no one can exist without application of logic in its naturalistic sense.

Natural and Scientific Logic

Dating from time past, people sought solutions to their problems; whether their decisions are rational enough is personal and yet another question. Natural logic therefore can be regarded as the individuals common sense acquired from birth and experiences. It can otherwise be called ones native wisdom which he applies to reason correctly, coherently and refrain from bad arguments. It is a process of spontaneous personal elaboration which arises from the observation of the environment, comparison and classification of objects or life situations. It is a form or typical successful reasoning that people have by nature which allows them to discern between truth and falsehood without needing to resort to the help of science.¹² For instance, it is what occurs when we see gray clouds and also smell of rain; we take umbrella along because we feel it is going to rain. Natural logic is somewhat a kind of intuition.

More so, the current quest by Nigerians for good leadership or say, the reasoning seen of a pedestrian who wants to cross the other side of the road to at least determine the pace to use in crossing and avoid accident is what is called Natural logic. It suffices to say that Natural logic is an essential, unique and personal part of a person which is common to all rational beings. However, this level of reasoning is not enough; Natural logic is most often not reliable especially when it comes to abstract thoughts and resolution of paradoxes. If you want to think deeply about something, you need follow the principles of logical reasoning and dismiss human conventions and assumptions including your own. It interests the human person to advance to scientific or academic logic which is that same Natural logic but trained by following the principles and rules of logic; processed by statements which originated certain conclusions. Interestingly, logic as a branch of Philosophy is interested in scientific logic.¹³ In this sense, logic is seen as the science of thought. Scientific logic therefore is interested in why people reason this or that way; it is conscious of certain processes and procedures of correct reasoning.

Logic as Art and Science

For Labgo, logic is both Art and Science. It is generally the science and art of correct inferential thinking. As a science, it is speculative and concerned itself with what is right and why it is right. Logic is a scientific art for ordering the operations of the mind, so that a man can proceed with ease and minimum of error. Logic is a science because it concerns itself with truth and the processes of correct thinking which can be taught to sound mind.¹⁴ We can consider logic scientific also because it is an intellectual and practical activity which encompasses the ordered, rational systematic structure and behavior of the physical world through observation and experiment.

It is equally a liberal art which seeks to develop a stable habit by which in the act of reasoning, one can proceed in an orderly manner. It gives to consciousness for instance, the accuracy and precision that guides the guitarist to play harmoniously. It is an art because it requires correct thinking or tactfulness and dexterity in development of crafts and skills. As an art also, it is the expression or application of human creative skill and also imagination that produces works to be appreciated primarily for their beauty.¹⁵

Laws of Thought

There are three fundamental laws said to have originated from Aristotle upon which logic and rational thinking are based. These laws are believed to be the necessary conditions for rational thinking to occur. If they are not true, then nothing else can be said to be true. The three laws or principles are: (a) Principle of Identity

(b) Principle of Non-Contradiction

(c) Principle of Excluded Middle

a) Principle of Identity

This principle states that if any given statement or proposition is true then it is true. What this implies is that something remains that which it is and cannot be any other thing. What one can essentially deduce here is that everything is itself and cannot be something else. A is A and cannot be C, Snow cannot be clouds and water cannot be stone. So if one says it is snowing while it is actually snowing, then it must be a true statement.

b) Principle of Non-Contradiction

This principle states that no statement or object can both be true and false at the same time. It means that nothing can be what it is and at the same time be what it is not. The statement “it is snowing” cannot be both true and false. This means that it cannot be snowing and not snowing during the same period at the exact location. In formula, X is not same as non-X.

c) Principle of Excluded Middle

This principle states that a statement is either true or false and cannot be both true and false. There is no middle course between truth and falsity. For every proposition, either its positive or negative form is true. We may rephrase it by saying that this principle asserts that every statement of the form $P \vee \neg P$ must be true.¹⁶

According to Irving Copi, even though the laws of thought are logically true, the claim that they deserve the privileged status as the most fundamental laws is doubtful. The principle of identity has been criticized on the grounds that things change and are always changing. For instance, consider the claim that the Vice Chancellor is speaking currently at the auditorium; one call to confirm found out he had finished and left. This does not falsify the initial claim, therefore the statements are both true. The principle of identity is true and does not interfere with our recognition of continuing change.

The principle of non-contradiction is attacked by Hegelians and Marxists on the ground that genuine contradiction is everywhere pervasive and that the world is replete with the inevitable conflict of contradictory forces. There are conflicts in the world between labour unions and private owners but to call these conflicting forces contradictory is to misunderstand the term contradiction. This is because; either the owner or the union is the negation, denial or the contradiction of the other. The principle of non-contradiction understood in the straight forward sense in which it is intended by logicians is unobjectionable and perfectly true.

The principle of excluded middle has been the object of much criticism because it leads to a two value orientation which implies that things in the world must be either white or black, and this hinders the realization of compromise.¹⁷ This objection also arises from misunderstanding because the statement, “this is black” cannot be jointly true with the same statement; “this is

white” where this refers to exactly the same thing. However, although these two statements cannot both be true, they can both be false.

References

Jude Chukwu, “Logic, Philosophy and Human Existence”, (Enugu: Zik-Chuks Press, 2018), p.93

Ibid, p.94

Barnabas Idoko, “General Introduction to Philosophy”, (Awka: DesignMix Prints, 2021), p.115

Socrates Ebo, *Introduction to Logic and Philosophy*, researchgate.net, (2018), p.6

Irving Copi, “Introduction to Logic”, (London: Macmillian, 1967), p.86

OmeetAmam, “Philosophy and Logic for everybody”, (Enugu: University of Nigeria Press, 2004), p. 56

Charlie Flanagan, *On the Historical Development of Logic*, medium.com/@charliejflanagan , accessed on (18/01/2023).

MILNE Library, *A Concise Introduction to Logic*, milnepublishing.geneseo.edu, accessed on (18/01/2023).

Michele Malatesta, “The Primary Logic; Instrument for Dialogue between the two culture”, (Italy: Millenium Roma Editrice, 1997), p.51

Ibid., p.53

Ibid., p.54

Moss Larry, *Natural Logic*, Indiana University, Indiana.edu, (2014), accessed on (19/01/2023).

Labgo, *Is Logic a Science or Art?*, steemit.com, accessed on (19/01/2023).

Patrick Johnson etInameti Udo, *The Laws of Thought*, Rudiments of Philosophy and Logic, pp.169-184

Joe Eneh, “Philosophy and logic for Beginners”, (Enugu: Spring time publishers, 2011), p.58.

Jacques Thiroux, “Ethics, Theory and Practice”, (California: Glencoe Publications, 1977). P.106

Ike Odimegwu et al, “Primer on Philosophy and Logic”, (Awka: Fab Education Books, 2009), p.13

IfeakorChinedu, *Introduction to Logic*, in Basic Philosophy and logic, Umeh F et al (Ed), Awka: Anchor Publishers Africa, p.142

CHAPTER NINE

ARGUMENT

Chinedulfeakor, Ph.D.

Introduction

You have read in the earlier chapter the definition of logic as the study of the methods and principles used to distinguish good (correct) from bad (incorrect) reasoning. Understanding this definition to mean that only the students of logic can reason well or correctly can be likened to saying that its only students of law can argue well which is not the case.

All reasoning is thinking according to IrvinCopi, but not all thinking is reasoning. There are many mental processes or kinds of thought that are different from reasoning for instance; one may remember something or imagine it or regret it without doing any reasoning about it. Thus the problem between correct and incorrect reasoning is central problem with which logic deals.

In ordinary uses of argument, many things might be suggested; anything from a slight verbal disagreement to an out and out brawl, a discussion, a debate, a summary of a chapter of a book and the like is often seen as argument.

Argument

Sometimes a person will attempt to establish the truth or falsity of a given statement by presenting evidence which will aid in establishing that statement's truth or falsity. These evidences are presented in statements. Statement or statements purporting to present evidence for or against the conclusion are called the premises of an argument. Arguments therefore are sequences of statements used to establish the truth or falsity of a conclusion, given as premises set.

Celestine N.Bittle defines argument as a discourse which logically deduces one proposition from others. The proposition from which the conclusion is deduced are called the premises. *An argument is any group of propositions of which one is claimed to follow from others, which are regarded as providing support or grounds for the truth of that one called the conclusion.* An argument is not a mere collection of propositions, it has a structure. In describing this structure, the terms premises and conclusion are usually employed for example;

Example i

Identical twins often have different IQ test scores

Identical twins inherit the same genes

So environment must play some part in determining IQ

Example ii

It is wrong to kill a human being

Abortion takes the life (kills) of a human being

Therefore, abortion is wrong

Proposition

Arguments deal with propositions not sentences. Propositions are truth bearers or truth candidates. The distinguishing feature they share with sentence is that they are either true or false and in this they differ from questions, commands and exclamations. Only propositions can either be asserted or denied or judged to be either true or false. The term proposition is the same thing with the term statement. Proposition can take different form or position is an argument, it can take the form of supportive evidence in an argument by which they are called premise or premises. They can also take the form of a conclusion of an argument. This implies that premises and conclusions are propositions in general terms used in arguments.

Inference

Arguments are done through inferring conclusions from evidences provided. Ordinarily, inference is the logical mix or connection between propositions or statements; it is that link that brings one proposition to connect to another to form a conclusion.

Inference is the process by which one proposition is arrived at or affirmed on the basis of one or more other propositions accepted as the starting point of the process. The logician is not concerned with the process of inference but with the propositions that are the initial and end points of that process and the relationship between them. Mediate and immediate inference is part of the types of inference you will be taught in the coming chapter.

Premise

A premise is the proposition or one of the propositions presented as evidence for another proposition called the conclusion. In other words, a premise is a proposition or one of the propositions which provide

the logical grounds for the affirmation of the conclusion. In passing, we may notice that certain English words often are used as flags or indicators of a premise. Some of these, are ; as, because, for and since.

Conclusion

The conclusion of an argument is that proposition which is affirmed on the basis of the other propositions of the argument, and these other propositions which are affirmed as providing support or reason for accepting the conclusion are the premises of that argument. Other words sometimes used as flags to indicate a conclusion are; accordingly, consequently, hence, so, therefor, thus and wherefore. It is worthy of note that not all arguments make use of these flag words and this list does not pretend to be exhaustive but enough arguments do use these words for them to be very useful in distinguishing premises and conclusions.

Types of Argument

We have two types of argument even though some works say they are three but for your level, we work with two basic types; *deductive and inductive arguments*. Two primary factors help in differentiating them; the varying degree with which their conclusions are asserted based on their premise and secondly, the direction of inference. However, the most reliable way of differentiating deductive argument from inductive arguments is the first factor.

Deductive Argument

Although every argument involves the claim that its premises provide some grounds for the truth of its conclusion, only a deductive argument involves the claim that its premises provide conclusive grounds. In deductive argument, claim is made that the truth of its premises is sufficient to establish the truth of its conclusion if the premises do logically entails the conclusion. If all the premises of a deductive argument are true, then the conclusion must also be true. *The implication of the above definition is that in a deductive argument, the premises provide enough, sufficient or conclusive grounds for the conclusion.* The traditional definition of deductive argument understood as deducing a particular conclusion from a general premise is not reliable.

We characterize a deductive argument as one whose conclusion is claimed to follow from its premises with *absolute necessity*, this necessity not being a matter of degree and not depending in any way upon whatever else may be the case. And in sharp contrast, we characterize an inductive arguments one whose conclusion is claimed to follow from its premises *only with probability*, this probability being a matter of degree and depends upon what else may be the case. Let us consider these examples.

examplei

All humans are mortals

Socrates is a man

Therefore, Socrates is mortal

example ii

I'm either going to Campus fellowship or staying to study at home

But I can't go to Campus fellowship

Therefore, I'm going to stay at home and study

Here is an example of a deductively valid argument whose conclusion is implicitly contained in its premises;

example iii

All wars are started by miscalculation

The Russian/Ukraine conflict is a war

Therefore, the Russia/Ukraine conflict was started by miscalculation.

Having said in the premise that all wars are started by miscalculation and in the second that Russia/Ukraine conflict is a war, we are implicitly saying that the Russia/Ukraine conflict was started by miscalculation and that is what is asserted by the argument's conclusion.

Inductive Argument

This differs from a deductive argument in that there is no claim to establish the truth of the conclusion solely from the truth of the premises. Again, if all the premises of an inductive argument were true, this would not be sufficient to establish the truth of the conclusion. For in any inductive argument, we might accept all the premises as true and still deny the truth of the conclusion without involving in any contradiction.

At best, the premises of inductive arguments give only probable reasons for supposing that the conclusions are true if the premises all are true. The truth of all the premises of an inductive argument does not guarantee the truth of the conclusion of that argument. To establish the truth of the conclusion of an inductive argument, we need to find evidence which will tend to confirm that conclusion.

Very often, inductive arguments are used to make predictions about the future event, but not all of them do predict, that is why we say that the truth of the conclusion of an inductive argument is never guaranteed solely by the truth of the premises of that argument.

example i

Socrates is human and is mortal

Plato is human and is mortal

Aristotle is human and is mortal

Therefore, probably, all humans are mortals

Inductive arguments may have universal that is general propositions for premises as well as conclusion. for example;

example ii

All cows are mammals and have lungs

All horses are mammals and have lungs

All humans are mammals and have lungs

Therefore, probably, all mammals have lungs

Inductive arguments may also have particular propositions for their conclusions too; this is why the question of defining induction as arguing from particular to universal is not reliable. See another example

example iii

Oguejofor is a Philosopher and is a priest

Bonachristus is a Philosopher and is a priest

Mbaegbu was a Philosopher and was a priest

Chinedu is a Philosopher

Therefore, Chinedu is a priest

Validity and Soundness

The question of validity/invalidity is the question of whether the conclusion follows from the premises, that is whether it is possible for the premises to all be true and the conclusion false. A deductive argument can either be valid or invalid; this is another way of saying correct or incorrect. It is correct when its premises if true, do provide conclusive grounds for its conclusion. That is when the premises and conclusion are so related that it is absolutely impossible for the premises to be true unless the conclusion is true also. The task of the logician is to clarify the relation between premises and conclusion in valid argument and thus to allow us to discriminate valid from invalid arguments.

So we have tried to posit that validity and invalidity are terms used for correct and incorrect deductive argument just like strong and weak argument are used for inductive arguments. It is worthy to note also that validity and invalidity in deductive argument has not much to do with the material truth of the premises as it have to do with the relations, connections, forms and structure of the argument. Ones the form or structure of the argument of the argument is right irrespective of its truthfulness, we say it is a

valid argument. This is so because the logician does not have as her sole responsibility to decipher material truth of statements as it has to do with the logicity of the inference.

In a valid deductive argument, there may be at least one or perhaps all false premises and a false conclusion. There may even be at least one and perhaps all false premises and a true conclusion. Also an invalid deductive argument may have a least one or perhaps all false premises and a false conclusion. Indeed in an invalid argument, all the premises and conclusion may be true.

Inductive arguments are neither valid nor invalid in the sense in which those terms are applied to deductive arguments. Inductive arguments may of course be evaluated to be better or worse according to the strength of the support provided their conclusions by the premises. That is by the degree of likelihood or probability which their premises confer upon the conclusion.

Here we have a valid argument made up of some false statements;

Example i

Some acids are soluble in water

Some things which are soluble in water tastes sweet

Accordingly, some acids are sweet

Here is an example of a valid and sound arguments;

Example ii

Either an uncaused being exists or an endless chain of beings has always existed

It is false that an endless chain of beings has always existed

therefore, an uncaused being exists

Sound/Unsound

A deductive argument may be either sound or unsound. A deductive argument is called sound if and only if all the premises of the argument are true and the argument is also valid otherwise the deductive argument is called unsound. Thus we may have a valid argument which is nevertheless unsound. Soundness of an argument depends on the statement's truth/false value. It is statements that can be said to be true or false but not both.

Obviously, an argument can be valid but still be bad argument. Because it has one or more false premises, such argument are said to be valid but not sound. In other words, to be sound, an argument must meet two conditions; be valid and secondly, have all true premises. Unsound argument is any argument that fails to meet both of these conditions.

Here is an example of sound valid argument, all the premises are true;

example

All human beings are mortals

All Nigerians are human beings

Therefore, all Nigerians are mortal

References

Aja, E (1992), *Logic and Clear Thought*; Enugu; Oak Publishers Ltd

Barry (1976) *Practical Logic*; New York; Rinheart Co

Baris, A.C (1950) *Argumentation, Discussion and Debate*, Isted, New York; McGra-Hill Book Co

Copi, M.I (1978) *Introduction to Logic*; New York: Macmillian Publishing Co. Inc

Copi, M.I (1979), *Symbolic Logic*: New York: Macmillian Publishing Co. Inc

Okafor, F.U (1990), *Logic; An Outline For Beginners*; Enugu; First Publishers

CHAPTER TEN

THEORY OF SYLLOGISM

ChidimmaEzeador Ph.D.

Introduction

The term syllogism originates from Latin word “*syllogismus*”, and from Ancient Greek “*sullogismos*” which means “conclusion” or “inference”. It is the first system of logic that was systematically developed. Uduigwomen calls syllogism the brain child of Aristotle, and according to him, syllogism roughly defined is an argument containing two premises and a conclusion¹. Abnitio, there was two rival theories of the syllogism that existed, and they were Aristotelian syllogistic and Stoic syllogistic. The method of syllogism however was superseded by first-order predicate logic following the work of GottlobFrege. One of the trio golden era philosophers Aristotle in his *Prior Analytics*, defines syllogism as a discourse in which a certain thing being stated, something other than which is stated follows of necessity from being so². Generally, syllogism is an argument which is made up of three propositions (two premises and a conclusion) such that one of them which is called the conclusion is said to be determined or deduced from the others. This is in contrast with inductive argument or reasoning which is determined by repeated observation from particular proposition to general proposition. Every syllogism contains three propositions which must have a quantifier that is, a linguistic symbol showing whether the assertion is made , which are (“all”, “some”, “none”, “no”), a subject term, (which designates that about which something is affirmed or denied), a predicate term (which specifies that which is being asserted or denied of the subject), and a copula or the verb to be, that is, what brings the subject and predicate terms together,(“are” or “is”). However, the Aristotelian study of deductive reasoning has to do with a special kind of proposition known as **categorical syllogism**. Other types of syllogism are hypothetical and disjunctive syllogisms.

Meaning and Structure of Categorical Syllogisms

A categorical syllogism basically consists of three categorical propositions, in which two serving as premises and one serving as conclusion. For Example;

Major premise - All great thinkers are skeptically-minded.

Minor premise - All philosophers are skeptically-mined.

Conclusion - Therefore, All philosophers are great thinkers.

The above premises and conclusion are categorical syllogism. It contains only three terms, each of which appears twice. These propositions are declarative statements which can be analyzed as assertions about classes, either affirming or negating wholly or partly that one class is included in another. Note that the positions of minor and major terms are fixed only in the conclusion. Syllogism is always arranged that of the two premises, the major stated first and the minor second. The conclusion always comes last. All philosophers are great thinkers is the conclusion of our example of a categorical syllogism. In actual usage, this arrangement does not always prevail. Uduma asserts that since the position of the terms may vary in the premises, syllogistic arguments may take on different forms. Importantly, Aristotle as cited by Uduma showed that a syllogism consists of three propositions, any of which may be **A, E, I, or O** in form³.

There are four different standard forms of categorical syllogism namely;

1. Universal-Affirmative (A): All Nigerians are hard working.
2. Universal-Negative (E): No Nigerians are hard working.
3. Particular-Affirmative (I): Some Nigerians are hard working.
4. Particular-Negative (O): Some Nigerians are not hard working.

Universal-Affirmative: This has to do with an assertion about two classes, the class of all Nigerians and the class of all hard working people (“all Nigerians” is contained in the second “all hard working people”). This is schematically written as “All S is P”.

Universal-Negative: This has to do with assertion about two classes. The first class is completely excluded from the second. It however universally denies Nigerians that they are hard working. It is written schematically as “No S is P”.

Particular-Affirmative: This has to do with affirming that some members of the class of all Nigerians are also members of the class of hard working people. The word “some” refers to “at least one”. Particular-Affirmative is schematically written as “Some S is P”.

Particular-Negative: This denies that particular members of the first class are included in the second. It is put schematically as “Some S is not P”.

Note that, the letters A, E, I and O which are traditionally used to identify the different types of categorical propositions are gotten from the Latin words *affirmo* (to affirm) and *nego* (to negate). Thus from the two Latin words *Affirmo* and *Nego*, the first vowels was taken in each, that is, A and E to represent Universal propositions. Also, the second vowels in each that is I and O to represent particular propositions.

Quality and Quantity

Importantly, every standard form categorical proposition has both a quality and a quantity. The quality is either affirmative or negative depending on if class inclusion is affirmed or negated (denied) by the propositions. Based on this, both Universal – Affirmative and Particular – Affirmative propositions are affirmative in quality, Universal-Negative and Particular-Negative propositions are negative in quality. However, on the other hand, the quantity is universal or particular depending on whether the proposition refers to all the members or some members of the class denoted by the subject term. Based on this, all Universal-Affirmative and Universal-Negative propositions are universal in quantity, while all Particular-Affirmative and Particular-Negative propositions are particular in quantity.

Distribution of Terms

The concept of **distribution of terms** in general according to Uduma “relates to the interpretation of terms as class names.”⁵ In this sense, for him, the distribution of terms pertains to the number of members of a class to which the term defining that class is meant to apply at any given time. “A term is distributed when it is meant to apply to all members of the class which it defines; and it is undistributed when it is meant to apply to only an indefinite part of those members”. For instance, If I say “All students are hard working”. The term “students” is distributed because I have referred to all students. But, supposing I say, “Some students are hard working”, the term students is not distributed because I am referring to part of the class of students. Below shows how terms A, E, I, O propositions are distributed.

Types of Proposition	Subject Term	Predicate Term
A	Distributed	Undistributed
E	Distributed	Distributed
I	Undistributed	Undistributed
O	Undistributed	Distributed

If we take first the case of an A – proposition: “All lawyers are liars”; “All politicians are corrupt”. The subject term is obviously intended to include all members of the class which it defines; the quantifier, “All”, leaves no one in doubt as to this. The term of an A-proposition is, therefore, distributed. But the predicate terms of A-propositions are not distributed.

The E proposition, such as, “No lawyers are liars”; “No politicians are corrupt”. The subject terms of these propositions are distributed; “for whatever is denied of the subject class is meant to be denied of each and every member of that class”. This means that in E-propositions, all

members of the subject class are excluded from membership in the predicate class. So, the predicate terms of E –propositions are also distributed.

I propositions assert that some of the members of the subject class are members of the predicate class; “Some lawyers are liars”; “Some politicians are corrupt”. The subject term of I-propositions is undistributed, for the quantifier, “some” connotes or indicates that not all members of the subject class are referred to. It is also obvious that the predicate term of an I-proposition is undistributed.

O- Propositions assert that some of the members of the subject class are not included in the predicate class. For instance, “Some students are not intelligent”. The subject term indicated by the quantifier is undistributed, but the predicate term is distributed because the quantifier “some” applies to only the subject.

Major, Minor and Middle Terms

In a standard-form categorical syllogism, the conclusion is the proposition that contains the major and minor terms. The subject term of the conclusion is called the *minor term* and the premise in which it occurs is the minor premise. The predicate term of the conclusion is known as the *major term*, and the premise in which it is found is the major premise. The term, which is common to the both premises, is the *middle term*.

The Mood of a Categorical Syllogism

Allowing all possible combinations of these four forms among the three propositions, we have a total of $4^3 = 64$ possible combinations. The form of the three constituent propositions defines what is called the mood of a categorical syllogism. For example, a syllogism like;

No moralists are policemen	E
<u>All sadists are policemen</u>	A
Therefore, No sadists are moralists	E

belongs as shown in the right-hand column to mood EAE.

The form of the above categorical syllogism is;

No P is M.

All S is M.

No S is P.

The mood is E,A,E (MAJOR PREM,ISE – universal negative, MINOR PREMISE- universal affirmative, CONCLUSION – universal negative).

Some politicians are not liars	O
<u>Some liars are acclaimed pastors</u>	I
Therefore, Some acclaimed pastors are politicians	I

There are techniques which must not fail to consider here when discussing the formal theory of syllogism. These are;

Conversion

Obversion

Contraposition

Conversion involves interchanging the subject and predicate terms of a proposition. A good example of this is “No cats are plants”. The converse of this becomes “No plants are cats”. Here, the two propositions are logically equivalent; either can be valid. There are some propositions that cannot be converted. For example; “All cats are animals”.

Obversion involves changing the quality of a proposition and replacing the predicate term by its complement. For example; “All students are intelligent” , its obverse is, NO students are non-intelligent. Basically, the two propositions are logically equivalent; they can be validly inferred from one another.

Contraposition simply means the observe of the converted obverse. This has to do with reversing the terms in a proposition and then negating them both. For example; “All Nigerians are hard working”. This can be done step by step.

1. All Nigerians are hard working (original sentence)
2. No Nigerians are non- hard working (observe of 1)
3. No non-hard working people are Nigerians (converse of 2)
4. All non-hard working people are non-Nigerians (obverse of 3)

References

- ¹ A . F. Uduigwomen, *How to Think*, (Aba:Vitalis Books,2003), p.139.
- ² Aristotle, *Prior Analytica*, (New York: Clarendon Press, 1949), P.24.
- ³ U. Oji, *Introduction to Logic* (Abakaliki: WillyRose& Appleseed Publishing Coy, 2008), p.153.
- ⁴ M. Obiajulu, *Introduction to the World of Philosophy and Logic*, (Onitsha:Uchac Productions Ltd,2007), P.98.
- ⁵ U. Oji, *The Fundamentals of Philosophy*, (Abakaliki: WillyRose& Appleseed Publishing Coy, 2000), P.161.

⁶ M. Obiajulu, “Theory of Syllogism” in *Basic Philosophy and Logic*, (Awka: Anchor Book Publishers Africa, 2020), P.156.

⁷ A. S. Ibrahim, “Syllogism”, (Digital Marketing Strategy & Planning, July, 2018). Accessed 24/1/2023.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

LOGICAL FALLACIES

Henry C, Okeke Ph.D.

General Introduction

According Irving Copi logic “is the study of the methods and principles used to distinguish correct from incorrect reasoning.”^{xv} Being the science of reasoning, it ensures that arguments are logically good and not bad^{xvi}. For an argument to be logically correct, the conclusion must necessarily be drawn from the premises of the argument. In previous modules, you will recall that validity and invalid are properties of an argument, whereas truth and falsity are properties of propositions/statements.^{xvii} It is therefore good to note that, once the conclusion of any argument does not flow from the premises, it is an incorrect argument. Hence, logical fallacy is as a result of deviation from standard principles, methods or technique of correct reasoning, which is called fallacy.

Definition of the Term Fallacy

Fallacy is can be defined as “a type of argument that seems to be correct, but contains a mistake in reasoning.”^{xviii} It can also be defined as intentional or unintentional logical mistakes in an argument. Better still, logical fallacy can be defined as “an argument that is usually psychologically persuasive but logically weak.”^{xix} It can be said to be an illogical step in the formulation of an argument.^{xx} Above definitions principally describes the elements of fallacy, which includes, there must be an argument, there must be error in reasoning in the argument, and the error may be intentional or unintentional, the must exist persuasion to accept the incorrect conclusion and the intention to mislead the audience.

The Relevance of Identifying Fallacies in Argument

An illogical argument may appear logical to a non-logical mind, thereby persuading the non-logical audience to accept the illogical claims of the opponent presented to him inadvertently. The import a logical or legal mind to recognize fallacious arguments includes the following:

- (a) To avoid common flaws in reasoning.
- (b) To encourage the logical minds not to be deceitful in persuading the opponent into accepting his illogical claims.

- (c) It will help the logical mind not to be misled by the opponent's persuasive illogical claims.
- (d) It is a gain for the logical mind to dictate illogicality and weakness of the opponents claim and thereby discredit his/her argument.
- (e) It will enable the logical mind put up much more persuasive claims, having faulted the opponent's claims.

Classification of Fallacies

Fallacies can be classified into two as follows: formal fallacies and informal fallacies.

i. **Formal fallacies** are fallacies that refer to arguments that have defective, invalid logical structure or form. This mistake in reasoning given makes it impossible to prove the intended conclusion.

ii. **Informal fallacies** refer to an arguments that have incorrect or irrelevant premises. The error in reasoning in informal fallacies are found in the contents, (i.e. that is the premises or propositions) wherein irrelevant information or assumption that are false are used in an argument and thereby fail to prove the premises.

For the sake of our discussions, we shall limit ourselves to informal fallacies. Informal fallacies can further be classified into fallacies of relevance (or irrelevance) and fallacies of ambiguity and fallacies of presumption, but will shall focus on the fallacies of relevance and fallacies of ambiguity.

Fallacies of Relevance (Irrelevance)

Fallacy of relevance, is committed, when “the premise(s) of an argument is/are found to be logically irrelevant to the conclusion.”^{xxi} The argument appeals to the emotion or psychology of the audience thereby making the audience to accept his/her claims, though irrelevant to the argument. Fallacies that fall within this class are many, but we shall limit our scope to a few that will help us in our present discussion.

Fallacies of Ambiguity

This is an error in reasoning committed where ambiguous terms or words are used with different meanings within a particular argument, thereby leaving the argument imprecise. Some of the fallacies of Ambiguities shall be explained here below.

A FALLACIES OF RELEVANCE (IRRELEVANCE)

1. Argumentum ad Baculum (Appeal to Force)

This type of fallacy places reliance on either open or veiled threat of force. It is a type of an argument where a party resorts to the use of force, threat or any form of non-rational method in persuading the other party to accept his or her points of view, belief, opinion or position. The cliché “might is right” succinctly describes this type of fallacy. This fallacy is committed at the point where the technique of rational argument is abandoned and coercion which may be by psychologically convincing the audience to accept a particular claims is adopted.^{xxii} Example: John, you ought to read your books if you do not want me to stop paying your school fees.

2. Argumentum ad Hominem(Appeal to the Person)

This fallacy is an error in reasoning which is committed when “an interlocutor attacks a person making an argument rather than the argument being made.”^{xxiii} Hence, instead of proving or disproving the issue for determination, one resorts to attacking the character or circumstance of the person. Here, the assertions or the argument of the person is abandoned and attack unleashed on the person who made the assertion. This fallacy can either be abusive or circumstantial in nature. In a layman’s understanding, “he left the message and is attacking the messenger.”

3. Argumentum ad Ignorantiam (Argument from Ignorance)

This fallacy is committed where a proposition or belief is held true because it has not been proved false. Or on the contrary a proposition is considered false because it has not been proved true. It is noteworthy that ignorance on how to prove the truth or falsity of a proposition does not establish the truth or falsehood of the proposition.

4. Argumentum ad Misericordiam(Appeal to Pity)

This is a fallacy committed when there is an appeal to pity or mercy, in other to ground the acceptance of the conclusion of an argument, where the conclusion is strictly on fact rather than sentiment. Example: In the courtroom practice, after the conviction of the defendant, before the sentencing convict, the counsel to the convict is given an opportunity to plead for leniency from the Court which is technically called plea for leniency or mercy.

5. Argumentum ad Populum (Appeal to the people)

This fallacy is committed by appealing to people’s emotions or sentiments to assent to an illogical conclusions that lacks enough evidence to convince the audience. It is called “a bandwagon” fallacy, because the conclusion lacks convincing reason for the audience to accept the conclusion, except that “everybody does it” and it is a popular opinion. It is good to note that a claim, or opinion is generally accepted does not make logically true.

6. Argumentum ad Verecundiam (Appeal to Inappropriate Authority)

Not all appeals to an authority is fallacy. Where an appeal is made to an authority that has professionally qualified gives a judgment on his area of specialty it is not fallacious.^{xxiv} However, fallacy is committed where we appeal to an authority that lacks requisite qualification, in order to provide a reasonable ground for the acceptance of a particular conclusions. Hence, acceptance of a claim because, it came from an authority that lacks expertise in the area of knowledge claimed is considered fallacious. Example: Inviting a theologian to give expert evidence in court of law on issues relating to surgical operations is an appeal to an inappropriate authority.

7. IgnorantiamElenchi (Irrelevant Conclusion)

This fallacy is committed, where an argument that set out to establish a particular conclusion, ends up proving a different conclusion.

8. PetitioPrincipii (Begging the Question)

Where the conclusion of an argument to be proved is already assumed in the premises, the fallacy committed is said to be petitoprincipii.^{xxv} It is also, called the fallacy of circular argument because, the premises presume the very conclusion that the argument is to be proved.^{xxvi} Hence, if the premises has assumed to be true the conclusion that is to be proved, it means that nothing is left to be proved in the argument and that would leave the audience with curiosity about how the conclusion is arrived at. Example: “Peter Obi is the best of all the presidential candidates in 2023 election” “But how do you know?” Because he was the best governor of Anambra state”

FALLACIES OF AMBIGUITY

1. Fallacy of Equivocation

This type of fallacy occurs where a key term or phrase in an argument is used in an ambiguous manner.^{xxvii} Hence, the term has different meanings as it appears in different parts of a particular argument.

2. Fallacy of Composition

This is the fallacy committed whenever we conclude that because a particular member of a class has a particular attributes, therefore the attribute applies to the whole class. In other words, a claim that is true or false about a part is also, true or false about the whole. Example: John is a law student and very intelligent, therefore all law students are very intelligent. There is an error in reasoning in this example, because that a part is intelligent does not mean that the whole law students are intelligent.

3. Fallacy of Division

This fallacy is opposite of fallacy of composition. This mistake in reasoning is committed when we argue or assume that what is true or false about the whole class must necessarily be true or false about a part of the class. Example: "Nigeria is a corrupt nation, therefore every Nigerian is corrupt".

4. Fallacy of Amphiboly

This fallacy is committed when we rely an ambiguous grammatical structure or construction, which often times misleads or confuses the audience. This fallacy though similar to the equivocation, but distinct in the sense that it is a mistake made by the arguer in interpreting the statement made by another. Whereas, the ambiguity in the equivocation is created by the arguer, which is most probably to deceive the audience^{xxviii}

5. Fallacy of Accent

This fallacy of ambiguity is "committed when a premise of an argument relies on one particular words for emphasis, but the conclusion relies on a different emphasis that gives same words a different meaning".^{xxix} This error in reasoning is often referred to as fallacy of "emphasis" or "stress" or "pragmatics". The fallacy here lies on the mistake on the emphasizing of a particular word/phrase that misleads. In a nutshell, this fallacy occurs, where the premise of the argument relies on the same word emphasized in the premise to draw a conclusion of the argument, but due to difference on the emphasis on the word/phrase a different meaning resulted, which can be misleads the audience.

References

ⁱDario Composta, "History of Ancient Philosophy," (1990): p.178.

ⁱⁱKyrian A Ojong and Adekunle A Ibrahim, "Fundamental Problems of Epistemology," *Calabar: Jochrisam Publishers* (2011): p.24.

ⁱⁱⁱComposta, "History of Ancient Philosophy," p.78.

^{iv}Ojong and Ibrahim, "Fundamental Problems of Epistemology," p.24.

^vOjong and Ibrahim, "Fundamental Problems of Epistemology," p.24.

^{vi}Godfrey O Ozumba, *A concise introduction to epistemology* (Jochrisam Publishers, 2001), p.91.

^{vii}George Edward Moore, "A defence of common sense," (1925).

^{viii}Ozumba, *A concise introduction to epistemology*, p.91.

^{ix}Sterling Power Lamprecht, "Our Philosophical Traditions a Brief History of Philosophy in Western Civilization," (1955): p.231.

^xOzumba, *A concise introduction to epistemology*, p.50.

^{xi}Ojong and Ibrahim, "Fundamental Problems of Epistemology," p.134.

^{xii}Ed L Miller, "Questions That Matter: An Invitation to Philosophy. 2d shorter ed," (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 1998).

^{xiii} Bentham Jeremy, "An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation," *London: T* (1789).

^{xiv} John Stuart Mill, "Utilitarianism; On Liberty; Representative Government; Edited by HB Acton," *London: JM Dent & Sons* (1972).

¹ Irving .M. Copi, et. al., *Introduction to Logic*, 14th ed.(Delhi, Pearson Education, 2012) P.2

² A.F. Uduigwomen, "Fallacies", in A.F. Uduigwomen and G.O. Ozumba (eds.), *A Concise Introduction to Philosophy and Logic*(Calabar: Glad Tidings Press Ltd.,1995) p.193

³ Alan Hausman, et. al., *Logic and Philosophy- A modern Introduction*(Boston, Wadsworth, 11 edition, ,2010) P.10

⁴ Copi et.al. *Introduction to Logic*, p.105.

⁵ Ronald C. Pine, "Essential Logic Chapter 4: informal fallacies I", p.155
<<http://www2.hawaii.edu/~pine/EL/chapt4-EL-am.pdf>> accessed January 20, 2023.

⁶ Lindsey Wilson College "Introduction to Fallacies"
<<https://www.lindsey.edu/academics/img/writing-center-pdfs/introduction-fallacies.pdf>>, accessed January 20,2023.

⁷ Robert Arp, and others, *Bad Arguments*, (New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2019), P.25

⁸ Ronald L. Hall, *A Brief Introduction to Logic*, (Stetson University)
P.1<<https://www.stetson.edu/artsci/philosophy/media/E.%20Chapter%204.pdf>> accessed 23/01/23

⁹ Audrey Yap, "Ad Hominem Fallacies and Epistemic Credibility" In Francisco J. Laporta and others (eds), *Argument Types and Fallacies in Legal Argumentation Law* (New York: Springer International Publishing, 2015) P. 19

¹⁰ Ronald L. Hall, *A Brief Introduction to Logic*, (Stetson University) P.3
<<https://www.stetson.edu/artsci/philosophy/media/E.%20Chapter%204.pdf>> accessed January 20,2023

¹¹ Oyeshile O. A. and Ugwuanyi L.O., *Elements of Philosophy and Logic*, 3rded (Abuja: Timless Publishers, ¹ Irving .M. Copi, et. al., *Introduction to Logic*, 14th ed.(Delhi, Pearson Education, 2012) P.2

² A.F. Uduigwomen, "Fallacies", in A.F. Uduigwomen and G.O. Ozumba (eds.), *A Concise Introduction to Philosophy and Logic*(Calabar: Glad Tidings Press Ltd.,1995) p.193

³ Alan Hausman, et. al., *Logic and Philosophy- A modern Introduction*(Boston, Wadsworth, 11 edition, ,2010) P.10

⁴ Copi et.al. *Introduction to Logic*, p.105.

⁵ Ronald C. Pine, "Essential Logic Chapter 4: informal fallacies I", p.155
<<http://www2.hawaii.edu/~pine/EL/chapt4-EL-am.pdf>> accessed January 20, 2023.

⁶ Lindsey Wilson College “Introduction to Fallacies”

<<https://www.lindsey.edu/academics/img/writing-center-pdfs/introduction-fallacies.pdf>>, accessed January 20, 2023.

⁷ Robert Arp, and others, *Bad Arguments*, (New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2019), P.25

⁸ Ronald L. Hall, *A Brief Introduction to Logic*, (Stetson University)

P.1<<https://www.stetson.edu/artsci/philosophy/media/E.%20Chapter%204.pdf>> accessed 23/01/23

⁹ Audrey Yap, “Ad Hominem Fallacies and Epistemic Credibility” In Francisco J. Laporta and others (eds 2019) P. 127.

¹² Schagrin, M.L. <<https://www.britannica.com/topic/circular-argument>> accessed January 20, 2023.

¹³ Texas State University <<https://www.txst.edu/philosophy/resources/fallacy-definitions/Equivocation.html>> accessed 17 January, 2023

¹⁴ <https://www.coursehero.com/file/p6v6i9k/Amphiboly-differs-from-equivocation-in-two-important-ways-First-equivocation-is/>

¹⁵ Copi IM, p.142