





(Review: Generality in Euclid)	Aristotelian Logic	Some Predicate Logic	Three Limitations	Up Next	References
	Necessity	of the dia	agram		
	1. With conter at A and a radus AB draw a circle 1	3. Interaction of circles 1 a	nd 2 . With ceter at B and a advis BA draw a circle 2		
There are at le necessary:	east three reaso	ons why Euclic	l's diagrams a	are	
Objects m	ay be "underspe	cified" [Netz, 1	999].		
2 The considered and the considered and the considered and the constant of	lered case canno	ot be recovered	from the text a	alone.	
The existe guaranteed	nce of some obj I by the postula	ects (e.g., inters tes alone.	section point ir	n l.1) is r	iot
				Aristotle's Lo	ogic







15 / 44

• Syllogisms were given different names (e.g., Barbara, Celarent, etc.) to aid memorization.









Advertisement: You should really take Phil 120 or Phil 470 to learn more about predicate logic.

I am just going to teach you show to represent sentences symbolically in predicate logic. Then we'll compare it with Aristotelian logic.



ristotle's Logic



26 / 44

28 / 44

- $(\forall x) \neg P(x)$  represents "Nothing has property *P*."
  - E.g., If P is "is awesome", then  $(\forall x) \neg P(x)$  represents "Nothing is awesome."

27 / 44







## (Neve:: Cenerality in Equal 20 Micro 20 Micr

32 / 44





39 / 44

Upshot 1: It is hard to translate Euclid's postulates, theorems, etc. into an Aristotelian framework, let alone prove the theorems using Aristotle's methods.



Review: Generality in Euclid	Aristotelian Logic	Some Predicate Logic	Three Limitations	(Up Next)	References
		Up Next			



