

AA100A Final Questions

[Sample]

Name

Institution

Course Number and Name

Instructor

Date

Introduction

Poets do not inherently dissent from tradition. Admittedly, writing and generation of new poems is motivated by disagreement with older poems. In poetry this is called imitation, which is a poet imitates literature work from their role models. However, recycling and reproducing early formulations cannot stand alone as a form of art. Therefore, there exists some friction between the new and old forms which keep them from of art alive. Louis MacNeice, an Irish poet, opines that poems must be traditional while at the same time depicting something new in their form to be recognizable and thus, he brings to light the tension between innovation and tradition. 'The Flea' by John Donne, 'The Fly' by William Blake and 'The Fly' by Miroslav Holub, and D.H. Lawrence in 'The Faber Book of Beasts', edited by Pau Muldoon demonstrates that tradition and dissent coexist in poetry.

Admittedly, Miroslav's 'The Fly' significantly differs from Donne's 'The Flea' and Blake's 'The Fly'. Miroslav's poetry has inherent repetition in the verse form and does not have rhyme. The work of Miroslav does not conform to any pre-established pattern or technique for line length. Considering how the poem is depicting insecticides, "She mated with a brown-eyed fly," and "'she was eaten by a swift fleeing out of the Estrées fires," the poem is more scientific. Besides, Miroslav's poem focusses more on description rather than analysis, in which the poet elaborates the behavior that is seen during a fly conflict. On the other hand, the fly consecrates with recalling the struggle by Crecy. This is what traditionally happened during the centennial war in the 14th century between France and England.

Just like 'The Fly', the poet uses personification and metaphor to develop the theme of seduction. Unlike 'The Fly', which focuses on presenting the similarity between man and

animals, Donne in 'The Flea' uses a more elaborate and supple metaphor in theme development. The poet uses personify their blood and the flea in the effort to convince a female to have sex with him. Although the woman had denied the poet the sex, the poet states that their blood had their 'blood had mingled' in the flea resulting in the flea to be 'comfortably swollen with our blood, two into one.' The poet goes on to use the flea to metaphorically signify their union. Through the use of metaphor and personification, Donne shows the tradition and dissent in poetry.

The woman's implied involvement in the conversation means that Donne presents the reader with a condensed comedy of manners: 'The Flea' shows us a flirtation in action, which doesn't endorse the speaker in any unqualified way. You don't have to like the poem, but we should acknowledge that it is more than just a piece of Elizabethan smut. Donne provides an original twist on the old theme of seduction, which brings something of the smack of real life into love poetry. In this era, sexual relations were only preserved for the married. The community valued purity, which was signified by the virginity in women. On the contrary, the poet is trying to use a well-created metaphorical situation to deviate and overlook socially held belief of the role of virginity in the union of marriage, which creates the aspect of dissent from the traditions.

'The Fly' by Holub shows significant difference from the work of Black and Donne. The structure and the content of 'The Fly' by Holub suggest that it is a modern poem. Modern poetry is often attacked for having the appearance of being prose which has been randomly cut into verse. The content of 'The Fly' by Holub dissent from the traditional writing of the poem, which seldom addressed warfare. Holub in 'The Fly' neutrally describe the battle and disregard the sense of prestige and glory that comes from war. Instead, the poet compares human vulnerability

with that of animals. Although Holub does not emphasize the use of poetic devices such as alteration and rhymes as seen in other poems, he conforms to the tradition of the poet through the use of personification in theme development. In the third stanza, the poet writes, "she rubbed her legs together on a slit-open horse and pondered on the immortality of flies," which gives the fly human nature. In the last stanza, the poet shows the end of the fly even after enjoying the 'fruits' of war, which he compares with the nature and mortality of human.

In brief, the three poems, 'The Fly' by William Blake, 'The Flea' by John Donne, and 'The Fly' by Miroslav Holub, shows the coexistence of dissent and tradition in the literature. The three poems show tradition through similarities in the use of poetic devices such as personification and metaphor in the theme development. On the other hand, the three poems also show disagreements from the traditional way of writing through their structure. Certainly, 'The Flea' by John Donne, 'The Fly' by William Blake and 'The Fly' by Miroslav Holub, and D.H. Lawrence in 'The Faber Book of Beasts', edited by Pau Muldoon demonstrates that tradition and dissent coexist in poetry.

Question Two

Traditional beliefs can be described as someone merely absorbing others' beliefs without studying them for themselves, as it is a belief passed down from generation to generation. They include ethical or moral principles and perspectives on how people should live their lives and treat others. Traditional moral convictions have a long history, reflecting the experience and understanding of many generations. For Socrates, knowledge is more precious than true opinion.

Admittedly, knowledge is more important and reliable than opinion. Socrates disregards the concept of moral traditionalism since it does not examine the existing beliefs. Socrates ascribes to the moral rationalism that suggested that all the beliefs should be tested. The beliefs that can be defended and explained rationally should be adopted while those, which cannot be defended and explained rationally disputed as morals. Socrates also suggests that knowledge comes from a personal experience, which is through testing the opinions and establishing elements that make those opinion true. According to Socrates, other reading and listening to other people's opinion does not make someone knowledgeable, a claim that contradicts how many people perceive knowledge. Hence, people only get knowledge through testing and understanding the elements of truth in opinions and suggestions.

Moral traditionalism gets its name from the fact that tradition is the best source of moral convictions. Many philosophers have rejected moral traditionalism, regardless of its arguments. Moral rationality comprises philosophers who hold the moral rationalism viewpoint, as well as opponents of moral traditionalism. Moral rationalists argue that we should question existing moral views and only hold convictions rationally sustained and justified. As a result, they believe that reason, not tradition, is the proper foundation for our moral convictions. Plato was known for being a moral rationalist. Socrates proposes in sections 91 to 97 of the Meno Agreement that knowledge and true opinion are equally reliable as guidance in any condition. Socrates also believes that accurate opinions can be transformed into knowledge by "discovering what makes them true." To put it another way, knowing something is not only believing that something is true (correct) but also comprehending why it is true.

Plato's claim that knowledge cannot be extracted from a series of dialogues is likely correct. If he is correct, this will represent a huge shift in how many people talk about and think about knowledge. Many people consider the testimony of others friends, professors, professionals, and eyewitnesses – to be an important source of information. On the other hand, Plato appears to imply that other people's evidence is merely a source of transitory thought.

Socrates suggests knowledge is more valuable than true opinion in the long run because it stays with us. This comes after understanding that something is true and becoming aware of what makes it true. Socrates argues that suggestions and opinions are not knowledge. For instance, if someone is told a certain argument is correct and believe in it without examining what makes it correct, he is likely to be persuaded otherwise by another person. However, if someone is told of an argument and critically examine it to establish what makes it truly holds to that argument, he is not easily persuaded since he has established the truth of the argument himself. Relying on knowledge rather than opinion cannot be misleading as the statutes of Daedalus, which were misleading since they were based on opinions instead of knowledge.

Knowledge is obtained when someone experiences the truth himself. Many people believe that reading or listening to others can be a source of knowledge, Plato and believed that knowledge is first-hand experience. The claim that knowledge cannot be picked second-hand crops up in a number of dialogues, so it is likely that Plato believed it to be true. If he were right, it would mean quite a radical departure from the way in which many people talk and think about knowledge. But Plato seems to hold that the testimony of other people is a source only of fleeting opinion. For example, when Nicias first proposes his definition, he explicitly says that he is repeating something that he has heard Socrates say. In this case, Plato argues that Nicias had no

knowledge since he parroted the opinion of others, which lacked his own examination and understanding of what made the opinion by Socrates true. Lack of personal experience in his definition resulted in the failure of the proposed definition, not because the definition was wrong, but because Nicias did not understand it as per the belief of Socrates in matters of knowledge.

In summary, the following are the questions that Socrates raises in his argument: Knowing what is good and wrong is not simply a component of virtue, but the full virtue. Because courage is only a part of virtue, it is not the knowledge of right and evil. Yes, it is a valid point. One can be confident that courage is not comparable to the knowledge of good and evil if knowledge of evil and good is all virtue, and courage is only a component of virtue. As a result, knowledge is more important to Socrates and Plato than true opinion.