

PHIL 145 (HoAP)

Notes

Materials Used:

-Patricia Curd, *A Presocratics Reader. Selected Fragments and Testimonia*, Indianapolis & Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2011.

-Plato, *Complete Works*. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by John M. Cooper, Indianapolis & Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1997.

This list will likely be in no particular order. Just read what is written here as a trivia, should at least fire up some memories of what actually matters to this course, I guess.

Here it goes:

4/10/2024

Friday

Presocratics;

Presocratics lived in Greece in the 6th and 5th centuries BCE,

They did not belong to a unified school and differed greatly in their views but shared intellectual attitudes and assumptions and displayed enthusiasm for inquiry (that knowledge of nature could answer questions instead of whatever the fuck [gods] they believed at that time) that justifies studying them as a group.

Presocratics rejected divine authority for their claims, and invited inquiry to the sources of human knowledge.

Presocratics dealt with a lot of fields of science and philosophy.

Thales was the first presocratic and also was the first titular philosopher.

Thales thought everything came from water.

Anaximander, who followed Thales, rejected water as the base of things and proposed a single reality to take its place which he called the boundless (or the indefinite) with no specific characteristics, out of which arise the other ingredients of the cosmos.

Anaximenes, who followed Anaximander, rejected the boundless, stating that it was too indefinite to do what Anaximander wanted it to do and promptly claimed that Air was the foundational stuff. He also proposed the mechanics of transformation for his theory, condensation and rarefaction, which Anaximander and Thales didn't do for theirs.

Anaximander and Anaximenes thought that the entire universe could be explained by looking at nature alone.

Muses, is the goddess of literature.

Hesiod,

poet and writer, he didn't think natural evidence was necessary for knowing the universe and relied on divine warrant of Muses (schizo).

His order of creation is as follows,

Chaos existed first, we do not know from where,

Then came Gaia [Earth],

And Tartaros [Underworld],

And Eros [erotic Love],

Erebos [Darkness] and black Night came into being from it,

From Night came Aither [bright upper air] and Hemera [Day],

Gaia brought Ouranos [Heaven], equal to herself to secure a dwelling place for gods,

Gaia then gave birth to;

Nymphs, who lived in wooded mountains,

Pontos, the barren sea,

Then she laid with Ouranos and gave birth to;

Ocean

and Koios

and Kreios

and Hyperion

and Iapetos

and Theia

and Rhea

and Themis

and Mnemosyne

and Phoebe

and Tethys

After all of them was born Kronos, the most terrible of children, and he hated his mighty father.

07/10/2024

Monday

Week 2 (apparently) Topics: Heraclitus, Parmenides, Democritus, (the [very cool]) Sophists

All the Sophists were contemporaries of Socrates.

Sophists are considered presocratics.

Socrates argued against the Sophists (his public enemy #1).

Heraclitus is known as “the obscure” (how cool is that wowie).

Heraclitus:

-* (Sextus Empiricus, Against the Mathematicians 7.132) *-

Logos → argument,

reasoning > rational thinking,

explanation > account,

word > conversing,

definition,

measure / ratio / order,

Heraclitus asserted logos as the single divine law that controls the universe.

If you make logos hold the meaning to everything, you can then understand and judge everything.
And if you make that your own logos then you can act as a philosopher.

Although people are in contact with logos, they fail to grasp it. They are inexperienced. They do not know/understand what to do with **logos** they come across.

The difference between a philosopher and others: They (others) are awake, they have the experiences, yet they behave as if they were asleep. They cannot develop a firm grasp of what it is they are experiencing. A psudeo-dream state that fades away. They fail to pay attention/notice the logos that is given to them.

Failure to comprehend (the logos) is in human nature, therefore being a philosopher means to beat that nature and start **realising**.

Logos does not belong to anyone, it is commonly found in the universe and it is up to the individual to discover and understand what it is. We are around logos.

If you take the understanding of the common thing as a private affair, you fail to understand it, to grasp what it is you need to take it universal, and as human beings, from nature, are selfish and egocentric, most take logos as their private understanding.

To be a philosopher you need to understand logos by reaching out and understanding the common, by moving out of one-self's private perspective.

You are in contact with logos everywhere, yet you cannot grasp logos if you are in a subjective, private position.

You need to avoid behaving as if you were asleep to be a philosopher. Awaken yourself.

See the things as they are instead of what you consider them as.

One has a small experience of logos in their private corner, but if they take **this** as the entire truth, they can only partially experience the truth about logos. You cannot be a philosopher with the partial truth, you need the entire truth.

> (The tutor says:) You cannot behave against your nature (you are ultimately bound to your physical body) but you can understand it and act accordingly (learn to live with it).

(Fragments of Heraclitus' text)

P1 / P2 / P26 / P27 / P20 / P19 / P12 → P18

(ordering makes better sense to the tutor)

Senses are limited in their nature, but this according to Heraclitus doesn't mean that we need get rid of them all-together, we don't need to despise them all-together.

11/10/2024

Friday

P63 → He expresses some confidence in the senses, yet at the same time doesn't wholly trust them.

P64 → Senses are bound by their physical limits. He also expresses confidence in the sense itself.

P12 → Nature is hidden for the senses. To grasp nature one must go beyond their senses.

P17 → Understanding of the logos itself as the common thing and ones contact with the logos from their perspective bound by their senses. Leave your private space and go through what is common.

P18 → Right thinking can go beyond what senses can achieve with respect to truth.

P20 → Your senses are your private sleep. You are awake when you are thinking.

Senses are not **strong** enough to reach a conclusion about the nature of things.

12/10/2024

Saturday

(Video Assignments)

Heraclitus on cosmos: There are three components, **earth, sea, and fire** that continuously change into each other, **in ways that are directed and measured by fire.**

To the effect that **“All is one”**.

There is reference to a fourth, **ether (air)**. (Might be introduced as a form of fire [a shiny, brighter fire])

Monism → All is one. >Glory to Glorzo.

Flux: What is the difference between change and flux.

Change → leaves change their colour, there is something that persists (leaf) and there is something that changes, the colour. There is something persistent and there is something that changes.

Flux → There is nothing that persists. Layers and dimensions of change. There is nothing that is stable. The leaf doesn't just change it's colour, it also changes it's shape, position, etc. The cognizer also changes. The surroundings also change.

A world where everything everywhere is in constant change.

Plato and Aristotle ascribe this type of theory to Heraclitus.

Plato may have gotten it wrong due to studying a follower of Heraclitus who made it seem more radical.

Heraclitus may be a change theorist instead of a flux theorist.

The river bed may be stable while the water and the person inside of it change.

(>Read about the river doctrine.)

14/10/2024
Monday
(Still Heraclitus)

P11 → “All things are **one**.”

one → in the sense of unity

All → in the sense of a **set** of things

1* A harmonious unity of everything; A harmonious totality

2* **Each thing** (everything) is a **unit of being** (existence).

Each individual thing is one thing, each thing has unity by itself.

>Numerical Identity

Everything has a numerical identity.

The material constitution of things.

There is something beyond the material elements of things which holds these things together to constitute a unit of existence.

This thing makes everything a (one) unit of existence.

P56 → All things need a bonding mechanism to stay as one.

Ex: A recipe for a meal. It is not material but it is an essential part. Without the recipe none can be achieved.

Identity: Everything is one unit of being something. It has this feature of being one unit of something by being the same thing as itself.

Logos is the principle that holds all things together. Logos is the recipe. It is beyond material constitutions.

HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE.

Software encodes everything to be a particular thing.

Hardware is it's physical precursor.

Numerical identity is the hardware and software put together.

Every particular thing has its own logos, and the things that include those things have their own logos.

Every human being shares the logos of being a human being, yet are different because they have different numerical identities.

P40 → A thing is numerically identical to itself if and only if its constitutive parts retain their identities within themselves.

P39 → An existing thing is the same as itself if and only if it retains its existence in space and temporal field in a continuous manner without any gaps.

18/10/2024

Friday

Parmenides of Elea

The poem begins with a long introduction. **(The Proem)**

Followed by truth. **(Truth)** ← *will be studied in class*

Followed by doxa section, “beliefs” or “opinions” a cosmology that, the goddess warns, is in some way deceptive. **(Doxa)**

Goddess thinks humans confuse *being* with *non-being*.

Being → *is (what-is)* → *necessarily is*

Non-being → *is-not (what-is-not)* → *necessarily is-not*

Proem Questions:

1) *What is the subject of the verb “is”?*

>An anonymous **it**. Anything that exists.

2) *What does “is” mean?*

Different senses of “is”: **The Pyramid** (*so coool*)

*Existence (I am)

*Predicative (I am happy) {*Just a predication, truth value is irrelevant*}

Happiness exists in (dependant) the person (I).

*Veridical (I am in the classroom) [It is the case that I am in the classroom] {*Has a relevant truth value*}

The state of affairs exists in the outside in which I truly am in the classroom.

Existential sense grounds the others. It is the base.

You can’t be veridical without being predicative and you can’t be predicative without existing.

21/10/2024

Monday

You can not know what-is-not.

You can not declare what-is-not.

Proposition:

Is not a sentence.

Sentences can function as a way to express propositions. Sentences are the means.

Snow is white. / Kar beyazdır. \leftarrow {*Same proposition, different sentences*}

Propositions *can be semantic.*

If I know P, then P is true. / If P is not true, then I don't know P. {*Same proposition.*}

You can not know a falsity.

(You can know the falsity to be false, but you can not know the falsity itself.)

You can not know which does not exist.

I know that "2+2=5" is false. {I know that the fact is false, not the "2+2=5" part.}

I know that "2+2=5". The sun revolves around the earth. {*There is nothing to know, there is not an object in the universe to know about a such fact. It is only a sentence.*}

Truth is bound with being.

Non-being / non-existence

Contingently existing \rightarrow non present [Logically Possible]

\rightarrow imaginary things [Logically Possible]

Necessarily non-existence \rightarrow square-circle [Logically Impossible]

\rightarrow absolute nothingness [Logically Impossible]

We can tell (talk) certain things about these impossible things ^

The difference between **sense** / **reference**

The evening star. The morning star. [Venus example (*retards*)]

Square-circle → *It has a sense, but not a reference.*

Absolute nothing → *It has a sense, but not a reference.*

It is designed to not to refer to anything.

You can declare what is not, but not in a truthful way. For truth you need a reference.

Thinking and language also are bound with being.

Something can have a meaning but not a reference. Having a meaning doesn't mean you are dealing with the truth.

Without meaning you can't think. But having a meaning doesn't mean something has a reference. It may give the feeling of having a reference when in reality, there isn't one.

You can declare things with their meaning but their truth depends on their existence. You can't declare it truthfully.

25/10/2024

Friday

If you wanna see the truth about **being** then you must leave behind your ordinary ways of thinking about existence and being.

It may go against your basic intuitions about existence itself.

You need to enter a new environment.

At this level of thinking **there is only one difference** (*being IS, non-being ISN'T*) although our reality is constituted on differences.

(This Parmenides guy is one cryptic fucker)

You are in a reduced environment, all the differences are suspended and you only have one difference.

being ————— non-being

Being behaves as → it is, and therefore it can not be nothingness

Non-being behaves as → it is not, and therefore it can not be

These are the only relevant matters of behaviour in this reduced universe

A matter of perspective → *specialists study the same thing in different ways*

Take an apple as an example, a biologist and a chemist will study it from different perspectives, they are studying the same thing from different angles.

*Now try to remove as much as you can from your object. At a certain point you will come across the naked being itself. **The most fundamental thing is that it exists. It should be there. Therefore existence is the most fundamental thing that grounds all other properties.***

Then you can see the being of the object itself as it's property.

*Studying **being qua being** → Metaphysics*

(as)

*In terms of being all things are same. **I do not exist more than anything else does.** I do not exist more than an apple. At this level of thinking there is only being. In terms of being everything is the same. Everything is being in different ways. Differences between all does not constitute being itself. I exist as a human and an apple exists as a storage device, but in terms of mere existence I do not exist more than the apple does.*

We are different from each other as to how we behave in our existence.

You can not do biology or chemistry with the being of the apple itself.

Different angles of view see different behaviours. When you study the being (being qua being) itself, you investigate into the manners of behaviour which are relevant to being and being only. How do you behave as a being. Your daily functions are not that relevant to your being.

Being behaves in three ways. (You'll see this on Monday I suppose.)

28/10/2024

Monday

The fundamental rules of being also apply to thinking since you can't think without being.

(>tutor talked about *being qua being* again)

thinking about being should not imply anything about non-being

being is and no way that it is not

1) ***being and non-being are exclusive*** (*they don't mix*)

Being is completely clear from non-being and vice versa.

2) They not only are exclusive but they are **exhaustively exclusive** (they do not include any properties of each other).

There is not a third possibility of an amalgamation of being and non-being. [PEM]

You don't have any empirical access to the being. You can only perceive the being by thinking. You can't touch the being, you can only touch it's shell (the apple), you can't touch the being in it's naked form. Your being is not your properties.

Tutor says: *Although it is the foundation of what you have it is not given to me. It is only intelligible to me, it is an object of thought, it is not an object of perception.*

You can't perceive the being. **It is what it is**, it doesn't resemble anything you can perceive.

Laws of Thinking: [PNC, PEM, PI]

1) The law of no contradiction (Principle of No Contradiction [P.N.C.]) { $\sim(P \wedge \sim P)$ }

^ *You discover this in the reduced environment of being and non-being. Being and non-being are exclusive and cannot share properties.*

(Thanks sooooo much Parmenides)

2) The Excluded Middle (equivalent of P.N.C) { $(\sim P \vee P)$ }

3) The Principle of Identity { $(P \rightarrow \sim\sim P)$ }

^ *(If being is then it is not the case that it is not)*

If being is then it is. (>I guess you can't disprove this.)

Parmenides tries to show that we are mistaken in our mortal speeches about being, we speak as if it can be in some connection with non-being, it is not.

01/11/2024

Friday

(>Ex-nihilo generation → coming into existence from nothing)

(>The idea behind all this is avoiding all reference to non-being)

1) Being does not come-into-existence. There is no birth to being, it has never been generated, it has always been there, there is no beginning in time for being. Being is eternal and so is DOOM

Change is impossible for being as it implies non-being, you can only come into existence if you do not exist.

2) Being does not change. Change implies a reference to non-being (you can only change from being not-something to being something).

You shouldn't talk about being in ways that imply generation.

3) Being does not perish. You cannot perish if you remain in the same state of existence, if something perishes it means that it goes under some form of change, which is impossible for being.

4) Being is **eternal -DOOM-**. Being does not have a temporal existence. There is no beginning and end for being.

According to Eleatics; time is composed of **distinct nows** (instances), which all follow each other. Now is the only point of time in which we exist. Nothing is still in the past, and nothing is in the future yet. Every existing thing only exists now. **Existence is NOW**. Now is the limits of my existence, my existence comes to an end when now ends.

$\{ [\text{now (past)}] - [\text{now (now)}] - [\text{now (future)}] \} \rightarrow \text{This implies ex nihilo generation. (Things disappear and come into existence again every moment.)}$

Therefore being cannot be in time, **being cannot have this temporality because this temporality implies ex nihilo generation**. Being is ETERNAL -DOOM-.

It is God which keeps us in existence throughout time.

5) Being does not move for three reasons;

a) **Only divisible things can move**. Something can not move without having it's halves in either side (at the transition point), this implies divisibility, therefore movement is impossible for being as it is indivisible.

b) Being does not exist in time, therefore it cannot move as movement needs time.

c) Void (the absence of being) does not exist. When there is no being, you have void. For there to be a movement you need void. If there is no void, where are you going to move into. You need void for movement and void does not exist, therefore movement is not possible.

Void = Non-being

6) Being is not divisible (is indivisible). If something is divisible, it should have parts, therefore being is indivisible as it is not composed of off parts.

Being cannot have parts because when something has parts, any of those of the parts it has is different from the whole thing itself. The whole is not identical to any of its parts and no part is identical to the whole itself. This sentence implied non-being numerous times by suggesting that the parts are not the whole therefore they make an appeal to non-being. **If you talk about difference one way or another you have to reference non-being.** If there is difference there is non-being.

-If something is not being then what is it?

+It's NOT.

*Thanks to non-being, things are different from each other. If it were only being, everything would have been the same or would not have had any properties.

(>Next week Democritus and the Atomists)

Video Assignments

Reductio ad absurdum: Establishing a claim by showing that the opposite scenario would lead to absurdity and contradiction.

(If the negation of my *demonstrandum* leads to absurdity then my *demonstrandum* is true.)

Principle of Sufficient Reason: Nothing is generated without there being a reason or cause.

Quod erat demonstrandum: That which was to be demonstrated.

Parmenides offers a reductio ad absurdum instead of QED regarding being. If being were generated, how? Either it would have come from what-is-not or what-is. If it were from nothing where would it have come from? (Does not work). If it were that what-is came from what-is then it would be a tautology, meaning that it has caused itself, which doesn't make sense. **It can't come from nothing and it can't come from itself.**

Hence the claim that being is generated is absurd. Hence the demonstrandum is being is ungenerated.

>A reductio ad absurdum argument for the demonstrandum that being is one.

+Being cannot have parts as when something has parts, the parts differ from the thing itself, and being cannot be different as it is the same and it only is, therefore being cannot have parts, which shows that being is one.

Parmenides says: "Being is a well rounded sphere."

How can something that is not perceptible have a shape or form?

Melissus' claim is that "***We can not think of being as what is full and non-being as what is empty. Outside of being is nothing and therefore nothing can move there.***"

Atoms differ from Parmenidian being because they are many. Pluralism about being as opposed to monism.

"What is no more is then what-is-not"

04/11/2024

Monday

Democritus:

(Atomists take some principles from Eleatics and Atomism came out as a reaction to Eleatism)

The full (atoms) > what-is > solid > body -> infinite in number

The void (empty) > what-is-not > rare > place for the atoms -> infinite in size

^ These are the material causes of every existing thing (First principles) > elements out of which perceptible things come into existence

They **completely exclude each other**. What is full is completely full and what is void completely lacks fullness.

Democritus was the first to make the atoms the first principles.

Atoms do not have any void, and for divisibility you need void, hence atoms are indivisible.

Atoms and void are opposites.

Whatever void is atom is not, and whatever atom is void is not.

Wherever atom is there is no void, and wherever void is there is no atom (in a particular sense).

Material causes are not necessarily matter.

Things are composed of atoms and void, but atoms are not composite things. Things need both atoms and void to exist.

Atoms are same in kind, but they differ from each other in shape, size, position and arrangement.

Composite things come into existence by the entanglement of the colliding atoms.

Atoms themselves do not alter *(there is no change for atoms as they exclude all void)*, composite things are NOT altered atoms, they are the compounds of atoms with void inbetween.

> *tome (parts), a-tome (that which cannot be divided)*

<u>Atoms</u>	<u>Void</u> (anti-atom)
---------------------	--------------------------------

what-is	what-is-not
---------	-------------

hing	not-hing
------	----------

08/11/2024

Friday

Democritus:

Infinity: How can an infinite number of atoms exist within an infinite void?

A 1:1 correspondence of infinities.

The set of all whole numbers = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5...

The part is as infinite as the whole.

The set of all even numbers = 2, 4, 6, 8, 10...

"Further, he posited that what-is is no more than what-is-not, and both are equally causes of things that come to be."

"For supposing the substance of the atoms to be compact and full, he said it is what-is and that it moves in the void, which he called "what-is-not" and which he declares is no less than what-is."

- Unlike Eleatics, who believed in the existence of only the being, Democritians believe in both the void and the atoms.

>Remember the paper hole thought experiment

11/11/2024

Monday

Democritus:

Void does not exist less than the atoms.

Void and atoms do not depend on each other for their existence.

-For Eleatics void is the absence of being. And there is nothing but being, therefore you would never find void, you can only think of it in a counterfactual way. You can not conceive void without taking being into account. You depend on being as it is the only understandable thing by *itself*. Being consumes all possibility of existence, therefore none is left for void. Void can only be understood counterfactually.

-For Atomists there is no such notion as void and atoms can exist and be theorized without depending on each other. They exclude each other. Atoms do not consume the existence of void, they just exclude each other, they let void go.

Atoms do not use any void, they don't reduce anything from the existence of void. Void is not the actual place of the atom.

^ He stayed on top of this topic for a whole hour. Learn this well.

IMPLICATIONS OF ATOMISM IN EPISTEMOLOGY

In reality (atomic level [as in zooming in]), there is nothing corresponding to the description of the "red ball".

The red ball does not have any of its qualities that is perceived by cognizers. It is only a composite of atoms. None of its qualities exist in reality, in the atomic level. The composition of atoms make it seem like so.

Like a TV screen, if you zoom into the pixels you won't be able to see shit.

You can not perceive the shapes of the atoms. You can not perceive reality. Reality is only intelligible.

Democritus is not an empiricist. He is an anti-realist.

-MIDTERM CUT OFF LINE-

25/11/2024

Monday

The Sophists:

Aristotle was aware that there were differences between Socrates and Presocratics.

The Sophists were interested in philosophy regarding human affairs.

Like Presocratics, the term “sophist” doesn’t designate a determinate school of philosophy.

Sophists taught for money, this wasn’t common in ancient Greece.

“Nurture”/Nature

Nomos/Physis debate “Normativity”

Did norms come from nature or nurture?

Sophists questioned this.

(The nature [the origins] of moral/political life/virtues)

-Convention is random, when in conflict, go with nature.

+Such rules have some foundation in nature and are not against it. Normativity of the laws and virtues have basis in nature.

29/11/2024

Friday

Socrates and Polemarchus: It is never just to harm anyone.

Thrasymachus doesn't like this conclusion, it is too naive for his taste of justice, he gets angered. ^

He claims to know what justice is better than Socrates and Polemarchus.

What is justice?

What is just?

Thrasymachus: *"Justice is nothing other than the advantage of the stronger."* "The advantage of the stronger is the just"

1- *In each city, it is the stronger which rules. i.e. The just is the stronger element.*

2- *The stronger elements (I.e the rulers) make the laws to their own advantage.*

3- *They declare what is to their advantage to be just for the subjects.*

4- *In all cities, the just is the advantage of the ruler.*

5- (By 4&1) *The just is the advantage of the stronger.*

"A ruler, insofar as he is a ruler, never makes errors and unerringly decrees what is best for himself, and this his subject must do."

They rebut: No craft seeks it's own advantage, it always works for the subject (a physician). So this should also apply to rulers and they should rule for the sake of their subject.

Thrasymachus then says: *"Justice is the good of another."* ← Abstaining from pleonexia(possession). ← **He proposes this to attack it later on.** Socrates defends this notion.

02/12/2024

Monday

Still Thrasymachus:

Tyrant is the most unjust person, hence he is the happiest.

What we call justice is praised and ordained not because it is just in itself, but because it is designed to be just by the stronger. What we call just is nothing other than what is called to be just.

Certain manners of behaviour are not praised because they are right in their nature but because they are loads of bullshit.

According to Thrasymachus, **justice has no substance.** Or a substantial objective nature. **It is contingent on who happens to be in power to define it.**

Justice is not a natural property.

Justice is dependant on the unjust, therefore justice in itself is corrupted since it is defined to be corrupted by the ones in power.

Callicles: He is really furious and hates society as it is.

Law and nature contradict each other.

In nature it more shameful to be subjected to injustice, whilst in society it is more shameful to commit injustice.

The origins of conventional laws and customs is a conspiracy. Conventional laws say that there is nothing wrong or shameful about suffering injustice, whilst in nature there is. This conspiracy is designed by the weak people against the stronger in order to constrict the stronger and get their natural superiority under control (designed by the weakest to protect themselves against the stronger, to deprive the stronger from their natural strength.).

The laws are made by the weak in their own advantage and designed in a way to avoid being exploited by the stronger and to avoid suffering from their hands.

Purposes of conventional laws and customs:

1- Prevent pleonexia (while superiors deserve it according to nature). The weak condemn pleonexia as unjust as something to blame and shame.

2- Establish equality (while they are naturally inferior) The weak praises equality as a social/ethical/political ideal and they blame all acts of offence against equality.

The weakest achieve this with education, by brainwashing.

“But surely, if a man whose nature is equal to it arises, he will shake off, tear apart, and escape all this, he will trample underfoot our documents, our tricks and charms, and all our laws that violate nature.”

According to Callicles pleonexia is right and correct with nature. The laws and customs oppose nature. The stronger are educated into slavery, they have learned not to want more when they inherently deserve it. They perceive it to be right to have less than their natural share.

There are two kinds of pleonexia,
the pleonexia of the weak is unjust and is against nature,
the pleonexia of the stronger is just and in accordance with nature.

06/12/2024

Friday

Protagoras:

Socrates challenges Protagoras and asks if virtue really is teachable.

Protagoras sets out show that virtue is teachable.

Socrates says, if virtue were teachable, then the most prominent politicians would have educated their own children in the ways of it, he then mentions that there is no school for political virtue.

Protagoras, then to defend his occupation, tells a story. >The speech starts

Protagorean **Myth of Prometheus** ← **Quite Important**

09/12/2024

Monday

The Myth of Protagoras: A Naturalistic Interpretation → Methexis Journal. Pp51-55

Protagoras:

Protagorian version of Myth of Prometheus again

His version of the story depends on some **naturalistic assumptions** about morality and political existence.

There are certain capacities that are not given to humans by Gods, humans possess them by nature.

The divine gifts are virtues. These virtues make humans capable of executing their natural capacities as perfectly as possible.

Humans have the capacity to do certain things even though they do not possess the innate ability (virtue) do so, one could learn to play the piano even if they don't possess the virtue.

A piano player would have both the natural capacity and the virtue to play the piano.

The divine gifts in the myth are virtues in this sense, humans have some natural capacities, but Gods give them the virtues to utilise them fully.

Reason, language, perception of moral values, being a political animal → These are **NOT** given by Gods (*exclusively human*)

Ex: Language was developed by human beings after Prometheus gave them fire. (Humans had the natural capacity of making sounds, and using this they developed language)

*Human beings were unequipped except for their power of **reason** (given by Epimetheus). The difference between rational and non-rational animals were already present before Prometheus stole the virtues from Gods.*

What Prometheus steals from the Gods is **the wisdom of practical arts**. This presupposes that human beings were already capable of receiving and understanding the wisdom (the technical knowledge required to do) of practical arts.

This theft alone presupposes the existence of rationality in human beings. Humans just lacked the technical knowledge to do so. They lacked the virtue. Prometheus' theft is not the rational capacity but the wisdom to do practical arts. Zeus' gifts should be understood in the same way.

Human beings were the only creatures to worship the Gods (they had a kind of kinship due to their received gifts from Prometheus).

With Prometheus, human beings acquired some wisdom, yet not enough (Zeus had to intervene to save humanity).

Human beings were already religious before Zeus' gifts. They already had some idea about fairness towards Gods (they erected altars, Gods deserved respect).

Humans had an understanding of justness/fairness at this point (they knew they were in debt to Gods). They already had this feeling, this wasn't given by any God. ← **Perception of moral values**

First attempts at establishing cities by humans failed, as after they came together they've begun wronging each other.

This shows that humans had some sense of justness, as ones who's feelings of justice were hurt (due to them suffering injustices) failed to establish cities.

Before Zeus human beings already had some natural capacity (opinions) of understanding towards what is good or bad, what is just and unjust.

Humans had some idea of justice/shame but didn't know how to perform it correctly, **they lacked the virtues.**

Humans were already political animals, as they had the natural instinct to come together with other members of their species.

Humans naturally have opinions but this doesn't mean that their opinions are naturally true.

Protagoras says he is helping citizens develop their virtues corresponding with their natural capacities.

Protagoras is a naturalist and conventionalist.

Natural Capacity

Phusis, Nature

Virtues

Nomos, Nurture

13/12/2024

Friday

The Man The Myth The Legend, Socrates:

-----History Lesson Begins (not included) -----

dramatic Socrates, historical Socrates

The Socratic Problem: Who was the historical Socrates?

Aristophanes wrote in *Clouds*, that Socrates had a school which taught the art of argumentation (refutation).

The way Aristophanes understood Socrates was him selling knowledge, like a Sophist. He represents Socrates as teaching argumentation for dishonest purposes (defaulting debt).

In Plato's *apology* Socrates complains that *Clouds* caused a bad reputation against him.

Xenophon's representation of Socrates is diametrically opposed to Aristophanes, he said that Socrates was extremely beneficial for the people around him.

For Xenophon Socrates was *taking care of the souls of his friends*. He also said Socrates was pious, unlike Aristophanes who said he made a mockery of Socrates.

Socrates' daemon. He was in contact with his daemon, which led him while making choices at times, people took this daemon as an alien god.

Socratic dialogues are the ones who represent the ideas of the historical Socrates.

-----History Lesson Ends -----

Plato's Socrates:

In the dialogues the interlocutors claim to have knowledge about something (*what is X?* *Justice, Piety, Virtue, Courage, etc.*), it is this type of dialogue that Socrates discusses.

Socrates puts these claims to a test.

As his interlocutors Socrates chooses individuals who are reputed to know something. He deliberately approaches these kind of people. His aim was to honestly learn something from these persons, *he aimed to learn, but not without examining if they indeed have the knowledge they claim to have.*

All the dialogues are aporetic. All of them end in failure, questions but no answers.

The discussions end up in a way where the interlocutor ends up convinced that they didn't know what they were talking about.

Socratic elenchus (refutation) Socrates' purpose was never refutation for the sake of refutation.

16/12/2024

Monday

Socrates:

Socratic Elenchus (*Socratic Refutation*):

The idea is to expose the interlocutor to his own ignorance. The discussion starts with the interlocutor claiming to have knowledge about something, they mostly do discussion on moral concepts. Socrates is interested in learning the truth about the subject (justice, virtues, etc.), and he tests the interlocutors to see if they have the knowledge they claim to have. They start with a definition or definition like justification about what they are discussing.

-I want to know what piety is.

+I know what piety is and piety is that.

Interlocutor suggests a definition. Socrates tests if this is true or not. Socrates then obtains other beliefs about the subject from the interlocutor. He obtains a set of beliefs. Socrates doesn't put words into his interlocutors mouths, he wants them to produce their own opinions (this takes time). He wants the interlocutors to express their own beliefs. He is also interested in educating his interlocutors. When the interlocutors are exposed to their own ignorance Socrates wants this to have an effect on them. He then shows the interlocutor that their set of beliefs imply the opposite of what they are discussing. **This is how a typical elenchus ends**, he shows the interlocutor that their beliefs are inconsistent and they do not know what they are discussing. At this very moment some interlocutors get mad (Callicles, Thrasymachus etc. [lmao]).

Definitions: Socrates is the first philosopher to be interested about the definition of things.

DEFINITION

definiendum = definiens

← components of a definition

the term to define

the expression formula

CRITERIA FOR A GOOD DEFINITION

1- Semantic → An informative identity statement between the definiendum and the definiens (*Human is a featherless biped*)

2- Logical → Provide both the **necessary** and **sufficient** condition for the definiendum (*Mother: A woman with at least one child*) The definiendum and the definiens must be coextensive. (set theory)

3- Metaphysical → >Down below

Identity Statement

A mother is a woman with at least one child. → **Identity statements work both ways**

A woman with at least one child is a mother. → **Identity statements work both ways**

20/12/2024

Friday

A lot of Predicate Logic shit, sets and bi-conditionals, the explanation of the logical part of the definition.

Logical co-extensivity [***bi-conditional state***] (*Woman with at least one child* \leftrightarrow *Mother*)

>Tutor lectured on thinking of counter examples in philosophy.

Blooded animals \leftrightarrow kidneyed animals

Even if the logical criterion is satisfied, the semantic criterion fails.

Not all bi-conditional relations are definitional relations.

All definitional relations are bi-conditional relations.

This is not an identity statement.

23/12/2024

Monday

Metaphysical qualities of the Socratic definition:

Socrates gives out an example, he asks what a bee is, and waits for a concrete answer. Check out **Republic 872.72b**, *the conclusion being that there must be some one thing that makes something a bee*, not a variety of examples. There are many types of bees, whilst there being something in common that makes all of them bees, he is interested in that common quality of beeness.

*“Even if they are many and various,
all of them have one and the same form which makes them virtues.”*

form(eidos)

The form which makes a group of actions all virtuous actions.

An entity in philosophy is much more intricate than the practical real world entities.

Forms are entities but not in a physical sense, they do not have a physical existence or temporality.

Extensionality

If the co-extensivity of the concepts cannot be identified, then there must be something else that is needed for a definition.

Extension vs Intension

*For a good definition one must pay attention to intension of the term that is being defined. There must be an intensional equivalence between the definiendum and the definiens, and extensional equivalence by itself is not enough. **The form one must find for a good definition must give out the intension of the word being defined.***

Exam will likely have questions such as: *Put this argument in a form of necessary and sufficient conditions.*

27/12/2024

Friday

Q&A:

Definiendum and the definiens,

senses of a thing [kidneyed and blooded animals, although they have the same set they aren't a definition]

>Read the paper refik wrote on socratic definitions, turns out he wasn't able to do better than the paper in class

30/12/2024

Monday

A Smooth Introduction to Plato:

THEORY OF FORMS

Socrates thinks that knowledge of definitions have a priority over the knowledge of its corresponding others.

We wouldn't be able to tell what is courageous from what is not if you do not know what courage is.

If you don't wear the right kind of glasses you wouldn't be able to see the right kind of things.

The epistemological priority of definitions ^.

Yet one is able to recognize things even if they don't know their definitions.

CONCEIVABLE THINGS

Perceive	percept	perceptible
Conceive(<i>intellect</i>)	concept	conceivable(<i>intelligible</i>)

Distinction between concept and conceivable

Intelligibles are not concepts.

Distinction between the concept and the existing things: *If there is a plague, cats will go extinct.* ←
(Here the reference is made to the species not the concept)

Cats exist in nature whether one has a concept of them or not. They exist independent of conception, as perceptibles.

Thus Plato is a REALIST not an Idealist

Since forms aren't physical things, the question of their presence (as in the case of "Where are the forms") is irrelevant. Only physical things have where-ness.

Reality is larger than physical things. Forms are real, and reality is not limited to physical things.