**CORE106-10 Fall 2015**

**September 4, 2015**

**Class Notes: Plato *Apology***

Process Notes:

1. The state didn’t necessarily want to kill Socrates. He could have escaped and if he had shown some humility he probably would have been acquitted.
2. Socrates does not really an give apology.
3. Socrates appealed to the prosecutors' better nature.

Key Points:

* **The unexamined life is not worth living. (p. 41)**
* Intellectual humility. Why does Socrates suggest that he is “wiser”?
* Not going to talk to the crowd they way they want; no concessions, furthermore, will carry on.
* "If anyone says that he has learned anything from me….be assured he is not telling the truth."
* People love his truth telling. “And this is not unpleasant.” P. 37
* I make you BE happy. Tough love…I can make your most idealized self "come to life."

Knowledge is knowledge of what we cannot know. Consider the poets and the craftsmen.

Notes:

Key example of intellectual humility on p. 33: "To fear death is no other than to think oneself wise when one is not, to think one knows when on does not know….I shall never fear or avoid things of which I do not know."

How can you convict me when I am risking my neck because I am obeying a god, not you? (p. 34)

He is focused on excellence preceding other good things. (p. 34).

A man who really fights for justice must lead a private, not a public life, if he is to survive even a short time. (p. 36).

* Description of the power of honesty on p. 22
* Discussion of the old accusations. P. 23
* “All I have is human wisdom” p. 25
* Recalls the Pythian remark. It turns out the Pythian is really mocking Socrates.
* Success breeds arrogance among Athenians. Where do we see this problem today?
* P. 27. Really, he was told…Socrates understands wisdom human wisdom is worthless.
* **The accusation is on p. 28. Corrupting the young, and impiety.**
* First of all..how much damage can one person do. P. 29
* Corrupting them willingly would be self defeating.
* I must believe in Gods because I talk of spiritual things.

Questions: Is it possible he thought he could have persuaded the jury in a backhanded way? Is the prospect of relief at not knowing everything part of the appeal? Expectation of certainty is a burden.

How weak was his case? Why, in the end did he get convicted?