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Quiz 3, *Republic*

1. Without repeating the text, explain the meaning of Cephalus’ definition of justice and use an example that demonstrates it.  
    Cephalus defines justice as returning what you owe, for example if I were to borrow a shovel from my neighbor I should return it when asked. When you take something from another that person whose been taken from is owed that item until such a time that the predicate is satisfied.

1a. Explain how Socrates refutes it and provide an example not used in the text.  
 Socrates points out that there are times when we ought not to return things based on the implications for their use. For example, if my neighbor said I need to retrieve my shovel to beat my wife with then I ought not to return the shovel. This is the correct thing to do, but isn’t what was defined as justice.

1. Without repeating the text, explain how Polemarchus defines justice and give an example.   
    Polemarchus says we should use cephalus’ definition with our friends, but only bring harm to our enemies. For example, if I have one neighbor I like and another I dislike and we are each growing gardens on our lawns, and I am in need of some seeds. If I borrow some from the neighbor I like I ought to give him back some seeds of the same type, but if I borrowed some from the neighbor I disliked I should give him back seeds that would cause harm to his garden.

2a. What problems does Socrates point out with it in terms of:

1. Friends and enemies  
    Socrates points out humans are terrible about judgments and could have made a miscalculation about a person’s goodness and friendship worthiness. This means we could be wrong about who our friends and enemies really are. For example, the neighbor I like might have told me horrible but untrue things about my other neighbor in order to sway me into friendship, but is in turn a terrible person himself.
2. Harming another  
    Socrates says that harming someone doesn’t make them a better person, and a just man would seek to harm no one. For example, if I were to hit my son every time he cried he wouldn’t learn to express his feeling in a more positive way, rather he would learn that crying will cause him to be hit. This doesn’t help him grow in any meaningful way, and could cause further harm during his development.
3. Why does Thrasymachus’ definition of justice suggest that he thinks there is no inherent standard of justice? Why is justice “relative?”  
    Thrasymachus says that justice is the stringer exerting their strength on a weaker group, and has no inherit goodness in itself because it changes with the group. This means justice becomes relative to the stronger group and the weaker group. The weaker group might find something to be unjust, but has no recourse as they are weaker than those doing the imposing.
4. Using the example of shepherds and sheep, how does Thrasymachus respond to Socrates’ claim that rulers should rule for the sake of the citizens?  
    Thrasymachus says rulers are like shepards in the particular way in which they care for their sheep for their own benefit. He continues by likening rulers and citizens in this way because he believes rulers will use citizens to do whats best for themselves.
5. What do Glaucon and Adeimantus want Socrates to do at the beginning of Book II? What task do they set before him? Explain.  
    They are asking him to truly persuade them of living a just life, as they believe justice to be something you practice for payment or reputation. Socrates is to show them the life of a just man is always better than that of an unjust man.
6. Multiple Choice Question: In *The Republic*, what is the best combination of seeming and being and just or unjust is as portrayed in the Ring of Gyges?
7. Seeming unjust but being just
8. Being unjust but seeming just
9. **Seeming just but being just**
10. Seeming unjust and being unjust
11. It can be argued that Thrasymachus, Polemarchus, and Cephalus are providing *legal* definitions of justice whereas Socrates is asking if there is something deeper—a moral definition. Why do you think this distinction is significant?   
     I think this is of great significance because matters of the law are often different from morality, but often mistaken for the same. We often tell ourselves that following the law is right, and necessarily someone who follows the law is a moral person. This seems apparent if you look at the broad concepts of law but fail in the details, for instance would a person who jay walked be immoral? Would we consider civil rights activists immoral?