

Josiah Kim

Professor Christopher Moore

PHIL 200

21 October 2019

Grammata #8

I am persuaded by all of Gorgias' arguments for the three theses defended; however, I find the first argument the most profound. More specifically, the sub-argument, "Eternal." This argument is Kierkegaardian in nature which I have a fondness towards. Kierkegaard argues that God cannot "exist" because He is eternal; therefore, supporting the argument that it is impossible for something eternal to exist.

I believe Gorgias is "seriously" arguing for the three theses. One might argue against this claim because in Gorgias' argument for the second thesis, he uses the example of chariots racing in the sea (79). At a glance, this example may seem childish and disprove Gorgias' "seriousness." However, I would argue that Gorgias uses this example to exemplify his "seriousness." By using an absurd example such as this, he is able to portray why someone's "conviction that chariots really are, racing in the sea" is also absurd (82).

The most striking difference between Gorgias' texts that we've read so far is the style of narration used by Gorgias. In the "Encomium of Helen," Gorgias' explanations are thorough and easy to follow. This is mainly due to the variety of grammar, vocabulary and examples that he used. On the other hand, "On Nature," is hard to comprehend. There is no variation in language and little to no examples are provided by Gorgias. Furthermore, the purpose for which he wrote the texts differ. This is exemplified by Gorgias' using the first person in both the "Encomium of Helen" and "Defense of Palamedes." In "Of Nature," he is the most distant from the writing by only using the third person. However, the structure in which Gorgias writes is similar throughout his texts. In each argument (and sub-argument), he provides his explanation and always concludes with a summary.