

Josiah Kim

Professor Christopher Moore

PHIL 200

28 October 2019

### Grammata #9

Before Thrasymachus enters the discussion, Socrates starts a conversation with Cephalus. They continue with a discussion about wealth. The first philosophical conversation roots from Socrates' question to Cephalus: "What's the greatest good you've received from being very wealthy?" (330d1). Cephalus says that wealth "saves us from having to cheat or deceive someone against our will" (331b1). Socrates then interprets Cephalus' definition of justice as not "speaking the truth and repaying what one has borrowed" (331d2). Then, Polemarchus interrupts and enters into discussion with Socrates. Socrates' problem with this definition is that enemies owe each other "something bad" (332b6). Therefore, repaying cannot be justice. Socrates and Polemarchus talk about Simonides' interpretation of justice as "treat[ing] friends well and enemies badly" (332d6). Socrates' problem with this definition is that harming one's enemies cannot be justice (334b6). They then discuss the importance of a just person and concludes that the function of an unjust person is "to harm a friend or anyone else" (335d11).

Ultimately, Thrasymachus believes that "a just man always gets less than an unjust one" (343d1). Furthermore, he sees that "injustice, if it is on a large enough scale, is stronger, freer and more masterly than justice" (344c3). He uses the example of tyranny in relation to this view. At the end of the book, Socrates and Thrasymachus see that a clever person is good; "therefore, a good and clever person doesn't want to outdo those like himself but those who are unlike him and his opposite" (350b6). Therefore, a just person is good and clever. In order for a city to be powerful, it will need the help of justice, not injustice. Furthermore, Socrates comes to the conclusion that a character of injustice is separation and an unjust person is wretched. Therefore, Socrates claims that injustice is never more profitable than justice.