

Socrates' Objections

1. No authority objection

1. No person will be wiser than another.
2. Teaching will be impossible.
3. Philosophical discussion and debate will be pointless.

2. Counter-example objections

Recall the claim that knowledge = perception. We want to find counter-examples to this claim, i.e., cases where you know but don't perceive, or where you perceive but don't know. If perception = knowledge, then Socrates argues:

1. Anyone who perceives an utterance in a given language should have knowledge of that utterance, i.e., understand it. This is false. I can hear a foreign language without knowing what is being said. This is case of perceiving without knowing.
2. I know what I remember even though I don't perceive at the time of remembering.
3. Seeing an object with one eye and not seeing it with the other be a contradictory state of both knowing it and not knowing it.
4. Perceiving dimly or faintly, clearly or unclearly, would mean that we can dimly or faintly, clearly or unclearly, know something.

Protagoras's Response

Socrates presents Protagoras's responses in reverse order. What are they?

Two: _____

One: _____

Narrow vs Broad Protagoreanism

Socrates broadens the scope of the Protagorean doctrine significantly in this part of the dialog:

- Narrow Protagoreanism: x is F to S only if S perceives x as F

- Perception is restricted to the five senses
 - F is restricted to whatever can be sensed
- Broad Protagoreanism: x is F to S only if S believes that x is F.
 - S is either an individual or a city/state
 - F is not restricted to the five senses.