

Chapter 1 : PDF Download Wise Guy The Life and Philosophy of Socrates Download Full Ebook - Video D

"Wise Guy: The Life and Philosophy of Socrates" by M.D. Usher is an excellent resource book for middle schoolers taking a world history class. Our standards require.

HPB condition ratings New: Item is brand new, unused and unmarked, in flawless condition. No defects, little usage. May show remainder marks. Older books may show minor flaws. Shows some signs of wear and is no longer fresh. Used textbooks do not come with supplemental materials. Average used book with all pages present. Possible loose bindings, highlighting, cocked spine or torn dust jackets. Obviously well-worn, but no text pages missing. May be without endpapers or title page. Markings do not interfere with readability. All text is legible but may be soiled and have binding defects. Reading copies and binding copies fall into this category. Mint condition or still sealed SS. Absolutely perfect in every way. No defects, little sign of use, well cared for. Not necessarily sealed or unused, but close. Could be an unopened promotional or cut item. Will show some signs that it was played and otherwise handled by a previous owner who took good care of it. Attractive and well cared for, but no longer fresh. Minor signs of wear, scuffing or scratching, but will play almost perfectly. This item is in okay condition. Obviously well-worn and handled. Most vinyl collectors will not buy good or below, but some tracks on CD or vinyl will play. This movie is unopened and brand new. No defects, little sign of use. No skipping; no fuzzy or snowy frames in VHS. Attractive and well cared for but no longer fresh. Minor signs of wear, but will play almost perfectly. This item is in okay condition and basically works well. Basically plays, but may be obviously well-worn with some scratching or tape distortion. Disc or tape is intact, but may be scratched or stretched. There may be skips or distortion or product defects. Sign up for bookish emails And get a coupon for your first purchase.

A cartoon-style picture book of the life of Socrates aimed at readers ages that is both humorous and informative. There was a nice blend of anecdotes and facts to keep it interesting.

Internet Sources The most interesting and influential thinker in the fifth century was Socrates , whose dedication to careful reasoning transformed the entire enterprise. Since he sought genuine knowledge rather than mere victory over an opponent, Socrates employed the same logical tricks developed by the Sophists to a new purpose, the pursuit of truth. Thus, his willingness to call everything into question and his determination to accept nothing less than an adequate account of the nature of things make him the first clear exponent of critical philosophy. Although he was well known during his own time for his conversational skills and public teaching, Socrates wrote nothing, so we are dependent upon his students especially Xenophon and Plato for any detailed knowledge of his methods and results. The trouble is that Plato was himself a philosopher who often injected his own theories into the dialogues he presented to the world as discussions between Socrates and other famous figures of the day. Nevertheless, it is usually assumed that at least the early dialogues of Plato provide a fairly accurate representation of Socrates himself. Euthyphro , for example, Socrates engaged in a sharply critical conversation with an over-confident young man. Finding Euthyphro perfectly certain of his own ethical rectitude even in the morally ambiguous situation of prosecuting his own father in court, Socrates asks him to define what "piety" moral duty really is. The demand here is for something more than merely a list of which actions are, in fact, pious; instead, Euthyphro is supposed to provide a general definition that captures the very essence of what piety is. First, there is the obvious problem that, since questions of right and wrong often generate interminable disputes, the gods are likely to disagree among themselves about moral matters no less often than we do, making some actions both right and wrong. Notice that this problem arises only in a polytheistic culture. More significantly , Socrates generates a formal dilemma from a deceptively simple question: If right actions are pious only because the gods love them, then moral rightness is entirely arbitrary, depending only on the whims of the gods. If, on the other hand, the gods love right actions only because they are already right, then there must be some non-divine source of values , which we might come to know independently of their love. In fact, this dilemma proposes a significant difficulty at the heart of any effort to define morality by reference to an external authority. Consider, for example, parallel questions with a similar structure: So this horn is clearly unacceptable. But on the first alternative, the authority approves or disapproves of certain actions because they are already right or wrong independently of it, and whatever rational standard it employs as a criterion for making this decision must be accessible to us as well as to it. Hence, we are in principle capable of distinguishing right from wrong on our own. Thus, an application of careful techniques of reasoning results in genuine if negative progress in the resolution of a philosophical issue. At most, it points us toward a significant degree of intellectual independence. The character of Euthyphro, however, seems unaffected by the entire process, leaving the scene at the end of the dialogue no less self-confident than he had been at its outset. The use of Socratic methods, even when they clearly result in a rational victory, may not produce genuine conviction in those to whom they are applied. The Examined Life Because of his political associations with an earlier regime, the Athenian democracy put Socrates on trial, charging him with undermining state religion and corrupting young people. Explaining his mission as a philosopher, Socrates reports an oracular message telling him that "No one is wiser than you. In each case, however, Socrates concludes that he has a kind of wisdom that each of them lacks: The goal of Socratic interrogation, then, is to help individuals to achieve genuine self-knowledge, even if it often turns out to be negative in character. As his cross-examination of Meletus shows, Socrates means to turn the methods of the Sophists inside-out, using logical nit-picking to expose rather than to create illusions about reality. If the method rarely succeeds with interlocutors, it can nevertheless be effectively internalized as a dialectical mode of reasoning in an effort to understand everything. Even after he has been convicted by the jury, Socrates declines to abandon his pursuit of the truth in all matters. Refusing to accept exile from Athens or a commitment to silence as his penalty, he maintains that public discussion of the great issues of life and virtue

is a necessary part of any valuable human life. Even when the jury has sentenced him to death, Socrates calmly delivers his final public words, a speculation about what the future holds. Disclaiming any certainty about the fate of a human being after death, he nevertheless expresses a continued confidence in the power of reason, which he has exhibited while the jury has not. Who really wins will remain unclear. Perhaps few of us are presented with the same stark choice between philosophy and death, but all of us are daily faced with opportunities to decide between convenient conventionality and our devotion to truth and reason. How we choose determines whether we, like Socrates, deserve to call our lives philosophical. Now in prison awaiting execution, Socrates displays the same spirit of calm reflection about serious matters that had characterized his life in freedom. Even the patent injustice of his fate at the hands of the Athenian jury produces in Socrates no bitterness or anger. Friends arrive at the jail with a foolproof plan for his escape from Athens to a life of voluntary exile, but Socrates calmly engages them in a rational debate about the moral value of such an action. Of course Crito and the others know their teacher well, and they come prepared to argue the merits of their plan. Escaping now would permit Socrates to fulfil his personal obligations in life. Moreover, if he does not follow the plan, many people will suppose that his friends did not care enough for him to arrange his escape. Therefore, in order to honor his commitments and preserve the reputation of his friends, Socrates ought to escape from jail. But Socrates dismisses these considerations as irrelevant to a decision about what action is truly right. As he had argued in the *Apology*, the only opinion that counts is not that of the majority of people generally, but rather that of the one individual who truly knows. The truth alone deserves to be the basis for decisions about human action, so the only proper approach is to engage in the sort of careful moral reasoning by means of which one may hope to reveal it. One ought never to do wrong even in response to the evil committed by another. But it is always wrong to disobey the state. Hence, one ought never to disobey the state. And since avoiding the sentence of death handed down by the Athenian jury would be an action in disobedience to the state, it follows Socrates ought not to escape. The argument is a valid one, so we are committed to accepting its conclusion if we believe that its premises are true. But what about the second premise, the claim that it is always wrong for an individual to disobey the state? Surely that deserves further examination. In fact, Socrates pictures the laws of Athens proposing two independent lines of argument in favor of this claim: First, the state is to us as a parent is to a child, and since it is always wrong for a child to disobey a parent, it follows that it is always wrong to disobey the state. *Crito* 50e Here we might raise serious doubts about the legitimacy of the analogy between our parents and the state. Obedience to our parents, after all, is a temporary obligation that we eventually outgrow by learning to make decisions for ourselves, while Socrates means to argue that obeying the state is a requirement right up until we die. Here it might be useful to apply the same healthy disrespect for moral authority that Socrates himself expressed in the *Euthyphro*. The second argument is that it is always wrong to break an agreement, and since continuing to live voluntarily in a state constitutes an agreement to obey it, it is wrong to disobey that state. *Crito* 52e This may be a better argument; only the second premise seems open to question. Even if we suppose, as the laws suggest, that the agreement is an implicit one to which we are committed by our decision to remain within their borders, it is not always obvious that our choice of where to live is entirely subject to our individual voluntary control. Nevertheless, these considerations are serious ones. Socrates himself was entirely convinced that the arguments hold, so he concluded that it would be wrong for him to escape from prison. As always, of course, his actions conformed to the outcome of his reasoning. Socrates chose to honor his commitment to truth and morality even though it cost him his life.

Chapter 3 : Download Wise Guy: The Life and Philosophy of Socrates PDF Free - Video Dailymotion

The story of Socrates' life unfolds through cheerful illustrations and a two-tiered text, one layer quite simple, the other full of juicy additional details about the philosopher's life and times. The ending assembles a "School of Athens," showcasing thinkers, from Erasmus to Martin Luther King, Jr., who have been inspired by Socrates' philosophy.

The extant sources agree that Socrates was profoundly ugly, resembling a satyr more than a man—and resembling not at all the statues that turned up later in ancient times and now grace Internet sites and the covers of books. He had wide-set, bulging eyes that darted sideways and enabled him, like a crab, to see not only what was straight ahead, but what was beside him as well; a flat, upturned nose with flaring nostrils; and large fleshy lips like an ass. Socrates let his hair grow long, Spartan-style even while Athens and Sparta were at war, and went about barefoot and unwashed, carrying a stick and looking arrogant. Something was peculiar about his gait as well, sometimes described as a swagger so intimidating that enemy soldiers kept their distance. He was impervious to the effects of alcohol and cold weather, but this made him an object of suspicion to his fellow soldiers on campaign. We can safely assume an average height since no one mentions it at all, and a strong build, given the active life he appears to have led. Against the iconic tradition of a pot-belly, Socrates and his companions are described as going hungry Aristophanes, *Birds*— In the late fifth century B. Although many citizens lived by their labor in a wide variety of occupations, they were expected to spend much of their leisure time, if they had any, busying themselves with the affairs of the city. Other forms of higher education were also known in Athens: One of the things that seemed strange about Socrates is that he neither labored to earn a living, nor participated voluntarily in affairs of state. Rather, he embraced poverty and, although youths of the city kept company with him and imitated him, Socrates adamantly insisted he was not a teacher Plato, *Apology* 33a—b and refused all his life to take money for what he did. The strangeness of this behavior is mitigated by the image then current of teachers and students: Because Socrates was no transmitter of information that others were passively to receive, he resists the comparison to teachers. Rather, he helped others recognize on their own what is real, true, and good Plato, *Meno*, *Theaetetus*—a new, and thus suspect, approach to education. He was known for confusing, stinging and stunning his conversation partners into the unpleasant experience of realizing their own ignorance, a state sometimes superseded by genuine intellectual curiosity. Socrates claimed to have learned rhetoric from Aspasia of Miletus, the de facto spouse of Pericles Plato, *Menexenus*; and to have learned erotics from the priestess Diotima of Mantinea Plato, *Symposium*. Socrates was unconventional in a related respect. Athenian citizen males of the upper social classes did not marry until they were at least thirty, and Athenian females were poorly educated and kept sequestered until puberty, when they were given in marriage by their fathers. It was assumed among Athenians that mature men would find youths sexually attractive, and such relationships were conventionally viewed as beneficial to both parties by family and friends alike. A degree of hypocrisy or denial, however, was implied by the arrangement: What was odd about Socrates is that, although he was no exception to the rule of finding youths attractive Plato, *Charmides* d, *Protagoras* a—b; Xenophon, *Symposium* 4. Socrates also acknowledged a rather strange personal phenomenon, a daimonion or internal voice that prohibited his doing certain things, some trivial and some important, often unrelated to matters of right and wrong thus not to be confused with the popular notions of a superego or a conscience. The implication that he was guided by something he regarded as divine or semi-divine was all the more reason for other Athenians to be suspicious of Socrates. Socrates was usually to be found in the marketplace and other public areas, conversing with a variety of different people—youth and old, male and female, slave and free, rich and poor—that is, with virtually anyone he could persuade to join with him in his question-and-answer mode of probing serious matters. Socrates pursued this task single-mindedly, questioning people about what matters most, e. He did this regardless of whether his respondents wanted to be questioned or resisted him. Who was Socrates really? The difficulties are increased because all those who knew and wrote about Socrates lived before any standardization of modern categories of, or sensibilities about, what constitutes historical accuracy or poetic license. All authors present their own interpretations of the personalities and lives of their characters, whether

they mean to or not, whether they write fiction or biography or philosophy if the philosophy they write has characters, so other criteria must be introduced for deciding among the contending views of who Socrates really was. One thing is certain about the historical Socrates: His comedy, *Clouds*, was produced in when the other two writers of our extant sources, Xenophon and Plato, were infants. In the play, the character Socrates heads a Think-o-Rama in which young men study the natural world, from insects to stars, and study slick argumentative techniques as well, lacking all respect for the Athenian sense of propriety. The actor wearing the mask of Socrates makes fun of the traditional gods of Athens lines 48, 24, mimicked later by the young protagonist, and gives naturalistic explanations of phenomena Athenians viewed as divinely directed lines 33; cf. *Theaetetus* e, d, a; *Phaedo* 96a. Worst of all, he teaches dishonest techniques for avoiding repayment of debt lines 48 and encourages young men to beat their parents into submission lines 48. Thus, what had seemed comical a quarter century earlier, Socrates hanging in a basket on-stage, talking nonsense, was ominous in memory by then. Comedy by its very nature is a tricky source for information about anyone. A good reason to believe that the representation of Socrates is not merely comic exaggeration but systematically misleading is that *Clouds* amalgamates in one character, Socrates, features now well known to be unique to other particular fifth-century intellectuals Dover, xxxii-lvii. That Socrates eschewed any earning potential in philosophy does not seem to have been significant to the great writer of comedies. Aristophanes did not stop accusing Socrates in when *Clouds* placed third behind another play in which Socrates was mentioned as barefoot; rather, he soon began writing a revision, which he published but never produced. Aristophanes appears to have given up on reviving *Clouds* in about 414, but his attacks on Socrates continued. Xenophon was a practical man whose ability to recognize philosophical issues is almost imperceptible, so it is plausible that his Socrates appears as such a practical and helpful advisor because that is the side of Socrates Xenophon witnessed. Although Xenophon tends to moralize and does not follow the superior conventions introduced by Thucydides, still it is sometimes argued that, having had no philosophical axes to grind, Xenophon may have presented a more accurate portrait of Socrates than Plato does. But two considerations have always weakened that claim: He left Athens in on an expedition to Persia and, for a variety of reasons mercenary service for Thracians and Spartans; exile, never resided in Athens again. And now a third is in order. Plato was about twenty-five when Socrates was tried and executed, and had probably known the old man most of his life. The extant sources agree that Socrates was often to be found where youths of the city spent their time. The dialogues have dramatic dates that fall into place as one learns more about their characters and, despite incidental anachronisms, it turns out that there is more realism in the dialogues than most have suspected. It does not follow, however, that Plato represented the views and methods of Socrates or anyone, for that matter as he recalled them, much less as they were originally uttered. There are a number of cautions and caveats that should be in place from the start. Even when a specific festival or other reference fixes the season or month of a dialogue, or birth of a character, one should imagine a margin of error. Although it becomes obnoxious to use circa or plus-minus everywhere, the ancients did not require or desire contemporary precision in these matters. All the children born during a full year, for example, had the same nominal birthday, accounting for the conversation at *Lysis* b, odd by contemporary standards, in which two boys disagree about who is the elder. This is a way of asking a popular question, Why do history of philosophy? One might reply that our study of some of our philosophical predecessors is intrinsically valuable, philosophically enlightening and satisfying. The truly great philosophers, and Plato was one of them, are still capable of becoming our companions in philosophical conversation, our dialectical partners. Because he addressed timeless, universal, fundamental questions with insight and intelligence, our own understanding of such questions is heightened. That explains Plato, one might say, but where is Socrates in this picture? Is he interesting merely as a predecessor to Plato? That again is the Socratic problem. Inconsistencies among the dialogues seem to demand explanation, though not all philosophers have thought so Shorey. Most famously, the *Parmenides* attacks various theories of forms that the *Republic*, *Symposium*, and *Phaedo* develop and defend. In some dialogues e. There are differences on smaller matters as well. A related problem is that some of the dialogues appear to develop positions familiar from other philosophical traditions e. Three centuries of efforts to solve the Socratic problem are summarized in the following supplementary document:

Contemporary efforts recycle bits and pieces—including the failures—of these older attempts. The Twentieth Century Until relatively recently in modern times, it was hoped that confident elimination of what could be ascribed purely to Socrates would leave standing a coherent set of doctrines attributable to Plato who appears nowhere in the dialogues as a speaker. Many philosophers, inspired by the nineteenth century scholar Eduard Zeller, expect the greatest philosophers to promote grand, impenetrable schemes. Nothing of the sort was possible for Socrates, so it remained for Plato to be assigned all the positive doctrines that could be extracted from the dialogues. In the latter half of the twentieth century, however, there was a resurgence of interest in who Socrates was and what his own views and methods were. The result is a narrower, but no less contentious, Socratic problem. Two strands of interpretation dominated views of Socrates in the twentieth century Griswold ; Klagge and Smith Although there has been some healthy cross-pollination and growth since the mid s, the two were so hostile to one another for so long that the bulk of the secondary literature on Socrates, including translations peculiar to each, still divides into two camps, hardly reading one another: The literary-contextual study of Socrates, like hermeneutics more generally, uses the tools of literary criticism—typically interpreting one complete dialogue at a time; its European origins are traced to Heidegger and earlier to Nietzsche and Kierkegaard. The analytic study of Socrates, like analytic philosophy more generally, is fueled by the arguments in the texts—typically addressing a single argument or set of arguments, whether in a single text or across texts; its origins are in the Anglo-American philosophical tradition. Hans-Georg Gadamer — was the doyen of the hermeneutic strand, and Gregory Vlastos — of the analytic. Thus terms, arguments, characters, and in fact all elements in the dialogues should be addressed in their literary context. For both varieties of contextualism, the Platonic dialogues are like a brilliant constellation whose separate stars naturally require separate focus. Marking the maturity of the literary contextualist tradition in the early twenty-first century is a greater diversity of approaches and an attempt to be more internally critical see Hyland Analytic developmentalism[6] Beginning in the s, Vlastos , 45—80 recommended a set of mutually supportive premises that together provide a plausible framework in the analytic tradition for Socratic philosophy as a pursuit distinct from Platonic philosophy. The evidence Vlastos uses varies for this claim, but is of several types: Finally, Plato puts into the mouth of Socrates only what Plato himself believes at the time he writes each dialogue. The result of applying the premises is a firm list contested, of course, by others of ten theses held by Socrates, all of which are incompatible with the corresponding ten theses held by Plato , 47— Many analytic ancient philosophers in the late twentieth century mined the gold Vlastos had uncovered, and many of those who were productive in the developmentalist vein in the early days went on to constructive work of their own see Bibliography. To use them in that way is to announce in advance the results of a certain interpretation of the dialogues and to canonize that interpretation under the guise of a presumably objective order of composition—when in fact no such order is objectively known. And it thereby risks prejudicing an unwary reader against the fresh, individual reading that these works demand. As in any peace agreement, it takes some time for all the combatants to accept that the conflict has ended—but that is where we are. In short, one is now more free to answer, Who was Socrates really? In the smaller column on the right are dates of major events and persons familiar from fifth century Athenian history. Although the dates are as precise as allowed by the facts, some are estimated and controversial Nails When Socrates was born in , a Persian invasion had been decisively repulsed at Plataea, and the Delian League that would grow into the Athenian empire had already been formed. Assuming that his stoneworker father, Sophroniscus, kept to the conventions, he carried the infant around the hearth, thereby formally admitting him into the family, five days after he was born, named him on the tenth day, presented him to his phratry a regional hereditary association and took responsibility for socializing him into the various institutions proper to an Athenian male. Athens was a city of numerous festivals, competitions, and celebrations, including the Panathenaea which attracted visitors to the city from throughout the Mediterranean. Like the Olympics, the Panathenaea was celebrated with special splendor at four-year intervals. After an initial battle, a long siege reduced the population to cannibalism before it surrendered Thucydides 2. As the army made its way home, it engaged in battle near Spartolus and suffered heavy losses Thucydides 2.

Chapter 4 : Socrates (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Greek philosophy for kids"I know that I know nothing."With this classic statement, uttered over two thousand years ago, Socrates set the standard for the future of Western philosophy.

Chapter 5 : Wise Guy : The Life and Philosophy of Socrates by M. D. Usher (, Hardcover) | eBay

Usher brings his lofty subject down to an understandable level, in his first book for children. With enlightening results, the author tackles the life and teachings of the famous Greek thinker in a.

Chapter 6 : Mark David Usher, Wise Guy: The Life and Philosophy of Socrates - PhilPapers

A biography of Socrates, a philosopher and teacher in ancient Greece who held that wisdom comes from questioning ideas and values rather than simply accepting what is passed on by parents and teachers Includes bibliographical references.

Chapter 7 : Wise guy : the life and philosophy of Socrates - Missouri Evergreen

Professor Usher talked about his book Wise Guy: The Life and Philosophy of Socrates, published by Farrar, Straus and ricedaydvl.com book, his first book for children, is a presentation of the life and.

Chapter 8 : Wise Guy: The Life and Philosophy of Socrates - Lexile® Find a Book | MetaMetrics Inc.

the father of philosophy to life in Wise Guy, an easy-to-read, well-illustrated primer for kids. The book is appropriate for two age groups, and , as it is written and illustrated for the younger.

Chapter 9 : Wise Guy: The Life and Philosophy of Socrates - M. D. Usher - Google Books

Dans "Sur la route avec Socrates" Daniel Cohn Bendit Ã©voque la rÃ©volte des footballeurs brÃ©siliens, en