



Edward Craig

PHILOSOPHY

A Very Short Introduction

OXFORD

Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction

'This is a lively and interesting introduction to philosophy. Despite its brevity *Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction* addresses many of the central philosophical questions in an engaging and thought-provoking style. At the same time it gives readers a flavour of some of the greatest works of philosophy and provides expert guidance for those who want to read the original works themselves. Edward Craig is already famous as the editor of the best long work on philosophy (the Routledge Encyclopedia); now he deserves to become even better known as the author of one of the best short ones.'

Nigel Warburton, The Open University

VERY SHORT INTRODUCTIONS are for anyone wanting a stimulating and accessible way in to a new subject. They are written by experts, and have been published in more than 25 languages worldwide.

The series began in 1995, and now represents a wide variety of topics in history, philosophy, religion, science, and the humanities. Over the next few years it will grow to a library of around 200 volumes – a Very Short Introduction to everything from ancient Egypt and Indian philosophy to conceptual art and cosmology.

Very Short Introductions available now:

ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY Julia Annas	CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY Simon Critchley
THE ANGLO-SAXON AGE John Blair	COSMOLOGY Peter Coles
ANIMAL RIGHTS David DeGrazia	CRYPTOGRAPHY Fred Piper and Sean Murphy
ARCHAEOLOGY Paul Bahn	DADA AND SURREALISM David Hopkins
ARCHITECTURE Andrew Ballantyne	DARWIN Jonathan Howard
ARISTOTLE Jonathan Barnes	DEMOCRACY Bernard Crick
ART HISTORY Dana Arnold	DESCARTES Tom Sorell
ART THEORY Cynthia Freeland	DRUGS Leslie Iversen
THE HISTORY OF ASTRONOMY Michael Hoskin	THE EARTH Martin Redfern
ATHEISM Julian Baggini	EGYPTIAN MYTHOLOGY Geraldine Pinch
AUGUSTINE Henry Chadwick	EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BRITAIN Paul Langford
BARTHES Jonathan Culler	THE ELEMENTS Philip Ball
THE BIBLE John Riches	EMOTION Dylan Evans
BRITISH POLITICS Anthony Wright	EMPIRE Stephen Howe
BUDDHA Michael Carrithers	ENGELS Terrell Carver
BUDDHISM Damien Keown	ETHICS Simon Blackburn
CAPITALISM James Fulcher	THE EUROPEAN UNION John Pinder
THE CELTS Barry Cunliffe	EVOLUTION Brian and Deborah Charlesworth
CHOICE THEORY Michael Allingham	FASCISM Kevin Passmore
CHRISTIAN ART Beth Williamson	THE FRENCH REVOLUTION William Doyle
CLASSICS Mary Beard and John Henderson	FREUD Anthony Storr
CLAUSEWITZ Michael Howard	GALILEO Stillman Drake
THE COLD WAR Robert McMahon	GANDHI Bhikhu Parekh

GLOBALIZATION

Manfred Steger
HEGEL Peter Singer
HEIDEGGER Michael Inwood
HINDUISM Kim Knott
HISTORY John H. Arnold
HOBBS Richard Tuck
HUME A. J. Ayer
IDEOLOGY Michael Freeden
INDIAN PHILOSOPHY
Sue Hamilton
INTELLIGENCE Ian J. Deary
ISLAM Malise Ruthven
JUDAISM Norman Solomon
JUNG Anthony Stevens
KANT Roger Scruton
KIERKEGAARD Patrick Gardiner
THE KORAN Michael Cook
LINGUISTICS Peter Matthews
LITERARY THEORY
Jonathan Culler
LOCKE John Dunn
LOGIC Graham Priest
MACHIAVELLI Quentin Skinner
MARX Peter Singer
MATHEMATICS Timothy Gowers
MEDIEVAL BRITAIN
John Gillingham and
Ralph A. Griffiths
MODERN IRELAND
Senia Pašeta
MOLECULES Philip Ball
MUSIC Nicholas Cook
NIETZSCHE Michael Tanner
NINETEENTH-CENTURY
BRITAIN Christopher Harvie and
H. C. G. Matthew
NORTHERN IRELAND
Marc Mulholland
PAUL E. P. Sanders
PHILOSOPHY Edward Craig
PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE
Samir Okasha

PLATO Julia Annas

POLITICS Kenneth Minogue
POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
David Miller
POSTCOLONIALISM
Robert Young
POSTMODERNISM
Christopher Butler
POSTSTRUCTURALISM
Catherine Belsey
PREHISTORY Chris Gosden
PRESOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY
Catherine Osborne
PSYCHOLOGY Gillian Butler and
Freda McManus
QUANTUM THEORY
John Polkinghorne
ROMAN BRITAIN Peter Salway
ROUSSEAU Robert Wokler
RUSSELL A. C. Grayling
RUSSIAN LITERATURE
Catriona Kelly
THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION
S. A. Smith
SCHIZOPHRENIA
Chris Frith and Eve Johnstone
SCHOPENHAUER
Christopher Janaway
SHAKESPEARE Germaine Greer
SOCIAL AND CULTURAL
ANTHROPOLOGY
John Monaghan and Peter Just
SOCIOLOGY Steve Bruce
SOCRATES C. C. W. Taylor
SPINOZA Roger Scruton
STUART BRITAIN John Morrill
TERRORISM Charles Townshend
THEOLOGY David F. Ford
THE TUDORS John Guy
TWENTIETH-CENTURY
BRITAIN Kenneth O. Morgan
WITTGENSTEIN A. C. Grayling
WORLD MUSIC Philip Bohlman

~~Available soon:~~

AFRICAN HISTORY John Parker and Richard Rathbone	HIEROGLYPHS Penelope Wilson
ANCIENT EGYPT Ian Shaw	HIROSHIMA B. R. Tomlinson
THE BRAIN Michael O'Shea	HUMAN EVOLUTION Bernard Wood
BUDDHIST ETHICS Damien Keown	INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS Paul Wilkinson
CHAOS Leonard Smith	JAZZ Brian Morton
CHRISTIANITY Linda Woodhead	MANDELA Tom Lodge
CITIZENSHIP Richard Bellamy	MEDICAL ETHICS Tony Hope
CLASSICAL ARCHITECTURE Robert Tavernor	THE MIND Martin Davies
CLONING Arlene Judith Klotzko	MYTH Robert Segal
CONTEMPORARY ART Julian Stallabrass	NATIONALISM Steven Grosby
THE CRUSADES Christopher Tyerman	PERCEPTION Richard Gregory
DERRIDA Simon Glendinning	PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION Jack Copeland and Diane Proudfoot
DESIGN John Heskett	PHOTOGRAPHY Steve Edwards
DINOSAURS David Norman	THE RAJ Denis Judd
DREAMING J. Allan Hobson	THE RENAISSANCE Jerry Brotton
ECONOMICS Partha Dasgupta	RENAISSANCE ART Geraldine Johnson
THE END OF THE WORLD Bill McGuire	SARTRE Christina Howells
EXISTENTIALISM Thomas Flynn	THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR Helen Graham
THE FIRST WORLD WAR Michael Howard	TRAGEDY Adrian Poole
FREE WILL Thomas Pink	THE TWENTIETH CENTURY Martin Conway
FUNDAMENTALISM Malise Ruthven	
HABERMAS Gordon Finlayson	

For more information visit our web site

www.oup.co.uk/vsi

Edward Craig

PHILOSOPHY

A Very Short Introduction

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Bangkok Buenos Aires Cape Town Chennai
Dar es Salaam Delhi Hong Kong Istanbul Karachi Kolkata
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Mumbai Nairobi
São Paulo Shanghai Taipei Tokyo Toronto

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Edward Craig 2002

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published as an Oxford University Press paperback 2002
First published as a Very Short Introduction 2002

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organizations. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Data available

ISBN 0-19-285421-6

5 7 9 10 8 6

Typeset by RefineCatch Ltd, Bungay, Suffolk
Printed in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd., Padstow, Cornwall

Contents

	List of illustrations	ix
1	Philosophy	1
	A very short introduction	
2	What should I do?	11
	Plato's <i>Crito</i>	
3	How do we know?	24
	Hume's <i>Of Miracles</i>	
4	What am I?	35
	An unknown Buddhist on the self: King Milinda's chariot	
5	Some themes	45
6	Of 'isms'	61
7	Some more high spots	74
	A personal selection	
8	What's in it for whom?	100
	Bibliography	119
	Where to go next	
	Index	127

List of illustrations

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|
| 1 | Boethius listens to the words of the Lady Philosophy | 6 | © Wallace Collection/Bridgeman Art Library |
| 2 | Socrates was depicted by Aristophanes as an eccentric in a basket | 13 | © AKG London |
| 3 | Socrates takes the hemlock from the gaoler | 22 | © Wolfe Collection, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; photo Erich Lessing/AKG London |
| 4 | Hume was smarter than he looked | 25 | © Mary Evans Picture Library |
| 5 | The Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes | 31 | © Dagli Orti/the art archive |
| 6 | The image of the chariot: Arjuna and Krishna | 40 | © H. Lute/Trip |
| 7 | The image of the chariot: Hercules and Athena | 40 | © Ancient Art & Architecture Collection |
| 8 | Marble head of Epicurus | 47 | © British Museum/Bridgeman Art Library |
| 9 | Beyond the family, anything goes | 53 | © Punch |
| 10 | Every subject talks its own talk | 67 | © www.CartoonStock.com |
| 11 | Descartes as physiologist | 80 | © AKG London |

12	Progress through	86	16	Hobbes's Leviathan rises	
	conflict	86		out of the English	
	© Mary Evans Picture Library			countryside	106
				© By permission of the	
				British Library	
13	Darwin's message		17	The Raja consults his	
	wasn't to be digested			priests	108
	quickly	90		© V&A Picture Library	
	© Down House/Bridgeman				
	Art Library				
14	What to blow up next?	97	18	The author and his	
	© AKG London			wares	117
				Photograph: Simon Blackburn	
15	Epicureanism in		19	Philosophy class	118
	practice?	102		© Punch	
	© J. King/Trip				

Philosophy

A very short introduction

Anyone reading this book is to some extent a philosopher already. Nearly all of us are, because we have some kind of values by which we live our lives (or like to think we do, or feel uncomfortable when we don't). And most of us favour some very general picture of what the world is like. Perhaps we think there's a god who made it all, including us; or, on the contrary, we think it's all a matter of chance and natural selection. Perhaps we believe that people have immortal, non-material parts called souls or spirits; or, quite the opposite, that we are just complicated arrangements of matter that gradually fall to bits after we die. So most of us, even those who don't *think about it* at all, have something like answers to the two basic philosophical questions, namely: what should we do? and, what is there? And there's a third basic question, to which again most of us have some kind of an answer, which kicks in the moment we get self-conscious about either of the first two questions, namely: how do we know, or if we don't know how should we set about finding out – use our eyes, think, consult an oracle, ask a scientist? Philosophy, thought of as a subject that you can study, be ignorant of, get better at, even be an expert on, simply means being rather more reflective about some of these questions and their interrelations, learning what has already been said about them and why.

In fact philosophy is extremely hard to avoid, even with a conscious effort. Consider someone who rejects it, telling us that 'Philosophy is

~~useless'. For a start, they are evidently measuring it against some~~
system of values. Secondly, the moment they are prepared to say, however briefly and dogmatically, why it is useless, they will be talking about the ineffectuality of certain types of thought, or of human beings' incapacity to deal with certain types of question. And then instead of rejecting philosophy they will have become another voice *within* it – a sceptical voice, admittedly, but then philosophy has never been short of sceptical voices, from the earliest times to the present day. We shall meet some of them in Chapter 6.

If they take the second of those lines, they may also be implying that making the discovery that human beings just can't cope with certain kinds of question, and making that discovery *for yourself* – and actually *making it*, rather than just lazily assuming that you know it already – isn't a valuable experience, or is an experience without effects. Surely that cannot be true? Imagine how different the world would have been if we were all convinced that human beings just aren't up to answering any questions about the nature or even existence of a god, in other words, if all human beings were religious agnostics. Imagine how different it would have been if we were all convinced that there was no answer to the question of what legitimates the political authority that states habitually exercise over their members, in other words, if none of us believed that there was any good answer to the anarchist. It may well be controversial whether the differences would have been for the good, or for the bad, or whether in fact they wouldn't have mattered as much as you might at first think; but that there would have been differences, and very big ones, is surely beyond question. That how people think alters things, and that how lots of people think alters things for nearly everyone, is undeniable. A more sensible objection to philosophy than that it is ineffectual is pretty much the opposite: that it is *too dangerous*. (Nietzsche, see pp. 93–99, called a philosopher 'a terrible explosive from which nothing is safe' – though he didn't mean that as an objection.) But what this usually means is that any philosophy is dangerous *except the speaker's*

~~own, and what it amounts to is fear of what might happen if things~~
change.

It might occur to you that perhaps there are people who don't even think it worthwhile to enter into this discussion at all, however briefly, not even to support the sceptical stance that I have just mentioned. And you would be right, but that doesn't mean to say that they don't have a philosophy. Far from it. It may mean that they are not prepared to 'philosophize' – to state their views and argue for them or discourse upon them. But it doesn't mean that they have no abiding values, nothing which they systematically regard as worthwhile. They might think, for instance, that real expertise at *doing* something is more desirable than any amount of theoretical knowledge. Their ideal would not so much be insight into the nature of reality as the capacity to become one with it in the execution of some particular activity, to have trained oneself to do something without conscious effort as if by a perfectly honed natural instinct. I am not just making these people up: a lot of Zen Buddhist thought, or perhaps I should say Zen Buddhist practice, leans strongly in this direction. And this ideal, of aiming at a certain kind of thoughtlessness, was the outcome of a great deal of previous thinking.

Philosophy

If philosophy is so close to us, why do so many people think that it is something very abstruse and rather weird? It isn't that they are simply wrong: some philosophy *is* abstruse and weird, and a lot of the best philosophy is likely to *seem* abstruse or weird at first. That's because the best philosophy doesn't just come up with a few new facts that we can simply add to our stock of information, or a few new maxims to extend our list of dos and don'ts, but embodies a picture of the world and/or a set of values; and unless these happen to be yours already (remember that in a vague and unreflective way we all have them) it is bound to seem very peculiar – if it doesn't seem peculiar you haven't understood it. Good philosophy expands your imagination. Some philosophy is close to us, whoever we are. Then of course some is further away, and

~~some is further still, and some is very alien indeed. It would be~~

disappointing if that were not so, because it would imply that human beings are intellectually rather monotonous. But there's no need to start at the deep end; we start at the shallow end, where (as I've said) we are all standing in the water already. Do remember, however (here the analogy with the swimming-pool leaves me in the lurch, the way analogies often do), that this doesn't necessarily mean that we are all standing in the same place: what is shallow and familiar, and what is deep and weird, may depend on where you got in, and when.

Philosophy

We may be standing in the water, but why try to swim? In other words, what is philosophy for? There is far too much philosophy, composed under far too wide a range of conditions, for there to be a general answer to that question. But it can certainly be said that a great deal of philosophy has been intended as (understanding the words very broadly) a means to salvation, though what we are to understand by salvation, and salvation from what, has varied as widely as the philosophies themselves. A Buddhist will tell you that the purpose of philosophy is the relief of human suffering and the attainment of 'enlightenment'; a Hindu will say something similar, if in slightly different terminology; both will speak of escape from a supposed cycle of death and rebirth in which one's moral deserts determine one's future forms. An Epicurean (if you can find one nowadays) will pooh-pooh all the stuff about rebirth, but offer you a recipe for maximizing pleasure and minimizing suffering in this your one and only life.

Not all philosophy has sprung out of a need for a comprehensive way of living and dying. But most of the philosophy that has lasted has arisen from some pressing motivation or deeply felt belief – seeking truth and wisdom purely for their own sakes may be a nice idea, but history suggests that a nice idea is pretty much all it is. Thus classical Indian philosophy represents the internal struggle between the schools of Hinduism, and between them all and the Buddhists, for intellectual supremacy; the battle for the preferred balance between human reason

~~and scriptural revelation has been fought in many cultures, and in some~~

is still going on; Thomas Hobbes's famous political theory (we shall be seeing more of it later) tries to teach us the lessons he felt had to be learnt in the aftermath of the English Civil War; Descartes and many of his contemporaries wanted medieval views, rooted nearly two thousand years back in the work of Aristotle, to move aside and make room for a modern conception of science; Kant sought to advance the autonomy of the individual in the face of illiberal and autocratic regimes, Marx to liberate the working classes from poverty and drudgery, feminists of all epochs to improve the status of women. None of these people were just solving little puzzles (though they did sometimes have to solve little puzzles on the way); they entered into debate in order to change the course of civilization.

The reader will notice that I haven't made any attempt to define philosophy, but have just implied that it is an extremely broad term covering a very wide range of intellectual activities. Some think that nothing is to be gained from trying to define it. I can sympathize with that thought, since most attempts strike me as much too restrictive, and therefore harmful rather than helpful in so far as they have any effect at all. But I will at least have a shot at saying what philosophy is; whether what I have to offer counts as a definition or not is something about which we needn't, indeed positively shouldn't, bother too much.

Philosophy

Once, a very long time ago, our ancestors were animals, and simply did whatever came naturally without noticing that that was what they were doing, or indeed without noticing that *they* were doing anything at all. Then, somehow, they acquired the capacities to ask *why* things happen (as opposed to just registering that they do), and to look at themselves and their actions. That is not as big a jump as may at first sight appear. Starting to ask why things happen is in the first place only a matter of becoming a little more conscious of aspects of one's own behaviour. A hunting animal that follows a scent is acting as if aware that the scent is



1. In this Renaissance painting Boethius (c.AD 480-525) listens to the words of the Lady Philosophy. *The Consolation of Philosophy* is his most famous book, and consolation was what he needed as he awaited execution. But philosophy has had many purposes besides this one.

~~there because its prey has recently passed that way – and it is because~~

that really is why the scent is there that it often succeeds in its hunt. Knowledge of this sort of connection can be very useful: it tells us what to expect. Furthermore, to know that A happens because B happened may improve your control over things: in some cases B will be something that you can bring about, or prevent – which will be very useful if A is something you want, or want to avoid. Many of these connections animals, humans included, follow naturally and unconsciously. And the practice, once one is aware of it, can valuably be extended by consciously raising such questions in cases where we do not have conveniently built-in answers.

There could be no guarantee, however, that this generally valuable tendency would always pay off, let alone always pay off quickly. Asking why fruit falls off a branch pretty soon leads one to shake the tree. Asking why it rains, or why it doesn't rain, takes us into a different league, especially when the real motive underlying the question is whether we can influence whether it rains or not. Often we can influence events, and it may well pay to develop the habit of asking, when things (a hunting expedition, for example) have gone wrong, whether that was because we failed in our part of the performance, as opposed to being defeated by matters beyond our control. That same useful habit might have generated the thought that a drought is to some extent due to a failure of ours – and now what failure, what have we done wrong? And then an idea might crop up which served us well in our infancy: there are parents, who do things for us that we can't do ourselves, but only if we've been good and they aren't cross with us. Might there be beings that decide whether the rain falls, and shouldn't we be trying to get on the right side of them?

Philosophy

That is all it would take for human beings to be launched into the investigation of nature and belief in the supernatural. So as their mental capacities developed our ancestors found their power increasing; but they also found themselves confronted by options and mysteries – life

~~raised a host of questions, where previously it had simply been lived,~~
unquestioningly. It is just as well that all this happened gradually, but even so it was the biggest shock the species has ever encountered. Some people, thinking more in intellectual than biological terms, might like to say that it was what made us human at all.

Philosophy

Think of philosophy as the sound of humanity trying to recover from this crisis. Thinking of it like that will protect you from certain common misapprehensions. One is that philosophy is a rather narrow operation that only occurs in universities, or (less absurdly) only in particular epochs or particular cultures; another, related to the first, is that it is something of an intellectual game, answering to no very deep need. On the positive side, it may lead you to expect that the history of philosophy is likely to contain some fascinating episodes, as indeed it does, and it certainly adds to the excitement if we bear in mind that view of what is really going on. Can reeling *homo sapiens* think his way back to the vertical? We have no good reason to answer that question either way, Yes or No. Are we even sure that we know where the vertical is? That's the kind of open-ended adventure we are stuck with, like it or not.

But isn't that just too broad? Surely philosophy doesn't include everything that that account of it implies? Well, in the first place, it will do us less harm to err on the broad side than the narrow. And in the second place, the scope of the word 'philosophy' has itself varied considerably through history, not to mention the fact that there has probably never been a time at which it meant the same thing to everyone. Recently something rather strange has happened to it. On the one hand it has become so broad as to be close to meaningless, as when almost every commercial organization speaks of itself as having a philosophy – usually meaning a policy. On the other hand it has become very narrow. A major factor here has been the development of the natural sciences. It has often been remarked that when an area of inquiry begins to find its feet as a discipline, with clearly agreed

~~methods and a clearly agreed body of knowledge, fairly soon it~~

separates off from what has up to then been known as philosophy and goes its own way, as for instance physics, chemistry, astronomy, psychology. So the range of questions considered by people who think of themselves as philosophers shrinks; and furthermore, philosophy tends to be left in charge of those questions which we are not sure how best to formulate, those inquiries we are not sure how best to set about.

This multiplication of thriving disciplines inevitably brings another factor into play, namely specialization within universities, and creates the opportunity to think of philosophy yet more narrowly. University philosophy departments are mostly quite small. In consequence, so is the range of their expertise, which tends to cluster around current (sometimes also local) academic fashion – it must do, since it is normally they who make it. Besides, undergraduate courses are, for obvious reasons, quite short, and therefore have to be selective on pain of gross superficiality. So the natural assumption that philosophy is what university philosophy departments teach, though I certainly wouldn't call it false, is restrictive and misleading, and ought to be avoided.

Philosophy

This book is called a very short introduction to philosophy. But, as I hope is now becoming clear, I can't exactly *introduce* you to philosophy, because you are already there. Nor can I exactly introduce you to *philosophy*, because there is far too much of it. No more could I 'show you London'. I could show you a few bits of it, perhaps mention a handful of other main attractions, and leave you on your own with a street map and some information about other guided tours. That's pretty much what I propose to do for philosophy.

At the beginning of this chapter I spoke of three philosophical questions, though they might better have been called three types or classes of question. Chapters 2–4 introduce, from a classic text, an example of each type. By progressing from very familiar ways of

~~thinking in the first to something most readers will find altogether~~

stranger in the third, they also illustrate (though not by any means in its full extent) another theme of this introduction: the range of novelty to be encountered in philosophy. I have also harped on somewhat about the difficulty of avoiding being philosophical. If that is so, we should expect to find some kind of philosophy more or less wherever we look. As if to confirm that, our first example comes from Greece and the fourth century BC, our second from eighteenth-century Scotland, and our third from India, written by an unknown Buddhist at an unknown date probably between 100 BC and AD 100.

Philosophy

All three of these texts should be fairly easy to obtain, especially the first two (see Bibliography). This book can perfectly well be read without them, but there are good reasons to read them yourself alongside it if that is possible. One is to be able to enjoy the writing. Much philosophy is well-written, and it is strongly recommended to enjoy the writing as well as the views and the arguments. But the main reason is that it will enable you to *join in* if you want to. Remember that this is not a completely foreign country: you are to some extent already a philosopher, and your ordinary native intelligence has a work permit here – you don't need to go through any esoteric training to get a licence to think. So don't be afraid, as you read, to start asking questions and forming provisional conclusions. But notice, *provisional*. Whatever you do, don't get hooked up on that laziest, most complacent of sayings, that 'everyone has a right to their own opinion'. Acquiring rights isn't that simple. Rather, keep in mind the wry comment of George Berkeley (1685–1753): 'Few men think, yet all will have opinions.' If true, that's a pity; for one thing, the thinking is part of the fun.

Finally, please read slowly. This is a very short book about a very long subject. I have tried to pack a lot in.

What should I do?

Plato's *Crito*

Plato, who was born in or around 427 BC and died in 347, was not the first important philosopher of ancient Greek civilization, but he is the first from whom a substantial body of complete works has come down to us. In the Indian tradition the Vedas, and many of the Upanishads are earlier; but of their authors, and how they were composed, we know next to nothing. The Buddha pre-dated Plato, though by just how much is a matter of scholarly disagreement; but the earliest surviving accounts of his life and thought were written down some hundreds of years after his death. In China, Confucius also pre-dated Plato (he was born in the middle of the previous century); again, we have nothing known to have been written by him – the famous *Analects* are a later compilation.

Plato's works all take the form of dialogues. Mostly they are quick-fire dialogues, conversational in style, though sometimes the protagonists are allowed to make extended speeches. There are two dozen or so of these known to be by Plato, and a handful more that may be. Of the certainly authentic group two are much longer than the others, and better thought of as books consisting of sequences of dialogues. (They are *Republic* and *Laws*, both devoted to the search for the ideal political constitution.) So there is plenty of Plato to read, and most of it is fairly easy to obtain, in translation in relatively inexpensive editions. As regards degree of difficulty, the range is wide. At one end we have a

~~number of dialogues comparable to the one we shall shortly be taking a~~
close look at. At the other are works like *The Sophist*, capable at times of making the most experienced readers scratch their heads and look blank.

A near constant feature of Plato's dialogues is the presence of Socrates, usually though not always as the leader of the discussion. Since the dialogue called *Crito* is not only conducted by Socrates but also concerns what he, personally, should do in a certain predicament in which he finds himself, we need to know a little about him and how he got into the situation he is in when the dialogue opens – namely in prison in Athens awaiting imminent execution.

Philosophy

Socrates lived from 469 to 399 BC. He was clearly a charismatic figure, with a somewhat eccentric lifestyle. Accepting the poverty it entailed, he appears to have spent all his time in unpaid discussion with whomever would join with him, which included many of the better-off, hence more leisured, young men of Athens. These included Plato, whose admiration for Socrates motivated the career and writings which immortalized both of them.

Not all our evidence about Socrates' thought comes to us through Plato, but by far the greater part of it does, so it is no easy matter to distinguish clearly between their views. Little doubt that Plato was sometimes trying to portray the historical Socrates; little doubt that he was sometimes using the figure of Socrates as a literary device to convey his own philosophy. Where to draw the line isn't always obvious, but scholars seem now broadly agreed that the real Socrates concentrated on ethical questions about justice and virtue ('How should I live?' is sometimes called 'the Socratic question'); and that he constantly probed whether his fellow Athenians really understood what was involved in these matters anything like as well as they claimed to. Nor was he always sure that he understood it himself – but then he didn't claim to.



2. Not everyone was as impressed by Socrates as Plato was. In *The Clouds*, by his contemporary Aristophanes, he appears as a self-important eccentric who spends his time dangling in a basket (so as to be in a better position for studying celestial phenomena).

- [**download online Apple Confidential 2.0: The Definitive History of the World's Most Colorful Company book**](#)
- [read Fertility and Other Stories \(European Classics\) for free](#)
- [Put 'Em Down, Take 'Em Out!: Knife Fighting Techniques from Folsom Prison online](#)
- [download Introduction to Linear Algebra \(4th Edition\) pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi](#)

- <http://nexson.arzamaszev.com/library/Microsoft-Exchange-Server-PowerShell-Cookbook--3rd-Edition-.pdf>
- <http://transtrade.cz/?ebooks/Fertility-and-Other-Stories--European-Classics-.pdf>
- <http://bestarthritiscare.com/library/Put--Em-Down--Take--Em-Out---Knife-Fighting-Techniques-from-Folsom-Prison.pdf>
- <http://pittiger.com/lib/Deadlines-Past--Forty-Years-of-Presidential-Campaigning--A-Reporter-s-Story.pdf>