

The central differences of lincoln's gettysburg address to thucydides' pericles e...

[Life](#), [Friendship](#)



These two speeches are the most memorable speeches given. They might seem different but as I read through the two speeches they sounded similar, despite the fact that they were given two thousand years apart. The similarities are featured in length, content and in the situations whereby the two speeches are given. In Pericles' speech appreciation of the ancestors, the people who died for the country, the survivors, and their families served as the purpose for his speech. The speech also reminded the readers and the listeners of the benefits of having democracy as well as the goodness of Athens.

Similarly, Lincoln's speech serve almost the same purpose as that of Pericles'. As I read through the speeches, I realized that Gettysburg Address is brief summary of Pericles' Funeral Oration. The two speeches speak of the people who have died for the country and how their actions have inspired the country. Although they are very similar we can't forget how different they are.

The major difference between the two speeches is the length. Gettysburg address is clearly shorter than Pericles' Funeral Oration, although the content is similar. This is because, Gettysburg Address being the most recent one seem to have a change of the vocabularies. Pericles emphasizes on a lot of issues whereas Lincoln give brief statements on the same issues mentioned by Pericles.

The literature in which Lincoln uses in his speech is quite different, short and brief but at the same time it is difficult to understand and evaluate. On the other hand, Pericles used simple English that was easier to understand. His emphasis provided explanations of some of the things that were probably

unclear. For example; "and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." (Lincoln " Gettysburg Address") " Our constitution does not copy the laws of neighboring states; we are rather a pattern to others than imitators ourselves. Its administration favors the many instead of the few; this is why it is called a democracy. If we look to the law, they afford equal justice to all in their private differences." (Pericles " Funeral Oration"). In these statements, the two are talking of the same issue of democracy but the literature in which they are using is quite different.

What is the relationship between justice and friendship for Confucius and Aristotle?

In the era of Confucius and Aristotle, friendship implied a lot of meanings. Their meaning for friendship is based on two perspectives; joy and faithfulness. Normally faithfulness is the basis of friendship but according to Aristotle there are three types of friendship. One of them is based on pleasure and she says that in this kind of friendship there is infidelity. The second one is based on law for the sake of utility and in this kind of relationship, there is a guarantee for fidelity due to molarity. Then she defines the third type of friendship which is based on virtue, whereby fidelity is an indispensable part. For Confucius, friendship is compared to the joy of benevolence whereas for Aristotle, it is compared to the joy of reasoning. Justice and friendship defines equality in different ways. According to Aristotle, equality is primary to merit with regard to justice. However, according to Confucius, equality is primary to quantity; the more unequal people are with regard to status, wealth and virtue, the more unlikely it will

for friendship to develop. However, friendship and justice seem to have similar concerns to things and people in the sense that there is an association between friendship and justice. The degree of injustice done to a person is at times, if not always related to the degree of friendship between the two people. The same case applies when forming a political association, whereby, they are formed for the sake of expedient whereas other associations are a part of this association.

Compare Antigone's view of divine law to Machiavelli's

Machiavelli's law is concerned with leadership qualities and policies.

Machiavelli's law is not based on personal ambitions, it is rather based on stability of a state or the unification of Italy under Italian rule. He relates the interest of a prince and those of the state. Therefore this moderates Renaissance individualism. His view in Antigone is clear when Creon handles himself and the way he keeps power. Creon turns into a hero through manipulation of people and being cynical. He is soulless but in the eyes of the beholder he was a false hero. This is compared to the beliefs that Antigone has that makes her a martyr.

Machiavelli's look into the two cases and concludes on the divine law on how people are becoming false hero through manipulation of the subject matter. They rather buy the heroism than earn it. However according to Antigone, heroism is fame and power. The current pope is applying Machiavelli to the current issue within the church, whereby, he displays Machiavellian characteristics to how he is handling the situation.

Does conscription contradict Hobbes' Lex Naturalis?

Nature puts the human kind in the situation that we are all equal in the faculties of body and mind, although it seems that, in most cases we differ in size and body strength. This applies to the faculty of the mind, whereby, we think differently. However, no matter how people try to differentiate themselves from the rest of the crowd, if we observe keenly, we are entitled to behaving in almost the same manner.

Conscription is the enlisting of people in some sort of a national service. On the other hand, the right of nature, is the liberty each man has his own power as he will himself for the preservation of his own nature. Conscription is normally found in the military services where every individual are required to do almost similar things. They are required to provide equal services as well as have equal IQ. Thereby, this contradicts the rule of natural, where every individual is entitled to his or her own power. The freedom to control themselves.

A law of nature is a precept, found out by reason, in which man is forbidden to do that which is destructive of his life. This law is usually used by many life-saving organizations whereby one is required to put him or herself t safety first before rescuing the other person. On the contrary to the conscription whereby, one puts him or herself at risk for the sake of the other. Generally, this rule of conscription contradict the law of nature according to Lex Naturalis.

References

Retrieved from: [http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.](http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/h/hobbes/thomas/h68l/chapter14.html)

[au/h/hobbes/thomas/h68l/chapter14.html](http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/h/hobbes/thomas/h68l/chapter14.html)

Retrieved from: <http://isomd.wordpress.com/2010/05/11/the-pope-machiavellian/>

Retrieved from: http://www.mrrena.com/misc/virtue_confucius_aristotle.php

Retrieved from: [http://www.academia.](http://www.academia.edu/962541/Pericles_at_Gettysburg_and_Ground_Zero_Tragedy_Patriotism_and_Public_Mourning)

[edu/962541/Pericles_at_Gettysburg_and_Ground_Zero_Tragedy_Patriotism_and_Public_Mourning](http://www.academia.edu/962541/Pericles_at_Gettysburg_and_Ground_Zero_Tragedy_Patriotism_and_Public_Mourning)