

Socrates and euthyphro

Philosophy



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Socrates and Euthyphro Socrates and Euthyphro Socrates and Euthyphro disagree on the meaning and the definition of holiness and religiousness, as presented in the Euthyphro dialogue. Socrates assumes the role of an ignorant student who asks Euthyphro to give him the definition of piety. On the other hand, Euthyphro takes the teachers role and does his best to provide the answer but makes three logical fallacies.

In his first attempt, Euthyphro defines piety as the torture of religious offenders. Specifically, he responds "...the holy is what I am doing now, persecuting murder and temple theft and everything of the sort, whether father or mother or anyone else is guilty of it" (pg. 4, 8). The definition is erroneous as it fails to integrate the holistic description of holiness. Notably, other righteous deeds reveal a positive aspect of holiness than punishing offenders. On noticing this error, Socrates challenges him to elucidate a broader and better meaning of sanctity that is inclusive.

After his realization of his mistake, lack of logical consistency, in the first definition, Euthyphro offers an updated version of his description that focuses on holiness from a godly point of view. In particular, he says that holiness is what the God approves. Therefore, " then what is dear to the gods is holy, and what is not dear to them is unholy" (pg. 6, 5).

Unfortunately, his explanation lacks clarity as it projects an assumption that gods agree on all things and disagree on nothing. Having noticed the fallacy, Socrates asks if the gods always agree on all things. At this point, Euthyphro realizes his mistakes and acknowledges that Gods offer a different opinion on various issues leading to quarrels amongst themselves. Consequently, Socrates gives him another him another chance to provide an improve definition of holiness.

In his third attempt to define holiness, Euthyphro describes piety as what is loved by all the gods. Specifically, he asserts that the Holy is what all the gods love, and whatever the gods hate, is unholy. He states that “ the holy is what all the gods love, and that the opposite, what all the gods hate is unholy” (pg. 10. 3). Similarly, the logical fallacy appears, as he does not offer a comprehensive explanation for defining the true nature of consecration. Notably, his description lacks an essential element of what makes something holy. Having noticed the logical inconsistency, Socrates challenged Euthyphro to substantiate if something is holy because the gods approve it, or the holiness of something makes the gods approve it. Upon realizing his mistake, he agrees that the gods approve something due to its holiness and not vice versa.

Conclusively, Euthyphro was disappointed with his inability to provide a broad and exhaustive definition of holiness. As observed, a proper description was unavailable at the end of the argument. Based on the argument, I conquer with Socrates. Although he (Socrates) did not provide a definition of holiness, he has uncovered the coherent inconsistency in the trivial explanation offered by Euthyphro. From a philosophical point of view, the logical flaws pointed out by Socrates, on Euthyphros definition of piety are genuine inconsistencies. Consequently, his ability to distinguish and identify the logical flaws makes me support his point.

References

Indiana University (n. d). Plato's “ Euthyphro”. Web.