

Protagoras' denial

Philosophy



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Protagoras' Denial Introduction Protagoras' denial centers on his conversation with Socrates. Socrates has initially asked Protagoras about the things that one could contribute with his teachings. Protagoras cited the importance of virtues that one could learn from him. With this, the present paper aims to know the major philosophical claim of Protagoras that was highly criticized by other Greek philosophers such as Aristotle.

Criticism to Protagoras Philosophical Claim

Protagoras assumed that the value of virtue could not be done with one's inability of the wise men to accept suggestions and criticisms from others. With this assumption, Read points out that it is irrational to accept criticism and oppositional statements (204). Lee noted that Aristotle criticized that this is where the principle of non-contradiction has been used as a critical accentuation to what Protagoras imposed (57). This could be due to the observation of Aristotle that the good and bad virtues, justice and injustices of Protagoras were found to be so much relative that it would already make the learners wonder which sides could be considered as true or false.

Conclusion

Protagoras, indeed, has a unique way of teaching his own philosophy. However, his study could have been criticized because of time before where access of information is not the same with the modern technology. This would mean that philosophers before would depend on their insights and elaborative knowledge based on experience and observational skills. With this, Protagoras could be considered as intellectually smart because his assumptions that were previously criticized are now orthodoxically used as means of how people should be virtually wise in terms of knowing how to listen and accept criticisms.

Works Cited

Lee, Mi-Kyoung. Epistemology after Protagoras: Responses to Relativism of Plato,

Aristotle, and Democritus. New York: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

Read, Stephen. " Review: The Law of Non-Contradiction: New Philosophical Essays".

Mind 116. 461 (2007): 203-206. Print.