МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
Національний університет кораблебудування
імені адмірала Макарова

Л. М. БОЙКО, О. М. ДРОЖАНОВА

ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY

Методичні вказівки для самостійного вивчення теми

Рекомендовано Методичною радою НУК

Миколаїв • НУК • 2018

УДК 141.1"652" (076)
Б 72

Автори: Л. М. Бойко, канд. філол. наук, доцент;
О. М. Дрожанова, канд. соціол. наук, доцент

Рецензент І. В. Шаповалова, канд. філос. наук, доцент

Рекомендовано Методичною радою НУК

Бойко Л. М.

Б 72 Ancient philosophy : методичні вказівки для самостійного вивчення теми / Л. М. Бойко, О. М. Дрожанова. – Миколаїв : НУК, 2018. – 48 с.

Методичні вказівки мають головною метою активізувати самостійну роботу студентів з вивчення теми "Антична філософія", а також спрямовані на розвиток у студентів мовленнєвих навичок, необхідних для спілкування з філософсько-методологічних питань.

Призначені для студентів-іноземців усіх спеціальностей і напрямків підготовки, а також для тих, хто бажає поглибити власні знання з англійської мови.

УДК 141.1"652"(076)

EXPLANATORY NOTE

Self-study is an important and necessary methodic form of studying philosophy course. Self-directed work under the direction of a teacher is aimed at activating students' creative mastering of the topic. It contributes to the formation of skills of systematization and classification of special knowledge, identification of a list of basic philosophical problems, understanding / explanation of concepts, terminology, more precise definition of the place of ancient philosophical schools and directions in the historical and cultural context.

This methodical manual is intended to optimize the mastery of knowledge on the history of ancient philosophy as a part of the general course of philosophy. Lecture note contains theoretical content, biographical and historiographic information related to the activities of outstanding philosophers of antiquity. Control questions, exercises and test tasks are used to fixing the acquired knowledge, and also are necessary for testing knowledge learned by students. Glossary of terms is intended to focus students' attention on the specifics of the formation of the conceptual framework of philosophical schools, contributes to understanding the original character of ancient Greek and Roman philosophical thought. A short list of references includes dictionaries, monographs, textbooks, the most important

theoretical studies and methodological developments directly related to the subject of the history of philosophy. A list of digital resources provides a quick and accurate search for the necessary educational and scientific information.

Ancient philosophy is the foundation of modern scientific and philosophical knowledge, the essence of which is a constant critical reflection toward their own grounds. The study of ancient philosophy helps to create a reliable basis for a general broad erudition in the field of ancient European history and culture, to form the basis of the scientific and philosophical picture of the world, to learn how to systematize ideas and ideas related to many spheres of intellectual activity.

LECTURE NOTE

1. Presocratic Philosophy.
2. Classical Greek Philosophy.
3. Hellenistic Philosophy.

1. Presocratic Philosophy

The Presocratics were 6th and 5th century BCE Greek thinkers who produced large-scale theories about the world, some of which were wildly mistaken but some profound enough to be influential down to our own day.

The first philosophers were making two great breaks with the past simultaneously. In the first place they were trying to understand the world by the use of their reason, without appealing to religion, or revelation, or authority, or tradition. This in itself was something wholly new, and one of the most important milestones in human development. But at the same time they were teaching other people to use their own reason too, and think for themselves; so they did not expect even their own pupils necessarily to agree with them. They were the first teachers who did not try to pass on a body of knowledge pure and unsullied, inviolate, but instead encouraged their pupils to discuss and argue, debate, put forward ideas of their own. These two developments in the mental life of mankind, both of them revolutionary, are linked, which is why they appeared on the scene

together They form the foundations of what we now call "rational thinking." Once they had been introduced they launched an unparalleled rate of growth in human knowledge and understanding.

The first thinkers of this kind emerged in the ancient Greek world in the 6th century bc. The one usually thought of as the very first, **Thales**, was a Greek who lived in the town of Miletus, on the Asia-Minor coast of what is now Turkey. After the name of the town, he and his followers have become known as the Milesian school. We do not know his dates of birth and death, but we know he was active and flourishing in the 580s bc, because he accurately predicted an eclipse of the sun that took place in 585 bc. He was also an early civil engineer, one who carried out the feat of diverting the waters of the river Hylas to enable King Croesus to pass.

The question that most obsessed Thales was: "What is the world made of?" It seemed to him that it must ultimately all be made from a single element. Now this is an amazing insight, extremely unobvious, and one we now know to be true: we now know that all material objects are reducible to energy. But this thought could not have occurred to Thales – the physics that leads up to it had not yet been done. He came to the conclusion that everything was water in one form or another. He could see that at very low temperatures water becomes rock, at very high temperatures air. Every time the rains come down plants spring out of the earth, so they are evidently water in another form. All living things need a huge and constant intake of water to go on living. Every landmass comes to an end at the water's edge; so Thales thought this meant that the whole earth is floating on water, and so has emerged out of water, and so is constituted of water.

Thales had a pupil called **Anaximander**, who was born in Miletus in 610 bc and lived to about 546 bc. He realized that if, as Thales said, the earth was supported by the sea, the sea would have to be supported by something else – and so on, ad infinitum, you would find

yourself in what is known as an infinite regress. He solved this problem with the astounding idea that the earth is not supported by anything at all. It is just a solid object hanging in space, and is kept in position by its equidistance from everything else. Anaximander did not think of the earth as being a globe, because it seemed to him self-evident that we live on a flat surface, so he thought of it as cylindrical. "The earth... is held up by nothing, but remains stationary owing to the fact that it is equally distant from all other things. Its shape... is like that of a drum. We walk on one of its flat surfaces, while the other is on the opposite side." This was too much for his pupil **Anaximenes**, who considered it self-evident that the earth was flat, and also that it must be held up by something. He came to believe that it floated on air in the sort of way the lid of a boiling saucepan sometimes floats on the steam.

A philosopher better known today than any of the Milesians is **Heraclitus** from Ephesus. He is famous for two ideas in particular, both of which have had great influence.

The first is the unity of opposites. He pointed out that the path up the mountainside and the path down the mountainside are not two different paths running in opposite directions, they are one and the same path. The young Heraclitus and the old Heraclitus are not two different individuals, they are the same Heraclitus. If your drinking companion says your bottle of wine is half full and you say it is half empty you are not contradicting him, you are agreeing with him. Everything (Heraclitus thought) is a coming together of opposites, or at least of opposing tendencies. This means that strife and contradiction are not to be avoided. Indeed, they are what come together to make up the world. If you did away with contradiction you would do away with reality. But this in turn means that reality is inherently unstable. Everything is in flux all the time. And this is the second idea that has been permanently associated with Heraclitus. "Everything is Flux."

Nothing in this world of ours just permanently is. Everything is changing all the time. Things come into existence in their different ways, and are never the same for two moments together so long as they exist, until eventually they go out of existence again. We ourselves are like this. Everything in the universe is like it – perhaps the universe itself is like it. What we think of as "things" are not actually stable objects at all, they are in perpetual transition. Heraclitus likened them to flames in this respect: flames look as if they are objects, but they are not so much objects as processes. This is a profound idea. But it also disconcerting. Human beings have always tried to find something stable to believe in, something reliable that would last and not pass away. And Heraclitus is telling us that there is no such thing. Change is the law of life and of the universe. We can never escape it. Having expressed ideas about the contradictoriness and variability of the world, Heraclitus became the first dialectician in the history of Western philosophy.

Perhaps the most famous of all the Presocratic philosophers, better known even than Heraclitus, is **Pythagoras**. He was born on Samos, an island off the coast from which all the philosophers came that we have discussed so far; and he lived from about 570 bc; to about 497 bc. He was a many-sided genius, one of his gifts being for mathematics – many of us in the 20th century have had to learn Pythagoras' Theorem at school. It was he who introduced the idea of the "square" and the "cube" of a number, thus applying geometrical concepts to arithmetic. Through his teachings the word "theory" acquired its now familiar meaning. He is thought to be the person who invented the term "philosophy", and who first applied the word "cosmos" to the universe. His direct influence lasted for generations.

He was the first great thinker to bring mathematics to bear on philosophy. This was one of the most fruitful notions that any human being has ever had. We are now used to the idea that mathematics

plays an indispensable role in our understanding of the universe. The fact that the cosmos at every level, from the outermost galaxies down to the interior of the individual atom, is saturated with structure of a kind that is expressible in mathematical that there must be some sort of intelligence behind the universe, if not necessarily a God in the conventional Christian sense. The very first person to have this insight about the expressibility of the whole universe in terms of mathematics was Pythagoras, and he also was led by it into some sort of mysticism.

One of the most attractive of the Presocratic philosophers is **Parmenides**, who flourished in the later part of the 6th century bc. Parmenides considered it self-contradictory to say of nothing that it exists. There can never, he thought, have been nothing, and therefore it cannot be true to say that everything – or, indeed, anything – came out of nothing. Everything must always have existed. For a similar reason it is not possible for anything to pass into nothing. Therefore not only must everything be beginning less and uncreated, it must also be eternal and imperishable. For similar reasons, too, there cannot be any gaps in reality, parts of reality where nothing is: reality must be continuous with itself at all points; all of space must be full, a plenum. This gives rise to a view of the universe being really a single unchanging entity. All is One. What appears as change, or movement, is something that occurs within an enclosed and unchanging system.

Surprisingly, perhaps, this is strikingly like the scientific view of the universe that developed between Newton in the 17th century and Einstein in the twentieth. Two things about that view made it reminiscent of Parmenides. First, it was deterministic, so everything was seen as being inescapably and necessarily as it is. Second, it was believed that only from the subjective standpoint of an observer could there be a "now": objectively speaking, all time-instants were equally significant. When two of the greatest minds of the 20th century found themselves having an argument about this, the name

of Parmenides came up in the discussion. The two were Einstein and Popper, and in the account the latter gives of it in his autobiography *Unended Quest* he writes: "I tried to persuade him to give up his determinism, which amounted to the view that the world was a four-dimensional Parmenidian block universe in which change was a human illusion, or very nearly so. (He agreed that this had been his view, and while discussing it I called him Parmenides.)" Nothing could illustrate more vividly than this the fact that the ideas of Parmenides have been a living point of reference for thinkers down to our own day.

The most colorful personality among the Presocratic philosophers was **Empedocles**, who lived for roughly the first half of the 5th century bc. He was a democratic political leader, no doubt a demagogue, who was credited with miraculous powers, and died by throwing himself into the crater of the volcano Mount Etna – which must be the most melodramatic, not to say operatic, death of any famous philosopher. Empedocles tried to reassert the reality of the ever-changing world of sensory experience, and also the plurality of this world, as against Parmenides, while conceding some of Parmenides' insights. He admitted that matter cannot come into existence out of nothing, or pass away into nothing, but he held that everything was made up of four different elements that are perennial: earth, water, air, and fire. This doctrine of the four elements was taken up by Aristotle, and played an important role in Western thinking until the Renaissance. Indeed, it is still quite often alluded to in Western literature.

Among the most insightful of the Presocratic philosophers were those known as **the Atomists**," by which term is meant chiefly two people, **Leucippus** and **Democritus**. Leucippus had the fundamental idea that everything is made up of atoms that are too small to be seen, or even subdivided any further – the word "atom" comes from the Greek words meaning "cannot be cut." Ail that exists,

he taught, are atoms and space; and all the different objects that there are consist simply of different collections of atoms in space. The atoms themselves are uncreated and indestructible, and all change in the universe consists of atoms altering either their formations or their locations. The interpretation that he and Democritus put on change was essentially causal, and this is notable because they made no attempt to explain natural phenomena in terms of purposes. Democritus once said: "I would rather discover one cause than gain the Kingdom of Persia". Yet another basic doctrine they taught is that the universe is not a continuum, as Parmenides said it was, but consists of separate entities. Between them they seem to have originated atomic physics. Altogether these two thinkers made astonishing strides, and there remains something profoundly original about their insights.

In the middle of the 5th century bc, Greek thinking took a somewhat different turn through the advent of **the Sophists**. The name is derived from the verb sophizesthai, "making a profession of being inventive and clever" and aptly described the Sophists, who, in contrast to the philosophers mentioned so far, asked money for their instruction. Philosophically they were, in a way, the leaders of a rebellion against the preceding development, which more and more had resulted in the belief that the real world is quite different from the phenomenal world. "What is the sense of such speculations?" they asked, since men do not live in these so-called real worlds. This is the meaning of the pronouncement of Protagoras of Abdera (mid-5th century) that "Man is the measure of all things, of those which are that they are and of those which are not that they are not". For man the world is what it appears to him to be, not something else. Thus the Sophists asserted the relativity of t If we stand back and view the Presocratics as a whole we find that before Protagoras they all had certain striking features in common. First, they were concerned primarily to understand the nature of the world around

us rather than human nature – indeed, it is doubtful whether they even had such a concept as "human nature." Second, they uninhibitedly went in for bold theorizing on the largest possible scale. Inevitably, given that they rue knowledge. were the very first thinkers to do so, much of what they came up with may seem wild and woolly. But the impressive thing is how many good ideas they had, ideas destined to bear rich fruit in the subsequent development of the attempts we human beings have made over the centuries to understand the world in which we find ourselves.

2. Classical Greek Philosophy

Socrates (469–399 bc) was the first great Greek philosopher to be Athenian by birth, and he lived in what has been called that city's golden age. As a young man, he studied the then-fashionable philosophies of what are now called the "pre-Socratic philosophers," which in their different ways were trying to understand the natural world around us. Two things above all impressed him about them, both of which he thought were to their disadvantage.

The first was that they were at odds with one another. They were a welter of conflicting theories. And there seemed to be no satisfactory way of deciding between them. They propounded exciting ideas about the world, but without much apparent regard for critical method; so it was impossible to tell which of them, if any, was true. But his second objection was that it would make little practical difference, anyway, even if we could discover which of them were true. What effect did it have on our actual lives to know how far the sun was from the earth, or whether it was the size of the Peloponnese or bigger than the whole world? Our behavior could in no way be affected by such knowledge. What we needed to know was how to conduct our lives and ourselves. For us, the urgent questions were more like: What is good? What is right? What is just? If we knew the answers to those questions it would have a profound effect on the way we lived.

Socrates did not think he knew the answers to these questions. But he saw that no one else knew them either When the oracle at Delphi declared him to be the wisest of men, he thought this could mean only that he alone knew that he did not know anything. There was no such thing at that time as securely based knowledge of the natural world, and not much knowledge about the world of human affairs either. So he went around Athens raising the basic questions of morality and politics with anyone who would listen to him. Such was the interest of the discussions he raised – and he was obviously a charismatic personality as well – that people gathered round him wherever he went, especially the eager young. His procedure was always the same. He would take some concept that was fundamental to our lives and ask, "What is friendship?" , or "What is courage?" , or "What is religious piety?". He would challenge a person who thought he knew the answer, and then subject that answer to examination by asking the person a series of searching questions about it. For instance, if the person claimed that courage was essentially the capacity to endure, Socrates might say, "But what about obstinacy, then? Obstinate people can show extraordinary persistence, and therefore endurance. Is that courage? Is it even admirable? "And so the other person would be driven to retract his answer, or at least qualify it. Under interrogation it always emerged that the original answer was defective.

This showed that although that interlocutor – and what is more the bystanders – had thought they knew what, let us say, "courage" was, actually they did not. This Socratic questioning became famous. And it killed two birds with one stone. It exposed the ignorance of people who thought they knew – but who in fact, as the Delphic oracle had told Socrates, knew no more than he did. And it aroused in the bystanders an interest in a fundamental philosophical question, and got them launched on a discussion of it. Although Socrates seldom came up with any final answers himself (and in any case it would have

been part of his method to insist that any such answer should itself be probed and questioned, and therefore could not be relied on to be "final"), he stimulated an excited interest in the problems he raised, and made people appreciate more fully than they had before the difficulties involved in trying to solve them.

It is doubtful whether any philosopher has had more influence than Socrates. He was the first to teach the priority of personal integrity in terms of a person's duty to himself, and not to the gods, or the law, or any other authorities. This has had incalculable influence down the ages. Not only was he willing to die at the hands of the law rather than give up saying what he believed to be right, he actually chose to do so, when he could have escaped had he wished. It is a priority that has been reasserted by some of the greatest minds since – minds not necessarily under his influence. Socrates did more than any other individual to establish the principle that everything must be open to question – there can be no cut and dried answers, because answers, like everything else, are themselves open to question. Following on from this, he established at the center of philosophy a method known as dialectic, the method of seeking truth by a process of question and answer. It has remained there ever since, and is used particularly as a teaching method – which is after all what Socrates himself used it for. It is not equally appropriate for all forms of teaching – it is not, for example, a good way of imparting pure information – but as a way of getting people to re-examine what they think they already know, it is incomparable. To be most effective it calls for a sympathetic personal relationship between teacher and pupil, one in which the teacher truly understands the pupil's difficulties and prompts him step by step in the right direction. This is often still called "Socratic method".

There is a well-known saying that the whole of Western philosophy is footnotes to **Plato**. This is because his writings have set an agenda which philosophy as a whole – and not only moral philosophy – can be

said roughly to have followed ever since. Plato was the first Western philosopher who wrote works that survive intact. What is more, we have reason to believe that we possess pretty well his entire output. As with his teacher Socrates, there are many people who regard him as the greatest philosopher of all time.

Plato lived for half a century after the death of Socrates, dying at the age of 81. During this time he published some two dozen dialogues which vary in length from 20 to 300 pages of modern print. The most famous of all of them are the Republic, which is chiefly concerned with the nature of justice, and which attempts, among other things, to set out a blueprint for the ideal state, and the Symposium, which is an investigation into the nature of love. Most of the rest are named after whoever appears in them as the chief interlocutor of Socrates. Thus we have the *Phaedo*, the *Laches*, the *Euthyphro*, the *Theaetetus*, the *Parmenides*, the *Timaeus*, and so on.

These dialogues are among the world's great literature. In addition to containing some of the best philosophy ever produced they are beautifully written – many language scholars think they contain the finest of all Greek prose. Perhaps the most moving of all, and therefore the best to read first, are those most directly to do with the trial and death of Socrates: the *Crito*, the *Apology*, and the *Phaedo*. The Apology purports to be the speech made by Socrates in his own defence at his trial, and is his *apologia pro vita sua*, his justification for his life.

The doctrine for which Plato is best known is his theory of Forms or Ideas, by which for these purposes he meant the same thing. (In this context, the words Form and Idea are usually spelled with a capital letter to make it clear that they are being used in Plato's sense.)

Reference has been made to the fact that when Socrates asked "What is beauty?" or "What is courage?" he regarded himself not as trying to pin down the definition of a word, but as trying to discover

the nature of some abstract entity that actually existed. He regarded these entities not as being in some place, or at any particular time, but as having some kind of universal existence that was independent of place and time. The individual beautiful objects that exist in our everyday world, and the particular courageous actions that individual people perform, are always fleeting, but they partake of the timeless essence of true beauty or true courage; and these are indestructible ideals with an existence of their own.

Plato took up this implied theory about the nature of morals and values and generalized it across the whole of reality. Everything, without exception, in this world of ours he regarded as being an ephemeral, decaying copy of something whose ideal form (hence the terms Ideal and Form) has a permanent and indestructible existence outside space and time.

Plato supported this conclusion with arguments from different sources. For example, it seemed to him that the more we pursue our studies in physics, the clearer it becomes that mathematical relationships are built into everything in the material world. The whole cosmos seems to exemplify order, harmony, proportion – or, as we would now put it, the whole of physics can be expressed in terms of mathematical equations. Plato, following Pythagoras, took this as revealing that, underlying the messy, not to say chaotic surface of our everyday world, there is an order that has all the ideality and perfection of mathematics. This order is not perceptible to the eye, but it is accessible to the mind, and intelligible to the intellect. Most important of all it is there, it exists, it is what constitutes underlying reality. In pursuit of this particular research program he drew into the Academy some of the leading mathematicians of his day, and under his patronage great strides were made in the development of various aspects of mathematics and what we now think of as the sciences. All were then part of "philosophy."

Just as Plato had been a pupil of Socrates, so **Aristotle** was a pupil of Plato. And Aristotle himself became tutor to Alexander

the Great, so there is a direct line of intellectual succession here through four generations of tremendous historical figures. Aristotle fully acknowledged Plato's genius, and his own indebtedness to him, but rejected something fundamental to Plato's philosophy, namely the idea that there are two worlds. As we have seen, Plato taught that there can be no such thing as reliable knowledge of this ever-changing world that is presented to our senses. The objects of true knowledge inhabit, he said, another world, an abstract realm independent of time and space, accessible only to the intellect. As far as Aristotle was concerned, there is only one world that we can do any philosophizing about, and that is this world we live in and experience. To him this is a world of inexhaustible fascination and wonder. Indeed, he believed that it was this sense of wonder that caused human beings to philosophize in the first place, whether as individuals or as a species; that this is the world they want to get to know and understand.

Furthermore, Aristotle did not believe that we could find any firm ground outside this world on which to stand, and from which to pursue philosophical enquiries. Whatever is outside all possibility of experience for us can be nothing for us. We have no validatable way of referring to it, or talking about it, and therefore it cannot enter into our discourse in any reliable way: if we stray beyond the ground covered by experience we wander into empty talk. From this standpoint Aristotle was dismissive of Plato's Ideal Forms: he simply did not believe that we have any good reasons to believe that they exist, and what is more he did not believe that they do exist.

Aristotle's desire to know about the world of experience was like an unslakable lust. Throughout his life he poured himself into research with gargantuan passion and energy across an almost incredibly wide range. He mapped out for the first time many of the basic fields of enquiry, and his own work on them provided the names for them that are used to this day: among these are logic, physics, political science,

economics, psychology, metaphysics, meteorology, rhetoric, and ethics. This is an almost unbelievable achievement for one individual. He also invented technical terms in those fields that have been used ever since, the words in other languages being derived either from his Greek terms or from their subsequently Latinized equivalents. Such terms include energy, dynamic, induction, demonstration, substance, attribute, essence, property, accident, category, topic, proposition, and universal. On top of all this he systematized logic, working out which forms of inference were valid and which invalid – in other words, what really does follow from what, and what only appears to but doesn't really; and he gave all these different forms of inference names. For two thousand years the study of logic was to mean the study of Aristotle's logic.

The key question from which Aristotle started out was: What are the objects in this world? What is it for something to exist? In his own words, "The question that was asked long ago, is asked now, and is always a matter of difficulty [is] 'What is being?' ".

His first important conclusion was that things are not just the matter of which they materially consist. He uses the example of a house. If you commissioned a builder to build a house on your land, and his trucks unloaded on to the site the bricks, the tiles, the wood and so on, and he said to you: "Here you are, here's your house," you would think it must be a joke, and a bad one. There would be all the constituent materials of a house, but it would not be a house at all – just a higgledy-piggledy heap of bricks and so on. To be a house, everything would need to be put together in certain ways, with a very specific and detailed structure, and it would be by virtue of that structure that it was a house. Indeed, the house would not need to be made of those sorts of materials at all, it could be made entirely of other things – concrete, glass, metal, plastics. It does of course (and this retains a certain importance) have to be made of some material, but it is not the materials that make it a house, it is the structure and

the form. Aristotle's most striking example of this is human beings. Take Socrates, he says.

The matter of which his body consists is changing every day, and it changes in its entirety every few years; yet throughout his life he goes on being the same Socrates. Therefore it cannot possibly be contended that Socrates is the matter of which his body consists. Aristotle extends this argument to whole species. We do not call all the different kinds of dogs dogs because they are made of some distinctive material. They are dogs by virtue of a distinctive organization and structure which they share, and which differentiate them from other animals that are likewise made of flesh, blood, and bone.

These arguments of Aristotle's against the kind of crude materialism which asserts that only matter exists are devastating, and have never been properly answered. Yet from his day to ours there have continued to be some people who are crude materialists. However, until they can answer Aristotle's objections their position would seem to call for little further consideration. Aristotle, then, has established that a thing is whatever it is by virtue of its form.

In all attempts to understand the world, says Aristotle, we should never lose sight of the fact that it is this world that we are trying to understand. Although we may be in awe of it we should never accept explanations of it that deny the validity of the very experiences we are trying to explain. We should make it a point of method in all our investigations to maintain a firm hold on these experiences, the experiences that actually present themselves to us, and to keep referring back to them at every stage, because it is understanding these that is, so to speak, the final cause of our enquiries. To jettison our hold on them in order to embrace belief in something we do not experience is to throw the baby out with the bath water He called this principle "saving the appearances." The phrase is a rather feeble-sounding one, but it is used by philosophers to this day because of the importance of the principle involved.

Plato and Aristotle are the two archetypes of the two main conflicting approaches that have characterized philosophy throughout its history. On the one hand there are philosophers who set only a secondary value on knowledge of the world as it presents itself to our senses, believing that our ultimate concern needs to be with something that lies "behind" or "beyond" (or "hidden below the surface of") the world. On the other hand there are philosophers who believe that this world is itself the most proper object for our concern and our philosophizing. To take an example much nearer to our own age, the great rationalist philosophers of the 17th and 18th centuries believed that the knowledge of the surface of things that our sensory experience seems to give us only too often deceives us; whereas the great empiricist philosophers of the selfsame period believed that reliable information can be based only on direct examination of observable facts. The opposition between the two tendencies is perennial, and comes out in one way or another in age after age, in different guises.

3. Hellenistic Philosophy

Aristotle's pupil Alexander the Great changed history in a way that affected the development of philosophy. In an astoundingly short time he conquered more or less the whole world as it was known to the ancient Greeks, from Italy to India, including most of what is now called the Middle East, together with vast areas of North Africa. The independence of the Greek city states came to an end as they were swallowed up in Alexander's empire, and they lost their cultural dominance.

Everywhere he went, Alexander founded new cities, from which his conquests were to be administered, and these he colonized with Greeks. The colonists mostly married local women, so the populations of these cities quickly became cosmopolitan, but their ruling ethos and language remained everywhere Greek. The upshot was that

the whole of the ancient world came to be run from "Greek " cities that were not in Greece, and whose populations were multiracial and multilingual. That world is known as the Hellenistic world. Its most important city was the one which Alexander named after himself, Alexandria, in Egypt. This became the chief international center of culture and learning, the site of the most important library the ancient world ever possessed. The Hellenistic age of which it was the cultural capital lasted for some three hundred years, from the downfall of the Greek city states in the 4th century bc to the rise of the Roman Empire in the 1st century bc. During that time the culture and civilization of ancient Greece became propagated throughout the ancient world. These were the circumstances in which the Roman republic emerged, and in which the Roman Empire struggled to establish itself. It was also the world into which Christianity was born, and explains why – although Palestine was a Roman colony – the New Testament was written in Greek.

Immediately after the death of Alexander his empire broke up into warring factions – so, while the cultural unity that he had created continued, there was incessant strife and conflict at the political level. All four of the new schools of philosophy that flourished during this period – the Cynics, the Sceptics, the Epicureans, and the Stoics – reflect that fact. All of them are concerned with how a civilized man is to live in an insecure, unstable, and dangerous world.

The first of these to appear were **the Cynics**. They were what we would now call dropouts. Their progenitor was Antisthenes, a disciple of Socrates and near-contemporary of Plato. Until he was middle-aged he lived a conventional life in that aristocratic circle of philosophers. But with the death of Socrates and the fall of Athens Antisthenes world came to an end, whereupon he decided to opt out and embrace a basic, simple life. He started dressing like a laborer, and living among the poor, and he proclaimed that he wanted; no government, no private property, no marriage, I and no established religion.

Antisthenes had a follower who became more j famous than himself, a man called Diogenes (404–323 bc). Diogenes aggressively flouted all ' the conventions, and deliberately shocked people, whether by not washing or by dressing, if at all, in filthy rags, or living in a burial urn, or eating disgusting food, or committing flagrant acts of public indecency. He lived like a dog; and for this reason people gave him the nickname "Cynic" (from the Greek word *kynikos*) which means "like a dog." This is how the word, which we still use, was coined. But its meaning has changed over time.

Diogenes and his followers were not cynics in today's sense of the word. They had a positive belief in virtue. But their basic creed was that the difference between true values and false values was the only distinction that mattered: all other distinctions were rubbish – all social conventions, for instance, such distinctions as those between yours and mine, public and private, naked and clothed, raw and cooked – all that was nonsense. Diogenes had the same contempt for the distinction between Greek and foreigner – so when asked what his country was he replied: "1 am a citizen of the world," and in doing so coined the single Greek word in which he expressed that thought, "cosmopolitan," a concept for which many have been grateful to him.

There are many good stories about Diogenes. The most famous is that when Alexander the Great came to visit him in his filthy hole and stood in the entrance asking if there was anything that he, the ruler of the entire world, could do for him,

Diogenes replied "Yes – you can stand out of my light." There is no doubt that he meant this figuratively as well as literally. It is possibly the most eloquent put-down of worldly values that a philosopher has ever managed to deliver.

The Sceptics were the first relativists in philosophy. In the broadest sense of the word "scepticism" there had long been a certain tradition of it in Greek philosophy. Xenophanes had taught that, although we

can always learn more than we know, we can never be sure that we have reached any final truth. Socrates said that the only thing he knew was that he did not know anything. However, Socrates did at least believe that knowledge was possible, and, what is more, he was bent on acquiring some, while Xenophanes believed that we could lessen the degree of our ignorance if we made the effort. Both men took a positive attitude towards enquiry and the possibility of learning.

The first person to make scepticism the be-all and end-all of his thought – to adopt it as being in itself a philosophy, so to speak, and one consisting of an active refusal to believe anything – was Pyrrho (365–270 bc). He launched a whole school of philosophers that became known as Sceptics. Pyrrho had served as a soldier with Alexander the Great, and had campaigned with him as far afield as India. Seeing such a huge diversity of countries and peoples seems to have impressed on him the diversity of opinions that are to be found among human beings. For almost everything believed by the people in one place there seem to be people somewhere else who believe the opposite. And normally the arguments are equally good on both sides – or so it seemed to Pyrrho. All we can do is go by things as they appear to us: but appearances are notoriously deceptive, so we should never assume the truth of one explanation rather than any other The best thing was to stop worrying and just go with the flow, that is to say swim along with whatever customs and practices pre\ ail in the circumstances we happen to find ourselves in.

Scepticism has had a permanently important part to play in the history of philosophy, from that day to this. Chiefly it is because certainty is simply not available at the level of argument, demonstration, or proof – although it was not until the 20th century I that this became generally acknowledged, so the pursuit of certainty was destined to play a centrally important role in the historical development of philosophy. What a valid argument proves is that its conclusions follow from its premises, but that is not at all the same as proving that

those conclusions are true. Every valid argument starts with an "if": if *p* is true then *q* must be true. But that leaves open the question of whether or not p is true. The argument itself cannot prove that, because it has already untrue. However, the working out of these tricky distinctions was to be a long and troublesome business in the history of philosophy.

Like many attitudes of the 20th century, the philosophy of Epicurus was materialistic, pleasure-seeking, and non-religious. It was the first such philosophy to be fully developed intellectually. Epicureanism was very much the creation of a single thinker, Epicurus (341–270 bc). Its aim above all else was to liberate people from fear, not only the fear of death but the fear of life. In an age when all forms of public life were unpredictable and highly dangerous it taught people to seek happiness and fulfilment in their private lives.

"Live unknown " was one of its maxims. This was completely at odds with all previous ideas of seeking fame and glory, or even wanting something so apparently decent as honor But Epicureanism was to an unusual degree a fully worked-out philosophy that tried to embrace all aspects of existence. It began with a view of physics.

First of all, Epicurus accepted the atomism of Democritus. He believed that all there was in the material universe were atoms and space, nothing else. Since it is impossible for atoms to come into existence out of nothing or pass away into nothing they are indestructible and eternal. However, their movements are unpredictable, and no combination that they form ever endures. For this reason, physical objects, all of which are combinations of atoms, are ephemeral. Their life is always a story of atoms coming together and then, eventually, dispersing again. All change in the universe consists either of this endlessly repeated process or of the objects thus formed moving in space.

We ourselves are among the objects formed in this way. A group of particularly fine atoms comes together to make a body and a mind

in the form of a single entity, a human being, whose eventual dispersal is inevitable. But this dispersal is not to be feared. Such a dissolution of the human being means that the entity that we are ceases to exist when we die, and therefore there is no one to whom being dead happens: so long as we exist, death is not, and when death is, we are not. Nor is there anyone to whom those terrors, that so many religions threaten people with after their deaths, can happen. "Death is nothing to us," says Epicurus; and anyone who genuinely grasps that truth, deep down, is liberated from fear of death.

As for the gods, Epicurus manages to get them out of the picture without denying their existence (which would have been a dangerous thing for him to do) by saying that they are far, far away and, being gods, they have no desire to become involved in the perpetual mess and turmoil of human affairs. So they are inactive as far as we are concerned, and "we have nothing to hope and nothing to fear" from them. For us, it is as if they do not exist.

Since non-existence is our own inescapable destiny we should make the best of the only life we have. The good life in this life, happiness in this world, should be our aim. The way to achieve this is to have nothing to do with the violence and uncertainties of public life but to withdraw into private communities of like-minded people. And because both our physical health and the maintenance of good personal relationships require it, we should enjoy our pleasures in moderation, though no non-injurious activity needs to be regarded as forbidden in itself.

The communities formed by the Epicureans for these purposes were in principle open to anyone, including women and slaves – a fact which drew a great deal of antagonism towards them from their surrounding societies. When Christianity came on the scene the Epicureans were anathema to Christians in particular, because of their denial of immortality and of the existence of a benevolent God, and also because of their affirmation of the values of this world.

The Stoics were the governing philosophy of the Roman empire. Stoicism as a philosophy continued as an organized movement for some five hundred years. With it, and through it, Western philosophy ceased to be specifically Greek and became international. This was a direct result of Alexander the Great's conquests having spread Greek culture throughout the so-called civilized world – the early Stoic philosophers were mostly Syrians, the later ones mostly Romans. The voices of the most famous of them came from the entire gamut of the social hierarchy, one even being a slave (Epictetus) and another a Roman Emperor (Marcus Aurelius). Stoicism seems to have had a special appeal for emperors.

Zeno (334–262 bc) of Citium, in Cyprus, was the founder of Stoicism. The core of the Stoic philosophy lies in the view that there can be no authority higher than reason. By unpacking the consequences of that belief we arrive at most of the important tenets of Stoic philosophy. First, the world as our reason presents it to us as being, that is to say the world of Nature, is all the reality there is. There is nothing "higher" and Nature itself is governed by rationally intelligible principles. We ourselves are part of Nature. The spirit of rationality that imbues us and it (and that is to say, everything) is what is meant by God. As thus conceived, God is not outside the world and separate from it, he is all-pervadingly in the world – he is, as it were, the mind of the world, the self-awareness of the world.

Because we are at one with Nature, and because there is no higher realm, there can be no question of our going anywhere "else" when we die – there is nowhere else to go. We dissolve back into Nature. It is through the ethics evolved from this belief that Stoicism achieved its greatest fame and influence.

Because Nature is governed by rational principles there are reasons why everything is asit is. We cannot change it, nor should

we desire to. Therefore our attitude in the face of our own mortality, or what may seem to us personal tragedy, should be one of unruffled acceptance. In so far as our emotions rebel against this, our emotions are in the wrong. The Stoics believed that emotions are judgements, and therefore cognitive: they are forms of "knowledge", whether true or false. Greed, for instance, is the judgement that money is a pre-eminent good and to be acquired by every available means – a false judgement. If all our emotions are made subject to our reason they will embody none but true judgements, and we shall then be at one with things as they actually are.

People who adopted the Stoic philosophy were often able to endure life's vicissitudes with calm and dignity. But even for them there might come a time when they would no longer wish to go on living – for example in circumstances of personal ruin or disgrace, or in the agonies of a terminal disease. In those circumstances, they believed, the rational thing to do was to end one's own life painlessly, and this many of them did. So a high proportion of the well-known Stoics ended their lives by committing suicide.

The most vivid and compelling of all the expositions of Stoicism are to be found in the writings of the later Stoics, which were all in Latin. The outstanding figures here are Seneca (c. 2 bc-ad 65) and Marcus Aurelius (ad 121–180). They were not original thinkers in the sense of adding significantly to already-existing Stoic doctrines, but they were such good writers that their works are read to this day by people who are not academics.

Stoic ethics have always been widely found to be impressive and admirable, even by people who do not wholly go along with them. They are not easy to practise – but perhaps it is bound to be a characteristic of any ethics worthy of the name that they are difficult to put into practice. They had an unmistakable influence on Christian ethics, which were beginning to spread at the time when Seneca,

Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius were writing. And, of course, to this very day the words "stoic " and "stoicism" are in familiar use in our language, with perhaps grudgingly admiring overtones, to mean "withstanding adversity without complaint". There must be many people now living who – even if they have never consciously formulated this fact to themselves – subscribe to an ideal in ethics which is essentially the same as that of the Stoics.?

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-CONTROL

1. What is the originality of ancient philosophy and what are its fundamental problems?

2. What periods can be distinguished in ancient philosophy?

3. Who are the Presocratics and what is the peculiarity of their philosophizing?

4. Which of the philosophers of Miletus School refers to the "seven wise men" and for what kind of knowledge? What could you tell about him?

5. Why is the appearance of the Milesian school considered the beginning of ancient philosophy?

6. What were the problems the ancient philosophers considered in the earliest history of philosophy?

7. Who is Pythagoras and what are the distinguishing features of the philosophy of Pythagoreanism?

8. Who was the founder of the theory of atomism? What is the essence of this theory?

9. Atomism is generally considered a concept of physics. Explain why atomism is a philosophical concept.

10. Which of the ancient thinkers was the first dialectician and why?

11. What is the specificity of the ontology of Empedocles, in comparison with the teaching of the Eleatic?

12. What period in ancient philosophy is called "classical" and what names are represent it?

13. Who are the Sophists and what is their role in the formation of critical reflection within the framework of Greek philosophy?

14. What is the difference between Socrates' doctrine of man, his virtues and knowledge, and the teachings of the Sophists?

15. What is the role of Socrates in the formation of the Athenian school of philosophy?

16. What does Socrates mean when he said "Know thyself"?

17. Why did Socrates say by "I know that I know nothing" and what did he mean by it? What is the meaning of a quote?

18. What are the place and role of Plato in European philosophy?

19. What contribution did Aristotle make to the formation of classical science and philosophy?

20. How Aristotle argued his disagreement with Platonic division of the world into the "world of ideas" and the "world of shadows"?

21. What is the difference between Aristotle's philosophy and Plato's philosophy?

22. How was the problem of relations between man and space solved in the Hellenistic philosophy?

23. What are the common features of Hellenistic philosophy?

24. What is the conceptual difference between the classical and the Hellenistic stages of ancient philosophy?

25. The names of which philosophers of the classical period are connected with the ethical quest of Stoics and Epicureans?

26. What are the main ideas of the school of Cynics?

27. What new ideas put forward stoicism in philosophy?

28. Who are Epicurus and the Epicureans?

29. What is the difference between the atomistic doctrine of Epicurus and the teaching of Democritus?

30. What ideas of ancient philosophy, in your opinion, are relevant at present? Is the legacy of ancient culture relevant today?

EXERCISES AND TASKS FOR STRENGTHENING LEARNING MATERIAL

1. Explain the following thought of Heraclitus: "*Homer was wrong in saying: 'Would that strife might perish from among gods and men!' He did not see that he was praying for the destruction of the universe; for if his prayer were heard, all things would pass away.*"

2. How does Heraclitus relate the notions of the origin of being with the dialectical understanding of being as a continuous movement? Explain your answer based on the content of the following passage.

"*This universe, which is the same for all, has not been made by any god or man, but it always has been, is, and will be an ever-living fire, kindling itself by regular measures and going out by regular measures*."

3. Give a comment to the saying of Socrates: "*There is only one good, knowledge, and one evil, ignorance.*" Why did Socrates believe that all good in the world is due to knowledge, wisdom? Why did he consider ignorance to be the greatest evil?

4. Read the passage from the universally known Plato's work "Apology" and answer the following questions:

– How do you evaluate the behavior of Socrates in court?

– How do you understand the words of Socrates: "*It is not difficult to avoid death, it is much more difficult to avoid wickedness*"?

"Perhaps you think that I was convicted for lack of such words as might have convinced you, if I thought I should say or do all I could to avoid my sentence. Far from it. I was convicted because I lacked not words but boldness and shamelessness and the willingness to say to you what you would most gladly have heard from me, lamentations and tears and my saying and doing many things that I say are unworthy of me but that you are accustomed to hear from others. I did not think then that the danger I ran should make me do anything mean, nor do I now regret the nature of my defense. I would much rather die after this kind of defense than live after making the other kind. Neither I nor any other man should, on trial or in war, contrive to avoid death at any cost. Indeed it is often obvious in battle that one could escape death by throwing away one's weapons and by turning to supplicate one's pursuers, and there are many ways to avoid death in every kind of danger if one will venture to do or say anything to avoid it. It is not difficult to avoid death, gentlemen; it is much more difficult to avoid wickedness, for it runs faster than death. Slow and elderly as I am, I have been caught by the slower pursuer, whereas my accusers, being clever and sharp, have been caught by the quicker, wickedness. I leave you now, condemned to death by you, but they are condemned by truth to wickedness and injustice. So I maintain my assessment, and they maintain theirs. This perhaps had to happen, and I think it is as it should be.

Now I want to prophesy to those who convicted me, for I am at the point when men prophesy most, when they are about to die. I say gentlemen, to those who voted to kill me, that vengeance will come upon you immediately after my death, a vengeance much harder to bear than that which you took in killing me. You did this in the belief that you would avoid giving an account of your life, but I maintain that quite the opposite will happen to you. There will be more people to test you, whom I now

held back, but you did not notice it. They will be more difficult to deal with as they will be younger and you will resent them more. You are wrong if you believe that by killing people you will prevent anyone from reproaching you for not living in the right way. To escape such tests is neither possible nor good, but it is best and easiest not to discredit others but to prepare oneself to be as good as possible. With this prophecy to you who convicted me, I part from you." (Plato. Apology)

5. Read Aristotle's arguments about the essence of philosophy and answer the following questions:

– What kind of person does Aristotle consider wise?

– What first prompted the man to philosophize?

– What are the specifics of philosophical knowledge according to Aristotle?

– What is the purpose of philosophy?

"*Since we are seeking this knowledge, we must inquire of what kind are the causes and the principles, the knowledge of which is Wisdom. If one were to take the notions we have about the wise man, this might perhaps make the answer more evident. We suppose first, then, that the wise man knows all things, as far as possible, although he has not knowledge of each of them in detail; secondly, that he who can learn things that are difficult, and not easy for man to know, is wise (sense-perception is common to all, and therefore easy and no mark of Wisdom); again, that he who is more exact and more capable of teaching the causes is wiser, in every branch of knowledge; and that of the sciences, also, that which is desirable on its own account and for the sake of knowing it is more of the nature of Wisdom than that which is desirable on account of its results, and the superior science is more of the nature of Wisdom than the ancillary; for the wise man must not be ordered but must order, and he must not obey another, but the less wise must obey him.*

Such and so many are the notions, then, which we have about Wisdom and the wise. Now of these characteristics that of knowing all things must belong to him who has in the highest degree universal knowledge; for he knows in a sense all the instances that fall under the universal. And these things, the most universal, are on the whole the hardest for men to know; for they are farthest from the senses. And the most exact of the sciences are those which deal most with first principles; for those which involve fewer principles are more exact than those which involve additional principles, e.g. arithmetic than geometry. But the science which investigates causes is also instructive, in a higher degree, for the people who instruct us are those who tell the causes of each thing. And understanding and knowledge pursued for their own sake are found most in the knowledge of that which is most knowable (for he who chooses to know for the sake of knowing will choose most readily that which is most truly knowledge, and such is the knowledge of that which is most knowable); and the first principles and the causes are most knowable; for by reason of these, and from these, all other things come to be known, and not these by means of the things subordinate to them. And the science which knows to what end each thing must be done is the most authoritative of the sciences, and more authoritative than any ancillary science; and this end is the good of that thing, and in general the supreme good in the whole of nature. Judged by all the tests we have mentioned, then, the name in question falls to the same science; this must be a science that investigates the first principles and causes; for the good, i.e. the end, is one of the causes.

That it is not a science of production is clear even from the history of the earliest philosophers. For it is owing to their wonder that men both now begin and at first began to

philosophize; they wondered originally at the obvious difficulties, then advanced little by little and stated difficulties about the greater matters, e.g. about the phenomena of the moon and those of the sun and of the stars, and about the genesis of the universe. And a man who is puzzled and wonders thinks himself ignorant (whence even the lover of myth is in a sense a lover of Wisdom, for the myth is composed of wonders); therefore since they philosophized order to escape from ignorance, evidently they were pursuing science in order to know, and not for any utilitarian end. And this is confirmed by the facts; for it was when almost all the necessities of life and the things that make for comfort and recreation had been secured, that such knowledge began to be sought. Evidently then we do not seek it for the sake of any other advantage; but as the man is free, we say, who exists for his own sake and not for another's, so we pursue this as the only free science, for it alone exists for its own sake." (Aristotle. Metaphysics)

6. Read the passage from the Aristotle's work "Politics" and answer the following questions: Why, according to Aristotle, "man is a more social being" than other herd animals? What can express a person's speech?

"*Now, that man is more of a political animal than bees or any other gregarious animals is evident. Nature, as we often say, makes nothing in vain, and man is the only animal whom she has endowed with the gift of speech. And whereas mere voice is but an indication of pleasure or pain, and is therefore found in other animals (for their nature attains to the perception of pleasure and pain and the intimation of them to one another, and no further), the power of speech is intended to set forth the expedient and inexpedient, and therefore likewise the just and the unjust. And it is a characteristic of man that he alone has any sense of good and evil, of just and unjust.*" (Aristotle. Politics)

7. Comment on the words of philosophers.

Heraclitus:

Abundance of knowledge does not teach men to be wise.

Everything flows, everything changes.

Xenophanes:

The Ethiops say that their gods are flat-nosed and black, while the Thracians say that theirs have blue eyes and red hair. Yet if cattle or horses or lions had hands and could draw, and could sculpt like men, then the horses would draw their gods like horses, and cattle like cattle; and each they would shape bodies of gods in the likeness, each kind, of their own.

Pythagoras:

Be a friend of the truth to the martyrdom, but do not be its defender to intolerance.

TEST TASKS

1. Ancient philosophy was preceded by:
a) Byzantine philosophy b) mythology
c) postmodern philosophy d) religion

2. Which of the ancient philosophers considered air as the origin of the universe?
a) Thales b) Anaximenes
c) Anaximander d) Democritus

3. Which of the ancient philosophers considered water as the origin of the universe?
a) Plato b) Heraclitus
c) Aristotle d) Thales

4. Who is the author of the saying "All things are numbers"?
a) Heraclitus b) Socrates
c) Pythagoras d) Parmenides

5. Heraclitus of Ephesus believed that the primary element is
a) water b) fire
c) land d) tree

6. Who was the first in ancient philosophy to formulate the principles of dialectics?
a) Anaximenes b) Democritus
c) Heraclitus d) Aristotle

7. _____ seeked for the initial stuff of the Universe.

a) Parmenides, Plato, Aristotle

b) Socrates, Protagoras, Gorgias

c) Democritus, Leucippus, Epicurus

d) Thales, Heraclitus, Anaximenes

8. Who is the author of the saying "All things are an exchange for fire, and fire for all things, as goods for gold and gold for goods."

a) Democritus b) Heraclitus

c) Thales d) Protagoras

9. Which of the following philosophers is not refers to the Milesian school?

a) Anaximenes b) Anaxagoras

c) Anaximander d) Thales

10. What philosophers' views are the most similar in the understanding of the structure of being?

a) Socrates and Parmenides b) Democritus and Leucippus

c) Plato and Aristotle d) Thales and Protagoras

11. Protagoras from Abdera was the most famous of the Sophists. This saying belongs to him: " _____ is the measure of all things, of those which are that they are and of those which are not that they are not"

a) univerce b) man c) God d) nature

12. Socrates said: "I know that I know nothing, but

a) it's impossible to know everything"

b) knowledge increases sorrow"

c) to know something isn't necessary"

d) others don't even know this"

13. The creator of formal logic is
a Plato b) Socrates
c) Aristotle d) Parmenides

14. Who is the author of the theory of or Ideas?
a) Democritus b) Plato
c) Aristotle d) Anaximenes

15. Aristotle developed the basic laws of
a) atomistic materialism b) logic
c) heuristic d) dialectics

16. According to Socrates bad deeds are the consequence of
a) poor upbringing b) human ignorance
c) divine providence d) imitation of authority

17. For Plato, the unreal and invalid world is the world of
a) first matter b) eidos
c) a lot of specific things and objects; d) representations

18. "Alexander the Great of Ancient Greek philosophy" refers to an outstanding thinker and scientist of antiquity, the founder of the Lyceum
a) Socrates b) Plato c) Aristotle d) Epicurus

19. According to Plato who should be the rulers of the ideal state?
a) farmers b) philosophers c) patricians d) citizens

20. Plato believed that ideas are
a) material b) unchanged c) relative d) useful

21. The central concept in the philosophy of Socrates was
a) matter b) cosmos c) good d) being

22. The saying "Fate leads the willing and drags along the unwilling" reflects the views of
a) Stoicism b) Scepticism c) Epicureanism d) Sophism

23. Which of the following philosophers held that everything was made up of four different elements: earth, water, air, and fire?

a) Parmenides b) Zenon
c) Anaxagoras d) Empedocles.

24. Socrates focused his thoughts on

a) the universe and the laws of its development
b) the person and internal factors of her actions
c) Atomistic theory
d) the political structure of state

25. Which of the ancient philosophers invented the term "philosophy"?

a) Plato b) Aristotle c) Socrates d) Pythagoras

26. "Opposite assertions cannot be true at the same time", asserted

a) Parmenides b) Aristotle c) Socrates d) Heraclitus

27. Seneca belongs to the school of

a) Cinism b) Stoicism c) Scepticism d) Pythagoreism

28. Epicurus developed the doctrine of

a) Plato b) Aristotle c) Heraclitus d) Democritus

29. What is happiness for Epicurus?

a) absence of suffering b) sensual pleasure
c) impassivity d) understanding

30. What feature was most characteristic of ancient philosophy?

a) theocentrism b) cosmocentrism
c) pantheism d) empiricism

GLOSSARY

Apatheia – a state of mind in which one is not disturbed by the passions (Stoicism).

Apeiron – "the boundless' or "the unlimited", which evolved to signify "the infinite" (Anaximander).

Aporia – "puzzle", question for discussion, "state of perplexity".

Arche – "beginning", "origin" or "source of action", first principle or element.

Aretḗ – virtue, the expertise of living well (Socrates).

Ataraxia – a lucid state of robust equanimity that was characterized by ongoing freedom from distress and worry (Epicur).

Atomism – the theory which maintains that atoms are the basic constituents of the physical universe.

Cosmos – orderliness as the fundamental quality of the universe, the harmonious order of the whole, consisting of many different things. (Pythagoras).

Doxa – opinion, acceptance of any statement on faith, without evidence and without criticism, even when the truth of the statement is far from obvious; quasi-knowledge, which we receive as a result of the sensory perception of the world, as opposed to the true knowledge obtained as a result of rational argumentation (Plato).

Eidos (*Forms, Ideas*) – in Plato doctrine abstract objects, which exist independently of thought, and are eternal, changeless, and

incorporeal; since they are imperceptible, we can come to have knowledge of them only through thought.

Energeia – the term in Greek philosophy for the designation of effectiveness, activity, efficiency.

Episteme – systematic theoretical knowledge (Aristotle).

Epoché – "suspension of judgment" but also as "withholding of assent", the state where all judgments about non-evident matters are suspended in order to induce a state of ataraxia (Scepticism).

Eudaimonism – the view that the good is happiness or faring well (Socrates).

Fatalism – the view that there are forces (e.g., the stars or the fates) that determine all outcomes independently of human efforts or wishes (Stoicism).

Intellectualism – a central tenet of Socratic morality, the doctrine that virtue is the expertise of the good, more frequently expressed as "Virtue is knowledge" (Socrates).

Logos – a principle of order and knowledge, provided the link between rational discourse and the world's rational structure (Heraclitus).

Metaphysics – a branch of philosophy, the subject of which are exclusively theoretically knowable first principles of being.

Nature (*phusis*) – the characteristic nature of a particular natural object or species. By extension the term also comes to mean the nature of things in general. Generally opposed to nomos, law or convention.

Relativism – a central tenet of Sophistic philosophy, the doctrine that no objective reality independent of the perceptions exists that could falsify them.

Substrate – the underlying subject of predication or bearer of attributes.

Techne – a multi-valued concept of Greek culture and philosophy. That is craft, dexterity, skill, skill, but can also mean deception, cunning. High degree of professional skills in any sphere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Textbooks:

1. A Companion to Ancient Philosophy [Text] / Ed. by M. Gill and P. Pellegrin. – Blackwell Publishing, 2006. – 832 p.

2. **Annas, Julia** Ancient Philosophy. A Very Short Introduction [Text] / J. Annas. – Oxford University Press, 2000. – 145 p.

3. The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy [Text] / Ed. by D. Sedley. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 412 p.

4. From the Beginning to Plato [Text] / Ed. by C.C.W. Taylor. – London : Routledge, 1997. – 484 p.

5. **Kenny, Anthony** Ancient Philosophy [Text] / A. Kenny. – Oxford University Press, 2006. – 364 p.

6. **Osborne, Catherine** Presocratic Philosophy. A Very Short Introduction [Text] / C. Osborne. – London : Oxford University Press, 2004. – 168 p.

7. **Preus, Anthony** Historical Dictionary of Ancient Greek Philosophy [Text] / A. Preus. – Lanham, Maryland : The Scarecrow Press, 2007. – 370 p.

Secondary literature:

8. A Companion to Aristotle [Text] / Ed. by G. Anagnostopoulos. – Chichester, U.K.; Malden, MA : Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. – 672 p.

9. A History of Pythagoreanism [Text] / Ed. by Huffman C.A. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2014. – 493 p.

10. **Annas, Julia** Plato. A Very Short Introduction [Text] / J. Annas. – Oxford University Press, 2003. – 120 p.

11. **Baracchi, Claudia** Aristotle's Ethics as First Philosophy [Text] / C. Baracchi. – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. – 353 p.

12. **Barnes, Jonathan** Aristotle. A Very Short Introduction [Text] / J. Barnes. – Oxford University Press, 2000. – 177 p.

13. **Barnes, Jonathan** The Presocratic Philosophers [Text] / J. Barnes. – Routledge, 2005. – 601 p.

14. Brill's Companion to Seneca: Philosopher and Dramatist [Text] / Ed. by Damschen G., Heil A., Waida M. – Leiden: Brill, 2014. – 883 p.

15. **Crivelli, Paolo** Aristotle on Truth [Text] / P. Crivelli. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2004. – 354 p.

16. **De Romilly, Jacqueline** The Great Sophists in Periclean Athens [Text] / J. De Romilly. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002. – 280 p.

17. **Graham, Daniel W.** Explaining the Cosmos: the Ionian Tradition of Scientific Philosophy [Text] / D. Graham. – Princeton University Press, 2009. – 368 p.

18. The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics [Text] / Ed. by M. Deslauriers, P. Destree. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2013. – 443 p.

19. The Oxford Handbook of Presocratic Philosophy [Text] / Ed. by Curd P., Graham D.W. – New York : Oxford University Press, 2008. – 608 p.

20. **Herman, Arthur** The Cave and the Light. Plato versus Aristotle [Text] / A. Herman/ – New York : Random House, 2013. – 576 p.

21. **Irvine, Joy William B.** A Guide to the Good Life: The Ancient Art of Stoic [Text] / J. W. B. Irvine. – London : Oxford University Press, 2009. – 329 p.

22. **Jordan, William** Ancient Concepts of Philosophy [Text] / W. Jordan. – London, New York : Routledge, 1993. – 226 p.

23. **Kellogg, Michael K.** The Greek Search for Wisdom [Text] / M. K. Kellogg. New York : Prometheus Book, 2012. – 304 p.

24. **Morgan, Kathryn A.** Myth and philosophy from the Presocratics to Plato [Text] / K. A. Morgan. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2000. – 323 p.

25. **Naddaf, Gerard** The Greek concept of nature [Text] / G. Naddaf. – New York : State University of New York Press, 2005. – 256 p.

26. **Nehamas, Alexander** The Art of Living: Socratic Reflections from Plato to Foucault [Text] / A. Nehamas. – Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000. – 294 p.

27. **Politis, Vasilis** Routledge Philosophy Guide Book to Aristotle and the Metaphysics [Text] / V. Politis.- London: Routledge, 2004. – 357 p.

28. **Scott, Dominic** Plato's Meno [Text] / D. Scott. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2005. – 250 p.

29. **Sedley, David** Plato's Cratylus: Cambridge Studies in the Dialogues of Plato [Text] / D. Sedley. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 412 p.

30. The Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism [Text] / Ed. by J. Warren. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2009. – 309 p.

31. The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius [Text] / Ed. by S. Gillespie, P.Hardie – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2007. – 956 p.

32. The Cambridge Companion to Plato's Republic [Text] / Ed. by Ferrari G.R.F. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2007. – 562 p.

33. The Cambridge Companion to The Stoics [Text] / Ed. by B. Inwood. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 450 p.

34. Vlastos, Gregory The Plato's Universe [Text] / G. Vlastos. – Washington, Parmenides Publishing, 2005. – 130 p.

Electronic resources:

1. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy http:// plato.stanford.edu/
2. Glyn Hughes' Squashed Philosophers http://www.sqapo.com/index.htm
3. PhilPapers https://philpapers.org/browse/ancient-greek-and-roman-philosophy
4. Twirpx http://www.twirpx.com/
5. The Cambridge Classical Journal https://www.cambridge.org/

CONTENTS

Навчальне видання

БОЙКО Любов Михайлівна
ДРОЖАНОВА Оксана Миколаївна

ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY

Методичні вказівки
для самостійного вивчення теми

(*англійською мовою*)

Комп'ютерне складання та верстання *В. В. Москаленко*
Коректор *М. О. Паненко*

Формат 60×84/16. Ум. друк. арк. 2,8. Тираж 100 прим. Вид № 17. Зам. № 113.
Видавець і виготівник Національний університет кораблебудування
імені адмірала Макарова
просп. Героїв України, 9, м. Миколаїв, 54025
E-mail : publishing@nuos.edu.ua
Свідоцтво суб'єкта видавничої справи ДК № 6402 від 19.09.2018 р.