

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-19843-1 - Socratic Moral Psychology
Thomas C. Brickhouse and Nicholas D. Smith
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

SOCRATIC MORAL PSYCHOLOGY

Socrates' moral psychology is widely thought to be "intellectualist" in the sense that, for Socrates, every ethical failure to *do* what is best is exclusively the result of some cognitive failure to *apprehend* what is best. Until fairly recently, the view that, for Socrates, emotions and desires have no role to play in causing such failure went unchallenged. This book argues against the orthodox view of Socratic intellectualism and offers in its place a comprehensive alternative account that explains why Socrates believed that emotions, desires, and appetites can influence human motivation and lead to error. Thomas C. Brickhouse and Nicholas D. Smith defend the study of Socrates' philosophy and offer a new interpretation of Socratic moral psychology. Their novel account of Socrates' conception of virtue and how it is acquired shows that Socratic moral psychology is considerably more sophisticated than scholars have supposed.

THOMAS C. BRICKHOUSE is John Mills Turner Professor of the Humanities, Department of Philosophy, Lynchburg College, Virginia. He is the co-author (with Nicholas D. Smith) of *The Philosophy of Socrates* (2000) and the co-editor (with Nicholas D. Smith) of *The Trial and Execution of Socrates* (2002).

NICHOLAS D. SMITH is James F. Miller Professor of Humanities, Department of Philosophy, Lewis and Clark College, Portland. He is the co-author (with Thomas C. Brickhouse) of *Plato and the Trial of Socrates* (2004) and the author of various essays on Plato, Aristotle, and contemporary epistemology.

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-19843-1 - Socratic Moral Psychology
Thomas C. Brickhouse and Nicholas D. Smith
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

SOCRATIC MORAL PSYCHOLOGY

THOMAS C. BRICKHOUSE

Lynchburg College

and

NICHOLAS D. SMITH

Lewis and Clark College



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-19843-1 - Socratic Moral Psychology
Thomas C. Brickhouse and Nicholas D. Smith
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521198431

© Thomas C. Brickhouse and Nicholas D. Smith 2010

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2010

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-521-19843-1 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in
this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is,
or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	page vi
Introduction	i
1 Apology of Socratic studies	11
2 Motivational intellectualism	43
3 The “prudential paradox”	63
4 Wrongdoing and damage to the soul	89
5 Educating the appetites and passions	132
6 Virtue intellectualism	153
7 Socrates and his ancient intellectual heirs: Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics	193
<i>Appendix: is Plato’s Gorgias consistent with the other early or Socratic dialogues?</i>	248
<i>Bibliography</i>	259
<i>Index of passages</i>	268
<i>General index</i>	272

Acknowledgments

Many of those who are the targets of our sharpest and most sustained criticism in this book, especially Mark McPherran and Terry Penner, are not only personal friends, but also scholars for whom we have the utmost respect and whose work we read with the greatest interest and enthusiasm. Anyone who has actually engaged in the practices of philosophy or scholarship knows very well that the ones from whom we learn most are usually those with whom we can argue amiably and at length, and who express the clearest and most compelling versions of views with which we do not agree. The galvanizing effects of Daniel Devereux's work on us is evident everywhere in this book. In recent years, a growing number of scholars have joined Devereux and us in rejecting the standard account of Socratic intellectualism, in favor of various views that recognize explanatory roles for the appetites and passions. Among these, Jessica Moss and Rachel Singpurwalla have now made several significant contributions, whose details we will occasionally contrast herein to our own non-standard account. We owe much to all of those whose views we criticize, for their scholarly contributions have not only provided instruction, but have also given us, the authors, reason to debate between ourselves and, in the end, to settle on our own positions.

We also acknowledge with profound gratitude the assistance we have received from friends who were kind enough to read and criticize earlier drafts of parts or all of this book. Such benefactors include (in alphabetical order): Hugh Benson, Thomas H. Chance, Antonio Chu, Angelo Corlett, Daniel Devereux, Zina Giannopoulou, Rusty Jones, Rachana Kamtekar, Mark McPherran, Jessica Moss, Terry Penner, Sarah Raskoff, Naomi Reshotko, George Rudebusch, Daniel Russell, Rachel Singpurwalla, Elliot Welch, and David Wolfsdorf. Finally, we are deeply indebted to the

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-19843-1 - Socratic Moral Psychology
Thomas C. Brickhouse and Nicholas D. Smith
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Acknowledgments

vii

anonymous readers of the book while it was still in manuscript form. Their many thoughtful and penetrating criticisms forced us to correct many errors and clarify numerous potential sources of misunderstanding. Even when we were not persuaded by their searching criticisms, we were forced to rethink our views and deepen our understanding of what we think is correct.