Grade Received= A-

Student's Name
English 110
Randall Cream
15 October 2006

Annotated Bibliography

In Plato's works, he utilizes a form of dialogue that aids the reader in formulating a source of knowledge from the text. These texts engage the reader in a form of dialectical thought process with the text that forces the reader into delving further into the text to gather meaning it. David Fortunoff proposes in his essay "The Nature of the Dialogue" that this form of writing includes a sort of what he terms 'dynamism' that prevents the text from stopping any progression of meaning. This allows the text to gain meaning as it develops through time with the addition of 'external evidence' found in both intra-textual evidence and inter-textual evidence. As the reader continues through a given Platonic text he gleans information that affects his present, future, and past understanding of the given text. Each addition to the text introduces a new understanding of the work as a whole, and the piece as an individual related to other portions of text. One such example is the theory of recollection introduced by Socrates. The theory of recollection illustrates the fluidity of Platonic work by showing how it relieves an apparent end of progression in the *Meno* and adds a new interpretation into analyzing Platonic texts as a whole.

----------Citation here deleted----------

Likening literature to games, <<Name of Author>> proposes that conflict and progress within texts act along the rules of common games. <<Name of Author>> paints Socrates as a strong opponent who wins by the immensity of his repetition in many separate dialogues. The dialectical form that is present in the *Meno* allows the reader to analyze the dialogue just as one would analyze a game of chess. The prior and present moves affect future moves just as the present state of a chess board reflects the moves that have already come. The actions currently represented in the story affect what is to come, the out come of which can be used to look back at what had happened. By using this as another tool in the repertoire for looking at Platonic texts as a whole, the reader is able to use Meno's paradox as a sort of defensive strategy. By adjusting his strategy around the defensive maneuver, Socrates allows himself to continue moving around the "board" keeping himself, more or less, in a constant stalemate with Meno.

----------Citation here deleted----------

In a response to <<Name of Author>> article, <<Name of Author>> posits that theory of recollection although helpful in understanding the acquisition of knowledge does not fully answer the question. There are gaps and holes in the explanation of the theory that it simply offers a gamble that if prompted one may gain insight into what he needs. This weaves itself into the dynamistic qualities of Platonic works by allowing an interpretation that the far past still has the ability to affect the present and future. Also in the interest of

gaining ‘insight’ one is able to apply this recollected insight inside and outside the work to look at both new and old perspectives.

----------Citation here deleted----------

<<Name of Author>> addresses the main question of the *Meno*: does virtue come from nature or is it taught? He posits that there are two perspectives to look at the question: Socratic inquiry, a form of drawing knowledge from oneself, and sophistical teaching, a way of extracting information using the theory of recollection. Once introduced to the theory of recollection the reader is able to delve into the depths of text. Both methods of analyzing learned that are presented by <<Name of Author>> essentially occupy the same space in the text, but it takes the theory of recollection to draw out their importance. The slave boy shows how similar Socratic and sophistical interpretations affect the same passage. This illustrates that meaning is innate in the text; however it is the responsibility of the reader to seek out these hidden meanings.

----------Citation here deleted----------

In <<Name of Author>> article she maintains that Socrates introduces the theory of recollection to convince Meno that there is hope in the search, which in turn should give him confidence in his “ability to inquire successfully into the nature of virtue” (291). This theory proposes that in the presence of conscious false beliefs man is able to search inward and bring out “unconscious true beliefs […] within our soul” (291). The

importance of the theory of recollection is evident as a way of overcoming hopelessness through sufficient ‘inquiry’. If questioning goes on for long enough it has the potential to set off certain unconscious memories lost in the soul and bring them into the consciousness of the questioned person. By doing this the theory of recollection goes insofar as solving the seeming paradox presented by Meno by giving a reason to search as a way to prompt recollecting. The theory also influences Socrates’ interaction with Meno’s slave boy by showing the reliability of inquiring as a way of inducing recollection.

----------Citation here deleted----------

This perspective on the Meno paradox relies on abduction especially as instinct, interference, and interaction. Guessing often turns out successful, perhaps due to a weak form of recollection or unconscious correct beliefs. Using clues or ideas that are familiar to the reader a person is able to analyze a text much as a person analyzes the learning paradox. These clues help to create new possibilities through the influence of new techniques. Abduction has a connection with the concept of dynamism through the mimicry of showing what a reader must do to become dialectically linked to the text to really understand it.

----------Citation here deleted----------

<<Name of Author>> posits the point that Meno's paradox presents a very large obstacle in the continual progression of the *Meno*. He comes to the conclusion that despite a couple viable answers all fail to really answer the question so that in the end the question is bypassed instead of answered. Fortunoff's idea that the work never stops moving is challenged here, but it is supported by simply bypassing the block. <<Name of Author>> idea that Meno's paradox has multiple ways of overcoming it allows the reader to decide which to believe. He also adds that the theory of recollection asks the reader to choose for himself and to analyze deeper, both the text and his own life.

----------Citation here deleted----------

The paper explores abduction as put forth by Charles Sanders Pierce as well as the paradox of learning found in Plato's *Meno*. Abduction is a way of logical thinking that seems to help develop truths for both the natural world and principles. In this capacity, the study of abduction becomes an additional way to analyze the *Meno*. <<Name of Author>> posits that prior knowledge always affects subsequent knowledge, even if the two seem completely incompatible. The two reconcile with each other to overcome any apparent obstacles. Using Socratic inquiry it is possible to find what is needed after trying many different solutions. If the theory of recollection is applied, as it was by Socrates in the *Meno,* one should be able to recollect something to reconcile old and new knowledge. In this function, the introduction of the theory of recollection directly reconciles the learning paradox conceived by Meno.

----------Citation here deleted----------

The teachability of virtue in many different philosophical works including some of Plato's works is the focus of this article. The variability on this single issue of virtue allows readers with many different perspectives on the issue infuse all encounters with virtue with prior know how. Plato himself completely denies the teachability in *Meno* through the use of the theory of recollection, however in the *Republic* he seems to allow for virtue to be taught in ideal conditions. After coming into contact with the theory of recollection from the *Meno* and other philosophical works, a person can combine these viewpoints to view the world from many new vantage points, which can then again be reapplied to the world. The reader when faced with a decision of belief must enter into a dialectical relationship with the text to further figure out which path he should take, however this does not pigeonhole someone from taking the other path at a later date after they have gained some understanding of the former path.