

TOWARDS OTHER HISTORIOGRAPHIES, ANTHROPOLOGIES AND HISTORIES OF PHILOSOPHY

POR OUTRAS HISTORIOGRAFIAS, ANTROPOLOGIAS E HISTÓRIAS DA FILOSOFIA
POR OTRAS HISTORIOGRAFÍAS, ANTROPOLOGÍAS E HISTORIAS DE LA FILOSOFÍA

Marcelo Barboza Duarte

Master in Education, Management and Diffusion in Biosciences from the Institute of Medical Biochemistry at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ); Specialized in Philosophy from the Lato-Sensu Postgraduate Department at Gama Filho University (UGF); Specialized in Religious Sciences from the Postgraduate Department of Faculdade Unida; Graduated in Pedagogy with qualification to teach Pedagogical Disciplines in Elementary and Secondary Education, Guidance, Supervision and Educational Administration from the Faculty of Education of the Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF); Bachelor of Theology from Faculdade Unida de Vitória - ES; Graduated in Philosophy from the University of Taubaté (UNITAU); Graduated in History from Estácio de Sá University (UNESA); Graduated in Sociology from Universidade Estácio de Sá (UNESA) and Bachelor in Philosophy from the Institute of Human Sciences and Philosophy at Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF).

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Received: 04/01/2024

Accepted: 09/01/2024

Published: 11/30/2024

ABSTRACT:

Much is still investigated, studied, speculated and discussed about the innumerable reasons for Socrates' condemnation and death. The three 'great crimes' that led to his conviction and death are presented and detailed by numerous authors after his death. However, the closest and supposedly reliable sources, more specifically, are the works Apology of Plato and the Memorabilia of Xenophon, both disciples of the philosopher, the fly of Athens. The present work focuses on the exhibitions of the referred works of the two disciples and tries to make the effort to verify the question and religious, judicial, criminal and political relation that led the master and philosopher to death. In this way, we realize that politics, justice and religion conducted the whole process

against Socrates, as well as his execution or death. Religion and politics are introduced from the beginning to the end of his conviction. Perhaps political instruments and the maintenance of power, domination and manipulation of the masses. However, we can also observe that through the records and reflections about him, records provided by Xenophon and Plato, it is possible to realize that the process and condemnation against Socrates could turn against his accusers, since, by persecuting and attacking the Athenian fly introduced into the city by the gods, and with a specific mission,' such persecutors and accusers would be going against the gods themselves. In other words, Xenophon and Plato provide us with elements to assume that by accusing Socrates of the three crimes, it is actually the accusers themselves who would be committing them from the beginning of the process to the end of it. With this, we can say that there is a partial justice, as well as the judicialization of politics, religion and philosophy, and also the manifestation of a religious fundamentalism, intolerant and prejudiced, which attacks those who think outside dogmatism and "the walls of the city." Through and by means of the literature review we can observe Socrates, a victim of religious fundamentalism, intolerance and the judicialization of politics, religion and philosophy: the condemnation of the art of critical thinking. Investigations, approaches, perspectives and contributions by and to Historiography, Anthropology, Philosophy, Sociology and Psychoanalysis: Philosophy, Historiography, their productions and writings under new perspectives, analyzes and or exegetical exercises.

KEYWORDS: Culture; Religion; Politics; Society; Education; Crime; Judicialization.

Introduction

Before we delve into the development of the theme and subject, we need to make some facts, details and important points clear in advance. Firstly, we would like to make it clear that our work is a kind of 'Socratic Apology for the Platonic Apology' being based and/or based on the works **Apology** of Plato and the **Memoirs** of Xenofonte. In other words, an Apology of Apology to Socrates, the subject, citizen, philosopher, master, educator and pedagogue persecuted, accused, condemned and killed for various reasons which we will expose, detail and clarify here.¹

In this way, the research sought in literature to only focus on the figure, character, actor, individual, subject and philosopher Socrates. Thus, making the effort to try to separate Socrates, his life, thoughts, attitudes, philosophy and philosophical performance from the figure of Plato and his 'shadow,' 'shadow' who still try to obfuscate or erase the identity, personality and reality of Socrates' existence. Let's clarify this supposed platonic 'shadow'. Not that Plato tried to do this to his master, to obfuscate him or erase him, in any way, but unfortunately, in a good part of the doubts and philosophical criticisms centuries after the fact of the existence or not of a Socrates came from the way of writing, thinking and philosophizing by Plato. This indirectly created doubts for some regarding the real existence of a Socrates.

However, it is precisely through and through Plato, Xenofonte, Aristophanes (even with his harsh and heavy criticisms and attacks on Socrates) and even Aristotle that we know a little more about Socrates, since he wrote nothing and did not leave any writings behind. He maintained his philosophy only through orality and demonstrative practice in everyday life. Therefore, it is these and other witnesses who tell us about the identity, person, figure, position, temperament, posture, profession, education, history and family of the great Athenian Muscogee, Socrates, especially his disciple, Plato - who, by producing his own philosophy, ended up placing Socrates as a kind of mediator of his ideas and thoughts, of his philosophical and other systems, all through Socrates' dialogues with passers-by in the streets or in the Athenian Agora.

Once the doubts regarding the existence of Socrates were overcome, through various sources such as Plato, as well as the specificities as subjects, philosophers and philosophizing, in which the differences in relation to Plato and other contemporaries of

¹ The work or play **The Clouds** by Aristophanes (5th century BC), contemporary to Socrates, will be one of the references to the attacks that Socrates suffered. From its physical, intellectual, cognitive, behavioral, family, economic aspects, among others. In other words, all the heavy and harsh attacks that Socrates suffers through this work are in line with those suffered and mentioned by Xenophon and Plato. And that moved us here.

these are noticeable. However, that would not be our objective here, as such an undertaking would require new and arduous work to be developed. Therefore, Socrates is a controversial and complex figure, that is a fact. But let us be careful not to confuse him with Plato, even though it is a difficult and complicated task.

The second fact and point to clarify concerns the Sophists and their movement in ancient Greece. We understand the great importance and contribution of the sophist movement both to philosophy and its ramifications, to language, logic, linguistics, discourse analysis, to human history, science in general, societies and to the world. However, the work at hand will not focus on this movement and its contributions directly in such areas, as the objective here is to delve into the Socratic subject and figure, their accusations, crimes, conviction and death.

With this, we will not dwell on the sophist movement, its representatives and contributions, but only briefly on some representative or other of the movement or other people who were involved and linked with the 'Socratic question', such as Meletus, Ânitus and Lincon, accusers and prosecutors, among others who were part of the jury made up of more than five hundred people. But as Socrates was a popular figure, fought in the war and had certain physical characteristics and specificities, in his philosophy and his philosophizing, the Athenian gadfly certainly did not go unnoticed. Therefore, the work in question is not or is alien to the facts described, ignorant about them or alienated from them. But in order to develop work with a focus on extracting important and relevant reflections and content on the research issue at hand, I mean its theme in question, we need to make certain choices, give up certain content in favor of others, this for development, quality, objectivity and specificity of the object analyzed and researched, therefore, only Socrates, his art of philosophizing, his supposed crimes, his trial, conviction and death will be the objects of analysis and developments of the work (Platão, 2008; Xenofonte, 2014). In other words, we won't dwell on the importance of the movement and contributions of sophistic philosophy, since Socrates, Plato and Aristotle didn't expunge it from the process and movement of philosophizing. These philosophers understood the contributions of sophistry to logic, language, epistemology, etc. In this way, the clashes between Socrates, Plato and Aristotle were not against Sophistic philosophy, but rather how it was used by the Sophists, including it as a means of profit, corruption, personal gain, just winning public debates, using education as a commodity and business, making education a mere elitist business, as well as disfiguring the virtuous formation of the Greek citizen. As a result, some sophists became personal enemies of

Socrates. In short, the philosophical debate became a personal conflict and persecution against Socrates.

Therefore, we prepare the reader to relate to these guidelines and paradigms that will guide the exposition of the work, especially the delimitation and specification of what is being worked on with contributions to philosophy, historiography, sociology, language, anthropology, politics, ethics, law, discourse analysis, religious sciences and others. Containing relationships, comparisons, approximations and reflections of the past and the present. It is worth mentioning that the work on screen is full of analogies, metaphors and allegories as representations of current social, political, cultural, economic and religious developments.

Our object of study and the facts that circulate around it are specifically in the 5th-4th centuries BC. Both it and the narratives about it come from Plato and Xenofonte, both contemporaries of Socrates. Therefore, from this point onwards, we find no need to reproduce these dates of the object and the narratives about it.

And so, we will continue with these fixed centuries in mind and with this we will follow the events that will involve and develop the core of the research, its object, relationships and narratives about them. In other words, we will make a journey to the 5th-4th centuries BC. Accompanied by other journeys to other centuries and narratives, historiographies etc. An apology to Socrates and other historiographical narratives.

Below we will present some perceptions and reflections on and in the work **Memorables** by Xenofonte and **Apology** by Plato. Some to be exposed are statements made by the aforementioned disciples and writers in relation to the person and figure of Socrates. Others are our perceptions and reflections on what Xenofonte and Plato provide us about the esteemed philosopher. Perhaps gods and religions are also subterfuges for many intolerants, prejudiced, opportunistic and fanatics to use to pursue what is different, strange or new to them, a type or mode of ethnocentrism. Or perhaps also to achieve some goal or several.

Therefore, here we can now state that in Freudian psychoanalysis it is expressed that neuroses and obsessions can be products of and of fear (fears) as well as being producers of it, this includes the very action and/or behaviors of intolerance, disrespect, persecution to the other and the lack of empathy for someone or something. Therefore, fear and/or fears generate neuroses, paranoia, hysteria, obsessions, prejudices, stereotypes and others, and at the same time fear or fears can be generated by such dysfunctions, disorders or mental and/or biochemical disorders, this is because different

motifs, modes and forms. (Duarte, 2022 A-B; Freud, 2011, 2013 ab, 2014, 2015, 2017; Delumeau, 2009). The texts discussed and the reflections of Xenofonte and Plato do not mention this directly, but indirectly they can suggest some relevant reflections on and in such perspectives.

However, as it is a complex method and with its demands and rigor, here in the work in question there would be no place for a practice of in-depth anamnesis and psychoanalysis as a kind of psychotherapy of the subjects involved in the 'issue of Socrates' condemnation and death,' as well as that society in such a context. It would not be impossible, but at this moment it is unfeasible, perhaps in future works.

Xenofonte and Plato relating Socrates, the critical philosopher, with the Gods

From the outset, it is worth saying that in our perceptions and reflections when comparing Xenofonte's **Memoirs** with Plato's **Apology**, there are two important traits that appear in the works of the aforementioned authors, Xenofonte and Plato. And they are, while in Plato's **Apology** we observe a discourse with more philosophical contents and a more philosophical Socrates, I mean in the philosophical exercise or practice, pedagogy and/or philosophy as an art, in Xenofonte's **Memoirs** we notice a more civic Socrates, "an exemplary citizen", given to combats in different ways, scopes and aspects, fundamentally those of social relations in search of justice and social-collective development, a historical being. In other words, in Xenofonte we see Socrates as a model citizen. The man-citizen who seeks to follow the rules of the city, but without forgetting to think for himself and criticize it and its configurations. Let's see what Xenofonte gives us about Socrates:

Therefore, I wonder how the Athenians at that time could allow themselves to be persuaded that Socrates did not have a sensible position with regard to the gods, if he never said or did anything impious in this field and everything whatever he said or did, in relation to the gods, was what any man who believed in them with the utmost reverence would say or do.

And it seems even stranger to me that some people allowed themselves to be persuaded that Socrates corrupted the young. He! who, in addition to everything I have already mentioned, was the man who had the most control over his own desires, both sexual and stomach; that he was also the one who best resisted cold, heat or any other ordeal, and, furthermore, that he had disciplined himself in such a way as to only need what was reasonable, so that having very little was easily enough for him.

Now, how could it be possible for him, if he himself behaved like this, to make others impious, disrespectful of the law, disorderly, licentious or lazy? On the contrary, he even cured these vices in many people, making them desire virtue and share the hope of, by worrying about themselves, achieving perfection. It is true that, under no circumstances, did he admit that he transmitted such teachings; but his behavior led those who lived with him to trust that, by imitating him, they could become like him. Furthermore, he also lacked care with his body and did not praise the carefree. So, he also criticized those who, after having overindulged in food, went overboard with physical exercise; although he even approved the practice of exercise, as long as it was in a balanced way and to the point where it was pleasant for the soul, since it was a very healthy practice and did not harm the care taken for the soul. And he wasn't weird at all, nor was he an exhibitionist, neither in what he wore, nor in what he wore, nor in his behavior. Furthermore, he did not encourage the ambition of those who accompanied him, because he not only put a brake on other desires but also did not demand dividends from those who sought his company. He believed that, with this attitude, he gained his freedom (Xenofonte, 2014, pp. 66-68).

But that! replied Socrates, it is only a small part of the knowledge necessary for a general; because a general must be able to make all kinds of preparations for war; take care of soldiers' supplies; be resourceful, active, careful, strong and perceptive, kind and rude, simple and decisive, cautious and cunning, prodigal and ambitious, generous and selfish, expert in defense but also in attack, and possess many other natural and learned qualities, fundamental to who intends to be a good general (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 168).

With this, Xenofonte presents us with a very civic and fair Socrates, above all, balanced, moderate, 'with a strong personality,' good character, critical, self-disciplined, strategist, articulate and deeply sensitive to the problems of the city and its people. A true virtuous man. Plato also points to details like this, in a questioning, critical, reflective, instigating Socrates who is not content with a dogmatized, stagnant, static and setback society.

His concern about corruption within Athenian democracy and the seizure of power by tyrants is a good example of Socrates' concern and struggle. Plato tells us about Socrates' perspectives on a possible life dedicated solely and exclusively to politics, which he didn't want, since Socrates imagined that he would have been assassinated if he had also been a politician. In other words, being an observer and knowledgeable about the social, political, economic, historical and religious processes that Athens was going through, he had already foreseen beforehand that he would die both as a man dedicated to politics and as a philosopher, but it was this second option that he chose and dedicated himself to, and that he ended up dedicating his life to until his conviction, sentence and death. Let's see what Plato tells us:

I, Athenians, have never held any other position in the city - I've only been a councilor. And it just so happened that our tribe, the Antiochids, was in the presidency when you decided to try en bloc the ten generals who didn't make the rescue in the naval battle, illegally, as it seemed to all of you sometime later. I was the only one among the presidents who opposed you doing something illegal and voted against it. And although the speakers were already prepared to indict and imprison me - and you encouraged and shouted - I thought that my duty was rather to risk siding with the law and the just than to side with you (who were not deciding just things) for fear of imprisonment or death. That was still the case when the city was governed democratically. But after the oligarchy came, it was the turn of the Thirty to immediately send for me, and four others, to the Rotunda, ordering that we bring Salamis Leon from Salamis, so that he could die. And things like this they often determined for many others, in the desire to blame as many people as possible. I, however, not by words but by actions, also this time showed that I worry about death (if it weren't something a bit rude to say...) not at all, while about not doing anything unjust or wicked, that's what I worry about completely. Because that government, however violent it was, didn't stun me enough to make me do anything unjust: after we left the Rotunda, the other four left in the direction of Salamis and brought Leon, while I, moving away, left in the direction of home... And perhaps he would have died because of it, if the government had not been quickly dissolved. You will also have many witnesses to these facts. Do you think then that I would have lived for so many years if I had carried out public activities and, carrying them out as befits a good man, had come to the aid of the righteous side and held this - as one should have - in the highest regard? It would be a long way off, Athenians! No other man would have! It will be clear, however, that I, throughout my entire life, in public (if I accomplished anything) was like this, and in private in the same way: never agreeing with anyone about anything that was against what was fair, not even with none of those that my slanderers say were my students. I've never been anyone's teacher! But if someone wants to hear me speak and accomplish what concerns me - whether younger or older - I have never denied that to anyone. Nor do I just dialogue when I get money, and when I don't, no: I do make myself available, equally, to both the rich and the poor, so that they can question me and - if they want - listen to what I say through answers (Platão, 2008, pp. 92-94).

(...) So know this, Athenians: if I had long ago intended to do politics, I would have been dead long ago, and it would not have benefited you or myself in any way. But don't get mad at me because I tell the truth! It's just that there is no one who will be saved, among men, after genuinely opposing you or any other majority, preventing many unfair and illegal things from happening in the city (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 92).

Thus, in both the **Memorables** and the **Apology** we can verify the presentation, representation, speeches, speeches and behaviors as elements and characteristics of a man subject, sensitive to his society and culture, aware of his actions in the social fabric, responsible for his actions and active in the construction of a better society, that is, it

encouraged it to seek *areté* = Greek *virtue* and the culmination in and with *eudaimonia* as a Greek *praxis*. So, Plato tells us,

That I happen to be this type of man – who was given to the city by God – you could understand from this: it's just that it doesn't seem like anything human that I've been careless about everything that's *mine* (and for so many years I've endured the family being neglected) to always accomplish what concerns *you*, addressing each one in particular as a father or an older brother, trying to persuade them to care about virtue (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 91).

(...) And if I say, on the other hand, that this also happens to be the greatest good for man – making speeches every day about virtue and the other things you hear me talking about, inspecting myself and to others –, and that life without inspection is not worth living for man, that is when you, while I speak, will listen to me even less... (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 102).

However, it is clearly observable in the Socratic statements and speeches presented by Plato, that Socrates did not fail to criticize the progress of politics, the education-training of the Greek citizen and his individualistic objectivity that was developing with the new political and educational proposals through and through the processes that seemed to contain and/or give a certain break in the unity of Greek man with the city and with the community as a whole, especially a certain break in the encompassing behavior of the virtuous, citizen seeking the *Eudaimonia* of the social whole holistically. Xenofonte corroborates, "it is nothing surprising that the judges were mistaken in their judgment," (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 66), and further states:

(...) he always lived in the open; he went to the public sidewalks and gyms first thing in the morning; he let himself be seen in the agora when it was full of people, and the rest of the day he spent in places where he could meet more people. he talked most of the time and anyone who wanted could hear him. but no one ever saw Socrates do or heard him say anything ungodly or sacrilegious (...) (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 62).

(...) as for him, he always discussed human aspects, examining what is pious and what is impious, what is beautiful and what is ugly, what is just and what is unjust, what is wisdom and what is madness, what is courage and what is cowardice, what the city is and what it is to take part in the running of the city, what government is and what it is to be a ruler, and other subjects of this kind which - he thought - made those who knew them good men and justified calling those who didn't know them slaves (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 65).

Now, with critias and alcibiades it was like this: while they accompanied socrates they were both able to find in him an ally to overcome fewer personal desires. (...) (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 74).

Socrates' devoted life to the city's gods is visibly notorious and clear, to the point of considering himself a gift from the gods to the city, "That I happen to be that kind of man – who was given to the city by the god (Platão, 2008, p. 91)," even though there were sarcasms, ironies and provocations on Socrates' part, the fact is that he really dedicated himself to a supposed divine inspiration and voice, as well as his *Daimon*, 'and not a religious life in the manner of the his accusers,' as is being noticed and will be noticeable until the end of the work on screen. And this is what Socrates tells us: "(...) with *the god* positioning me, as I thought and supposed - that I must live philosophizing and inspecting myself and others (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 87)," and "(...) know – that the god commands me, and I myself think that no greater good has yet arisen for you in the city than my service to the god! (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 89)," and concludes:

Therefore, then, even now circulating, I investigate and interrogate according to the god - whether I think that someone, whether among the citizens or among foreigners, is wise. And whenever it seems to me that this is not the case, by helping the god, I show him that he is not wise. With this lack of time, I didn't have time to carry out any city activity worth mentioning, nor a family one, and I am, because of my servitude to the god, in extreme poverty... (Platão, 2008, p. 76).

"Men of Athens, I salute and love you, but I will obey the god rather than you, and as long as I breathe and have the means, I fear I will not stop philosophizing and warn and show you (to any of you that I ever meet), speaking the way I'm used to (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 89)."

Regarding the question of the gods and Socrates' devotion, Xenofonte (2014, p. 60) contributes: "Not Socrates; he only said what he actually knew, he said that the divinity was giving him signs. And he advised many of those who accompanied him on what they should do or not do, because this divinity indicated this to them." And concludes,

It seemed to Socrates that placing questions of this nature for the consideration of the gods was acting sacrilegiously. He said, rather, that it was necessary to learn the things that the gods had determined should be learned, and to seek, through divination, to ask the gods about matters that are not clear to men. Then, the gods would give their sign to those who were in their grace (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 62).

Well, we can say that in the Platonic **Apology** in relation to Xenofonte's **Memoirs** (or vice versa) such components and characteristics of the Greek citizen do not only

appear in detail in and of the Socratic figure and his attitudes and/or characteristics, but in comparing the two disciples of Socrates and his apologetic narratives (not in the pejorative or negative sense), it is observable such ways of presenting, exposing, representing, describing and specifying the qualities of the Greek gadfly, the 'great Socrates' distinctly in certain aspects, as each author highlights what marked him in the philosopher's life and in his words and speeches. In this case, that of master Sócrates.

It is also important to say that both Socratic disciples in their mentioned and specific works, and their apologies, each of the two authors works with their own training and personal experiences to talk about the master, as well as their social relationships with Socrates and the other disciples, therefore, its conceptual tools, subjective and objective, are both public and private. The entire narrative about the master philosopher is very peculiar to each author, both those of Plato and those of Xenofonte.

I have often wondered, perplexed, with what arguments those who accused Socrates convinced the Athenians that his death was a good thing for the city. The accusation they brought against him said something like:

Socrates is guilty of not recognizing the gods that the city recognizes and of having introduced new deities in turn; and he is also guilty of corrupting the younger ones.

As for the first accusation - that he didn't recognize the gods that the city recognized - what evidence did they use? Because it was always in the open that Socrates made sacrifices, over and over again, both at home and on the city's public altars, and when he resorted to divination, he didn't do it in secret either. Moreover, it was common knowledge that Socrates claimed to be inspired by a deity. It seems to me that precisely for this reason he was accused of having introduced new divinities. But, again, he didn't introduce anything different from what others do who, believers in divination, resort to auspices, oracles, divine warnings and sacrifices (Xenofonte, 2014, pp. 59-60).

Therefore, having presented this important relationship between the two apologies and the aspects and angles of the two aforementioned disciples, as well as their places of speech, subjectivities, objectivities and vision of the master, we can delve into the Socrates of Xenofonte and Plato, a victim of religious fundamentalism, of intolerance and the judicialization of politics, religion and philosophy: the condemnation of the art of critical thinking. Socrates is not an irreligious or anti-religious subject, on the contrary, his religiosity, perhaps spirituality, is intrinsically linked to the search for collective virtue and a good life for the collective of and in the *polis*, therefore, his spirituality is loaded with a certain ethics, moral and holistic way aiming for the good of all.

It is worth highlighting that the work will carry out two 'large' movements without incurring anachronisms, but only as modes of reflection, analysis and comparisons of cultural elements and/or products of culture, as well as its forces, such as economy, politics, religion, beliefs, values, myths, mentalities, behaviors, social imaginary, ideals, codes, laws, utopias and dystopias.

And what about the diseases, epidemics, pandemics and viruses that have ravaged and are still ravaging the world from ancient times to the present? Now, it is undeniable that viruses, pests and diseases also move history, societies and their cultures. These are marks or traits of eras and specific to certain societies and cultures. When they do not become global (Ujvari, 2020).

Therefore, our major movement will be focused through mirrorings and/or reflections between past and present, ancient Greeks and contemporary societies. This is because historical processes are driven by the forces of cultural and/or cultural elements (including viruses, pandemics, plagues, etc.), as well as being driven by diverse socio-historical movements and processes. Both complement each other, culture and history, history and culture, and we will only realize such facts if we introduce broader and more holistic views on the histories and cultures of humanity over the millennia. In other words, perhaps by looking at small details of ancient Greek culture and history we can see ourselves better today (Sahlins, 2007).

This is the first major movement of the work, while the second brings a complex, but not irrelevant or unnecessary, critique of the historical and cultural production of the West, marked by its colonialisms, ethnocentrism, Eurocentrism, 'Europeanisms' and dogmatic, apologetic and conservation of the schools of that continent and the *status quo* of certain *canons* of Western-European hegemonic production. Therefore, the work will not seek to detail or detail facts and elements of laws, rules and codes of conduct (Arnaoutoglou, 2003 has an important and enlightening work on these items), as well as other cultural elements that divert us from the general which we will try to specify to delimit and realize the two wingspans. Yesterday and today, histories and cultures in question.

Contextualizing time, space, social, political, religious, historical and Socratic phenomena and their philosophy

Many works, research and speculations are raised about the life, philosophy and death of Socrates. Therefore, countless contributions build both a mosaic about the life

of this intriguing and thought-provoking philosopher and an enormous theoretical framework around him. Perhaps what we reflect on Socrates could be a common fact or event, isolated and without 'mirroring' in other times, situations, moments and historical processes, and thus without echoing in other times, cultures and peoples. Or perhaps its resonance is not so strong, evident and meets other 'similar waves.'

But the reality is that all of this can occur, from echoes, mirroring to similar resonances in and of social, cultural, political and historical processes. Perhaps new perspectives and reflections on this fact in the history of philosophy will awaken us to other histories of philosophy, other anthropologies and historiographies.

Now, it is indisputable that generally and in almost all times that science has access, periods and contexts, it is observable that the human being is a symbolic being, with senses, signs, meanings, languages, historical, social and in some way given practices or thoughts linked to and of beliefs, spiritualities, faith, myths and religiosities. Whether in ancient times and contexts or today. And when we stop to study and/or research ancient peoples such as Sumerians, Mesopotamians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, Romans and many others, we will always come across these people involved with their ways of spirituality, mysticism, beliefs, gods, religions, rites etc. As well as in and with their anthropophagisms and resignifications of those mentioned. Just as we also have them in our contemporary times and in our own ways, however, there are always some traits that are similar and others that are very peculiar in relation to past and current practices and vice versa, both in our century and in previous ones, there are always some characters and specificities that link us to the people of the past and them to us in such manifestations and human phenomena. In this way, belief, myths, faith and spirituality as human traits and characters are almost universal. In other words, as far as we know about it, this phenomenon is intrinsic and inherent to the human presence and its social relations. In other words, beliefs, myths, spirituality and religion are human traces and phenomena (Lévêque, 2018; Durkheim, 2014; Frazer, 1984).²

It is worth saying that the term "religion" does not and did not apply to the ancient world as we know it today. Both the term and religion (or religions), originating from the Latin term *religare*, to reconnect, replace, return, bring man back to God (the Christian

² This subject of the paragraph in question, as well as the two subsequent paragraphs, can be seen in works such as: Botero, 2013; Durkheim, 2014; Gaarder, J.; Hellern, V.; Notaker H, 2016; Frazer, 1984; Armstrong, 2015; Funari, 2016; Vernant, 2017; Hume, 2007; Waiblinger, 2016; Eliade, 2017; Aslan, 2019, Duarte, 2022a, 2022b; Vico, 2008; Sin-Léqi-Unnínni, 2017. There are other important works in the areas of Anthropology, Sociology, Religious Sciences and others on the subjects of the mentioned paragraphs.

God). We cannot incur anachronisms by applying the term "religion" today to the past, as we would be out of context. What we could say is that ancient people had their beliefs, gods, myths and rites of and for their spirituality and/or spiritual and 'religious' performance, even the gods or entities being materialized in, by and through objects, people, things, animals, plants, natural phenomena or nature in general. The fact is that what we call 'religion' in antiquity were traits, rites, elements and actions of some form of worship and worship of some form, types and modes of veneration and belief, both in a type or mode of God and of various Gods, 'visible' and/or invisible, animate and/or inanimate, anthropomorphic, anthropopathic or without any resemblance to humans, animals, etc. Therefore, it was not such beliefs or veneration in the 'Religion' mode that we conceived in modernity, and that we observe in current religions in a systematized, orthodox, systematizing and institutionalized way as in modernity today. Even if there or here they carry certain appearances, similarities and characteristics with each other, however, many signs, symbols, senses, meanings and objectifications are not exactly the same, as each individual as well as society vary and relativize their spiritualities, beliefs, mythological and/or religious values and content, fundamentally influenced by the time and the social, political, economic and historical context (Freud, 2011, 2013a-b, 2014, 2015, 2017).

Therefore, ancient men and/or societies who believed in something or something, 'religious,' and with their rites for and in something general or specific, embraced their beliefs and cultures also through and in anthropophagic processes, including and integrating with beliefs of neighboring and distant peoples, assimilating and/or introducing cults, gods, rites and beliefs from other peoples and cultures (a clear example is the Greeks, Romans and Jews giving new meaning to Sumerian, Mesopotamian and Egyptian rites, gods and beliefs, whether in Greek culture or in Judaism, just as the Greeks were 'devoured' by the Romans, as well as Christianity bringing in its essence elements from various religions, cultures, etc.).

Perhaps we can call it cultural exchanges or simply religious-cultural anthropophagism. And since we are talking about the Greeks, how can we not remember that they also absorbed a lot of elements from Mesopotamian, Egyptian, Eastern and other cultures, and thus formed their religious way with their myths, rites, gods and pantheon.

It is also important to say and emphasize that historically there have also been many conflicts, wars, struggles and social, political and economic clashes in human

history for reasons of a religious nature, from antiquity to modernity. In other words, such religious conflicts come from Sumer, Mesopotamia, Persia, Egypt, Greece, Rome, Jews, Babylonians, etc., as well as through and in the Crusades, the Protestant Reformations, the Counter-Reformations, the night of Saint Bartholomew, the courts of inquisitions, the Society of Jesus, Muslim Jihad, current 'Christian' wars and so on. In other words, in all these facts there was the presence of conflicts, militancy and struggles with religious elements, however, at certain times in the background were political, economic, ideological and cultural issues, while at other times the religious issue was the backdrop background of many conflicts, wars and clashes.

Returning to the Greek period to situate ourselves in the work at hand, this concerns ancient Greece, and specifically Athens in the 'Classical' era of Socrates, Plato, Xenofonte and other contemporaries of Socrates mentioned here, and who lived with the Athenian gadfly, their teachings and philosophy, we could say that this independent city-state called Athens and which made up a mosaic that formed ancient Greece, was a city that was already 'quite open' to other cultures, thoughts, rites and religiosities. I say quite open in relation to other more closed and conservative Greek cities, as in the case of Sparta. Athens being more tolerant and Sparta more intolerant, in some political, governmental, educational and other aspects. Not surprisingly, Athens was one of the centers of the ancient world in and around the region. This 'by his power,' his strength and impositions in different ways.

In this way, Athens received and sent people to and from different places. And along came and went cultural and also religious elements (sophists, philosophers, foreigners, slaves and merchants, so to speak). But it is clear that there were in the city of Athens, as in any other Greek city of the time, individuals, leaders, groups and factions that were more conservative and radical, or at least tended towards that, towards fundamentalism and violent conservatism. And in this way they overvalued their rites, gods, beliefs and religiosities. In the Platonic **Apology** and Xenofonte's **Memoirs** we can observe these traits, but both authors place their narratives according to their perceptions. And how does this happen? Let's take a look at the traps set by the accusers to try and catch Socrates and his ways of getting rid of his persecutors and accusers:

(...) Meletus, are you saying that I corrupt the young? Yes, of course, as it says in the complaint you made: "By teaching them not to believe in the gods that the city believes in, but in different, new numinous things". Isn't it by teaching this that you're saying I'm corrupting them?

"But of course, that's exactly what I'm saying."

In the name, then, of those very gods, Meletus, of which we are now speaking, say even more clearly, for me and for these men (he points to the jury), for I personally am unable to understand if you are saying that I teach belief in the existence of some gods (and then I myself believe in the existence of gods and I am absolutely not an atheist, nor is that why I act badly) - but not exactly in those in which the city believes, but different ones, and that's why you intimate me, because they're different - or whether you're saying outright that I myself don't believe in gods and I teach that to others...

"That's what I'm saying, that you don't believe in gods at all."

(...) But then, in the name of Zeus, is that really what it seems to you, that I don't believe in the existence of any god?

"No, by Zeus, not one way or the other!"

You're unbelievable, Meleto! And just as it seems so to me, it must seem so to you...

For this man (he points to Meletus), Athenian man, seems to me to be very proud and insolent, and simply to make this accusation out of pride, insolence, foolishness. He's like someone who puts himself to the test by writing a riddle: "Will Socrates, the wise man, realize that I'm amusing myself and contradicting myself, or will I completely deceive him and the rest of the listeners?". For it seems to me that this man contradicts himself in his denunciation, as if to say: "Socrates is wrong not to believe in gods, even though he believes in gods...". (Platão, 2008, pp. 82-83).

(...) You have heard, Athenian men; I have told you the whole truth: because you like to hear those who think they are wise (but who are not...) being inspected, for it is not an unpleasant thing... This, as I have already said, the god has determined to do to me, from divinations and dreams - and by all the means by which any other divine providence has also ever determined a man to do anything (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 95).

(...) For it is not for this that the juror sits - to do justice a favor - but to judge. And he has not sworn to favor whomever he sees fit, but to enforce the laws. Therefore, neither should we accustom you to swearing in vain, nor should you, for neither of us would be being religious... So don't expect me, Athenian men, to force myself to do such things with you, which I consider neither beautiful, nor just, nor pious, especially, by Zeus, when I am defending myself against the accusation of irreligiosity made by this Melet here (points to the accuser).

Because, of course, if I persuaded them and with my appeal forced them to violate their oaths, the existence of gods I would be teaching them not to consider, and I would simply be, in defending myself, making my own accusation - that I don't believe in gods... But that's a long way off! For I believe, Athenian men, as none of my accusers believe; and now I leave it to you - and to the god - to judge me as is best for me and for you (Platão, 2008, p. 98).

And Xenophon contributes his perceptions of the distortions of Socrates' accusers against the philosopher. It's important to point out that Xenophon sees Socrates as a man of the people and concerned about the people, but let's not confuse him with popular people, populisms and/or populists in political and artistic life, and above all in modern conception and understanding, or perhaps we can situate ourselves from the period of the Roman Empire to the present day. But let's not think of this term, action and conception in a linear way, nor in the same way over time and in social, political, economic and historical space, since being a man of the people and concerned with the people changes as history changes and as a result of the influences of its processes.

But Socrates - the accuser repeated - taught his children to denigrate their parents, convincing his companions that he made them wiser than their parents, since he said that it was legal for a son to put his father in prison if he was mad. This provision proved that it was the law that the most ignorant should be condemned by the wisest.

On the contrary, what Socrates actually thought was that anyone who takes ignorance as a just cause for condemning someone to prison is then condemning himself at the hands of others who know subjects that he himself has not mastered (...).

Well, Socrates," continued the accuser, "had led those who accompanied him to dishonor not only his parents but also his other relatives, telling them that those who were close to them were of no use to the sick and the defendants, but rather the doctors or those who knew how to act in a court of law. He also added that his friends, too, were of no use unless they were qualified to be useful. The only people he recognized as having merit were those who had the necessary knowledge to act in each situation and the possibility of clarifying it.

In this way, by presenting himself to his companions, he convinced the younger ones that he was the wisest and most qualified to make others wise, and that they would never find with anyone else what they found with him (Xenofonte, 2014, pp. 84-85).

The accuser also claimed that, from the most famous poets, he had chosen the most immoral steps and, based on these examples, had taught his companions to be evil and despotic.

(...) Socrates agreed that work is beneficial and good for man, just as not working is harmful and bad, and that working is good and not working is bad; and he also said that those who work are doing something good and that those who work are good, and, on the contrary, those who abandon themselves to fate or commit any other fault or irregularity are called idlers.

This conception matched the maxim:

There's nothing bad about work, there's nothing wrong with not working.

But the accuser later claimed that he also often cited that passage from Homer, in which Ulysses.

When he met a king or a noble man, he approached him, and with soft words, he calmed him down:

«Friend, it doesn't seem wrong to you to be afraid.

So, sit down, you, and make your men sit down.»

Then, if it was his turn to find a man of the people, he loudly beat him with the scepter and reproached him, saying:

«Friend, sit still and listen to the words of those who are better than you: you who are neither a warrior nor brave, who count neither in battle nor in counsel.»

and that he interpreted it as if the poet had praised the beating of common men and the poor.

But Socrates never said such a thing!

Because if that were the case, he would well have thought himself worthy of a beating!

What he was saying was that those who are of no use, either in word or deed, to the army, the city or even the people, and who, even when they are needed, are incapable of any help, if they are also arrogant, must be stopped at all costs, even if they happen to be very rich.

Socrates, on the other hand, was a friend of the people and concerned about his fellow human beings. And although he was sought out by many, both from his own country and from abroad, he never traded his teaching for any salary; rather, he shared it liberally with all of them. Of these, some, having received a little knowledge from him for free, sold it - and well! - to the others, without being friends of the people, as he was. They even refused to talk to anyone who couldn't pay them.

Socrates gained prestige for the city among the other men, and much more than Licas, in Lacedæmonia, who became glorious for that very reason. For while Licas received as guests the foreigners who visited Lacedæmonia at the time of the youth gymnastics competitions, Socrates spent his entire life spending his possessions and being as helpful as he could to all those who came to him. And those who had been in his company had already become better when he let them go. And having, in my opinion, these qualities, it seems to me that Socrates deserved better honor from the city than death (Xenofonte, 2014, pp. 86-88).

Now, we can in this discussion between accusations, dialogues and interpretations that while Plato exposes a Socrates deeply committed to the truth, critical freedom, the just, ethics and morals, freedom of thought, education and training of the Greek citizen, philosophy, justice, good, beauty, courage, Greek *areté* (Greek virtue), holistic religiosity that encompasses virtue and Eudaimonia, and so on, a very philosophical and educational Socrates (with his genius and or *Daimon*, almost a being gifted spiritually or by the gods), Xenofonte presents him as a Socrates who is more of a citizen, leader,

soldier, faithful, dignified, honored and with aspects also linked to *areté*, but more in the social, carnal-human dimension and relationships social (Platão, 2008, 2016; Xenofonte, 2014). To these facts, Xenofonte helps us with the posture, reason, judgment and considerations of Socrates when the president of the council assembly is influenced and carries out an arbitrary and unfair judgment, which Socrates does not agree with and denies,

(...) is it not surprising, yes, that other aspects that everyone knew about were not taken into account? Like, for example, what happened on that occasion when, being part of the Council and having taken an oath as a councillor, which obliged him to act according to the law, he was appointed to the presidency of the Assembly, at the time when the people, and against what was established by law, intended, with just one vote, to condemn to death Thrasyllus and Erasinides and the other nine strategists as well. He didn't want to accept the decision and drew upon himself the hatred of the people and the threats of many of the powerful; but, for him, it was more valuable to keep his word than to please the people in a decision that went against justice or to avoid those who threatened him (...).

(...) Socrates, on the contrary, believed that the gods knew everything that is said, everything that is done, everything that is planned in silence; and that they were present everywhere and sent signs to men about everything that concerns men (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 66).

The above were presented in this way only to demonstrate the ways of thinking of a more abstract Socrates and abstracted by philosophical thought in Plato compared to a more citizen Socrates, flesh, passions, relationships, sensations in Xenofonte. In Plato the model or ideal of man is the Philosopher and philosophizing, and in Xenofonte the model or ideal is that of the citizen. However, both authors and disciples of Socrates will express such ideals and simultaneous categories in Socrates, however, each of these will highlight a Socrates according to their perspective and ideal of man-citizen, society and city.

Both authors and their works corroborate each other, bringing new thoughts, perspectives and Socratic identities. The problem that we often do not see such facts, characteristics and elements is due to the European colonization and interpretation of Greek thought, Greek philosophy and what comes later. Of what can or cannot be seen there, both in history and in 'Greek-Eastern-Western-European' culture and thought (Platão, 2008; Xenofonte, 2014; Bosi, 2012; Hobsbawm, 2017; Ferro, 2017).³

³ For an introduction to the possibility of decolonial, decolonial and anti-ethnocentric reflections, see Duarte, 2021, 2022 A-B, 2023.

Following in the footsteps of Socrates

Before we continue, it is necessary to say that Socrates did not consider himself a master and always stated that he did not teach anything, because for him being a master and teaching was the function of someone who really knew how to teach, and he always assumed the position and posture of a 'ignorant' in the sense of not knowing things absolutely and with certainty as much as being capable of knowing how to teach them, therefore, he could not have the capacity to do so, as the teaching masters were the ones who did this, something he said he was not, and therefore his only advantage in knowing, was knowing that he didn't know and that he wasn't a master to teach what he didn't know and was either sure whether he knew or not. Now, this was a classic stance of the methods and procedures of ironic and Socratic *maieutics* towards their interlocutors and those who claimed to know and truly know things.

(...) And what is this, if not that most reprehensible ignorance: that of thinking you know what you don't know? I, men, may also differ from the majority of men in this regard. And if I were to say that I am actually wiser than someone in something, it would be in this – because, just as I don't know enough about things (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 88).

Finally, I turned to the technicians. I knew within myself that I, to put it mildly, knew nothing, but as for them – I knew that I would discover them knowledgeable in many beautiful things! And in that I was not mistaken they did know what I did not know, and therefore they were wiser than me. However, Athenian men, it seems to me that these good workers also have the same defect as the poets: by performing their art beautifully, each one also thought he was the wisest in other things (in the most important ones!), and this excessiveness of theirs hid that wisdom... So, I asked myself – in the name of the oracle – if I would prefer to be as I am, neither wise in their wisdom nor ignorant in their ignorance or possessing these two things that they possess. I then answered myself and the oracle that it would be more beneficial for me to be as I am (Platão, 2008, pp. 75-76).

Furthermore, the young men who follow me – those who have more free time, among the richest, *of their own free will* – like to hear men being "inspected", and they themselves often imitate me, that is, they try to "inspect" others... As a consequence, they discover, I think, a great abundance of men who *think* they know something, but who know little or nothing. From then on, those "inspected" by them start to hate *me*, not themselves, and say that Socrates is a miasmatic and corrupts young people... And when someone asks them what he does and what he teaches, they have nothing to say – they ignore –, but so that it doesn't seem like they are in *aporia*, they say what is always at hand against everyone who philosophizes – "things suspended in the air and things under the earth, and not believing in gods, and to make inferior speech superior." Because the truth (I think) they would not like to say: that there is evidence that, knowing nothing, they only *pretend* to know (Platão, 2008, p. 77).

Let us then return from the beginning to what the accusation is, on the basis of which the slander arose, precisely to which Meletus made this accusation against me, giving credit. Well then. What were the slanderers saying when they slandered me? It is necessary to read their sworn statement, as if of actual accusers: "Socrates acts badly and does more than he should in investigating the things under the earth and the heavenly, and in making inferior speech superior, and in teaching others these things. same things." It's something like that (Platão, 2008, p. 68).

In other words, Socrates never claimed to know anything nor to be a master of teaching or master of anyone, since he was just seeking true knowledge of things, but generally never reached a clear and absolute certainty given the complexity of things, of language, the correspondence between things, objects and terms, the complexity of culture, society and social relations, in this way Socrates always let his discussions fall into aporias, objectives of his procedure and ironic and *maieutic* inquiry-discursive *method*, since the purpose of these was precisely to demonstrate that we do not know or truly know the things that we think we know or know.

(...) Well, once, going to Delphi, he dared to ask for this divination (as I was saying, *don't make a fuss*, men): he asked if anyone would be wiser than me. He then replied to Pythia that there was no one wiser. (...)

(...) After hearing those words, I reflected like this: "What is the god saying, and what is he saying in riddles? Well, I know within myself that I am not wise – neither much nor little. What is he saying then, when he claims that I am the wisest? He is certainly not lying, because for him it is not legal." And after being in aporia for a long time (what is he saying?), with great difficulty I turned to an investigation of this, in the following way: I went to one of those who seem to be wise, because, if there was a place, it was this one where I would refute the riddle and show the oracle – "this one is wiser than me, and you claimed it was me..."

When I examined this man closely (I don't absolutely need to call him by name; he was one of those involved in politics and I had this impression when I examined him) and when I talked to him, Athenian men, it seemed to me that he seemed to be wise to many other men and especially to himself, but he was not. From then on, I was hated by him and many of the people around him, and as I was leaving, I was thinking to myself: "I am indeed wiser than this man, because we both run the risk of not knowing anything beautiful or good, but while he thinks he knows something, he doesn't, I, since I don't really know, don't think I know either.... It is probable, therefore, that I am wiser than him in one small thing, precisely this: because what I don't know, I don't think I know either."

Then I went to another - one of those who seemed to be even wiser than him - and it seemed the same to me; there too I became hated not only by this man but also by many others! After that I went to a series, realizing with disturbance and fear that I had become hated - and yet it seemed imperative to take the god's saying into the highest

consideration! "I must go then - to examine what the oracle is saying - to all those who seem to know something." And, by the way, Athenian men, since you have to be told the truth, the impression I really got was this: while the better-off ones hardly seemed to me (to me who was investigating in accordance with the god) to be lacking the utmost in reflective conduct, others - who seem to be more banal men - seemed more reasonable!

Finally, I turned to the technicians. I knew within myself that I, to put it mildly, knew *nothing*, but as for them – I knew that I would discover them knowledgeable in many beautiful things! And in that I was not mistaken they did know what I did not know, and therefore they were wiser than me. However, Athenian men, it seems to me that these good workers also have the same defect as the poets: by performing their art beautifully, each one also thought he was the wisest in other things (in the most important ones!), and this excessiveness of theirs hid that wisdom... So, I asked myself – in the name of the oracle – if I would prefer to be as I am, neither wise in their wisdom nor ignorant in their ignorance or possessing these two things that they possess. I then answered to myself and to the oracle that it would be more profitable for me to be as I am (Platão, 2008, pp. 73-75).

I've never been anyone's teacher! But if someone wants to hear me speak and accomplish what concerns me – whether younger or older – , I have never denied that to anyone (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 94).

In view of the above, we can say that Socrates is carrying out three distinct search movements in his critical philosophizing, (A) If the gods really 'got it right' in saying that he, Socrates, was the wisest of men at that time and in that context; (B) He discovered that his interlocutors who claimed to know about things actually knew nothing at all, perhaps in some cases only superficially, and in general and or in most cases knew almost nothing, including many contradictions and incoherencies of and between their interlocutors and their speeches; and (C) Socrates discovered that by recognizing his ignorance and seeking the truth of things he wasn't wise, but that by doing so, by seeking to know or know, he somehow and to a certain extent became wise, at least in the face of those who claimed to know and really knew nothing, in other words, he, Socrates, doesn't possess it (wisdom), but he seeks it, and then he discovers that he has an advantage over those who claim to know without really knowing for sure, so he, Socrates, possesses some knowledge, which the gods and the oracle mentioned-mentioned. In other words, he is wise because he knows that he doesn't really know, truly and with certainty, but he seeks to know about the truth of all things. Even if he falls into aporias.

His attitude and philosophical reflection were to seek knowledge and to awaken his interlocutors to the same goal, and this by means of and through his maieutic, dialogical, dialectical method and procedure and in questioning conversations on many

issues, which almost always walked with and in 'stages' of aporias. Socrates makes it clear that he has a "vocation, calling or divine mission" to philosophize (even this could be questioned as knowledge). But he doesn't claim to know this, he is on a quest to know or discover this, whether he is wise or not, whether the gods have told him the truth or not, so his 'mission-vocation' is also a 'self-search').

In this way, when the dear reader sees the expression "the master Socrates" or "the master", it is only a 'title' or pronoun of treatment given to him later, since those who come to know him can't escape the "affective" responsibility of understanding him as such, a 'great master,' and also by almost universal convention, he receives such a title or pronoun of treatment, so we will also have him as an esteemed master, and so we present him, we will present him and we will place him at some moments as perceptible in the work on screen.

It is also important to make it clear that while the pre-Socratics are concerned with the search for reasons and external 'truths', of the cosmos, the universe, its origin and order, the *arkhé*, the Sophists relativize education, training and its contents, as well as the primacy of an education focused on the art of discourse, of speaking well and how to win debates, so that these subjects would become notorious and able to exercise political practice effectively and 'efficiently'. Until this moment we can already observe the entire system, structure, scenario and social, economic, historical, legal, epistemological and political context in which Socrates is inserted, as well as the problems concerning the religious issues already mentioned, and still to be better examined during and in the development of the research work on screen.

In other words, almost in general (with a few specific cases) the sophists only propagated and taught a certain kind of education for personal gain, for individuals and specific groups, and not for the benefit of the community, as Socrates hoped. Not to mention that such sophistic education was paid for and quite expensive. Socrates in all this context, as well as the political and philosophical clashes and conflicts, turns to a new practice of philosophy and philosophizing, both 'different' from the pre-Socratics in a certain aspect, and from the Sophists; in this case, Socratic philosophizing is inward, inward and inward to the soul, encompassing the criticality of the things of man, his social relations and the world.

In Plato's *Apology*, *Euthyphron*, we can observe four interesting facts that link Socrates to the facts stated, (1) the political relationship of one of his accusers; (2) Socrates' lamentation or contestation in the face of the accusations and the process that

he is unjustly the victim of; (3) the reputation, esteem and prestige that some people had for Socrates and (4) his call to a philosophy that was incomprehensible to many and which became an instrument in the cause of Socrates' persecution, a philosophy that was mistakenly or objectively considered by his accusers to have originated with the physicists and anti-gods and sophists:

EUTHYPHRON

Don't come to me, Socrates. But then, what complaint did he make against you?

SOCRATES

Which? Not an inconsiderable one, it seems to me; Because understanding such a subject when you are still young is not a trivial thing! He knows, as he says, how young people are corrupted and who are those who corrupt them. He runs the risk of being a wise man – and, because he notices my ignorance in corrupting those his age, he comes to accuse me in the city just like he did with his mother... And it seems to me that he is the only one of those involved in politics, to start correctly, as it is correct that Meletus fights first for the young, so that they are the best possible, just as it is expected that the good farmer fights first for the young plants, and only after that for the others as well. Furthermore, perhaps Meletus is “uprooting” us first, who “corrupt the germinations of the young”, as he says; then, after that, it is clear that, fighting for his elders, he will become the city's culprit for the largest and most numerous goods – at least that is what is expected to happen to those who had such a beginning!

EUTHYPHRON

That's what I would like, Socrates, but I'm afraid the opposite will happen. For it seems to me that he simply begins by harming the city at the hearth by intending to harm you. But tell me: he says that you corrupt young people by doing what?

SOCRATES

Strange things, admirable man, to hear like that. For he says that I am a maker of gods and that, for this very reason – for making new gods and not believing in the old ones – he denounced me, as he says.

EUTHYPHRON

I understand, Socrates. It's because you yourself say that “the numinous sign” is with you at all times. It is because you opened a new vein in relation to divine things that he made this accusation, and then he comes to court to slander you – knowing that matters of this type incite the majority to slander. For about me too, when I say something to them in the assembly about divine things, predicting the future for them, they laugh, as if I were crazy! But nothing that I predicted was said without truth; They are the ones who are jealous of all of us who are this way. But we must absolutely not worry about them – rather we must “go to meet them” (Platão, 2008, pp. 26-28).

It is important to pay attention to these facts, as they will be in the discussion of the core of Socrates' persecution, accusation, conviction and death. As well as the target of attacks that becomes Socratic philosophy. We will even resume these discussions and unfold them to the considerations in the work at hand.

Socratic philosophy does not wish to 'waste time' with reason in the foundations of the universe, nor with the ability to win debates (which is why it is not physics – pre-Socratic nor sophistic), but rather with the education and training of the Greek citizen and good living, aiming for the good of the collective. ⁴It is an art of philosophizing not about why the universe or things, but why things are the way they are, what they are for and above all, what is the reason of the human being or soul in relation to everything and the world. Socrates is concerned with the virtuous education of the Greek citizen. And a critical education.⁵

Thus, Socrates will take over the rationalization and philosophical systematization from pre-Socratic times in the manner and style of the Sophists, and will reformulate a philosophy that is not focused on the cosmos or on winning debates, but rather on and aimed directly at 'men', society and its social relations. And from there, to carry out the procedures of such criticality.

I believe that there is already a Socratic dialectic process here, in which teachings, contents and inner and outer realities are introduced into individuals, just as they were in Socrates, but in Socrates, social contents are not only introduced, but are reflected on, rethought, problematized, put into criticism and again externalized in an oral and questioning way (moving towards his famous aporias), in the famous Socratic inquiries, questions and dialogues. A process of internalization, criticism of what is internalized, problematized and then externalized. And this was to cost Socrates dearly.

⁴ To such accusations about being a physicist or sophist Socrates defends himself from the accusers: " (...) they tried to convince them and accuse me of something even more untrue: that there is a certain Socrates, a wise man, thinker of suspended things in the air, and who has investigated everything under the earth, and who makes inferior speech superior (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 67)" and concluded "These, Athenian men, who spread this fame – These are my most skillful accusers, because those who listened to them consider that those who investigate these things also do not believe in gods (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 68). Corroborates Xenofonte (2014, pp. 62-63) "(...) And he also did not discuss, as most others do, about the nature of the universe, examining the functioning of that entity that the wise call Cosmos or about which laws govern each of the celestial phenomena (...)."

⁵ In Plato's work *The Banquet*, we can say that Socrates brings us deep and important reflections and teachings about friendship, love, loyalty, tolerance, social relationships, education and among others.

Thus, it will be in this philosophy of man, of society and of the search for oneself and in oneself in and of the aforementioned that Socrates 'abandons' the philosophy of the search for the cosmos and the *arkhé*, and will dedicate himself for the rest of his life, and until his death, and death because of such searches and concerns, to a way of philosophy or philosophizing that focuses on man, the soul, virtue, society and social relations, as well as cultural and religious relations. This includes the search for knowledge, how to know and what the foundations and conditions are for trying to know something.

Socrates doesn't want to know the why and how of the universe and its origin, order or principle, but rather how to live and act well, what goodness is and how to practice it, what courage is and how to exercise it, what good-right-just is and how to do it, beauty and how to achieve it, justice and how to exercise it, and so many other facts and elements, and that if terms and concepts are related to the practices and reality (interpretations and/or representations) of them, where there are contradictions and why.

It would not surprise us that in Socrates there is a transformation or re-elaboration of pre-Socratic and sophistic philosophy, as already said and important to emphasize, and which disturbs us with 'the famous aphorism:' "Know yourself." Being a problematization, restlessness and search not for exterior universal foundations, but for interior ones. Which inspires us to say that it seems that such a phrase moved Socrates to also move the pre-Socratic philosophy of the cosmos towards humans, moving society and social relations riddled by critical thought and/or reflection. The aforementioned aphorism "know yourself," inscribed on the Delphic portal, 'disturbs' Socrates to the point that the philosopher sets out in search of knowing himself and others. And so Socrates will inspire others after him who will also set out on the same journey, in search of knowledge, what is possible to know, how to know, what its foundations, conditions and so on. Socrates has a great concern with the virtuous development of the collective.

Therefore, in such a movement from the outside to the inside and from the inside to the outside, the esteemed master seeks to know, and to know himself through his own being, including himself through and with others, as if the other were a mirror for himself and for the search for understanding himself and others, and not least, his intriguing and thought-provoking statement fits: "I only know that I know nothing." Such ignorance of himself and about himself also makes him not know himself and others well, as well as seeing his own ignorance in them and through them. And this generates new

knowledge, what I don't know and/or think I know about "reality" (or representation) and its relationship with things. We are not surprised by the oracle at Delphi telling Socrates' friend, Querefonte, that Socrates was the wisest among men (Platão, 2008, 2016; Xenofonte, 2014).

This is because Socrates knew that he did not know, but upon discovering such knowledge (or not knowing), that he does not know or knew anything, he let go of the fixity of ignorance and let it move in and through the search for knowledge, 'including the abandonment ' out of concern for the outer world, the cosmos, the *arkhé* and universe, and thus set out in search of the inner world, and at the same time of the problem of 'man, society, language and social relations,' comparing them and confront them with and before "reality" and in correspondence with and of things, words and concepts, as if what is and why it is. What matches? Fundamentals, "realities" etc. The art of critical thinking or the art of thinking critically emerges, and this is art and an act of freedom.

The act of the artist or philosopher is free, but not without reason. Your freedom resides in the power of equivocation that we were talking about [...] it consists of assuming a situation of fact, giving it a figurative meaning beyond its own meaning. Thus Marx, not content with being the son of a lawyer and a student of philosophy, thinks of his own situation as that of a "petit bourgeois intellectual", and in the new perspective of the class struggle. In this way, Valéry transforms into pure poetry a discomfort and loneliness that others would not have done anything about. Thought is inter-human life as it understands and interprets itself. In this voluntary resumption, in this passage from the objective to the subjective, it is impossible to say where the forces of history end and where ours begin, and the question strictly means nothing, since there is only history for a subject who lives it and there is only a subject situated historically (Merleau-Ponty, 1999, p. 630).

(...) How could it be possible, then, for a man like that to corrupt youth? Unless the concern with virtue is corruption...

«But, by Zeus - insisted the accuser - he induced his companions to disrespect the established laws by saying that it was madness to choose the Archons of the city by lot, while no one thought it necessary for them to be chosen in that way, neither pilots, nor architects, nor flutists, nor any other craftsman who dedicated himself to works of the kind, in which he who fails makes lighter mistakes than those who fail in the affairs of the city.» As the accuser argued, these words had incited young people to despise the established constitution and made them violent.

For me, I think that those who exercise intelligence and believe that they are capable of teaching citizens what is advantageous to them, are unlikely to become violent because they know that violence is associated with enmity and danger, while persuasion has the same

effect without risks and in a friendly manner (...) (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 69).

Returning to the issue of religion in Xenofonte, it is verifiable that he demonstrates countless times how Socrates was or at least tried to be fair and faithful to the city and its values, an exemplary citizen and a model even of a religious or believer (perhaps we can understand between the lines a more spiritualized being?!). Platão, on the other hand, brings us a more philosophical Socrates and even a very political and pedagogue, at least more involved with the themes, while Xenofonte brings us a Socrates who is more of a citizen, leader and soldier – and both were (Platão, 2008; Xenofonte, 2014).

They knew that Socrates lived in an austere way, but with great autonomy, that he had total control over all his passions and that it was possible for him to argue, however he wanted, with any type of interlocutor (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 71).

(...) if a god had confronted them with living a whole life like the one they saw Socrates live or die, both would have chosen death. (...) (Xenofonte, 2014, pp. 71-72).

(...) Because I know that Socrates also showed his companions that he himself was a well-formed man and that he spoke brilliantly about virtue and other issues relating to man. (...) (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 72).

Now, with Critias and Alcibiades it was like this: while they accompanied Socrates they were both able to find in him an ally to overcome less personal desires. (...) (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 74).

If he himself had done something wrong, it would seem fair that he should be considered bad; but, if, on the contrary, he lived his life sensibly, how would it be possible to justly blame him for an evil that did not exist in him?

Well, since he didn't do anything bad, if, at least, he had seen and approved what others were doing wrong, then it would be fair for them to censure him (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 76).

Xenofonte, by bringing us a Socrates closer to and with his experiences, subjectivities, objectivities and perceptions, as well as with everything that happened with the notable master Socrates, he, Xenofonte and Socrates himself in the face of his accusers, demonstrate to us not only the injustices and contradictions committed against Socrates, but they open disturbing and important reflections on the judicialization of and in Athens and/or Greece or part of it, its democracy (in this specific case only Athens) and religious fanaticism linked to intolerance, conservatism and corruption. How does this happen? Let's see.

Socrates is accused of three serious crimes of the time and social, political, historical and religious context, which are: corruption of young people, not believing in

or undoing, mocking, denigrating or disqualifying the traditional gods of the culture and the city, and finally introducing new gods, as Plato informs us,

(...) Meletus, do you claim that I corrupt the youngest? Yes, of course, as stated in the complaint you made: "Teaching not to believe in the gods in which the city believes, but in different, new numinous things". Isn't it by teaching this that you are saying that I corrupt them?

In the name then of these gods themselves, Meletus, of whom we speak now, say even more clearly, to me and to these men (points to the jury), for I, personally, am not able to understand if you are saying that I teach to believe in the existence of some gods (and then I myself believe in the existence of gods and I am not absolutely an atheist nor is that why I act badly) – but not exactly in those in which the city believes, but in different ones, and that is why you tell me intimate, because different – , or if you are completely stating that I myself do not believe in gods and teach this to others...??

Because this man (points to Meletus), Athenian man, seems to me to be very arrogant and insolent, and to simply make this accusation out of arrogance, insolence, a joke. He resembles someone who puts himself to the test by composing a riddle: "Will Socrates, the wise man, realize that I am having fun and contradicting myself, or will I completely deceive him and the rest of his listeners?" Because it seems to me that this man contradicts himself in his denunciation, as if he were saying: "Socrates acts badly by not believing in gods, even though he believes in gods...". But that's who's kidding (Platão, 2008, pp. 82-83).

I'm glad you responded, even if at great cost, forced by these people! Now, do you not assert that I not only teach, but that I also believe in numinous things, whether new or ancient? Therefore, at least I believe in numinous things, according to your speech, and in this regard you even swore in the act of indictment... If I believe in numinous things, it is certainly very imperative that I also believe in numinous things; it's not like this?

(Silence)

But is! I'll put it in acknowledging yes, since it doesn't respond. And as for the numen, do we not consider them, in effect, to be gods or children of gods? Do you say yes or no?

"For sure."

Now, if I consider the numen (as you yourself say) and if the numen are certain gods - that's why I say that you speak in riddles and are amusing yourself by saying that although I don't consider the gods, I in turn consider the gods again, since the numen at least I do? And if the numen, in turn, are certain bastard children of the gods, born to nymphs or any other mothers (of which they are also said to be), which man would consider the existence of the children of the gods, but not the gods? It would be just as strange if one were to consider the existence of the children of horses, or even of asses - the half-asses - but not of horses and asses (Platão, 2008, p. 84).

Now, both Plato's works and Xenofonte's **Memoirs** leave us facts and evidence that are connected, demonstrating that Socrates was deeply religious, a believer and faithful to the gods, especially Zeus, Athena and Apollo, perhaps not fanatical like his accusers or the their way, but just the fact that Socrates consulted the oracles and followed 'the will or mission of the gods' already demonstrates his devotion, and by the way, he is quite aware of his 'spirituality' and/or 'religiosity'. This also includes his attitudes with a lot of irony and sarcasm towards the supposedly most faithful and devout, the most conservative and fundamentalist religious people. Sócrates is the gadfly who comes to disturb and bother his listeners and interlocutors. The 'action of the gods' was to set the gadfly with a 'mission', to educate Athens to live virtuously.⁶

In addition, Socrates is also constantly demonstrated by disciples in speeches and attitudes regarding the gods, rites, beliefs, traditions and values linked to the culture, tradition and religion of Athens, and Greece in general or as a whole. So, he does them both to remember, reminisce, re-signify and to criticize, update and educate the population that interacts with him. Socrates' religiosity and/or spirituality is not blind, fanatical, fundamentalist, intolerant and mediocre, but open to reflection and learning for the carnal citizen as well as the 'soulmatic', spiritual, mystical and religious citizen. Now, it is clear to us that Socrates in both Platonic works and Xenofonte's **Memoirs** is a restorative, resignifying Socrates and more faithful than those who accuse him (Platão, 2008; Xenofonte, 2014).

Reflecting on previous discussions and statements to date, it can be observed that Socrates is committed to a 'mission given by the gods,' a mystical-spiritual-religious vocation in the art of philosophizing, and philosophizing critically, without dogmatism, fundamentalism and conservatism, but by philosophy as a libertarian and liberating art and practice, transforming man and society, given as an instrument of criticism by the gods of wisdom themselves, in the case of ancient Greece, both the Goddess Athena and

⁶ From the beginning to the end of Plato's Apology and Xenofonte's Memoirs, it can be seen and reflected on the countless times in which Socrates expresses himself, states, defends himself, justifies himself and makes considerations based on his belief in and obedience to the gods of the city. There are so many mentions that in some way attest to Socrates' belief, that it would be exhausting to count the contexts and present them systematically and in a certain order. Socrates' own life of 'not being tied to almost anything,' especially materially, financially and economically, is already a fact of his completeness and completeness in mystical-religious sincerity to fulfill the search for and the truth of things and the facts of and in the city, especially in what would be crucial for the virtuous education-training of the Greek citizen. As well as the scope of Greek *Eudaimonia*.

Apollo, more specifically this one, where the same Oracle of Delphi, representative, guided and inspired by the God Apollo says that Socrates is the wisest man in Athens, therefore the God of the Sun, of justice, of musicality and melody, of the arts, of order, of medicine, of healing, of law and light, symbols that represent knowledge, testify in favor of Socrates. That Socrates is not irreligious or anti-religious, he does not introduce new gods, but he is being sent and guided by the gods of Greece and Athens, as well as with a specific mission: to educate and form true virtuous citizens, unlike what the sophists did. In this way, Socrates is not breaking the city's laws, but dedicatedly complying with them, and Socrates says:

Well then. I must then defend myself, Athenians, and try to remove the slander from within you – the one you have cultivated for a long time – in a short time... I would really like things to happen that way, since it is better both for you as for me, and that I would do well in my defense. But I think this is difficult, and it's not entirely lost on me what the difficulty is... However, let things go where God wants them to go. I must obey the law, and I must defend myself (Platão, 2008, p. 68).

Socrates recognizes the importance of laws in organizing and maintaining a society and city, as without them society can fall into barbarism. However, he criticizes the way in which laws can be manipulated and applied, given the accusations against him, his trial and conviction is an example, therefore, his critical position is in all its discursive and dialectical manifestation in relation to what is false from what is true, from what is real from what is unreal, from what is fallacious and rhetorical from what is undemonstrable, from what is just or justice from what is or will be injustice, etc. To this the philosopher says:

What you Athenian men felt towards my accusers, I do not know; but even I myself, with them, almost forgot myself, they spoke so convincingly! However, as a matter of fact, they said nothing. And of the many lies they told, I was most astonished by one – this: when they said that you should be careful not to be deceived by me, because I would be skilled at speaking! Not being ashamed of immediately being refuted by me with facts (when I didn't show myself to be in one way or another capable of speaking) – that seemed to me to be the most shameless thing on their part. Unless they call someone who speaks the truth “skilled in speaking”: for if that is what they are talking about, then I would recognize that I am – not in their way – an orator...

These, then, as I was saying, said almost nothing true. But you will hear the whole truth from me – but not, Athenian men, by Zeus, “belletrified” speeches, like theirs, nor well ordered in expressions and words; you will hear things said impromptu, with the words that occur to me (because I believe that the things I say are fair), and none of you expect anything different! It certainly wouldn't look good, men, at my age to address you making speeches like a teenager.

However, with intensity, I ask and request this from you, Athenian men: if you hear me defend myself with the same speeches that I usually give not only in the agora, next to the stalls (where many of you have heard me), but also in other places, do not be astonished or create an uproar because of this. Well, the situation is this: I now, at seventy years of age, go to court for the first time; Therefore, the language here is simply strange to me... And in the same way that you, if I were actually a foreigner, would certainly be condescending to me, if I spoke with that accent and those manners in which I was raised, I also now ask this of you, as seems fair to me: that you leave aside my ways of speaking (they would perhaps be worse, perhaps better), and examine this properly and pay attention to this – whether I speak fair things or not. For while the virtue of the juror is this, the virtue of the speaker is to speak the truth.

First of all then, men of Athens, I think it fair to defend myself against the first false accusations against me and against the first accusers, and then against the last and the last. For there have been many of my accusers among you, and for many years now, who have said nothing true, whom I fear more than those around Anito, even though they are also skilled. But those men are more skillful – those who, taking charge of the education of most of you from childhood, tried to convince you and accuse me of something even more untrue: that there is a certain Socrates, a wise man, a thinker of things suspended in the air, and which has investigated everything under the earth, and which makes inferior speech superior.

These Athenian men, those who spread this fame – these are my most skillful accusers, because those who listened to them consider that those who investigate these things do not believe in gods either. Afterwards, these accusers are many and they have been accusing me for a long time, speaking to you, moreover, at that age when they would be most convinced (some of you were boys or teenagers), simply accusing in isolation – without there being defense (Platão, 2008, pp. 65-67).

Opinions aside, men, it doesn't seem fair to me to appeal to the juror and, by appealing, to escape, but rather to instruct and persuade. Because that is not why the jury sits – to do justice in favor –, but to judge. And he did not swear to favor whoever seemed good to him, but rather to enforce the laws. Therefore, neither should we get them – you – used to swearing in vain, nor should you get used to it, because none of us would be being religious...

Therefore, do not expect, men of Athens, that I will force myself to do such things to you, which I consider neither beautiful, nor just, nor pious, especially for Zeus, when I am defending myself from the accusation of irreligiosity made by this Meletus here (points to the accuser). Because, evidently, if I persuaded them and by my appeal forced them to violate their oaths, the existence of gods I would be teaching them not to consider, and I would simply be, in defending myself, making my own accusation – that I do not believe in gods. But it takes a long time to be like that! For I believe, men of Athens, as none of my accusers believe; and now I leave it to you – and to God – to judge me according to what is best, both for me and for you (Platão, 2008, p. 98).

In front of more than five hundred citizens who made up a certain type of jury, Sócrates explains that he has been persecuted for a long time, for various reasons and by different subjects with different types of accusations and slander, both considering him an atheist for supposedly being a type as a natural philosopher, like the physicists (pre-Socratic, and who in fact were not truly and absolutely atheists, as each one carried their specific beliefs), but they also accused him of being a type of sophist. Sócrates will inform the jurors that such accusers have their ways of distorting the reality of the facts and trying to confuse the listeners with fallacious and contradictory speeches, in which he, Sócrates will demonstrate to the listeners during the course of the process, but that he would do this in his natural way to speak, or rather, to philosophize. With this, Socrates will also point out and name some of his accusers and slanderers, such as Meletus, Anito and Lincon (Platão, 2008, 2016; Xenofonte, 2014).

To these facts, Xenofonte's **Memoirs** and Plato's **Apology** open 'a vein or artery' of the social context of the time through religious and political channels, the suppression of these through legal and judicial channels, committed not to doing justice, but to the politics and trade-economy, already corrupted. The fact is why Socrates also asked what was fair, what was justice, courage, among other terms linked to social and institutional practices. It is no wonder that the fly fell into a hornet's nest, and they devoured it. Xenofonte and Plato show us legal and judicial interference in aspects of education, personal religiosity, freedom and critical thinking. Socrates was even prohibited from speaking or dialoguing with people, especially men under the age of thirty,

Once this warning had reached them, Crítias and Cáricles had to talk to the younger ones.

Socrates then asked the two if he could ask them any questions, if he didn't understand something they were asking of him.

They both answered yes.

- Well - he began - I am ready to obey the laws. But, so that, through ignorance, I do not miss something that is required of me, I would like you to explain it to me precisely. They think that this art of speaking is that of well-made speeches or they are ordering me to abstain from that which does not construct speeches in conditions.? Because, if it's good speeches, it's obvious that I'll have to stop speaking well; Now, if it's the ones that aren't done well, it's obvious that I have to try to speak correctly.

Then, Cáricles, irritated, retorted:

- Since you don't understand, Socrates, I'll explain to you much more clearly what we're prohibiting you: you can't talk to younger people about anything.

- Well, then, so that I don't have any doubts [about what I can do and what is forbidden to me], mark there at what age men are still considered boys.

Cáricles replied - it is not time for them to belong to the Council, because they still do not have enough sense. In other words, don't talk to anyone under thirty.

- Now, what if, by chance, I'm going to make some purchase and the store clerk is under thirty, can't I ask him how much he takes for the merchandise?

- Of course, in these cases you can! – exclaimed Cáricles - But you have a habit, Socrates, of asking things whose answers you know very well. These are the questions you shouldn't ask!

- Oh! So I shouldn't answer any young person who asks me, even if I know the answer, things like "Where does Cáricles live?" or "Where is Critias?"

- Of course, in these cases you can!

Then Critias interrupted: - What you will have to avoid, Socrates, are your conversations about shoemakers, architects, craftsmen. Because it seems to me that they can't even hear you anymore, their ears are always ringing.

- Well, that being the case, I also have to avoid what I usually say next, about *what is fair*, *what is pious*, and other things like that, right?

- Exactly - replied Cáricles - and also about cattle drivers, unless you want to see how you make the cattle lose weight (Xenofonte, 2014, pp. 77-78).

Now, if there are gods of justice, if there is the pursuit of justice and virtue, a man who is unjustly condemned demonstrates that justice has failed or the gods are unjust, that justice is flawed or does not exist or did not exist for such a man or in such a time. And also that this may have already happened and/or will happen again.

But what I said before – that a lot of hatred arose against me, and among many –, know that it is true. And that is what will condemn me, if indeed it will condemn me: not Meletus, not Anito, but the slander and envy of many! Something that many men, beautiful and good, have condemned and will still (I think) condemn; there is no danger of it stopping at me... (Platão, 2008, p. 86).

But if you had waited a little longer, this would have happened naturally... (...) Well, you see my age, that I'm advanced in life and I'm close to death. I don't say this to all of you, but to those who voted for my death (Platão, 2008, p. 104).

And I, being slow and older, have now been caught by being slower, while my accusers, being skillful and sharp, by being more agile: vileness! And I shall now depart condemned - by you - to the death penalty, while they, condemned - by the truth - to meanness and injustice (Platão, 2008, p. 105).

It is these messages that also remain in the indictment and sentence against Socrates: What if these men were just and were wronged by justice? The very notion of

justice falls into disrepair and is lost in itself. Socrates leaves the system and the structure corrupted, committed to self-destruction. In what way? By not having an advocate, by accepting his condemnation and by not fleeing death when he could. This is not his intention or goal, to demoralize his city, culture, laws and customs, but there is no other way, if not to let justice reveal itself for what it is and what it really does, can do or fail to do, culminating in more injustices... ⁷ It is worth remembering the Socratic questions about what justice is or would be.

Therefore, so far, both Xenophon demonstrates in the **Memorabilia** and Plato in the **Apology** that the condemnation of Socrates is notoriously political, in the interests of a few, "(...) and there too I became hated not only by this man but also by many others! (...)" (Platão, 2008, p. 74),

(...) they say that Socrates commented to Euthydemus and many others who were present that Critias seemed to him to have the instincts of a swine, crazy with the desire to rub himself against Euthydemus just like pigs on rocks. From then on, Critias began to hate Socrates; so that when, when he was one of the Thirty, he became a drafter of laws, together with Charicles, he remembered him and promulgated a law that prohibited the teaching of the art of speaking, insulting him, since he had no other way to attack him except to equate him with philosophers and earn him the censure of some and the disrespect of others.

What happens is that at the time when the Thirty were condemning many of the city's men to death, not the least important ones, and encouraging many others to act unjustly, Socrates observed that it would seem extraordinary to him that, if a cattle driver allowed himself to weaken and his oxen languished, he might not agree that he was a bad herder. Now - he continued -, it would seem even more extraordinary to him that, if a statesman allowed his fellow citizens to weaken and wither away, he would not be ashamed or consider himself a bad statesman (Xenofonte, 2014, pp. 76-77).

Now, I believe that no one learns anything from those they don't love. Socrates did not please either Critias or Alcibiades, even when they both lived with him; Before, and right from the beginning, what the two aspired to was leadership of the city (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 79).

But what I said before - that much hatred has arisen against me, and with many - you should know that it is true. And this is what will condemn me, if it condemns me at all: not Melethus or Anito, but the

⁷ The fact is that almost all of Socrates' accusers were persecuted, exiled or executed for the injustice caused to Socrates, as well as the affront to the gods in his death. And a statue was raised to Socrates in his honor, to the gadfly, the man who taught the art of thinking and philosophizing critically (Pinheiro, 2014, pp. 7-10). "We do not know whether or not Xenofonte achieved his purpose, but, centuries later, Diogenes Laertius will introduce us to some repentant Athenians who punished those who had accused Socrates and also decided to honor the philosopher by having a statue erected to him" (Pinheiro, 2014, p. 55).

slander and envy of many! Something that has condemned many fine and good men, and still will (I think) condemn them; there is no danger of it stopping with me... (Platão, 2008, p. 86).

(...) He did not want to accept the deliberation and attracted the hatred of the people and the threats of many of the powerful; but, for him, it was more valuable to keep his word than to please the people in a decision that went against justice or to avoid those who threatened him (Platão, 2008, p. 66).

It was precisely because of this "inspection", Athenian men, that many hatreds arose against me, and so hard and heavy, that from them many *slanders* began to emerge (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 76).

(...) What I deserve to receive or offer as a retraction - for not having conducted myself quietly in life, and not having militated in favor of what the majority militate for (money and business, leadership of the army and leadership of the people, and other posts and conspiracies and groupings that exist in the city), after considering that I myself was, in reality, too honest to come out alive if I went against it, (. (...) ?? I went, intending to persuade each of you not to militate for any of your own things - but rather to militate for *yourself*, in order to be the best and wisest you can be - or for the things of the city - rather than for the *city itself*- and thus, in the same way, to militate for the other things (Platão, 2008, pp. 99-100).

But no, there is nothing like that, nor – if you have ever heard from anyone – that I intend to educate men and that I make money; this is also not true (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 70).

When I looked closely at this man (I don't need to call him by name; he was one of those involved in politics and I got this impression from examining him) and talked to him, Athenian men, it seemed to me that he seemed to be wise to many other men and especially to himself, *but that he wasn't. I then tried to show him that he thought he was wise, but that he wasn't.* I tried to show him that he was wise. Then I kept trying to show him that he *thought* he was wise, but that he wasn't. From then on, I became a man who was hated by him and many of the people around him and, as I was leaving, I kept thinking to myself - "I am indeed wiser than this man, because we are both in danger of not knowing anything beautiful or good, but while he *thinks* he knows something, *not knowing* it, I, as I don't really know it, don't think I *know* it either.... It is probable, therefore, that I am wiser than him in one small thing, precisely this: because what I don't know, I don't think I know either" (Platão, 2008, p. 73).

For reasons of monopolization of public power, coercion, legitimization of force, and conflicts of a commercial-economic nature, as well as fear of loss of political status, prestige, commercial and financial of Socrates' accusers, Plato (2008, p. 76) informs us: "Meletus taking the pains of the poets, Anito those of the workers and those involved in politics, and Lycon those of the orators (...)." In other words, the case of the trial and conviction of Socrates was a political-religious and religious-political case, with a

political-religious justice biased in a partial way to benefit the accusing and convicting party, in the matter of the philosopher Socrates, the thinker, pedagogue and social critic philosopher. The fly that pestered passers-by in the city and the Agora. We urgently need new or different readings, interpretations and representations of anthropology, historiography, the history of ancient philosophy, sociology and philosophy in general. And this is the effort of this research project.

Therefore, Xenofonte through the **Memoirables** and Plato through the **Apology** open yet another 'vein or artery' of society, the alienation, inculcation, manipulation of the masses and the artificial, superficial, mediocre, biased and malicious faith, belief, religiosity and values of accusers, influencers (perhaps also influenced), as they did not see or wish to see that during Socrates' life and philosophy, he was more faithful, citizen, believer, just and religious than they who accused him.

Xenophon and Plato give us facts about the lives of the accusers and the accused (Socrates), in which they contradict the whole process and the arguments of the accusers. Xenophon and Plato expose the contamination of the process and its purposes: the wasps want to silence the fly, because there are people who have interests, gains and profit from the death of the philosopher, educator and critic, at least that is what is clear from Plato's and Xenophon's expositions. Religion and religiosity linked to politics and justice are the main, strong and front car of the fight, the persecution, the militancy against Socrates and his stance of philosophical-pedagogical-ethical-moral '*praxis*', culminating in his accusation, condemnation and execution. The fly usually flies over cattle, horses, goats or sheep that are tied up or grazing, irritating and disturbing them in some way. Until they 'scare him off!' The fly.

Xenophon and Plato open the last of the cuts in the structure of the social fabric. This - by demonstrating in their works that Socrates is more religious than the accusers, and as a sign and fact, they point out that the accusers and their accusations about religion had no foundation, nor did they have character, morals or ethics, because they distorted facts and terms to formulate faults and false "religious breaches" on Socrates' part, when in fact it was they who were doing this through fallacious rhetoric and high levels of sophistry, incurring further injustices against Socrates, the city, the laws and the gods - leading to serious consequence, including the very notion, conception and attribution of Greek religion, politics and justice.

Therefore, both Xenofonte and Plato put all of this into question and into internal and institutional crises. In other words, both Xenofonte in the **Memoirables** and Plato in

the **Apology** expose the viscera of a court with a process that Socrates seemed to already predict the outcome, his condemnation, as the process is contaminated, as well as corrupted and unjust religiosities, which compromise justice, ethics and morals, and distort both justice, politics and 'religion' when they use them as instruments of personal attack against philosophy and the art of critical philosophizing, as well as against the life of Socrates. Generally, religion also produces fears, and both are instruments of manipulation.

In both authors, Xenofonte and Plato, the social, political, legal and religious body is being torn apart by and in its contradictions, controversies, controversies and injustices internal to the very notion, conception and deliberation of justice or what would or should be as towards the life of the accused, Sócrates. Both Xenofonte and Plato also provide us with reflections and insights into the collective mentality and its religiosity. Which seems to be made up of rude, incautious, ignorant (Socrates spoke a lot about Athenian ignorance), manipulated, mediocre, without "real" or true knowledge of religious traditions, their cults, rites, oracular prophecies, laws and much less of the life of Socrates who walked and lived with many of them, philosophizing and inquiring in their maieutics and aporias.

Politics and religion were unified and judicialized, and thus became instruments and tools for the persecution, framing, condemnation and execution of the art of philosophizing, and of philosophizing critically. Socrates was an example to be given to society, which would later regret such injustice, and thus turn against Socrates' detractors and condemners. Perhaps such an event can be compared and reflected with similar ones in and from history. Since such analyzes and reflections are from a certain political, social, economic, religious and historical context and situation of a certain time, subjects and their historical-cultural processes.

Perhaps cases similar to that of Socrates have already occurred in history, in societies and their cultures, perhaps they occur in contemporary times, or perhaps centuries after his death, perhaps in the medieval, modern era or today. But who can say? Perhaps they are mirrors and reflections of images from yesterday and today, from today and yesterday.

In this way, Xenofonte and Plato demonstrate to us a "rigid" process, politicized on the one hand, biased, artificial, contaminated, partial and full of fallacious rhetoric to accuse, incriminate and condemn him as a defendant. The objective was to condemn Socrates in two ways or ways: (1st) Either make him deny everything he did and fall into

some contradiction, being humiliated and perhaps execrated from society, then perhaps killed or murdered in some way or (2nd) simply take him step by step until condemnation, as his accusers knew Socrates well, his values, thoughts, ideals, family, military, political history, among others.

The intention of the accusers was to use the legality of the law, the imaginary and religious mentality of the people and/or society, and justice as a manipulable sting to commit illegalities, crimes and injustices against Socrates (or perhaps others), which Xenofonte in the **Memoirs** and Platão in the **Apology** exposes us in different ways and ways. Opening deep social arteries or veins, also exposing the viscera of its society, culture, laws and justice. The practices of ethnocentrism and intolerance in relation to the person, speeches and behaviors of the philosopher, Socrates, are quite visible and clear.

Considerations

Therefore, both Xenofonte and Platão indirectly or directly provide us with elements and traces of Socrates' religiosity and that of his accusers and condemners, as well as his positioning and behavior within the Greek *polis*, with the philosopher and master Socrates 'as a model of a moderate, ideal, just, honorable, virtuous, good soldierly, loyal, faithful and true Athenian citizen'. Meanwhile, he was defamed, slandered, persecuted, accused, tried, sentenced and killed.

While their accusers and condemners enter the midst of rhetorical, fallacious and contradictory speeches, demonstrating their character, behaviors and objectives, to silence 'the gadfly', and in such obsession they are led by the blindness of hatred and ignorance of a religious-political fundamentalism or vice versa, thus also falling into limbos of fanaticism, intolerance, mediocrity, fundamentalism, contradictions, controversies and personal interests exposed in their speeches. Silencing Socrates is the greatest objective and great target to be achieved, as it will perhaps result in some benefit for his accusers and condemners. Shutting Socrates seems like there should be some return, profit or gain for the aforementioned accusers, and also perhaps for those who voted in favor of the conviction, in principle, of the 500, 280 were in favor of the conviction (Platão, 2008; Xenofonte, 2014).

Finally, Xenofonte and Plato unmask not only the process and its injustice, but its corruption and fraudulent manner, especially the ignorance and fanaticism of a people with certain fundamentalisms that blind them from seeing that by condemning Socrates, in fact the whole of society, their structure, institutions and supposed religious

allegiances to the gods and justice would be condemned and would collapse. The unjust accusation, trial, conviction and death of Socrates would open wounds in society and its thinking. So much so that reflections after his death meant that some involved in the trial and death of Socrates were soon also persecuted.

But as we do not have concrete and detailed evidence, we only learn and reflect on some perceptions, statements, records and reflections on Xenofonte's **Memorables**, where up until now, as in Plato's **Apology**, we see disciples and/or followers who had experience with a citizen loved by them, a philosopher, educator, leader, pedagogue, etc., who preferred to die than see his beloved city collapse or fall into a civil war because of his speech, demonstrating the contradictions that could dilute the city. His death was enough to demonstrate his love, faith, religiosity, conscience, tolerance, justice and respect, both towards his peers and towards the ignorant, fanatics and manipulative and manipulated fundamentalists. In the end, perhaps everything is a mere political and power game. It will be?

Socrates in the **Memoirs** and the **Apology** is the detonator of discrepancies, manipulators, charlatans of religiosity, the supposed righteous, the detonator of the ignorance and blindness of a people, their magistrates and their partisan, corrupt, mediocre and alienating justice. The living Socrates taught through his own *praxis* the model of citizen, and many saw him as such (including the children of some accusers), and the dead Socrates became the most faithful model, a faithful one who died for the real common good, and even became immortal in the memory.

Conclusion, Socrates is also demonstrated in Xenophon's **Memoirs** and Platonic **Apology** as the true religious, who is moved by love, Eros, virtue, wisdom, sophia, justice, courage, education, conscience, tolerance and with his life as a *praxis* and constant dialectical processes. This is different from those without love or empathy, in this case, here, the ignorant, unfair, "blind", cowardly, mediocre, alienated, intolerant and with a life, speech and religious practices that are totally contradictory, controversial and full of antagonisms. Yes, the *Memorabilia* and the *Apology* make these facts perceptible to us, perhaps they move or shake our consciences and unconscious.

From Xenofonte's **Memoirs** and the Platonic **Apology**, as in other works by other authors, we can formulate the following: Socrates is directly accused of or for three crimes: A) not believing in and/or dishonoring the gods; B) introduce new gods and C) corrupt the young. These crimes seem to unfold into others in rhetorical and fallacious speeches, such as Socrates is or would be unfair, unfaithful, corrupt, corrupting, liar,

irresponsible, unreliable, atheist, etc.,⁸ but through the reports of Xenofonte and Plato we can reverse them for or against the accusers themselves. Let's see how Aristophanes writes and describes about Socrates, and then how Socrates saw himself facing the mission of God:

(...) STREPSIADES

Making a gesture with his hand in the direction of SOCRATES' house.
Look this way; Do you see that little house and that little door?

FIDIPIDES

I am seeing. What do you mean by this, my father?

STREPSIADES

There is the "Pensatory", the school of knowledgeable spirits. Inside live people who, talking about the sky, convince us that it is a furnace that covers us and that we are its coal. Those guys teach others, if they want to contribute some money, to make all causes victorious, just or unjust, using just words.

FIDIPIDES

And who are these guys?

STREPSIADES

I don't really know their names; They are meditative thinkers and very serious.

FIDIPIDES

Now I know who they are! You're talking about those swindlers, barefoot and white, that group where the damn Socrates and the damn Cairefon.

(...) DISCIPLE

What would it mean if you knew about another idea of Socrates?

STREPSIADES

Which? Tell me please!

DISCIPLE

Cairefon de Sfetos asked if in his opinion mosquitoes buzz through the trunk or the rear end.

STREPSIADES

What was Socrates' response to mosquitoes?

DISCIPLE

⁸ Aristophanes (5th century BC and contemporary of Socrates) in his work or theatrical production *The Clouds* makes harsh and heavy criticisms like these of the person of Socrates (and they go much further, even to Socrates' economic aspects). But indirectly Aristophanes also provides us with elements, content and tools to demonstrate some possibilities of possible Socratic criticisms and questions about the progress of the organization and configuration of the city, especially with regard to education, politics and the art of philosophizing.

He said mosquito intestines are very thin; the colon, being narrow, forces the air to pass directly to the rear; then, exiting through the tight rectum, it makes the anus resonate because of the violence of the blow.

STREPSIADES

So the mosquito's butt is a trumpet! The author of this discovery is triply happy! Certainly, anyone who knows their guts can easily escape conviction if they are accused...

(...) *Addressing SOCRATES.*

And you, pontiff of the subtlest words, tell us what you want. We would not pay attention to any other of today's sophists, who live with their heads in the stratosphere, except only Prodicus, for his wisdom and erudition, and you, for your superb walk in the streets, for your way of looking to the sides, for your sufferings he endures walking barefoot, for his trust in us, for his imposing pose.

(...) SOCRATES

What Zeus? Don't mock me! Zeus does not exist.
(Aristòfanes, 2016, pp. 9-10, 13-14, 27-28).

1. "Many" hear that Socrates was appointed by the gods to carry out "a certain mission."⁹

"That I happen to be that kind of man – who was given to the city by God (Platão, 2008, p. 91)."

"Not Socrates; he only said what he actually knew, he said that the divinity was giving him signs. And he advised many of those who accompanied him on what they should do or not do, because this divinity indicated this to them (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 60)."

"(...) with *the god* positioning me, as I thought and supposed – that I must live philosophizing and inspecting myself and others (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 87)."

"Yes, he said that it was necessary to learn the things that the gods had determined should be learned, and to seek, through divination, to ask the gods about matters that are not clear to men. Then, the gods would give their sign to those who were in their grace (...) (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 62)."

⁹ It is evident in the Apology that it is Socrates 'who claims' that he heard from Cherephon, who is a 'type of wise man,' and thus Socrates places himself as an 'instrument of the gods, who was inspired with a certain *Daimon*, in whom the leads, instructs and guides him through his philosophical and practical life, such facts can be verified to corroborate and complement the quotations on screen, for this purpose see Platão, 2008, pp. 72-78 and in Xenofonte's Memoirs, 2014, pp. 239-253, we can verify Socrates' delivery as a type of sacrifice to the Gods. These pages of the aforementioned works present both the statement of the Oracle of Delphi about Socrates and his journey in search of knowledge, critical philosophizing, and his life 'devoted to this cause' (Platão, 2008, Xenofonte, 2014).

"(...) know – that the god commands me, and I myself think that no greater good has yet emerged for you in the city than my service to the god! (...) (PLATÃO, 2008, p. 89)."

"(...) Furthermore, it was commonplace that Socrates said he was inspired by a divinity (...) (Xenofonte, p. 59)."

"And whenever it seems to me that this is not the case, by helping the god, I show him that he is not wise. With this lack of time, I didn't have time to carry out any city activity worth mentioning, nor a family one, and I am, because of my servitude to the god, in extreme poverty... (Platão, 2008, p. 76)."

2. Therefore, Socrates is doing what the oracle and gods assigned him to do. Fulfill the mission of the gods. The gods of the city and the people. Socrates does not consider himself wise or capable of carrying out his mission, as he considers himself ignorant and seeking wisdom. The oracle and witnesses such as Cherephon (5th century BC and contemporary of Socrates) confirmed this.

3. Socrates is not only respecting the gods but obeying them. In this way, Socrates not only believes in the gods of his culture and city but also respects, honors, obeys and worships them with his own life and practices.¹⁰ We are not surprised that Socrates will make some criticisms of the gods that these individuals professed and manipulated for their pleasure and/or personal interests. And not against the gods themselves. And how does this happen? When Socrates places Meletus in a form of aporia. An observable fact when Meletus falls into contradiction both with himself and in relation to what the gods are, who they are, how to believe in them and who to believe in, leaving him in a contradictory and fallacious 'vicious' cycle, as he does not respond accurately to the questions proposed by Socrates. In view of the accusations and denunciations, Meletus is violating the city's laws by unfairly accusing a citizen and without evidence, perhaps with unfounded arguments as Socrates demonstrates, both in terms of the question that Socrates was irreligious and religious at the same time, as well as the question of corrupting youth, in both situations Meletus falls into aporias and also contradicts himself,

¹⁰ "(...) It will be clear, however, that I, throughout my life, in public (if I accomplished anything) was *like this*, and in private the same way: never agreeing with anyone about anything that was against the just, not even with any of those whom my slanderers claim to have been my pupils (Platão, 2008, p. 94), to follow the line of reasoning in the paragraph under discussion, *ibid.* 94), to follow the line of reasoning in the paragraph under discussion, *ibidem*, pp. 68, 76, 89. "(...) it was evident that he honored the gods more than any other man. As for corrupting the young, of which the accuser also accused him, it was clear that if his companions showed reprehensible aspirations, he corrected them, urging them to desire the most beautiful and noblest of virtues that would lead them to manage the city and their own patrimony well (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 89)." *Ibid.*, pp. 59-60, 90-91, 95)."

Meleto does this there in front of the jury. And Socrates soon makes his comments, since Meletus not only contradicts himself, but also falls into certain aporias, let's see the sequence of the dialogue starting with the accusation of corruption of youth and its contradictions, and then the question of the gods:

Concerning then the things of which my first accusers accused me, this defense before you is sufficient. After that, before Meletus – this “good and patriotic” man, as he says he is – and before the latter I will try to defend myself. Once again (as if these accusers were different...), let us take their sworn statement; it is more or less this: “Socrates acts badly”, he says, “by corrupting the young and by not believing in the gods in which the city believes, but in different, new, numinous things”. It's a complaint like that. But let us inspect each point of this complaint. He says that by corrupting young people I act badly. But I personally, men of Athens, say that *Meletus* He acts badly, because he keeps having fun with what is serious, by taking men to jury in a frivolous way, by pretending to take things seriously and worrying about issues for which he absolutely never *fought!* That this is so, I will try to demonstrate to you as well.

Tell me here, Meleto: do you do anything other than have the highest regard for the youngest people to be the best they can be?

“That's what I do.”

Come on then, tell these people (*points to the jury*): who makes them better? Of course you know, militant that you are! After discovering who (as you say) *corrupts them*, you summon me to their presence and accuse me. But whoever *makes them better*, come forward, tell them and reveal: who is he?

(*Silence*)

Do you see, Meletus, how you remain silent and have nothing to say? In reality, doesn't it seem shameful to you and proof enough of what I was saying – that's why you haven't been active at all? Come on, speak up, good man: who makes them better?

“The laws.”

But that's not what I'm asking, fine man, but who is the *person*, first, who knows exactly this – the laws.

“They, Socrates, the jurors.” (*Points to the jury*)

What are you saying, Meletus? That these people here have the conditions to educate young people and make them better?

“For sure.”

they all have it, or do some of them have it and some of them don't?

“*All!*”

By Hera, you speak well – and of a great abundance of beneficiaries! But what about these people, the listeners (*points to the audience*), do they make them better or not?

“They are also.”

And the counselors?

“The counselors too.”

But then, Meletus, don't tell me that those who go to the assembly corrupt the young? Or do they *all* also make them better?

"They are also."

Apparently, *all* Athenians make them beautiful and good, *except me*: only I corrupt them. Is that what you're saying?

"Absolutely, that's what I'm saying."

Immense is the misfortune you imputed to me! Answer me again: does it really seem like that with horses too – are *all men the ones* who make them better, while *just one* person corrupts them? Or is it entirely the opposite of that, with just one having the means to make them better, or very few – the grooms –, while the majority, if they live with horses and use them, corrupt them? Is it not so, Meletus, whether with horses or with all other animals? I'm sure it is, totally, whether you and Anito say yes or no! For the bliss would be immense for young people, if only one corrupted them, while the others benefited them... But you, Meletus, sufficiently demonstrate that you never paid attention to young people and clearly display your lack of militancy – because you have absolutely no militated by the things in the name of which he summons me.

(...) But this, at this point, is clear, Athenian men (as I said): that Meletus never *fought* for these things, neither much nor little. Yet speak to us: in what way, Meletus, do you assert that I corrupt the youngest? Yes, of course, as stated in the complaint you made: "Teaching not to believe in the gods in which the city believes, but in different, new numinous things". Isn't it by teaching this that you are saying that I corrupt them? "But sure, that's what I'm saying."

In the name then of these gods themselves, Meletus, of whom we speak now, say even more clearly, to me and to these men (*points to the jury*), for I, personally, am not able to understand if you are saying that I teach to believe in the existence of some gods (and then I myself believe in the existence of gods and I am not absolutely an atheist nor is that why I act badly) – but not exactly in those in which the city believes, but in *different ones*, and that is why you tell me intimate, because *different* -, or if you are completely stating that I myself do not believe in gods and teach this to others...

"That's what I'm saying, that you don't believe in gods at all."

Admirable Meletus, for what purpose do you say this? So I don't believe either that the Sun or the Moon are gods, like other men?

"No, by Zeus, ye sworn men, since he asserts that the Sun is stone and the Moon is earth!"

Do you think you are accusing *Anaxagoras*, dear Meletus, and do you despise these people here (*pointing to the jury*), thinking that they are so lacking in literary resources that they do not know that the books of Anaxagoras of Clazômena are full of these speeches? Furthermore, it is from me that young people learn these things – they who can, buying them from time to time for not much (for a drachma!) in the orchestra, laugh at Socrates if he pretends that they are his, especially when they are so strange? But then, in the name of Zeus, is that really what it seems to you, that I don't believe in the existence of any god?

"No, by Zeus, not one way or the other!"

You are unbelievable, Meletus! And just as it seems to me, it must seem to you...

Because this man (*points to Meletus*), men of Athens, seems to me to be very arrogant and insolent, and to simply make this accusation out of arrogance, insolence, a joke. He resembles someone who puts

himself to the test by composing a riddle: "Will Socrates, the wise man, realize that I am having fun and contradicting myself, or will I completely deceive him and the rest of his listeners?" Because it seems to me that this man contradicts himself in his denunciation, as if he were saying: "Socrates acts badly by not believing in gods, even though he believes in gods..." But that's who's kidding!

(...) Are there among men, Meletus, who believes in the existence of human affairs, but does not believe in the existence of men?

(Meletus *protests in a low voice*)

May he respond, men, and not promote one riot after another! There are those who don't believe in the one about horses, but in the one about horse matters they do? Or do you not believe in the existence of flutists, but in flute matters?

(Silence)

There is no better of men! If you don't want to answer, I'll tell you and these others (*points to the jury*). But answer at least what follows from this: are there those who believe in the existence of *numinous matters*, but do not believe in the existence of *numinous matters*?

"There is not."

I'm glad you responded, even if at great cost, forced by these people! Now, do you not assert that I not only teach, but that I also believe in *numinous things*, whether new or old? Therefore, I at least believe in *numinous things*, according to your speech, and in this regard, you even swore in the act of indictment... If I believe in *numinous things*, it is certainly very imperative that I also believe in *numinous things*; it's not like this?

(Silence)

But is! I'll put it in acknowledging yes, since it doesn't respond. And as for the numen, do we not consider them, in effect, *to be gods* or children of *gods*? Do you say yes or no?

"For sure."

Now, if I consider the numen (as you say) and if the numen is determined gods – that is why I say that you speak in an enigma and are amused when you say that I, although I *do not* consider the gods, once again consider them as in turn the gods, since at least I consider the *numes* ... And if the numes, in turn, are certain bastard children of the gods, born of nymphs or any other mothers (of which they are also said to be), Which of the men would consider the existence of *the children* of the gods, but not *of the gods*? It would be equally strange if one considered the existence of the children of horses, or even of donkeys – the half-asses –, but not that of horses and donkeys...

The fact, Meletus, is that there is no way it could not be to prove to us that you made this accusation, or else because you were in aporia as to the true evil action for which you would summon me... But so that you can convince some of the men, even if they have little common sense, that the person who considers numinous things *is not* the same person who considers divine things, and which in turn *is* the same one that considers *neither* names, nor gods, nor heroes – there is no such thing! (Platão, 2008, pp. 78-85).

Therefore, do not expect, men of Athens, that I will force myself to do such things to you, which I consider neither beautiful, nor just, nor pious, especially for Zeus, when I am defending myself from the accusation of irreligiosity made by this Meletus here (*points to the accuser*). Because, evidently, if I persuaded them and by my appeal forced them to violate their oaths, the existence of gods I would be teaching them *not to consider*, and I would simply be, in defending myself, making my own accusation – that I do not believe in gods. But it takes a long time to be like that! For I believe, men of Athens, as none of my accusers believe; and now I leave it to you – and to God – to judge me according to what is best, both for me and for you (Platão, 2008, p. 98).

In other words, what seems to be demonstrable by Socrates is that Meletus with his accomplices, who considered themselves to be just men and defenders of justice, are not true, they are unjust and corrupt, they also consider themselves to be in favor and defenders of the truth, but they are liars, slanderers and distorters of facts and words, they also presented themselves as believers in the city's gods and defenders of belief in them, but in fact what they demonstrate is that they are in some way fundamentalist, dogmatic, perhaps anti-religious or irreligious. It is from the perspective of the analysis of the discourse and rhetoric in and of the dialogues, which give us to understand that Socrates makes such an accusatory turn, indirectly criticizing the gods (money) of such individuals who professed and manipulated him for their pleasure or personal interests.

4. Socrates is accused of introducing new gods. But in fact he is interpreting them, reinterpreting them and 'sharing his instructions' as well as 'his messages and teachings' by philosophizing, and not just by the mythical process, leading to blind beliefs, but rather by reason reflecting the myths, the gods and their teachings for life, the soul, the good and virtuous citizen, for morals, for fairer social relations and ethics. And not merely reproducing rituals, speeches, popular sayings, beliefs and so on. Let's see:

(...) if, having previously remained, like everyone else, in the place where I was positioned, when the commanders (who you yourselves chose to command me) positioned me (both in Potidaia and in Amphipolis and Delium), and having run the risk of dying, now, on the contrary, with *the god* positioning me, as I thought and supposed – that I must live philosophizing and inspecting myself and others –, I would abandon my post, fearing death or any other event? (Platão, 2008, p. 87).

Therefore, not even if you release me now, not giving credit to Anito, who stated that, in the beginning, it was not necessary to bring me here, or that, once brought, it was not possible *not to kill me* (as he told you that, if I escaped, his children, being able to occupy themselves with what Socrates teaches, would all be completely corrupt); and if you, faced with this, said to me: "Socrates, now we will not obey Anito and

release him, but on this condition, that you no longer philosophize or spend your time dedicating yourself to this investigation. If you are caught doing this again, you will die"; If you would therefore release me, as I said, under these conditions, I would say to you: "Men of Athens, I salute and love you, but I will obey God rather than you, and as long as I breathe and have conditions, I fear I will not stop philosophizing and you warn and show (to any of you that I ever meet), speaking in that way to which I am accustomed - 'best of men, you, being an Athenian, of the greatest and most reputed city for wisdom and strength, do not feel ashamed of military in favor of money (in order to possess as much as possible), and fame and honor, but in favor of reflection, truth and the soul (in order to be the best possible) *not* military or worry?' And if any of you want to argue and say that you are a soldier, I will not immediately release him or step aside, but I will interrogate him, and inspect him, and refute him. And if it seems to me that I have not acquired virtue – but I say that I have –, I will reproach you for considering the least worthy of the maximum, and the most banal, too much. I will do this with the youngest and the oldest (with anyone I meet), with the foreigner and with the fellow citizen – more with the fellow citizens, because, by race, you are closer to me. Well, this is what the god commands me, and I myself think that no greater good has yet arisen for you in the city than my service to the god! I do nothing else as a circle other than to persuade, both the youngest and the oldest among you, not to militate in favor of either the body or money – not sooner (nor with the same intensity) than in favor of the *soul*, the in order to be the best possible – and I will say that virtue does not arise from money, but from virtue money, and all other human goods, public and private. If by saying such things I corrupt young people, such things would have to be harmful... But, if someone claims that I say things different from these, they say nothing! In view of this, Athenians", I would say, "whether you obey Anito or not, whether you release me or not, I will not be able to do otherwise not even if I am about to die countless times!"

(Court *reacts to Socrates' statements*) (Platão, 2008, pp. 88-90).

Socrates justifies his mission, philosophy, philosophizing and connects them to the gods and religious practice, this to rational, intellectual procedures and flowing into a way of believing and doing consciously involving the common good and the harmonious development of the city. For example, "Know yourself as a message to spread, and the God Apollo will be your witness." Therefore, whoever holds Socrates, holds the gods (like going against the God Apollo) supposedly of the city. So who has the truth? Corrupt subjects involved in unfair practices and an unfair and corrupted process to achieve personal ends and objectives or a subject who lives almost his entire life for the benefit of his people, culture, city, traditions and intellectual formation of youth? This topic already connects to the next one and the accusation against Socrates of corrupting the youth.

5. Socrates values the intellectual development of young people in his beloved city. There are young people who follow him of different types and for different reasons, origins, character, personalities, families, etc. (including followers who are children of their accusers). All of these are following their ideas, thoughts, philosophy and way of seeing and living life and social relations with and between humans and gods. These young people are not just following Socrates, but a supposed envoy of the gods and oracles of the city, with this, they are following 'the gods and their message' through the inferences, inquiries, questions and Socratic dialogues via the ironic and maieutic method. Therefore, Socrates is not corrupting them, but refining and developing them through the process of rationalization that he tried and was asked to do by the gods, since even though it is through the Oracle of the God Apollo that the message arrives to and from the "journey Socratic," however, Socrates made sacrifices to the gods he believed in, that is, several (Platão, 2008, pp. 73-87; Xenofonte, 2014, pp. 59-60, 89-91). "It would certainly be terrible, and in fact very precisely then I would be summoned to court, because I do not believe in the existence of gods by disobeying divination, by fearing death and by thinking that I am wise, when I am not (Platão, 2008, pp. 87-88)."

Therefore, whoever impedes this Socratic process of development of young people, alienates them and removes them from those possibilities (educating and refining) of virtuous education according to the God who 'moved and inspired' Socrates, which was education with the aim of a society in the end for the development of wisdom as well as *eudaimonic* life.

His behavior, moreover, showed that he had trained himself in such a way that he could more easily resist the most privileged of these young men with a palm on their face and in their prime, than others could resist the one who was in the most disadvantaged of situations, because he was ugly and had lost the freshness of his years.

With his behavior towards food, drink and sex, he thought that the pleasure he got was in no way inferior to that of those who abused these situations; besides, he had a lot less to worry about.

Then, those who believe - based on what some write or affirm by simple conjecture - that Socrates was extremely competent in influencing others in the search for the path to virtue but incapable of guiding them towards it, those who observe not only what He punished with systematic interrogations those who thought they knew everything and who also saw what he said to those he interacted with on a daily basis, to later judge whether or not he had the capacity to make his companions better (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 95).

Therefore, Xenofonte and Plato provide elements for us to deduce, speculate, create hypotheses and/or perceive other objectives behind the constant accusations and

contradictions of Socrates' accusers-persecutors, as well as facts that distinguished between the objectives of the proposals to educate through critically Socratic philosophizing and by the fundamentalist, conservative and fallacious stances in and of the accusations of Socrates' opponents or persecutors. And in the end it is the accusers and supporters who commit all the crimes that they point out and print on and on the accused, Sócrates. Let us continue with and in the following reflection and see the subtleties of the accusers "(...) But Socrates, what is your activity? Where did these slanders against you come from? It certainly wasn't after you had an activity that was no more extravagant than anyone else's that such fame and talk arose; only if you actually did something *different* from what most people do... (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 71)."

The scenario and arena in which Socrates is thrown would actually be a great tangle of political and religious clashes, in which Socrates finds himself the model citizen and religious person *versus* the fanatics and fundamentalists, let's look at the scenario that Socrates finds himself in regarding the situation of his supposed irreligiosity and false accusations, Socrates expresses this by saying: "(...) when I am defending myself from the accusation of irreligiosity made by this Meletus here (*points to the accuser*) (Platão, 2008, p. 98)." And Socrates further informs us, "Meletus, do you claim that I corrupt the youngest? Yes, of course, as stated in the complaint you made: "Teaching not to believe in the gods in which the city believes, but in different, new, numinous things" (Platão, 2008, p. 82)." And he continues, "But now it is not easy, in a short time, to undo great calumnies. Being in fact convinced of not acting badly towards anyone, I am far from acting badly towards myself (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 101)." and Socrates concluded "(...) and try to rip out the slander from within you – the one you have cultivated for a long time (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 68)." "(...) But now it is not easy, in a short time, to undo major slanders (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 101)." And Socrates asks,

In the name then of these gods themselves, Meletus, of whom we speak now, say even more clearly, to me and to these men (*points to the jury*) , for I, personally, am not able to understand if you are saying that I teach to believe in the existence of some gods (and then I myself believe in the existence of gods and I am not absolutely an atheist nor is that why I act badly) – but not exactly in those in which the city believes, but in *different ones*, and that is why you tell me intimate, because *different* –, or if you are completely stating that I myself do not believe in gods and teach this to others...?? (Platão, 2008, p. 82).

So, because they are (I think) friends of prestige, intense and numerous, they have filled your ears – both then and now – with intense slander. It was based on this that Meleto came upon me, together with Anito

and Lycon – Meleto taking the pains of the poets, Anito taking the pains of the workers and those involved in politics, and Lycon taking the pains of the orators (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 76).

Therefore, behind all this persecution, lies, slander, distortions and schisms against Socrates, he also explains to us the other reasons that exist: "(...) a lot of hatred arose against me, and with many –, know that and truth. And that is what will condemn me, if indeed it will condemn me: not Meletus, not Anito, but the slander and envy of many! (Platão, 2008, p. 86)." And Socrates continues saying that, "Meletus taking the pains of poets, Anito those of workers and those involved in politics, and Lycon those of orators (...) (Platão (2008, p. 76)." Xenofonte contributes by saying that Sócrates, after not accepting an unfair conviction process against a former commander who is being accused, a fact when Sócrates was the leader of the Assembly in question of the discussion of the merits, the fraudsters in the process against him began to persecute Sócrates, and so we are informed that: "He did not want to accept the deliberation and attracted the hatred of the people and the threats of many of the powerful; but, for him, it was more valuable to keep his word than to please the people in a decision that went against justice or what avoid those who threatened him (...) (Xenofonte, 2014, p. 66)." Plato also helps us by saying about Socrates' persecutors, that the philosopher lives by dialoguing and questioning people in the streets, in the *Agora* and wherever whatever, practicing and exercising his philosophy with others, those he encountered: "It was precisely because of this "inspection", Athenian men, that many hatreds arose against me, and so hard and heavy, that from them then many *slanders* began to emerge (...) (Platão, 2008, p. 76)."

Was Socrates, a victim of religious fundamentalism, intolerance and the judicialization of politics, religion and the art of philosophizing: the condemnation of the art of critical thinking?

References

- Abbagnano, N. (2012). *Dicionário de filosofia*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
 Arendt, H. (2015). *As origens do totalitarismo*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
 Arendt, H. (2017). *Eichmann em Jerusalém*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
 Aristófanes. (2016). *As nuvens: uma comédia grega*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
 Aristóteles. (1991). *Ética a Nicômaco*. São Paulo: Nova Cultural.
 Armstrong, K. (2015). *Uma história de Deus*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
 Arnaoutoglou, I. (2003). *Leis da Grécia antiga*. São Paulo: Odysseus.
 Asch, S. E. (1977). *Psicologia social*. Rio de Janeiro: Nacional.
 Aslan, R. (2019). *Deus uma história humana*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.

- Beard, M. (2017). *SPQR: uma história da roma antiga*. São Paulo: Crítica.
- Borges, V. P. (1990). *O que é história*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
- Bornheim, G. (1999). *Os filósofos pré-socráticos*. São Paulo: Cultrix.
- Bosi, A. (2012). *Dialética da colonização*. São Paulo: Companhia das letras.
- Botero, J. (2013). *No começo eram os deuses*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- Cairns, E. E. (2010). *O cristianismo através dos séculos: uma história da igreja cristã*. São Paulo: Vida Nova.
- Cardoso, C. F. S. (2014). *O Egito antigo*. São Paulo: Brasiliense. (Tudo é História).
- Cassirer, E. (2001). *Ensaio sobre o homem: Introdução a uma filosofia da cultura humana*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Cassirer, E. (2011). *Linguagem e mito*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Chauí, M. (2006). *Convite à Filosofia*. São Paulo: Ática.
- Coleman, J. A. (2018). *O dicionário de mitologia*. São Paulo: Pé da Letra.
- Commelin, P. (2017). *Mitologia grega e romana*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Coulanges, F. (2015). *A cidade Antiga*. São Paulo: Martin Claret.
- Duarte, M. B. (2021). O que é história, o sentido da história e a historiografia. *Oficina do historiador*, Porto Alegre, v. 14, n. 1, pp. 1-14, jan.-dez. 2021.
- Duarte, M. B. (2022 A) Etnocentrismo, xenofobia e medo: pulsão, repressão e recalque como medo oculto do outro, do desconhecido, do diferente e do diverso. *Interritórios*, v. 8, n. 17: e254345 [2022] 2022 A.
- Duarte, M. B. (2022 B). Sagrado, Profano, Religião, Magia, Sacrifício e Ritos em Frazer, Durkheim, Hubert & Mauss, Van Gennep e Lévi-Strauss. *Antropológicas*, ano 26, v. 33, n. 1, pp. 252-267, [2022] 2022 B.
- Duarte, M. B. (2023). O ser cidadão no Brasil: um problema de semântica, de conceito, não entendimento do termo, não ativação e efetividade da prática ou uma economia da concretude? *Revista Caminhos da Educação: diálogos, culturas e diversidades*. Piauí: Universidade Federal do Piauí - UFPI e do Grupo de pesquisa Eleko: histórias, culturas e experiências formativas. Rio de Janeiro: Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro -UERJ.
- Durkheim, E. (2014). *As formas elementares da vida religiosa*. Rio de Janeiro: Paulus.
- Eliade, M. (2013). *Mito e realidade*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Eliade, M. (2017). *O sagrado e o profano: a essência das religiões*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Ferro, M. (2017). *A colonização explicada a todos*. São Paulo: Unesp.
- Festinger, L. (1976). *Teoria da dissonância cognitiva*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
- Florenzano, M. T. *O mundo antigo: economia e sociedade*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2017. (Tudo é História).
- Foucault, M. (2014). *Vigiar e punir*. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes.
- Frazer, J. G. (1984). *O ramo de ouro*. Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara.
- Freud, S. (1980). *Escritos sobre psicologia do inconsciente (1915)*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago.
- Freud, S. (1988). *O ego e o id*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago.
- Freud, S. (1994). *Cinco lições de psicanálise, Leonardo da Vinci e outros trabalhos*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago.
- Freud, S. (2011). *O mal-estar na civilização*. São Paulo: L&PM.
- Freud, S. (2012). *Introdução ao narcisismo, ensaios de metapsicologia*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Freud, S. (2012). *Totem e tabu*. São Paulo: LP&M.
- Freud, S. 2013a. *O futuro de uma ilusão*. São Paulo: LP&M.
- Freud, S. 2013b. *O mal-estar na cultura*. São Paulo: L&PM.
- Freud, S. (2014). *Psicologias das massas e análises do EU*. São Paulo: L&PM.

- Freud, S. (2015). *Além do princípio de prazer*. São Paulo: L&PM.
- Freud, S. (2017). *Inibição, sintoma e medo*. São Paulo: L&PM.
- Funari, P. P. (2016). *As religiões que o mundo esqueceu*. São Paulo: Contexto.
- Gaarder, J.; Hellern, V.; Notaker H. (2016). *O livro das religiões*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Gibbon, E. (2015). *Os cristãos e a queda de Roma*. São Paulo: Penguin Companhia.
- Gibbon, E. (2016). *Declínio e queda do Império Romano*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Ginzburg, C. (2016). *Medo, reverência e terror*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Grimal, P. (2016). *História de Roma*. São Paulo: Unesp.
- Hadot, Pierre. (2019). *O que é filosofia antiga?* São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Hirst, J. (2017). *A mais breve história da Europa*. Rio de Janeiro: Sextante.
- Hobsbawm, E. (2011). *A era dos extremos*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Hobsbawm, E. (2015). *A invenção das tradições*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- Hobsbawm, E. *Sobre história*. (2017). São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Hume, D. *História natural da religião*. (2007). São Paulo: Unesp.
- Jaeger, W. (2018). *Paidéia - a formação do homem grego*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Japiassú, H.; Marcondes, D. (2006). *Dicionário básico de filosofia*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
- Le Goff, J. (2014). *Uma breve história da Europa*. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes.
- Le Goff, J. (2016). *A História deve ser dividida em pedaços*. São Paulo: Unesp.
- Le Goff, J. (2017). *As raízes medievais da Europa*. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes.
- Lévêque, P. (2018). *As primeiras civilizações*. Coimbra: Edições 70.
- Liverani, M. (2016). *Antigo oriente*. São Paulo: Edusp.
- Martin, T. R. (2010). *Roma antiga*. Porto Alegre: L&PM.
- Matiszak, P. (2016). *Os inimigos de Roma*. São Paulo: Manole.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1999). *Fenomenologia da percepção*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Nichols, R. H. (2008). *História da Igreja cristã*. Rio de Janeiro: Cultura Cristã.
- Orwell, G. (2014). *1984*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Pinheiro, A. E. (2008). *Platão: apologia de Sócrates*. Porto Alegre: L&PM.
- Platão. (2001). *Mênon*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Platão. (2008). *Apologia de Sócrates, Eutífron, Críton*. Porto Alegre: L&PM.
- Platão. (2016). *Apologia de Sócrates: clássicos gregos*. Brasília: UNB.
- Platão. (2016). *Teeteto*. Rio de Janeiro: Puc-RJ.
- Platão. (2017). *O banquete*. São Paulo: Edipro.
- Reale, G. (2015). *Sofistas, Sócrates e Socráticos menores*. São Paulo: Loyola.
- Sahlins, M. (2007). *História e cultura: apologia a Tucídides*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
- Said, E. W. (2016). *Orientalismo*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Seed, P. (1999). *Cerimonias de posse na conquista europeia do Novo Mundo*. São Paulo: Unesp.
- Smith, J. R. (2014). *As cruzadas: uma história*. São Paulo: Ecclesiae.
- Shelley, B. (2018). *História do cristianismo*. Rio de Janeiro: Thomas Nelson.
- Ujvari, S. C. (2020). *A história da humanidade contata pelo vírus*. São Paulo: Contexto.
- Unninni, Sin-Léqi-Unninni. (2017). *Ele que o abismo viu*: Epopeia de Gilgámesh. São Paulo. Autêntica.
- Vernant, J. P. (2017). *O universo, os deuses, os homens*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Veyne, P. (2012). *Os gregos acreditavam em seus mitos? ensaio sobre a imaginação constituinte*. São Paulo: Unesp.
- Veyne, P. (2016). *Mito e religião na Grécia antiga*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Vico, G. (2008). *Ciência nova*. São Paulo. Ícone Editora.

Xenofonte. (2014). *Memoráveis*. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra; Annablume.

Xenofonte. (2017). *Ditos e feitos memoráveis de Sócrates*. São Paulo: Edipro.

Waiblinger, A. (2016). *A Grande Mãe e a criança divina*. São Paulo: Cultrix.

RESUMO:

Muito ainda se investiga, estuda, especula e se discute sobre os inúmeros motivos da condenação e morte de Sócrates. Os três 'grandes crimes' que o levaram a condenação e morte são apresentados e detalhados por inúmeros autores, após a sua morte. Entretanto, as fontes mais próximas e supostamente confiáveis, mais especificamente, são as obras Apologia de Platão e as Memoráveis de Xenofonte, ambos discípulos do filósofo, o moscão de Atenas. O presente trabalho se debruça nas exposições das referidas obras dos dois discípulos e tenta fazer o esforço de verificar a questão e relação religiosa, judicial, criminal e política que levaram o mestre e filósofo a morte. Desse modo, percebemos que política, justiça e religião conduziam todo o processo contra Sócrates, bem como sua execução ou morte. A religião e a política estão introduzidas do início ao fim de sua condenação. Talvez instrumentos políticos e de manutenção de poder, domínio e manipulação de massas. Porém, também podemos observar que através dos registros e reflexões sobre ele, registros fornecidos por Xenofonte e Platão, é possível perceber que o processo e condenação contra Sócrates poderia se voltar contra seus acusadores, uma vez que, ao perseguir e atacar o moscão ateniense 'introduzido na cidade pelos deuses, e com missão específica,' tais perseguidores e acusadores estariam indo contra os próprios deuses. Ou seja, Xenofonte e Platão nos fornecem elementos para pressupor que ao acusarem Sócrates pelos três crimes, na verdade os próprios acusadores é quem estariam os cometendo desde o início do processo ao fim dele. Com isso, podemos dizer que há uma justiça parcial, bem como a judicialização da política, da religião e da filosofia, e a manifestação de um fundamentalismo religioso, intolerante e preconceituoso, o qual ataca a quem pensa fora do dogmatismo e "dos muros da cidade." Através e por meio da revisão da literatura podemos observar Sócrates, uma vítima do fundamentalismo religioso, da

intolerância e da judicialização da política, da religião e da filosofia: a condenação da arte de pensar criticamente. Investigações, abordagens, perspectivas e contribuições pela e para a Historiografia, Antropologia, Filosofia, Sociologia e Psicanálise: a Filosofia, Historiografia, suas produções e escritas sob novos olhares, análises e ou exercícios exegéticos.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Cultura; Religião; Política; Sociedade; Educação; Crime; Judicialização.

RESUMEN:

Todavía se investiga, estudia, especula y discute mucho sobre las numerosas razones de la condena y muerte de Sócrates. Los tres "grandes crímenes" que condujeron a su condena y muerte son presentados y detallados por numerosos autores después de su muerte. Sin embargo, las fuentes más cercanas y supuestamente fiables, más concretamente, son la Apología de Platón y los Memorables de Xenofonte, ambos discípulos del filósofo, el Moscó de Atenas. El presente trabajo se centra en las

exposiciones de las obras antes mencionadas de los dos discípulos y trata de hacer un esfuerzo por constatar la cuestión y la relación religiosa, judicial, criminal y política que llevó al maestro y filósofo a la muerte. De esta manera, nos damos cuenta de que la política, la justicia y la religión impulsaron todo el proceso contra Sócrates, así como su ejecución o muerte. La religión y la política se introducen desde el principio hasta el final de su condena. Tal vez instrumentos políticos e instrumentos para mantener el poder, la dominación y la manipulación de las masas. Sin embargo, también podemos observar que a través de los registros y reflexiones sobre él, registros proporcionados por Jenofonte y Platón, es posible ver que la acusación y condena contra Sócrates podría volverse contra sus acusadores, ya que, al perseguir y atacar a la mosca ateniense "introducida en la ciudad por los dioses, y con una misión específica", tales perseguidores y acusadores estarían yendo contra los propios dioses. En otras palabras, Jenofonte y Platón nos proporcionan elementos para presuponer que al acusar a Sócrates de los tres crímenes, en realidad los propios acusadores los estarían cometiendo desde el principio del proceso hasta el final del mismo. Con esto, podemos decir que hay una justicia parcial, así como la judicialización de la política, la religión y la filosofía, y también la manifestación de un fundamentalismo religioso, intolerante y prejuicioso, que ataca a quienes piensan fuera del dogmatismo y de "los muros de la ciudad". A través de la revisión de la literatura podemos observar a Sócrates, víctima del fundamentalismo religioso, de la intolerancia y de la judicialización de la política, la religión y la filosofía: la condena del arte de pensar críticamente.

Investigaciones, aproximaciones, perspectivas y aportes de y para la Historiografía, la Antropología, la Filosofía, la Sociología y el Psicoanálisis: la Filosofía, la Historiografía, sus producciones y escritos bajo nuevas miradas, análisis y/o ejercicios exegéticos.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Cultura; Religión; Política; Sociedad; Educación; Crimen; Judicialización.