1951

Plato's doctrine of man

Williams, Ora Bea

Boston University

http://hdl.handle.net/2144/8753

Boston University
Approved by

First Reader . Peter A. Bertocci . .
Professor of Philosophy

Second Reader . Bernard W. Meiklond
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION

1. Purpose ................................................................. 1  
2. Method Used ............................................................. 3  
3. Previous Work ........................................................... 4

## I HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1. Pre-Socratic Thought .................................................. 5  
2. Socratic Conception of Man .......................................... 6

## II THE METAPHYSICAL PLACE OF MAN IN THE COSMOS

1. Man as a Part of the Universe ...................................... 13  
2. The Nature of the Soul ............................................... 15  
   1. Psychological Analysis of the Soul .............................. 18  
      (1) Three elements ................................................. 20  
         (i) Host of appetites ...................................... 21  
            (ii) Spirit ............................................... 22  
            (iii) Reason ............................................. 23  
   11 The Conception of Eros ......................................... 24  
      (1) An inward drive toward perfection .......................... 25  
      (2) Love .......................................................... 27  
   111 The Origin and Destiny of the Soul ........................... 32  
      (1) Creation of the soul ...................................... 32  
      (2) Moral responsibility a part of the soul ............... 33  
      (3) Eternality of the soul .................................. 34

## III MAN AND THE GOOD LIFE

1. Plato's conception of the Good .................................. 35  
   1. The Good as a Metaphysical Entity ............................ 35  
   11 The Good as Moral Value ..................................... 36  
      (1) Logical Conception of the Good .......................... 40  
      (2) Social Conception of the Good ........................... 41  
   2. Meaning of Virtue in the Life of Man ........................ 42  
      1. Temperance .................................................. 45  
      11 Courage ..................................................... 47  
      111 Reason ........................................................ 50  
      111 Justice the all-embracing virtue ........................ 53  
   3. The Highest Good for Man ...................................... 64  
      1. Life of Contemplation ..................................... 65  
      11 Life of Realization ........................................ 65  
      111 Development of Character through Mixture ............. 66
INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This thesis proposes to present a systematic interpretation of Plato's theory of Man, using the Republic as a core and many of the other dialogues as aids toward a clearer understanding. This is an attempt to reconstruct his doctrine of Man from his own writing while neglecting many famous interpretations by scholars from the fifth century B.C. through the modern era. This paper will not be concerned with separate dialogues. More of a synoptic account will be given and the chapters will be determined according to subject matter alone. The purpose, therefore, is to give unity and shape to this particular problem. Although it is true that Plato's philosophy must be studied as a whole before any one theory can be isolated, this thesis is interested in presenting only one aspect of his thought. The problem to be discussed forms the center of his thought, for he strives to answer in his own way the question which perplexed the psalmist: "What is man that thou art mindful of him?" As one moves from dialogue to dialogue, the central position which Plato gives to man may be discerned. Each work gives a newer, fresher insight into the very nature of man.
The Republic has been selected as the core of this thesis because it represents Plato at his best. The earlier dialogues are based on Socratic thought and merely pave the way to a clearer understanding of man as he is presented in the Republic. The dialogues which follow appear to substantiate or enlarge upon an aspect of the concept of human nature contained in this work. This observation, as all observations, is tentative and may be subject to modifications.

The most important factor to keep in mind is that it is not the purpose of this thesis to solve the problems raised by Plato concerning the nature of man, but rather it is to understand them. Grounding in the text, however, is necessary before the basic problems can be grasped; for it is far too easy to become subjective and to allow personal problems to become Platonic ones. In attempting to present a systematic conception of man it has been necessary to accept the interpretation which conforms more with logical pattern in mind. The Republic supplies the outline and, as has been said, the other works will be used to give a clearer estimation of human nature. To be technical, one cannot say that this is the meaning of Plato, for he is far too complex for such a statement. One can merely say that this is more representative of Plato. No final conclusions will be offered that cannot be altered in light of further and varied
interpretation. Another difficulty is the manner in which Plato philosophizes. One must realize that the dialogue which he uses as a form tends to be dramatic, and his method therefore may differ from what he has to say. For instance, he speaks of the coherence of knowledge; in fact, he stresses it. Yet he is not a systematic thinker himself. His method is that of a movement from hypothesis to hypothesis; his mentality is intuitive rather than rational, suggestive rather than definitive. ¹

Method Used

Plato's theory of man is presented as an outgrowth of earlier Greek thought, especially that of the Sophists. No attempt has been made to separate his thought from that of Socrates for two reasons: first, because Plato's earlier ideas were so influenced by Socrates that they can not be distinguished, and second, because both men were fighting the basic problems raised by their opponents, the Sophists. (In the section on the "Historical Background" the Sophists will be discussed.)

This thesis is divided into chapters according to the relationship of man to the universe, man to society, man to man, and man to his inner self. Using this approach one may begin with man as a real part of all that there is and discover how he is metaphysically related to reality.

¹ Demos, PP, x.
Then one can move on to his association with a smaller unit—society. What is man's relation to the state? Why is there a need for a state? If there is a state, then it must be made up of individuals. If so, then how should one individual treat another? Why? Does it give the individual a personal sort of satisfaction when he lives with others, serves others? How does it affect him as a human being? What can he do to become the type of person he should be? These and many other problems will be answered in light of the theory of man as interpreted from the reading of Plato's dialogues.

Previous Work

It would be an impossible task to enumerate all the works that have been done on Plato as a thinker, teacher, or artist. His dialogues have been translated into over fifty languages and are steadily being translated into more. I am indebted, however, to the following writers for ideas that they have suggested concerning this thesis: Raphael Demos, Werner Jaeger, A. E. Taylor, R. Lodge, F. Cornford, and John Wild. The Jowett translation of the dialogues has been used exclusively except for the Cornford translation and edition of the Republic.
CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Before Plato all philosophical speculation was prologue. He was the first to see the role of philosophy in the education of a new type of man. The importance of the Pre-Socratics, as the earlier speculators are called, should not be underestimated, however. They must not be treated as steps in a continuous process alone, but must be studied as individual philosophers in order to appreciate their importance. The earlier philosophers cannot, however, demand a position as high as that of Socrates or Plato. In studying one particular problem it is impossible as well as irrelevant to discuss the thought of particular men other than that part of their thought which is pertinent to the issue.

The poet was the undisputed leader of the people during the age of the Pre-Socratics. Slowly the statesman and the law-giver joined him. This situation persisted until the time of the Sophists, who were social innovators in that they differed from the earlier naturalists and ontologists. The Sophists mark the point where philosophical speculation set to work to solve the problem of the nature of the individual and his relation to the universe. Turning
again to the poets, it is difficult to see where "mythical thinking" in the epic ended and rational thinking began. Indeed, rational ideas are interpenetrated in the very content of mythology. Because such is true, a line cannot be drawn between Homeric and Ionian natural philosophy. Viewing Greek thought as organic, there is no discontinuity between rational and mythical thinking. If Homeric epics are analyzed, it will be seen that logic invaded mythology quite early and began to transform it. For instance, there is not much difference between Homer's idea that Ocean is the origin of all things\(^1\) and Thales' idea that water is the basic principle of the universe. Both theories are inspired by the tangible reality of water. Again the notions of Love and Hate, the two most fundamental emotions which are binding and separating forces in the thought of Empedocles have the same ancestry as Hesiod's Cosmogenic Eros. It is impossible to say that philosophic thinking began at the point where mythological thinking ended. For even in Aristotle and especially in Plato there is evidence of mythical thinking. This is obvious in Plato's myths of the soul and in Aristotle's description of the love that all things have for the unmoved Mover.\(^2,3\)

Early Greek thought begins by delving into the mysteries of nature rather than the nature of man. To

\(^{1}\) Il. \textit{XIV}, 201 (203), 246.
\(^{2}\) Jaeger, \textit{Arist.}, pp. 50, 51.
\(^{3}\) Phad., 246--254.
explain this fact many scholars have said that the earlier thinkers were devoted to knowledge and sought to discover the answer to the deepest possible problem, which is the problem of Being itself. They were absorbed in the study of existence as such. Because of this many anecdotes were built up to ridicule these early thinkers. Thales was made to fall in a well and be jeered at by his Thracian maid for desiring to probe in celestial things when he could not see what was at his own feet. Anaxagoras is quoted as caring nothing for his family and country but pointing to the heaven says, "This is my country." Pythagoras was once asked why he was living, and he said, "To look at heaven and nature." These and like anecdotes serve as illustrative of the philosopher's inexplicable interest in cosmology, which was called meteorology in those days. They were considered strange and bizarre by the common people because of their scholarly search for the origin of the universe.

In the sixth century the natural philosophers devoted their lives to the study of this problem, or of the physics of the universe. The entire intellectual movement was given the name of physics as well as the type of thinking it created. This concept of physics differs from the modern idea of it, for such problems today would be termed metaphysics. In the Greek conception, however, two concepts are confused: the inquiry into the origin of the universe, which compels reason to move beyond the phenomenal; and the
comprehension of everything which proceeds from that origin and can be discovered through empirical investigation.¹

It is only natural that the Ionian would be led to ask the important question of "how" once they had discovered what each held to be the ultimate of the universe. They were compelled by their inquisitive nature to extend their knowledge of facts and discover the laws which governed natural phenomena. The myths, too, were subjected to the careful scrutiny of scientific thought. Here is the emergence of true philosophical thought.

In supplying the historical background of Platonic thought the Orphic movement must be added to the stream of early Greek thought. It exemplifies the search for a higher meaning of life, "it resembles the attempt of logical thought to establish a philosophical foundation for the rule of moral law throughout the cosmos."² Its teachings were not the cause of its great influence; rather the Orphic movement gave a new feeling for human life. Herein lies the beginning of a new consciousness of the self with a definite moral tinge. Because of its moral significance, it differed greatly from the Homeric conception of the soul. It taught that the soul should be kept pure in its earthly existence because it comes from God and does not perish. A believer in such a creed feels obligated for life and feels respon-

ible for the purity of his soul. Their doctrine continued
is that the soul is the highest and best part of man.
Because careful investigation had revealed to man that there
is a ceaseless cycle of birth and decay, that mighty nature
did not care for such a puny creature as man but far trans-
cended their brief happiness with its iron justice, men
turned to belief in their divine destiny. The soul became
a stranger in this world and longed for its eternal home.

The Orphic conception of the soul marks a definite
advance in man's concept of selfhood. Without it Plato
could never have developed the theory that human nature is
divine and that man's sensual nature can be separated from
his true self which he should perfect. Empedocles in his
philosophy synthesizes the Orphic conception of the divine
in man with the philosophical explanations which had been
advanced. He very clearly shows how these two seemingly
opposed views could supplement and complete each other. He
symbolizes the union of the two in his image of the soul
which is tossed up and down in the whirl of the elements—
air, water, earth, and fire. In the cosmos interpreted by
the physicists the soul can find no place; only when the
soul can make a place for itself in the philosopher's cos-
mos, as in Heraclitus, can man be content with a theory of
metaphysics.

The cosmological theories of the early Ionians were
pure, disinterested research without reference to human life.
Slowly philosophical investigation turned inward to examine the nature of humanity, as the whole cosmos gradually focused on the study of man, as this problem became more and more central in philosophical thought. Even Democritus was unable to exclude from his severely logical explanation of the universe the problem of man and man's moral world. He avoided the solutions, however, and chose to separate ethics from natural philosophy. His ethical theory was expanded in the old-fashioned form of parainesis, moral exhortation, and became a peculiar mixture of traditional maxims and the scientific and rationalistic spirit of philosophy. These and other attempts to bring the two worlds—world of nature and world of man—together are symptoms of the growing importance of the new philosophical problem of human life.

The increasing concentration of philosophy on problems of human existence made it historically impossible for the Sophists not to arise. They came into existence, however, to meet a practical and not a theoretical need. That is the basic reason why they had such a strong influence in Athens. They were founders of educational science. They called their theory of education an art, however, and not a science. In Plato we have a detailed account of Protagoras' view of the subject. They could not understand philosophy as divorced from life. They were the heirs of the educational tradition of the poets, and their proper place in the history of Greece cannot be grasped until they are assigned a
position in the history of Greek culture. The Sophists regarded Homer as the encyclopaedia of all human knowledge and as a mind of prudential wisdom for the conduct of life. They thought the poets immediately and timelessly present and discussed them as if they lived today. However, they did not proclaim the educational traditions of poetry alone because they also created much of their own. They dealt with all conceivable problems both varied and new. They were influenced by science, politics, religion, and such influences and were very proud of their knowledge. Plato is never tired of parodying and ridiculing their exaggerated self-conceit. Many of them combined the functions of scholar, orator, teacher, and litterateur. It was impossible to place them in any one trade or position. Heppias of Elis, who was conversant in all areas of knowledge, knew all trades, wore no garment which he had not made himself, was a perfect homo universale.

The Sophists were important because they made Greece cognizant of her own culture. At a time when Greek traditions were breaking down they realized that culture was the great duty which falls to the lot of the nation. This way they discovered the aim of the development of the people and the basis of every kind of social organization. However, the realization may be best described in Hegel's terms when

1. Rep. 598 d.
he said that Minerva's owl did not begin her flight until the dusk had fallen.

Not enough is known about the Sophists to give a detailed and individual account of their teachings and purposes. They were heralders of the day and wrote for the day in which they lived. Hence their works did not survive the time. They laid great stress upon the differences among themselves, as is shown by Plato's contrasting descriptions of the Sophists in the *Protagoras*. However, it is known that the Sophists directed study to the body of man as a physical organism. Man is subject to certain rules prescribed by his own nature, and these rules must be known if he is to live a happy or contented life. They began with an optimistic belief that man's inner nature is capable of being educated and the bad man is an exception. Of course, this is a point where Socrates and the Sophists meet. *Protagoras*, the most famous of the Sophists, stressed education and gave it a wide and deep foundation. Education is not a simple automatic process, but it is more of a soul shaping. This notion is explicit in *Protagoras'* assertion that the harmony and rhythm of poetry and music must be impressed upon the soul to make it rhythmical and harmonious.

The Sophists are also very important to philosophical thought—not because of any great metaphysical contribution but because they made it possible for the development of such great minds as those of Socrates and Plato. Socrates
and Plato directed all their energies toward defeating the Sophists, who declared that the natural standard of human conduct is utility, ultimately enjoyment or pleasure. They asserted that each man determined what was best for himself according to the amount of pain or pleasure it gave him. This extreme relativism led to the formation of the famous statement by Protagoras, "Man is the measure of all things."

The views of the Sophists on man, the state, and the universe lack the seriousness of the earlier philosophers. Yet it would be wrong to judge their achievements in the fields of ethics and metaphysics alone. Their greatest contribution to Greek culture was in the field of formal education. Their weakness was in the intellectual and moral foundations of their teaching, but they are not to be judged too harshly for this because it was indicative of the times in which they lived. It is only natural that such an era in history in which individualism is stressed relativism should arise along with an unparalleled demand for education and also that talented educators should arise to fulfill the need.

The fourth century, however, was a fulfilment of the promise of the fifth. It was an age of tremendous revolution in which equality was based on law. The people only enjoyed listening to standards and contents for less and less attention was paid to them. Plato, the greatest thinker of his day, saw the difficulty in building up society and
the State more clearly than anyone else and took up the challenge. Over the fourth century lies the shadow of collapse which sends off a bright ray and slowly fades away. Plato the man must be seen in such a setting where the very foundation of his social and political world was shaken. After thirty years of war Athens fell and the most glorious political structure ever built crumbled. The Greek world was convulsed by her fate. The moral and political repercussions were felt by all because life in the city state had been so closely connected with that of the government. It was far more than merely political; it shook all moral laws and struck at the roots of religion. Because of this the fourth century was an age of constant endeavor at internal and external reconstruction. It was because of inner conflicts and suffering that the Greek spirit turned inward upon itself. The Greeks believed in order to relieve the suffering they must change the world. This is the place where Plato fully expresses his theory of man. Only through man would this change be possible. Plato realized this and arranged his thought to include the proper education that would allow man to surpass himself and to improve the world in which he lives. Why should such a task fall upon man? What is his relation to reality which allows him to transcend the world and thus improve it? These and other questions will be fully answered in the following chapters.
CHAPTER II

THE METAPHYSICAL PLACE OF MAN IN THE COSMOS!

AS A SOUL

Before one can understand events about man, it is necessary to understand his own nature and purpose. For this reason it is necessary to begin a discussion of man by analyzing his inner nature, designated as soul by Plato.

Of all things which a man has, next to the gods, his soul is the most divine and most truly his own . . . and in our opinion he ought to honor her second only to the gods . . . even in life what makes each of us what we are is only the soul.1

A sigh whispered in the dark gazing at a starry sky, a seeking for knowledge in books of ancient wisdom, a yearning "to be or not to be"—why? Man overwhelmed by his minuteness when surveying as far as the eye can see and the mind can comprehend, man mystified when seeking to discover the fathomless depth of his inner being, man looking at man with a wondering air because he varies in all degrees—between beast and god, foolish and wise, ugly and beautiful—and asks how shall I regard them with hostility and antagonism, condescension and tolerance, love and affection, or with righteousness and justice—why? Each man in his own

1. Laws, 959.
peculiar way, be it sighing, seeking, or yearning, desires an answer to one question: where do I fit in? Do I belong?

Is man an intruder or fugitive from another world resting here awhile before he journeys on? Or is he here by chance—a mere result of chemical reaction under favorable conditions? Perhaps he was created to be a plaything of the gods, who delight in his efforts to free himself from the web of life. Plato answers nay to these and like assertions. Man is no stranger, intruder, or victim of chance; he is related to the cosmos and has a specific purpose to fulfill. His real or inner self allies him with the eternal and the passing; it causes and does the sighing, seeking, yearning; it alone can find the sense of belonging to the universe, to the race of mankind, and most important of all, only the soul can discover its true worth because only the soul can know itself.

Before one can understand events about him, it is necessary to know something of his own nature and purpose. For this reason it is necessary to begin a discussion of man by analyzing his inner nature.

No meaningful interpretation of Plato's concept of the soul can be given without discussing his meaning of eros. The best discussion is found in the Symposium. The Symposium is the most perfect of all Plato's dialogues; it is more than that his art reaches its height. No words could possibly do it justice, whether one is analyzing or
paraphrasing the language. All that can be done is to mark its main theme and relate it to Plato's concept of the soul. By the title of the work Plato shows that this dialogue differs from most of his others because it does not have a central character. Plato gave the discussion of *eros* a very appropriate setting by his selection of time and scene. From the earliest time, the symposium meant to the Greeks the milieu where honors were celebrated in poetry and song. This may be found true in Homer and Xenophanes, as well as the aristocratic educational maxims of Theognis sung at banquets. Plato, however, was the founder of a new philosophical form of the symposium. His symposia became one of the regular meeting places of the teacher and pupil. The many works of post-Platonic Greek literature bearing the word "symposium" in their title bear witness of the change in meaning and the existence of the philosophical spirit bringing deeper and richer problems.¹

In Plato's thinking and writing, it is possible to ascertain two methods. His work represents an attempt to obtain ideals of universal validity and a lively awareness of all the concrete facts of life in which he is living. Both concepts can be traced to thinkers before Plato and before his concept of *eros* can be understood, one must understand the background. Plato was deeply impressed by two

thinkers, and he struggled throughout his life to reconcile the thought of the two. In the Symposium he believed that he had succeeded. The two thinkers were Heraclitus, a philosopher of change, and Socrates, a seeker of universal ideals.

Heraclitus represents the humanizing of philosophical problems. Before his time the Ionians, Milesians, and Eleatics had contented themselves with purely unbiased naturalistic interpretations of the cosmos. Although Heraclitus was greatly influenced by their thought and other objective conceptions of the universe, he never lost sight of the human life in the vast pattern of nature. He held that the human soul with all its sufferings and emotions was the center of the energies of the cosmos. Nature could be known only through the words and deeds of men because they were the instruments through which nature worked. He was the first to seek a place for man in the struggling universe which paradoxically is a sea of Being and Becoming.

Heraclitus opened a vast new area of knowledge to the human mind when he said, "Travel over every road, you cannot discover the frontiers of the soul--it has so deep a logos."\(^1\) By this he meant that an entirely new realm of knowledge could be discovered if the soul would turn and contemplate upon herself. This inner self is of a deeper and more

\(^1\) Called to attention by Jaegar, Paid., I, 179 (Frag. 45).
mystifying nature than the grand cosmos herself. No other thinker before Socrates had awakened such a keen interest in the inner self as Heraclitus had. He stands at the very pinnacle of the freedom of Ionian thought when he said, "I sought for myself." This is the highest expression of selfhood that had been uttered.

Heraclitus' conception of selfhood is embodied in Plato's conception of the soul. By selfhood Heraclitus meant the idea of the logos which knows its own self and place in the universe. Here within the new cosmos which his predecessors had discovered, Heraclitus gave man as the logos a central place. However, to live as a cosmic being it is necessary to obey the cosmic laws. Life as such is much more than existence; it entails the relationship with the universe in its entirety. All is one, but the one is a matrix of tensions and compulsions, change and identity. The self, the world, the cosmos has its beginning from opposites. Through the struggle with the opposite life is possible.

It rests by changing. Living and dead, waking and sleeping, young and old are at bottom one and the same. This changes, and that is that; and that changes again and is this.1

For Heraclitus man is a part of the cosmos as all else is. As such he must obey the cosmic law of change as all other parts do. Man differs from other parts of the cosmos in

1. Frag. 88.
that he is able to obtain wisdom. Through its kinship with the "everlasting fire," the soul is capable of knowing divine truth.

Plato was greatly influenced by this doctrine of change as expounded by Heraclitus of Cratylus. When he was very young he attended some of Cratylus' lectures and was swept away with the Heraclitean flow. Then he met Socrates and a new world became visible to him. Socrates spoke of moral problems in which he discussed the eternity of essences such as the Good, the Just, and the Beautiful. At this point Plato did not know what to think. He was so impressed by the Heraclitian idea of change that he could not join in with Socrates' determined search for a fixed point in the ethical world. Confusion suddenly cleared away and Plato discovered harmony in doctrines he once thought to be mutually exclusive. Both Heraclitus and Socrates were right! Each was speaking of different worlds. Heraclitus spoke of the phenomenal world which we know through experience. It was all so plain to him then and he continued throughout his life to hold this view regarding the sensible world. But Socrates was looking for a different sort of reality which did not flow but was truly "is." His was a search for the immutable and eternal which transcended the phenomenal. Socrates introduced Plato to universal concepts which composed the world of true being. The essences which could be grasped only by thought were named Ideas by Plato.
and placed in a separate world apart from the world of sense.

Socrates spoke of the excellence of the soul, too, and added something new. He called the soul psyche in such a tone that reverence was added to the passionate and beseeching urgency which he expressed. Rhode in his great book Psyche passes over the importance of Socrates' thought in the development of Greek spirit. This may be justifiable on the grounds that Socrates made no essential contribution to the realms of thought concerning the cult of the dead or immortality. However, as Burnet points out in a very fine article in which he traces the development of the soul in Greek history, neither the Homeric and epic eikon, the shades in Hades, nor the air-soul of the Ionic philosophers, nor the soul-daemon of Orphic belief, nor the psyche of Attic tragedy can explain the new meaning of soul given by Socrates. He attributes to the soul a peculiar spiritual emotion which has influenced the Christian conception very much. This statement must not be so construed as to think Socrates was a Christian thinker, as many early church fathers asserted. His thought definitely was Hellenic in origin. Analogies and preliminary stages to his teaching can be pointed out in the Orphic and Dionysian cults. Socrates was a hard thinker, however, and modified these concepts to a high degree.

1. Burnet, Art., 1930, 236.
Socrates emphasized the inner life by saying that the soul is the highest source of values in human life. He gave no definite outline of it as Plato did, but contented himself with singing its praises. Virtue and happiness became qualities of the spirit which could be mirrored by the body. His greatest contribution to the Platonic conception of the soul is that one should care for the soul. By this he did not mean what the Christians asserted, nor did he mean that the soul should be separated from the body. On the contrary, he believed that one could not properly care for the soul unless the body too was cared for. Both needed treatment; one could have a sick soul as well as a sick body. The duty of the soul was not to separate itself from the body but to control the body instead. Self-control as such must be developed through proper exercise and proper food. The proper exercise was practical thinking grounded in the dialectic; proper food was learning.

Plato's problem was to connect the two worlds which he sincerely believed in. The question was how. How could he reconcile these two worlds in one coherent system of thought? Herein lies the seed of his conception of the soul as *eros*. Metaphysically there was need for an entity which could tie the two realms together. There was need for some principle of betweenness, some mediator, to bring the world of appearance and the world of values together. All these requirements were met in Plato's conception of *eros*. 
If the highest conception of *eros* is taken to be man's instinctive urge to develop his own higher self, then *eros* can be declared to be one of the basic characteristics of the soul. *Eros* is born from man's metaphysical yearning after the wholeness which is forever impossible to the individual nature. This yearning shows man to be merely a fragment always striving to be reunited with its appropriate other self as long as he exists in helpless separation. It represents the striving of the soul for Truth, Wisdom, Beauty, and Goodness. In other words, it is that which gives direction to live and leads as Demos suggested to more life and better life. Self-perfection, however, can be obtained only in relation to something else or someone else who will complement the powers which need completion. This is illustrated in the speech made by Aristophanes when he indirectly indicates that there is something else besides sexual union which makes partners desire to remain together forever. Whatever it is they cannot say; the soul of each wants something from the other which is impossible to name.

*Eros* became an epitome of all human striving to obtain the Good. It is a yearning for wholeness and perfection voiced by an incomplete and imperfect being. As such it is not an ideal or a form, but a part of the nature of man which makes it possible for eternal life. For *eros* is interpreted as the love for the Good, and at the same time it

is the urge of human nature toward self-fulfillment. In fact it is what Plato means by philosophy: the yearning of the true self to take shape within us. This yearning for the good entails the desire to possess the good forever.\(^1\) It is the aspiration of the man who knows he is still imperfect to mould his own spirit and reason with his gaze steadily fixed on the Ideas.

The type of desire or activity which deserves the name of _eros_ is the urge to procreate, whether it be biological, social, or spiritual. There is first the desire to have an offspring by a beautiful person.\(^2\) (The Platonic meaning of beauty will be given while discussing the ladder of beauty, of love.) This strikes one as being strange in the very beginning because it seems to be confined to the body. The attractiveness of the body does have its function in this theory, but it is secondary to the inward beauty which belongs to the soul. There is a strong desire within man to have someone like himself to leave behind. This represents the meaning of _eros_ as a physical impulse, the impulse of our bodies to be immortal.\(^3\) There is also the desire to perpetuate oneself in the onward flow of the life of the community through some heroic deed or creative act. Phaedrus said that men died for what they loved in order to

\(^1\) _Symp._, 206a.
\(^2\) _Symp._, 206f.
\(^3\) _Symp._, 208a–b.
be remembered for their valiant deeds.¹

Socrates proposes to show that the soul as eros has additional virtues. He synthesizes all that had been said before in the speech he bases on Diotima's knowledge of love. According to Diotima, eros cannot be given positive characteristics. It is the desire for something which is lasting. It yearns for beauty, completion, perfection; hence, it cannot be beautiful, complete, or perfect. It stands between beauty and ugliness, wisdom and ignorance, perfection and imperfection, mortality and immortality, between celestial and earthly realms. Here the gap between the world of Ideas and the world of appearances is closed. To use Nietzsche's term, the soul becomes a "bridge." It is the bond, the syndemos that binds the whole universe together. Thus man becomes the central figure in the cosmos. He is a part of two realms binding them together in a unique fashion by forever striving to become perfect as the Ideas are perfect.

How is it possible to attain this perfection? Love is the key given to Socrates by Diotima. Love is a form of eros and as such it is forever partnered with want, yet overflowing with riches.² Using the human being as an example, because here eros reaches its highest expression, Diotima describes the various stages which are necessary

1. Symp., 179.
2. Symp., 203c-e.
before the feeling of wholeness which the individual yearns for is attainable. These stages have been referred to by many scholars as the ladder of Love or Beauty. The ascent begins in early youth when the physical beauty of another is admired and desired. Then the youth realizes that there are many beautiful bodies, and the dependence upon the one beautiful person that he admires dwindles away. This does not mean that he contents himself with love affairs with every beautiful person who will allow it, but it means that he is beginning to appreciate beauty in itself. Next, he begins to notice a spiritual beauty which is not as common as physical beauty. This type being of a more enduring form, he gives it a higher position. He comes to prefer the charms of the inner self more than the outward beauty, even when the spirit is in an unattractive body. (As Alcibiades' love for Socrates even when he likened him to the statuettes of Silenus which were sold in art shops. When these statuettes, ugly as they were, were opened, images of gods were within them.) The emphasis here is transferred from outward beauty to inward loveliness. At this stage, eros takes on an educational character and brings forth speeches designed to improve the appreciation of the young. It moves upward to recognize the beauty of all sciences and all knowledge.

2. Symp., 210b.
3. Symp., 210e.
realizes that they are a part of the Beautiful which is above and beyond all individual phenomena and relationships.¹

Plato does not mean that one lives for one trance-like aesthetic moment when all particular beauties are absorbed in the essence of Beauty. Instead he maintains that the only life worth living is spent in perpetual contemplation of the eternal Beauty.² This does not imply a static condition of the soul at all, which is lacking in completeness. Diotima had defined eros as the desire to make the Good one's own forever, which indicates the possession of a lasting state throughout life. Plato refers to this state as "divine beauty," or "lasting beauty," which he identifies with the Good. He goes on to say that Beauty and the Good are two closely allied aspects of the same reality. Beauty and Goodness are pure states which are the highest principles of human action as well as the ground of all that happens in nature. For Plato believes that there is perfect harmony between the individual and the cosmos, morality and the universe. This concept of eros is his attempt to bring together the two realms talked about in the theories of Heraclitus and Socrates.

If the interpretation that eros is the yearning to make the Good one's own forever is correct, then eternal beauty and goodness must be within the very heart of the

1. Symp., 210d-e.
2. Symp., 211c.
individual, urging him onward, driving him forward. But this does not answer the negative, degrading aspects of human nature. This accounts only for the construction of personalities such as Socrates, but leaves out weaklings and tyrants. Further reading in the Phaedrus and the Republic confirms such doubts. *Eros* may be the basic drive within the soul, but it is not all of it. If this were not true, then there would be no difference between individuals.

What is the principle of differentiation in souls? First we must inquire into the nature of the self as such. The best interpretation of the soul can be given by using the myth of the charioteer which Plato used in the *Phaedrus*. Without such an analogy the interpretation will overlook some of the important factors. "Let the life of the individual be likened to the indwelling mobile power of a winged yoke of horses and a charioteer." As Wild reminds us, attention is called at once to the wings. The wings dominate the speech made by Socrates in this passage. Their role is due to the fact that without their aid the chariot drawn by two steeds could never possibly ascend to the celestial realm where the gaze of the charioteer is fixed. The wings do not belong to either of the steeds nor the charioteer alone. They rather belong to the uniting power of the whole

1. Phaedr., 246a--257.
2. Phaedr., 246a-b.
vehicle, as the individual who loves loves with his whole being and not with a part. However, they are more closely united with the charioteer than with any of the other parts, because he through careless driving can smash the wings and ground the vehicle. Under more skillful driving the chariot can rise to the upper region, as the lover who sees the inward beauty rises beyond the attractions of phenomena. Thus driver and wings depend upon each other. He embodies the concept of reason which guides the chariot and prevents the confusion which would ensue without his intervention. But what would cause such confusion?

The chariot is drawn by two steers who could only by their own power move the vehicle but could never raise it off the ground. Without a trained driver, the more powerful horse would take control and pull the chariot around and around. Soon the weaker horse would rebel and decide to go his own way. By such constant interference the motion of the entire vehicle is impeded, the wings are crushed, and the vehicle is grounded. This situation could be averted by the skillful driver. The meaner animal must be beaten into submission\(^1\) and he will then follow the able steer\(^2\) to a position where ascent is possible. The horses, as the driver, have power independent of each other. They can react at will to any temptation, but will be less likely

\(^{1}\text{Phaedr., 254e.}\)
to do so if they are properly disciplined. There is the power of the meaner horse who sees only what is before him. Aspiration has no meaning for him and he can only be trained to stand in fear before it.¹ The better steed does not have a vision which is much longer, but he respects the driver and becomes responsive to what he cannot see. The driver sees what the horses see and more. His gaze is fixed on eternal things and he sets his goal in that direction.²

This myth is interpreted for us in Book IV of the Republic. The existence of the tripartite division of the soul—reason, spirit, appetite—is established by an analysis of the conflicts of motives. The illustration of a thirsty man is used to make clearer this concept of the soul. He is held in check by the reflection that the drink would be bad for him. Here at least two forces are at work, one urging the man to drink and the other restraining him. The element which encourages him onward sees only the immediate results, as the meaner steed saw only what was before him; but the reflective element refuses to allow this urge to triumph; in this opposition reason controls desire through discipline. There is a third element, which is designated as the spiritual one, which enters at this time. This factor takes the side of reason and may be praised or rebuked by reason. These three factors are not independent entities, as may be

¹. Phaedr., 254e.
². Phaedr., 554b.
thought, but are necessary components of the soul. They represent three forms of desire with the characteristic objects of wisdom, honor, and satisfaction of bodily desire.¹ Here are three distinct but inseparable factors which include rational planning, long range endeavor or seeking, and momentary appeasement. In the actual living of life individualism is possible because of the varied degree of influence of each element of the soul upon the other. The highest type of life toward which man aspires can be lived only when the soul is controlled by reason which has through training gained rational insight into the permanent structure of the universe and life in the world.

It has been shown that all the diverse strands of the universe meet in the soul. The soul as such must possess a fixed character and identity to exist at all. Of the origin and fate of the soul, no one can be sure. Plato's accounts of the beginning and destiny of the soul are vague and confusing because he does so in a poetic form with the use of myths. The soul is the primary factor of experience and can only be explained by some transempirical factor. Plato may be interpreted to have believed that a definite number of souls were created by God in cooperation with the eternal patterns and the receptacle.

¹. Rep., IV, 439.
It is certain, however, that he believed these souls to be immortal. The basic proof which he gives for its immortality in the Republic rests upon its kinship to the eternal Ideas. The soul cannot be destroyed by any external force, only by its own viciousness. As Socrates said:

Everything is destroyed by its own peculiar evil or corruption; or if that will not destroy it, there is at any rate nothing else that can bring it to an end.¹

The general trend of Plato's arguments for the immortality of the soul may be said generally to follow this pattern: if the soul cannot be destroyed by its own illness, which is vice, then it cannot be destroyed at all. He does not even consider that the life of the soul may depend on the life of the body. He is more interested in the soul as a repository of moral values than he is in its psycho-physical aspect.

Plato is sure that the soul can never appear in its perfect form in this world. It is too much like "the sea-god Glauclus, whose original form can hardly be discerned, because parts of his body have been broken off or crushed and altogether marred by the waves, and the clinging overgrowth of weed and rock and shell has made him more like some monster than his natural self."² We cannot comprehend its true nature unless its love of nature is comprehended.

Plato goes on in the myth of Eur to give a picture of

¹. Rep., X, 610.
². Rep., 611c-d.
the destiny of the soul after death. The emphasis, however, is not on judgment or punishment. Instead he stresses the choice of lives made by the souls after their years of wandering. The doctrine of the wandering of the soul after death, taken over from Orpician traditions, enables Plato to make clearer the moral responsibility of man.

Here he attempts to reconcile the old Greek idea of maia, in which life is determined by the Fates from birth to death, with the nearer idea of free choice. The conception of free choice appears quite early in Plato's work in reference to right action. Both elements, necessary and free choice, play their parts in the game of life. The climax comes in the Republic when the Interpreter tells the souls:

No guardian spirit will cast lots for you, but you shall choose your own destiny. Let him to whom the first lot falls choose first a life to which he will be bound of necessity. But Virtue owns no master; as a man honors or dishonors her, so shall he have more of her or less. The blame is his who chooses; Heaven is blameless.

With these words the Interpreter scattered the lots at their feet. Once the choice was made it was irrevocable. Immediately crying and wails of complaint filled the air as the souls made poor selections. Plato makes the point clear in

1. Rep., 617e.
2. Appears first in Apol. 39a and Crito 52c, where he is talking of Socrates as a perfect example of making a choice that affects one's entire life. In Prat. 356e and Georg. 499e it appears as a philosophical problem.
several instances that the choice of soul made depends a great deal upon the previous life of the selector. One soul chose the life of a swan, another a nightingale, one a lion's life, and another a life of athletic honor. Only Odysseus, after his manifold experience chose not a life of glory, suffering, and action, but a new life, which was lying about not being observed—that of a man living in quiet retirement. He had learned that wealth, glory, fame did not mean happiness anymore than their opposites. The middle life, as always, is best.¹ The conclusion can be drawn that the fundamental purpose of the soul is to live so that it may make the right decision in a later life. The greatest danger each person faces is that he may choose the wrong pattern of life. Therefore, man must seek out the knowledge which enables him to do this and neglect another. The first question of life directed by eros is to discover the Good. Once the concept of the Good becomes concrete, then a life of correct decision can be lived.

¹. Rep., 620c.
CHAPTER III

MAN AND THE GOOD LIFE

The Nature of Good

The Good holds a central position in the philosophical thought of Plato. It is not only the most outstanding principle in ethics, it forms also the bases of his metaphysics, theory of knowledge, theory of art, and theology. Neither his conception of the universe, society, man, nor the moral order can be fully understood apart from the Platonic conception of the Good. In this idea the ultimate standard of values and the ultimate standard of being are conjoined.

Important as the conception of the Good is and central as it is to his philosophy, Plato does not give a systematic presentation of it in any of his writings. There are many scattered references to the Good in his Dialogues, especially in the Republic III and VII, the Philebus, and the Timaeus. Even in the named Dialogues, the idea of the Good never becomes more than a hint of what might be. In discussing this concept, the most to be hoped for is a clearer understanding of what Plato was attempting and a recognition of the basic problems involved which contribute to the vagueness and confusion of the conception of the Good.
It is important to be as clear as possible when discussing this concept and not become lost in the confusion. With this in mind, the first step is to realize that Good refers to value in general and not moral value in particular. Moral value is merely one particular instance of value. The Good is being treated as a metaphysical entity first and as a theory of value, secondly.

The central metaphysical concept of Plato is the Idea of the Good. The Good itself is the First Form. This does not mean that the Good was the first in time necessarily, for this is another question. However, it does mean that the Good is first in importance. The other forms have meaning only in relationship to the Form of the Good.

The Good is the source and original ground of all existence and gives meaning to all existence without which knowledge would be impossible. The Good may be compared to the Sun as Socrates revealed in the Republic when pressed by Glaucon to give a definition of the Good.

This, then, which gives to the objects of knowledge their truth and to him who knows them his power of knowing, is the Form or essential nature of the Good. It is the cause of knowledge and truth; and so while you may think of it as an object of knowledge, you will do well to regard it as something beyond truth and knowledge and, precious as these both are, of still higher worth. And, just as in our analogy light and vision were to be thought of as like the Sun, but not identical with it, so here both knowledge and truth are to be regarded as like the Good, but to identify either with the Good is
The Good must hold a yet higher place of honor. 1

The Form of the Good is of such a complex nature that it is difficult to assign any distinct characteristics to it, for in the Good all opposites are merged into one and all contradictions fade away. The Good becomes the one which is eternal, complete, self-sufficient, perfect, ideal. It goes beyond virtue, yet the virtues gain meaning in its light. It transcends the eternal values of Truth, Goodness, Beauty, Wisdom; yet they are characteristic of its innermost nature. The Good is beyond the reach of knowledge; 2 however, training of the intellect is a preliminary conditioning, before the Good is glimpsed by intuition in a mystical-like fashion.

The metaphysical conception of the Good in Plato's thought is all too inclusive. The vastness of it results in the loss of distinguishing characteristics. The mind cannot succeed in comprehending such greatness, and the concept slides past the intellect to be grasped by the powers of intuition alone. For the Good is other than truth and knowledge. 3 It is at the top of the Ladder of Truth, Knowledge, Beauty and is reached in a flash which is sudden and abrupt, not slow and deliberate. 4 Knowledge of the Good becomes su-

2. Sym., 211a.
per-rational; that is, it is non-conceptual and non-referential. It can be understood only in relation to its place in the system. But the nature of the Good is not a part of any system of coordinates and cannot be defined or interpreted by its place in the system. The Good, in other words, is the sun which is the source and renders visibility to all things. It is the criterion by which rational beliefs are tested, the principle of intelligibility. But the criteria cannot be tested and must declare themselves.¹ Knowledge of the Good transcends truth. Here Plato indicates that the Good is not a truth; but truth is like the Good, but not the Good. The Good is beyond truth as it is beyond the other virtues.

This elaboration of the Idea of the Good only goes further to illustrate the paradoxical nature of Plato's doctrine of the Good, which transcends knowledge, truth, and goodness, yet is eminent in them.

Mystical as this interpretation of the Good may seem, there is an interplay between reason and insight in gaining knowledge of its nature. For instance, from observation of beauty in empirical things, one is led to beauty in the forms. From here one can contemplate Beauty itself. As indicated, there is a progression from reason to insight. For the Idea of the Good is attained at the extreme limit of the intelligible, and by a process of definition.² The realm of the

1. Demos, Pop., 74.
2. Rep., 532b; 534b.
intelligible does not contain the Good, rather it suggests it. For the vision of the Good is attained by a leap—sudden and immediate.

Man can know the Good as it is in its pure state. But such an experience is rare and fleeting. For as long as he remains in the body and is partially controlled by the desires of the body, knowledge of the Good is impossible for him. Such a man is condemned to the cave, and his happiness consists chiefly in remembrance and anticipation. But the privileged souls who are able to see the Good achieve the vision in a state Plato calls madness. There is a question whether they reach this state by their own efforts alone or not. It is clear that man must strive and ascend the various steps in the ladder of knowledge; at a certain point he becomes passive, and then revelation may or may not come. The vision of the Good entails the passivity and the activity of man. Once he has viewed the Good, he attempts to convert the insight into a system of concepts. This is what Plato did when outlining his theory of values.

Plato's system of values if isolated from his concept of the Good would be consistent and understandable. But he attempted to merge the two, and confusion resulted. Goodness became inherent in things and yet it transcended them. This haziness loomed largest at the point where being and value merged to become one. What happened was that the metaphysical concept of the Good as an eternal,
perfect entity, which was the ground of all, became confused with the good as being good for or instrumental.

Good as Moral Value

The Good as moral value is the reason for all things being as they are; it is the standard and purpose which gives meaning to the universe and prevents purposeless activity. The Good is of a two fold nature. Metaphysically, it is the really real; and morally, it is the less really real in a descending order. The Good as the really real is made more vivid and outstanding when compared with the Good which is less real because of its difference; perfection gains by imperfection.

Demos goes so far as to suggest that this is the first statement of the Doctrine of the Great Chain of Being. Considering such an interpretation, the cosmos becomes a hierarchy of higher and lower forms, a hierarchy of forms and things, a hierarchy of higher and lower things. The Great Chain of Being links the eternal pattern with the eternal receptacle.

This conception of the Good as imminent in the world is logically consistent. As Plato says in the Philebus, a rational account must not jump at once but should proceed

1. Demos, POP, 55.
2. Tim., 41b.
3. Demos, POP, 56.
4. Demos borrowed such an interpretation from Professor Arthur Lovejoy, who wrote a book titled The Great Chain of Being.
step by step, going through all the intervening stages.¹
This law of continuity forms the basis of all the ladders in
Plato's philosophy. It renders all empirical goods rational.

Herein lies one of the distinguishing characteristics
of the goodness in the empirical world and the Idea of the
Good. Things become good because they fit into a logical
pattern. Their usefulness and practicality can be deduced
from their very being. Their value is enhanced by their re-
lation to other things and their usefulness. As Plato so
clearly pointed out, "The best definition is and ever will
be: the useful is good, the harmful is base."² The useful-
ness and practicality of any particular, however, depends
upon its relation to the Good.

Human beings are no exception. They too have a place
in this hierarchy of values, and their very well being or
happiness depends upon their fulfillment of the function as-
signed. Each particular becomes real in so far as it parti-
cipates in the Good. For instance, the man who paints but
is a bad painter can not be called a painter in the Platonic
sense. To be a painter, he must work until he has become the
best possible painter that he can. The good for the indivi-
dual, as for each particular, must fit into the universal
scheme of goods. For every element of positive knowledge

¹. Tim., 16f.
². Lodge, PTE, 141.
must be included within the system of values.¹

From an ethical and social point of view, the Good is the ideal of social organization which calls out the complete development of every member, each contributing its all to the common good. All the so-called goods such as beauty, riches, health, influential relations are detrimental rather than helpful if their influence is not good. By themselves they are neither good nor bad, but their goodness or badness is determined by their rational or irrational use. This leads to a complete relativism if one does not view the entire ladder of values. The completeness of the whole attracted to the mystical Good saves ethical standards from becoming meaningless.

Socially, each person has a part to play in the community. How well he acts his role will determine his degree of happiness. (Plato assumes that the just man is the happy man. A discussion of this will be presented under the subsection entitled "Justice.") The individual is obligated to seek the Good at all times. Because he is a citizen, he is obliged to fulfill certain functions and obey the laws in return for the security offered by the state. Because he is a soul in a body, he is obliged to the highest good to allow his reason to control the rest of his being. The Good cannot be seen by a man who is not at peace with himself.

¹ Lodge, PTE, 141.
and his community. Man must realize that his good lies not in the so-called goods of this world but in the use of all that he has. As Socrates said near the end of the Phaedrus: "May I have such a quality of gold as only the wise can bear." ¹

The social and ethical conceptions of the Good lead to a discussion of the relation of the Good to the useful or the practical in the life of man. Plato believed, as the Greek dramatists before him, that the order about him indicated that one's life should also be orderly and useful if he wanted to be at one with the universe. As Plato said, "He is a vain fellow who regards anything but the bad as ridiculous ... and who in his efforts to attain the beautiful acts as his goal is something other than the Good." ² Even in a social interpretation of the Good it is seen that the idea of completeness is important. It is a system of consistency and order resulting from a mixture of forms. In the Timaeus, it is suggested "to be perfect," as Socrates said the Good is,³ "is to be complex,"⁴ it is to be "one in many."

That every mixture, whatever it be and whatever its quantity, if it does not meet with measure and a symmetrical nature, does of necessity destroy both the ingredients and itself, for there exists not a tempering, but a certain unmixed bringing together, confused truly of this kind on every occasion in duality to those who possess it.⁵

The notion of measure and symmetry suggest harmony which results from mathematical laws. In the Gorgias, Plato speaks of that orderliness by which heaven and earth, gods and men, are held together and describes it as geometrical equality. 1 These geometrical conceptions and mathematical ratios are appearances of the Good. The Good is more than measure and symmetry, but measure and symmetry are ratios of the Good in so far as the Good can be grasped by reason. Symmetry suggests the relation of the Good to the Beautiful also. Beauty is somehow mysteriously and inseparably connected with the Good. It is like an outer shell in which truth and the Good are enclosed and which reveals them to reason. 2

Therefore, the Good is of a two fold nature: metaphysically, it is really real, and morally, it is a consistent system of values mysteriously connected with the Form of the Good. From a metaphysical basis, the Idea of the Good is the first Form; it is a combination of being and value; it is the ground of all things—eternal, self-sufficient, complete, perfect. The Good is imminent in the world as a system of values. In this connection empirical things become good only in so far as they are able to climb the ladders of value. The chief feature of the empirical good is its consistency. (1) Logically, the Good is the principle of completeness which promotes harmony in the universe. (2) Ethically, the

2. Gt. Hip.
Good is the standard or norm for all values. It is the end as well as the cause. (3) Socially, the Idea of the Good is the ideal of social organization which makes it possible for each individual to contribute his all for the common good.

There are really two doctrines of the Good. The first is a doctrine of the Good as a metaphysical entity. The second is a doctrine of the Good as goodness and good for in the scale of values inherent in the empirical world. All the characteristics previously named such as desirability, completion, and self-sufficiency are not the Good itself. The importance of this concept lies in its close relation to man and the good life. The questions which follow are: How is man related to the Good? What is the highest Good for him?

The Virtues

The good life, as the Good itself, involves the temperate and the orderly, the courageous and the brave, the rational and the just. A life containing these virtues in proper proportions "cannot be other than perfectly good."\(^1\) The virtues are essential to the development of the ideally highest life and the good life cannot be discovered apart from them.

There are four virtues which are considered cardinal in Platonic thought. They are temperance, courage, reason,

\(^1\) Gorg., 507.
and justice. There is a tendency in Plato to consolidate all the separate virtues into one exclusive virtue and make that in some way dependent upon knowledge. This tendency becomes articulate in Socrates' question to Protagoras.

Now I want you to tell me truly whether virtue is one whole, of which justice and temperance and holiness are parts; or whether all these are only the names of one and the same thing.1

Of course, Protagoras being the good skeptic that he was replied that the virtues were distinct and continued to say, in essence,

Poor virtue, she's but words,—a vain romance
I took for truth; a slave of circumstance.2

Socrates denies this stoutly and proceeds to prove that each virtue is only an aspect of a master virtue, which has its ground in knowledge. He uses the example of the virtue courage to substantiate his position. Protagoras said that courage was the inclination to approach the frightful, but he forgot that there are kinds of frightful things; the wise man fears dishonor, and the coward fears death. Knowledge determines the estimate of the situation, and courage is the "knowledge of which is and is not dangerous."3 Socrates pushes the point that the virtues depend on knowledge, further in the Gorgias when conversing with Callicles.

The virtue of each thing, whether of body or soul, instrument or creature, when given to them in the

2. Called to attention by Baker, DM, 28 (The Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation, 464.).
best way, comes to them not by choice, but as the result of the order and truth and art which are imparted to them. Am I not right? I maintain that I am, and does not the virtue of each thing depend on order or arrangement? Yes, I say.¹

This "order, truth, art" and "order or arrangement" depend upon reason, as will be seen, and may be submerged in knowledge, for "knowledge is virtue." To broaden the concept of knowledge as virtue Plato introduces the concept of justice. Justice is the almost impossible virtue to attain, for all other virtues are necessary for its development. Although all the virtues are ultimately one, for the sake of articulation each virtue will be discussed separately, with their unity in the life of the just soul always in mind.

Wherever anything is bought with or sold for it, there in truth will be virtue, courage, temperance, justice; in fact, there every virtue will be present, and it matters little whether pleasure or care or anything else of this nature is present or absent. But whenever such values are severed from wisdom and are then exchanged, there only a shadow of virtue exists which in reality is unworthy of a free man which contains nothing true nor healthy. In truth, temperance, justice, and courage consist in the purgation from these sense stimuli, and wisdom itself is a purgation.²

To give further evidence of the unity of the virtues in Platonic thought, each of the four main virtues will be discussed separately and summarized in the discussion of "Justice."

Temperance.—The elevation of temperance as one of

¹ Gorg., 506.
² Gorg.
the four cardinal virtues in Platonic thought is the result of the philosopher's heritage. Over the Delphi in Greece there is a motto which expresses this idea very clearly: "Nothing too much," and "Know thyself."¹ The Greek dramatists and poets praised the virtue of the mean, and the works of the artists remain to verify their restraint.

The Platonic conception of temperance transcends this more popular notion, however. Temperance to the average man means a certain innate disposition toward quietness, orderliness, obedience to laws, and minding one's own business.² Plato would say that each definition could be used to promote a good, but in order to be a good, the virtue must be worth having for itself alone. Temperance dwells on two levels of value. It is instrumental in that this disposition promotes acceptance, obedience, docility, and cooperation with directions of superior insight. These attributes have no value in themselves; but if rationally used, they can bring about values. The individuals who dwell on this lower plane of passivity have a feeling that they are living according to the good, but they do not really know.

... their happiness depends upon their self-control; if the better elements of the mind which lead to order and philosophy prevail, then they pass their life in this world in happiness and harmony... masters of themselves and orderly.³

---

¹. Ritter, EPP, 306.
². Charm., 159b; 160e; 161b; 163a.
³. Rep., 431c.
The temperate life consists in the enjoyment of gentle, mild pleasures and of desires without frenzy. Violent and maddening pleasures could never be a part of the ideal life because only intemperance could ensue. Plato sometimes spoke of taming the passions and at other times of eliminating them. Either way, it may be concluded that the passions are no source of strength; yet, they may become causes of inspiration if they are properly cared for and trained.

The higher level of temperance is the level at which insight involves the duty of imposing upon oneself the burdens of leadership; at this level one has gained knowledge of himself. He knows his capacities as well as his limitations. The temperate man realizes that he must know the Good in order to be truly temperate. One may well say that on the lower level temperance has not been attained, or that the docile man possesses only a degree of temperance. The individual at the higher level realizes that acceptance can be a vice as well as a virtue. He is a man with duties and responsibilities that must be cared for. He is temperate because he recognizes the Good and tries to live accordingly. This is the place where temperance seems to blend with the other virtues and become one. Courage is needed to carry out certain convictions that have been determined by reason in accord with temperance. Here philosophical insight is needed.

1. Charm., 163d.
because it is only at this level that man can be truly and completely temperate.¹

There is something about temperance which makes it a good, and according to the Greek feeling makes for happiness and a higher life; there is an innate disposition in man which desires moderation. Man feels more attuned to the laws of the universe when he lives a self-controlled life. Because of this disposition he can more easily accept higher education. Temperance is good because it has a natural kinship with reason, and because of its willingness to accept what reason brings. As Plato said,

... whereas the simple and moderate desires, which with the aid of reason and right belief are guided by reflection, you will find only in a few, and those with the best inborn dispositions and the best educated.²

In summary, temperance is a good to be desired for itself, but it too is subject to reason. There is a tendency in the temperate man to follow an opinion which is right on the basis of its value which is determined by reason. There is also present a sense of values in temperance, whether it is at the lower level guided by right opinion or at the higher level guided by reason and philosophical insight. The temperate life, therefore, is a good life because it embodies a mixture of natures which are blended into one. All men can be temperate on one level or the other and can devote them-

1. Phaed., 68c-d.
2. Rep., 431c.
selves to the control of instincts by reason.

Courage.—The virtue which is characteristic of the guardian class in Plato's ideal society is courage. Courage is an innate psychophysical disposition which manifests itself physiologically in accelerated heartbeat, more rapid breathing, and blood flow. This disposition can be developed by certain hardening processes used in physical education programs. The shell-like protectiveness produced and revealed in the face of danger was what the Greeks meant by courage.

The question as to the nature of courage was asked Socrates by Laches, who defined courage as endurance in battle, and he wanted to know if courage would measure up to a virtue according to the standard of the Good. Socrates pointed out that all endurances are not good. For example, an individual can endure much suffering for an unjust cause, or one may suffer more hardships than the end justifies. In either case, courage could not be considered a good because its consequences were not desirable or just. Instead, Socrates replied that courage is a positive, desirable virtue. It consists in a knowledge of what is to be feared and what is not to be feared. The only knowledge that provides this information for man is knowledge of the Good. That which is good should not be feared, but that which is not of the Good should. From this it can be seen that the courageous man is temperate; he differs from the coward in that he shows no
fear and from the "dare-devil" in that he shows no daring in-trepidity. He realizes that fear comes from ignorance of what is good and what is evil. (Socrates' behavior at his trial is illustrative of the action and attitude of a courageous man. He was certain that no evil could befall a good man and accepted his unjust conviction as a duty to be observed.)

In summary, courage, as temperance, depends upon knowledge. Knowledge of what is to be feared and what is not to be feared. It is the willingness to act in accord with rational insight regardless of temptation whether it be pleasure, pain, fear, or desire. Courage in abstraction is natural to man; but for consistency in practice, discipline by intellect is necessary.¹ Courage in its absolute sense, as temperance, becomes indistinguishable from the other virtues and merged within the all-embracing virtue, justice.

**Reason.**--

... it will be the business of reason to rule with wisdom and forethought on behalf of the entire soul; while the spirited element ought to act as its subordinate and ally.²

The duty of reason is to rule; of the nature of reason there can be no certainty. Plato describes her in a poetic fashion. He likens reason to the charioteer in the myth which appears in the *Phaedrus*. Because of his knowledge
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of the Good, which is pictured as the sun, the charioteer directs his vehicle in her direction. But the bright rays of the sun could not be borne without adjusting his eyes to the growing brightness and the pain from the light. To succeed at this he would possess self-control, perseverance, determination, and courage. No man can become master of himself if he lacks the harmony and self-control which come from discipline of the mind. If he cannot control himself, then he cannot achieve knowledge of the Good. Only after he has linked all elements within himself together will he become one instead of many; only after he is harmoniously attuned will he be able to master himself. Reason is the promoter of order and agreement. As such it is an essential virtue without which the Good itself could not be known. There is a progression from reason to insight which enables a bodied soul to glimpse that which it desires—the Idea of the Good.

Justice—Reason, courage, temperance—all three are united in the all-embracing virtue, justice. The Republic itself may be said to be a lengthy definition of justice. It is seen that Plato defines justice in the state in order to illustrate and make more meaningful, it seems, his explanation of the just soul. Justice in the state means that the three social functions—governing, executive, and productive—are kept distinct yet rightly performed. But the individual, he says, is the "state writ large." Therefore the three elements in the state correspond to the elements of the soul,
which are appetite, spirit, and reason. All three factors are present in all souls, and society is so divided because these elements are developed to various degrees in different individuals.

Before a soul can be just, there are certain demands to be met. A definite condition of the soul must be achieved in which reason rules and directs the will. Justice, itself, is the point where all the cardinal virtues—temperance, courage, and reason—meet. It consists in having reason take over the rule and the care of the entire soul and with the aid of courage keep the senses and appetites in check. The just soul, because of its harmony, is happy.

This statement has been challenged, and for this reason three arguments are advanced in the Republic to substantiate the fact that the just man is happier than the unjust man. The first argument begins that the man whose soul is under the despotism of a master passion is the unhappiest. He is unhappy because he lacks freedom, is controlled by wealth, and fears insecurity. Such a man is laboring under meaningless servitude because he cannot control his ambition and desires. The best elements within him are enslaved while the intemperate, corrupt parts control his being. This man, as the despotic state, is degraded to shamefulness because of the many wants that cannot be satisfied. He is
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urged on by detrimental desires to seek security in fleeting values, such as wealth and power, and becomes the most miserable of men. The wealth he has gained cannot buy for him the love and friendship that he and every soul longs for. In fact because of his money he leads a lonely and miserable life away from the herd. He is suspicious and mistrustful of everyone. Eventually such fears turn him into a parasite depending on his henchmen for protection. He becomes a tool in their hands and suffers more with his newly acquired wealth than ever before. Whatever people may think, the actual tyrant (unjust man) is really the most abject slave, a parasite of the vilest scoundrels. Never able to satisfy his desires, he is always in need; and, to an eye that sees a soul in its entirety, he will seem to be the "poorest of the poor."1

It is evident from the first argument that the soul ruled by a master passion is unhappy in comparison with the soul of the just man which is well-rounded and guided by reason. "... the happiest man is he who is first in goodness and justice, namely, the true king who is also king over himself."2

The second argument: Because each part of the soul has its own form of pleasure and its peculiar desire, it seems that any one of the three could govern the soul.
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There is the part with which man gains knowledge and understanding, another which may be called honor-loving or ambitious, and another which is so multifarious that no single name will be appropriate but could be named after its most dominate characteristic, appetite. The third element could be referred to as "money-loving" also, because this is the chief concern of the appetite. The human soul, it is argued, is sometimes governed by one principle and sometimes by another. Individuals guide or are guided by one of the three. Since this is true, there are three corresponding types of individuals; and, the argument continues, if a man representing each type were asked which life was the pleasantest, each man would praise his own above all others.

The business man would say that the art of profit making is more pleasant than dreaming or a reputation if it brought in more money. The spirited man would shun pleasure derived from making money as beneath him and the pleasure of learning for its sake alone as a waste of time. His reputation would be all important to him. The philosopher would think that knowing the truth and always gaining a fresher understanding are beyond all comparison with other pleasures.

Who could say which man is right and which is wrong? Each man is basing his knowledge on his experience.

Plato realized the difficulty of answering this question, which was the question of the day. Is man the measure of all things as the Sophists said? Basing his
answer on the foundation of experience, insight, and reasoning, he said that the philosopher was the best judge because he alone would have experienced the peculiar pleasures of all three parts of the soul, and whose experience is supported by reason and insight. (The training of the philosopher which makes this statement valid will be discussed in the next section.) Plato agrees that the pleasure of honor comes to all men—the rich, the brave, and the wise—but only the philosopher can know how sweet it is to contemplate the truth. The philosopher because of his training would be better prepared to reach a decision through reason; therefore, the man who uses reason for the pursuit of wisdom would be the person to judge what was most valuable. "Of the three kinds of pleasure, then, the sweetest will belong to that part of the soul whereby we gain understanding and knowledge, and the man in whom that part predominates will have the pleasantest life." ¹

The just man is deemed to be happier than the unjust one in two arguments, but a third argument is advanced in favor of the unjust man's happiness. The third proof of the just man's happiness turns on the distinction between pure or positive pleasure, and illusory pleasures which are exaggerated by the comparison with a preceding want or pain. Pleasure, it was said, is a neutral state between intense

¹. Rep., 582d.
pains. It is a comparative state recognized by man and is not the height of positive enjoyment but "the peace which comes with the absence of pain." If this is true, then it is the state of rest which is pleasant because it lies between that which is painful and less painful. The argument was declared invalid by Socrates. He said that people who think of pleasure as being something comparative instead of positive are deceived in their ignorance by the contrast between pain and the absence of pain, just as one who has never seen white is deceived by the contrast between black and gray. One must have knowledge of truth and reality before any sound ideas of what is pleasantest can be advanced. One must rise above the level of comparative pleasures in order not to fail to distinguish between the higher and lower pleasures. The question which is then asked by Socrates is which is more pleasant, that which is connected with the contingent or that which is connected with the eternal.

This is the same question that he asked Ion in the dialogue named for the latter. Can the knowledge of a particular give us Truth? These questions are still important for us today. Socrates attempted an answer when he said,

Those who have no experience of wisdom and virtue and spend their whole time in feasting and self-indulgence are all their lives fluctuating downwards from the central point and back again, but never rise beyond it into the true upper region, to which
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they have not lifted their eyes. Never really satisfied with real nourishment, the pleasure they taste is uncertain and impure. Bent over their tables, they feed like cattle with stooping heads and eyes fixed upon the ground; so they grow fat and breed, and in their struggle kick and butt one another to death with horns and hoofs of steel, because they can never satisfy with unreal nourishment that part of themselves which is itself unreal and incapable of lasting satisfaction.

Will the unjust man be happy if his dark deeds are not discovered? No, answered Socrates. If he does escape detection and punishment, he will be profitless because he will probably grow worse. If he had been found out, it is possible that the brute within him could have been tamed and his soul could have been restored to its native soundness. Such a man would still love to "live with himself" and face his shortcomings. As Socrates said, justice is good, not because it is the best policy in the long run, but because it is the ultimate principle upon which the universe is constructed. "But in reality justice . . . is not a matter of internal behavior, but of the inward self and of attaining to all that is in the fullest sense a man's proper concern." No, an escapee has not escaped the universal law of justice which acts internally as well as externally upon the individual.

The question now arises, why is there evil in man if he is happier and will profit more if he is good. Why
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should the soul be ignorant and weak if man is essentially good? The answer to this question is fourfold—ignorance, internal strife, social order, and the past; or, if modern terms were used, one could say that the sources of evil were the misuse of free will and conditioning forces of heredity and environment. The root evil is sometimes called ignorance by Plato. Ignorance, however, is not a negative quality but the presence of a false belief which is thought to be true; and out of this self-deception grows all other evils. ¹ In other dialogues the root evil is spoken of as internal strife or dissension instead of as evil. Eternal strife is considered the greatest evil because the unity of the soul is broken. ² Evil is represented here as a revolution of the part against the whole, as in the case of the despotic man who allowed his appetite, which fluctuated continuously, to control the higher part of his soul. When an artificial order is established with the appetite as the leader, the harmony of universal, social, and individual values has been lost.

The individual, however, is not the cause of all evil. He inherits a good part of it from those who were before him.

My good man, the evil force that now moves you and prompts you to go temple robbing is neither of human origin nor of divine but it is some impulse
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bred of old in men from ancient wrongs unexpiated which courses round wreaking ruin.¹

Such evil as this results from the past and cannot be changed by man. It is the lure of the receptacle appearing again causing men to reject what is good.

There are evils resulting from the social order in which man finds himself. Plato compared the individual with the state; according to this analogy evil in the individual is the reflection of evil in the community. Plato said that society and not the individual should be blamed for the wickedness which existed; the blame should rest with the "begetter, not . . . the begotten."² Plato also makes a point that both virtue and vice must arise from a strong soul because a weak soul is incapable of anything great. Vice, as illustrated in the case of the tyrant, arises from the perversion of a great gift. "The more vigorous a seed is, the more it falls short of its proper perfection when deprived of the season, the food, the place that suits it. For evil is more opposed to the good than to the not-good."³

However, to assign evil to the past or to the existing social order does not give a relevant account of evil. Since evil is not a negative quality but a positive one, it must have a definite root. To go backwards, evil in the soul is due to ignorance or internal strife; internal strife

¹. Laws, 854b.
². Tim., 87b.
³. Rep., 491b.
is due to the existing social order; the existing social order is due to the past which in turn is due to the creator. The only answer to be ventured is that evil is an unpreventable part of the divine plan without which creation could not have taken place.

Can the fallen soul become good again? The best account of the fallen soul is the myth of the cave. The individuals in the cave live in a world of illusion in which they are ignorant of themselves and of the world. When they look about them they can see only the reflections of objects which were reflections themselves. The first act is a revolutionary one in which the chains of man are broken. He is then free to turn his entire body and face the source of light. This is painful at first; and as he finds the source of light and sees objects as they are, it will be unbelievable. The weak man will not face the change, but will return to the false security he had previously known. The courageous man will continue the upward path, leaving the cave behind him. Outside there would be a steep, rugged hill which is to represent the arduous, painful task of education. The light from the sun, which is the true light, would blind the free man because he would have been used to walking in shadows produced by darkness. All at once everything would become clear to him. He would see men as they are, objects as valueless, and the Sun as the True Light.

The most important point of the myth is not the breaking of
the chains, difficult ascent to knowledge, nor vision of the
good; it is the emphasis placed on the descent into the cave
again and again.

The return to the cave is more painful than the es-
cape. The enlightened man loses his way in the darkness;
he is laughed at by fools, and criticized by friends. If he
is too weak to bear their rebuttals or not patient enough to
instruct, he will return to the outer world to contemplate
on the Form of the Good. This would be a monastic life that
could not be as rich as the life of the character who con-
tinuously moves between the outer world and the cave. The
weaker philosopher's life would lack the mixture which makes
for harmony and enrichment. But the man who returns to the
cave with his vision as a shield before him will fear no
evil. He will know that no harm can befall a good man and
will try to lead those who will follow him into the real
world.

There is no need for man to feel that he is weighed
down by past evils. Once again, as in the myth of Er, Plato
is stressing free choice. Man is morally responsible for
the kind of individual he becomes. The highest life for man
can only be lived in the light of freedom of choice. Man as
a part of the universe seeks the best possible life for him-
self as well as the supreme good for all. How is man as an
individual related to the highest good? What is the highest
good for man?
The Highest Good for Man

The *summum bonum* for man in the Dialogues is the ideally perfect life. The pattern of the perfect life is outlined in the *Philebus* as the mixed life of contemplation and action according to the Idea of the Good. This position overturns two popular notions of what is the highest good for man. The first popular standpoint appears on two levels—social and individual. The individual regards all so-called goods as being good in themselves and believes that the highest good for the individual consists in acquiring possessions of these goods. If such were true, the rich would be the only ones who were happy. They would be thought of as possessing all that is of value. On the social level, the interest would be in the survival of the community and its increase in power, wealth, and law and order. It would be concerned with goodness of character, genius, religion, research, and philosophy only in so far as they could be utilized by the community. This illustrates a discord between individual and social goods which makes it impossible for the possession of goods to be the source of ideal life for man.

The so-called philosophic standpoint proper is as contradictory to the Platonic view of the highest good for man as the popular notion of the value of acquiring possessions. For the philosopher none of the so-called goods of this world possess ultimate value. The actual world seems
unreal to him; it is fluctuating, sensory, chaotic, confused, and meaningless. Only the ideal world satisfies all the demands of his reason. So he retires to his garden and dreams of that which is perfect, beautiful, systematic, permanent, clear-cut, intelligent, transcendental—though not actual.

The ideal world represents the mean between the two extremes, as in the Philebus. The wise man realizes that the things of this world are not "goods" but neither are they evils. They are here to be used, and their usage determines whether they become goods or evils. However, the wise man sees good only where it may be realized with the means at his disposal; the ideal can become actual only in so far as empirical means and motives become illumined with transcendental insight and lose their merely empirical character to become one with the universal structure.

The highest value for man is not the absorption into a contemplative ideal realm as suggested in the Phaedo and the Republic, but it is the development of character through participating in virtues as reason directs. In other words, the highest good for the individual is living as a consciously organic portion of the whole and by so doing realizing his deepest happiness and well-being.

In the Philebus, it is stated that the summmum bonum must be universally desirable, complete, entire, and perfectly sufficient. These demands can be fulfilled only by a life which is full and complete rather than one-sided and
abstract; a life which is richly empirical rather than purely transcendental. The fundamental principle in such a life is measure or the power of organization. This life must be rearranged to be a growing, harmonious, systematic whole in which only positive values can fit.

A life of value-realization becomes more than an ideal only in the philosopher. Plato had before him a mental picture of his teacher and idol, Socrates, when he described the philosopher. The life of Socrates was a living testimony of the best possible life. To get a clear picture of the philosopher-king, the description of a philosopher by Socrates and Alcibiades will be discussed.

The True Philosopher

According to Socrates, the philosopher is mystical in a sense. In order to emphasize the sincerity and forthrightness of the philosopher in contrast with the deviousness and deceitfulness of this world, he called the philosopher other-worldly. The philosopher is not totally out of this world because he is acquainted with universals; he is at home in both worlds. As illustrated in the Crito, Socrates was a law-abiding citizen. He refused to break the laws of the city even though he had been unjustly accused and condemned. He had made a contract with the city in which he had promised to obey its laws in return for protection and security. The Sophists accused the philosopher of escaping into a world of abstraction because he could not
deal with the realities of life. Socrates agreed to a certain extent that philosophers are a bit impractical, unskilled with their hands, incapable of even tying up their bed-clothes into a neat bundle. When a handsome fellow is praised for his good looks, the philosopher will not be able to see the value in the looks. When a rich man is being praised for his wealth, he will not be able to see why the rich man should be praised. But if it is true that the values of this world are only instrumental, then the philosopher is the wise one.

The picture Alcibiades paints of the philosopher in the Symposium is his view of Socrates. Although Alcibiades is afraid of Socrates, he is mysteriously drawn to him because of his many powers. This man, Socrates, is a mystery to me, he says, and his hold on me is a mystery also. He is the only man who can make me ashamed, and I wish that he would go away; yet if he did this, I would be the most miserable of men. I have listened to many famous orators, but their eloquent speeches are uncomparable to his common words. "My heart leaps and tears run out of my eyes at the sound of his speech; and I see great numbers of other people having the same experience."¹

You would be surprised to find that this divine bit of humanity is also a man of action. During the campaigns he endured more hardships than any of us. In one of the
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battles when the troops retreated in disorder, he stepped along just as if he were in the streets of Athens, calmly looking at friend and foe alike, and giving everyone the understanding that he would defend himself stoutly if attacked. This courageous man could become so involved in some problem that he would stand for hours in quiet contemplation until at last he was satisfied. This man is beyond understanding. He is a mystic, homely mingling with men and yet apart from us.

Alcibiades succeeded in giving the characteristics of a true philosopher in his rambling sort of way. Here was a man who because of the varied content of his life led an enriched and developing existence. He was temperate, courageous, and wise. His only intense indulgence was his search for truth. Plato exhibits the conception of eros in actual operation through Alcibiades' speech. The earthly and inarticulate love of Alcibiades for Socrates is interpreted as the movement of eros, the love of the imperfect for the perfect.¹

Plato's chief concern was how such a man as Socrates could be produced. His answer was correct training in which new individuals would emerge and change the existing social order. Because all men do not have the same mental ability, the wisest should be the ones to guide the less wise. In the conception of the philosopher-king, the state
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and the individual became one; the abstract and the actual are together as the soul of the philosopher is unified. Only through such a man can the wholeness come about because he knows the good for each thing and the common good for all.

The philosopher will possess natural virtues and reason, but in order to use them to the best advantage he must be subjected to intensive formal training. The program for education may be summarized as follows. Up to the ages of seventeen and eighteen all children would be trained in literature, music, and a little elementary mathematics. From the ages of eighteen to twenty an intensive course of physical and military training will be endured, leaving no time for leisure or study. By the time that the student has finished such training, a test will be given in order to determine the ones that will continue studying. The ones that pass will be given advanced training in mathematics and its relation to other reality for ten years. After further selection at this time, five years will be devoted to the study of dialectics and the principle of morality. Between the ages of thirty-five and fifty, he will gain practical experience by public service in subordinate posts. At the age of fifty the best will reach the vision of the good and thereafter divide their time between study and governing the state.

Such a program of studies provides for individual differences by allowing periods for mental and philosophical
development, theoretical and practical growth. The philosopher-ruler will be subjected to many temptations and tests of endurance before he reaches the level of public service. His training is rich, varied, and contains many possibilities for growth as his life should.

The question asked is how this ideal individual can come to be. It is obvious that under the existing social order no such training could be advanced. Only through a revolution in the state as suggested by Plato could this program be established. As Socrates said, the artist can paint a picture that has not been seen by anyone and yet the beauty of the picture cannot be denied. Such is the case of the philosopher.

According to Plato, the philosopher differs from other men because he is a lover of truth. Because he loves all truth, he refuses to be satisfied with a kind of knowledge which is accurate only in so far as it goes but does not cover the entirety. He presses forward until he reaches the end of the intellectual world and apprehends truth in its own nature. In his knowledge all the virtues are one because they are all good. He realizes the interrelatedness of all things and combines the pleasures of mind and appetite to develop a richer, more harmonious life. He is always seeking positive values to give himself a fresher view of the whole.
CHAPTER IV

MAN AND SOCIETY

There seems to be an innate impulse toward perfection in Plato, as in most of the early Greek thinkers. Perfection was the aim of the professions as well as of the arts. The idea of the "best state" was not new with him by any means. Long before his time many Greeks had speculated about the ideal social conditions for the improvement of man. Many of the old poets had written of an ideal state of law and order; the Spartan Tystaeus had proclaimed that the perfect order was identical with Spartan tradition. Solon went further and derived the perfect state from the eternal ideals of moral reason. Some of the Sophists went still further and gave concrete proposals for bettering social conditions. Plato's Republic was born from a rich and varied heritage. His approach to the study of social conditions differed from that of his predecessors and contemporaries in that he did not content himself with assuming one type of constitution and giving "advise" for its improvement, or with discussion of the relative values of each type of constitution as did the Sophists. His approach was more radical; he begins with the general problem of justice.

Plato begins the discussion of the state without
mentioning the subject at all. Instead the characters are interested in one virtue, justice. Through the discussion some valuable information concerning the origin of the state is imparted. It is a natural, spontaneous production of man and not an unnatural social contract as implied by Glaucón, nor an organized oppression of the weak as Thasymachus insisted.¹ Instead, the state is an organic, hierarchical whole which arises from the lack of individual self-sufficiency. Each individual depends on others to supply many of his needs. Others in turn are dependent upon him. Because this is the basic nature of the state, service for individuals, the state is to promote the well being and growth of its citizens. Its goodness or justice is determined by this factor, for the state is good or just only in so far as it provides for individual development. The individual and society depend upon each other for mutual assistance and survival.

Although the relationship between the individual and society is a necessary one, it is not necessarily symmetrical. The state supplies many of the material and efficient causes without which individual life would be impossible; in return the individual contributes formal and final causes without which the state would be meaningless. Hence, it seems that the state depends on the individual more than he does on
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the state. The crucial difference between social life and individual life must be clarified, however, before an adequate theory of man can be developed.

The state is a composite being made up of many individuals living in one designated area during a particular time. It is, in other words, a whole made up of individuals who are parts. This is not the basic difference between the two. The individual is also a composite being made up of many parts. As the state is a whole, so is the individual. Plato used the knowledge he had of the state to spell out the characteristics of the soul in a clearer fashion. The picture of the state is larger and more distinct. The crucial difference between the individual and the state is not evident here. It lies in the fact that only the individual intellect has access to the pure forms and can be inspired by them. The state itself is never met. Only some representative in the form of the governor, or councilman, or such is ever seen. As an organism the state cannot think coherently or plan. This is the task of individual minds, because human intellect is the only source of reason and purpose. The individual as such cannot exist without the state although it is true to say that intellectually the individual is more than the state. Social life, which is external and cannot represent life in its truest form, depends upon intellect, which is symbolized in the life of man. But individual life is so intertwined with social life that life without society
becomes impossible. Plato never gives the picture of a "feral" man or some lone wanderer in an idyllic existence as portrayed by Rousseau. He realized that society has definite effects upon the thoughts of man. This is one reason why he detested the artist who was not a philosopher. Such an artist could make second-hand copies of reality so attractive that people considered these as being real. The young must grow up with beauty about him so he would have beautiful thoughts.¹ If one is surrounded by imitations, his life will become such. This does not mean that the individual should live without society, but tends to illustrate how society helps to mold man. The state is important and gains its importance because it makes possible "a mode of life more unified, more clear, more stable, and more sharply articulated than that of its reflected counterpart."²

The degree that this unification, clarity, and stability may become manifested in human existence is determined to a large extent by the type of state in which the individual lives. If the state is just, then it is so because the people who compose it are just. Hence, the first step in the transformation of society is the development of personalities. Human character must be molded from early childhood and guided continuously. In order to achieve the type of individual and state desired, Plato outlines five steps through
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which the reformation of the individual and the state is possible.

First, there should be a thoroughly organized educational program. This can be done through education as treated by Plato in the Republic. He considers education an integral and vital part of the wider subject of the well-being of individuals. There is need for a thoroughly organized educational program which includes all members of the state. An analysis of the soul, however, is necessary before a really rational theory of education can be advanced.

The human soul is emphatically and before all else "something living, something which in the strict sense we can neither create nor destroy, but which we can feed or starve, nourish or poison."¹ As a living entity, it must be nourished. Nurture is really the essence of true education. The nature of the soul determines the type of nourishment it needs. However, before these favorable conditions can be met, the psychology of the soul must be understood.

The soul is a complex whole which consists of three parts—appetite, spirit, and reason. Beginning at the lower end of the scale is appetite. It was so called because it corresponds to the bodily desires; it is also called "the wealth-loving or gain-loving element." There are two kinds of appetites which are termed necessary and unnecessary by Plato. Necessary appetites are those which we cannot get rid of.
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of and the satisfaction of which proves to be good. Unnecessary appetites are those superfluous ones whose satisfaction proves to be harmful. Appetites form the largest portion of the soul, and the majority of men live for them, but Plato does not devote his chief share of attention to this aspect in the theory of education. The appetites instead are to be tamed. By this he means that man should train the appetites in order that they may contribute to the good of the whole soul.

The second element in his analysis of the soul is not quite so easily described or understood. This is the indispensable foundation of courage, which is common to good watch dogs, horses, and such. It is the source of pugnacity and aggressiveness, with their possible developments into ferocity and cruelty. Spirit is said to be that part of the soul which is peculiarly fostered and stimulated by athletic exercise; it is the "low" element in human nature which if rightly cultured becomes true bravery, but if exclusively encouraged degenerates into blind brutality.

In Plato's mind the third element is the highest. He refers to it as "the philosophic."¹ This element is introduced as a necessary psychological complement of the element of spirit which would be unbalanced were it not for this counterbalancing factor. These three elements are distinct,
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but inseparable. They form the inner nature of man, which is divine or most divine in man. A review of the psychology of the soul is necessary in order to understand the proposals made by Plato in his theory of education. The function of education, as he conceives it, is to provide nourishment for the soul.

The soul is the object of "musical" as well as "gymnastic" training. At first sight it would appear that the objects of music and gymnastics are opposite; music cultivates the inner man, and gymnastics is related to bodily training. The truth is that music and gymnastics appeal to the development of the soul. Music educates not only the character, but the philosophic part of the soul as well. While gymnastics produces bodily health and strength, it also disciplines the psychological element of spirit. Hence the soul is the object of both types of training.

Musical training begins before gymnastics, for stories are told to children long before they can take physical exercise. Literature, music, and the other fine arts combine to form "musical" education. Employment of these methods makes it possible to express certain ethical characteristics which are conveyed through the eye and ear to the soul. Of the various kinds, literature in the form of myths, stories, and poetry comes first. The question raised first is what should it express and then how should it be expressed. The first question is concerned with content and the second with
form. Plato was concerned with the presentation, or style, and how it influences the mind. Such a problem as the one of style did not arise until relatively late in the development of the child. Hence the concern at the beginning of education, during infancy, should be with regard to content or substance of literature.

And the beginning, as you know, is always the most important part, especially in dealing with anything young and tender. That is the time when the character is being molded and easily takes any impress one may wish to stamp upon it.¹

This is Plato's reason for giving a great deal of attention to the beginning of education. The young soul like the young body is plastic and malleable and needs care and attention, as the body needs care if it is to grow. The formulation of education laid in early childhood forms the basis of the character. Because this is true, Plato would have the true nature of the gods and that which is god-like in man habitually put before the eyes of the young. The child will be brought up in the belief that beings greater than himself act in a certain way, and their natural impulse to imitate will be utilized in the development of character.²

All stories embodying false ideas must be excluded from the educational program. The writer should strive to present the good as it really is. "And the truth is that nature is good and must be described as such."³ The bulk of
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Greek religious ideas consists of myths which, generally speaking, are false, though they may contain elements of truth. Instead of an authorized collection of historical books, they had a mass of mythical stories variously colored and presented. Some of them sang of the genius of poets or artists, adventures of heroes; and others spoke of the torrid tales of the gods. The bulk of these myths could be pronounced misleading and therefore must not be admitted. The falseness of myths may be due to the ignorance of the writer, misrepresentation of facts, and time-lapse which prevents accuracy in details. Then, too, the myths can be untrue in another and more serious sense than due to historical error. They may contradict fundamental ideas due to moral, metaphysical, or logical inconsistency. Therefore, the stories and myths which could contribute nothing positive to the development of character must be excluded from the state's program.

The earliest type of education must begin by appealing to the inner nature of the individual. From the cultivation of this common groundwork, Plato passes onward to the development of the virtues within the soul. The poets, for their work to be admitted, must be teachers and philosophers. They are not to be ornamental luxuries in the commonwealth nor caterers to the pleasure of the intelligentsia, but rather an integral part with work of their own—revealing the true nature of the divine, nerving the heart, and
chastening the emotions through the power of heroic efforts, and surround the mind with an atmosphere of health and beauty. Few poets ever live up to this, but at least a few had claimed it. The poet must be able to discriminate between that which is low and unworthy and that which is helpful and beneficial.

Dramatic poetry, which does not promote individual growth in direction of the good, can do considerable harm in the development of character. Such writers depend upon illusion for success first of all; and secondly, their character continues to weaken by the over-stimulation of emotions. The first charge may be made clearer if the analogy of painting is used. Painting and such arts produce their effect by taking advantage of certain optical illusions. Similarly the poet takes advantage of illusions of feeling. He presents the aspects of character which appeal to him most. He likes to represent the emotional aspect of personality with shifting lights and shadows, where the contrasts are strong and the shadows rapid. Success depends not upon rational judgment of the audience, but rather upon the illusory feelings of the moment which aim at immediate satisfaction. If dramatic poetry is judged by meaning, it condemns itself to inferiority. The second charge against dramatic poetry was challenged by Aristotle. Plato disapproved of people who used the arts as a medium through which pent up emotions could be released. His condemnation rests on the
thesis that if one gives away to emotions which are external to him, surely he will react in a similar way when similar circumstances arise because he will find that his will has been weakened and his self-respect undermined.\(^1\)

Many evils can result from the neglect of musical education as pointed by Plato when discussing the decline of the soul. However,

> When a man surrenders himself to music, allowing his soul to be flooded through the channels of his ears with those sweet and soft and mournful airs . . . if he persists in subduing it to such incantations, he will end by melting it away altogether.\(^1\)

not

Man must continue to educate only the psychological aspect of himself, but should train the body in order to have a truly harmonious and musical life. Physical training must be included in education of the child and should begin in early childhood.\(^2\) It is true that a sound and healthy body is not enough to produce a sound mind, but it does have power to affect the mind. Gymnastics are primarily concerned with the effect of the body on the soul. Of all the elements in training, Plato devotes more time to diet and exercise.

Between the ages of seventeen and twenty, physical exercise should be pursued alone to the exclusion of all serious mental work because "hard work and sleep are enemies to study" and "that figure which a man makes in his gymnastic is one of the greatest tests of his character." The exercises

would discipline the body for the work of a soldier. Diet, too, was very important. (Plato now brings in all that was known by the medical sciences in his day.) He thought of the doctors as he did of the poets. They, like the poets, were misleading the people. Many of the long names given to diseases were mere inventions of the doctors to impress their patients, asserted Plato. Any person who in continually going to see such a deceiver as a doctor should be as ashamed as a man who is always going to court to get justice because he has none.¹ Modern educational practices can profit much by Plato's insight into this problem. Take a look at the athlete who has no idea of doing anything except by force because his perceptions are clogged and dull from exercise and lack of sleep. Such a life moves without grace or harmony. However,

The sense of physical fitness fills a man with self-confidence and energy and makes him twice the man he was. But suppose he does nothing else and holds aloof from any sort of culture ... such a man ends by being wholly uneducated and a hater of reason.²

The purpose of education is to bring these two elements, music and gymnastics, together—"to bring them into tune with one another by adjusting the tension of each to the right pitch." The person who applies both kinds of education to the soul and blends them in perfect proportion will be master of himself.
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Education is continuous and does not end at any definite time. It is, however, divided into periods. The first fifteen years of life are spent in nourishing the soul on the arts and physical education. After the fifteenth birthday, the student is introduced to theology, which deals with powers beyond the control of man. The weeding-out process begins at this point, and the warrior is separated from the worker. The failures are assigned the duties of artisans, farmers, and the like. Those who pass the test receive ten more years of training in mind, body, and character. At the end of this period a more difficult test is given. Those who fail are assigned positions as defenders and constitute the warrior class of the city.

In order to console the ones who had failed these examinations, Plato said,

"Citizens, you are brothers, yet God has framed you differently. Some of you have the power of command; and these he has made of gold, wherefore, they have the greatest honor; others of silver, to be auxiliaries; others again, who are to be husbandmen and craftsmen, he has made of brass and iron; and the species will be generally preserved in the children. But as you are of the same original family, a golden parent will sometimes have a silver son, or a silver parent a golden son."

The ones of "golden metal" who passed the examination at thirty are brought into the light of philosophy. The purpose of philosophy is to teach them to think clearly and rule wisely. To achieve this aim, the training must be

more highly specialized. Five years would be devoted to the study of metaphysics to enable students to rise above the harsh realities of everyday existence to the lofty realm of contemplation. They must not remain in the world of eternals too long but should return to the world of appearances and become lifters of the people. During periods of the return, all manners of temptation are presented to the striving philosopher—money to feed the appetite of ambition, sensual indulgence for the emotional appetite, vanity for the appetite of pride. If they are able to control and overcome these appetites through courage and endurance, they will be ready to rule at fifty. These survivors, having been subjected to the pleasures and sorrows of the world and having experienced contentment in knowledge of the good, would then possess enough theoretical and practical wisdom, without any crippling intellectual pride remaining, to become philosopher-kings.

After the development of a group of philosopher-kings, the second phase of the reformation has actualized, in which authority to rule is based on wisdom. Because ruling is an art, the artist must be properly trained.

Until philosophers are kings, or the kings and princesses of this world have the spirit and power of philosophy, and political greatness and wisdom meet in one, and those commoner natures who either to the exclusion of the other are compelled to stand aside, cities will never have rest from their evils, ... no, nor the human race, as I believe, ... and then only will this our state have a pos-
sibility of life and behold the light of day.¹

The third step in the reformation of the state is a startling one for Plato's age. He felt that there must be an equalization of the sexes if the ideal state were to become real. Women should be subjected to the same education as men. They were to undergo the athletic training as well as the musical. They, too, would be given tests at the ages of twenty and thirty. It would be possible for women to become rulers, but this was highly improbable. Women differed in degree of knowledge although not in kind. They would have the opportunity of fulfilling their functions as individuals in the just state. As Plato said,

Natural gifts are to be found here and there in both creatures alike; and every occupation is opened to both, so far as their natures are concerned; though woman is for all purposes the weaker.²

Because the unity of the state could be assured only if the rulers and militia were loyal, there would be a community of families and goods among the two upper classes. Repulsive as this may sound, it reveals keen insight, for if all men and women are brothers and sisters, their first loyalty will be to the state and not to an individual family. The ruler would not be interested in private goods for his family, for he would be a part of the entire community and would will what was best for it. Although the wives and
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children would be held in common, there would be no tolerated promiscuity. Sexual intercourse would be controlled by the rulers, who ruled by their wisdom.¹ (The details of such regulations were not clearly outlined by Plato.) This type of communal living would apply only to the rulers and guardians. The merchants, farmers, artisans, and such (because they would support the state financially) would be allowed to maintain private families and private goods. This reward would really be a bribe which would enable the less intelligent beings to be happy in their lowly positions.

Since it is possible for children to inherit tendencies from their parents, fourthly, a program of eugenics will be necessary. The mating of superior men and women is encouraged in order to produce offspring who could rule wisely and justly. In his later days, Plato went so far as to suggest that the children of inferior parents should be placed on the mountain sides to die! Of course, this was a common practice in his day, but Plato is the man who suggested the possibility of "golden" children coming from "brass" parents!

In summary: The just state would be possible only through an all inclusive system of education. The rulers would be philosophers who were subjected to the training of the state and excelled in all areas. These rulers, as well
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as the guardians, would live in a community and would share wives, children, and goods; for if all was shared, there would be little opportunity for jealousy and selfishness. This state would be supported by the workers, defended by the guardians, and ruled by the philosophers.

Even after the arrival of such a just state, decline is inevitable. According to Plato there is a fatal law of degeneration in human as well as in state affairs, and because society and the individual are similar to each other, the degeneration of character can be compared to the decline of the state. That degeneration is a part of the process of life is evident in the world of appearance, where all is change. Rise, withering away, and finally decay to rise again is the picture of earthly existence. Degeneration follows a cycle in the life of man as well as in the life of a society.1 As such, it is inevitable and cannot be checked. Although the degeneration of personality can be compared with the fall of the state, this does not mean that each individual in a certain society corresponds to the society in which he lives. A truly good life may be lived in a corrupt and decadent society. (In this observance lies the hope for better social conditions in the future.) Man, as we said before, determines the final and formal ends of society and is not completely a product of its influence. It is an
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oversimplification to say that the individual is a reflection of the state or, in Plato's words, that the state is the individual "writ large." He is more than a smaller reproduction of society if he allows rational nature to determine what in his communal living is best for him. It must be remembered that social forces aid in the development of life through education and hygienic precautions, but life itself must be lived by the individual. He alone can seek ultimate truth and know when it has been found. As Plato said, the individual must lead and society must follow in order for progress to take place.\(^1\) Such is not true in the degeneration of the state, however, because social corruption can pervert the individual. This fact is clearly illustrated in Book VIII of the *Republic*, where in each case social decay precedes individual decay and accelerates individual degeneration.

The decay of society may be well begun when the philosopher is the ruler. He is a lover of truth and realizes that only truth can keep a man humble and detached from worldly ambition. Without this philosophical humility, pride begins to show itself, and ambition takes the place of justice.\(^2\) Here the subjective rationalization of life begins, and the honor loving or timocratic man appears to replace the philosopher.

---

The greed and avarice of men makes some of them dissatisfied with the just life they are living. Because of the fatal law of degeneration, men soon tire of what they have and long for what they do not have. The rulers begin to wonder what it would be like to have a private family and property. Soon their desires become strong enough to make them act. Once they have tasted the lust for riches and luxury, the simple life is not for them.¹ The rulers want power to protect their goods; and because of this wealth, they gain control of the government.

This new government is a timocracy, which is characterized as courageous and ambitious. It becomes a militaristic state, needed by the wealthy people and the rulers for protection. The gaining of wealth would triumph over the love of justice, and its accumulation would be the aim of the rulers. As a result, the people would be heavily taxed and without political rights.

The timocratic person is attracted by reason and impressed by culture, but he possesses neither. He is sober, useful, respected, and values the law of profit. He may be referred to as the "self-made man." In his haste for immediate wealth he builds up a heap of accumulated wrongs which eventually destroys him as the timocratic state is destroyed by the wronged populace. This type of person is governed by opinions and reflections of the status quo. He looks for immediate results and has little regard for long
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range hopes and fears. Very soon he will begin to merge his desire for honor with his desire for power. He will crush all who stand in his way in gaining power. Power will seek to become more powerful, and very soon he will be drunk on his success. At such a time he will realize that his ambition will become actualized only if he has power, and to have power he must have money. The honor-loving man then becomes a lover of money. ¹

The money-loving or oligarchic man has lost the gleam of reality which was possible only through rational insight. His reason has become an instrument for his appetite. It aids him in satisfying as many desires as possible and controlling his striving and aspirations. The money-loving man is torn asunder by the very structure of his appetites which falls into conflict. It is necessary for a certain amount of work to be done in order to satisfy the expectations of the appetite yet there. Then the accumulation of material goods becomes an end and all else must be sacrificed, even the fulfillment of other desires. Herein lies the conflict. This man wants power, but power is no good unless it is used. If it is used, then it becomes less powerful. He will become two personalities instead of a unified one. One part of him will become niggardly, and the repressed part will become rebellious and impatiently await
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a chance for expression. Like the oligarchical state, "Such a man will be at war with himself."¹ His life would swing between repressive discipline and wasteful escape. Each self will become more and more different from the other and more and more antagonistic toward the other. All discipline finally breaks down, and he gives way to the flood of famished desires.²

When only desires remain to control the human body, necessary and unnecessary appetites cannot be distinguished from each other. Such a being "passes through the day indulging each chance appetite."³ One idea to him is as good as another, and he rejects the one which affords the least intensity of immediate pleasure. This type of individual is compared to the democratic society, which is standardless and chaotic, a state of self-indulgence and anarchy.

Out of this confused, standardless state a leader arises. The so-called hero persuades the helpless masses to follow him with promises of peace and security. When he has control over the state, he keeps it in perpetual wars in order to drain the energies of the people and keep them weak. Meanwhile he is becoming stronger and the citizens become more and more dependent upon him. Drunk with his increasing powers, he becomes a tyrant whose word is law. The recently
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acquired privileges are snatched away and once more the people become political puppets manipulated by the ruler.  
This state is the worst one of all, and any change occurring would be for the better. The people are depressed, and many are without hope. They are kept in check by fear, but a few courageous ones even under such a government work for a revolution.

The growing power of the tyrant does not make him happy. He fears more for his life with each acquired piece of wealth. He reaches the point where he can trust no one and thinks the world is plotting against him. However, he is a powerful, dynamic figure who obeys only one law, the law of self-assertion. Demos compares the strength of this dictator with that of the philosopher. Each has a unified goal in life, but the philosopher is ruled by his reason and the tyrant by his appetite.

The tyrannized life is subordinated as a whole to a single fixed idea and achieves the solipsism of a single martyr passion. Guiding his actions against any threatening power, he appears to have courage when he is afraid. He is afraid of his enemies and more afraid of his companions. More and more he withdraws from everyone and lives in his narrow world in a miserable and enclosed condition. The more power he gains, the more miserable he becomes, because
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he has more to lose and more to fear for. The tyrant is the most miserable of men as the tyrannized state is the most miserable of states.

Although the tyrant has suppressed all the traces of reason and yielded to the temptation of the flesh all the way, Plato does not let us forget that he is still a man—a miserable man. His misery is a product of the life he has chosen, but there is still hope for redemption in such a man. There is something about the human soul that cannot fade away. It is a truly amazing fact that human life can persist under corrupted and vicious conditions. It refuses to die even when denied and repressed by the tyrannical person.

It is evident from this account of the inversion of human character that regardless of social conditions or any other conditions the soul will survive. That which makes a man a human cannot be lost. The inversion of character has been traced from the true life of reason to the artificial existence of passions; it is a downward regression of the conquest of reason by the appetite. It is a realistic picture of man as he is today and was yesterday. The same old struggles are going on; it is the universal picture of man as he is. Man as he is, however, is not man as he should be. The "ought" is quite a distance from the "is." Individuals may be placed in any rung along the inverted order; and until each is at the top, there is need for a reformation
as Plato so clearly indicates.

In summary: Plato's original aim for construction of a just state was to define the just man. Because the state is a larger organic whole than man, the relation of parts can be more clearly determined. The just state is the harmonious state in which all levels of society fulfill their places. These places have been assigned by the philosopher-kings as previously stated. The three classes of society are the working class composed of the merchants, farmers, artisans, and such; the guardian class composed of the military defenders; and the rulers, who are trained philosophers.

In the ideal state the workers, who are members of the lower class, are not depraved creatures made to work. They have a life apart from the state as well as one with the state. Each man's soul is a mixture composed of appetite, spirit, and reason. The artisan is one who allows his appetite to control his reason and will. Therefore, he is not able to control himself without the aid of laws. The virtue of this group is temperance. Temperance may be defined as moderation. Of course, the less intelligent man is not without reason; and he can use his reason to control his appetite. Because of his nature, however, he cannot become a temperate self without assistance. This assistance he gets in the required twenty years of training.

The warrior class possesses the virtue of moderation
and must develop courage. It is the duty of the guardian to protect the city and the private property of the citizen. They are not to become lax in their duties but must be ready to cooperate with the rulers at all times. Their private lives are closely connected with those of the rulers because the two classes live in the same community and share wives and goods. The guardians are the good watch dogs who never sleep; they think first of the well-being of the citizens and are ready at all times to protect the group.

The philosopher-kings constitute the ruling group. These persons are reluctant rulers who long to contemplate on the Good. Their one desire is to rule justly, for they have been trained to do this by being exposed to practical knowledge and tested on theoretical knowledge. The philosophers represent reason in the state and make the laws which regulate the life and work of the members of the other groups.

The just state becomes a reality only when these three groups are operating harmoniously. The philosophers guide, the warriors protect, and the workers support the state. In each group each member has a definite part to play; and if one fails, the entire unit suffers. It is the same as having a broken nose. The nose does not receive the pain alone, but the entire body reacts to the pain.

The ideal state is controlled by reason, but this is not to be construed to mean that the philosopher is the only
person who possesses this virtue, for it is a part of each individual. The philosopher merely has more of an abundance of it. Reason may be defined as the appreciation of the Good, or the appreciation of values. Each man can be reasonable under such a definition, but his degree of wisdom varies. Reason aims at both personal and private goods because essentially all goods are a part of the universal Good. The universal Good is superpersonal and all inclusive.¹

The ideal of reason is one of wholeness, union of opposites, and moderation. The philosopher is a rational man, but he is a whole man. He combines intelligence with passions and receives more pleasure than does appetitive man because he realizes the need for moderation. There must be a union of opposites by reason in order to act moderately. Moderation is the middle path of the two extremes; therefore the just state is operated according to the principles of organic unity, scientific management, and purposiveness throughout. However, this ideal state is not an end in itself, but it is a means of supporting the good life for each individual.²

In this chapter the quest was to find a state; instead, a man was found. Whether Plato's ideal state ever comes into existence or not, it is clear that such a state
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can be built within the life of man. Following Socrates' discussion of the state, it was not clear where the leader would be led. Now it is seen that Plato holds the state to be one of the fundamental conditions of human life and is judging it by its moral and educational functions. In this, the true state, the standard is not sheer power or force, but rather man, who as a soul is the source of values in the world. By using this criterion with strict logic to purify the existing state, Plato has left at last nothing but the "inner state within the soul." He holds that the self-reformation of the individual must be the starting point of a new order. He puts forward a startling principle: realize the true state in your own soul. The essence of Plato's state is not in its eternal structure but in its metaphysical nucleus, the idea of absolute reality and value around which it is built. Therefore,

the man who succeeds in realizing the divine order in his soul has made a greater contribution to the realization of Plato's state than he who constructs an entire city which externally resembles Plato's political scheme but is deprived of its divine essence, the Idea of the Good, the source of perfection and happiness. 

SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

Plato's doctrine of man unlocks the door to the expansive wealth of his philosophic thought. Man is the connecting point between the World of Appearances and the World of Ideas. In other words, he is a bridge between imperfection and perfection, incompleteness and completion. But what is the nature of man which enables him to maintain such an exalted position?

Man is composed of two distinct parts, which Plato designated as body and soul. The body is the organic unit which supplies a locus for the soul. In other words, it is the outer manifestation of the real person. Because the body exists in and is a product of the world of things, it is a subject to the very same laws which govern other empirical "things." It responds to stimulations of varied sorts, grows with age, blooms, and then dies away. It, too, waxes and wanes in the twilight of life. Here man is most akin to the World of Appearances. He exists in bodily form among "things," and unless he is able to transcend what is given by the senses, he will be stuck on the level of sensuality. But how can man, living in the sensible world and being a part of it, rise above that which surrounds him? The answer may be found when viewing the individual. There are two elements of which he is composed; one is the body,
which is akin to the physical world, and the other is the soul, which is eternal.

The true nature of the soul remains elusive after reading Plato's dialogues. His peripheric discussions are partially due to the fact that super-sensibles (Kantian language) cannot adequately be described in ordinary everyday language. Concepts to be understood must be presented in an intelligent fashion. For Plato realized that no one had the right to be obscure. Hence, he used poetry and mythology to express his ideas in a clearer and more easily understood medium. However, vague though his descriptions of the soul may be, they are the central point in his thought. The soul forms the connection between the two worlds; it is the hub of existence. Without the soul the world of change and appearance would become meaningless and valueless; for there would be no communication between it and the Realm of Ideas, which are meaningful.

A discussion of the nature of the soul will not be complete without reference to its origin and destiny. These two points are most speculative of all. In the Timaeus, souls were created by the Demiurge and placed on a star. While in the Phaedrus and Republic the origin is passed over and its improvement is discussed. Plato is sure that the souls were created and in a definite number. Regardless of whether they visited on a star or journeyed through faraway lands, as in the myth of Er, they were of a
definite number. Souls reappear time and time again throughout the course of time. Plato, as the Indian mystics, refers to this process as transmigration, while Nietzsche gives it a moral twist and calls it "recurrence." Another point emphasized by Plato is relation to the destiny of the soul is that the soul chooses the body and the life that it will live. All future choices, as pointed out before, are outgrowths of past ones. For example, some of the saints of another age who had lived a pleasant life grew careless and would choose a worthless existence and would then scream of their mistakes before they descended to the world. Souls, however, are not thought of as self-generated. They were all created during the same time, and being eternal they will live throughout time. Their value is due to the fact that they are eternal, have gazed at the forms, and have the possibility of recognizing them even during their earthly existence through contemplation. The entire cycle of the souls' existence is aimed at their further development. Desiring to learn more the soul descends into body, dies, and on its heavenly journey still picks knowledge.

What is it that causes the soul to continue to search for something that it does not have? Why does the soul feel incomplete and inadequate? Within each man there is an inward drive toward perfection. Plato calls this dynamic force eros. It compels man to move beyond the world
of imagery and opinion to one of eternal stability. This is the real connecting link between the two worlds. For this reason, man is able to give value to the world of things. He realizes that many of the "things" are good for some specific purpose. Through communication with the world of ideas man discovers how to utilize these particulars and endow them with external value.

All men, however, are not able to rise above the world of flux, although this unique force which strives for completeness permeates their inner beings. Why? The soul of man is composed of three elements which are designated as a host of appetites, spirit, and reason. The appetites constitute the largest portion of the soul for they are more closely connected with the urges and drives of the body. Because appetites can be so demanding in their hunger for immediate satisfaction, most men are led by them. Spirit is the most difficult element of the soul to understand. What is commonly meant by will, as mind in action, more clearly depicts Plato's meaning of spirit. It cooperates readily with reason and is willing to carry out its demands. Reason should be the ruling factor of the soul. When it is dominant, eros is free to direct the soul toward eternal things. But the degree that each element exists in the individual soul differs. Hence, many and varied types of individuals appear. Some are ruled by passions; others, guided by reason; and many remain indifferent. There are
those who cannot be categorized but fluctuate or fall between classifications.

It is the soul which renders man a center of value, not his body or any other externality. He is valuable because of his kinship with the Forms. Having viewed the Ideas, man can contribute more to the external world in which his body exists. He is on the line between these two worlds and transmits value as well as meaning from the World of Forms to the World of Appearances. Man, however, is not satisfied with gazing at the Forms alone; he is directed by the power of eros to the Idea of the Good. The Good is the source and sustainer of all of value in the cosmos. It is the magnet which draws man above the world of sensations. It is Plato's God. The Idea of the Good forms the heart of Plato's metaphysics, but its position is of no greater importance than that of man. Without man, the Good would not be known and its power would be worthless. Man alone can realize it as a source of values and strive to bring all that exists into its light. Again it is seen that Plato needs man to explain even the Good!

Although man is made up of two distinct parts, body and soul, only one portion should rule. Reason, which is the highest part of the soul, should control the individual because it can plan and make possible the execution of such plans through commanding the lower parts of the soul. The duty of the body is to make the execution of such plans
easier. It is clearly seen that the soul is superior to
the body in all respects. The soul is not only the guiding
and motivating principle, but it is also a seat of values;
it is eternal and self-moving. Because the soul is so pre-
cious, it must be cared for in a very special way. In
other words, the soul must be nurtured from infancy through
to death. To meet this need man must have an organized sys-
tem of education. The aim of education is the nurture of
the soul; the soul must recognize the Good and realize that
reality may differ from the obvious. Such an education
takes a long time, longer even than a lifetime; therefore
it must begin early in order to help the individual throw
off the chains of ignorance and revel in the light of the
sun longer.

Such a system of education as Plato proposed is
impossible without the aid of an organized state. There is
no state in existence which may be likened to his ideal
state. Even he admitted it was only a signpost or a guide.
Herein lies a great weakness—the ideal state must have
leaders who have been trained under the proposed new system
of education, yet the system of education cannot material-
ize until such a state as described in the Republic has been
realized. Perhaps Plato meant that a few great thinkers
could arise without this specialized training and they
could begin the much needed reformation. However, the
problem is seen; there is too much wishful thinking and not
enough data for practical application. This, however, is not a criticism against his theoretical view of man, but rather a sigh and wonderment of how this individual can be produced.

Plato's doctrine of man is sound and conveys keen insight into the character of human nature. His account of the development of character through a mixed life as urged in the *Philebus* reveals the genius of the man. Plato had the uncanny power of analyzing man as a social, biological, and rational animal. It would not be too difficult to believe that he had studied man as the laboratory technologist studied ants, their habits and their habitat. He views man from afar and accurately describes and portrays the things which are closest to their hearts and minds. He depicts and makes place for the little things as well as the stirring events in man's mind. Yet he never forgets the great worth and value of mankind through such an analysis. Although Plato is vague at spots, when discussing the origin and destiny of the soul (but who isn't?), all any thinker can or has contributed to his theory of man is fresher interpretations and expanded explanations. The greatest number of criticisms have been leveled at Plato when he attempts to outline a plan by which the development could take place. He insulted the institution of monogamy, denied freedom to the artist, and became ambiguous when speaking of the individual and the state in the *Republic*. The state
is to promote the growth and development of character, yet he has men such as the artist sacrificed for the good of the state. It is impossible for the state to be totally organic and for individuals to be free, rational, and centers of values. These two concepts cannot be reconciled. Plato left one with a vague start of an unfinished task on this issue. Again this is attacking his political theory and not his theory of man directly. If history is any indication of importance, Plato's doctrine of man must be given first place. His influence is still felt in our civilization.

After two thousand years Plato's influence is still felt. The character of any system of present-day thought is determined by its relation to his. The doctrine of man which he expounded has had a deep and lasting influence on the Christian concept of man which is embodied in so-called Western thought. The shadow of Plato hovers over philosophy as the shadow of Jesus Christ tints Christian theology. It is largely due, however, to his influence on Christian thought that his teachings were preserved and passed on to posterity. As Taylor says,

To few men does the world owe a heavier debt than to Plato. He has taught us that "philosophy," loving and single-minded devotion to truth, is the great gift of God to man and the rightful guide of man's life, and that the few to whom the intimate vision of truth has been granted are false to their
calling unless they bear fruit in unwearied and humble service to their fellows.¹

Platonic thought entered the stream of Christianity very early. This was due largely to the influence of Plotinus, who was the last of genius among Greek philosophers. Plotinus and his followers called themselves "Platonists," and they believed that they were reviving the true philosophy of Plato. The Neo-Platonic interpretation of Plato is dominated by the passion for a fully articulate vision of the world as a structural unity. Plotinus tries to bridge the gap between the Ideas and Platonic theory of science by relying on the passage in the Republic about the Good which is the source and sustainer of all things. Thus he and his forerunners constructed the famous scale or ladder of "emanations" which connects all. Whenever one comes under the influence of "scales of value" and "ladders of perfection" in Christian theology, he is dealing with the influence of Plato transmitted by Plotinus. If there had been little to offer to Christianity in Platonic thought, Plotinus would not have succeeded. The greatest appeal is due to Plato's ethical theory of man. He introduces two astounding concepts which were Christian-like, so that many of the early church fathers declared he had been taught by Moses. In the Gorgias, Plato emphasized the points that the good man will not harm his enemies and that it is better to suffer than

¹. Taylor, Pla., 3.
to do wrong. His ethics resembles Christianity not only in content, but partially also in spirit. Both may be called ethics of renunciation, or negation of the will, and otherworldly. Both, as Nietzsche would say, are the ethics of the slave opposed to that of the superman. The question that both Christ and Plato constantly challenge one with is, "What shall it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"^1

Another reason for his influence is because he rejected materialism and affirmed the primacy of the soul. The entire elaborate system of education he proposed had one paramount goal in mind, the nurture of the soul. Because the soul grows and develops the proper environment should be provided for it. For this reason he censured mythology because it was largely false; in fact he proposed to censure all art because it had such a strong influence upon young and tender minds. Here Plato's inconsistency comes up again. He forgot that muzzles are for animals and not for men. How could he expect the artist to develop into the best possible poet, painter, or such if his freedom were limited and his work dictated? Again Plato has to make it clear if society is composed of a group of autonomous individuals or if it is an organic whole. Yet his conception of the immortality of the soul and the mythical pictures of future rewards and

1. Shorey, PAM, 72.
punishments were appealing to the Church Fathers. Platonism came into Western thought largely through three channels—Augustine, Boethius, and Dionysus. The Plato who influenced them was seen largely through the medium of Plotinus. In different and varied ways the Platonic conception has emerged again and again in history. When Leibniz and Newton discovered the calculus in the seventeenth century, they were going back to the mathematical ideas originated in the first generation of the Academy. Even such a recent figure as Whitehead takes the general view of nature as stated by Timaeus for his starting point. It is impossible to overestimate Plato’s contributions to and influence upon the modern mind, and any attempt made to do so would be inadequate and lacking in many respects. The simple statement that Platonic ideas have become part of the unconscious inheritance of the educated man may partially convey some idea of the extent and depth of his influence.
EPILOGUE

All modern views of man are adaptations, transformations and varying interpretations of two primary concepts: (1) the classical view of man, (2) the Christian view of man. To understand and appreciate the modern conflicts in regard to human nature, it is necessary to see historically the modern concept of man in relation to these traditional views. This, however, is clearly another story and cannot be retold here. But the conflicts have not yet been resolved and modern culture remains somewhat of a battleground for these two opposing views of human nature. At present the modernized classical view of man seems to have triumphed. An investigation of the basic premise of the classical argument may shed light on this analysis.

The classical view of man is made up primarily of Platonic, Aristotelian, and Stoic conceptions of human nature. Many varying features are included in this concept, but there is one primary common factor—the uniqueness of man's rational faculties.¹ This uniqueness is his nous which may be translated as "spirit" with primary emphasis upon thought and reason. In Plato, nous is the highest element in the soul, and the other two being the spirited and appetitive mand is sharply distinguished from the body and becomes the organizing and unifying principle of

¹. Niebuhr, DM, 6
the soul. Plato’s conception of mind and matter leads toward an implicit dualism. The consequences of such doctrines have led to two ideas which in some ways predetermine any theory of man based on ideas which in some ways predetermine any theory of man based on ideas which in some ways predetermine any theory of man based on classical rationalism and dualism: (1) The concept that reason and divinity are equated. (2) Dualism identifies the body with evil and assume the goodness of mind or spirit. (This body-mind dualism and the value-judgments passed upon both body and mind as Niebuhur points out, stand in sharpest contrast to the Biblical view of man and achieve a fateful influence in all subsequent theories of human nature.1 "The Bible knows nothing of a good mind and an evil body!"

Although Platonic thought is predominant in the classical view of man, it is not the Classical View. Influence of Aristotelian and Stoic conceptions must be considered as determining factors plus many minute contributions of distinguishable and indistinguishable origin.

As previously noted the influence of Platonism upon the classical view of man, which in turn influenced the modern view, is abiding. Niebuhr points out that Platonism draws the most obvious, immediate, and plausible conclusions about the character of human creativity. Be-

cause man has the capacity to form and reform the impulses of nature into new and more inclusive patterns, his creative capacity is identified with reason. At this point Niebuhr levels, and rightly so, a negative criticism.

Plato does not recognize that the anarchic impulses which the "soul" brings into subjection are more than mere bodily impulses. They are impulses which have been given their freedom by the fact that man is spirit as well as nature. Plato thus falsely identifies anarchy with bodily impulse.¹

Ideally the soul is the principle of organization and order in the body, but this is not the entire story. In the Phaedo, Plato admits that the soul "is almost always opposing and coercing the elements of which she is believed to be composed."² This obviously indicates that there are inner conflicts within man that will cause him to stand in contradiction to himself, unless there is a possible transcendency of human spirit. Man is not body and soul, or body or soul, but a unity—a capacity to transcend both the body and the soul.

Plato's theory of human nature is in harmony with this metaphysics and cannot be declared invalid because of inconsistency. But it opens way, in fact prompts, the romantic charge that reason enervates and destroys feelings. Plato would declare that he had been misinterpreted; but by identifying spirit with reason and equating creativity

¹. Niebuhr, DM, VI, 30.
². Pha., 320a.
with the capacity to discipline a previously given vitality into order, the relation of reason to impulse becomes negative. He speaks of "the ten thousand cases of opposition of the soul to the things of the body." ¹

A positive relation between reason and impulse is portrayed in the Platonic concept of ἔρως. ἔρως represents the natural desires and vitalities as they are transformed or sublimated rather than as being repressed by reason. In the famous figure of the charioteer, this is further illustrated, for reason guides the steers toward divine beauty. This indicates a positive rather than a negative relationship between reason and bodily desires. (This is also evidence of difficulty involved in attempting to systematize Plato's doctrine of man).

In spite of Plato's deification of mind (which sometimes resulted in asceticism, as in the Phaedo), Plato remained, as Baker says, a genuine humanist.

He dignifies man by insisting that his highest faculty is rational knowledge by which he knows timeless and immutable reality. ²

¹ Phaed., 120b.
² Baker, DM, 102
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to present Plato's doctrine of man in a systematic fashion by relating the individual to the cosmos, to society, to man, and to himself. It is necessary to see man in relation to all these forces and influences in order to understand his purpose and desires. The strongest desire within each human breast is a feeling to belong. Man wants to belong to something or someone. If he finds the universe unfriendly, he can turn to society; from society, he may turn to friends, and from friends to himself. The feeling of and desiring to be a part of everything leads man onward. It is the compelling force in human existence. Yet, Plato points out, quite clearly man will never be satisfied to belong to one particular realm; he must feel that he is a part of all that is. The important issue is where does man fit into the scheme of things.

To answer this question, the Republic has been used as a core; for it represents the center point in Plato's thought. All his previous works appear to be stepping stones leading to his masterpiece, while his later dialogues merely expand or interpret what already appears in the Republic. His other dialogues, however, have been consulted in order to understand the Republic better. The latter portion of the chapter "Man and the Good Life" was
taken from the Philebus almost directly; and the discussion of eros in Chapter II relies heavily on the Symposium.

This paper was divided into chapters according to subject matter. The first chapter gives the historical background. Plato's doctrine of man, as his other themes, did not spring full born as Minerva did from the brow of Zeus. Instead, it was the result of an accumulative process. Long before his time the quest for knowledge of reality had begun. Early writings prove that man, indirectly and then more directly, became the center of the philosophic quest. Heraclitus and Socrates are to be remembered because of their influence on Plato, in whose writings the doctrine of man burst into bloom. Plato's theory of the World of Appearances can be traced back to Heraclitus, and the Moral Stability of the World he owes to Socrates. In sketching the background the Sophists cannot be excluded. Without them there would have been no Socrates or Plato as they are known now. Both Socrates and Plato were fighting the ethical relativism of the Sophists, who declared that the natural standard of human conduct is utility, ultimate enjoyment, or pleasure.

Chapter II is a discussion of man's place in the cosmos as a metaphysical entity. Plato realizes the necessity of understanding one's own nature and purpose before attempting to know external events. Before an analysis of the structure of the soul is discussed, a review of his
conception of eros is needed.

Eros, in its highest form, is man's instinctive urge to develop his own higher self. It is man's metaphysical yearning after the wholeness which is forever impossible to the individual nature. The yearning shows man to be merely a fragment always striving to be reunited with its appropriate other self as long as he exists in helpless separation. In other words, eros is that which gives direction to life and leads to more life and better life. In the Symposium, eros is interpreted as love for the Good. In other words, it is what Plato means by philosophy—the yearning of the true self to take peace within us. Eros, then, is the basic drive within the soul which has perfection as its goal. This drive is common in all men, but it is not all of the soul. If this were true, then there would be no difference between souls.

What is the principle of differentiation in souls? Before an answer can be attempted, an analysis of the structure of the inner self is necessary. The soul is divided into three distinct but inseparable elements. They are designated as a host of appetites, spirit, and reason. The appetites constitute the largest portion of the soul and are more closely allied to the body. They aim at the immediate satisfaction of desires. The spirited element anticipates and is, therefore, passive until moved by reason, which should be the ruling principle in the soul. These three
principles are not independent entities, but are inseparable and necessary components of the soul. In the actual living of life individualism is possible because of the varied degree that each element influences the total personality. The best possible life can be lived only when the soul is controlled by reason, which has gained rational insight into the permanent structure of the universe and life in the world.

The fact that the soul is the higher part of the self and the really real is more important to Plato than any discussion of its origin or destiny. Plato remains somewhat vague on the subject. Concerning the destiny of the soul, he is sure of its eternality. The basic proof that he gives evolves around the soul's kinship to the eternal forms. No external force can destroy the soul, if destruction is possible; for only the soul can destroy itself by its own viciousness.

Plato's conception of the soul illustrates man's kinship with the Ideas. The soul is closer to the eternal forms, for it too is eternal. Because the soul has gazed upon perfect Ideas, it can strive to reproduce them in the everyday world of things. This leads to Chapter III, in which the good life is discussed.

It is the Idea of the Good which dominates this discussion of the ethical life of man. Discussion of this concept may be summarized as follows: (1) Logically, the Good
is the principle of completeness which promotes order and harmony in the universe. (2) Ethically, the Good is the standard or norm for all values. It is the end of all things as well as the cause. (3) Socially, the Idea of the Good is the ideal of social organization which makes it possible for each individual to contribute his all for the common good. (4) Metaphysically, the Good is the first Form, that is, the first in importance, for particular things are good only in so far as they participate in the Idea of the Good.

The Idea of the Good is that which is desired, complete, and self-sufficient; and it is measure, beauty, and truth. The highest good for man must conform to the criterion of the highest good before it can deserve such a name. What is the highest good for man? As far as can be determined from the Dialogues, the highest good for man is the development of character. A life of character building is referred to as a life of reason. This does not mean sheer contemplation, for reason is the appreciation and promotion of values which are necessary for a well-balanced life. A life of reason is one in which reason and passions are harmoniously combined. This is generally speaking, for the development of character is personal, and each man must discover what his function is and fulfill it the best he knows how.

A good life, however, must be a virtuous one. Virtue comes from knowledge, and since this is possible, each
man will be virtuous if he receives the correct training. Plato gives special attention to four virtues--temperance, courage, wisdom, justice. In a truly Platonic sense all these virtues really are one. But for the sake of clarification they can be divided. Each is called a virtue because it is good in itself. Temperance consists in the enjoyment of mild, gentle pleasures, and desires without frenzy; and, secondly, it results from knowledge of the good. Courage consists also in knowledge of what is to be feared and what is not to be feared. This knowledge is determined by reason and seasoned by temperance. Reason, itself, is the promoter of order and agreement. When the three cardinal virtues are working harmoniously together, then justice, the all-embracing virtue, results.

Plato proves through three arguments that the just soul is happier than the unjust one: (1) The unjust soul is controlled by some master passion and the best elements within him are enclosed. Because of this happiness is impossible, for the soul is not master of itself but a slave to its passions. (2) Because each part of the soul has its own form of pleasure or desire, any one of the three parts--reason, spirit, or appetite--could govern. This is not true because there is a judge of good and better--the philosopher, who has experienced the peculiar pleasures of all three parts of the soul and whose judgment is based on reason and insight. (3) The third proof of the just man's priority to happiness is based on the distinction be-
tween pure or positive pleasures and illusory or comparative pleasure. Only the wise man recognizes or is able to rise above the level of comparative pleasures in order not to fail to distinguish between the higher and lower pleasures.

The development of the good life depends upon knowledge of the virtues. Only through knowledge is happiness possible for knowledge leads to the ideally perfect life. The *summmum bonum* for man is not the absorption into a contemplative realm as suggested in the *Phaedo* and *Republic*, nor is it the possession of a large number of the so-called "goods" of the world, rather it results from the development of character through participating in virtues as directed by reason.

Chapter IV, which is entitled "Man and Society," makes an honest attempt to discover Plato's ideal state, but instead, man was discovered. Only in the life of a rational individual could such a state take place. However Plato holds the state to be one of the fundamental conditions of human life and is judging it by its moral and educational functions. In this, the true state, the standard is not sheer power or force, but rather man as a source of values in the world.

However, to develop the type of individual desired, a reformation of the state is necessary. Plato outlines five steps necessary to the transformation of the state.

1. First, there must be a thoroughly reorganized system of
education which is all inclusive. (2) The rulers must be philosophers who are subject to the training of the state and excell in all knowledge. (3) These rulers, as well as the guardians, would live in a community and would share wives, children, and goods. The merchants and artisans and other workers would have family life as they desired.

Equalization of sexes in all things according to ability. (5) A scientific program of eugenics.

Even in an ideal state decline is inevitable. There is a fatal law which permeates the affairs of state as well as those of human beings. Degeneration follows a cycle which can be seen in the life of a person as well as in the life of the state. The philosopher feels the pangs of desire and as Faust decides to live by a master passion. Such is true of the aristocratic state which becomes a timocratic one in which the one desire is honor and more honor. Such a man corresponding to this government is superficial and swayed by "culture" which he knows nothing about. With the growing wealth of the timocratic state, more emphasis is placed on protection as the state slowly turns into an oligarchy. The honor-loving man of the timocratic state becomes a lover of money. When this happens the accumulations of material goods become an end and all else must be sacrificed, even the fulfillment of other desires. Such a man will be at war with himself as the oligarchical state is torn asunder from within. When only desires remain to control the
human body, necessary and unnecessary appetites cannot be distinguished from each other. Society becomes standardless and chaotic as are the individuals who compose it. Such an individual, as such a state, is referred to as democratic. Out of this confused standardless state a leader arises. He persuades the helpless masses to follow him to their own destruction. This is the worst possible state, as it is the worst possible disease the soul could have. Such a man fears his companions as well as his enemies. The more power he gains, the more miserable he becomes, because he has more to lose and more to fear. Once again the people will rise to shake off the power of the tyrant as they changed other types of governments. The cycle completes itself and the just state emerges again.

The just state comes into being when the three classes which compose it—working class, guardian class, and ruling class—work harmoniously together. In other words, only when the soul of each individual is united by reason, and he fulfills his proper place in society can the ideal state become a reality. It is not an impossible task, for the ideal state can exist within the life of any and every one.

Plato's doctrine of man is the key which unlocks the door of his philosophic thought. Man as Plato sees him is a citizen of two worlds, the World of Ideas and the World of Appearances. Communication between these two realms is
possible only through man, who transmits values from the
eternal real to the every day world.

Any attempt to evaluate Plato's doctrine of man will
prove inadequate, for no other single mind has influenced
Western thinking half so much. He presents a solid picture
of man as he is related to the universe, to society, and to
himself that needs little improvement, for it takes into
consideration the smallest to the most enormous needs of
man.