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SAPTEPTIA SOCRATICA JOCOSERIA.

An inquiry about the serio-comic Socratic wisdom in ancient classical literature.

CHAPTER I

XENOPHON'S SYMPOSIUM

Scholars who compared the Symposium written by Xenophon with the Symposium written by Plato, have not failed to point out the parallelism of motives as to general structure, as to topics and as to verbal similarities. Thus the conviction has grown that either Xenophon was dependent on Plato's Symposium, or that Plato used Xenophon's Symposium. The former view prevails among modern scholars, and as representative of this view we quote first Gilbert Murray: "When Plato wrote the Symposium, Xenophon was not entirely satisfied with the imaginative impression left by that stupendous masterpiece. He corrected it by a Symposium of his own, equally imaginary - for he was a child when the supposed banquet took place - but far more matter-of-fact, an entertaining work of high antiquarian value."

Prof. A. E. Taylor in his book on

---


Plato, in the following manner: "The Symposium is perhaps the most brilliant of all Plato's achievements as a dramatic artist; perhaps for that very reason, it has been worse misunderstood than any other of his writings. Even in its own day it was apparently quite misapprehended by Xenophon, if one may judge by the tone of the very inferior imitation of it in his own piece of the same name. Xenophon was led by the form of the dialogue to suppose that it is meant to deal with the sexual passion and to pit against it a Symposium of his own, which has as its climax a eulogy of the pleasures of married life." That Xenophon, a pupil of Socrates and a contemporary of Plato, knew less about Socrates and Plato than modern scholars know, seems certainly a very strange statement. It is conceded by some scholars that the Socrates whom Xenophon represents is more true to life than the Socrates represented by Plato. Compare the statement by Gilbert Murray: "He (Xenophon) gives a Socrates whom his average contemporary would have recognized as true to life. Plato, fired by his own speculative ideas, had inevitably altered Socrates."

Would it not be worth while to review the content of Xenophon's Symposium, especially since this work is by far less known to the general public than Plato's Symposium? That Plato's Symposium conceals a mystery has been asserted by many scholars and poets. How sceptical we may be towards this assertion there is no doubt that

Xenophon's Symposium reveals a straightforward, plain morality. How much more profitable is it therefore to approach Xenophon's morality before we discuss the mystery of Plato's Symposium, if there is any. We must not be prejudiced by the fact that Xenophon's work is far less artistic than Plato's masterpiece. The greater the art of a master, the more subtlety we find in the concealment of his motives. Let us therefore approach in an unprejudiced manner Xenophon's Symposium.

Callias, the son of Hipponicus and former pupil of Protagoras, Gorgias, and Prodicus, invites Socrates and his friends Critobulus, Hermogenes, Antisthenes, and Charmides to a feast to be given in Callias' house at the Piraeus in honor of Autolycus, a young lad, the winner of the pankration, whom Callias, his lover and friend had brought to see the spectacle of the horse-race at the great Panathenaic festival.

The young lad who is so honored is not alone; he is accompanied by his father Lycon who is to be present at the feast. Socrates is at first not disposed to join the dinner party. When Callias had assured him that he would learn to know in him a man worthy of infinite respect, and had characterized himself as a man who though having wise things to say keeps his wisdom to himself, and his friends, Socrates, urged by the host, accept the invitation.
At the feast Autolycus is seated next to his father while the rest recline on couches. The beauty of the boy, combined with his modesty and self-respect, impressed those present so much that some fell into unwonted silence, while the gestures of the rest who gazed at Autolycus were equally significant. The temperate and harmonious love which Callias showed for Autolycus through the soft intonation of his voice, the frank and liberal expression of his gestures, gave testimony that he was far from any passion-whirled emotion.

"Such, at any rate, the strange effects now wrought on Callias by love. He was like one transformed, the cynosure of all initiated in the mysteries of this divinity." 5

Thus far Xenophon has provided a setting and cast that throws no suspicion of serious love within the circle. Just as in our modern society a young lady is introduced as debutante, just so the Greek male youth was introduced. The hero of the occasion in Xenophon's Symposium is a young athlete who has won a prize. He is like the poet Agathon in whose honor the feast is given in Plato's Symposium, and who is alluded to by Plato in Protagoras and in the Symposium itself as being in sensual love with Peusania, a fact that is corroborated by Xenophon's vehement attack and whose perversion is at the end of his Symposium, made a subject of satire in one of Aristophanes' comedies. The fact that Autolycus is

5 The Works of Xenophon, translated by H. G. Dakyns, M.A., Vol. 3 part 1, Symposium, or the Banquet, page 295
6 The Thesmophoriazusae by Aristophanes
accompanied by his father; the fact that the divine nature of Callias' temperate and harmonious love for Autolycus is contrasted with the love of those who are given to common passion, establishes a situation that is not ambiguous. The hint is given that those initiated into the mysteries of love will know that Callias is above suspicion and reproach.

After the company had supped in silence, the doorkeeper announces the arrival of Philippus, the jester. He is admitted by Callias to entertain the company. Callias in giving his permission "glanced across to where Autolycus was seated, as if to say: 'I wonder how you take the jest.'" Philippus upon entering has difficulty to stir a smile among the company. In the manner of clowns he falls into a dolorous moan, until Critobulus breaks into a peal of laughter. Philippus is of good cheer and hopes to entertain the company. After the tables are removed, the libation poured out and a hymn sung, a Syracusan enters with a flute girl, a dancing girl and a boy. The latter plays the harp and dances with infinite grace. After the girl had played to them upon the flute, and the boy, in turn, upon the harp, Socrates makes a compliment to the host about the wonderful feast he had supplied. Whereupon Callias suggests perfumes for the guests. Socrates then replies:

"No, I protest. Scents resemble clothes. One dress is beautiful on man and one on woman; and so with fragrance: what becomes the woman, ill becomes the man. Did ever man anoint himself with oil of myrrh to please his fellow? Women, and especially young women (like our two friends' brides, Nicératus' and Critolulus'), need no perfume, being but compounds themselves
of fragrance. No sweeter than any perfume else to women is good olive-oil, suggestive of the training school: sweet if present, and when absent longed for. And why? Distinctions vanish with the use of perfumes. The freeman and the slave have forthwith both alike one odour. But the scents derived from toils - those toils which every free man loves - need customary habit first, and time's distillery, if they are to be sweet with freedom's breath, at last." 7

Socrates' differentiation is that what becomes the woman ill becomes the man, and his almost puritanical statement of the fragrance derived from toils, the praise of two women who are ξενάγαγμα brides of two young men present, give the ethical tone to Xenophon's Symposium.

Socrates, in quoting two ξενάγαγμα from Théognis, maintains that the fragrance that befits a youth after the days of gymnastics are over, is that of true nobility, acquired in converse with the good. Lycon, the father, nods approval, and admonishes his son Autolycus to listen to what Socrates is saying.

"That he does (Socrates answered for the boy), and he puts the precept into practice also; to judge, at any rate, from his behavior. When he had set his heart on carrying off the palm of victory in the pankration, he took you into his counsel; and will again take counsel to discover the fittest friend to aid him in his high endeavour, and with his friend associate." 8

The question raised by some of the company, "Where will he find a teacher to instruct him in that wisdom?" - "Why, it is not to be taught!" - "Why should it not be learnt as well as other things?" is deferred by Socrates, because the dancing girl is handed some hoops and begins her performance.

The dancing girl flings ξενάγαγμα twelve hoops over her head.

8 - Ibidem, page 299
and catches them in perfect time as they fall. This feat gives Socrates occasion for the following remark:

"The girl's performance is one proof among a host of others, sirs, that woman's nature is nowise inferior to man's. All she wants is strength and judgment; and that should be an encouragement to those of you who have wives, to teach them whatever you would have them know as your associates." 9

It seems as if Socrates is trying to answer the questions that have been raised by the company; to teach the wisdom to young men on how to guide their wives.

Now follows the humorous objection raised by Antisthenes, why Socrates does not tutor his own wife Xanthippe, instead of letting her remain the most shrewish. Socrates replies with profound philosophic stoicism:

"Well now, I will tell you. I follow the example of the rider who wishes to become an expert horseman: "None of your soft-mouthed, docile animals for me," he says; "the horse for me to own must show some spirit"; - in the belief, no doubt, if he can manage such an animal, it will be easy enough to deal with every other horse besides. And that is just my case. I wish to deal with human beings, to associate with man in general; hence my choice of wife. I know full well, if I can tolerate her spirit, I can with ease attach myself to every human being else."

"A well-aimed argument, not wide of the mark by any means; the company were thinking," is the terse remark by Xenophon. Socrates answered concerning Xanthippe is not merely personal. As befitting a philosopher, it contains a general principle: he who wants to associate with mankind and tolerate and manage it, must first learn how to associate with his wife, to tolerate and to manage her.

9 - Ibidem page 300
10 - " " 300
Does it seem that Socrates is trying to answer the question which has just been raised by the company and that he had to defer on account of the performance of the dancing girl? Has the recommendation to Autolycus to take counsel with his father, to discover the fittest friend to teach him virtue, any connection with Socrates' remark about the relation of young men to their wives? We hold the answer in abeyance.

The dancing girl astonishes the company with a more daring feat of throwing somersaults several times, backwards, forwards, through a hoop studded with a bristling row of upright swords. This gives Socrates the occasion to remark that courage can be taught, and he suggests to the Syracusan that the girl be exhibited to the state, to teach the whole Athenian people courage to face hostile lances at close quarters. The jester remarks that the orator Peisander, one of the oligarchs, could profit very well, since his incapacity to look a row of lances in the face at present makes him shy of military service.

The graceful performance of the boy dancer brings Socrates to express his admiration of the dancer who, while he danced, exercised all parts of his body. Such a gymnastic dance seems to Socrates a good exercise for a man who wants to keep his body light and healthy. To the merriment of the company, Socrates reveals that he himself dances, as his pupil Charmides who caught him doing it one morning, can tell. The merriment is heightened when the
Jester Philippus mimics the dance of the boy and the girl, in burlesque fashion. The grotesque jigs of the jester make him tired and thirsty; he lies down on the couch and calls for wine. Socrates admonishes the company to use moderation in drinking so that they may not be driven to violent drunkenness, but merely reach the goal of sportive levity.

While the cup bearers carried out their duties, the boy played on the lyre tuned to accompany the flute, and sang, and in the blending of boyish and girlish beauty, as Charmides remarked, the sorrows were lulled to sleep and Aphrodite's flame kindled. Socrates suggests in a similar manner as the physician Eriyymachus in Plato's Symposium, that the company heighten the festivity by conversation. Some of the company appoint him as director of the feast and Socrates challenges the host Callias to give an exhibition of his wisdom. Callias agrees on the condition that each one of the company propound some virtue of which he claims to have the knowledge. Socrates amends this suggestion, calling on every one to declare what particular thing he claims to know as best worth having. Callias then starts with the assertion that he prides himself in having the gift of making his fellow mortals better, by teaching them nobility of the soul through justice. He promises later to explain what he means, and calls upon Niceratus to tell on what knowledge he most prides himself. Niceratus declares that he is proud to have learned the Iliad and Odyssey by heart. Satiric remarks follow by Antisthenes and Socrates, concerning the professional rhapsodists. It is Socrates'
opinion that the rhapsodists do not understand the underlying meaning of these poems. Critobulus who is called upon, declares that he prides himself on beauty, and promises to maintain that by beauty he can make people better. Anthistenes prides himself on wealth, although he confesses he has neither money nor property in land. When Charmides on the other hand, is most proud of his poverty. Socrates is asked by the host in what he takes his greatest pride, "then he, with knitted brows, quite solemnly: On pandering. And when they laughed to hear him say this, we continued: Laugh to your hearts' content, my friends; but I am certain I could make a fortune, if I chose to practice this same art." 11 Phillipus the jester is most proud to set folk-laughing. Lycon, the father of Autolycus, takes his greatest pride in his son, and Autolycus confesses that he is not proud of his prize of victory, but of his rather. Lycon, complimented by the host Callias, declares that in possessing such a son as Autolycus, he feels himself to be the wealthiest man in the world. Finally Hermonogenes tells he plumes himself most highly on the virtue and the power of his friends, and that they care for him. 11

Everyone is now called upon to defend his thesis. From an artistic point of view this monotonous procedure of finding out each one's preference and the repetition of former statements in defence of each one's thesis, is very inferior to the procedure in Plato's Symposium, where we find the unity of one theme carried through dramatically and with masterful characterization of the persons

11 - Ibidem, page 309
involved. Compared to Plato the artist, Xenophon the general is a dry reporter, yet what he lacks in artistry he makes up in straightforwardness of his view that is imbued with the tradition of aristocratic Athenian sentiment.

Callias discloses that he spends his time in making more just than upright by giving them money, for by furnishing them with the means to buy necessaries, the people would rather not incur the risk of evil doing. He must however confess to Antisthenes that those to whom he gives the money do not requite his gifts of gold with any sign of gratitude, and Antisthenes therefore draws the conclusion that he can render people just to all the world but not towards himself. Callias thinks that in this respect he is like the many carpenters and housebuilders who spend their time in building houses for half the world, but for themselves they simply cannot do it and forced to live in lodgings. With this argument he believes to have confuted the sophistry of Antisthenes. Socrates compares Callias to those prophets who proverbially foretell the future for mankind, but cannot foresee what is coming to themselves.

Niceratus maintains that Homer, being the wisest of mankind, has touched upon nearly every human topic in his poems. Niceratus can benefit all with his knowledge of Homer, and make them skilled in economy or oratory or strategy. Those whose ambition is to be like Archilles, Ajax, Nestor or Odysseus, should pay court to him. He claims the knowledge of how to be a king or a
Nicératus repeats thus a misconception that Socrates had several times refuted: that practical knowledge can be derived from poets instead of from life itself. The thesis by Nicératus maintained rather by pleasure in words than by pleasure in wit, peters out into an insignificant bantering about onions which, according to Homer, makes wine sweeter.

It is now Critobulus' turn, who has to explain why he prides himself on beauty. Critobulus, like Pausaniass and Agathon in Plato's Symposium, is a young romantic, given to the cult of beauty, an esthetic cult that leads him as well as Pausaniass and Agathon, to outright perversion. He declares himself to be the beauty of the world, the paragon of animals, and rejoices still more in the beauty of his beloved, Cleinias, the son of Alcibiades. He is sore vexed with sleep and night, which rob him of the sight of Cleinias. He is thankful to daylight and the sun that restore to him his heart's joy. He professes an entire philosophy of beauty:

"The strong man may by dint of toil obtain good things; the brave, by danger boldly faced, and the wise by eloquence of speech; but to the beautiful alone it is given to achieve all ends in absolute quiescence." 12

Far sweeter than riches is Cleinias to him. Gladly would he become a slave and forswit freedom if Cleinias would deign to be his lord. He would prefer danger incurred in his behalf than security of days. His bombastic speech in behalf of beauty goes on in the following manner:

12 - Ibidem, page 314
So that if you, Callias, may boast of making men more just and upright, to me belongs by juster right than yours to train mankind to every excellence. We are the true inspirers who infuse some subtle fire into amorous souls, we beauties, and thereby raise them to new heights of being; we render them more liberal in the pursuit of wealth; we give them a zest for toil that mocks at danger, and enables them where honour the fair vision leads, to follow. We fill their souls with deeper modesty, a self-constraint more staunch; about the things they care for most, there floats a halo of protecting awe. Fools and unwise are they who choose not beauteous men to be their generals. How merrily would I, at any rate, march through fire by the side of Cleinias; and so would all of you, I know full well, in company of him who now addresses you.

Cease, therefore, your perplexity, O Socrates, abandon fears and doubts, believe you know that this thing of which I make great boast, my beauty, has power to confer some benefit on humankind.

Once more, let no man dare dishonour beauty, merely because the flower of it soon fades, since even as a child has growth in beauty, so is it with the stripling, the grown man, the reverend senior. And this the proof of my contention. Whom do we choose to bear the sacred olive-shoot in honour of Athene? - whom else save beautiful old men? witnessing thereby that beauty walks hand in hand as a companion with every age of life, from infancy to eld.

Or again, if it be sweet to win from willing hearts the things we seek for, I am persuaded that, by the eloquence of silence, I could win a kiss from yonder girl or boy more speedily than ever you could. O sage! by help of half a hundred subtle arguments."

Here Socrates interrupts Critobulus and asks him whether he claims to rival him in beauty. He proposes that as soon as the arguments have gone the round, they must obtain a verdict on the point of beauty. With an ironic touch about the effeminacy of Critobulus, Socrates exclaims:

"Judgment shall be given - not at the bar of Alexander, son of Priam - but of these who, as you flatter yourself, have such a hankering to kiss you."

13 - Ibidem, pages 314-315
14 - " 316/316
Critobulus answers deprecatingly why he would not leave it to the arbitration of Cleinias. Socrates upbraids Critobulus for ever repeating that name. Critobulus breaks out in romantic passion:

"And if his name died on my lips, think you my mind would less recall his memory? Know you not, I wear so clear an image of him in my soul, that had I the sculptur's or the limner's skill, I might portray his features as exactly from this image of the mind as from contemplation of his actual self." 15

"But Socrates broke in: Pray, whythen, if you bear about this lively image, why do you give me so much trouble, dragging me to this and that place, where you hope to see him?

Crit. For this good reason, Socrates, the sight of him inspires gladness, whilst his phantom wrings not joy so much as it engenders longing.

At this point Hermogenes protested: I find it most unlike you, Socrates, to treat thus negligently one so passion-crazed as Critobulus.

Socrates replied: Do you suppose the sad condition of the patient dates from the moment only of our intimacy?

Herm. Since when, then?

Soc. Since when? Why, look at him: the down begins to mantle on his cheeks, and on the nape of Cleinias' neck already mounts. The fact is, when they fared to the same school together, he caught the fever. This his father was aware of, and consigned him to me, hoping I might be able to do something for him. Ay, and his plight is not so sorry now. Once he would stand agape at him like one whose gaze is fixed upon the Gorgons, his eyes one stony stare, and like a stone himself turn heavily away. But nowadays I have seen the statue actually blink. And yet, may Heaven help me! my good sirs, I think, between ourselves the culprit must have bestowed a kiss on Cleinias, than which love's flame asks no fiercer fuel. So insatiable a thing is it and so suggestive of mad fantasy. (And for this reason held perhaps in higher honour, because of all external acts the close of lip with lip bears the same name as that of soul in love.) Wherefore, say I, let every one who wishes to be master of himself and sound of soul abstain from kisses imprinted on fair lips.
Then Charmides: Oh! Socrates, why will you scare your friends with these hobgoblin terrors, bidding us all beware of handsome faces, whilst you yourself - yes, by Apollo, I will swear I saw you at the schoolmaster's that time when both of you were poring over one book, in which you searched for something you and Critobulus, head to head, shoulder to shoulder bare, as if incorporate?

Ah yes, alack the day! (he answered); and that is why, no doubt, my shoulder ached for more than five days afterwards, as if I had been bitten by some fell beast, and methought I felt a sort of scraping at the heart. Now therefore, in the presence of these witnesses, I warn you, I will swear Critobulus, never again to touch me till you wear as thick a crop of hair upon your chin as on your head.

So pell-mell they went at it, half jest half earnest, and so the medley ended. Callias here called on Charmides." 16

Here we must point out the basic conflict that Socrates and the school which he established carried out not indeed with the cult of beauty that is native to the Greek genius, but with the romantic exaggeration of this cult in his own day, with its corresponding perversion of instincts, its dangerous self-glorification and self-villification, as is apparent from the speech of Critobulus. This conflict brought Socrates, and especially Plato, to give a new philosophical, ethical and especially educational interpretation to Greek aristocratic civilization, that had run through the heroic cycle as represented by the poems of Homer, through the religious consciousness of the toiling masses as represented by Hesiod, through the aesthetic cycle as represented by the lyric and dramatic poetry and the flourishing of all arts in the age of Pericles, that ended with the sophists in intellectual confusion and the perversion of all inner

16 - Ibidem, pages 316, 317, 318
values that had built up this civilization. (The scriptural texts on
which this civilization was based were misunderstood and turned into
their opposite meaning, as the Dialogues of Plato can testify.) This
basic conflict concerning the spiritual/ethical nature of love was ironically dis-
guised and mysteriously masked by Plato himself and the entire
Platonic tradition that lasted through centuries, found its revival in
Christian Renaissance. The testimony of Xenophon is therefore so much
more valuable because it can lead us back to the original meaning of
Plato's irony and satiric mask.

Concerning the Eros of Socrates, Xenophon reports in his straightforward, simple manner elsewhere:

Let us take as an example that saying of his, so often on his lips: "I am in love with so and so"; and all the while it was obvious the going-forth of his soul was not towards excellence of body in the bloom of beauty, but rather towards faculties of the soul unfolding in virtue. And these "good natures" he detected by certain tokens: a readiness to learn that to which the attention was directed; a power of retaining in the memory the lessons learnt; and a passionate predilection for those studies in particular which serve to good administration of a house or of a state, and in general to the proper handling of man and human affairs. Such beings, he maintained, needed only to be educated to become not only happy themselves and happy administrators of their private households, but to be capable of rendering other human beings as states or individuals happy also.¹⁷

If Socrates' interest centered in the administration of private households, the problem of wedlock must have loomed up as its focus. Testimony to this is Xenophon's "The Economist". Here we find a conversation recorded between Socrates and the same Critobulus, who is characterized

¹⁷ - Ibidem pages 130/131
as an esthetic idler. Socrates asks him the question why a certain farmer succeeds in agriculture and another fails, and invites him to see these various farmers, and learn his lesson. When Critobulus promises to do so, Socrates replies with a certain irony:

"Yes, and while you contemplate, you must make trial of yourself and see if you have wit to understand. At present, I will bear you witness that if it is to go and see a party of players performing in a comedy, you will get up at cock-crow, and come trudging a long way, and ply me volubly with reasons why I should accompany you to see the play. But you have never once invited me to come and witness such an incident as those we were speaking of just now.

Crit. And so I seem to you ridiculous?"

Socrates asks him also the question why certain people dealing with horses are brought to the brink of poverty, and certain others have found in the same pursuit the road to affluence. Critobulus answers that he knows both characters and asserts with a certain

ness that his knowledge has not brought him a bit farther since he does not find himself a whit the more included among those who gain. Here Socratesironizes again the esthetic idler and amateur:

"Because you look at them just as you might at the actors in a tragedy or comedy, and with the same intent - your object being to delight the ear and charm the eye, but not, I take it, to become yourself a poet. And there you are right enough, no doubt, since you have no desire to become a playwright. But, when circumstances compel you to concern yourself with horsemanship, does it not seem to you a little foolish in the matter, especially as the same creatures which are good for use are profitable for sale?"
"Soc. ..... In further illustration, I can show you how some men treat their wedded wives in such a way that they find in them true helpmates to the joint increase of their estate, while others treat them in a way to bring upon themselves wholesale disaster.

Crit. Ought the husband or the wife to bear the blame of that?

Soc. If it goes ill with a sheep we blame the shepherd, as a rule, or if a horse shows vice we throw the blame in general upon the rider. But in the case of women, supposing the wife to have received instruction from her husband and yet she delights in wrong-doing, it may be that the wife is justly to blame; but supposing he has never tried to teach her the first principles of "fair and noble" conduct, and finds her quite an ignoramus in these matters, surely the husband will be justly held to blame. But come now (he added), we are all friends here; make a clean breast of it and tell us, Critobulus, the plain unvarnished truth: Is there any one to whom you are more in the habit of entrusting matters of importance than to your wife?

Crit. There is no one.

Soc. And is there any one with whom you are less in the habit of conversing than with your wife?

Crit. Not many, I am forced to admit.

Soc. And when you married her she was quite young, a mere girl - at an age when, as far as seeing and hearing, she had the smallest acquaintance with the outer world?

Crit. Certainly.

Soc. Then would it not be more astonishing that she should have real knowledge how to speak and act than that she should go altogether astray?

Crit. But let me ask you a question, Socrates: have these happy husbands, you tell us of, who are blessed with good wives educated them themselves?

Soc. There is nothing like investigation. I will introduce you to Aspasia, who will explain these matters to you in a far more scientific way than I can. My belief is that a good wife, being as she is the partner in a common estate, must needs be her husband's counterpoise and
counterpart for good; since, if it is through the trans­
actions of the husband, as a rule, that goods of all sorts
find their way into the house, yet it is by means of the
wife's economy and thrift that the greater part of the ex­
penditure is checked, and on the successful issue or the
mishandling of the same depends the increase or impoverish­
ment of a whole estate. And so with regard to the remain­
g arts and sciences, I think I can point out to you the ablest
performers in each case, if you feel you have any further
need of help." 20

These mssages can well illustrate how different the
Socratic outlook is from the romantic ravings of a young Athenian
esthete, the spoiled child of a spoiled generation. It is to be
noted that Critobulus had been entrusted by his father to Socrates,
to cure him of his obsession for Cleobias, so that Socrates appears
as his real physician.

How far this basic conflict of Socrates concerning im
love went, is illustrated by Xenophon in the account of Socrates'
relation to Critias, the oligarch, a former pupil of Socrates, who
gone wrong and brought so much misfortune to Athens. Xenophon calls
Critias an arrant thief, savage and murderer. Socrates' conflict
contributed to bring
with Critias that αμέτρητον about the philosopher's destruction, is
related in the following manner:

"...Socrates was well aware that Critias was attached to
Euthydemos, aware too that he was endeavouring to deal by
him after the manner of those wantons whose love is ερατις
carnal of the body. From this endeavor he tried to deter
him, pointing out how illiberal a thing it was, how ill be­
fitting a man of honour to appear as a beggar before him whom he loved, in whose eyes he would fain be precious, ever petitioning for something base to give and base to get.

20 - Ibidem, Chapt. 111, p. 9-16 - pages 211/212
But when this reasoning fell on deaf ears and Critias refused to be turned aside, Socrates, as the story goes, took occasion of the presence of a whole company and of Euthydemus to remark that Critias appeared to be suffering from a swinish affection, or else why this desire to rub himself against Euthydemus, like a herd of piglings scraping against stones.

The hatred of Critias to Socrates doubtless dates from this incident. He treasured it up against him, and afterwards, when he was one of the Thirty and associated with Charicles as their official lawgiver, he framed the law against teaching the art of words merely from a desire to vilify Socrates." 21

Charmides, in defending his thesis why he prided himself on poverty, tells that when he was wealthy he lived in daily terror lest some burglar should break into his house and steal his goods and do him some injury. He was afraid before informers. He had to court those people because he knew that they could injure him far less than they could injure him. Now that he has lost his property he feels at ease and gets a good night's rest. The distrust of his fellow-citizens has vanished. Instead of trembling at threats, it is now his turn to threaten. He feels himself a free man, at liberty to go abroad or stay at home as soothes his fancy. The tables now are turned. It is the rich who rise to give him their seats, who stand aside and make way for him as he meets them in the street. Today he is like a despot; yesterday he was literally a slave. Formerly he had to pay his tribute to the sovereign people, and now it is he who is supported by the state by means of general taxation. When he was rich it was a matter of reproach to him that he was befriended with Socrates. Now that he has become a beggar no one 21

21 - Memorabilia, Book 1, Ch.11 P.27-31 - page 12
cares about it. When he rolled in plenty he had everything to lose; now he has everything to gain and lives in hope of some day getting something.

Antisthenes, who is the next speaker, maintains that being poor he makes a boast of wealth because wealth and poverty lie not in a man's estate but in men's souls. Wealth of his sort makes one liberal in soul. He got these riches from Socrates, and he is ready to display them to all his friends, and to give them a share of the wealth that lies within his soul. He has the most luxurious of possessions, unbroken leisure, which leaves him free to contemplate things worthy of contemplation. The host Callias confesses that he envies him, but Nicèratus, versed in the law of Homer, confesses the opposite: he is inordinately fond of riches.

It is now the turn of Hermógenes to tell who his friends are, to demonstrate the greatness of their power and care for him. He confesses that the gods who know and can do all things, deign to be his friends. By reason of their care for him he can never escape from their side. Knowing beforehand the end and issue of each event, the gods give him signals, sending messengers, be it some voice or vision of the night, with omens of the solitary bird, with tell him what he should and what he should not do. When he listens to their warnings all goes well with him, but if he has been disobedient, chastisement follows. Asked by Socrates what service he pays to the gods to secure their friendship, he answers that he gives them thanks, speaks well of them, and whenever he takes their sacred names to witness, he does not willingly falsify his word.
The jester Philippus sums up the pride of his life. He makes people laugh. When they are in lusc's way they invite him to a share of it, but if something ill betides them, they run away from him in fear he may set them laughing.

The Syracusean does not pride himself on the boy, as someone ventures to guess. He is rather afraid that some people might wheedle him away with bribes to pass his nights with them. Thus he is afraid the boy might be corrupted. But Socrates, eliciting from the Syracusean him the confession that he himself sleeps with the boy every night, says that he may boast of his own flesh if he does not corrupt the boy. The Syracusean prides himself rather on the silly fools who come to see his puppet show, to which the jester adds that he heard him the other day pray to the gods to grant him great store of corn and wine, but dearth of wits.

The defense of Socrates' thesis follows as climax:

"Pass on (said Callias); now it is your turn, Socrates. What have you to say to justify your choice? How can you boast of so discredited an art?

He answered: Let us first decide what are the duties of the good go-between; and please to answer every question without hesitating; let us know the points to which we mutually assent. Are you agreed on that?

The Company, in chorus. Without a doubt (they answered, and the formula, once started, was every time repeated by the company, full chorus).

Soc. And, further, that towards agreeableness, one step at any rate consists in wearing a becoming fashion of the hair and dress? Are you agreed to that?
Omnes. Without a doubt.

Soc. And we know for certain, that with the same eyes a man may dart a look of love or else of hate on those he sees. Are you agreed?

Omnes. Without a doubt.

Soc. Well! and with the same tongue and lips and voice may speak with modesty or boastfulness?

Omnes. Without a doubt.

Soc. And there are words that bear the stamp of hate, and what words that tend to friendliness?

Omnes. Without a doubt.

Soc. The good go-between will therefore make his choice between them, and teach only what conduces to agreeableness?

Omnes. Without a doubt.

Soc. And is he the better go-between who can make his clients pleasing to one person only, or can make them pleasing to a number?

The company was here divided; the one half answered, "Yes, of course, the largest number," whilst the others still maintained, "Without a doubt."

And Socrates, remarking, "That proposition is agreed to also," thus proceeded: And if further he were able to make them pleasing to the whole community, should we not have found in this accomplished person an arch-go-between?

Clearly so (they answered with one voice).

Soc. If then a man had power to make his clients altogether pleasing; that man, I say, might justly pride himself upon his art, and should by rights receive a large reward?

And when these propositions were agreed to also, he turned about and said: Just such a man, I take it, is before you in the person of Antisthenes!

Whereupon Antisthenes exclaimed: What! are you going to pass on the business? will you devolve this art of yours on me as your successor, Socrates?
I will, upon my word, I will (he answered): since I see that you have practiced to some purpose, may elaborated, an art which is the handmaid to this other.

And what may that be? asked Antisthenes.

**Soc.** The art of the procurer.

The other (in a tone of deep vexation): Pray, what thing of the sort are you aware I ever perpetrated?

**Soc.** I am aware that it was you who introduced our host here, Cullias, to that wise man Prodicus; they were a match, you saw, the one enamoured of philosophy, and the other in need of money. It was you again, I am well enough aware, who introduced him once more to Hipplas of Elis, from whom he learnt his "art of memory;" since which time he has become a very ardent lover, from inability to forget each lovely thing he sets his eyes on. And quite lately, if I am not mistaken, it was you who sounded in my ears such praise of our visitor from Heraclea, that first you made me thirst for his society, and then united us. For which I am your debtor, since I find him a fine handsome fellow and true gentleman. And did you not, moreover, sing the praises of Aeschylus of Philus in my ears and mine in his? - in fact, affected us so much by what you said, we fell in love and took to coursing wildly in pursuit of one another like two dogs upon a trail.

With such examples of your wonder-working skill before my eyes, I must suppose you are a first-rate match-maker. For consider, a man with insight to discern two natures made to be of service to each other, and with power to make these same two people mutually enamoured! That is the sort of man, I take it, who should weld together states of friendship; cement alliances with gain to the contracting parties; and, in general, be found an acquisition to those several states; to friends and intimates, and partisans in war, a treasure worth possession. But you, my friend, you got quite angry. One would suppose I had given you an evil name in calling you a first-rate matchmaker.

Yes (he answered meekly), but now I am calm. It is clear enough, if I pass these powers I shall find myself surcharged with spiritual riches.

In this fashion the cycle of the speeches was completed.**22**

Socrates' original announcement of his thesis that what he claims to know as best worth having is the art of being a pand.
or procuror, or go-between, or match-maker, is certainly a serio-comic
remark. The seriousness and clownishness of this jest
is heightened by Xenophon to large dimensions. Socrates declared it
quite solemnly, "With knitted brow, and made it visible as a jest in adding to his
announcement: "Laugh to your hearts' content, my friends; but I am
certain I could make a fortune, if I choose to practice this same
art." As he stands thus before us we recognize in him the great
Mimus, the comedian and mountebank, the crafty entertainer of the
people who can bring into his disguised speech the salt of comic
wit. This is the outward appearance of the Demolung, the spiritual
worker for the people, and awakener of the conscience of those
who are destined to be leaders. This great jest is logically con-
ected with what Xenophon described as the main function of Socrates' Eros: he strove to educate those who could become "not only happy
to themselves and happy administrators of their private households; but
to be capable or rendering other human beings as states or individ-
uals happy also." The center of his educational interest was
in establishing the right relations between man and wife, with the
further outlook on the social inter-relation between all fellow men and the management of the state. We find
in Xenophon's "The Economist" reported for the benefit of Crito-
culus, the account of Socrates' conversation with Ischomachus, held in the portico of Zeus Eleutherios, the god of freedom or of
freed man, an ideal husband who lives in ideal relation with his
wife, who sets forth all the points that such a relation involves.
This very lengthy discourse shows Ischomachus as teacher of his wife:

Soc. Pray narrate to me, Ischomachus, I beg of you, what you first essayed to teach her. To hear that story would please me more than any description of the most splendid gymnastic contest or horse-race you could give me.

Why Socrates (he answered), when after a time she had become accustomed to my hand, that is, was tamed sufficiently to play her part in a discussion, I put to her this question: "Did it ever strike you to consider, dear wife, what led me to choose you as my wife among all women, and your parents to entrust you to me of all men? It was certainly not from any difficulty that might best either of us to find another bedfellow. That I am sure is evident to you. No; it was with deliberate intent to discover, I for myself and your parents in behalf of you, the best partner of house and children we could find, that I sought you out, and your parents, acting to the best of their ability, made choice of me. If at some future time God grant us to have children born to us, we will take counsel together how best to bring them up, for that too will be a common interest, and a common blessing if haply they shall live to fight our battles and we find in them hereafter support and succour when ourselves are old. But at present there is our house here, which belongs alike to both. It is common property, for all that I possess goes by my will into the common fund, and in the same way all that you deposited was placed by you to the common fund. We need not stop to calculate in figures which of us contributed most, but rather let us lay to heart this fact that whichever of us proves the better partner, he or she at once contributes what is most worth having."

In the course of this account of Socrates' conversation with Ischomachus, the latter is reported as having said to his wife:

"...the gods, my wife, would seem to have exercised much care and judgment in compacting that twin-system which goes by the name of male and female, so as to secure the greatest possible advantage to the pair. Since no doubt the underlying principle of the bond is first and foremost to perpetuate through procreation the races of living creatures,

23 - Ibidem "The Economist", Ch. VII, § 6-12 ff. - pages 227/228
and next, as the outcome of this bond, for human beings at
any rate, a provision is made by which they may have sons
and daughters to support them in old age." 24

And further we find this passage:

"And seeing that both alike feel the need of giving and
receiving, He set down memory and carefulness between them
for their common use, so that you would find it hard to de-
termine whether of the two, the male or the female, has the
larger share of these. So, too, God set down between them
for their common use the gift of self-control, where needed,
adding only to that one of the twain, whether man or woman,
which should prove the better, the power to be rewarded with
a larger share of this perfection. And for the very reason
that their natures are not alike adapted to like ends, they
stand in greater need of one another; and the married couple
is made more useful to itself, the one fulfilling what the
other lacks.

"Now, being well aware of this, my wife," I added, "and
knowing well what things are laid upon us twain by God Him-
self, must we not strive to perform, each in the best way
possible, our respective duties? Law, too, gives her con-
sent - law and the usage of mankind, by sanctioning the
wedlock of man and wife; and just as God ordained them to be
partners in their children, so the law establishes their
common ownership of house and estate. Custom, moreover, proclaims as beautiful those excellences of man and
woman with which God gifted them at birth. Thus for a
woman to bide tranquilly at home rather than roam abroad
is no dishonour; but for a man to remain indoors, instead
of devoting himself to outdoor pursuits, is a discreditable. But if a man does things contrary to the
nature given him by God, the chances are, such insubordin-
ation escapes not the eye of Heaven: he pays the penalty,
whether of neglecting his own works, or of performing
those appropriate to woman." 25 26

24 ibidem, "The Economist, Ch. VII, § 12-18ff. Pages 226/228
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we can realize the great truth that is contained in Socrates's statement that he takes pride in being a pander, go-between or match-maker. It throws a searchlight on the figure of Socrates which, directed on Plato's writings, brings us to an entirely different interpretation of their meaning. For as our inquiry will demonstrate, in Socrates the teacher of youth we shall recognize the mystagogue of youth, who leads them on in an indirect manner to a self-realization in marriage, the management of a private household, and as a step further to the management of the state. But more than that, our inquiry will bring evidence that the Socratic type of the Mimus and Demiurg, veiled under mystagogic poetic fictions, stands in the center of post-Socratic poetry, and that Xenophon's characterization of Socrates' Eros holds true in the case of Theocritus, Virgil, Horace, and in general in the case of the great classical tradition of post-Socratic Greco-Roman poetry.

The beauty contest between Socrates and Critobulus is now on, and Socrates hopes to win the prize of beauty, since he pretends that as Sir Pandarus he stands high in the esteem of those who are the judges of the contest. An attendant brings a lamp to throw light on Socrates and Critobulus. In a humorous bantering Socrates elicits from Critobulus that things in general are beautiful if properly constructed for some work, or naturally adapted to satisfy some want. By this token Socrates proves that his eyes are more
beautiful than those of Critobulus. Critobulus' eyes can see just straight in front of them, whereas those of Socrates, prominent and projecting, can see aslant. If noses are for the sake of smelling, the nose of Socrates spread out wide and flat as if to welcome scent from every quarter, whereas Critobulus' nostrils point to earth. As to Socrates' snub nose, it allows the orbs of sight free range of vision, while the nose of Critobulus looks like an inserting wall of partition. Critobulus gives in at once that if mouths are made for purposes of biting, Socrates could doubtless bite off a much larger mouthful; and thanks to his thick lips, Socrates adds, he can give a softer kiss. And do not the Nymphs have as their progeny Sileni, who \( \text{XXX XXXX XXXX} \)? While the Socrates resembles? A secret vote is taken Socrates has the lamp-stand brought close up to Critobulus. When the urns were emptied it was found that every vote without exception was cast for Critobulus. At this announcement, Socrates remarks with irony:

"...The coin you deal in, Critobulus, is not at all like that of Callias. He makes people just; whilst yours, like other filthy lucre, can corrupt both judge and jury." 26

Critobulus is now to receive the meed of victory in kisses due from boy and girl. The company in bandying jests, is in hilarious uproar, during which only the pious Hermogenes kept silent. Socrates, apparently in disgust with what is going on, asks Hermogenes what a drunken bawl is. Hermogenes explains it modestly as annoyance caused to people over wine. To this Socrates \( \text{XXX XXXX} \) 25 - Ibidem, Symposium, Ch. V, § 10 - page 331
inquires whether he is not aware that he is annoying the company by silence. It would be hard, replies Hermogenes, to insert one grain of sense after Socrates' talk. There are still a few more remarks made, but meanwhile the Syracusean, who feels that he was neglected, attacks Socrates in a fit of jealousy, ridiculing him in the manner of Aristophanes, asking him how many fleas' feet distance it is from him to Socrates. A quarrel is likely to break out when Antisthenes pits the jester against the Syracusean. But Socrates assures the situation and breaks into a song when the jester is called upon to prepare a pantomime, instead of letting the dancing girl perform on a potter's wheel, which finds uncongenial to a banquet. The Syracusean is pleased with his suggestion and leaves to organize the performance. Socrates then starts like a synthesis of the speeches on love in Plato's Symposium.

Socrates starts his speech in the following manner:

"If were but reasonable, sirs, on our part not to ignore the mighty power here present, a divinity in point of age coequal with the everlasting gods, yet in outward form the youngest, who in magnitude embraces all things, and yet his shrine is planted in the soul of man. Love is his name! and least of all should we forget him who are one and all votaries of this god. For myself I cannot name the time at which I have not been in love with some one. And Charmides here has, to my knowledge, captivated many a lover, while his own soul has gone out in longing for the love of not a few himself. So it is with Critobulus also; the beloved of yesterday is become the lover of to-day. Ay, and Nicærus, as I am told, adores his wife, and is by her adored. As to
Hermogenes, which of us needs to be told that the soul of this fond lover is consumed with passion for a fair ideal—call it by what name you will—the spirit blest of nobleness and beauty. See you not what chaste severity dwells on his brow; how tranquil his gaze; how moderate his words; how gentle his intonation; how radiant his whole character. And if he enjoys the friendship of the most holy gods, he keeps a place in his regard for us poor mortals. But how is it that you alone, Antisthenes, you misanthrope, love nobody?

Nay, so help me heaven! (he replied), but I do love most desperately yourself, O Socrates!

Whereat Socrates, still carrying on the jest, with a coy, coquettish air, replied: Yes; only please do not bother me at present. I have other things to do, you see.

Antisthenes replied: How absolutely true to your own character, arch go-between! It is always either your familiar oracle won't suffer you, that's your pretext, and so you can't converse with me; or you are bent upon something, or somebody else.

Then Socrates: For Heaven's sake, don't carbonado me, Antisthenes, that's all. Any other savagery on your part I can stand, and will stand, as a lover should. However (he added), the less we say about your love the better, since it is clearly an attachment not to my soul, but to my lovely person." 26

With deep psychological insight Xenophon outlines the different states in the ascent of love. The state of Charmides, as beloved, the state of Critobulus, as romantic lover/ of a boy, are the two emotional romantic states which stirred the youth of Athens in Socrates' day. Plato shows us in his Dialogue Lysis the method of a dialogue on friendship which is called "obstetric", how Socrates unsettled with Hermes-like dissimulation and irony, the romanticism of this emotional love in conversing in a wrestling school with the young romantic lover Hippothales, and the boy whom the latter admires,

26 Ibidem - Symposium, Ch. VII. § 1-6. - pages 336/338
Lysis. He uses an intricate dialectic that confuses the young people and intentionally destroys all notions of friendship that they have had. Plato shows especially how Socrates, in dealing with the boy Lysis, used a different method from the romantic tradition that used to flatter and to spoil the beloved boy. He humbles Lysis and reduces him to the feeling of his ignorance instead of puffing him up and spoiling him.

Hermogenes, whose angelic nature we have learned to know, is in a superior state. His soul is filled with spiritual love: he has the passion for a fair ideal.

Quite apart stands Antisthenes, a founder of the cynic school, whom Socrates calls a misanthrope. Antisthenes confesses he is in love with Socrates, who feels annoyed by him and rebukes him. If Socrates was a genuine teacher, which it cannot be doubted, can easily be surmised how impatient he became when a pupil stayed too long with him, instead of starting his own work. Antisthenes had spoken of his unbroken leisure that he enjoyed in contact with Socrates, and his satisfaction of sexual desire "by what comes first to hand". The intellectual result to which he came was cynicism, which in our opinion is in the last end the philosophy of laziness.

Socrates then turns to Callias:

"And that you, Callias, do love Autolycus, this whole town knows and half the world besides, if I am not mistaken;

27 - Plato, Lysis, 210 B.
and the reason is that you are both sons of famous fathers, and yourselves illustrious. For my part I have ever admired your nature, but now much more so, when I see that you are in love with one who does not wanton in luxury or languish in effeminacy, but who displays to all his strength, his hardihood, his courage, and sobriety of soul. To be enamoured of such qualities as these is a proof itself of a true lover’s nature.

Whether indeed Aphrodité be one or twain in personality, the heavenly and the earthly, I cannot tell, for Zeus, who is one and indivisible, bears many titles. But this thing I know, that these twain have separate altars, shrines, and sacrifices, as befits their nature - she that is earthly, of a lighter and a laxer sort; she that is heavenly, purer and holier in type. And you may well conjecture, it is the earthly goddess, the common Aprodité, who sends forth the bodily loves; while from her that is named of heaven, on friendship and on noble deeds. It is by this latter, Callias, that you are held in bonds, if I mistake not, Love divine. This I infer as well from the fair and noble character of your friend, as from the fact that you invite his father to share your life and intercourse. Since no part of these is hidden from the father by the fair and noble lover." 28

Xenophon works out with utmost care, the ideal case of love and friendship of a mature man to a youth who has proven strength, hardihood, courage, and sobriety of soul. From our modern point of view we can very well understand the nature of such a friendship. But why the stress on love? The mysterious purpose or telos is symbolically made visible at the end of Xenophon’s Symposium, from which, in combination with other evidence, we shall be able to draw our conclusions.

Socrates proceeds to the main part of the speech addressed to Callias, trying to show him how far the love of soul is better than the love of the body. This is a theme which Plato treats in his Symposium and in Phaedrus, with greater art but

28 - Ibidem, Symposium, Ch. VIII, § 4-10, pages 338/339
more sophistification. On the part of those whose admiration is bestowed upon the inner disposition, love is well-named sweet and voluntary compulsion. But among those whose desire is for the body, there are not a few who blame, nay hate, the ways of their beloved ones. When the bloom of beauty withers, the affection which was based upon it must also wither up and perish. But the soul with every step she makes in her onward course towards deeper wisdom, grows ever worthier of love. Also the feelings of one who loves the body pall when the surfeit is engendered. But the soul's attachment, owing to its purity, knows no satiety. And yet this love inspires to words and deeds that bear the impress of Aphrodite. That a soul whose bloom is visible alike in beauty of external form and an inner, bashful and generous disposition, imperial and affable, born to rule among its fellows, will admire and cling to his beloved, needs not to be shown. It needs rather to be taught how it is natural that this type of lover should be loved by the boy whom he cherishes. The latter will know that the lover regards him as both beautiful and good, that he is more anxious to promote the well-being of his beloved than to indulge his selfish joys, and above all, his faith and trust, whatever may come, loss of beauty through sickness, nothing will diminish their affection. In happiness they will rejoice together, in misfortune prove still more constant, and share their troubles.

But does not the lover who depends upon the body bring dire reproach upon his minion? In using persuasion rather than violence, is he not more despicable. Nothing harsh was ever yet
engendered by attachment based on moral qualities; whilst shameless of intercourse, time out of mind, has been the source, countless and unhallowed deeds. The society of him whose love is of the body is in itself illiberal. The true educator who teaches virtue and excellence in speech and conduct, deserves on the contrary to be honored as Cheiron and Phoenix were honored by Achilles. How base, however, is the lover of the body who behaves like a cringing beggar before his idol. Socrates excuses "turbulence" (or wantonness) of his language: "...partly the wine exalts me; partly that love which ever dwells within my heart of hearts now pricks me forward to use great boldness of speech against his base antagonist." 29 The lover of the body makes his idol wanton; the lover of the soul inspires his beloved not only to be studious of virtue, but to practice virtue. By mythic argument it can be shown that the gods and heroes set greater stores by friendship of the soul than bodily enjoyment. The fair women whom Zeus loved remained mortal; but the heroes whose soul he admired, he raised to immortality, as for instance, Heracles and Dioscuri. Zeus loved Ganymede for his soul's sake, not for his body's sake. He quotes two verses of Homer to prove that the name Ganymede is compounded of two words meaning "joy" and "counsel," and is honored among the gods not as one "whose body" but "whose mind" gives pleasure. The friendship of Achilles for Patroclus, Orestes and Pylades, Theseus and Peirithoüs, is not because they lay inarmed, but because of their comradship based on common and noble

29 - Ibidem, Symposium, Ch. VIII, § 25, page 342
In Xenophon's Symposium Socrates now attacks Pausanias, the "lover of the poet Agathon", both of whom play such a prominent part in Plato's Symposium, as follows:

"Nay, take the fair deeds of to-day: and you shall find them wrought rather for sake of praise of volunteers in toil and peril, than by men accustomed to choose pleasure in place of honour. And yet Pausanias, the lover of the poet Agathon, making a defence in behalf of some who wallow in incontinence, has stated that an army composed of lovers and beloved would be invincible. These, in his opinion, would, from awe of one another, have the greatest horror of desertion. A truly marvelous argument, if he means that men accustomed to turn deaf ears to censure and to behave to one another shamelessly, are more likely to feel ashamed of doing a shameful deed. He adduced as evidence the fact that the Thebans and the Eleians recognize the very principle, and added: Though they sleep unarmed, they do not scruple to range the lover side by side with the beloved one in the field of battle. An instance which I take to be no instance, or at any rate one-sided, seeing that what they look upon as lawful with us is scandalous. Indeed, it strikes me that this vaunted battle-order would seem to argue some mistrust on their part who adopt it - a suspicion that their bosom friends, once separated from them, may forget to behave as brave men should. But the men of Lacedaemon, holding that "if a man but lay his hand upon the body and for lustful purpose, he shall thereby forfeit claim to what is beautiful and noble" - do, in the spirit of their creed, contrive to mould and fashion their "beloved ones" to such height of virtue, that should these find themselves drawn up with foreigners, albeit no longer side by side with their own loved, conscience will make desertion of their present friends impossible. Self-respect constrains them; since the goddess whom the men of Lacedaemon worship is not "Shamelessness", but "Reverence". 30

First it must be stated, the suggestion that an army composed of lovers and beloved would be invincible, against which Xenophon takes issue, is expressed in Plato's Symposium not by Pausanias
Athenaeus, who in one passage seems to imply that Xenophon's Symposium was the earlier of the two works, contains a passage that Plato had criticized and censured Xenophon. Or are we to imagine that Plato had criticized Xenophon's Symposium? Is not another explanation of those passages which suggest the view that Xenophon's Symposium was the earlier of the two works the opposite? Athenaeus, who in one passage seems to imply that Xenophon's Symposium was the earlier of the two works, contains a passage that Plato had criticized and censured Xenophon.

Plato, Symposium 179 E

The translator of Xenophon, H. G. Dakyns, who favors the view that Plato had used Xenophon's Symposium, is not of the opinion of those whom think that Plato had criticized and censured Xenophon. Dakyns writes; "As to the priority of Xenophon's work to Plato's I am strongly inclined to agree; as to the real motive of Xenophon's work to Plato's, I am not of the opinion of those who hold that Xenophon's Symposium was the earlier of the two works."

As we know, Plato's Symposium, a work of a poet to state that if Xenophon was dependent on Xenophon's Symposium, we must be careful not to press the extreme courtesy of Plato too far. Plato had considered Xenophon's Symposium, that Symposium was the earlier of the two works. Plato had taken a definite position against Plato's Symposium, that Symposium was the earlier of the two works.

As we know, Plato's Symposium, a work of a poet to state that if Xenophon was dependent on Xenophon's Symposium, we must be careful not to press the extreme courtesy of Plato too far. Plato had taken a definite position against Plato's Symposium, that Symposium was the earlier of the two works.
glorification not only of his theme but of his hero?

Introduction, page lxx, footnote.
Lysis, and from the tenor of all of Plato's writings, in what inner conflict Socrates moved among such men. In Xenophon's case this conflict, as we have seen, is very outspoken. If we once conceived the idea that the dramatic conflicts in Plato's Symposium centers around Pausanias' and the effeminate estheticism of Agathon, and that these two men the three representatives of sober wisdom; the physician Erixymachus who speaks on love from the viewpoint of health; the sage Socrates who speaks on love from the viewpoint of philosophy, psychology of love and prophetic inspiration; and the buffoon Aristophenes who, inventing a comic myth, speaks with facetious dissimulation and benevolent tolerance towards any kind of love, but actually ridicules Pausanias and Agathon, then we come to a reading of the text in which all motives fit and with which Xenophon must have heartily agreed. But before we can read the text in this manner, we must learn to know Socrates, the mystagogue of Phaedrus, and recognize the serio-comic treatment that he gives him. The analysis of Plato's Phaedrus and Symposium will therefore be the theme of some of the chapters that follow.

Here let us keep in mind Milton's critical appreciation of Plato and Xenophon. He stood near enough to the Renaissance where Platonism was a metaphysical mystery and was actually re-lived, to know its inner motives:

"Thus from the laurest fraternity of poets, riper years and the ceaseless round of study and reading led me to the shady spaces of philosophy; but chiefly to the divine volumes of Plato and his equal Xenophon: where, if I should tell ye what I learnt of chastity and love, - I mean that which is truly so, whose charming cup is only virtue, which she bears in her hand to those that are worthy; (the rest
are cheated with a thick intoxicating potion, which a certain sorceress, the abuser of love's name, carries about; and how the first and chiefest office of love begins and ends in the soul, producing those happy twins of her divine generation, knowledge and virtue. With such abstracted sublimities as these, it might be worth your listening, readers, as I may one day hope to have ye in a still time, when there shall be no chiding." 33

Milton, the great poet and the great scholar, cannot have meant that Xenophon was the equal of Plato in the power of thinking or in the masterful art of composition; he must have meant that Xenophon was the equal of Plato in ethical inspiration, and that he shared with him the same unadulterated views on love derived from the teaching of Socrates.

Socrates winds up his speech on love in the Symposium we are studying, by addressing Callias once more. He ought to be thankful to the gods who inspired him with love for Autolycus, a youth covetous of honor, as the victory in the pankration testifies, who is likely to have a greater ambition than to add lustre to himself and to his father. He will come to recognize his ability, through manly virtue, to benefit his friends and to exalt his fatherland, by trophies which he will set up against enemies in war. Thus he will make for himself a name to be remembered among Hellenes and barbarians. To be well pleasing in Autolycus' eyes, Callias ought to inquire by what knowledge Themistocles was able to set Hellas free. He should ask himself what keen wit belonged to Pericles.

so that he became the best adviser of his fatherland. He should scan the field of history, to learn by what wisdom Solon established the laws of Athens. He should find the clue to the training by which the men of Lacedaemon have come to be regarded as the best of leaders. Are not in the house of Callias the noblest citizens of Sparta lodged as representatives of a foreign state?

Socrates finishes his speech with the very significant words:

"Be sure that our state of Athens would speedily entrust herself to your direction were you willing. Everything is in your favour. You are of noble family, "eupatrid" by descent, a priest of the divinities, and of Braschtheus' famous line, which with Iacchus marched to encounter the barbarian. And still, at the sacred festival today, it is agreed that no one among your ancestors has ever been more fitted to discharge the priestly office than yourself; yours a person the goodliest to behold in all our city, and a frame adapted to undergo great toils." 34

Callias was "dadouchos (or torch-holder)" in the Elusinian mysteries, and is therefore called a priest of the divinities, Demeter and Koré. Socrates reminds Callias of the influence of this most revered institution in Athens that had given the greatest inspiration to its foremost citizens, and with which the memory of the most notable events that showed the best spirit of Athens, was religiously linked, for "Just as Themistocles had won the battle of Salamis by help of Iacchus on the 16th Boedromion, the first day of the mysteries, so Chabrias won the sea-fight of Naxos by help of the day itself. 35

34 - Ibidem, The Symposium, Ch. VIII, § 40, pages 347/348
35 - Compare Xenophon's Hellenics, VI. l.c.
36 - Daynk's translation Symposium, footnote 11, page 347
Callias thanks Socrates and begs him to introduce him to the state, that he may employ himself in state affairs and never lapse from her good graces. To which Socrates replies that Callias should only not fear if people see that his loyalty to virtue is genuine and not of mere repute.

When the discourse had ended Autolycus whose hour for walking excercise had come, arose to leave the room with his father, Lycon was deeply impressed with the speech that before leaving he turned to Socrates, remarking, "By Hera, Socrates, if ever any one deserved the appellation "beautiful and good," you are that man!"

The oath sworn by Lycon, by Hera, is the first musical note to the charming scene that follows:

"(A mimic scene.)

So the pair departed. After they were gone, a sort of throne was first erected in an inner room abutting on the supper chamber. Then the Syracusean entered, with a speech;

With your good pleasure, sirs, Ariadne is about to enter the bridal chamber set apart for her and Dionysus. Anon, Dionysus will appear, fresh from the table of the gods, wine-flushed, and enter to his bride. In the last scene the two will play with one another.

He had scarce concluded, when Ariadne entered, attired like a bride. She crossed the stage and sate herself upon the throne. Meanwhile, before the god himself appeared a sound of flutes was heard; the cadence of the Bacchic air proclaimed his coming.

At this point the company broke forth in admiration of the ballet-master. For no sooner did the sound of music strike upon the ear of Ariadne than something in her action revealed to all the pleasure which it caused her. She did not step forward to meet her lover, she did not rise even from her seat; but the flutter of her unrest was plain to see.
When Dionysus presently caught sight of her he loved, lightly he danced towards her, and with show of tenderest passion gently reclined upon her knees; his arms entwined about her lovingly, and upon her lips he sealed a kiss; she the while with most sweet bashfulness was fain to wind responsive arms about her lover; till the banqueters, the while they gazed all eyes, clapped hands and cried "Encore!" But when Dionysus rose upon his feet, and rising lifted Ariadne to her full height, the action of those lovers as they kissed and fondled one another was a thing to contemplate. As to the spectators, they could see that Dionysus was indeed most beautiful, and Ariadne like some lovely blossom; nor were those mocking gestures, but real kisses sealed on loving lips; and so, with hearts aflame, they gazed expectantly. They could hear the question asked by Dionysus, did she love him? and her answer, as prettily she swore she did. And withal so earnestly, not Dionysus only, but all present, had sworn an oath in common; the boy and girl were verily and indeed a pair of happy lovers. So much less did they resemble actors, trained to certain gestures, than two beings bent on doing what for many a long day they had set their hearts on.

At last when these two lovers, caught in each other's arms, were seen to be retiring to the nuptual couch, the members of the supper party turned to withdraw themselves; and whilst those of them who were unmarried swore that they would wed, those who were wedded mounted their horses and galloped off to join their wives, in quest of married joys.

Only Socrates, and of the rest the few who still remained behind, anon set off with Callias, to seek out Lycon and his son, and share the walk.

And so the supper party, assembled in honour of Autolycus, broke up."

Does it not lie near, in view of this exquisite Greek music, that Callias, the torch-holder of the Eleusinian mysteries and priest of their divinities, is to introduce Autolycus as a novice to be initiated and go through the rites and experiences that lead on to the religious and psycho-biological foundations of human
life, the center of which is wedlock? Are we not near the truth when we state that Socrates' conception of the lover of the soul is derived from the source of the mysteries? Are not Socrates and Callias and all the worshippers of the shrine of Venus Urania, the representatives of the priest of the mysteries, where the novice experienced a holy marriage (hieros gamos), a marriage of minds?

What strikes the reader in Xenophon's Symposium is the fact that Autolycus is withdrawn from the scene of Bacchus and Ariadne, just that scene that is for modern ears and eyes a not unusual love scene, elaborated in dramatic and operatic texts.

On the other hand Autolycus is exposed to and indoctrinated with speeches that are strange, confusing and even dangerous. From this core we find a chasm of misunderstanding between the ancient Greeks and our modern age over which no bridge has been spanned. In spite of evidence that lies at hand from the sources of Greek and Roman literature and from the sources of Renaissance literature, the modern age has not come to realize that the Dionysic poetry and philosophy is a mystagogic veil for youth that contains the lofty and simple lesson to which Homer gave expression when he made Odyseuss say:

"Better and fairer is nothing than this, when husband and wife keep house together with one heart and mind between them, and they themselves know it best." 39

Is not (after all) to a great part, Xenophon's work an illustration of it? Yet Xenophon is a rare exception. He is a
moralist. Plato is a higher type. He is an artist-philosopher who gave to antiquity the method of mystagogic education. Let us learn from him what educational influence he attributed to wine parties and to Dionysic poetry.
CHAPTER II
PLATO ON DIONYSIC POETRY

The paradox of Plato's relation to poetry has been stressed in our modern age from the negative rather than the positive point of view. The controversy between philosophy and poetry, one of the leading themes in Plato's "Republic", has been interpreted in the sense of the rigid letter, not in the sense of its underlying spirit. The banishment of the imitative tribe, the poets, from the state as being thrice removed from the truth, has been taken literally as a real enactment of the state instead of as a symbol of a philosophic mental attitude. In this connection it is worth while to consider whether Plato's "Republic" is not a book written for the clarification of ideas on government and its underlying ethical motives that ought rather to regulate the human mind than be an actual model to be set up for a state. It is the first attempt of painting a "Civitas Dei" and its reign is not of this world.

From the positive point of view of Plato's relation to poetry, it is actually true to state that the function of poetry and music stood uppermost in Plato's mind. Plato started his career as a poet and the works of this philosopher testify that they are the expression of a master-poet. He was witness of an age that lived from a rich, poetic tradition, yet without the
spiritual incentives. The danger of poetry, as Plato saw it through the eyes of Socrates, was the obstruction of the creative consciousness of the mind, begetting only ideals of illusion. The human mind, having to cope with the realities of life itself, needed a unified and purified attitude on values that were both ethical and aesthetic. But on the one side the sophists undermined the ethical foundations of life by making the intellect a slave to ambitions of the will without regard to what was right and wrong. On the other hand, the poets lulled the mind to sleep with a merely esthetic attitude that gave to the mind confusing dreams and illusions instead of stirring it to creative thought and action through which the individual as well as society could prosper. Plato, like Socrates, was an enemy of the sophists. But he was a friend of the poets even more than Socrates. He saw in the poets his future allies once they had been anchored in his philosophy. Are not the poets the best liars? Well, let them learn to tell lies as Odysseus told them, with full knowledge of the truth, which for Plato meant with full knowledge of what is beautiful and good. And is not the mind of the young most easily persuaded by lies? Let them be persuaded by poetic lies that will lead them out to realize the ideals of what is beautiful and good. He therefore relegated poetry to education which he defined in the first book of his "Laws" as follows:
"......the education we speak of is training from childhood in goodness, which makes a man eagerly desirous of becoming a perfect citizen, understanding how both to rule and be ruled righteously. This is the special form of nurture to which, as I suppose, our present argument would confine the term "education"; whereas an upbringing which aims only at money-making or physical strength, or even some mental accomplishment devoid of reason and justice, it would term vulgar and illiberal and utterly unworthy of the name "education"......"

And with this ideal of education in mind, Plato recommended that **children** be trained in music and poetry inspired by Apollo and the Muses. But he added a third kind of poetry, poetry with philosophic background, to be sung by men from the ages of thirty to sixty who were not only poets but philosophers, and whom he called the "chorus of Dionysus". He conceived thus **a Dionysic poetry** under the aegis of philosophy which had heretofore been associated with religious institutions. A written poetry, with full irony, with a consciousness that poetry is a transitory stage of illusion for the well-born male youth, that would lead him to the exaltations of Dionysic introversion, give him the and anagogic ideas for wedlock, lead him out to temperate sobriety. The philosophic tenor of such poetry would be that what mattered still far more than the rhythms and harmonies of poetry was the individual task to master the rhythms and harmonies of a genuine life. And a pupil of the Academy which Plato had founded, **the dionysic poet** Horace, expresses with a few pertinent verses this philosophic attitude towards life and ironic attitude towards poetry.

In the Epistle to Florus, a friend and enthusiast of Horace, who

---

had requested him to send him more poems, a request that the poet humorously denied, he wrote:

"Nimirum sapere est abiectis utile nugis, et tempestivum pueris concedere ludum, ac non verba sequi fidibus modulanda Latinis, sed verae numerosque modoque ediscere vitae."

("In truth it is profitable to cast aside toys and to learn wisdom; to leave to lads the sport that fits their age, and not to search out words that will fit the music of the Latin lyre, but to master the rhythms and measures of a genuine life.")

The "Laws" of Plato, the work of his old age that contains his ripest thoughts, is written in the form of a dialogue between three characters, old and experienced: an anonymous Athenian who is the main speaker, a Spartan named Megillus, and a Cretan called Clinias. The last two play a minor role and are often reduced to mere listeners. The first book starts with this a discussion on lawgivers. The laws of Sparta and Crete are found deficient, since they aim solely to instill courage, which is but one part of virtue. Laws ought to be framed to further a more important virtue, temperance, which is concerned with the right attitude towards pleasure and pain. Plato has a view opposite to that of a temperance union. In order to educate a young man to temperance, Plato does not suggest preaching temperance to him, but to test him first in order to find out what his natural disposition is. The necessity for such a test is suggested by the following considerations: for the sake of temperance it is necessary to cultivate in our souls two things - namely, the greatest possible confidence...

1 - Horace Epistles, II. ii. 141-144, Loeb Classical Library, translation by H. Rushton Fairclough, 1929, Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica, pages 436-437
and its opposite, the greatest possible fear, both of which can be
called the marks of modesty. When we desire to make a person
fearless in respect of a number of **fears**, it is by drawing him,
with the help of the law, into fear. Now the Athenian continues:'

"And how about the opposite case, when we attempt with
the aid of justice to make a man fearful? Is it not by
pitting him against shamelessness and exercising him against
it that we must make him victorious in the fight against his
own pleasures? Or shall we say that, whereas in the case
of courage it is only by fighting and conquering his innate
cowardice that a man can become perfect, and no one unversed
and unpractised in contests of this sort can attain even
half the excellence of which he is capable, - in the case of
temperance, on the other hand, a man may attain perfection
without a stubborn fight against hordes of pleasures and
lusts which entice towards shamelessness and wrong-doing,
and without conquering them by the aid of speech and
act and skill, alike in play and at work, - and, in fact,
without undergoing any of these experiences?"

But such a **test** should be free and safe from serious risk.
There exists a potion for inducing fearlessness and excessive
and untimely confidence - wine:

"For, first, it makes the person who drinks it more
jovial than he was before, and the more he imbibes it,
the more he becomes filled with high hopes and a sense of
power, till finally, puffed up with conceit, he abounds in
every kind of licence of speech and action and every kind
of audacity, without a scruple as to what he says or what
he does."

The illustration of such a test is Xenophon's Symposium.
The moral motives for such a test are summed up at the end of the
first book:

"Athenian. It appears then that we ought to be placed

1 - Plato, The Laws, Book 1, 647 C-D, Loeb Classical Library,
   pages 77/79
2 - Ibidem, 649 B, page 83
amongst those conditions which naturally tend to make us exceptionally confident and audacious when we are practising how to be as free as possible from shamelessness and excessive audacity, and fearful of ever daring to say or suffer or do anything shameful.

Clinias. So it appears.

Ath. And are not these the conditions in which we are of the character described,—anger, lust, insolence, ignorance, covetousness, and extravagance; and these also,—wealth, beauty, strength, and everything which intoxicates a man with pleasure and turns his head? And for the purpose, first, of providing a cheap and comparatively harmless test of these conditions, and, secondly, of affording practice in them, what more suitable pleasure can we mention than wine, with its playful testing—provided that it is employed at all carefully? For consider: in the case of a man whose disposition is morose and savage (whence spring numberless iniquities), is it not more dangerous to test him by entering into money transactions with him, at one's own personal risk, than by associating with him with the help of Dionysus and his festive insight? And when a man is a slave to the pleasures of sex, is it not a more dangerous test to entrust to him one's own daughters and sons and wife, and thus imperil one's own nearest and dearest, in order to discover the disposition of his soul? In fact, one might quote innumerable instances in a vain endeavor to show the full superiority of this playful method of inspection which is without either serious consequence or costly damage. Indeed, so far as that is concerned, neither the Cretans, I imagine, nor any other people would dispute the fact that herein we have a fair test of man by man, and that for cheapness, security and speed it is superior to all other tests.

Clin. That certainly is true.

Ath. This then—the discovery of the natures and conditions of men's souls—will prove one of the things most useful to that art whose task it is to treat them; and that art is (as I presume we say) the art of politics: is it not so?

Clin. Undoubtedly. 1

This argument leads over to the second book which is devoted to the subject of education from the viewpoint of the law.

giver, in the relation of liberal education about which Plato is here concerned only to poetry and music.

Before we go into the discussion of the content of the second book of Plato's "Laws", we must first ascertain in what manner Plato's "Laws" are written and for what purpose. Plato distinguishes a four-fold poetry: a poetry of the Muses for the choir of children; a poetry for the choir of those under thirty, invoking "Apollo Paiân", praying to him of his grace to persuade the youth; the Dionysiac choir of those who are over thirty and under sixty; "and lastly, there were left those who, being no longer able to uplift the song, shall handle the same moral themes in stories and by oracular speech." 1

When Plato wrote the "Laws" he belonged to the fourth group. They are written in the manner of "oracular speech", with very cautious suggestions that lightly touch on the subject, and guard the inner meaning. Thus have an undertone. At the same time discussing not so much laws as philosophic principles for law-giving, they are written for the young to be read and studied in school, but actually to be understood when they have arrived at maturity. This four-fold distinction of poetry ought not to be understood as a poetry for actual choirs. The word "choir" is symbolic. In Horace's poems, for instance, we can easily dis-

1 - Ibidem, Laws, Book 11, 664 D, page 129
tistinguish poems that belong to the choir of the Muses, poems that are the expressions of the second choir of Apollo Paian, a great number of poems that are of Dionysiac nature, and lastly poems that belong to the fourth group. Far from being an enemy of the poets, philosophic Plato reveals himself as a law-giver to the poets.

Plato starts the discussion on education with what his interlocutor Celenias calls a "strong statement": the safe-keeping of right education depends on the correct establishment of the institution of wine parties. He upholds this statement not in a straightforward, direct, progressive manner, but in a guarded, round-about, circular way. In the course of this discussion the Athenian himself confesses:

"This is, I imagine, the third or fourth time that our discourse has described a circle and come back to the same point."

The argument proceeds in the following manner:

"Athenian. What I state is this; that in children the first childish sensations are pleasure and pain, and that it is in these first that goodness and badness come to the soul; but as to wisdom and settled true opinions, a man is lucky if they come to him even in old age; and he that is possessed of these blessings, and all that they comprise, is indeed a perfect man. I term, then, the goodness that first comes to children "education". When pleasure and love, and pain and hatred, spring up rightly in the souls of those who are unable as yet to grasp a rational account; and when, after grasping the rational account, they consent thereunto that they have been rightly trained in fitting practices; this consent, viewed as a whole, is goodness, while the part of it that is rightly trained what ought to be hated, right from the beginning up to the very end, and to love what ought to be loved, if you were to mark this part off in your definition and call it "education", you would be giving it, in my opinion, its right name."
After the consent of the interlocutor he continues the trend of his thought:

"...Now these forms of child-training, which consist in right discipline in pleasures and pains, grow slack and weakened to a great extent in the course of men's lives; so the gods, in pity for the human race thus born to misery, have ordained the feasts of thanksgiving as periods of respite from their troubles; and they have granted them as companions in their feasts the Muses and Apollo the master of music, and Dionysus, that they may at least set right again their modes of discipline by associating in their feasts with gods. We must consider, then, whether the account that is harped on nowadays is true to nature? What it says is that, almost without exception, every young creature is incapable of keeping either its body or its tongue quiet, and is always striving to move and to cry, leaping and skipping and delighting in dances and games, and uttering, also, noises of every description. Now, whereas all other creatures are devoid of any perception of the various kinds of order and disorder in movement (which we term rhythm and harmony), to us men the very gods, who were given, as we said, to be our fellows in the dance, have granted the pleasurable perception of rhythm and harmony, whereby they cause us to move and lead our choirs, linking us one with another by means of songs and dances; and to their choir they have given its name from the "cheer" implanted therein. Shall we accept this account to begin with, and postulate that education owes its origin to Apollo and the Muses?

Clinias. Yes."}

The uneducated man is without choir-training; the educated man full choir-trained. Choir training as a whole embraces both dancing and song. So the well-educated man will be able both to sing and dance well, provided that he sings good songs and dances good dances. But here comes in one difficulty which shows the profound philosopher as enemy of mere estheticism. We cannot regard a man as better trained in choristry and music when he

---

1 - Ibidem, Book 11, 653, D, E, 654 A - pages 91/93
is able both with gesture and voice to represent adequately that which he conceives to be good, though he feels neither delight in the good nor hatred in the bad. He is better trained in choristry and music who, though not wholly able to represent his conception rightly by voice and gesture, yet keeps right in his feelings of pain and pleasure, welcoming every thing good and abhorring everything not good.

With this remark the philosopher establishes a safeguard for education, that ought not to allow the esthetic education to lapse into histrionic estheticism. Care should be taken also to goodness of posture and of tune, and to admit postures and tunes which attach to goodness of soul or body, and to banish those which attach to badness of soul. Where laws are, or will be in the future, rightly laid down regarding musical education and recreation, the poets will not be granted such license that they may teach whatever form of rhythm or tune they best like themselves, to the children of law-abiding citizens and the young men in the choirs, no matter what the result may be in the way of virtue or depravity. Egypt gives an example of such a law. The postures and tunes are prescribed in detail and posted up in the temples and no innovation or invention is allowed over and above the traditional forms. The tunes which possess a natural correctness and are ascribed to Isis, are permanently consecrated and enacted by law.

In grasping the principle of correctness and tune one might then with confidence reduce them to legal form and prescription. Fresh music would then not have great power to
corrupt choric forms that are consecrated.

In a meandering, slow-moving argument, the Athenian a comes to the point that if a man were to organize a competition for a pleasure contest and offer a prize to the competitor who gives the greatest amusement to the spectators, and if the whole population of the state would be called to be the judges, the tiniest children would award the prize to the showman of puppets; older lads to the exhibitor of comedies; the educated women, and the young men and the mass of the people in general, to the producer of tragedies; whereas old men like the Athenian, & Clinias and Megillus, would take delight in listening to a rhapsoda giving a recitation of the Iliad, the Odyssey, or a piece from Hesiod, and award the prize accordingly. This point is intended to show the relativity of esthetic judgment. The custom in Sicily and Italy to entrust the decision on poetic and musical productions has only helped to corrupt the standard of pleasure of the audience. There is a necessity of having judges in such matters who would not sit as pupils, but rather as teachers of the spectators, ready to oppose those who offer the pleasure in a way that is wrong.

Since education is the process of drawing and guiding children towards that principle which is pronounced right by the law and confirmed truly by the experience of the oldest and most just, there are "chants and incantations" that are designed to habituate the children to pains and pleasures in conformity to the law. The legislator of the state must persuade the poet with noble and...
laudable praised or even compel him, if persuasian fails, to portray by his rhythms the gestures and by his harmonist the tunes of men who are temperate, courageous and good in all respects. The interlocutor suggests a general in Crete and Lacedaemon. But when the Athenian insists that a poet ought to teach that the man who is temperate and just leads a pleasant life whether he be great or small, strong or weak, rich or poor; and even on the contrary, even if he is richer than Midas but unjust he is a wretched man, the interlocutor Clinias is not inclined to agree entirely. He replies finally to the Athenian who had given repetitious variations of his insistant argument, that truth is a noble thing, and enduring. Yet to persuade men of it seems no easy matter. The Athenian replies:

"Be it so; yet it proved easy to persuade men of the Sidonian fairy-tale, incredible though it was, and of numberless others.

Clinias. What tales?

Ath. The tale of the teeth that were sown, and how armed men sprang out of them. Here, indeed, the lawgiver has a notable example of how one can, if he tries, persuade the souls of the young of anything, so that the only question he has to consider in his inventing is what would do most good to the State, if it were believed; and then he must devise all possible means to ensure that the whole of the community constantly, so long as they live, use exactly the same language, so far as possible, about these matters, alike in their songs, their tales, and their discourses. If you, however, think otherwise, I have no objection to your arguing in the opposite sense."

Here Plato lays down the principle of the ironic,

1 - Plato, Laws, etc, Book 11, 663 E, 664A, pages 125/127
esthetic treatment of fiction from a philosophic point of view, intended for the enchantment of the young, a principle that is characteristic of post-Socratic poetry, the poetry of Theocritus and the poetry of the Augustan age. When the Athenian repeats that the task of the three choirs and of the old men that will handle the same moral themes in stories and by oracular speech, will be in enchanting the souls of children and in asserting that one and the same life is declared by the gods to be both most pleasant and most just, he is asked by the interlocutor what he means by his third choristors: the chorus of Dionysus: 1

"Clinias. How so? Tell us; for at the first mention of it, a Dionysiac choir of old men sounds mighty strange, - if you mean that men over thirty, and even men over fifty and up to sixty, are really going to dance in his honour." 2

The Athenian must admit that every man, as he grows older, becomes reluctant to sing songs and takes less pleasure in doing so, and when compelled to sing, the older he is and the more temperate, the more he will feel ashamed. With Odyssean cleverness the Athenian gives for the existence of a Dionysiac choir, at first the most plausible psychological suggestion:

\[\text{[How then shall we encourage them to take readily to singing? Shall we not pass a law that, in the first place, no children under eighteen may touch wine at all, teaching that it is wrong to pour fire upon fire either in body or in soul, before they set about tackling their real work, and thus guarding against the excitable disposition of the young? And next, we shall rule that the young man under thirty may take wine in moderation, but that he must entirely abstain from intoxication and heavy drinking. But when a man has reached the age of forty, he may join h}\]

1 - Plato, Laws, 655 B- pages 129/131
the convival gatherings and invoke Dionysus, above all other
gods, inviting his presence at the rite (which is also the
recreation) of the elders, which he bestowed on mankind as
a medicine potent against the crabbedness of old age, that
thereby we may renew our youth, and that, through forget-
fulness of care, the temper of our souls may lose its hardness
and become softer and more ductile, even as iron when it has
been forged in the fire. Will not this softer disposition,
in the first place, render each one of them more ready and
less ashamed to sing chants and "incantations" (as we have
often called them), in the presence, not of a large company
of strangers, but of a small number of intimate friends?" 1

So we learn, after all, that this Dionysiac choir is not
a public choir for the theatre; it is not even a private choir in
the sense that these men from thirty to sixty would sing to-
gether; it is a harmonious group of friends who would sing their
incantations to the young in an intimate circle, in convivial gath-
erings. The Cretan is still mystified: 2

"Clinias. At any rate, Stranger, we and our friends here
would be unable to sing any other song than that which we
learnt by practice in choruses." 3

Whereupon the Athenian gives away the riddle and explains
the function of a man who belongs to the Dionysiac choir. He re-
plies to Clinias:

"Athenian. Naturally; for in truth you never attained
to the noblest singing. For your civic organization is that
of an army rather than that of city-dwellers; and you keep
your young people massed together like a herd of colts at
grass; none of you takes his own colt, dragging him away from
his fellows, in spite of his fretting and fuming, and puts a
special groom in charge of him, and trains him by rubbing him.

1 - Laws, Book 11, 666 A, B, C, pages 133/135
2 - Ibidem, 666 D, page 135
down and stroking him and using all the means proper to child-
nursing, that so he may turn out not only a good soldier, but
also to manage a State and cities - in short, a man who (as
we said at the first) is more of a warrior than the warriors
of Tyrtaeus, inasmuch as always and everywhere, both in States
and in individuals, he esteems courage as the fourth in order
of the virtues, not the first. 1

The function of a Dionysiac singer is thus the individual
treatment of a young man: a young colt that is to the tamed. He is to
be dragged away with incantations, with Dionysian poems, from the
herd of his own fellows, against his will; he should be in charge
of a groom, some intimate friend of the circle who is to supervise
him, and do that kind of child-nursing that would make him able to
manage a State. Such a Dionysiac singer is Socrates in relation to
Autolycus, whose groom is Callias; or Socrates in relation to
Phaedrus, whose groom is the physician Brixymachus; such a Dionysiac
the 50-year old singer and groom is Horace in relation to the youth Ligurinus, and
to many other youths; such a Dionysiac singer is Philaestras; the
biographer of Apollonios; of Tyana, who addressed erotic poems to a
young boy, leading him on "through the psychagogic art of fiction or
lies, to truth".

"That PLATO I read for nought, but if he tame
Such coltish years......" 2

wrote Sir Philip Sidney in "Astrophel and Stella", who was the groom

1 - Ibidem, 666 E - Pages 133/135
2 - Astrophel and Stella, Elizabethan Sonnets, with an introduction
by Sidney Lee, Archibald Constable and Co. Ltd, 1904, XXII, page 21
of Mr. Rich. Such Dionysiac singers were many poets of the Renaissance and of the Elizabethan age; and such a Dionysiac singer and groom was William Shakespeare in relation to W. H., whose ironic sonnets have an outlook "hugely politic".

In this connection let us quote another passage found later in the book, that gives evidence that Plato understood the gift of Dionysus' wine in an esoteric sense, that cannot be declared to the multitude:

"Athenian. Then we must no longer, without qualification, bring that old charge against the gift of Dionysus, that it is bad and unworthy of admittance into a State. Indeed, one might enlarge considerably on this subject; for the greatest benefit that gift confers is one which one hesitates to declare to the multitude, since, when declared, it is misconceived and misunderstood."

When asked what he means, the Athenian replies in a guarded way of characteristic especially the second book of Plato's Laws, where by mythical illusion he refers to the process of introversion that is induced in the votaries of Dionysus for the sake of wedlock:

"Athenian. There is a secret stream of story and report to the effect that the god Dionysus was robbed of his soul's judgment by his stepmother Hera, and that in vengeance therefore he brought in Bacchic rites and all the frenzied choristry, and with the same aim bestowed also the gift of wine. These matters, however, I leave to those who think it safe to say them about deities, but this much I know,—that no creature is ever born in possession of that reason, or that amount of reason, which properly belongs to it when fully developed; consequently, every creature, during the period when it is still lacking in its proper intelligence, continues all in a frenzy, crying out wildly, and, as soon as it can get on its feet, leaping wildly. Let us remember how
we said that in this we have the origin of music and gymnastic.

Clinias. We remember that, of course.

Ath. Do we not also remember how we said that from this origin there was implanted in us men the sense of rhythm and harmony, and that the joint authors thereof were Apollo and the Muses and the god Dionysus?

Clin. Certainly we remember.

Ath. Moreover, as to wine, the account given by other people apparently is that it was bestowed on us men as a punishment, to make us mad; but our own account, on the contrary, declares that it is a medicine given for the purpose of securing modesty of soul and health and strength of body." 1

Just before this passage the Athenian had given social rules or so-called "banqueting laws" for Dionysiac poets. These rules can be understood both in a literal sense and in a metaphorical sense: these rules refer to friendly understanding and cooperation of an intimate circle of friends who have the most sober man as their leader; rules that prevailed among the circle of poets of the Augustan age or among the poets of the Elizabethan age who visited the "Mermaid": 1

"Athenian. . . . Such a gathering inevitably tends, as the drinking proceeds, to grow ever more and more uproarious; and in the case of the present day gatherings that is, as we said at the outset, an inevitable result.

Clinias. Inevitable.

Ath. Everyone is uplifted above his normal self, and is merry and bubbles over with loquacious audacity himself, while turning a deaf ear to his neighbours, and regards himself as competent to rule both himself and everyone else.

Clin. To be sure.

1 - Ibidem, 672 B, C, D, pages 155/157
Ath. And did we not say that when this takes place, the souls of the drinkers turn softer, like iron, through being heated, and younger too; whence they become ductile, just as when they were young, in the hands of the man who has the skill and ability to train and mould them. And now, even as then, the man who is to mould them is the good legislator; he must lay down banqueting laws, able to control that banqueter who becomes confident and bold and unduly shameless, and unwilling to submit to the proper limits of silence and speech, of drinking and of music, making him consent to do in all ways the opposite, - laws able also, with the aid of justice, to fight against the entrance of such ignoble audacity, by bringing in that most noble fear which we have named "modesty" and "shame".

Clin. That is so.

Ath. And as law-wardens of these laws and cooperators therewith, there must be sober and sedate men to act as commanders over the un-sober; for to fight drunkenness without these would be a more formidable task than to fight enemies without sedate leaders. Any man who refuses willingly to obey these men and the officers of Dionysus (who are over sixty years of age) shall incur as much disgrace as the man who disobeys the officers of Ares, and even more.

Clin. Quite right.

Ath. If such was the character of the drinking and of the recreation, would not such fellow-drinkers be the better for it, and part from one another better friends than before, instead of enemies, as now? For they would be guided by laws in all their intercourse, and would listen to the directions given to the un-sober by the sober.

Clin. True, if it really were of the character you describe. 1

Only in such a lawful and orderly manner could the State make use of the institution of wine-parties, regarding it in a serious light and practicing it with a view to temperance. But if on the other hand, this institution is regarded in the light of play, it should not be allowed. It would at any rate be advisable that
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magistrates during their year of office, pilots and judges while on duty, counsellors while attending any important council, and in a few other important instances, wine should not be allowed.

Next to these guarded hints to Dionysiac poets "pro domo" Plato devotes the second book to discussing the criteria of judging poetry and art. Only such Dionysiac poets who have the principle of nobility implanted in their souls could become competent judges. The judge must have regard to three things: "correctness" (the truth of the copy to the original), moral effect or "utility", and "charm" or pleasure. Though this last, by itself, is no criterion of artistic excellence, it is a natural "concomitant" (in the mind of the competent judge) when the work of art in question possesses a high degree of both "utility" and "correctness".

The negative criteria for judging music and poetry, are positive and negative criteria in our opinion, are likely to have been the source poetic principles for the in Horace's Ars Poetica.

The conclusion at which Plato arrives in this book that "choristry as a whole is identical with education as a whole", can prove what deep concern Plato had for poetry and music. He enlarged the range and depth of poetry and music, and a great deal of the poetry of the western world in ancient classical times and during the Christian ages, owes its immense debt to the Platonic tradition.

2 - Plato, Laws, Book II, (as above) page 672 E, page 157
To sum up briefly: Plato's second book of the "Laws" brings the short outline of KX esthetics, compared to which our modern theories on the subject lose themselves, in our opinion, in mere verbalism. This book has been understood, if at all, in a moralistic sense, too close to the letter and far from its spirit instead of in an aesthetic and ethical sense which the great artist, who was still more a great philosopher, had in mind.

In our view Plato's KXK idea of the function of art KXK is not that art has to represent a mere show of beauty and goodness; its higher function is the begetting of beauty and goodness in the soul of man. In fulfilling this function the method of art is indirect, not direct. In suggesting in a casual manner to test young men through the playful method of wine parties and "to pit them against shamelessness" in order to bring them to modesty, Plato KXK implication allows the Dionysiac poets to expose vices in poetry to be presented in a musical manner in the spirit of irony and satire. Hence we can understand such a verse by the "learned Catullus" as:

"Nam castum esse decet pium poetam ipsum, Versiculos non necesse'st." 1

(For it behooves the pious poet KXK to be chaste himself, It is not necessary that his verses be so.)

As Plato's political and educational conception of the function of poetry and music is the philosophic expression of the ancient Greek myth of Amphion, King of Thebes, who by the sound of
his lyre moved stones and by his supplicating spell led them whither he would, and thus built the walls of Thebes citidal.

In this poetic sense Plato came to the conclusion that "choristry as a whole is identical with education as a whole".

Plato, a philosophic Orpheus, enlarged with his work the range and depth of poetry and music, and a great deal of the poetry of the western world in ancient classical times and during the Christian ages, owes its immense debt to the Platonic tradition. ¹

The psychology of Dionysiac poetry and its serio-comb mystagogic veil is disclosed to us by the adherent to the tenets of the Platonic academy, the ancient writer and Platonist, Plutarch. In his essay, "How a Young Man Ought to Hear Poems", addressed to his young friend Marcus Sodatus, we find the following passage:

¹ - Plato, Laws, Book 11, 672 B, page 157
Not only such a passage quoted from Plutarch, but also the work of ancient sculpture can give evidence that Dionysiac poetry leading the young man into the psychological state of introversion symbolized as a descent into the underworld, and leading him out to wedlock. As an illustration we offer the reproduction of a bas relief (presumably dating from the 1st century B.C.). The mythological title given to this bas relief by Italian archaeologists is "Bacco Indiano invitato de Icario a riposarsi". The title given by English archaeologists, "Dionysus visiting a poet", is less flourish and seems to be more fitting. In our view, this bas relief tells, by means of sculptural representation, the psychological Dionysiac story which is in the background of the Platonic dialogue and serio-comically veiled in post-Socratic Greek and Latin poetry.

Along the walls of a Greek home the psychological process of the Dionysiac story is unfolded before us. This Dionysiac story is here represented in three phases of development. We see a boy not above the age of puberty, bearing a Thyrsus, looking back to a half-drunk Silenus who is piping a flute. This Silenus bears a marked resemblance to Socrates. The mystifying serio-comic Dionysiac love declarations in Greek and Roman poetry is here represented. The next psychological phase of the Dionysiac process is shown by a...
youth looking back to a woman smaller than himself, who looks at him with yearning supplication as if she were Poverty herself, and the youth the god of wealth, Plutus. She is supported by a man who does not participate in the Bacchanalian revel, but looks ahead unmoved, in visionary ataraxia. He looks like a seer, a vaetes, who is offering the woman to the Bacchanalian youth. In the centre we see the third phase and final outcome of the Dionysiac process: Dionysus in the dignified garb and posture of a philosopher, strides forward. Two misshapen satyrs are clinging to him for slavish service and support: the one untying the sandals of the philosophic lord, the other, hunchbacked, under the protection of the garb of the master to cover his own ugliness. The symbolization of the thwarted, goatish animal nature of man whom Dionysus was to shape to comeliness and beautiful appearance. On the bench is seated a young man, and lying near him is a young woman, in the intimacy of repose that would indicate a couple in love. The sculptural stress here is that the woman, in sphinx-like attitude, is puzzled by Dionysus, represented as a man in philosophic and priestly dignity, who seems to be the visiting well-wisher of both.

We have led up the inquiry so far that we do not need of our own to express a hypothesis or a theory concerning the serio-comic of Dionysiac poetry. In this chapter, it is Plutarch's statement, previously quoted, that can serve us as a basis of our inquiry. That the worship of Venus Urania that tied the male lover to his male beloved was a mystag...
pretense that had for its aim to lead on the young male beloved to wedlock, is brought near to us by an epigram of Theocritus that represents a happy marriage as dependent on this heavenly goddess.

For a Statue of the Heavenly Aphrodite.——

Aphrodite stands here; she of heavenly birth;
Not that base one who's wooed by the children of earth.
'Tis a goddess; bow down. And one blemishless all,
Chrysegonē, placed her in Amphicles' hall:
Chryspgonē's heart, her children, was his,
And each year they knew better what happiness is.
For, Queen, at life's outset they made thee their friend;
Religion is policy too in the end.↓

CHAPTER III

PLATO'S PHAEDRUS

The playful element and sportive humor of Plato's Dialogue "Phaedrus" cannot escape a reader of this masterpiece. Yet the underlying psychological motive that would give unity to this Dialogue has heretofore been considered as a puzzle. In our view Plato's "Phaedrus" is the example of serio-comic, mystagogic treatment of a youth, in order to induce in him the descent into his own soul, the Dionysiac introversion or "madness" of which Socrates speaks in this Dialogue. It illustrates the first part of the Socratic method of "midwifery" in order to bring young men to themselves, the inducement of the state of Orphic or Pythagorean mysticism, out of which they are to be brought to an ascent of the mountain ranges of rational idealism in thought and action. This view of the relation of mysticism and rational idealism that is at present not common among scholars; yet in Henri Bergson's book "Les deux sources de la Moralté" the reader can find a philosophic analysis that takes some account of it with regard to the Eros of Socrates.

Plato's "Phaedrus" is not primarily a dialogue on love. It is mainly a dialogue on living rhetoric, a rhetoric that is psychologically conscious as conditioned by the persons to whom it is addressed, inspired by gentle love and expressed in the pure form of artistic presentation. But it is mainly a defence of
mystagogic love, and the literary serio-comic attitude that is dependent on it.

Following our simple method, let us give an account of the content of 'Phaedrus' and let us try to read again with the reader this masterpiece, for we are not interested to bring into it interpretations that cannot easily be brought out. Our only interest is to have the motives of this Dialogue seen in their own natural light.

Phaedrus, a youth with literary aspirations whom we know also from Plato's 'Symposium', being about to take a walk for his health outside the city, upon the advice of his physician Acumenus, the father of the physician Arixymachus, with whom he is in intimate contact, meets Socrates on his way. He had been spending some hours before with the rhetorician Lysias, discoursing on the theme of love. Phaedrus tells:

"... Lysias has represented one of the beauties being tempted, but not by a lover; this is just the clever thing about it; for he says that favours should be granted rather to the one who is not in love than to the lover."

Phaedrus shows a youthly enthusiasm that cannot but provoke Socrates' irony:

Socrates. O noble Lysias! I wish he would write that they should be granted to the poor rather than to the rich, to the old rather than to the young, and so of all the other qualities that I and most of us have; for truly his discourse would be witty and of general utility. I am so determined to hear you, that I will not leave you, even if you extend your walk to Megara, and, as Herodicus says, go to the wall and back again.

1 - Plato, by Harold North Fowler, Loeb Classical Library, Phaedrus, 227 C - page 415
2 - Ibidem, 227 D, page 415
After some bantering, by means of which Plato characterizes Phaedrus as a modern novelist would characterize the coy, talkative, and not altogether truthful young lady, they both wander towards a quiet spot under a plane tree along the stream Ilissus, where Phaedrus is to read to Socrates the role that he has hidden under his cloak and that contains the actual discourse of Lysias. On the way Phaedrus inquires from Socrates whether it is not from some place along here by the Ilissus that Boreas is said to have carried off Oreithyia? The streamlet looks very pretty and pure and clear and fit for girls to play by." Socrates replies that the place is about two or three furlongs farther down, where one crosses over to the precinct Agra, and can discover an altar of Boreas thereabouts. Does Socrates believe that this tale is true? asks Phaedrus with some insistence. Socrates gives a rational explanation, with a slight jesting allusion of his own role as physician of Phaedrus' soul.

Socrates. If I disbelieved, as the wise men do, I should not be extraordinary; then I might give a rational explanation, that a blast of Boreas, the north wind, pushed her off the neighboring rocks as she was playing with Pharmaceus, and that when she had died in this manner she was said to have been carried off by Boreas.

Socrates has no time to discuss such mythological tales in a Euhemeristic manner; such rational explanations are very pretty in general but they lead into fruitless questions about the origins forms of the Centaurs, the Chimaera, the Gorgons, Pegas, and many other inconceivable, portentous natures. Therefore the common
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opinion on such problems is good enough for him. What he is concerned about is to know himself whether he is a monster more complicated and more furious than Tiphon, or a gentler and simpler creature to whom a divine and quiet lot is given by nature.

Phaedrus and Socrates have just reached the spot under the plane tree, a charming resting place near a tall and shady willow that is in full bloom and spreads fragrance. The water of the stream is very cool, gentle breezes sweep through the air that is filled with the sense of summer and sounds of summer. The grass, growing on the gentle slope, is thick enough to lay one's head on it.

Phaedrus is now to read the speech by Lysias, for not to enjoy nature, but Socrates, a friend of learning, has left the city only for this purpose;

Phaedrus begins to read the speech, which starts in the following manner:

You know what my condition is, and you have heard how I think it is to our advantage to arrange these matters. And I claim that I ought not to be refused what I ask because I am not your lover. For lovers repent of the kindnesses they have done when their passion ceases; but there is no time when non-lovers naturally repent. For they do kindnesses to the best of their ability, not under compulsion, but of their free will, according to their view of their own best interest.

1 - Ibidem, 230 D, E. page 425
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On this premise is built up the speech by Lysias, that by a youth pleads that the non-lover ought to be accepted, because he is more rational, more agreeable, more enduring, less hurtful, less boastful than the lover, and because there are many more non-lovers in this world than lovers.

Phaedrus expects that Socrates would share the admiration which he himself has for this speech by Lysias, but Socrates expresses his admiration with such deep irony that even Phaedrus notices he is only making fun of him. Phaedrus asks:

Phaedrus: What do you think of the discourse, Socrates? Is it not wonderful, especially in diction?

Socrates: I am quite overcome by it. And this is due to you, Phaedrus, because as I looked at you, I saw that you were delighted by the speech as you read. So, thinking that you know more than I about such matters, I followed in your train and joined you in the divine frenzy.

Phaedrus: Indeed! So you see fit to make fun of it?

Socrates: Do I seem to you to be joking and not to be in earnest?

Phaedrus: Do not jest, Socrates, but, in the name of Zeus, the god of friendship, tell me truly, do you think any other of the Greeks could speak better or more copiously than this on the same subject?

Finally Socrates discloses in very polite form, his own opinion of the speech. As to its rhetorical manner, he has detected repetitions, and as to the subject itself, wise men and women of old who have written on love would rise up in judgment
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against him and confute him if he assented to this speech.

Socrates feels so inspired that although he is conscious of his ignorance, he could make another speech different from this and quite as good. Phaedrus' enthusiasm is aroused. If Socrates can make a better speech than that in the book, then Phaedrus promises to set up at Delphi a statue as large as life, not only of himself but of Socrates also.

Phaedrus, however, should not think, replies Socrates, that he can compose a speech containing nothing that Lysias had said. For who could, in arguing, that the non-lover ought to be more favored than the lover, permit praise of the non-lover's calm sense and blame of the lover's unreason? Phaedrus urges him to speak, and Socrates tries to withdraw, declaring that he had spoken only in jest. Phaedrus, in maiden-like excitement, exclaims:

.... I swear to you - by what god? By this plane tree? I take my solemn oath that unless you produce the discourse in the very presence of this plane tree, I will never read you another or tell you of another.

After this threatening oath Socrates veils his face intending to gallop through the discourse forced upon him, so that he may not feel ashamed when Phaedrus looks upon him. After invoking the Muses he gives the following introduction to the speech:
Now there was once upon a time a boy, or rather a stripling, of great beauty: and he had many lovers. And among these was one of peculiar craftiness, who was as much in love with the boy as anyone, but had made him believe that he was not in love; and once in wooing him, he tried to persuade him of this very thing, that favours ought to be granted rather to the non-lover than to the lover; and his words were as follows:

Socrates's speech is not a praise of the non-lover, but an exposition of the disadvantages which ensue if a youth submits according to to a sensual lover, a theme which Socrates had treated in Xenophon's Symposium. Two principles guide the soul: one is natural desire of pleasure, the other is an acquired opinion which is in search of the best. When opinion conquers and by the help of reason leads us to the best, the conquering principle is called temperance; but when desire which is devoid of reason rules in us and drags us to pleasures, that power of mis-rule is called excess. The rational desire which overcomes the tendency of opinion towards right, and is led away to the enjoyment of beauty, especially of personal beauty, is called the power of love.

Here Socrates feels the influence of divine fury which comes over him and inspires him to speak in the dithyrambs. And he continues to speak against the sensual lover in the following manner: being a victim of his passions, and not in his right senses, he will make his beloved as agreeable to himself as possible. The beloved, who is equal or superior to the lover, will be hateful to him; therefore the lover will always be intent upon reducing his beloved to inferiority.
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and debar his beloved from society, where his beloved could gather wisdom. He will banish from him divine philosophy, and there is no greater injury which he can inflict on him than this. The beloved will be only the delight of the lover's heart and a curse to himself. As to the training of the body, the lover will choose one who is delicate rather than one who is sturdy and strong, not practiced in manly exercises but knowing only a soft and luxurious diet. Such a beloved person will not be able to fight or to meet the exigencies of life.

In the matter of his possessions the lover will deprive of his beloved father, mother, kindred and friend because of jealousy. He will even cast a jealous eye upon his gold and silver and other property because these make the beloved a less easy and manageable prey.

The lover is not only mischievous to his love, he is also extremely unpleasant to live with; and not only while his love continues is he mischievous and unpleasant, but when his love ceases, he becomes a perfidious enemy of him on whom he showered his oath and prayers and promises. Socrates concludes his speech with the following admonition:

... These things, dear boy, you must bear in mind, and you must know that the fondness of the lover is not a matter of goodwill, but of appetite which he wishes to satisfy:

Just as the wolf loves the lamb, so the lover adores his beloved.

When Phaedrus insists that Socrates should continue his
speech and say as much about the non-lover as he has said about the lover and set forth all his good points and show that he ought to be favored, Socrates replies:

Did you not notice, my friend, that I am already speaking in hexameters, not mere dithyrambics, even though I am finding fault with the lover? But if I begin to praise the non-lover, what kind of hymn do you suppose I shall raise? I shall surely be possessed of the nymphs to whom you purposely exposed me. So, in a word, I say that the non-lover possesses all the advantages that are opposed to the disadvantages found in the lover. Why make a long speech? I have said enough about both of them. And so my tale shall fare as it may; I shall cross this stream and go away before you put some further compulsion upon me. I

from the viewpoint of healthy commonsense

So far Plato has recorded the attitude of Socrates of the viri Socratioli towards a vice which was the bane of Greek life. But Plato's philosophy, though not devoid of common sense, is not based on it. It soars along on the wings of divine mysticism that does not moralize any earthly passions, but makes use of them for the sake of the deeper purification of the soul than morality is ever capable of.

When Socrates is about to leave Phaedrus entreats him to stay and talk over what has been said. Socrates ironizes Phaedrus as the greatest lover of discourse he has ever known, except Simmias the Theban. He confesses to Phaedrus that when he was about to cross the stream the spirit and the sign that usually comes to him holding him back from something he is about to do, just came to him and forbade him going away before clearing his conscience, as if he had committed some sin against deity. He already had a prophetic premonition of it when he was speaking his discourse. He felt distressed.
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leist he be buying honor among men by sinning against the gods. It was a dreadful speech that Phaedrus made him give, foolish and somewhat impious; what could be more dreadful than that? Is not Love the son of Aphrodite and a god? If Love is a god or something divine he can of be nothing evil. But the two speeches, that Lysias and his own, said Love that was evil. So then they sinned against love. Their foolishness was really funny besides, for while they were saying nothing sound or true, they put on airs as though they amounted to something, if they could cheat some mere mannikins and gain honor among them. Therefore Socrates feels he needs to undergo a purification. When Stesichoros, the Greek poet, was stricken with blindness for speaking ill of Helen, he straightway knew it and recanted, and wrote the poem that begins with the words:

"That saying is not true; thou didst not go within the well-oared ships, nor didst thou come to the walls of Troy". 1

It is to be noticed that the beginning of this poem contradicts the Homeric tradition. Euripides, following Herodotos, Helen had presented in his tragedy of the same name, as faithful wife of Menelaus, who had fled to Egypt and was later reunited with her husband. Stesichoros, when Socrates contrasts with Homer, who remained blind ostensibly because he did not know how to purify himself from mythological errors. When Stesichoros had written this poem which is called a recantation, his vision was restored at once. Socrates intends to be even wiser than Homer and Stesichoros: he will make a recantation even before he suffers punishment for speaking
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ill of love. For were not the two speeches shameless? If any man of a noble and gentle nature who was himself in love with another of the same sort, or who had ever been loved by such a one, had happened to hear them saying that lovers, on account of small matters, are hostile, jealous and harmful to the beloved, would he not think he was listening to people brought up among low sailors who had never seen a generous love? Therefore with sweet discourse he intends to state in a speech "that other things being equal, the lover should be favoured rather than the non-lover". ¹ And he advises Lysias to do the same.

Plato, who takes great care to show how Phaedrus is un-critically swayed by every suggestion and carried away by emotions, incapable of rational thinking, makes Phaedrus reply that he advises Lysias to write as soon as he can that the lover should be favored rather than the non-lover: ²

Be assured that he will do so: for when you have spoken the praise of the lover, Lysias must of course be compelled by me to write another discourse on the same subject. ³ Socrates replies to it, with deep psychological insight into the juvenile state of mind of Phaedrus:

I believe you, so long as you are what you are. ⁴

The lines immediately following show the hypnotic power of suggestion which Socrates exerts and to which Phaedrus submits:

Phaedrus. Speak then without fear.
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Socrates. Where is the youth to whom I was speaking? He must hear this also, lest if he do not hear it, he accept him as a non-lover before we can stop him.

Phaedrus. Here he is, always close at hand whenever you want him.

Socrates then begins his speech, with his head bare, not as before, covered through shame:

Phaedrus. Here he is, a youth so close at hand whenever you want him.

Socrates. Understand then, fair youth, that the former discourse was by Phaedrus, the son of Pythocles (Eager for Fame) of Myrrhinus (Myrrha-town); but this which I shall speak is by Stesichorus, son of Euphemus (Man of Pious Speech) of Himera (Town of Desire).

Jowett gives the following version of this sentence, in a freer translation that to give the sense rather than the literal translation quoted above:

Socrates. Know then, fair youth, that the former discourse was that of a finely-scented gentleman, who is all myrrh and fragrance, named Phaedrus, the son of Vain Man. And this is the recantation of Stesichorus the pious, who comes from the town of Desire, ...

Keeping the literal translation in mind it is correct to say that the former speech by Socrates was inspired by Phaedrus, the youth as he is according to his nature, the Athenian youth of the age to whom Socrates had addressed a warning to submit to a lover.

The speech which follows this introduction and that advises that a youth should submit to a lover, is inspired by the poet Stesichorus. Socrates speaks in favor of a poetic love between a male beloved, as Stesichorus seems to have praised.

Concerning the influence of Stesichorus on Greek poetry we find the following statement by J. W. Mackail, Professor of Poetry:
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at the University of Oxford, in his lecture on "Theocritus and the Idyl":

"... In the history of ancient poetry, the pastoral is its one authentic and unique creation. But long before the time of Theocritus the Sicilian genius had been a factor in that history of no small importance. Just at the centre of the lyric age and before the vital energies of Greek poetry had concentrated on Athens, Stesichorus and the school of poets who bore his name appear, so far as can be judged from the few surviving fragments and the scanty notices of later writers, to have gone far, and in a very curious way, towards anticipating the work of the Alexandrians. Stesichorus himself was definitely a precursor of Theocritus. He remoulded the material of the epic under an idyllic or quasi-lyrical treatment. Among his poems are quoted instances of nearly all the kinds, other than the pastoral, which are extant in Theocritus' own works: encomia, epithalamia, epyllia, erotica; and even the pastoral itself seems to have taken its beginnings, in some sense, with him. His Daphnis is only a name, but there is evidence enough to assure us that it is the name of one who was the direct ancestor of the Theocritean figure - the patron saint, one might call him, of the Sicilian pastoral - which reappears in Theocritus himself, and in Virgil.

In view of the dependence of Theocritus on Stesichorus, the former's pastoral poems can give us the clue to the content of Stesichorus' poems. The central figure of the Idyls of Theocritus is Daphnis, a fig. pastoral figure like Adonis, who is slain by the theme of the Aphrodite. With the death of Daphnis the Idyls of Theocritus start. Daphnis is then represented as rival singer of shepherds, and as wooer of a country maid. The poems of Theocritus, as we shall have occasion to show later in a chapter on Pastoral Poetry, are of Dionysiac nature, having the Adonis myth as its center, celebrating the Dionysiac introversion as the death of a youth, and leading up to the nuptial theme. Within this cycle of poems the motive of...

the love in the sense of Jupiter's love to Ganymede, occurs. A comparison of Virgil's pastoral poetry with that of Theocratus, will in one of the following chapters bring the evidence of the serio-comic nature of this love, as a mystagogic pretense.

Socrates begins his speech in praise of divine madness four and as he himself later analyses, making four divisions of it: 1

".... ascribing them to four gods, saying that prophecy was inspired by Apollo, the mystic madness by Dionysus, the poetic by the Muses, and the madness of love, inspired by Aphrodite and Eros, we said was the best."

The speech that leads up to praise of divine madness of love is as follows: 2

".... And I must say that this saying is not true, which teaches that when a lover is at hand the non-lover should be more favoured, because the lover is insane, and the other sane. For if it were a simple fact that insanity is an evil, the saying would be true; but in reality the greatest of blessings come to us through madness, when it is sent as a gift of the gods. For the prophetess at Delphi and the priestesses at Dodona when they have been mad and have conferred many splendid benefits upon Greece both in private and in public affairs, but few or none when they have been in their right minds; and if we should speak of the Sibyl and all the others who by prophetic inspiration have foretold many things to many persons and thereby made them fortunate afterwards, anyone can see that we should speak a long time. And it is worth while to adduce also the fact that those men of old who invented names thought that madness was neither shameful nor disgraceful; otherwise they would not have connected the very word mania with the noblest of arts, that which foretells the future, by calling it the manic art. No, they gave this name thinking that mania, when it comes by gift of the gods, is a noble thing, but nowadays people call prophecy the manic art, tastelessly inserting a T in the word. So also, when they gave a name to the investigation of the future which rational persons conduct through observation of birds and by other signs, since they furnish mind (nous) and information (historia) to human thought (dianoia) they called it the.
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oionicistic (oionicistike) art, which modern folk now call oionicistic, making it more high-sounding by introducing the long O. The ancients, then testify - that in proportion as prophesy (mantike) is superior to augury, both in name and in fact, in the same proportion madness, which comes from god, is superior to sanity, which is of human origin.

Moreover, when diseases and the greatest troubles have been visited upon certain families through some ancient guilt, madness has entered in and by oracular power has found a way of release for those in need, taking refuge in prayers and the service of the gods, and so, by purifications and sacred rites, he who has this madness is made safe for the present and the after time, and for him who is rightly possessed of madness a release from present ills is found.

And a third kind of possession and madness comes from the Muses. This takes hold upon a gentle and pure soul, arouses it and inspires it to songs and other poetry, and thus by adorning countless deeds of the ancients educates later generations. But he who without the divine madness comes to the doors of the Muses, confident that he will be a good poet by art, meets with no success, and the poetry of the sane man vanishes into nothingness before that of the inspired madness.

All these noble results of inspired madness I can mention, and many more. Therefore let us not be afraid on that point, and let no one disturb and frighten us by saying that the reasonable friend should be preferred to him who is in a frenzy. Let him show in addition that love is not sent from heaven for the advantage of lover and beloved alike, and we will grant him the prize of victory. We, on our part, must prove that such madness is given by the gods for our greatest happiness; and our proof will not be believed by the merely clever, but will be accepted by the truly wise. First, then, we must learn the truth about the soul divine and human by observing how it acts and is acted upon......

Socrates defends these ecstatic conditions of the soul: prophetic, initiatory, poetic and erotic, as in our modern age.

William James had defended them in his book "Varieties of Religious Consciousness", not from the viewpoint of a judgment of fact when witnessed by one who is sane and not carried away, but from the viewpoint of judgment of value, in considering the purifying effect that these states of mind have on the soul and the beneficent fruits
that grow out of them.

Socrates proceeds now to speak about the metaphysical nature of the soul and gives a poetic-figurative account of the inner conflicts in it: 1

Every soul is immortal. For that which is ever moving is immortal; but that which moves something else or is moved by something else, when it ceases to move, ceases to live. Only that which moves itself, since it doesn’t leave itself, never ceases to move, and this is also the source and beginning of motion for all other things which have motion. But the beginning is ungenerated. For everything that is generated must be generated from a beginning, but the beginning is not generated from anything; for if the beginning were generated from anything, it would not be generated from a beginning. And since it is ungenerated, it must be also indestructible; for if the beginning were destroyed, it could never be generated from anything nor anything else from it, since all things must be generated from a beginning. Thus that which moves itself must be the beginning of motion. And this can be neither destroyed nor generated, otherwise all the heavens and all generation must fall in ruin and stop and never again have any source of motion or origin. But since that which is moved by itself has been seen to be immortal, one who says that this self-motion is the essence and the very idea of the soul will not be disgraced. For every body which derives motion from without is soulless, but that which has its motion within itself has a soul, since that is the nature of the soul; but if this is true, that that which moves itself is nothing else than the soul, then the soul would necessarily be ungenerated and immortal.

Concerning the immortality of the soul this is enough; but about its form we must speak in the following manner. To tell what it really is would be a matter for utterly superhuman and long discourse, but it is within human power to describe it briefly in a figure; let us therefore speak in that way. We will liken the soul to the composite nature of a pair of winged horses and a charioteer. Now the horses and charioteers of the gods are all good and of good descent, but those of other races are mixed; and first the charioteer of the human soul drives a pair, and secondly one of the horses is noble and of noble breed, but the other quite the opposite in breed and character. Therefore in our
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case the driving is necessarily difficult and troublesome. Now we must try to tell why a living being is called mortal or immortal. Soul, considered collectively, has the care of all that is soulless, and it traverses the whole heaven, appearing sometimes in one form and sometimes in another; now when it is perfect and fully winged, it mounts upward and governs the whole world; but the soul which has lost its wings is borne along until it gets hold of something solid, when it settles down, taking upon itself an earthly body, which seems to be self-moving, because of the power of the soul within it; and the whole, compounded of soul and body, is called a living thing, and is further designated as mortal. It is not immortal by any reasonable supposition, but we, though we have never seen or rightly conceived a god, imagine an immortal being which has both a soul and a body which are united for all time. Let that, however, and our words concerning it, be as is pleasing to God; we will now consider the reason why the soul loses its wings... 

Scholars have not failed to reiterate again and again that the allegoric myth that represents the soul under the figure of a charioteer, symbolizing reason or judgment, and the two horses, a good one and a bad one, symbolizing, according to referring Taylor, "honor" or "mettle" to the good horse, and "appetite" referring to the bad horse; or, according to Fowler, symbolizing the influence of the emotions for the good horse, and the "appetites" for the bad horse, is at variance with the account of the soul as given in "Phaedo", where the soul is described as one and indivisible, and also with hints in the "Republic" and the express teaching of the "Timaeus". Just this point, among many others, can contribute to disclose to us the mystagogic psychology of Socrates as revealed in "Phaedrus". In the second part this Dialogue establishes the
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principle that any speech is conditioned psychologically by the person to whom the speech is addressed. The allegoric parable of the charioteer and the two horses is addressed to the youth Phaedrus, bisexual and schizophrenic in his tendencies. Therefore Socrates brings before him the picture of the charioteer with a bad and good horse, to teach him in an anagogic way that he will have to curb tendencies that are indicative of unnatural or destructive desires and mystic emotions. The tendency that Socrates pursues under the picture of an erotic relation to Phaedrus, is to bring about the mystic identification of soul between Socrates and Phaedrus— an identification of the soul as he taught his disciples before he drank the cup of hemlock:

When he had finished speaking, Crito said: "Well, Socrates, do you wish to leave any directions with us about your children or anything else— anything we can do to serve you?

"What I always say, Crito," he replied, "nothing new. If you take care of yourselves you will serve me and mine and yourselves, whatever you do, even if you make no promises now; but if you neglect yourselves, as it were, in the path marked out by our present and past discussions, you will accomplish nothing, no matter how much or how eagerly you promise at present.

Phaedrus is not yet mature enough to understand the serious argument that the soul is one and indivisible. Not until he has gone through the ecstatic introversion that will bring him to himself and to the establishment of a home, he has learned to tame the unruly horse, made it humble and obedient,
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it is useless for Socrates to speak to Phaedrus about the soul being one and indivisible. This allegoric parable by Socrates is to be understood in the light of the Socratic method in general, which the religious Danish philosopher, Soren Kierkegaard, characterizes as an ironic method that holds the truth to be conveyed "in teleological suspense" until the individual has matured and arrived to it himself.

Socrates enters the soul of Phaedrus with his continuing speech, speaking "madly" as he himself later confesses; not "manfully", as Phaedrus believes, by inventing a poetic myth that is likely to beget introversion in Phaedrus' soul. He takes the youth along in an imaginative flight in the upper regions of heaven, with divine wings and under the leadership of the gods. But Socrates is not so far carried away that he cannot bring a humorous touch into the situation in mentioning the goddess of the home, Hestia:

The natural function of the wing is to soar upwards and carry that which is heavy up to the place where dwells the race of the gods. More than any other thing that pertains to the body it partakes of the nature of the divine. But the divine is beauty, wisdom, goodness, and all such qualities; by these then the wings of the soul are nourished and grow, but by the opposite qualities, such as vileness and evil, they are wasted away and destroyed. Now the great leader in heaven, Zeus, driving a winged chariot, goes first, arranging all things and caring for all things. He is followed by an army of gods and spirits, arrayed in eleven squadrons; Hestia alone remains in the house of the gods. Of the rest, those who are included among the twelve great gods and are accounted leaders, are assigned each to his place in the army. There are many blessed sights and many ways

---
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hither and thither within the heaven, along which the blessed gods go to and fro attending each to his own duties; and whoever wishes, and is able, follows, for jealousy is excluded from the celestial band. But when they go to a feast add a banquet, they proceed steeply upward to the top of the vault of heaven, where the chariots of the gods, whose well matched horses obey the rein, advance easily, but the others with difficulty; for the horse of evil nature weighs the chariot down, making it heavy and pulling toward the earth the charioteer whose horse is not well trained. There the utmost toil and struggle await the soul. For those that are called immortal, when they reach the top, pass outside and take their place on the outer surface of the heaven, and when they have taken their stand, the revolution carries them round and they behold the things outside of the heaven.

Considering the dangers of such a flight, will not a poor mortal like Phaedrus, suddenly carried up into heaven, come to the conclusion that the safest place for him is there where Hestia dwells?

The region above the heaven, Socrates continues, and he thinks of the inner realm of the soul of true being colorless, formless and intangible truly existing essence, becomes after such a flight visible only to the mind, the pilot of the soul. The divine intelligence since it is nurtured on mind and pure knowledge, and the intelligence of every soul which is capable of receiving that which befits it, rejoices in seeing reality for a space of time, and by gazing upon truth is nourished and made happy until the revolution brings it again to the same place. In the revolution with the gods it beholds absolute justice, temperance, and knowledge, not such knowledge as has a beginning and varies as it is associated with one or another of the things we call realities, but that which abides in the real, eternal
absolute; and in the same way it beholds and feeds upon the other eternal verities, after which it returns home. Socrates describes what the great mystics call "pure vision". The gods attain this of pure vision untroubled, but the other souls only those which best follow God raise the head of the charioteer up into the outer region above heaven. Because the horses are unruly they see something and fail to see others. Socrates gives a Dantesque description of the confusion and rivalry among the many souls whose wings are broken through the incompetence of the drivers, and where many are lamed. This leads up to the theme of the reincarnation of souls in human bodies on this earth. Souls, growing heavy through forgetfulness and evil, and losing their wings, fall to the earth, but since they have had a glimpse of the plane of truth, are not reincarnated into beasts but into men:

...... the soul that has seen the most shall enter into the birth of a man who is to be a philosopher or a lover of beauty, or one of a musical or loving nature, and the second soul into that of a lawful king or a warlike ruler, and the third into that of a politician or a man of business or a financier, the fourth into that of a hard-working gymnast or one who will be concerned with the cure of the body, and the fifth will lead the life of a prophet or someone who conducts mystic rites; to the sixth, a poet or some other imitative artist will be united, to the seventh, a craftsman or a husbandman, to the eighth, a sophist or a demagogue, to the ninth, a tyrant.

All those who live on earth are in states of probation in which he who lives righteously improves his lot, and he who lives unrighteously deteriorates it. Ten thousand years must elapse before the soul can return to the same place whence it came, for it
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cannot grow wings in less time. Only the soul of a philosopher, guileless and true, or the soul of a lover, who is not without philosophy, may acquire wings in the third recurring period of one thousand years. If they chose this life three times in succession they have their wings given them and go away at the end of three thousand years. But the rest when they have finished their first life, receive judgment and go either to places of correction under the earth, or are raised up into a heavenly place by justice. After a thousand years they chose their second life, and are reincarnated as beasts or men, according to their choice. The soul which has never seen the truth can never pass into human form, for a human being must have a recollection of those things which our soul once beheld when they journeyed with God.

In this life

..... the mind of the philosopher only has wings, for he is always, so far as he is able, in communion through memory with those things the communion with which causes God to be divine. Now a man who employs such memories rightly is always being initiated into perfect mysteries and he alone becomes truly perfect; but since he separates himself from human interests and turns his attention towards the divine, he is rebuked by the vulgar, who consider him mad and do not know that he is inspired.

In modern psychology the Platonic theory of knowledge of introversion as recollection has its analogy in cases studied by psychiatrists. Individuals unable to adjust themselves to life without into themselves and even revert to a mode of thinking and to symbols that belong to former ages: so-called "archaic thinking". Modern
psychiatrists have also observed cases of successful introversion
where individuals, after a temporary withdrawal, emerge again to
active life rejuvenated with new strength. The subterranean journey
has proved for them a fountain of youth. The far more difficult
life in ancient times, the extreme fear of life, must have brought
about a greater number of cases of introversion than in modern times,
and with it there appears to have grown out mystic school of healers
who by means of mystic teachings and mystic rites brought individuals
into introversion and led them successfully out of it, by giving
them healthy, psycho-biological, religious ideas. In the relation
of Socrates to Phaedrus we behold such a mystic physician of the
soul, who, with his mighty intellect combined the mystagogic
method with a philosophy of life that left the Orphics and Pythagoreans far behind.

Socrates speaks now in "honor of memory" in which the
philosopher lives, on this earth, yearning for the joys which his
soul had in the blessed state of heaven. When this philosopher
sees the beauty on earth, remembering the true beauty he feels his
wings growing and longs to stretch them for an upward flight, but
cannot do so, and like a bird gazes upward and neglects the things
below. This is of all inspirations the best and of the highest
who
origin to him who has it or shares in it; he who loves the beautiful
partaking in this madness, is called a lover.

In the course of this thought, Socrates states: 1

1 - Ibidem, 250 B, C, page 485
...... Now in the earthly copies of justice and temperance and the other ideas which are precious to souls there is no light, but only a few, approaching the images through the darkling organs of sense, beheld in them the nature of that which they imitate, and these few do this with difficulty. But at that former time they saw beauty shining in brightness, when, with a blessed company - we following in the train of Zeus, and others in that of some other god - they saw the blessed sight and vision and were initiated into that which is rightly called the most blessed of mysteries, which we celebrated in a state of perfection, when we were without experience of the evils which awaited us in the time to come, being permitted as initiates to the sight of perfect and simple and calm and happy apparitions, which we saw in the pure light, being ourselves pure and not entombed in this which we carry about with us and call the body, in which we are imprisoned like an oyster in its shell.

Socrates projects thus the mystic state of introspection, which prepares Phaedrus, with its visions and apparitions, as it was experienced in the Eleusinian mysteries, on the screen of heaven in which the philosopher had previously dwelled. He contrasts the spiritual and moral state of mind of a human being not newly initiated, with one who is newly initiated: 1

...Now he who is not newly initiated, or has been corrupted, does not quickly rise from this world to that other world and to absolute beauty when he sees its namesake here, and so he does not revere it when he looks upon it, but gives himself up to pleasure and like a beast proceeds to lust and begetting; he makes licence his companion and is not afraid or ashamed to pursue pleasure in violation of nature. But he who is newly initiated, who beheld many of these realities, when he sees a god-like face or form which is a good image of beauty, shudders at first, and something of the old awe comes over him, then, as he gazes, he reveres the beautiful one as a god, and if he did not fear to be thought stark mad, he would offer sacrifice to his beloved as to an idol or a god. And as he looks upon him, a reaction from his shuddering comes over him, with sweat and unwonted heat; for as the effluence of beauty enters him through the eyes, he is warmed; the effluence moistens the germ of the feathers, and as he grows warm, the parts from which the feathers grow, which were
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before hard and choked, and prevented the feathers from sprouting, become soft, and as the nourishment streams upon him, the quills of the feathers swell and begin to grow from the roots over all the form of the soul; for it was once all feathered.

The psychological reason for this poetic, ἀξακίς mystagogic eroticism that Socrates feigns and paints for Phaedrus, will later become apparent. Socrates continues:

Now in this process the whole soul throbs and palpitates, and as in those who are cutting teeth there is an irritation and discomfort in the gums, when the teeth begin to grow, just so the soul suffers when the growth of the feathers begins; it is feverish and is uncomfortable and itches when they begin to grow. Then when it gazes upon the beauty of the boy and receives the particles which flow thence to it (for which reason they are called yearning), it is moistened and warmed, ceases from its pain and is filled with joy; but when it is alone and grows dry, the mouths of the passages in which the feathers begin to grow become dry and close up, shutting in the sprouting feathers, and the sprouts within shut in with the yearning, throb like pulsing arteries, and each sprout pricks the passage in which it is, so that the whole soul, stung in every part, rages with pain; and then again, remembering the beautiful one, it rejoices. So, because of these two mingled sensations, it is greatly troubled by its strange condition; it is perplexed and maddened, and in its madness it cannot sleep at night or stay in any one place by day, but it is filled with longing and hastens wherever it hopes to see the beautiful one. And when it sees him and is bathed with the waters of yearning, the passages that were sealed are opened, the soul has respite from the stings and is eased of its pain, and this pleasure which it enjoys is the sweetest of pleasures at the time. Therefore the soul will not, if it can help it, be left alone by the beautiful one, but esteems him above all others, forgets for him mother and brothers and all friends, neglects property and cares not for its loss, and despising all the customs and proprieties in which it formerly took pride, it is ready to be a slave and to sleep wherever it is allowed, as sheer as possible to the beloved; for it not only reveres him who possesses beauty, but finds in him the only healer of its greatest woes. Now this condition, fair boy, about which I am speaking, is called Love by men, but when you hear what the gods call it, perhaps because of your youth you will laugh. But some of the Homeridae, I believe, repeat two verses on Love from the spurious poems of Homer, one of which is very outrageous and not perfectly metrical. They sing them as follows:

---
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"Mortals call him winged Love, but the immortals call him The Winged One, because he needs grow wings."

You may believe this, or not; but the condition of lovers and the cause of it are just as I have said.

Socrates now describes how each lover chooses his beloved according to the god whom he reveres: 1

Now he who is a follower of Zeus, when seized by Love can bear a heavier burden of the winged god; but those who are servants of Ares and followed in his train, when they have been seized by Love and think they have been wronged in any way by the beloved, become murderous and are ready to sacrifice themselves and the beloved. And so it is with the follower of each of the other gods; he lives, so far as he is able, honouring and imitating that god, so long as he is uncorrupt-ed, and is living his first life on earth, and in that way he behaves and conducts himself towards his beloved and toward all others. Now each one chooses his live from the ranks of the beautiful according to his character, and he fashions him and adorns him like a statue, as though he were his god, to honour and worship him. The followers of Zeus desire that the soul of him whom they love be like Zeus; so they seek for one of philosophical and lordly nature, and when they find him and love him, they do all they can to give him such a character. If they have not previously had experience, they learn then from all who can teach them anything; they seek after information themselves, and when they search eagerly within themselves to find the nature of their god, they are successful because they have been compelled to keep their eyes fixed upon the god, and as they reach and grasp him by memory they are inspired and receive from him character and habits, so far as it is possible for a man to have part in God. Now they consider the beloved the cause of all this, so they love him more than before, and if they draw the waters of their inspiration from Zeus, like the bacchantes, they pour it out upon the beloved and make him, so far as possible, like their god. And those who followed after Hera seek a kingly nature, and when they have found such an one, they act in a corresponding manner towards him in all respects; and likewise the followers of Apollo, and of each of the gods, go out and seek for their beloved a youth whose nature accords with that of the god, and when they have gained his affection, by imitating the gods themselves and by persuasion and education they lead the beloved to the conduct and nature of the god, so far as each of them can do; they exhibit no jealousy or meanness toward the loved one, but endeavour by every means in their power to lead him to the likeness of the god whom they honour.
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And now Socrates makes the following disclosure:  

...Thus the desire of the true lovers, and the initiation into the mysteries of love, which they teach, if they accomplish what they desire in the way I describe, is beautiful and brings happiness from the inspired lover to the loved one, if he be captured; and the fair one who is captured is caught in the following manner:—  

It appears then from this passage that those who bring about initiation and teach the mysteries of love have a special method of catching and capturing the beloved. These need to be lured into the mysteries.  

Our chapter on pastoral poetry of Virgil and Theocritus, and our inquiry into the poems by Horace and other Roman poets will bring evidence that this lure is a serio-comic mystagogic pretense of the Dionysiac love of a poet for a male youth. Under the picture of an erotic relation between lover and beloved which goes even so far, under certain conditions, to make sensual concessions, Socrates mystifies Phaedrus, whereby he shows him the necessity of curbing unnatural desires. We present here the full text of the and shall speech, confront it later with more serious utterances by Plato:  

In the beginning of this tale I divided each soul into three parts, two of which had the form of horses, the third that of a charioteer. Let us retain this division. Now of the horses we say one is good and the other bad; but we did not define what the goodness of the one and the badness of the other was. That we must now do. The horse that stand:
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at the right hand is upright and has clean limbs; he
carries his neck high, has an aquiline nose, is white in
colour, and has dark eyes; he is a friend of honour joined
with temperance and modesty, and a follower of true glory;
he needs no whip, but is guided only by the word of comman
and by reason. The other, however, is crooked, heavy, ill-
put together, his neck is short and thick, his nose flat, his colour dark, his eyes grey and bloodshot; he is
the friend of insolence and pride, is shaggy-eared and deaf,
hardly obedient to whip and spurs. Now when the charioteer
beholds the love-inspiring vision, and his whole soul is
warmed by the sight, and is full of the tickling and pricklings
of yearning, the horse that is obedient to the charioteer,
constrained then as always by modesty, controls himself and
does not leap upon the beloved; but the other no longer heed
the pricks or the whip of the charioteer, but springs wildly
forward, causing all possible trouble to his mate and to the
charioteer, and forcing them to approach the beloved and
propose the joys of love. And they at first pull back indig
antly and will not be forced to do terrible and unlawful
deeds; but finally, as the trouble has no end, they go forward
with him, yielding and agreeing to do his bidding. And they
come to the beloved and behold his radiant face.

And as the charioteer looks upon him, his memory is borne
back to the true nature of beauty, and he sees it standing
with modesty upon a pedestal of chastity, and when he sees
this he is afraid and falls backward in reverence, and in
falling he is forced to pull the reins so violently backward
as to bring both horses upon their haunches, the one quite
willing, since he does not oppose him, but the unruly beast
very unwilling. And as they go away, one horse in his shame
and wonder wets all the soul with sweat, but the other, as
soon as he is recovered from the pain of the bit and the fall,
before he has fairly taken breath, breaks forth into angry
reproaches, bitterly reviling his mate and the charioteer for
their cowardice and lack of manhood in deserting their post
and breaking their agreement; and again, in spite of their
unwillingness, he urges them forward and hardly yields to
their prayer that he postpone the matter to another time.
Then when the time comes which they have agreed upon, they
pretend that they have forgotten it, but he reminds them;
struggling and neighing, and pulling he forces them again
with the same purpose to approach the beloved one, and when
they are near him, he lowers his head, raises his tail, takes
the bit in his teeth, and pulls shamelessly. The effect
upon the charioteer is the same as before, but more pronounced;
he falls back like a racer from the starting-rope, pulls the
bit backward even more violently than before from the teeth
of the unruly horse, covers his scurrilous tongue and jaws
with blood, and forces his legs and haunches to the ground,
causing him much pain. Now when the bad horse has gone through the same experience many times and has ceased from his unruliness, he is humbled and follows henceforth the wisdom of the charioteer, and when he sees the beautiful one, he is overwhelmed with fear; and so from that time on the soul of the lover follows the beloved in reverence and awe.

Now the beloved, since he receives all service from his lover, as if he were a god, and since the lover is not feigning, but is really in love, and since the beloved himself is by nature friendly to him who serves him, although he may at some time earlier time have been prejudiced by his schoolfellows or others, who said that it was a disgrace to yield to a lover, and may for that reason have repulsed his lover, yet, as time goes on, his youth and destiny cause him to admit him to his society. For it is the law of fate that evil can never be a friend to evil and that good must always be friend to good. And when the lover is thus admitted, and the privilege of conversation and intimacy has been granted him, his good will, as it shows itself in close intimacy, astonishes the beloved, who discovers that the friendship of all his other friends and relatives is as nothing when compared with that of his inspired lover. And as this intimacy continues and the lover comes near and touches the beloved in the gymnasium and in their general intercourse, then the fountain of that stream which Zeus, when he was in love with Ganymede, called "şeşînê" flows copiously upon the lover; and some of it flows into him, and some, when he is filled, overflows outside; and just as the wind or an echo rebounds from smooth, hard surfaces and returns whence it came, so the stream of beauty passes back into the beautiful one through the eyes, the natural inlet to the soul, where it animates the passages of the feathers, waters them and makes the feathers begin to grow, filling the soul of the loved one with love. So he is in love, but he knows not with whom; he does not understand his own condition and cannot explain it; like one who has caught a disease of the eyes from another, he can give no reason for it; he sees himself in his lover as in a mirror, but is not conscious of the fact. And in the lover's presence, like him he ceases from his pain, and in his absence, like him he is filled with yearning such as he inspires, and love's image, requited love, dwells within him; but he calls it, and believes it to be, not love, but friendship. Like the lover, though less strongly, he desires to see his friend, to touch him, kiss him, and lie down by him; and naturally these things are soon brought about. Now they lie together, the unruly horse of the lover has something to say to the charioteer, and demands a little enjoyment in return for his many troubles; and the unruly horse of the beloved says nothing, but teeming with passion and confused emotions he
embraces and kisses his lover, caressing him as his best
dfriend; and when they lie together, he would not refuse
his lover any favour, if he asked it; but the other horse
and the charioteer oppose all this with modesty and reason.

If now the better elements of the mind, which lead to a
well ordered life and to philosophy, prevail, they live a
life of happiness and harmony here on earth, self controlled
and orderly, holding in subjection that which causes evil in
the soul and giving freedom to that which makes for virtue;
and when this life is ended they are light and winged, for
they have conquered in one of the three truly Olympic con-
tests. Neither human wisdom nor divine inspiration can
confer upon man any greater blessing than this. If however
they live a life less noble and without philosophy, but yet
ruled by the love of honour, probably, when they have been
drinking, or in some other moment of carelessness, the two
unruly horses, taking the souls off their guard, will bring
them together and seize upon and accomplish that which
is by the many accounted blissful; and when this has once
been done, they continue the practice, but infrequently,
since what they are doing is not approved by the whole mind.
So these two pass through life as friends, though not such
friends as the others, both at the time of their love and
afterwards, believing that they have exchanged the most
binding pledges of love, and that they can never break them
and fall into emnity. And at last, when they depart from
the body, they are not winged, to be sure, but their wings
have begun to grow, so that the madness of love brings them
no small reward; for it is the law that those who have once
begun their upward progress shall never again pass into
darkness and the journey under the earth, but shall live a
happy life in the light as they journey together, and because
of their love shall be alike in their plumage when they
receive their wings.

These blessings, so great and so divine, the friendship
of a lover will confer upon you, dear boy; but the affection
of the non-lover, which is alloyed with mortal prudence and follows mortal and parsimonious rules of conduct,
will beget in the beloved soul narrowness which the common
folk praise as virtue; it will cause the soul to be a wand-
erer upon the earth for nine thousand years and a fool below
the earth at last. There, dear Love, thou hast my recanta-
tion, which I have offered and paid as beautifully and as
well as I could, especially in the poetical expressions
which I was forced to employ on account of Phaedrus. Pardon,
I pray, my former words and accept these words with favour;
be kind and gracious to me; do not in anger take from me the
art of love which thou didst give me, and deprive me not of
sight, but grant unto me to be even more than now esteemed by the beautiful. And if in our former discourse Phaedrus and I said anything harsh against thee, blame Lysias, the father of that discourse, make him to cease from such speeches, and turn him, as his brother Polemarchus is turned, toward philosophy, that his lover Phaedrus may no longer hesitate, as he does now, between two ways, but may direct his life with all singleness of purpose toward love and philosophical discourses.

In the light of this lengthy passage, with its unnatural romantic, poetic, erotic and mystic appeal to an inexperienced youth, Plato's 'Symposium' has been read. It is important first to state in what light Plato makes Socrates view this discourse. In the second part of the Dialogue he explains to Phaedrus:¹

...We described the passion of love in some sort of figurative manner, expressing some truth, perhaps, and perhaps being led away in another direction, and after composing a somewhat plausible discourse, we chanted a sportive and mythic hymn in meet and pious strain to the honour of your lord and mine, Phaedrus, Love, the guardian of beautiful boys........It seems to me that the discourse was, as a whole, really sportive jest.....

Sapientia Socratica Joco-Seria! This is a phrase current among the humanists of the Renaissance. How are we to understand this serio-comic, Socratic wisdom when we discover it at its source, where it is pointed us by name? ²

Socrates' speech to Phaedrus is written under the figure of the myth of Ganymede, with which Plato did not agree. Plato's serious attitude on the question of sex and love is stated in the first book of the"Laws", in the following manner:²

...And whether one makes the observation in earnest or in jest, one certainly should not fail to observe that when male unites with female for procreation the pleasure experienced is held to be due to nature, but contrary to

¹ - Ibidem, 265 B, C, D, page 533
nature when male mates with male or female with female, and that those first guilty of such enormities were impelled by their slavery to pleasure. And we all accuse the Cretans of concocting the story about Ganymede. Because it was the belief that they derived their laws from Zeus, they added on this story about Zeus in order that they might be following his example in enjoying this pleasure as well.

One of the most important problems of Plato as a law-giver is that of safeguarding the holiness of the conjugal union, and for creating opportunities for the meeting of the sexes, with the view of their proper choice in marriage. The following passage illustrates Plato's concern of this problem:

... For, in view of the fellowship and intercourse of marriage, it is necessary to eliminate ignorance, both on the part of the husband concerning the woman he marries and the family she comes from, and on the part of the father concerning the man to whom he gives his daughter; for it is all-important in such matters to avoid, if possible, any mistake. To achieve this serious purpose, sportive dances should be arranged for boys and girls; and at these they should both view and be viewed, in a reasonable way and on occasions that offer a suitable pretext, with bodies un clad, save so far as sober modesty prescribes. Of all such matters the officers of the choirs shall be the supervisors and controllers, and also, in conjunction with the Law-wardens, the lawgivers of all that we leave unscribed.

But the problem of marriage is intimately connected with the problem of love. Is there no danger to the state if illicit, promiscuous love begins to prevail? In the eighth book of the "Laws" Plato approaches this problem with the following preamble:

... But the things which do make no small difference, and of which it is hard to persuade men - these form a task especially for God (were it possible that orders should come

1 - Plato, Laws, Vol. II, pages 147/149
from him); as it is, they are likely to require a bold man who, valuing candour above all else, will declare what he deems best for city and citizens, and in the midst of corrupted souls will enjoin what is fitting and in keeping with all the constitution, and gainsay the mightiest lusts, acting alone by himself with no man to help him save, as his solitary leader, Reason.

When the interlocutor Clíniás asks him the Athenian:

"What is it we are reasoning about now, Stranger? For we are still in the dark," the latter tells about his scruples about the meeting of the sexes:

Athenian. Naturally: but I will try to explain myself more clearly. When in my discourse I came to the subject of education, I saw young men and maidens consorting with one another affectionately; and, naturally, a feeling of alarm came upon me, as I asked myself how one is to manage a State like this in which young men and maidens are well-nourished but exempt from those severe and menial labours which are the surest means of quenching wantonness, and where the chief occupation of everyone all through life consists in sacrifices, feasts and dances. In a State such as this, how will the young abstain from those desires which frequently plunge many into ruin, - all those desires from which reason, in its endeavour to be law, enjoins abstinence? That the law previously ordained serve to repress the majority of desires is not surprising; thus, for example, the proscription of excessive wealth is of no small benefit for promoting temperance, and the whole of our education-system contains laws useful for the same purpose; in addition to this, there is the watchful eye of the magistrates, trained to fix its gaze always on this point and to keep constant watch on the young people. These means, then, are sufficient (so far as any human means suffice) to deal with the other desires. But when we come to the amorous passions of children of both sexes and of men for women and women for men, - passions which have been the cause of countless woes both to individuals and to whole States, - how is one to guard against these, or what remedy can one apply so as to find a way of escape in all such cases from a danger such as this? It is extremely difficult, Clíniás.
His first thought in mind is thus the danger of the promiscuity of the sexes. The second thought is that the outright permission of unnatural love, as customary in Crete and Lacedaemon, is just as dangerous to the state. The Athenian continues:

For whereas, in regard to other matters not a few, Crete generally and Lacedaemon furnish us (and rightly) with no little assistance in the framing of laws which differ from those in common use,—in regard to the passions of sex (for we are alone by ourselves) they contradict us absolutely. If we were to follow in nature's steps and enact that laws which held good before the days of Laius, declaring that it right to refrain from indulging in the same kind of intercourse with men and boys as with women, and adducing as evidence thereof the nature of wild beasts, and pointing out how male does not touch male for this purpose, since it is unnatural,—in all this we would probably be using an argument neither convincing nor in any way consonant with your states. Moreover, that object which, as we affirm, the lawgiver ought always to have in view does not agree with these practices. For the enquiry we always make is this—which of the proposed laws tends toward virtue and which not. Come then, suppose we grant that this practice is now legalized, and that it is noble and in no way ignoble, how far would it promote virtue? Will it engender in the soul of him who is seduced a courageous character, or in the soul of the seducer the quality of temperance? Nobody would ever believe this; on the contrary, as all men will blame the cowardice of the man who always yields to pleasures and is never able to hold out against them, will they not likewise reproach that man who plays the woman's part with the resemblance he bears to his model? Is there any man, then, who will ordain by law a practice like that? Not one, I should say, if he has a notion of what true law is.

Now the Athenian comes to a third constructive thought, permitting a "third kind of love", based on friendship between men, which in the course of the slow discussion he discloses as a device of "making a natural use" of reproductive intercourse—on the one hand, by abstaining from the male.....and on the other hand, by
abstaining from every female field in which you would not desire the seed to spring up". \textit{RicJt} to speak in modern terms, he in order proposes a kind of sublimated love between male friends, to secure the abstinence of young men from women until they are ready to marry.\textit{Waxx} We shall follow the discussion without any omission, so that the Continuing our quotation, text may speak for itself: \textit{taxx} the Athenian gives an analysis of friendship and \textit{tacaxx} love: 1

xx What then do we declare to be the truth about this matter? It is necessary to discern the real nature of friendship and desire and love (so-called), if we are to determine them rightly; for what causes the utmost confusion and obscurity is the fact that this single term embraces these two things, and also a third kind compounded of them both.

CLINIAS. How so?

ATHENIAN. Friendship is the name we give to the affection of like for like, in point of goodness, and of equal for equal; and also to that of the needy for the rich, which is of the opposite kind; and when either of these feelings is intense we call it "love".

CLINIAS. True.

ATHENIAN. The friendship which occurs between opposites is terrible and fierce and seldom reciprocal amongst men, while that based on similarity is gentle and reciprocal throughout life. The kind which arises from a blend of these presents difficulties,-first, to discover what the man affected by this third kind of love really desire to obtain, and, in the next place, because the man himself is at a loss, being dragged in opposite directions by the two tendencies,-of which the one bids him to enjoy the bloom of his beloved, while the other forbids him. For he that is in love with the body and hungering after its bloom, as it were that of a ripening peach, urges himself on to take his fill of it, paying no respect to the disposition of the beloved; whereas he that counts bodily desire as but secondary, and puts longing looks in place of love, with soul lusting really for soul, regards the bodily satisfaction of the body as an outrage, and, reverently worshipping temperance, courage, nobility and

\footnote{1 - Ibidem, Laws, Book VIII, 836A, 837 A, B, C, D, E, pages 153/155}
wisdom, will desire to live always chastely in company with
the chaste object of his love. But the love which is blend-
ed of these two kinds is that which we have described just
now as third. Since, then, love has so many varieties, ought
the law to prohibit them all and prevent them from existing
in our midst, or shall we not plainly wish that the kind of
love which belongs to virtue, and desires the young to be as
good as possible should exist within our State, while we
shall prohibit, if possible, the other two kinds? Or what
is our view, my dear Megillus?

MEG. Your description of the subject, Stranger, is
perfectly correct.

ATH. It seems that, as I expected, I have gained
your ascent; so there is no need for me to investigate your
law, and its attitude towards such matters, but simply to
accept your agreement to my statement. Later on I will try
to charm Clinias also into agreeing with me on the subject.
So let your joint admission stand at that, and let us by all
means proceed with our laws.

MEG. Quite right.

In Plato's "Republic" the right relation of male lover
is
to male beloved, described as the relation of "father to son".¹
Defined in this sense it is safeguarded against any misunderstanding.

Here in the "Laws" Plato, thinking of a device for enacting this
the
law of relation of lover to beloved, attempts to safeguard it in a
similar way by placing it under the same category as that of the
max the relation of a man to a brother or to a sister, to a son or
to a daughter. Just as the sexual intercourse between such near
relatives is considered generally as "hated of God and most shame-
fully shameful," just so the relation of lover and beloved ought to
be considered by public opinion.²

¹ - Ibidem, Republic, Book X, 809 E, 810 A, B, C, D, pages 157/159

Athenian. I know of a device at present for enacting this law, which is in one way easy, but in another quite the hardest possible.

Megillus. Explain your meaning.

Ath. Even at present, as we are aware, most men, however lawless they are, are effectively and strictly precluded from sexual commerce with beautiful persons,—and that not against their will, but from their own most willing consent.

Meg. On what occasions do you mean?

Ath. Whenever any man has a brother or sister who is beautiful. So too in the case of a son or daughter, the same unwritten law is most effective in guarding men from sleeping with them, either openly or secretly, or wishing to have any connexion with them,—nay, most men never so much as feel any desire for such connexion.

Meg. That is true.

Ath. Is it now, then, by a brief sentence that all such pleasures are quenched?

Meg. What sentence do you mean?

Ath. The sentence that these acts are by no means holy, but hated of God and most shamefully shameful. And does not the reason lie in this, that nobody speaks of them otherwise, but every one of us, from the day of his birth, hears this opinion expressed always and everywhere, not only in comic speech, but often also in serious tragedy,—as when there is brought on to the stage a Thyestes or an Oedipus, or a Marcarus having secret intercourse with a sister, and all these men are seen inflicting death upon themselves willingly as a punishment for their sins?

Meg. Thus much at least you are quite right in saying—that public opinion has a surprising influence, wherethere is no attempt by anybody ever to breathe a word that contradicts the law.

Ath. Then is it not true, as I said just now, that when a lawgiver wishes to subdue one of those lusts which especially subdue men, it is easy for him at least to earn the method of mastering them,—that it is by consecrating this public opinion in the eyes of all alike—bond and free, women and children, and the whole State—that he will effect the firmest security for this law.
Plato is too wise a man not to know that straight morality in matters of love is only of partial effect in view of the emotional nature of the young. The indirect method of how to tame the young colts, he had already suggested in the second book of the "Laws" by carefully suggesting, in a concealed way, the function of the Dionysiac choir. Here, in a book destined to be read by the young in the schools, the Odyssean master-mind of Plato brings into the discussion an objection that is likely to encourage the young to believe that such a law would not work. The young, encouraged to laugh at the law-giver, are not likely to guess how the mind of the law-giver is capable of outwitting them. The discussion continues:

MEGILLUS. Certainly; but how it will ever be possible for him to bring it about that all are willing to say such a thing.

ATHENIAN. A very proper observation. That was precisely the reason why I stated that in reference to this law I know of a device for making a natural use of reproductive intercourse, on the one hand, by abstaining from the male and not slaying of set purpose the human stock, nor sowing seed on rocks and stones where it can never take root and have fruitful increase; and, on the other hand, by abstaining from every female field in which you would not desire the seed to spring up. This law, when it has become permanent and prevails - if it has rightly become dominant in other cases, just as it prevails now regarding intercourse with parents - is the cause of countless blessings. For, in the first place, it follows the dictates of nature, and it serves to keep men from sexual rage and frenzy and all kinds of fornication, and from all excess in meats and drinks, and it ensures in husbands fondness for their own wives; other blessings also would ensue, in infinite number, if one could make sure of this law. Possibly, however, some young bystander, rash and of superabundant virility, on hearing of the passing of this law, would denounce us for making foolish

---
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and impossible rules, and fill all the place with his outcries; and it was in view of this that I made the statement that I knew of a device to secure the permanence of this law when passed which is at once the easiest of all devices and the hardest. For while it is very easy to perceive that this is possible, and how it is possible—since we affirm that this rule, when duly consecrated, will dominate all souls, and cause them to dread the laws enacted and yield them entire obedience,—yet it has now come to this, that men think that, even so, it is unlikely to come about,—just in the same way as, in the case of the institution of public meals, people refuse to believe that it is possible for the whole State to be able to continue this practice constantly; and that, too, in spite of the evidence of facts and the existence of the practice in your countries; and even there, as applied to women, the practice is regarded as non-natural. Thus it was that, because of the strength of this unbelief, I said that it is most difficult to get both these matters permanently legalised.

MEG. And you were right in that.

The Athenian now brings forth the suggestion which he called "a device for making a natural use of reproductive intercourse":

ATHENIAN. Still, to show that it is not beyond the power of man, but possible, would you like me to try to state an argument which is not without some plausibility?

CLINIAS. Certainly.

ATH. Would a man be more ready to abstain from sexual indulgence, and to consent to carry out the law on this matter soberly, if he had his body not ill-trained, but in good condition, than if he had it in bad condition?

CLIN. He would be much more ready if it were not ill-trained.

ATH. Do we not know by report about Icicus of Tarentum because of his contests at Olympia and elsewhere,—how, spurred on by ambition and skill, and possessing courage combined with temperance in his soul, during all the period of his training (as the story goes) he never touched a

woman, nor yet a boy? And the same story is told about Crison and Astylus and Diopompus and very many others. And yet, Clinias, these men were not only much worse educated in soul than your citizens and mine, but they also possessed much more sexual vigour of body.

CLIN. That this really happened in the case of these athletes is indeed, as you say, confidently affirmed by the ancients.

ATH. Well, then, if these men had the fortitude to abstain from that which most men count bliss for the sake of victory in wrestling, running, and the like, shall our boys be unable to hold out in order to win a much nobler victory—that which is the noblest of all victories, as we shall tell them from their childhood's days, charming them into belief, we hope, by tales and sentences and songs.

CLIN. What victory?

ATH. Victory over pleasures,—which if they win, they will live a life of bliss, but if they lose, the very opposite. Furthermore, will not the dread that this is a thing utterly unholy give them power to master those impulses which men inferior to themselves have mastered?

CLIN. It is certainly reasonable to suppose so.

The example taken from the life of the athletes, teaching the boys to obtain a victory over the pleasures of sex, can convince us how close Plato is to the spirit of Xenophon's Symposium in which intentionally an athlete, a winner of the pankration, was introduced into a Dionysiac wine party and charmed with an ideal love for Callias, which as we see here from this text, is a "device for making a natural use of reproductive intercourse", bringing about a sublimation of love in an opposite direction until he is mature for marriage. The tale that Socrates tells to Phaedrus is a similar device and charm of mystagogic nature,
that has in view the anagogic goal of wedlock. The relation of Socrates to Phaedrus is represented in the bas relief, Dionysus, by the scene where a Silenus charms a boy who is the thyrsus-bearer. The subsequent two other phases in the evolution of the Dionysiac process are not represented in the Dialogue "Phaedrus", but we must keep them in mind in order to understand the Dialogue. That the goal of the Dionysiac tale with which Socrates charms Phaedrus thereby showing the necessity of overcoming the pleasures of love in relation to a male lover, is evidenced by the passage in Plato's "Laws" that immediately follows what we have previously quoted:

ATHENIAN. Now that we have reached this point in regard to our regulation, but have fallen into a strait because of the cowardice of the many, I maintain that our regulation on this head must go forward and proclaim that our citizens must not be worse than fowls and many other animals which are produced in large broods, and which live chaste and celibate lives without sexual intercourse until they arrive at the age for breeding; and when they reach this age they pair off, as instinct moves them, male with female and female with male; and thereafter they live in a way that is holy and just, remaining constant to their first contracts of love; surely our citizens should at least be better than these animals. If, however, they become corrupted by most of the other Hellenes or barbarians, through seeing and hearing that among them the "lawless Love" (as it is called) is of very great power, and thus become unable to overcome it, then the Law-wardens, acting as lawgivers, must devise for them a second law.

But Plato is aware that the strict law for the "third kind of law" which ought to hold true for philosophers and Dionysiac poets, cannot hold true for public morality in general of

---
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his own time. He therefore makes similar sexual concessions, as Socrates had made to Phaedrus. He places, therefore, deviations from this strict law under the rule of privacy and shame, which should be viewed as dishonorable, if detected.

CLINIAS. What law do you recommend them to make if that which is now proposed slips out of their grasp?

ATHENIAN. Evidently that law which comes next to it as second.

CLIN. What is that?

ATH. One ought to put the force of pleasures as far as possible out of gear, by diverting its increase and nutriment to another part of the body by means of exercise. This would come about if indulgence in sexual intercourse were devoid of shamelessness; for if, owing to shame, people indulged in it but seldom, in consequence of this rate indulgence they would find it a less tyrannical mistress. Let them, therefore, regard privacy in such actions as honourable-sanctioned both by custom and by unwritten law; and want of privacy—yet not the entire avoidance of such actions—as dishonourable. Thus we shall have a second standard of what is honourable and shameful established by law and possessing a second degree of rectitude; and those people of depraved character, whom we describe as "self-inferior", and who form a single kind, shall be hemmed in by three kinds of force and compelled to refrain from law-breaking.

CLIN. What kinds?

ATH. That of godly fear, and that of love of honour, and that which is desirous of fair forms of soul, not fair bodies. The things I now mention are, perhaps, like the visionary ideals in a story; yet in very truth, if only they were realized, they would prove a great blessing in every State. Possibly, should God so grant, we might forcibly effect one of two things in this matter of sex-relations, either that no one should venture to touch any of the noble and freeborn save his own wedded wife, nor sow any unholy and bastard seed in fornication, nor any unnatural and barren seed in sodomy, or else we should entirely abolish love for males, and in regard to that for women, if we enact a law that any man who has intercourse with any woman save those who have been brought to his

under the sanction of Heaven and holy marriage, whether purchased or otherwise acquired, if detected in such intercourse by any man or woman, shall be disqualified from any civic commendation, as being really and alien,—probably such a law would be approved as right. So let this law—whether we ought to call it one law or two—be laid down concerning sexual commerce and love affairs in general, as regards right and wrong conduct in our mutual intercourse due to these desires.

In view of this authentic text in Plato's "Laws", we can now return to the Dialogue "Phaedrus" with the knowledge of what Socrates had in mind when he gave such discourses on love, and what Plato had comprehend in mind when he wrote it. We must read the Dialogue "Phaedrus", and especially the discourse on love from the viewpoint of Socrates and Plato, and not from the viewpoint of Phaedrus, as he understands it, in his inexperienced, emotional way.

Xenophon tells that Socrates had incurred the hatred of Critias because he had rebuked the latter's perversion, and that after he had criticized the thirty tyrants one of whom was Critias, who were putting highly respectable citizens to death wholesale, Socrates was summoned by Critias and Charicles, who proceeded to point out the law and forbade him to converse with the young.

Socrates inquired whether he was permitted to ask for an explanation in case he failed to understand the commands at any point. After permission was given to him, Socrates replied:

I am prepared to obey the laws, but to avoid transgression of the law through ignorance I need instruction: is it on the supposition that the art of words tends to correctness of statement or to incorrectness that you bid us abstain from it? for if the former, it is clear we must abstain from speaking correctly, but if the latter, our endeavour should be to amend our speech.

1 - Xenophon, Memorabillia, Book 1, Ch. 2 § 33-34.
2 - " " 1, " 2, §35
Apparently, in Plato's Phaedrus, Socrates blends with irony, a mixture of correct statements with poetical, somewhat fanciful statements that are not strictly correct. The glowing description of the emotional state of the lover is a poetic invention designed to arouse the imagination of Phaedrus. It does not seem to be a true description of Socrates' state of mind. His sober relation to Aloibiades can prove it.

In view of Plato's text in the "Laws", experienced psychologists will be able to judge in the light of their science, the psychological effect that Socrates intends to bring about. In arousing in the imagination of Phaedrus, the love instinct in the opposite direction, giving him the task to sublimate this instinct. He works for introversion in Phaedrus where the hemmed-in love instinct of the youth will break through and assert itself in the right direction: towards a woman. This psychological indirect effect of introversion seems to have been known to the ancients in general, and to the Socratic school in particular. Evidence for this is the very important statement in Plato's "Symposium" by the physician Erixymachus, a representative of the Sicilian medical school, the very type of biology from which both Plato and Aristotle draw the biological analogies which play so large a part in their ethics. This important statement, heretofore entirely overlooked, reads:

1 - Taylor, Plato the Man and His Work, The Dial Press, page 217
2 - Plato Symposium, Loeb Classical Library, 186 C, D, page 125
...For the art of medicine may be summarily described as a knowledge of the love-matters of the body in regard to repletion and evacuation; and the master-physician is he who can distinguish there between the nobler and baser Loves, and can effect such alteration that the one passion is replaced by the other; and he will be deemed a good practitioner who is expert in producing Love where it ought to flourish but exists not, and in removing it from where it should not be....

Thus far, we trust, the mystagogic role of Socrates as a physician of the soul of Phaedrus, and the serio-comic, playful treatment that he gives to this emotional youth, has become clear. Socrates sums up the theme of the two discourses in retrospect in the second part of the Dialogue as follows:

The two discourses were opposites; for one maintained that the lover, and the other that the non-lover, should be favoured.......

there are two kinds of madness, one arising from human diseases, and the other from a divine release from the customary habits.

As our two discourses just now assumed one common principle, unreason, and then, just as the body, which is one, is naturally divisible into two, right and left, with parts called by the same names, so our two discourses conceived of madness as naturally one principle within us, and one discourse, cutting off the left-hand part, continued to divide this until it found among its parts a sort of left-handed love, which it very justly reviled, but the other discourse, leading us to the right-hand part of madness, found a love having the same name as the first, but divine, which it held up to view and praised as the author of our greatest blessings.

Now two questions arise that have a bearing on the problem of the unity of the Dialogue. First, why is the Platonic Socrates against the un-erotic, merely intellectual relation of a teacher to a youth and in favor of a erotic, poetic relation which

1 - Plato Phaedrus, 265 A, 266 A,
he praises as philosophic and spiritual? Related to this question is also: in what sense could Socrates state that "the affection of the non-lover, which is alloyed with mortal prudence and follows mortal and parsimonious rules of conduct, will beget in the beloved soul the narrowness which the common folk praise as virtue?"

Second, what connection has the first part of the Dialogue that leads up to three speeches on love: that of Lysias in favor of the non-lover, the two of Socrates, one in blame of the lover of the body, the other in praise of the lover of the soul, with the second part of the Dialogue that deals with the problem of rhetoric through the sub-title of the Dialogue "Phaedrus": "On The Beautiful, Ethical"? It is not a dialogue like the "Greater Hippias (or On The Beautiful: Refutative)" where the abstract idea of the beautiful is discussed in a refutative manner with a self-satisfied and somewhat conceited sophist. It is an illustration of the ethical manner how to deal with a beautiful youth and how to lead him on through love on a pilgrim's progress to discover beauty in ever widening circles of experiences of the mind, as outlined by Socrates in Plato's Symposium.

The outward manner of the platonic Socrates in relation to this male youth may be ironic, serio-comic, jesting, in contrast to Xenophon's Socrates in relation to Critobulus, who is presented as moralizing and edifying. The inner
attitude of the Platonic Socrates, however, is unquestionably moved by the highest ethical ideal that draws its inspiration from the Divine. Is not Plato's highest goal the mystic communion with the Divine that can bring about the unification of the individual soul in search of self-knowledge and of truth, in practice of temperance and justice and to the attitude of reverence? Plato is the great metaphysical philosopher whose philosophy is based on the mystic, metaphysical experience of the mind that has attained the evidence of the unseen. Such an experience, which in the still dim light of our modern psychology is called introversion, and in the glorifying light of religion, illumination, is the presupposition for Plato's philosophy. From this experience follows the relation of a unified soul to the totality of a manifold world, bridged over by the theory of ideas. The impelling force to this experience is emotional love. Plato anticipates the Christian teachings that the sublimation of love links the human and the divine. Rational idealism is the fruit that grows out of mysticism, not its bloom; it is the consequence of Plato's mysticism, not its premise. Love is the creative force, reason the instrument of this force. Lysias, who the intellectual relation of a teacher to a youth, in the viewpoint of the Platonic Socrates thwarts the development of this youth in neglecting just this emotional force out of which the greatest attainments of the human mind can grow. With this conflict against the dry intellect and dry morality, the Dialogue "Phaedrus" starts.
In evidence of this statement we bring a passage from Plato's "Epistle VII" to Dion's friends that contains a description and a defence of the whole course of Plato's participation in the political affairs of Sicily, and that contains a long digression dealing with Plato's views on philosophy and its teaching.

His friend Dionysius, the tyrant of Syracuse, he says, was an unsatisfactory pupil, since he claimed to be already an expert in philosophy. Later on, it is said, he wrote a treatise on metaphysics himself, which he claimed to be superior to Plato's lectures. But he and all others who make such claims are imposters." Plato expresses himself as follows:

... And I am even told that later on he himself (Dionysius) wrote a treatise on the subjects in which I then instructed him, composing it as though it were something of his own invention and quite different from what he had heard; but of all this I know nothing. I know indeed that certain others have written about these same subjects; but what manner of men they are not even themselves know. But thus much I can certainly declare concerning all these writers, or prospective writers, who claim to know the subjects which I seriously study, whether as hearers of mine or of other teachers, or from their own discoveries; it is impossible, in my judgment at least, that these men should understand anything about this subject. There does not exist, nor will there ever exist, any treatise of mine dealing therewith. For it does not at all admit of verbal expression like other studies, but, as a result of continued application to the subject itself and communion therewith, it is brought to birth in the soul on a sudden, as light that is kindled by a leaping spark, and thereafter it nourishes itself. Notwithstanding, of thus much I am certain, that the set statement of these doctrines in writing or in speech would be my own statement; and further, that if they should be badly stated in writing, it is I who would be the person most deeply pained. And if I had thought that these subjects ought to be fully stated in writing or in speech to the public, what nobler action could I have performed in my
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life than that of writing what is of great benefit to mankind and bringing forth to the light for all men the nature of reality? But were I to undertake this task it would not, as I think, prove a good thing for men, save for some few who are able to discover the truth themselves with but little instruction; for as to the rest, some of it would most unreasonably fill with a mistaken contempt, and others with an overwhelming and empty aspiration, as though they had learnt some sublime mysteries.

This passage is so much more important since in the view of scholars Plato's "Epistle VII" has the best claim to authenticity. The suddenness of the mystic vision that is brought to birth "as light that is kindled by a leaping spark and thereafter nourishes itself" that Plato evidently considers the pre-supposition for the understanding of his philosophy, a pre-supposition that is in the ever-silent background of his philosophy, is explained in Plato's "Symposium" as follows: by Socrates, Dictima:

"When a man has been thus far tutored in the lore of love, passing from view to view of beautiful things, in the right and regular ascent, suddenly he will have revealed to him, as he draws to the close of his dealings in love, a wondrous vision, beautiful in its nature; and this, Socrates, is the final object of all those previous toils."

The mystic vision is brought about in one who has been tutored in the lore of love, as Phaedrus is tutored by Socrates. It is brought about at the point when he draws to the close of his dealings in love ( ). "How this close of his dealings in love comes about is not told, but our inquiry has brought together that evidence that brings the conclusion that the close of the dealings in love comes about at the induction of the initiation into wedlock. It is to be noticed that Plato..."
remarks that the truth concerning which he has been silent, could be discovered by a few men with but little instruction. It is thus a simple truth the inference of which lies near. The reason for not disclosing this truth is the same that he gives in the second book of the "Laws" where he speaks of the greatest benefit that the gift of Dionysus confers, "which one hesitates to declare to the multitude, since, when declared, it is misconceived and misunderstood".

In concordance with this passage from "Epistle VII" is another one in Plato's "Epistle II", which has less claim to authenticity. But even if this letter is spurious, and supposing that "the writer of this letter was a rhetor of a later age and of Pythagorean leanings", it is interesting to us as evidence of the point of view that learned men of ancient times had of Plato's writings.

The passage reads:

Beware, however, lest these doctrines be ever divulged to uneducated people. For there are hardly any doctrines, I believe, which sound more absurd than these to the vulgar, or, on the other hand, more admirable and inspired to men of fine disposition. For it is through being repeated and listened to frequently for many years that these doctrines are refined at length, like gold, with prolonged labour. But listen now to the most remarkable result of all. Quite a number of men there are who have listened to these doctrines—men capable of learning and capable also of holding them in mind and judging them by all sorts of tests—and who have been hearers of mine for no less than thirty years and are now quite old; and these men now declare that the doctrines that they once held to be most incredible appear to them now the most credible, and what they then held most credible now appears the opposite. So, bearing this in mind, have a care lest one day you should repent of what has now been divulged improperly. The greatest safeguard is to avoid writing and to learn by
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heart; for it is not possible that what is written down
should not get divulged. For this reason I myself have never
yet written anything on these subjects, and no treatise by
Plato exists or will exist, but those which now bear his name
belong to a Socrates become fair and young. Fare thee well,
and give me credence; and now, to begin with, read this let-
ter over repeatedly and then burn it up.

This passage is to a great part a repetition what Plato had
written in "Epistle VII"; but there is an additional remark of great
importance that can give us the proper view to Plato's writings.
This remark is that the writings which bear Plato's name "belong to a
Socrates become fair and young"; considering that Plato wrote his
his maturest work, the "Laws", to be read by the
young, and which contain passages that cannot be understood by the
young, we must view Plato's writings in a double light.

They are anagogic writings for the young and at the same time are
entities of the method and mental attitude for Dionysiac poets and
philosophers how to lead on their purpose to bring about a spiritual
and intellectual regeneration of the young, and to lead them on so
that they gain a Socratic attitude in life. They are written in a
euphemistic style with the ironic insight of the folly of youth
and with a moral insight how to bring about the wisdom of old age.
It is a theme that repeats itself in infinite poetic and phil-
that are impregnated with the Platonic tradition,
osophic variations in the post-Socratic literature of ancient times
and in the literature of the Renaissance.
Without this mystic experience that has grown out of love and has brought about a harmonious, healthy relation towards private life and public life, the mind lacking unification moves, according to Plato, merely among the phantoms of opinion, not in the realm of essential ideas that leads the individual to truth. A youth that has not been purified in this sense can have no real relation to the spoken and written word. Plato's greatest educational problem is the awakening of the creative intelligence of the individual mind. If a creative intellect is to grow, it inner has to be brought to its own experiences, without any super-imposed morality or super-imposed intellectual attitude. The educational method can therefore be anagogic. The individual has to be \textit{brought} to a consciousness that is above the dry letters of books. Rhythm, harmony, musical order are elements that have to be brought to grow in the soul of the young, not merely as elements to be admired in artistic productions. The intellectual rationalism of Lysias is amusical and banausic. In this sense the second part of the Dialogue that deals with rhetoric, is linked with the first part that deals with love. As the first part advocates, a \textit{philia} poetic, erotic, philosophic and spiritual relation of a teacher to a youth, so in the second part is advocated a corresponding serio-comic, ironic, mystagogic, poetic literature for youth, that is likely to awaken in the final end, the creative intelligence.

We bring here the evidence of these motives from quotations of the second part that is closely linked with the first part.
The first part differentiates the psychology of *Eros Paedagogicus*; expounds and literary attitude. The second part expounds the philosophy of the literary form through which it can find expression. More than the argument itself of the Dialogue, the artistic form of presentation is the best illustration for the anagogic, serio-comic method towards youth, which Plato made visible to poets and philosophers of the Dionysiac type.

Phaedrus is so much carried away by Socrates' speech on first love, which he finds more beautiful than the discourse that he is afraid Lysias will make a poor showing if he consents to compete with it. Thus he has entirely forgotten the enthusiasm which he had for it not long ago, and remembers only that one of the politicians had been abusing the orator by calling him a speech writer, so perhaps out of pride, Lysias may refrain from writing. Are not the most influential and important men in Greece ashamed to write speeches, and leave writings behind them through fear of being called sophists by posterity? Socrates is of the opposite opinion. Only those who cannot write will cherish such a view. The proudest of the statesmen are most fond of writings and leaving them for posterity. They care so much for praise that when they write a speech they add at the beginning the names of those who praise them in each instance. After some explanations on this point, Socrates concludes that it is clear that writing speeches in not in itself a disgrace, but the disgrace consists in speaking or writing not well, but disgracefully and badly. So the question comes up what is the method of writing well or badly.
Phaedrus is delighted. Being a youth with literary aspirations, what greater pleasure could he find than such a discussion? Since in the view of Plato this problem is not intellectual, but refers to the arts of the nine Muses, the philosopher makes Socrates introduce a fanciful myth about the grasshoppers who would be pleased to hear them converse about such matters. A lover of the Muses ought to know the story about the grasshoppers, These grasshoppers were once men before the birth of the Muses; and when the Muses were born and song appeared, some of the men were so overcome with delight that they sang and sang, forgetting food and drink, until at last, unconsciously they died. From them the tribe of the grasshoppers afterwards arose, and they have this gift from the Muses, that from the time of their birth they need no sustenance but sing continually, without food or drink, until they die, when they go to the Muses to report, who honors each of them on earth: 1

SOCRATES. ....They tell Terpsichore of those who have honoured her in dances, and make them dearer to her; they gain the favour of Erato for the poets of love, and that of the other Muses for their votaries, according to their various ways on honouring them; and to Calliope, the eldest of the Muses, and to Urania who is next to her, they make report of those who pass their lives in philosophy and who worship these Muses who are most concerned with heaven and with thought divine and human and whose music is the sweetest. So far many reasons we ought to talk and not sleep in the moontime.

Is not this myth a gentle, ironic satire on an old civilization that lives from its traditional inheritance of the esthetic arts of the nine Muses, incessantly repeating what was once
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the utterance of the creative spirit? Is not Socrates here in the role of the awakener of the creative spirit who brings about the birth of the nine Muses?

Socrates proceeds to place the problem: 1

If a speech is to be good, must not the mind of the speaker know the truth about the matters of which he is to speak?

Phaedrus replies, with his learning from the school of the orators, that persuasion comes from what seems to be true, not from truth; an orator does not need to know what is really just, but what seems just to the multitude who are to pass judgment, and not what is really good or noble, but what seems to be so.

Socrates then brings in the following example to illustrate what he means: 2

SOCRATES. If I should urge you to buy a horse and fight against the invaders, and neither of us knew what a horse was, but I merely knew this about you, that Phaedrus thinks a horse is the one of the tame animals which has the longest ears--

PHAEDRUS. It would be ridiculous, Socrates.

SOCRATES. No, not yet; but if I tried to persuade you in all seriousness, composing a speech in praise of the ass, which I called a horse, and saying that the beast was a most valuable possession at home and in war, that you could use him as a mount in battle, and that he was able to carry baggage and was useful for many other purposes--

PHAEDRUS. Then it would be supremely ridiculous.

SOCRATES. But is it not better to be ridiculous?
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than to be clever and an enemy?

**PHAEDRUS.** To be sure.

**SOCRATES.** Then when the orator who does not know what good and evil are undertakes to persuade a state which is equally ignorant, not by praising the "shadow of an ass" under the name of a horse, but by praising evil under the name of good, and having studied the opinions of the multitude persuades them to do evil instead of good, what harvest do you suppose his oratory will reap thereafter from the seed he has sown?

**PHAEDRUS.** No very good harvest.

The untenable position of that oratory that plays upon the will of the multitude without regard to what in the conscientious, individual judgment is good or bad, is thus made ridiculous in the eyes of Phaedrus. But the art of speaking could reply that she does not compel anyone to learn to speak without knowing the truth; he should learn the truth first, and then acquire the art of speaking. Here Socrates has an objection: oratory is not an art, but a craft devoid of art. According to Lacanian wisdom, a real art of speaking which does not seize hold of truth, does not exist and never will. When Phaedrus wants to examine this argument Socrates invites the grasshoppers to persuade the fair young Phaedrus that unless he pay proper attention to philosophy, he will never be able to speak properly about anything. In the name of the grasshoppers Socrates extends the conception of rhetoric for all situations of life. Is not rhetoric in its entire nature an art which leads the soul by means of words, not only in law courts and the various other public assemblages, but in private companies as well? Phaedrus has not acquired this idea in the
schools. According to him, the art of speaking and writing is exercised chiefly in lawsuits, and that of speaking also in public assemblies. He has never heard of any further uses: 1

SOCRATES. Then you have heard only of the treatises on rhetoric by Nestor and Odysseus, which they wrote when they had nothing to do at Troy, and you have not heard of that by Palamedes?

PHAEDRUS. Nor of Nestor's either, unless you are disguising Gorgias under the name of Nestor and Thrasymachus or Theodorus under that of Odysseus.

SOCRATES. Perhaps I am. 

The impression that this passage gives is that Phaedrus has derived his conceptions of rhetoric from the sophists of the age and that on this subject he has not cultivated his mind in the school of Homer.

Socrates now starts the argument with the question whether the parties in a lawsuit do not contend in speech about the just and the unjust. Since this is the case he whose speaking is an art will make the same thing appear to the same persons at one time just and another, if he wishes, unjust, and in political speaking he will make the same things seen to the state at one time good and at another the opposite. Now Socrates contends the Eleatic Palamedes, meaning the disciple of Parmenides Zeno, has such an art of speaking that the same things appear to his hearers to be alike and unlike, one and many, stationary and in motion, so that the art of contention and speech is not confined to courts and political gatherings, but apparently, if it is an art 1 - Phaedrus, 261 B, C, page 519
at all, it would be one and the same in all kinds of speaking, the art by which a man will be able to produce a resemblance between all things between which it can be produced, and to bring to the light the resemblances produced and disguised by any one else. To explain it more clearly, Socrates asks: the question whether deception is easier when there is much difference between things, or when there is little. When Phaedrus concedes the latter to be the case, Socrates comes to the conclusion that he who is to deceive another, and not to be deceived himself, must know accurately the similarity and dissimilarity of things. Now it is impossible that a man not knowing the truth about a given thing, will be able to recognize in other things the great or small degree of likeness to that which he does not know. In the case of those whose opinions are at variance with facts and who are deceived, this error evidently slips in through some resemblances. Then he who does not understand the real nature of things will not possess the art of making his hearers pass from one thing to its opposite by leading them through the intervening resemblances or of avoiding such deception himself. So that it follows that he who does not know the truth, but pursues opinions, will it seems attain an art of speech which is ridiculous and not an art at all.

Socrates now invites Phaedrus to look with him in the speech of Lysias and what he himself had said, to find out which shows art and which the lack of art. Phaedrus consents since he finds that their talk is too abstract, because it
lacks sufficient examples. About his own two discourses Socrates remarks:¹

And by some special fortune, as it seems, the two discourses contain an example of the way in which one who knows the truth may lead his hearers on with sportive words; and I, Phaedrus, think the divinities of the place are the cause thereof; and perhaps, too, the prophets of the Muses, who are singing above our heads, may have granted this boon to us by inspiration; at any rate, I possess no art of speaking.

Here Plato shapes as an artist an argument that he does not express with words. An emotional youth like Phaedrus, who does not know the difference between objective truth and opinion and finds an argument about it too abstract, is to be led on with sportive words of poetic deceptions, which he has to learn to discover for himself before he can approach such a serious subject like rhetoric.

Socrates makes Phaedrus read the beginning of Lysias' discourse:²

PHAEDRUS. You know what my condition is, and you have heard how I think it is to our advantage to arrange these matters: And I claim that I ought not to be refused what I ask because I am not your lover. For lovers repent of---

Socrates elicits from Phaedrus that there are certain matters about which people agree, and others about which they are at variance. "When we say "iron" or "silver" we all understand the same thing, when we say "justice" or "goodness" we disagree with each other and often with ourselves. Rhetoric will have the greater power to deceive in things about which we are doubtful, than
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who in things about which we agree. Then he is to develop an art of rhetoric must first make a methodical division and acquire a clear impression of each class, that in which people must be in doubt, and that of which they are in doubt. Love belongs to the doubtful things, Phaedrus finds, otherwise Socrates could not have said that he is an injury to the beloved and to the lover, and again that he is the greatest of blessings. Socrates asks Phaedrus whether he had defined love in the beginning, for he has quite forgotten. Phaedrus replies with enthusiasm, "Yes, by Zeus, and wonderfully well." Whereupon Socrates exclaims:

Oh, how much more versed the nymphs, daughters of Achelous, and Pan, son of Hermes, are in the art of speech than Lysias, son of Cephalus! Or am I wrong, and did Lysias also, in the beginning of his discourse on Love, compel us to suppose Love to be some one thing which he chose to consider it, and did he then compose and finish his discourse with that in view?...

The jest of serio-comic Socratic wisdom, in this explanation, does not lie in the logical demand of the definition of love, for we maintain that the Dialogue "Phaedrus" is just such a good comedy as Pailleront's comedy, "Le monde où s'ennuie" which treats a similar theme with French native wit. The jest lies here in this remark that Socrates urges that the theme of love ought to be treated for a young man in a poetic manner, in the manner of the nymphs and Pan, the son of Hermes.

The formal discussion about rhetoric in which Plato
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Brings in very pertinent principles, is in this dialogue more than an argumentative theme; it is an artistic theme intended to show the character of Socrates and Phaedrus and the necessity of serio-comic, anagogic treatment which the state of mind of this youth requires.

Going back to the beginning of Lysias' speech, Socrates calls the attention of Phaedrus that Lysias does not begin at the beginning but undertakes to swim on his back up the current of his discourse from its end, and begins with what the lover would say at the end to his beloved. The parts of the discourse are thrown out helter-skelter. It does not fulfill the requirements of a good discourse that must be organized like a living being, with a body of its own so as not to be headless or footless, but to have a middle and members, composed and in fitting relation to the whole. Lysias' speech reminds Socrates of an inscription on the tomb of Midas the Phrygian, where the lines are so arranged that it makes no difference whether any line of it is put first or last. Phaedrus is humbled. To Socrates' question whether he knew any rhetorical reason why Lysias had arranged his topics in this order he felt moved to answer:

You flatter me in thinking that I can discern his motives so accurately.

Phaedrus concludes the discussion of the speech of Lysias with the remark:

You are making fun of our discourse, Socrates.
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By way of contrast Socrates discloses the structure of the two discourses which he himself gave under the inspiration of the nymphs. We have already quoted important passages that contain the analytical retrospect concerning their rhetorical arrangement. He arrives at the general idea that in his chance utterances were involved two principles: that of perceiving and Bring together in one idea the scattered particulars that one may make clear by definition the particular thing which he wishes to explain, and that of dividing things again by classes where the natural joints are, and not trying to break any part after the manner of a bad carver. The man who is able to see things that can naturally be collected into one and divided into many, Socrates declares he would follow after, and "walk in his footsteps as if he were a god!"

Phaedrus agrees that this method may be called dialectic, but it seems to him that rhetoric still escaped them. Socrates starts enumerating the technical requirement for a speech as orators of this time taught: the introduction first, the narrative second, with the testimony after it, third the proofs, fourth the probabilities, confirmation and further confirmation. He mentions the orator Theodorus, who tells how refutations and further refutation must be accomplished, the Parian Eunus who invented covert allusion, Gorgias and Tisias who saw that probabilities are more to be esteemed than truth, who taught how to make small things seem great, and invented conciseness of speech and measureless length on all subjects. He mentions further Prodicus who objected that dis-
courses should be neither long nor short but of reasonable length, aludes to Hippias from Elis, and to Polus who in a learned manner taught duplication, sententiousness and figurativeness, Licymnius who enforced beautiful diction, Protagoras who taught correctness of diction, the mighty Chalcedonian who gave precepts concerning tearful speeches to arouse pity for old age and poverty and for rousing large companies to laugh, and soothing them again by his charms when they are angry, and for devising and abolishing calumnies on any grounds whatsoever. Socrates finally comes to the last technical requirement of a good speech, the conclusion which some call recapitulation whereas others give another name to it but about which all agree. Thus is brought before the reader the scholastic points of rhetoric in Socrates' age.

Now Socrates proceeds with the attack against this scholasticism. Suppose some one should come to Phaedrus' friend, the physician Eryximachus, or to his father Acumenus, and should say that he knows how to apply various drugs to people so as to make them warm, if he wished, cold, and he can make them vomit if he likes, or can make their bowels move. Could he claim, on the basis of this knowledge, that he is a physician and can make any other man a physician to whom he imparts the knowledge of these things. Phaedrus answers that his friends would ask him whether he knew whom he ought to cause to do these things, and when, and how much. If he could not answer these questions in the affirmative they would say that the man was crazy, and imagined, because he had read something in a book, or had stumbled upon some medicine, that he
was a physician when he really had no knowledge of the art. The same would be the case if some one should go to Sophocles or Euripides and should say that he knew how to make very long speeches about a small matter and very short ones about a great affair, and pitiful utterances, and again terrible and threatening ones. The poets would laugh at him if he thought, by imparting those things, he could teach the art of writing tragedies, for tragedy was anything else but the proper combination of these details in such a way that they harmonized with each other and with the whole composition. Socrates inculcates to Phaedrus that these poets would not rebuke him harshly, but being musicians they would say in gentler tones that he knows the necessary preliminaries of harmony and not harmony itself. In a similar spirit the physician Acumenus would reply to his man that he knew the preliminaries of medicine and not medicine itself. The mellifluous that the Adrastus or Pericles would reply in a similar gentle tone that the scholastic points of rhetoric is only a preliminary to rhetoric.

Being led thus so far, Phaedrus inquires how and from whom the truly rhetorical and persuasive art is to be acquired. Socrates replies that in order to become a perfect orator one must be endowed first with a natural gift. To this gift must be added knowledge and practice. But the quest of this knowledge and practice does not lie along the path of Lysias and Thrasyllus. To take the example of Pericles, the most perfect orator in existence, his natural abilities were aided by his contact with the philosopher Anaxagoras, who taught him the nature of mind and the
lack of mind, for all great arts demand discussion and speculation about nature. From such pursuits a loftiness of mind and effectiveness in all directions seem somehow to come. The method of rhetoric is much the same as the method of the art of healing; in both cases one must analyse a nature in one that of the body, and the other that of the soul. One must proceed in a scientific manner, not merely by practice and routine, to impart health and strength to the body by prescribing medicine and diet, or by proper discourses and training to give to the soul the desired belief and virtue. One cannot acquire any appreciable knowledge of the nature of the soul without knowing the nature of the whole man, and as Phaedrus adds, if Hippocrates the Asclepiad is to be trusted, one cannot know the nature of the body either, except in that way. Socrates suggests that in this case they ought not to be content with the authority of Hippocrates, but to see also if their reason agrees with him on examination. In considering the nature of anything one must see first whether it is simple or multiple, and then if it is simple, enquire what power of acting it possesses, or of being acted upon, and by what it is acted upon. If it has many forms, one must number them, and then see in the case of each form, what its action is, and how it is acted upon, and by what. Thus one can proceed scientifically. The man whose rhetorical teaching is a real art, will explain accurately the nature of that to which his words are to be addressed, and that is the soul. The goal of all his effort is to produce conviction
in the soul. Any one who seriously teaches the art of rhetoric will first describe the soul with perfect accuracy, and make us see whether it is one and all alike, or, like the body, of multiform aspect. Secondly, he will say what its action is, and toward what it is directed, or how it is acted upon and by what. Thirdly, he will classify the speeches and the souls and will adapt each to the other, showing the causes of the effects produced, and why one kind of soul is necessarily persuaded by certain classes of speeches and another is not. Those who write treatises on the art of speech nowadays, are deceivers, and conceal the nature of the soul though they know it very well. Until they write and speak by this method we cannot believe that they write by the rules of art. When Phaedrus asks what this method is, Socrates replies that it is not easy to tell the exact expressions to be used, but he will tell how one must write if one is to do it, so far as possible in a truly artistic way.

From a modern point of view, one would expect that Socrates at this point would lay the foundation for some sort of scientific psychology. What he actually does is to lay the foundation for "psychagogia", a method of how to lead the soul on. He sums up his view in the following manner:

1 - Phaedrus, 271 D, E, 272 A, B, pages 553/555
Since it is the function of speech to lead souls by persuasion, he who is to be a rhetorician must know the various forms of soul. Now they are so and so many and of such and such kinds, wherefore men also are of different kinds; these we must classify. Then there are also various classes of speeches to one of which every speech belongs. So men of a certain sort are easily persuaded by speeches of a certain sort for a certain reason to actions or beliefs of a certain sort, and men of another sort cannot be persuaded. The student of rhetoric must, accordingly, acquire a proper knowledge of these classes and then be able to follow them accurately with his senses when he sees them in the practical affairs of life; otherwise he can never have any profit from the lectures he may have heard. But when he has learned to tell what sort of man is influenced by what sort of speech, and is able, if he comes upon such a man, to recognize him and to convince himself that this is the man and this now actually before him is the nature spoken of in a certain lecture, to which he must now make a practical application of a certain kind of speech in a certain way to persuade his hearer to a certain action or belief - when he has acquired all this, and has added thereto a knowledge of the times for speaking and for keeping silence, and has also distinguished the favourable occasions for brief speech or pitiful speech or intensity and all the classes of speech which he has learned, then, and not till then, will his art be fully and completely finished; and if anyone who omits any of these points in his speaking or writing claims to speak by the rules of art, the one who disbelieves him is the better man. "Now then," perhaps the writer of our treatise will say, "Phaedrus and Socrates, do you agree to all this? Or must the art of speech be described in some other way?"

PHAEGRUS. No other way is possible, Socrates. But it seems a great risk to attain to it.

Since this road to the art of rhetoric seems to Phaedrus long and rough, Socrates suggests that they should find out whether there is not a shorter and easier road to this art. Perhaps there is no need, as the orators say, of treating these matters with such gravity and carrying them back so far to first principles with many words. They say in the courts nobody cares for truth, about what is just and good, but for that which is con-
vinging; and that is probability, so that he who is to be an artist in speech, must fix his attention upon probability. For sometimes one must not even tell what was actually done, if it was not likely to be done, but what was probable, whether in accusation or in defence. So that a speaker must always aim at probability, paying no attention to truth. This is the theory of the orator Θυ Tisias, who suggested the following case: if a feeble and brave man assaulted a strong coward, and robbed him of his cloak or something, and was brought to trial for it, neither party ought to speak the truth. The coward should say that he had not been assaulted by the brave man alone, whereas the other should prove that only they two were present, and use the argument: "How could a little man like me assault such a man as he is?" The coward will not acknowledge his cowardise, but will perhaps try to invent some other lie, and thus give his opponent a chance to confute him. But even if one clings to the theory of probability, one has to keep in mind that probability is accepted by the people because of the likeness to truth; but he who knows the truth is always best able to discover likenesses. Therefore the necessity for the orator of taking account of the character of his hearers, and of being able to divide things by classes and to comprehend particulars under a general idea, is indispensable for the art of speech. Although such an ability of psychological adjustment and logical training cannot be gained without much diligent toil, the wise man will strive for it so that he may be able to speak and to act in a manner pleasing to the gods. A man of sense should practice
to please not his fellow slaves, but his good and noble masters. Therefore the long and difficult road ought not to be shunned.

A man trained on this road will attain his better ends even from the viewpoint of probability in the art of speech.

After this conclusion of the discussion on rhetoric, Plato proceeds to state the literary attitude of his philosophy, which he has maintained during his life. Socrates starts the discussion about the propriety and impropriety in writing. He asks Phaedrus whether he knows how he can act and speak best about rhetoric so as to please God best. Since Phaedrus gives a negative answer, Socrates proceeds to tell him a tale which he pretends to have heard from the ancients, but for the truth of which he cannot vouch. The tale is as follows:

I heard, then, that at Naucratis, in Egypt, was one of the ancient gods of that country, the one whose sacred bird is called the ibis, and the name of the god himself was Theuth. He it was who invented numbers and arithmetic and geometry and astronomy, also draughts and dice, and, most important of all, letters. Now the king of all Egypt at that time was the god Thamus, who lived in the great city of the upper region, which the Greeks call the Egyptian Thebes, and they call the god himself Ammon. To him came Theuth to show his inventions, saying that they ought to be imparted to the other Egyptians. But Thamus asked what use there was in each, and as Theuth enumerated their uses, expressed praise or blame, according as he approved or disapproved. The story goes that Thamus said many things to Theuth in praise or blame of the various arts, which it would take too long to repeat; but when they came to the letters, "This invention, O king," said Theuth, "will make the Egyptians wiser and will improve their memories; for it is an elixir of memory and wisdom that I have discovered." But Thamus replied, "Most ingenious Theuth, one man has the ability to beget arts, but the ability to judge

Phaedrus, 274 C, D, E, 275 A, B, pages 561/565
of their usefulness or harmfulness to their use belongs to
another; and you, who are the father of letters, have
been lead by your affection to ascribe to them a power the op-
posite of that which they really possess. For this inven-
tion will produce forgetfulness in the minds of those who
learn to use it, trust in writing, produced by external
characters which are no part of themselves, will discourage
the use of their own memory within them. You have invented
an elixir not of memory, but of reminding; and you offer your
pupils the appearance of wisdom, not true wisdom, for they
will read many things without instruction and will therefore
seem to know many things, when they are for the most part ig-
norant and hard to get along with, since they are not wise,
but only appear wise."

PHAEDRUS. Socrates, you easily make up stories of Egypt
or any country you please.

It is interesting that Plato makes Phaedrus remark that
the story which Socrates pretends to have heard, is one that
Socrates made up. It is the more interesting since he says "stories
of Egypt or any country you please". The name
Thamus for Ammon points to Syria. Professor Taylor 1 asks the
question, "Is the name Thamus, which has perplexed the commenta-
tors, due to a presumably wilful confusion with the Syrian Thammuz?"
In favor of such a supposition there is one undeniable fact: the
figure of the Syrian Thammuz is identical with the Greek figure of
Adonis, the symbolic figure of a youth to be initiated in the
mysteries of Aphrodite at her shrine in Paphos. Since in the
light of our inquiry the Dialogue "Phaedrus" presents the mystag-
ogic method how to initiate a youth into Dionysiac philosophy, and
since in post-Socratic pastoral poetry the figure of Adonis is the
it is not surprising that
central myth of initiation, the name Thamus that is identical with

1 - Plato, The Man and His Work, by A. E. Taylor, The Dial Press,
New York, 1929, footnote page 316
the figure of Adonis, is used.

Socrates replies to Phaedrus, who guesses that Socrates had made up the story, in a manner that shows that one cannot lead on the young folks with stories that originated in Greece:

They used to say, my friend, that the words of the oak in the holy place of Zeus at Dodona were the first prophetic utterances. The people of that time, not being as wise as you young folks, were content in their simplicity to hear an oak or a rock, provided only it spoke the truth; but to you, perhaps, it makes a difference who the speaker is and where he comes from, for you do not consider only whether his words are true or not.

PHAEDRUS. Your rebuke is just; and I think the Theban is right in what he says about letters.

Socrates now states his attitude on writing, that is the presupposition for Platonic philosophy and the Platonic tradition in general:

He who thinks, then, that he has left behind him any art in writing, and he who receives it in the belief that anything in writing will be clear and certain, would be an utterly simple person, and in truth ignorant of the prophecy of Ammon, if he thinks written words are of any use except to remind him who knows the matter about which they are written.

PHAEDRUS. Very true.

SOCRATES. Writing, Phaedrus, has this strange quality, and is very like painting; for the creatures of painting stand like living beings, but if one asks them a question, they preserve a solemn silence. And so it is with written words; you might think they spoke as if they had intelligence, but if you question them, wishing to know about their sayings, they always say only one and the same thing. And every word, when once it is written, is bandied about, alike among those who understand and those who have no interest in it,
and it knows not to whom to speak or not to speak; when ill-treated or unjustly reviled it always needs its father to help it; for it has no power to protect or help itself.

PHAEDRUS. You are quite right about that, too.

The statement that writing has "this strange quality, and be the forerunner of is very like painting", seems to the slogan of Horace's "Ars Poetica":1 Ut pictura poesis (poetry is like painting). This Socratic attitude on writing which Horace had, is testified to by the following lines in his "Ars Poetica":2

Scribendi recte sapere est et princípium et fons. rem tibi Socraticae poterunt ostendere chartae, verbaque provisam rem non invita sequentur.

(Of good writing the source and fount is wisdom. Your matter the Socratic pages can set forth, and when matter is in hand words will not be loath to follow.) (translation H. Rushton Fairclough, Loeb Classical Library)

The famous German critic, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, who fought against Ut pictura poesis in his famous thesis "Laokoon oder über die Grenzen der Malerei und Dichtung", from esthetic premises that are in themselves incontestible, does not seem to have been aware of the skeptical, philosophic background of thought out of which this analogy arose.

In opposition to the written word, Socrates extols the spoken word:3

Now tell me; is there not another kind of speech, or word, which shows itself to be the legitimate brother of this bastard one, both in the manner of its begetting and in its better and more powerful nature?

PHAEDRUS. What is this word and how is it begotten, as you say?

1 - Horace, Ars Poetica, verse 361
2 - " " 309/311
3 - Phaedrus, 276 A, page 567
SOCRATES. The word which is written with intelligence in the mind of the learner, which is able to defend itself and knows to whom it should speak, and before whom to be silent.

PHÆDROUS. You mean the living and breathing word of him who knows, of which the written word may justly be called the image.

The stress on "the living and breathing word" is a spiritual principle of Plato's philosophy that is shared by the greatest teachers of humanity. As is well known, in Plato's "Academy" the oral instruction was of far greater importance than the study of Plato's writings. The stress on "the living and breathing word" is a spiritual principle of the entire Platonic tradition. It is due only to the development of a scientific language in the age of the printing press that the written word has become for modern humanity of most important significance. But on the other side, this high evaluation of the written word has brought about infinite misunderstandings concerning the attitude of writers of former times who wrote from a religious, philosophic, ethical or poetic point of view.

Not only the esoteric, but also the very nature of the human mind, brought Plato to such a skeptical evaluation of the written word. In his "Epistle VII" we find a passage that explains this skeptical evaluation of the written word:

"Every existing object has three things which are the necessary means by which knowledge of that object is acquired; and the knowledge itself is a fourth thing; and

as a fifth thing one must postulate the object itself which is cognizable and true. First of these comes the name; secondly the definition; thirdly the image; fourthly the knowledge. If you wish, then, to understand what I am now saying, take a single example and learn from it what applies to all. There is an object called a circle, which has for its name the word we have just mentioned; and, secondly, it has a definition, composed of names and verbs; for "that which is everywhere equidistant from the extremities to the centre" will be the definition of that object which has for its name "round" and "spherical" and "circle". And in the third place there is that object which is in course of being portrayed and obliterated, or of being shaped with a lathe, and falling into decay; but none of these affections is suffered by the circle itself, whereto all these others are related inasmuch as it is distinct therefrom. Fourth comes knowledge and intelligence and true opinion regarding these objects; which does not exist in vocal utterance or in bodily forms but in souls; whereby it is plain that it differs both from the nature of the circle itself and from the three previously mentioned. And of those four intelligence approaches most nearly in kinship and similarity to the fifth, and the rest are further removed

... And none of the objects, we affirm, has any fixed name, nor is there anything to prevent forms which are now called "round" from being called "straight", and the "straight" "round"; and men will find the names no less firmly fixed when they have shifted them and apply them in an opposite sense. Moreover, the same account holds good of the Definition also, that, inasmuch as it is compounded of names and verbs, it is in no case fixed with sufficient firmness. And so with each of the Four, their inaccuracy is an endless topic; but, as we mentioned a moment ago, the main point is this, that while there are two separate things, the real essence and the quality, and the soul seeks to know not the quality but the essence, each of the Four proffers to the soul either in word or in concrete form that which is not sought; and by thus causing each object which is described or exhibited to be always easy of refutation by the senses, it fills practically all men with every manner of perplexity and uncertainty. In respect, however, of those other objects the truth of which, owing to our bad training, we usually do not so much as seek--being content with such of the images as are proffered, those of us who answer are not made to look ridiculous by those who question, we being capable of analysing and convicting the Four. But in all cases where we compel a man to give the Fifth as his answer to explain it, anyone who
is able and willing to upset the argument gains the day, 
and makes the person who is expounding his view by speech 
or writing or answers appear to most of his hearers to be 
wholly ignorant of the subjects about which he is attempting 
to write or speak; for they are ignorant sometimes of the 
fact that it is not the soul of the writer or speaker that 
is being convicted but the nature of each of the Four, which 
is essentially defective. But it is the methodical study 
of all these stages, passing in turn from one to another, up 
and down, which with difficulty implants knowledge, when the 
man himself, like his object, is of a fine nature; but if 
his nature is bad—and, in fact, the condition of most men's 
souls in respect of learning and of what are termed "morals"
is either naturally bad or else corrupted,—then not even 
Lynceus himself could make such folk see. In one word, 
neither receptivity nor memory will ever produce knowledge in 
him who has no affinity with the object, since it does not 
germinate to start with in alien states of mind; consequently 
neither those who have no natural connexion or affinity with 
things just, and all else that is fair, although they are 
both receptive and retentive in various ways of other things, 
nor yet those who possess such affinity but are unreceptive 
and unretentative—none, I say, of these will ever learn to 
the utmost extent the truth of virtue nor yet of vice. For 
in learning these objects it is necessary to learn at the same 
time both what is false and what is true of the whole Existence 
and that through the most diligent and prolonged investigation, 
as I said at the commencement: and it is by means of the exam-
ination of each of these objects, comparing one with another—
names and definitions, visions and sense-perceptions,—proving 
them by kindly proofs and employing questionings and answerings 
that are void of envy—it is by such means, and hardly so, that 
there bursts out the light of intelligence and reason regarding 
each object in the mind of him who uses every effort of which 
mankind is capable.

And this is the reason why every serious man in dealing 
with really serious subjects carefully avoids writing, lest 
thereby he may possibly cast them as a prey to the envy and 
stupidity of the public. In one word, then, our conclusion 
must be that whenever one sees a man's written compositions—
whether they be laws of a legislator or anything else in any 
other form,—these are not his most serious works, if so be 
that the writer himself is serious: rather those works abide 
in the fairest region he possesses. If, however, these really 
are his serious efforts, and put into writing, it is not "the 
gods" but mortal men who "Then of a truth themselves have 
utterly ruined his senses."
This argument of Plato prepares us to understand the literary attitude that Socrates expresses to Phaedrus. This literary attitude, in our view, refers to post-Socratic poetry, to the love poetry of Theocritus, to Virgil's "Eclogues", to Catullus, to Horace, to Ovid, to Martial, Juvenal and Persius; to the great poets and philosophers of the Renaissance and especially to the ethos of the great Elizabethan poets: ¹

SOCRATES. ... Now tell me this. Would a sensible husbandman, who has seeds which he cares for and which he wishes to bear fruit, plant them with serious purpose in the heat of summer in some garden of Adonis, and delight in seeing them appear in beauty in eight days, or would he do that sort of them, when he did it at all, only in play and for amusement? Would he not, when he was in earnest, follow the rules of husbandry, plant his seeds in fitting ground, and be pleased when those which he had sowed reached their perfection in the eighth month?

PHAEADUS. Yes, Socrates, he would, as you say, act in that way when in earnest and in the other way only for amusement.

SOCRATES. And shall we suppose that he who has knowledge of the just and the good and beautiful has less sense about his seeds than the husbandman?

PHAEADUS. By no means.

SOCRATES. Then he will not, when in earnest, write them in ink, sowing them through a pen with words which cannot defend themselves by argument and cannot teach the truth effectually.

PHAEADUS. No, at least, probably not.

SOCRATES. No. The gardens of letters he will, it seems, plant for amusement, and will write, when he writes, to treasure up reminders for himself, when he comes to the forgetfulness of old age, and for others who follow the same path, and he will be pleased when he sees them putting forth tender leaves. When others engage in other amusements, refreshing themselves with banquets and kindred entertainments, he will pass the time in such pleasures as I have suggested.

¹ - Phaedrus, 276 B, C, D, pages 567/569
The garden of love letters in post-Socratic, ancient classical literature, and in Renaissance literature, whether addressed to beautiful boys or to poetic mistresses, are gardens of Adonis, of which Socrates speaks. The gardens of Adonis were pots in which flowers were rapidly forced, to die again equally rapidly.

The Dialogue "Phaedrus" is an illustration both of the love play and amusement of poetic literature that followed the Platonic tradition, and of the serious purpose that was behind this love literature. The discourse on love that Socrates addressed to his love instinct Phaedrus, arousing under proper reservations, is a seed planted in the garden of Adonis, rapidly forced, to die again equally rapidly, when Phaedrus had come to his mystic experience "at the close of his dealings in love". This conversation on love held in "the heat of summer" is a conversation with Phaedrus Adonis, with Phaedrus Thammuz. Socrates does not expect that Phaedrus, after this conversation, will emerge a different man within eight days. He does not expect that Phaedrus, after having listened to the discussion on rhetoric that he outlined for him a long and difficult road, will profit immediately. But while treating him in such a mystagogic, serio-comic way, Socrates has a "serious purpose" in mind, for seeing a long process of development in Phaedrus, if the latter remains in erotic, poetic, spiritual contact with him. With such a similar serious purpose in view, the erotic, ancient classical literature and Renaissance

sonnet poetry were written.

To Socrates' suggestion about the garden of letters planted for amusement, Phaedrus replies: 1

A noble pastime, Socrates, and a contrast to those base pleasures, the pastime of the man who can find amusement in discourse, telling stories about justice, and the other subjects of which you speak.

Yet Socrates lifts him up to a higher level in pointing out the superiority of philosophic discourse: 2

SOCRATES. Yes, Phaedrus, so it is; but, in my opinion, serious discourse about them is far nobler, when one employs the dialectic method and plants and sows in a fitting soul intelligent words which are able to help themselves and him who planted them, which are not fruitless, but yield seed from which there spring up in other minds other words capable of continuing the process for ever, and which make their possessor happy, to the farthest possible limit of human happiness.

The presupposition for speech writing as an art is then summed up by Socrates: 3

A man must know the truth about all the particular things of which he speaks or writes, and must be able to define everything separately; then when he has defined them, he must know how to divide them by classes until further division is impossible; and in the same way he must understand the nature of the soul, must find out the class of speech adapted to each nature, and must arrange to adorn his discourse accordingly, offering to the complex soul elaborate and harmonious discourses, and simple talks to the simple soul. Until he has attained to all this, he will not be able to speak by the method of art, so far as speech can be controlled by method, either for purposes of instruction or of persuasion. This has been taught by our whole preceding discussion.

Socrates then sums up his great literary attitude of

---

1 - Phaedrus 276 E, page 569
2 - " 276 E, 277 A, pages 569-571
3 - " 277 B, C, page 571
Sapientia Socratica Jocosearia:

But the man who thinks that in the written word there is necessarily much that is playful, and that no written discourse, whether in metre or in prose, deserves to be treated very seriously (and this applies also to the recitations of the rhapsodes, delivered to sway people's minds, without opportunity for questioning and teaching), but that the best of them really serve only to remind us of what we know; but who thinks that only in words about justice and beauty and goodness spoken by teachers for the sake of instruction and really written in a soul is clearness and perfection and serious value, that such words should be considered the speaker's own legitimate offspring, first the word within himself, if it be found there, and secondly its descendants or brothers which may have sprung up in worthy manner in the souls of others, and who pays no attention to the other words, that man, Phaedrus, is likely to be such as you and I might pray that we ourselves may become.

"We have amused ourselves with talk about words long enough", Socrates continues. He sends Phaedrus with a message to Lysias:

...If he has composed his writings with knowledge of the truth, and is able to support them by discussion of that which he has written, and has the power to show by his own speech that the written words are of little worth, such a man ought not to derive his title from such writings, but from the serious pursuit which underlies them.

Such a man would be called a philosophers, Socrates maintains:

On the other hand, he who has nothing more valuable than the things he has composed or written, turning his words up and down at his leisure, adding this phrase and taking that away, will you not properly address him as poet or writer of speeches or of laws?

Socrates sends also a message to Phaedrus' friend, the later famous orator, Isocrates:

PHAEDRUS. The fair Isocrates. What message will you

---

1 - Phaedrus, 277 E, 278 A, B, pages 573/575
2 - 273, C, page 575
3 - 278, DE, pages 575/577
4 - 279, A, B, page 577
give him? What shall we say that he is?

SOCRATES. Isocrates is young yet, Phaedrus; however, I am willing to say what I prophesy for him.

PHAEGRUS. What is it?

SOCRATES. I think he has a nature above the speeches of Lysias and possesses a nobler character; so that I should not be surprised if, as he grows older, he should so excel in his present studies that all who have ever treated of rhetoric shall seem less than children; and I suspect that these studies will not satisfy him, but a more divine impulse will lead him to greater things; for my friend, something of philosophy is inborn in his mind. This is the message that I carry from these deities to my favorite Isocrates, and do you carry the other to Lysias, your favorite.

The following prayer brings the Dialogue Phaedrus to its spiritual conclusion:

SOCRATES. Is it not well to pray to the deities here before we go?

PHAEGRUS. Of course.

SOCRATES. O beloved Pan and all ye other gods of this place, grant to me that I may be made beautiful in my soul within, and that all external possessions be in harmony with my inner man. May I consider the wise man rich; and may I have such wealth as only the self-restrained man can bear or endure. Do we need anything more, Phaedrus? For me that prayer is enough.

PHAEGRUS. Let me also share in this prayer; for my friends have all things in common.

SOCRATES. Let us go.