

柏拉图著作集

PLATO

(英文本)

4

[英] 本杰明·乔伊特 英译/评注

Translated into English with Analyses and Introductions
by Benjamin Jowett

B502.232

28

.4

柏拉图著作集

(英文本)

[英] 本杰明·乔伊特 英译/评注



图书在版编目(CIP)数据

柏拉图著作集. 4: 英文 / (古希腊) 柏拉图著; (英) 乔伊特 (Jowett, B.) 译评. —桂林: 广西师范大学出版社, 2008.10

(西方古典文丛)

ISBN 978-7-5633-7660-5

I. 柏… II. ①柏…②乔… III. 柏拉图 (前 427~前 347) —文集—英文 IV. B502.232-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2008) 第 120094 号

广西师范大学出版社出版发行

(广西桂林市中华路 22 号 邮政编码: 541001)
网址: <http://www.bbtpress.com>

出版人: 何林夏

全国新华书店经销

广西师范大学印刷厂印刷

(广西桂林市临桂县金山路 168 号 邮政编码: 541100)

开本: 890 mm × 1 240 mm 1/32

印张: 16.875 字数: 522 千字

2008 年 10 月第 1 版 2008 年 10 月第 1 次印刷

印数: 0 001~3 000 册 定价: 36.00 元

如发现印装质量问题, 影响阅读, 请与印刷厂联系调换。

编者说明

此套英文版《柏拉图著作集》是为适应中国读者阅读、研究柏拉图著作的需要而编辑出版，收录了本杰明·乔伊特（Benjamin Jowett, 1817—1893）所译的全部柏拉图著作，以及乔伊特为每篇作品所撰写的导读性文字，共六卷。

尽管柏拉图的著作，尤其是一些名篇，至20世纪出现了不少优秀译文，但一百余年前乔伊特这套完整的英译本仍然具有不可替代的地位和价值。乔伊特典雅、晓畅的文字风格历来为人称道，他避免生僻词和学院化，以其特有的韵律驾驭浅显的文字，为柏拉图在现代赢得了大量读者；这些读者可能不懂古希腊语，甚至母语并非英语，但都可借助这一译本相对完整地了解柏拉图的著作和哲学。

英译本第四版是在乔伊特去世六十年后修订而成，较乔伊特生前的最后一版第三版有~~不少改动~~，主要是使译文在字面上更忠实于希腊文原著，这方面可参看第四版前言中的说明（各版前言的摘选收入第一卷卷首）。

以下就本版的一些~~编辑处理~~说明。

所有译文内容的修~~订~~以第四版~~为准~~，但有选择地保留了一部分第四版编者所加的附注（在书中以方括号标出），乔伊特的原注则基本维持不变。

遵照第四版删节了一部分乔伊特的导读性文字，但也依据第三版，保留了一些编者认为仍然有益于中国读者的内容。

在各卷、各篇顺序的编排上大体参照了第四版，但基于本版编者的理解，并照顾到篇幅问题，适当作了一些调整。

作为参考内容，将疑为伪作的《大希庇阿斯》、《小希庇阿斯》、《阿尔希比亚得斯（一）》和《美涅塞努斯》，以及受关注度较高的《第七封信》收作附录。

在第一卷后附有英文版第三、四版均沿用的柏拉图著作索引，是非常有用的资料。

本套书在编辑、排印方面定有不够完善之处，敬请广大读者批评指正，以便改进。

2008年6月

柏拉图著作集（六卷）

总目

Volume 1	Volume 3
Prefaces	Republic
Charmides	Appendix
Lysis	Introduction and Analysis
Laches	
Ion	Volume 4
Protagoras	Phaedrus
Euthydemus	Cratylus
Meno	Theaetetus
Appendix	Parmenides
Greater Hippias	Appendix
Index	The Seventh Letter
Volume 2	Volume 5
Gorgias	Sophist
Symposium	Statesman
Euthyphro	Philebus
Apology	Timaeus
Crito	Critias
Phaedo	
Appendix	Volume 6
Lesser Hippias	Laws
Alcibiades I	Appendix
Menexenus	Introduction and Analysis

Introduction 1

Phaedrus 33

Introduction 96

Cratylus 157

Introduction 231

Theaetetus 304

Introduction 398

Parmenides 434

Appendix

The Seventh Letter 501

Works of Plato Vol.4
Contents

PHAEDRUS

INTRODUCTION

THE *Phaedrus* is closely connected with the *Symposium*, and may be regarded either as introducing or following it. The two dialogues together contain the whole philosophy of Plato on the nature of love, which in the *Republic* and in the later writings of Plato is only introduced playfully or as a figure of speech. But in the *Phaedrus* and *Symposium* love and philosophy join hands, and one is an aspect of the other. The spiritual and emotional part is elevated into the ideal, to which in the *Symposium* mankind are described as looking forward, and which in the *Phaedrus*, as well as in the *Phaedo*, they are seeking to recover from a former state of existence. Whether the subject of the dialogue is love or rhetoric, or the union of the two, or the relation of philosophy to love and to art in general, and to the human soul, will be hereafter considered. And perhaps we may arrive at some conclusion such as the following — that the dialogue is not strictly confined to a single subject, but passes from one to another with the natural freedom of conversation.

Phaedrus has been spending the morning with Lysias, the celebrated 227
rhetorician, and is going to refresh himself by taking a walk outside the
wall, when he is met by Socrates, who professes that he will not leave him
until he has delivered up the speech with which Lysias has regaled him, and 228
which he is carrying about in his mind, or more probably in a book hidden
under his cloak, and is intending to study as he walks. The imputation is not
denied, and the two agree to direct their steps out of the public way along the
stream of the Ilissus towards a plane-tree which is seen in the distance.
There, lying down amidst pleasant sounds and scents, they will read the 229
speech of Lysias. The country is a novelty to Socrates, who never goes out of
the town; and hence he is full of admiration for the beauties of nature,
which he seems to be drinking in for the first time.

As they are on their way, Phaedrus asks the opinion of Socrates respecting

the local tradition of Boreas and Oreithyia. Socrates, after a satirical allusion to the 'rationalizers' of his day, replies that he has no time for these 'nice' interpretations of mythology, and he pities anyone who has. When you once begin there is no end of them, and they spring from an uncritical philosophy after all. 'The proper study of mankind is man'; and he is a far more complex and wonderful being than the serpent Typho. Socrates as yet does not know himself; and why should he care to know about unearthly monsters? Engaged in such conversation, they arrive at the plane-tree; when they have found a convenient resting-place, Phaedrus pulls out the speech and reads: —

The speech consists of a foolish paradox which is to the effect that the non-lover ought to be accepted rather than the lover — because he is more rational, more agreeable, more enduring, less suspicious, less hurtful, less boastful, less engrossing, and because there are more of them, and for a great many other reasons which are equally unmeaning. Phaedrus is captivated with the beauty of the periods, and wants to make Socrates say that nothing was or ever could be written better. Socrates does not think much of the matter, but then he has only attended to the form, and in that he has detected several repetitions and other marks of haste. He cannot agree with Phaedrus in the extreme value which he sets upon this performance, because he is afraid of doing injustice to Anacreon and Sappho and other great writers, and is almost inclined to think that he himself, or rather some power residing within him, could make a speech better than that of Lysias on the same theme, and also different from his, if he may be allowed the use of a few commonplaces which all speakers must equally employ.

Phaedrus is delighted at the prospect of having another speech, and promises that he will set up a golden statue of Socrates at Delphi, if he keeps his word. Some raillery ensues, and at length Socrates, conquered by the threat that he shall never again hear a speech of Lysias unless he fulfils his promise, veils his face and begins.

First, invoking the Muses and assuming ironically the person of the non-lover (who is a lover all the same), he will inquire into the nature and power of love. For this is a necessary preliminary to the other question — How is the non-lover to be distinguished from the lover? In all of us there are two principles — a better and a worse — reason and desire, which are generally at war with one another; and the victory of the rational is called temperance, and the victory of the irrational intemperance or excess. The latter takes many forms and has many bad names — gluttony, drunkenness,

and the like. But of all the irrational desires or excesses the greatest is that which is led away by desires of a kindred nature to the enjoyment of personal beauty. And this is the master power of love.

Here Socrates fancies that he detects in himself an unusual flow of eloquence — this newly found gift he can only attribute to the inspiration of the place, which appears to be dedicated to the nymphs. Starting again from the philosophical basis which has been laid down, he proceeds to show how many advantages the non-lover has over the lover. The one encourages softness and effeminacy and exclusiveness; he cannot endure any superiority in his beloved; he will train him in luxury, he will keep him out of society, he will deprive him of parents, friends, money, knowledge, and of every other good, that he may have him all to himself. Then again his ways are not ways of pleasantness; he is mighty disagreeable; ‘crabbed age and youth cannot live together’. At every hour of the night and day he is intruding upon him; there is the same face, now devoid of youthful charm — and he is always repeating, in season or out of season, the praises or dispraises of his beloved, which are bad enough when he is sober, and published all over the world when he is drunk. At length his love ceases; he is converted into an enemy, and the spectacle may be seen of the lover running away from the beloved, who pursues him with vain reproaches, and demands his reward which the other refuses to pay. Too late the beloved learns, after all his pains and disagreeables, that ‘As wolves love lambs so lovers love their loves’. (cf. *Char.* 155d.) Here is the end; the ‘other’ or ‘non-lover’ part of the speech had better be understood, for if in the censure of the lover Socrates has broken out in verse, what will he not do in his praise of the non-lover? He has said his say and is preparing to go away.

Phaedrus begs him to remain, at any rate until the heat of noon has passed; he would like to have a little more conversation before they go. Socrates, who has risen, recognizes the oracular sign which forbids him to depart until he has done penance. His conscience has been awakened, and like Stesichorus when he had reviled the lovely Helen he will sing a palinode for having blasphemed the majesty of love. His palinode takes the form of a myth.

Socrates begins his tale with a glorification of madness, which he divides into four kinds; first, there is the art of divination or prophecy — this, in a vein similar to that pervading the *Cratylus* and *Ion*, he connects with madness by an etymological explanation (μαντική, μανική) — compare οἰονοιστική, οἰωνοιστική, ‘’tis all one reckoning, save the phrase is a little

245 variations'; secondly, there is the art of purification by mysteries; thirdly,
poetry or the inspiration of the Muses (cf. *Ion*, 533ff.), without which no
man can enter their temple. All this shows that madness is one of heaven's
blessings, and may sometimes be a great deal better than sense. There is also
a fourth kind of madness — that of love — which cannot be explained
without inquiring into the nature of the soul.

246 All soul is immortal, for she is the source of all motion both in herself and
in others. Her form may be described in a figure as a composite nature made
up of a charioteer and a pair of winged steeds. The steeds of the gods are
immortal, but ours are one mortal and the other immortal. The immortal
soul soars upwards into the heavens, but the mortal drops her plumes and
settles upon the earth.

Now the use of the wing is to rise and carry the downward element into
the upper world — there to behold beauty, wisdom, goodness, and the other
247 things of God by which the soul is nourished. On a certain day Zeus the lord
of heaven goes forth in a winged chariot; and an array of gods, and demi-
gods, and of human souls in their train, follows him. There are glorious and
blessed sights in the interior of heaven, and he who will may freely behold
them. The greatest vision of all is seen at the feast of the gods, when they
ascend the heights of the empyrean — all but Hestia, who is left at home to
keep house. The chariots of the gods glide readily upwards and stand upon
the outside; the revolution of the spheres carries them round, and they have
a vision of the world beyond. But the others labour in vain; for the mortal
steed, if he has not been properly trained, keeps them down and sinks them
towards the earth. Of the world which is beyond the heavens, who can tell?
There is an essence formless, colourless, intangible, perceived by the mind
only, dwelling in the region of true knowledge. The divine mind in her
revolution enjoys this fair prospect, and beholds justice, temperance, and
knowledge in their everlasting essence. When fulfilled with the sight of them
248 she returns home, and the charioteer puts up the horses in their stable, and
gives them ambrosia to eat and nectar to drink. This is the life of the gods;
the human soul tries to reach the same heights, but hardly succeeds; and
sometimes the head of the charioteer rises above, and sometimes sinks below,
the fair vision, and he is at last obliged, after much contention, to turn
away and leave the plain of truth. But if the soul has followed in the train of
her god and once beheld truth she is preserved from harm, and is carried
round in the next revolution of the spheres; and if always following, and
always seeing the truth, is then for ever unharmed. If, however, she drops

her wings and falls to the earth, then she takes the form of man, and the soul which has seen most of the truth passes into a philosopher or lover; that which has seen truth in the second degree, into a king or warrior; the third, into a householder or money-maker; the fourth, into a gymnast; the fifth, into a prophet or mystic; the sixth, into a poet or imitator; the seventh, into a husbandman or craftsman; the eighth, into a sophist or demagogue; the ninth, into a tyrant. All these are states of probation, wherein he who lives righteously is improved, and he who lives unrighteously deteriorates. After death comes the judgement; the bad depart to houses of correction under the earth, the good to places of joy in heaven. When a thousand years have elapsed the souls meet together and choose the lives which they will lead for another period of existence. The soul which three times in succession has chosen the life of a philosopher or of a lover who is not without philosophy receives her wings at the close of the third millennium; the remainder have to complete a cycle of ten thousand years before their wings are restored to them. Each time there is full liberty of choice. The soul of a man may 249 descend into a beast, and return again into the form of man. But the form of man will only be taken by the soul which has once seen truth and acquired some conception of the universal: — this is the recollection of the knowledge which she attained when in the company of the Gods. And men in general recall only with difficulty the things of another world, but the mind of the philosopher has a better remembrance of them. For when he beholds the visible beauty of earth his enraptured soul passes in thought to those glorious sights of justice and wisdom and temperance and truth which she once gazed 250 upon in heaven. Then she celebrated holy mysteries and beheld blessed apparitions shining in pure light, herself pure, and not as yet entombed in the body. And still, like a bird eager to quit its cage, she flutters and looks upwards, and is therefore deemed mad. Such a recollection of past days she receives through sight, the keenest of our senses, because beauty, alone of the ideas, has any representation on earth; wisdom is invisible to mortal eyes. But the corrupted nature, blindly excited by this vision of beauty, rushes on to enjoy, and would fain wallow like a brute beast in sensual 251 pleasures. Whereas the true mystic, who has seen the many sights of bliss, when he beholds a god-like form or face is amazed with delight, and if he were not afraid of being thought mad he would fall down and worship. Then the stiffened wing begins to relax and grow again; desire which has been imprisoned pours over the soul of the lover; the germ of the wing unfolds, and stings, and pangs of birth, like the cutting of teeth, are everywhere felt.

252 (Cf. *Symp.* 206ff.) Father and mother, and goods and laws and proprieties are nothing to him; his beloved is his physician, who can alone cure his pain. An apocryphal sacred writer says that the power which thus works in him is by mortals called love, but the immortals call him dove, or the winged one, in order to represent the force of his wings — such at any rate is his nature. Now the characters of lovers depend upon the god whom they followed in the other world; and they choose their loves in this world
253 accordingly. The followers of Ares are fierce and violent; those of Zeus seek out some philosophical and imperial nature; the attendants of Hera find a royal love; and in like manner the followers of every god seek a love who is like their god; and to him they communicate the nature which they have received from their god. The manner in which they take their love is as follows: —

I told you about the charioteer and his two steeds, the one a noble animal who is guided by word and admonition only, the other an ill-looking villain who will hardly yield to blow or spur. Together all three, who are a figure
254 of the soul, approach the vision of love. And now a fierce conflict begins. The ill-conditioned steed rushes on to enjoy, but the charioteer, who beholds the beloved with awe, falls back in adoration, and forces both the steeds on their haunches; again the evil steed rushes forwards and pulls shamelessly. The conflict grows more and more severe; and at last the charioteer, throwing himself backwards, forces the bit out of the clenched teeth of the brute, and pulling harder than ever at the reins, covers his tongue and jaws with blood, and forces him to rest his legs and haunches with pain upon the ground. When this has happened several times, the villain is tamed and humbled, and from that time forward the soul of the lover follows the
255 beloved in modesty and holy fear. And now their bliss is consummated; the same image of love dwells in the breast of either; and if they have self-control, they pass their lives in the greatest happiness which is attainable by man — they continue masters of themselves, and conquer in one of the three
256 heavenly victories. But if they choose the lower life of ambition they may still have a happy destiny, though inferior, because they have not the approval of the whole soul. At last they leave the body and proceed on their pilgrim's progress, and those who have once begun can never go back. When the time comes they receive their wings and fly away, and the lovers have the same wings.

Socrates concludes: —

257 These are the blessings of love, and thus have I made my recantation in

finer language than before; I did so in order to please Phaedrus. If I said what was wrong at first, please to attribute my error to Lysias, who ought to study philosophy instead of rhetoric, and then he will not mislead his disciple Phaedrus.

Phaedrus is afraid that he will lose conceit of Lysias, and that Lysias will be out of conceit with himself, and leave off making speeches, for the politicians have been deriding him. Socrates is of opinion that there is small danger of this; the politicians are themselves the great rhetoricians of the age, who desire to attain immortality by the authorship of laws. And therefore there is nothing with which they can reproach Lysias in being a writer; but there may be disgrace in being a bad one. 258

And what is good or bad writing or speaking? While the sun is hot in the sky above us, let us ask that question; since by rational conversation man lives, and not by the indulgence of bodily pleasures. And the grasshoppers who are chirruping around may carry our words to the Muses, who are their patronesses; for the grasshoppers were human beings themselves in a world before the Muses, and when the Muses came they died of hunger for the love of song. And they carry to them in heaven the report of those who honour them on earth. 259 260

The first rule of good speaking is to know and speak the truth; as a Spartan proverb says, 'true art is truth'; whereas rhetoric is an art of enchantment, which makes things appear good and evil, like and unlike, as the speaker pleases. Its use is not confined, as people commonly suppose, to arguments in the law courts and speeches in the assembly; it is rather a part of the art of disputation, under which are included both the rules of Gorgias and the eristic of Zeno. But it is not wholly devoid of truth. Superior knowledge enables us to deceive another by the help of resemblances, and to escape from such a deception when employed against ourselves. We see therefore that even in rhetoric an element of truth is required. For if we do not know the truth, we can neither make the gradual departures from truth by which men are most easily deceived, nor guard ourselves against deception. 261 262

Socrates then proposes that they shall use the two speeches as illustrations of the art of rhetoric; first distinguishing between the debatable and undisputed class of subjects. In the debatable class there ought to be a definition of all disputed matters. But there was no such definition in the speech of Lysias; nor is there any order or connexion in his words any more than in a nursery rhyme. With this he compares the regular divisions of the 263 264 265

other speech, which was his own (and yet not his own, for the local deities must have inspired him). Although only a playful composition, it will be
266 found to embody two principles: first, that of synthesis or the comprehension of parts in a whole; secondly, analysis, or the resolution of the whole into parts. These are the processes of division and generalization which are so dear to the dialectician, that king of men. They are effected by dialectic, and not by rhetoric, of which the remains are but scanty after order and arrangement have been subtracted. There is nothing left but a heap of
267 'ologies' and other technical terms invented by Polus, Theodorus, Evenus, Tisias, Gorgias, and others, who have rules for everything, and who teach how to be short or long at pleasure. Prodicus showed his good sense when he said that there was a better thing than either to be short or long, which was to be of convenient length.

268 Still, notwithstanding the absurdities of Polus and others, rhetoric has great power in public assemblies. This power, however, is not given by any technical rules, but is the gift of genius. The real art is always being
269 confused by rhetoricians with the preliminaries of the art. The perfection of oratory is like the perfection of anything else; natural power must be aided by art. But the art is not that which is taught in the schools of rhetoric; it is nearer akin to philosophy. Pericles, for instance, who was the most
270 accomplished of all speakers, derived his eloquence not from rhetoric but from the philosophy of nature which he learnt of Anaxagoras. True rhetoric
271 is like medicine, and the rhetorician has to consider the natures of men's souls as the physician considers the natures of their bodies. Such and such persons are to be affected in this way, such and such others in that; and he
272 must know the times and the seasons for saying this or that. This is not an easy task, and this, if there be such an art, is the art of rhetoric.

I know that there are some professors of the art who maintain probability
273 to be stronger than truth. But we maintain that probability is engendered by likeness of the truth which can only be attained by the knowledge of it, and
274 that the aim of the good man should not be to please or persuade his fellow servants, but to please his good masters who are the gods. Rhetoric has a fair beginning in this.

Enough of the art of speaking; let us now proceed to consider the true use of writing. There is an old Egyptian tale of Theuth, the inventor of writing,
275 showing his invention to the god Thamus, who told him that he would only spoil men's memories and take away their understandings. From this tale, of which young Athens will probably make fun, may be gathered the lesson that

writing is inferior to speech. For it is like a picture, which can give no answer to a question, and has only a deceitful likeness of a living creature. It has no power of adaptation, but uses the same words for all. It is not a legitimate son of knowledge, but a bastard, and when an attack is made upon this bastard neither parent nor anyone else is there to defend it. The husbandman will not seriously incline to sow his seed in such a hot-bed or garden of Adonis; he will rather sow in the natural soil of the human soul which has depth of earth; and he will anticipate the inner growth of the mind, by writing only, if at all, as a remedy against old age. The natural process will be far nobler, and will bring forth fruit in the minds of others as well as in his own.

The conclusion of the whole matter is just this, — that until a man knows the truth, and the manner of adapting the truth to the natures of other men, he cannot be a good orator; also, that the living is better than the written word, and that the principles of justice and truth when delivered by word of mouth are the legitimate offspring of a man's own bosom, and their lawful descendants take up their abode in others. Such an orator as he is who is possessed of them, you and I would fain become. And to all composers in the world, poets, orators, legislators, we hereby announce that if their compositions are based upon these principles, then they are not only poets, orators, legislators, but philosophers. All others are mere flatterers and putters together of words. This is the message which *Phaedrus* undertakes to carry to *Lysias* from the local deities, and *Socrates* himself will carry a similar message to his favourite *Isocrates*, whose future distinction as a great rhetorician he prophesies. The heat of the day has passed, and after offering up a prayer to *Pan* and the nymphs, *Socrates* and *Phaedrus* depart.

There are two principal controversies which have been raised about the *Phaedrus*; the first relates to the subject, the second to the date of the dialogue.

There seems to be a notion that the work of a great artist like *Plato* cannot fail in unity, and that the unity of a dialogue requires a single subject. But the conception of unity really applies in very different degrees and ways to different kinds of art; to a statue, for example, far more than to any kind of literary composition, and to some species of literature far more than to others. Nor does the dialogue appear to be a style of composition in which the requirement of unity is most stringent; nor should the idea of unity derived from one sort of art be hastily transferred to another. The double

titles of several of the Platonic dialogues are a further proof that the severer rule was not observed by Plato. The *Republic* is divided between the search after justice and the construction of the ideal state; the *Parmenides* between the criticism of the Platonic Ideas and of the Eleatic One or being; the *Gorgias* between the art of speaking and the nature of the good; the *Sophist* between the detection of the sophist and the correlation of ideas. The *Theaetetus*, the *Politicus*, and the *Philebus* have also digressions which are but remotely connected with the main subject.

Thus the comparison of Plato's other writings, as well as the reason of the thing, lead us to the conclusion that we must not expect to find one idea pervading a whole work, but one, two, or more, as the invention of the writer may suggest, or his fancy wander. If each dialogue were confined to the development of a single idea, this would appear on the face of the dialogue, nor could any controversy be raised as to whether the *Phaedrus* treated of love or rhetoric. But the truth is that Plato subjects himself to no rule of this sort. Like every great artist he gives unity of form to the different and apparently distracting topics which he brings together. He works freely and is not to be supposed to have arranged every part of the dialogue before he begins to write. He fastens or weaves together the frame of his discourse loosely and imperfectly, and which is the warp and which is the woof cannot always be determined.

The subjects of the *Phaedrus* (exclusive of the short introductory passage about mythology which is suggested by the local tradition) are first the false or conventional art of rhetoric; secondly, love or the inspiration of beauty and knowledge, which is described as madness; thirdly, dialectic or the art of composition and division; fourthly, the true rhetoric, which is based upon dialectic, and is neither the art of persuasion nor knowledge of the truth alone, but the art of persuasion founded on knowledge of truth and knowledge of character; fifthly, the superiority of the spoken over the written word. The continuous thread which appears and reappears throughout is rhetoric; this is the ground into which the rest of the dialogue is worked, in parts embroidered with fine words which are not in Socrates' manner, as he says, 'in order to please Phaedrus'. The speech of Lysias which has thrown Phaedrus into an ecstasy is adduced as an example of the false rhetoric; the first speech of Socrates, though an improvement, partakes of the same character; his second speech, which is full of that higher element said to have been learned of Anaxagoras by Pericles, and which in the midst of poetry does not forget order, is an illustration of the higher or true

rhetoric. This higher rhetoric is based upon dialectic, and dialectic is a sort of inspiration akin to love (cf. *Symp.* 210ff.); in these two aspects of philosophy the technicalities of rhetoric are absorbed. And so the example becomes also the deeper theme of discourse. The true knowledge of things in heaven and earth is based upon enthusiasm or love of the ideas going before us and ever present to us in this world and in another; and the true order of speech or writing proceeds accordingly. Love, again, has three degrees: first, of interested love corresponding to the conventionalities of rhetoric; secondly, of disinterested or mad love, fixed on objects of sense, and answering, perhaps, to poetry; thirdly, of disinterested love directed towards the unseen, answering to dialectic or the science of the ideas. Lastly, the art of rhetoric in the lower sense is found to rest on a knowledge of the natures and characters of men, which Socrates at the commencement of the dialogue has described as his own peculiar study.

Thus amid discord a harmony begins to appear; there are many links of connexion which are not visible at first sight. At the same time the *Phaedrus*, although one of the most beautiful of the Platonic dialogues, is also more irregular than any other. For insight into the world, for sustained irony, for depth of thought, there is no dialogue superior, or perhaps equal to it. Nevertheless the form of the work has tended to obscure some of Plato's higher aims.

The first speech is composed 'in that balanced style in which the wise love to talk' (*Symp.* 185c). The characteristics of rhetoric are insipidity, mannerism, and monotonous parallelism of clauses. There is more rhythm than reason; the creative power of imagination is wanting.

'Tis Greece, but living Greece no more.

Plato has seized by anticipation the spirit which hung over Greek literature for a thousand years afterwards. Yet doubtless there were some who, like *Phaedrus*, felt a delight in the harmonious cadence and the pedantic reasoning of the rhetoricians newly imported from Sicily, which had ceased to be awakened in them by really great works, such as the odes of Anacreon or Sappho or the orations of Pericles. That the first speech was really written by Lysias is improbable. Like the poem of Solon, or the story of Thamus and Theuth, or the funeral oration of Aspasia (if genuine), or the pretence of Socrates in the *Cratylus* that his knowledge of philology is derived from Euthyphro, the invention is really due to the imagination of Plato, and may