

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

(xv)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

PRE-SOKRATIC PHILOSOPHY.

CHAPTER I.

SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY IN GREECE, BEFORE AND IN THE TIME OF
SOKRATES.

	Page		Page
Change in the political condition of Greece during the life of Plato	1	The Monas—'Αρχή, or principle of Number — geometrical conception of number—symbolical attributes of the first ten numbers, especially of the Dekad . . .	12
Early Greek mind, satisfied with the belief in polytheistic personal agents, as the real producing causes of phenomena . . .	2	Pythagorean Kosmos and Astronomy — geometrical and harmonic laws guiding the movements of the cosmical bodies . .	<i>ib.</i>
Belief in such agency continued among the general public, even after the various sects of philosophy had arisen	3	Music of the Spheres	14
Thales, the first Greek who propounded the hypothesis of physical agency in place of personal. Water, the primordial substance, or ἀρχή	4	Pythagorean list of fundamental Contraries—Ten opposing pairs	15
Anaximander—laid down as ἀρχή the Infinite or Indeterminate—generation of the elements out of it, by evolution of latent, fundamental contraries—astronomical and geological doctrines	5	Eleatic philosophy—Xenophanes	16
Anaximenes—adopted Air as ἀρχή—rise of substances out of it, by condensation and rarefaction . .	7	His censures upon the received Theogony and religious rites . .	17
Pythagoras—his life and career—Pythagorean brotherhood—great political influence which it acquired among the Greco-Italian cities—incurred great enmity, and was violently put down . .	9	His doctrine of Pankosmism, or Pantheism—the whole Kosmos is Ens Unum or God—Ἐν καὶ Πᾶν. Non-Ens inadmissible . .	<i>ib.</i>
The Pythagoreans continue as a recluse sect, without political power	<i>ib.</i>	Scepticism of Xenophanes—complaint of philosophy as unsatisfactory	18
Doctrine of the Pythagoreans—Number the Essence of Things	10	His conjectures on physics and astronomy	19
		Parmenides continues the doctrine of Xenophanes—Ens Parmenideum, self-existent, eternal, unchangeable, extended—Non-Ens, an unmeaning phrase	20
		He recognises a region of opinion, phenomenal and relative, apart from Ens	21
		Parmenidean ontology—stands completely apart from phenomenology	22

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

xvi

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER I.—*continued.*

Page	Page
Parmenidean phenomenology — relative and variable	23
Parmenides recognises no truth, but more or less of probability, in phenomenal explanations.—His physical and astronomical conjectures	25
Herakleitus—his obscure style, impressive metaphors, confident and contemptuous dogmatism	27
Doctrine of Herakleitus—perpetual process of generation and destruction — everything flows, nothing stands—transition of the elements into each other backwards and forwards	28
Variety of metaphors employed by Herakleitus, signifying the same general doctrine	29
Nothing permanent except the law of process and implication of contraries — the transmutative force. Fixity of particulars is an illusion for the most part : so far as it exists, it is a sin against the order of Nature	30
Illustrations by which Herakleitus symbolized his perpetual force, destroying and generating	31
Water—intermediate between Fire (Air) and Earth	32
Sun and Stars—not solid bodies, but meteoric aggregations dissipated and renewed—Eclipses— <i>ἐκπύρωσις</i> , or destruction of the Kosmos by fire	33
His doctrines respecting the human soul and human knowledge. All wisdom resided in the Universal Reason — individual Reason is worthless	35
By Universal Reason, he did not mean the Reason of most men as it is, but as it ought to be	37
Herakleitus at the opposite pole from Parmenides	38
Empedokles—his doctrine of the four elements and two moving or restraining forces	39
Construction of the Kosmos from these elements and forces—action and counteraction of love and enmity. The Kosmos alternately made and unmade	40
Empedoklean predestined cycle of things—complete empire of Love — Sphærus—Empire of Enmity —disengagement or separation of the elements—astronomy and meteorology	41
Formation of the Earth, of Gods, men, animals, and plants	43
Physiology of Empedokles—Procreation — Respiration — movement of the blood	45
Doctrine of effluvia and pores— explanation of perceptions—intercommunication of the elements with the sentient subject —like acting upon like	46
Sense of vision	47
Senses of hearing, smell, taste	<i>ib.</i>
Empedokles declared that justice absolutely forbade the killing of anything that had life. His belief in the metempsychosis. Sufferings of life, are an expiation for wrong done during an antecedent life. Pretensions to magical power	48
Complaint of Empedokles on the impossibility of finding out truth	49
Theory of Anaxagoras—denied generation and destruction—recognises only mixture and severance of pre-existing kinds of matter	50
Homœomerics—small particles of diverse kinds of matter, all mixed together	<i>ib.</i>
First condition of things—all the primordial varieties of matter were huddled together in confusion. <i>Noûs</i> or reason distinct from all of them, supervened and acted upon this confused mass, setting the constituent particles in movement	51
Movement of rotation in the mass, originated by <i>Noûs</i> on a small scale, but gradually extending itself. Like particles congregate together—distinguishable aggregates are formed	52
Nothing (except <i>Noûs</i>) can be entirely pure or unmixed; but other things may be comparatively pure. Flesh, Bone, &c. are purer than Air or Earth	53
Theory of Anaxagoras, compared with that of Empedokles	54
Suggested partly by the phenomena of animal nutrition	55
Chaos common to both Empedokles and Anaxagoras: moving agency, different in one from the other theory	56

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

xvii

CHAPTER I.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Noûs, or mind, postulated by Anaxagoras—how understood by later writers—how intended by Anaxagoras himself	56	All properties of objects, except weight and hardness, were phenomenal and relative to the observer. Sensation could give no knowledge of the real and absolute	74
Plato and Aristotle blame Anaxagoras for deserting his own theory	58	Reason alone gave true and real knowledge, but very little of it was attainable	75
Astronomy and physics of Anaxagoras	59	No separate force required to set the atoms in motion—they moved by an inherent force of their own. Like atoms naturally tend towards like. Rotatory motion, the capital fact of the Kosmos	76
His geology, meteorology, physiology	60	Researches of Demokritus on zoology and animal generation	78
The doctrines of Anaxagoras were regarded as offensive and impious	62	His account of mind—he identified it with heat or fire, diffused throughout animals, plants, and nature generally. Mental particles intermingled throughout all frame with corporeal particles	<i>ib.</i>
Diogenes of Apollonia recognises one primordial element	<i>ib.</i>	Different mental aptitudes attached to different parts of the body . .	79
Air was the primordial, universal element	63	Explanation of different sensations and perceptions. Colours	80
Air possessed numerous and diverse properties; was eminently modifiable	64	Vision caused by the outflow of effluvia or images from objects. Hearing	81
Physiology of Diogenes—his description of the veins in the human body	65	Difference of tastes—how explained	82
Kosmology and Meteorology . .	66	Thought or intelligence—was produced by influx of atoms from without	83
Leukippus and Demokritus—Atomic theory	68	Sensation, obscure knowledge relative to the sentient: Thought, genuine knowledge—absolute, or object per se	84
Long life, varied travels, and numerous compositions, of Demokritus	<i>ib.</i>	Idola or images were thrown off from objects, which determined the tone of thoughts, feelings, dreams, divinations, &c.	85
Relation between the theory of Demokritus and that of Parmenides	69	Universality of Demokritus—his ethical views	<i>ib.</i>
Demokritean theory—Atoms—Plena and Vacua—Ens and Non-Ens	70		
Primordial atoms differed only in magnitude, figure, position, and arrangement—they had no qualities, but their movements and combinations generated qualities	72		
Combinations of atoms—generating different qualities in the compound	73		
All atoms essentially separate from each other	74		

CHAPTER II.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE EARLIER PHILOSOPHERS—GROWTH OF DIALECTIC—ZENO AND GORGIAS.

Variety of sects and theories—multiplicity of individual authorities is the characteristic of Greek philosophy	87	which have been lost. Importance of the information of Aristotle about them	88
These early theorists are not known from their own writings,		Abundance of speculative genius and invention—a memorable fact in the Hellenic mind	89

VOL. I.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

xviii

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER II.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Difficulties which a Grecian philosopher had to overcome—prevalent view of Nature, established, impressive, and misleading ..	89	place—Grain of millet not sonorous	99
Views of the Ionic philosophers—compared with the more recent abstractions of Plato and Aristotle	90	Zenonian arguments in regard to motion	100
Parmenides and Pythagoras—more nearly akin to Plato and Aristotle	93	General purpose and result of the Zenonian Dialectic. Nothing is knowable except the relative ..	102
Advantage derived from this variety of constructive imagination among the Greeks	<i>ib.</i>	Mistake of supposing Zeno's <i>reductions ad absurdum</i> of an opponent's doctrine, to be contradictions of data generalized from experience	103
All these theories were found in circulation by Sokrates, Zeno, Plato, and the dialecticians. Importance of the scrutiny of negative Dialectic	94	Zenonian Dialectic—Platonic Parmenides	104
The early theorists were studied, along with Plato and Aristotle, in the third and second centuries B.C.	96	Views of historians of philosophy, respecting Zeno	<i>ib.</i>
Negative attribute common to all the early theorists—little or no dialectic	<i>ib.</i>	Absolute and relative—the first, unknowable	105
Zeno of Elea—Melissus	<i>ib.</i>	Zeno did not deny motion, as a fact, phenomenal and relative ..	106
Zeno's Dialectic—he refuted the opponents of Parmenides, by showing that their assumptions led to contradictions and absurdities	97	Gorgias the Leontine—did not admit the Absolute, even as conceived by Parmenides	107
Consequences of their assumption of Entia Plura Discontinua. Reductiones ad absurdum ..	98	His reasonings against the Absolute, either as Entia	<i>ib.</i>
Each thing must exist in its own		Ens, incogitable and unknowable	108
		Ens, even if granted to be knowable, is still incommunicable to others	<i>ib.</i>
		Zeno and Gorgias—contrasted with the earlier Grecian philosophers	109
		New character of Grecian philosophy—antithesis of affirmative and negative—proof and disproof	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER III.

LIFE OF PLATO.

Scanty information about Plato's life	113	Plato as a teacher—pupils numerous and wealthy, from different cities	123
His birth, parentage, and early education	114	Visit of Plato to the younger Dionysius at Syracuse, 367 B.C. Second visit to the same—mortifying failure	126
Early relations of Plato with Sokrates	115	Expedition of Dion against Dionysius—sympathies of Plato and the Academy	127
Plato's youth—service as a citizen and soldier	117	Success, misconduct, and death of Dion	<i>ib.</i>
Period of political ambition	118	Death of Plato, aged 80, 347 B.C. ..	<i>ib.</i>
He becomes disgusted with politics	119	Scholars of Plato—Aristotle ..	128
He retires from Athens after the death of Sokrates—his travels	120	Little known about Plato's personal history	130
His permanent establishment at Athens—386 B.C.	121		
He commences his teaching at the Academy	122		

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

xix

CHAPTER IV.

PLATONIC CANON, AS RECOGNISED BY THRASYLLUS.

	Page		Page
Platonic Canon—Ancient and modern discussions	132	Proceedings of Demetrius in beginning to collect the library ..	150
Canon established by Thrasyllus. Presumption in its favour ..	133	Certainty that the works of Plato and Aristotle were among the earliest acquisitions made by him for the library	151
Fixed residence and school at Athens—founded by Plato and transmitted to successors	<i>ib.</i>	Large expenses incurred by the Ptolemies for procuring good MSS.	154
Importance of this foundation. Preservation of Plato's manuscripts. School library	134	Catalogue of Platonic works, prepared by Aristophanes, is trustworthy	<i>ib.</i>
Security provided by the school for distinguishing what were Plato's genuine writings	136	No canonical or exclusive order of the Platonic dialogues, when arranged by Aristophanes ..	155
Unfinished fragments and preparatory sketches, preserved and published after Plato's death ..	<i>ib.</i>	Other libraries and literary centres, besides Alexandria, in which spurious Platonic works might get footing	<i>ib.</i>
Peripatetic school at the Lykeum—its composition and arrangement	137	Other critics, besides Aristophanes, proposed different arrangements of the Platonic dialogues ..	156
Peripatetic school library, its removal from Athens to Sképsis—its ultimate restitution in a damaged state to Athens, then to Rome	138	Panætius, the Stoic—considered the Phædon to be spurious—earliest known example of a Platonic dialogue disallowed upon internal grounds	157
Inconvenience to the Peripatetic school from the loss of its library	139	Classification of Platonic works by the rhetor Thrasyllus—dramatic—philosophical	158
Advantage to the Platonic school from having preserved its MSS.	140	Dramatic principle—Tetralogies ..	<i>ib.</i>
Conditions favourable, for preserving the genuine works of Plato	141	Philosophical principle—Dialogues of Search—Dialogues of Exposition	160
Historical facts as to their preservation	<i>ib.</i>	Incongruity and repugnance of the two classifications	163
Arrangement of them into Trilogies, by Aristophanes	<i>ib.</i>	Dramatic principle of classification—was inherited by Thrasyllus from Aristophanes	164
Aristophanes, librarian at the Alexandrine library	142	Authority of the Alexandrine library—editions of Plato published, with the Alexandrine critical marks	<i>ib.</i>
Plato's works in the Alexandrine library, before the time of Aristophanes	<i>ib.</i>	Thrasyllus followed the Alexandrine library and Aristophanes, as to genuine Platonic works ..	165
Kallimachus—predecessor of Aristophanes—his published Tables of authors whose works were in the library	143	Ten spurious dialogues, rejected by all other critics as well as by Thrasyllus—evidence that these critics followed the common authority of the Alexandrine library	166
Large and rapid accumulation of the Alexandrine Library	144	Thrasyllus did not follow an internal sentiment of his own in rejecting dialogues as spurious	167
Plato's works—in the library at the time of Kallimachus	<i>ib.</i>	Results as to the trustworthiness of the Thrasyllian Canon	168
First formation of the library—intended as a copy of the Platonic and Aristotelian <i>Μουσεία</i> at Athens	146		
Favour of Ptolemy Soter towards the philosophers at Athens ..	147		
Demetrius Phalereus—his history and character	148		
He was chief agent in the first establishment of the Alexandrine Library	149		

b 2

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

XX

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER V.

PLATONIC CANON AS APPRECIATED AND MODIFIED BY MODERN CRITICS.

Page	Page		
The Canon of Thrasyllus continued to be generally acknowledged, by the Neo-Platonists, as well as by Ficinus and the succeeding critics after the revival of learning	170	Susemihl—coincides to a great degree with K. F. Hermann—his order of arrangement	180
Serranus—his six Syzygies—left the aggregate Canon unchanged. Tennemann—importance assigned to the Phædrus	171	Edward Munk—adopts a different principle of arrangement, founded upon the different period which each dialogue exhibits of the life, philosophical growth, and old age, of Sokrates—his arrangement, founded on this principle. He distinguishes the chronological order of composition from the place allotted to each dialogue in the systematic plan	181
Schleiermacher—new theory about the purposes of Plato. One philosophical scheme, conceived by Plato from the beginning—essential order and interdependence of the dialogues, as contributing to the full execution of this scheme. Some dialogues not constituent items in the series, but lying alongside of it. Order of arrangement	172	Views of Ueberweg—attempt to reconcile Schleiermacher and Hermann—admits the preconceived purpose for the later dialogues, composed after the foundation of the school, but not for the earlier	182
Theory of Ast—he denies the reality of any preconceived scheme—considers the dialogues as distinct philosophical dramas	173	His opinions as to authenticity and chronology of the dialogues. He rejects Hippias Major, Erastæ, Theagês, Kleitophon, Parmenidês: he is inclined to reject Euthyphron and Menexenus	184
His order of arrangement. He admits only fourteen dialogues as genuine, rejecting all the rest	175	Other Platonic critics—great dissensions about scheme and order of the dialogues	185
Socher agrees with Ast in denying preconceived scheme—his arrangement of the dialogues, differing from both Ast and Schleiermacher—he rejects as spurious Parmenidês, Sophistês, Politikus, Kritias, with many others	<i>ib.</i>	Contrast of different points of view instructive—but no solution has been obtained	186
Schleiermacher and Ast both consider Phædrus and Protagoras as early compositions—Socher puts Protagoras into the second period, Phædrus into the third	176	The problem incapable of solution. Extent and novelty of the theory propounded by Schleiermacher—slenderness of his proofs	<i>ib.</i>
K. F. Hermann—Stallbaum—both of them consider the Phædrus as a late dialogue—both of them deny preconceived order and system—their arrangements of the dialogues—they admit new and varying philosophical points of view	<i>ib.</i>	Schleiermacher's hypothesis includes a preconceived scheme, and a peremptory order of interdependence among the dialogues	187
They reject several dialogues	179	Assumptions of Schleiermacher respecting the Phædrus inadmissible	188
Steinhart—agrees in rejecting Schleiermacher's fundamental postulate—his arrangement of the dialogues—considers the Phædrus as late in order—rejects several	<i>ib.</i>	Neither Schleiermacher, nor any other critic, has as yet produced any tolerable proof for an internal theory of the Platonic dialogues	189
		Munk's theory is the most ambitious, and the most gratuitous, next to Schleiermacher's	190

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

xxi

CHAPTER V.—*continued.*

Page	Page		
The age assigned to Sokrates in any dialogue is a circumstance of little moment	190	Reasons, founded on the early life, character, and position of Plato	200
No intentional sequence or interdependence of the dialogues can be made out	191	Plato's early life—active by necessity, and to some extent ambitious	201
Principle of arrangement adopted by Hermann is reasonable—successive changes in Plato's point of view: but we cannot explain either the order or the causes of these changes	192	Plato did not retire from political life until after the restoration of the democracy, nor devote himself to philosophy until after the death of Sokrates	204
Hermann's view more tenable than Schleiermacher's	193	All Plato's dialogues were composed during the fifty-one years after the death of Sokrates	205
Small number of certainties, or even reasonable presumptions, as to date or order of the dialogues	194	The Thrasyllean Canon is more worthy of trust than the modern critical theories by which it has been condemned	206
Trilogies indicated by Plato himself	195	Unsafe grounds upon which those theories proceed	<i>ib.</i>
Positive dates of all the dialogues—unknown	196	Opinions of Schleiermacher, tending to show this	207
When did Plato begin to compose? Not till after the death of Sokrates	<i>ib.</i>	Any true theory of Plato must recognise all his varieties, and must be based upon all the works in the Canon, not upon some to the exclusion of the rest	210
Reasons for this opinion. Labour of the composition—does not consist with youth of the author	197		
Reasons founded on the personality of Sokrates, and his relations with Plato	199		

CHAPTER VI.

PLATONIC COMPOSITIONS GENERALLY.

Variety and abundance visible in Plato's writings	212	They were delivered to miscellaneous auditors. They coincide mainly with what Aristotle states about the Platonic Ideas	218
Plato both sceptical and dogmatical	<i>ib.</i>	The lectures De Bono may perhaps have been more transcendental than Plato's other lectures	219
Poetical vein predominant in some compositions, but not in all	213	Plato's Epistles—in them only he speaks in his own person	220
Form of dialogue—universal to this extent, that Plato never speaks in his own name	214	Intentional obscurity of his Epistles in reference to philosophical doctrine	221
No one common characteristic pervading all Plato's works	<i>ib.</i>	Letters of Plato to Dionysius II. about philosophy. His anxiety to confine philosophy to discussion among select and prepared minds	222
The real Plato was not merely a writer of dialogues, but also lecturer and president of a school. In this last important function he is scarcely at all known to us. Notes of his lectures taken by Aristotle	216	He refuses to furnish any written, authoritative exposition of his own philosophical doctrine	223
Plato's lectures De Bono obscure and transcendental. Effect which they produced on the auditors	218	He illustrates his doctrine by the successive stages of geometrical	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

xxii

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER VI.—*continued*.

	Page		Page
teaching. Difficulty to avoid the creeping in of error at each of these stages	224	to all alike—follow a process devious as well as fruitless	237
No written exposition can keep clear of these chances of error	226	The questioner has no predetermined course, but follows the lead given by the respondent in his answers	238
Relations of Plato with Dionysius II. and the friends of the deceased Dion. Pretensions of Dionysius to understand and expound Plato's doctrines	<i>ib.</i>	Relation of teacher and learner. Appeal to authority is suppressed	239
Impossibility of teaching by written exposition assumed by Plato; the assumption intelligible in his day	227	In the modern world the search for truth is put out of sight. Every writer or talker professes to have already found it, and to proclaim it to others	240
Standard by which Plato tested the efficacy of the expository process. —Power of sustaining a Sokratic cross-examination	229	The search for truth by various interlocutors was a recognised process in the Sokratic age. Acute negative Dialectic of Sokrates	241
Plato never published any of the lectures which he delivered at the Academy	230	Negative procedure supposed to be represented by the Sophists and the Megarici; discouraged and censured by historians of philosophy	242
Plato would never publish his philosophical opinions in his own name; but he may have published them in the dialogues under the names of others	<i>ib.</i>	Vocation of Sokrates and Plato for the negative procedure: absolute necessity of it as a condition of reasoned truth. Parmenidés of Plato	243
Groups into which the dialogues admit of being thrown	232	Sokrates considered the negative procedure to be valuable by itself, and separately. His theory of the natural state of the human mind; not ignorance, but false persuasion of knowledge	244
Distribution made by Thrasylus defective, but still useful—Dialogues of Search, Dialogues of Exposition	<i>ib.</i>	Declaration of Sokrates in the Apology; his constant mission to make war against the false persuasion of knowledge	245
Dialogues of Exposition—present affirmative result. Dialogues of Search are wanting in that attribute	233	Opposition of feeling between Sokrates and the Dikasts	246
The distribution coincides mainly with that of Aristotle—Dialectic, Demonstrative	<i>ib.</i>	The Dialogues of Search present an end in themselves. Mistake of supposing that Plato had in his mind an ulterior affirmative end, not declared	<i>ib.</i>
Classification of Thrasylus in its details. He applies his own principles erroneously	234	False persuasion of knowledge—had reference to topics social, political, ethical	247
The classification, as it would stand, if his principles were applied correctly	236	To those topics, on which each community possesses established dogmas, laws, customs, sentiments, consecrated and traditional, peculiar to itself. The local creed, which is never formally proclaimed or taught, but is enforced unconsciously by every one upon every one else.	
Preponderance of the searching and testing dialogues over the expository and dogmatical	<i>ib.</i>		
Dialogues of Search—sub-classes among them recognised by Thrasylus—Gymnastic and Agonistic, &c.	<i>ib.</i>		
Philosophy, as now understood, includes authoritative teaching, positive results, direct proofs	237		
The Platonic Dialogues of Search disclaim authority and teaching—assume truth to be unknown			

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

xxiii

CHAPTER VI.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Omnipotence of King Nomos ..	248	raised. The affirmative and negative veins are in him completely distinct. His dogmas are enunciations <i>à priori</i> of some impressive sentiment	270
Small minority of exceptional individual minds, who do not yield to the established orthodoxy, but insist on exercising their own judgment	253	Hypothesis—that Plato had solved all his own difficulties for himself; but that he communicated the solution only to a few select auditors in oral lectures—Untenable	272
Early appearance of a few free-judging individuals, or free-thinkers in Greece	255	Characteristic of the oral lectures—That they were delivered in Plato's own name. In what other respects they departed from the dialogues, we cannot say	273
Rise of Dialectic—Effect of the Drama and the Dikastery ..	256	Apart from any result, Plato has an interest in the process of search and debate <i>per se</i> . Protracted enquiry is a valuable privilege, not a tiresome obligation	274
Application of Negative scrutiny to ethical and social topics by Sokrates	<i>ib.</i>	Plato has done more than any one else to make the process of enquiry interesting to others, as it was to himself	276
Emphatic assertion by Sokrates of the right of satisfaction for his own individual reason	257	Process of generalisation always kept in view and illustrated throughout the Platonic Dialogues of Search—general terms and propositions made subjects of conscious analysis	277
Aversion of the Athenian public to the negative procedure of Sokrates. Mistake of supposing that that negative procedure belongs peculiarly to the Sophists and the Megarici	258	The Dialogues must be reviewed as Distinct compositions by the same author, illustrating each other, but without assignable inter-dependence	278
The same charges which the historians of philosophy bring against the Sophists were brought by contemporary Athenians against Sokrates. They represent the standing dislike of free inquiry, usual with an orthodox public ..	259	Order of the Dialogues, chosen for bringing them under separate review. Apology will come first; Timæus, Kritias, Leges, Epinomis, last	279
Aversion towards Sokrates aggravated by his extreme publicity of speech. His declaration, that false persuasion of knowledge is universal; must be understood as a basis in appreciating Plato's Dialogues of Search	264	Kriton and Euthyphron come immediately after Apology. The intermediate dialogues present no convincing grounds for any determinate order	<i>ib.</i>
Result called <i>Knowledge</i> , which Plato aspires to. Power of going through a Sokratic cross-examination; not attainable except through the Platonic process and method	267		
Platonic process adapted to Platonic topics—man and society	269		
Plato does not provide solutions for the difficulties which he has			

CHAPTER VII.

APOLOGY OF SOKRATES.

The Apology is the real defence delivered by Sokrates before the Dikasts, reported by Plato, without intentional transformation ..	281	Even if it be Plato's own composition, it comes naturally first in the review of his dialogues ..	282
		General character of the Apo-	

CHAPTER VII.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
logy — Sentiments entertained towards Sokrates at Athens ..	283	—exemplified by Plato throughout the Dialogues of Search— Xenophon and Plato enlarge it ..	290
Declaration from the Delphian oracle respecting the wisdom of Sokrates, interpreted by him as a mission to cross-examine the citizens generally—The oracle is proved to be true	284	Assumption by modern critics, that Sokrates is a positive teacher, employing indirect methods for the inculcation of theories of his own	291
False persuasion of wisdom is universal—the God alone is wise ..	285	Incorrectness of such assumption —the Sokratic Elenchus does not furnish a solution, but works upon the mind of the respondent, stimulating him to seek for a solution of his own	292
Emphatic assertion by Sokrates of the cross-examining mission imposed upon him by the God ..	286	Value and importance of this process—stimulating active individual minds to theorise each for itself	293
He had devoted his life to the execution of this mission, and he intended to persevere in spite of obloquy or danger	287	View taken by Sokrates about death. Other men profess to know what it is, and think it a great misfortune: he does not know	<i>ib.</i>
He disclaims the function of a teacher—he cannot teach, for he is not wiser than others. He differs from others by being conscious of his own ignorance ..	288	Reliance of Sokrates on his own individual reason, whether agreeing or disagreeing with others ..	295
He does not know where competent teachers can be found. He is perpetually seeking for them, but in vain	<i>ib.</i>	Formidable efficacy of established public beliefs, generated without any ostensible author	<i>ib.</i>
Impression made by the Platonic Apology on Zeno the Stoic ..	289		
Extent of efficacious influence claimed by Sokrates for himself			

CHAPTER VIII.

KRITON.

General purpose of the Kriton ..	297	by the Laws of Athens to Sokrates, demanding from him implicit obedience	300
Subject of the dialogue—interlocutors	<i>ib.</i>	Purpose of Plato in this pleading —to present the dispositions of Sokrates in a light different from that which the Apology had presented—unqualified submission instead of defiance	301
Answer of Sokrates to the appeal made by Kriton	298	Harangue of Sokrates, delivered in the name of the Laws, would have been applauded by all the democratical patriots of Athens	302
He declares that the judgment of the general public is not worthy of trust: he appeals to the judgment of the one Expert, who is wise on the matter in debate ..	298	The harangue insists upon topics common to Sokrates with other citizens, overlooking the specialties of his character	303
Principles laid down by Sokrates for determining the question with Kriton. Is the proceeding recommended just or unjust? Never in any case to act unjustly	299	Still Sokrates is represented as adopting the resolution to obey, from his own conviction; by a reason which weighs with him,	
Sokrates admits that few will agree with him, and that most persons hold the opposite opinion: but he affirms that the point is cardinal	<i>ib.</i>		
Pleading supposed to be addressed			

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

XXV

CHAPTER VIII.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
but which would not weigh with others	304	to the emotions, but overlooks the ratiocinative difficulties, or supposes them to be solved	306
The harangue is not a corollary from this Sokratic reason, but represents feelings common among Athenian citizens	<i>ib.</i>	Incompetence of the general public or <i>idiōtai</i> —appeal to the professional Expert	307
Emphatic declaration of the authority of individual reason and conscience, for the individual himself	<i>ib.</i>	Procedure of Sokrates after this comparison has been declared—he does not name who the trustworthy Expert is	308
The Kriton is rhetorical, not dialectical. Difference between Rhetoric and Dialectic	305	Sokrates acts as the Expert himself: he finds authority in his own reason and conscience	<i>ib.</i>
The Kriton makes powerful appeal			

CHAPTER IX.

EUTHYPHRON.

Situation supposed in the dialogue—interlocutors	310	Such mistake frequent in dialectic discussion	317
Indictment by Melētus against Sokrates—Antipathy of the Athenians towards those who spread heretical opinions	<i>ib.</i>	First general answer given by Euthyphron—that which is pleasing to the Gods is Holy. Comments of Sokrates thereon	318
Euthyphron recounts that he is prosecuting an indictment for murder against his own father—Displeasure of his friends at the proceeding	311	To be loved by the Gods is not the essence of the Holy—they love it because it is holy. In what then does its essence consist? Perplexity of Euthyphron	319
Euthyphron expresses full confidence that this step of his is both required and warranted by piety or holiness. Sokrates asks him—what is Holiness?	312	Sokrates suggests a new answer. The Holy is one branch or variety of the Just. It is that branch which concerns ministration by men to the Gods	320
Euthyphron alludes to the punishment of Uranus by his son Kronus, and of Kronus by his son Zeus	313	Ministration to the Gods? How? To what purpose?	<i>ib.</i>
Sokrates intimates his own hesitation in believing these stories of discord among the Gods. Euthyphron declares his full belief in them, as well as in many similar narratives, not in so much circulation	313	Holiness—rectitude in sacrifice and prayer—right traffic between men and the Gods	321
Bearing of this dialogue on the relative positions of Sokrates and the Athenian public	314	This will not stand—the Gods gain nothing—they receive from men marks of honour and gratitude—they are pleased therewith—the Holy therefore must be that which is pleasing to the Gods	322
Dramatic moral set forth by Aristophanes against Sokrates and the freethinkers, is here retorted by Plato against the orthodox champion	315	This is the same explanation which was before declared insufficient. A fresh explanation is required from Euthyphron. He breaks off the dialogue	<i>ib.</i>
Sequel of the dialogue—Euthyphron gives a particular example as the reply to a general question	317	Sokratic spirit of the dialogue—confessed ignorance applying the Elenchus to false persuasion of knowledge	<i>ib.</i>

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

xxvi

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER IX.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
The questions always difficult, often impossible to answer. Sokrates is unable to answer them, though he exposes the bad answers of others	322	Gods—this is true, but is not its constituent essence	327
Objections of Theopompus to the Platonic procedure	324	Views of the Xenophontic Sokrates respecting the Holy—different from those of the Platonic Sokrates—he disallows any common absolute general type of the Holy—he recognises an indefinite variety of types, discordant and relative	328
Objective view of Ethics, distinguished by Sokrates from the subjective	<i>ib.</i>	The Holy a branch of the Just—not tenable as a definition, but useful as bringing to view the subordination of logical terms	329
Subjective unanimity coincident with objective dissent	325	The Euthyphron represents Plato's way of replying to the charge of impiety, preferred by Melétus against Sokrates—comparison with Xenophon's way of replying	<i>ib.</i>
Cross-examination brought to bear upon this mental condition by Sokrates—position of Sokrates and Plato in regard to it	326		
The Holy—it has an essential characteristic—what is this?—not the fact that it is loved by the			

CHAPTER X.

ALKIBIADES I. AND II.

Situation supposed in the dialogue. Persons—Sokrates and Alkibiades	331	kibiades is going to advise the Athenians about what he does not know himself	335
Exorbitant hopes and political ambition of Alkibiades	332	Answer farther amended. The Athenians do not generally debate about just or unjust—which they consider plain to every one—but about expedient and inexpedient, which are not coincident with just and unjust. But neither does Alkibiades know the expedient. He asks Sokrates to explain. Sokrates declines: he can do nothing but question	336
Questions put by Sokrates, in reference to Alkibiades in his intended function as adviser of the Athenians. What does he intend to advise them upon? What has he learnt, and what does he know	<i>ib.</i>	Comment on the preceding.—Socratic method—the respondent makes the discoveries for himself	337
Alkibiades intends to advise the Athenians on questions of war and peace. Questions of Sokrates thereupon. We must fight those whom it is better to fight—to what standard does better refer? To just and unjust	333	Alkibiades is brought to admit that whatever is just, is good, honourable, expedient: and that whoever acts honourably, both does well, and procures for himself happiness thereby. Equivocal reasoning of Sokrates	<i>ib.</i>
How, or from whom, has Alkibiades learnt to discern or distinguish Just and Unjust? He never learnt it from any one; he always knew it, even as a boy	334	Humiliation of Alkibiades. Other Athenian statesmen are equally ignorant. But the real opponents, against whom Alkibiades is to measure himself, are,	
Answer amended. Alkibiades learnt it from the multitude, as he learnt to speak Greek.—The multitude cannot teach just and unjust, for they are at variance among themselves about it. Al-			

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

xxvii

CHAPTER X.—*continued.*

Page	Page
the kings of Sparta and Persia. Eulogistic description of those kings. To match them, Alkibiades must make himself as good as possible	338
But good—for what end, and under what circumstances? Abundant illustrative examples	339
Alkibiades, puzzled and humiliated, confesses his ignorance. Encouragement given by Sokrates. It is an advantage to make such discovery in youth	340
Platonic Dialectic—its actual effect—its anticipated effect—applicable to the season of youth	<i>ib.</i>
Know Thyself—Delphian maxim—its urgent importance—What is myself? My mind is myself	<i>ib.</i>
I cannot know myself, except by looking into another mind. Self-knowledge is temperance. Temperance and Justice are the conditions both of happiness and of freedom	342
Alkibiades feels himself unworthy to be free, and declares that he will never quit Sokrates	<i>ib.</i>
Second Alkibiadés—situation supposed	343
Danger of mistake in praying to the Gods for gifts which may prove mischievous. Most men are unwise. Unwise is the generic word: madmen, a particular variety under it	<i>ib.</i>
Relation between a generic term, and the specific terms comprehended under it, was not then familiar	344
Frequent cases, in which men pray for supposed benefits, and find that when obtained, they are misfortunes. Every one fancies that he knows what is beneficial: mischiefs of ignorance	<i>ib.</i>
Mistake in predications about ignorance generally. We must discriminate. Ignorance of <i>what?</i> Ignorance of good, is always mischievous: ignorance of other things, not always	345
Wise public counsellors are few. Upon what ground do we call these few wise? Not because they possess merely special arts or accomplishments, but because	
they know, besides, upon what occasions, and under what limits each of these accomplishments ought to be used	345
Special accomplishments, without the knowledge of the good or profitable, are oftener hurtful than beneficial	346
It is unsafe for Alkibiades to proceed with his sacrifice, until he has learnt what is the proper language to address to the Gods. He renounces his sacrifice, and throws himself upon the counsel of Sokrates	347
Different critical opinions respecting these two dialogues	348
Grounds for disallowing them—less strong against the Second than against the First	<i>ib.</i>
The supposed grounds for disallowance are in reality only marks of inferiority	349
The two dialogues may probably be among Plato's earlier compositions	350
Analogy with various dialogues in the Xenophontic Memorabilia—Purpose of Sokrates to humble presumptuous young men	351
Fitness of the name and character of Alkibiades for idealising this feature in Sokrates	352
Plato's manner of replying to the accusers of Sokrates. Magical influence ascribed to the conversation of Sokrates	354
The purpose proclaimed by Sokrates in the Apology is followed out in Alkibiadés I. Warfare against the false persuasion of knowledge	355
Difficulties multiplied for the purpose of bringing Alkibiades to a conviction of his own ignorance	356
Sokrates furnishes no means of solving these difficulties. He exhorts to Justice and Virtue—but these are acknowledged Incognita	357
Prolixity of Alkibiadés I.—Extreme multiplication of illustrative examples—How explained	<i>ib.</i>
Alkibiadés II. leaves its problem avowedly undetermined	358
Sokrates commends the practice of praying to the Gods for favours undefined—his views about the	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

xxviii

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER X.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
semi-regular, semi-irregular agency of the Gods—he prays to them for premonitory warnings	359	Good itself is indispensable; without that, the knowledge of other things is more hurtful than beneficial	360
Comparison of Alkibiadēs II. with the Xenophontic Memorabilia, especially the conversation of Sokrates with Euthydemus. Sokrates not always consistent with himself	360	Knowledge of Good—appears postulated and divined, in many of the Platonic dialogues, under different titles	362
Remarkable doctrine of Alkibiadēs II.—that knowledge is not always Good. The knowledge of		The Good—the Profitable—what is it?—How are we to know it? Plato leaves this undetermined	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER XI.

HIPPIAS MAJOR — HIPPIAS MINOR.

Hippias Major—situation supposed—character of the dialogue. Sarcasm and mockery against Hippias	364	name of a friend in the background, who has just been puzzling him with it—What is the Beautiful?	371
Real debate between the historical Sokrates and Hippias in the Xenophontic Memorabilia—subject of that debate	365	Hippias thinks the question easy to answer	<i>ib.</i>
Opening of the Hippias Minor—Hippias describes the successful circuit which he had made through Greece, and the renown as well as the gain acquired by his lectures	366	Justice, Wisdom, Beauty must each be something. What is Beauty, or the Beautiful?	<i>ib.</i>
Hippias had met with no success at Sparta. Why the Spartans did not admit his instructions—their law forbids	<i>ib.</i>	Hippias does not understand the question. He answers by indicating one particularly beautiful object	372
Question, What is law? The lawmakers always aim at the Profitable, but sometimes fail to attain it. When they fail, they fail to attain law. The lawful is the Profitable, the Unprofitable is also unlawful	367	Cross-questioning by Sokrates—Other things also are beautiful; but each thing is beautiful only by comparison, or under some particular circumstances—it is sometimes beautiful, sometimes not beautiful	<i>ib.</i>
Comparison of the argument of the Platonic Sokrates with that of the Xenophontic Sokrates	368	Second answer of Hippias— <i>Gold</i> , is that by the presence of which all things become beautiful—scrutiny applied to the answer. Complaint by Hippias about vulgar analogies	373
The Just or Good is the beneficial or profitable. This is the only explanation which Plato ever gives—and to this he does not always adhere	369	Third answer of Hippias—questions upon it—proof given that it fails of universal application	374
Lectures of Hippias at Sparta—not upon geometry, or astronomy, &c., but upon the question—What pursuits are beautiful, fine, and honourable for youth?	370	Farther answers, suggested by Sokrates himself—1. The Suitable or Becoming—objections thereunto—it is rejected	<i>ib.</i>
Question put by Sokrates, in the		2. The useful or profitable—objections—it will not hold	375
		3. The Beautiful is a variety of the Pleasurable—that which is received through the eye and the ear	376

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

xxix

CHAPTER XI.—*continued.*

Page	Page
Objections to this last—What property is there common to both sight and hearing, which confers upon the pleasures of these two senses the exclusive privilege of being beautiful?	376
Answer—There is, belonging to each and to both in common, the property of being innocuous and profitable pleasures—upon this ground they are called beautiful	378
This will not hold—the Profitable is the cause of Good, and is therefore different from Good—to say that the beautiful is the Profitable, is to say that it is different from Good—but this has been already declared inadmissible	<i>ib.</i>
Remarks upon the Dialogue—the explanations ascribed to Hippias are special conspicuous examples: those ascribed to Sokrates are attempts to assign some general concept	<i>ib.</i>
Analogy between the explanations here ascribed to Sokrates, and those given by the Xenophontic Sokrates in the Memorabilia	380
Concluding thrust exchanged between Hippias and Sokrates	382
Rhetoric against Dialectic	384
Men who dealt with real life, contrasted with the speculative and analytical philosophers	<i>ib.</i>
Concrete Aggregates—abstract or logical Aggregates. Distinct aptitudes required by Aristotle for the Dialectician	385
Antitheses of Absolute and Relative, here brought into debate by Plato, in regard to the Idea of Beauty	386
Hippias Minor—characters and situation supposed	387
Hippias has just delivered a lecture, in which he extols Achilles as better than Odysseus—the veracious and straightforward hero better than the mendacious and crafty	388
This is contested by Sokrates. The veracious man and the mendacious man are one and the same—the only man who can answer truly if he chooses, is he who can also answer falsely if he chooses, <i>i. e.</i> the knowing man—the ignorant man cannot make sure of doing either the one or the other	389
Analogy of special arts—it is only the arithmetician who can speak falsely on a question of arithmetic when he chooses	<i>ib.</i>
View of Sokrates respecting Achilles in the Iliad. He thinks that Achilles speaks falsehood cleverly. Hippias maintains that if Achilles ever speaks falsehood, it is with an innocent purpose, whereas Odysseus does the like with fraudulent purpose	390
Issue here taken—Sokrates contends that those who hurt, or cheat, or lie wilfully, are better than those who do the like unwillingly—he entreats Hippias to enlighten him and answer his questions	<i>ib.</i>
Questions of Sokrates—multiplied analogies of the special arts. The unskilful artist, who runs, wrestles, or sings badly, whether he will or not, is worse than the skilful, who can sing well when he chooses, but can also sing badly when he chooses	391
It is better to have the mind of a bowman who misses his mark only by design, than that of one who misses even when he intends to hit	392
Dissent and repugnance of Hippias	<i>ib.</i>
Conclusion—That none but the good man can do evil wilfully: the bad man does evil unwillingly. Hippias cannot resist the reasoning, but will not accept the conclusion—Sokrates confesses his perplexity	393
Remarks on the dialogue. If the parts had been inverted, the dialogue would have been cited by critics as a specimen of the sophistry and corruption of the Sophists	394
Polemical purpose of the dialogue—Hippias humiliated by Sokrates	395
Philosophical purpose of the dialogue—theory of the Dialogues of Search generally, and of Knowledge as understood by Plato	<i>ib.</i>

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

XXX

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER XI.—*continued.*

Page	Page
<p>The Hippias is an exemplification of this theory—Sokrates sets forth a case of confusion, and avows his inability to clear it up. Confusion—shown up in the Lesser Hippias—Error in the Greater 396</p> <p>The thesis maintained here by Sokrates, is also affirmed by the historical Sokrates in the Xenophontic Memorabilia .. 398</p> <p>Aristotle combats the thesis. Arguments against it 399</p> <p>Mistake of Sokrates and Plato in dwelling too exclusively on the</p>	<p>intellectual conditions of human conduct 400</p> <p>They rely too much on the analogy of the special arts—they take no note of the tacit assumptions underlying the epithets of praise and blame 401</p> <p>Value of a Dialogue of Search, that it shall be suggestive, and that it shall bring before us different aspects of the question under review 402</p> <p>Antithesis between Rhetoric and Dialectic <i>ib.</i></p>

CHAPTER XII.

HIPPARCHUS—MINOS.

<p>Hipparchus—Question—What is the definition of Lover of Gain? He is one who thinks it right to gain from things worth nothing. Sokrates cross-examines upon this explanation. No man expects to gain from things which he knows to be worth nothing: in this sense, no man is a lover of gain 403</p> <p>Gain is good. Every man loves good: therefore all men are lovers of gain 404</p> <p>Apparent contradiction. Sokrates accuses the companion of trying to deceive him—accusation is retorted upon Sokrates 405</p> <p>Precept inscribed formerly by Hipparchus the Peisistratid—never deceive a friend. Eulogy of Hipparchus by Sokrates .. <i>ib.</i></p> <p>Sokrates allows the companion to retract some of his answers. The companion affirms that some gain is good, other gain is evil .. 406</p> <p>Questions by Sokrates—bad gain is <i>gain</i>, as much as good gain. What is the common property, in virtue of which both are called Gain? Every acquisition, made with no outlay, or with a smaller outlay, is gain. Objections—the acquisition may be evil—embarrassment confessed 407</p> <p>It is essential to gain, that the</p>	<p>acquisition made shall be greater not merely in quantity, but also in value, than the outlay. The valuable is the profitable—the profitable is the good. Conclusion comes back, That Gain is Good 407</p> <p>Recapitulation. The debate has shown that all gain is good, and that there is no evil gain—all men are lovers of gain—no man ought to be reproached for being so—the companion is compelled to admit this, though he declares that he is not persuaded 408</p> <p>Minos. Question put by Sokrates to the companion, What is Law, or The Law? All law is the same, <i>quatenus</i> law: what is the common constituent attribute? .. <i>ib.</i></p> <p>Answer—Law is, 1. The consecrated and binding customs. 2. The decree of the city. 3. Social or civic opinion 409</p> <p>Cross-examination by Sokrates—just and lawfully-behaving men are so through law: unjust and lawless men are so through the absence of law. Law is highly honourable and useful: lawlessness is ruinous. Accordingly, bad decrees of the city—or bad social opinion—cannot be law .. <i>ib.</i></p> <p>Suggestion by Sokrates—Law is the <i>good</i> opinion of the city—</p>
---	--

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

xxxi

CHAPTER XII.—*continued.*

Page	Page
but good opinion is true opinion, or the finding out of reality. Law therefore wishes (tends) to be the finding out of reality, though it does not always succeed in doing so	410
Objection taken by the Companion—That there is great discordance of laws in different places—he specifies several cases of such discordance at some length. Sokrates reproves his prolixity, and requests him to confine himself to question or answer	<i>ib.</i>
Farther questions by Sokrates—Things heavy and light, just and unjust, honourable and dishonourable, &c., are so, and are accounted so everywhere. Real things are always accounted real. Whoever fails in attaining the real, fails in attaining the lawful	411
There are laws of health and of cure, composed by the few physicians wise upon those subjects, and unanimously declared by them. So also there are laws of farming, gardening, cookery, declared by the few wise in those respective pursuits. In like manner, the laws of a city are the judgments declared by the few wise men who know how to rule	<i>ib.</i>
That which is right is the regal law, the only true and real law—that which is not right, is not law, but only seems to be law in the eyes of the ignorant	412
Minos, King of Krete—his laws were divine and excellent, and have remained unchanged from time immemorial	<i>ib.</i>
Question about the character of Minos—Homer and Hesiod declare him to have been admirable, the Attic tragedians defame him as a tyrant, because he was the enemy of Athens	413
That Minos was really admirable—and that he has found out truth and reality respecting the administration of the city—we may be sure from the fact that his laws have remained so long unaltered	<i>ib.</i>
The question is made more deter-	
minate—What is it that the good lawgiver prescribes and measures out for the health of the mind, as the physician measures out food and exercise for the body? Sokrates cannot tell. Close	414
The Hipparchus and Minos are analogous to each other, and both of them inferior works of Plato, perhaps unfinished	<i>ib.</i>
Hipparchus—double meaning of <i>φιλοκερδής</i> and <i>κέρδος</i>	415
State of mind of the agent, as to knowledge, frequent inquiry in Plato. No tenable definition found	<i>ib.</i>
Admitting that there is bad gain, as well as good gain, what is the meaning of the word <i>gain</i> ? None is found	416
Purpose of Plato in the dialogue—to lay bare the confusion, and to force the mind of the respondent into efforts for clearing it up	<i>ib.</i>
Historical narrative and comments given in the dialogue respecting Hipparchus—afford no ground for declaring the dialogue to be spurious	417
Minos. Question—What is the characteristic property connoted by the word <i>Νόμος</i> or law?	418
This question was discussed by the historical Sokrates, Memorabilia of Xenophon	<i>ib.</i>
Definitions of law—suggested and refuted. Law includes, as a portion of its meaning, justice, goodness, usefulness, &c. Bad decrees are not laws	419
Sokrates affirms that law is everywhere the same—it is the declared judgment and command of the Wise man upon the subject to which it refers—it is truth and reality, found out and certified by him	<i>ib.</i>
Reasoning of Sokrates in the Minos is unsound, but Platonic. The Good, True, and Real, coalesce in the mind of Plato—he acknowledges nothing to be Law, except what he thinks ought to be Law	420
Plato worships the Ideal of his own	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

xxxii

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER XII.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
mind—the work of systematic constructive theory by the Wise Man	422	Eulogy on Minos, as having established laws on this divine type or natural rectitude	423
Different applications of this general Platonic view, in the Minos, Politikus, Kratylus, &c. <i>Natural Rectitude of Law, Government, Names, &c.</i>	<i>ib.</i>	The Minos was arranged by Aristophanes at first in a Trilogy along with the Leges	424
		Explanations of the word Law—confusion in its meaning	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER XIII.

THEAGES.

Theagês—has been declared spurious by some modern critics—grounds for such opinion not sufficient	430	this circumstance it depends how far any companion profits by the society of Sokrates. Aristides has not learnt anything from Sokrates, yet has improved much by being near to him	434
Persons of the dialogue—Sokrates, with Demodokus and Theagês, father and son. Theagês (the son), eager to acquire knowledge, desires to be placed under the teaching of a Sophist	431	Theagês expresses his anxiety to be received as the companion of Sokrates	435
Sokrates questions Theagês, inviting him to specify what he wants	<i>ib.</i>	Remarks on the Theagês—analogy with the Lachês	436
Theagês desires to acquire that wisdom by which he can govern freemen with their own consent	432	Chief peculiarity of the Theagês—stress laid upon the divine sign or Dæmon	<i>ib.</i>
Incompetence of the best practical statesmen to teach any one else. Theagês requests that Sokrates will himself teach him	<i>ib.</i>	Plato employs this divine sign here to render some explanation of the singularity and eccentricity of Sokrates, and of his unequal influence upon different companions	437
Sokrates declares that he is not competent to teach—that he knows nothing except about matters of love. Theagês maintains that many of his young friends have profited largely by the conversation of Sokrates	433	Sokrates, while continually finding fault with other teachers, refused to teach himself—difficulty of finding an excuse for his refusal. The Theagês furnishes an excuse	438
Sokrates explains how this has sometimes happened—he recites his experience of the divine sign or Dæmon	<i>ib.</i>	Plato does not always, nor in other dialogues, allude to the divine sign in the same way. Its character and working essentially impenetrable. Sokrates a privileged person	439
The Dæmon is favourable to some persons, adverse to others. Upon			

CHAPTER XIV.

ERASTÆ OR ANTERASTÆ—RIVALES.

Erastæ—subject and persons of the dialogue—dramatic introduction—interesting youths in the palæstra	442	Two rival Erastæ—one of them literary, devoted to philosophy—the other gymnastic, hating philosophy	442
---	-----	---	-----

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

xxxiii

CHAPTER XIV.—*continued.*

Page	Page
Question put by Sokrates—What is philosophy? It is the perpetual accumulation of knowledge, so as to make the largest sum total	443
In the case of the body, it is not the maximum of exercise which does good, but the proper, measured, quantity. For the mind also, it is not the maximum of knowledge, but the measured quantity which is good. Who is the judge to determine this measure?	<i>ib.</i>
No answer given. What is the best conjecture? Answer of the literary Erastes. A man must learn that which will yield to him the greatest reputation as a philosopher—as much as will enable him to talk like an intelligent critic, though not to practise	444
The philosopher is one who is second-best in several different arts—a Pentathlus—who talks well upon each	445
On what occasions can such second-best men be useful? There are always regular practitioners at hand, and no one will call in the second-best man when he can have the regular practitioner	<i>ib.</i>
Philosophy cannot consist in multiplication of learned acquisitions	445
Sokrates changes his course of examination—questions put to show that there is one special art, regal and political, of administering and discriminating the bad from the good	446
In this art the philosopher must not only be second-best, competent to talk—but he must be a fully qualified practitioner, competent to act	447
Close of the dialogue—humiliation of the literary Erastes	<i>ib.</i>
Remarks—animated manner of the dialogue	<i>ib.</i>
Definition of philosophy—here sought for the first time—Platonic conception of measure—referee not discovered	448
View taken of the second-best critical talking man, as compared with the special proficient and practitioner	449
Plato's view—that the philosopher has a province special to himself, distinct from other specialties—dimly indicated—regal or political art	450
Philosopher—the supreme artist, controlling other artists	451

CHAPTER XV.

ION.

Ion. Persons of the dialogue. Difference of opinion among modern critics as to its genuineness	454
Rhapsodes as a class in Greece. They competed for prizes at the festivals. Ion has been triumphant	<i>ib.</i>
Functions of the Rhapsodes. Recitation—exposition of the poets—arbitrary exposition of the poets was then frequent	455
The popularity of the Rhapsodes was chiefly derived from their recitation—powerful effect which they produced	456
Ion both reciter and expositor—Homer was considered more as an instructor than as a poet	<i>ib.</i>
Plato disregards and disapproves the poetic or emotional working	456
Ion devoted himself to Homer exclusively. Questions of Sokrates to him—How happens it that you cannot talk equally upon other poets? The poetic art is one	457
Explanation given by Sokrates—both the Rhapsode and the Poet work, not by art and system, but by divine inspiration—fine poets are bereft of their reason, and possessed by inspiration from some God	<i>ib.</i>
Analogy of the Magnet, which holds up by attraction successive stages of iron rings. The Gods first inspire Homer, then act	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

XXXIV

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER XV.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
through him and through Ion upon the auditors	459	Rhapsodic art. What is its province?	463
This comparison forms the central point of the dialogue. It is an expansion of a judgment delivered by Sokrates in the Apology	<i>ib.</i>	The Rhapsode does not know special matters, such as the craft of the pilot, physician, farmer, &c. but he knows the business of the general, and is competent to command soldiers, having learnt it from Homer	464
Platonic antithesis: systematic procedure distinguished from unsystematic: which latter was either blind routine, or madness inspired by the Gods. Varieties of madness, good and bad	<i>ib.</i>	Conclusion. Ion expounds Homer, not with any knowledge of what he says, but by divine inspiration	<i>ib.</i>
Special inspiration from the Gods was a familiar fact in Grecian life—privileged communications from the Gods to Sokrates—his firm belief in them	461	The generals in Greece usually possessed no professional experience—Homer and the poets were talked of as the great teachers—Plato's view of the poet, as pretending to know everything, but really knowing nothing	465
Condition of the inspired person—his reason is for the time withdrawn	462	Knowledge, opposed to divine inspiration without knowledge	466
Ion does not admit himself to be inspired and out of his mind . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Illustration of Plato's opinion respecting the uselessness of written geometrical treatises	467
Homer talks upon all subjects—Is Ion competent to explain what Homer says upon all of them?			

CHAPTER XVI.

LACHES.

Lachês. Subject and persons of the dialogue—whether it is useful that two young men should receive lessons from a master of arms. Nikias and Lachês differ in opinion	468	We must know what virtue is, before we give an opinion on education—virtue, as a whole, is too large a question—we will enquire about one branch of virtue—courage	472
Sokrates is invited to declare his opinion—he replies that the point cannot be decided without a competent professional judge	469	Question—what is courage? Lachês answers by citing one particularly manifest case of courage—mistake of not giving a general explanation	473
Those who deliver an opinion must begin by proving their competence to judge—Sokrates avows his own incompetence	470	Second answer. Courage is a sort of endurance of the mind—Sokrates points out that the answer is vague and incorrect—endurance is not always courage: even intelligent endurance is not always courage	474
Nikias and Lachês submit to be cross-examined by Sokrates	471	Confusion. New answer given by Nikias. Courage is a sort of Intelligence—the intelligence of things terrible and not terrible. Objections of Lachês	<i>ib.</i>
Both of them give opinions off-hand, according to their feelings on the special case—Sokrates requires that the question shall be generalised, and examined as a branch of education	<i>ib.</i>	Questions of Sokrates to Nikias. It is only future events, not past	
Appeal of Sokrates to the judgment of the One Wise Man—this man is never seen or identified	472		

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

XXXV

CHAPTER XVI.—*continued.*

Page	Page		
or present, which are terrible: but intelligence of future events cannot be had without intelligence of past or present	475	looking for a solution. Intelligence — cannot be understood without reference to some object or end	478
Courage therefore must be intelligence of good and evil generally. But this definition would include the whole of virtue, and we declared that courage was only a part thereof—it will not hold therefore as a definition of courage	476	Object—is supplied in the answer of Nikias. Intelligence — of things terrible and not terrible. Such intelligence is not possessed by professional artists	<i>ib.</i>
Remarks. Warfare of Sokrates against the false persuasion of knowledge. Brave generals deliver opinions confidently about courage without knowing what it is	477	Postulate of a Science of Ends, or Teleology, dimly indicated by Plato. The Unknown Wise Man —correlates with the undiscovered Science of Ends	479
No solution given by Plato—apparent tendency of his mind, in		Perfect condition of the intelligence—is the one sufficient condition of virtue	480
		Dramatic contrast between Lachés and Sokrates, as cross-examiners	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER XVII.

CHARMIDES.

Scene and personages of the dialogue. Crowded palaestra. Emotions of Sokrates	482	knowledge, distinct from the knowledge itself	485
Question, What is Temperance? addressed by Sokrates to the temperate Charmides. Answer, It is a kind of sedateness or slowness	483	Sokrates doubts the possibility of any knowledge, without a given <i>cognitum</i> as its object. Analogies to prove that knowledge of knowledge is impossible	<i>ib.</i>
But Temperance is a fine or honourable thing, and slowness is, in many or most cases, not fine or honourable, but the contrary. Temperance cannot be slowness	<i>ib.</i>	All knowledge must be relative to some object	486
Second answer. Temperance is a variety of the feeling of shame. Refuted by Sokrates	<i>ib.</i>	All properties are relative—every thing in nature has its characteristic property with reference to something else	<i>ib.</i>
Third answer. Temperance consists in doing one's own business. Defended by Kritias. Sokrates pronounces it a riddle, and refutes it. Distinction between making and doing	484	Even if cognition of cognition were possible, cognition of non-cognition would be impossible. A man may know what he knows, but he cannot know what he is ignorant of. He knows the fact <i>that</i> he knows: but he does not know how much he knows, and how much he does not know	487
Fourth answer, by Kritias. Temperance consists in self-knowledge	<i>ib.</i>	Temperance therefore as thus defined, would be of little or no value	488
Questions of Sokrates thereupon. What good does self-knowledge procure for us? What is the object known, in this case? Answer: There is no object of		But even granting the possibility of that which has just been denied, still Temperance would be of little value. Suppose that all separate work were well per-	

c 2

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

xxxi

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER XVII.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
formed, by special practitioners, we should not attain our end—		and dramatising this part of the mental process. Sokrates accepts for himself the condition of conscious ignorance	494
Happiness	489	Familiar words—constantly used, with much earnest feeling, but never understood nor defined—ordinary phenomenon in human society	495
Which of the varieties of knowledge contributes most to well-doing or happiness? That by which we know good and evil . .	490	Different ethical points of view in different Platonic dialogues . .	496
Without the science of good and evil, the other special science will be of little or no service. Temperance is not the science of good and evil, and is of little service	<i>ib.</i>	Self-knowledge is here declared to be impossible	497
Sokrates confesses to entire failure in his research. He cannot find out what temperance is; although several concessions have been made which cannot be justified	491	In other dialogues, Sokrates declares self-knowledge to be essential and inestimable. Necessity for the student to have presented to him dissident points of view	<i>ib.</i>
Temperance is and must be a good thing; but Charmides cannot tell whether he is temperate or not; since what temperance is remains unknown	492	Courage and Temperance are shown to have no distinct meaning, except as founded on the general cognizance of good and evil . .	498
Expressions both from Charmides and Kritias of praise and devotion to Sokrates, at the close of the dialogue. Dramatic ornament throughout	<i>ib.</i>	Distinction made between the special sciences and the science of Good and Evil. Without this last, the special sciences are of no use	<i>ib.</i>
The Charmides is an excellent specimen of Dialogues of Search. Abundance of guesses and tentatives, all ultimately disallowed . .	<i>ib.</i>	Knowledge, always relative to some object known. Postulate or divination of a Science of Teleology	499
Trial and Error, the natural process of the human mind. Plato stands alone in bringing to view		Courage and Temperance, handled both by Plato and by Aristotle. Comparison between the two . .	500

CHAPTER XVIII.

LYSIS.

Analogy between Lysis and Charmides. Richness of dramatic incident in both. Youthful beauty	502	Lysis entreats Sokrates to talk in the like strain to Menexenus . .	507
Scenery and personages of the Lysis	<i>ib.</i>	Value of the first conversation between Sokrates and Lysis, as an illustration of the Platonic-Sokratic manner	508
Origin of the conversation, Sokrates promises to give an example of the proper way of talking to a youth, for his benefit . .	503	Sokrates begins to examine Menexenus respecting friendship. Who is to be called a friend? Halt in the dialogue	<i>ib.</i>
Conversation of Sokrates with Lysis	<i>ib.</i>	Questions addressed to Lysis. Appeal to the maxims of the poets. Like is the friend of like. Canvassed and rejected	509
Lysis is humiliated. Distress of Hippothalcs	507		

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

xxxvii

CHAPTER XVIII.—*continued.*

Page		Page
	Other poets declare that likeness is a cause of aversion; unlikeness, of friendship. Reasons <i>pro</i> and <i>con.</i> Rejected	510
	Confusion of Sokrates. He suggests, That the Indifferent (neither good nor evil) is friend to the Good	<i>ib.</i>
	Suggestion canvassed. If the Indifferent is friend to the Good, it is determined to become so by the contact of felt evil, from which it is anxious to escape ..	511
	Principle illustrated by the philosopher. His intermediate condition—not wise, yet painfully feeling his own ignorance	<i>ib.</i>
	Sokrates dissatisfied. He originates a new suggestion. The Primum Amabile, or Object originally dear to us, <i>per se</i> : by relation or resemblance to which other objects become dear	512
	The cause of love is desire. We desire that which is akin to us—or our own	513
	Good is of a nature akin to every one, evil is alien to every one. Inconsistency with what has been previously laid down	514
	Failure of the enquiry. Close of the dialogue	<i>ib.</i>
	Remarks. No positive result. Sokratic purpose in analysing the familiar words—to expose the false persuasion of knowledge ..	515
	Subject of Lysis. Suited for a Dialogue of Search. Manner of Sokrates, multiplying defective explanations, and showing reasons why each is defective	516
	The process of trial and error is better illustrated by a search without result than with result. Usefulness of the dialogue for self-working minds	<i>ib.</i>
	Subject of friendship, handled both by the Xenophontic Sokrates, and by Aristotle	518
	Debate in the Lysis partly verbal, partly real. Assumptions made by the Platonic Sokrates, questionable, such as the real Sokrates would have found reason for challenging	519
	Peculiar theory about friendship broached by Sokrates. Persons neither good nor evil by nature, yet having a superficial tinge of evil, and desiring good to escape from it	520
	This general theory illustrated by the case of the philosopher or lover of wisdom. Painful consciousness of ignorance the attribute of the philosopher. Value set by Sokrates and Plato upon this attribute	521
	Another theory of Sokrates. The Primum Amabile, or original and primary object of Love. Particular objects are loved through association with this. The object is, Good	522
	Statement by Plato of the general law of mental association	<i>ib.</i>
	Theory of the Primum Amabile, here introduced by Sokrates, with numerous derivative objects of love. Platonic Idea. Generic communion of Aristotle, distinguished by him from the feebler analogical communion	523
	Primum Amabile of Plato, compared with the Prima Amicitia of Aristotle. Each of them is head of an analogical aggregate, not member of a generic family	525
	The Good and Beautiful, considered as objects of attachment ..	526

CHAPTER XIX.

EUTHYDEMUS.

Dramatic and comic exuberance of the Euthydemus. Judgments of various critics	Dionysodorus: manner in which they are here presented
Scenery and personages	Conversation carried on with Kleinias, first by Sokrates, next by the two Sophists
The two Sophists, Euthydemus and	<i>ib.</i>
	527
	<i>ib.</i>
	528
	<i>ib.</i>

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

XXXVIII

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER XIX.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Contrast between the two different modes of interrogation	529	The talk of the two Sophists, though ironically admired while it is going on, is shown at the end to produce no real admiration, but the contrary	541
Wherein this contrast does not consist	530	Mistaken representations about the Sophists—Aristotle's definition—no distinguishable line can be drawn between the Sophist and the Dialectician	542
Wherein it does consist	531	Philosophical purpose of the Euthydémus—exposure of fallacies, in Plato's dramatic manner, by multiplication of particular examples	544
Abuse of fallacies by the Sophists—their bidding for the applause of the by-standers	532	Aristotle (<i>Soph. Elench.</i>) attempts a classification of fallacies: Plato enumerates them without classification	545
Comparison of the Euthydémus with the Parmenidés	<i>ib.</i>	Fallacies of equivocation propounded by the two Sophists in the Euthydémus	<i>ib.</i>
Necessity of settling accounts with the negative, before we venture upon the affirmative, is common to both: in the one the process is solitary and serious; in the other, it is vulgarised and ludicrous	533	Fallacies— <i>à dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter</i> —in the Euthydémus	546
Opinion of Stallbaum and other critics about the Euthydémus, that Euthydémus and Dionysodoros represent the way in which Protagoras and Gorgias talked to their auditors	534	Obstinacy shown by the two Sophists in their replies—determination not to contradict themselves	547
That opinion is unfounded. Sokrates was much more Eristic than Protagoras, who generally manifested himself by continuous speech or lecture	535	Farther verbal equivocations	<i>ib.</i>
Sokrates in the Euthydémus is drawn suitably to the purpose of that dialogue	536	Fallacies involving deeper logical principles—contradiction is impossible.—To speak falsely is impossible	548
The two Sophists in the Euthydémus are not to be taken as real persons, or representatives of real persons	<i>ib.</i>	Plato's Euthydémus is the earliest known attempt to set out and expose fallacies—the only way of exposing fallacies is to exemplify the fallacy by particular cases, in which the conclusion proved is known <i>alivunde</i> to be false and absurd	<i>ib.</i>
Colloquy of Sokrates with Kleinias—possession of good things is useless, unless we also have intelligence how to use them	537	Mistake of supposing fallacies to have been invented and propagated by Athenian Sophists—they are inherent inadvertencies and liabilities to error, in the ordinary process of thinking. Formal debate affords the best means of correcting them	550
But intelligence—of what? It must be such intelligence, or such an art, as will include both the making of what we want, and the right use of it when made	538	Wide-spread prevalence of erroneous belief, misguided by one or other of these fallacies, attested by Sokrates, Plato, Bacon, &c.—complete enumeration of heads of fallacies by Mill	551
Where is such an art to be found? The regal or political art looks like it; but what does this art do for us? No answer can be found. Ends in puzzle	539	Value of formal debate as a means	
Review of the cross-examination just pursued by Sokrates. It is very suggestive—puts the mind upon what to look for	540		
Comparison with other dialogues—Republic, Philébus, Protagoras. The only distinct answer is found in the Protagoras	<i>ib.</i>		

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00962-1 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 1

George Grote

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

xxxix

CHAPTER XIX.—*continued*.

	Page		Page
for testing and confuting fallacies	554	sons half-philosophers, half-politicians	557
Without the habit of formal debate, Plato could not have composed his Euthydēmus, nor Aristotle the treatise <i>De Sophisticis Elenchis</i>	555	Kriton asks Sokrates for advice about the education of his sons—Sokrates cannot recommend a teacher—tells him to search for himself	558
Probable popularity of the Euthydēmus at Athens—welcomed by all the enemies of Dialectic ..	<i>ib.</i>	Euthydēmus is here cited as representative of Dialectic and philosophy	559
Epilogue of Plato to the Dialogue, trying to obviate this inference by opponents—Conversation between Sokrates and Kriton ..	556	Who is the person here intended by Plato, half-philosopher, half-politician? Is it Isokrates? ..	560
Altered tone in speaking of Euthydēmus—Disparagement of per-		Variable feeling at different times, between Plato and Isokrates ..	562