

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Classics

From the Renaissance to the nineteenth century, Latin and Greek were compulsory subjects in almost all European universities, and most early modern scholars published their research and conducted international correspondence in Latin. Latin had continued in use in Western Europe long after the fall of the Roman empire as the lingua franca of the educated classes and of law, diplomacy, religion and university teaching. The flight of Greek scholars to the West after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 gave impetus to the study of ancient Greek literature and the Greek New Testament. Eventually, just as nineteenth-century reforms of university curricula were beginning to erode this ascendancy, developments in textual criticism and linguistic analysis, and new ways of studying ancient societies, especially archaeology, led to renewed enthusiasm for the Classics. This collection offers works of criticism, interpretation and synthesis by the outstanding scholars of the nineteenth century.

Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates

Best known for his influential *History of Greece*, the historian and politician George Grote (1794–1871) wrote this account of Plato's dialogues as a philosophical supplement to the *History*. First published in 1865 and written in dialogic form, Grote's account of Plato's works includes substantial footnotes and marginalia. This second volume covers the transitional and middle dialogues including *Gorgias* and *Symposium*, as well as some of the later works. It also contains the index to both volumes, originally issued separately. Grote includes apocryphal works, as he relied on the order and classification of Plato's works specified by the ancient Greek scholar Thrasyllos of Mendes. With two volumes each running to over six hundred pages, Grote's scholarship is formidably comprehensive. The publication of *Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates* confirmed him as one of the greatest authorities on Plato in the nineteenth century.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection will bring back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates

VOLUME 2

GEORGE GROTE



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2
George Grote
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108009638

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2009

This edition first published 1865
This digitally printed version 2009

ISBN 978-1-108-00963-8 Paperback

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press wishes to make clear that the book, unless originally published by Cambridge, is not being republished by, in association or collaboration with, or with the endorsement or approval of, the original publisher or its successors in title.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

P L A T O,
AND THE
OTHER COMPANIONS OF SOKRATES.

By GEORGE GROTE, F.R.S.,

AUTHOR OF THE 'HISTORY OF GREECE':

D.C.L. OXON., AND LL.D. CAMBRIDGE:

VICE-CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON:

MEMBER OF THE INSTITUTE OF FRANCE, AND HON. MEMBER OF THE IMPERIAL AND
ROYAL ACADEMIES OF ST. PETERSBURG, KHARKOFF, KÖNIGSBERG, MUNICH,
AMSTERDAM, BRUSSELS, AND TURIN:

HON. MEMBER OF THE HISTORICAL SOCIETIES OF MASSACHUSETTS, AND OF
PHILADELPHIA, U.S. OF AMERICA.

~~~~~

Κάλλιστα γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο καὶ λέγεται καὶ λελέξεται, ὅτι τὸ μὲν ὠφέλιμον  
καλὸν, τὸ δὲ βλαβερὸν αἰσχρόν. PLATO, *Republ.* v. 457 B.

Τὸ μὲν οὖν περιττὸν ἔχουσι πάντες οἱ τοῦ Σωκράτους λόγοι, καὶ τὸ κομψὸν  
καὶ τὸ καινοτόμον, καὶ τὸ ζητητικὸν· καλῶς δὲ πάντα ἵσως χαλεπόν.

ARISTOTEL. *Polit.* ii. 6, 1265 a 10.

~~~~~

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1865.

The right of Translation is reserved.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

LONDON: PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET,
AND CHARING CROSS.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

(iii)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XX.

MENON.

Page	Page		
Persons of the Dialogue	1	Illustration of this theory—knowledge may be revived by skilful questions in the mind of a man thoroughly untaught. Sokrates questions the slave of Menon	7
Question put by Menon—Is virtue teachable? Sokrates confesses that he does not know what virtue is. Surprise of Menon	<i>ib.</i>	Enquiry taken up—Whether virtue is teachable? without determining what virtue is	8
Sokrates stands alone in this confession. Unpopularity entailed by it	2	Virtue is knowledge—no possessions, no attributes, either of mind or body, are good or profitable, except under the guidance of knowledge	<i>ib.</i>
Answer of Menon—plurality of virtues, one belonging to each different class and condition. Sokrates enquires for the property common to all of them	3	Virtue, as being knowledge, must be teachable. Yet there are opposing reasons, showing that it cannot be teachable. No teachers of it can be found	9
Analogous cases cited—definitions of figure and colour	4	Conversation of Sokrates with Anytus, who detests the Sophists, and affirms that any one of the leading politicians can teach virtue	<i>ib.</i>
Importance at that time of bringing into conscious view, logical subordination and distinctions—Neither logic nor grammar had then been cast into system	<i>ib.</i>	Confused state of the discussion. No way of acquiring virtue is shown	10
Definition of virtue given by Menon; Sokrates pulls it to pieces	5	Sokrates modifies his premisses—knowledge is not the only thing which guides to good results—right opinion will do the same	<i>ib.</i>
Menon complains that the conversation of Sokrates confounds him like an electric shock—Sokrates replies that he is himself in the same state of confusion and ignorance. He urges continuance of search by both	6	Right opinion cannot be relied on for staying in the mind, and can never give rational explanations, nor teach others—good practical statesmen receive right opinion by inspiration from the Gods	11
But how is the process of search available to any purpose? No man searches for what he already knows: and for what he does not know, it is useless to search, for he cannot tell when he has found it	<i>ib.</i>	All the real virtue that there is, is communicated by special inspiration from the Gods	<i>ib.</i>
Theory of reminiscence propounded by Sokrates—anterior immortality of the soul—what is called teaching is the revival and recognition of knowledge acquired in a former life, but forgotten	7	But what virtue itself is, remains unknown	<i>ib.</i>
		Remarks on the dialogue. Proper order for examining the different topics, is pointed out by Sokrates	<i>ib.</i>

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

iv

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XX.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Mischief of debating ulterior and secondary questions, when the fundamental notions and word are unsettled	12	the Menon, Phædrus, and Phædon	18
Doctrine of Sokrates in the Menon—desire of good alleged to be universally felt—in what sense this is true	13	Doctrine of Plato, that new truth may be elicited by skilful examination out of the unlettered mind—how far correct?	19
Sokrates requires knowledge as the principal condition of virtue, but does not determine—knowledge, of what?	14	Plato's doctrine about <i>à priori</i> reasonings—different from the modern doctrine	20
Subject of Menon, same as that of the Protagoras—diversity of handling—Plato is not anxious to settle a question and get rid of it	<i>ib.</i>	Plato's theory about pre-natal experience. He took no pains to ascertain and measure the extent of post-natal experience . .	22
Anxiety of Plato to keep up and enforce the spirit of research	15	Little or nothing is said in the Menon about the Platonic Ideas or Forms	23
Great question discussed among the Grecian philosophers—criterion of truth—Wherein consists the process of verification?	16	What Plato meant by Causal Reasoning—his distinction between knowledge and right opinion . .	<i>ib.</i>
None of the philosophers were satisfied with the answer here made by Plato—that verification consists in appeal to pre-natal experience	<i>ib.</i>	This distinction compared with modern philosophical views . .	24
Plato's view of the immortality of the soul—difference between		Manifestation of Anytus—intense antipathy to the Sophists and to philosophy generally	25
		The enemy of Sokrates is also the enemy of the Sophists—Practical statesmen	27
		The Menon brings forward the point of analogy between Sokrates and the Sophists, in which both were disliked by the practical statesmen	28

CHAPTER XXI.

PROTAGORAS.

Scenic arrangement and personages of the dialogue	29	Questions of Sokrates to Protagoras. Answer of the latter, declaring the antiquity of the sophistical profession, and his own openness in avowing himself a sophist	34
Introduction. Eagerness of the youthful Hippokrates to become acquainted with Protagoras . .	30	Protagoras prefers to converse in presence of the assembled company	36
Sokrates questions Hippokrates as to his purpose and expectations from Protagoras	<i>ib.</i>	Answers of Protagoras. He intends to train young men as virtuous citizens	<i>ib.</i>
Danger of going to imbibe the instruction of a Sophist without knowing beforehand what he is about to teach	32	Sokrates doubts whether virtue is teachable. Reasons for such doubts. Protagoras is asked to explain whether it is or not . .	37
Remarks on the Introduction. False persuasion of knowledge brought to light	33	Explanation of Protagoras. He begins with a mythe	38
Sokrates and Hippokrates go to the house of Kallias. Company therein. Respect shown to Protagoras	34	Mythe. First fabrication of men	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

v

CHAPTER XXI.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
by the Gods. Prometheus and Epimetheus. Bad distribution of endowments to man by the latter. It is partly amended by Prometheus	38	Whether justice is just, and holiness holy? How far justice is like to holiness? Sokrates protests against an answer, "If you please"	49
Prometheus gave to mankind skill for the supply of individual wants, but could not give them the social art. Mankind are on the point of perishing, when Zeus sends to them the dispositions essential for society	39	Intelligence and moderation are identical, because they have the same contrary	50
Protagoras follows up his mythe by a discourse. Justice and the sense of shame are not professional attributes, but are possessed by all citizens, and taught by all to all	40	Insufficient reasons given by Sokrates. He seldom cares to distinguish different meanings of the same term	<i>ib.</i>
Constant teaching of virtue. Theory of punishment	<i>ib.</i>	Protagoras is puzzled, and becomes irritated	51
Why eminent men cannot make their sons eminent	41	Sokrates presses Protagoras farther. His purpose is, to test opinions and not persons. Protagoras answers with angry prolixity	<i>ib.</i>
Teaching by parents, schoolmaster, harpist, laws, dikastery, &c.	42	Remonstrance of Sokrates against long answers, as inconsistent with the laws of dialogue. Protagoras persists. Sokrates rises to depart	52
All learn virtue from the same teaching by all. Whether a learner shall acquire more or less of it, depends upon his own individual aptitude	43	Interference of Kallias to get the debate continued. Promiscuous conversation. Alkibiades declares that Protagoras ought to acknowledge superiority of Sokrates in dialogue	53
Analogy of learning vernacular Greek. No special teacher thereof. Protagoras teaches virtue somewhat better than others	44	Claim of a special <i>locus stantii</i> and professorship for Dialectic, apart from Rhetoric	<i>ib.</i>
The sons of great artists do not themselves become great artists	45	Sokrates is prevailed upon to continue, and invites Protagoras to question him	<i>ib.</i>
Remarks upon the mythe and discourse. They explain the manner in which the established sentiment of a community propagates and perpetuates itself	<i>ib.</i>	Protagoras extols the importance of knowing the works of the poets, and questions about parts of a song of Simonides. Dissenting opinions about the interpretation of the song	54
Antithesis of Protagoras and Sokrates. Whether virtue is to be assimilated to a special art	46	Long speech of Sokrates, expounding the purpose of the song, and laying down an ironical theory about the numerous concealed sophists at Krete and Sparta, masters of short speech	<i>ib.</i>
Procedure of Sokrates in regard to the discourse of Protagoras—he compliments it as an exposition, and analyses some of the fundamental assumptions	47	Character of this speech—its connection with the dialogue, and its general purpose. Sokrates inferior to Protagoras in continuous speech	55
One purpose of the dialogue. To contrast continuous discourse with short cross-examining question and answer	48	Sokrates depreciates the value of debates on the poets. Their meaning is always disputed, and you can never ask from themselves what it is. Protagoras	
Questions by Sokrates—Whether virtue is one and indivisible, or composed of different parts? Whether the parts are homogeneous or heterogeneous?	<i>ib.</i>		

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

vi

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XXI.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
consents reluctantly to resume the task of answering	56	that the subject is still in confusion, and that he wishes to debate it again with Protagoras.	
Purpose of Sokrates to sift difficulties which he really feels in his own mind. Importance of a colloquial companion for this purpose	59	Amicable reply of Protagoras . .	69
The interrupted debate is resumed. Protagoras says that courage differs materially from the other branches of virtue	<i>ib.</i>	Remarks on the dialogue. It closes without the least allusion to Hippokrates	70
Sokrates argues to prove that courage consists in knowledge or intelligence. Protagoras does not admit this. Sokrates changes his attack	60	Two distinct aspects of ethics and politics exhibited: one under the name of Protagoras; the other, under that of Sokrates . .	71
Identity of the pleasurable with the good—of the painful with the evil. Sokrates maintains it. Protagoras denies. Debate . .	<i>ib.</i>	Order of ethical problems, as conceived by Sokrates	<i>ib.</i>
Enquiry about knowledge. Is it the dominant agency in the mind? Or is it overcome frequently by other agencies, pleasure or pain? Both agree that knowledge is dominant	61	Difference of method between him and Protagoras flows from this difference of order. Protagoras assumes what virtue is, without enquiry	72
Mistake of supposing that men act contrary to knowledge. We never call pleasures evils, except when they entail a preponderance of pain, or a disappointment of greater pleasures	62	Method of Protagoras. Continuous lectures addressed to established public sentiments with which he is in harmony	73
Pleasure is the only good—pain the only evil. No man does evil voluntarily, knowing it to be evil. Difference between pleasures present and future—resolves itself into pleasure and pain	63	Method of Sokrates. Dwells upon that part of the problem which Protagoras had left out	74
Necessary resort to the measuring art for choosing pleasures rightly—all the security of our lives depends upon it	65	Antithesis between the eloquent lecturer and the analytical cross-examiner	75
To do wrong, overcome by pleasure, is only a bad phrase for describing what is really a case of grave ignorance	66	Protagoras not intended to be always in the wrong, though he is described as brought to a contradiction	<i>ib.</i>
Reasoning of Sokrates assented to by all. Actions which conduct to pleasure or freedom from pain, are honourable	<i>ib.</i>	Affirmation of Protagoras about courage is affirmed by Plato himself elsewhere	76
Explanation of courage. It consists in a wise estimate of things terrible and not terrible	67	The harsh epithets applied by critics to Protagoras are not borne out by the dialogue. He stands on the same ground as the common consciousness	<i>ib.</i>
Reluctance of Protagoras to continue answering. Close of the discussion. Sokrates declares		Aversion of Protagoras for dialectic. Interlude about the song of Simonides	77
		Ethical view given by Sokrates—worked out at length clearly. Good and evil consist in right or wrong calculation of pleasures and pains of the agent	78
		Protagoras is at first opposed to this theory	79
		Reasoning of Sokrates	<i>ib.</i>
		Application of that reasoning to the case of courage	80
		The theory which Plato here lays down is more distinct and specific than any theory laid down in other dialogues	81

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

vii

CHAPTER XXI.—*continued.*

Page		Page
	Remarks on the theory here laid down by Sokrates. It is too narrow, and exclusively prudential	
82	Comparison with the Republic ..	83
	The discourse of Protagoras brings out an important part of the whole case, which is omitted in the analysis by Sokrates	<i>ib.</i>
	The Ethical End, as implied in the discourse of Protagoras, involves a direct regard to the pleasures and pains of other persons besides the agent himself	85
	Plato's reasoning in the dialogue is not clear or satisfactory, especially about courage	86
	Doctrine of Stallbaum and other critics is not correct. That the analysis here ascribed to Sokrates is not intended by Plato as serious, but as a mockery of the sophists	87
	Grounds of that doctrine. Their insufficiency	88
	Subject is professedly still left unsettled at the close of the dialogue	89

CHAPTER XXII.

GORGIAS.

	Persons who debate in the Gorgias. Celebrity of the historical Gorgias	90
	Introductory circumstances of the dialogue. Polus and Kalliklès ..	91
	Purpose of Sokrates in questioning. Conditions of a good definition ..	<i>ib.</i>
	Questions about the definition of Rhetoric. It is the artisan of persuasion	92
	The Rhetor produces belief without knowledge. Upon what matters is he competent to advise? ..	93
	The Rhetor can persuade the people upon any matter, even against the opinion of the special expert. He appears to know, among the ignorant	<i>ib.</i>
	Gorgias is now made to contradict himself. Polus takes up the debate with Sokrates	94
	Polemical tone of Sokrates. At the instance of Polus he gives his own definition of rhetoric. It is no art, but an empirical knack of catering for the immediate pleasure of hearers, analogous to cookery. It is a branch under the general head flattery	<i>ib.</i>
	Distinction between the true arts which aim at the good of the body and mind—and the counterfeit arts, which pretend to the same, but in reality aim at immediate pleasure	96
	Questions of Polus. Sokrates denies that the Rhetors have any real power, because they do nothing which they really wish ..	96
	All men wish for what is good for them. Despots and Rhetors, when they kill any one, do so because they think it good for them. If it be really not good, they do not do what they will, and therefore have no real power	97
	Comparison of Archelaus, usurping despot of Macedonia—Polus affirms that Archelaus is happy, and that every one thinks so—Sokrates admits that every one thinks so, but nevertheless denies it	98
	Sokrates maintains—1. That it is a greater evil to do wrong, than to suffer wrong. 2. That if a man has done wrong, it is better for him to be punished than to remain unpunished	99
	Sokrates offers proof—Definition of Pulchrum and Turpe—Proof of the first point	100
	Proof of the second point	<i>ib.</i>
	The criminal labours under a mental distemper, which, though not painful, is a capital evil. Punishment is the only cure for him. To be punished is best for him	102
	Misery of the Despot who is never punished. If our friend has done wrong, we ought to get him punished: if our enemy, we ought to keep him unpunished	<i>ib.</i>
	Argument of Sokrates paradoxical	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

viii

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XXII.—*continued.*

Page	Page		
—Doubt expressed by Kalliklès whether he means it seriously	103	... sive by the language in which he expresses it	114
Principle laid down by Sokrates—That every one acts with a view to the attainment of happiness and avoidance of misery	104	Sokrates maintains that self-command and moderation is requisite for the strong man as well as for others. Kalliklès defends the negative	118
Peculiar view taken by Plato of Good—Evil—Happiness	<i>ib.</i>	Whether the largest measure of desires is good for a man, provided he has the means of satisfying them? Whether all varieties of desire are good? Whether the pleasurable and the good are identical?	<i>ib.</i>
Contrast of the usual meaning of these words, with the Platonic meaning	105	Kalliklès maintains that pleasurable and good are identical. Sokrates refutes him. Some pleasures are good, others bad. A scientific adviser is required to discriminate them	119
Examination of the proof given by Sokrates—Inconsistency between the general answer of Polus and his previous declarations—Law and Nature	106	Contradiction between Sokrates in the Gorgias, and Sokrates in the Protagoras	120
The definition of Pulehrum and Turpe, given by Sokrates, will not hold	108	Views of critics about this contradiction	<i>ib.</i>
Worse or better—for whom? The argument of Sokrates does not specify. If understood in the sense necessary for his inference, the definition would be inadmissible	<i>ib.</i>	Comparison and appreciation of the reasoning of Sokrates in both dialogues	121
Plato applies to every one a standard of happiness and misery peculiar to himself. His view about the conduct of Archelaus is just, but he does not give the true reasons for it	109	Distinct statement in the Protagoras. What are good and evil, and upon what principles the scientific adviser is to proceed in discriminating them. No such distinct statement in the Gorgias	122
If the reasoning of Plato were true, the point of view in which punishment is considered would be reversed	110	Modern ethical theories. Intuition. Moral sense—not recognised by Plato in either of the dialogues	123
Plato pushes too far the analogy between mental distemper and bodily distemper—Material difference between the two—Distemper must be felt by the distempered person	111	In both dialogues the doctrine of Sokrates is self-regarding as respects the agent: not considering the pleasures and pains of other persons, so far as affected by the agent	<i>ib.</i>
Kalliklès begins to argue against Sokrates—he takes a distinction between Just by Law and Just by nature—Reply of Sokrates, that there is no variance between the two, properly understood	112	Points wherein the doctrine of the two dialogues is in substance the same, but differing in classification	124
What Kalliklès says is not to be taken as a sample of the teachings of Athenian sophists. Kalliklès—rhetor and politician	113	Kalliklès, whom Sokrates refutes in the Gorgias, maintains a different argument from that which Sokrates combats in the Protagoras	125
Uncertainty of referring to Nature as an authority. It may be pleaded in favour of opposite theories. The theory of Kalliklès is made to appear repul-		The refutation of Kalliklès by Sokrates in the Gorgias, is unsuccessful—it is only so far successful as he adopts unintentionally	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

ix

CHAPTER XXII.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
the doctrine of Sokrates in the Protagoras	126	incomplete analogy — circumstances of difference	138
Permanent elements — and transient elements—of human agency —how each of them is appreciated in the two dialogues	127	Sokrates in the Gorgias—speaks like a dissenter among a community of fixed opinions and habits. Impossible that a dissenter, on important points, should acquire any public influence	139
In the Protagoras	128	Sokrates feels his own isolation from his countrymen. He is thrown upon individual speculation and dialectic	140
In the Gorgias	129	Antithesis between philosophy and rhetoric	<i>ib.</i>
Character of the Gorgias generally —discrediting all the actualities of life	130	Position of one who dissents, upon material points, from the fixed opinions and creed of his countrymen	141
Argument of Sokrates resumed—multifarious arts of flattery, aiming at immediate pleasure	132	Probable feelings of Plato on this subject. Claim put forward in the Gorgias of an independent <i>locus standi</i> for philosophy, but without the indiscriminate cross-examination pursued by Sokrates	142
The Rhetors aim only at flattering the public—even the best past Rhetors have done nothing else —citation of the four great Rhetors by Kalliklès	<i>ib.</i>	Importance of maintaining the utmost liberty of discussion. Tendency of all ruling orthodoxy towards intolerance	143
Necessity for temperance, regulation, order. This is the condition of virtue and happiness	133	Issue between philosophy and rhetoric—not satisfactorily handled by Plato. Injustice done to rhetoric. Ignoble manner in which it is presented by Polus and Kalliklès	145
Impossible to succeed in public life, unless a man be thoroughly akin to and in harmony with the ruling force	134	Perikles would have accepted the defence of rhetoric, as Plato has put it into the mouth of Gorgias	146
Danger of one who dissents from the public, either for better or for worse	<i>ib.</i>	The Athenian people recognised a distinction between the pleasurable and the good: but not the same as that which Plato conceived	147
Sokrates resolves upon a scheme of life for himself—to study permanent good, and not immediate satisfaction	135	Rhetoric was employed at Athens in appealing to all the various established sentiments and opinions. Erroneous inferences raised by the Kalliklès of Plato	149
Sokrates announces himself as almost the only man at Athens, who follows out the true political art. Danger of doing this	136	The Platonic <i>Idéal</i> exacts, as good, some order, system, discipline. But order may be directed to bad ends as well as to good. Divergent ideas about virtue	<i>ib.</i>
Myths respecting Hades, and the treatment of deceased persons therein, according to their merits during life — the philosopher, who stood aloof from public affairs, will then be rewarded	<i>ib.</i>	How to discriminate the right order from the wrong. Plato does not advise us	150
Peculiar ethical views of Sokrates —Rhetorical or dogmatical character of the Gorgias	137	The Gorgias upholds the independence and dignity of the dissenting philosopher	151
He merges politics in Ethics—he conceives the rulers as spiritual teachers and trainers of the community	<i>ib.</i>		
<i>Idéal</i> of Plato—a despotic lawgiver or man-trainer, on scientific principles, fashioning all characters pursuant to certain types of his own	138		
Platonic analogy between mental goodness and bodily health—			

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

x

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XXIII.

PHÆDON.

	Page		Page
The Phædon is affirmative and expository	152	not in its post-existence. Doctrine—That the soul is a sort of harmony—refuted by Sokrates	166
Situation and circumstances assumed in the Phædon. Pathetic interest which they inspire	<i>ib.</i>	Sokrates unfolds the intellectual changes or wanderings through which his mind had passed	167
Simmias and Kebês, the two collocutors with Sokrates. Their feelings and those of Sokrates	153	First doctrine of Sokrates as to cause. Reasons why he rejected it	<i>ib.</i>
Emphasis of Sokrates in insisting on freedom of debate, active exercise of reason, and independent judgment for each reasoner	155	Second doctrine. Hopes raised by the treatise of Anaxagoras	168
Anxiety of Sokrates that his friends shall be on their guard against being influenced by his authority—that they shall follow only the convictions of their own reason	<i>ib.</i>	Disappointment because Anaxagoras did not follow out the optimistic principle into detail. Distinction between causes efficient and causes co-efficient	169
Remarkable manifestation of earnest interest for reasoned truth and the liberty of individual dissent	156	Sokrates could neither trace out the optimistic principle for himself, nor find any teacher thereof. He renounced it, and embraced a third doctrine about cause	171
Phædon and Symposium—points of analogy and contrast	157	He now assumes the separate existence of ideas. These ideas are the causes why particular objects manifest certain attributes	172
Phædon—compared with Republic and Timæus. No recognition of the triple or lower souls. Antithesis between soul and body	159	Procedure of Sokrates if his hypothesis were impugned. He insists upon keeping apart the discussion of the hypothesis and the discussion of its consequences	173
Different doctrines of Plato about the soul. Whether all the three souls are immortal, or the rational soul alone	160	Exposition of Sokrates welcomed by the hearers. Remarks upon it	174
The life and character of a philosopher is a constant struggle to emancipate his soul from his body. Death alone enables him to do this completely	161	The philosophical changes in Sokrates all turned upon different views as to a true cause	<i>ib.</i>
Souls of the ordinary or unphilosophical men pass after death into the bodies of different animals. The philosopher alone is relieved from all communion with body	163	Problems and difficulties of which Sokrates first sought solution	175
Special privilege claimed for philosophers in the Phædon apart from the virtuous men who are not philosophers	164	Expectations entertained by Sokrates from the treatise of Anaxagoras. His disappointment. His distinction between causes and co-efficients	<i>ib.</i>
Simmias and Kebês do not admit readily the immortality of the soul, but are unwilling to trouble Sokrates by asking for proof. Unabated interest of Sokrates in rational debate	165	Sokrates imputes to Anaxagoras the mistake of substituting physical agencies in place of mental. This is the same which Aristophanes and others imputed to Sokrates	177
Simmias and Kebês believe fully in the pre-existence of the soul, but		The supposed theory of Anaxagoras cannot be carried out, either by Sokrates himself or any one else. Sokrates turns to general words, and adopts the theory of ideas	179
		Vague and dissentient meanings	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

xi

CHAPTER XXIII.—*continued.*

Page	Page
attached to the word Cause.	Reply to Kriton about burying
That is a cause, to each man,	his body 192
which gives satisfaction to his	Preparations for administering the
inquisitive feelings 180	hemlock. Sympathy of the
Dissension and perplexity on the	gaoler. Equanimity of So-
question,—What is a cause? re-	krates 193
vealed by the picture of Sokrates	Sokrates swallows the poison. Con-
—no intuition to guide him . . 183	versation with the gaoler <i>ib.</i>
Different notions of Plato and Ari-	Ungovernable sorrow of the friends
stotle about causation, causes	present. Self-command of So-
regular and irregular. Inductive	krates. Last words to Kriton,
theory of causation, elaborated	and death 194
in modern times <i>ib.</i>	Extreme pathos, and probable
Last transition of the mind of So-	trustworthiness of these personal
krates from things to words—to	details 195
the adoption of the theory of	Contrast between the Platonic
ideas. Great multitude of ideas	Apology and the Phædon 196
assumed, each fitting a certain	Abundant dogmatic and poetical
number of particulars 186	invention of the Phædon com-
Ultimate appeal to hypothesis of	pared with the profession of ig-
extreme generality 187	norance which we read in the
Plato's demonstration of the im-	Apology 197
mortality of the soul rests upon	Total renunciation and discredit
the assumption of the Platonic	of the body in the Phædon.
ideas. Reasoning to prove this	Different feeling about the body
189	in other Platonic dialogues . . 198
The soul always brings life, and is	Plato's argument does not prove
essentially living. It cannot re-	the immortality of the soul.
ceive death: in other words,	Even if it did prove that, yet
it is immortal <i>ib.</i>	the mode of pre-existence and
The proof of immortality includes	the mode of post-existence, of
pre-existence as well as post-	the soul, would be quite unde-
existence — animals as well as	termined 200
man—also the metempsychosis,	The philosopher will enjoy an ex-
or translation of the soul from	istence of pure soul unattached
one body to another 190	to any body 201
After finishing his proof that the	Plato's demonstration of the im-
soul is immortal, Sokrates enters	mortality of the soul did not
into a description, what will be-	appear satisfactory to subse-
come of it after the death of the	quent philosophers. The ques-
body. He describes a <i>Nekyia</i> . . 191	tion remained debated and pro-
Sokrates expects that his soul is	blematical 203
going to the islands of the blest.	

CHAPTER XXIV.

PHÆDRUS—SYMPOSIUM.

These two are the two erotic dia-	mulus to improving philoso-
logues of Plato. Phædrus is the	phical communion. Personal
originator of both. 206	Beauty, the great point of ap-
Eros as conceived by Plato. Dif-	proximation between the world
ferent sentiment prevalent in	of Sense and the world of Ideas.
Hellenic antiquity and in	Gradual generalisation of the
modern times. Position of	sentiment 209
women in Greece <i>ib.</i>	All men love Good, as the means
Eros, considered as the great sti-	of Happiness, but they pursue it

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xii

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XXIV.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
by various means. The name <i>Eros</i> is confined to one special case of this large variety	210	culties of man—Comparison and combination of particular sensations indispensable — Reminiscence	218
Desire of mental copulation and procreation, as the only attainable likeness of immortality, requires the sight of personal beauty as an originating stimulus	211	Reminiscence is kindled up in the soul of the philosopher by the aspect of the visible Beauty, which is the great link between the world of sense and the world of Ideas	219
Highest exaltation of the erotic impulse in a few privileged minds, when it ascends gradually to the love of Beauty <i>in genere</i> . This is the most absorbing sentiment of all	212	Elevating influence ascribed, both in Phædrus and Symposium, to <i>Eros Philosophus</i> . Mixture in the mind of Plato, of poetical fancy and religious mysticism, with dialectic theory	221
Purpose of the Symposium, to contrast this Platonic view of <i>Eros</i> with several different views of it previously enunciated by the other speakers: closing with a panegyric on Sokrates, by the drunken Alkibiades	213	Differences between Symposium and Phædrus. In-dwelling conceptions assumed by the former, pre-natal experiences by the latter	222
Views of <i>Eros</i> presented by Phædrus, Pausanias, Eryximachus, Aristophanes, Agathon	214	Nothing but metaphorical immortality recognised in Symposium	223
Discourse of Sokrates from revelation of Diotima. He describes <i>Eros</i> as not a God, but an intermediate Dæmon between Gods and men, constantly aspiring to divinity, but not attaining it	<i>ib.</i>	Form or Idea of Beauty presented singly and exclusively in Symposium	<i>ib.</i>
Analogy of the erotic aspiration with that of the philosopher, who knows his own ignorance, and thirsts for knowledge	215	<i>Eros</i> recognised, both in Phædrus and Symposium, as affording the initiatory stimulus to philosophy—Not so recognised in Phædon, Theætétus, and elsewhere	224
<i>Eros</i> as presented in the Phædrus—Discourse of Lysias, and counter-discourse of Sokrates, adverse to <i>Eros</i> —Sokrates is seized with remorse, and recants in a high-flown panegyric on <i>Eros</i>	216	Concluding scene and speech of Alkibiades in the Symposium—Behaviour of Sokrates to Alkibiades and other handsome youths	<i>ib.</i>
Panegyric—Sokrates admits that the influence of <i>Eros</i> is a variety of madness, but distinguishes good and bad varieties of madness, both coming from the Gods. Good madness is far better than sobriety	217	Perfect self-command of Sokrates—proof against every sort of trial	226
Poetical mythe delivered by Sokrates, describing the immortality and pre-existence of the soul, and its pre-natal condition of partial companionship with Gods and eternal Ideas	<i>ib.</i>	Drunkenness of others at the close of the Symposium—Sokrates is not affected by it, but continues his dialectic process	<i>ib.</i>
Operation of such pre-natal experience upon the intellectual fa-		Symposium and Phædon—each is the antithesis and complement of the other	227
		Symposium of Plato compared with that of Xenophon	228
		Small proportion of the serious, in the Xenophontic Symposium	230
		Platonic Symposium more ideal and transcendental than the Xenophontic	231
		Second half of the Phædrus—passes into a debate on Rhetoric.	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

xiii

CHAPTER XXIV.—*continued.*

Page	Page		
Eros is considered as a subject for rhetorical exercise	232	tinuous speech, will produce any serious effect in teaching. Dialectic and cross-examination are necessary	240
Lysias is called a logographer by active politicians. Contempt conveyed by the word. Sokrates declares that the only question is, Whether a man writes well or ill?	233	The Dialectician and Cross-Examiner is the only man who can really teach. If the writer can do this, he is more than a writer	244
Question about teaching the art of writing well or speaking well. Can it be taught upon system or principle? Or does the successful Rhetor succeed only by unsystematic knack?	234	Lysias is only a logographer: Sokrates promises to become a philosopher	<i>ib.</i>
Theory of Sokrates—That all art of persuasion must be founded upon a knowledge of the truth, and of gradations of resemblance to the truth	<i>ib.</i>	Date of the Phædrus—not an early dialogue	245
Comparison made by Sokrates between the discourse of Lysias and his own. Eros is differently understood: Sokrates defined what he meant by it: Lysias did not define	235	Criticism given by Plato on the three discourses—His theory of Rhetoric is more Platonic than Sokratic	<i>ib.</i>
Logical processes—Definition and Division—both of them exemplified in the two discourses of Sokrates	<i>ib.</i>	His theory postulates, in the Rhetor, knowledge already assured—it assumes that all the doubts have been already removed	<i>ib.</i>
View of Sokrates—That there is no real Art of Rhetoric, except what is already comprised in Dialectic—The rhetorical teaching is empty and useless	237	The Expositor, with knowledge and logical process, teaches minds unoccupied and willing to learn	246
What the Art of Rhetoric ought to be—Analogy of Hippokrates and the medical Art	<i>ib.</i>	The Rhetor does not teach, but persuades persons with minds pre-occupied—guiding them methodically from error to truth	<i>ib.</i>
Art of Rhetoric ought to include a systematic classification of minds with all their varieties, and of discourses with all their varieties. The Rhetor must know how to apply the one to the other, suitably to each particular case	238	He must then classify the minds to be persuaded, and the means of persuasion or varieties of discourse. He must know how to fit on the one to the other in each particular case	247
The Rhetorical Artist must farther become possessed of real truth, as well as that which his auditors believe to be truth. He is not sufficiently rewarded for this labour	239	Plato's <i>Ideal</i> of the Rhetorical Art—involves in part incompatible conditions—the Wise man or philosopher will never be listened to by the public	248
Question about Writing—As an Art, for the purpose of instruction, it can do little—Reasons why. Writing may remind the reader of what he already knows	<i>ib.</i>	The other part of the Platonic <i>Ideal</i> is grand but unattainable—breath of psychological data and classified modes of discourse	249
Neither written words, nor con-		Plato's ideal grandeur compared with the rhetorical teachers—Usefulness of these teachers for the wants of an accomplished man	250
		The Rhetorical teachers conceived the Art too narrowly: Plato conceived it too widely. The principles of an Art are not required to be explained to all learners	252
		Plato includes in his conception of Art, the application thereof to new particular cases. This can never be taught by rule.	<i>ib.</i>
		Plato's charge against the Rhe-	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xiv

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XXIV.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
torical teachers is not made out	254	No one has ever been found competent to solve the difficulties raised by Sokrates, Arkesilaus, Karneades, and the negative vein of philosophy	258
Plato has not treated Lysias fairly, in neglecting his greater works, and selecting for criticism an erotic exercise for a private circle	<i>ib.</i>	Plato's <i>ideal</i> philosopher can only be realised under the hypothesis of a pre-existent and omniscient soul, stimulated into full reminiscence here	259
No fair comparison can be taken between this exercise of Lysias and the discourses delivered by Sokrates in the Phædrus	255	Different proceeding of Plato in the Timæus	260
Continuous discourse, either written or spoken, inefficacious as a means of instruction to the ignorant	256	Opposite tendencies co-existent in Plato's mind—Extreme of the Transcendental or Absolute—Extreme of specialising adaptation to individuals and occasions	261
Written matter is useful as a memorandum for persons who know—or as an elegant pastime ..	257		
Plato's didactic theories are pitched too high to be realised	258		

CHAPTER XXV.

PARMENIDES.

Character of dialogues immediately preceding — much transcendental assertion. Opposite character of the Parmenides	263	in nature is mean to the philosopher	268
Sokrates is the juvenile defendant — Parmenides the veteran censor and cross-examiner. Parmenides gives a specimen of exercises to be performed by the philosophical aspirant	<i>ib.</i>	Remarks upon this—Contrast between emotional and scientific classification	<i>ib.</i>
Circumstances and persons of the Parmenides	265	Objections of Parmenides—How can objects participate in the Ideas? Each cannot have the whole Idea, nor a part thereof	270
Manner in which the doctrine of Parmenides was impugned. Manner in which his partisan Zeno defended him	<i>ib.</i>	Comparing the Idea with the sensible objects partaking in the Idea, there is a likeness between them which must be represented by a higher Idea—and so on <i>ad infinitum</i>	<i>ib.</i>
Sokrates here impugns the doctrine of Zeno. He affirms the Platonic theory of Ideas separate from sensible objects, yet participable by them	266	Are the Ideas conceptions of the mind, and nothing more? Impossible	271
Parmenides and Zeno admire the philosophical ardour of Sokrates. Parmenides advances objections against the Platonic theory of Ideas	267	The ideas are types or exemplaria, and objects partake of them by being likened to them? Impossible	272
What Ideas does Sokrates recognise? Of the Just and Good? Yes. Of Man, Horse, &c.? Doubtful. Of Hair, Mud, &c.? No	<i>ib.</i>	If Ideas exist, they cannot be knowable by us. We can know only what is relative to ourselves. Individuals are relative to individuals: Ideas relative to Ideas	<i>ib.</i>
Parmenides declares that no object		Forms can be known only through the Form of Cognition, which we do not possess	273
		Form of Cognition, superior to our	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

xv

CHAPTER XXV.—*continued.*

Page	Page		
Cognition, belongs to the Gods. We cannot know them, nor can they know us	274	that he has been premature in delivering a doctrine, without sufficient preliminary exercise	286
Sum total of objections against the Ideas is grave. But if we do not admit that Ideas exist, and that they are knowable, there can be no dialectic discussion	<i>ib.</i>	What sort of exercise? Parmenides describes: To assume provisionally both the affirmative and the negative of many hypotheses about the most general terms, and to trace the consequences of each	287
Dilemma put by Parmenides—Acuteness of his objections	275	Impossible to do this before a numerous audience—Parmenides is entreated to give a specimen—After much solicitation he agrees	288
The doctrine which Parmenides attacks is the genuine Platonic theory of Ideas. His objections are never answered in any part of the Platonic dialogues	276	Parmenides elects his own theory of the <i>Unum</i> , as the topic for exhibition—Aristoteles becomes respondent	<i>ib.</i>
Views of Stallbaum and Socher. The latter maintains that Plato would never make such objections against his own theory, and denies the authenticity of the <i>Parmenidés</i>	277	Exhibition of Parmenides—Nine distinct deductions or Demonstrations, first from <i>Unum Est</i> —next from <i>Unum non Est</i>	<i>ib.</i>
Philosophers are usually advocates, each of a positive system of his own	<i>ib.</i>	The Demonstrations in antagonising pairs, or Antinomies. Perplexing entanglement of conclusions given without any explanation	289
Different spirit of Plato in his Dialogues of Search	278	Different judgments of Platonic critics respecting the Antinomies and the dialogue generally	290
The <i>Parmenidés</i> is the extreme manifestation of the negative element. That Plato should employ one dialogue in setting forth the negative case against the Theory of Ideas is not unnatural	<i>ib.</i>	No dogmatical solution or purpose is wrapped up in the dialogue. The purpose is negative, to make a theorist keenly feel all the difficulties of theorising	294
Force of the negative case in the <i>Parmenidés</i> . Difficulties about participation of sensible objects in the world of Ideas	279	This negative purpose is expressly announced by Plato himself. All dogmatical purpose, extending farther, is purely hypothetical, and even inconsistent with what is declared	295
Difficulties about the Cognizability of Ideas. If Ideas are absolute, they cannot be cognizable: if they are cognizable, they must be relative. Doctrine of <i>Homo Mensura</i>	280	The Demonstrations or Antinomies considered. They include much unwarranted assumption and subtlety. Collection of unexplained perplexities or <i>ἀπορίας</i>	297
Answer of Sokrates—That Ideas are mere conceptions of the mind. Objection of Parmenides correct, though undeveloped	281	Even if Plato himself saw through these subtleties, he might still choose to impose and to heap up difficulties in the way of a forward affirmative aspirant	<i>ib.</i>
Meaning of Abstract and General Terms, debated from ancient times to the present day—Different views of Plato and Aristotle upon it	284	The exercises exhibited by Parmenides are exhibited only as illustrative specimens of a method enjoined to be applied to many other Antinomies	299
Plato never expected to make his Ideas fit on to the facts of sense: Aristotle tried to do it and partly succeeded	286		
Continuation of the Dialogue—Parmenides admonishes Sokrates			

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xvi

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XXV.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
These Platonic Antinomies are more formidable than any of the sophisms or subtleties broached by the Megaric philosophers ..	300	momentary stoppages in the course of time	309
In order to understand fully the Platonic Antinomies, we ought to have before us the problems of the Megarics and others. Uselessness of searching for a positive result	301	Review of the successive pairs of Demonstrations or Antinomies in each, the first proves the Neither, the second proves the Both	310
Assumptions of Parmenides in his Demonstrations convey the minimum of determinate meaning. Views of Aristotle upon these indeterminate predicates, Ens, Unum, &c.	302	The third Demonstration is mediatorial, but not satisfactory—The hypothesis of the Sudden or Instantaneous found no favour ..	311
In the Platonic Demonstrations the same proposition in words is made to bear very different meanings	303	Review of the two last Antinomies. Demonstrations VI. and VII. ..	312
First Demonstration ends in an assemblage of negative conclusions. <i>Reductio ad Absurdum</i> of the assumption—Unum non Multa	304	Demonstration VII. is founded upon the genuine doctrine of Parmenides	313
Second Demonstration	305	Demonstrations VI. and VII. considered—Unwarrantable steps in the reasoning—The fundamental premiss differently interpreted, though the same in words	314
It ends in demonstrating <i>Both</i> , of that which the first Demonstration had demonstrated <i>Neither</i>	306	Demonstration VIII. and IX.—Analysis of Demonstration VIII.	315
Startling paradox—Open offence against logical canon—No logical canon had then been laid down	308	Demonstration VIII. is very subtle and Zenonian	316
Demonstration third—Attempt to reconcile the contradiction of Demonstrations I. and II. ..	<i>ib.</i>	Demonstration IX.— <i>Neither</i> following <i>Both</i>	<i>ib.</i>
Plato's imagination of the Sudden or Instantaneous—Breaches or		Concluding words of the Parmenides—Declaration that he has demonstrated the Both and the Neither of many different propositions	317
		Comparison of the conclusion of the Parmenides to an enigma of the Republic. Difference. The constructor of the enigma adapted its conditions to a fore-known solution. Plato did not	318

CHAPTER XXVI.

THEÆTETUS.

Subject and personages in the Theætétus	319	cannot teach, but he can evolve knowledge out of pregnant minds	321
Question raised by Sokrates—What is Knowledge or Cognition? First answer of Theætétus, enumerating many different cognitions. Corrected by Sokrates	320	Ethical basis of the cross-examination of Sokrates—He is forbidden to pass by falsehood without challenge	322
Preliminary conversation before the second answer is given. Sokrates describes his own peculiar efficacy—mental obstetric—He		Answer of Theætétus—Cognition is sensible perception: Sokrates says that this is the same doctrine as the <i>Homo Mensura</i> laid down by Protagoras, and that both are in close affinity with	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

xvii

CHAPTER XXVI.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
the doctrines of Homer, Hera- kleitus, Empedoklès, &c., all ex- cept Parmenides	323	doctrine, as given here by So- krates is to a great degree just. You cannot explain the facts of consciousness by independent Subject and Object	340
Plato here blends together three distinct theories, for the purpose of confuting them: yet he also professes to urge what can be said in favour of them. Diffi- culty of following his exposition	324	Plato's attempt to get behind the phenomena. Reference to a double potentiality—Subjective and Objective	343
The doctrine of Protagoras is com- pletely distinct from the other doctrines. The identification of them as one and the same is only constructive—the interpretation of Plato himself	<i>ib.</i>	Arguments advanced by the Pla- tonic Sokrates against the Pro- tagorean doctrine. He says that it puts the wise and foolish on a par—that it contradicts the common consciousness. Not every one, but the wise man only, is a measure	345
Explanation of the doctrine of Pro- tagoras— <i>Homo Mensura</i>	325	In matters of present sentiment every man can judge for himself. Where future consequences are involved special knowledge is required	346
Perpetual implication of Subject with Object—Relate and Cor- relate	327	Plato, when he impugns the doc- trine of Protagoras, states that doctrine without the qualification properly belonging to it. All belief relative to the condition of the believing mind	347
Such relativity is no less true in regard to the ratiocinative com- binations of each individual, than in regard to his percipient capacities	328	All exposition and discussion is an assemblage of individual judg- ments and affirmations. This fact is disguised by elliptical forms of language	349
Evidence from Plato proving im- plication of Subject and Object, in regard to the intelligible world	330	Argument—That the Protagorean doctrine equalises all men and animals. How far true. Not true in the sense requisite to sustain Plato's objection	351
The Protagorean measure is even more easily shown in reference to the intelligible world than in reference to sense	331	Belief on authority is true to the believer himself—The efficacy of authority resides in the be- liever's own mind	352
Object always relative to Subject — Either without the other, im- possible. Plato admits this in <i>Sophistes</i>	335	Protagorean formula—is false, to those who dissent from it	353
Plato's representation of the Pro- tagorean doctrine in intimate conjunction with the Heraklei- tean	<i>ib.</i>	Plato's argument—That the wise man alone is a measure—Reply to it	<i>ib.</i>
Relativity of sensible facts, as de- scribed by him	336	Plato's argument as to the distinc- tion between present sensation and anticipation of the future	354
Relations are nothing in the object purely and simply, without a comparing subject	337	The formula of Relativity does not imply that every man be- lieves himself to be infallible	355
Relativity twofold—to the com- paring Subject—to another Object, besides the one directly described	<i>ib.</i>	Plato's argument is untenable— That if the Protagorean formula be admitted, dialectic discus- sion would be annulled—The reverse is true—Dialectic recog- nition	<i>b</i>
Statement of the doctrine of Hera- kleitus—yet so as to implicate it with that of Protagoras	338		
Agent and Patient—No absolute Ens	339		
Arguments derived from dreams, fevers, &c., may be answered	340		
Exposition of the Protagorean			

VOL. II.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xviii

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XXVI.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
nises the autonomy of the individual mind	356	which the mind makes by itself—It perceives Existence, Difference, &c.	371
Contrast with the Treatise De Legibus—Plato assumes infallible authority—sets aside Dialectic	358	Sokrates maintains that knowledge is to be found, not in the Sensible Perceptions themselves, but in the comparisons and computations of the mind respecting them	<i>ib.</i>
Plato in denying the Protagorean formula, constitutes himself the measure for all. Counter-proposition to the formula	<i>ib.</i>	Examination of this view—Distinction from the views of modern philosophers	372
Import of the Protagorean formula is best seen when we state explicitly the counter-proposition	359	Different views given by Plato in other dialogues	373
Unpopularity of the Protagorean formula—Most believers insist upon making themselves a measure for others, as well as for themselves. Appeal to Abstractions	<i>ib.</i>	Plato's discussion of this question here exhibits a remarkable advance in analytical psychology. The mind rises from Sensation, first to Opinion, then to Cognition	374
Aristotle failed in his attempts to refute the Protagorean formula—Every reader of Aristotle will claim the right of examining for himself Aristotle's canons of truth	362	Plato did not recognise Verification from experience, or from facts of sense, as either necessary or possible	378
Plato's examination of the other doctrine—That knowledge is Sensible Perception. He adverts to sensible facts which are different with different Perceptants.	363	Second definition given by Theætétus—That Cognition consists in right or true opinion	379
Such is not the case with all the facts of sense. The conditions of unanimity are best found among select facts of sense—weighing, measuring, &c.	364	Objection by Sokrates—This definition assumes that there are false opinions. But how can false opinions be possible? How can we conceive Non-Ens; or confound together two distinct realities?	<i>ib.</i>
Arguments of Sokrates in examining this question. Divergence between one man and another arises, not merely from different sensual impressibility, but from mental and associative difference	365	Waxen memorial tablet in the mind, on which past impressions are engraved. False opinion consists in wrongly identifying present sensations with past impressions.	380
Argument—That Sensible Perception does not include memory—Probability that those who held the doctrine meant to include memory	367	Sokrates refutes this assumption. Dilemma. Either false opinion is impossible, or else, a man may know what he does not know	381
Argument from the analogy of seeing and not seeing at the same time	<i>ib.</i>	He draws distinction between possessing knowledge, and having it actually in hand. Simile of the pigeon-cage with caught pigeons turned into it and flying about	<i>ib.</i>
Sokrates maintains that we do not see <i>with</i> our eyes, but that the mind sees <i>through</i> the eyes: that the mind often conceives and judges by itself, without the aid of any bodily organ	370	Sokrates refutes this. Suggestion of Theætétus—That there may be non-cognitions in the mind as well as cognitions, and that false opinion may consist in confounding one with the other. Sokrates rejects this	382
Indication of several judgments,			

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

xix

CHAPTER XXVI.—*continued.*

Page	Page
He brings another argument to prove that Cognition is not the same as true opinion. Rhetors persuade or communicate true opinion; but they do not teach or communicate knowledge .. 383	not hold. For rational explanation, in this sense, is already included in true opinion .. 386
New answer of Theætétus—Cognition is true opinion, coupled with rational explanation .. 384	Conclusion of the dialogue—Summing up by Sokrates—Value of the result, although purely negative .. 387
Criticism on the answer by Sokrates. Analogy of letters and words, primordial elements and compounds. Elements cannot be explained: compounds alone can be explained <i>ib.</i>	Remarks on the dialogue. View of Plato. False persuasion of knowledge removed. Importance of such removal <i>ib.</i>
Sokrates refutes this criticism. If the elements are unknowable, the compound must be unknowable also 385	Formation of the testing or verifying power in men's minds. Value of the Theætétus, as it exhibits Sokrates demolishing his own suggestions 388
Rational explanation may have one of three different meanings. 1. Description in appropriate language. 2. Enumeration of all the component elements in the compound. In neither of these meanings will the definition of Cognition hold <i>ib.</i>	Comparison of the Philosopher with the Rhetor. The Rhetor is enslaved to the opinions of auditors 389
Third meaning. To assign some mark, whereby the thing to be explained differs from everything else. The definition will	The Philosopher is master of his own debates 390
	Purpose of Dialogue to qualify for a life of philosophical Search .. 391
	Difficulties of the Theætétus are not solved in any other Dialogue <i>ib.</i>
	Plato considered that the search for Truth was the noblest occupation of life 393
	Contrast between the philosopher and the practical statesman—between Knowledge and Opinion 394

CHAPTER XXVII.

SOPHISTES—POLITIKUS.

Persons and circumstances of the two dialogues 396	and instructive. No logical manuals then existed 402
Relation of the two dialogues to the Theætétus 398	Plato describes the Sophist as analogous to an angler. He traces the Sophist by descending subdivision from the acquisitive genus of art 403
Plato declares that his first purpose is to administer a lesson in logical method: the special question chosen, being subordinate to that purpose 399	The Sophist traced down from the same, by a second and different descending subdivision 404
Method of logical Definition and Division 400	Also, by a third <i>ib.</i>
Sokrates tries the application of this method, first, upon a vulgar subject. To find the logical place and deduction of the Angler. Superior classes above him. Bisecting division <i>ib.</i>	The Sophist is traced down, from the genus of separating or discriminating art 405
Such a lesson in logical classification was at that time both novel	In a logical classification, low and vulgar items deserve as much attention as grand ones. Conflict between emotional and scientific classification 406

b 2

CHAPTER XXVII.—*continued.*

Page	Page
The purifier—a species under the genus discriminator—separates good from evil. Evil is of two sorts; the worst sort is, Ignorance mistaking itself for knowledge	408
Exhortation is useless against this worst mode of evil. Cross-examination, the shock of the Elenchus, must be brought to bear upon it. This is the sovereign purifier	409
The application of this Elenchus is the work of the Sophist, looked at on its best side. But looked at as he really is, he is a juggler who teaches pupils to dispute about every thing—who palms off falsehood for truth	<i>ib.</i>
Doubt started by the Eleate. How can it be possible either to think or to speak falsely?	410
He pursues the investigation of this problem by a series of questions	411
The Sophist will reject our definition and escape, by affirming that to speak falsely is impossible. He will require us to make out a rational theory, explaining Non-Ens	<i>ib.</i>
The Eleate turns from Non-Ens to Ens. Theories of various philosophers about Ens	412
Difficulties about Ens are as great as those about Non-Ens	413
Whether Ens is Many or One? If Many, how Many? Difficulties about One and the Whole. Theorists about Ens cannot solve them	<i>ib.</i>
Theories of those who do not recognise a definite number of Entia or elements. Two classes thereof	414
1. The Materialist Philosophers. 2. The Friends of Forms or Idealists, who recognise such Forms as the only real Entia . .	<i>ib.</i>
Argument against the Materialists—Justice must be something, since it may be either present or absent, making sensible difference—But Justice is not a body	415
At least many of them will concede this point, though not all.	
Ens is common to the corporeal and the incorporeal. Ens is equivalent to potentiality	416
Argument against the Idealists—who distinguish Ens from the generated, and say that we hold communion with the former through our minds, with the latter through our bodies and senses	<i>ib.</i>
Holding communion—What? Implies Relativity. Ens is known by the mind. It therefore suffers—or undergoes change. Ens includes both the unchangeable and the changeable	417
Motion and Rest are both of them Entia or Realities. Both agree in Ens. Ens is a <i>tertium quid</i> —distinct from both. But how can anything be distinct from both?	418
Here the Eleate breaks off without solution. He declares his purpose to show, That Ens is as full of puzzle as Non-Ens	<i>ib.</i>
Argument against those who admit no predication to be legitimate, except identical. How far Forms admit of intercommunion with each other	<i>ib.</i>
No intercommunion between any distinct forms. Refuted. Common speech is inconsistent with this hypothesis	419
Reciprocal intercommunion of all Forms—inadmissible	<i>ib.</i>
Some Forms admit of intercommunion, others not. This is the only admissible doctrine. Analogy of letters and syllables . .	<i>ib.</i>
Art and skill are required to distinguish what Forms admit of intercommunion, and what Forms do not. This is the special intelligence of the Philosopher, who lives in the bright region of Ens: the Sophist lives in the darkness of Non-Ens	420
The Eleate comes to enquire what Non-Ens is. He takes for examination five principal Forms—Motion—Rest—Ens—Same—Different	<i>ib.</i>
Form of Diversum—pervades all the others	421
Motion is different from Diversum,	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

xxi

CHAPTER XXVII.—*continued.*

	Page	Page
or is not <i>Diversum</i> . Motion is different from <i>Ens</i> —in other words, it is <i>Non-Ens</i> . Each of these <i>Forms</i> is both <i>Ens</i> and <i>Non-Ens</i>	422	
By <i>Non-Ens</i> , we do not mean anything contrary to <i>Ens</i> —we mean only something different from <i>Ens</i> . <i>Non-Ens</i> is a real <i>Form</i> , as well as <i>Ens</i>	423	
The <i>Eleate</i> claims to have refuted <i>Parmenides</i> , and to have shown both that <i>Non-Ens</i> is a real <i>Form</i> , and also what it is	<i>ib.</i>	
The theory now stated is the only one, yet given, which justifies predication as a legitimate process, with a predicate different from the subject	424	
Enquiry, whether the <i>Form</i> of <i>Non-Ens</i> can come into intercommunion with the <i>Forms</i> of <i>Proposition</i> , <i>Opinion</i> , <i>Judgment</i>	425	
Analysis of a <i>Proposition</i> . Every <i>Proposition</i> must have a noun and a verb—it must be proposition of <i>Something</i> . False propositions, involve the <i>Form</i> of <i>Non-Ens</i> , in relation to the particular subject	<i>ib.</i>	
<i>Opinion</i> , <i>Judgment</i> , <i>Fancy</i> , &c., are akin to <i>Proposition</i> , and may be also false, by coming into partnership with the <i>Form Non-Ens</i>	426	
It thus appears that <i>Falsehood</i> , imitating <i>Truth</i> , is theoretically possible, and that there may be a profession, like that of the <i>Sophist</i> , engaged in producing it	427	
Logical distribution of <i>Imitators</i> —those who imitate what they know, or what they do not know—of these last, some sincerely believe themselves to know, others are conscious that they do not know, and designedly impose upon others	<i>ib.</i>	
Last class divided—Those who impose on numerous auditors by long discourse, the <i>Rhetor</i> —Those who impose on select auditors, by short question and answer, making the respondent contradict himself—the <i>Sophist</i>	<i>ib.</i>	
Dialogue closed. Remarks upon it. Characteristics ascribed to a <i>Sophist</i>	428	
		These characteristics may have belonged to other persons, but they belonged in an especial manner to <i>Sokrates</i> himself
		The conditions enumerated in the dialogue (except the taking of a fee) fit <i>Sokrates</i> better than any other known person
		The art which <i>Plato</i> calls “the thoroughbred and noble <i>Sophistical Art</i> ” belongs to <i>Sokrates</i> and to no one else. The <i>Elenchus</i> was peculiar to him. <i>Protagoras</i> and <i>Prodikus</i> were not <i>Sophists</i> in this sense
		Universal knowledge—was professed at that time by all philosophers— <i>Plato</i> , <i>Aristotle</i> , &c.
		Inconsistency of <i>Plato</i> ’s argument in the <i>Sophistês</i> . He says that the <i>Sophist</i> is a disputatious man, who challenges every one for speaking falsehood. He says also that the <i>Sophist</i> is one who maintains false propositions to be impossible
		Reasoning of <i>Plato</i> about <i>Non-Ens</i> —No predications except identical
		Misconception of the function of the copula in predication
		No formal <i>Grammar</i> or <i>Logic</i> existed at that time. No analysis or classification of propositions before the works of <i>Aristotle</i>
		<i>Plato</i> ’s declared purpose in the <i>Sophistês</i> —To confute the various schools of thinkers— <i>Antisthenes</i> , <i>Parmenides</i> , the <i>Materialists</i> , &c.
		<i>Plato</i> ’s refutation throws light upon the doctrine of <i>Antisthenes</i>
		<i>Plato</i> ’s argument against the <i>Materialists</i>
		Reply open to the <i>Materialists</i>
		<i>Plato</i> ’s argument against the <i>Idealists</i> or <i>Friends of Forms</i> . Their point of view against him
		<i>Plato</i> argues—That to know, and to be known, is action and passion, a mode of relativity
		<i>Plato</i> ’s reasoning—compared with the points of view of both
		The argument of <i>Plato</i> goes to an entire denial of the <i>Absolute</i> , and a full establishment of the <i>Relative</i>

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xxii

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XXVII.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Coincidence of his argument with the doctrine of Protagoras in the <i>Theætétus</i>	440	Necessity of accepting the evidence of sense	454
The Idealists maintained that Ideas or Forms were entirely unchangeable and eternal. Plato here denies this, and maintains that Ideas were partly changeable, partly unchangeable	<i>ib.</i>	Errors of Antisthenes—depended partly on the imperfect formal logic of that day	455
Plato's reasoning against the Materialists	441	Doctrine of the Sophistês—contradicts that of other Platonic dialogues	<i>ib.</i>
Difference between Concrete and Abstract, not then made conspicuous. Large meaning here given by Plato to Ens—comprehending not only Objects of Perception, but Objects of Conception besides	<i>ib.</i>	The persons whom Plato here attacks as Friends of Forms are those who held the same doctrines as Plato himself espouses in <i>Phædon</i> , <i>Republic</i> , &c.	460
Narrower meaning given by Materialists to Ens—they included only Objects of Perception. Their reasoning as opposed to Plato	442	The Sophistês recedes from the Platonic point of view, and approaches the Aristotelian	461
Different definitions of Ens—by Plato—the Materialists, the Idealists	443	Aristotle assumes without proof, that there are some propositions true, others false	463
Plato's views about Non-Ens examined	444	Plato in the <i>Sophistês</i> has undertaken an impossible task—He could not have proved, against his supposed adversary, that there <i>are</i> false propositions	<i>ib.</i>
His review of the select Five Forms	446	What must be assumed in all dialectic discussion	465
Plato's doctrine—That Non-Ens is nothing more than different from Ens	<i>ib.</i>	Discussion and theorising presuppose belief and disbelief, expressed in set forms of words. They imply predication, which Antisthenes discarded	466
Communion of Non-Ens with proposition—possible and explicable	447	Precepts and examples of logical partition, illustrated in the <i>Sophistês</i>	467
Imperfect analysis of a proposition—Plato does not recognise the predicate	448	Recommendation of logical bipartition	468
Plato's explanation of Non-Ens is not satisfactory—Objections to it	449	Precepts illustrated by the <i>Philêbus</i>	<i>ib.</i>
Plato's view of the negative is erroneous. Logical maxim of contradiction	452	Importance of founding logical Partition on resemblances perceived by sense	470
Examination of the illustrative propositions chosen by Plato—How do we know that one is true, the other false?	<i>ib.</i>	Province of sensible perception—is not so much narrowed by Plato here as it is in the <i>Theætétus</i>	<i>ib.</i>
		Comparison of the <i>Sophistês</i> with the <i>Phædrus</i>	471
		Comparison of the <i>Politikus</i> with the <i>Parmenidês</i>	473
		Variety of method in dialectic research—Diversity of Plato	<i>ib.</i>

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

xxiii

CHAPTER XXVIII.

POLITIKUS.

	Page		Page
The Politikus by itself, apart from the Sophistês	475	lawless government by scientific men. It is a second-best	485
Views of Plato on mensuration. Objects measured against each other. Objects compared with a common standard. In each Art, the purpose to be attained is the standard	<i>ib.</i>	Comparison of unscientific governments. The one despot is the worse. Democracy is the least bad, because it is least of a government	486
Purpose in the Sophistês and Politikus is—To attain dialectic aptitude. This is the standard of comparison whereby to judge whether the means employed are suitable	476	The true governor distinguished from the General, the Rhetor, &c. They are all properly his subordinates and auxiliaries . .	<i>ib.</i>
Plato's defence of the Politikus against critics. Necessity that the critic shall declare explicitly what his standard of comparison is	477	What the scientific Governor will do. He will aim at the formation of virtuous citizens. He will weave together the energetic virtues with the gentle virtues. Natural dissidence between them	487
Comparison of Politikus with Protagoras, Phædon, Philêbus, &c. . .	<i>ib.</i>	If a man sins by excess of the energetic element, he is to be killed or banished: if of the gentle, he is to be made a slave. The Governor must keep up in the minds of the citizens an unanimous standard of ethical orthodoxy	488
Definition of the Statesman or Governor. Scientific competence. Sokratic point of departure. Procedure of Plato in subdividing . .	478	Remarks—Socratic Ideal—Title to govern mankind derived exclusively from scientific superiority in an individual person	<i>ib.</i>
King during the Saturnian period, was of a breed superior to the people—not so any longer . .	479	Different ways in which this ideal is worked out by Plato and Xenophon. The man of speculation and the man of action . . .	489
Distinction of Causes Principal and Causes Auxiliary. The King is the only Principal Cause, but his auxiliaries pretend to be principal also	481	The theory in the Politikus is the contradiction to that theory which is assigned to Protagoras in the Protagoras	490
Plato does not admit the received classification of government. It does not touch the point upon which all true distinction ought to be founded—Scientific or Unscientific	482	Points of the Protagorean theory—rests upon common sentiment	491
Unscientific governments are counterfeits. Government by any numerous body must be counterfeit. Government by the one scientific man is the true government	483	Counter-Theory in the Politikus. The exigences of the Eleate in the Politikus go much farther than those of Protagoras	492
Fixed laws, limiting the scientific Governor, are mischievous, as they would be for the physician and the steersman. Absurdity of determining medical practice by laws, and presuming every one to know it	484	The Eleate complains that under the Protagorean theory no adverse criticism is allowed. The dissenter is either condemned to silence or punished	<i>ib.</i>
Government by fixed laws is better than lawless government by unscientific men, but worse than		Intolerance at Athens, not so great as elsewhere. Plato complains of the assumption of infallibility in existing societies, but exacts it severely in that which he himself constructs	493

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xxiv

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XXVIII.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Theory of the Politikus—distinguished three gradations of polity. Gigantic individual force the worst	494	—in the latter to the formation and modification of names	497
Comparison of the Politikus with the Republic. Points of analogy and difference	495	Courage and Temperance are assumed in the Politikus. No notice taken of the doubts and difficulties raised in Lachês and Charmidês	498
Comparison of the Politikus with the Kratylus. Dictatorial, constructive, science or art, common to both; applied in the former to social administration		Purpose of the difficulties in Plato's Dialogues of Search—To stimulate the intellect of the hearer. His exposition does not give solutions	500

CHAPTER XXIX.

KRATYLUS.

Persons and subject of the dialogue Kratylus—Sokrates has no formed opinion, but is only a Searcher with the others	501	Each man believes others to be wiser on various points than himself—Belief on authority—not inconsistent with the affirmation of Protagoras	509
Argument of Sokrates against Hermodogenes— all proceedings of nature are conducted according to fixed laws—speaking and naming among the rest	502	Analogy of physical processes (cutting and burning) appealed to by Sokrates—does not sustain his inference against Protagoras	510
The name is a didactic instrument; fabricated by the lawgiver upon the type of the Name-Form, and employed as well as appreciated, by the philosopher	503	Reply of Protagoras to the Platonic objections	511
Names have an intrinsic aptitude for signifying one thing and not another	505	Sentiments of Belief and Disbelief, common to all men—Grounds of belief and disbelief, different with different men and different ages	512
Forms of Names, as well as Forms of things nameable—essence of the Nomen, to signify the Essence of its Nominatum	<i>ib.</i>	Protagoras did not affirm, that Belief depended upon the will or inclination of each individual, but that it was relative to the circumstances of each individual mind	513
Exclusive competence of a privileged lawgiver, to discern these essences, and to apportion names rightly	506	Facts of sense—some are the same to all sentient subjects, others are different to different subjects. Grounds of unanimity	515
Counter-Theory, which Sokrates here sets forth and impugns—the Protagorean doctrine—Homo Mensura	507	Sokrates exemplifies his theory of the Absolute Name or the Name-Form. He attempts to show the inherent rectitude of many existing names. His etymological transitions	516
Objection by Sokrates—That Protagoras puts all men on a level as to wisdom and folly, knowledge and ignorance	508	These transitions appear violent to a modern reader. They did not appear so to readers of Plato until this century. Modern discovery, that they are intended as caricatures to deride the Sophists	519
Objection unfounded—What the Protagorean theory really affirms—Belief always relative to the believer's mind	<i>ib.</i>		

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

XXV

CHAPTER XXIX.—*continued.*

Page	Page		
Dissent from this theory — No proof that the Sophists ever proposed etymologies	521	All names are not consistent with the theory of Herakleitus: some are opposed to it	536
Plato did not intend to propose mock-etymologies, or to deride any one. Protagoras could not be ridiculed here. Neither Hermogenes nor Kratylus understand the etymologies as caricature	522	It is not true to say, That Things can only be known through their names	537
Plato intended his theory as serious, and his exemplifications as admissible guesses. He does not cite particular cases as proofs of a theory, but only as illustrating what he means	525	Unchangeable Platonic Forms—opposed to the Herakleitean flux, which is true only respecting sensible particulars	<i>ib.</i>
Sokrates announces himself as Searcher. Other etymologists of ancient times admitted etymologies as rash as those of Plato	527	Herakleitean theory must not be assumed as certain. We must not put implicit faith in names	538
Continuance of the dialogue—Sokrates endeavours to explain how it is that the Names originally right have become so disguised and spoiled	529	Remarks upon the dialogue. Dissent from the opinion of Stallbaum and others, that it is intended to deride Protagoras and other Sophists	539
Letters, as well as things, must be distinguished with their essential properties, each must be adapted to each	530	Theory laid down by Sokrates <i>à priori</i> , in the first part—Great difficulty, and ingenuity necessary, to bring it into harmony with facts	540
Essential significant aptitude consists in resemblance	531	Opposite tendencies of Sokrates in the last half of the dialogue—he disconnects his theory of Naming from the Herakleitean doctrine	542
Sokrates assumes that the Name-giving Lawgiver was a believer in the Herakleitean theory	532	Ideal of the best system of naming—the Name-Giver ought to be familiar with the Platonic Ideas or Essences, and apportion his names according to resemblances among them	543
But the Name-Giver may be mistaken or incompetent—the rectitude of the name depends upon his knowledge	<i>ib.</i>	Comparison of Plato's views about naming with those upon social institutions. Artistic, systematic construction—contrasted with unpremeditated, unsystematic growth	545
Changes and transpositions introduced in the name—hard to follow	533	Politikus compared with Kratylus	546
Sokrates qualifies and attenuates his original thesis	<i>ib.</i>	Ideal of Plato—Postulate of the One Wise Man—Badness of all reality	547
Conversation of Sokrates with Kratylus: who upholds that original thesis without any qualification	<i>ib.</i>	Comparison of Kratylus, Theætétus, and Sophistês, in treatment of the question respecting Non-Ens, and the possibility of false propositions	548
Sokrates goes still farther towards retracting it	535	Discrepancies and inconsistencies of Plato, in his manner of handling the same subject	550
There are names better and worse—more like, or less like to the things named: Natural Names are the best, but they cannot always be had. Names may be significant by habit, though in an inferior way	536	No common didactic purpose pervading the Dialogues—each is a distinct composition, working out its own peculiar argument	<i>ib.</i>

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00963-8 - Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates, Volume 2

George Grote

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xxvi

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XXX.

PHILEBUS.

	Page		Page
Character, Personages, and Subject of the <i>Philēbus</i>	552	It is nevertheless instructive, in regard to logical division and classification	562
Protest against the Sokratic Elenchus, and the purely negative procedure	553	At that time little thought had been bestowed upon classification as a logical process	563
Enquiry—What mental condition will ensure to all men a happy life? Good and Happiness—correlative and co-extensive. <i>Philēbus</i> declares for Pleasure, Sokrates for Intelligence	<i>ib.</i>	Classification — unconscious and conscious	564
Good—object of universal choice and attachment by men, animals, and plants—all-sufficient—satisfies all desires	554	<i>Plato's</i> doctrine about classification is not necessarily connected with his Theory of Ideas	<i>ib.</i>
Pleasures are unlike to each other, and even opposite cognitions are so likewise	<i>ib.</i>	Quadruple distribution of Existences. 1. The Infinite. 2. The Finite. 3. Product of the two former. 4. Combining Cause or Agency	565
Whether Pleasure, or Wisdom, corresponds to this description? Appeal to individual choice	555	Pleasure and Pain belong to the first of these four Classes—Cognition or Intelligence belongs to the fourth	<i>ib.</i>
First Question submitted to Protagoras—Intense Pleasure, without any intelligence—He declines to accept it	556	In the combination, essential to Good, of Intelligence with Pleasure, Intelligence is the more important of the two constituents	566
Second Question—Whether he will accept a life of Intelligence purely without any pleasure or pain? Answer— <i>No</i>	557	Intelligence is the regulating principle—Pleasure is the Indeterminate, requiring to be regulated	567
It is agreed on both sides, That the Good must be a Tertium Quid. But Sokrates undertakes to show, That Intelligence is more cognate with it than Pleasure	<i>ib.</i>	Pleasure and Pain must be explained together — Pain arises from the disturbance of the fundamental harmony of the system—Pleasure from the restoration of it	<i>ib.</i>
Difficulties about Unum et Multa. How can the One be Many? How can the Many be One? The difficulties are greatest about Generic Unity—how it is distributed among species and individuals	<i>ib.</i>	Pleasure presupposes Pain	<i>ib.</i>
Active disputes upon this question at the time	558	Derivative pleasures of memory and expectation belonging to mind alone. Here you may find pleasure without pain	568
Order of Nature—Coalescence of the Finite with the Infinite. The One — The Finite Many — The Infinite Many	559	A life of intelligence alone, without pain and without pleasure, is conceivable. Some may prefer it: at any rate it is second-best	<i>ib.</i>
Mistake commonly made—To look only for the One, and the Infinite Many, without looking for the intermediate subdivisions	560	Desire belongs to the mind, presupposes both a bodily want, and the memory of satisfaction previously had for it. The mind and body are here opposed. No true or pure pleasure therein	568
Illustration from Speech and Music	<i>ib.</i>	Can pleasures be true or false? Sokrates maintains that they are so	570
<i>Plato's</i> explanation does not touch the difficulties which he had himself recognised as existing	561	Reasons given by Sokrates. Pleasures attached to true opinions,	