

Robert Zaborowski (University of Warmia & Mazury)♦

PLATO'S *PHAEDRUS* 253E5–255A1 REVISITED.  
A REAPPRAISAL OF PLATO'S VIEW ON THE SOUL\*

*Unter Philologie soll hier, in einem sehr allgemeinen Sinne,  
die Kunst, gut zu lesen, verstanden werden.  
Nietzsche, Antichrist 52*

**Abstract.** The paper is a reconsideration of the second part of the chariot allegory (*Phdr.* 253e5–255a1). After presenting a rationale and *status quæstionis* I analyse what Plato says about the lover's soul when he meets his beloved. As a result a new interpretation is offered. It departs from orthodox and common readings because I suggest that (i) the charioteer, the good horse and the bad horse stand *not only* for, respectively, reason, spirit and appetite, *and* that (ii) thinking, feeling and desiring should be ascribed *not only* to, respectively, the charioteer, the good and the bad horse. It is rather that each element of the psyche contains a kind of rationality, a kind of affectivity, and a kind of appetite, and, each of the three functions belongs to each of the three elements of the soul. The inward differentiation of kinds of functions should be understood by means of hierarchy.

**Keywords:** Plato, the *Phaedrus*, Plato's conception

---

♦ Address for correspondence: Institute of Philosophy, ul. K. Obizta 1, 10–725 Olsztyn, Poland. Email: thymos2001@yahoo.fr.

\* I had started working on what has now become this paper over 20 years ago. Some elements were contained in my PhD thesis (Warsaw 1998) and in several works published since then (e.g. R. Zaborowski, *Rozumienie logos*, esp. pp. 104–106 (with an Abstract in English, p. 113) & R. Zaborowski, *Sur le sentiment chez les Présocratiques*, pp. 140–144). The research during which the paper was written in Vandœuvre (2007, 2013, 2017), Edinburgh (2008, 2011), Cork and Dublin (2010, 2011), Cambridge (2011), and Utrecht (2012), was funded, respectively, by the Hardt Foundation, the British Academy, the Royal Society of Edinburgh, the Royal Irish Academy, the De Brzezie Lanckoroński Foundation, and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences. Various elements of this paper were presented in Edinburgh (2008), Madrid (2009), Glasgow (2011), and Cagliari (2012). The paper as it is published here is the second part of what has become too long to be published in one piece. For the first part see R. Zaborowski, *Two Neglected Details in Plato's Chariot Allegory*. I am grateful to Tadeusz Kobierzycki, the late Jacques Brunschwig, Douglas L. Cairns, the late Scott Austin, Purificación Sánchez Zamorano, Josh Wilburn, and, last not least, Anthony W. Price and Kostas Kalimtzis for their useful comments and stimulating remarks.

of the soul, tripartition of the soul, Plato's chariot allegory, hierarchical approach.

### 1. Preliminary remarks

This paper concentrates on the *Phaedrus* 253e5–255a1, which is a description of the lover in his meeting with a beloved. The description is worked out by Plato by means of an allegory of a chariot composed of a charioteer and two horses. Plato introduced the allegory and developed it earlier. At 253c7–d1 we are explicitly told that the allegory started with the division of the soul – by way of approximation – into three forms, i.e. at 246a3 ff. I have analysed the context in view of the allegory of the soul in another paper which is why the introduction to this paper is short. This is also why what follows will be better read together with the first paper<sup>1</sup>. The importance of the passage is exceptional insofar as it is used to form an opinion about Plato's view on the soul generally and the relation between rationality and affectivity in particular, with corollaries concerning the human being, personality and several other themes. Since I consider that the common reading is a misreading, I find necessary to discuss the passage in detail. Because of my claim I need first to discuss a number of other readings to show how far they are erroneous. If I happen to overload my paper with references to the secondary literature I beg the reader to be excused. I believe the issue to be of such importance that I don't wish to be neglectful or incomplete in my argument. As it is, the purpose of my work is twofold: critical insofar as I discuss downsides of a widespread interpretation and positive insofar as I urge a new reading. I shall suggest how it may help understand not only the passage itself but also, and this is equally if not more important, its multi-layered conception of a human being. Thereby, it also contributes to current discussion about the relation between thinking (reason) and feeling (emotion).

An important proviso is required. This paper is about the *Phaedrus* and is limited to the *Phaedrus*. What I mean is that I pass over the *Republic* and the *Timaeus*, where Plato has a lot to say about the soul as well. I was told that such an approach is

*very strong, and rests on strong presuppositions, and have a great deal of consequences. I do not say that the arguments of the author are flawed – in fact, there is, indeed, a difficulty – but positing this thesis, without facing it with Republic and Timaeus seems [...] quite misleading. It is maybe not Phaedrus' scope to give a clear account of the nature of the tripartite soul; but it does not entail that some solutions could be provided by the Republic and Timaeus.*<sup>2</sup>

My answer to this is that the *Phaedrus* is so different from the *Republic* and the *Timaeus* that, I like to think, such an approach is well grounded. The difference

<sup>1</sup> See R. Zaborowski, *Two Neglected Details in Plato's Chariot Allegory*.

<sup>2</sup> An anonymous reviewer for another journal in 2015.

between the *Phaedrus* on the one hand and the *Republic* and the *Timaeus* on the other in what concerns Plato's claims about the soul is so enormous that I don't know how to explain them<sup>1</sup>. What is more, any resort to a developmentalist view fails because the *Phaedrus* is almost unanimously – with exception of Owen<sup>2</sup> and Robinson<sup>3</sup> – regarded as later than the *Republic* but earlier than the *Timaeus*. What is at stake is that almost unanimously and too often the three forms, functions, aspects or parts<sup>4</sup> are interpreted according to one element/one function ascription in the following way: the charioteer as the reason (or the rational), the good (or the white) horse as the spirited (or the emotive/affective), and the bad (or the black) horse as the desiderative (or the appetitive)<sup>5</sup>.

In my view, as I hope to prove, such an interpretation flies in the face of the description Plato offers. But let me first point to the extent of the misreading – I refer only to Platonists but it should not be forgotten that this interpretation is taken up by many others who, most probably, did not read what Plato says in his dialogue. The impact of this interpretation of the *Phaedrus*' account is so strong that it is observable also outside the scholarship in the fields of Plato or ancient philosophy. It goes far beyond it and has been accepted as such by

<sup>1</sup> The *Phaedrus*' approach (i) is allegorical, (ii) gives the description of the soul in process and, last not least, (iii) in the *Phaedrus* – and only there – the soul is said to be unoriginated in its entirety (246a1–2: ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀγέννητόν τε καὶ ἀθάνατον ψυχὴ ἄν εἴη, see also 245d1 and d3). For more see R. Zaborowski, *Two Neglected Details in Plato's Chariot Allegory*, pp. 192–197. However, I don't want to give the impression that the pictures in the *Republic* and in the *Phaedrus* are insolubly incompatible. The conclusion I arrive at is partly similar to what several scholars dealing with the *Republic* reach. See *Appendix 1* below.

<sup>2</sup> If G. E. L. Owen, *The Place of the Timaeus in Plato's Dialogues*, p. 95 – and Robinson (see next note) – were right that we [should] set the *Phaedrus* after the *Timaeus*, then it would make no more sense to say that at the end of his life – in the *Timaeus* – Plato abandoned the tripartition and, more importantly, the opposite would be true: the *Phaedrus* would be, together with the *Laws*, Plato's last word on the structure of the soul. But my wishful preference plays no role in this paper.

<sup>3</sup> See T. M. Robinson, *Plato's Psychology*, p. 63, n. 20: [...] I tentatively follow G. E. L. Owen [...] in seeing it [the *Timaeus*] rather as the crowning work of the *Republic* group, followed closely by the *Phaedrus*.

<sup>4</sup> Plato's word is εἶδη (*Phdr.* 253c8). See J. Moline, *Plato's Theory of Understanding*, p. 53: *These parts have been termed "faculties," "principles," "activities," "aspects," "instances," and "levels" of the psyche.* I suppose those who speak about *parts* take too literally that Plato makes a division (*Phdr.* 253c7: διείλομεν) – but the division does not have to result in parts: Plato speaks simply about a division *into three* (*Phdr.* 253c7: τριχῆ). As I shall suggest, *stratum* is a better term since it presupposes a qualitative distinction by involving a vertical (hierarchical) perspective.

<sup>5</sup> Some are skeptical as to whether the allegory is compatible with the tripartition of the soul Plato presents and discusses at length in the *Republic*, e.g. P. Natorp, *Dottrina platonica delle Idee*, pp. 562–563: *I due corsieri del cocchio dell'anima non possono affatto essere interpretati come l'ἐπιθυμητικόν e il θυμοειδές della Repubblica.* [...] *nel Fedro non è dato mai trovare la più fioca allusione a un θυμός o θυμοειδές come parte autonoma dell'anima* [...] (but the reason of this may be that he places the *Phaedrus* before the *Republic*, see P. Natorp, *Dottrina platonica delle Idee*, p. 565: [...] *quella [classificazione] del Fedro può essere intesa come remota prefigurazione della tripartizione della Repubblica*). See also A. W. Price, *Parts of the Soul in Plato's Phaedrus*, p. 2, also skeptical about identifying the *Phaedrus*' allegory with the tripartition of the *Republic*: *What I wish to do here is to read the psychology of Socrates' second speech in a way that relates it to the Republic, but despairs of any one-to-one mapping between the soul-parts that are distinguished there, and the elements of the chariot of the soul here [...]*, and most explicitly L. Gerson, *A Note on Tripartition and Immortality in Plato*, p. 93: [...] *the charioteer and horses, on this model, cannot represent tripartite, incarnated, vicious and acratia individuals, whose selves are, as we have seen, acutely divided.*

scholars who do not look into Plato's text instead simply relying on those whom they considered authorities in the matter<sup>1</sup>.

## 2. *Status quaestionis*

This is about what I would call an orthodox interpretation. Obviously, one could hardly refer to all interpretations so huge is the secondary literature on the *Phaedrus*'s allegory. I hope that the selection below is representative and will speak for itself. I tried to check as many works as possible without going into excess. However, if my selection may seem partial, I only am to blame. What has surprised me the most is that while translations of the passage are characteristically correct, this is not so for the interpretation of the charioteer and both horses. It means that not only those who read the *Phaedrus* in Greek but also Greekless readers are, it seems to me, able to read the passage correctly but, curiously, they do not do so. Plato's technical terms he put forward in the *Republic* – *to logistikon*, *to thumoeides*, *to epithumetikon* – are absent in the *Phaedrus*, so there is no issue of rendering Plato's technical terms into modern language. Instead there is a description rich enough to let us build a conception of what the three actors symbolize.

I wonder if the reason why the features of the charioteer and of the two horses are not so often taken into consideration correctly in the analysis of the passage is not as old as the tradition of conceiving the human psyche by means of the reason – emotion dichotomy<sup>2</sup>. But this tradition cannot be outlined here<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Or even worse. Moreover, this kind of picture is spread out far beyond Platonists and philosophers of mind. To give one example, albeit an extremely influential one, see J. LeDoux, *The Emotional Brain*, p. 24: *For him [i.e. Plato], emotions were like wild horses that have to be reined in by the intellect, which he thought of as a charioteer*, with no reference given. J. LeDoux, *The Emotional Brain*, p. 24 & p. 107, makes another two claims: *Plato, for example, said that passions and desires and fears make it impossible for us to think*, and: *Plato proclaimed that the passions are wild beasts trying to escape from the human body*. In both cases his reference is the *Phaedo* (undetermined page) indicated after: A. Flew, *Body, mind and death*, Macmillan, New York 1964, which is a series of *Readings, Selected, Edited, and Furnished with an Introductory Essay*. But what is even more unexpected is that, as we will see at the end of this paper, the core of Plato's view, in the way I reconstruct it here, resembles several of LeDoux's statements (see below). For more examples see R. Zaborowski, *Some remarks on Plato on emotions* & R. Zaborowski, *On the Relevance of Plato's View on Affectivity ...*. As I see it, Plato is charged with a (very) negative view of the emotions or is believed to be the first who developed it. But the reality is that this is not Plato who misrepresents human nature but interpreters who misrepresent his view. I have tried to do justice to Plato's view on affectivity in several papers and chapters. See R. Zaborowski, *Emotions et liberté dans la paideia*, R. Zaborowski, *Feeling–Thought Linkage and its Forms ...*, R. Zaborowski, *Some remarks on Plato on emotions*, R. Zaborowski, *Plato and Max Scheler on the Affective World* & R. Zaborowski, *On the Relevance of Plato's View on Affectivity ...*.

<sup>2</sup> On the opposition (or distinction?) of *λόγος* versus *πάθος* in Plato and afterwards see below. P. A. Vander Waerdt, *Peripatetic Soul–Division ...*, p. 373, speaks about *a dichotomy between reason and emotion that Plato's elevation of θυμός to independent status was meant to modify*. In my view this is anachronistic. I hope that this paper will prove that, at least as for the *Phaedrus*, the dichotomy between reason and emotion is *not yet set*. Accordingly, it would be more appropriate to speak about *an elaboration of integrated view* by Plato (see below).

<sup>3</sup> P. A. Vander Waerdt, *The Peripatetic Interpretation ...* & P. A. Vander Waerdt, *Peripatetic Soul–Division ...*, may be right that it begins with the peripatetic interpretation of Plato's tripartite psychology. However, as P. A. Vander Waerdt, *Peripatetic Soul–Division ...*, p. 381, indicates, it is Clement who *attributes the Peripatetic doctrine to Plato* and in doing so he uses the chariot allegory's elements. The relevant passage from Clement is from his *Stromata* 5.8.53.1.1–3: οὕτως καὶ Πλάτων ἐν τῷ Περὶ ψυχῆς [i.e. the *Phaedrus*] τὸν τε ἡνίοχον καὶ τὸν ἀποστατήσαντα ἵππον (τὸ ἄλογον μέρος, ὃ δὴ δίχα τέμνεται, εἰς θυμὸν καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν.) καταπίπτειν φησὶν. To me it looks like a total deformation (a horse distanced from the charioteer, meaning τὸ ἄλογον and divided into two!) rather than a Peripatetic interpretation.

So let me start with an example from Marsilio Ficino's comment:

*In the soul joined [to the body], the soul agitated by corporeal passions [passionibus corporeis], he means the reason [rationem], as it participates in the understanding, to serve as the charioteer, and the irascible and concupiscible powers to serve as the horses [...].<sup>1</sup>*

And this is what we read again and again since then. What I have found can scarcely be a prosaic mishap since most of my checks give the same, or a very similar, result. I begin with two explicit claims about the commonality of this interpretation:

*It is generally agreed that [...] the charioteer symbolizes reason<sup>2</sup>,*

and:

*In the charioteer and good and bad horses respectively we can discern, as is commonly agreed, at least an approximate correspondence to the reasoning, spirited and appetitive parts of soul (to give them their usual labels) familiar from the analysis in the Republic [...] the charioteer, the voice of reason in the soul.<sup>3</sup>*

As McGibbon and Ferrari describe it, this way of interpreting is *general* and it could be said without exaggeration, I think, that the interpretation of the *Phaedrus*' charioteer as reason has become a kind of official or orthodox doctrine. Here you are a selection of examples of interpreting the charioteer as reason (my underlining):

*the charioteer represents the reason<sup>4</sup>,  
the charioteer represents the reason<sup>5</sup>,  
[t]he charioteer is clearly reason<sup>6</sup>,  
The charioteer represents reason<sup>7</sup>,  
the charioteer – the intellect – is troubled by his horses<sup>8</sup>,  
[t]he charioteer is reason (and the accompanying desires, as in Republic, Book 9, 580d)<sup>9</sup>,*

<sup>1</sup> Marsilio Ficino and the Phaedran Charioteer, pp. 184–185 (underlining is mine). How much Ficino's reading is biased can be seen from the following, pp. 186–187: *The nature of desire, on the other hand, in the meanwhile drags the reason down towards sexual intercourse and procreation [coitum atque genituram] – the latter being absent from Plato's passage.*

<sup>2</sup> D. D. McGibbon, *The Fall of the Soul in Plato's Phaedrus*, p. 56 (underlining is mine).

<sup>3</sup> G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, p. 185 & p. 186 (underlining is mine).

<sup>4</sup> B. Jowett, *Introduction to Phaedrus*, p. 410.

<sup>5</sup> W. K. C. Guthrie, *Plato's View on the Nature of the Soul*, p. 9.

<sup>6</sup> D. A. Rees, *Bipartition of the Soul in the Early Academy*, p. 112. For him, p. 113, [i]t is plain that the three constituents of the myth are the parts of the soul figuring in the Republic.

<sup>7</sup> M. J. O'Brien, *The Socratic Paradoxes and the Greek Mind*, p. 167.

<sup>8</sup> A. W. H. Adkins, *From the Many to the One ...*, p. 133.

<sup>9</sup> J. Moravcsik, *Noetic Aspiration and Artistic Aspiration*, p. 46, n. 4.

*la raison étant le cocher*<sup>1</sup>,  
*the charioteer, reason*<sup>2</sup>,  
*The charioteer represents reason*<sup>3</sup>,  
*the soul (= reason) as a charioteer*<sup>4</sup>,  
*correspond[s] [...] the driver to the faculty of reason*<sup>5</sup>,  
*the charioteer, reason*<sup>6</sup>,  
*The Reasoning part of the soul is the charioteer*<sup>7</sup>,  
*a charioteer representing reason*<sup>8</sup>,  
*la plus haute [partie de l'âme] [...] à savoir la raison*  
*[...] Ici le cocher symbolise la raison*<sup>9</sup>,  
*Whatever passion there is in true Platonic love has to*  
*be supplied by the charioteer, reason itself.*<sup>10</sup>

And so on and so forth. The same in a recent commentary:

*The chariot image is compatible with the tripartite soul*  
*of the Republic: charioteer equivalent to reason.*<sup>11</sup>

And to end, let me remark that in a recent volume *Plato and the Divided Self* we meet a similar identification in three contributions:

*charioteer (reason) [...] The image of the charioteer*  
*expresses (better than the image of the farmer in the*  
*Republic) reason's two functions: to manage the other*

<sup>1</sup> J. de Romilly, *Les conflits de l'âme dans le Phèdre de Platon*, p. 104.

<sup>2</sup> R. Bett, *Immortality and the Nature of the Soul in the Phaedrus*, p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> C. L. Griswold, *Self-Knowledge in Plato's Phaedrus*, p. 96. However, his approach is more nuanced. Compare pp. 109–110: *Neither here nor elsewhere in the palinode, indeed, are we offered a conception of the soul in which reason, emotion, and desire are simply indifferent to one another. [...] The doubt here concerns an opposition not between reason and emotion but between one kind of complex of reason/emotion and another (true reason and genuine satisfaction versus opinion and false satisfaction).*

<sup>4</sup> E. N. Ostenfeld, *Ancient Greek Psychology and Modern Mind-Body Debate*, p. 47.

<sup>5</sup> S. Lovibond, *Plato's theory of mind*, p. 52.

<sup>6</sup> C. H. Kahn, *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue*, p. 260.

<sup>7</sup> C. Bobonich, *Plato's Utopia Recast ...*, p. 298. Bobonich is unambiguous as far as he *consider[s] in more detail the ways in which Plato restricts both lower parts in the Phaedrus and the Timaeus*. See also p. 300: *[...] the Spirited part [...] is fundamentally more similar to the Appetitive part than to the Reasoning part. And although the myth does not employ analytic terms, it makes it clear that the fundamental point of similarity between the lower parts and of dissimilarity between them and the upper part is epistemological.*

<sup>8</sup> M. F. Burnyeat, *The Truth of Tripartition*, p. 6. Likewise in the French version: M. F. Burnyeat, *La vérité de la tripartition*, p. 42: *l'âme est un composé figuré par un cocher qui représente la raison*. His position is more complex in M. F. Burnyeat, *The passion of reason in Plato's Phaedrus*, a paper that for a long time had been known to those who had attended Burnyeat's lecture, and which had been referred to as an unpublished version. We meet there a series of expressions such as *the charioteer of pure reason* which is said to be *simplicity* (p. 247), then an idea that *there can be desire and thought on both sides of the conflict* (p. 253, also p. 254: *movements of thought and desire*), next *the non-rational and unreasoned types of desire represented by the two horses* (p. 255), and finally *changes of thought and feeling on either side* (p. 254). Nonetheless, no systematic treatment of how these concepts are set out within the soul and/or its elements is provided (all underlining is mine).

<sup>9</sup> L. Mouze, *Introduction to: Platon, Phèdre*, p. 81.

<sup>10</sup> C. J. Rowe, *The charioteer and his horses ...*, p. 146.

<sup>11</sup> H. Yunis, *Commentary*, p. 138.

*parts and to know the truth*<sup>1</sup>,  
*the white horse helps the charioteer [...] Spirit should*  
*still come to the assistance of reason*<sup>2</sup>,  
*the activity of reason (viz., dianoia/the charioteer)*<sup>3</sup>.

The point I disagree with and I am going to confront is the identification of the charioteer with the reason only and, on the other hand, of the reasoning faculty with the charioteer only. And the same is, *mutatis mutandis*, true of two other elements and two other mental functions traditionally ascribed to them. But before I pass on to what Plato writes, I have to mention alternative analyses and interpretations. They propose a different identification of the charioteer. However, since they are ambiguous, I cannot consider them as anticipatory of mine or can say that they are so only to a limited degree.

First comes Ioannidi's paper where we read that:

*Le cocher est bien l'instance «hégémonique», mais comment l'appeler «raison» étant donné que les bêtes n'ont pas de raison et que les âmes déchues du ciel, qui est leur lieu originel, s'incarnent sur terre en hommes [...]*<sup>4</sup>.

This is ambiguous because although she expresses a doubt about the chariot being the reason, she doesn't give the charioteer any label and, also, the reason of her doubt is unclear: the chariot is not, after all, an animal<sup>5</sup>. More complex is the case of A. W. Price. Here is what he says in his *Mental Conflict*:

*It is the charioteer who 'catches sight of the light of his beloved', which fills him 'with tickling and pricks of longing' (253e5–254a1). Here a cognitive experience is itself intensely felt; indeed the feeling is integral to the cognition, guaranteeing that (as the charioteer has yet explicitly to comprehend) to look at the boy's face is to recollect the Form of Beauty (cf. 250c8–251a7).*<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> R. Kamtekar, *Speak with the same voice as reason*, p. 85 & p. 96. She goes as far as to say (p. 97) that [r]epresenting reason as the charioteer leads us not only to identify with reason, but also to regard the behavior (and presumably also the condition) of our appetites and emotions as our responsibility, just as a charioteer is responsible for his horses (underlining is mine).

<sup>2</sup> T. Brennan, *The nature of the spirited part of the soul and its object*, p. 119 (underlining is mine).

<sup>3</sup> C. Sheffield, *Erôs before and after tripartition*, p. 227 (underlining is mine).

<sup>4</sup> H. Ioannidi, *Contribution à l'étude de la doctrine platonicienne du thymos*, p. 181 (underlining is mine).

<sup>5</sup> But this is to be treated with caution all the more since this is only the first part of the paper with the second to be about *une autre composante d[e] ce] concept platonicien* (H. Ioannidi, *Contribution à l'étude de la doctrine platonicienne du thymos*, p. 182), which was never published (as I have learnt from L. Brisson, H. Ioannidi died prematurely). However, in this 15–page long published paper no more than one page is devoted to the *Phaedrus* and, last not least, the paper aims at *thumos*, not reason, so the role of this claim is secondary.

<sup>6</sup> A. W. Price, *Mental Conflict*, p. 78 (underlining is mine, italics for *felt* is Price's). See also M. F. Burnyeat, *The passion of reason in Plato's Phaedrus*, p. 258: [...] *what gives the philosopher the emotional strength to overcome his lower impulses is the gradual growing of his wings, which means: the recovery of knowledge from within. [...] intensely felt, understanding of what the life of the soul is really like* (underlining is mine).

So far so good. Yet on preceding pages Price subscribes to the common opinion since he writes:

*the charioteer of the soul, namely reason [...] The charioteer is the emblem of reason<sup>1</sup>.*

What is more, he makes the same identification in several papers of his, published both earlier and later, e.g.

*the driver (that is, reason) [...] the cognition is reason's, the benefit the whole soul's<sup>2</sup>,*

or

*the charioteer of reason, assisted by the horse of spirit [...] <sup>3</sup>,*

and:

*the charioteer of the soul, that is reason<sup>4</sup>.*

And in his more recent paper on this topic I am aware of he says:

*in the Phaedrus he [i.e. Socrates] ascribes anti-rational anger that confronts reason to the bad horse (254c7)<sup>5</sup>.*

All this is equivocal since I cannot judge how much we deal here with an isolated remark of Price as opposed to his opposite claim restated several times. More particularly, I don't know to what extent Price anticipated what I will suggest in my paper and to what extent he shares the common interpretation of the charioteer as reason, which I will argue against.

The third author, Palumbo, is ambiguous for a similar reason. In fact, when she speaks about the whole soul, she writes:

*un'anima innamorata [...] quella certa forma di pensiero, che rappresenta la seconda componente dell'emozione [...] una sensazione, un sentimento o un pensare [...] l'insieme di queste tre componenti, un insieme strutturato nel modo descritto<sup>6</sup>,*

yet on the next page she states explicitly that:

*l'auriga corrisponde all'intelletto<sup>7</sup>.*

As it is, I was unable to find an interpretation of characterization of the charioteer and both horses being in accordance with a detailed description elaborated by Plato. None, however strange may it seem, is correct because none takes into account the whole description, i.e. all details Plato places in his description. Before I embark on my analysis of *Phdr.* 253e5–255a1, it is fair to devote also some remarks on Ferrari's observations. This is because although I

<sup>1</sup> A. W. Price, *Mental Conflict*, p. 71 & p. 74 (underlining is mine).

<sup>2</sup> A. W. Price, *Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle*, p. 79 (underlining is mine).

<sup>3</sup> A. W. Price, *Plato and Freud*, p. 265 (underlining is mine).

<sup>4</sup> A. W. Price, *Reason's New Role in the Phaedrus*, p. 244 (underlining is mine).

<sup>5</sup> A. W. Price, *Parts of the Soul in Plato's Phaedrus*, p. 8 (underlining is mine). In his last book, A. W. Price, *Virtue and Reason in Plato and Aristotle*, he practically does not use the *Phaedrus*.

<sup>6</sup> L. Palumbo, *Eros Phobos Epithymia*, p. 48 (underlining is mine).

<sup>7</sup> L. Palumbo, *Eros Phobos Epithymia*, p. 49 (underlining is mine).

have quoted him above among supporters of the common interpretation<sup>1</sup>, he is, in another point, quite close to what I am going to arrive at. Ferrari published a paper on the passage in question and then he revisited it in two sections of his book<sup>2</sup>. Ferrari focuses on

*a curious feature of the give-and-take between two of the figures, the charioteer and the bad horse [...] namely, that although the charioteer seems to stand for the control of reason and the bad horse for brutish, uninhibited lust, in the struggle between the two it is the bad horse who adopts persuasive language and the methods of reason, while the charioteer maintains control by sheer strength and wordless violence. [...]*<sup>3</sup>.

What is unprecedented in his comment is to see that

*the charioteer and bad horse in their respective attempts to realise their desires, each adopt methods more appropriate (given the content of those desires) to the other.*<sup>4</sup>

And, as far as I can say, he is right when he writes that this is:

*a feature which, so far as I can discover, has as yet passed without adequate remark among scholars*<sup>5</sup>.

This looks promising. Yet Ferrari, first, limits his analysis of the passage to the two elements only instead of three. Since

*[t]he good horse does not take part in this exchange of roles*<sup>6</sup>,

Ferrari does not take it into account. This shows that he is interested in *the exchange of the roles* only, rather than – as will be the case in this paper – in the meaning of the chariot as a whole and in the way it is described and characterized in action. Since most of his analysis is set in dichotomic terms, e.g.

*'reason' and 'desire' are symptomatic of their [i.e. the chariot's elements'] behaviour*<sup>7</sup>,

most often my interpretation will differ from his. For just as Ferrari ascribes two functions – reason and desire – to each of the two different characters, so I

<sup>1</sup> See G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, p. 186: *the charioteer, the voice of reason in the soul* (underlining is mine).

<sup>2</sup> See G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, section *The Struggle in the soul: sheep's clothing* (pp. 185–190) and *The struggle in the soul: philosophical madness* (pp. 186–203).

<sup>3</sup> G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, p. 186 ≈ G. R. F. Ferrari, *The Struggle in the Soul ...*, p. 1. J. Wilburn, *Courage and the Spirited Part of the Soul in Plato's Republic*, puts stress on the relation between reason and the spirited element – which is rare – but he analyses the *Republic* in his article and says nothing about the *Phaedrus*.

<sup>4</sup> G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, p. 190. The charioteer's desires are explicitly denied by T. Irwin, *Plato's Moral Theory*, p. 238: *No desires are ascribed to the rational part, but all belong in the non-rational part [...]*.

<sup>5</sup> G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, p. 186.

<sup>6</sup> G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, p. 270, n. 53.

<sup>7</sup> G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, p. 201.

myself will ascribe three functions – reason, emotion (that I call feeling) and desire – to each of the three different characters<sup>1</sup>.

As far as I understand Ferrari I am going in the same direction as he does. But, if I may say so, he has stopped halfway. From my perspective it looks as if Ferrari understands that – though without using such words – there are several kinds of reasoning<sup>2</sup>. However, I am not sure how he exactly applies these principles – i.e. a principle of several kinds of the same function and a principle of these functions being hierarchical – to desire<sup>3</sup>. Certainly he does not apply it to the spirited insofar as he is silent about it. Ferrari surely notices correctly a resemblance of the charioteer and the bad horse when he says:

[...] *the charioteer and the bad horse are contrasted (in the matter of reason) not as the rational to the irrational part of the soul but rather in terms of the level at which their reasoning takes place.*<sup>4</sup>

Yet he limits himself to apply this principle of homogeneity to two elements only and only because of this one function<sup>5</sup>, reasoning<sup>6</sup>, while I will argue for a homogeneity of all three elements and for their homogeneity being composed by three functions. My thesis is that according to Plato's allegory there are three levels of different, hierarchically unfolded sets or linkages, actually inseparable inwardly. The concepts such as reason, emotion, and desire may be used only for the sake of conceptual analysis of these sets, which are literally indivisible into them.

### 3. What does Plato say in *Phdr.* 253e5–255a1?

At the present time please read the text of the *Phaedrus* 253e5–255a1 (ed. J. Burnet). I am underlining elements pertaining to several psychic functions of the three characters, representing the lover's soul and portrayed as one human being and two animals and described by Plato thus:

ὅταν δ' οὖν ὁ ἡνίοχος ἰδὼν τὸ ἐρωτικὸν ὄμμα,  
πᾶσαν αἰσθήσει διαθερμήνας τὴν ψυχὴν, γαργαλισμοῦ

<sup>1</sup> If I am not mistaken he alludes to all three functions only once, G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, p. 200: *say: reason, emotion, desire*. But he does so in a paragraph where he relies on the *Republic* (see below Appendix I).

<sup>2</sup> See G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, p. 190: *display [of] the limitations of the only kind of reasoning*.

<sup>3</sup> Although G. R. F. Ferrari, *The Struggle in the Soul ...*, p. 1, alludes to *a certain complexity in each of the soul's parts*, he limits himself to an analysis of the relationship between the charioteer and the black horse – thereby excluding the white horse – which is a conflict between [t]he *desires of the charioteer and of the bad horse* and their *exchange of roles* (p. 2).

<sup>4</sup> G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, pp. 191–192 (underlining is mine).

<sup>5</sup> In one passage, G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, p. 200, ascribes two functions to all three elements: *Quite clearly, however, these labels have only limited application to the conduct exhibited by the charioteer and horses. These allegorical figures are actual characters [...] each with his own appetites and capacity for deliberation*. On another occasion, G. R. F. Ferrari, *The Struggle in the Soul ...*, p. 8, n. 23, points out that *both thought and feeling are correspondingly represented in the charioteer and black horse* (he informs us that this is also acknowledged by M. Burnyeat, *Recollection in the Phaedrus* (unpublished), p. 32).

<sup>6</sup> See also C. Bobonich, *Plato's Utopia Recast ...*, p. 329 – if yet there is a question of *allow[ing] the lower parts to have a rich variety of beliefs*, there is no mention of affectivity involved in the upper element.

τε καὶ πόθου κέντρων ὑποπλησθῆ, ὁ μὲν εὐπειθῆς τῷ ἠνιόχῳ τῶν ἵππων, αἰεὶ τε καὶ τότε αἰδοῖ βιαζόμενος, ἑαυτὸν κατέχει μὴ ἐπιπηδᾶν τῷ ἐρωμένῳ· ὁ δὲ οὔτε κέντρων ἠνιοχικῶν οὔτε μάστιγος ἔτι ἐντρέπεται, σκιρτῶν δὲ βία φέρεται, καὶ πάντα πράγματα παρέχων τῷ σύζυγί τε καὶ ἠνιόχῳ ἀναγκάζει ἰέναι τε πρὸς τὰ παιδικὰ καὶ μνειάν ποιεῖσθαι τῆς τῶν ἀφροδισίων χάριτος. τὸ δὲ κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν ἀντιτείνετον ἀγανακτοῦντε, ὡς δεινὰ καὶ παράνομα ἀναγκαζομένῳ· τελευτῶντε δέ, ὅταν μηδὲν ἢ πέρας κακοῦ, πορεύεσθον ἀγομένῳ, εἷξαντε καὶ ὁμολογήσαντε ποιήσειν τὸ κελευόμενον.

καὶ πρὸς αὐτῷ τ' ἐγένοντο καὶ εἶδον τὴν ὄψιν τὴν τῶν παιδικῶν ἀστράπτουσιν. ιδόντος δὲ τοῦ ἠνιόχου ἢ μνήμη πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κάλλους φύσιν ἠνέχθη, καὶ πάλιν εἶδεν αὐτὴν μετὰ σωφροσύνης ἐν ἀγνῷ βάρθρῳ βεβῶσαν· ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἔδεισέ τε καὶ σεφθεῖσα ἀνέπεσεν ὑπτία, καὶ ἅμα ἠναγκάσθη εἰς τοῦπίσω ἐλκύσαι τὰς ἠνίας οὕτω σφόδρα, ὥστ' ἐπὶ τὰ ἰσχία ἄμφω καθίσει τὸ ἵππῳ, τὸν μὲν ἐκόντα διὰ τὸ μὴ ἀντιτείνειν, τὸν δὲ ὑβριστὴν μάλ' ἄκοντα. ἀπελθόντε δὲ ἀπωτέρω, ὁ μὲν ὑπ' αἰσχύνης τε καὶ θάμβους ἰδρῶτι πᾶσαν ἔβρεξε τὴν ψυχὴν, ὁ δὲ λήξας τῆς ὀδύνης, ἦν ὑπὸ τοῦ χαλινοῦ τε ἔσχεν καὶ τοῦ πτόματος, μόγις ἐξαναπνεύσας ἐλοιδόρησεν ὀργῆ, πολλὰ κακίζων τὸν τε ἠνιόχον καὶ τὸν ὁμόζυγα ὡς δειλία τε καὶ ἀνανδρία λιπόντε τὴν τάξιν καὶ ὁμολογίαν· καὶ πάλιν οὐκ ἐθέλοντας προσιέναι ἀναγκάζων μόγις συνεχώρησεν δεομένων εἰς αὐθὶς ὑπερβαλέσθαι. ἐλθόντος δὲ τοῦ συντεθέντος χρόνου [οὔ] ἀμνημονεῖν προσποιούμενῳ ἀναμνησκῶν, βιαζόμενος, χρεμετίζων, ἔλκων ἠνάγκασεν αὐτὸν προσελθεῖν τοῖς παιδικοῖς ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς λόγους, καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐγγύς ἦσαν, ἐγκύψας καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν κέρκον, ἐνδοκῶν τὸν χαλινόν, μετ' ἀναιδεΐας ἔλκει· ὁ δ' ἠνιόχος ἔτι μᾶλλον ταυτὸν πάθος παθῶν, ὥσπερ ἀπὸ ὑσπληγος ἀναπεσῶν, ἔτι μᾶλλον τοῦ ὑβριστοῦ ἵππου ἐκ τῶν ὀδόντων βία ὀπίσω σπάσας τὸν χαλινόν, τὴν τε κακηγόρον γλῶτταν καὶ τὰς γνάθους καθήμαξεν καὶ τὰ σκέλη τε καὶ τὰ ἰσχία πρὸς τὴν γῆν ἐρείσας ὀδύνας ἔδωκεν. ὅταν δὲ ταυτὸν πολλάκις πάσχων ὁ πονηρὸς τῆς ὑβρεως λήξη, ταπεινωθεὶς ἔπεται ἤδη τῆ τοῦ ἠνιόχου προνοία, καὶ ὅταν ἴδῃ τὸν καλόν, φόβῳ διόλλυται· ὥστε συμβαίνει τότε ἤδη τὴν τοῦ ἐραστοῦ ψυχὴν τοῖς παιδικοῖς αἰδομένην τε καὶ δεδιῶσαν ἔπεσθαι.

A remark. The fact that this is about a meeting of the lover with the beloved – and not another kind of event – is surely not without importance for the type of

mental repertoire we find in the description. Should it be another event, we will have different acts of thinking, feeling and desiring. I think, however, that even if the event Plato chose is particularly rich – please try to think about another similarly or more rich – this is still a single and specific case without Plato’s stating general claims as several commentators have done and I am going to do about classes, genera and species of mental acts. The *Republic* (see *Appendix I*) is more explicit in this regard, yet it is poorer in presenting complex connections between the three elements of the soul and between their functions, especially in their dynamic aspect.

Now, let me classify all acts set forward by Plato in the description as they are ascribed to their subjects, be it single, double or triple.

subject/ function	single				dual			all 3	the whole
	1	1 <sup>#</sup>	2	3	1+2	1+3	2+3	1+2+3	1–2–3
	ὁ ἡνίοχος	ἡ μνήμη [τοῦ ἡνίοχου]	ὁ μὲν [εὐπειθῆς τῶ ἡνίοχῶ τῶν ἴππων] = <ὁ μὲν ἀγαθός >	ὁ δὲ [οὔτε κέντρων ἡνιοχικῶν οὔτε μάστιγος ἔτι ἐντρέπεται] = ὁ πονηρός = <ὁ δὲ κακός >	ὁ ἡνίοχος + ὁ μὲν	ὁ ἡνίοχος + ὁ δὲ	ὁ μὲν + ὁ δὲ	tutti	ἡ τοῦ ἔραστοῦ ψυχῆ <sup>1</sup>
perceptions	ἰδὼν τὸ ἐρωτικὸν ὄμμα [...] αἰσθήσει [...] ἰδόντος δὲ τοῦ ἡνίοχου	εἶδεν [...] ἰδοῦσα δέ	see tutti	ἰδῆ τὸν καλόν	see tutti	see tutti	see tutti	εἶδον τὴν ὄψιν	
sensations	διαθερμῆνας τὴν ψυχὴν, γαργαλισμοῦ τε καὶ πόθου κέντρων		ἰδρῶτι πᾶσαν ἔβρεξε τὴν ψυχὴν						
emotions	πόθου + see μνήμη	ἔδεισέ τε καὶ σεφθεῖσα	αἰδοῖ βιαζόμενος [...] ὑπ’ αἰσχύνῃς τε καὶ θάμβους	τῆς τῶν ἀφροδισίων χάριτος [...] τῆς ὀδύνης [...] ὀργῆ [...] μετ’ ἀναιδείας [...] ὀδύνας [...] φόβῳ διόλγυται	ἀγανακτοῦντε				αἰδομένην τε καὶ δεδωῖαν

<sup>1</sup> For more see 251a1–b7 & 251e2–b2, see below p. 181, n. 2.

[integral] experience	ἔτι μᾶλλον ταῦτον πάθος παθῶν			ταῦτόν πολλάκις πάσχων					
foresight / intention	τῇ τοῦ ἡνιόχου προνοία								
memory & memory related behaviour	see ἢ μνήμη τοῦ ἡνιόχου		ἑαυτὸν κατέχει	μνείαν ποιείσθαι τῆς τῶν ἀφροδισίων [...] ἀναμνηστικῶν	ἀμνημονεῖν προσποιομένω				
calculating					ὁμολογήσαντε				ὁμολογίαν
will			ἑκόντα	ἄκοντα					
dispositional features				ὑβριστοῦ [...] ὑβρεως	δειλία τε καὶ ἀνανδρία				

## Remarks:

1) From 253e5 to 255a1 the dual number is used 13 times in total, 11 of them in relation to the charioteer and the good horse and 2 in relation to the good and the bad horse (and never for the charioteer and the bad horse).

2) I consider the minimum of functions and only the mental ones and touch upon neither spatial movements (e.g. μὴ ἐπιπηδᾶν, ἰέναι τε πρὸς τὰ παιδικά, ἀντιτείνετον, πορεύεσθον ἀγομένω, ἀνέπεσεν ὑπτία, τοῦπίσω ἐλκύσαι τὰς ἡνίας οὕτω σφόδρα, ὥστ' ἐπὶ τὰ ἰσχία ἄμφω καθίσει τῷ ἵππῳ, τὸ μὴ ἀντιτείνειν, ἀπελθόντε δὲ ἀπωτέρω, προσιέναι, ἔλκων ἡνάγκασεν αὐτὸν προσελθεῖν, ἔπεται, ἔπεσθαι) nor transitive verbs of acting upon, esp. forcing (e.g. ἀναγκάζει ἰέναι, ἀναγκαζόμενῳ, τὸ κελευόμενον, ἡνέχθη, ἡναγκάσθη εἰς τοῦπίσω ἐλκύσαι, προσιέναι ἀναγκάζων, βιαζόμενος, ἔλκων ἡνάγκασεν, ταπεινωθεῖς).

3) Please remember that from 255a1 on the main character of the narrative is again the lover, not his soul only, and the tripartition of the soul is no longer – with one exception though – treated by Plato in the dialogue. Before the beginning of the passage analysed, i.e. 253e5, the main character is alternately the psyche (e.g. 245c6 ff., 249e5: πᾶσα μὲν ἀνθρώπου ψυχῆ, 250e1, 251b7 ff.) and the human being (e.g. 248e4–5: ὃς μὲν ἂν δικαίως διαγάγη ἀμεινονος μοίρας μεταλαμβάνει, ὃς δ' ἂν ἀδίκως, χείρονος, 249b6–7) or the lover (e.g. 253c5: δι' ἔρωτα μανέντος φίλου τῷ φιληθέντι γίγνεται). The exception is 255e4–256a6, where Plato alludes to the lover's black horse and his charioteer (255e4–6: ἐν οὖν τῇ συγκοιμήσει τοῦ μὲν ἐραστοῦ ὁ ἀκόλαστος ἵππος ἔχει ὅτι λέγει πρὸς τὸν ἡνιόχον), to the beloved's black horse (256a1: ὁ δὲ τῶν παιδικῶν ἔχει μὲν οὐδὲν εἰπεῖν) and to the beloved's white horse and his charioteer (256a5–6: ὁ δὲ ὁμόζυξ αὐτῷ μετὰ τοῦ ἡνιόχου πρὸς ταῦτα μετ' αἰδοῦς καὶ λόγου ἀντιτείνει). This passage confirms that the division of the soul is valid and that, crucially, it is valid for both the lover and the beloved. The mental state and behaviour of the beloved's soul would fill another Table, even if a more modest one.

#### 4. Analysis

It could be pointed out that within the allegory of the chariot the character of the charioteer is less allegorical than the characters of the two horses, since anything ascribed to the charioteer (human being) is as it may be, while some or a majority of actions of the good and bad horses (animals) cannot be but allegorical insofar as these are personifications. But remember, three characters are not strictly two horses and the charioteer, but they possess these forms: horse-like and charioteer-like<sup>1</sup>. And this fact – an unequal degree of allegorizing the charioteer and the two horses within the allegory – might complicate an interpretation which should – if one wants to insist on this fact – view the chariot and the horses on different levels. If so, in the case of the two horses we deal with a second-degree allegory, their faculties being allegorical, which is not the case of the allegorical charioteer, whose faculties have nothing of allegorical. The charioteer is a human being and there is nothing weird in his capacity for reasoning, feelings, sensations, memory, etc., which is not obvious at all as regards the two horses. The question is then: in what sense these animals share thinking, emotions, memory, and will? It seems that they hardly do, yet we have their description in front of us and we see what kind of mental functions they are given by Plato.

Maybe I should not insist on this too much and only suggest that this fact of an unequal degree of allegorizing explains, in my view, why a confusion of the lover with the charioteer is made so often. It is plausible that the deformation of reducing the charioteer to the reason alone stems from the distinction between the human and the animal: given that the two horses are animals and as such are devoid of reasoning, they are taken by many to symbolize anything but reasoning. Therefore the charioteer happens to be a natural recipient of anything that is not inherent to the horses, i.e. of the rationality, since other faculties are inherent to the horses or are more easily believed to be so, esp. their impulses, drives, needs, reactions etc. However, as we see, several non-intellectual faculties are ascribed to the charioteer and some of intellectual or at least non-non-intellectual functions are ascribed to the horses in Plato's description. According to the Table this is done in such a detailed way that it hardly can be a simple coincidence. Hence the allegorical distinction in Plato's *Phaedrus* between the charioteer and the two horses is not to be taken literally as an opposition between the human being and the animal, or even as opposition at all.

Moreover, the above kind of objection would suggest that in order to satisfy the proposed interpretation – but also several others – Plato should have conceived a three-element set composed of three human beings, discriminated by a hierarchy of their functions. This would be odd<sup>2</sup>. Plato used a model which is about one element superior and two others inferior. They are superior and inferior by definition. At least they are supposed to be so, because in fact,

<sup>1</sup> See 253c8–d1: *ἰππομόρφω* μὲν δύο τινὲ εἶδη, *ἡνιοχικὸν δὲ εἶδος* τρίτον, καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἡμῖν ταῦτα μενέτω.

<sup>2</sup> Maybe not entirely: it would be something in-between if we think about the lover's soul of the *Phaedrus* and the state of the *Republic*, composed of classes (εἶδη, e.g. *Rep.* 580d3: ὡσπερ πόλις, ἣν δ' ἐγώ, διήρηται κατὰ τρία εἶδη) of individuals.

however, there are troubles with the coordination of what is inferior by what is superior within one soul. The superior needs the help of one of inferior elements – the one which is obedient and autonomous – against the other. Why then does the charioteer not replace the second, reluctant horse by another one? This is probably because the issue is not related to the horse itself but to its position that makes (any ?) horse within a human being to be so<sup>1</sup>. And here, I think, the distinction between human versus animal is lessened by the description of the pretty human communication of both horses with the charioteer<sup>2</sup>.

Now, in order to see how much the orthodox interpretation of the charioteer, the good horse and the bad horse as, respectively, reason, spirit and appetite is inaccurate, please consider the two following perspectives: (i) subjects in their relation to functions (vertical order in the Table) and (ii) functions in their relation to subjects (horizontal order in the Table)<sup>3</sup>.

If (i) we catalogue subjects in their relation to functions (vertical order in the Table), the following obtains:

• (1) the charioteer sees (253e5: ἰδὼν τὸ ἐρωτικὸν ὄμμα, 254b5: ἰδόντος δὲ τοῦ ἡνίοχου, and also he sees through his memory – 254b5–7: ἡ μνήμη [...] ἰδοῦσα, 254b6 & 254b7: εἶδεν [...] ἰδοῦσα δέ), has a perception (this is a general way of speaking, seeing being a species of a genus perception, 253e6: αἰσθήσει), experiences bodily sensations such as warming (253e6: διαθερμήνας τὴν ψυχὴν) and tickling (253e6: γαργαλισμοῦ). He has emotions that can be unfolded on more than one level: on the one hand, there is a longing (more precisely goads of longing, 253e6–254a1: πόθου κέντρων – which is a set of bodily sensation and a psychic longing), on the other hand he – through his memory – experiences fear (254b7: ἔδεισε) and holy awe (254b8: τε καὶ σεφθεῖσα). The charioteer has a memory (254b5: μνήμη) as well as a foresight (254e7: προνοιά<sup>4</sup>). Finally he is said to experience an experience (254d7–e1: ταῦτὸν πάθος παθῶν). See also *dual1*+2 for anger (254b1: ἀγανακτοῦντε) & *the whole* for seeing (254b4: εἶδον).

<sup>1</sup> This is because in gods both horses – i.e. the white and the black – are good horses. See 246a7–8: θεῶν μὲν οὖν ἵπποι τε καὶ ἡνίοχοι πάντες αὐτοὶ τε ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ἐξ ἀγαθῶν. Also, in gods both horses are not put into opposition as is the case of the horses in human beings: εἴτα τῶν ἵππων ὁ μὲν αὐτῷ καλὸς τε καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐκ τοιοῦτων, ὁ δ' ἐξ ἐναντίων τε καὶ ἐναντίος (246b2–3).

<sup>2</sup> Again, this is but an allegorical image of a moving set within which elements are human-like and horse-like.

<sup>3</sup> For the reason of room I omit a presentation from the dynamic point of view of the narrative as it is structured in subsequent stages of the encounter. Broadly, I would divide it into eight stages as follows: 1<sup>st</sup> step at 253e5–254a7: the charioteer's view of the beloved, 2<sup>nd</sup> at 254a7–254b3: the charioteer's & the white horse's responses as opposed to the black horse's, 3<sup>rd</sup> at 254b4–5: all three elements' view of the beloved, 4<sup>th</sup> 254b5–254c1: the charioteer's memory is acting, 5<sup>th</sup> at 254c2–254d1: both horses' different responses, 6<sup>th</sup> at 254d1–7: more on the black horse's action, 7<sup>th</sup> at 254d7–e5: the charioteer's response, 8<sup>th</sup> and the last that ends at 254e9 where Plato comes back to the entire soul of the lover (254e5–8: the black horse's being tamed). I must recognize, however, there is a difficulty: are ὅταν δ' οὖν ὁ ἡνίοχος ἰδὼν τὸ ἐρωτικὸν ὄμμα at 253e5 and ἰδόντος δὲ τοῦ ἡνίοχου ἡ μνήμη πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κάλλους φύσιν ἡνέχθη at 254b simultaneous and the same moment of the event is just presented by Plato twice or are they two distinct stages of the event, first ὅταν δ' οὖν ὁ ἡνίοχος ἰδὼν ... and then ἰδόντος δὲ τοῦ ἡνίοχου ἡ μνήμη ... ? If the latter, which may seem to be implied by the passage, how then to explain both horses' responses and involvement at 254a1–b3?

<sup>4</sup> The word is difficult to render. See e.g. LSJ: *perceiving beforehand, foresight, foreknowledge [...] foresight, forethought [...]*.

• (2) the good horse has a sensation of sweating (254c4: ἰδρῶτι), feels several emotions, e.g. respect/fear/shame (254a2: αἰδοῖ<sup>1</sup>), shame and amazement (254c4: αἰσχύνης τε καὶ θάμβους). It is able to control itself (254a2: ἑαυτὸν κατέχει), and it stops willingly (254c2: ἐκόντα). See also *dual1+2* for anger (254b1: ἀγανακτοῦντε) & *the whole* for seeing (254b4: εἶδον).

• (3) the bad horse is perceiving the beauty (254e8: ἴδη), experiences pain (254c5: τῆς ὀδύνης, 254e5: ὀδύνας) as well as such emotions as pleasure (254a6–7: τῆς τῶν ἀφροδισίων χάριτος), anger (254c7: ὀργῆ), and fear (254e8: φόβῳ). It is also said to experience the same experience several times (254e5: ταῦτὸν πολλάκις πάσχων). It is certainly a subject of memory (254a6: μνεῖαν ποιῆσθαι, 254d4: ἀναμνησκῶν), also because it blames the charioteer and the good horse for their breaking an agreement (254d1: ὁμολογίαν). Unlike the good horse it is not willing to retreat (254c3: ἄκοντα). Yet it must also be capable of understanding the charioteer's orders and intention and their content, since it ends by following the charioteer's intention. See also *the whole* for seeing (254b4: εἶδον).

Before I comment on the next group of subjects, i.e. double subjects for which Plato uses a dual number, please remember that in Plato's times the dual number was nearly anachronistic<sup>2</sup>, which means that Plato was keen on pointing out to the closeness of two elements. Although in the Table there are only two of them, both in relation to the charioteer and the good horse when considered as a team, the total number of dual forms in the passage in question is 13, only two of them being used in relation to both horses<sup>3</sup>. As for the range of words presented in the Table this proportion is similar: two cases for the charioteer and the good horse and none either for both horses or for the charioteer and the bad horse. It looks as if the good horse is much closer to the charioteer than to the second horse<sup>4</sup>.

• (1+2) the charioteer and the good horse taken together get angry in the same time and for the same reason (254b1: ἀγανακτοῦντε) and they are united first in agreeing (254b3: ὁμολογήσαντε) and then in pretending that they forgot about the agreement (254d3–4: ἀμνημονεῖν προσποιουμένῳ). Because they break the agreement (254d1: ὁμολογίαν), they are qualified by the bad horse as acting out of cowardice and lack of manliness (254c8: δειλία τε καὶ ἀνανδρία)<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Another complex term, even more difficult to render than πρόνοια, since there is no similar concept in English. See e.g. LSJ who give a huge range of meaning: *as a moral feeling, reverence, awe, respect for the feeling or opinion of others or for one's own conscience, and so shame, self-respect [...] sense of honour [...] sobriety, moderation [...] regard for others, respect, reverence [...]*.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. J. Humbert, *Syntaxe grecque*, p. 16: *Il semble qu'il ait été possible, au temps de Platon et d'Aristophane, d'employer le duel pour désigner des objets qui sont par paires; mais la tendance la plus courante, représentée par Platon, favorisait nettement le pluriel [...]*.

<sup>3</sup> See 254c2–3: τῷ ἵππῳ [...] ἀπελθόντε. There are two other terms one would be eager to add as referring to the closeness of both horses: τῷ σύζυγί (at 254a5, LSJ: *yoked together, paired, united*) and τὸν ὁμόζυγα (at 254c8, LSJ: *yoked together*). But these two terms refer to nothing but their physical position within the chariot.

<sup>4</sup> See H. Ioannidi, *Contribution à l'étude de la doctrine platonicienne du thymos*, p. 181: [...] *le cocher n'a pas besoin d'exercer de contrainte-châtiment sur le cheval blanc, inaltérablement généreux et docile [...]*.

<sup>5</sup> To say that they are acting in a similar way is not to say that they are indistinguishable. As the Table shows, they are distinct for more than one aspect. But this is what is denied by R. Hackforth, *Plato's Phaedrus*, p. 107: *The fact is that in the case before us the desire of the good horse cannot be discriminated from that of the*

They are also united by other duals referring to their being in opposition to the bad horse when approaching the beloved<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, a common feature of both is the impact they produce by their sensations – the charioteer's warming and the good horse's wetting – on the whole soul (or on their own souls).

- (1+3) the charioteer and the bad horse taken together. There is no dual form applied to the charioteer and the bad horse. However, there is one feature that is attributed to both: experiencing an experience, though obviously, the content of these experiences is unidentical (for more see below).

- (2+3) the good horse and the bad horse taken together. There is no dual number in the Table above. The two dual forms in the passage refer to their moving backward, yet both of them are doing so for different motifs and with different phenomenologies.

Next, we have a triple subject:

- (1+2+3) the charioteer, the good horse and the bad horse taken together are considered grammatically together only once: we are told that when they approach the beloved they perceive his illuminating face (254b4: καὶ πρὸς αὐτῷ τ' ἐγένοντο καὶ εἶδον τὴν ὄψιν τὴν τῶν παιδικῶν ἀστράπτουσαν),

and, finally, a united, i.e. internally undifferentiated subject<sup>2</sup>:

- (1–2–3) the whole soul, i.e. the lover's soul. (I cannot discuss here what is, if any, the difference between the lover and the lover's soul in the passage.) At this stage of the narrative (254e9) Plato abandons the soul as considered in its division into the charioteer and the two horses and comes back to the entire soul of the lover. The entire soul considered as a whole is said to follow the beloved person with awe and fear (254e9: αἰδουμένην τε καὶ δεδιῶσαν). This way of behaving results from all what has been said from 253e5–255a1, where Plato pictures the internal conflict of the soul's several elements in their approaching the beloved person, and more especially from 254e2–254e8, where we are told how this conflict is solved by training and taming the bad horse.

---

*charioteer: they both want precisely the same kind of satisfaction from the beloved [...] In this subjugation [i.e. of sheer lust] the charioteer and the good horse are so much one in purpose and function that their distinction can hardly be maintained if we seek to go behind the imagery. Quite the opposite – though, according to the Table, wrongly as well – is claimed by T. Irwin, Plato's Moral Theory, p. 238: [...] appetite and emotional parts are not distinguished, since all desires belong equally to the non-rational part; the rational part is allowed only belief, not knowledge. In the same vein as Hackforth T. M. Robinson, Plato's Psychology, p. 117: [...] the good horse [...] in practice [...] cannot be distinguished from the charioteer. Their desires and aims are invariably one and the same; there is no hint of rebellion which so characterizes Republic VIII. Robinson claims that in the Phaedrus myth we deal with lip service paid to tripartition. But then, p. 124, he asserts that: at all event in the Phaedrus he [i.e. Plato] opts equally firmly, it seems, for the tripartition of the discarnate soul. Moreover, as one can see from the Table and the analysis, there is no talk of desire in the passage at all.*

<sup>1</sup> See 254a7–b3: [...] τῷ [...] ἀντιτίθεντον ἀγανακτοῦντε [...] ἀναγκαζομένῳ· τελευτῶντε [...] πορεύεσθον ἀγομένῳ [...] εἶξαντε καὶ ὁμολογήσαντε [...], 254c8: λιπόντε [...] and 254d3–4: προσποιουμένῳ [...].

<sup>2</sup> For a background compare 251a1–b7 & 251e2–252b2 where the lover's (whole and undifferentiated) soul is described in similar words, e.g. perception (251a3: ἴδη, 251a7: ἰδόντα, 251e3: ἰδοῦσα, 251c6: βλέπουσα), sensation (251a4: ἔφριξε, 251a7–b1: ἐκ τῆς φρίκης μεταβολή τε καὶ ἰδρῶς καὶ θερμότης, 251b2–3: ἐθερμάνθη [...] θερμανθέντος, 251d6: οἰστρά, 251e4–5: κέντρων τε καὶ ὠδίνων), emotion (251c7: ἴμερος, 251d1: γέγηθεν, 251d4: ἴμερον, 251d6: ὀδυνάται, 251e2: ποθοῦσα, 251e3: ἴμερον, 251e5: ἡδονήν, 252a7: πόθου, 252a7: σέβεσθαι), as well as experience (252b2: τοῦτο δὲ τὸ πάθος), and memory (251d6: μνήμην). With such ascriptions one could better complete the above Table's last column.

At present, one could wonder if a solution of the internal conflict is a matter of taming the bad horse rather than of coordinating the entire soul which, to be sure, includes taming of the bad horse. In reality, it looks as if the whole soul's three elements are coordinated in one respect but not in others. It is characteristic how the whole soul's being and behaving are determined by one of its elements, the one which is, we are often told explicitly or implicitly, the least valuable. The fact that taming of the bad horse affects the entire soul rather than this very element of the entire soul only is significant<sup>1</sup>. Plato is explicit that this is the entire soul, now no longer with reference to its division, that is experiencing awe and fear. Here again the charioteer and the bad horse are closely related, which proves how much the bad horse matters in this story<sup>2</sup>.

Now (ii) I list functions in their relation to subjects (horizontal order in the Table). They can be distinguished according to their genus, species or subspecies<sup>3</sup>:

- perception (genus), and more particularly seeing (species), is shared by: 1 and 1's memory (call it 1<sup>#</sup>), 3, and 1–2–3.

There is no other species of the perception genus (though we can suppose an acoustic perception).

- sensation (genus) is shared by: 1, 2,

yet the subspecies are different, i.e. warming for the charioteer and wetting for the good horse. The common point is that in both cases this sensation is transferred, depending on the reading, either to the whole soul or to their own souls<sup>4</sup>.

- emotion (as genus) is shared by: 1 & 1<sup>#</sup>, 2, 3, 1+2, 1–2–3,

which makes this category the best represented both for each level and for all levels taken together. Moreover, it is represented by species as well as by subspecies. As for species, longing is experienced by: 1, fear by: 1<sup>#</sup>, 2, 3, 1–2–3, shame by: 2, amazement by: 2, pain by: 3, anger by: 3, 1+2. Now, in two cases we deal with the same species of emotion shared by more than one subject, with different subspecies however. More precisely, 1<sup>#</sup>, 2, 3, and 1–2–3 experience different kinds of fear, while 3, and 1+2 experience different kinds of

<sup>1</sup> See *ἐπειτα* ἡδὴ τῆ τοῦ ἡνιόχου προνοίᾳ (254e7, the black horse's following the charioteer's intention) being a *sine qua non* of τοῖς παιδικοῖς αἰδομένῃν τε καὶ δεδιῶσαν *ἐπεσθαι* (254e9–255a1, the lover's whole soul's following the beloved so and so).

<sup>2</sup> Surely one can ask why the bad horse is needed at all. Ultimately the question turns out to be nonsensical, since, one may answer, such is the structure of the soul, such is the soul as a whole, such is the lover, or to use modern language, such is the ontic structure of a human being. See C. L. Griswold, *Self-Knowledge in Plato's Phaedrus*, p. 95: *the control of unreasonable desire by reasonable desire [...] the black horse is enormously important in determining human nature*, R. Bett, *Immortality and the Nature of the Soul in the Phaedrus*, p. 21: *they [the lower, changeable parts] are just as important as reason itself to the soul's fulfilling of its final destiny*, & R. Burger, *The Thumotic and the Erotic Soul*, p. 67: [...] *but without his persistent demands to advance toward the beloved, the upward journey would not be initiated at all. Contra J. Moravcsik, Noetic Aspiration and Artistic Aspiration*, p. 46: *the "bad" horse is described as unqualifiedly bad, not helping in the ascent at all, and not being necessary to the healthy functioning of a human [...]*.

<sup>3</sup> Let a genus be affectivity (versus thinking or willing), a species – a modal group of affectivity (e.g. joy versus sorrow) and a subspecies – a particular kind of an affective group (e.g. terror versus anxiety).

<sup>4</sup> For more on this see R. Zaborowski, *Two Neglected Details in Plato's Chariot Allegory*, pp. 199–215, where 253e5–254a1 and 254c4–5 are discussed.

anger. Not every translation makes this explicit enough. But the Greek words given in the text leave no doubt about it. As for fear, the lexemes we find are the following: ἔδεισέ τε καὶ σεφθεῖσα for the charioteer's memory, αἰδοῖ for the good horse, φόβω for the bad horse, and αἰδουμένην τε καὶ δεδιῶν for the lover's soul and, on the other hand, as for anger, these are ὀργῆ for the bad horse, and ἀγανακτοῦντε for the charioteer and the good horse experiencing it together. What is of consequence is that fear's as well as anger's subspecies differ depending on the kind of subject.

An interesting thing is that – as we know from Homer for instance – φόβω is a more physical and less psychological fear than ἔδεισέ and, on the other hand, σεφθεῖσα has a more spiritual character than αἰδοῖ<sup>1</sup>. If we accept these distinctions, we have to agree that the order of fears extraordinarily conforms to the order of the soul's elements: the most physical fear for the bad horse representing the lowest element of the soul, then the psychological fear for the middle element of the soul and, finally, the spiritual (or religious fear) for the highest element of the soul doubled by another kind of fear (ἔδεισέ), less physical and more psychological than φόβω<sup>2</sup>. And, as Plato says, the whole soul, i.e. the lover's soul, is described in terms of αἰδουμένην τε καὶ δεδιῶν, which means that the fear (or fears) experienced by the whole soul – after it has got coordinated – are of similar kind to those of the charioteer (ἔδεισε but not σεφθεῖσα) and of the good horse (αἰδοῖ)<sup>3</sup>. The same can be claimed as regards anger: ὀργῆ, the bad horse's anger, is more physical and less psychological (or intellectual) than ἀγανακτοῦντε, the charioteer and the good horse's anger. The charioteer and the good horse are opposed to the bad horse as much as ἀγανακτοῦντε and ὀργῆ are opposed as two subspecies of anger.

• integral experience is ascribed to 1 (ταῦτὸν πάθος παθῶν) as well as to 3 (ταῦτὸν πολλάκις πάσχω). As for its contents, it is not the same experience, though it is caused by the same event: the conflict between the lover's soul's elements. The first is followed by the second in the subsequent sentence (respectively 254e1 and 254e6). Both pertain to the training and taming of the bad horse<sup>4</sup>. I call the experience *integral* because in both cases it has a neither purely intellectual nor purely affective character<sup>5</sup>. If at this point one is willing to still

<sup>1</sup> This is at least the case in Homer, see R. Zaborowski, *La crainte et le courage dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssee*.

<sup>2</sup> See also M. F. Burnyeat, *The passion of reason in Plato's Phaedrus*, p. 257: [...] *the bad horse can be humbled, its desire for sexual possession replaced by fear of it (254e): a fear which corresponds to moral shame in the good horse (aidoumenēn with 254ac) and to the charioteer's reverence for the divine (dediōn with 254b) (underlining is mine)*. Alas, Burnyeat says nothing about the lover's whole soul's fear.

<sup>3</sup> It is awkward that L. Palumbo, *Platone e la paura*, p. 292, considers only δεδιῶν ἐπεσθαι at 254e9–255a1, given that she speaks about *la molteplicità di valenze semantiche dei termini che esprimono il sentimento della paura* (p. 296) in Plato.

<sup>4</sup> See Hermiæ Alexandrini, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, (ed.) P. Couvreur, p. 199 [= Hermias Alexandrinus, *In Platonis Phaedrum scholia*, (eds.) C. M. Lucarini, & C. Moreschini, pp. 207–208]: Ταῦτὸν πάθος λέγει τὸ ἀνθελεκῶσαι [LSJ: *draw or pull against*] [...] Ὅταν δὲ ταῦτὸν πολλάκις [...] Ὅταν οὖν τοιοῦτον πάθος πολλάκις πάθη καὶ ταπεινωθῆ, ἔπειται λοιπὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀντιτείνει [LSJ: *act or strive against, resist*] τῷ ἠνιόχῳ ἢ ἄλλοις πᾶσα ζωή.

<sup>5</sup> I am well aware that my interpretation flies in the face of many others. Suffice it to look at translations of the words in question that vary a lot, see e.g. Jowett (in: *Introduction to Phaedrus*): *charioteer is worse off & this has happened several times* | Ritter (in: *Platon, Phaidros*): *Bei dem Lenker wiederholt sich in gesteigertem Maße*

interpret the charioteer as (symbolizing) reason he will have to explain how the reason experiences sensations, feelings and emotions. More particularly, if one identifies the charioteer with *to logistikon*, he should admit that *to logistikon* experiences πάθος, or, more probably, several πάθη<sup>1</sup>, not to speak of an *involuntary reflex*<sup>2</sup>, if Yunis is right in ascribing it to the charioteer.

- foresight is ascribed to 1 only. This is logical and again complies with the order of the soul's elements of which some are higher and equipped with higher cognitive functions than others.

- memory and calculation (also because of ὁμολογίαν) are ascribed:  
1, 2, 3, 1+2<sup>3</sup>.

While we are explicitly told the charioteer has a memory – and this memory is being described as a subject of seeing as well as of fear<sup>4</sup> –, both, the charioteer and the good horse share the same behaviour of simulating their lack of memory. This, of course, presupposes a memory of theirs and also a kind of calculation. On the other hand, the bad horse must keep what has been told and agreed between both parties since, otherwise, the charioteer and the good horse would not have needed to simulate their forgetfulness. This is also confirmed verbally by Plato: the bad horse keeps in mind a memory of pleasure and, this is why it pressures the charioteer and the good horse by reminding them of their agreement<sup>5</sup>.

I extend the label of this function from memory to calculating because for the process of simulating a minimal amount of calculation is needed in order to fake an attitude. On a more internal level one needs to compare what has been promised with what is or is not in progress. A comparison of past data with the

---

*was ihm vorher begegnet ist & Erfahrungen* | Fowler (in: Plato, *Phaedrus*): *effect upon the charioteer & the same experience many times* | Hackforth, *Plato's Phaedrus: resentment & it happens time and again* | Chambry (in: Platon, *Phèdre*): *saisi d'une émotion plus forte encore que la première fois & plusieurs expériences* | Pucci (in: Platone, *Fedro*): *impressionato ancora più & sottoposto allo stesso trattamento* | Vicaire (in: Platon, *Phèdre*): *le cocher, encore plus ému cette fois-ci & traitée plusieurs fois de cette façon* | Rowe (in: Plato, *Phaedrus*): *the same happens to the charioteer & the same thing happens* | Nehamas & Woodruff (in: Plato, *Phaedrus*): *the same feelings as before & has suffered the same thing* | Reale (in: Platone, *Fedro*): *la medesima impressione che sentiva prima & la medesima cosa* | Heitsch (in: Platon, *Phaidros*): *erlebt & dieselbe Erfahrung* | Mouze (in: *Introduction to: Platon, Phèdre*): *le même sentiment & le même traitement* | Brisson (in: Platon, *Phèdre* & Platon, *Phèdre*): *encore plus ému cette fois-ci & traitée plusieurs fois de la même façon*. We see here several choices: neither of two is rendered, only either of them is rendered, both of them are rendered as experience/emotion/feeling/impression. It would be probably no exaggeration in saying that this is the hugest discrepancy in translations for all terms of the passage in question. H. Yunis, *Commentary*, p. 162, links ταῦτὸν πάθος to ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἔδεισέ τε καὶ σερφεῖσα ἀνέπεσεν ὑπτία, which is, he tells us, *described as a πάθος because this first part of the charioteer's reaction is virtually an involuntary reflex as the lover approaches the beloved and see him*. Unfortunately he does not comment on ταῦτὸν πολλάκις πάσχω.

<sup>1</sup> This is why *to logistikon* may hardly be restricted to the rational. Even more inaccurate is to say, as S. Lovibond, *Plato's theory of mind*, p. 47, does: to logistikon, *literally* 'the rational' (underlining is mine).

<sup>2</sup> H. Yunis, *Commentary*, p. 162.

<sup>3</sup> See also M. F. Burnyeat, *The passion of reason in Plato's Phaedrus*, p. 257: [...] *two memories compete within him, the charioteer's memory of Beauty and Temperance and the bad horse's memory of sexual pleasure* [...]. Alas, again, as for the lover's whole soul's fear, Burnyeat says nothing about the good horse's memory and the charioteer and the white horse's feigned forgetfulness either.

<sup>4</sup> For memory being a subject (254b5–c1) see R. Zaborowski, *Two Neglected Details in Plato's Chariot Allegory*, pp. 215–219.

<sup>5</sup> See esp. 254d2: μόγις συνεχώρησεν δεομένων εἰς αἴθρις ὑπερβαλέσθαι.

present is required and this is what I understand here as a calculation, more especially because it is not an easy task to deceive the bad horse, which would not have been the case if the bad horse had been only a primitively reacting animal. One could always say that instincts can become violent without being credited with any calculation whatsoever, yet in the passage in question Plato depicts the bad horse in other than purely reactive and mechanical terms. For similar reasons a degree of calculating occurs in the good horse and in the charioteer as well.

At this juncture it is useful to point out that, unlike emotion and its species and subspecies, we have here no wording for species and subspecies – if there are any involved in the event described – of memory and calculation. However, this is not because Plato did not know any<sup>1</sup>. It is not wrong then, I think, to infer that the passage in question focuses on emotion-related acts rather than on thought-related ones. In the same vein, almost nothing is said about will. Apart from the good horse's willingness to refrain (254c2: ἐκόντα) and the bad horse's unwillingness to refrain (254c3: ἄκοντα) the passage is mute in this regard.

## 5. Interpretation

If the above analysis is accurate, then it seems that the general interpretation of the charioteer, the good horse and the bad horse as, respectively, reason, spirit and appetite is not correct or, better, is not entirely correct<sup>2</sup>. In a word, it is fragmentary and, as a result of that, reductionist. As a matter of fact, the charioteer, the good horse and the bad horse stand for, respectively, reason, spirit and appetite *but* they stand *not only* for, respectively, reason, spirit and appetite *and*, on the other hand, reason, spirit and appetite can be ascribed to, respectively, the charioteer, the good and the bad horse, *but* they should be ascribed *not only* to, respectively, the charioteer, the good and the bad horse.

I mean that, on the one hand, the charioteer is not only rational, the good horse is not only affective and the bad horse is not only desiring because they do possess also other psychic functions. On the other hand, reasoning is ascribed by Plato not only to the charioteer, affectivity not only to the good horse<sup>3</sup> and the desire not only to the bad horse because each of the three elements repre-

<sup>1</sup> One of the best known passage in this respect runs thus: *καὶ μοι ἐπὶ τοῖς τέτταρσι τμήμασι τέτταρα ταῦτα παθήματα ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ γιγνόμενα λαβέ, νόησιν μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνωτάτω, διάνοιαν δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ, τῷ τρίτῳ δὲ πίστιν ἀπόδος καὶ τῷ τελευταίῳ εἰκασίαν, καὶ τάξον αὐτὰ ἀνά λόγον, ὡσπερ ἐφ' οἷς ἐστὶν ἀληθείας μετέχει, οὕτω ταῦτα σαφηνείας ἡγησάμενος μετέχειν. (Rep. 511d6–e4, transl. Shorey: *Now take these four functions which are found in the soul in addition to these four segments – understanding at the highest level, thought at the second, belief at the third, and apprehension by images at the bottom – and put them in proportion according as you think each contains a measure of clarity to the degree that its objects contain a measure of truth*). Two points are to be made quickly: (1) the four thought-related acts are called all experiences (παθήματα) in the soul, (2) the hierarchy is manifest and its verticality is explicated by the τῷ ἀνωτάτω (= *what is the highest*).*

<sup>2</sup> It is now more clear why I said above that Ferrari is going in the same direction as I but he stops halfway. He goes further than many others but not as far as I do in this paper because he corrects the general interpretation only as to the charioteer and the bad horse and only in one respect.

<sup>3</sup> See A. W. Price, *Emotions in Plato and Aristotle*, p. 130, n. 19: *According to the Phdr., reason itself is subject to passions that prepare it for a fuller rationality; see Price (1995 [= Mental Conflict]: 80–2, 1997 [= Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle]: 63–7). Compare J. M. Rist, Plato says that we have tripartite souls, p. 105: That does not mean that the Guardians cannot fight: it only means that soldiers cannot be wise – not, of course, that they cannot think at all.*

sented by, respectively, the charioteer, the good horse and the bad horse has three functions ascribed to it.

The Table above shows that the ascription of functions to their subjects has anything but exclusiveness and if it is read vertically the same is true: to all three subjects multiple functions are assigned. Ascription in both senses is intricate, even if the degree of this intricacy varies from less to more functions being ascribed to a subject and even if they are now simpler, now more complex functions.

According to Plato's description the charioteer shows, especially because of his unique feature – i.e. an inward distinction of his memory as a subject of perception and of two subspecies of fear – more functions than either of the two horses. As the Table shows, two configurations are not represented (non-existent?). These are two duals, the charioteer and the bad horse as well as the good and the bad horses. This can be surprising because this means that the bad horse is the most isolated element of the three, though, on the other hand, as a single subject it has some functions (taken as genera, not as species) in common with the charioteer and the good horse. First, it has a peculiarity of experiencing an experience – this is what is said also about the charioteer (but not about the good horse). Second, it feels fear. It means that the bad horse has in common with the charioteer and the good horse the same genus (emotion, and also memory), but also it has in common a species of emotion, i.e. a particular emotion such as fear. But because this is another sub-species of fear we must acknowledge the difference at the level of sub-species between the bad horse, the good horse, the charioteer and, finally, the lover's entire soul.

What is commonly known is that there are three elements within the soul. What is known and accepted less is that each of the three elements is a set of several functions such as visual (and probably acoustic) perception, sensation, memory, desire/will, foresight, thinking and feeling<sup>1</sup>. Hence, it is more appropriate to say that there is a variety of functions within each of the three elements of the lover's souls. And it is more appropriate to say that the three elements are intrinsically heterogeneous as to their functions rather than to say that they have each only one function. This is a general claim and because of the allegorical character of the description it is hard to decide whether their functions are just and only as those represented in the allegory or whether the described functions are only examples of what the charioteer, the good and the bad horse are subjects of without the list being exhaustive<sup>2</sup>.

The model may be therefore best interpreted as follows:

(I) (1) there are three elements within the soul (this is generally known), (2) they are not simple but painted with several functions, (3) the functions are homonymously similar.

<sup>1</sup> Compare Descartes' list of components included in *cogito* (though, of course, in Descartes there is no question of partition of the soul), see below *Appendix 2*.

<sup>2</sup> Rather not for the reason mentioned above, i.e. the individual character of the event in our passage. Would it not be queer if all mental events were reducible to or accountable for by means of the same repertoire? But maybe Plato's allegory's meaning is more modest. Josh Wilburn suggested to me that *perhaps the Phaedrus is capturing something about the phenomenology of erotic experience, rather than presenting theoretical claims about the nature of each soul part* (May 9, 2018, a personal communication *per nuntium electronicum*).

Next, (II) (4) within the soul the three elements are unfolded vertically as levels, and (5) their homonymously similar functions differ according to the level they belong to.

Finally, (III) there are two important corollaries, in fact inseparably linked to one another with the first resulting in the second: (6) the functions do not exist in isolation but in groups, (7) within a group there is no strict, clear-cut distinction between its members, which are distinguishable only approximately.

Now, of great help is a suggestion made by Moline of replacing the modern term of functions by symbols, although he does not have the *Phaedrus* in mind:

*Given their history in faculty psychology and in interpretations influenced by it, the terms "Reason," "Spirit," and "Appetite" unfortunately do exhaust or limit the capacity of anything to which they are applied in our context. It will be prudent, then, to let the parts go incognito for a time, labeling them uncontroversially as A, B, and C, and noting the things Plato says and suggests about the desires, capacities, and activities of each in their names and descriptions. [...] It suggests a minimal capacity we might call "cognitive" even in part C. [...] That Plato assigns a minimal level of cognitive capacity to B and C is indicated in a number of ways [...] On familiar intellectualist interpretations of the "it" in question here – part A – we would not expect it to want anything at all, for it is a mere faculty for learning, inquiring, and calculating. Yet we have seen that part A cannot be such a faculty. Such intellectualist readings are shown to be untenable by Plato's serious isomorphism of polis and psyche and by his describing each part – this one included – as a lover.<sup>1</sup>*

As for the *Phaedrus*'s allegory I would suggest to label by symbols functions and instead of speaking about reason (or thinking), spirit (or feeling), and desire, to speak henceforth about, say, respectively t(hinking)–, f(eeling)–, and d(esiring)–function. Accordingly, on the more general scale, it could be said that the three elements of the soul, A (the charioteer), B (the good horse) and C (the bad horse) are ascribed homonymously and modally similar but materially different functions such as t, f, and d. To give a full picture I would say that

the vertical perspective may be presented thus:

$$A=A_t+A_f+A_d,$$

$$B=B_t+B_f+B_d,$$

$$C=C_t+C_f+C_d,$$

while a horizontal one in the following way:

$$t=t(A)+t(B)+t(C),$$

$$f=f(A)+f(B)+f(C),$$

$$d=d(A)+d(B)+d(C).$$

<sup>1</sup> J. Moline, *Plato's Theory of Understanding*, pp. 59–63.

Both are about the functional structure of the soul but each privileges one approach over another.

The major anthropological issue is, of course, to know what causes what: is, e.g. d(A) different from d(C) *because* they belong to different levels of the psyche or are A and C different levels of the psyche *because* they are characterized by materially different desires (d)<sup>1</sup>? The issue is huge and it cannot be hoped that I solve it here. But my intuition would be that it may be said that the answer to the question *what causes what?* is indifferent or that the question is badly asked. The issue is not about causality but about constitution, which means that one *is* another (and not one is *because of* another). To say that thought/feeling/desire–constituents of one set differ from those of another insofar as these sets are of different levels and to say that the two sets are of different levels insofar as their thought/feeling/desire–constituents are different amounts to the same because the components irreducibly and essentially constitute stratal sets while strata are unavoidably constituted by their components<sup>2</sup>. If an analogy with Plato’s state is permitted, it would be as to ask whether similar characters form one class or, rather, a class is formed of similar characters<sup>3</sup>.

Accordingly, there are three sets and, to use the *Republic*’s labels, they may be called the *logistikon* set (including *logistikon* thinking, *logistikon* feeling, and *logistikon* desiring), the *thumoeides* set (including *thumoeides* thinking, *thumoeides* feeling, and *thumoeides* desiring), and the *epithumetikon* set (including *epithumetikon* thinking, *epithumetikon* feeling, and *epithumetikon* desiring). From the point of view of function they may be called thus: thinking<sub>logistikon</sub>, thinking<sub>thumoeides</sub>, thinking<sub>epithumetikon</sub>, feeling<sub>logistikon</sub>, feeling<sub>thumoeides</sub>, feeling<sub>epithumetikon</sub>, desiring<sub>logistikon</sub>, desiring<sub>thumoeides</sub>, desiring<sub>epithumetikon</sub>, or if you are still reluctant to map the *Republic*’s vocabulary on the *Phaedrus*’ allegory, then call them: thinking<sub>charioteer</sub>, thinking<sub>good horse</sub>, thinking<sub>bad horse</sub>, feeling<sub>charioteer</sub>, feeling<sub>good horse</sub>, feeling<sub>bad horse</sub>, desiring<sub>charioteer</sub>, desiring<sub>good horse</sub>, desiring<sub>bad horse</sub>.

Important is to notice that while there is a clear–cut divide in what concerns the elements of the soul (the charioteer, the good horse and the bad horse, or, if one agrees to graft them on the *Republic*’s terminology, to *logistikon*, to *thumoeides*, to *epithumetikon*), there is no such clear–cut divide as for functions. In our passage of the allegory there are no such words as reason, emotion and will, but only examples of functions which we are used to putting into boxes labelled with such tags. Consequently, it is not surprising that it is not easy to explain the Greek model with our vocabulary, especially because a huge gap between Plato’s and our terminological approaches exists. But we should not

<sup>1</sup> Think also about different objects of the charioteer’s memory (noetic) and the bad horse’s memory (physical).

<sup>2</sup> This looks as another exemplification of the *Euthyphro* dilemma. Compare also Aristotle’s *EE* 1220a24–25: οἷον πόνοι τε ἄριστοι καὶ τροφή ἀφ’ ὧν γίνεται εὐεξία, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς εὐεξίας ποιοῦσιν ἄριστα [...].

<sup>3</sup> Similarly, if some claim, as does T. Penner, *Thought and Desire in Plato*, p. 104, that [w]e can also see from 582A8–B6 that Plato felt confident that the money–lover (he in whom appetite reigns), had he experienced the pleasures of learning the truth itself, would instead have been a lover of wisdom, it may be asked on what it depends that the money–lover could experience the pleasure of learning the truth itself – is it a result of an accident or of another factor, e.g. his constitution, that is at issue? Plato would certainly have an answer to that (also in the *Phaedrus*) but to me it looks like a problem of (moral) luck.

*treat Plato as a child who talked bad English or German instead of as a grown-up man who talked good Greek [because] the modern classification, whether it is adequate or inadequate, proceeds upon an entirely different principle from the Greek.*<sup>1</sup>

Now, it is crucial to see that a *single* act (if there is such thing at all) has, therefore, two characteristics:

formal: being e.g. t– rather than f– or d–function, and  
material: being of e.g. 1<sup>st</sup> rather than 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> level.

We have high desire (but not isolated from high thought and emotion) and low thought (linked with low emotion and low desire). All in all, we may schematically identify three kinds of acts of three levels, that is: nominally nine categories. But the material aspect is conceptually more discrete than the formal one. The formal one relies on the proportion of constituents an act includes<sup>2</sup>. We call an act different from another one because of the proportion of t–, f– and d–function in its content. For instance, of two, an act<sub>x</sub> and an act<sub>z</sub> (and to better compare them I speak about acts of the same level, for they are more easily comparable having a common denominator), act<sub>x</sub> is more intellectual and less affective, while act<sub>z</sub> is more affective and less intellectual, because the former has an analytical composition of, say, 70%t+25%f+5%d, while the latter of 19%t+54%f+27%d. Now, both of them can occur at the level of *to logistikon*, *to thumoeides*, or *to epithumetikon*, or to use the *Phaedrus*' image, of the charioteer, the good horse, or the bad horse. And this is what we see: the charioteer calculates and so does the black horse, but the nature of both calculations is different, while on another occasion the charioteer and the black horse experiences fear, but the nature of their fears is different.

## 6. Conclusion

In my paper I have focused on what is known as Plato's chariot allegory. The analysis of *Phdr.* 253e5–255a1 clearly shows that the most common interpretation, i.e. the one in which the charioteer is the reason, the good horse the spirit, and the bad horse the appetite is incorrect insofar as it is fragmentary. In point of fact, it reduces the content of the allegorical picture in what regards the structure of the soul – to take it quantitatively – to 1/3 of the whole<sup>3</sup>. As I understand it, the tripartition of the soul in Plato's *Phaedrus* does not follow –

<sup>1</sup> J. L. Stocks, *Plato and the Tripartite Soul*, p. 216 (underlining is mine).

<sup>2</sup> I would say that the same is valid for species, e.g. an act is love rather than joy but it is not *pure* love. It is rather love *with* some ingredient of joy.

<sup>3</sup> Compare J. Moss, *Appearances and Calculations ...*, p. 37, n. 6, for whom this is a kind of a face-value reading, since, as she says, [i]t is worth noting that the *Phaedrus*'s description of the non-rational parts makes all of these attributions completely explicit (see especially 253 d–254 e [i.e. our passage under analysis]), and while the *Phaedrus*'s tale of horses and charioteer is allegory, unless Plato conceives of the lower parts as capable of fairly sophisticated cognition it is very misleading and unilluminating allegory indeed, to what she added: the *Phaedrus*'s description of the non-rational soul very strongly implies that these parts are capable of sophisticated cognition (conceptual thinking, propositional thinking, belief, using evaluative concepts). [...] It would be a pretty pointless allegory if Plato didn't think the non-rational parts of the soul can do these things. A better interpretation is: Plato DID think the non-rational parts of the soul can do these things, and he chose to illustrate that idea with the *Phaedrus*'s allegory (Mar. 7, 2018, a personal communication *per nuntium electronicum*).

as it has been suggested constantly – the division into three functions but rather is meant to ascribe each of the three functions to each of the three elements of the psyche. This is, in my view, to support the hierarchical model of the internal structure of the soul already displayed in the *Republic* (see below *Appendix I*).

In my interpretation the claim about the inward complexity of all three elements of the soul is decisive: the charioteer, the good horse and the bad horse are, respectively, *not only* reason, spirit and appetite, but they are, to use the common labels, sets of reason–cum–spirit–cum–appetite. Alternatively and more precisely I suggest reading them as three sets of a number of heterogeneous functions as in the Table above, say sensing–cum–perceiving–cum–thinking–cum–feeling–cum–remembering–cum–calculating. The essential point in my interpretation is that functions of sets are formally similar but they differ because of the material character of their functions. By material character I mean the kind (= level) of thinking, feeling or desiring each of the sets experiences. If my reading is pertinent, then I suggest replacing one usual interpretation as follows:

<i>Phaedrus</i>	a common (?) interpretation
the bad horse	desire
the good horse	spirit (emotion)
the charioteer	reason

with a new one:

<i>Phaedrus</i>	my <sup>(1)</sup> interpretation
the bad horse	thinking–cum–feeling–cum–desiring of the basic level
the good horse	thinking–cum–feeling–cum–desiring of the middle level
the charioteer	thinking–cum–feeling–cum–desiring of the highest level

or, alternatively, if some want to insist on the primordially reflective, affective and appetitive character of, respectively, the charioteer, the good horse and the bad horse:

<i>Phaedrus</i>	my <sup>(2)</sup> interpretation
the bad horse	desiring–cum–thinking–cum–feeling (= the low level psyche)
the good horse	feeling–cum–thinking–cum–desiring (= the middle level of the psyche)
the charioteer	thinking–cum–feeling–cum–desiring (= the high level of the psyche)

In this model there are three structural oppositions:

(1) elements of the soul (*to logistikon*, *to thumoeides*, and *to epithumetikon*) are complex, i.e. they are sets, but their components (thinking, feeling, and

desiring) are simple<sup>1</sup>,

(2) the divide between levels is distinguishable but the divide between components is indistinguishable (whether this is epistemic or ontic<sup>2</sup>, I am unable to say), and

(3) the levels are modally similar but materially heterogeneous: all three levels represent similar functions but these functions' objects are of different levels (e.g. the object of feeling<sub>good horse</sub> and of feeling<sub>bad horse</sub> is different)<sup>3</sup>.

To be clear, the suggested interpretation of the *Phaedrus*' chariot allegory in what concerns the description of the soul differs from the standard interpretation mainly in two points:

(i) none of the three levels of the soul is exclusively rational, affective or appetitive, and

(ii) rationality, affectivity and conation are not limited to only one element of the chariot, i.e. one element or level of the psyche.

However, such a negative description is not sufficient, since in a minimal case it allows for the three levels of the soul with two components each. Therefore, it would be better to state it in positive terms:

– each level contains altogether a kind of rationality, a kind of affectivity, and a kind of appetite, and:

– each of the three functions belongs to each of the three levels of the soul<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Hence no homunculi dilemma. Even if we read literally and take the charioteer's memory, the charioteer's soul and the white horse's soul as subjects (see R. Zaborowski, *Two Neglected Details in Plato's Chariot Allegory*), we arrive at a threefold structure since only at the third level components are simple. I have found a curious parallel in J. H. Jackson, *Croonian Lectures on Evolution ...*, p. 661: *There are really subdegrees or subdepths of the second depth, and no doubt of the first and third depth [...]* and J. LeDoux, *The Emotional Brain*, p. 76: *And the visual cortex itself is a complicated structure, being composed of many subregions and subsystems that each contribute in unique ways to the act of seeing.* There is no homunculus dilemma because the vertical perspective (higher vs lower) is not repeated in higher or lower sets of what we distinguish and call as thinking and feeling. See also J. Moline, *Plato's Theory of Understanding*, p. 75: *It is important to recognize here that not just any internal conflict in a part will be sufficient to start an infinite (and hence vicious) regress. [...] But there is not the slightest evidence that Plato regarded any of the parts of the psyche as isomorphic in structure to the entire tripartite psyche. There is evidence that he recognized conflicts within part C, and hence that he was committed to regarding at least that part as having subparts.* I think that they may be said isomorphic formally but not materially.

<sup>2</sup> If they are inseparable ontically, the modern labels such as *thought* and *feeling* are but names for various aspects – inseparable by their essence – of a mental act and the Greek words (νοῦς and θυμός as well as τὸ λογιστικόν, τὸ θυμοειδές, and τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν) are more appropriate to render the integral character of such acts.

<sup>3</sup> Compare R. Robinson, *Plato's Separation of Reason from Desire*, p. 47: *Plato's desire is itself a heterogeneous collection [...]*. For a striking parallel in neuroscientific research compare J. LeDoux, *The Emotional Brain*, p. 102: *Implicit in such a view is that emotion is a single faculty of mind and that a single unified system of the brain evolved to mediate this faculty. While it is possible that this view is correct, there is little evidence that it is. A new approach to the emotional brain is needed. [...] there may not be one emotional system in the brain but many (underlining is mine).*

<sup>4</sup> M. Woods, *Plato's Division of the Soul*, p. 31, is right when he speaks about *different desires*, but he fails to see that there is *more to the distinguishing of three elements in the soul than the distinguishing of three aspects* (p. 36) in their hierarchical set up. The issue is therefore not about the charioteer being (always) good and the black horse being (always) bad but about how well the three elements are coordinated. This is an issue emerging already at the pre-incarnate stage: only those souls who are badly coordinated fall. Compare R. Ingarden, *Wykłady z Etyki*, p. 392 & p. 400, for his conception of a system composed of relatively isolated systems and its functioning either as coordinated or not, and its being coordinated on several levels.

Their inward differentiation of functions is hierarchical<sup>1</sup>.

I believe that the suggested interpretation is vital not only for the sake of historical reconstruction. I think that, because of avoiding the reason/emotion dichotomy, it also makes Plato's approach helpful to a conceptual advancement in thinking about the soul (or the mind) and its functions and inner conflicts. Consequently, Plato should not be held responsible, as we learn again and again from academic and non-academic books, for the dichotomization of feeling (or emotion) and thought (or reason) and for what results from this dichotomization, namely a negative view of affectivity<sup>2</sup>. As such the new reading commits us to giving Plato a new place, especially because he turns out to be relevant for current discussions, mainly both about the relation between rationality and affectivity and the essence of affectivity.

Since it happens that the above interpretation coincides with several rare interpretations of the *Republic* in what concerns the issue of the elements of the soul and their functions, I add *Appendix 1*. Since I find some similarities of Plato's approach with those of subsequent philosophers, I illustrate them in *Appendix 2*. They concern the complexity of mental functions and/or the nature of communication between them. If what I present there is correct, Plato turns out to be a forerunner of a good number of philosophers without, however, being recognized by them as such. Furthermore, if I am right to interpret Plato's view as above, there are – it seems to me – striking parallels in modern neuroscientific research concerning integration of functions and a hierarchy of three integrated systems:

*Functions are mediated by interconnected systems of brain regions working together rather than by individual areas working in isolation.*

[...]

*The brain can be divided into three divisions along the vertical axis, the hindbrain, midbrain, and forebrain. As we ascend from hindbrain to forebrain, the functions represented go from psychologically primitive to psychologically elaborate.*

[...]

*There exists, so to speak, a hierarchy of three-brains-in-one, or what I call, for short, a triune brain. [...] The triune brain thus puts the limbic system into a broader evolutionary context to account for behaviors and mental functions of all levels of complexity.<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> The only commentator who, to the best of my knowledge, read it this way is C. L. Griswold, *Self-Knowledge in Plato's Phaedrus*, p. 93: *The image indicates that this unity [i.e. the unity of the human soul] should be hierarchical*. See also K. Kalimtzis, *Taming Anger*, who repeatedly speaks about a *determinate hierarchical relationship that has been forged between the parts of the soul* (p. 44) and *Plato's hierarchy of a plethora of psychological elements* (p. 61), although he doesn't mention the *Phaedrus*.

<sup>2</sup> For examples see R. Zaborowski, *Some remarks on Plato on emotions*, pp. 142–143.

<sup>3</sup> J. LeDoux, *The Emotional Brain*, p. 77, p. 82 & p. 98. See also e.g. I. A. Strigo & A. D. Craig, *A neurobiological view of pain as a homeostatic emotion*, p. 103: [...] *each hierarchical level of the nervous system*.

As I understand it, Plato's approach is integrated and hierarchical in what regards united and inseparable functions, homogeneous in form but heterogeneous in content insofar as functions of several strata have different values as their objects. These functions are organized in (three) sets unfolded on three layers.

### Appendix 1

My paper is about the *Phaedrus*. Yet since the implications of my interpretation coincide with, to some extent, implications of some earlier interpretations of the *Republic*, I list them shortly below. By no means would I like to decrease their importance. Yet I don't want either to make any confusion about the fact that:

(i) they concern the *Republic* and never, as far as I may tell, are related to the *Phaedrus*,

(ii) they are not as comprehensive as mine, that is they recognize some elements which I underline in my interpretation but they never, again as far as I may tell, contain all the elements I take to be crucial nor, not less importantly, are they linked with one another.

I wish to include this *Appendix* also because one of the discussants in Edinburgh pointed out to me that there is nothing new in my paper. He told that I am just restating the points made by Kraut<sup>1</sup>. Yet Kraut in his paper does not refer to the *Phaedrus*. Since he does not discuss the tripartition of the soul either, I do not include him in the below list.

I think that if what is so universally neglected in the *Phaedrus* is sometimes recognized in the *Republic*, this may be because, while the context in the former is complex and allegorical, in the latter it is put straightforwardly, though succinctly, by Plato himself, e.g. at 580d7–8:

Τίνα ταύτην; Τήνδε. τριῶν ὄντων τριταὶ καὶ ἡδοναὶ  
μοι φαίνονται, ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μία ἰδίᾳ· ἐπιθυμίαι τε  
ὁσαύτως καὶ ἀρχαί.<sup>2</sup>

What visibly comes out of this passage is that just as there are three forms of the soul (580d3–4: διήρηται κατὰ τρία εἶδη, οὕτω καὶ ψυχὴ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου τριχῆ), so there are three pleasures or kinds of pleasure, and three desires or three kinds of it. Moreover, the three kinds of pleasures and desires are ascribed to the three forms of the soul. Therefore, any attentive reader of this passage can be aware of the phenomenon of the relation between pleasures and desires on the one hand and forms of the soul on the other. This is more explicitly put than in the allegory of the *Phaedrus* but poorer in content since it concerns only two species of mental acts: desires and pleasures.

It is worthwhile to mention J. L. Stocks who makes the point about the difference between ancient and modern ways of viewing the relations of mental functions and this in the context of the *Republic* (with no word about the *Phaedrus*). He writes this:

<sup>1</sup> See R. Kraut, *Reason and Justice in Plato's Republic*.

<sup>2</sup> Shorey's transl.: "What is that?" "The following: The three parts have also, it appears to me, three kinds of pleasure, one peculiar to each, and similarly three appetites and controls."

*one activity is supreme, but the other two persist as strictly subordinate activities in a residual form. [...] they are all present together [...] In what sense does this doctrine involve us in the assertion of 'parts' of the soul? The treatment of this question is commonly confused and prejudiced by the modern psychological classification of the elements of consciousness under the three heads of Denken, Fühlen, Wollen – Thought, Feeling, Desire – Cognition, Affection, Conation. [...] [...] It is at once evident from the fact that our psychologists are careful to inform us that their triad is in simultaneous occupation of consciousness; all three are present in every 'psychosis' though in varying proportions; while the Greek triad is often represented (as we have seen) as a triad of alternatives, each excluding the others, and each striving on occasion to supplant whichever of the other two is in possession. [...] No direct comparison, therefore, is possible between these two classifications.<sup>1</sup>*

As it seems to me, while Stocks correctly grasps the essence of the two classifications, he is entirely mistaken in his attribution. The moderns have a tendency to separate mental functions and to make a plea for separateness of thought, feeling, and desire – should it be only because of their language, which not only makes it possible but, also, at the same time does not allow them to think about indivisible sets – , while early Greeks and Plato too think of the mental as unified and inseparable (again a linguistic argument is solid)<sup>2</sup>. Plato's chariot allegory is, in this context, further strong evidence, and I wonder why Stocks didn't mention the *Phaedrus* in his paper.

To mention other modern commentators, I refer to R. W. Hall, who remarked:

*Not only is the soul as a whole a complex whole, but each part appears to be differentiated. Like the spirited (θυμοειδής (sic)) and appetitive (ἐπιθυμητικόν) parts, the rational part "enjoys its own proper pleasures and the best," although its pleasures are absolutely the*

<sup>1</sup> J. L. Stocks, *Plato and the Tripartite Soul*, pp. 214–216 (underlining is mine). O. Renaut, *Platon. La médiation des émotions*, p. 165, commenting on Stocks speaks about *des motivations qui sont le reflet de l'organisation hiérarchique composée de ces trois fonctions* – but the word *hiérarchique* is Renaut's and is used, again, in the context of the *Republic*.

<sup>2</sup> Whether they are epistemically indistinguishable or ontically inseparable is impossible to know. Compare an analogy with Aristotle's convex and concave of a curve in *EN* 1102a: καθάπερ ἐν τῇ περιφερείᾳ τὸ κυρτὸν καὶ τὸ κοίλον or better, because of ἀδιαχώριστον, in *EE* 1219b33–34: ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ καμπύλῳ τὸ κοίλον καὶ τὸ κυρτὸν ἀδιαχώριστον. But Greek wordings is different and we have such words as νοῦς, θυμός, φρήν etc. Attention to this has been drawn, among others, by T. Zieliński, *Homeric Psychology [1922]* & M. J. O'Brien, *The Socratic Paradoxes and the Greek Mind*, pp. 45–55. See also J. Moline, *Plato's Theory of Understanding*, p. 21: *That intellect, emotion, and conation were not distinct for early Greeks is clear not merely from the evidence about the uses of the term νοῦς already cited but from evidence on the uses of the term θυμός [...]*. More recently in respect of early Greek philosophy see R. Zaborowski, *Sur le sentiment chez les Présocratiques*.

best. To each part of the soul then, there are its appropriate pleasures and desires. [...] not only is the soul as a whole divided into three parts, but each part is complex [...]<sup>1</sup>,

then mention G. Vlastos writing that:

practical reason – a reason which is not only calculative (as his term, *logistikon*, might unfortunately suggest) but passionate [...] it engages the heart no less than the intellect, it involves love for ideals of conduct [...]<sup>2</sup>,

then point to N. P. White who writes that Plato

[...] does not regard the “appetitive” part of the soul as the only part that may be said to have “appetites” or “desires” [...] Both the reasoning part and the spirited part have them too. [...] the appetitive part of the soul is not regarded by him as a genuinely unitary part, but as a heterogeneous collection of various desires and impulses [...]<sup>3</sup>,

and next go to J. Annas claiming that:

It is important that for Plato reason is not conceived as aiming at academic, drily intellectual discoveries; it wants [...] cares [...] Spirit also, however, involves reasons and reason-giving [...] In both these respects spirit is like reason, and may indeed seem to be doing the same job as reason [...] ‘the desiring part’ [...] is said to ‘agree’ to being ruled (442c, d) so it cannot be completely unreasoning [...] can indeed perform some reasoning about what it wants [...] this part is thought of as being able to reason out how to obtain its desires, and valuing means to this end<sup>4</sup>,

and end with M. Burnyeat:

---

<sup>1</sup> R. W. Hall, *Ψυχὴ as Differentiated Unity in the Philosophy of Plato*, p. 69 (underlining is mine). But he seems to deny this as regards the *Phaedrus*, since he says, p. 75: *The Phaedrus represents a continuation of the differentiated unity of immortal soul although the individual soul includes the spirited and appetitive parts, whereas in the Republic the immortal soul was a differentiated unity composed of the rational part of the soul and its appropriate pleasures and desires. Although such pleasures and desires fitting for the rational part of the soul are not mentioned in the Phaedrus myth, it is reasonable to assume that mention of them was not necessary for what appeared to be at least one of Plato's purposes in the myth, the imaginative account of the fall of the soul, its bodily incarnation, and the conditions and nature of its subsequent deliverance.* On the other hand, in his conclusion, p. 82, he says that: *Consequently it seems possible to maintain that in the Republic, Phaedrus, Timaeus, and Laws grounds exist for construing the nature of the individual immortal soul as a differentiated unity composed of those pleasures, desires, and other affections appropriate to the cognitive or rational faculty, and the division of that faculty into reason proper and opinion* (underlining is mine). So, unlike myself, he does not extend this characteristic to the two other elements of the soul.

<sup>2</sup> G. Vlastos, *Justice and Psychic Harmony in the Republic*, pp. 520–521 (underlining is mine).

<sup>3</sup> N. P. White, *A Companion to Plato's Republic*, p. 226. White grasps that appetite belongs to all three elements – but he does not do so for the two other functions; he also grasps the heterogeneous character of the appetite but, again, only of this one element and he understands the heterogeneity in a narrower way than I do.

<sup>4</sup> J. Annas, *An Introduction to Plato's Republic*, pp. 125–130 (underlining is mine).

*In the divided soul reason has desires and pleasures of its own, while appetite has conceptions of what is pleasurable and can reason how to get it; the middle, spirited part is devoted to honour and has a network of beliefs about what that requires.<sup>1</sup>*

In 1987 Ferrari summarized the issue in the following way:

*[...] the reasoning, spirited and appetitive components of the tripartite soul most fully described in the Republic. Quite clearly, however, these labels have only limited application to the conduct exhibited by the charioteer and horses. These allegorical figures are actual characters (even if of a rather vaudevillian sort), each with his own appetites and capacity for deliberation. But the correspondence with the Republic is not disarmed; for interpreters have long found that these labels do not adequately apply even to that work's description of the behaviour of the parts. There are two main camps over this issue. Many have been influenced by the assumption that each 'part' of soul ought to stand for a single faculty (say: reason, emotion, desire) [...] Other interpreters, in response, have worked from the assumption that Plato was never aiming at a theory in which (to put it baldly) reason simply reasons and desire desires; that the parts of soul are better construed as a type of agent rather than faculty [...].<sup>2</sup>*

As I have tried to show in my paper, first, *other interpreters* do not make use of the *Phaedrus* for their claim, next, they are, Ferrari included, Annas excluded, more keen on dichotomy of functions (*reason simply reasons and desire desires*) than on their trichotomy and, as a result of that, they omit the third element<sup>3</sup> I do not cease to focus on, and, finally, they are much less explicit and holistic than I am about the structure and the essence of the exact ascription of functions to the elements of the soul.

Optimistically, also among those who do not deal with Plato directly several scholars are not overwhelmed by the common interpretation. It is relieving that without being expert in Plato it is possible to read him correctly. Let me give two examples of philosophers working on affectivity and its relation with rationality and mentioning Plato only by the way. So does Macmurray in the following words:

<sup>1</sup> M. Burnyeat, *Culture and Society in Plato's Republic*, p. 227 (underlining is mine). See also J. Moss, *Pictures and passions in the Timaeus and Philebus*, p. 260: *the desires, pleasures, and emotions of the rational part* – again no relation to the *Phaedrus* and the remark is left undeveloped.

<sup>2</sup> G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas*, pp. 200–201 (underlining is mine).

<sup>3</sup> Likewise in C. Bobonich, *Plato's Utopia Recast ...*, p. 295: *Both the Phaedrus and the Timaeus divide the soul into three parts and freely attribute beliefs and desires to these parts*. There is, again, a shouting silence about the third, affective function (emotion/feeling).

*The only one of the great philosophers who recognized this parallelism between thought and feeling, and who maintained that our feelings could be true or false, was Plato. He insisted on it both in the Republic and in the Philebus. This view of Plato has usually been treated by commentators as a forgiveable eccentricity in Plato's thought [...] It seems to me not merely true but of much more profound significance than Plato himself recognized. It is not that our feelings have a secondary and subordinate capacity for being rational or irrational. It is that reason is primarily an affair of emotion, and that the rationality of thought is the derivative and secondary one. [...]*<sup>1</sup>,

and, much more recently, M. Stocker:

*[...] Plato suggests in the later parts of the Phaedrus (253ff.), Symposium (205ff.), and Republic (580ff.) [that] reason is said to require for its perfection its own proper desire, pleasure and feeling.*<sup>2</sup>

As it is, he mentions the *Phaedrus*, and more precisely, it seems, the part of the dialogue I analyse in this paper. However, his remark is short, general, put in the footnote and not developed elsewhere.

I would like to end my list of examples with P. Aronoff. The reason for that is that this is a surprising case insofar as Aronoff makes a claim extremely similar to mine, yet he does so concisely and without pointing to any dialogue:

*In the tri-partite soul, each part has its own reason, emotion, and desire [...]*<sup>3</sup>

This important statement is not developed and it could have hardly been otherwise, given that the quote comes from a review of W. W. Fortenbaugh's book. More surprising is that when one checks, as I did, what exactly Aronoff refers to, he will discover that Aronoff's remark is, so to speak, independent of what Fortenbaugh says, who, as Aronoff tells us:

*believes that bi-partition is a significant advance on tri-partition. [...] in the bi-partite soul, emotion and desire are grouped together and clearly separated from reason.*

I am not sure whether in his second sentence Aronoff is contrasting Fortenbaugh's claim about *a significant advance*, or rather commenting on Fortenbaugh's interpretation. Aronoff is not so explicit nor gives any page numbers of the book of Fortenbaugh which he is reviewing, but, it seems to me, he must have in mind the following passages from Fortenbaugh's work:

*[...] In fact the Republic is quite explicit that each of the three psychic parts has its own desires. [...] in the*

<sup>1</sup> J. Macmurray, *Reason and Emotion*, pp. 25–26 (underlining is mine).

<sup>2</sup> M. Stocker, *Psychic Feelings*, p. 5, n. 1 (underlining is mine).

<sup>3</sup> P. Aronoff, [a review of:] W. W. Fortenbaugh, *Aristotle on Emotion* (underlining is mine).

*Republic [...] the two lower parts of the tripartite soul include phenomena that are not emotions [...] in the Republic. By assigning emotions to all three psychic parts, tripartition fails to make clear a fundamental distinction between emotional response and reasoned deliberation.*<sup>1</sup>

As it is Aronoff says more than Fortenbaugh whose book he has under review but still not enough to let us know what the basis is for Aronoff's claim. Since I cannot pursue this issue any further, let us admit that Aronoff's observation is exceptionally important but because of its terse character it cannot be adequately exploited.

## Appendix 2

This historical overview is evidently too short and underdeveloped. However, I hope, it is acceptable here since it forms an Appendix to a paper of considerable length.

Plato's view on the soul – as I reconstruct it in this paper by way of reading the allegory of the chariot, that is, that:

- (i) the elements of the soul are functionally complex,
  - (ii) all three main functions are ascribed to each of the three elements of the soul, and, finally,
  - (iii) the distinction between elements which are formally similar is to be understood in terms of hierarchy of these functions,
- is philosophically and psychologically promising since it explains how the mental dynamics operate. This view takes for granted that if the soul's elements may be in conflict, this is because they can communicate, which, in turn, presupposes that they are comparable. And comparability is a kind of homogeneity, be it a common denominator or a common numerator, so to speak. If all three elements of Plato's soul are, as I propose to see, complex by being composed of homonymously similar components, they can be in accord or in discord. This situation could be compared to that of, say, three persons speaking in the same tongue. If one of them does not speak this tongue, they cannot communicate any longer. And this is what we risk happening, if we reduce the three elements of the soul, the charioteer and the two horses to, respectively, the pure reason, the pure emotions and the pure desire, as the common interpretation is used to doing.

In his allegory of the chariot Plato anticipates this principle and so avoids the problems entailed by feeling–thought dichotomization. If two, or as in the chariot case three, forces have to be compared and opposed in conflict, they have to have some similarity in their nature which is such: the three elements are homogeneous when compared with each other because they are heterogeneous (complex) in the same way, i.e. composed of three inseparable functions. Hence, they can communicate with each other.

---

<sup>1</sup> W. W. Fortenbaugh, *Aristotle on Emotion*, pp. 32–33 & p. 37.

An interesting fact is that in the course of history a stream of thinkers who advocated a similar view to what I suggest accepting as Plato's and that I call the principle of homogeneity can be identified. For the most part, they did not refer to Plato. Quite often and most probably, they – maybe with the exception of Aristotle – even were not aware of being Plato's followers or sharing the same stance.

I start with Aristotle who is quite explicit about a homogeneity being necessary in order to make communication possible, since he tells us that:

[...] *the reasoning faculty is a principle controlling not reasoning but appetite and passions; therefore he must necessarily possess those parts* (transl. H. Rackham)<sup>1</sup>.

It looks as if three types of acts were intricate, not simple, functionally<sup>2</sup>.

I turn to Plutarch. What is impressive is that Plutarch is the most explicit about feeling and thought being inseparably related, employing, at his time, no longer synthetic words as those used by early Greeks, such as νοῦς, θυμός, and φρήν (see above), but words that are much closer to modern *affective experience* and *calculation*. For he writes:

*it is not easy to grasp any feeling [πάθος] of man entirely freed from calculation [λογισμοῦ] nor any motion of thought [διανοίας κίνησιν] to which no desire, or ambition or joy or sadness is added*<sup>3</sup>.

Now, in *Platonic Questions* (Q. IX) Plutarch is commenting on the allegory of the chariot. However, how we understand his comment depends on *whether* we follow the original text *or* read it in translation. This is because a translation may obscure the issue treated here, insofar as it renders untranslatable Greek concepts by words which are their inaccurate equivalents. For instance, if we read the text translated as suggested by Goodwin & al.:

*Plato himself, after he had compared the form of the soul to a pair of horses and a charioteer, likened (as every one knows) the rational faculty to the charioteer, and the concupiscent one to one of the horses, which was resty and unmanageable altogether, bristly about the ears, deaf and disobedient both to whip and spur; and the irascible he makes for the most part very obsequious to the bridle of reason, and assistant to it.*<sup>4</sup>

we could think, especially if still having in mind Plutarch's previous passage about inseparability of feeling and thought, that Plato is a representative of

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics* 1219b40–1220a2: ἄρχει δ' ὁ λογισμὸς οὐ λογισμοῦ ἀλλ' ὀρέξεως καὶ παθημάτων, ἀνάγκη ἄρα ταῦτ' ἔχειν τὰ μέρη (underlining is mine).

<sup>2</sup> That homogeneous elements may be opposed only if they are of different levels is confirmed in Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1111b15: καὶ προαιρέσει μὲν ἐπιθυμία ἐναντιοῦται, ἐπιθυμία δ' ἐπιθυμία οὐ (transl. H. Rackham: *desire can run counter to choice, but not desire to desire* (underlining is mine)).

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, *De animæ procreatione in Timaeo*, (ed.) C. Hubert 1025D3–7: οὐ μὴν ῥαδίως ἂν τις οὔτε πάθος ἀνθρώπου παντάπασιν ἀπηλλαγμένον λογισμοῦ κατανοήσειεν οὔτε διανοίας κίνησιν, ἢ μῆδὲν ἐπιθυμίας ἢ φιλοτιμίας ἢ τοῦ χαίροντος ἢ λυπομένου πρόσσεστι.

<sup>4</sup> Plutarch, *Platonic Questions*, pp. 442–443.

distinctness of feeling and thought. We may want to know why Plutarch, a Platonist himself, has an opposite view to Plato. But this is not the case. In fact, the words Plutarch uses for translating Plato's allegory are Plato's own words from his *Republic*. Therefore, what we may be sure of is that for Plutarch the *Phaedrus*' allegory is another version of the *Republic*'s trichotomy of the soul. In the light of *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1025D3–7 just quoted we should read Plutarch's gloss as a support for an integrated view. Let us therefore translate:

καὶ Πλάτων [Phaedr. 246a] αὐτὸς εἰκάσας συμφύτω  
ζεύγει καὶ ἡνίοχῳ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς, εἶδος, ἡνίοχον μὲν, ὡς  
παντὶ δῆλον, ἀπέφηνε τὸ λογιστικόν· τῶν δ' ἵππων τὸ  
μὲν περὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἀπειθές καὶ ἀνάγωγον παντά-  
πασι 'περὶ ὧτα λάσιον, κωφόν, μάστιγι μετὰ κέντρων  
μόγις ὑπεῖκον' [253e], τὸ δὲ θυμοειδὲς εὐήνιον τὰ  
πολλὰ τῷ λογισμῷ καὶ σύμμαχον. (Plutarch, *Platonicae  
quaestiones*, (ed.) C. Hubert, 1008C5–11)<sup>1</sup>

in the following way:

*Plato himself, after he had portrayed the form of the soul as a pair of horses and a charioteer, showed the charioteer, as it is obvious, as being to logistikon, and of two horses to men peri tas epithumias being disobedient and completely unmanageable, "with thick hair in the ears, deaf and hardly submitting to whip and spurs"; and to de thumoeides cooperative with to logistikon and its ally,*

where I leave the three technical terms – τὸ λογιστικόν, τὸ θυμοειδές, and τὸ περὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας<sup>2</sup> – untranslated because I have no words which could adequately mirror the explicitly heterogeneous character of each of them. We have here a significant example of what can reinforce the interpretation which I argue against but only because it presupposes already what, as I argue, is incorrect, that is, it renders the three technical terms by reason, spirit/emotion, and appetite/desire, each of which is homogeneous. This is then but a vicious circle.

One may argue that the sharp opposition between thinking and feeling come out with Aristotle and was developed by the Hellenistic philosophers<sup>3</sup>. But we should not forget that Descartes whose *cogito* is often translated and

<sup>1</sup> It is a strange thing that P. A. Vander Waerdt, *Peripatetic Soul-Division ...*, pp. 377–380, refers to this passage as a part of his argument about *collapsing the θυμικόν and ἐπιθυμητικόν into a single ἄλογον*.

<sup>2</sup> Unlike at 1007E8–9, 1008A4–5, A10, D9, D10, and 1009A4, here Plutarch uses τὸ περὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας instead of τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν.

<sup>3</sup> I know about only *one* opposition of λόγος versus πάθος in Plato. This is *Rep.* X, 604a9–10: τὸ μὲν ἀντιτείνειν διακελευόμενον λόγος καὶ νόμος ἐστίν, τὸ δὲ ἔλκον ἐπὶ τὰς λύπας αὐτὸ τὸ πάθος (in Shorey's transl.: *what spurs him on to hold out against this is reason and convention, while the actual experience draws him towards grief*). In Aristotle see e.g. *Eudemian Ethics* 1215a2–3: ἄτοπον γὰρ προσφέρειν λόγον τοῖς λόγου μὴθὲν δεομένοις, ἀλλὰ πάθος, even though in this context λόγος may mean *proof* or *argument*. P. A. Vander Waerdt, *The Peripatetic Interpretation ...*, p. 290, speaks about a *revision of Aristotle's doctrine on the relation between the πάθη and λόγος* by the author of *Magna Moralia* and, p. 291, about *different relations between the πάθη and λόγος*, but gives reference neither to Plato nor Aristotle.

interpreted as (purely) intellectual understands it as an integrated function. He is quite emphatic about it when saying, for instance:

*Res cogitans. Quid est hoc? Nempe dubitans, intelligens, affirmans, negans, volens, nolens, imaginans quoque, & sentiens.*<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that Descartes's *cogito* includes *several* functions, as different as doubting, understanding, affirming, denying, wanting, refusing as well as imagining and, last not least, sensing. It is awkward that few people have it in mind when referring to the Cartesian *cogito*. My point is that if we take reason to be as complex a function as this is in Descartes, then we could translate and understand the charioteer and τὸ λογιστικόν as *reason*<sup>2</sup>. But who does so<sup>3</sup>? It seems to me that very rarely do readers have in mind such a broad, rich and complex meaning of *reason* when speaking about the charioteer (or τὸ λογιστικόν). The evidence that most often (i) the charioteer and τὸ λογιστικόν are not apprehended in this way and (ii) reason is understood as a simple function is that the charioteer and τὸ λογιστικόν are read in these interpretations in functional opposition to the good horse and τὸ θυμοειδές as well as to the bad horse and τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν.

What comes out from the above interpretation, i.e. that only functions similar in character, that is homogeneous in being similarly heterogeneous, has been

---

<sup>1</sup> Descartes, *Meditationes de prima philosophia* II, 28 (compare also Descartes, *Meditations metaphysiques* II, 22: *une chose qui pense est une chose qui doute, qui conçoit, qui affirme, qui nie, qui veut, qui ne veut pas, qui imagine aussi, & qui sent.*). This is not accidental since Descartes reiterates this point in *Principia philosophiae* I, 9: *Cogitationis nomine, intelligo illa omnia, quae nobis consciis in nobis sunt, quatenus eorum in nobis conscientia est. Atque ita non modò intelligere, velle, imaginari, sed etiam sentire, idem est híc quod cogitare.* (compare also Descartes, *Les principes de la philosophie* I, 9: *Par le mot penser, j'entends tout ce qui se fait en nous de telle sorte que nous l'apercevons immédiatement par nous-mêmes; c'est pourquoy non seulement entendre, vouloir, imaginer, mais aussi sentir, est la mesme chose icy que penser*), and, again, even more explicitly, Descartes, *Meditationes de prima philosophia* II, 29: *hoc est proprie quod in me sentire appellatur; atque hoc praecise sic sumptum nihil aliud est quàm cogitare* (compare also Descartes, *Meditations metaphysiques* II, 23: *ce qui en moy s'appelle sentir, & cela, pris ainsi precisement, n'est rien autre chose que penser*).

<sup>2</sup> The same is valid for νοῦς of ψυχῆς κυβερνήτη μόνῳ θεατῇ νῶ (in *Phdr.* 247c7–8): νοῦς is not a simple function, e.g. reason, but includes several functions. Some scholars seem to link, even to identify, the charioteer with ψυχῆς κυβερνήτη [...] νῶ (247c7–8), e.g. B. Woyczyński, *O rozwoju poglądu Platona na duszę*, p. 92, also C. Sheffield, *Erôs before and after tripartition*, p. 227: *the dianoia of the philosopher becomes winged (249c), a description which best fits the charioteer (247c4–8)*. This seems unfounded to me insofar as (1) ψυχῆς κυβερνήτη occurs at another stage of the narrative where there is no explicit mention of tripartition, (2) because of the next sentence (247d1: ἄτ' οὖν θεοῦ δianoia νῶ τε καὶ ἐπιστήμη [...]) it looks as if νῶ is used in relation to god/s only, especially since the paragraph is summarized by καὶ οὗτος μὲν θεῶν βίος (248a1; moreover it is a part of a description of the ὑπερουράνιον τόπον), (3) κυβερνήτη is a hapax in the *Phaedrus*, what is not the case of ἡνίοχος (the charioteer that can be understood as the commander of the tripartite soul); at no other place κυβερνήτης and ἡνίοχος are put in relation with one another. But even if we admit that the charioteer is equal to νοῦς, νοῦς, according to my interpretation, should be described in a similar way as the charioteer, i.e. it should not be limited to the pure intellectual function/power either.

<sup>3</sup> A rare example is G. Klosko, *The "Rule" of Reason in Plato's Psychology*, p. 351 whose manoeuvre is to *distinguish this aspect of reason [i.e. the calculative function] from its other components, especially its inherent desires. [...] the conative and calculative sides of reason [...]*. On the other hand, Klosko speaks, p. 347, about *Plato's attribution of reasoning faculties to all parts of the soul [...] the faculty of calculative reason present in one of the other parts*. This makes his and my interpretations similar because of taking reason as complex and faculty of calculation as not exclusive to one element only. Yet he (i) limits himself to one faculty and one elements only, (ii) makes no mention of a hierarchy of faculties, (iii) focuses on the *Republic* IV, VIII and IX.

remarked by several philosophers, such as Spinoza<sup>1</sup>, Hume<sup>2</sup>, and Nietzsche<sup>3</sup>, to give well-known names.

Let me end this *Appendix* with an intriguing case of how much deformation of Plato's view is inherent to the history of philosophy. Max Scheler is one of most self-declared<sup>4</sup> and recognized supporter of a multilayered approach to affectivity on the one hand and of inseparability of feeling and thinking on the other<sup>5</sup>. Yet what he says about Plato's view about affectivity is patently inexact:

*Plato, too, fell victim of the deception of the ancient  
and historically very effective division of spirit into  
"reason" and "sensitivity".*<sup>6</sup>

This shows us how much the common interpretation is widespread. Its existence and impact are so powerful that even those whose share a view similar to Plato's are either replicating it without going to Plato's dialogues or reading him badly.

## References

- Adkins A. W. H., *From the Many to the One ... A Study of Personality and Views of Human Nature in the Context of Ancient Greek Society, Values and Belief*, Constable, London 1970.
- Annas J., *An Introduction to Plato's Republic*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1981.
- Aristotle, *The Eudemian Ethics*, (ed.) by F. Susemihl, transl. by H. Rackham, Harvard University Press – William Heinemann Ltd., Cambridge, MA – London 1981.
- Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, (ed.) J. Bywater, transl. by H. Rackham, Harvard University Press – William Heinemann Ltd., Cambridge, MA – London 1934.
- Aronoff P., [a review of:] W. W. Fortenbaugh, *Aristotle on Emotion* in: *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2003-05-27 [retrieved Dec. 20, 2009].
- Bett R., *Immortality and the Nature of the Soul in the Phaedrus* in: *Phronesis* 31, 1986, pp. 1–26.

<sup>1</sup> B. Spinoza, *Ethics Demonstrated in Geometrical Order*, transl. J. F. Bennett, *Part IV, Prop. VII: An affect can't be restrained or removed except by another affect that is opposite to it and stronger than it* (underlining is mine).

<sup>2</sup> D. Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* II, III, III, (eds.) L. A. Selby-Bigge & P. H. Niddich, pp. 415–416: *Nothing can oppose or retard the impulse of passion, but a contrary impulse; and if this contrary impulse ever arises from reason, this latter faculty must have an original influence on the will, and must be able to cause, as well as hinder any act of volition. [...] as nothing can be contrary to truth or reason, except what has a reference to it, and as the judgments of our understanding only have this reference, it must follow, that passions can be contrary to reason only so far as they are accompany'd with some judgment or opinion [...]* (underlining is mine).

<sup>3</sup> F. Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, transl. W. Kaufmann, p. 276: *The will to overcome an affect is ultimately only the will of another, or of several other, affects* (underlining is mine).

<sup>4</sup> E.g. M. Scheler, *Formalism in Ethics ...*, p. 332: *I find this phenomenal character of the "depth" of feeling to be essentially connected with four well-delineated levels of feeling that correspond to the structure of our entire human existence.*

<sup>5</sup> E.g. H. Spiegelberg, *The Phenomenological Movement*, p. 293: *Scheler's main effort here was to use phenomenology for the purpose of breaking down the rigid disjunction between reason and emotion [...]* (underlining is mine).

<sup>6</sup> M. Scheler, *Formalism in Ethics ...*, p. 166. For more on that see R. Zaborowski, *Plato and Max Scheler on the Affective World*.

- Bobonich C., *Plato's Utopia Recast: His Latter Ethics and Politics*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 2002.
- Brennan T., *The nature of the spirited part of the soul and its object* in: *Plato and the Divided Self*, (eds.) R. Barney, T. Brennan & Ch. Brittain, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2012, pp. 102–127.
- Burger R., *The Thumotic and the Erotic Soul: Seth Benardete on Platonic Psychology* in: *Interpretation* 32, 2004, pp. 57–75.
- Burnyeat M., *Culture and Society in Plato's Republic* in: *Tanner Lectures* 20, 1999, pp. 217–324.
- Burnyeat M. F., *The Truth of Tripartition* in: *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 106, 2006, pp. 1–23.
- Burnyeat M. F., *La vérité de la tripartition* in: *Le moi et l'intériorité*, (eds.) G. Aubry & F. Ildefonse, Vrin, Paris 2008, pp. 37–56.
- Burnyeat M. F., *The passion of reason in Plato's Phaedrus* in: M. Burnyeat, *Explorations in Ancient and Modern Philosophy*, vol. 2, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2012, pp. 238–258.
- Descartes R., *Meditationes de prima philosophia* in: *Œuvres de Descartes*, vol. 7, (eds.) Ch. Adam & P. Tannery, Vrin, Paris 1957.
- Descartes R., *Principia philosophiæ*, in *Œuvres de Descartes*, vol. 8, (eds.) Ch. Adam & P. Tannery, Vrin, Paris 1957.
- Descartes R., *Meditations metaphysiques* in: *Œuvres de Descartes*, vol. 9, (eds.) Ch. Adam & P. Tannery, Vrin, Paris 1957.
- Descartes R., *Les principes de la philosophie* in: *Œuvres de Descartes*, vol. 9, (eds.) Ch. Adam & P. Tannery, Vrin, Paris 1957.
- Ferrari G. R. F., *The Struggle in the Soul: Plato, Phaedrus 253c7–255a1* in: *Ancient Philosophy* 5, 1985, pp. 1–10.
- Ferrari G. R. F., *Listening to the Cicadas. A Study of Plato's Phaedrus*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1987.
- Fortenbaugh W. W., *Aristotle on Emotion. A Contribution to philosophical psychology, rhetoric, poetics, politics and ethics*, [2<sup>nd</sup> ed.] Duckworth, London 2002.
- Gerson L., *A Note on Tripartition and Immortality in Plato* in: *Apeiron* 20, 1987, pp. 81–96.
- Griswold C. L., *Self-Knowledge in Plato's Phaedrus*, Yale University Press, New Haven & London 1986.
- Guthrie W. K. C., *Plato's View on the Nature of the Soul* in: *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique*, vol. 3: *Recherches sur la tradition platonicienne*, Fondation Hardt, Vandœuvres – Genève 1957, pp. 3–22.
- Hackforth R., *Plato's Phaedrus*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1952.
- Hall R. W., *Ψυχή as Differentiated Unity in the Philosophy of Plato* in: *Phronesis* 8, 1963, pp. 63–82.
- Hermiæ Alexandrini, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, (ed.) P. Couvreur, Librairie Emile Bouillon, Paris 1901.
- Hermias Alexandrinus, *In Platonis Phaedrum scholia*, (eds.) C. M. Lucarini, & C. Moreschini, De Gruyter, Berlin – Boston 2012.
- Humbert J., *Syntaxe grecque*, Klincksieck, Paris 1954.

- Hume D., *A Treatise of Human Nature*, (eds.) L. A. Selby–Bigge & P. H. Niddich, [2<sup>nd</sup> ed.] Clarendon Press, Oxford 1978.
- Ingarden R., *Wykłady z Etyki*, (ed.) A. Węgrzecki, PWN, Warszawa 1989.
- Ioannidi H., *Contribution à l'étude de la doctrine platonicienne du thymos* in: *ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑ* 25–26, 1995–1996, pp. 166–183.
- Irwin T., *Plato's Moral Theory. The Early and Middle Dialogues*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1977.
- Jackson J. H., *Croonian Lectures on Evolution and dissolution of the nervous system. Lecture II* in: *The British Medical Journal*, Apr. 5, 1884, pp. 660–663.
- Jowett B., *Introduction to the Phaedrus* in: *The Dialogues of Plato*, transl. B. Jowett, vol. 1, [3<sup>rd</sup> ed.] Macmillan and Co., London 1892.
- Kahn C. H., *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue. The philosophical use of a literary form*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1996.
- Kalimtzis K., *Taming Anger. The Hellenic Approach to the Limitations of Reason*, Bristol Classical Press, London 2012.
- Kamtekar R., *Speak with the same voice as reason. Personification in Plato's psychology* in: *Plato and the Divided Self*, (eds.) R. Barney, T. Brennan & Ch. Brittain, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2012, pp. 77–101.
- Klosko G., *The "Rule" of Reason in Plato's Psychology* in: *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 5, 1988, pp. 341–356.
- Kraut R., *Reason and Justice in Plato's Republic* in: *Exegesis and Argument. Studies in Greek Philosophy presented to Gregory Vlastos*, (eds.) E. Lee, A. D. Mourelatos & R. Rorty, Van Gorcum, Assen 1973, pp. 207–224.
- LeDoux J., *The Emotional Brain. The Mysterious Underpinnings of Emotional Life*, Simon & Schuster, New York 1996.
- Liddell H. G., Scott R. & Jones H. S., *A Greek–English Lexicon with a Supplement*, [9<sup>th</sup> ed.] Clarendon Press, Oxford 1940 [= LSJ].
- Lovibond S., *Plato's theory of mind* in: *Companions to ancient thought*, vol. 2, (ed.) S. Everson, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1991, pp. 35–55.
- Macmurray J., *Reason and Emotion*, Faber & Faber Limited, London 1935.
- Marsilio Ficino and the Phaedran Chrioteer*, introd., texts, transl. M. J. B. Allen, University of California Press, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1981.
- McGibbon D. D., *The Fall of the Soul in Plato's Phaedrus* in: *Classical Quarterly* 14, 1964, pp. 56–63.
- Moline J., *Plato's Theory of Understanding*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison 1981.
- Moravcsik J., *Noetic Aspiration and Artistic Aspiration* in: *Plato on beauty, wisdom and the arts*, (eds.) J. Moravcsik & P. Temko, Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, NJ 1982, pp. 29–46.
- Moss J., *Appearances and Calculations: Plato's Division of the Soul* in: *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 34, 2008, pp. 35–68.
- Moss J., *Pictures and passions in the Timaeus and Philebus* in: *Plato and the Divided Self*, (eds.) R. Barney, T. Brennan & Ch. Brittain, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2012, pp. 259–280.
- Mouze L., *Introduction to: Platon, Phèdre*, transl. L. Mouze, Le Livre de Poche, Paris 2007, pp. 55–185.

- Natorp P., *Dottrina platonica delle Idee. Una introduzione all'idealismo*, transl. V. Cicero, Vita e Pensiero, Milano 1999.
- Nietzsche F., *Beyond Good and Evil*, transl. W. Kaufmann in: *Basic writings of Nietzsche*, The Modern Library, New York 2000, pp. 191–435.
- O'Brien M. J., *The Socratic Paradoxes and the Greek Mind*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill 1967.
- Ostenfeld E. N., *Ancient Greek Psychology and Modern Mind–Body Debate*, Aarhus University Press, Aarhus 1987.
- Owen G. E. L., *The Place of the Timaeus in Plato's Dialogues* in: *The Classical Quarterly* 3, 1953, pp. 79–95.
- Palumbo L., *Platone e la paura* in: *Il dibattito etico e politico in Grecia tra il V et il IV secolo*, (ed.) M. Migliori, La Città del Sole, Napoli 2000, pp. 283–304.
- Palumbo L., *Eros Phobos Epithymia. Sulla natura dell'emozione in alcuni dialoghi di Platone*, Loffredo Editore, Napoli 2001.
- Penner T., *Thought and Desire in Plato* in: G. Vlastos (ed.), *Plato: A Collection of Critical Essays*, vol. 2, Anchor Books, Garden City, NY 1971, pp. 96–118.
- Plato, *Platonis Opera*, vol. 1–5, (ed.) J. Burnet, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1900–1907.
- Plato, *Phaedrus*, transl. H. N. Fowler, Harvard University Press – William Heinemann Ltd, Cambridge, MA & London 1925.
- Plato, *Phaedrus*, transl. A. Nehamas & P. Woodruff, Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., Indianapolis – Cambridge 1995.
- Plato, *Phaedrus*, (ed.) H. Yunis, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011.
- Plato, *Republic*, transl. P. Shorey, Harvard University Press – William Heinemann Ltd, Cambridge, MA & London 1969.
- Platon, *Phaidros*, transl. C. Ritter, Verlag von F. Meiner, Leipzig 1922.
- Platon, *Phaidros*, transl. E. Heitsch, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1993.
- Platon, *Phèdre*, transl. E. Chambry, Garnier – Flammarion, Paris 1964.
- Platon, *Phèdre*, transl. P. Vicaire, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1985.
- Platon, *Phèdre*, transl. L. Mouze, Le Livre de Poche, Paris 2007.
- Platon, *Phèdre*, transl. L. Brisson in: Plato, *Œuvres complètes*, transl. L. Brisson & al., Flammarion, Paris 2011, pp. 1241–1297.
- Platon, *Phèdre*, transl. L. Brisson, GF, Paris 2012.
- Platone, *Fedro*, transl. P. Pucci in: Platone, *Opere complete*, vol. 1, Editori Laterza, Bari 1966.
- Platone, *Fedro*, (ed.) G. Reale, A. Mondadori, Milano 1998.
- Plutarch, *De animæ procreatione in Timaeo*, (ed.) C. Hubert, Teubner, Leipzig 1954.
- Plutarch, *Platonic Questions* in: *Plutarch's Morals*, vol. 2, transl. by several hands, corrected and rev. W. W. Goodwin, Little, Brown, and Co., Boston 1878.
- Plutarch, *Platonicæ quaestiones*, (ed.) C. Hubert, Teubner, Leipzig 1954.
- Price A. W., *Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1989.

- Price A. W., *Plato and Freud* in: *The person and the human mind*, (ed.) C. Gill, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1990, pp. 247–270.
- Price A. W., *Reason's New Role in the Phaedrus* in: *Understanding the Phaedrus. II Symposium Platonicum*, (ed.) L. Rossetti, Akademie Verlag, Sankt Augustin 1992, pp. 243–245.
- Price A. W., *Mental Conflict*, Routledge, London – New York 1995.
- Price A. W., *Emotions in Plato and Aristotle* in: *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Emotion*, (ed.) P. Goldie, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2010, pp. 121–142.
- Price A. W., *Virtue and Reason in Plato and Aristotle*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 2011.
- Price A. W., *Parts of the Soul in Plato's Phaedrus* (unpublished, quoted with permission).
- Rees D. A., *Bipartition of the Soul in the Early Academy* in: *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 77, 1975, pp. 112–118.
- Renaut O., *Platon. La médiation des émotions. L'éducation du thymos dans les dialogues*, Vrin, Paris 2014.
- Rist J. M., *Plato says that we have tripartite souls. If he is right, what can we do about?* in: M.–O. Goulet–Gazé, G. Madec & D. O'Brien (eds.), *ΣΟΦΙΗΣ ΜΑΙΗΤΟΡΕΣ. «Chercheurs de sagesse». Hommage à Jean Pépin*, Institut des Études Augustiniennes, Paris 1992, pp. 103–124.
- Robinson R., *Plato's Separation of Reason from Desire* in: *Phronesis* 16, 1971, pp. 38–48.
- Robinson T. M., *Plato's Psychology*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1970.
- Romilly de J., *Les conflits de l'âme dans le Phèdre de Platon* in: *Wiener Studien* 95, 1982, pp. 100–113.
- Rowe C. J., *Plato: Phaedrus*, Aris & Phillips, Warminster 1986.
- Rowe C. J., *The charioteer and his horses: an example of Platonic myth-making* in: *Plato's Myth*, (ed.) C. Partenie, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2009, pp. 134–147.
- Scheler M., *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values. A New Attempt toward the Foundation of an Ethical Personalism*, transl. M. S. Frings & R. L. Funk, Evanston 1973.
- Sheffield C., *Erôs before and after tripartition* in: *Plato and the Divided Self*, (eds.) R. Barney, T. Brennan & Ch. Brittain, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2012, pp. 211–237.
- Spiegelberg H., *The Phenomenological Movement. A historical introduction*, [3<sup>rd</sup> ed.] Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht 1994.
- Spinoza B., *Ethics Demonstrated in Geometrical Order*, transl. J. F. Bennett [available from [http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/spinoza\\_1665.pdf](http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/spinoza_1665.pdf), retrieved Dec. 15, 2017].
- Stocker M., *Psychic Feelings. Their Importance and Irreducibility* in: *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 61, 1983, pp. 5–26.
- Stocks J. L., *Plato and the Tripartite Soul* in: *Mind* 24, 1915, pp. 207–221.

- Strigo I. A. & Craig A. D., *A neurobiological view of pain as a homeostatic emotion* in: *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Pain*, (ed.) J. Corns, Routledge, New York 2017, pp. 98–112.
- The Dialogues of Plato*, transl. B. Jowett, vol. 1, [3<sup>rd</sup> ed.] Macmillan and Co., London 1892.
- Vander Waerdt P. A., *The Peripatetic Interpretation of Plato's Tripartite Psychology* in: *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 26, 1985, pp. 283–302.
- Vander Waerdt P. A., *Peripatetic Soul-Division, Posidonius, and the Middle Platonic Moral Psychology* in: *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 26, 1985, pp. 373–394.
- Vlastos G., *Justice and Psychic Harmony in the Republic* in: *The Journal of Philosophy* 66, 1969, pp. 505–521.
- White N. P., *A Companion to Plato's Republic*, Hackett Publ. Comp., Indianapolis 1979.
- Wilburn J., *Courage and the Spirited Part of the Soul in Plato's Republic* in: *Philosophers' Imprint* 15, 2015, pp. 1–21.
- Woods M., *Plato's Division of the Soul* in: *Proceedings of the British Academy* 73, 1987, pp. 23–47.
- Woyczyński B., *O rozwoju poglądu Platona na duszę* [1925], Wyd. UMK, Toruń 2000.
- Yunis H., *Commentary* in: *Plato, Phaedrus*, (ed.) H. Yunis, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011, pp. 85–249.
- Zaborowski R., *Rozumienie logos. Presokratycy – Platon* in: *Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria* 3/1998, pp. 89–112.
- Zaborowski R., *La crainte et le courage dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée. Contribution lexicographique à la psychologie homérique des sentiments*, Stakroos, Warszawa 2002.
- Zaborowski R., *Emotions et liberté dans la paideia. Perspectives ancienne et moderne: entre Platon et Claparède* in: *Paideia: Education in the Global Era*, vol. 1, (eds.) K. Boudouris & M. Knežević, Ionia Publications, Athens 2008, pp. 250–263.
- Zaborowski R., *Sur le sentiment chez les Présocratiques. Contribution lexicographique à la philosophie des sentiments*, Stakroos, Warszawa 2008.
- Zaborowski R., *Feeling–Thought Linkage and its Forms in the Ancient and Modern Times* in: *Greek philosophy and the issues of our age*, vol. 1, (eds.) K. Boudouris & M. Adam, Ionia Publications, Athens 2009, pp. 230–240.
- Zaborowski R., *Some remarks on Plato on emotions* in: *Emotions in Pre- & Early Modern Mediterranean*. A special issue of *Mirabilia: Electronic Journal of Antiquity & Middle Ages* 15, 2012, pp. 141–170.
- Zaborowski R., *Plato and Max Scheler on the Affective World* in: *Organon* 47, 2015, pp. 65–81.
- Zaborowski R., *On the Relevance of Plato's View on Affectivity to the Philosophy of Emotions* in: *Journal of Ancient Philosophy* 10, 2016, pp. 70–91.
- Zaborowski R., *Two Neglected Details in Plato's Chariot Allegory* in: *Organon* 48, 2016, pp. 191–224.
- Zieliński T., *Homeric Psychology* [1922], transl. N. Kotsyba in: *Organon* 31, 2002, pp. 15–46.