Myth and philosophy on stage in Platonic dialogues

Tofighian, O.

3.4 Myth/hypothesis, Theoretical Enhancement and Transition – *Phaedrus*

3.4.1 *Theme introduction, setting and narrative mode*

Unlike the *Protagoras*, which is comparable in terms of its intensely animated spaces, the *Phaedrus* does not contain an explicit narrator.[1] Lysias narrates his own tale regarding an earlier conversation and both interlocutors replace an explicit narrator in guiding the reader through the systematic presentations of speeches and the sequence of topics for discussion and evaluation. A study of the *Phaedrus* must address the fact that it does not contain an explicit narrator. The tale of the interaction between Phaedrus and Lysias where Lysias presents Phaedrus with the speech on love is taken for granted as having occurred earlier in the day but it is clear from the dialogue that Phaedrus either wrote the speech himself or appropriated it. Therefore, the earlier events narrated by Phaedrus could very well be made up or at least heavily contrived. As mentioned, a question worthy of serious consideration is why Plato did not use an explicit narrator to assist in interpreting Phaedrus' details of his prior engagement, i.e. the significance of the precursory events leading up to the trip to the country. No one else was present during the conversation between Socrates and Phaedrus which complicates efforts to determine the narrator. If one assumes that Plato is the narrator in his own literary production then the question arises as to whether he is acting as the actual author or an implied author – whether Plato is explicating a theory or describing a philosophically complex situation for readers to consider – and whether he created or recreated the events. These issues are

[1] For one interpretation which recognizes the importance of considering narrative mode see Ferrari (1987) pp. 2-4. Ferrari recognizes the fact that in the *Phaedrus, Protagoras, Phaedo and Symposium* Plato makes a special effort to elaborate on the setting and background. But in contrast to the other three, Ferrari explains, the *Phaedrus* does not contain an explicit narrator. He argues that using an explicit narrator in the *Protagoras, Phaedo and Symposium* helps Plato illustrate the distinction between a premeditated manipulation of the environment, expressed by the narrator, and a spontaneous reaction to the immediate surroundings and events. However, it is unfortunate that Ferrari does not return to the significance of narrative mode, or lack of it, and test the possible influences it may have on other aspects of the *Phaedrus*.

impossible to solve yet by considering them and acknowledging the difficulties created by not being able to discover the answers one delves into the dialogue with more caution and a better understanding of what possibilities the text may contain.[2]

One way I have been suggesting thus far for determining Plato's intentions in each individual dialogue is to understand the status of the interlocutors as they are introduced, their relationships with each other, and their representation by the narrator or the relevance of the lack of narrator. The shift in Plato's representation of Socrates in the *Protagoras* – not to mention the representation of Protagoras and sophists in general – exposes a very fascinating feature of Plato's writing style. Also, the implications associated with choosing not to use an explicit narrator, like in the *Meno*, are fundamentally important to the structure, content and perspective enforced in the text. Therefore, one complete philosophical view does not completely control all the dialogues and it is obvious that Plato chose different explicit or implicit, reliable or unreliable, narrators to correspond to the scenario he wants to produce. In the *Protagoras,* for instance, the plot and theme, expressed through the myth/hypothesis, that Plato selected influenced the way he expounded certain ideas, theories and the arguments attached to them. The fact that a sophist, and not Socrates, tells the myth that governs the direction and meaning of the dialogue and that the outcome of the debate is in favor of Protagoras is a significant factor contributing to the argument that Socrates as narrator was to a large extent unreliable.[3] Therefore, the use of an explicit narrator reveals many crucial methodological and structural factors. Equally, Plato's decision to neglect introducing an explicit narrator evokes different questions about perspective, character hierarchy and status and dialogue setting; all of which I will develop and engage with in this chapter.

[2] For a comprehensive study of the different kinds of authors, narrators and readers one can consider in the study of literature see Booth (1987).

[3] In the previous study on the *Protagoras* I showed how the character of Socrates was constructed, presented and used in a radically different way in comparison to the other dialogues. Considering the *Protagoras* under the guiding influence of its myth/hypothesis, i.e. the plot structure it introduces into the meaning of the text and the way it defines the characters, can be expanded further to better understand the relationship between the narrator and the structure and meaning of the text. Consequently, other issues can also be raised such as the possibility of an unreliable narrator.

The beginning of the *Phaedrus* is possibly the most detailed and vivid of all the dialogues.[4] The setting is the country, or the outskirts of the city. This is in contrast to the other dialogues almost all of which we are sure are situated within the walls of the city.[5] The pair decides to go beyond the threshold of the city to converse and then return to the *polis*, where all the mundane activities of the citizens are performed. This situation introduces one of the main themes associated with the plot. The theme I am referring to is performance, activity or ritual which takes one from a mundane state to a liminal one and then back again. The threshold of the city, the country side or outer ring represents liminal space, i.e. symbolically, the spatial fringe of 'reality' which shares qualitative affinities with marginal characters (tricksters, outcasts or minorities) and liminal moments (times of limbo or transition). I will argue later that this feature of liminality is important for analyzing the plot of the dialogue which relates to ritual initiation or 'rite of passage' (both in terms of Phaedrus' enlightenment and Plato's theoretical project). The intention of the theme of ritual practice is to facilitate transformation or transition; in the case of the literary setting of the text the move away from the norm can be interpreted as a device which prepares the philosophical dimension of the text for a conceptual 'rite of passage' (Cf. section on liminality in my chapter on methodology). Also, Phaedrus claimed that he had come from Epicrates' house, which once belonged to Morychus, where Lysias was entertaining a group of people.[6] This reconfirms the theme of transition by establishing a clear contrast between the place and company Phaedrus experienced when in the city to the place and company he enjoys in the setting of the dialogue. I will explain the relevance of the transition theme later in detail but at this point it is important to recognize the thematic implications of the introduction and setting.

[4] Nicholson (1999) pp. 15-17. Also, see C.L. Griswold, Jr. (1986). The first chapter, "The Dramatic Scene and the Prologue", acknowledges the importance of literary and aesthetic devices for understanding the meaning and message of the dialogue. However, Griswold limits his analysis to the importance of one theme, i.e. the necessity of self-knowledge.

[5] For an interpretation that links Socrates' trip out to the country with his loss of composure and enthusiasm for listening to Lysias' speech see the introduction by Nehamas and Woodruff to Plato (1995) pp. x-xi.

[6] Epicrates and Morychus, as well as Lysias, were not well known for virtuous lives.

Next, it is obvious from the beginning that Socrates and Phaedrus are close friends. The pair have some significant interests in common: a love for speeches and the topic of love itself. But it is clear that there is an imbalance of power between the two. Phaedrus seeks Socrates' approval of Lysias' speech; admires Socrates myth of the charioteer; and accepts Socrates' theory of rhetoric, all of which indicate that Phaedrus occupies the inferior role in a master/student relationship. This is an essential dynamic in a ritual initiation context which I will elaborate on in this chapter.

The motif of transition or transformation through performance is a recurring motif which is indispensable to the plot structure and, consequently, the direction of the different parts of the dialogue and the meaning of the dialogue as a whole. My use of the term performance in the study of the *Phaedrus* requires further elaboration. Even though performance is a common theme it is represented in different ways in different aspects of the text. My study of the *Phaedrus* will illuminate how the concept of performance characterizes myth, argument and the literary context. However, at this point I will only briefly detail these instances to prepare the reader for later analysis:

a) Socrates' interaction with Phaedrus in the dialogue

The dialogue between the two interlocutors develops within the framework of the master/student relationship indicative of mystery cults and other esoteric religious traditions. This form of initiation based communication conveys a specific theoretical program but requires the initiate and the initiator to engage in forms of physical activity to coincide with the stages of mental development. This dynamic between theory or contemplation and choreographed physical activity works to enhance and complete both parts of the ritual performance. The space in which the ritual is held, the prior events leading into it, the gestures and movements at the beginning middle and end of the process and the sensations encountered by both during the course of the initiation all function to contextualize the theoretical agenda. Without the two components much of the meaning of the theory is lost and vulnerable to misinterpretation or abuse and practically all of the physical features exhibited by Socrates and Phaedrus become trivial and arbitrary.

b) The myth of the charioteer

The myth of the charioteer manifests the structure of the ritual initiation process exhibited by the relationship between Socrates and Phaedrus. The figures and their activities are essentially saved or damned depending on the success of an elaborate course in kinesthetic learning. The narrative functions as a code to understanding the performance undertaken by the interlocutors in the dialogue I described above.

c) The relationship between philosophy and the themes and traditions appropriated by the text

When interpreted together, as parts of a whole, philosophy, the mythic elements in the dialogue and the literary features are to be interpreted as a performance. Philosophical premises, inferences and conclusions become based in an actual physical or 'worldly' context in which theory becomes true only because there is a particular instance in which it can be recognized and explained. Therefore, ritual performance need not be reduced to a cultural aesthetic or a sacred social phenomenon. Performance in relation to my interpretation of the different aspects of the dialogue is the contextualizing of philosophy, without which thinking loses a necessary quality and theory leaves itself open to misplaced criticism (i.e. critique of mere abstract thought rather than thought based on the details of an actual event or experience).

d) Plato's prescription for how one must do philosophy

My reading of the *Phaedrus* interprets the text as Plato's attempt to transform his earlier methods and views on metaphysics and epistemology. For the transition to be successful and to integrate his developments with his foundational methods and theories he employed performance as both a literary and philosophical device. Through ritual performance Plato 1) facilitated transition, 2) unified the physical with his theoretical program and 3) enhanced the act of doing philosophy by outlining a dynamic interdependent approach which respects physical context and behavior and considers them as important as abstract investigation.

My use of the term transition also requires further elaboration. Through his myth – which is pivotal for introducing a plot structure – Plato is initiating a point of transition

in method, metaphysics and epistemology. By transition I am not suggesting that he is completely changing anything that he had argued for prior. I am proposing the view that he is presenting ideas and procedures with new dimensions of depth with the intention of being able to account for more phenomena and experiences. The *Phaedrus* was written after many issues had already been addressed. Even though the dialogues until this point had provided much insight on a diverse range of topics they also opened up the possibility for, and encouraged, different perspectives and criticisms of Plato's initial arguments. If one takes all of Plato's *oeuvre*, as opposed to his earlier dialogues or merely some of his most prominent works, one notices more variety in terms of method, a more harmonious metaphysics and a theory of knowledge that accounted for the virtue of experience as well as ideas. This view does not mean that I am subscribing to a developmental interpretation of the Platonic corpus but simply suggests that theoretical concerns can share the same quality of fluidity and sometimes unpredictability that characterize human experience.

The myth of the charioteer represents a shift in perspective without abrogating or contradicting the conclusions of Plato's previous studies. The basic distinction between knowledge and opinion remained through out Plato's writing and the various modifications and additions made through out the course of his work always exemplify a characteristic rejection of dogma. My study of the *Phaedrus* aims to examine how myth functions as a transitory moment that operates, through mutual scaffolding, with arguments in the dialogues before and after the myth of the charioteer. Like the *Meno* and the *Protagoras* I recognize the myth as consisting of a hypothesis that awaits argumentative response. The philosophical theories and positions of prior dialogues are referenced in the myth of the charioteer and by making connections in the myth between passionate love, the soul and knowledge – the components of the hypothesis presented and used in the *Phaedrus* – Plato is setting up a framework with which future metaphysical and epistemological arguments can be referenced to.

3.4.2 *The myth/hypothesis*

Before the myth of the charioteer Plato describes the four different types of divine madness (the gift of prophecy from Apollo, madness arrived at through mystic rites associated with Dionysus, poetic madness provided by the Muses and the bestowal of *eros* by Aphrodite) and provides a brief description of the immortality of the soul. The myth is then introduced as an account of the soul's nature. Socrates clarifies that the explanation "resembles" the truth and is only the product of what man is capable of – only a god can provide a true exposition (246). I do not believe that it would be a misinterpretation in this case – a mere literal reading – to understand Socrates' comment as admitting to the view that myth is the symbolic expression of the ineffable. I think it is fair to say that since the nature of soul is inaccessible then any account of it can only ever be 'likely' – in this respect, even attempting to prove or disprove a distinct ontological entity such as the soul must be considered to be a project with 'likely' results (In this way I both acknowledge the inaccessibility of the soul for any kind of description and avoid reducing the myth of the soul's journey to some form of aesthetic or mystical account since I am not concerned with proving the existence or non-existence of the soul). However, my interpretation does not recognize myth as simply a symbol for that which transcends the senses and reason, and therefore I wish to suggest that the concept of soul must be understood in terms of its role in the narrative, i.e. the way it relates to the other elements in the dialogue and how it operates with the arguments mentioned in the text. The most likely story would be the account that best suits the issue or issues under discussion, coordinates with logical accounts and empirical data, and leads to the most desirable consequences. It is plausible to interpret Socrates' statement as implying that the tale has these qualities but, like any other account of the nature of soul, falls short of certainty – a fact that does not affect my study of the myth since my primary concern is the function of myth in a mutual scaffolding relationship with argument and not truth value. Consequently, I will demonstrate how the myth engages in a mutual scaffolding relationship with arguments, imports a plot structure that assists in understanding the

meaning of the dialogue, determines the character roles and illuminates the significance of certain symbols used in the text – the main concerns of my thesis.

After the preamble to the myth Plato delivers his well-known narrative about the pre-natal journey of the soul. We are told that humans are rational but, in contrast to gods, are also influenced by emotions or spirit (easy to restrain) and desires (difficult to restrain) which he symbolizes in the form of horses. The reality is that we, as 'charioteers' (the rational part of the soul), must control two opposing 'horses' (the other two parts of the soul: emotions and urges) – a task that Plato describes as both difficult and unpleasant (246). Plato continues by stating that the soul governs all that is inanimate and transmigrates into different physical bodies when it descends from perfection, therefore creating mortal beings.

> There is not a single sound reason for positing the existence of such a being who is immortal, but because we have never seen or formed an adequate idea of a god, we picture him to ourselves as a being of the same kind as ourselves but immortal, a combination of soul and body indissolubly joined together (246).

In light of this statement Plato mentions that the ontological and linguistic certainties related to the existence of gods and of pre-embodied souls, particularly in their perfected state, is a matter beyond human recognition. The reasons why a perfect soul becomes punished and is stripped of its 'wings' – its metaphysically perfect state – can be understood, but only retrospectively. A soul is evaluated to have been a good or a bad soul in its previous existence depending on the right and wrong behavior expressed by an individual now, while in its mundane reality.

> The function of a wing is to take what is heavy and raise it up into the region above, where the gods dwell; of all things connected with the body, it has the greatest affinity with the divine, which is endowed with beauty, wisdom, goodness and every other excellence (246).

Plato continues by explaining how these qualities of virtue nourish the wings of the soul so they can grow while opposite qualities lead to the deterioration of the wings. It is clear that he is neither using metaphor nor metonymy here, but rather aspects of the myth and aspects of the arguments cooperate mutually since the indispensable connection between elevating towards the gods through the use of wings and transcending the senses through knowledge of absolute concepts are both 'divine' quests. Especially in the case of this dialogue, both are based on an essential plot of enlightenment through a performance of initiation (a feature I will explain in detail later).

Suddenly, immediately after explaining the connection between the wings of the soul and virtue Plato begins describing the divine chariot procession. At this point the myth describes the different divine characters and the roles they play in the story. Zeus is the 'mighty leader' of the gods who governs everything that takes place. Following him is "a host of gods and spirits marshaled in eleven bands" (247). Twelve gods each lead their own group of souls while another god, Hestia, is mentioned as staying behind in the house of the gods. Those individuals who have the power and interest in following the gods view the same amazing spectacles witnessed by the gods but when the followers approach the "summit of the arch" of the outer heaven they must struggle against a steep stretch. The bad horse which is driven by physical desire can disrupt this crucially important course of the journey by redirecting himself back to the material world – the place where his main interests lie.

We are told that those souls that can control their 'dark horse' reach the summit and perceive the other side of the heavens while standing on the outer surface of the universe as it rotates. The glorious sights along the path up are now, on the other side, replaced by the realm of absolute reality – the reality which true knowledge is in reference to and realized only by intellect. Plato explains that the gods enjoy the full revolution of the universe and behold absolute justice, discipline and knowledge, satisfy themselves with the advantages of absolute reality, before returning to the inside realm of the heavens. Then they set their horses at their manger, feed them with ambrosia and

quench their thirst with nectar. On the other hand, human souls have a limited encounter with absolute reality and some even miss their chance of having any experience at all. The myth mentions three kinds of experience: 1) the best a soul following a god can achieve is an impaired vision of reality because the height of the chariot only allows the charioteer to peer above into the outer heavens 2) next, the chariots of some souls oscillate up and down and do not enable the soul to acquire a complete view of the higher heavens 3) and the third group, remain below the surface at all times and spends the journey competing with others for a better position, therefore the souls in this group damage their wings and, as a result, end up with opinions in life rather than seeking knowledge (248).

After establishing and evaluating the three possible journeys a soul can embark on Plato divides these three categories by detailing the different kinds of people each experience produces and the hierarchy of incarnations they must undergo:

1) the soul that witnessed the outer heavens the most is destined to become a) seeker of wisdom b) a seeker of beauty c) a follower of the Muses, i.e. a lover (cf. the four kinds of divine madness I described at the beginning);

2) the fate of the soul that experienced reality to a slightly less, and fragmented, extent is a) a law-abiding monarch b) a warrior and commander;

3) and to an even less degree a) a man of affairs b) a manager of a household c) a financier;

4) next in the regression is a) a lover of physical activity b) a trainer c) a physician;

5) the souls below them become a) a soothsayer b) an official of the mysteries;

6) those that follow in the list occupy the role of a) a poet b) a practitioner of some other imitative art;

7) next are incarnated as a) an artisan b) a farmer;

8) the second last become a) a popular teacher[7] b) a demagogue;

9) and the last are destined to be tyrants (248).

[7] Consider the depiction of Lysias in the dialogue as a popular teacher and rhetorician.

Plato explains that one's fate is determined by one's actions and choices in a previous life. We are told that one can only return to a disembodied state after ten thousand years unless one lives the life of a philosopher three times in a row, after which they can begin a process through which they find salvation in a shorter time period and fewer incarnations (249). Those that do not choose a philosophical life are judged according to the moral quality of their previous human lives and either reap reward in one of the levels of heaven or undergo punishment in one of the levels beneath the earth. After one thousand years they draw lots and choose the kind of life they wish to be reincarnated into, which may include non-human species.

At 247 Plato uses the word truth and it is clear that he is not talking about the truth of the tale but truth in a different context:

> Nevertheless the fact is this; for we must have the courage to speak the truth, especially when truth itself is our theme. (247)

In this passage Plato is alluding to his earlier arguments concerning the status of Forms. He refers to the realm of truth that contains those beings which true knowledge is concerned with – "intangible but utterly real". Only the gods have complete and unlimited access to this reality while human souls must experience it in the ways described above. What is significant here is that Plato is making a statement that alludes strongly to the theory of Forms and its importance to his notion of truth. It will become clearer, later, that his intention here is to point out which lines of familiar argument will be subject to the transition.

In identical fashion, at 249 Plato introduces the theory of recollection and explains its significance in relation to the myth. The soul's original journey becomes the basis for remembering as one pursues philosophy, thus identifying philosophy as a divine pursuit. Plato then refers to the fourth type of madness and how the soul, when it encounters a beautiful person, remembers that which it witnessed before its embodiment. On the other

hand, some individuals do not make the connection between beautiful things and the beautiful sights they perceived during their prenatal experience and do not gain knowledge (250). "But beauty, as we were saying, shone bright in the world above, and here too it still gleams clearest, even as the sense by which we apprehend it is our clearest" (250). Even though sight does not lead to knowledge we are told that it is the keenest of the senses and sparks our memories of true reality in the strongest way possible.

3.4.3 *The philosophical arguments*

At times one is tempted to interpret certain passages in the myth as a form of exegesis of other parts; a switch to rational explanation (246, 248, 251-256, particularly the section when the contact between the lover and beloved refers to the prenatal journey and the nature of the incarnated soul). It is difficult to draw boundaries in these parts of the text between myth and argument. For this reason I indicated how Plato mentions arguments in the previous sub-section on the myth/hypothesis. In certain places he argues by simply cross-referencing an argument he had made in another dialogue like, for instance, when at 249 and 250 he refers to the theory of recollection and at 247 when he indicates the relevance of considering the theory of Forms.[8] However, these moments in the myth are just that; allusions to a philosophical argument and do not constitute *logos* in the way they are presented. There are other times throughout the myth when social situations and human behavior are explained as consequences of mythical events – in light of the framework established by the myth these examples are a form of justification for fantastic details in the narrative. Also, the myth accounts for the fact that different individuals are attracted to different attributes in a beautiful person. Examples of personal

[8] Santas lists the theories referred to in the second speech as "1. The immortality of souls, not the personal immortality by offspring in the *Syposium*, but the everlasting existence of all souls as in the *Phaedo*. 2. The tri-partite division of the soul, as in the *Republic*. 3. The theory of Forms, realities, 'colorless, shapeless, and intangible' (247c). 4. The recollection of Forms." ([1992] p. 305).

interaction and domestic relations are provided and explained by Plato as consequences of the influence of the soul's prenatal experience (251-252 and 255). These are interesting and give a degree of strength to the story but are hardly philosophical arguments. Even though it is important to understand parts of the myth in relation to the previous theories it makes use of, it is more important to see what kinds of hypotheses the myth is opening up possibilities for – hypotheses Plato uses to construct more detailed and contextually nuanced arguments (a point I will return to).

The myth of the charioteer in the *Phaedrus* is related to rational arguments in an interesting way that differs from other dialogues because it is the medium by which Plato makes the transition from a basic metaphysical theory and epistemology – used in his early to middle period – to a more complex one without giving the impression of a radical change (once the transition is completed it seems obvious that this development was implied in the earlier position and that the change was inevitable). These theories are used in the later part of the *Phaedrus* and afterwards in dialogues of the late period. The way the transition is expressed through myth gives the impression that the earlier positions contained the later elaborations, dormant, all the time. The *Phaedrus'* rigorous arguments are contained in the second half of the dialogue and deal with the issue of rhetoric and it is not necessary to discuss the arguments in detail here (in the next sub-section on mutual scaffolding I discuss the influence of the myth on the analysis of rhetoric). The topic has its own issue to criticize and its own context for the debate. What is important is that the half of the dialogue after the myth, and the dialogues after the *Phaedrus*, are structured using a more advanced metaphysics and epistemology, as well as the method of collection and division which feature in special ways in the narrative as I will explore in the next part of this section.

A comparison of Socrates' responses to Lysias' speech is helpful because the first speech shares features of Plato's early and more basic philosophical positions and the second with a more advanced Platonic perspective. The second recognizes the importance of *eros* while the first reflects the philosophical views of dialogues like the *Phaedo*.

Socrates' first speech is attached to the older theory that rejects the body completely but after the second speech, which contains the myth, physical love and mental love are united as complimentary.[9] There is an interesting move to an investigation which bases itself on a hypothesis which unites the soul, the body and the intellect. The myth in the second speech facilitates the transition from the simpler theory to a more developed one. One can already notice an anticipation of the metaphysics and epistemology of later dialogues in the positions expressed in the myth/hypothesis.[10]

> The Phaedrus does not suggest that logos is bent on deceiving us, or that the truth it images only approximates what is. Nor does it suggest that all articulations of, say, the nature of justice are equally good. On the contrary, the Phaedrus itself shows how progress can be made from partially true logoi about something (such as eros) to more adequate logoi that call upon a larger context closer to the whole truth of the matter.[11]

3.4.4 *Mutual scaffolding*

The brief details concerning the four kinds of madness and the immortality of the soul, together, act as a preamble for the myth. This is an immediate indication that the narrative is a serious philosophical component of the dialogue. The description of the four kinds of madness and the immortality of the soul were intended to facilitate the myth and to make sense of the references made to the arguments. Plato establishes a dynamic relationship between a particular kind of madness and the soul; the indispensable connection between passion and knowledge.[12] The association between the preface and the account of the soul's journey is clarified in certain parts of the myth. One notices how

[9] Also, there is a contrast with the view of love in the *Syposium* which asserts that love is an intermediary between humans and the divine, whereas in the *Phaedrus* love is something divine (White [1993] pp. 55-56).
[10] White (1993) pp. 1-2. White indicates that the metaphysical, epistemological and methodological platform for later dialogues is established as a transformative extension of earlier theories.
[11] Griswold (1986) p. 120.
[12] Nehamas and Woodruff, introduction to Plato (1995) p. xx.

pre-embodied situations and events, such as the following of a certain god (252) and the degree to which one witnesses the realm above the heavens (248), influences predispositions and inclinations in this world, such as attraction to particular virtues and the talent for recognizing, or ability to comprehend, truth when one is confronted by particulars (252-253). Being taken over by the fourth kind of madness which leads to the acquisition of knowledge is dependent on the way one becomes aware of one's own natural capacities.[13]

"At 245b Socrates sets up a criterion for evaluating arguments."[14] In his essay "Love and the Method of Hypothesis" Scolnicov indicates that love, as it is described by Socrates, leads to the best consequences in comparison to Lysias' account of love. The passages that immediately follow 245b are devoted to the necessary task of setting up a hypothesis which is then shown to be the most desirable. By the end of the myth of the charioteer it is clear that a functional link between beauty, love and the soul is indispensable for knowledge acquisition. The link, and the narrative in which it is formulated, is a hypothesis because it is used to clarify a range of issues in the rest of the dialogue; the myth is not simply Socrates' attempt to show that *eros* is good. "… it is a necessary condition of the victorious argument that it have shown love not to be a mere matter of utility, such as understood by Lysias and the many. Not that the victorious argument may be invalid. But to us, in our turn, the opposite has to be proved, namely that erotic madness brings us the greatest good fortune".[15] In my chapter on the *Meno* – which I argued was a form of manual for how a hypothesis must be used correctly and for how to evaluate a good hypothesis – I contrasted Meno's hypothesis with Socrates' and explained that Socrates' hypothesis was the better one based on its consequences even though both were logically formulated. In the *Phaedrus* Plato does the same except the issue is more intricate and sensitive which makes the hypothesis harder to decipher and, therefore, it is harder to associate aspects of the rest of the dialogue with it as

[13] White defines the four different kinds of madness in relation to Socrates' two speeches and explains Socrates' use of collection and division ([1993] pp. 42-44).
[14] Scolnicov (1992) p. 250.
[15] Scolnicov (1992) p. 250.

consequences. However, once all the details are distinguished from each other and the appropriate connections are made with the hypothesis the result is sound and desirable. "And if we can do this (always providing our argument is valid), our premises will be worthier of acceptance precisely because our conclusion is preferable to our opponent's".[16]

As a consequence of the myth, the dialogue supports the view that we are enticed by certain objects of love more than others, objects that lead one to knowledge of the truth while in a physical state. The attraction to these objects is determined by our soul's prenatal adventure; a theory made possible because Plato has already set up the framework or context in order to make the view meaningful. This was done by proposing, as a hypothesis, the essential relationship between beauty, love and the soul and that there are different dimensions and degrees to the relationship. Basically, the introduction to the myth defined the terms and conditions with which Plato could construct his myth. It is interesting that he attributes these initial beliefs to the poet Stesichorus, whose name means, very appropriately, 'he who sets up the chorus'. "Socrates conceals himself under the name Stesichorus in order to speak on behalf of the lover, and he addresses a boy (243e4) who is played by Phaedrus. Socrates is concealed as a poet and as an advocate of noble love, and Phaedrus as a potential philosopher. A new rhetorical framework is thereby created for this speech."[17]

There are a few parts of the myth that are significant for my mutual scaffolding style of analysis. At 248 Plato delineates three different classes of charioteers depending on the limit to which their journey reaches. The first kind he describes is the closest to the god that it follows and keeps its head above the surface of the heavens and therefore has a vision of reality, although somewhat impaired. The second class bobs above and below the surface and therefore only sees a part of reality. And the third kind of charioteer does not reach the surface and therefore does not have a depository of knowledge, but only

[16] Scolnicov (1992) p. 250.
[17] Griswold (1986) p. 74.

opinion, to recollect once it is born into the world. The journey is repeated, Plato has Socrates explain, and if a soul misses out on gaining a vision of reality it is incarnated. As I have described, if the soul has had a sufficient view of the Forms before birth its first incarnation is the most conducive to seeking "wisdom or beauty". Alternatively, and equally as good, the soul becomes "a follower of the Muses and a lover" (248). Depending on the choices one makes in life one either descends to a lower social and intellectual status or can begin regaining wings after three successive incarnations at the top class. Therefore, the search to remember what was lost depends on the nature of the quest one embarks on while disembodied. The first kinds of souls which had a better vision of reality recognize knowledge much easier and clearer in their experience with the world. The second kind to a lesser degree and the third kind can only ever acquire opinions. According to the myth, the soul's prenatal performance constructs a particular kind of mental capacity which corresponds with a particular process for knowledge acquisition; a process determined to be repeated during an embodied state. This means that knowledge acquisition during embodiment must be interpreted as a physical performance – with the same structure as the prenatal journey – which needs to be understood in correspondence with its culmination in intellectual enlightenment or some state inferior to it.

There are many sections of the myth that are committed to incorporating the senses or physical activity into the search for knowledge. At 249-250 the myth presents an interesting angle on the issue of the Form of beauty and perception. Socrates discusses how the sight of beauty reminds one of true beauty. Attracted by the earthy vision of a beautiful individual the spectator becomes mad with love because the sight helps recollect the beautiful itself[18] – although more than just sight is needed to arrive at knowledge.[19] It is only beauty that can have this effect on humans because Socrates tells of how it was the only Form that was seen in its full grandeur while the soul was on its cosmic journey. However, those who have been in a physical state longer than others

[18] Nicholson (1999) pp. 198-199.
[19] Price (1992) pp. 244-245. Price compares and contrasts the role of sight in the *Phaedrus* with other dialogues.

misinterpret the vision and descend into base physical pleasure and ignore the pleasure of beholding an example of the ideal in the beloved (250-251). Expressing one's love through physical affection is not rejected; it is encouraged but only at the correct moment – after the Form has been fully appreciated – and with the right intentions. The need for the myth to elaborate this point about the role of the senses is important because it helps place things like physical attraction and the physical compliment to erotic love in context.[20]

Plato explains in significant detail how the lover attends to the beloved in both physical and nonphysical ways. The beloved's beauty assists the lover's imagination of divine qualities. In reaction to the physical beauty of his counterpart the lover honors and worships him by trying to enhance the natural attributes the beloved contains – traits which resemble the god that the lover was led by during the pre-embodied state. Only once the beloved is in a mature state of love is physical contact advisable and is, in fact, described by Plato as destiny (255). The myth describes sexual interaction in poetic style and compares the beloved's attraction to Zeus' longing for Ganymede.[21] The link between the sight of the beautiful, physical beauty and the soul is thus confirmed by describing the beloved's experience: "the 'stream of longing' sets in full flood towards the lover. Part of it enters into him [the lover], but when his heart is full the rest brims over, and as the wind or an echo rebounds from a smooth and solid surface and is carried back to its point of origin, so the stream of beauty returns once more to its source in the beauty of the beloved. It enters in at his eyes, the natural channel of communication with the soul, and reaching and arousing the soul it moistens the passages from which the feathers shoot and stimulates the growth of wings, and in its turn the soul of the beloved is filled with love" (255).

Through the myth of the charioteer Plato introduces the idea that Forms can be recognized through the senses, i.e. encounters with the physical world. In relation to

[20] Santas (1992) pp. 306-307.
[21] For more details concerning the connection between the symbolic details of this example and Plato's metaphysics of love see White (1993) pp. 162-163.

earlier dialogues one may be tempted to assert that a new theory is being presented. But this need not necessarily be the case. If we recognize the interplay between beauty, passionate love and soul as the definition of a hypothesis in contrast to the intellect-senses/soul-matter dualism hypothesis one need not conclude that a theoretical shift has taken place. Instead, Plato is here performing a smooth transition from a straight forward, conceptual theory of the soul-world relationship that was designed to promote pure intellectual virtue over carnal delight, to a more exhaustive account that appreciates the more emotional and phenomenological aspects of the soul-world experience. "Thus desire has an inherent degree of rationality and rationality includes an element of desire."[22]

According to the new hypothesis of the soul, the object of love for different souls must be committed to the divinity which they were destined to love. The hypothesis that Plato encourages us to accept now involves love – an indispensable human element to consider whether we discuss sensation or cognition.[23] According to this hypothesis, a rational being desires to know something because he sees it as absolutely beautiful and because, consequently, he is truly in love with it. It would be perverse to think that one would want their soul to be profoundly in touch with what one does not love. In terms of the literary setting of the dialogue this may also explain why Socrates and Phaedrus are attracted to the topic and each other – because they both love speeches and those who present them.[24]

Plato's arguments in the *Phaedrus* regarding authorship and reader response deserve more attention here. Particular scenes in the text reveal some interesting thoughts that pertain to our critique of Plato's attitude towards, and use of, myth and its potential to act as a hypothesis. Firstly, in the context of speech writing Plato argues that no man of

[22] White (1993) pp. 156-157.
[23] White (1993) p. 42. For White, Plato's definition of love represents a merger of different kinds of desire, all akin to each other. This amalgamation helps explain the intensity of desires, the quality of the pleasures they provide and the hybrid reality (beautiful bodies) of the things desired.
[24] Socrates' love of receiving and producing speeches in the *Phaedrus* is not shared by the attitude held by the Socrates depicted in other dialogues (Nehamas and Woodruff, introduction to Plato [1995] p. xi).

affairs could criticize Lysias for producing speeches and that writing as such is not a bad thing. Socrates makes his point to Phaedrus by stating "there is nothing disgraceful in speech-writing….The disgrace comes, I take it, when one speaks and writes disgracefully and badly instead of well" (258). For Plato a speech is worthy of praise if the writer produces it with the knowledge of good and evil and his speech encourages his audience to do good (260). Secondly, Plato touches on the method used by rhetorical speakers to mislead their listeners. According to Plato, some rhetorical speakers use the technique of moving in small degrees leading from one thing to its opposite so that their attempt to stray from the truth is not detected (262). Since these two points refer to writing in general and a rhetorical technique, the former being an imitation and the latter a tool that also facilitates argument, they can be extrapolated to discuss some interesting interpretations and evaluations of myth.

Plato believes that the art of speech writing must be judged according to one's writing ability and connection with truth. The same criteria can be extended to better understand his attitude towards myth. Myth must also be judged according to the ability of the myth writer to write his myth well (what constitutes a well written myth in Plato depends on its place in the text as a whole, which includes its relation to theory). The second point about misleading descriptions, moving from one thing to its opposite in small degrees to avoid detection, explains how one may make the mistake of rejecting myth, or at least dichotomizing it, when interpreting it in relation with argument. Myth is misinterpreted if one considers the structure and content of a philosophical treatise and draws a stark contrast with the structure and content of myth. If one attempts to move from philosophy to an account one presupposes to be dissimilar, such as myth, in small steps one can be misled to think the two are binary opposites. But if one recognizes the place of myth as a hypothesis in a unity (mutual scaffolding in a Platonic dialogue) that purposefully incorporates arguments and literary techniques then the inherent logic and indispensable place of a myth/hypothesis in the dialogues becomes clear. This unifying perspective challenges the dichotomy paradigm that is often arrived at after small steps

implemented to analyze minute particulars of structure and content of both myth and philosophy with the intention of confirming binary opposites.

At 262 and 263 Plato states that if one does not wish to mislead others or himself one must know the true nature of the subject of study and thus be able to determine whether the subject is ambiguous or unambiguous. Knowledge of a subject is a prerequisite to identifying what the subject resembles or contrasts. Like the concept of love, myth is an ambiguous idea and a complex genre of representation. In his first speech the concept of love was referred to by Socrates as a curse to lover and beloved and subsequently, in the second speech, described as the greatest of blessings. Similarly, myth has been categorized by Plato in a similar way – as both the source of corruption and as an indispensable guide for morality. A definitive definition of myth, therefore, would be required, just as a definition of love was necessary in Socrates' speech, if one wanted to give a sophisticated evaluation of the subject.

> The first speech introduces the need for methodological considerations essential for successfully pursuing reasoned discussion. Failing to establish a definition at the outset results in disagreement not only between the views of the discussants but also within each participant. Such disagreement will tell against success in inquiry, since the contesting views do not meet on common ground. And, more fundamentally, this lack of agreement entails that each participant will have internally incompatible views (quite apart from any incompatibility arising between views of two people).[25]

One does not find an explicit definition of myth in the *Phaedrus* or any other dialogue but a place for myth and its benefits for philosophy can be extrapolated from what Plato explains in relation to rhetoric.[26] Firstly, Plato confirms his confidence in his method for accounting for the emotion of love when Socrates states "And in trying to tell what the emotion of love is like it may be that we hit upon some truth…a not entirely

[25] White (1993) p. 38.
[26] Griswold (1986) p. 142. Griswold recognizes the place of the myth in relation to the analysis of rhetoric and a network of other features in the text. However, he concludes that the myth can be translated into a non-mythic discourse, i.e. myth is an economical and elegant way to express complex points (146-147).

unconvincing speech, a mythical hymn which celebrates in suitably devotional language the praises of Love" (265). This comment is in contrast to other evaluations of myth expressed in other dialogues. Plato's transition from blame to praise in relation to myth can be explained in the same terms that Socrates explains how he first blamed and then praised love when he responded to Lysias in his two speeches. Socrates explains that his speeches are the result of applying two different methods of reasoning: one based on 'collection' of particulars and establishing a *genus*, which deductively leads to certain conclusions. The other method concentrates on the 'division' of a subject, followed by a skilful articulation of the individual parts. In the first method of inquiry the focus is primarily on clarity and consistency. Plato believes that by approaching the issue with a synoptic view of a diverse range of particulars, the inquirer can unify the data under a generic term. This allows for the formation of a definition, thus clarifying the exact nature of the subject under question. Plato states that at this point the most important thing is the progression of the argument in accordance with clarity and consistency rather than whether the proposed definition is good or bad. In the second method of inquiry one is advised to divide the proposed genus into species once again (266) but this time the species are evaluated with a proposed definition in place. Returning to phenomena under these conditions – the reevaluation of the definition through collection and division – opens up a more philosophically sophisticated process of analysis which enables the inquirer to determine the validity of his or her hypothesis. By considering the virtues of this approach Lysias' speech is exposed as a badly arranged rhetorical exercise and Socrates' first speech is based on a hypothesis leading to undesirable conclusions. However, the second speech, based on a myth/hypothesis, is both well arranged and leads to conclusions conducive to arriving at an understanding of Beauty, i.e. a philosophical endeavor for truth. White acknowledges the methodological advances and advantages of Socrates' second speech by paying homage to Plato's positioning of the myth and its interrelation with the course of argument. I disagree that methodological utility of certain parts of the myth can be seen in distinction from features of the tale such as setting, plot, character dynamics, literary themes and motifs and the role of performance (his division is based simply on Socrates' reflective comments afterwards). However, I find his

observations compelling in that he recognizes the hypothesis inherent in the myth which includes the method of collection and division, construction and testing of definition and the importance of considering consequences.

> When, during their subsequent reflections, Socrates tells Phaedrus that the second speech was "really sportive jest" (265d), he excludes from this assessment those part of that speech which adumbrated the method of determining truth by collection, division, and determining a thing's nature. The jest may then refer to the splendid mythic panorama of this speech, engendered only after incompletely applying the method for securing truth in rhetoric. But it remains vital to interpret the myth according to the problem for the sake of which this myth has been introduced.[27]

The *Phaedrus* is a literary work of art that illustrates an essential connection between the senses, the intellect and taste through the example of a mythic performance – the details of which I described at the beginning of this chapter. The assumptions and conclusions that may be read into the myth seem against the grain of Plato's anti-corporeal/strictly rational position from the early and middle periods. However, it is plausible that Plato is warning readers not to concentrate on the written text and therefore ascribe static meanings to the theories and their components. We must be careful of the danger of stigmatizing Plato as an absolutist in terms of theory and method especially in the face of overwhelming evidence from dialogues such as the *Phaedrus* that differ significantly from others. Instead, we need to be more sensitive to the dynamics of each dialogue, i.e. the way objects and ideas are contingent upon the issue under discussion and the way the proposed hypothesis relates to them with the aim of reaching desirable consequences. In this sense the myth resembles the performance of actually doing philosophy and practicing rhetoric in support of it. In reference to my preliminary elaboration of my understanding of performance represented in the *Phaedrus* the art of rhetoric can no longer remain a systematic structural and stylistic enterprise. My interpretation is that since philosophy unifies thought with all aspects of physical encounters, therefore

[27] White (1995) pp. 88-89.

culminating in a performance rather than a mental exercise, then the role of rhetoric must not be detached from elements vital to its implementation such as location, frameworks of discourse, power relations between interlocutors and other socio-cultural factors. Focusing purely on the theories and ideas written down can lead one astray since Plato is not around to defend any form of literal interpretation of his texts. But the plot, the confrontations between characters and the themes and motifs used in the dialogue encourage one to consider 'meta' issues about how philosophy is to be received; how it is written; and how it is influenced by aspects of narrative. Concentration on these elements opens up philosophical practice to deeper meanings which involve context appreciation, and it avoids constraining ones thought with merely static propositions. If we consider the myth as a tool to facilitate transition of his theory, or enhancement of theory, we are looking not at the ideas and theories but the effect of the literary and rhetorical staging of the dialogue and the techniques used to do it. This technique facilitates a shift in our thinking by staging a theatrical performance with its own inherent logic which demands examination – a motivation needed to think about philosophy in 'meta' way as well as a practical participatory way.

The theme of lover and beloved is a device to present the new theory that incorporates an important place for the physical world, physical pleasure and passion. This transition is done with a myth in order to put the new ideas into an all encompassing perspective or worldview. The perspective involves mental love and physical love and, most importantly, how passionate love plays a role in our search for truth – knowledge and love must ultimately be seen in relation to each other. One example is how recollection is clarified as remembering through a dialogue with beauty. It is better to interact in real physical and emotional situations rather than remember the Forms by reading books or by pure abstract thinking – a sharp diversion from previous positions.

As a part of his attempt to transform the nature of his theory and method and expose the intricacies they contain, Plato provides new investigative philosophical tools. The prelude to the myth and the myth itself repeatedly utilizes the method of collection

and division. The introduction of this approach, as a pivotal shift in Plato's philosophical method, has important consequences for the later part of the dialogue – the discussion of rhetoric – and the techniques used for analysis in later dialogues.[28] Plato begins by dividing madness into four types (244-245), followed by distinguishing the soul's "divine and human" parts "by observing it in both its passive and its active aspects" (245). At 246 he separates the soul into a ruling element, a good element and a bad element.[29] This is not yet division in the profound sense but then Plato explains the different classes of charioteers and the various incarnations they might enter during their long existence of transmigration (248) which, as I have discussed, attempts to give some form of hypothetical starting point for coming to terms with personal and social idiosyncrasies in various individuals. Also, at 252 he describes the characteristics and peculiarities of the range of souls depending on the god which they followed during their pre-embodied state. The method of collection and division runs throughout and is building on an old method which began by demonstrating why conventional definitions were inadequate (a strong feature of the *aporetic* dialogues). The consequences of using this method are proven to be extremely productive and Plato elaborates on the approach in the second section, at 265, to show the steps and benefits of a more advanced and nuanced hypothetical method that proceeds through collection and division.[30]

3.4.5 *Plot structure*

The myth of the charioteer, like the other dialogues I investigate, has a major plot which controls the meaning of the dialogue and a number of themes running through it. The theme of cosmic dualism (247) is represented along with the 'gnostic' theme of physical entrapment (250) as minor contextual threads in the plot. But the main storyline is that of ritual initiation leading to transformation. This plot entails a number of concepts

[28] Gill (1992) p. 162; White (1993) pp. 277-291.
[29] White (1993) pp. 38-41.
[30] Scolnicov (1992) p. 251.

which feature in the myth. These ideas pertain to a kind of intellectual and sensual soteriology; the significance of salvation and atonement and their connection to mental and physical pleasure. The plot is archetypal and shares affinities with similar mythic archetypes such as deliverance, eschatology and reincarnation. What is significant in the ritual initiation form of plot is that actual physical performance is a vital concomitant to any myth created to represent it and, therefore, the role of the body must be included in the process leading to enlightenment. This is why I believe Plato has introduced his myth at this stage of his corpus. He recognizes the importance of the body in relation to salvation and accepting this factor demands a form of ritual.[31] Passionate love is combined with the Idea of Beauty to enable the body to play this role in his metaphysics and epistemology.[32]

The form of ritual deliverance plot, and its associated themes mentioned above, governing the text requires a master/student or initiator/initiate dynamic as part of its structure.[33] The topic of *eros* is incorporated into the dialogue to make the connection between passion and knowledge, as I explained above. Also, the role of *eros* in the way it is used in the text can be understood as a critical development and reinterpretation of the customary 'homo-erotic' relationships in ancient Greece.[34] In Socrates' second speech the relationship is explained on a deeper level which involves education of divine knowledge.

[31] Cf. Socrates' encounter with Diotima in the *Symposium* which shares affinities with the plot and themes of the *Phaedrus*. However, one must be careful not to import plots and themes directly from one dialogue to another since, as I have argued in my case studies, each dialogue has its own context, perspective and details of concern which play active and vital roles in the plots and themes. Some cross-dialogue comparisons and inter-textual communication is inevitable to a certain extent but must be analyzed with caution

[32] De Vries mentions some of the most influential views concerning the unity (both artistic and thematic) of the *Phaedrus* – including his own interpretation ([1969] pp. 22-24).

[33] C. Gill explains that one of the themes in the *Phaedrus* is a form of shared enquiry (dialectic) where the questioner assists the respondent in his assent to each step of the argument. In addition, the mutual participation between questioner and respondent represents a more dialectically engaging style of philosophy in contrast to reading and listening to lectures. Gill also elaborates on the question and answer method in combination with other methods. (1992). Also, refer to further comments on the dynamics of the relationship on pp. 166-167).

[34] For details concerning the role of homosexual relationships and the references to it in the different speeches see Nehamas and Woodruff, introduction to Plato (1995) pp. xv-xvii. For background information on the topic and its use for the context of the *Phaedrus* see Nicholson (1999) pp. 109-114. For the educational and initiatory function associated with homosexual relationships particularly in Athens see Tanner (1992) p. 218.

The character roles remain the same but the function of the roles and their significance for the purposes of Platonic philosophy, as it is depicted in the *Phaedrus*, are transformed. The relationship between Socrates and Phaedrus follows a general pattern and power dynamic that fashioned the interaction between an older lover and a younger beloved in may facets of ancient Greek and non-Greek cultures which has continued through different eras in various manifestations. One version of this pattern is represented in the myth of the charioteer and its concordance with the interaction between the interlocutors in the dialogue gives primacy to a form of educational rite of passage or personal development through transition. Griswold expresses this concordance between the different sections in the text, particularly the second part which deals with rhetoric.

> The description at the end of the Phaedrus of the relationship between dialectician and student (a relationship explained in the context of a discussion about rhetoric) is grounded in the present description of Zeus-like lover and beloved. In this manner the teaching of the palinode continues to frame the subsequent discussion of rhetoric and dialectic.[35]

3.4.6 *Character selection*

a. *Master*

The dialogue only has two characters with Socrates occupying the role of master, instructor or guide. In the dialogue Socrates and Phaedrus are companions but it becomes strikingly clear that the roles that they occupy in the friendship resemble a master/student relationship. Socrates is enthusiastic about Phaedrus' speech because he is confident that he can dominate and persuade Phaedrus to critically reevaluate his admiration for Lysias' speech and, consequently, undergo a more profound progressive change in his understanding of some of the major topics in the text. In connection to mystic

[35] Griswold (1986) p. 130.

master/student relationships, Socrates is similar to the spiritual master who is also a lover and wishes to enhance the qualities he loves in the beloved. Consistent with most mystic ritual traditions, Socrates' intention is to make Phaedrus, the beloved, into a lover himself.[36]

b. *Student*

> Thus the beloved finds himself being treated like a god and receiving all manner of service from a lover whose love is true love and no pretence, and his own nature disposes him to feel kindly towards his admirer (255).

At a certain point in the dialogue, prior to presenting the above statement, (253-254) the myth blends into a hypothetical example of the interaction between a lover and his beloved. Many elements from the myth are imported into this section, particularly the plot structure. As a consequence of the plot, the two characters in the dialogue are shaped in terms of their different functions, personalities and relationship with each other. The position of Phaedrus is contingent upon the position of Socrates which I have described above; a dialectic significantly influenced by the structure of the storyline and the intricacies it both directly represents and implies. At 255 Plato explains the dynamics at play when a true lover aims to attract his beloved. There is a salient theme running through his description that has an uncanny resemblance to most mystic rites involving master and student. The master loves the beloved because of his potential to become a lover of the Forms which leads to the beloved recognizing his potential in the gaze and affection of the lover. Ultimately, Plato is describing the first steps taken by an initiate toward true knowledge. When the plot is recognized in this sense the parallels with Phaedrus' education in the dialogue are too close to be ignored. Also, the place of Phaedrus in the dialogue can be understood as a literary device which has been carefully designed to facilitate many of the points I made in my analysis, i.e. transition or transformation of hypothesis, liminal space and ritual performance. After illustrating the

[36] De Vries (1969) p. 5. De Vries lists a number of other important character traits that particularly stand out in the figure of Socrates depicted in the *Phaedrus*.

spiritual and intellectual interaction between master/lover and student/beloved the dialogue tends to veer further away from the mythic symbols and focuses primarily on the friendship between the two followed by the second half of the dialogue regarding rhetoric. I believe that this is further support for my argument that suggests that the myth, in addition to the other points I made, provided structural cohesion and interpretative assistance. In other words, once the transition has been completed the topic of rhetoric can be readdressed using the enhanced hypothesis and methodology. The myth lingers in the second part by virtue of the stage setting it projected, i.e. the location, the plot, the prescribed character roles and the themes and motifs.

> One notable feature of the description [description of oral discourse in Phaedrus 276a-277a] is the presence of language which indicates some kind of active participation on the part of the person taught as well as the teacher. The desiderated discourse, impossible to achieve in writing, is 'living', capable of defending or helping itself; it has to be 'implanted' in a suitable mind or character (psuchen prosekousan), that is, one which is capable of generating logoi to implant in other ethe and thus of rendering the process of such generation athanaton. What is characterized is not, for the most part, the contribution of teacher or pupil, but the logos in which they both participate.[37]

3.4.7 *Index of themes and motifs*

a. ***Indications of former view/later view transition***

- Socrates' opening line: "Where have you come from, my dear Phaedrus, and where are you going?" (227)
- Socrates' first speech represents the negative view of the body, characteristic of earlier dialogue, which is replaced by the palinode
- Socrates' second speech represents the new view; positive (or at least useful) view of the body and senses, characteristic of the later dialogues

[37] Gill (1992) p. 164.

b. ***Collection and division***

- Good and bad speeches
- Four types of madness (244-245)
- Types of souls – divine and human; parts of soul – desire, emotion and reason (myth of the charioteer)
- Twelve ruler gods and their corresponding groups of souls
- Three kinds of experience with reality a soul can have following a god (248)
- Three kinds of experience produced three classes of incarnated souls which include numerous sub-groups (248)
- Collection and division/genus and species method of investigation (265-266)

c. ***Love, soul and knowledge connection***

- Love as madness defined (244-245)
- Definition of soul (245)
- Nature of soul explained by the myth (transition to new hypothesis – indispensable link between love, soul and knowledge/passionate love [249-250], the senses [250-251], immortality [245], theory of Forms [247] and recollection [249-250])
- New hypothesis presented in a myth depicting a ritual (allegory of the charioteer)
- Transition occurs and is detailed in the ritual space opened by the myth (liminal)

d. ***Liminal space***

- "outside the walls" (227)
- The discussion takes place in the country rather than city (the only dialogue that takes place outside the city walls), or the outer ring of the city. There are no human inhabitants but only supernatural beings and sacred symbols (particularly the cicadas due to the fact that represent transformation). The description of the location is important particularly because of the contrast with the details associated with the location of Lysias' speech earlier that day (including the company)
- The myth depicts a ritual process; the dialogue enters a liminal phase
- Reality, the region that true knowledge is concerned with, is only witnessed on the arch or outside rim of the heavens or universe (247)