Plato and His Legacy

Plato and His Legacy

Edited by

Yosef Z. Liebersohn, John Glucker,
and Ivor Ludlam

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Plato and His Legacy

Edited by Yosef Z. Liebersohn, John Glucker and Ivor Ludlam

This book first published 2021

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-7056-8
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-7056-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

This volume originates from an international symposium entitled Plato, His Dialogues and Legacy, held at Bar-Ilan University, Israel, on 5-6 June, 2018.

Part I, Plato and Platonism, offers two different general approaches to Plato's philosophy in antiquity.

Chapter One, The Platonic System in Historical Perspective, by Lloyd Gerson (Toronto, Canada), proposes a general view of the various elements and aspects of what the author takes to be Plato's own unified and consistent system of philosophy.

Chapter Two, The Origins of Platonist Dogmatism, by John Dillon (Dublin, Ireland), provides a historical view of early Platonism, suggesting that it began to develop as a system of Philosophy in the early Academy, after Plato.

Part II, Platonic Issues, offers two new readings of some aspects of one of Plato's most influential dialogues.

Chapter Three, *Rep* I: Early Lessons on Justice, by Roslyn Weiss (Lehigh, USA), is an analysis of some of the discussions in *Republic* I, suggesting that they anticipate much of what is said about justice in Book IV.

Chapter Four, A Paradigm Shift in Reading Plato, by Ivor Ludlam (Haifa, Israel), demonstrates how Plato may have constructed at least some of his early and middle dialogues.

Part III, Plato's Legacy, the main section of this book, provides new information and insights into some crucial episodes and aspects of Plato's interpretation, reception, and influence in various periods, from antiquity to our own age, and in various countries, from Germany and Italy to Japan and Israel.

Chapter Five, Stoic Cosmology and Plato's *Timaeus*: Some Further Notes, by Keimpe Algra (Utrecht, Netherlands), presents further developments of the author's former contributions to the study of Plato's *Timaeus* as a source for Stoic cosmology.

Chapter Six, The Principle of "Doing One's Own" in the Platonic-Stoic Tradition, by Tomohiko Kondo (Hokkaido, Japan), is an analysis of Platonic

and Stoic texts showing the continuity and differences between Plato's and Chrysippus' thought on this issue.

Chapter Seven, Marsilio Ficino's Interpretation of Plato's *Philebus*, by Dorothea Frede (Hamburg, Germany), provides an assessment of the origin and nature of Ficino's comments on *Philebus*.

Chapter Eight, Ficino's *Argumentum in Euthydemum* and the Tradition of the Exegesis of the Platonic Dialogues, by Michael Erler (Würzburg, Germany), is a discussion of the influence of Ficino's approach to one Platonic dialogue on later exegetical tradition, especially in Germany.

Chapter Nine, The Case of Plato's *Charmides* in the Fifteenth Century: Ficino, Poliziano, and a Lesson from Bruni. Preliminary Notes, by Amos Edelheit (Maynooth, Ireland), is a preliminary study of some different methods and approaches to translating Plato into Latin in the first generations of the Renaissance.

Chapter Ten, Plato's Influence on Analytic Philosophy: Metaphysics, Epistemology, and Philosophy of Mathematics, by Yannis Stephanou (Athens, Greece), offers an exposition of some Platonic influences on analytic philosophers in Britain and the USA, from Russell to some of our contemporaries.

Chapter Eleven, How Modern Japanese People Read Plato's *Politeia*, by Noburu Notomi (Tokyo, Japan), provides a description of the special place of Plato's *Republic* in the intellectual and cultural life of modern Japan.

Chapter Twelve, Plato in *Eretz-Israel*, by John Glucker (Tel-Aviv, Israel), is a historical exposition of Plato's late arrival in Hebrew letters, from the first Hebrew translation in 1914 to the study of Plato in Israel's universities today.

PART I:

PLATO AND PLATONISM

CHAPTER ONE

THE PLATONIC SYSTEM IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

LLOYD P. GERSON
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

1.

Among contemporary Plato scholars, few would claim that Plato has a systematic philosophy. Far more frequently, it is held that we find in the dialogues arguments for doctrines or positions that may be woven into some sort of systematic unity by *soi-disants* Platonists, though this was certainly not done so by Plato himself. In the extreme, we find the hermeneutical position according to which Plato's philosophy must be rigorously segmented into exactly the size and shape of a particular dialogue.[1] That is, the manifest literary form of each dialogue tracks the philosophy such that it is dubious at best to appeal to one dialogue for doctrinal clarification of what is said in another. Now much depends, of course, on what we mean by the word "system." But even a fairly lax definition will very likely meet significant resistance if it is claimed that, according to the proffered definition, Plato's philosophy is systematic.

Let us begin, then, with the most anodyne possible sense of "system." A systematic philosophy must (a) have one or perhaps a few unifying principles, that is, reductively unifying the disparate *explananda*. These principles must (b) be posited as providing explanatory ultimacy. Without explanatory ultimacy, a supposed unifying principle need be nothing more than the statement that the universe includes everything that there is or everything that is the case. Unification in the strong sense implies

[1] This is an approach inspired in the English-speaking world by Paul Shorey's *What Plato Said* (Shorey 1933), though Shorey, purporting to confine his accounts of Plato's philosophy to a "dialogue-by-dialogue" principle, provides ample cross-references to other dialogues in the margins.

explanation, and explanation without explanatory ultimacy is no explanation at all. Finally, (c) there must be some indication that the unifying principle or principles guarantee the dynamic continuity of the system, lest that system is reduced into disarray by entropy.

On this rather slim basis, there is no doubt that Plato presents us with a system in the dialogues. And if we acknowledge the testimony of Aristotle and the indirect tradition as providing a more or less accurate account of Plato's philosophy both within and apart from the dialogues, we have a highly elaborate account of that system.[2] The unifying principle, according to Plato, is the unhypothetical first principle of all, the Idea of the Good. That the Good is the principle of explanatory ultimacy follows alone from its being the hypothetical first principle, but it also follows from the identification of the Idea of the Good with the "something adequate" (τι ικανόν) in Socrates' "autobiography" in *Phaedo*, where he seeks to substitute Anaxagoras' *inadequate* explanations for the way things are with his own metaphysical account (101E1). That account, beginning with the hypotheses of Forms, ends with the unhypothetical first principle of all in *Republic*. And as for dynamic continuity, the Good, the source of all that is, is also the goal of all that is; it is what all things desire precisely because it is that from which all things come.[3] So, dynamic continuity is built into the system from its inception.

The elaboration of this system is found first in the writings—now unfortunately existing only in fragmentary form— of the other members of the Old Academy, Speusippus and Xenocrates, but also more clearly in Aristotle where we learn that, along with the Good, identified by Plato with the One, Plato introduced another principle, the Great-and-Small or the Indefinite Dyad, the primary instrument of the One's generation of all things and with the One the source of their systematic unity.[4] Just how the Indefinite Dyad is related to the One, that is, whether it is an independent principle or a subordinate principle, is a difficult question and I shall return to it later in this paper. A far more fine-grained elaboration of the system is found in Plotinus who not only tries to fill in details which are

---

[2] I shall here not recount the reasons for rejecting the approach of Harold Cherniss in *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy* (Cherniss 1944) and *The Riddle of the Early Academy* (Cherniss 1945). See Gerson 2014.

[3] See Proclus, *Platonic Theology* II 6, p. 40, 9-19 Saffrey-Westerink, on the systematic link between the One as cause and the Good as goal. The fundamental Platonic principle is that the investigation of the goal must focus on the source or origin of whatever has a goal.

[4] *Meta.* A 6, 987a14-18. See also B 1, 995b15ff; Z 2, 1028b19-21; K 1, 1059b2; Λ 1, 1069a33ff; M 1, 1076a19ff; 9, 1086a11-13; N 3, 1090b35-36.

missing from the dialogues, but also to show how the system "works" by its application to a range of philosophical problems. He tries to show, in effect, that explanatory ultimacy is the desideratum in every phenomenon in need of explanation. Plotinus is in fact the first philosopher (so far as we know) to articulate explanatory ultimacy as belonging to that which is αἴτιον ἑαυτοῦ ("self-explaining" or "autoexplicable").[5]

In response to those who would say that Aristotle is not a reliable witness to Plato's philosophy and that Plotinus, removed from Plato by more than 600 years, is an original thinker, only inspired by Plato and not a reliable exegete of his philosophy, I will only here make the following very brief remarks. As for Aristotle, he nowhere says that his account of Plato's philosophy is based solely on the dialogues; on the contrary, his account refers both to the dialogues and to Plato's unwritten teachings. To those who want to insist that Aristotle is not a reliable witness to Plato's unwritten teachings—assuming he had any—I can only ask what is the basis for rejecting the testimony of the man who insisted that he loved Plato and the other members of the Academy, but that he loved the truth even more, the man who spent almost 20 years in close physical proximity to Plato in a fundamentally oral culture?

Since I have claimed that the fundamentals of Plato's system are to be found in plain sight in the dialogues and in Aristotle's testimony, I think it is incumbent on me to at least try to explain why so many reject the systematic representation of Plato's philosophy out of hand. I'm afraid that I shall disappoint you if you expect me to try my hand at psychoanalysis. But one sort of explanation for this curious phenomenon does strike me as at least plausible. It is the belief that the systematic representation of Plato's philosophy is bound to diminish to negligibility the chances that Plato is speaking the truth. By contrast, this or that insight presented by Plato in one or another dialogue—say the elenctic method or the psychology of the erotic or the failings of democracy—can be massaged or "renovated" in such a way that it stands a chance of being true or perhaps at least just respectable. One should not, I think, underestimate the self-regarding motivations of those who have devoted their adult lives to the study of Plato and who, at all costs, do not want their colleagues to believe that they have devoted their lives to a nut. They want to make Plato respectable and so they strive to present the world with a bowdlerized Plato or Plato "lite."

I realise that what I am saying is harsh. But I would like briefly to adduce the following examples of what I am talking about and appeal to

[5] See *Enn.* VI 8 [39], 14.41.

whomever is interested to offer a better explanation than I have of what exactly is going on here. I should make clear that I am focusing primarily on the English-speaking world of Platonic scholarship, since in Europe the systematic nature of Plato's philosophy is, if not a commonplace, certainly a widely held view. Consider the book edited by R.E. Allen and published in 1965. This book, titled *Studies in Plato's Metaphysics*, purports to be a collection of essays that give us the state-of-the-art in scholarship on Plato's metaphysics.[6] In these 20 or so essays, all by distinguished Plato scholars, there is not a single mention of what Plato's calls the unhypothetical first principle of all, the Idea of the Good. One innocent of the sociology of the academy might well be forgiven for being surprised that multiple studies of Plato's metaphysics would not even mention what Plato's calls his first principle, the source of everything else in the universe. It is much as if someone wrote a book on the metaphysics of Thomas Aquinas and neglected to mention what Aquinas calls *ipsum esse* or *esse subsistens*, namely, the first principle of all, God. What, we may ask, could be the reason for not even mentioning it even if just to make some argument for dismissing its relevance? Consider another example. I.M. Crombie wrote a two-volume work called *An Examination of Plato's Doctrines* published in 1963.[7] The second of the two volumes, comprising some 550 pages, has the subtitle "Plato on Knowledge and Reality." And perhaps by now you will not be surprised to learn that not one word is said in this volume about the Idea of the Good, in which case there is of course no mention of the systematic nature of Plato's philosophy. Crombie does mention Aristotle's account of Plato's unwritten doctrines, though he insists that these doctrines are "not to be found in the dialogues." Just two more examples among scores of examples that I could adduce. First, there is the article by Verity Harte in the volume edited by Gail Fine, *The Oxford Handbook of Plato*, titled "Plato's Metaphysics", and published in 2011.[8] Professor Harte has quite a lot to say about Forms, but nothing at all to say about the superordinate Idea of the Good. And here it is rather clear that she does this because she wishes to focus on those aspects of Plato's metaphysics that have some relevance to contemporary metaphysical discussions, the implicit assumption being that a superordinate Idea of the Good would have none. Finally, there is a recent book by Blake Hestir called *Plato on the Metaphysical Foundation of Meaning and Truth*, published in 2016.[9] I must admit that when I saw this book advertised in

[6] Allen 1965.
[7] Crombie 1963.
[8] Harte 2011.
[9] Hestir 2016.

the Cambridge University Press catalogue, I was as thrilled as Plato represents Socrates as being thrilled when he heard that Anaxagoras has published a book in which he claimed to show how a divine intellect arranged everything here below for the best. Since Plato says that the Idea of the Good gives truth to the Forms, that is, since Plato tells us explicitly what is the metaphysical foundation of truth, I naively thought that Hestir's book would be entirely devoted to the Idea of the Good. Like Socrates, I was to be disappointed. For although Hestir does not *completely* ignore the Idea of the Good, it would have perhaps been better if he had. For in the one paragraph devoted to the Idea of the Good, he does quote the passage in which Plato says that the Good provides truth to the Forms, though he adds that there is an "ambiguity" between this truth and the semantic truth in which he is primarily interested, an ambiguity that works in Plato's favour. So, Hestir suggests to us that the Idea of Good is not really relevant to a discussion of the metaphysical foundation of meaning and truth, since "truth" is used equivocally in referring to ontological truth and semantical truth, the former having apparently no relevance to the latter.

In adducing these examples, I do not mean to suggest that no scholars have paid any attention to the Idea of the Good and therefore to the systematic nature of Plato's philosophy. I will just mention the names of Adam, Joseph, Santas, Patterson, Annas, Irwin, and Kraut, all of whom have devoted, it is fair to say, a bit of attention to the Idea of the Good. It would take me too far afield to try to show that in each case what is said is demonstrably false to the text of *Republic*, to say nothing of the passages in *Philebus*, *Phaedo, Timaeus*, and elsewhere where the Good is discussed. In *Republic* alone, there are about two dozen distinct substantive claims made about the Idea of the Good over and above the one I have mentioned, namely, that the Good is the unhypothetical first principle of all.[10] The most common view among those who have rather diffidently written about the Idea of the Good is that it is either the "sum" of all Forms or the "Form of Forms" expressing what all the Forms have in common. But neither of these interpretations can stand up to even a cursory examination of all the relevant texts. I certainly do not want to minimise the difficulties of making sense of all these texts or, indeed, making the same sense of all of them. I should add, though, that a great many Platonists and Plato-scholars had striven mightily to make sense of

[10] See Szlezák 2012 for a convenient digest of the claims made about the Idea of the Good in *Republic*.

these passages. It just seems, though, that their works did not make it to the reading lists of many North American scholars of Plato.

In any case, I hope it is clear that any claim to the systematic nature of Plato's philosophy must have its primary focus on the Idea of the Good and that, by contrast, an unwillingness to recognise the systematic nature of Plato's philosophy is, not surprisingly, quite easily explained by an unwillingness to take seriously the explicit words of Plato himself. I hope it goes without saying that this unwillingness is deserving of ridicule when it is found in a self-declared historian of ancient philosophy. But I think it is also true that if the study of ancient philosophy is relevant to philosophy, then it is also bad philosophy to distort its history.

2.

When I claim that the Idea of the Good is the lynch-pin of Plato's systematic philosophy, I am saying something beyond the obvious fact that it is said by Plato to be the first principle of all. In addition, I claim that any discussion not only of Plato's metaphysics, but of his epistemology and ethics as well, is going to be impeded and probably doomed to fail if it does not bring the Idea of the Good into the discussion. This is part of what I meant above by explanatory ultimacy. If, within any area of philosophy, explanatory ultimacy is achieved, it is not an unreasonable conjecture that in a philosophical system, these *explanantes* will converge. Such convergence or reduction to unity is as much a desideratum of science as it is of Platonism.

Let us consider first the so-called theory of Forms which, even in the literally deracinated contemporary versions of Plato's metaphysics, plays a prominent role. As we learn from *Phaedo*, Plato posited Forms as provisional explanations for physical phenomena.[11] These phenomena are, roughly speaking, the "non-exclusive having" by a physical individual of a property. "Non-exclusive having" is distinguished from "exclusive having" which is the unique possession of a property, that which, by definition, nothing other than its subject can have. The phenomenon of non-exclusive having covers all cases in which we can accurately say that "S if f" and imply that it is possible that "R is f" is also true where S and R are not equivalent and where "f" stands for the identical property numerically multiply instantiated. As we learn from Socrates' "autobiography", the Forms are posited to explain the possibility of such phenomena because the sort of explanation that Anaxagoras provided could not serve to

[11] See *Phd.* 95A4-102A9.

explain the teleological dimension of the phenomena. Socrates explicitly conflates the explanation for the fact that "S is f" with the explanation for why it is good that S is f (97C6-D3). That it is only the Idea of the Good that can provide a sufficient explanation is hammered home by Socrates just a couple of pages later when he says that "it is the Good or that which is binding that truly binds or holds things together (99C5-6)."

Let us reflect for a moment on why Plato apparently thought that the Form of Beauty is not an adequate explanation for Helen's beauty or that the Form of Equality is not an adequate explanation for the equality of two things that are equal. Socrates' "simple hypothesis" succeeds in explaining anything if and only if there is a λόγος or account of the Form. Without that, we cannot know if the word or concept "beauty" refers to that which actually explains. In general, a Form can only explain if its nature is real and it is non-exclusive participating in it that explains the property rather than a reductivist explanation of another sort. For example, a Form of Rationality could not explain why this animal is rational if it turned out that rationality was reductively analysable into electro-chemical brain states. So, being able to give a λόγος of a Form is a central part of the putative explanation it provides. But there is an obvious problem with this. For, to put it simply, a λόγος has multiple elements but a Form is simple or one or uniform (μονοειδές) in its nature. If a λόγος says what a Form is, how can a Form be multiple?

The summary answer to this difficult question has already been provided in the sentence just above that I quoted, "It is the Good or that which is binding that truly binds or holds things together." But if this is thought to be too opaque or allusive, let us recur to *Republic* 509B6-7 where the Good is said "to provide existence (εἶναι) and essence (οὐσία) to the Forms."[12] It is the unique superordinate and unhypothetical Good which makes a unity of that which is intrinsically multiple, as expressed in a λόγος of its οὐσία. Of course, this provision of unity or oneness is eternal, meaning among other things that the Good is inseparable from any account of the being of anything intelligible. That is why Plato is conflating—purposefully, I suppose—explanations by Forms and teleological

[12] It should be stressed that the fact that the Good transcends the "existence (εἶναι)" of Forms does not entail that the Good itself does not exist. The Idea of the Good is the "happiest of that which is (εὐδαιμονέστατον τοῦ ὄντος)" (526E4-5, referring to E2), the "brightest of that which is (τοῦ ὄντος τὸ φανότατον) (518C9)," and "towards the vision of the best among things that are (πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ἀρίστου ἐν τοῖς οὖσι θέαν)" (532C6-7). The Good does, however, transcend the "essence (οὐσία) of the Forms. So, Plato is positing a first principle of all whose existence is such that it has no finite nature.

explanations. So, the Idea of the Good is not just the unhypothetical first principle of all, but it is inseparable from the sorts of explanation that Plato's metaphysics seeks to provide and which, most importantly, he thinks cannot in principle be provided by a naturalist or physicalist philosophy.

This interpretation no doubt raises many questions of its own. Before I try to answer at least a few of them, let me emphasise that the intelligibility of such questions or the relevance of such questions to Plato's philosophy is entirely a function of our assumption that Plato's philosophy is systematic. Many scholars, eschewing explanatory ultimacy in Plato, refuse the relevance of such questions because the answers are not in the text. But if Plato is presenting us with the outline of a system and its application to the solution of numerous philosophical problems, then we may assume that he is doing so because he thinks that this system is true. That is, it is within this system that these problems can be solved. So, insisting that these questions are unanswerable and thus irrelevant is treating Plato's philosophy like Shakespeare's plays and insisting that the question of what size shoes Hamlet wore is a badly formed question. On the contrary, asking these functional or causal questions about the Platonic system is more like asking such questions about an ecosystem or an astronomical system. We know that there are answers to these questions if we are in fact dealing with a system.

The first question I wish to address is how exactly does the Idea of the Good provide the unity that a complex Form possesses? It is true, but not very illuminating, to respond to this question by citing the same passage in *Republic* just mentioned where the Good is said to "exceed everything else in its seniority (πρεσβείᾳ) and in its power (δυνάμει) (509B8-9)." Plato does not tell us wherein lies this power, only that there must be something that has it given the existence of its effects. Later Platonists understood this to mean that the Good, which is absolutely simple, must somehow be that which is expressed multiply in the array of Forms. The most penetrating interpretation of this power—originally proposed by Damascius, I believe—is that it is analogous to white light which is virtually the entire colour spectrum. Or to use a contemporary example, it is analogous to a function which is virtually its domain and range. Since the Good is, then, virtually all the Forms we need to explore how this can be so, that is, how that which is "above οὐσία" and incomposite can be virtually all that is intelligible. Much of the history of ancient and medieval metaphysics, which is of course the history of Platonic metaphysics, is concerned with characterising the first principle of all in such a way that its virtuality is perspicuous. For what it is worth, I think this line of investigation

culminates in the idea of the first principle of all as *ipsum esse* or *actus essendi*, meaning that its existence is an act or actuality over and above the actuality that is the essence of any Form. I shall not here pursue this point further, only noting in passing that the claim that Plato's philosophy is a system does not stand or fall on showing that the system is perfect or complete, at least as we have it.

I want to turn now to why it is inadequate to say merely that there is an array of Forms and a superordinate Idea of the Good providing existence and essence to the Forms and to leave it at that. For even if the Good is virtually the Forms and even if their complexity is rooted in the simplicity of the Good, the interconnectedness of the Forms is not explained. I mean that the Good is posited to explain how a complex entity can be one, but it does not explain the interconnectedness of the complexities that each Form is. That *something* must explain this is obvious from Plato's refinement in *Phaedo* of his simple hypothesis, namely, the cleverer hypothesis, according to which we should not simply say that something is hot because there is hotness in it, but that it is hot because there is fire in it and fire always brings with it hotness (105B5-C7). It does so, of course, because a Form of Fire and a Form of Hotness are supposed to be eternally and therefore necessarily interconnected. Similarly, something is not adequately explained by saying that there is oddness in it, but by saying that there is fiveness in it and fiveness always bring with it oddness. The extremely important point of these homey examples is that somehow or other the Form of Fire and the Form of Hotness must be necessarily connected such that whatever participates in the one participates in the other. But the Forms are supposed to be "monads" (μονάδες) and "incomposites" (ἀσύνθετα). How then is it possible for them to be eternally necessarily "connected"? Plato returns to this puzzling fact again in *Sophist* where he speaks about the "association of Forms" (κοινωνία τῶν εἰδῶν), their "plaiting" (συπλοκή), and "their being mixed with those [other γένη] necessarily forever" (…συμμειγνυμένω μὴν ἐκείνοις ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀεί) (254E4). How are these metaphors to be analysed?

It seems clear that Plato needs a principle to unify that which is conceptually diverse. So, Hotness and Fire are hypothesised as one in reality but multiple in their intellection. But their oneness in reality must still make room for saying that the oddness of five and the evenness of four are one in reality without falling into self-contradiction. Since Forms are unchangeable in their identity and atemporal and so necessarily interconnected if they are interconnected at all, the guarantor of their eternal interconnectedness must be an intellect that is equally unchangeable and atemporal. For if it were possible that the intellect were

temporal and so changeable, it would be possible that it should not think the necessary interconnectedness of the Forms, in which case that interconnectedness would not be necessary. On this interpretation, what is "one in being" is intelligible Being itself. But it is also multiple in the eternal intellection of it. Here we have yet another reason why only that which is absolutely simple and "sufficient" for explanation must be "above" οὐσία and Being, that is, the Being with οὐσία.

On this interpretation, intellect and Forms are cognitively identical but distinguishable *quoad nos*. To be aware of our own intellect, as when we are self-reflexively aware of a unity amidst some diversity, is implicitly to be aware of the Forms which are in fact cognitively identical with that intellect of which we are images. I would suggest that the doctrine of recollection may be understood as our making actual this implicit awareness. But there is an insuperable bar to our thereby having embodied knowledge. It is that we can only think the identities-in-diversity representationally, in words, even "mentalese" or in images. And to do this requires a temporalised existence. To see that 5+3=8 is not to do what an eternal intellect does eternally. But doing this in a temporalised manner does give us an intimation of eternity. And the difference between on the one hand seeing 5+3=8 as an eternal truth eternally cognised as a unity-in -diversity in an eternal intellect and on the other hand seeing it as an abstraction from the temporal is that in the former case we see that it is an eternal truth, whereas in the latter case its truth is purely stipulative or tautologous. Therefore, it is only in the former case that 5+3=8 could be an *explanans* since no tautology explains anything.

This eternal intellect, adduced but unused by Anaxagoras, is the Demiurge of *Timaeus* which not only serves as the locus of eternal and necessary truths, but is also the instrument of the Idea of the Good in the provision of intelligibility to the sensible world. Plato gives us quite an elaborate account of the quasi-anthropomorphic attributes of the Demiurge, which even if mythological, are still unambiguously located as an instrumental or subordinate principle. This is evident from two passages in *Timaeus* where Timaeus himself declines to give an account of the "first principle or principles of all" in the dialogue because their discussion requires employing a different method from the one presently being used (48C2-6, 53D4-7). So, the Demiurge cannot be the first principle of all, a point that seems quite lost on the so-called Middle Platonists.

This leaves us with the additional question of why the first principle of all acts at all. Again, in *Republic* we learn that the Good, like the Sun, is "overflowing" (506B3, 508B6-7). In addition, in *Timaeus* we learn that the

Demiurge is good and *for that reason* "ungrudging" (ἄφθονος) (29E1-3). What the two passages tell us is that the Good is essentially diffusive. Stated otherwise, from the variety in the cosmos, which includes the variety of Forms, and from the explanatory inadequacy of any composite to explain anything here below, we can infer that the explanation will be an incomposite whose explanatory adequacy consists in its nature being essentially productive of all composites. But because it is incomposite, that nature cannot be distinct from its existence.

So much might seem to justify the identification of the first principle as the One (not, of course, the number one), but why is it the Good, too? The line of reasoning Plato seems to be following is this: all action or activity aims for a good. The Good is that at which all things aim (*Rep.* 505D5-9). Since the first principle of all is essentially productive, it is unlimited in its productivity. So, everything that is, that is, every composite, is the Good's product either immediately, like the Forms, or mediately, through the Forms. But the first principle's activity in production cannot be of a good outside itself since that would indicate a defect in it, namely, not "containing" beforehand what it produces. Therefore, the good it seeks is itself or in itself. Whatever it produces has its good in it; otherwise, there would be goods outside of it, goods that would be additions to itself, resulting in it being defective with respect to goodness. So, the good that everything else seeks is just that first principle. The result of this line of reasoning is that the first principle of all is the One viewed as the incomposite adequate or ultimate explanation for the existence of everything and the Good as that which everything seeks. So, goodness must be essentially diffusive.[13] In addition, the identity of Good and One enables us to give substantial content to the former. We are able to determine proximity to the Good by degree or level of unity, not absolutely, but relative to the kind of unity something has or is as explained by its eternal Form.

Given the above, the ascent to the Good should be understood as the reversion of the effect to its cause. Expressed systematically, the fundamental dynamic structure of the universe is "remaining" (μονή), "procession" (πρόοδος), and "reversion" (ἐπιστροφή). The most extensive treatment of this structure is found in Proclus' *Elements of Theology*. [14] As we have seen, procession and reversion are grounded in the overflowing of the Good and the desire of all things for the Good, that from which they originate. The idea of remaining is based on the text in *Timaeus* in which it

[13] See Kremer 1987 for a useful sketch of the history of this idea among Platonists.
[14] See *Elements of Theology* Prop.75, 70.28-72.4 Dodds.

is said that the Demiurge "remained in himself in his accustomed manner" (ἔμενεν ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ κατὰ τρόπον ἤθει) (42E6) while ordering the cosmos. If the Demiurge remained, then so did its principle. The structure is dynamic owing to the essential activity of the first principle of all. The dynamism does not result ultimately in dissolution because reversion is guaranteed by the remaining and the procession. It is so guaranteed because the procession is from the self-loving first principle. If its self-loving were a property of it, that is, if it were distinct from its self-loving, then procession from it would not produce eros in everything else. Procession, if it is to be part of a system, must be from the nature of that which proceeds. And reversion must be an integral part of the whole dynamic.

This dynamic structure is primarily eternal. In the eternal realm, procession and reversion are no less eternal than the remaining of the Good. Because the temporalised cosmos is an image of this eternal dynamic structure, it represents it imperfectly. Thus, in all erotic activity the relation between eternal intellect and the Good is recapitulated in a diminished way. That is, the lover satisfies his desire for the Good by achieving the fulfilment of his own nature as intellect. Beauty is the Good as attractive. But the intellects of embodied human beings are the intellects of temporalised souls. So, the desires of embodied souls are themselves images of intellectual desire. The reversion of all embodied souls to the Good is, in one sense, a quest for the unknown. But no one seeks for that which is completely unknown, a point made in a limited and focused manner in Meno's paradox. The quest for the unknown is a reversion because it is a quest to return to the source of one's own being. The soul that reverts is engaged in an attempt to recover itself as it is found in its cause. The recovery is re-integration with the ultimate cause; the opposite of this is dis-integration or dissolution.

The reversion to the Good is the metaphysical foundation of the passage in the *Republic* (505D5-9) where Socrates asserts that, though people are content with the seeming just or beautiful, no one is content with the seeming good. Platonists connect this passage with the numerous passages in which Plato says that no one willingly does wrong. Plato does not ever say, however, and he certainly does not mean to imply by this that no one willingly does right either. On the contrary, our freedom is found entirely and exclusively in our pursuing the Good. The asymmetry underlying this theory of action is anathema to any Naturalist since the Naturalistic explanations for action cannot discriminate between those that are oriented to the good—whatever that means—and those that are oriented to the bad. Indeed, a Peripatetic such as Alexander of Aphrodisias,

counters the Stoic compatibilist position by insisting that only if we are free to choose contraries ("to do otherwise") are we free at all.[15] There are few things that more vividly express the systematic nature of Platonism than the asymmetry of human action which is only explicable if there is a distinction between the real good and the apparent good and if the real good is universal.[16] For if the real good is only objective for each individual and not universal, there is no way to maintain asymmetry. For in that case, every action will have as its goal the apparent (objective) good. It cannot be the case that we are free when we do what we think is good for ourselves and not free when we do what we think is good for ourselves even though objectively it is not. For the difference between the two case is something that is external to the psychology of the agent. Without the universal Good, we have no grounds to resist symmetry, whether that of the Naturalist or that of the Peripatetic. With the universal Good, and with its everlasting "overflowing," the perpetuity of the dynamic system is assured.

What I have tried to do in this section of the paper is to show the poverty of a truncated account of Plato's metaphysics. Such an account omits the superordinate Idea of the Good and an eternal intellect eternally engaged in thinking the unity-in-diversity that is the foundation of necessary truths. Time permitting, it would be possible to produce a parallel discussion concerning knowledge or ἐπιστήμη. Multiple contemporary efforts to make Plato into an empiricist or, somewhat less absurdly, into an empirically rooted epistemologist, all falter on their inattention to the systematic nature of Plato's philosophy. For knowledge is what the Demiurge has, and what a disembodied intellect such as our own has. Embodied intellection, insofar as it requires representations of that which is cognised, can in principle only contain as content images of or diminished versions of the paradigm cases. So, if by "knowledge" we mean ἐπιστήμη, there can be no knowledge of the sensible realm, but only δόξα or belief. That this is a systematic point follows from the fact that the only way to understand ἐπιστήμη is as the mode of cognition that defines philosophy in *Republic* and that pertains to intelligibles. This is the mode of cognition of the intellect that the Demiurge is. In addition, as we learn in the Divided Line passage, the *ne plus ultra* of cognition is only possible

[15] Originating in Aristotle, *EN* Γ 3 and 5; *EE* B 6 and 10. See Cicero, *De fato* 40; Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De fato* 169, 13-15; 181, 12-14; 196, 24-25; 199, 8-9; 211, 31-33; *Mant.* 172, 30-31.

[16] See Plotinus, *Enn*. III 1 [3], 9.4-16. Cf. VI 8 [39] 6, 27-29, where Plotinus argues that our will (βούλησις) is free even when we are constrained by "externals" because our wills are permanently oriented to the Good.

if the Forms are seen to be derived from the Good. Without the Idea of the Good, knowledge for Plato would not even be possible. And if knowledge is not possible, then we cannot have it. And if we cannot have it, then the reason for the theory of recollection is gone.

3.

In the remainder of this paper, I want to turn to ethics. Since almost all discussions of Platonic ethics in contemporary scholarship ignore the Idea of the Good as being irrelevant, it will be helpful to see why this is a mistake or, more precisely, why to exclude the Idea of the Good is to distort Plato's ethics into something that is either fundamentally indefensible or question-begging at best. Recall, first, that Plato has said that the subject matter of philosophy is the intelligible world broadly speaking. He has also maintained that the determination of what is good and bad, right and wrong is a philosophical matter. Plato thinks that the naturalist, whether as relativist or hedonist, does not have the resources to defend a coherent position about these. For on naturalistic terms, they have the resources only to express what is ἴδιον for a particular person, not what is κοινόν to all persons, whereas what is really good belongs to the latter not the former. That is, what is needed in ethics, according to Plato, is universality, not merely objectivity, which of course can be indexed to the individual.

Discussions of Plato's ethics typically either invoke as the basis for a claim that virtues are good a co-ordinate Form of the Good, that is, a Form like every other Form, or else they eschew any appeal to metaphysical altogether. The latter alternative has its roots in a strategy first to set apart a Socratic non-metaphysical ethical doctrine. Then, with this in place, the manifestly metaphysical framework for ethics in the so-called Platonic (as opposed to Socratic) dialogues can be ignored as irrelevant or unnecessary for the ethical doctrine. On the former alternative, a co-ordinate Form of the Good serves as the anchor for the general argument: everyone desires the real good; the virtues are the real good; therefore, everyone desires the virtues. Since it is obviously the case that many people do not desire to be virtuous, it is concluded that this must be a failure of knowledge. If one knew that the virtues were the real good, then one would desire them. It is not clear, though, whether, say, the knowledge of Justice or the ability to give a λόγος of Justice is supposed to suffice for knowing that Justice is good or that knowing that Justice is good is supposed to be an additional piece of knowledge, additional to the knowledge of the λόγος of Justice. For someone who wants to be just, knowing what Justice is would seem to

suffice; however, for someone who has no particular inclination to being just, knowing what Justice is in itself could not motivate just behaviour, even granting that one desires the real good for oneself. For saying that justice is a virtue and virtue is good because the Form of Justice is a species of the generic Form of the Good will have probative force for someone only if it follows that what is good *simpliciter* is good for me; otherwise, what is good for me—objectively good for me—can diverge from what is good and no reason can be given why one should seek the latter rather than the former. But a generic Form of Good cannot provide the requisite universality as is evident from the miscreant's perfectly legitimate question: I acknowledge that justice is a type of goodness but why should I be good? It does not help to reply that everyone seeks the real good, not the apparent good. For one might well maintain that what is really good for me—that which I certainly and ardently seek—is, alas, really bad for you. Too bad for you. Universality cannot be achieved by a generic Form of the Good as Aristotle's criticism in the *Nicomachean Ethics* makes clear just because of the equivocity of "good." Just as "good" differs across the categories, it can well differ across individuals.[17]

The nexus virtue-knowledge-happiness or the human good is the focus of most studies of Plato's ethics. The relation between virtue and knowledge and the relation between virtue and happiness are central. It is within this nexus that the so-called Socratic paradoxes are critically examined. So, the claims that it is better to suffer than to do evil, that a bad person is worse off if he is not punished than if he is, that no one does wrong willingly, that tyrants do what seems best to them but not what they want, and that a worse person cannot harm a better person are analysed in order to reveal the assumptions according to which these claims would be true, even if paradoxical. Thus, a typical analysis of the paradoxes would aim to show that virtue is necessary and sufficient for happiness and accordingly that vicious behaviour cannot make one happy. So, the evildoer cannot be better off than the one who suffers evil; that a bad person unpunished is deprived of the possibility of rehabilitation in virtue, that wrongdoing is exclusively the result of lack of knowledge of virtue, that a tyrant is ignorant that wrongdoing is conducive to happiness, and that a virtuous person is somehow impervious to the harm inflicted upon him by a vicious person.

Such an analysis clearly depends on a certain understanding of virtue. But as Plato says in Book 10 of *Republic*, there is a considerable difference between virtue with and without philosophy (619B7ff). The

[17] See *EN* A 6.

difference is evident in the fact that someone who is virtuous without philosophy is not happy. And if he is not happy, then it is far from clear why such a person would be better off suffering rather than doing evil or why he would not be better off going unpunished for an occasional bad deed or why the knowledge that he must have if he is virtuous is not sufficient to prevent him from wrongdoing.

Those who are committed to staying within the ambit of the paradoxes and who simultaneously eschew any recourse to the superordinate Idea of the Good should be troubled. For though they can agree that philosophy does transform ordinary virtue into something else and that it is only this something else that is the foundation for the truth of the paradoxes, the conception of philosophy must necessarily exclude what Plato says philosophy is in the *Republic*, the desire for knowledge of perfect Being (τὸ παντελῶς ὄν), knowledge which, as he then tells us, is only possible in the "light" of the superordinate Idea of the Good.

There are perhaps two possible paths that one can take in order to integrate philosophy into the account of virtue such that virtue remains necessary and sufficient for happiness and the paradoxes can be defended on that basis. One path takes philosophy as refutation in the manner of Socratic elenchus. According to this, one embraces one's own ignorance or at least is continuously open to refutation of any claim. But this stance cannot be what turns mere popular virtue into true virtue. The unnamed virtuous individual who in *Republic* 10 chooses the life of a tyrant does so because there is something he is ignorant of not because there is something he believes he knows that in fact he does not. There is no indication that he embraces the wicked life for any reason other than his ignorance of the ineluctably bad consequences of such a life.

Second, there is the banal recourse to philosophy as an examination of life, the soul-care Socrates pronounces himself devoted to in *Apology* (29E2). But soul-care in itself is highly problematic as a basis for defending the paradoxes and the absolutism of Platonic ethics. For someone might well acknowledge the desirability of soul-care at the same time as insisting on the necessity of body-care. Given a devotion to both, circumstances could well indicate from time to time attention to one rather than the other. For example, Socrates might be well advised to flee from prison on behalf of body-care, even if he thereby neglects soul-care temporarily.

In order to make soul-care robust enough to be the substance of the philosophy that turns ordinary virtue into the virtue that is sufficient and necessary for happiness, one would need to argue that soul-care alone is self-care, that is, that the soul is the self. On this basis, one could argue

that body-care is only care for one's possession and care for one's possession over care for oneself is never a rational strategy. This may well be the case, but it is disingenuous to claim that body-care is care for a possession like the "externals" that one may possess. For though it may be that caring for one's fingernails as opposed to one's soul is indefensible, the situations in which body-care and soul-care are in real-life tension are those in which the subject of bodily states and the subject of non-bodily states conflict. The most obvious examples in the dialogues are those in which one is faced with a choice between pursuing appetites the satisfaction of which one believes to be pleasurable and refraining from their pursuit because one believes their pursuit would be harmful. Since the subject of the appetites is, according to Plato, a psychical subject, the conflict is not between soul-care and body-care, but between care for one part of the soul as opposed to another. It is mere rhetoric to suppose that this is a choice which is always obvious. One can, for instance, easily imagine a Callicles sincerely endorsing the desirability of soul-care so long as it does not conflict with the duties and the pleasures of a grown-up Athenian citizen.

The implausibility of both of these interpretations of the philosophy required for happiness diminishes even further when we consider that Plato tells us exactly what philosophy is in *Republic*. Someone devoted to philosophy seeks knowledge of τὸ παντελῶς ὄν.[18] But Plato also tells us that this knowledge depends upon a cognitive assent to the Idea of the Good. So, it is puzzling, to say the least, how we are to arrive at a non-question-begging, non-prudential, defence of the Socratic paradoxes without recourse to metaphysics, specifically to the first principle of all.

From the above, it would be easy to conclude that if Plato's ethics does indeed rest on the metaphysical first principle of all, it either proves too much or, what amounts to the same thing, it proves nothing at all. Let there be a superordinate Idea of the Good such that everything that can be said to have "good" predicated of it does so because it partakes indirectly or directly of the Good. If just acts are good because just acts instantiate

[18] *Rep.* 476A9-D6. Cf. 484B3-6. That philosophy is associated with the truth is a claim that is ubiquitous in the dialogues. See *Ap.* 29E1-2; *Cr.* 47C8-48A1; *Phd.* 65E2, 66D7, 67B1-2, 84A8-9, 99E6; *Phdr.* 249B5-C8; *Rep.* 475E2-4, 484C9, 485C3-D5, 490B5-6, 611E1-612A4; *Parm.* 135D6, 136C5, E1-3; *Tim.* 90B6-C4; *Ep.* VII 344A8-B2. In *Republic*, we get the crucial additional information that it is the Idea of the Good that provides truth to the Forms and that dialectic, the name for philosophical methodology, must ascend to the cause of truth to understand Forms.

Justice and Justice partakes of the Good, this does not even begin to tell us whether a contentious ethical or political or social act is just or not. If, to take another example, Euthyphro agrees that piety is good ultimately because of the Idea of the Good and the Form of Piety, how does that concession help us to know whether prosecuting his father for the homicide of a slave is pious or not? This problem remains, of course, even when we have agreed that "good" and "good for me" are identical or at least extensionally equivalent.

I believe that the answer to this question rests entirely on giving credence to Aristotle's testimony that the Good is identical to the One. We must again stress that the Good or One is a principle and a principle stands outside what it is a principle of. Since the first principle of all is unqualifiedly unique and simple, the way this principle is manifested is according to composition. That is, something is good insofar as or to the extent that it is an integrated unity.[19] Every Form is an integrated unity by definition because it is an eternal and unchangeable one, composed of its existence and the οὐσία in which it partakes. But the integrated unities of the things that instantiate Forms are necessarily more complicated because Forms are manifested in things which "are and are not simultaneously" (*Rep.* 478D5-6). In addition, since Forms can be variously manifested, the integrated unity of a just act, a just person, a just city, or a just law may all be manifested differently. To say this is only to elucidate the obvious point in *Symposium* that a beautiful body and a beautiful institution both manifest Beauty but they do not do so in the same way. As a first attempt at understanding how integrated unity provides a criterion for ethical prescriptions, the proper question would be: does this action or policy arise from or contribute to the integrated unity of the natural kind to which it is attached. For example, the *polis* is, according to Plato, an integrated unity when all the essential parts are doing their job. So social or political policies can be judged if they arise from the actions of the legislators, doing their job of conserving the unity of the *polis* or if they arise as attempts by the legislators to repair or preserve that unity. A similar account would apply to the actions of the virtuous individual. In the case of both, the integrated unity entails the rule of reason for the benefit of the whole *polis* or the whole individual human being. As Plato insists later in *Republic*, the opposite of the rule of reason entails the dis-integration of the self.

---

[19] See *Rep.* 422E-423B, 462A-B, where it is clear that the difference between a successful or good state and a bad one in the presence or absence of integrative unity. Also, cf. *Symp.* 192C-D on love as integrative unity. See Aristotle, *EE* A 8, 1218a19, discussing the Good, on justice and health as τάξεις.

The rule of reason in the virtuous individual is established in *Republic* Book 4 with the definition of the virtues. But the rule of reason there described, although it produces virtue does not produce virtue with philosophy, which is not even thematised until Book 5. Book 4 establishes the integrated unity of the human being; not until Book 9 do we arrive at the integrated unity of the philosopher. This is a higher unity since it achieves separation from the body, separation in the sense of psychological distancing. Living thus according to the rule of reason is to become detached—or as much as is physically possible to be detached—from the idiosyncratic, from that which is ἴδιος. Adhering to the deliverances of universal reasoning, the identity of "good" and "good for me" becomes as obvious as the identity of "true" and "true for me."

It is not, I think, a serious criticism of this interpretation to say that it leaves many or perhaps even most actions and states below the threshold of relevance to integrated unity. There will be many actions that, as the Stoics insisted, will be indifferent. But the absolutism that Socrates insisted on in *Crito* (49B8; cf. 49A6-7; *Ap.* 29B6-7; *Gorg.* 469B12, 508E, etc.), namely, that one must never under any circumstances commit an unjust deed, thinking that it is unjust, remains and is clarified. For to do that, is to be oriented to self-disassociation. And there can be no scenario under which one could benefit from this. We can, though, readily concede that this claim would make no sense unless the soul were the self and the soul were immortal.

More than any other dialogue, *Philebus* explicitly connects the Idea of the Good with the normative idea of integrated unity. Everything that is said to exist is a composite of "one and many", having within themselves a principle of limit (πέρας) and unlimitedness (ἀπειρία) (16C9-10, 23C9-10). The "one" presumably refers to the Forms already indicated as "monads." The "many" refers to the divisible or "scattered" essence that is the result of sensible embodiment of immaterial Forms. The principle of limit is the One and the principle of unlimitedness is the Indefinite Dyad. Everything is a composite of limit and unlimited and in addition to these there is a cause of the mixture, intellect (νοῦς). Under the rubric "unlimited" comes all that which admits of degrees, of more or less, and under the rubric "limit" comes all that admits of quantification, whether continuous or discreet (24E7-25B2). As we learn from *Timaeus*, the divine Intellect imposes shapes and numbers on the pre-cosmic "soup" in order to make a cosmos that is as good as possible, that is, a cosmos that resembles the Living Being. Normativity enters the picture with the idea of "measure" (τὸ μέτρον) which indicates the correct or exact imposition of mathematical order as opposed to any deviation from this.

An integrated unity is just the product of the imposition of limit on the unlimited. An optimal integrated unity possesses the correct or exact ordering of the instantiations of the principle of unlimitedness by the instantiations of the principle of limit. The integrated unity of the parts is the best possible instantiation of the paradigm. In *Republic*, the integrated unity of the soul is that of the parts of the soul ordered according to the rule of reason. In *Philebus*, a different question is raised, namely, that of the optimal integrated unity of a human being which, being a complex of soul and body is different from the soul and, ideally, of the subject of the immortal part of the soul. The embodied soul is the subject both of psychical states and acts and the subject of bodily states, including pleasure and pain. And this dialogue raises the very specific question of what constitutes optimal integrated unity for the human being so conceived, the locus of multiple subjectivities.

The Good is manifested in integrated unity. To put it in Aristotelian terms, integrated unity is the essence of the manifestation of goodness. That is why the principle of limit—not limit itself—is the One and also why it is repeatedly emphasised that the manifestation of the Good for a human being will be in integrated unity. The problem with which *Philebus* wrestles is that, though we are really intellects for whom bodily pleasure is nothing, we are in fact now embodied and embodied souls do desire pleasure. But the strictures that the dialogues discover for pleasure, the distinction between true and false ones, are intended to minimise the self-disassociation of the intellect while embodied, thereby impeding its destiny.

Built upon this metaphysical foundation, ethical prescriptions can be judged according to whether or not they inhibit or promote integrated unity. The quantitative nature of the optimal integrative unity renders futile the claim that unlike "true" and "true for me" which are identical, still "good" and "good for me" can diverge. It is, for Plato, a mathematical impossibility that my good can be achieved at your expense even if you or I or anyone else may take it to be so.

All this metaphysical and mathematical heavy equipment, which I have tried to sketch in a highly compressed manner, perhaps unduly, is necessary to allow Plato's ethics to be reduced to something other than a banal exhortation to soul-care or to prudentialism under the guise of something else, that is, a refutation of subjectivism which only leaves us with objectivism rather than with universality.[20]

[20] See Penner 2003, who makes an heroic effort to support prudentialism by offering an interpretation of the Idea of the Good that makes it a universal of sorts, equivocally instantiated by the particular good of each individual.

Apart from the overwhelming evidence for the systematic nature of Plato's philosophy, perhaps the best argument for it is that if it were not a system, the fidelity of philosophers to Plato's philosophy for well over 2,000 years would beggar belief. This fidelity did not preclude disagreements among Platonists regarding matters large and small. But adherence to the system endured despite the disagreements.

Let me conclude by trying to make the point about the Platonic system in a different way. Contemporary naturalism, the polar opposite to Platonism, has a systematic basis, namely, theoretical physics. The Platonic system endured and even dominated so long because there was no other plausible system. With the rise of the new physics in the 17th century, and for reasons that have a great deal to do with the arguments that Plato makes about being and knowledge, an alternative system gradually came into view, a system not fundamentally at odds with the naturalism of Anaxagoras, though immensely more sophisticated. But this new system came at a price, as David Hume so clearly saw. The price was that the study of intellect, being, goodness, and beauty had either to be abandoned or folded into physical science. As Plato insisted, however, the subject matter of philosophy removes it from the physical sciences because it is removed from the sensible realm. To locate philosophy in the intelligible realm inevitably leads one to the systematic reduction to an unhypothetical first principle of all. My claim, then that Platonism is a system is my claim that Plato thought that philosophy must be systematic or else it must cede its claim to having a distinct subject matter. The late Richard Rorty was exactly right in maintaining that Platonism is the polar opposite of naturalism. He was also right in maintaining, although many will disagree, that Platonism is identical with philosophy, understood as having a distinct subject matter.[21] Since Rorty rejected out of hand the existence of that subject matter, he rejected philosophy. I have been arguing only that Plato's philosophy is systematic. And if Rorty is right that Platonism is the only alternative to naturalism, then it would be well to bring the systematic nature of Plato's philosophy into the discussion. Why would anyone suppose that Platonism stripped of its systematic framework could be anything but a feeble opponent of naturalism?

[21] See Rorty 1979, esp. Part III, 2.