

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Pater's Plato and Platonism *Plato and Platonism: a Series of Lectures* by Walter Pater. London and New York. Macmillan and Co. 1893. 8s. 6d.

Lewis Campbell

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 06 / June 1893, pp 263 - 266
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00197938, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00197938

How to cite this article:

Lewis Campbell (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 263-266 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00197938

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

tends to make Xenophon appear duller and more limited in imagination than he actually is.]

III. (—p. 136).—Socrates and Xenophon. An attempt to prove that the intimacy between Σ. and Ξ. is mythical. Diog. L. and his authorities Dinarchus &c., invented it. There is nothing in Xenophon himself to convince us of its reality.

[There is something, I think, in the warmth of attachment shown by Ξ. to the memory of Σ. In any case R.'s disproofs of the tradition derived from Xenophon himself are negative. His discussion of *Mem.* I. v., the conversation between Σ. and Pericles (the younger), is very good: it is probably fictitious, though for myself I should fix some interval between B.C. 421—416 as its 'ideal' date. τοὺς γε νῦν πωρεύοντας would be a somewhat unhappy phrase surely for the Lacedaemonians after Leuctra. Again it is Herr Richter rather than Xenophon who is wrong about the generals at Arginusae (*Mem.* A, i. 18 v. *Hell.* i. 7, 30), p. 135 and p. 62, 'nur von neun.' Xenophon, by a slip of the tongue perhaps, says ἐννέα when he should strictly have said ὀκτώ, since Conon of course was not indicted and Archestratus was dead.]

IV. (—p. 149).—As to Xenophon's sources for his philosophical works. He is mainly indebted to Plato for the 'Socratica,' Herr Richter thinks, and next to him to Antisthenes (here R. follows Dümmler),

and also to Isocrates (see a comparison of *Hiero* i. vii. with the *de Pace* § 111 foll.).

[These parallelisms are interesting and set one thinking, but I do not think that Richter proves his point of plagiarism. He forgets what a large stock of common ideas were current concerning Socrates and other matters for writers of all sorts to draw upon, nor does he allow sufficiently for the subtle influence of mind upon mind.]

V. (—p. 152).—On the composition of Xenophon's writings. With the exception of *Anab.* and *Cyneg.* (which are outside the discussion) the collective works fall within B.C. 370—350 *circa*.

[This seems to me to crowd the works into too small a space or rather to curtail Xenophon's literary activity unduly. I should fix his literary *floruit* at least ten or fifteen years earlier.

VI. (—p. 154).—[I am not satisfied by the suggestion that Xenophon was driven to literature by *aspera pauperies* after being ousted from Skillus, and that he 'stumped' the country reading his works and filling his pockets as a 'wandernder Sophist.' That there are signs of oral delivery in many of the compositions is certain: and that the original form of publication was oral is not improbable. Herr Richter's promised development of this section of his studies should be interesting. Thanks are due to him for this instalment.]

H. G. DAKYNS.

PATER'S PLATO AND PLATONISM.

Plato and Platonism: a Series of Lectures by WALTER PATER. London and New York. Macmillan and Co. 1893. 8s. 6d.

'*Nil tetigit quod non ornavit*' is the commonplace which rises to the lips on taking up this last and largest of Mr. Pater's 'Appreciations.' 'Last year he gave us Raphael in a comely guise and now he presents Plato to us, no doubt as suitably apparelled.' But as we read onward we are charmed and interested in a more serious manner than heretofore. The book is in fact a brilliant critical essay of the kind which, in Mr. Pater's view, is, ever since Montaigne employed it, the best vehicle for modern philosophic thought. Readers of *Marius the Epicurean*, who remember the subtle exposition there of Cyrenaicism will be

prepared for similar *tours de force*. Yet it is not without a feeling of pleased and exhilarating surprise that they will alight on such pages of the present volume as that in which the character and mind of Zeno the Eleatic are delineated (p. 23), or those which explain perhaps more luminously than has been done hitherto the value which Plato set on Dialectic (pp. 161—164). The following statement, one of cardinal import, deserves to be quoted at length, both for the felicity of its expression, and for its undeniable truth:—

'Platonism is not a formal theory or body of theories, but a tendency, a group of tendencies—a tendency to think or feel, and to speak, about certain things in a particular way, discernible in Plato's dialogues as reflecting the peculiarities, the marked peculiarities, of himself and his own mental complexion. Those tendencies combine and find their

complete expression in what Plato's commentators, rather than Plato, have called the 'theory of ideas,' itself indeed not so much a doctrine or theory, as a way of regarding or speaking of general terms, such as *Useful* or *Just*; of abstract notions, like *Equality*; of ideals, such as *Beauty*, or *The Perfect City*; of all those terms or notions, in short, which represent under general forms the presentations of our individual experience; or, to use Plato's own frequent expression, borrowed from his Eleatic teachers, which reduce "the Many to the One."—P. 136.

The author's characterization of the 'historic method' may also be repeated here:—

'Dogmatic and eclectic criticism alike have in our own century, under the influence of Hegel and his predominant theory of the ever-changing "Time-Spirit" or *Zeit-geist*, given way to a third method of criticism, the historic method, which bids us replace the doctrine, or the system, we are busy with, or such an ancient monument of philosophic thought as *The Republic*, as far as possible in the group of conditions, intellectual, social, material, amid which it was actually produced.'

It is in some ways fortunate for Mr. Pater's readers that he has not thought it necessary to confine himself within the cogent limits which the method so prescribed might seem to impose. He has made a strong and earnest effort on his own account thus to understand and realize Plato. But in setting forth his conception he has freely availed himself of the wealth of illustration readily afforded by his own full and fertile mind. His readers are insensibly drawn within a magic circle of quintessential flame that has been fed with all the choicest products of art and literature. Not one century alone is present here. Much rather, all the centuries, the bloom of every civilization, flowers culled from every soil, are intertwined to form the delicately brodered framework. Talk of ποικιλία! Why here are Isaiah and the children of Sion, Louis the IXth, Fra Damiano of Bergamo, the Gregorian Chant, St. Ouen and Notre Dame de Bourges (confessedly a 'far cry' from Athens), Montaigne and Thackeray, Dante and Berkeley, Wordsworth and Henry Vaughan—not to mention Marcus Aurelius, Spinoza, Descartes and Bacon (whose business in such affairs is more obvious)—contributing their several tones to the production of this symphony in prose! These cross-lights, as from 'storied windows richly dight' on forms of alabaster, shed a manifold radiance on the firm outlines of the solid central work, which is also permeated by a remote Hegelian influence and by the writer's personal idiosyncrasy, in which refined æsthetic sensitiveness is blended with a

quiet intensity of religious feeling. Something of this mode of sentiment appears in the comparison of Ionian pessimism to the moodiness of adolescence, 'when it is forced suddenly to bethink itself and for a moment feels already old, feels the temperature of the world about it sensibly colder':—also in the frequent adaptation of Scriptural expressions. A pleasing result of the writer's power of religious sympathy is his just and penetrating view of the religious vein in Socrates.

The Essayist has many privileges, which Mr. Pater's genius turns to good account. He may isolate and draw out tendencies, he may accentuate contrasts, he may seize on salient features, he may press analogies; he need not shrink from iteration, nor from glaring discrepancies (which it is the reader's business to harmonize); he may steep his work in the atmosphere of a pervading sentiment, without incurring blame for 'subjectivity.' He may use words in new or foreign senses ('assistant' p. 85, 'amiable' p. 158, 'παρλειπόμυνα' p. 257), and may indulge, after Hegel's fashion (p. 88), in fanciful etymologies:—even an occasional pun (like that on *carrière ouverte* p. 96) may be permitted him. He need not profess to have overtaken a voluminous and wearisome 'literature.' He is not tied, as the mere interpreter is, to the avoidance of minute errors, which take little from the essential value of his work. He can concentrate attention on the form, without being haunted by distracting anxieties on account of material exactitude.

The matter of the book before us has, much of it, been common property for about forty years, commencing from the time when the historic method was first seriously applied to criticism. But it is not the less a solid gain to possess this bright and genial exposition of truths which we have long potently believed. For, however he may try to veil his gift, Mr. Pater is essentially a poet. And if Goethe and Hermann offered to discourse on Homer, who would not be tempted to exclaim 'Dear Gottfried, we will gladly listen to you εἰσαῦθις,—on some other day'! The siren voice of Mr. Pater will be heard, where that of the unkempt Heraclitean 'Sibyl' could not penetrate. That is why such sentences as these are of peculiar value:—

'Think, for a moment, of the difference, as regards mental attitude, between the naturalist who deals with things through ideas, and the layman (so to call him) in picking up a shell on the sea-shore; what it is that the subsumption of the individual

into the species, its subsequent alliance to and co-ordination with other species really does for the furnishing of the mind of the former. The layman, though we need not suppose him inattentive, or unapt to retain impressions, is in fact still but a child; and the shell, its colours and convolution, no more than a dainty, very easily destructible toy to him. Let him become a schoolboy about it, so to speak. The toy he puts aside; his mind is drilled perforce, to learn *about* it; and thereby is exercised, he may think, with everything except just the thing itself, as he cares for it; with other shells, with some general laws of life, and for a while it might seem that, turning away his eyes from the "vanity" of the particular, he has been made to sacrifice the concrete, the real and living product of nature, to a mere dry and abstract product of the mind. But when he comes out of school, and on the sea-shore again finds a fellow to his toy, perhaps a finer specimen of it, he may see what the service of that converse with the general has really been towards the concrete, towards what he sees,—in regard to the particular thing he actually sees. . . . 'What broad-cast light he enjoys!—that scholar, confronted with the sea-shell, for instance, or with some enigma of heredity in himself or another, with some condition of a particular soul, in circumstances which may never precisely so occur again. . . . He not only sees, but understands (thereby only seeing the more) and will therefore, also remember'. . . . 'So much by way of apology' (!) 'for general ideas.'—Pp. 142—144.

The last words are characteristically significant. Mr. Pater is really charmed with Plato; but there are other and rival charms which he will not forego. Some of the discrepancies to which I before alluded may be thus accounted for. He admires Marcus Aurelius (p. 242), yet he is struck with a 'mortal coldness' (p. 40) in thinking of him. 'Monotheism' has his good word upon occasion; yet he finds it 'repellent.' At one moment Form is everything and Matter nothing (p. 4), though by and by precipitancy of Form without Matter is shown to be a mark of Sophistry (p. 101). In writing on metaphysical subjects he appears like some strong-winged butterfly which now mounts into the pure azure, now flits about the tree-tops, but anon is sure to be found hovering amongst the fragrant garden-flowers. The words of Descartes come back to us as we read:—'Nec aliter quam captivus, qui forte imaginaria libertate fruebatur in somniis, quum postea suspicari incipit se dormire, timet excitari, blandisque illusionibus lentè conivè; sic spontè labor in veteres opiniones.' What most fascinates him in Plato is precisely the coexistence in him of the supreme visual faculty with the severity of abstract reasoning:—

'It is in the blending of diverse elements in the mental constitution of Plato that the peculiar Platonic quality resides. Platonism is in one sense an emphatic witness to the unseen, the transcendental, the

non-experienced, the beauty, for instance, which is not for the bodily eye. Yet the author of this philosophy of the unseen was,—Who can doubt it who has read but a page of him? this, in fact, is what has led and kept to his pages many who have no turn for the sort of questions Plato actually discusses:—The author of this philosophy of the unseen was one, for whom, as was said of a very different French writer, "the *visible* world really existed." Austere as he seems, and on well-considered principle really is, his temperance or austerity, aesthetically so winning, is attained only by the chastisement, the control of a variously interested, a richly sensuous nature.'—P. 114.

Plato's writings form an exceedingly complex whole, and it is not surprising that each new writer on the subject, approaching it at a different angle, should accentuate a different aspect, diverging perhaps in each case somewhat from the 'entire point.' To Mr. Grote's apprehension, the *Protagoras*, was of all the dialogues intellectually the most mature. Mr. Pater appears to dwell with most complacency on the *Phaedrus*, *Symposium* and *Charmides*. And I venture to think that, of the eternal triad, Beauty, Goodness, Truth, the first obtains more importance with him than in the long run with Plato,—that of the terms composing his motto (*φιλοσοφία, μουσική*) he lays undue emphasis on the second. In saying that Beauty alone has a visible antitype, Plato did not mean to subordinate Wisdom to Beauty. It is true that under Plato's influence Mr. Pater declares himself as the upholder of a 'dry beauty,'—of severe simplicity in art and life. But is the connotation of '*καλόν*' when applied to conduct any longer coextensive with that of 'beautiful'? Or is not the Puritanism of the *Republic* (especially in Book x.) even more thoroughgoing than our author imagines, and is it quite fair to infer from isolated positions in Book i. that Art is to be for Art's sake alone, and not rather for the sake of Life?—Meanwhile the book before us is in every sense of the words an unmistakable *τόκος ἐν καλῷ*.

Plato's attitude towards mysticism is another point where Mr. Pater's view appears hardly adequate. Not regress, but progress seems to me the distinguishing note of Platonism. There is an important difference (well displayed in Professor Caird's fine chapter on 'God as the end of knowledge') between Spinoza's '*Omnis determinatio est negatio*' and Plato's '*Omnis negatio est determinatio*.' The *Phaedo* indeed counsels withdrawal from the world, the meditation of death. But this is not the lesson of the *Symposium*, nor the spirit of the prayers at marriage

festivals in the *Republic*, nor the motto of the great victory of primæval Athens over Atlantis.

The incidental chapter on Lacedæmon has been universally admired. It is a prose poem, in which all that is most valuable of K. O. Müller's great work has been condensed, so as to bring out the significance of Plato's reaction towards Laconism. But (1) was the actual dividing line between Ionian and Dorian so wide and deep as Pericles and Mr. Pater would have us think, or had the Dorian consciously that sense of the beauty of austerity which Mr. Pater attributes to him? (2) Granting that Pythagoreanism found a congenial habitat in Dorian cities, is there any ground for supposing that Laconian culture 'held' in any way directly of Pythagoras? (3) Why are the Perioeci passed over almost silently? May not they as well as the Helots have contributed to relieve the monotony of Spartan discipline:—for instance by fine work in iron:—of which the 'street of the smiths' in Tripolitza reminds the traveller of to-day?

I have already hinted,—I trust in no pedantic sense,—that there are occasional oversights ('*παραλείποντα*') which in another edition one would be glad to see removed. On p. 82 'Cebes' (*bis*) should have been 'Phædo.' On p. 84 Socrates is credited with the argument of Simmias, and the words *ἀνε ἀποδείξεως κ.τ.λ.*, in which Simmias acknowledges the weakness of his own position, are taken for the expression of Socrates' own 'immovable personal conviction.' 'The fling round the bat' (whatever that picturesque phrase may mean) is no equivalent for *τῆς βολῆς πέρι* (or *περί*) *τῆς νυκτερίδος*, nor does *παρ' ἄλλα σκοποῦντες* signify 'using our eyes in common' (p. 162). Plato's school was not 'in the quiet precincts of the *Acadēmus*' (p. 134), nor is *ἀκολουθεῖν τὸν λόγον* a Greek construction. Let me hasten to set against these trivial flaws some expressions of more than common beauty:—'the principle of outline' p. 98; 'youth...willing to undergo much for the mere promise of some good thing it can scarcely even imagine' p. 89; 'Time...is itself a kind of artist, trimming pleasantly for us what survives of the rude world of the past' p. 250; 'the diamond, we are told,

if it be a fine one, may gain in value by what is cut away' p. 257.

The translations of illustrative passages are extremely close and have a strong flavour of the original. For the purpose of guiding students to a perception of the Greek, they are admirably conceived. It is a matter of which I write with diffidence, but I venture to doubt whether to the 'English reader' they are likely to convey the feeling of spontaneity,—of conversational ease and freedom, as of a wind blowing where it listeth, which is an inseparable attribute of Plato's style:—whether their very ingenuity does not give them a certain air of quaintness and remoteness. See for example p. 95 'that private education...likes them'; p. 38 'Have you anything...being unmixedly.' The most successful of these versions, perhaps, is that of *Protag.* 343, prefixed to Lecture VIII.

The subject of 'Plato and Platonism' is not yet exhausted. Mr. Pater has brought his delicate spectroscope to bear upon that 'bright particular star,' has registered its prismatic colouring, and ascertained the elementary constitution of this distant world. But if we could come nearer, should we not know more? And there is one means of coming nearer which has hardly yet been realized, still less applied. Plato's industry extended over half a century. Could the problem raised by Schleiermacher be even partly solved, and the order in which the dialogues were written approximately ascertained, our conception of the evolution of this master mind might be in some ways modified; his points of contact with earlier and contemporary thought and the manner of his reaction from them might appear more evidently. The assumption, which scholars in an increasing number are beginning to accept as proved,—that the dialectical dialogues as well as the *Timæus* are intermediate between the *Republic* and the *Laws*,—seems destined to play no inconsiderable part in future Platonic studies. For example, whatever may be ultimately thought of Mr. Henry Jackson's theories, it will some day be reckoned to his credit that he made this assumption the starting-point of his laborious investigation.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.