

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

Plato and Aristotle on the Soul:

The Concept of Soul in *Symposium* and *De Anima*

Bachelor Thesis

Study Program: Liberal Arts

Field of Study: 3.1.6 Political Science

Thesis Advisor: Mgr. Mgr. Peter Šajda PhD.

Degree to be awarded: Bachelor (Bc.)

Handed in: 30. 4. 2015

Date of Defence: 12. 6. 2015

FILIP ŽOFČIN

Bratislava 2015

Declaration of Originality

I hereby declare that this Thesis is my own work and has not been published in part or whole elsewhere. All used literature and other sources are attributed and properly cited in references.

Bratislava, 30. 4. 2015

Filip Žofčín

Abstrakt

Názov práce: Idea Duše u Platóna a Aristotela:

Koncepcia duše v *Sympóziu* a v *O Duši*

Autor bakalárskej práce: Filip Žofčín

Vysoká škola: Bratislavská Medzinárodná Škola Liberálnych Štúdií

Školiteľ: Mgr. Mgr. Peter Šajda, PhD.

Vedúci komisie pre obhajoby: Samuel Abrahám, PhD.

Komisia pre obhajoby: Samuel Abrahám, PhD., Prof. František Novosád, Mgr.

Dagmar Kusá, PhD.

Miesto, rok, rozsah práce: Bratislava, 2015, 35 strán

Stupeň odbornej kvalifikácie: Bakalár (Bc.)

Kľúčové slová: Platón, Sympóziom, Aristoteles, duša, oduševnenosť, láska, človek, večnosť, zvieratá, sila, spojenie

Fakt, že máme dušu je pre mnohých znakom toho, že sme skutočne ľudia. V histórii našej civilizácie sa nájde mnoho pokusov o objasnenie tohto fenoménu. Cieľom tejto práce je podieľať sa na týchto pokusoch preskúmaním práce dvoch slávnych filozofov: Platóna a Aristotela. Predtým, než začneme rozoberať ich názory na problematiku duše, sa pozrieme na to, ako sa s problémom duše vysporiadali filozofi v minulosti. Úlohou tejto kapitoly bude uviesť čitateľa do základnej problematiky. V ďalšej časti sa autor práce pokúsi interpretovať Platónovo *Sympóziom* a nájsť v ňom stopy Platónovej teórie o duši. Ďalšia časť, zaoberajúca sa dielom Aristotela *O duši*, bude hlavne o objasnení Aristotelovho výkladu duše. Bude slúžiť aj na neskoršie prepojenie oboch autorov. Hlavným cieľom tejto práce je zistiť, či existuje prepojenie medzi Platónovým a Aristotelovým pohľadom na dušu. Výsledok tohoto pátrania je v poslednej kapitole, kde sa ukázu spoločné a aj odlišné vlastnosti oboch opisov. Platón i Aristoteles vidia v ľudskej duši tri časti, ktoré majú rôzne funkcie. A obaja sa tiež zhodujú na tom, že ľudská duša túži po získaní nesmrteľnosti. No ich prieskum duše neprebíha rovnako. Zatiaľ čo Platón sa zameriava len na ľudskú dušu, Aristoteles skúma duše všetkých živých tvorov.

Abstract

Thesis Title: Plato and Aristotle on the Soul: The Concept of Soul in *Symposium* and *De Anima*

Author: Filip Žofčín

University: Bratislava International School of Liberal Arts

Thesis Advisor: Mgr. Mgr. Peter Šajda, PhD.

Head of Defence Committee: Samuel Abrahám, PhD.

Defence Committee: Samuel Abrahám, PhD. Prof. František Novosád, Mgr. Dagmar Kusá, PhD.

Place, year, length of the thesis: Bratislava, 2015, 35 pages

Academic Degree: Bachelor of Science (Bc.)

Key Terms: Plato, Symposium, Aristotle, De Anima, soul, spirit, love, human, eternity, animals, drive, connection

People usually agree that there is a connection between being human and having a soul. This phenomenon has been dealt with throughout the whole history of the civilization. This thesis' aim is to add some more light into the debate, by discussing the works of two great philosophers: Plato and Aristotle. Prior to the examination of their ideas, there will be a chapter dealing with the issues of soul in the history of philosophy. This chapter will introduce the reader to the main problems of this topic. Next there will be the interpretation of the *Symposium* where the author will look for the account of the soul. The part about Aristotle's *De Anima* will serve for the comparison and possible connection between the two authors. The main goal of the thesis is to find out, whether there is indeed a meeting point between the two philosophers or not. In the final chapter, the connection will be made, the similarity and also the difference of the two accounts will be revealed. Both Plato and Aristotle describe the human soul as something that incorporates three parts with various functions. And both also agree on the struggle of the soul for immortality. But their approach to the question is not the same. While Plato describes the soul of a human being, Aristotle describes souls of all living things.

Table of Contents

Abstrakt.....	iii
Abstract	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Introduction.....	6
Chapter I: The Question of the Soul in Philosophy.....	8
1.1. What is the Soul?	8
1.2. Accounts of the Soul before Plato and Aristotle	9
1.3. Understanding of the Soul in Philosophy from St. Augustine until today	11
Chapter II: Plato's account of Soul in <i>Symposium</i>	14
2.1. Plato on the Soul	14
2.2. Search for the Soul in <i>Symposium</i>	15
2. 2. 1. Socrates' Speech	20
2.3. Conclusion	24
Chapter III: Aristotle's Account of Soul in <i>De Anima</i>	25
3.1. Aristotle's Philosophy	25
3.2. The Account of Soul in <i>De Anima</i>	26
3. 2. 1. Book I.....	26
3. 2. 2. Book II.....	28
3. 2. 3. Book III	32
3. 3. Conclusion	35
Chapter IV: The Final Conclusion of the Soul in <i>Symposium</i> and <i>De Anima</i>	37
4. 1. General Conclusion	37
4. 2. Degrees of the Soul	38
Resumé	42
Bibliography	46

Introduction

Today it may seem that the topic of the soul is somehow old-fashioned. We have modern psychology, which treats the problems of the human psyche as if they were just some diseases of human body. But we still perceive the soul as something else than the body. We are certainly not the first people who noticed this, so if one wants to examine the question of the soul, the best place to start would be ancient Greece. But as with everything, it is always better to look into more than one source. That is why I have chosen “the giants” of philosophy, Plato and Aristotle. To find what Aristotle thinks about this topic is easy, he wrote a book called *De Anima*, which means On the Soul. But Plato’s account is a bit more scattered throughout his writings. Before I tackle these two, I will make a brief introduction into the problem of the soul in philosophy in the first chapter.

There is a lot that can be written about various periods and philosophers, but my first chapter about this will serve as an opening for the topic of soul. Even though there is a connection between the soul and the field of psychology, I will not attempt to describe all the psychological aspects of this topic. This thesis is concerned with the philosophical problem of soul in the writings of two Greek philosophers.

In my second chapter (maybe the most ambitious one) I will explore whether there is a notion of soul inside *Symposium*. My choice of literature may seem odd, but I believe that the traces of Plato’s account of soul are in there as well. They are mostly hidden in the speeches about love, but these two concepts share a common ground. They are both non-physical, and they appear to exist inside the bodies of people. Through the interpretation of the text I will try to prove the existence of the Plato’s account of the soul inside it.

After this chapter, there will be the one containing Aristotle’s ideas. The main concern of that part will be the interpretation of *De Anima*. Since this book is exclusively about the soul, this part will be mostly an analysis of its various aspects. The purpose of this chapter is to highlight the points where Plato and Aristotle “meet” and their notions overlap.

The said connection will be made in the last chapter, which will also include the conclusion of my thesis. After the text is thoroughly examined, I will show certain similarities and differences between Aristotle's and Plato's interpretations.

Chapter I: The Question of the Soul in Philosophy

1.1. What is the Soul?

It is one of those unanswerable questions of the history of humanity. Is there even such a thing as the soul? The fact that such question will probably never be resolved makes it even more interesting for the scientists and for the prophets. If there would be an easy answer, it would not be as important. One can doubt the whole existence of the soul as such, or try to prove it by using science. But none of them would be able to offer a persuasive answer. From the earliest days there has been many attempts to find the soul's place inside or outside the human body. Throughout the whole history of philosophy the idea of what soul is was being changed. It had different meaning for ancients, for the Christian philosophers and it has another meaning today, with the existence of modern psychology. According to Galikova the ancient civilizations (Chinese, Egyptians and Mesopotamic) believed that soul exists "*inside the human's heart*" (Galikova, 2007). Here we can see that the idea of an external element inside human body is very old. People have always seen that we are different than other objects on our planet, there were animals, plants, rocks etc. And then there were humans, seemingly perfect animals which are able to adapt to the environment and to tame other animals. So the logical assumption done by our ancestors was, that we have something that the others do not have. Today, we call it the soul. Since this thesis is mainly concerned with two Greek authors, I shall explain the origin of the word itself. The Greek version of the word is psyche, this word can be translated either as "*life, or something that relates to the breathing*" (Kazdin, 2000). Other names given to the soul in different languages are connected to the word "*spirit*" (Kazdin, 2000). This connections will reveal itself to be quite useful in the chapter about Plato. All of these meanings represent something that is not entirely physical, but at the same time essential for human to be alive "*Human, who has lost his psyche is either dead, or unconscious*" (Galikova, 2007).

The concept of the soul is a universal phenomenon. And it is always presented as something that is invisible, untouchable. Pinker says that: "*...it is usually envisioned*

as some kind of ghost or spirit” (Pinker, 1997). One of the most influential texts of western civilization – *the Bible*, also mentions existence of soul: “*And fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him that is able to destroy both soul and body in hell*” (Matthew 10:28). In this quotation from *the Bible* the soul is used as something that completes the human body. We can assume, that the writers of *the New Testament* were familiar with the works of the Greek philosophers and their notion of the soul, and in fact we still understand it in a similar sense. So we see, that the notion of the soul is millennia old. From the first shamans to today’s self-help books (*Chicken Soup for Soul*), the importance of something that would explain our inner actions was recognized. Today, the question of inner movements is mostly present in psychology, but for centuries before it was even created, the soul was our “inner mover”.

1.2. Accounts of the Soul before Plato and Aristotle

The first account about the existence of the soul can be found in prehistoric times, “*Shamans performed acts, where the soul left the body and entered different object*” (Kazdin, 2000). So it was seen as a transcendental object. Later on we can see that the ideas about the Soul were not only present in the western world or among the shamans in rainforests, but also in the Orient. There are some theories that the first Greek philosophers may have been influenced by the thinkers from the Far East (Copleston, 1946). Copleston believes that this might be a result of the geographical placement of the first philosophers. However he later says explicitly that: “*It is out of the question to suppose that Greek philosophy came from India or from China*” (Copleston, 1946). That being said, the possibility of contact between the two worlds was not impossible, but as far as we know, there is no visible connection between the philosophical schools of the East and the West. First account of the soul given in Greek philosophy was made by Anaximenes (Taylor, 1997). He proposes the idea that breath is something inside the human body, which controls it and the air as something that encloses us from the world around. Taylor thinks that even though we cannot be sure what Anaximenes has really said, there is no doubt that he was talking about the soul (Taylor, 1997). As I have said before, in the Greek language the word for soul is

connected to the word “breath” (Kazdin, 2000), so Anaximenes’ idea makes sense. Whether he meant to talk about the soul as we understand it or not, we must accept the fact that the words he had used imply the existence of something transcendental inside the human. The fact that he talked about the breath points towards the direction of the soul existing inside the body and taking part in its movements, thoughts etc. so he must have dealt with the question of the reasons for human behaviour. We cannot forget that Anaximenes lived in 6th century B.C. and in those times he was asking the same questions psychologists ask even today.

Another important pre-Socratic figure dealing with the question of soul was Heraclitus. He is mostly known for his concept of “everything flows”, which can be applied to the soul as well. Since our soul is always in the process of dying and being born, it is never the same (Taylor, 1997). This idea is quite different, because it does not put the soul on the pedestal in our body, it is just part of it that can change. So according to Heraclitus we cannot look for the individuality in it. Taylor says it very openly: *“Evidently we must find our identity in a pattern of changing experiences that is systematic, and ultimately secured by the unity of the logos (reason), for which there need not be any one essential item that remains to constitute the identity”* (Taylor, 1997). Thus we can see that even though the soul seems like something that is quite easy to accept and placed in its special place (usually inside the body), there are different opinions about it.

The concept of the Soul was later very thoroughly studied by the Pythagoreans. They were the first Greek philosophers to give the soul its immortal character (Taylor, 1997). Soul was given the ability to repeatedly incarnate to other bodies (not necessarily human). This idea is strongly against the one Plato introduces (Copleston, 1946), but more on that in another chapter. The soul’s immortality was thus moved also onto humans, who were supposedly *“fallen gods”* (Taylor, 1997), and that our life inside the bodies is just a punishment. At this point the idea of “self” inside the souls starts to take the real shape. The accounts of soul given after this, usually possess the element of the soul being the “carrier” of our self. And that is very important moment for the later investigations in the field of psychology. By accepting the fact, that the soul carries something special, that makes the individual unique, we can see why even the more modern philosophers (e.g. Descartes, Hegel etc.) were occupied with the problem of the soul.

1.3. Understanding of the Soul in Philosophy from St. Augustine until Today

After we have the basic presumption established, we can start with the problem of soul in the modern age. The emergence of science called psychology is based upon the idea that there is something more inside the human than just flesh and bones. At this point the accounts given by Plato and Aristotle will be omitted, since they have their own designated chapters. With the emergence of Christianity the idea about what is the soul has changed. Suddenly there was an all knowing creator - the God. Influence of religion is visible in the works of early philosophers. St. Augustine was very thorough when he was examining himself and his attitudes towards Christianity. He was aware of the soul, and he was trying to explain it. Augustine was curious about its origin, about its nature and about its relationship with the body (Furley, 1999). For Augustine the research might have been a little bit sensitive, since he was moving in the realm of Christian dogmas. Although he is not afraid to admit that some things he is simply unable to prove, like what is the source of the soul (Furley, 1999). But he acknowledges that soul is immaterial substance (Furley, 1999). This corresponds with the accounts of soul which have been given so far. Souls are for Augustine immortal elements inside human bodies, they exist before the body is created and even in the afterlife (Furley, 1999). It is questionable to what extent is this theory connected to the concept of Christianity, where one's soul lives after the death either in heaven or in hell.

The concept of soul in Christianity is later more established by St. Thomas Aquinas, who claims that there is one soul who is omnipresent inside human body (Russell, 1946). His account of human soul says that it is connected to the body and is immortal. But only for humans, animals' souls can die (Russell, 1946). The difference from Augustine is, that every soul is created after the birth (Russell, 1946). So there is no presence of it before the life starts. Here we can think about the influence of Christianity on the modern understanding of the soul, since we still somehow perceive it as this "presence" inside human bodies.

After the influence of Christianity on the philosophy stopped being so strong, another descriptions of the soul appeared. One of the most influential philosophers of all times, Rene Descartes, was trying to prove existence of everything by doubting

everything. Hence his famous: *Cogito ergo sum*. He achieved the moment when he could doubt all the physical things, except his mind (soul). (Copleston, 1946). Copleston argues that Descartes believes that mind must always be thinking. If it stops, it dies (Copleston, 1946). This idea reinforces the thoughts we have about the function of the soul as the mover of body. Without functioning soul, there would be only an empty shell, or more precisely a corpse. Descartes even goes as far as to say that body without soul is incomplete and vice versa (Copleston, 1946).

Question of soul remains relevant in philosophy also in the modern age. One of the most influential thinkers of the whole history of philosophy – Hegel, gives a lot of importance to the problem of soul. According to Copleston, Hegel's soul is the transition point between nature and spirit (Copleston, 1946). Hegel has a notion of the soul being the inner part of human and the body being the shell for the soul (Copleston, 1946). We have seen a similar way of dealing with the soul in Pythagorean approach, but for them, the body was for the soul more like a cell than a shell. Hegel later introduces the idea of spirit, which is more active and has more influential position in the human body than the soul (Copleston, 1946). The connection between the words spirit and soul was until now used mostly as a synonym, but now these two were separated. Hegel's spirit is responsible for things like imagination or memory, thus it can be empirically studied, unlike soul, which is just a natural complement of the body and its functions are difficult to observe (Copleston, 1946). But it would be very unwise to say, that with this idea the importance of soul ends.

If the goal of psychology is to explain why an individual does what he does (Kazdin, 2000), the notion of soul appears to be useful also for this field of science. The word psychology etymologically comes from the Greek word psyche. Which is translated as the soul (Kazdin, 2000). Thus the correlation between these two cannot be unseen. While philosophy is mainly concerned with the theoretical questions about the soul, psychology wants to understand its influence on the life of people.

There is a lot that can be said about the question of soul in the philosophy, or about its position in modern psychology but that is not the goal of this thesis. The main aim of this paper is to elaborate on the two great books by the two of the greatest philosophers of their time (or even of all time.) Plato is certainly one of the greatest

thinkers of all times, his ideas are being researched even today, so it is only obvious that his account of soul is important. And Aristotle, is by some considered to be a founder of modern psychology (Asmus, 1986). Thus the inquiry about what they have to say about the question of soul is relevant even today.

Chapter II: Plato's Account of Soul in *Symposium*

2.1. Plato on the Soul

This chapter introduces Plato's position on the problem of soul inside *the Symposium*. Before I start with the main topic, it would be for the best to give some more concise account of soul in Plato's whole work. The question of soul is not the primary one inside *Symposium*, so the introduction will help to establish where he talks about the soul. The most important source of information about the topic of soul is his famous *Republic*. In the book IV, he introduces the notion of soul being divided into three parts in the same way in which he divides the citizens of his ideal city: "*Then the individual has these same parts in his soul...*" (*Republic*, 435b). Plato is trying to compare a well-functioning city with the soul of well-functioning individual. Those parts are: *rational part, appetitive part and spirited part* (*Republic*, 435c - 441c). The first part deals with the issues of rational calculations. It is the reasonable part. "*We'll call the part of the soul in with which it calculates the rational part*" (*Republic*, 439d). The role of this part is also to stop the second one when it is too strong. (*Republic*, 439c - d) The second part is the irrational, responsible for hunger, thirst, lust and similar bodily pleasures (*Republic*, 439d). These two parts create the well balanced organism, that is not destroying itself, but each of them is very different from the other. The third part, is maybe the most unique one. "*The spirited part a third thing in the soul that is by nature the helper of the rational part*" (*Republic*, 441a). The spirited part is the brave one. It can be found among the soldiers who are willing to die for the cause of justice, or for the safety of their fellow citizens. It is a quality that is present in the individual since the birth, "*...one can see that they are full of spirit right from birth...*" (*Republic*, 441a). It may be called the courageous part as well. So here we have the three parts. In *Republic*, Plato compares those parts to the types of citizens in his ideal city, but that is not the concern of this thesis. When we know, what the three most important elements of soul are for Plato, we can now enter the *Symposium* and look for them inside it.

2.2. Search for the Soul in *Symposium*

Symposium is one of the most important pieces written by Plato. It is mainly a description of the speeches from one of the parties Socrates attended. This account is given to us by Apollodorus, who was not in fact present at the Symposium. He is what we can call a second-hand narrator. So what we read is only a recollection of something that someone else has told to him. This type of narration may seem strange to us today, but when we think about it a bit more, it makes a lot of sense. Plato was trying to write about something that might have not happened, and the most influential genre of his age was drama. Plato as a philosopher wants to communicate his ideas as effectively and understandably as possible, he uses Socrates as the main character and puts him inside dialogue-filled Symposium. By doing this, he achieved that *Symposium* is well written and his arguments are debated in the real time so to speak. Every idea he proposes, is commented in the later parts of his book. There is still a space for the debate about where Plato's original thoughts start and where there is just account of Socrates' ideas. Proving this however, is not goal of the thesis. After the first reading, *Symposium* may seem like it has not connection to the topic of soul. The most discussed topic is love, as Phaedrus said (177a). Love is a strong emotion, one would say it is the strongest one of them, so it is a topic worthy of discussion. And there is where I begin my interpretation.

The first speaker (interlocutor as Plato calls them) is Phaedrus. He says that Love is a God, the oldest one of them (*Symposium*, 178c). The connection between the God and the soul is not very obvious on the first sight, but in later part of his speech, Phaedrus attributes the love the abilities, which can be found inside the Plato's division of the soul. Phaedrus openly talks about courage, sacrifice or honour, as noble deeds done by those who are in love (*Symposium*, 179a-c). In previous chapters, I have mentioned the connection between the Greek words for breath and soul. Thus when Phaedrus says: "*When Homer spoke of God breathing might into some of the heroes, he described exactly the effect which Love, of his very nature, produces in men who are in love*" (*Symposium*, 179b). "Breathing might into heroes", who are then courageous and willing to die for someone - this can be interpreted as a reference to the spirited part of the soul, which is responsible for brave warriors' acts. So Phaedrus introduces the idea that the spirited part of man's

soul was strengthened, so they were better prepared for the honourable fight. This can sound a bit strange, but we must take into an account that Phaedrus describes Homer's verse. However the connection between love and soul is visible in this part. At this point I would like to establish one important aspect of this thesis, however I propose the idea of soul and love being connected, but I do not want to say, that they are the same. Towards the end of his speech, Phaedrus concludes his account of love by saying: "*Love is... the most powerful to assist men in acquisition of merit and happiness, both here and hereafter.*" (*Symposium*, 180b). In *Republic*, the spirited part of the soul was attributed to the soldiers – protectors of the city. When love's goal (among others) is to assist men in acquiring things, it can be looked upon not only as a force making people do things, but it seems as it is more of an internal part of them, that enables them to accomplish great deeds.

Next speech was the one done by Pausanias. He started by disagreeing with his predecessor. In his speech was introduced the idea of love not being a single entity (*Symposium*, 180c). This is a very useful notion for the connection with the soul, which also cannot be understand as an undividable object. However, Pausanias talks about two parts of love, and in *Republic* we are given the account of the three parts of the soul. Pausanias' division of love gives us the common love and heavenly love (*Symposium*, 180e). The names themselves suggest that one of them is less godlike than the other. To make an analogy with the soul, we have an appetitive part and rational part. One of them is dealing with the worldly things like food, sex and others, and the second one is devoted to more intellectual purposes. To highlight the connection Pausanias clearly describes the common love as this: "*...its only aim is the satisfaction of its desires...*" (*Symposium*, 181a). Indeed, there is not any other part of the soul that would be concerned with the desires and pleasures. The heavenly love is slightly more complicated than the other one. Lovers who act in accordance with it, are more mature and they cherish the intelligence and wishes for higher fulfilment out of relationship (*Symposium*, 181d). We can again see, that the rationality of a lover is very important when we move in this realm of love. Thus the part of his soul, which is responsible for premeditated decision based on the logic and not on the "thirst" must play part in here. Later on Pausanias describes, how the condemnation of certain kinds of love is connected to the character of such society (*Symposium*, 182c). Plato used his three parts of soul in the *Republic* as an analogy to the three types of citizen a

good city needs. If one of the parts is not present, the society will not flourish and will eventually fail. What Pausanias said, is very similar, as with the types of citizens, if the variations of Love are limited, the whole system might fall apart. Later in his speech he praised the heavenly love for being valuable to the citizens (*Symposium* 185b). The notion of rationality is present even in the way Pausanias describes the fact that one can love in a correct way (*Symposium*, 183d). And if there is a right way, it implies that some thought process must be done before one jumps into love, otherwise the loving would be done in a wrong manner. Pausanias' speech contributes to the account of soul in *Symposium* in a very important way, if for nothing else, then for the fact that he has introduced various kinds of love.

The following speech has introduced another interlocutor: Eryximachus. He, as a doctor, opened the discussion about love not being only in the souls of men, but also inside the animals, plants and all things (*Symposium*, 186a). This conception is useful for us, when we will compare it a little bit more to the Aristotle's theory of Soul. Thanks to Eryximachus, we are told for the first time that love can be found inside the soul.

In the first two speeches it was possible to identify the similarities between the concepts of soul and love. But now, we must accept the fact that love works inside the soul. This is not a difficult thing to grasp, if we assume that we can understand love as a "pusher" who pushes the right buttons inside the soul, so its correct part performs its role. When we call love a pusher, it may be helpful to turn towards St. Augustine who thought about the soul as a "mover" (*Farley, 1999*). So the sense of something making human act in certain way is not entirely new. Maybe it is a bit too over-interpreted to call love "a pusher", mostly the love which is being discussed in *Symposium*. Nussbaum claims that: "*Symposium is a treaty about passionate, erotic love...*" (*Nussbaum, 2003*). This claim has some merit to it, but it surely does not exclude the possibility that the love, they speak about, can be understood in different ways.

The speech of Eryximachus contains very vivid description of love, from the medical point of view, but as such it is not very useful for us now, so let us continue with the fourth speech, which is given by Aristophanes. His monologue contains one of the most well-known concepts of *Symposium* – the circle people (*Symposium*, 190a). One

of the very important information about them is that they had three sexes (male, female and the combination of those two). The whole idea of the circle people suggests that in the past, there was no such thing as man and woman, every human was living in one body with his counterpart (soulmate) and they were happy together. (Symposium, 190a – e). Nussbaum points out that Aristophanes' speech is quite humorous, "...it shows this disfigured image of human, which enables us to look at ourselves the same way we look upon any animal" (Nussbaum, 2003). Her remark helps to sustain the position that the human is just one of the animals, and thus shares certain elements with them. This argument will be quite helpful in the chapter about Aristoteles' soul. Later in the speech, the creatures are cut into halves, thus creating the humans we know today (Symposium, 191a). This cut has left deep scars in our souls. As Aristophanes points out: "Each of us is the mere broken tally of a man, the result of a bisection..." (Symposium, 191d). Suddenly humans became separated from their counterparts and must endlessly seek for them. The search for one's soulmate, however noble it may appear, has suddenly become the whole point of human existence, and unless the other part is found, they cannot be happy. Here it would be quite useful to explain the concept of soulmates – which is according to dictionary "a person who is perfectly suited to another in temperament" (Merriam – Webster, 2015). Who else could then be a soulmate if not the other half, that Aristophanes is talking about? He points out, however, that these two parts are drawn together by their desires (Symposium, 192e). This opens the idea, that the appetitive part of the soul is responsible for the need to find the other half. But does this mean, that our soul is incomplete without the other half? It would be very difficult to prove this, so let us accept that the soul just desires to be complete, which means that it indeed has all the parts it needs, but their ratio is always different. This creates different temperaments inside the individual. "Temperament is the character of an individual, it makes it unique based on the different mixture of elements in his personality" (Colman, 2001). Thus Aristophanes' speech has brought us the idea of different types of humans and even though one of the main motives behind the hunt for the other part is desire, we cannot exclude the notion of looking for one's ideal partner- ideal in every way. This notion itself gives us the right to think that symposium is about more than "erotic love" (Nussbaum, 2003). Here we can leave Aristophanes and continue with the next speech.

This time we hear from Agathon, he (as some of his predecessors) supports the idea that love is a god (*Symposium*, 195a-195e). Though the idea of love as a god is highly abstract and probably a little bit metaphorical, it gives us the impression that we are indeed dealing with something eminent, something transcendental. As I have pointed out before, all those (and many more) qualities can be attributed to the soul as well. Agathon continues his account with a rather interesting connection between love and soul: “...he has established his dwelling in the characters and souls of men” (*Symposium*, 195e). So love for him is not the same as soul, but rather love can be located inside it. This makes complete sense. Love as a powerful mover can be found inside human soul, from where it pushes man into doing the honourable deeds. All this seems quite logical, but later Agathon says that love is not in all souls, “...for when he encounters a hard nature, he departs...” (*Symposium*, 195e). Does this mean that the wretched (hard) souls have no love in them? Well, certainly there is nothing like the love the interlocutors talk about. They mostly assign the love the good qualities. However love can make one do the things that are not generally considered honourable, but when the goal of the action is good, it can be accepted, “...his true nature, which is to be willing to do anything for anybody in order to attain excellence...and nothing can be more honourable than that” (*Symposium*, 185a). So the love can make bad things look good, but when the soul of an individual is completely evil, there is not much it can do. Later on, Agathon mentions another important aspect of love, which can show us its similarity with the Plato’s concept of soul: “In addition Love is richly endowed with self-control.” (*Symposium*, 196c). It has been mentioned before, that there is indeed a part of soul which duty is to control the passions. So the love, according Agathon, has similar role as the rational part of the soul. Question is, whether only a good natured soul (the one where the love resides) is able to control itself. If there would be no love inside the soul, the soul would be unable of controlling its desires, and that would make the soul “hard natured” (*Symposium*, 195e). This implies that there can be souls, which are not able to control themselves. They might possess the ability, but other parts inside them have won over the rational part, thus making the soul wretched. Only a few lines later Agathon enforces the relation between soul and love. “As for courage, love more than matches Ares, the god of war” (*Symposium* 196d). Love is thus also responsible for courage, which dwell in the spirited part of the soul. The idea of one part of soul

overpowering the other is also valid here. At this point account given by Agathon is sufficient for the purposes of this thesis.

2. 2. 1. Socrates' Speech

Probably the most important description of love in the whole *Symposium* is the one delivered by Socrates. At the beginning of his speech, he starts with the questioning of Agathon. Socrates often uses the method of questions and answers when he deals with a problem. The largest part of Socrates' speech is his account of the dialogue, which he had with Diotima (*Symposium*, 201c). She is supposed to be a priestess, with whom Socrates discussed the issues of love. It is hard to tell, to what extent is this dialogue a recollection of a real conversation. According to Nussbaum, Diotima is "...made up..." (*Nussbaum, 2003*). Whether it is true or not, is not really important, it (if nothing else) just shows us that Plato really finds the way of explaining things via dialogue very useful. For Diotima, love is a spirit that bridges the world of Gods and the world of men (*Symposium*, 202e – 203a). Here I would like to come back to the notion of soul being connected with spirituality. It is being said by Diotima, that love is one of many spirits (*Symposium*, 203a), so this suggests that soul can exist in similar way as love. As I have mentioned earlier, it does not necessarily mean that they are the same, but it just shows us the possible likeness of the two "things". It is not said openly in *Symposium*, but I think that it is possible to make this assumption. Finally Socrates and Diotima come up with the definition of love: "...love is desire for the perpetual possession of the good" (*Symposium*, 206a). In Agathon's speech Plato discussed the problem of love living in various kinds of souls (*Symposium*, 195e), he came up with the conclusion that love lives in the "good" souls and withdraws from those which are hard to live in (*Symposium*, 195e). Thus when love is a desire for possession of the good, it must be connected with the "good" soul, since it can reside only in such soul (it wants to possess it). This then implies that what is good for love, creates the base for the good soul. Later one very important aspect of love is uncovered. It was said that love makes us want to possess things perpetually, this could only be achieved if humans were immortal. So here Diotima claims that: "...love is love of immortality as well as the good" (*Symposium*, 207a). If one wishes

to possess anything for the eternity, he must be immortal. And here we can use the soul to resolve this issue. Plato, through Socrates in *Phaedo*, “...argues for the immortality of the soul” (Taylor, 1997). This idea helps us to believe that Plato’s concept of love and of the soul are indeed deeply connected. Love is about the desire to possess things eternally and the soul is immortal, thus they. So only if those two work together, they can achieve the common goal, which would be the immortality. Plato gives a direct comment on the soul also in this dialogue, where he says that human soul is always in the process of change (*Symposium*, 207e). He compares it to the body, as body gets older, so does the soul. Let us not forget that the soul is not physical object, so even though it may get old, it cannot dissolve in the same way a physical body would. Here we are introduced to a very useful concept, which Plato uses. The idea of “recollection” (*Symposium*, 208a). What recollection does is important for the problem of immortality of knowledge. Via recollecting the knowledge that was once lost (because of aging) can be “found” again by seeing something that reminds the individual of the “lost” information. “*This device, Socrates, enables the mortal to partake of immortality, physically as well as in other ways...*” (*Symposium*, 208b). Therefore humans can indeed experience the immortality. And it is not only love that drives one to remember things, it is the soul (which according to Plato is immortal) that is the carrier of the knowledge. In this part of the *Symposium* the notion of the soul, is maybe slightly omitted, but the text implies it in a strong way. The dialogue continues, and Diotima suggests the idea, that men do all the courageous things they do, not because of the honourability of the deed itself, but for the eternal glory that it will bring (*Symposium*, 208d). If this is truth, then we have to look at the spirited part of the soul, as the part that is responsible for the love of immortality. Since that part is concerned with honour or courage, and their ultimate goal is eternal glory. Diotima continues and puts another pieces into the puzzle. “*Those whose creative instinct is physical have recourse to women...by begetting children they can secure for themselves immortality*” (*Symposium*, 208d). The part of the soul that deals with the procreation (with sex) is the appetitive. Based on what Diotima said, we can assume that also this part of the soul craves the immortality, it only achieves it in a different way. So now we have two parts of the soul, wanting in fact the same thing. And to make it all complete, Diotima offers us the view on the rational part of the soul as well. Those who are not concerned with the

eternal glory, or physical pleasure that is connected with the creation of children, would like to find themselves in the presence of beautiful (internally and externally) friend, with whom they can “have children” (*Symposium*, 209b – 209d). Plato gives us the example of Homer, who left many great poems which are indeed children of his mind. And as said before, the third part of the soul is not concerned with sex, or glory it loves the wisdom and knowledge. It is precisely how the immortality of wise men is achieved – via their rational, moderate, virtuous deeds (books, thoughts), which they leave behind after their death. All these aspects of the love of immortality hints, that it can be achieved through exercising the various parts of the soul. And the ratio between the parts not only creates the character of an individual but it also presupposes his own actions. It has been said before, that every part of an individual is constantly changing, this implies that also the ratio of the parts of the soul is subjected to the change, thus it offers the idea that a soul, which started as a wretched one, can improve itself and become “good” soul, worthy of love. So how does the soul become better? Plato offers us the way in which the soul can uplift itself. Diotima tells Socrates how a man can achieve a higher level of understanding the world and the concepts such as love. “*First...must begin, when he is young, by applying himself to the contemplation of physical beauty...*” (*Symposium*, 210a). This suggests that to start improving the soul, one must exercise all its parts. First is, logically, the more primal part. At this point he loves one beautiful person and devotes himself to it. Later he realizes that all the bodies are the same, “*when he has reached this conclusion he will become a lover of all physical beauty*” (*Symposium*, 210b). Nussbaum suggests that before he comes to this conclusion, “*He must rationally decide, that all the bodies are indeed the same in a certain way.*” (Nussbaum, 2003). Indeed, without some amount of thinking, one would not be able to understand this concept. So we may conclude, that the rational part of the soul is being used at this moment. “*The next stage is for him to reckon beauty of soul more valuable than the beauty of body...*” (*Symposium*, 210c). This revelation gives the seeker the ability to understand that the boundaries of the physical world are unimportant and immortality of the knowledge is the most important goal to pursue. It seems as though the spirited part of the soul is omitted in this process. Indeed, Diotima does not put the importance of courage and honour in the one’s strive for knowledge. But she talks about how one man can completely understand beauty, “*...as he approaches the end of his initiation*

a beauty whose nature is marvellous indeed, the final goal...” (*Symposium*, 210d). The third step is highly metaphorical and we can even say that such complete understanding is impossible, for if one wants to achieve it, he must study (and understand) everything there is (*Symposium*, 210e). I have attributed the first two steps to the various parts of soul, but the third one I have left on its own. To achieve the third stage, one must go through all the knowledge that is available of all the things, and to do that, he would also try to understand the concepts which belong to the spirited part of the soul. Beauty is used as the final stage of knowing. Before that one must go through all the beautiful things (bodies, knowledge...). And if one devotes his life to such endeavours, he will be satisfied and his soul will be good (if Beauty is the ultimate goal, way to it is good), thus it will be full of love. Here it will be appropriate to leave Socrates’ speech and move to the last one. The last speaker literary barged into the room.

The last speaker that came to *Symposium* was a Greek hero Alcibiades. Nussbaum calls him: “...*this beautiful and gorgeous being...*” (Nussbaum, 2003). Even though Alcibiades is at that time celebrated, he was the leader of Athens’ army (Nussbaum, 2003), Socrates has mixed feelings about him: “*Be ready to protect me Agathon, for I find that the love of this fellow has become no small burden*” (*Symposium*, 213b). Socrates later even says that Alcibiades is jealous of his friends (*Symposium*, 213d). We thus may think, that Alcibiades is “stuck” at the stage of loving one body (although Socrates is hardly beautiful at that time). Alcibiades describes how he was trying to be a lover of Socrates (*Symposium* 215e – 217e). Alcibiades comments on how he was in fact seducing Socrates, which again gives him more of the appearance of a “soul in progress”, but he does mentions that he “...*felt reverence for Socrates’ character, his self-control and courage...*” (*Symposium*, 219d). Is this a part of *Symposium* where Plato praises Socrates? He is praised by Alcibiades for the qualities that are to be found in a well-balanced soul. Later Socrates’ soul is being glorified again, when Alcibiades talk about his courage in the battle (*Symposium*, 220e). Although Nussbaum thinks that Alcibiades was still in love with Socrates (Nussbaum, 2003), his speech about him hints, that Socrates himself was as close to the perfection as it gets. And by letting speak lover about his beloved, we may better understood what love can does to the man’s soul.

2.3. Conclusion

On the surface it may appear that *Symposium* is indeed a discussion about love. In this chapter I tried to argue, that there are several places where Plato's account of the soul is present. The first appearance is the Phaedrus speech, where love enhances the courage of soldiers, thus exercising the spirited part of their souls. Another speaker, Pausanias, mentions various types of love, which is in accordance with various kinds of Plato's soul. The most visible connection is given to us by Aristophanes. He uses the story about the ancient people who lost their partner, to whom they were physically attached, thus they roam the world with the hope to find their other half. This adds to the idea that of the importance of complete soul. One cannot be complete if he does not find his long lost partner, who completed him. His soul is thus incomplete. In Agathon's speech we are told that love exists inside souls of people. So we see, that both exist inside the human, and together they contribute to his actions. And when Socrates comes on the stage, the account of soul in *Symposium* is complete. He presents his idea about the process of acquiring knowledge through love. It is a process, which requires all the parts of the soul to cooperate, thus only a complete and healthy soul is capable of it. Here we are also introduced to the concept of the immortality of soul. It is immortal itself, it lives after the body perishes, but to gain all the knowledge hidden in one's soul, the individual must go through a long process of learning and loving. In the end, there is the possibility of complete understanding. This however can happen only when the mortal body comes into contact with the immortal knowledge. And since soul is immortal as well, the perfect unity of perishable body and eternal soul can be achieved.

Chapter III: Aristotle's Account of Soul in *De Anima*

3.1. Aristotle's Philosophy

The main objective of this chapter is to present the definition of the soul introduced by Aristotle in his work *De Anima*. The title of the book itself means "On the Soul" and it suggests that it is the best work when it comes to Aristotle's inquiry about soul. This chapter will introduce the main points Aristotle makes about various parts or functions of the soul. This will be important for the last chapter, which will deal with the possible connections between the account of soul in *Symposium* and *De Anima*.

It is only fair to Aristotle to start with a little background of his philosophy. He has contributed to the field of philosophy in many ways, his examination of soul is just one of them. His scientific researches stretched from subjects like physics to more social problems like politics or ethics. He allegedly wrote around 400 books (Russell, 1994). His most famous works deal with metaphysics. There he introduced the theory of matter and form. Russell explains what forms are with this example: "*We may start with the marble statue, here marble is the matter, while the shape conferred by the sculptor is the form*" (Russell, 1946). Form is for him then a thing that bounds the matter and gives it its shape and qualities. We can see a hint of his theory about soul in his metaphysical works. There is a lot that can be written about his metaphysics, but it is not a goal of this thesis.

Hillar even says that Aristotle's research in the field of psychology was the first study of the life giving principle (Hillar, 1994). I will say openly, that even though Aristotle's contribution to today's psychology is great, we cannot forget his predecessors (mainly Plato, who is the topic of the previous chapter). When it comes to the question of soul itself, Russell offers an idea: "...*the soul is what makes the body one thing...*" (Russell, 1946). This would mean that the soul is the "glue" that makes the body the way it is.

3.2. The Account of Soul in *De Anima*

At the beginning of *De Anima*, Aristotle highlights the importance of soul: “*We should with reason place the study of the soul in the first rank*” (402a 1). So clearly we can see how important this topic is. Even without his comment on the soul, we would understand how much he thinks it is important, since he dedicated the whole book to this topic. *De Anima* is divided into three books. Book I introduces the basic problems Aristotle is going to deal with. Aristotle also examines the problem of soul in the works of his predecessors. The problems of historical views on soul has been, to some extent, tackled in the first chapter, so they will not be present in here. The second and the third book deal with Aristotle’s own notion of the soul. These chapters are mostly concerned about how Aristotle defines the soul.

3. 2. 1. Book I

Aristotle’s exploration begins with the basic questions about the soul. As the interlocutors in *Symposium* usually start with the definition of what love is, Aristotle also asks these questions at the beginning. This is a very useful and scientific way of dealing with the problem. Charlton correctly identifies these questions and lists them (Charlton, 1980). The first problem that Aristotle opens up is whether the soul is a thing or a quality of something else (402a 23-25). The second question doubts the independence of Soul. It can be either existing thing on its own, or it can be result of other thing’s actions. (402a 25-26). In present days we somehow expect the soul to be a concept existing on its own, not as a part of something, but somebody had to ask these questions. If Aristotle (and others) did not tackle these problems thousands of years ago, we would not able to imagine something like a soul today. As I have mentioned before, in Greek language, the notion of soul is connected to the air, thus its existence can be difficult to explain. Third question standing in front of Aristotle was the internal division of the soul. He was concerned, whether the soul is constructed out of a number of parts (402b 1). And after the soul has been questioned as one object, the last question came. He wanted to find out, if all the souls (soul of man, monkey, tree...) are the same, or whether they differ from each other (402b 1-8).

Answers to these questions will be presented in the conclusion of the thesis. This approach of Aristotle is highly logical and shows us that his methods were scientific. As Hillar points out about the study of the soul: “*it contributed to the knowledge of the truth and in general to the knowledge of nature*” (Hillar, 1994). Aristotle’s examination of the different aspects of soul may not be able to show us its exact position, or be able to say what it is in one sentence, but the process of examining the topic of the soul, is one that tries to answer what it is that makes humans the way they are. And such research can never be dismissed. In the later parts of the Book I Aristotle starts with the problems of the soul’s connection to the body. He assumes that the changes happening inside the soul are connected to the physical body as well (403 a16-18). One of the topics discussed by Aristotle is movement. He wants to know: “*...if the soul is moving by itself or takes part on the movement*” (406a 12-13). This is a very useful question, for it will help to understand the nature of the soul, for the static soul and the soul as the mover would be two different things. Hillar now interprets Aristoteles’ soul as the mover (Hillar, 1994). This idea corresponds to those of Timaeus, Democritus or Filippus (406b 16-30). Aristotle criticizes the previous accounts of soul for being too wide and not concerned about the reason behind the connection of body and soul (407b 13-19). This connection is something that ought to be highlighted. If the soul would just happen to be in the body, they might be understood as two different objects that may, or may not work together. According to Hillar, the main result of the Book I is this: “*The soul is responsible for our recognition, sensation, opinion and desire, but also for locomotion, growth, maturation, nourishment -- life as such belongs to the soul*” (Hillar, 1994). This idea suggests that the soul is something essential for life, for these are all the activities that a living organism does. Aristotle confirms this: “*...body dissolves and turns into ashes, once the soul leaves it*” (411b 8-9). So it is the soul that enables life. Without it, there would be no organic life, for there would be nothing that would hold the body together. Here Aristotle introduces the difference between human soul and the soul of animals and plants. He agrees that all of them have soul, but that the plants are different, since they do not have the capacity of sensation (411b 25-30). At this point the Book I ends, so we can move on to the second one.

3. 2. 2. Book II

According to Johansen, here at the beginning of the Book II, “*The first constructive step is taken*” (Johansen, 2012). If he means, that here Aristotle starts his own inquiry about the soul, he is correct. Indeed, Aristotle wants to leave the ideas of older philosophers and create his own account from the start (412a 3-5). The Book II opens up the debate about the internal structure of the soul and about its placement inside the physical body. He starts with looking for the objects that can have the soul. Aristotle comes to the conclusion that: “*Every natural body which partakes of life will be a substance, and substance of composite kind*” (412a 15-17). Here it would be useful to explain what he means by the substance. It is a combination of certain matter with certain form, thus creating something that exists (Kříž, 1996). So living body must be constructed out of more elements. Later he answers the question if soul and body being the same. Body and the soul are not the same, body is for him just a matter that has a potentiality to become something more. Thus the soul is according the Aristotle very important part of a living body. Soul is then the element that gives life to the natural body. “*Substance is actuality (entelechy). The soul therefore, will be the actuality of a body of this kind*” (412a 19-20). Entelechy (actuality) is the actualization of the potential (Webster, 2015), it is the realization of the potential existing in the body. Thus the soul is, according to this, the cause of life in a natural body. Aristotle calls it “*the first actuality of natural body...*” (412a 29). This suggests the importance of the soul in creating living body from lifeless object. So we may say, that every living creature must have some kind of soul. After describing what the soul as such is, Aristotle goes on about finding its function inside the object. He explains it on the example of an axe, where the thing that makes it the axe is the actuality that enabled the matter of an axe to serve as an axe. He says that it is the soul that makes axe an axe (412b 15-18). Since the axe is not a living body, that example was just to show what he means in theory. But it implies that soul is the principle giving the matter the certain form. The fact is though, that both the body of an object and the soul create the living body – “*But just as the pupil and the sight make up an eye, so in this case the soul and body make up an animal*” (413a 2-3). So it is the combination of the two elements that can enable the body to be alive.

Suddenly when it was distinguished that some things are alive and some are not, the next step was to say what precisely “being alive” means. Aristotle claims that at least one of the following must be present in an object so we can consider it to be alive: “*intellect, perception, movement, and rest in respect of place and furthermore the movement involved in nutrition and both decay and growth*” (413a 23-24). After accepting this as truth, we see that also plants are alive, for they do grow and decay. Thus we must conclude that some sort of soul exist even in the plants and animals. This means, that there are more kinds of souls. Plants do not do much, they “just exist”, they receive the nourishment, they grow and then they die. Animals on the other hand are bodies that apart from the basic living have also the sense perception (413b 2-3). At this point Aristotle only says that: “*soul is the source of the things above mentioned*” (413b 13-14). Here he means the activities of the soul mentioned in 413a 23-24. Even without further explanation we can see, that for him the soul is the reason why people, plants and animals are different from the rocks. When dealing with the human soul, Aristotle makes a remark about the intellect. He believes, that even animals understand such things as pleasure, or wanting (413b 23-24), but about the intellect he says that it belongs a different kind of soul (413b 26). This division gives us the first sketch of the three types of souls. The one that the plants have, which is concerned with nourishment, the one of animals, which possesses the ability of sense perception and the third one, which is probably reserved only for humans – intellectual kind. As we had said before, it is the soul which gives the form to the certain kind of body. Aristotle argues that the soul is not a body itself, it is something that belongs to the body and exists inside it (414a 20-25). Thus we can conclude that a body becomes the kind of body it is (animal, plant, human) because the soul of that kind gives the body its features, so it enables the body to become the way it is. And also we can see that the soul of Aristotle is also connected with the non-physical world.

I have talked so far about the functions of souls, but Aristotle is a bit more careful with that word, so he only talks about the “*potentialities*” (414a 30) of the soul. And as we have mentioned it is the potentiality and the actuality that creates the whole living organism. There are several potentialities: “*nutrition, sense perception, desire, movement in respect of place, and thought*” (414a 31). So what are they if not the functions of souls? The word potentiality contains the answer to that question, it is

about the amount of activity the one soul is possible to offer to the body. As I said, plants have only nutrition and decay. Animals are more gifted, they can use their senses. Some of them have only one (touch), but it is enough to distinguish them from the plants (414b 4). Aristotle later points out the fact that the potentialities of the soul exist in an order (414b 33). The order suggests that some bodies do possess only one potentiality, others more. The “lowest” one is the nutrition, all the natural bodies need it otherwise they would perish. The senses are then present in a smaller number of bodies, which are thus able to perceive the world around them. And “above” them is the smallest part, the one which possess the intellect (people). The last group must have all the other potentialities in them, because only when all are present, the human mind can work properly. Thus we may say, that calling someone an animal (as a pejorative) contains the Aristotelian logic, when we compare such human to the animal without any reasonable part in his soul.

Aristotle starts his examination of different potentialities of soul by focusing on the first one – the nourishing. He points out that it is the most common potentiality, because all living bodies must be nourished and must reproduce (415a 24-25). Although it may seem that the only concern of this topic should be the most basic of organisms, it must be understood that this part is present in all the living things – also in humans, which is important for the inquiry of this thesis. Here Aristotle explains his notion of mortality of individuals, where he understands that no individual object can exist eternally, but he gives them the opportunity to have a share in it. It is the species that survives and in it the element of an individual is present (415b 3-8). So we can conclude, that the potentiality to nourish life is as important as the one to create a new life. It would be impossible to sustain the soul and to justify the nourishment if the whole goal of the soul would be to feed an object which will die and will not leave anything behind. So it is not the nutrition that is the primary cause for the soul to come into being, “*the primary soul will be that which can generate something like itself*” (416b 25). Thus the “first” soul’s duty is to create an offspring. This is the most important element of it.

Later on Aristotle goes on to define in a more precise way the sense perception. He says that if we want to know more about the senses, we ought to look at the object of the sensual perception. There are three kinds of objects: “*we perceive two in themselves, and one incidentally*” (418a 9). For Aristotle the first two are those which

cannot be perceived by any other sense, “e.g. sight has colour, hearing sound and taste flavour, while touch has many varieties of objects” (418a 12-13). Thus it is important to see that not all the senses are the same, while they may share the fact that they provide the natural body with the information about the world around, they do have differences among themselves.

First of the senses he discusses is the sight. The object of sight is mostly the colour (418a 26-27). But to see something we need a light. For without light there is darkness and in darkness we cannot see the colours. But there is another thing necessary for the sight to be able to perceive its object. It is the transparent, “It is the colourless which is receptive of colour... and which is colourless is also invisible” (418b 9-10). Air is this invisible element that enables the sight. So we can perceive colours, which are in light, which then comes to the eye through the air. It is remarkable to think that Aristotle understood these physical problems in the ancient times, but in another way it makes complete sense since one of his other books is called *Physics*. Another sense is the hearing. Here again, the notion of the air plays a very important role. Only things which can move the air can be heard, since they disturb the air, which can then enter the ear (420a 2-3). So only the parts of body in which the air can be received can take part on the hearing process, “For this reason the animal does not hear with every part of it...” (420a 6). From this we can understand why the ears are the only organ capable of detecting sound. In the chapters 9, 10 and 11 of the Book II Aristotle explains the theory about the smell, the taste and the touch. The importance of the air for the smell is obvious, but taste does not need it. Aristotle claims that taste can be perceived through the moisture (422a 10-15). Touch does not need any external object to carry the sensation (like sound needs the air), the medium that perceives the sensations of touch is flesh (423b 26). So the whole body can feel when another objects touches it. This sense is very important because if the animal did not have it, it would not be able to perceive complete picture of its surroundings. Aristotle claims that touch and taste are two senses that every living body must have (434b 24). Since their bodies are physical objects, they must be able to feel the pressure from other objects and feed themselves. Taste perceives objects that is nourishing for the body and can distinguish between good and bad nutrients (434b 20). Even though the taste is important, Aristotle later picks the touch as the most important of the senses. It is the only one that perceives the objects by the internal parts of the body, and not by

other sense-organs (435a 18). Aristotle also thinks that the excessive pressure perceived by touch can kill an animal. Thus it is the strongest. Other senses can, only under certain circumstances, lead to the death of the animal, but usually they only ruin their sense-organs (435b 15-20). So it is the touch that indicates whether the animal is dead or alive. If it cannot feel other objects, it cannot be alive. Other senses (sight, smell, hearing) support the life of some animals, but they are not necessary for all of them.

Aristotle continues his examination of animal senses in the Book III. He says that animals have to move, and for movement the animal needs the sense perception, if it would not have it, it could not feed itself (434b 2). Thus all the moving bodies need a soul capable of sense perception. The more complex animals need other senses as well. Aristotle says, that they are important for the animals that move, so they can perceive not only the closest objects, but also the distance (434b 25-29). The animals that are moving, cause the movement of other things. They push something, they go through the air, and thus they are, in a way, touching it. So the animal that moves towards a certain goal, needs all the senses, so it can see, hear, smell and touch the objects around it. If it would not be capable of this, it could get into dangerous situations.

3. 2. 3. Book III

The last book of *De Anima* contains the information about all kinds of souls. So let us then summarize what Aristotle says in here, in a way that is in accordance with the order of the souls. First, there is the soul of plants. As it has been said before, everything that is alive must have the nutritive soul (434a 24). Otherwise it would die. So what is alive, must have some kind of soul. Plants (and other unmoving living bodies) get their nourishments from the place where they grow. Thus they do not need to move, and their offspring can come from their roots, or via their seeds travelling through the air. The seeds do not move by themselves, they are being blown away by the wind. So when the first kind of soul has fulfilled its purpose, the plant can die with it. Aristotle also explain why the plants do not have the ability to perceive the outside

world through the senses. They simply do not have the means to perceive through senses, like ears, eyes etc. (424a 33-35).

Next one is the soul of animals. In the third book we are introduced to one of the basic divisions between humans and animals. *“That perceiving and understanding, therefore are not the same is clear. For all animals have the former, but few the latter”* (427b 7-9). It is obvious that the second group of animals, which has the capacity of understanding is humans. Thus we may make an assumption about the basic difference between the man and the animal. Another potentiality of the animal soul introduced by Aristotle is the imagination. As he says, it is neither thinking nor sense perception (427b 15). The ability to create images out of nothing inside the mind is truly something special. Since one can create, in his mind, images he has never seen before, it can be hardly understood as a sense perception. Imagination also does not in fact require reason, even though it seems important. But it needs the information from the senses. So only some animals and higher bodies have it. It is a more complex activity of the soul, so not all of the animals can use it. But there are some animals, which can (429a 7), so we cannot say that it is exclusive for the reasonable creatures. The imagination also plays an important role in the movement of the animals. They can only move towards an object, which shape they know, therefore they must have a mental image of it inside their head (Johansen, 2012). Aristotle explains this by saying that what is most important for the imagination is the sense perception (429a 2). Thus imagination works as a reflection of the perceived objects inside the mind. So far we have been dealing with the potentialities of the soul, which were not exclusive to the one kind of living bodies.

Now we will move on to the part dealing with the intellect, which can be found only inside humans. *“That part of soul, then called intellect (and I speak of as intellect that by which the soul thinks and supposes) is actually none of existing things before it exists”* (429a 21-23). So it is a thing on its own, it does not have an organ, or is not perceived as an outside object. Intellect is responsible for creation. It is the part of the soul where the potentiality of all other forms exists (429a 29). Thinking is thus responsible for the activity that is unlike any others. Subject of the sensual perception needs the physical organs to perceive stimuli from the outside world. And if the perception is too strong, it can be overwhelmed, which disables the organ (429b 3-5). This cannot happen to the intellect. If it concentrates on an object, it is only able to

understand it more. Thus Aristotle concludes, that intellect does not have to be connected to the physical body in the same way as other activities of the soul are (429b 6). This idea takes us back to the question about immortality of soul. Since intellect is somehow inside the soul (its internal part), when the body dies, it seems that the intellect is the element inside soul that can go on after the death. Another important role of an intellect is the creation of unity (430b 6). It puts together the pieces of information gathered from different sources and makes sense of them. As it has been mentioned, all the “lower” potentialities of soul must be actualized in the “higher” kinds, it would not work without them. The intellectual soul needs the images inside the mind in order to contemplate about things (431 a 15-17). Without the images inserted in the mind the thoughts would not have an object to think about: “*In general, the intellect activity is its objects*” (431b 18). As mentioned before, mind without the input of outside objects would not be working at all. But the term “imagination” may be, according to Johansen, misleading. Its Greek name *phantasia* strongly suggests the importance of visual part in the mental projection, but he thinks that that it has to do with “*mental representation*” (Johansen, 2012). Thus we see that humans need all the potentialities of soul to be working together so they enable more than just a survival of humans.

After all the above was said, we can continue with the definition of the human’s soul. Aristotle says, that there are two main potentialities in the soul of a human, one is judgement, which deals with reason and senses and the other that produces movement (432a 15-16). And movement is the object of next Aristotle’s inquiry. He is aware that even growing and decaying is a movement of some sort (432b 9), so it makes sense that all the natural bodies have it. But more complicated sorts of movement are not available for all the bodies. He then concludes that it is the intellect and the desire, which are responsible for the movement (433a 9). We must be aware that it is not the kind of intellect that is responsible for the contemplative, philosophical thoughts, but rather an intellect that works for a certain aim – Aristotle calls it a practical intellect (433b 15). Johansen comes with the distinction that the theoretical intellect will think about the various means to reach the goal, and practical intellect will imagine the one that seems better (Johansen, 2012). So the movement must have some direction, otherwise, it would be uncoordinated motion, which would be similar (if not the same) to the growing and decaying of the plants. The desire, as Aristotle says, is also

oriented toward some goal (433b 17). Thus we can say, that it is the desire that presupposes the practical intellect, it gives it the reason to think about a certain goal. Aristotle also claims that the desire produces movement (433b 21). Intellect thus cannot move on its own, it needs something that would make it move. It is the desire that gives it the first idea to move. The theoretical intellect, since its role is to contemplate and think things over, is usually right, but the desire can be both right and not wrong (433a 27-28). Aristotle later introduces another useful difference between reason and desire, the fact that desire is concerned with the present good (433b 8-9). Theoretical intellect can, through thinking, expect the outcomes of present decisions, but the desire, is called desire for a reason. Thus the desire can be fooled and persuaded by the false images of present pleasure. So the desire creates movement, movement happens through the body parts. Hence the desire is something that is not being present only in the soul, but it must be examined as a something connected to the body (433b 21-22). Aristotle then concludes that for desiring, the human needs the imagination (433b 30). We know now that some animals have the imagination as well. But some animals' imagination is connected with the "*deliberation*" (434a 7). Deliberation is "*careful thought or discussion in order to make a decision*" (Webster, 2015). Only humans are able to deliberate in their minds. This adds to the notion of the imagination not being connected only to the sight. The more sophisticated level of imagination, the one that humans have, can imagine more complicated problems. Aristotle thus concludes that animals who are not able to deliberate, do not have the faculty of knowledge, and thus they cannot control their desire and it will always win (434a 13-15). So it is the ability to make a reasoned decision based on careful deliberation that separates men from the animals.

3. 3. Conclusion

In the Book I Aristotle asks three questions about the soul. So what are the answers to them? First question is concerned with what the soul really is. I think it is safe to say, that soul is an existing "thing". But it is not a thing in the physical sense. The soul is for Aristotle the actuality of the potential existing in the body. Body of a plant has different potentiality than the body of the human, therefore their soul is not the same.

But soul as such does not exist on its own. The second question deals with the independence of the soul. Here is Aristotle quite clear when he says that soul cannot exist without a body (414a 20). Thus we may conclude that soul cannot exist on its own. The third question Aristotle asks is about the internal order of the soul. And here we must consider that the internal structure of different kinds of souls is not the same. The task of the plant's soul is to sustain the life of a plant and to enable its procreation. In the animals' soul we see new elements of sense perception and imagination, but there are also the roles that belong to the soul of the plants. Thus there are two souls inside the animal. The human soul therefore has two previous souls, but also the soul, that entitles people to have intellect. So we can see, that the human incorporates three souls, with various activities belonging to them. Hence the answer to the Aristotle's question would be that soul of a human is indeed constructed from more parts, which have an internal order.

So the soul of humans must include the actualized potentials of the animal soul, and the soul of plants. But only thanks to the intellectual function of the human's soul are people able to know, understand and master the world around them. It may appear that soul of a human is the perfect one, since it possess all the qualities of the "lesser" souls, but it is precisely this fact that enables us to believe that sometimes, only a certain kind of soul prevails. Some men may be physically humans, and have humans' soul, but the soul of an animal inside them may overpower the intellectual part and make them blindly follow their instinct.

Chapter IV: The Final Conclusion of the Soul in *Symposium* and *De Anima*

4. 1. General Conclusion

At this point it is time to compare the two views, which have been presented so far. In my opinion, the account of soul hidden in Plato's *Symposium* and Aristotle's view on it in *De Anima* share common elements. Besides the obvious similarity between the topics, I do believe that there are some less obvious connections. The first thing that is similar is the overall focus of both books. At one point in Socrates' speech we could see the importance of the philosophical contemplation as a way of reaching the complete understanding of things. Johansen believes, that such contemplation is also the goal of the whole *De Anima* (Johansen, 2012). Thus the message the reader gets is about the importance of reasonable thinking. Also the way in which Plato describes love is similar to Aristotle's approach towards the question of soul. They both want to define what the topic of their discussion is about. Interlocutors in *Symposium* usually want to establish what love is. For some it is a god, some believe that it is a spirit or they talk about love as if it was a force inside people. Then, they wish to know, what the functions of love are, or how does it affect people. Aristotle wants to find concrete answers as well, he achieves them through the examination of various kinds of souls (plant's, animal's and human's). His approach is probably more scientific. But I do not want to dismiss *Symposium* for not being as clear as *De Anima*, it has a good structure that lets the reader see Plato's point. This serves as a reminder that both belong to the founders of modern science.

But the similarities do not end there. Next there is Plato's division of soul into three parts. It is (at least in the number) similar to the three kinds of soul introduced by Aristotle. Plato's parts are the appetitive, spirited and reasonable. Aristotle places his souls in the plants, animals and in people. Here, an important note must be made: Plato talks about the soul of a human, but Aristotle talks about various kinds of souls. That being said, the human's soul consists of all the "lesser" varieties of soul. When we know this, we can make the comparison between the two interpretations. Since the

humans share the same “parts” of soul that can be found in plants and in animals, we can say, that Aristotle is describing various faculties of human soul. In *Symposium* the interlocutors describe mostly love. For the purpose of this thesis I have introduced the idea of love being a pusher (mover) that creates movement of the body towards a certain goal. It can make man pursue his passion for sex, or for food, it can enable him to go and fight in wars and when a man is capable of a deeper understanding of the whole concept of love, he can enjoy the more sophisticated things, like philosophy. Love can do all of this. But all these activities also appear inside the soul. At least in the one Plato talks about in his other books. There is however one thing that makes the comparison difficult, Aristotle does not really mention that soul might be connected to the romantic idea of love. *De Anima* is about the soul, not about love. That is why I have made my interpretation of *the Symposium* in such a way, so I can compare the differences. For the sake of the coherence of this chapter, I will talk about the degrees of the soul. Each degree will represent either the part of soul of Plato or its kind introduced by Aristotle.

4. 2. Degrees of the Soul

Now let us talk about the first degree of the soul. Here we can observe another similar element between the two accounts. In *De Anima*, we are told that the soul of plants is responsible for the nourishment and the procreation of the individual. Appetitive part of Plato’s soul is also used by the organism to feed itself and to mate with others. For Plato this is the part of the soul that makes people enjoy the earthly pleasures. Food and sex are the first things that come to mind. If this part of the soul is prevailing in a person, he/she is more likely to be interested in the said activities. This part of soul enjoys the intercourse, but mostly for the sake of pleasure, not for the sake of procreation. It would be wrong to think that this part of soul is worse than the others, it just serves different purpose. Here we can help ourselves with Aristotle’s notion of the soul’s first degree. For him the soul has the ability to actualize the potential hidden in the matter. The first kind of soul actualizes the ability of a body to feed and to procreate. He puts this kind of soul inside the plants. However, as it was mentioned before, all the kinds of the soul are present inside the humans as well. The plant’s only

need is to have enough nourishments and to create an offspring. But these two activities are necessary for humans as well. Thus while Plato sees this as a part of soul responsible for the basic human needs, Aristotle sees it as a first and most important element that makes life itself possible. But we can say, that both Plato and Aristotle see the human soul as threefold, which would not be working properly if any of the parts would be missing. Aristotle and also Plato argue that living beings long for the eternal life. This can be, to some extent, achieved through the intercourse. From a physical point of view the children of an individual serve as his/her continuation in the eternity, since they carry the genes of their ancestors. But Plato sees the love for eternal life more profoundly, and he thinks that the reasonable part of the soul plays role in it. Aristotle understands that bodies cannot live forever, but through the reproduction process and the continuation of the species, they can have a share of immortality. We know that children possess certain genetic information given to them by their parents. It may be too strong to talk about immortality, but there is certain notion of life continuing after the death. But there must be said, that Aristotle's soul dies with the body, it cannot exist separately.

When we move forward to the second degree of the soul, we will get into more complex aspects of the human psyche. And also in this part the difference between Plato and Aristotle is perhaps the most visible. The second degree of Plato's soul introduces the notion of a strong, courageous spirit in men. Those who are influenced by this part, are able of courageous acts and deeds that other consider to be brave. For Plato it is soldiers who use this part of the soul the most. Or people heavily influenced by love. When Aristotle describes the second degree of soul, he talks mostly about the animals, but we know now that it is inside the humans as well. It is responsible for sense perception, which opens new possibilities for the individual. One of those new things that plants cannot have is movement. But senses can give us much more than the ability to move around, and to perceive our surroundings. One of the functions that originates in this degree of soul is imagination. It is possible only after a certain image, or idea has been planted into our mind through the sight. It is very important for the animals and for the people as well, animals would not be able to picture a distant place where they are going, and if the people did not have the imagination they would not be able to think about more complicated subjects. Which is something that the animals cannot do. So where does the *Symposium* come in? The brave warriors

from Homer's opuses, who were so courageous and brave, could achieve their brilliance in the battle only when all their senses were perfectly developed and enabled them to move on the battlefield in a glorious way. Their spirits were driven by the image of victory and eternal glory. Here we see the interconnectedness of the animal kind of the soul, with the spirited soul as described by Phaedrus, who talks about the courageous deeds of the people in love.

The third degree of the soul, is the one that contains the most profound elements inside the human's body. Plato calls this part the rational, Aristotle says, that only humans have this kind of soul, since only they are capable of reasonable thinking. Both clearly put this degree of soul on the highest position of the order of souls. Plato believes that this part of soul is the one which opens the possibility of higher forms of reasoning. This part, when it is exercised properly, (as we could see in Socrates's speech in the 2nd chapter) enables the individual to obtain the complete knowledge of things. The thinking process is also very important for Aristotle's account of soul. Only humans have in themselves all the previous degrees of soul. Aristotle gives it the explanation that all those previous degrees are there in order to sustain and to support the life of a human. Here we see the importance of the unity of the kinds of soul connected to the physical body, (nutritive, sensual) with the one that is above them – the intellectual part. Without all those cooperating together no human endeavour would be possible. Or more precisely, we would not even be humans at all. Aristotle describes the varieties of souls as they existed in the world around him. Either in plants or in animals. Those could be studied more easily than humans. But the soul of humans is different. It is the only one that can exist after the death of a body, when the animals and plants die, their soul will perish with them. Thus we see the main difference between humans and other living bodies. Only people achieve the ultimate connection between the body and the mind. This enables them to pursue higher goals than just plain survival. The notion of a unity between the physical and the transcendental bodies can be observed in *Symposium* as well. In Socrates' speech I introduced the idea that only after an individual has exercised all the parts of his soul properly, he is able to understand the things as they really are. In *Symposium*, this can be achieved only after one reaches the point, where he is capable of high intellectual contemplation. One of the steps to it is the understanding the concept of beauty itself, instead of its real world representation in living bodies. After this, man can

contemplate about it. So it is not the physical body that can understand the highest achievable knowledge. It is the intellectual part of the soul, which can exist after the physical body dies that can reach and understand it. Thus we again see the importance of the unity of the body and soul. Body is just flesh and bones, when body dies, they turn to dust. Both Plato and Aristotle then agree that only when natural body is guided by the reasonable (intellectual) soul, it can achieve greatness and “touch” the eternity.

Resumé

Hlavnou úlohou tejto bakalárskej práce je poukázať na možnú zhodu medzi názormi dvoch antických filozofov na dušu. Otázka duše je relevantná aj v dnešnej dobe, keďže sa stále častejšie ľudia stretávajú s psychickými poruchami a tak musia využívať služby psychológov. Práve v psychológii je najviac viditeľné uplatnenie výskumu duše. Táto práca si však nedáva za cieľ vysvetliť vplyv filozofie na psychológiu.

Pojem duša je univerzálny a do istej miery ho chápu ľudia po celom svete. Táto téma bola preskúmaná mnohými autormi z rôznych uhlov. Táto práca sa nesnaží dokázať novú pravdu, ktorá by vrhla na tému iné svetlo. Za objekt môjho výskumu som si vybral práce Platóna a Aristotela. Oba sú považovaní za otcov filozofie, alebo aj vedy ako takej. Je teda celkom logické pozrieť sa na problematiku duše v ich dielach. Ako hlavné zdroje pre moju prácu som si zvolil Platónovo *Sympózium* a Aristotelovo *O Duši*. Analýza týchto diel sa nachádza v druhej a tretej kapitole tejto práce.

Predtým, než sa vrhneme do prác antických mudrcov, preskúmame problematiku duše v dejinách filozofie. Táto téma by vystačila na samostatnú prácu, preto je táto časť skôr informatívna a podhaľuje čitateľovi niektoré aspekty filozofického prístupu k otázkam o duši. Hlavný účel prvej kapitoly je teda skôr oboznámenie sa s problematikou a načrtnúť niektoré témy, ktoré sa vyskytnú neskôr v práci. Napríklad grécke chápanie slova duša. Je dôležité povedať, že v gréčtine sa slovo duša chápe v súvislosti so vzduchom, alebo s čímisi ako duch (duch v človeku). Tento fakt bude hrať svoju úlohu v neskorších kapitolách práce. Prvá kapitola taktiež obsahuje skrátený prierez dejinami filozofického ponímania duše. Spomenutí sú pred sokratovskí filozofi, Sv. Augustín alebo René Descartes. No ako som povedal, najdôležitejšia časť práce začína druhou kapitolou.

V druhej kapitole sa venujem rozboru Platónovho *Sympózia*. Hoci sa môže zdať táto voľba ako nevhodná na prieskum problému duše, keďže *Sympózium* je hlavne o láske. Aby som ho mohol správne interpretovať, na začiatku uvediem stručný opis Platónovej teórie o duši, ktorá sa nachádza v jeho *Ústave*. Tam sa dozvieme, že duša má tri časti, prvá sa zaoberá rôznymi pozemskými slasťami ako je jedlo, víno a ženy. Druhá časť zodpovedá za odvahu a statočnosť ľudí (hlavne vojakov). Funkciu poslednej časti duše je racionálne uvažovanie. Tieto časti duše sa v rôznych podobách

dajú nájsť aj v *Sympóziu*. Z viacerých rečníkov by som spomenul najmä Aristofana, v ktorého príhovore sa dozvieme zaujímavý príbeh o vzniku ľudí. Zistíme, že v minulosti bol každý zrastený so svojim dokonalým partnerom, no naše telo bolo neskôr rozdelené a tak dnes musíme chodiť po svete a snažíme sa nájsť našu druhú polovicu. V práci som tento príbeh prirovnal k hľadaniu spriaznenej duše. Ľudská duša túži byť kompletná, a to sa stane len v tom prípade, keď nájde svojho dávno strateného milenca. V Aristofanovej reči sa nachádza silný erotický podtón, ktorý nás opäť privádza k funkcii prvej časti duše. Ako sme povedali, táto časť duše túži po fyzickom potešení a to môže v plnej miere dosiahnuť len spojením sa so svojou polovičkou. Ďalším dôležitým momentom *Sympózia* je Agatonova reč. Počas jeho príhovoru sa dozvieme, že láska sa nachádza v dušiach ľudí. No nie v každej duši, iba v takej, ktorá má v sebe dobro. Agathon taktiež tvrdí, že láska hrá dôležitú úlohu pri odvážnych činoch starovekých hrdinov. Takže opäť vidíme spojitosť medzi pojmami láska a duša. Lásku v *Sympóziu* teda môžeme chápať ako istý druh sily, ktorá poháňa činnosť človeka. Je teda celkom logické, že láska sa musí podieľať aj na fungovaní duše.

Jedným z najdôležitejších rečníkov v *Sympóziu* je Sokrates. Jeho príspevok do diskusie je dôležitý nie len pre jeho obsah, ale aj preto, že je to často sa vyskytujúca a v podstate aj hlavná postava Platónových diel. Sokrates sa zúčastnil (minimálne) jednej diskusie o láske už pred sympóziom, bol to jeho dialóg s Diotimou. Ich spoločný rozhovor priniesol Sokratovi cenné poznatky na túto tému. Hlavný prínos jeho príhovoru je v odhalené procesu, akým človek dospeje k úplnému poznaniu. Na začiatok je potrebné aby si uvedomil krásu jedného tela, potom všetkých tiel a na konci pochopí krásu ako takú. Tento proces ponúka určitú analógiu s časťami duše, najnižšia časť sa zaoberá telesnými pôžitkami, ďalšia napomáha dosiahnutiu svetskej slávy a získaniu rešpektu živých ľudí a posledná je schopná filozofickej kontemplácie, vďaka ktorej je človek schopný poznávať veci tak, aké skutočne sú. Ďalší zo Sokratových bodov, ktoré sa hodia k problému duše, je fakt, že láska poháňa človeka k túžbe po nesmrteľnosti. Pre Platóna je ľudská duša nesmrteľná, takže tu dochádza k spojeniu oboch pojmov. Nesmrteľnosť ľudskej duše tu neznamená, že žije večne ako nejaký duch, ale v tomto prípade skôr ide o myšlienku, že poznanie nadobudnuté v jednom živote, sa dokáže po smrti tela a prevtelení duše dostať do nového tela. Teda proces poznávania dokáže zaručiť „nesmrteľnosť“.

Tretia kapitola sa už venuje práci Aristotela. Jeho dielo *O Duši* poskytuje dokonalý obraz o jeho chápaní duše. Aristoteles pristúpil k tomuto problému trochu inak ako Platón. V jeho bádani sa pokúsil preskúmať duše všetkých živých organizmov, nie len ľudskú. Najprv sa zameril na dušu v rastlinách. Usúdil, že rastliny nevykonávajú veľa činností, takže ani ich duša nepotrebuje rozsiahle množstvo funkcií. Preto má len dve, vyživovaciú a rozmnožovaciú. Prvá má za účel dodávať živiny potrebné pre fungovanie života rastliny a druhá umožňuje rastline rozširovať svoje gény aj po svojej smrti. Vegetatívna duša je teda celkom jednoduchá, no je nutné aby jej aktivita bola prítomná v každom živom organizme, inak by nebol schopný existovať a množiť sa.

Ďalší druh duše, ktorý Aristoteles skúma je zvieracia duša. Aby zviera mohlo byť na živé, jeho duša musí byť takisto schopná prijímať živiny a rozmnožovať sa, to jej dodáva činnosť prvého stupňa duše. Duša zvieratá je však o čosi schopnejšia. Hlavným rozdielom je to, že zvieratá majú možnosť pohybu. Dokážu to vďaka tomu, že nie sú prirastené na jedno miesto (ako rastlina) a vďaka tomu, že dokážu vnímať svoje okolie zmyslami. Sú schopné využívať, zrak, čuch, sluch, chuť a hmat. Aristoteles sa venuje podrobnejšiemu opisu všetkých zmyslov, no na záver dodáva, že najdôležitejším zmyslom je dotyk. Ten ako jediný zo zmyslov neprijíma podnety z okolia sprostredkované (cez vzduch), ale telo živočícha musí prísť do priameho kontaktu s daným objektom. Jeho telo je teda samo zmyslovým orgánom. Tvor je teda schopný prijímať zmyslové podnety, len keď jeho vnútorné orgány fungujú správne. Ak by nefungovali, naznačovalo by to, že zviera je mŕtve. Zvieratá sú vďaka vlastnostiam svojej duše schopné aj predstavivosti. Bez nej, by sa ťažko mohli pohybovať, lebo by nevedeli kam vlastne ídú.

Posledný typ duše patrí človeku. Táto duša musí mať schopnosti všetkých duší, ktoré existujú v nižších organizmoch. Preto sa teda človek dá nazvať „pánom tvorstva“. To čo ho odlišuje od zvierat a rastlín je schopnosť racionálneho uvažovania. Len vďaka tomu sa dokáže vysporiadať s problémami, ktoré sú omnoho komplikovanejšie než tie, ktoré musia riešiť zvieratá. Aristotelova koncepcia duše pracuje s faktom, že keď umrie telo živého tvora, umrie aj jeho duša. No ani on nevynecháva zmienku o možnej nesmrteľnosti. Pre nižšie živočíchové to je nesmrteľnosť v neúplnom zmysle slova. Aristoteles naráža na fakt, že cez ich potomstvo prežíva časť ich genetického

materiálu. No ľudská duša je na tom s nesmrteľnosťou trochu inak, síce tiež nemôže žiť sama o sebe, ale jedna z jej funkcií – intelekt, prežíva aj po smrti jednotlivca.

To, že intelekt dokáže prekročiť prah smrti nám pripomína Platónovu koncepciu nesmrteľnosti. Tu začína porovnávanie Platónovej a Aristotelovej teórie o duši. Ďalšiu z podobností nájdeme v podobnosti vegetatívneho druhu Aristotelovej duše a Platónovej časti duše, ktorá riadi ľudské ukávanie sa. Obe sa do istej miery zaoberajú erotickým potešením a prijímaním stravy. Aristotelova duša v rastlinách to síce robí z nutnosti, no ako vieme, tá istá činnosť sa odohráva aj v človeku a bolo by naivné mysliť si, že ľudia prijímajú potravu a rozmnožujú sa, len preto že musia. Pokiaľ ide o prepojenie oduševnenej časti duše a zvieracieho druhu duše, podobnosť nie je veľmi zrejmá. No keď sa nad tým zamyslíme, uvedomíme si, že vojaci vo vojnách museli byť v lepšom fyzickom stave ako ich nepriatelia a ich zmysly museli byť taktiež nadmieru vyvinuté. Takže čím silnejšia „zvieracia časť“ bola v bojovníkovi, tým odvážnejší mohol byť. Ako sme už spomenuli intelekt je najvyššia činnosť, ktorú duša môže vykonávať. S tým súhlasí Platón aj Aristoteles. Obaja sa tiež zhodnú na tom, že duša v sebe obsahuje trojicu rozličných prvkov, ktoré musia nevyhnutne spolupracovať, inak človek nedokáže naplno využiť potenciál, ktorý sa v ňom skrýva.

Bibliography

- Asmus. V. F. (1986). *Antická Filozofie. [Antic Philosophy]*. Jan Zouhar. Praha.
- Charlton W. (1980). *Aristotle's Definition of Soul*. Brill.
- Colman A. (2001). *Oxford Dictionary of Psychology*. Oxford University Press Inc. New York.
- Copleston F. (1946). *History of Philosophy, Volume I, Greece and Rome*. Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group Inc. New York.
- Furley D. (1999). *Routledge History of Philosophy Volume II from Aristotle to Augustine*. Routledge. New York.
- Galikova S. (2007). *Psyche*. VEDA. Bratislava. Translated by the Author.
- Grube G. M. A. (1992). *Plato's Republic*. Hackett Publishing.
- Hamilton W. (1951). *Plato's Symposium*. Hunt Barnard Printing Ltd. Great Britain.
- Hamlyn D.W. (1968). *Aristotle's De Anima*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Hillar M. (1994). *Contributors to the Philosophy of Humanism*. Humanists of Houston. Houston.
- Holy Bible: 21st Century King James Version*. (1994) 21st Century Publishing.
- Johansen T. K. (2012). *The Power of Aristotle's Soul*. Oxford University Press. United Kingdom.
- Kazdin A. (2000). *Encyclopedia of Psychology, Volume 6*. Oxford University Press Inc. New York
- Kříž A. (1996). *Aristoteles: O Duši. [Aristotle: On the Soul]* Petr Rezek. Praha.
- Merriam-Webster. (2015). *Merriam – Webster Dictionary*. Merriam – Webster Inc.
- Nussbaum M. (2003). *Křehkost Dobra. [Fragility of Goodness]* Oikoymenh. Praha. Translated by the Author.
- Pinker S. (1998). *How the Mind Works*. Penguin Books.
- Roussel A. (1994). *Filozofický Slovník. [Philosophical Dictionary]*. EWA Edition. Praha. Translated by the Author.
- Russell B. (1946) *History of Western Philosophy*. George Allen and Unwin Ltd. London.
- Taylor C. (1997). *Routledge History of Philosophy Volume I from the Beginning to Plato*. Routledge. London