

## Plato in *Ennead* III 4 *On Our Allotted Guardian Spirit*

Καὶ ὁ μὲν κατὰ τὰς πρακτικὰς ἐνεργῶν σπουδαῖος ἦν ἄνθρωπος,  
ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὰς καθαρτικὰς δαιμόνιος ἄνθρωπος ἢ καὶ δαίμων ἀγαθός,  
ὁ δὲ κατὰ μόνας τὰς πρὸς τὸν νοῦν θεός,  
ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὰς παραδειγματικὰς θεῶν πατήρ.  
Porph. *Sent.* 32, 91-94

### ABSTRACT

In *Ennead* III 4 [15] *On Our Allotted Guardian Spirit*, which Porphyry (VPlot 10, 14-30) associates with the episode of the conjuration of Plotinus' guardian spirit (δαίμων) in the Isaeum, Plotinus exposes his views on the nature of the companion spirits allegedly presiding over our activity. While the testimony preserved by Porphyry may be understood as pointing to an attempt to provide some empirical support for Plotinus' doctrine, Plotinus' main concern in this treatise is to ground his demonology not in ritual practice, or in experience more generally, but in Plato's authority. For this purpose, Plotinus endeavours to reconcile relevant Platonic references drawn from various dialogues (*Timaeus*, *Republic*, *Phaedo*, *Phaedrus*, *Cratylus*, *Symposium*). I shall attempt to show that a twofold concern underlies the common thread running through Plotinus' reconstruction of Plato's doctrine: on the one hand, an "expansive reading" of Plato's demonology, a reading which reflects Plotinus' "expansive psychology" (Kalligas 2014, 486) and anticipates his anthropology in *Enneads* VI 7 [38] *How the Multitude of the Forms Came into Being and on the Good* and I 1 [53] *On What is the Living Being, and What is Man*; on the other hand, the view that a *daimon* is inactive on the ontological level which it supervises and which is immediately inferior to the level of the *daimon*'s own activity: our guardian spirits are inactive on our level, so that we can be both responsible for our choices and capable of changing them.

### OUTLINE

- 🌀 Introduction: Summoning Spirits in the Isaeum  
T1
- I. Plotinus' Doctrine: "Expansive Demonology" and Freedom of Choice  
T2-T5
- II. The *Timaeus*, the *Symposium*, and the *Phaedrus*: "The δαίμονες that Plato calls δαίμονες" (Plot. VI 7, 6, 32-33)  
T6-T11
- III. The *Phaedo* and the *Phaedrus*: the *Daimon* as ἡγεμῶν  
T12-T13, T10
- IV. The Myth of Er and the *Timaeus*: Exteriority and Interiority  
T4-T6, T14
- 🌀 Epilogue: Platonic "Philosophy without Conflict"

## TEXTS

### T1 Porph. *VPlot.* 10, 14-34

Ἦν γὰρ καὶ κατὰ γενέσειν πλέον τι ἔχων παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους ὁ Πλωτῖνος. Αἰγύπτιος γάρ τις ἱερεὺς ἀνελθὼν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην καὶ διὰ τινος φίλου αὐτῷ γνωρισθεὶς θέλων τε τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σοφίας ἀπόδειξιν δοῦναι ἠξίωσε τὸν Πλωτῖνον ἐπὶ θέαν ἀφικέσθαι τοῦ συνόντος αὐτῷ οἰκείου δαίμονος καλουμένου. Τοῦ δὲ ἐτοίμως ὑπακούσαντος γίνεται μὲν ἐν τῷ Ἰσίῳ ἢ κλησίς· μόνον γὰρ ἐκεῖνον τὸν τόπον καθαρὸν φῆσαι εὐρεῖν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον. Κληθέντα δὲ εἰς αὐτοψίαν τὸν δαίμονα θεὸν ἐλθεῖν καὶ μὴ τοῦ δαιμόνων εἶναι γένους· ὅθεν τὸν Αἰγύπτιον εἰπεῖν· «μακάριος εἶ θεὸν ἔχων τὸν δαίμονα καὶ οὐ τοῦ ὑφειμένου γένους τὸν συνόντα.» Μῆτε δὲ ἐρέσθαι τι ἐκγενέσθαι μῆτε ἐπιπλέον ἰδεῖν παρόντα τοῦ συνθεωροῦντος φίλου τὰς ὄρνεις, ἃς κατεῖχε φυλακῆς ἕνεκα, πνίξαντος εἴτε διὰ φθόνον εἴτε καὶ διὰ φόβον τινά. Τῶν οὖν θειοτέρων δαιμόνων ἔχων τὸν συνόντα καὶ αὐτὸς διετέλει ἀνάγων αὐτοῦ τὸ θεῖον ὄμμα πρὸς ἐκεῖνον. Ἔστι γοῦν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης αἰτίας καὶ βιβλίον γραφὲν *Περὶ τοῦ εἰληχότος ἡμᾶς δαίμονος*, ὅπου πειρᾶται αἰτίας φέρειν περὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς τῶν συνόντων.

Plotinus certainly possessed by birth something more than other men. A certain Egyptian priest, who came to Rome and made his acquaintance through a friend, wanted to give a display of his wisdom. So he asked Plotinus to come and see a visible manifestation of his own companion spirit evoked. Plotinus readily consented, and the conjuration took place in the Temple of Isis: the Egyptian said it was the only pure spot he could find in Rome. When the *daimon* was summoned to appear, a god came, who did not belong to the race of *daimones*. And the Egyptian said: "O blessed art thou, who have a god for your *daimon* and not a companion of the subordinate order." It was not however possible to ask any questions of the god or even to see him present for longer, as the friend who was taking part in the manifestation strangled the birds which he was holding as a protection, either out of jealousy or because he was afraid of something. So the companion of Plotinus was a *daimon* of the more god-like kind, and Plotinus continually kept the divine eye of his soul fixed in this companion. It was a reason of this kind that led him to write the treatise *On Our Allotted Guardian Spirit*, in which he sets out to explain the differences between spirit-companions.

(A. H. Armstrong's translation, slightly modified  
on the basis of M. Edward's translation)

### T2 Plot. *III* 4, 3, 1-10

Τίς οὖν δαίμων; ὁ καὶ ἐνταῦθα.<sup>1</sup> Τίς δὲ θεός; ἢ ὁ ἐνταῦθα. Τὸ γὰρ ἐνεργῆσαν τοῦτο ἕκαστον ἄγει, ἅτε καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἡγοῦμενον. Ἄρ' οὖν τοῦτο ἐστὶν ὁ δαίμων, ὅσπερ ζῶντα εἰλήχει;<sup>2</sup> Ἡ οὐ, ἀλλὰ τὸ πρὸ αὐτοῦ· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐφέστηκεν ἀργοῦν, ἐνεργεῖ δὲ τὸ μετ' αὐτόν. Καὶ εἰ μὲν τὸ ἐνεργοῦν ἢ αἰσθητικοί,

Who then becomes a *daimon*? He who was one here too. And who a god? Certainly who was one here. For what was active in a man directs (ἄγει) him [after death], since it ruled here too. Is this, then, "the *daimon* to whom he was allotted while he lived"? No, but that which is before what is active; for this [the *daimon*]

<sup>1</sup> Pl. *Cra.* 398 c.

<sup>2</sup> Pl. *Phd.* 107 d.

καὶ ὁ δαίμων τὸ λογικόν· εἰ δὲ κατὰ τὸ λογικὸν ζώημεν, ὁ δαίμων τὸ ὑπὲρ τοῦτο ἐφεστῶς ἀργὸς συγχωρῶν τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ. Ὁρθῶς οὖν λέγεται ἡμᾶς αἰρήσεσθαι.<sup>3</sup> Τὸν γὰρ ὑπερκείμενον κατὰ τὴν ζωὴν αἰρούμεθα.

presides inactive over the man, but that which comes after it is active. If the acting principle is that by which we have sense-perception, the spirit is the rational principle; but if we live by the rational principle, the daimon is what is above this, presiding inactive and giving its consent to the principle which works. So it is rightly said that “we shall choose.” For we choose the principle which stands above us according to our choice of life.

(A. H. Armstrong’s translation, slightly modified)

### T3 Pl. *Cra.* 398 c

ταύτη οὖν τίθεται καὶ ἐγὼ τὸν δαίμονα πάντ’ ἄνδρα ὃς ἂν ἀγαθὸς ᾖ, δαιμόνιον εἶναι καὶ ζῶντα καὶ τελευτήσαντα, καὶ ὁρθῶς ‘δαίμονα’ καλεῖσθαι.

And so I assert that a knowing man is every man who is good, that he is daimonic whether living or dead, and that he is rightly called a “*daimon*”.

### T4 Pl. *R.* X 617 d-e; 620 d-e

σφᾶς οὖν, ἐπειδὴ ἀφικέσθαι, εὐθὺς δεῖν ἰέναι πρὸς τὴν Λάχεσιν. προφήτην οὖν τινα σφᾶς πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τάξει διαστῆσαι, ἔπειτα λαβόντα ἐκ τῶν τῆς Λαχέσεως γονάτων κλήρους τε καὶ βίων παραδείγματα, ἀναβάντα ἐπὶ τι βῆμα ὑψηλὸν εἰπεῖν—‘Ἀνάγκης θυγατρὸς κόρης Λαχέσεως λόγος. Ψυχαὶ ἐφήμεροι, ἀρχὴ ἄλλης περιόδου θνητοῦ γένους θανατηφόρου. οὐχ ὑμᾶς δαίμων λήξεται, ἀλλ’ ὑμεῖς δαίμονα αἰρήσεσθε. πρῶτος δ’ ὁ λαχὼν πρῶτος αἰρείσθω βίον ᾧ συνέσται ἐξ ἀνάγκης. ἀρετὴ δὲ ἀδέσποτον, ἣν τιμῶν καὶ ἀτιμάζων πλέον καὶ ἔλαττον αὐτῆς ἕκαστος ἔξει. αἰτία ἐλομένου: θεὸς ἀναίτιος.’

Now, when they [the souls] arrived, they had to make their way immediately toward Lachesis. There a prophet first made them stand in order and then took from Lachesis’ lap lots and examples of lives. Then he went up to a high platform and said: “This is the word of Lachesis, the maiden daughter of Ananke: ‘Souls that live for a day, this is the beginning of another deadly period for the mortal kind. No *daimon* will select you by lot, but you will be the one to choose a *daimon*. Let the one who draws the first lot be the first to choose a life to which he will adhere by necessity. But virtue has no master; by honoring it or dishonoring it, each will have a greater or lesser share of it. Let the one who chooses be responsible; God is blameless’.”

(My translation is based upon those of P. Shorey and of C. Emlyn-Jones and W. Preddy)

ἐπειδὴ δ’ οὖν πάσας τὰς ψυχὰς τοὺς βίους ἡρῆσθαι, ὥσπερ ἔλαχον ἐν τάξει προσιέναι πρὸς τὴν Λάχεσιν: ἐκείνην δ’ ἐκάστῳ ὃν εἴλετο δαίμονα, τοῦτον φύλακα συμπέμπειν τοῦ βίου καὶ ἀποπληρωτὴν τῶν αἰρεθέντων.

When all the souls had chosen their lives, according to the order of their lots they approached Lachesis. And she sent with each, as the guardian of one’s life and the fulfiller of one’s choice, the *daimon* one had chosen.

(P. Shorey’s translation, slightly modified)

### T5 Plot. III 4, 5, 15-25

---

<sup>3</sup> Pl. *R.* X 617 e.

Ὅταν δὲ λέγῃται, ὡς πρῶτον οἱ κληροὶ, εἴτα τὰ τῶν βίων παραδείγματα,<sup>4</sup> ἔπειτα ταῖς ψυχαῖς<sup>5</sup> <ὡς δαίμονα αἰρήσονται><sup>6</sup> καὶ ὡς ἐκ τῶν παρόντων τοὺς βίους κατὰ τὰ ἦθη, τὸ κύριον μᾶλλον δίδωσι ταῖς ψυχαῖς διατιθείσας τὰ δοθέντα πρὸς τὰ αὐτῶν ἦθη. Ὅτι γὰρ ὁ δαίμων οὗτος οὐ παντάπασιν ἔξω ἀλλ' οὕτως ὡς μὴ συνδεδεμένος οὐδ' ἔνεργων, ἡμέτερος δέ, ὡς ψυχῆς πέρι εἰπεῖν, οὐχὶ ἡμέτερος δέ,<sup>8</sup> εἰ ὡς ἄνθρωποι τοιοῦδε τὴν ὑπ' αὐτὸν ζῶν ἔχοντες, μαρτυρεῖ τὰ ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ· ἃ εἰ μὲν οὕτω ληφθεῖη, οὐδεμίαν ἔξει μάχην σχόντα ἄν τινα ἀσυμφωνίαν, εἰ ἄλλως ὁ δαίμων ληφθεῖη. Τὸ δὲ ἀποπληρωτὴν ὦν τις εἴλετο<sup>9</sup> καὶ αὐτὸ σύμφωνον.

But when it is said that first come the “lots,” then “the examples of lives,” then that the souls “will choose a *daimon*” and that [they choose] the lives from what is present according to the characters, Plato gives the power of decision rather to the souls, which adapt what is given to them to their own characters. For that this *daimon* is not entirely outside but only in the sense that it is not bound to us and is not active [in us], but is ours, if we speak with respect to our souls, but not ours, if we are considered as men of a particular kind who have a life which is subject to it, is shown by what is said in the *Timaeus*; if the passage is taken in this way, it will contain no contradiction, but it would have some disaccord, if the *daimon* were understood otherwise. And the “fulfiller of what one has chosen” is also in accord.

(A. H. Armstrong's translation, slightly modified)

#### T6 Pl. *Ti.* 90a–b

τὸ δὲ δὴ περὶ τοῦ κυριωτάτου παρ' ἡμῖν ψυχῆς εἶδους διανοεῖσθαι δεῖ τῇδε, ὡς ἄρα αὐτὸ δαίμονα θεὸς ἐκάστω δέδωκεν, τοῦτο ὃ δὴ φαμεν οἰκεῖν μὲν ἡμῶν ἐπ' ἄκρῳ τῷ σώματι, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ συγγένειαν ἀπὸ γῆς ἡμᾶς αἰρεῖν ὡς ὄντας φυτὸν οὐκ ἔγγειον ἀλλὰ οὐράνιον, ὀρθότατα λέγοντες· ἐκεῖθεν γάρ, ὅθεν ἡ πρώτη τῆς ψυχῆς γένεσις ἔφυ, τὸ θεῖον τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ ῥίζαν ἡμῶν ἀνακρεμαννὺν ὀρθοῖ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα.

And as regards the most lordly kind of our soul, we must conceive of it in this wise: we declare that God has given to each of us, as his/her *daimon*, that kind of soul which is housed in the top of our body and which raises us – seeing that we are not an earthly plant but a heavenly plant – up from earth towards our kindred in the heaven. And herein we speak most truly; for it is by suspending our head and root from that region whence our soul's generation first arose that the divine keeps upright the whole body.

(R. G. Bury's translation, slightly modified)

#### T7 Plot. VI 7, 6, 8-36

Εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἐκεῖ σώματα ταῦτα, ἦσαν αὐτῶν τῇ ψυχῇ

For if these bodies were there, the soul had perceptions

<sup>4</sup> Pl. R. X 617 d.

<sup>5</sup> ψυχαῖς cod. Igal. Kalligas: τύχαις cet., H-S1: <τὰ ἐν> ταῖς τύχαις Creuzer

<sup>6</sup> <> Kalligas: <ὡς αἰρήσονται τὸν δαίμονα> Igal: <δαίμονα ὡς αἰρησόμεθα> H-S4: locum non sanatum esse consuerunt H-S2. Cf. Pl. R. X 617 d-e

<sup>7</sup> ἔξω – ἀλλ' οὕτως ὡς μὴ συνδεδεμένος – οὐδ' interpung. H.-S. I follow P. Kalligas' Greek text

<sup>8</sup> Compare with T7 (Plot. VI 7, 6, 19): ἔχει καὶ αὖ οὐκ ἔχει.

<sup>9</sup> Pl. R. X 620 d-e.

αἰσθήσεις καὶ ἀντιλήψεις· καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἐκεῖ, ἡ τοιαύτη ψυχὴ, ἀντιληπτικὴ τούτων, ὅθεν καὶ ὁ ὕστερος ἄνθρωπος, τὸ μίμημα, εἶχε τοὺς λόγους ἐν μιμήσει· καὶ ὁ ἐν νῶ ἄνθρωπος τὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἄνθρωπον. ἐλλάμπει δ' οὗτος τῷ δευτέρῳ καὶ οὗτος τῷ τρίτῳ· ἔχει δέ πως πάντας ὁ ἔσχατος, οὐ γινόμενος ἐκεῖνοι, ἀλλὰ παρακείμενος ἐκείνοις. ἐνεργεῖ δὲ ὁ μὲν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸν ἔσχατον, τῷ δέ τι καὶ παρὰ τοῦ πρὸ αὐτοῦ, τῷ δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ τρίτου ἢ ἐνέργεια, καὶ ἔστιν ἕκαστος καθ' ὃν ἐνεργεῖ, καίτοι πάντας ἕκαστος ἔχει καὶ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἔχει. τοῦ δὲ σώματος χωρισθείσης τῆς τρίτης ζωῆς καὶ τοῦ τρίτου ἀνθρώπου, εἰ συνέποιτο τῇ δευτέρῳ,<sup>10</sup> συνέποιτο δὲ μὴ χωρισθεῖσα τῶν ἄνω, οὐ ἐκείνη καὶ αὕτη λέγεται εἶναι. μεταλαβούσης δὲ θήρειον σῶμα θαυμάζεται δέ, πῶς λόγος οὕσα ἀνθρώπου. ἡ πάντα ἦν, ἄλλοτε δὲ ἐνεργεῖ κατ' ἄλλον. καθαρὰ μὲν οὕσα καὶ πρὶν κακυνθῆναι ἄνθρωπον θέλει καὶ ἀνθρωπὸς ἐστι· καὶ γὰρ κάλλιον τοῦτο, καὶ τὸ κάλλιον ποιεῖ. ποιεῖ δὲ καὶ δαίμονας προτέρους, ὁμοειδεῖς τῇ <ῆ><sup>11</sup> ἄνθρωπον· καὶ ὁ πρὸ αὐτῆς δαιμονιώτερος, μᾶλλον δὲ θεός, καὶ ἔστι μίμημα θεοῦ δαίμων εἰς θεὸν ἀνηρτημένος, ὥσπερ ἄνθρωπος εἰς δαίμονα. οὐ γὰρ λέγεται θεός, εἰς ὃν ὁ ἄνθρωπος.<sup>12</sup> ἔχει γὰρ διαφοράν, ἣν ἔχουσι ψυχὰι πρὸς ἀλλήλας, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὥσι στοίχου.<sup>13</sup> λέγειν δὲ δεῖ δαίμονας εἶδος δαιμόνων, οὓς φησιν ὁ Πλάτων<sup>14</sup> δαίμονας.<sup>15</sup> ὅταν δὲ συνέπηται τὴν<sup>16</sup> θήρειον φύσιν<sup>17</sup> ἐλομένη<sup>18</sup> ψυχὴ<sup>19</sup> ἢ συνηρτημένη [τῇ]<sup>20</sup> ὅτε ἄνθρωπος ἦν, τὸν ἐν αὐτῇ λόγον ἐκείνου τοῦ ζώου ἔδωκεν. ἔχει γὰρ, καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια αὕτη χεῖρων.

and apprehensions of them; and the man there, the soul of this kind, was able to apprehend these bodies; and that is why the later man, the imitation, had their forming principles in imitation; and the man in Intellect apprehends the Man before all men. And this Man shines on the second, and this second on the third; and the last man somehow possesses all men, not by becoming those other men, but by being set alongside them. And one of us is active according to the last and lowest man, but another has also something from the one before him, and another's activity comes even from the third, and each is the man according to whom he is active, although each of us has all of them – and again does not have them. And, when the third life and the third man are separated from the body, if the third life follows the second life – and it follows it when it is not separated from what is above – , then the third life is said to be also where the second is. But, when the soul takes the body of a beast, one wonders how it does it, since it is the forming principle of man. Yet, the soul was all things, but it acts according to different forming principles at different times. So, when it is pure and before it is debased, it wills man and is man. For this is more beautiful, and the soul makes what is more beautiful. And it also makes *daimones*, which are superior, belonging to the same kind as that of the soul which makes man. And the man who is above the soul which makes man is more of a *daimon*, and who is even higher is a god. And a *daimon* is an imitation of a god, dependent on the god, just as a man is dependent on a *daimon*. For that on which man is dependent is not

<sup>10</sup> τῇ δευτέρῳ H-S2: ἡ δευτέρῳ a, Kalligas

<sup>11</sup> < > H-S

<sup>12</sup> Compare with T9 (Pl. *Smp.* 203 a): θεὸς δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ οὐ μείγνυται.

<sup>13</sup> στοίχου Volkmann: στίχου a

<sup>14</sup> *Smp.* 202 e-203 a; *Phdr.* 246 e; Pl. *Ti.* 90 a.

<sup>15</sup> δαίμονας a, H-S1: δαήμονας Kalligas (Pl. *Cra.* 398 b)

<sup>16</sup> τὴν a: τῇ Theiler, H-S: <τῇ> τὴν Hadot, Kalligas

<sup>17</sup> Pl. *Ti.* 42 c.

<sup>18</sup> ἐλομένη correxi: ἐλομένη a

<sup>19</sup> ψυχῇ a: ψυχῇ Ficino

<sup>20</sup> del. Kirchhoff



called “god”. A god, a man, and a *daimon* differ from one another in the same sense in which souls differ from one another, although they belong to the same order. And one should call the *daimones* that Plato call “*daimones*” “a kind of *daimones*”. But when, having made its choice, the soul, which was joint [to the higher soul] when [the living being] was a man, follows the nature of a beast, it gives [to the living being] that beast’s forming principle which exists in it. For the soul has it, and this activity is worse.

(My translation, based on A. H. Armstrong’s translation)

### T8 Plot. I 1, 7, 14-14; 10, 6-12

Ἀπὸ δὴ τούτων τῶν εἰδῶν, ἀφ’ ὧν ψυχὴ ἤδη παραδέχεται μόνη τὴν τοῦ ζώου ἡγεμονίαν, διάνοιαι δὴ καὶ δόξαι καὶ νοήσεις· ἔνθα δὴ ἡμεῖς μάλιστα. Τὰ δὲ πρὸ τούτων ἡμέτερα, ἡμεῖς δὴ τὸ ἐντεῦθεν ἄνω ἐφεστηκότες τῷ ζῳῷ. Κωλύσει δὲ οὐδὲν τὸ σύμπαν ζῶον λέγειν, μικτὸν μὲν τὰ κάτω, τὸ δὲ ἐντεῦθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἀληθὴς σχεδόν· ἐκεῖνα δὲ τὸ λεοντῶδες καὶ τὸ ποικίλον ὅλως θηρίον.<sup>21</sup> Συνδρόμου γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ λογικῇ ψυχῇ, ὅταν λογιζώμεθα, ἡμεῖς λογιζώμεθα τῷ τοῦ λογισμοῦ ψυχῆς εἶναι ἐνεργήματα.

From these forms, from which the soul alone receives its lordship over the living being, come reasonings and opinions, and intellections; and this is precisely where “we” are. That which comes before [i.e. below] this is “ours” but “we”, in our presidency over the living being, are what extends from this point upwards. But there will be no objection to calling the whole thing “living being”; the lower parts of it are something mixed, the part which begins on the level of thought is, I suppose, the true man: those lower parts are the “lion-like”, and altogether “the various beast.” Since man coincides with the rational soul, when we reason it is really “we” who reason because rational processes are activities of soul.

Διττὸν οὖν τὸ ἡμεῖς, ἢ συναριθμουμένου τοῦ θηρίου, ἢ τὸ ὑπὲρ τοῦτο ἡδὴ· θηρίον δὲ ζωῳθὲν τὸ σῶμα. Ὁ δ’ ἀληθὴς ἄνθρωπος ἄλλος ὁ καθαρὸς τούτων τὰς ἀρετὰς ἔχων τὰς ἐν νοήσει αἱ δὴ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ χωριζομένη ψυχῇ ἴδρυνται, χωριζομένη δὲ καὶ χωριστῇ ἔτι ἐνταῦθα οὔση· ἐπεὶ καί, ὅταν αὐτὴ παντάπασιν ἀποστῇ, καὶ ἡ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς ἐλλαμφθεῖσα ἀπελήλυθε συνεπομένη.<sup>22</sup>

So “we” is used in two senses, either including the beast or referring to that which, even in our present life, transcends it. The beast is the body which has been given life. But the true man is different, clear of these; he has the virtues which belong to the sphere of intellect and have their seat actually in the separate soul, separate and separable even while it is still here below. For, when it withdraws altogether, the lower soul which is illumined by it goes away too in its train.

(A. H. Armstrong’s translation, slightly modified)

<sup>21</sup> Pl. R. IX 590 a; 588 c.

<sup>22</sup> Compare with T7 (Plot. VI 7, 6, 21-22): εἴ συνέποιτο τῇ δευτέρᾳ, συνέποιτο δὲ μὴ χωρισθεῖσα τῶν ἄνω, οὗ ἐκεῖνη καὶ αὕτη λέγεται εἶναι.

**T9 Pl. *Smp.* 202 e-203 a**

καὶ γὰρ πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον μεταξύ ἐστὶ θεοῦ τε καὶ θνητοῦ. - τίνα, ἢν δ' ἐγώ, δύναμιν ἔχον; - ἐρμηνεύον καὶ διαπορθμεύον θεοῖς τὰ παρ' ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ θεῶν, τῶν μὲν τὰς δεήσεις καὶ θυσίας, τῶν δὲ τὰς ἐπιτάξεις τε καὶ ἀμοιβὰς τῶν θυσίων, ἐν μέσῳ δὲ ὄν ἀμφοτέρων συμπληροῖ, ὥστε τὸ πᾶν αὐτὸ αὐτῷ συνδεδέσθαι. διὰ τούτου καὶ ἡ μαντικὴ πᾶσα χωρεῖ καὶ ἡ τῶν ἱερέων τέχνη τῶν τε περὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τελετὰς καὶ τὰς ἐπωδὰς καὶ τὴν μαντείαν πᾶσαν καὶ γοητείαν. θεὸς δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ οὐ μίγνυται, ἀλλὰ διὰ τούτου πᾶσά ἐστὶν ἡ ὁμιλία καὶ ἡ διάλεκτος θεοῖς πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ἐγρηγορόσι καὶ καθεύδουσι: καὶ ὁ μὲν περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα σοφὸς δαιμόνιος ἀνὴρ, ὁ δὲ ἄλλο τι σοφὸς ὢν ἢ περὶ τέχνας ἢ χειρουργίας τινὰς βάναντος. οὗτοι δὲ οἱ δαίμονες πολλοὶ καὶ παντοδαποὶ εἰσιν, εἷς δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ Ἔρως.

'For the whole of what is *daimonic* is between what is divine and what is mortal.' 'Possessing what power?' I asked. 'Interpreting and transporting human things to the gods and divine things to men; entreaties and sacrifices from below, and ordinances and requitals from above: being midway between, it makes each to supplement the other, so that the whole is combined in one. Through it are conveyed all divination and priestcraft concerning sacrifice and ritual and incantations, and all soothsaying and sorcery. God with man does not mingle: but *daimones* are the means of all society and converse of men with gods and of gods with men, whether waking or asleep. Whosoever has skill in these affairs is a *daimonic* man to have it in other matters, as in common arts and crafts, is for the mechanical. Many and multifarious are these *daimones*, and one of them is Eros.'

(H. N. Fowler's translation, slightly modified)

**T10 Pl. *Phdr.* 246 a-247 a**

ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας ἡγεμῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ Ζεὺς, ἐλαύνων πτηνὸν ἄρμα, πρῶτος πορεύεται, διακοσμῶν πάντα καὶ ἐπιμελούμενος: τῷ δ' ἔπεται στρατιὰ θεῶν τε καὶ δαιμόνων, κατὰ ἕνδεκα μέρη κεκοσμημένη. μένει γὰρ Ἑστία ἐν θεῶν οἴκῳ μόνη: τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ὅσοι ἐν τῷ τῶν δώδεκα ἀριθμῷ τεταγμένοι θεοὶ ἄρχοντες ἡγοῦνται κατὰ τάξιν ἣν ἕκαστος ἐτάχθη.

The great leader (ἡγεμῶν) in heaven, Zeus, driving a winged chariot, goes first, arranging all things and caring for all things. He is followed by an army of gods and *daimones*, arrayed in eleven squadrons; Hestia alone remains in the house of the gods. Of the rest, those who are included among the twelve great gods and are accounted leaders (ἡγοῦνται), are assigned each to his place in the army.

(H. N. Fowler's translation)

**T11 Plot. *III* 4, 3, 21-28**

Ἔστι γὰρ καὶ πολλὰ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ πάντα καὶ τὰ ἄνω καὶ τὰ κάτω αὖ μέχρι πάσης ζωῆς,<sup>23</sup> καὶ ἐσμὲν ἕκαστος κόσμος νοητός, τοῖς μὲν κάτω συνάπτοντες τῷδε, τοῖς δὲ ἄνω καὶ τοῖς κόσμου τῷ νοητῷ, καὶ μένομεν τῷ μὲν ἄλλῳ παντὶ νοητῷ ἄνω, τῷ δὲ

For the soul is many things, and all things, both the things above and the things below down to the limits of all life, and we are each one of us an intelligible *cosmos*, making contact with this world below through the lower powers of soul and with the intelligible world

<sup>23</sup> Compare with T7 (Plot. *IV* 7, 6, 23): ἡ πάντα ἦν. Cf. Arist. *De An.* *Γ* 8, 431 b 21: ἡ ψυχὴ τὰ ὄντα πῶς ἐστὶ πάντα.

ἐσχάτῳ αὐτοῦ πεπεδήμεθα τῷ κάτω οἷον ἀπόρροϊαν  
ἀπ' ἐκείνου διδόντες εἰς τὸ κάτω, μᾶλλον δὲ  
ἐνέργειαν, ἐκείνου οὐκ ἐλαττουμένου.

through the powers above and through the powers of  
the *cosmos*. And we remain with all the rest of our  
intelligible part above, but, by its ultimate fringe, we  
are tied to the world below, giving a kind of outflow  
from that intelligible part above to what is below, or  
rather an activity, by which that intelligible part is not  
itself lessened.

(A. H. Armstrong's translation, slightly modified)

#### T12 Pl. *Phd.* 107 d-108 a

λέγεται δὲ οὕτως, ὥς ἄρα τελευτήσαντα ἕκαστον ὁ  
ἐκάστου δαίμων, ὅσπερ ζῶντα εἰλήχει, οὗτος ἄγειν  
ἐπιχειρεῖ εἰς δὴ τινὰ τόπον, οἱ δὲ τοὺς συλλεγέντας  
διαδικασμένους εἰς Αἴδου πορεύεσθαι μετὰ  
ἡγεμόνος ἐκείνου ᾧ δὴ προστέτακται τοὺς ἐνθένδε  
ἐκεῖσε πορεύσασθαι: τυχόντας δὲ ἐκεῖ ὧν δὴ τυχεῖν καὶ  
μείναντας ὃν χρόνόν αἴτιος δεῦρο πάλιν ἡγεμῶν  
κομίζει ἐν πολλαῖς χρόνου καὶ μακραῖς περιόδοις.  
ἔστι δὲ ἄρα ἡ πορεία οὐχ ὥς ὁ Αἰσχύλου Τηλέφος  
λέγει: ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ ἀπλὴν οἰμόν φησιν εἰς Αἴδου  
φέρειν, ἡ δ' οὔτε ἀπλὴ οὔτε μία φαίνεται μοι εἶναι.  
οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν ἡγεμόνων ἔδει: οὐ γὰρ πού τις ἂν  
διαμάρτοι οὐδαμῶς μιᾶς ὁδοῦ οὐσης. νῦν δὲ ἔοικε  
σχίσεις τε καὶ τριόδους πολλὰς ἔχειν: ἀπὸ τῶν  
θυσιῶν τε καὶ νομίμων τῶν ἐνθάδε τεκμαιρόμενος  
λέγω.

And so it said that, when a man dies, the *daimon* of the  
man, who had received the living man as its lot (ὅσπερ  
ζῶντα εἰλήχει), directs (ἄγει) [him] to a place where  
the dead are gathered together; then they are judged  
and depart to the other world with the leader  
(ἡγεμόνος) whose task it is to conduct thither those  
who come from this world; and when they have there  
gathered their due and remained through the time  
appointed, another leader (ἡγεμών) brings them back  
after many long periods of time. And the journey is  
not as Telephus says in the play of Aeschylus; for he  
says a simple path leads to the lower world, but I think  
the path is neither simple nor single, for if it were, there  
would be no need for leaders (ἡγεμόνων), since no one  
could miss the way to any place if there were only one  
road. But really there seem to be many forks of the road  
and many windings; this I infer from the rites and  
ceremonies practised here on earth.

(H. N. Fowler's translation, slightly modified)

#### T13 Plot. *III* 4, 3, 10-16 (continuing T2)

Διὰ τί οὖν αὐτὸς ἄγει;<sup>24</sup> Ἡ τὸν βιοτεύσαντα οὐκ  
ἔστιν ἄγειν, ἀλλὰ πρὸ τοῦ μὲν ἄγειν, ὅτε ἔζη,  
παυσάμενον δὲ τοῦ ζῆν ἄλλω παραχωρεῖν τὴν  
ἐνέργειαν τεθνηκότα τὴν αὐτοῦ κατ' ἐνέργειαν  
ζωῆν. Ὁ μὲν οὖν ἐθέλει ἄγειν καὶ κρατήσας ζῆν αὐτὸς  
ἄλλον καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχων δαίμονα· εἰ δὲ βαρύνειτο τῇ

Why, then, does the *daimon* direct (ἄγει)? Of course, it  
is not possible that the dead man directs (ἄγειν)  
[himself], but, before that, he could direct (ἄγειν), when  
he was alive. But, when he ceases to live, it is possible  
that he hands over the activity to someone else, since he  
has died with respect to his life that corresponded to

<sup>24</sup> Pl. *Phd.* 107 d.



ῥώσει τοῦ χείρονος ἤθους, ἔχει ἐκεῖνο τὴν δίκην.<sup>25</sup>

the activity. And the *daimon* then wants to direct (ἄγειν) and, having become dominant, it lives itself and has itself, too, another *daimon*. But, if it is weighed down by the force of its bad character, this weighing down contains in itself the penalty.

(My translation, based on H. R. Armstrong's translation)

#### T14 Plu. *De genio* 22, 591 E

τὸ μὲν οὖν ὑποβρύχιον<sup>26</sup> ἐν τῷ σώματι φερόμενον ψυχὴ λέγεται· τὸ δὲ φθορᾶς λειφθὲν οἱ πολλοὶ νοῦν καλοῦντες ἐντὸς εἶναι νομίζουσιν αὐτῶν, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς ἐσόπτροις τὰ φαινόμενα κατ' ἀνταύγειαν· οἱ δὲ ὀρθῶς ὑπονοοῦντες ὡς ἐκτὸς ὄντα δαίμονα<sup>27</sup> προσαγορεύουσι.

Now the part carried submerged in the body is called the soul, whereas the part left free from corruption is called by the multitude the "intellect", who take it to be within themselves, as they take reflected objects to be in the mirrors that reflect them; but those who conceive the matter rightly call it a *daimon* as being external.

(P. H. De Lacy's and B. Einerson's translation, slightly modified)

---

<sup>25</sup> Compare with T7 (Plot. VI 7, 6, 33-37): ὅταν δὲ συνέπηται τὴν θήρειον φύσιν ἐλομένη ψυχὴ ἢ συνηρτημένη [τῇ] ὅτε ἄνθρωπος ἦν, τὸν ἐν αὐτῇ λόγον ἐκείνου τοῦ ζώου ἔδωκεν. ἔχει γάρ, καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια αὕτη χείρων.

<sup>26</sup> Pl. *Phdr.* 248 a: ὑποβρύχιοι συμπεριφέρονται.

<sup>27</sup> Pl. *Ti.* 90 a.