

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	vii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	I
<b>MARGINAL PAGE</b>	
<b>THE THEAETETUS</b>	
142A-143C. THE INTRODUCTORY DIALOGUE . . . . .	15
THE MAIN DIALOGUE . . . . .	17
143D-151D. Introductory Conversation . . . . .	17
	<i>I. The Claim of Perception to be Knowledge . . . . .</i>
151D-E. Theaetetus identifies knowledge with perception . . . . .	29
151E-152C. Dialectical combination of Theaetetus' position with Protagoras' doctrine . . . . .	30
152C-153D. Dialectical combination with the Heraclitean doctrine of Flux . . . . .	36
153D-154B. Preliminary account of the nature of sense-objects and percipients . . . . .	39
154B-155D. Some puzzles concerning size and number . . . . .	41
155D-157C. Theory of the nature of sense-perception . . . . .	45
157C-D. Theaetetus accepts the theory of perception . . . . .	51
157E-160E. The claim of perception, so defined, to be infallible . . . . .	52
160E-161B. Interlude. Criticism begins . . . . .	58
161B-163A. Some objections against Protagoras . . . . .	60
163A-164B. Objections to a simple identification of perceiving and knowing . . . . .	62
164C-165E. Socrates undertakes to defend Protagoras . . . . .	65
165E-168C. The Defence of Protagoras . . . . .	68
168C-169D. Interlude . . . . .	75
169D-171D. Criticism of Protagoras' doctrine as extended to all judgments . . . . .	76
171D-172B. Restatement of the question: Wherein lies the superiority of the wise? . . . . .	80
172B-177C. Digression. The contrast of Philosophy and Rhetoric . . . . .	81
177C-179C. Refutation of the Defence of Protagoras . . . . .	89

## CONTENTS

MARGINAL PAGE		PAGE
179C-181B.	The extreme Heraclitean position, contrasted with Parmenides' denial of all motion and change .	92
181B-183C.	Criticism of extreme Heracliteanism . . . . .	95
183C-184B.	Interlude. Socrates declines to criticise Parmenides	101
184B-186E.	' Perception is Knowledge ' finally disproved .	102
<i>II. The Claim of True Judgment to be Knowledge .</i>		
187A-C.	Theaetetus states the claim of true judgment .	109
187C-E.	How is false judgment possible ? . . . . .	110
187E-188C.	False judgment as thinking that one thing (known or unknown) is another thing (known or unknown)	111
188C-189B.	False judgment as thinking the thing that is not .	114
189B-190E.	The apparent impossibility of false judgment as mistaking one thing for another . . . . .	116
190E-195B.	One class of mistakes can be explained by taking into account memory. The Wax Tablet . . . . .	120
195B-196C.	False judgment in general cannot, however, be defined as the misfitting of perception to thought	127
196D-199C.	Memory compared to an Aviary, to provide for mistaken judgments not involving perception . . . . .	130
199C-200D.	Rejection of ' interchange of pieces of knowledge ' as an account of false judgment . . . . .	136
200D-201C.	Conclusion: Knowledge cannot be defined as true belief . . . . .	140
<i>III. The Claim of True Belief accompanied by an account or explanation to be Knowledge .</i>		
201C-202C.	Socrates states this theory as he has heard it .	142
202C-206C.	The theory criticised for making elements unknowable . . . . .	146
206C-E.	Three possible meanings of ' account ' : (1) Expression of thought in speech (irrelevant) . . . . .	154
206E-208B.	(2) Enumeration of elementary parts. This will not convert a true notion into knowledge .	155
208B-210B.	(3) The statement of a distinguishing mark. This will not convert a true notion into knowledge .	158
210B-D.	EPILOGUE. All these attempts to define knowledge have failed . . . . .	163

## CONTENTS

MARGINAL PAGE	THE SOPHIST	PAGE
216A-218D.	Introductory Conversation . . . . .	165
218D-221C.	Illustrative Division defining the Angler . . . . .	170
	The seven Divisions defining the Sophist . . . . .	172
221C-223B.	Division I. The Sophist as hunter . . . . .	173
223C-224E.	Divisions II-IV. The Sophist as salesman . . . . .	174
224E-226A.	Division V. Eristic . . . . .	175
226A-231B.	Division VI. Cathartic method of Socrates . . . . .	177
	The Methods of Collection and Division . . . . .	184
231B-235A.	Survey yielding the genus 'Image-making' . . . . .	187
235A-236C.	Division of Image-making into two species . . . . .	195
236C-237B.	Statement of the problems of unreal appearances and of falsity in speech and thought . . . . .	199
	 <i>I. The Worlds of Reality and Appearance . . . . .</i>	 202
237B-239C.	(a) The totally unreal . . . . .	203
239C-242B.	(b) Definition of <i>eidolon</i> and the problem of false statement and belief . . . . .	209
242B-244B.	(c) The perfectly real. What does 'real' mean? . . . . .	216
244B-245E.	Criticism of Parmenides' One Real Being . . . . .	220
245E-246E.	The Battle of Gods and Giants. Idealists and Materialists . . . . .	228
246E-248A.	A mark of the real is offered for the Materialists' acceptance . . . . .	232
248A-249D.	The Idealists must concede that reality includes some changing things . . . . .	239
249D-251A.	Transition. What does the Idealist mean by 'real'? . . . . .	248
	 <i>II. The Combination of Forms and the Problem of Negative Statements . . . . .</i>	 252
251A-C.	Exclusion of the trivial question, how one individual thing can have many names . . . . .	253
251C-252E.	Proof that some Forms will combine, others will not . . . . .	255
252E-253C.	The texture of philosophic discourse . . . . .	260
253C-254B.	Description of the science of Dialectic . . . . .	262
	The structure of the world of Forms . . . . .	268
254B-D.	Three of the most important Forms selected for purposes of illustration: Existence, Motion, Rest. . . . .	273

## CONTENTS

MARGINAL PAGE		PAGE
254D-255E.	Two further Forms, Sameness and Difference, distinct from these three and all-pervading . . .	279
255E-257A.	A review of true statements involving the five Forms shows that there are any number of true statements asserting that 'what is' in a sense 'is not' . . . . .	285
257B-258C.	There are also any number of true statements asserting that 'what is not' in a sense 'is' . . .	289
258C-259D.	Conclusion: We have refuted Parmenides' dogma that 'what is' cannot in any sense 'not-be', and that 'what is not' cannot in any sense 'be' . . .	294
	<i>III. False Speaking and Thinking</i> . . . . .	298
259D-261C.	Introductory statement of the problem . . . . .	298
261C-262E.	Every statement is a complex of heterogeneous elements (name and verb) . . . . .	303
262E.	Every statement is about something and is either true or false . . . . .	308
262E-263B.	The definition of true statement . . . . .	309
263B-D.	The definition of false statement . . . . .	311
263D-264B.	Judgment being simply unspoken statement, false judgment and false 'appearing' are possible . . .	318
264B-D	Transition, connecting these results with the interrupted Division of Image-making . . . . .	320
264D-268D.	Division VII. The Sophist as a species of Image-maker . . . . .	323
	INDEX . . . . .	333