



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.


다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#) 

MASTER'S THESIS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

THE POLITICS OF SHAME
IN PLATO

플라톤과 부끄러움의 정치학

AUGUST 2015

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

YOON, JISEOB

정치학석사학위논문

THE POLITICS OF SHAME IN PLATO

플라톤과 부끄러움의 정치학

2015년 8월

서울대학교 대학원
정치외교학부 정치학전공
윤 지 섭

THE POLITICS OF SHAME IN PLATO

Thesis Advisor Ryu, Honglim

Submitting a master's thesis of Political Science

April 2015

**Graduate School of Seoul National University
Department of Political Science**

Yoon, Jiseob

**Confirming the master's thesis written by
Jiseob Yoon**

July 2015

Chair Park, Sungwoo (Seal)

Vice Chair Ryu, Honglim (Seal)

Examiner Song, Jiewuh (Seal)

Abstract

This thesis aims to explore the political meaning of shame from Plato's conception of shame. Shame is a complex phenomenon composed of emotion, cognition, and sociality. It is also a phenomenon with ambivalent character, for shame can lead a person to interact in a proper manner, while it can also compel a person to withdraw from discussion and social participation. Among the ancient Greek literature that portrays the Greek culture which was especially sensitive to shame, Plato's dialogues manifest the political meaning of shame. Plato, utilizing shame as a leitmotif in his dialogues, displays the complex and ambivalent character of shame. Therefore, by reconstructing Plato's conception of shame from a comprehensive analysis of the Platonic corpus, this thesis illuminates the political meaning of shame in Plato, and the political implication of shame in our political life.

Based on the two manners that Plato employs to display shame, this study examines Plato's dialogues in three stages. Plato, on the one hand, portrays shame as a subject of his characters' discussion. On the other hand, he presents shame as a psychological experience of his characters. To reconstruct Plato's conception of shame, this thesis first explores the complex nature of shame, which is illustrated in the texts where shame appears as a subject of conversation. Second stage is designed to investigate diverse dramatic manifestations of shame, which are demonstrated in the texts where the characters experience shame. Then, with the analyses from the previous two stages, the third stage is to examine the function of shame in relation to its connection with virtues.

From the analyses, this study finds the following points. First, it is shown in Plato's conception of shame that he was aware of its complex and ambivalent character. In the texts where i) the quasi-definition of shame, ii) the location of shame in tripartite soul, and iii) the origin of shame are discussed about by the characters, Plato's descriptions illustrate the emotional, cognitive, and social aspects of shame. Moreover, the location of shame in the spirited part of the soul explains that the contrasting effects of shame depend on which of the two parts, the rational or the appetitive, shame associates with. Second, through diverse manifestations of shame, Plato shows that shame experience, if properly formed, can bring a certain change in a person. By distinguishing three types of shame according to the three critical factors of shame experience, this study examines the proper condition of shame experience. Third, Plato's descriptions of the relationships between shame and the four virtues show that the change shame brings to a person is, in specific, the cultivation of the virtues in oneself.

In conclusion, the political meaning of shame in Plato is that shame functions in civic education as a catalyst for nurturing the civic virtues. Guiding a person to a better way of life by fostering civic virtues, Plato's conception of shame plays a significant role in his soul-craft and state-craft. Furthermore, as shame provides a certain kind of practical knowledge, which education by texts cannot cover, Plato's conception of shame offers the political implications of shame in our political life, too.

Keywords: shame, politics of shame, Plato, civic education, virtue

Student Number: 2013-20182

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I. Introduction: Why Does Shame Matter Now?	1
Chapter II. The Complex Nature of Shame	21
1. Quasi-Definition of Shame: Euthyphro, Laws	22
2. The Place of Shame in Tripartite Soul: Republic, Phaedrus.....	29
3. The Origin of Shame: Protagoras, Symposium	35
Chapter III. Dramatic Manifestations of Shame	39
1. First Type: Avoiding Shame	42
2. Second Type: Confronting Shame	56
3. Third type: Socratic Shame	64
Chapter IV. Shame and Virtue	72
1. Shame and Justice.....	72
2. Shame and Temperance	75
3. Shame and Courage	78
4. Shame and Wisdom	82
Chapter V. Conclusion: The Political Implications of Shame	85
Bibliography	95
Abstract (Korean)	107

I. INTRODUCTION:

WHY DOES SHAME MATTER NOW?

Shame has a complex and ambivalent character. It is a complex phenomenon composed of emotion, cognition, and sociality. Shame, on the exterior, takes the form of an emotion accompanied by physical reactions such as blushing. Shame involves a cognitive stage in which a person recognizes oneself as inadequate in some way. Sociality also takes part in shame, as shame occurs in regard to the other, the witness, either exterior or interior. Shame also has an ambivalent trait: while it serves as a mechanism for one's socially and morally decent behavior, it may also compel a person to withdraw from discussion and social participation. The self-regulating aspect of shame, by letting us interact in a proper manner, gives shame a possibility of being classified as a civic virtue. The shunning and isolating aspect of shame, however, makes it closer to being a vice in political life, especially in a democracy to which participation of citizen is essential. This thesis aims to explore the political meaning of shame –a place and a role of shame in political life– from Plato's conception of shame. I attempt to show, in a nutshell, that shame plays a significant role in civic education.

The role of shame in contemporary society is studied in various areas: in addition to political theory, the most noticeable fields are laws, gender studies, and psychology. Most studies, however, tend to focus on the negative effects of shame on the agent and society. In political theory, scholars tend to regard shame as an emotion that can threaten one's participation in and deliberation on society. John Rawls (1971), building upon Gabriel Taylor's psychological theory, characterizes

shame in terms of negative self-assessment, as an emotion a person feels upon loss of self-esteem.¹ Dana Villa (1992), while drawing a comparison between Nietzsche and Arendt, accuses shame of enabling mass society to have ‘world-destroying’ effects.² Similarly, in law, Martha Nussbaum (2004), utilizing Donald Winnicott’s psychological theories, argues that a liberal society needs to “inhibit shame and protect its citizens from shaming,” in order to “protect the equal dignity of all citizens”³ and prohibit the stigmatization of minorities.⁴ Queer theorist Michael Warner (1999) also condemns the politics of shame for branding and isolating certain groups and individuals from society by insisting on what is the normal while silencing the “deviants.”⁵

Some scholars take the opposite side of the discussion. Amitai Etzioni (2003) argues that shame expresses society’s shared moral values which are in danger of vanishing from contemporary societies. Etzioni goes further to suggest shaming penalties, and claims that shaming, rather than imprisonment, allows the individual to show penitence and be reconciled with society.⁶ A recent study by Manu Samnotra (2014) provides a new interpretation of the role of shame in Arendt’s political thought; arguing that “Arendt’s theoretical vision is [...] hospitable to a role for shame in political action”⁷, Samnotra claims that shame motivates a political actor to depart from one’s private space, to engage in and

¹ Rawls (1971), 440-446. See Deigh (1983), O’Hear (1976) for discussion on Rawlsian concept of shame.

² Villa (1992); Jill Locke (2007) and May & Kohn (1996) also interpret shame in Arendt’s political theory to be a negative concept, and arrive at similar view that shame has deleterious effect on society. See Samnotra (2014) for discussion on Arendtian concept of shame.

³ Nussbaum (2004), 174.

⁴ Nussbaum (2004), 15. See chapter 4-6 for a full discussion.

⁵ Warner (1999).

⁶ See Etzioni (2003) chapter 2.

⁷ Samnotra (2014), 338.

cooperate within political space, and conclude that “shame is a crucial ingredient in whether a political space will arise at all.”⁸

While the contemporary debate on shame goes on, some scholars look into ancient Greek culture in an attempt to understand shame and its role, and I follow them into examining the ancient Greek literature. As the positive side of shame is related to values and virtues, the discourses on civic virtue, of which the Greeks offer the archetype, take part in the discussion of shame. Although it has been a view of long standing that the discourse on civic virtue is unnecessary –if not unacceptable– in contemporary liberal society, there are also attempts to save a place for civic virtue in our political life, and many scholars refer to the Greeks in order to revive it.⁹ Undergoing different forms of polity, and thus experiencing different ways of life, ancient Greeks had great concern for the good way of life. From their sensitivity to morality and virtue, we can examine the ample discourse on virtue ethics in the early stage of western civilization.¹⁰

More specifically, studies on shame often look into the honor culture of the ancient Greeks.¹¹ In much Greek literature, honor-pursuing Greeks show particular fear of being shamed in front of an audience. Shame plays a significant role especially in Greek dramas, often depicted as a motive of characters’ actions.¹² Contrast between ‘shame (*aidos*)’ and ‘honor (*time*)’, ‘shame (*aidos*)’ and ‘good reputation (*eukleia*)’, or ‘shame (*aischron*)’ and ‘fine (*kalos*)’ frequently appear in

⁸ Ibid, 348.

⁹ MacIntyre (2007), Pangle (1998), Barlett (2002), Galston (1988).

¹⁰ On Greek morality, see Dover (1994).

¹¹ Maibom (2010), 11; Taylor (1985).

¹² One of the plays in which shame is a main motive of character’s action is *Hyppolytus* of Euripides. See Cairns (1993), Segal (1970) for manifestation of shame in Phaedra’s speech.

Greek literature.¹³ Since Dodds (1951) applied the term ‘shame-culture’¹⁴ to early Greek society, there has been a wide consensus among scholars that Greek culture was sensitive to shame. In *The Greeks and the Irrational*, one of the earliest studies on shame in Greek culture, Dodds claims that Greek culture has progressed from shame-culture of earlier society depicted in Homer into guilt-culture of later Archaic Age, with the development of religion, morals, and the notions of sin and atonement.

Against Dodds’ heteronomous concept of shame in progressivist view¹⁵, I agree with Bernard Williams (1993) and Douglas Cairns (1993) on the psychology of shame that shame is not simply heteronomous. Williams and Cairns examine the concept of shame in ancient Greek literature deeper, and independently arrive at a similar view. Williams (1993) argues that the modern progressivist view has failed to comprehend the Greeks’ complex understanding of shame –conception of shame that is “complex enough to dispose of the familiar criticism that an ethical life shaped by it is unacceptably heteronomous, crudely dependent on public opinion.”¹⁶ He shows that the motivational force of shame does not depend on an

¹³ See Cairns (1993) for the comprehensive overview of the concept of shame shown in Greek literature.

¹⁴ The terms ‘shame-culture’ and ‘guilt-culture’, which Dodds borrowed and applied to ancient Greek society, were first introduced by Benedict (1946). Benedict distinguishes between shame-culture and guilt-culture, with a focus on Japanese society: in the shame-culture of Japan, desire to be extolled in other’s eyes and fear of external disapproval is the motivation to virtuous behavior, whereas in the guilt-culture of modern Western society, a person’s intrinsic value overrides one’s reputation.

¹⁵ In addition to Dodds 1951, the progressivist account has been provided by some modern scholars, foremost of which is A. H. Adkins (1960, 1970). According to progressivist narrative, ethical conceptions have gone through the development, which have taken a long time. While they agree that the world of Homer was a shame-culture, some, including Dodds, believe that evolution from shame to guilt has occurred by the time of Plato, others, including Adkins, believe all the Greek culture to be shame-culture and that it was replaced by guilt not until the modern age. See Williams (1993), 4-5.

¹⁶ Williams (1993), 97.

actual external audience, and that the imagined audience –the internalized other– operates the same way. With the internalized other, Williams writes, “the other need not be a particular individual or [...] group. The other may be identified in ethical terms, [and be] conceived as one whose reactions [the self] would respect.”¹⁷ According to Williams’ view, whether actual or imagined, one is afraid of being ashamed not in front of any audience, but those with whom one shares values and identifies oneself.¹⁸ Cairns, in the same year as Williams, also refutes the heteronomous view. On Cairns’ view, the distinctions between shame and guilt are all untenable “since at all stages both shame and guilt possess an internalized component, and neither is differentiated from the other by the fact that it may occur before a real audience, before a fantasy audience, or before oneself.”¹⁹ Piers’ distinction of shame/guilt as goal/prohibition and failure/transgression²⁰, and even the Lewis-Rawls-Taylor’s approach that shame is related to the self as a whole, and guilt is related to one’s action as an agent²¹, according to Cairns, do not eliminate the grey area between shame and guilt. Opposing the heteronomous view on shame, Cairns’ study consists of a deeper analysis of shame as presented in various Greek literatures from Homer to Plato and Aristotle.

Among the diverse Greek texts that portray their concept of shame, this study focuses on the works of Plato. Although earlier Greek poets might have also noted shame, it is in Plato’s dialogues that the political meaning of shame is manifested. Moreover, Plato brings up shame repeatedly as a leitmotif in his works; although the main theme may be bigger issues like justice and virtue, shame

¹⁷ Williams (1993), 84.

¹⁸ See Williams (1993), Chapter 4. Shame and Autonomy.

¹⁹ Cairns (1993), 27.

²⁰ Piers and Singer (1953). See Cairns (1993), 14-20.

²¹ H. B. Lewis (1971), Rawls (1973), Taylor (1985). See Cairns (1993), 21-26.

appears repeatedly, in important ways. Shame, in Plato's dialogues, works in two manners: as a subject of interlocution, and as a dramatic device. The concept of shame is invited in several dialogues in the course of delineating main ideas, leading the discussion toward the theme, e.g. in *Gorgias*, *Protagoras*, and *Charmides*.²² Plato also uses shame as a dramatic device, which has an effect of changing the scenes. When the interlocutors suddenly show signs of experiencing shame, it is mostly the moment when the discussion takes on a new aspect or turns to a new question, usually indicating that the interlocutor cannot continue to argue against Socrates, or that he cannot but accept Socrates' view.²³ Furthermore, Plato seems to be aware of the complexity and ambivalence of shame. When Plato's characters discuss about shame, it is described as a positive thing in some dialogues, even as a kind of virtue, whereas in others it is described as a negative matter. When shame works as a dramatic device and interlocutors themselves feel shame, in addition to contrasting assessments of the interlocutors –some of them are acclaimed while the others are accused of being ashamed– different manifestations of shame are depicted. In this thesis, therefore, I attempt to explore Plato's notion of shame (*aidos/aischune*)²⁴ and its political implication.

²² For more details, see chapter two of this thesis, for the chapter is based on the analyses of the texts where shame appears as a subject of discussion.

²³ For more details, see chapter three of this thesis, for the chapter investigates the texts where shame is used as a dramatic device.

²⁴ There are two words for shame in Attic Greek: *aidos*(αἰδώς) and *aischune*(αἰσχύνη). While the two words might have offered a distinction between different kinds of shame, scholars have shown that the distinction between the two words have become blurred, by the time of Plato; see Carins (1993), 415 and 455; Williams (1993), 194 n.9; Tarnopolsky (2010), 11-13. I also find it myself that Plato is using the two words as a synonyms in the texts I investigate throughout this thesis.

STUDIES OF SHAME IN PLATO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies of Plato's treatment of shame are focused almost exclusively on a single text, the *Gorgias*.²⁵ Attention on shame in *Gorgias* began with Race (1979). In his attempt to "examine [...] the role of shame in connection with the themes and structure of the work"(197), Race analyzes how shame is demonstrated in each of the three discussions. Race concludes that while shame "[introduces] each new interlocutor [...] and highlights the dramatic reversals"(197), it is also revealed through the dialogue that the truly shameful thing is to be ignorant of our ignorance and refuse to participate in philosophy.

In my view, Race's account makes at least two kinds of contribution to the literature. First, Race recognizes that Plato is deliberately emphasizing shame and thus calls it a leitmotif. Among the minor motifs that help the whole dialogue to maintain coherence, shame, occurring over 75 times and playing an important role as a dramatic device, is the most insistent leitmotif. In this study, I go further and find that shame constitutes an important part not only of the *Gorgias*, but of the Platonic corpus generally. Second, Race notices that there are differences between three instances of shame. I build on this analysis and hold that the different manifestations of shame depicted in *Gorgias* help us understand the complexity and the ambivalence of shame. Therefore, I offer an inclusive investigation on twenty different manifestations of shame in Platonic corpus, in chapter three.

Later studies of *Gorgias* can be divided into two groups which are not completely mutually exclusive. In one direction, most studies focus on the role of

²⁵ See Race (1979); Kahn (1983); McKim (1988); Moss (2005); Cain (2008); Futter (2009); Tarnopolsky (2010); Cho (2014).

shame in refutations (Kahn (1983), McKim (1988), Moss (2005), Cain (2008), Futter (2009), and Cho (2014)). Charles Kahn, while claiming that Socratic elenchus has the “double character,” notes the role played by shame in the three refutations. Kahn argues that Socrates’ elenchus is an examination of the interlocutor’s life as well as of his statements, and that it is the test of the coherence between the life and the thesis.²⁶ While the elenchus examines the life, the thesis, and reflects the incoherence between the two, shame plays the role of marking the fact that Socrates brings moral concerns into the dialogue, which, if properly recognized and understood by the interlocutor, would lead to a true understanding of the good one truly desires –the perception of one’s incoherent position. Shame, in Kahn’s view, motivates the readers to convert our ways of life into the philosophic life.

McKim (1988) argues that the apparent logical flaws in Socrates’ arguments should be regarded as intentionally implanted by the dramatist himself in some dramatic purpose, and that the chief weapon of Socrates is shame, whereas logic plays only a subordinate role to shame. According to McKim, Socrates uses shame instead of logic because shame is most effective weapon for his attempt to demonstrate that everyone including Polus and Callicles, deep down, already believes in the Socratic Axiom.²⁷ The reason for silence pass over of the

²⁶ Kahn(1983) calls it as the “double character of the elenchus,” contrasting the personal and the dramatic with the dialectic and the logical. It seems, however, that he is assigning three characters to the Socrates’ elenchus: i. “an examination of the truth and coherence of [one’s] life,” ii. “[an examination of the truth and coherence of one’s] propositional claims”, iii. “[an examination] of the harmony between the life and the claims.”(76) As far as I understand, Kahn somehow associates i. and iii., and by the ‘double’ character he refers to ii. and iii. Nonetheless, as it is not my primary concern, and as it does not have relevant influence on my argument, I leave it to a subsequent study.

²⁷ “For Socrates, virtue is always supremely beneficial to the moral agent himself as well as to those toward whom he acts virtuously, whereas vice, in addition to the material harm

interlocutors, McKim explains, is to make the readers –us– think about the issue ourselves. He concludes that while we can ‘win’ the argument by refusing to admit our true beliefs and proving that we are cleverer than Polus, we would be also proving that we are just as dishonest as Callicles, refusing to confront with our sense of shame.

Cain (2008), like McKim, focuses on the logical flaws in Socrates’ refutation of Polus. Cain states that the two problems in the refutation are, as Callicles accused Socrates of, charges of shame and ambiguity. She argues that these flaws, which are related to each other, are employed by Plato as a means of dramatic parody. According to Cain, Socrates not only exploits Polus’ sense of shame in bringing him to agree with Socrates’ thesis that doing wrong is better but more shameful than suffering it (the shame charge), but also deliberately misleads Polus by using an ambiguous slide in meaning of the word shameful (*aischron*), shifting between two usages of the term (the ambiguity charge). Despite the fallacies, Polus admits a claim which he denied earlier. Cain asserts that, by making Polus, the young rhetorician, refuted by sophistic rhetorical technique –misuse of language– Plato intended to parody and criticize the absurdity of sophists being trapped in their own devices.

Moss (2005) also focuses on the role of shame in the refutation, and Futter (2009) develops his argument against Moss. Moss’ study consists of two parts, and the first part, the claim that Socrates uses shame as a tool of persuasion, is the one Futter objects against. According to Moss, Socrates depends on shame in refutation, instead of adhering to sheer logical argument. The reason shame is used as a tool of

it inflicts on others, is always supremely harmful to the agent, being bad for the health of his soul. We may refer to this belief as the Socratic Axiom that virtue is always beneficial and vice is harmful.” McKim (1988), 35.

persuasion, Moss argues, is that shame reveals one's true belief and moral sense, and that it has force against the lure of pleasure, separating one's judgments about what is good from that about what is pleasant. Futter, in opposition to Moss, asserts that it is inference, rather than shame, that reveals the deep beliefs of Polus and Callicles. Also, in Futter's view, the so-called "strategic advantage"²⁸ of shame over pleasure-based evaluation is incapable of arousing moral persuasion.

Cho (2014) claims that whereas logic is the main device for persuasion that works in stages in conscious sphere, shame serves as another important device that affects instantly by intuition in the sphere of unconsciousness. Cho argues that shame functions in two ways. First, as an emotional being, the reader empathizes with the interlocutor through shame and thus Plato's words become vivid to the reader. Second, it is through shame that Socrates leads the interlocutors to examine their own lives, which would have failed if he had depended merely on logic. According to Cho, Socrates' refutation would have failed without shame.

Although it is true that these studies help us to examine what role shame plays in the refutation, dialogue, and drama, they do not guide us to explore the concept of shame itself. The main purpose of these studies is to explain how interlocutors were refuted, and to understand *Gorgias* better. Plato's conception of shame, or how the nature of shame was depicted in his dialogues is not their primary concern.

The second group of studies concerning *Gorgias* more directly aims to explore the nature of shame. Moss (2005), in the second part of the study, and Tarnopolsky (2010) attempt to investigate the different types of shame depicted in the dialogue. Moss claims that there are two views of shame presented in the

²⁸ Moss (2005), 149.

Gorgias.²⁹ According to Moss, Socrates views shame in its characterization of spirit (*thymos*), which controls appetite in alliance with reason. In Socrates' view, shame is very much related to the spirit, which has the power to lead the soul to either good or evil. Callicles, on the other hand, distinguishes between "what is shameful by nature and what is shameful merely by convention,"³⁰ and implies that what we call shameful is shaped by social convention rather than our own beliefs. In Callicles' view, social and heteronomous nature of shame disables it from having the moral force.

Tarnopolsky (2010) provides the most detailed analysis of shame in the *Gorgias*. Tarnopolsky notes that existing commentaries failed to reveal the complete complexity of Plato's idea of shame.³¹ Tarnopolsky charges Kahn (1983) and McKim (1988) of two failures: they suppose that shame works the same way in all three refutations, and also that the reactions of the characters to shame are always the same. Based on these criticisms, Tarnopolsky investigates the diverse manifestations of shame. She distinguishes between the moment of recognition and that of reaction, and claims that there are a number of ways one can react to shame. She also notes that Plato's way of shaming is different from Socrates' shaming elenchus. Building upon her analysis, Tarnopolsky suggests distinctions between flattering shame, Socratic shame, and Platonic shame.

Although Moss and Tarnopolsky recognize that there are multiple manifestations of shame and attempt to distinguish among them, they fail to provide a plausible differentiation. Moss acknowledges that Socratic shame and Calliclean shame are different from each other, but this binary distinction is not

²⁹ Ibid, 166.

³⁰ Ibid, 165.

³¹ See Tarnopolsky (2010) chapter two for the full discussion.

enough to bring out the complexity of shame: a direct example is that the shame of Gorgias differs from that of Callicles. Tarnopolsky goes further and distinguishes diverse manifestations of shame with more detail, but her differentiation still bears some shortcomings. The most critical flaw is that Tarnopolsky's distinction of three kinds of shame assumes that Socrates and Plato are the 'shamers', and hence, that it misses out Socrates' own shame experiences.³²

All the previous studies focus on *Gorgias*, but analysis of this sole text is insufficient for a comprehensive understanding on Plato's conception of shame. Shame in other dialogues has been relatively neglected, with the exception of Gooch (1987) and Raymond (2013), who notice the appearance and importance of shame in other texts. Gooch (1987) contributes to the literature by introducing six red faces in Plato, but misses out two other red faces and also fails to explain their blushing phenomena adequately. The six red faces Gooch locates are Thrasymachus (350d) in *Republic*, Hippocrates (312a) in *Protagoras*, Lysis (213d) and Hippothales (204b-c) in *Lysis*, Clinias (275d) and Dionysodorus (297a) in *Euthydemus*. Gooch acknowledges that blushing(erythraio) is linked to shame, and that Thrasymachus and Dionysodorus blush from being ashamed. Gooch argues, however, that the other four characters blush not from shame, but from youthful self-conscious embarrassment³³. The first of Gooch's two flaws is that he omitted two other blushing characters: Charmides in *Charmides* (158c-d) and the rival lover in *Lovers* (134b). The second flaw, which is more critical, is that his

³² I provide more explanation on Tarnopolsky's distinction will be provided in chapter three, where I offer my own distinction of shame experiences.

³³ Gooch distinguishes embarrassment from shame and humiliation, in that embarrassment occurs "regardless of the perceptions or intentions of others [and] without [...] shame."(125) But this distinction is due to his limited understanding of shame, as his conception of shame is rather heteronomous.

understanding of shame as public humiliation, and that it occurs only with external others, is only a limited understanding. The “embarrassment about our abilities or our failure to meet expectations,” by which Gooch explains the other four characters, is itself a part of shame.

Raymond (2013) goes further to explore the notion of shame in *Charmides*, one of which was omitted by Gooch, but still fails to grasp a comprehensive understanding of shame in Plato. Raymond locates two other blushed characters Gooch misses out,³⁴ and recognizes Plato’s concern for shame, as Plato included at least one blushing episode in each of the six dialogues³⁵ narrated by Socrates. Raymond argues that Plato –and Aristotle, on the premise that Plato and Aristotle have the same perspective on shame –“doubt[ed] about the ethical value of shame and its role in a life of virtue”³⁶ because its motivations are fundamentally oriented towards the opinions of a community, and thus can distort a subject’s perception of value.³⁷ In this point of view, Raymond discounted the significance of Socrates’ shame in *Hippias Major* (304c6-d8) which is an example of manifestation of shame that does not depend on the opinions of others but on internalized norms, and states that this instance should not be stressed too much in examining Plato’s view of shame. Pace Raymond, however, Socrates’ shame comprises a crucial part of Plato’s concept of shame, as I will show in the later chapter.³⁸

³⁴ Raymond 2013, 72-73 n39.

³⁵ Note that there are six dialogues in the entire Platonic corpus which are narrated by Socrates himself, and blushing characters appears in all six dialogues. See Raymond 2013, 72.

³⁶ Ibid, 28.

³⁷ See Raymond 2013, chapter one for full discussion on Plato and Aristotle’s understanding of the nature of shame.

³⁸ For Socrates’ experiences of shame, see Section Three Socrates’ Shame of Chapter

So far, I find four shortcomings in the literature on shame in Plato's works. First, most studies focus only on the dramatic role of shame in refutation and fail to pay attention to the nature of shame itself, when exploration of the latter would provide an advance in discussion on Plato's conception of shame. Second, while some scholars attempt to investigate the nature of shame,³⁹ they examine only shaming 'situations,' except Raymond (2013). As I mentioned earlier, there are two manners by which Plato displays shame in his dialogues –as a subject of discussion and as a psychological experience– and all scholars except Raymond look into the texts where the interlocutors experience shame. In order to reconstruct Plato's conception of shame, however, examination of the texts where shame comes up as a subject is needed. Third, the concentration of the existing literature on a single text leads to insufficient explanation of the complex nature and diverse manifestations of shame. Other relevant dialogues, such as *Protagoras*, *Charmides*, and *Laws*, need to be included in the examination. Finally, the most crucial flaw is that, due to the former weaknesses, existing literature fails to grasp a comprehensible understanding of political meaning of shame in Plato, 'what is shame' in Plato's political thought. It is my aim, therefore, to sketch Plato's conception of shame, and to show that the role of shame in civic education is the core of Plato's politics of shame.

Three Dramatic Manifestations of Shame.

³⁹ With the two studies from the *Gorgias* literature, Gooch (1987) and Raymond (2013) are relatively focusing on the nature of shame.

THE POLITICS OF SHAME IN PLATO: AN OUTLINE⁴⁰

This study starts with the question ‘what is shame?’ To reconstruct Plato’s concept of shame, I will examine Plato’s dialogues in three stages. First, I will examine the discussions where shame takes place as a subject from diverse dialogues, and explore the complex nature of shame. Second, I go on to look into the situations in which the characters experience shame, and analyze diverse manifestations of shame. Third, utilizing the analyses of related texts from previous chapters, I examine the function of shame, in regard to its relationship with virtues. Sketching the conception of shame in Plato’s dialogues will finally lead us to find political implications of shame. In doing so, I plan to study thirteen dialogues which are related to shame. Among them, texts I intend to consider mainly are six dialogues: *Gorgias*, *Protagoras*, *Charmides*, *Symposium*, *Republic*, and *Laws*. Other seven texts included are *Euthyphro*, *Crito*, *Phaedrus*, *Euthydemus*, *Lysis*, *Lovers*, and *Hippias Major*.

In chapter two ‘The Complex Nature of Shame’, I will examine the nature of shame, focusing on how Plato’s Socrates and other interlocutors describe it in their discussion. I will begin with the scenes where they give a quasi-definition of shame in *Euthyphro* (12a-c) and *Laws* (646e-650b). To put it simply, shame is a kind of fear, a fear on bad reputation, which safeguards a person from crucial areas such as pain and pleasure.

I go on to study the place of shame in Plato’s tripartite soul, and attempt to

⁴⁰ Throughout this thesis, citations from Plato’s dialogues are mainly from Cooper ed. (1997), with some of my revisions marked with []. Revisions are aimed to deliver Plato’s conception of shame more clearly. References of revision are OCT, Perseus Digital Library for entire corpus, and other translations and commentaries for each dialogue, which are listed in the Bibliography.

show that Plato locates sense of shame in the spirited part (*thymos*). Plato's famous tripartite theory of human soul is developed in, among the other dialogues, the *Republic* and the *Phaedrus*. In *Republic*, Socrates introduces three parts of the soul: the rational part (*to logistikon*), the appetitive part (*to epithymetikon*), and the spirited part (*to thymoeides*) (439c-441c). When introducing the spirited part, sense of shame is described as an example. In the story of Leontius, his desire to look at the corpses brings anger and shame.⁴¹ Socrates emphasizes that the spirited part is “by nature the helper of the rational part”(441a2) unless it has been corrupted. This nature of spirited part is depicted more vividly in the myth of the winged chariot in *Phaedrus* (246a-247c, 253c-256e), and again it is sense of shame that characterizes the spirited part. The nobler horse –the spirited part– along with the charioteer –the rational part– resists the wrong requests of the bad horse –the appetitive part– and sets free the soul. It is by the control of its sense of shame, indeed, that the nobler horse obeys the charioteer.

Then I intend to look into the texts where Plato, through myths, describes how shame came into human life. Two myths that tell about the origins of shame are Protagoras' myth of Prometheus in *Protagoras* (320c-323c), and Aristophanes' myth in *Symposium* (189c-193e). In *Protagoras*, sense of shame is given to human by Zeus, as a political wisdom along with justice. By providing humans the ability to build a city and live together, Zeus saves human race from becoming extinct. In *Symposium*, when Zeus cut the original sphere form of human race into halves as a punishment for their hubris, sense of shame enters human life with navel, which is

⁴¹ The “fine (*kalos*)” in Leontius' resentful shouting “Have your fill of the fine spectacle”(440a), ironically proposes the opposite, “*aischron*”, ugly or shameful. On interpretation of Leontius' story as implying shame, see Cairns (1993), 383; Raymond (2013), 22; O'Brien (1967), 168-9.

given as a remembrance of the incident.

From the analysis, an explanation on the complex nature of shame can be provided. The quasi-definition of shame shows that shame has an emotional aspect, as it defines shame as a kind of fear. The cognitive aspect of shame, which is related to the recognition of the gap between the ideal and the reality of oneself, is illustrated in Aristophanes' myth. In the myth, the sense of shame is given by Zeus in order to remind human race of their hubristic attempt to match the gods, and their fall. The sociality of shame can be explained concerning Protagoras' myth since sense of shame is given as a political art. The ambivalence of shame is derived partly due to the diverse possible reactions. This trait of shame can be explained in regard to the location of shame in the spirited part of tripartite soul. As the spirited part can side with either the rational part or the appetitive part, the reaction can vary.

In chapter three "Dramatic Manifestations of Shame", I attempt to explore diverse manifestations of shame, from the scenes where the characters of Plato experience shame. Examining how Plato manifests shame in drama is also an important part in reconstructing his conception of shame. I present twenty shame experiences of thirteen characters from Plato's dialogues. Each experience shows different manifestations, and is composed of multiple factors. It is not easy, however, to analyze every shame experience according to each factor, for an experience of shame in Plato's dialogues does not always include all the factors. Neither is shame itself a simple phenomenon to detect concretely, nor does Plato spell out all the details of the situations. Nonetheless, there seems to be some key factors that appear in the instances and result in the characterizing of each experience. I find three critical factors: the standard, the reaction, and Plato's

attitude toward the experience.

Utilizing three factors, I distinguish three types of shame, which are avoiding shame, confronting shame, and Socratic shame. Followings are the shaming episodes I will analyze. There are six episodes of avoiding shame: Thrasymachus (350d) in *Republic*, Polus (461b, 482d-e) and Callicles (482c-486d) in *Gorgias*, Dionysodorus (297a) in *Euthydemus*, Hippothales (204b-c) *Lysis*, and the Rival Lover (134b) *Lovers*. There are another six experiences of confronting shame: Charmides (158c-d) in *Charmides*, Cleinias (275d) in *Euthydemus*, Lysis (213d) in *Lysis*, Hippocrates (312a) in *Protagoras*, Gorgias(458d-e, 460a-461b, 482c-d, 497b), and Crito (45e-46a) in *Crito*. Finally, there are four episodes of Socratic shame: *Phaedrus* 237a and 243b, *Symposium* 198b-c, *Hippias Major* 304c-e, and *Crito* 44c, 46b, and 47a-48a.

In chapter four “Shame and Virtue”, I will go on to examine the function of shame, in relation to the four virtues: justice, temperance, courage, and wisdom. It is apparent from several texts that Plato was attentive to the relationship between shame and virtue. In short, I attempt to show that sense of shame functions in civic-education, serving as a catalyst for nurturing virtues in human soul.

First section is on shame and justice, the connection between of which is sketched most prominently in the myth of Protagoras’ famous Great Speech. (*Protagoras*, 320c-323a). When human race failed in founding cities as they wronged (*adikeo*) each other due to lack of the political art, Zeus sent Hermes to provide justice and a sense of shame to human race. Zeus ordered him to let each and every one share them, since city would never be constructed unless they all have justice and shame. He also commanded to establish a law in the name of himself that one who cannot share them shall be put to death, “for he is a pestilence

to the city”(322d5). Although Plato does not explicitly state how justice and sense of shame are related to each other, we can be sure that he implied a strong connection between the two. Zeus could have given only justice without shame, but he gave human both.

The most obvious text that shows the connection between shame and temperance is *Charmides*. The dialogue is about investigating the definition of temperance (*sophrosyne*), and shame is given as a second definition (160d-161d). Although it was denied after all that sense of shame is a definition of temperance, the fact that it was chosen as a candidate shows Plato’s concern on the connection between temperance and shame. While shame may not be the same as temperance, I interpret that shame is a strong mechanism that leads one to be moderate.

Shame and courage also seem to be linked according to *Symposium* and *Laws*. In Phaedrus’ speech (*Symposium*, 178a-180d), shame is portrayed as one side of love which guides a person to accomplish great things and be courageous. According to Phaedrus, it is the most painful thing to be found being coward by, and thus be ashamed in front of, the lover (178d). In *Laws*, shame is identified as a fear of ill-repute (647a), and is also stated as a thing that contributes to victory (647b), as fear of ill-repute among one’s friends leads a person to be courageous. It is also described that shame is a kind of fear that coward is free of and never experiences (699c). As it is shown, the relationship between shame and courage is relatively noticeable: sense of shame induces a person to have courage.

Finally, there is also a connection between shame and wisdom. By wisdom, however, I limit it as a self-knowledge, for it might be difficult to argue that sense of shame provide a person with the technical wisdom. Nevertheless, Plato shows that shame can lead a person to a self-knowledge. One part of shame is

recognition of the gap between the ideal and the reality of the self. The dramatic manifestations display the characters' experience of acknowledging one's position – true belief, genuine self in reality, and the gap. Another reference is Aristophanes' myth (189c-193e) in *Symposium*. As introduced earlier, navel is the remembrance of human race's hubris and fall; it is to remind humans of their imperfectness that gods turned human face towards the scar of sutura. This connection between shame and self-knowledge, that shame is a mechanism for bringing self-knowledge, implies that shame, indeed, is a rather significant concept for Plato's Socrates: Socrates' famous saying "know thyself", and his 'knowledge of ignorance', all has deep connection with sense of shame.

As for the conclusion, I attempt to draw the political implications of shame from the analyses of the previous chapters. I expect to discover that the most essential to Plato's politics of shame is that it serves as an important part in civic education, as a catalyst for nurturing civic virtues.

II. THE COMPLEX NATURE OF SHAME

In this chapter, I intend to explore Plato's conception of shame, by examining his descriptions of its complex nature, which are delivered through the characters in the dialogues. Among the two modes by which Plato displays shame in his dialogues, this chapter focuses on the texts where shame appears as a subject of interlocution. There are two points I aim to make here. First, assembling and unfolding Plato's descriptions on shame from various dialogues, I will show that Plato was aware of the complexity of shame. Second, as a supporting argument, although these conversations on shame are relatively brief and short in length, they ought not to be taken as peripheral discussions, for they compose important parts of each dialogue.

This chapter is composed of three sections, which are the three approaches I take to investigate the concept of shame: quasi-definition, place in tripartite soul, and genesis illustrated in myths. As I assemble the relevant pieces of dialogues, it was able to distinguish them into three different types. I argue that it is not just an arbitrary distinction, for it is quite relevant to Socrates' way of identifying a concept. Socrates' speech on Eros in *Symposium* is an example.⁴² Before starting the speech, he states that he will first explain who and what sort of being Eros is, and then of his works. In the first part, which explores the identity of Eros, Socrates tells, first, where Eros belongs, whether in the world of gods or of

⁴² Among the dialogues in which Socrates performs the identification of a concept, I choose *Symposium*, for it is the most prominent dialogue that Socrates claims himself of possessing the knowledge of the concept and giving full description on it. There are some other dialogues such as *Gorgias* and *Meno* in which Socrates distinguishes 'what it is (τί ἐστίν)' and "what sort of thing it is (ὁποῖόν γέ τι) / what is the quality of it (ποία τις)", but the distinction of these questions may exceed the purpose of this thesis.

humans (201d-203a), second, the genesis of Eros from a myth (203a-204c), and third, the definition of Eros (204c-206a).⁴³ It is notable that the composition of the first part of Socrates' speech is very similar to that of the present chapter. The second part of Socrates' speech is about the function of Eros, and chapter four will cover this part, the function of shame.

Therefore, I will begin with exploring the quasi-definition of shame in *Euthyphro* (12a-c) and *Laws* (646e-650b). Next, I go on to locate shame in Plato's tripartite soul, investigating *Republic* (439c-441c) and *Phaedrus* (246a-247c, 253c-256e). Then I look into the myths which illustrate the origin of shame, in *Protagoras* (320c-323c) and *Symposium* (189c-193e). The adjusted order is designed to make better explanation of the complexity and ambivalence of shame.

1. Quasi-Definition of Shame: Euthyphro, Laws

One of the famous questions which Plato's Socrates pursues is "What is ...?(τί ἐστὶ;)". In many dialogues, Socrates asks his interlocutors the "what is ...?" questions, and the questions usually are the main themes: "what is justice?" in *Republic*, "what is sophrosyne?" in *Charmides*, and "what is courage?" in *Laches*, etc. Unfortunately, there is no dialogue in which the question "what is shame" is raised as a main theme. Plato, however, does provide scenes in the dialogues where Socrates and his interlocutors discuss the meaning of shame. Two notable texts are

⁴³ Socrates tells that 1) Eros belongs to neither gods nor humans, but is something in between, 2) that he is the son of Poros and Penia, and 3) that "love is wanting to possess the good forever".

Euthyphro and *Laws*.

The fact that “what is shame?” is not the main question of a dialogue has a two-sided effect. On the one hand, while the other main questions are pursued throughout the dialogues, with different characters attempting to give answers and several times of investigation in different aspects, “what is shame” is not. For example, the question “what is justice” is answered by Cephalus, Polemarchus, and Thrasymachus in Book 1 of the *Republic*. Also in the *Charmides*, “what is sophrosyne” is replied by Charmides in three different responses, and in four more revisions by Critias.⁴⁴ The inspection of what shame is, on the contrary, is simply and briefly given by Socrates, which leads to the result that we are relatively not confident about whether the given clarification of shame is a thoroughly examined definition. On the other hand, unlike the other questions which are often left unanswered⁴⁵, Socrates himself describes what shame is. Although it might not be the complete definition of the concept, we can assume that the description does not cause discomfort to Socrates; at least, it is not negated by him. Thus, I call the description a ‘quasi-definition’ of shame.

The First Part of the Quasi-Definition of Shame: the Genus Fear

One of the places where a quasi-definition of shame appears is *Euthyphro*. The main question in *Euthyphro* is “what is piety?” As in other Socratic dialogues, the interlocutor fails to give satisfaction to Socrates in answering the question. Seeing

⁴⁴ There are some scholars who distinguishes Critias’ trials into three, e.g. Tuozzo(2011), but I share Lampert’s view. For the full description on the reading of *Charmides*, see Lampert 2010, chapter two.

⁴⁵ ‘Aporetic’ dialogues, dialogues which end in aporia, are typical for Plato’s early dialogues, e.g. *Euthyphro*, etc.

that Euthyphro is having difficulties in clarifying what piety is, Socrates exemplifies the way he wants Euthyphro to explain piety, by giving an example of shame. In *Euthyphro* 12 a-c, Plato provides genus-species distinction of shame:

Socrates: As I say, you are making difficulties because of your wealth of wisdom. Pull yourself together, my dear sir, what I am saying is not difficult to grasp. I am saying the opposite of what the poet said who wrote:

You do not wish to name Zeus, who had done it, and who made all things grow, for where there is fear(δέος) there is also shame(αἰδώς). I disagree with the poet. Shall I tell you why?

Euthyphro: Please do.

Socrates: I do not think that “where there is fear there is also shame,” for I think that many people who fear disease and poverty and many other such things feel fear, but are not ashamed of (αἰδεῖσθαι δὲ μηδὲν) the things they fear. Do you not think so?

Euthyphro: I do indeed.

Socrates: But where there is shame there is also fear. For is there anyone who, in feeling shame and embarrassment at [a certain action] (αἰδούμενός τι πράγμα καὶ αἰσχυνόμενος), does not also at the same time fear and dread (πεφόβηται τε καὶ δέδοικεν) a reputation for wickedness?

Euthyphro: He is certainly afraid.

Socrates: It is then not right to say “where there is fear there is also shame,”

but that where there is shame there is also fear. Since, as I think, fear is more comprehensive (ἐπὶ πλέον) than shame. Shame is a part of fear just as odd is a part of number, with the result that it is not true that where there is number there is also oddness, but that where there is oddness there is also number. Do you follow me now? (12a5-c7)

Socrates describes shame (αἰδώς) as a species of the genus fear (δέος). According to Socrates, when a person feels shame, fear of “a reputation for wickedness” always exists. But when a person feels fear, it is not always the case that he/she feels shame at the same time.

The example of disease and poverty which Socrates gives at 12b needs some explanation, for it is not improbable for one to be ashamed of disease and poverty. It might be more clearly understood if we consider αἰδεῖσθαι in the sense of “respect”. The Greek word αἰδώς is a sense of shame in the context that one has “respect for the feeling or opinion of others or for one’s own conscience.”⁴⁶ When a person feels shame, it is because one is seen doing something wrong not by anyone, but by someone he/she respects, including oneself. Therefore, when Socrates says that people fear disease and poverty but feel no αἰδώς, it seems more proper to understand him as saying not that they are not ashamed of disease and poverty, but that they do not respect, or have reverence for, and thus are not

⁴⁶ αἰδώς in the Greek Lexicon LSJ, Perseus Digital Library.
<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/morph?l=ai%29dw%2Fs&la=greek&can=ai%29dw%2Fs0&prior=kai%22#lexicon>

ashamed in front of disease and poverty.

Although not the main question, examination of shame is an important component of the dialogue in two ways. First, it exemplifies the way Socrates expects Euthyphro to explain what piety is, and thus guiding the dialogue toward a better delineation of the main theme. By distinguishing fear and shame as genus and species, Euthyphro realizes that “the pious is a part of justice”(12d), and goes on to the next step to clarify “what part of the just the pious is”(12e). Second, the example of shame and fear is not selected by chance, as Raymond (2013) mentions⁴⁷, since Plato returns to shame and fear at the end of the dialogue. In the last scene, Socrates tells Euthyphro that they have to “investigate again from the beginning what piety is”(15c). Socrates would not give up before he learns what piety is, for he knows that Euthyphro thinks himself to have “clear knowledge of piety and impiety”(15d). What makes Socrates so sure about Euthyphro’s possession of the knowledge is that unless Euthyphro had clear knowledge of piety and impiety, he would not have prosecuted his old father, for the fear of the gods, and shame before men (15d). This statement of Socrates alludes to Euthyphro’s shamefulness in doing and saying things regarding pious, which he does not have knowledge of. Mentioning shame in the earlier part of dialogue may be a foreshadowing, or a preparatory discussion to activate Euthyphro’s –and also the readers’– sense of shame, aiming to deliver in the end that action and speech without truthful deliberation is a shame.

In short, Plato gives a quasi-definition of the term that it is a part of fear, while developing and elaborating the main theme with the help of shame. The

⁴⁷ Raymond notices that the shame and fear are brought up again later, and points out that the example is not chosen randomly, but does not provide further analysis; see Raymond 2013, p. 19, n.27.

problem of this description, however, is that although it tells us the genus of shame, it does not inform us about the particularity of the species. After the fear-shame example, Euthyphro distinguishes piety from other parts of just: “the pious is the part of the just that is concerned with the service to the gods, while that concerned with the service to men is the remaining part of justice.”(12e). Disappointingly, the discussion on fear and shame in *Euthyphro* ends without characterizing in detail the species shame.

The Second Part of the Quasi-Definition of Shame: the Species Shame

The rough sketch of shame in *Euthyphro* is refined in *Laws*. Plato fills in the blank space of genus-species description, starting with distinguishing two species of fear in 646e-647a:

Athenian: Can we [discern] two nearly opposite kinds of fear (δύο φόβων) ?

Clinias: Which?

Athenian: These: when we expect evils to occur, we are in fear of them, I suppose?

Clinias: Yes.

Athenian: And we often fear for our reputation, when we imagine we are going to get a bad name for doing or saying something disgraceful. This is the fear which we, and I [suppose] everyone else, call

‘shame(αἰσχύνην)’.

Clinias: Surely.

Athenian: These are the two fears I meant. The second resists pains and the other things we dread (τοῖς ἄλλοις φόβοις), as well as our keenest and most frequent pleasures. (646e4-647a6)

According to the Athenian, shame is one of the two species of fear, the fear of gaining a low repute for disgraceful action and speech, while the other is the fear of something bad to happen. One interesting description is that the two fears are opposite to each other. This idea can be explained by Plato’s description in the *Symposium* (178d-179a). In a war, when we have to decide whether to charge toward an enemy position or not, the first kind of fear, presumably a fear of death in this case, makes us hesitate to advance, while shame, a fear of disrepute for being coward, deters us from withdrawing. This is why Plato writes that there are two things which ensure the victory: fearlessness of enemies, and fear of shame among friends. (647b5-7)

The description of shame in the *Laws* is not much long, but it is still an important part of the dialogue. In the *Laws*, the elders from three cities discuss about institutions and laws of a city. According to their discussion, education is said to be one of the most important part of lawmaking and city construction. When Plato describes how the virtues should be fostered in Book 1, he introduces shame as a way of testing the citizen, whether one has the virtue or not (646e-650b). Moreover, he later brings up shame several more times, too. Not only in Book 1, but also in Book 3 (699c), Plato explains that a person has to obey to sense of

shame in order to become a virtuous man. Also in Book 5 (729b-c), Plato tells that it is sense of shame and not money that we have to bequeath to the children. Later again in Book 7 (813c-d), Plato presents sense of shame as an important characteristic of the Director of Children.

In sum, the quasi-definition of shame Plato provides tells that shame is a fear of ill-repute. Plato provides the quasi-definition of shame through genus-species distinction, in the *Euthyphro* and the *Laws*. Although this description does not give us the full description of the nature of shame, at least one thing is shown. Being a kind of fear, shame has an emotional aspect. Also, while the relevant texts in the *Euthyphro* and the *Laws* is short in length, their significances in the dialogues are not marginal. Therefore, we can take these descriptions of shame to be important in constructing Plato's conception of shame as well.

2. The Place of Shame in Tripartite Soul: Republic, Phaedrus

This section aims to show that shame is placed in the spirited part of Plato's tripartite soul. The fact that shame belongs to the spirited part, which itself is hard to discern, shows Plato's awareness of its complex nature, more clearly. Among the three parts, the spirited part is the part into which Plato puts more care, in introducing and identifying. The two most important texts in which Plato's tripartite theory of human soul is introduced are the *Republic* and the *Phaedrus*.

The Tripartite Soul and the Spirited Part

In the *Republic* Book 4, 439c-441c, Socrates describes the three parts of human soul: the rational part (τὸ λογιστικὸν), the appetitive part (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν), and the spirited part (τὸ θυμοειδές). Socrates starts by distinguishing the rational part and the appetitive part, which are relatively clear to grasp, and then separates the spirited part from the previous two, first from the appetitive part and next from the rational part.

When Socrates asks Glaucon whether the part by which we get high-spirited is a third element or identical to existing parts, Glaucon supposes the spirited part to be of the same nature as the appetitive part. To show its separateness from the appetitive part, Socrates tells an anecdote of Leontius:

Socrates: But I've heard something relevant to this, and I believe it. Leontius, the son of Aglaion, was going up from the Piraeus along the outside of the North Wall when he saw some corpses lying at the executioner's feet. He had an appetite to look at them but at the same time he was disgusted and turned away. For a time he struggled with himself and covered his face, but, finally, overpowered by the appetite, he pushed his eyes wide open and rushed towards the corpses, saying, "Look for yourselves, you evil wretches, take your fill of the [fine (καλοῦ) spectacle]." (439e6-440a3)

When Leontius feels a strong desire to glance at the corpses, there is another force within him that resists the desire, "as an alien thing against an

alien⁴⁸ (ὥς ἄλλο ὄν ἄλλω)”(440a6). Socrates goes on to tell other cases in which the spirited part allies with the rational part and opposes the desires that are against the reason. When a person believes oneself to be acting or suffering unjust things, the spirited part, according to Socrates, arouses indignation and fights back, standing in the side of the rational part.

While the distinction from the appetitive part is made, now it is the relation with the rational part that needs to be clarified, for it has been told that the spirited part arms itself and works for the rational part. These two parts, however, is distinguished rather easily. Glaucon starts with the case of children, that they are full of high spirit from birth, but not of reason, and that many people obtain it later in life while some fail to have it at all.(441a7-b1) With Socrates’ additional explanation through the case of animals and a quotation from Homer⁴⁹, it is cleared up that there are three different parts in human soul.

In addition to Leontius story, Plato gives more vivid illustration of his tripartite theory of human soul in the *Phaedrus*. In the dialogue, Socrates and Phaedrus discuss about Lysias’ speech, on its subject –“lover (ἐραστής)”– and rhetoric. Criticizing Lysias’ speech, Socrates gives two speeches on “lover.” In the first speech, Socrates reforms the structure of speech but he still follows Lysias in the substance. As he realizes that his first speech is inadequate to the subject, he gives the second speech that is entirely his own in form and substance,

⁴⁸ Translation from Perseus Digital Library.
<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0168%3Abook%3D4%3Asection%3D440a>. sources from Plato in Twelve Volumes, Vols. 5 & 6 translated by Paul Shorey. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1969.

⁴⁹ “He smote his breast and chided thus his heart.”(441b6; Hom. Od. 20.17) Socrates interpret this line to be testifying that there are two different parts which one can reason while the other cannot reason what is right and wrong but be high-spirited.

demonstrating that erotic mania, as given by gods, is a benefit. In Socrates' second speech, the myth of the winged chariot, in which the form of human soul is depicted, is offered after the proof of immortality of the soul.

In the myth, human soul is depicted as a chariot composed of a charioteer and two horses. The charioteer is the rational part which drives the chariot, and the nobler of the two horses is the spirited part, while the other horse, which is opposite to the former in breed and character, is the appetitive part. Whereas the latter horse is unruly and does not obey the charioteer willingly, the noble horse obeys the charioteer with its temperance and sense of shame (μετὰ σωφροσύνης τε καὶ αἰδοῦς). So far, Plato introduces and explains three different parts of human soul in the *Republic* book 4, and provides more allegorical description in the *Phaedrus*.

Plato's depiction of the spirited part shows that this part has a peculiar character that can be seen only in the relationship with the other two parts. The spirited part mediates between the other two parts of the soul, and is "by nature the helper of the rational part" (441a2) unless it has been corrupted. In the *Republic*, Plato distinguishes the spirited part after introducing the other two parts in advance, and describes its character in terms of its relationship with the appetitive part and the rational part; the spirited part resists the desires, and acts upon the rational part. Also in the *Phaedrus*, on the one hand, when the nobler horse obeys the charioteer, it struggles against the wrong lust of the bad horse and helps the charioteer to drive toward the right direction. On the other hand, when the nobler horse submits to and joins the bad horse, the soul can be driven toward the wrong direction. This relational characteristic of the spirited part is very much related to the complexity of shame, which I will soon elaborate.

Placing Shame in the Spirited Part

As shown above, among the three parts of the human soul, Plato uses peculiar way of description especially for the spirited part. Now I move on to demonstrate that shame is located in the spirited part, and that this shows us Plato's attention to the complex nature of shame.

While Plato describes the spirited part with attention, it is sense of shame by which Plato characterizes the spirited part. When Leontius feels the desire to look at the corpses, resistance of the spirited part is expressed as anger and shame. The reason Leontius struggled and covered his face at first is because he perceived his desire to look at the dead bodies to be shameful. What made him even more ashamed and brought anger is that he could not restrain that desire. This interpretation of Leontius' shame is based on the understanding of the relation between *καλός* and *αἰσχρός*, and also on Plato's narrative on anger in 440c. Greek words *καλός* (beautiful, fine, noble, honorable) and *αἰσχρός* (ugly, shameful, base, dishonouring) are used as antonyms of each other. Leontius' cry "take your fill of the fine (*καλοῦ*) spectacle"(440a3) is an ironical expression, suggesting that he considered the scene as shameful. Furthermore, Socrates explains that it is when a person recognizes oneself to be in the wrong that gives a noble person furious anger (440c), which explains Leontius' resentment as coming from his recognition of shameful situation he is in.⁵⁰

Also in the myth of the winged chariot (246a-247c, 253c-256e), Plato displays sense of shame as the most typical feature of the noble horse. Plato

⁵⁰ Cairns (1993, 383), Raymond (2013, 22), and O'Brien (1967, 168-9) also offers interpretations of Leontius' story as implying shame.

introduces the nobler horse as “a lover of honor with temperance and sense of shame (μετὰ σωφροσύνης τε καὶ αἰδοῦς)”(253d6), while the other horse is “companion to insolence and boastfulness (ὑβρεως καὶ ἀλαζονείας ἑταῖρος)”(253e3). When a lover is with the beloved boy, the nobler horse which is obedient to the charioteer controls and prevents himself from rushing into the boy, “by sense of shame (αἰδοῖ) as always”(254a1). The other horse, on the contrary, leaps violently forward and forces the noble horse and the charioteer to approach the boy. Again, when the charioteer pulls the reins back, the nobler horse willingly falls back and “drenches the whole soul with sweat out of shame and wonder (ὑπ’ αἰσχύνης τε καὶ θάμβους)”(254c4), while the other horse falls back unwillingly and rages.

Characterizing the spirited part by sense of shame, it is evident that Plato locates shame in this part of soul. As previously shown, the spirited part demanded especial explanation for the distinctiveness in its relationships with other parts. Placing shame in the spirited part indicates that Plato, too, was aware of and is conceptualizing the complex nature of shame. The cognitive aspect of shame is not a separate feature from the relationship between the rational part and the spirited part. Mediating characteristic of the spirited part, that it can liberate the soul when sided with reason while also able to destroy it when sided with desires, is connected to the ambivalence of shame, that shame can be both virtue and vice. Furthermore, the relational characteristic of the spirited part can provide an explanation for the absence of an independent dialogue on ‘what is shame’: because sense of shame presents itself and works only through its relationships with other concepts. So far, the emotional and cognitive aspects, and ambivalent character of shame is sketched throughout the two sections.

3. The Origin of Shame: Protagoras, Symposium

Another approach of introducing the nature of shame is by studying its genesis. Plato portrays how shame comes into human life through two myths: Protagoras' myth of Prometheus in *Protagoras* (320c-323c), and Aristophanes' myth in *Symposium* (189c-193e). While illustrating the origin, Plato's description of shame in two myths demonstrates that he conceptualizes shame with sociality as one of its traits. Also, the cognitive aspect of shame is displayed with more detail, as Plato regards shame as a phenomenon which occurs when one realizes the gap between the self in ideal and the self in reality.

In Protagoras' myth, sense of shame is given to human by Zeus as a political wisdom, along with justice. The first half of the myth contains the famous Greek myth of Prometheus and fire. When Epimetheus "used up all the power and abilities on the non-reasoning animals"(321c), Prometheus gave human race the practical arts together with fire. The other half of the story is relatively new: a story about sense of shame as Zeus' gift to human race. Wisdom in practical arts, which were given by Prometheus, allowed human race to stay alive, but humans did not equip the political wisdom, "wisdom for living together in society"(321d). Human race, living scattered at first, was being slaughtered by wild animals. When they tried to found cities in order to survive from beasts' attacks, they wronged each other due to the lack of the art of politics, and thus would be scattered again and destroyed. Zeus, the keeper of the political wisdom, fearing the complete destruction of human race, sent Hermes to provide justice and shame to human race:

Zeus was afraid that our whole race might be wiped out, so he sent Hermes to bring justice and a sense of shame to humans, so that there would be order within cities and bonds of friendship to unite them. Hermes asked Zeus how he should distribute shame and justice to humans. ‘Should I distribute them as the other arts were? This is how the others were distributed: one person practicing the art of medicine suffices for many ordinary people; and so forth with the other practitioners. Should I establish justice and shame among humans in this way, or distribute it to all?’ ‘To all,’ said Zeus, ‘and let all have a share. For cities would never come to be if only a few possessed these, as is the case with the other arts. And establish this law as coming from me: Death to him who cannot partake of shame and justice, for he is a pestilence to the city.’ (322c1-d5)

Protagoras’ myth palpably shows that shame has a strong relation to sociality. Humans without sense of shame could not live together. Only after shame comes into human life, could they socialize and respect each other. With sense of shame, together with justice, humans come to recognize what is right and wrong. As they are equipped with shame, they are able to pay attention to the ideals of others and community, able to prevent themselves from doing wrong to each other, and thus sustain a society.

While Protagoras’ myth shows that shame enables humans to pay attention to others, Aristophanes’ myth in *Symposium* (189c-193e) suggests that sense of shame has a context of respecting the gods also.⁵¹ Aristophanes’ primary

⁵¹ Nussbaum also gives interpretation of Aristophanes’ myth in relation to shame (Nussbaum, 2004, 182-183). While Nussbaum focuses on the breakdown of the

aim of telling the myth is to explain the power of Eros, and the myth is mainly on the original nature of human in the beginning and what it suffers. But it also contains an idea on the origin of shame. According to the myth, there were originally three genders of human beings: male, female, and hermaphrodite. Moreover, humans were spherical in shape, with four arms, four legs, and two faces on opposite sides of one head. Their strength and power were fearful. As they thought highly of themselves (τὰ φρονήματα μεγάλα εἶχον), they attacked the gods. Zeus and other gods were perplexed as they could neither wipe humans out –for it would also eliminate the reverence and sacrifices they receive from humans– nor tolerate their licentiousness. Zeus’ solution was to cut them into halves, to make them weaker, but not extinct, so that the gods will receive more worship as population multiples. After cutting humans in two, Zeus ordered Apollo to turn their faces towards the wound and heal them. Apollo tied up the wound in the center of the stomach, leaving a small mouth, which we now call navel. The reason for turning the faces towards the stomach and leaving some wrinkles around the navel was to let humans remember their hubris and fall whenever they look at the navel.

The myth tells us that with shame, humans’ pay attention and show respect to the absolute beings. According to Aristophanes’ myth, navel is a remembrance to let humans feel shame at the memory of their hubris and helpless collapse. They thought themselves match for the gods, but their overconfidence failed them. The navel is to let humans remember their imperfection and recognize that they are not an absolute being, whenever they get too self-confident and become shameless. What they believe to be the truth, and what they think

omnipotence, I rather focus on the respect and attention to absolute being.

themselves capable of may not always be true. Shame, then, has a aspect of respecting others, not only human beings, but also the absolute beings, which includes the truth.

Another important aspect of shame which Aristophanes' myth demonstrates is that shame occurs when a person recognizes the gap between the ideal and the reality. The navel is the memento from humans' experience of the discordant between their ideal and the reality. Their ideal images of self had the equal power to the gods, but themselves in reality were not like their beliefs. According to the myth, in sum, humans experience shame as they recognize or experience the gap between what they believed themselves to be capable of –the self in ideal– and what they really are capable of –the self in reality.

III. DRAMATIC MANIFESTATIONS OF SHAME

In this chapter, I attempt to explore diverse manifestations of shame, from the scenes where the characters of Plato experience shame. Examining how Plato manifests shame in drama is an important part in reconstructing his conception of shame, for shame is not just an abstract concept but is a psychological phenomenon of which the experience is an indispensable element. There are thirteen characters I found to be experiencing shame, each of which shows slightly different manifestations. Some characters physically blush while others do not, some outburst while others mute, and some refuse to converse with Socrates further while some still participate, etc. Despite the wide range of diversity and intricacy of the phenomenon, there are groups of cases which share common features. I divide these manifestations in three groups: shame of characters who avoid it, shame of characters who confront it, and shame of Socrates.

As I mentioned in the introduction, Tarnopolsky (2010) discerns that Plato portrays different manifestations of shame through his characters in *Gorgias*. Tarnopolsky distinguishes flattering shame, Socratic shame, and Platonic shame, but there are two shortcomings in her distinction.⁵² One problem is that the distinction postulates that Socrates and Plato are in the position of the shamer, while the interlocutors are in the position of the ashamed. Flattering shame is the disposition of shame that the interlocutors have, which makes the orator to evade saying anything that may bring shame and pain to the audience, even if it contains

⁵² Moss (2005) also notes different views of shame in *Gorgias*, but I focus on Tarnopolsky because her account offers the most detailed explanation and distinction.

the truth.⁵³ On the contrary, respectful shame, which includes Socratic shame and Platonic shame, “requires that one remain open to the possibility of being rightfully shamed [...] by an other in the ongoing and mutual project of collective self-examination.”⁵⁴ While Socratic shame uses shaming elenchus as a method of shaming, which might irritate some characters, Platonic shame uses myth and thus is more appropriate to a character like Callicles. Tarnopolsky states that “Socrates is not shameless”⁵⁵, but her conception of Socratic shame only includes Socrates’ position as a shamer and not Socrates’ own sense of shame. Therefore, in this chapter, I show that Socrates has his own shame experiences in several dialogues, and illustrate that Plato depicts Socrates’ shame different from other characters’ shame.

The second shortcoming of Tarnopolsky’s distinction is that it does not fully grasp the diversity of shame experiences. Tarnopolsky perceives that there are two moments –moment of recognition and moment of reaction– and a number of reactions, and claims that shame works differently in the three interlocutors, but after all, all three interlocutors’ shame are classified under flattering shame. This shortcoming might be due to the limited examples of shame experience, for including more examples from other dialogues may show not only the diverse factors of shame, but also the differences Plato depicts in specific shame experiences. Therefore, building on Tarnopolsky’s analysis, I present three critical factors that compose a shame experience, and classify diverse experiences of shame under three types of shame.

The classification is according to the combination of three factors: the

⁵³ Tarnopolsky (2010), 104-106.

⁵⁴ Tarnopolsky (2010), 108.

⁵⁵ Tarnopolsky (2010), 109.

standard, the reaction, and Plato's attitudes toward each case. There are many factors that can be found in Plato's description to form a shaming experience, and each manifestation differs by the combination of factors. A single instance of experience might not always include all the factors, partly because of the subtleness of the experience itself, and partly because Plato does not give us full description of the situations with every single detail. Some of the factors are as follows: the moment of recognition (prospective or retrospective), related emotion (fear, anger, etc.), ideal or standard (sheer desire or deliberation), reaction (deliberation on the situation and oneself, attempt to transform oneself into a better state, accepting the feeling with truthful attitude, or withdrawal from any further deliberation, etc.), and physical reaction (blushing or not), etc. Among these factors, there are three factors I consider to be most critical in forming overall disposition of an experience: the quality of the standard, whether it is just a desire to look noble in the eyes of other, or includes deliberation on what is good; character's reaction to shame, whether one reacts with truthfulness or just tries to ignore or avoid; and the stance on the situation Plato shows.⁵⁶

Followings are the shaming episodes I analyze. There are six episodes of avoiding shame: Thrasymachus in *Republic*, Polus and Callicles in *Gorgias*, Dionysodorus in *Euthydemus*, Hippothales in *Lysis*, and the rival lover in *Lovers*⁵⁷. There are another six episodes of confronting shame: Charmides in *Charmides*, Cleinias in *Euthydemus*, Lysis in *Lysis*, Hippocrates in *Protagoras*, Gorgias in

⁵⁶ I might have to add that the superficiality of the categorizing is a stimulus, intended to let Plato's readers take a closer look into how Plato illustrates shame in his dialogues.

⁵⁷ I agree with Raymond (2013, 72, n.39) that although it is generally agreed that *Lovers* is not authentic work of Plato, the fact that the dialogue contains shame experiences may rather demonstrate that the imitators of Plato also recognized Plato's interest in the experience of shame and blushing.

Gorgias, *Crito* in *Crito*. Finally, I present four episodes of Socrates' shame in *Phaedrus*, *Symposium*, *Hippias Major*, and *Crito*.

1. First Type: Avoiding Shame

The first type of shame consists in evading shame: the ashamed characters do not confront their feelings, but try to ignore or deny their feelings of shame. In avoiding shame, the characters are ashamed as they recognize that they fall short of their ideal image of self which is formed by sheer desire, without deliberation. Also, they do not show truthful reactions. They do not reflect on their feeling of shame: not on what is wrong within oneself, nor the standard that one is trying to live up to, nor one's current situation, nor what one has to do to live a better life. They only try to avoid it, and withdraw from further discussion on the ongoing issue. Cases of avoiding shame are of Thrasymachus (*Republic* 350c-d), Callicles (*Gorgias* 494e, 497a-b, 505b-c), Dionysodorus (*Euthydemus* 297a-b), Polus (*Gorgias* 482d-e), Hippothales (*Lysis* 204b-c), and the rival lover (*Lovers* 134a-c, 139a). While the former three characters show strong avoidance, the latter three characters show relatively unassertive reactions.

The first case of avoiding shame is Thrasymachus' shame in the *Republic* (350c-d). Thrasymachus blushes out of shame when he and Socrates arrive at the conclusion that the just man is good and wise, while the unjust man is bad and ignorant. Socrates narrates that Thrasymachus admitted to Socrates with baulk and reluctance, with tremendous amount of sweat, and that he then saw something he

had “never seen before”:

Thrasymachus agreed to all this, not easily as I’m telling it, but reluctantly, with toil, trouble, and –since it was summer– a quantity of sweat that was a wonder to behold. And then I saw something I’d never seen before – Thrasymachus blushing. But, in any case, after we’d agreed that justice is virtue and wisdom and that injustice is vice and ignorance, I said: All right, let’s take that as established. But we also said that injustice is powerful, or don’t you remember that, Thrasymachus? (350c-d)

Plato does not explain the cause of Thrasymachus’ blushing, and leaves it to the readers. Socrates witnesses Thrasymachus sweating and blushing, but he simply goes back to delivering the argument without any explanation except for that it might be because it was summer. It is rather obvious, however, that the cause of Thrasymachus’ sweating and blushing is the contradiction between the conclusion and his earlier claim. Thrasymachus’ earlier claim that injustice is virtue and wisdom while justice is the opposite(348c-349d) turned out to be false, and he himself has arrived at the contradicting conclusion through the conversation with Socrates. What Thrasymachus cannot endure is being seen by other attendees that he was wrong, and also to be seen defeated in argument by Socrates. His standard, which he has failed to live up to, is his desire to be seen strong, in argument in this case. This standard can be specified as a sheer desire, for he would have cared instead for what is the truth, and try to examine his own argument, if his standard have been a deliberated one.

Thrasymachus’ reaction strengthens my interpretation that his standard is

a sheer desire:

(continued from the previous quotation)

I remember, but I'm not satisfied with what you're now saying. I could make a speech about it, but, if I did, I know that you'd accuse me of engaging in oratory. So either allow me to speak, or, if you want to ask questions, to ahead, and I'll say, "All right," and nod yes and no, as one does to old wives' tales.

Don't do that, contrary to your own opinion.

I'll answer so as to please you (350d-e)

Thrasymachus' reaction is to give up active participation in the discussion, and contribute only the minimum. He gives only short responses to Socrates, which are not sincere answers but answers that are aiming only to please Socrates. Giving up asserting himself, he does not really admit that he is currently feeling shame, and also tries to avoid further situations he might be ashamed of.

Callicles in *Gorgias* (481b-505d) is another example of avoiding shame. Callicles does not externally show blushing, nor express that he is ashamed. Nonetheless, during the discussion with Socrates, Callicles shows signs of shame few times, which are followed by revision of his argument or change in attitude. The conversation between Callicles and Socrates begins as Callicles criticizes former interlocutors, Gorgias and Polus, to have contradicted themselves and not say what they really think because of shame (481c-e). Socrates takes this utterance as a claim that Callicles himself, in contrast, can speak out frankly and not be

ashamed (487d5-7).⁵⁸ As the conversation goes on, however, Callicles's attitudes belie his claimed character.

A moment which many scholars agree on Callicles' shame is when he says "Aren't you ashamed, Socrates, to bring our matters to such matters? (494e7-8)",⁵⁹ as Socrates brings in the case of catamite to the argument of hedonism. Although he charges Socrates of shame, it is Callicles himself, in fact, who is ashamed to discuss these things and answer Socrates' question. Callicles' shame is twofold. On the one hand, Callicles is ashamed to insist that the pleasure and the good are identical in the example of catamite. On the other hand, he is ashamed of contradicting himself when he says that good and pleasure are different.⁶⁰ Callicles chooses to say that they are the same, in order to keep consistency (495a5-6). Ironically however, this decision made Callicles the same charge he had made against Gorgias and Polus; he did not say what he really thinks, but said something he does not think to be true, because of shame.

Shortly after, Callicles and Socrates arrive at the point where Callicles has to agree that the pleasure and the same are different:

Socrates: So, feeling enjoyment isn't the same as doing well, and being in pain isn't the same as doing badly, and the result is that what's pleasant

⁵⁸ "And as to my claim that you're able to speak frankly without being ashamed, you yourself say so and the speech you gave a moment ago bears you out."

⁵⁹ Contra Klosko, who argues that "Callicles has no shame" (Klosko 1984, 136), Dodds (1959, 307); Kahn (1983, 105-6), Lewis (1986, 205); Stauffer (2006, 109-110), Tarnopolsky (2010, 81) take this scene as manifesting Callicles' shame.

⁶⁰ Lewis (1986, 205) similarly notes that Callicles is doubly shamed: ashamed for seeming to approve of catamites' life, as any decent Athenian will be, and also "ashamed of being ashamed" since he claimed himself of "being above conventional morality"; Tarnopolsky (2010, 81) also notes that Callicles' shame show that "there can be competing feelings of shame within the same individual".

turns out to be different from what's good.

Callicles: I don't know what your clever remarks amount to, Socrates.

Socrates: You do know. You're just pretending you don't, Callicles. Go just a bit further ahead.

Callicles: Why do you keep up this nonsense?⁶¹

Socrates: So you'll know how wise you are in scolding me. Doesn't each of us stop being thirsty and stop feeling pleasure at the same time as a result of drinking?

Callicles: I don't know what you mean.

Gorgias: Don't do that, Callicles! Answer him for our benefit too, so that the discussion may be carried through. (497a-b)

Callicles rather condemns Socrates and avoids answering at the moment. It is only when Gorgias requests him not to quit the conversation, that he reluctantly rejoins the conversation. But soon after when he arrive at the same point again, he, censuring Socrates for being puerile, suddenly changes his argument: from the earlier argument that the pleasure and the good are identical, to the new argument that some pleasures are better and others are worse (499b).

Later again, when he has no other choice but to agree that "correction is better for the soul than uncorrected licence (505b),"⁶² Callicles tries to avoid

⁶¹ OCT assigns this line to Socrates; Cooper (1997) and Dodds (1959) assigns it to Callicles. I accepted the latter interpretation, for it seems more plausible for Callicles to say the line at the moment. For Dodd's commentary on the line, see Dodds (1959), 312.

⁶² Translation from the Perseus Digital Library:
<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Plat.+gorg+505&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext>

answering, and, after all, gives up on continuing the conversation:

Socrates: So to be disciplined is better for the soul than lack of discipline, which is what you yourself were thinking just now.

Callicles: I don't know what in the world you mean, Socrates. Ask somebody else.

Socrates: This fellow won't put up with being benefited and with his undergoing the very thing the discussion's about, with being disciplined.

Callicles: And I couldn't care less about anything you say, either. I gave you these answers just for Gorgias' sake.

Socrates: Very well. What'll we do now? Are we breaking off in the midst of the discussion?

Callicles: That's for you to decide. [...] Couldn't you go through the discussion by yourself, either by speaking in your own person or by answering your own questions? (505b-d)

From here on, Socrates questions and answers himself.

Similar to Thrasymachus, Callicles' standard is made up of his desire to look strong in argument, and thus show Socrates that Socrates' philosophic life is inferior to his own way of life. At the beginning of their conversation, Callicles criticizes Socrates that his way of refutation, which is clinging to refuting trivial

[%3A1999.01.0166](#), source from *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, Vol. 3 translated by W.R.M. Lamb. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1967.

matters, led Gorgias and Polus ashamed into contradicting themselves. Moreover, Callicles claims that spending too much time on philosophy ruins one's life (482c-486d), and asserts that "this is the truth (484c)." Callicles' ideal image of himself was to refute Socrates and show his superiority. But Callicles feels shame as he realizes that his statement is refuted by Socrates. He claimed himself to be speaking frankly, free from shame. However, in front of others, including Gorgias and Polus who he has accused of shame, Callicles himself is being seen contradicting oneself. If he had set his standard with deliberation, he would pursue to examine himself, whether his belief that his way of life is better than Socrates' philosophic life is really the truth. Yet, he does not.

Callicles' reaction is similar to Thrasymachus in that he withdraws from further discussion after all. Callicles, however, shows more dynamic and dramatic responses of avoiding shame. Whenever he confronts shame situation, he avoids giving answers, either reproaching Socrates or pretending he does not understand Socrates' questions (494e, 497a-b, 505b-c). He also changes his argument and pretends as if it was his original argument, criticizing Socrates instead (499b). Then finally, he ceases to participate in conversation and tell Socrates to question and answer himself (505d). These reactions are not designed to confront his shame with truthfulness, but only to avoid and ignore it, and even to pretend as if he is not ashamed at all.

Another character who manifests avoiding shame is Dionysodorus in *Euthydemus* (297a); this time, however, Plato illustrates a rather farcical picture of the character. As the two brother sophists Euthydemus and Dionysodorus use their sophistry and lead Cleinias and Ctesippus into predicament, Socrates interjects his own conversation with Cleinias, and interposes time to time. Dionysodorus blushes

when his brother Euthydemus denounces him:

You are ruining the argument, said Euthydemus to Dionysodorus, and this fellow here will turn out to be not knowing, and then he will be knowing and not knowing at the same time. And Dionysodorus blushed.

But you, I said, what do you say, Euthydemus? Your all-knowing brother doesn't appear to be making a mistake, does he?

Am I a brother of Euthydemus? Said Dionysodorus, interrupting quickly.

And I said, Let that pass, my good friend, until Euthydemus instructs me as to how I know that good men are unjust, and don't begrudge me this piece of information.

You are running away, Socrates, said Dionysodorus, and refusing to answer.
(297a-b)

Dionysodorus blushes when he is being accused of "ruining the argument", which is the complete opposite of what he desires. Two brother sophists are aiming to demonstrate their wisdom (274b), and Dionysodorus says that however one responds, the interlocutor will be refuted by them (275e). Dionysodorus' ideal image of self is constructed by his desire to show, or show off, his lately acquired wisdom, but in reality, he is rather scolded.

Dionysodorus, as the former two characters, shows reaction of evasion, but in a way less furious and more ridiculous. As Socrates asks Euthydemus whether he think his brother to be making mistake, Dionysodorus interrupts

quickly and says, “Am I really a brother of Euthydemus?”(297b). At the very moment when his mistake has to be revealed and admitted, he quickly turns away the topic, but the question is too absurd that it betrays his disconcertedness. When Socrates tells him not to interrupt until Euthydemus teaches him what he had to, Dionysodorus speaks again: “you are running away, Socrates, and refusing to answer.(297b)”. Similar to Callicles’ utterance in *Gorgias* 494e, it seems to be Dionysodorus who is on the charge of running away from the confronted situation.

About these three shame experiences, Plato does not explicitly state his attitude; but his way of describing and illustrating the situations and characters implies that he does not value highly of the cases. Callicles is depicted as a vehement character, especially when he faces shame. Dionysodorus is portrayed in a rather sarcastical way. Plato’s unfavorable attitude towards avoiding shame will become clearer in comparison with next two types of shame.

While the above three characters shows relatively strong reactions of avoidance to shame, the other three characters show less strong reactions, but still do not confront shame. The three characters are the Polus, Hippothales, and the rival lover. Polus is another one among the three characters who feels shame in *Gorgias* (482d-e). Unlike Callicles, Polus does not explicitly show strong avoiding reactions such as condemning Socrates, or deciding himself to quit the conversation with Socrates. Rather, Polus heteronomously gives the position of interlocutor over to Callicles, as Callicles suddenly turns himself up and takes the position. As a result, Polus’ shame is not expressed by Polus himself, but by Callicles:

Callicles: Socrates, I think you’re grandstanding in these speeches, acting like

a true crowd pleaser. Here you are, playing to the crowd now that Polus has had the same thing happen to him that he accused Gorgias of letting you do to him. For he said, didn't he, that when Gorgias was asked by you whether he would teach anyone who came to him wanting to learn oratory but without experience in what's just, Gorgias was ashamed and, out of deference to human custom, since people would take it ill if a person refused, said that he'd teach him. And because Gorgias agreed on this point, he[Polus] said, he[Gorgias] was forced to contradict himself, just the thing you like. He[Polus] ridiculed you at the time, and rightly so, as I think anyhow. And now the very same thing has happened to him[Polus]. And for this same reason I don't approve of Polus: he agreed with you that doing what's unjust is more shameful than suffering it. As a result of this admission he was bound and gagged by you in the discussion, too ashamed to say what he thought. (482c-e)

Callicles accuses Polus of being shamed into lying. According to Callicles, Polus was ashamed to say what he really thinks, which is that suffering what is unjust is more shameful than doing it. Although there are different interpretations on Polus' behavior,⁶³ what is evident is that Polus did not continue the discussion with Socrates and never showed up thereafter. Polus' reaction is in contrast with Gorgias' reaction, which will be presented in the next section, for Gorgias shows himself up during Callicles' conversation and asks Callicles not to withdraw from the

⁶³ Kahn (1983, 117) understands Polus as being insincere and telling a lie, McKim (1998, 40) sees him as being sincere and blurting out his deep belief, and Tarnopolsky (2010, 65-67) interprets Polus as simply being perplexed by the situation.

discussion.

Hippothales in *Lysis* (204b-c) is a blushing character, who, like Polus, does not show strong sign of rejecting shame, but still does not confront it. Hippothales feels shame when his innermost thought is revealed to Socrates and the others. In the opening scene of the dialogue, Hippothales invites Socrates to come with him to spend some time:

“Well, come straight over here to us, why don’t you? You won’t come? It’s worth your while, I assure you.”

“Where do you mean, and who all are you?”

“Over here,” he said, showing me an open door and an enclosed area just facing the wall. “A lot of us spend our time here. There are quite a few besides ourselves –and they’re all good-looking”

[...]

“[Hippothales:] Well then, won’t you please come in and see who’s here?”

“First I’d like to hear what I’m coming for –and the name of the best-looking member.”

“Each of us has a different opinion on who that is, Socrates.”

“So tell me, Hippothales, who do you think it is?”

He blushed at the question, so I said, “Aha! You don’t have to answer that, Hippothales, for me to tell whether you’re in love with any of these boys or not –I can see that you are not only in love but pretty far gone

too. I may not be much good at anything else, but I have this god-given ability to tell pretty quickly when someone is in love, and who he's in love with."

When he heard this he really blushed, which made Ctesippus say, "O very cute, Hippothales, blushing and too embarrassed to tell Socrates the name. But if he spends any time at all with you he'll be driven to distraction hearing you say it so often. We're all just about deaf, Socrates, from all the 'Lysis' he's poured into our ears. And if he's been drinking, odds are we'll wake up in the middle of the night thinking we hear Lysis' name. As bad as all this is in normal conversation, it's nothing compared to when he drowns us with his poems and prose pieces. And worst of all, he actually sings odes to his beloved in a weird voice, which we have to put up with listening to. And now when you ask him the name he blushes!" (Lysis 203a-204d)

Hippothales' shame is due to the unintended revelation. Hippothales blushes when Socrates sees through Hippothales that he is in love and asks him who looks best to him. Hippothales blushes still more, when Socrates tells Hippothales that he is even able to discern who is in love with Hippothales. Hippothales' intention on asking Socrates to come with him was to get advice from Socrates on "what one should say or do" in order to make his prospective boyfriend adore him (206c). Nonetheless, instead of telling Socrates frankly from the first moment of their meeting, Hippothales hides his intention in persuading Socrates. He rather emphasizes twice that there are good-looking members, one of which is apparently his lover, Lysis.

At Socrates' disclosure, Hippocrates blushes and does not answer Socrates' question. It is told by Ctesippus that Hippothales is in love with Lysis. Hippothales' reaction to his feeling of shame is not to face it in truthful attitude. Hippothales does not run away from entire discussion, but he does not give answer to the very question that made him blush. The exact situation of Hippothales' shame –the standard, the reality, and the gap– is difficult to seize because he does not, and Plato does not make him– reflect on himself. Hippothales' reaction is in contrast to that of Lysis, who reflects on his shame and articulates what made him feel shame – Lysis' shame will be investigated in the next section.

The last example of avoiding shame is the rival lover in *Lovers* (134b, 139a). The rival lover feels shame twice in the dialogue. First, he blushes when his argument is rebutted by the other lover, and reacts by not admitting that he is refuted by him. As the rival lover claims that he knows what philosophy is, and that philosophy is to learn many things as possible (133c), Socrates examines him by asking whether “doing lots of exercise” is the way to get “into good physical condition” (133e). When the rival lover replies ‘yes’, which is not a satisfactory answer, Socrates asks the other lover instead, who is an athlete:

“As far as I’m concerned, Socrates,” he said, “I thought even a pig would know, as they say, that it’s moderate exercise that produces good physical condition, so why shouldn’t a man who doesn’t sleep or eat know this, somebody who’s out of shape and scrawny from sitting around meditating?” The boys were amused by what he said, and they snickered, while the other lover blushed.

And I said, “Well then, do you now grant that it’s neither lots of exercise nor a little, but a moderate amount, that produces good physical condition? Or do you want to fight out the argument against the two of us?”

Then he said, “With him I would very happily fight it out, and I’m sure that I would be able to support the claim I made, even if my position were far weaker than it is –for he’s no competition. But there’s no need to compete with you about my opinion. I agree that it’s not lots of athletics but a moderate amount that produces good physical condition in people.” (Rival Lovers 134a-c)

The rival lover blushes as he was being refuted by the other lover. He desires to look better than the other lover in front of the beloved and the other boys, but the reality is that he was disproved by him. If the rival lover’s standard involves deliberation on the truth and what is good, he would sincerely admit that he was wrong. Instead, his reaction to the feeling of shame is to behave vaingloriously with grandiloquent words. He does not accept the reality that his claim is wrong while the other lover’s claim is right. He, however, does not assert further, nor quit the discussion. He agrees to Socrates, and the dialogue goes on as their conversation continues.

The second shame of the rival lover is portrayed in the final scene of the dialogue, when his claim that philosophy is learning many things gets refuted by Socrates at last. At the moment, “the wise fellow was ashamed at what he’d said before and fell silent (139a).” After all, the rival lover had to face the truth that his claim was wrong. When the feeling of shame occurs to him, he does not condemn Socrates like Callicles, but still, he does not say anything.

It might be true that the latter three characters' reactions are more positive and hopeful in that they might, at some point, confront their feelings and react in more truthful way. Nonetheless, their reactions lack truthfulness, and Plato's stance on these characters are different from those of the characters in second type, which I will now go on to.

2. Second Type: Confronting Shame

In contrast to avoiding shame, characters of confronting shame try to face their shame with more truthful attitude. Although their standard may still be formed by the desire to appear good in others' eyes, they do not ignore or evade their feeling of shame. Also, Plato's descriptions of these examples are more positive. The characters who show confronting shame are Charmides (*Charmides* 158c-d), Cleinias (*Euthydemus* 275d), Lysis (*Lysis* 213d), Hippocrates (*Protagoras* 312a), Gorgias (*Gorgias* 458d-e, 460a-461b, 482c-d, 497b), and Crito (*Crito*).

Charmides' shame in the *Charmides* (158c5-d6) is the typical blushing which Socrates, and Plato, values. In an early scene, Socrates asks Charmides if he agrees that he already partakes sufficiently of sophrosyne, as Critias described him to be sufficiently sophron. Charmides first response, however, is blushing. Then, Charmides explains why he cannot answer easily: if he denies, it would not only seem odd (ἄτοπον) to say such things about oneself, but also make Critias a liar; if he admits and praise himself, it would appear offensive (ἐπαχθὲς). At these reactions, Socrates adds descriptions. First, to Charmides' blushing, he says that Charmides "looked more beautiful than ever (158c5-6)." Then, to Charmides'

answer, he describes it as something that is “not ignoble (158c57)”. Charmides is truthful in facing his feeling of shame. He recognizes what makes him to be ashamed, and articulates it without hiding. Even after this (perhaps) painful moment, he does not withdraw from discussion, but investigates what *sophrosyne* is, together with Socrates.

“So tell me yourself: do you agree with your friend and assert that you already partake sufficiently of temperance, or would you say that you are lacking in it?” At first Charmides blushed and looked more beautiful than ever, and his bashfulness was becoming at his age. Then he answered in a way that was quite dignified: he said that it was not easy for him in the present circumstances, either to agree or to disagree with what had been asked. “Because,” he said, “if I should deny that I am temperate, it would not only seem an odd thing to say about oneself, but I would at the same time make Critias here a liar, and so with the many others to whom, by his account, I appear to be temperate. But if, on the other hand, I should agree and should praise myself, perhaps that would appear distasteful. So I do not know what I am to answer.” (158c-d)

Cleinias’ shame in *Euthydemus* (275d) is another example of confronting shame. As Socrates requested the two sophists to persuade Cleinias that he ought to love wisdom and cultivate virtue, Euthydemus starts the question: “Cleinias, which are the men who learn, the wise or the ignorant?” Cleinias blushes at this question, and Socrates narrates that it is because the question was weighty (*μεγάλου*). Although the question itself seems to be too obvious, Cleinias felt shame because

he could not answer the either way, just as Dinoysodorus says: “whichever way the boy answers he will be refuted.”(275e) Nonetheless, with Socrates’ encouragement,⁶⁴ Cleinias does not withdraw out of shame, and answers what he believes to be right. Although the two sophists rather confuse him, Socrates leads the boy to love wisdom and practice virtue. This was possible because Cleinias does not just give up at the feeling of shame, but faces it with sincerity, not avoiding to be examined.

Cleinias, which are the men who learn, the wise or the ignorant?

Being confronted with this weighty question, the boy blushed and looked at me in doubt. And I, seeing that he was troubled, said, Cheer up, Cleinias, and choose bravely whichever seem to you to be the right answer –he may be doing you a very great service. (275d-e)

Lysis’ shame in the *Lysis* (213d) is also a confronting shame. His reaction to shame is peculiar; he bursts into telling the truth out of shame. When Socrates and Menexenus were struggling with the discussion, Socrates asks Menexenus if their inquiry have been going the wrong way. Lysis, who has been listening to their conversation, says suddenly that they seem to him to be on the wrong way, and at the same moment (ἄμα), he blushes. Socrates explains that he was paying too much attention on the conversation that his words escaped him unwittingly. As Socrates did with Thrasymachus in *Republic* 350d, he might not explain all about the character’s shame. As Lysis blurts out and blushes at the same time, it might be true

⁶⁴ “Have no fear, Cleinias, and answer bravely, whichever way that seems to you to be right” (275d7-e1).

that he was embarrassed by his unintended utterance, but we can also suggest that he blurted his thought out of shame. Anyways, Lysis' shame did not make him to withdraw or tell a lie. Rather, he was telling what he believed to be true when he blushed, and Socrates chooses him to be the next interlocutor as he was delighted by Lysis' love of wisdom.

“Do you think, Menexenus,” I said, “that we may have been going about our inquiry in entirely the wrong way?”

“I certainly think so, Socrates,” said Lysis. And [at the same moment (ἄμα)], he blushed. I had the impression that the words just slipped out unintentionally because he was paying such close attention to what was being said, which he clearly had been all along.

Well, I wanted to give Menexenus a break anyway, and I was pleased with the other's fondness for philosophy, so I turned the conversation towards Lysis, and said: “I think you're right, Lysis, to say that if we were looking at things in the right way, we wouldn't be so far off course. ...”
(213d1-e2)

Hippocrates in *Protagoras* (312a) also shows confronting shame. In the opening scene of *Protagoras*, Hippocrates comes to Socrates' house early in the morning, desperate to meet Protagoras. As it is too early to visit Protagoras, and for Hippocrates was too stimulated, Socrates suggests a walk in his garden and asks Hippocrates what Protagoras is and what Hippocrates expects to become. After a short discussion, it turns out to be as sophist that Hippocrates is going to pay

Protagoras, to become a sophist himself. At this very moment when Hippocrates recognizes that he is so desperate to meet Protagoras expecting to become a sophist himself, he blushes out of shame.

“A sophist is what they call him, anyway, Socrates.”

“Then it is as a sophist that we are going to pay him?”

“Yes.”

“And if somebody asks you what you expect to become in going to Protagoras?”

He blushed in response –there was just enough daylight now to show him up– and said, “if this is at all like the previous cases, then, obviously, to become a sophist.”

“What? You? Wouldn’t you be ashamed to present yourself to the Greek world as a sophist?”

“Yes, I would, Socrates, to be perfectly honest.” (311e4-312a7)

Gorgias (*Gorgias* 458d-e, 460a-461b, 482c-d, 497b) is the character which Plato contrasts with Callicles in their reactions to shame. Gorgias shows his sense of shame twice in the dialogue, first in the beginning of his discussion with Socrates (458d-e), second in the end of the discussion (460a-461b). The discussion of Gorgias and Socrates begins when they are asked by Chaerephon and Callicles to make a conversation. As Socrates says he will accept their request “as long as Gorgias is willing,” Gorgias replies:

Gorgias: It'll be to my shame ever after, Socrates, if I weren't willing, when I myself have made the claim that anyone may ask me anything he wants. All right, if it suits these people, carry on with the discussion, and ask what you want.(458d-e)

Gorgias, admitting the situation he is in, states that he has a sense of shame, and tries to do what he thinks to be right. Although his standard might be just not to be seen contradicting his own words in front of others, and not a truly deliberated standard, he does not hide or avoid his sense of shame.

The discussion which started with Gorgias' sense of shame ends with his shame again. As Socrates shows that Gorgias' claim –that he can teach his pupil about what is just and what is unjust– is contradicting his earlier claim, Polus (461b) and Callicles (482c-d) condemn Socrates that he made Gorgias shamed into telling such a lie. As Polus comes up as a new interlocutor, the conversation of Gorgias and Socrates ends. For a while, it seems like Gorgias does not show specific reaction to the feeling of shame, until the third interlocutor, Callicles, encounters shame and avoids it in 497b. As shown in the last section, when Callicles evades giving direct answers to Socrates and tries to cease from the discussion, Plato brings out Gorgias to tell Callicles to keep up the conversation, “for [his] benefit too.” While Callicles withdraws from examining himself and the truth, Gorgias tries to keep examining, even by listening to others' discussion.

The last example of confronting shame is the shame experience of Crito in *Crito* (44c, 45d-46a). Crito frankly expresses his feeling of shame, and tries to adjust the situation according to the standard. Crito's standard is shaped by what

other people say and think, not by his own deliberation. Yet, Crito's reaction, which is to follow Socrates' examination of his standard, is still truthful.

Crito's sense of shame is one of the reasons Crito lists in order to persuade Socrates to save himself:

Crito: [B]ut listen to me even now and be saved. If you die, it will not be a single misfortune for me. Not only will I be deprived of a friend, the like of whom I shall never find again, but many people who do not know you or me very well will think that I could have saved you if I were willing to spend money, but that I did not care to do so. [And yet what reputation could be more shameful(αἰσχίον)] than to be thought to value money more highly than one's friends, for the majority will not believe that you yourself were not willing to leave prison while we were eager for you to do so. (44b-c)

Crito tries to persuade Socrates by stating that he –Crito– will be ashamed of the reputation that he considers money more important than friends. As Socrates rejects Crito's arguments and refuses to leave the prison, Crito cites other reasons, including his feeling of shame in another aspect. This time, Crito feels shame for being seen as a coward:

Crito: I feel ashamed on your behalf and on behalf of us, your friends, lest all that happened to you be thought due to cowardice on our part: the fact that your trial came to court when it need not have done so, the

handling of the trial itself, and now this absurd ending which will be thought to have got beyond our control through some cowardice and unmanliness on our part, since we did not save you, or you save yourself, when it was possible and could be done if we had been of the slightest use. Consider, Socrates, whether this is not only evil, but shameful, both for you and for us. Take counsel with yourself, or rather the time for counsel is past and the decision should have been taken, and there is no further opportunity, for this whole business must be ended tonight. If we delay now, then it will no longer be possible; it will be too late. Let me persuade you on every count, Socrates, and do not act otherwise. (45e-46a)

As shown, Crito expresses his sense of shame twice, once for being seen as a person who values money more than friends, and another for being seen as a coward. For both times, Crito's standard is set only according to how he will look in others' eyes. He desires to be seen as a person with dignity, and this desire itself is not wrong. But the problem is that his standard is founded only on his desire to be seen as a decent person, not with the deliberation on what it is to be a truly decent person. Even so, Crito's reaction to his feeling of shame is truthful, for he admits the feeling and tries to rectify what is wrong. Plato contrasts Crito's shame with that of Socrates at first, but after the conversation with Socrates, Crito is depicted to be persuaded by Socrates at last (54d). Socrates' shame, which is in contrast with Crito's shame, and which also persuades Crito, will be described in the next section.

3. Third Type: Socratic Shame

Finally, the third type of shame is that of Socrates. There has been some debate among scholars whether Socrates is shameless or not.⁶⁵ Tarnopolsky (2010) argues that Socrates is not shameless. She shows that what Plato describes to be the shamelessness is different from Socrates' behavior, but does not indicate specific instances of Socrates' shame experience.⁶⁶ Raymond (2013), following Woodruff (2000)⁶⁷, locates Socrates' shame in *Hippias Major*,⁶⁸ but fails to find other important scenes. In this section, I will study four examples of Socrates' shame: *Phaedrus* 237a and 243b, *Symposium* 198b-c, *Hippias Major* 304c-e, and *Crito* 44c, 46b, and 47a-48a.

Socrates' shame is distinctive in that Socrates, in addition to showing complete truthfulness towards his shame, follows his own standard which is not just made up of his desire but also of his deliberation on what is good. Furthermore, Plato's attitude toward his teacher's feeling of shame is different from that toward the other character's experiences of shame, for Socrates' shame is described longer in length, at more significant moments of dialogues, with exceptional effects on other interlocutors and the readers.

The first example of Socrates' shame is depicted in the *Phaedrus* 237a and 243b. In 237a, when Socrates begins his first speech, he tells Phaedrus that he will

⁶⁵ Especially in reference to Callicles' censure at Gorgias 494e: "Aren't you ashamed, Socrates, to bring our matters to such matters?"; e.g. Green(2005) and Tarnopolsky(2005)

⁶⁶ Tarnopolsky (2010), 109.

⁶⁷ Woodruff (2000), 144-6.

⁶⁸ Raymond (2013), 25-6.

hide his face (ἐγκαλυψάμενος) while speaking, so that he may not have to look at Phaedrus and feel shame:

Phaedrus: Speak, then.

Socrates: Do you know what I'll do?

Phaedrus: What?

Socrates: I'll cover my head while I'm speaking. In that way, as I'm going through the speech as fast as I can, I won't get embarrassed(ὕπ' αἰσχύνῃς) by having to look at you and lose the thread of argument. (237a1-5)

While Socrates emphasizes his sense of shame by asking Phaedrus “Do you know what I'll do?” intentionally, there is no hint about the reason of Socrates' shame in 237a. One interpretation is offered by De Vries(1969): while Phaedrus thinks that Socrates was fearing he might fail to make better speech than Lysias, Socrates was ashamed because he uses the poor conception of Eros.⁶⁹ Although Plato provides no further description of how Phaedrus construes Socrates' behavior, he does supply a clue on Socrates' reason, and it supports De Vries' reading:

Socrates: Now I will prove to be wiser than Homer and Stesichorus to this small extent: I will try to offer my Palinode to Love before I am punished for speaking ill of him –with my head bare [this time, not, as before, (οὐχ ὥσπερ τότε)] covered in shame (ὕπ' αἰσχύνῃς). (243b3-7)

⁶⁹ De Vries (1969), 82.

When Socrates begins his second speech, he reminds Phaedrus of his earlier action: “with my head bare this time, not, as before, covered in shame.”(243b4-7). Socrates’ statement implies that his former shame was due to his wrong description of Eros and the failure of giving the genuine speech – and doubtlessly not due to the inferiority to Lysias’ speech. Socrates feels no shame for the second speech because it is his own, true idea about Eros in substance, and also in rhetoric. His speech in reality does not fail his ideal. Socrates’ standard is not just made up of his desire to look good in giving speech in front of Phaedrus, but of his deliberation on what is right and wrong, the truth. To his feeling of shame, Socrates reacts by admitting the shamefulness of his earlier speech and adjusting the second speech according to what is truly good. Meanwhile, Plato employs Socrates’ shame as a device for developing the dialogue, correcting the speeches from Lysias’ speech to Socrates’ first speech, and then to the second. This also implies that Plato considers Socratic shame as a way of correcting not only of the speeches, but also of oneself, one’s soul.

Second instance of Socrates’ shame is in Symposium 198b-c. When Socrates’ turn to make a speech about Eros has come after Agathons’, he utters that he was so conscious about not being able to say anything half as fine as Agathon, that he “almost ran away for shame, if had been a place to go(ὅπ’ αἰσχύνης ὀλίγου ἀποδράς ὀχόμεν, εἴ πη εἶχον)”(198b7-c1). What is noteworthy here is Socrates’ reaction afterwards. Socrates says that he just recognized that he was ridiculous to agree to deliver a eulogy for Eros and even claim that he knows about Eros (177d). He tells the others that he had no idea of what they –Eryximachus and others who made encomiums– meant by ‘praising’, which was not to describe the truth about

Eros, but just to make Eros look more beautiful. Then Socrates declares that he will not follow the previous way of eulogy, because he is not able to give a speech in such a way, but instead speak the truth in his own way.

Socrates was ashamed at first because he could not make it to what others think to be the ideal for eulogy, but after deliberation, he figures out that he need not conform to others' method, which is merely to make Eros seem the most beautiful to those who do not have knowledge about him. He chooses to follow his own standard to tell the truth, and tells the others not to make any comparison with previous speeches.

“... I propose that each of us give as good a speech in praise of Love ...”

“How could I vote ‘No,’ when the only thing I say I understand is the art of love?” (177d)

“Anyway, I was worried that I’d not be able to say anything that came close to them in beauty, and so I would almost have run away [for shame], if there had been a place to go.” (198b7-c1)

Then I realized how ridiculous I’d been to agree to join with you in praising Love and to say that I was a master of the art of love, when I knew nothing whatever of this business, of how anything whatever ought to be praised. In my foolishness, I thought you should tell the truth about whatever you praise, that this should be your basis, and that from this a speaker should select the most beautiful truths and arrange them most suitably. I was quite vain, thinking that I would talk well and that I knew the truth about praising

anything whatever. But now it appears that this is not what it is to praise anything whatever; rather, it is to apply to the object the grandest and the most beautiful qualities, whether he actually has them or not. [...] I'm not giving another eulogy using that method, not at all –I wouldn't be able to do it!– but if you wish, I'd like to tell the truth my way. I want to avoid any comparison with your speeches, so as not to give you a reason to laugh at me. [...] You will hear the truth about Love, and the words and phrasing will take care of themselves. (198d-199b)

Socrates' reaction to his feeling of shame is, first, to admit his feeling of shame, second, to examine the situation and find out what is wrong, and third, to follow the truth. While, to some, Socrates might seem weird and foolish not to praise Eros in the same way as the others, he reacts according to his own standard, what is truly good. The standard Socrates chooses to follow is not the desire to just appear good to the others, but the deliberation on the truth. Plato's attitude on this example of Socrates' shame is significant, because Socrates' confession of his shame ironically indicates that it is not Socrates but the previous speakers who have to feel shame, for it is their way of praising which is shameful.

One more shame experience of Socrates is described in the *Hippias Major* 304c-e. *Hippias Major* is another Socratic dialogue, which questions “what is fine (καλός)?” Hippias offers three different definitions, all of which fail to satisfy Socrates, and the dialogue ends without an answer to the question. In the course of conversation, Socrates recognizes clearly that he is ignorant of what the ‘fine’ is. At the end of the dialogue, Hippias suggests Socrates to “give up and abandon all that small-talking(304b).” Socrates replies to Hippias that when he –Socrates– becomes

convinced by what Hippias and others say, that he is spending his life on small and worthless things instead of big things, another man comes to him and criticizes him:

Socrates: He asks if I'm not ashamed that I dare discuss the fine activities when I've been so plainly refuted about the fine, and it is clear that I do not even know at all what that is itself. "Look," he will say. "How will you know whose speech –or any other action– is finely presented or not, when you do not know the fine? And when you are ignorant of fine?"

The man who condemns Socrates seems most likely to be Socrates himself, or more precisely, his conscience.⁷⁰ What is more important here, however, is Socrates' attitude toward the both criticisms:

Socrates: That's what I get, as I said. Insults and blame from you, insults from him. But I suppose it is necessary to bear all that, for it is quite reasonable that I might be benefited by it. I actually think, Hippias, that I have been benefited by conversation with both of you; for I think I know the meaning of the proverb "fine things are difficult. (304e3-9)

While the both sides give shame to Socrates, he does not avoid or ignore shame. Rather, he considers the situation to be beneficial. One of the two opinions might turn out to be unworthy at last, but still, it is better to deliberate all the possible

⁷⁰ Woodruff (2000), 144-6 and Raymond (2013), 25-6 also interpret that this man is Socrates.

ways rather than simply conforming oneself to one of the opinions. Showing complete truthfulness toward the feeling of shame is Socrates' typical way of reaction to shame. Plato, by placing this experience of shame as the final scene of the dialogue, tries to deliver a message to the readers – although there might be insults and blame, one will benefit from examining oneself and gaining self-knowledge.

Last example of Socratic shame is illustrated in *Crito* 44c, 46b, 47a-48a. In contrast to Crito's shame, Socrates accepts only those that seem best to him after deliberation. Crito, in order to persuade Socrates to escape from the prison, expresses his shame that many people will think of him as valuing money more than friends, and of Socrates' friends as cowards, for not getting Socrates out of jail and save him from execution (44b-c, 45d-46a). Socrates replies to Crito that it is not the opinion of the majority that one has to fear for and pay attention to. Rather, he tells Crito that it is the opinion of the wise man who understands justice and injustice, and most of all, what the truth itself will say, that one has to listen to (44c, 47a-48a). One thing that needs to be pointed out here is that although Socrates might not be paying much attention to opinion of others, it is not that he does not accept any opinion at all and be obstinate. He describes himself to be “the kind of man who listens to nothing within [him] but the argument that on reflection seems best to [him] (46b),” and that “one must not value all the opinions of men, but some and not others, nor the opinion of all men, but those of some and not of others (47a).” Socrates will follow the rules which he had found to be the best, until he discovers a new one that is even better than the old, discerning of which will be made through accepting the opinion of wise man after careful reflection.

As it is shown through various experiences of shame, from avoiding shame to Socratic shame, shame can bring different effect to the ashamed. Shame in general brings the recognition of an inadequate situation a person is in. Avoiding shame results to withdrawing from further adjustment and leaves the person to stay wrong. Confronting shame leads a person to understand what is wrong within oneself, and provides a chance to be adjusted. Similar to confronting shame, Socratic shame allows a person to comprehend one's situation, and guide the person to live according to what is the truth. Socratic shame is more of an ideal type, which shows the proper condition that is needed to bring the positive change in one's soul.

IV. SHAME AND VIRTUE

In this chapter, I will explore the function of shame in relation to each of the four virtues: justice, temperance, courage, and wisdom. From the previous chapter, it is shown that shame, if properly conditioned, brings a certain change in a person. In this chapter, I attempt to show that the change shame causes is, in specific, the cultivation of virtues. This will also lead to demonstrate that shame functions in Plato's civic-education, as it serves as a catalyst for nurturing civic virtues in human soul.

1. Shame and Justice

The most obvious place where the connection between shame and justice is depicted is the myth of Prometheus in Protagoras' famous Great Speech (*Protagoras*, 320c-329d). The myth is placed in the first part of the Great Speech, which is Protagoras' answer to Socrates' question whether the virtue is teachable. Protagoras answers in two ways, first by telling a story, and then by developing an argument. The gist of the story is that political virtue is shared by everyone. Thus, the reason Athenians accept advice from everyone when it is about political virtue, while accepting only of professionals for other issues, is because they think that everyone partakes of political virtue, and not because it is not teachable as Socrates argued earlier (319b-e). In order to investigate the relationship between shame and justice from this story, I want to focus on three points: that it was given as a

‘political wisdom’ without which human cannot live together, to ‘each and every one’, as an ‘only companion’ to justice.

To start with, sense of shame is a ‘political wisdom’ which is indispensable for humans to form a community. Before Zeus gave humans the political wisdom, they were living scattered, being destroyed by wild animals. Practical wisdom (τὴν ἔντεχνον σοφίαν; 321d1) that Prometheus gave human was the wisdom for maintaining life (τὴν περὶ τὸν βίον σοφίαν; 321d4), but not the wisdom for living in a society, or, political wisdom (τὴν περὶ τὴν πολιτικὴν σοφίαν, 321d4-5).

[H]uman beings at first lived in scattered isolation; there were no cities. They were being destroyed by wild beasts because they were weaker in every way, and although their technology was adequate to obtain food, it was deficient when it came to fighting wild animals. This was because they did not yet possess the art of politics(πολιτικὴν τέχνην), of which the art of war is a part. They did indeed try to band together and survive by founding cities. The outcome when they did so was that they wronged each other, because they did not possess the art of politics, and so they would scatter and again be destroyed. (322a8-b8)

Political wisdom is essential for humans in two senses: the art of politics is for preserving the human society from both external threats, and internal conflicts. As the art of politics include the art of war, humans could not defend themselves from beasts when they lacked it. Also, when they tried to gather together in order to survive from animal attack, it was impossible to maintain for long as they wronged

each other for the lack of political art. Then, given to humans in the name of the political wisdom, justice and sense of shame is what enable human to live together in a society, bring order within cities, and unite humans in friendly bonds (322c) – yet, under two conditions.

One condition is that the political wisdom should be given to ‘each and every one’. When Zeus orders Hermes to distribute shame and justice to humans, Hermes asks him whether they should be distributed in the same way the other arts have been. Art of medicine is given to few people because one practitioner of medicine suffices the needs of many, and so are the other arts. Zeus’ answer, however, is ‘NO’. Zeus tells Hermes to let all of humans have justice and shame, for few possessors are not sufficient; unless everyone partakes them, cities will never arise. Furthermore, he even established a law stating that “who cannot partake of shame and justice shall be put to death, for he is a pestilence to the city (322d).” The question is, why shame needs to be shared by everyone. According to Plato’s description, art of politics is different from other arts. For example, art of medicine does not need to be held by all. If a person needs to be cured of some physical illness, it is not necessary for oneself to learn the art of medicine. If people are to live healthily and be cured of diseases, few practitioners can use their arts to suffice all. On the contrary, if cities are to be built with order and friendly ties, not one outsider is allowed. Everyone must partake in maintaining the society, and one who does not share the virtue should either be disciplined or be deported, for just one aberrant person can cause trouble and wrong others.

Another important condition is that it is not only justice but also shame, which is essential component of political wisdom. It is rather easy to accept that justice is a necessary part of political wisdom. What is less easy to accept, and still

important in investigating the relationship between justice and shame, is why Plato put shame as another part of political wisdom. He could have just said that Zeus gave justice, and simply justice, to humans as a political wisdom, or with some other virtues such as courage. But he chose shame, which leads us to assume that there is something which justice cannot achieve alone, and only shame can bring. According to what has been shown in previous chapters, shame is fear of disgrace in the eyes of an observer which occurs when one failed to live up to the standard of the observer, either external or internal. Shame motivates a person to transform oneself into the standard, whereas the person who does not have sense of shame would not try to live up to the ideal, nor even admit that there is something wrong within oneself. Plato put justice and shame together because it is shame that lets people acknowledge whether they are acting justly or unjustly, and leads them to act according to justice.

2. Shame and Temperance

Close connection between shame and temperance is shown in the *Charmides*. In the journey to find the definition of sophrosyne, shame is Charmides' second try (160d-161d) of defining it. After the blushing episode of Charmides (158c5-d6), Socrates suggests that they investigate together what temperance is, and tells Charmides to express his opinion about what it is. Charmides gives three definitions of sophrosyne, and yet he fails to defend them. Although it was rejected in the dialogue that shame is the definition of temperance, it clearly shows that they have certain relationship, because of which Plato chose shame as a candidate.

Charmides' second definition comes when, after his first try that sophrosyne is "a sort of calmness" is rejected, Socrates tells him to look into himself and consider what kind of person does the presence of sophrosyne makes him:

"Then start over again, Charmides," I[Socrates] said, "and look into yourself with greater concentration, and when you have decided what effect the presence of temperance has upon you and what sort of thing it must be to have this effect, then put all this together and tell me clearly and bravely, what does it appear to you to be?"

He paused and, looking into himself very manfully, said, "Well, temperance seems to me to make people ashamed and bashful, and so I think [shame (αἰδώς)] must be what temperance really is."

"But," I said, "didn't we agree just now that temperance was an admirable thing?"

"Yes, we did," he said.

"And it would follow that temperate men are good?"

"Yes."

"And could a thing be good that does not produce good men?"

"Of course not."

"Then not only is temperance an admirable thing, but it is a good thing."

"I agree."

"Well then," I said, "you don't agree with Homer when he said that '[shame] is not a good mate for a needy man'?"

"Oh, but I do," he said.

“So it seems to be the case that shame both is and is not a good.”

“Yes, it does.”

“But temperance must be a good if it makes those good in whom it is present and makes bad those in whom it is not.”

“Why yes, it seems to me to be exactly as you say.”

“Then temperance would not be [shame] if it really is a good and if [shame] is no more good than bad.” (160d5-161b2)

Charmides answers that “sophrosyne makes a person ashamed or be sensitive to shame (αἰσχύνεσθαι ποιεῖν ἢ σωφροσύνη καὶ αἰσχυντηλὸν τὸν ἄνθρωπον)” and that sophrosyne is the same as sense of shame. Socrates’ rejection to this definition is that while sophrosyne is a good thing in all sense, shame is a good thing in some situations but a bad thing in others:

Function of shame in cultivating temperance comes into view, regarding two things from the conversation of Socrates and Charmides: first, Charmides’ description that ‘temperance makes sense of shame in a person’, and second, Socrates’ rejection that temperance, which is always a good thing, cannot be same thing as shame, which is not always a good thing. First, pace Charmides, while he puts temperance as a cause and shame as a result, it is also –if not more– plausible that they work in the opposite direction. When a person feels shame and recognizes the gap between one’s ideal and reality, one also realizes the imperfectness of oneself, and that he/she is not an absolute being. Shame shows a person that what one desires does not correspond to justice or the standard, hence lets one control the desires. Secondly, my interpretation that shame gives rise to temperance, escapes Socrates’ rejection. Shame might be both good and bad, as Socrates says.

As admitted in the previous chapter, shame does not always lead a person into a better state, but as also shown in the chapter, shame, when adequately formed, can make a change in a person. Although a good thing cannot be the same as a thing that is both good and bad, it is possible that the latter results in a good thing, as long as it is properly formed. In short, shame is a mechanism that fosters temperance, and I argue that this strong relationship is what led Plato to choose shame as a candidate for the definition of temperance.

3. Shame and Courage

The connection between shame and courage is fairly familiar, for the quasi-definition of shame is closely related to courage. As it has been implied in chapter two, shame provokes courage in a person, out of the fear of ill-repute. Prominent places where Plato relates their connection is the *Symposium* and the *Laws*.

In the *Symposium*, Phaedrus, who is the first to give speech in praise of Eros (178a-180d), describes shame as one of the highest blessings Eros –or Love– imparts:

[L]ove gives to us the greatest goods. [...] There is a certain guidance each person needs for his whole life, if he is to live well; and nothing imparts this guidance –not high kinship, not public honor, not wealth– nothing imparts this guidance as well as Love. What guidance do I mean? I mean a sense of shame (τὴν αἰσχύνην) at acting shamefully, and a sense of pride (τὴν φιλοτιμίαν) in acting well. Without these, nothing fine or great can be accomplished, [neither

by city nor by individual person (οὔτε πόλιν οὔτε ἰδιώτην)] . (178c2-d4)

Phaedrus praises Eros in that he is the cause of humans' highest blessings, which is a guidance that every person needs in order to live well. This guidance, Phaedrus explains, is a sense of shame on the one hand and a sense of pride on the other hand, without which neither city nor person can accomplish great things.

Then Phaedrus recounts in detail with some examples:

[I]f a man in love is found doing something shameful, or accepting shameful treatment because he is a coward and makes no defense, then nothing would give him more pain than being seen by the boy he loves –not even being seen by his father or his comrades. (178d-e)

When a person who is suffering shameful things because of the lack of courage is disclosed to the public, it is being seen by the lover which is more painful, than being seen by one's father or comrades.

Similarly, a man in love would rather die, than to be seen by his lover leaving his position or flinging away his arms:

If only there were a way to start a city or an army made up of lovers and the boys they love! Theirs would be the best possible system of society, for they would hold back from all that is shameful, and seek honor in each other's eyes. Even a few of them, in battle side by side, would conquer all the world, I'd say. For a man in love would never allow his loved one, of all people, to see him leaving ranks or dropping weapons. He'd rather die a thousand deaths! And as

for leaving the boy behind, or not coming to his aid in danger –why, no one is so base that true Love could not inspire him with courage, and make him as brave as if he’d been born a hero. (178e3-179a8)

Other stories as of Alcetis (179b-d), Orpheus (179d-e), and Achilles (179e-180b) are also given as examples of Eros guiding a lover into courage.

In the *Laws*, shame is identified as a good fear which brings courage and contributes to victory. As shown in chapter two, Plato distinguishes two kinds of fears. One is fear of bad things to happen, ordinary fear which we refer to generally, and the other is fear of ill-repute (647a), which is shame. While the former fear brings cowardliness in a person, the latter brings courage, for the latter resists the former. The latter “resists pains and the other things we dread (647a),” for a person act courageously in fear of being seen as a coward by others. In regard to the two fears, the Athenian states that two things contribute to victory:

Athenian: So this fear not only safeguards us in a lot of other crucial areas of conduct but contributes more than anything else, if we take one thing with another, to the security that follows victory in war. Two things, then, contribute to victory: fearlessness in face of the enemy, and fear of ill-repute among one’s friends. (647b3-7)

One should not have the fear of evils and be fearless against the enemy, while the other kind of fear, fear of disgrace among one’s friends, is needed. This description of shame in war situation is similar to that of Phaedrus. Shame, the fear of being seen coward in the eyes of one’s loved ones, either a lover or friends, overrides the

fear of enemy and death.

Moreover, in the *Laws*, Plato portrays how shame might be utilized in education, especially for the training of the courage in citizens:

Athenian: Anyway, my friend, compared with current practice, this training would be remarkably [simple], and would suit individuals, small groups, and any larger numbers you may want. Now if a man retreated into some decent obscurity, [by a feeling of shame (τῆς αἰσχύνης)] at the thought of being seen before he is in good shape, and trained against his fears alone and in privacy, equipped with just this drink instead of all the usual paraphernalia, he would be entirely justified. But he would be no less justified if, confident that he was already well equipped by birth and breeding, he were to plunge into training with several fellow drinkers. While inevitably roused by the wine, he would show himself strong enough to escape its other effects: his virtue would prevent him from committing even one serious improper act, and from becoming a different kind of person. Before getting to the last round he would leave off, fearing the way in which drink invariably gets the better of man. (648c-d)

Training with wine is to become rightly courageous, for drinking wine makes one to become more audacious and even shameless, overcoming of which will nurture proper courage in oneself. The trainee would pay careful attention not to do anything disgrace. So some will go somewhere alone for the shame of being seen

unprepared in front of others, and practice in private until they are trained. Others who train together will practice not to do anything dishonorable in front of the fellows. In sum, through these texts, Plato portrays that shame lead a person to foster courage in oneself.

4. Shame and Wisdom

Finally, shame has a connection to wisdom, as well. Although it is difficult to find Plato's statement on direct relationship between shame and wisdom, his description on shame alludes to their link. Cognitive aspect of shame, which is the recognition of the gap between one's ideal and reality, implies that shame brings certain recognition to the ashamed. Plato's display of shame as a psychological experience shows this relationship in a dramatic way. Shame experiences suggest that shame leads a person to self-knowledge.

Admittedly, shame might not work in learning technical wisdom. One might argue that a person may acquire technical knowledge when he/she is ashamed of being a complete novice. Still, it is not appropriate to say that shame works in nurturing wisdom, for it is not the technical knowledge itself that shame gives. Instead, it is recognition of the fact that one lacks certain knowledge, and the aspiration to learn, that shame offers to the ashamed person. In fact, the recognition of one's deficiency is what self-knowledge is about. Hence, when I say shame has a connection with wisdom, I refer to self-knowledge.

Shame provides self-knowledge by letting the ashamed be aware of one's current situation. Through shame, a person recognizes three things: the ideal image

of self, self in reality, and the existence of the gap in between. It is true that some might not clarify the images of ideal and reality, as they do not reflect but try to avoid. But they still realize that there exists the gap, the discordance between what they believe themselves to be and what they are in reality.

This cognitive effect is more vividly depicted in various experiences of shame. Plato's characters show us how they realize their real selves and candid beliefs. While the characters who show avoiding shame fails to grasp the articulated knowledge of the selves, they still come to perceive the existence of certain deficiency.

Characters who show confronting shame benefits more from the experiences of shame, as they become conscious of their real selves. Also, they come to realize what their ideal images of selves, or the beliefs they have are. For instance, when they experiences shame, Charmides carefully reflects his situation and articulates himself, and Hippocrates realizes his true belief that he would actually not admire to go to Protagoras if it is to become a sophist himself.

Finally, in the case of Socrates, who shows most truthful reaction to his feeling of shame, he comes be aware of his ignorance and imperfectness through shame experience more than any character of Plato's characters. Socrates deliberates not only on whether the self in reality is in accordance to the standard, but also on whether the standard itself is in accordance with the truth. Socrates confronts his feeling of shame in every aspect, never trying to avoid or ignore it. The more the character show truthfulness toward his shame, the better knowledge of oneself he gets from it. This attitude of Socrates toward his sense of shame is not irrelevant to the fact that he is the wisest man in Athens.

In sum, Plato uses shame as a mechanism for gaining one's self-

knowledge. Also, it is implied that shame, indeed, is a rather significant concept for Plato's Socrates. Socrates' famous saying "know thyself", and 'knowledge of ignorance' are all strongly connected with sense of shame.

V. CONCLUSION:

THE POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF SHAME

This thesis started from questioning the political meaning of shame, its role and place in political life. In order to answer this question I studied Plato's conception of shame, for it is in his dialogues that the political meaning of shame is illustrated, among the various Greek literature which contemporary studies on shame often look into. Although Plato's conception of shame might not give direct solution to contemporary debate on shame, it might provide one among a range of possible alternatives. Therefore, to conclude the thesis, I want to draw the political implications of shame based on the previous analyses. I will first summarize the important points made in the previous chapters, and then, building upon those points, find the political implications of shame.

In chapter two, I showed that Plato's conception of shame demonstrates his awareness of the complex nature of shame. I examined Plato's conception of shame following his three approaches to describe shame, which are to explore the quasi-definition, the place in tripartite soul, and the genesis of shame. To begin with, Plato's quasi-definition of shame indicates that shame is related to emotion. Plato provides the quasi-definition of shame by distinguishing the genus and species. According to Plato's description in *Euthyphro* and *Laws*, shame is a good kind of fear, fear of ill-repute. Although this quasi-definition had not gone through a thorough investigation by Socrates and his interlocutors, and therefore may not be a comprehensive description of shame, it clearly shows that emotion is one aspect of shame.

Secondly, the location of shame in the spirited part shows that Plato was aware of the ambivalent character of shame. When distinguishing the spirited part from the other two parts, Plato pays careful attention to the relational characteristic of the spirited part. The spirited part is by nature the helper of the rational part, while it can also ally with the appetitive part and rebel against the rational part, when corrupted. Meanwhile, Plato utilizes shame as a representative of the spirited part. In the myth of chariot, the soul is led to a right direction when the nobler horse follows its sense of shame and obeys to the charioteer, but it is led to a wrong direction if the nobler horse submits to the shameless horse. Like the spirited part, which can be rightly understood only within its relationships with the other two parts, shame also is a concept that can be understood only within its relationships with other concepts. This can be an explanation for why Plato did not write an independent dialogue on shame but presented in various dialogues. Moreover, just like the spirited part can be a helper of the rational part in guiding the soul to the right direction, and also an ally of the appetitive part in guiding to the opposite way, shame can serve as a guidance to a better way of life, if sided with reason, while it can also serve as an obstacle, if sided with desire.

Thirdly, through the two myths which portray the genesis of shame, it is illustrated that Plato conceptualizes shame with social and cognitive aspects. Protagoras' myth introduces sense of shame as one of the two political wisdoms, without which humans cannot construct a community. The myth indicates that, sense of shame allows people to live together, by making them respect each other. In Aristophanes' myth, shame is described to be given by Zeus in order to make humans remember their hubris and fall, and respect the gods. Plato's account of shame in the two myth shows that shame is closely related to the socialization

within a community; shame allows a person to respect external others, internalized norms, and the absolute being such as the gods, the truth, or one's ideal. In addition, Aristophanes' myth illustrates that shame has a cognitive aspect, as it occurs when a person recognizes the gap between the ideal and the reality.

Next, in chapter three, I investigated the scenes where Plato's characters experience shame, and showed that Plato explains how shame works in our lives through diverse manifestations of shame. I found twenty shame experiences of thirteen characters in Platonic Corpus, and each episode shows slightly different manifestation of shame. There are various factors that compose a shame experience, and among them, I found three factors to be critical in characterizing each experience. The first factor is the standard: whether the character forms the standard simply out of his desire to look good in front of others, or with deliberation on the good and the truth. This factor is closely related to the fact that shame is located in the spirited part, for the spirited part can either play negative role when sided with desire, or play positive role when sided with reason. The second factor is the reaction: whether the character reacts truthfully, or just avoids and ignores shame. The third factor is Plato's attitude toward the experience: his tone of description, what significance and effect each experience has on the dialogue as a whole.

According to the three factors, I distinguished avoiding shame, confronting shame, and Socratic shame. Characters who show avoiding shame form their standard according to their sheer desire, not with deliberation. They try to ignore their feelings of shame and avoid facing shame truthfully. In describing these situations, Plato portrays the characters as vehement and pugnacious, or sometimes ridiculous, which implies his rather negative attitude. Confronting

shame differs from avoiding shame in that characters show more truthful reaction to their feelings of shame. Although they form their standard according to their desire, they try to face the situation with sincerity, and try to deliberate and reflect themselves. Also, Plato describes these characters in more favorable way, admiring their senses of shame and reactions. Socratic shame is the shame experiences of Socrates himself, through which Plato delineates how shame can lead a person to deliberate on a better way of life. Socrates forms his standard through deliberation on what is good. Even if his standard contrasts with the standard of the majority, he follows his own, unless his standard is proved to be false. When Socrates feels shame, he never ignores or runs away from discussing about it further. Instead, he carefully deliberates what is wrong within him, frankly articulates his feeling and situation, and tries to make a correction according to the truth. Through Socrates' shame experiences, Plato tells the readers the conditions –the standard and reaction– in which shame can result to a positive change in oneself.

Finally, in chapter four, I explored the relationships between shame and the four virtues, and showed that shame functions in nurturing the civic virtues. As shown in chapter three, shame can bring a change in oneself. By making shame appear in various dialogues in relation to the virtues, Plato shows that the change shame brings to a person is nurturing civic virtues within oneself, and thus leading one to a better way of life. More specifically, with shame, a person is able to pursue justice, and recognize whether one is acting according to justice. Temperance is motivated by shame, as shame lets one control the desire for pleasure. While shame is a fear of ill-repute, this specific kind of fear lead one to be fearless and have proper courage. Shame also provides a person the knowledge of oneself, as it gives guidance to recognition of one's reality, ideal, and the gap.

From the previous chapters, I find that Plato's concept of shame has a significant role within political life, as it plays a role in his soul-craft and state-craft. Shame takes part in Plato's soul-craft, as shame functions as a catalyst for nurturing civic virtues in a person. Shame, by helping a person with character-building, can guide the person to a better way of life. This role of shame is also related to its role in state-craft, for building good characters in citizens is especially significant in the construction of a city. In the *Laws*, where the interlocutors build the city Magnesia, Plato describes education as "the art which is concerned to foster a good character", and presents it as "the art of statesmanship" (650b). Plato writes that "education is the acquisition of virtue, the correct formation of our feelings of pleasure and pain" (653c). Cultivating virtues and fostering a good character in a person, shame functions as a part of mechanism for civic education, which is a substantial part of the state-craft.

Aiming to reconstruct Plato's conception of shame and investigate its political meaning, this thesis builds upon the existing literature on shame in Plato, and contributes back to the literature by overcoming the weaknesses and providing further implications. The shortcomings I attempted to overcome are related to the comprehensiveness of the analysis. First, much of the previous studies focus on the role of shame in refutation, but there are other important features of shame that need to be investigated in order to reconstruct Plato's conception of shame. These studies⁷¹ point out that Plato employs shame as a method of refutation, often as a method even more powerful than logic. In addition to the role of shame in refutation, this thesis demonstrated that there are also other descriptions about

⁷¹ Kahn (1983); McKim (1988); Moss (2005); Cain (2008); Futter (2009); and Cho (2014) provide analyses on the role of shame in refutation

shame that Plato gives, which are the descriptions about the complex nature of shame, diverse dramatic manifestations of shame, and its functions. The analysis on the role of shame in refutation is a part of the analysis on the dramatic manifestations of shame. While shaming the interlocutor may result to a successful refutation on the shamer's side, I showed that the shame experience of the ashamed person itself can provoke change in oneself.

Second, most of the existing studies investigate shame from the scenes where Plato's characters experience shame, but Plato does not describe shame only through psychological experiences. This thesis suggested that Plato adopts two manners to display shame: as a subject of discussion, and as a psychological experience. Plato portrays shame not only by making his characters experience it, but also by letting them discuss about it as a subject in conversation. Among the previous studies, only Raymond (2013) explores the texts where Plato describes shame as a subject of a discussion. But Raymond, too, fails to distinguish the two manners. Examining the texts unsorted, his analysis on the nature of shame is somewhat vague. In order to get a clear understanding of Plato's conception of shame, we need to explore the texts in the appropriate ways according to Plato's way of displaying shame. In this thesis, chapter two is designed to look into the texts where shame appears as a subject of discussion, and chapter three is designed to study the scenes where shame is experienced by the characters. Chapter four investigates both kinds of texts, as Plato illustrates the relationship between shame and the virtues through both manners. By distinguishing the two manners, we can understand Plato's conception of shame more clearly, both as a notion and as a psychological experience.

Third, almost all of the existing literature rightly finds that shame is a important concept in the *Gorgias*, but other texts in which shame is also a significant concept are neglected. Therefore, this study introduced ample texts from various dialogues which are relevant to shame. While it is true that shame is one of the key concepts in understanding the *Gorgias*, it is also true that the *Gorgias* is one of the dialogues that are important in understanding Plato's conception of shame, for it offers –at least– three experiences of shame. Nevertheless, other texts are also important in studying the concept, for they provide diverse description on shame with different approaches. Thus, in this study I assembled the relevant texts, as exhaustively as possible, and organized them into a way which I believe to be the best to reconstruct Plato's conception of shame.

Finally, through overcoming the weaknesses of the existing literature, this study suggests new and more detailed ideas on Plato's conception of shame. Above all, I showed that the core of Plato's politics of shame is its function in civic education, that it serves as a catalyst for fostering the civic virtues. Although some scholars note that Plato sees shame to be functioning in moral education, their accounts are rather vague and limited. Raymond (2013) states that Plato views shame to be playing “an important role in moral education,”⁷² but he does not provide specific explanation or textual evidence on what specific role Plato considers shame to be playing. Moss (2005) claims that shame has a “potential as a tool of moral education,”⁷³ and grasps that shame can lead the soul to virtue if properly educated, but does not give further explanation on how shame works in leading the soul to virtue. Building on their analyses, I demonstrated more

⁷² Raymond (2013), 3.

⁷³ Moss (2005), 30.

precisely how shame, in Plato, functions in civic education. I examined the texts where Plato actually shows how shame fosters each of the four virtues. Moreover, I showed that Plato regards shame to be valued very highly, especially among the law-makers (*Laws* 647a), as fostering these virtues are the most important project in Plato's city construction. Thus, the function shame performs deserves to be included not just in moral education, but also, to name it in a way more related to its political meaning, in civic education.

Furthermore, I also interpret that Plato utilizes shame not only as a method of persuasion, but also as a method of self-education. By self-education, I mean that one learns about something by oneself. Many studies of shame in the *Gorgias* suggest that shame works as a method of refutation and persuasion.⁷⁴ Shame can be a way of persuasion if there are the shamer –the person who tries to persuade– and the ashamed –the person who is to be persuaded– but it is not always the case. If Socrates is indeed the one who gives shame to Gorgias, Polus, and Callicles as many studies say, shame is a method of persuasion in these cases. But there are some other cases which do not have specific shamer. Socrates' shame is the most notable example. When Socrates feels shame in the *Symposium*, there was no one trying to persuade him or give shame to him. He feels shame when he recognizes that something is wrong, by himself. Through articulating the situation, he comprehends the discordance, and adjusts himself according to what he believes to be the truth.

The idea on the function of shame in civic education also leads to the further implications of shame in our political life, as shame fills in the space where the education by texts cannot cover. The self-knowledge that is obtained through an

⁷⁴ Race (1979), McKim (1988), Moss (2005), Cain (2008)

experience of shame, is a kind of knowledge that cannot be obtained through reading texts. It is a kind of knowledge that can only be earned through the experience – it is a kind of practical knowledge.

Education, either contemporary education or Plato’s design of education, is a broad and complicated topic to write about in this thesis. I have to admit that I cannot demonstrate the whole picture of civic education, for education is not a simple process. But what I can say is that shame can be placed within the wide scope of the education process as one possible way of education among various others. In addition, I also cannot say that there are no other psychological phenomena that can serve the role in education. But what I can say is that shame is at least one among the diverse elements. To put it in a different way, while I have no intention to argue that shame is the only element that can function in civic education, I am trying to defend shame from the criticism that shame is simply a pugnacious emotion.

In contrast to the view that shame is a negative emotion which needs to be eliminated from our liberal society, I suggest, following Plato’s understanding of shame, that shame can perform a positive function in our society. Nussbaum (2004) is one of the scholars who criticize shame for being “connected to infantile omnipotence and (inevitable) narcissistic failure.”⁷⁵ While distinguishing compassion and love as positive emotions to a society, she distinguishes “primitive shame”⁷⁶ as a negative emotion, along with other emotions such as disgust. While she admits that shame can sometimes be “constructive”, she claims that primitive character of shame overrides the constructive aspects of shame. She also states that

⁷⁵ Nussbaum (2004), 185; the parenthesis is the original.

⁷⁶ Nussbaum (2004), 177-188.

shame has a stigmatizing and branding effect, and thus classifies shame as a pugnacious emotion.

In fact, Plato's conception of shame actually shares some points with that of Nussbaum. Plato also shows that in some cases, shame can have a negative effect, leading a person to withdraw from participation and discussion. Ignoring his own shame and rather criticizing Socrates to be shameful, Callicles' attitude toward shame is indeed very similar to Nussbaum's primitive shame, for it shows Callicles' narcissistic desire for omnipotence. Nevertheless, Plato does not simply oppose shame. On the contrary, he sees the role of shame in civic education, and values it highly. In other shame experiences like that of Charmides, Lysis, and most of all, that of Socrates, Plato shows that when properly formed, shame can nurture virtues in oneself.

Being aware of the ambivalent character of shame, what Plato shows us about shame is what benefit we can get from shame, and how we can get that benefit. Properly formed shame can function as a catalyst for fostering civic virtues, and bring certain knowledge which can be provided only by experience. We can get this benefit when we deliberate on the standard and show truthful reaction to our feeling of shame. Socrates, questioning and refuting Athenians, might have performed this peculiar way of education on his interlocutors, and also on himself. Plato, on the other hand, might be performing it indirectly through the dialogues on us, the readers.

Bibliography

■ Platonic Corpus (Greek Texts and Translations)

- Arieti, James A., and Roger M. Barrus. 2010. *Plato's Protagoras: Translation, Commentary, and Appendices*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bloom, Allan David. 1991. *The Republic of Plato*. Basic Books.
- Burnet, J, ed. 1900-1907. *Platonis Opera* (OCT). I (1900), II (1901), III (1903), IV (1902), V (1907) Oxford Classical Texts: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, John M., and D. S. Hutchinson. 1997. *Plato: Complete Works*. Hackett Publishing Company.
- Denyer, Nicholas. 2008. *Plato: Protagoras*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dodds, Eric Robertson. 1959. *Gorgias*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Irwin, Terence. 1979. *Plato's GORGIAS*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tuckey, T. Godfrey. 1968. *Plato's Charmides*. Adolf M. Hakkert.
- Woodruff, Paul. 1982. *Hippias Major*. Hackett Publishing Company.

Internet Sources

Perseus Digital Library, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/> (Greek texts and English translations)

■ Secondary References

- Adkins, A. W. H. 1960. *Merit and Responsibility*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- . 1970. *From the Many to the One*. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press.
- Allen, Danielle S. 2010. *Why Plato Wrote*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Arneson, Richard J. 2007. "Shame, Stigma, and Disgust in the Decent Society." *The Journal of ethics* 11(1): 31–63.
- Arnhart, L. 2001. "Monoson, S. Sara. Plato's Democratic Entanglements: Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy." *The American political science review* 95(2): 466.
- Avnon, Dan. 1995. "'Know Thyself': Socratic Companionship and Platonic Community." *Political theory*: 304–29.
- Bartlett, Robert C. 2002. "Socratic Political Philosophy and the Problem of Virtue." *American Political Science Review* 96(03): 525–33.
- Behrendt, Hadar, and Rachel Ben-Ari. 2012. "The Positive Side of Negative Emotion The Role of Guilt and Shame in Coping with Interpersonal Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 56(6): 1116–38.
- Benedict, Ruth. 1946. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Blitz, M. 2011. "Christina H. Tarnopolsky, Prudes, Perverts and Tyrants: Plato's Gorgias and the Politics of Shame." *Perspectives on politics* 9(3): 713–14.
- Braithwaite, John. 1993. "Shame and Modernity." *British Journal of Criminology* 33(1): 1–18.
- Britt, Lory, and David Heise. 2000. "From Shame to Pride in Identity Politics." *Self, identity, and social movements*: 252–68.
- Brooks, Thom. 2008. "Shame on You, Shame on Me? Nussbaum on Shame Punishment." *Journal of applied philosophy* 25(4): 322–34.
- Broucek, Francis J. 1991. *Shame and the Self*. Guilford Press.
- Burnyeat, M. F. 2006. "The Truth of Tripartition." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 106: 1–23.
- . 1980. "Aristotle on Learning to Be Good." In *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*, ed. Amélie Oksenberg Rorty. University of California Press, 69–92.
- Cain, R.B. 2008. "Shame and Ambiguity in Plato's Gorgias." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 41(3): 212–37.

- Cairns, Douglas. 1993. *Aidôs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2011. "Honour and Shame: Modern Controversies and Ancient Values." *Critical quarterly* 53(1): 23–41.
- Calhoun, Cheshire. 2004. "An Apology for Moral Shame." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 12(2): 127–46.
- Calhoun, Craig. 2001. "Putting Emotions in Their Place." *Passionate politics: Emotions and social movements*: 45–57.
- Carmichael, D. 2001. "S. Sara Monoson, Plato's Democratic Entanglements: Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy." *PHILOSOPHY IN REVIEW* 21(3): 194–95.
- Cho, Kwangjae. 2014. "A Study on the Role of Shame in Plato's Gorgias." Seoul National University. (written in Korean).
- Collins, S. D. 1998. "Euben, J. Peter. Corrupting Youth: Political Education, Democratic Culture, and Political Theory." *The American political science review* 92(3): 681.
- Cooper, John M. 1984. "Plato's Theory of Human Motivation." *History of Philosophy Quarterly*: 3–21.
- Corey, D.D. 2011. "HEALTHY SHAME Review of Christina H. Tarnopolsky's Prudes, Perverts, and Tyrants: Plato's ``Gorgias'' and the Politics of Shame." *The Review of politics* 73(2): 362–64.
- Craik, Elizabeth M. 1993. "AIDOS in Euripides' Hippolytos 373-430: Review and Reinterpretation." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 113: 45–59.
- Cua, Antonio S. 2003. "The Ethical Significance of Shame: Insights of Aristotle and Xunzi." *Philosophy East and West* 53(2): 147–202.
- Curzer, Howard J. 2002. "Aristotle's Painful Path to Virtue." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 40(2): 141–62.
- Dalgleish, Tim, and Michael J. Power. 1999. *Handbook of Cognition and Emotion*. Wiley Online Library.
- Deigh, John. 1983. "Shame and Self-Esteem: A Critique." *Ethics*: 225–45.

- . 2006. “The Politics of Disgust and Shame.” *The Journal of ethics* 10(4): 383–418.
- Deneen, Patrick. 2009. *Democratic Faith*. Princeton University Press.
- Deonna, J., and Fabrice Teroni. 2009. “The Self of Shame.” *Emotions, ethics, and authenticity*: 33–50.
- Deonna, Julien A., Raffaele Rodogno, and Fabrice Teroni. 2012. *In Defense of Shame: The Faces of an Emotion*. Oxford University Press.
- Deonna, Julien, and Fabrice Teroni. 2011. *Is Shame a Social Emotion?* Springer.
- Devettere, Raymond J. 2002. *Introduction to Virtue Ethics: Insights of the Ancient Greeks*. Georgetown University Press.
- Dickie, Matthew W. 1978. “Dike as a Moral Term in Homer and Hesiod.” *Classical Philology* 73(2): 91–101.
- Dodds, E. R. 1945. “Plato and the Irrational.” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 65: 16–25.
- . 1951. *25 The Greeks and the Irrational*. Univ of California Press.
- Dover, Kenneth J. 1968. *Aristophanes. Clouds. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*.
- . 1994. *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Hackett Publishing.
- Edwards, Anthony T. 2012. “ΑΙΔΩΣ Δ’ ΟΥΚ ΑΓΑΘΗ: Works and Days 317-319.” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 52(1): 1–20.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 1996. “Shame and Public Life.” *Trauma and Self, London: Rowman and Littlefield*.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 2003. *The Monochrome Society*. Princeton University Press.
- Euben, J. Peter. 1997. *Corrupting youth*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. <http://www.riss.kr/link?id=M7471036>.
- . 1999. “Corrupting Youth: Political Education, Democratic Culture, and Political Theory.” *American journal of philology* 120(4): 621–23.
- Ferrari, Gloria. 1990. “Figures of Speech: The Picture of Aidos.” *Mètis. Anthropologie des mondes grecs anciens* 5(1-2): 185–204.

- Foucault, Michel, and Joseph Pearson. 2001. *Fearless Speech*. Semiotext (e) Los Angeles.
- Fussi, Alessandra. 2000. "Why Is the Gorgias so Bitter?" *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 33(1): 39–58.
- Futter, D.B. 2009. "Shame as a Tool for Persuasion in Plato's Gorgias." *Journal of the history of philosophy* 47(3): 451–62.
- Galston, William A. 1988. "Liberal Virtues." *American Political Science Review* 82(04): 1277–90.
- Goldstein, L. F. 2007. "WITHOUT INHIBITION Review of Arlene W. Saxonhouse's Free Speech and Democracy in Ancient Athens." *The Review of politics* 69(2): 288–90.
- Gooch, Paul W. 1987. "Red Faces in Plato." *The Classical Journal* 83(2): 124–27.
- Goodwin, Jeff, James M. Jasper, and Francesca Polletta. 2009. *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gordon, Jill. 2010. *Turning Toward Philosophy: Literary Device and Dramatic Structure in Plato's Dialogues*. Penn State Press.
- Gosling, Justin Cyril Bertrand. 2010. *Plato (Arguments of the Philosophers)*. Routledge.
- Green, J. E. 2005. "The Shame of Being a Philosopher: Critical Response to Tarnopolsky." *Political theory* 33(2): 266–79.
- Griswold Jr, Charles L. 1988. "Plato's Metaphilosophy: Why Plato Wrote Dialogues."
———. 2010. *Platonic writings/Platonic Readings*. Penn State Press.
- Guenther, Lisa. 2011. "Shame and the Temporality of Social Life." *Continental Philosophy Review* 44(1): 23–39.
- Guynn, Noah D. 1999. "Historicizing Shame, Shaming History: Origination and Negativity in the Eneas." *L'Esprit Créateur* 39(4): 112–27.
- Hamblet, Wendy C. 2012. "Christina H. Tarnopolsky, Prudes, Perverts, and Tyrants: Plato's Gorgias and the Politics of Shame. Reviewed by." *Philosophy in Review* 32(2): 145–48.

- Herzfeld, Michael. 1980. "Honour and Shame: Problems in the Comparative Analysis of Moral Systems." *Man* 15(2): 339–51.
- Hooker, J. T. 1987. "Homeric Society: A Shame-Culture?" *Greece & Rome* 34(2): 121–25.
- Hyland, Drew A. 1968. "Why Plato Wrote Dialogues." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*: 38–50.
- Jacob, Bernard E. 1999. "What Socrates Said—and Why Gorgias and Polus Did Not Respond: A Reading of Socrates' Definition of Rhetoric in Gorgias 461–466." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 29(1): 77–98.
- Kahn, Charles H. 1983. "Drama and Dialectic in Plato's Gorgias."
- Kekes, John. 1988. "Shame and Moral Progress." *Midwest Studies In Philosophy* 13(1): 282–96.
- Kennedy, George Alexander. 1991. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- Konstan, David. 2003. "Shame in Ancient Greece." *Social Research* 70(4): 1031–60.
- . 2006. *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*. University of Toronto Press.
- Koss, Mary P. 2000. "Blame, Shame, and Community: Justice Responses to Violence against Women." *American Psychologist* 55(11): 1332.
- Kovacs, David. 1980. "Shame, Pleasure, and Honor in Phaedra's Great Speech (Euripides, Hippolytus 375-87)." *The American Journal of Philology* 101(3): 287–303.
- Koziak, Barbara. 2007. "Political Emotions: Aristotle and the Symphony of Reason and Emotion." *Perspectives on Politics* 5(3): 620–21.
- Lampert, Laurence. 2010. "How Philosophy Became Socratic: A Study of Plato's 'Protagoras,' 'Charmides,' and 'Republic.'"
- Lane, Melissa S. 2012. *Eco-Republic: What the Ancients Can Teach Us about Ethics, Virtue, and Sustainable Living*. Princeton University Press.

- Lansky, Melvin R. 2005. "The Impossibility of Forgiveness: Shame Fantasies as Instigators of Vengefulness in Euripides' Medea." *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 53(2): 437–64.
- Lewis, Helen B. 1971. "Shame and Guilt in Neurosis." *Psychoanalytic review*.
- Lewis, Michael. 1995. *Shame: The Exposed Self*. Simon and Schuster.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. 1983. 41 *The Justice of Zeus*. Univ of California Press.
- . 1990. 1 *Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek Religion, and Miscellanea: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Locke, Jill. 1999. "Hiding for Whom? Obscurity, Dignity, and the Politics of Truth." *Theory & Event* 3(3).
- . 2007. "Shame and the Future of Feminism." *Hypatia* 22(4): 146–62.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. 1984. 99 *After Virtue*. University of Notre Dame Press Notre Dame.
- Maibom, Heidi L. 2010. "The Descent of Shame." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 80(3): 566–94.
- Markovits, Elizabeth. 2008. *The Politics of Sincerity: Plato, Frank Speech, and Democratic Judgment*. Penn State Press.
- Massaro, Toni M. 1997. "The Meanings of Shame: Implications for Legal Reform." *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 3(4): 645.
- May, Larry, and Jerome Kohn. 1997. *Hannah Arendt: Twenty Years Later*. Mit Press.
- McDonnell, Lorraine M., P. Michael Timpane, and Roger Benjamin. 2000. *Rediscovering the Democratic Purposes of Education. Studies in Government and Public Policy*. ERIC.
- McKim, Richard. 1988. "Shame and Truth in Plato's Gorgias." In *Platonic Writings/Platonic Readings*, ed. Charles L. Griswold. Pennsylvania State University Press, 34–48.
- McNeill, David N. 2010. *An Image of the Soul in Speech: Plato and the Problem of Socrates*. Penn State Press.

- Michelini, Ann N. 1998. "ΠΟΛΛΗ ΑΓΡΟΙΚΙΑ: Rudeness and Irony in Plato's Gorgias." *Classical Philology* 93(1): 50–59.
- Miller, F. D. 2003. "S. Sara Monoson, Plato's Democratic Entanglements: Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy." *The Philosophical review* 112(4): 561–66.
- Monoson, Susan Sara. 2000. *Plato's democratic entanglements*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. <http://www.riss.kr/link?id=M7864772>.
- Moore, C. 2013. "Prudes, Perverts, and Tyrants. Plato's Gorgias and the Politics of Shame, by Christina H. Tarnopolsky." *Ancient philosophy* 33(1): 202–8.
- Morrison, Andrew P. 1998. *The Culture of Shame*. Jason Aronson, Incorporated.
- . 2014. *Shame: The Underside of Narcissism*. Routledge.
- Moss, Jessica. 2005. "Shame, Pleasure and the Divided Soul." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 29: 137–70.
- Moxnes, Halvor, and R. Rohrbaugh. 1996. "Honor and Shame." *The social sciences and New Testament interpretation*: 19–40.
- Mulgan, R. 2002. "S. Sara Monoson, Plato's Democratic Entanglements: Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy." *Ethics* 112(3): 631–33.
- Nails, D. 2001. "Monoson, S. Sara, Plato's Democratic Entanglements: Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy." *Journal of the history of philosophy* 39(2): 289.
- Nathanson, Donald L., American Psychiatric Association, and others. 1987. *The Many Faces of Shame*. Guilford Press.
- Nehamas, Alexander. 1998. 61 *The Art of Living: Socratic Reflections from Plato to Foucault*. Univ of California Press.
- Newbold, R. F., and others. 1985. "Sensitivity to Shame in Greek and Roman Epic, with Particular Reference to Claudian and Nonnus." *Ramus* 14(1): 30.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. 1998. *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew*. Westminster John Knox Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 1980. "Shame, Separateness, and Political Unity: Aristotle's Criticism of Plato."

- . 2001. *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. Cambridge University Press.
- . 2004. *Hiding from Humanity: Disgust, Shame, and the Law*. Princeton University Press.
- O’Hear, Anthony. 1976. “Guilt and Shame as Moral Concepts.” *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*: 73–86.
- Pangle, Thomas L. 1998. ““The Retrieval of Civic Virtue: A Critical Appreciation of Sandel’s Democracy’s Discontent.” *Debating Democracy’s Discontent: Essays on American Politics, Law, and Public Philosophy*.
- Park, Sungwoo. 2003. “Could Socrates Reconcile with Callicles?”. *The Journal of Greco-Roman Studies* 20: 81-118. (written in Korean)
- . 2010. “Reinterpretation of Socratic Citizenship in Plato’s Apology and Crito”. *The Journal of Asiatic Studies* 53(2) (written in Korean)
- (박성우). 2014. 『영혼 돌봄의 정치』. 인간사랑.
- Parra, Nicolás. 2012. “Friendship and War: True Political Art as the Alliance of Philosophy and Rhetoric in Plato’s Gorgias.” *ideas y valores* 61(SPE149): 59–83.
- Piers, Gerhart, and Milton B. Singer. 1971. *Shame and Guilt: A Psychoanalytic and a Cultural Study*. Oxford, England: W. W. Norton.
- Pollis, Adamantia. 1965. “Political Implications of the Modern Greek Concept of Self.” *The British Journal of Sociology* 16(1): 29–47.
- Race, William H. 1979. “Shame in Plato’s Gorgias.” *Classical Journal*: 197–202.
- Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge. Harvard University Press.
- . 2009. *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard university press.
- Raymond, Christopher Cecil. 2013. “Shame and Virtue in Plato and Aristotle.” The University of Texas at Austin.
- Roochnik, D. 2001. “Plato’s Democratic Entanglements: Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy, by S. Sara Monoson.” *Ancient philosophy* 21(2): 483–86.

- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, and Allan Bloom. 1979. "Emile, or On Education, Trans. Allan Bloom." *New York: Basic Books* 54: 108–70.
- Ryu, Honglim. 1994. "The Politics of Ethical Discourse." Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.
- (유흥림). 2003. 『현대 정치사상 연구』. 인간사랑.
- Samnotra, Manu. 2014. "'Sensitive to Shame': Hannah Arendt on Becoming Worldly*." *Constellations* 21(3): 338–50.
- Saxonhouse, Arlene W. 2006. *Free speech and democracy in ancient Athens*. Cambridge: New York :
- Schneider, Carl D. 1987. "A Mature Sense of Shame." *The many faces of shame*: 194–213.
- Segal, Charles. 1970. "Shame and Purity in Euripides' Hippolytus." *Hermes*: 278–99.
- Sigalet, Geoffrey Thomas. 2011. "Pimps, Pupils and Philosophers: Aristotle's Politics of Shame." McGill University Libraries.
- Simon, Bennett. 1992. "Shame, Stigma, and Mental Illness in Ancient Greece." *Stigma and mental illness*: 29–39.
- Smith, Richard H., J. Matthew Webster, W. Gerrod Parrott, and Heidi L. Eyre. 2002. "The Role of Public Exposure in Moral and Nonmoral Shame and Guilt." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 83(1): 138.
- Sokolon, Marlene K. 2013. "The Shameless Truth: Shame and Friendship in Aristotle." *European Journal of Political Theory* 12(4): 447–65.
- Sokolon, Marlene K., and others. 2006. *Political Emotions: Aristotle and the Symphony of Reason and Emotion*. Cambridge Univ Press.
- Stauffer, Devin. 2002. "Socrates and Callicles: A Reading of Plato's 'Gorgias.'" *The Review of Politics* 64(4): 627–57.
- . 2006. "The Unity of Plato's Gorgias." *Rhetoric, Justice, and the Philosophic Life* 64: 80.
- Strauss, Leo. 2013. *On Tyranny: Corrected and Expanded Edition, Including the Strauss-Kojève Correspondence*. University of Chicago Press.

- Strauss, Leo, and Cropsey, Joseph. 1987. *History of Political Philosophy*. University of Chicago Press.
- Striblen, Cassie. 2007. "Guilt, Shame, and Shared Responsibility." *Journal of Social Philosophy* 38(3): 469–85.
- Tangney, June Price. 1999. "The Self-Conscious Emotions: Shame, Guilt, Embarrassment and Pride."
- Tangney, June Price, and Ronda L. Dearing. 2003. *Shame and Guilt*. Guilford Press.
- Tangney, June Price Ed, and Kurt W. Fischer. 1995. "Self-Conscious Emotions: The Psychology of Shame, Guilt, Embarrassment, and Pride." In *The Idea for This Volume Grew out of 2 Pivotal Conferences. The 1st Conference, on Emotion and Cognition in Development, Was Held in Winter Park, CO, Sum 1985. The 2nd Conference, on Shame and Other Self-Conscious Emotions, Was Held in Asilomar, CA, Dec 1988.*, Guilford Press.
- Tarnopolsky, Christina. 2005. "Reply to Green." *Political Theory* 33(2): 273–79.
- . 2010. *Prudes, perverts, and tyrants*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, Christopher Charles Whiston. 2008. *Pleasure, Mind, and Soul: Selected Papers in Ancient Philosophy*. Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, Gabriele. 1985. "Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment."
- Thiselton, Anthony C. 2000. *7 The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Tuozzo, Thomas M. 2011. "Plato's Charmides: Positive Elenchus in a 'Socratic' Dialogue."
- Vaughan. G. M. 2007. "Arlene W. Saxonhouse, Free Speech and Democracy in Ancient Athens." *Perspectives on politics* 5(1): 156.
- Velleman, J. David. 2001. "The Genesis of Shame." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 30(1): 27–52.
- Villa, Dana R. 1992. "Beyond Good and Evil: Arendt, Nietzsche, and the Aestheticization of Political Action." *Political Theory* 20(2): 274–308.

- Vlastos, Gregory. 1991. *Socrates, Ironist and Moral Philosopher*. Cornell University Press.
- Warner, Michael. 2000. *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life*. Harvard University Press.
- Waterfield, R. 2001. "Plato's Democratic Entanglements: Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy (S. Sara Monoson)." *Heythrop journal* 42(2): 259.
- Williams, Bernard Arthur Owen, and Anthony A. Long. 1993. *Shame and Necessity*. Taylor & Francis.
- Woodruff, Paul. 1996. "Shame and Necessity." *Ancient Philosophy* 16(1): 177–80.
- . 2000. "Socrates and the Irrational." In *Reason and Religion in Socratic Philosophy*, eds. Nicholas D. Smith and Paul Woodruff. Oxford University Press, 130–50.
- . 2007. "Socrates and Political Courage." *Ancient Philosophy* 27(2): 289–302.
- Zuckert, Catherine H. 2009. *Plato's Philosophers: The Coherence of the Dialogues*. University of Chicago Press.

국 문 초 록

플라톤과 부끄러움의 정치학

서울대학교 대학원

정치외교학부 정치학전공

윤 지 섭

본 논문의 목적은 플라톤의 부끄러움 개념을 재구성함으로써 부끄러움의 정치적 의미와 역할을 고찰하는 것이다. 부끄러움은 인지적, 감정적, 사회적 측면을 포함하는 복합적인 심리현상이다. 또한 개인이 사회적으로 적합한 태도를 스스로 지키도록 하는 긍정적 역할과, 타인과 사회를 회피하고 참여를 꺼리게 하는 부정적 역할을 하는 양면성을 갖는다. 명예와 수치에 민감했던 고대 그리스 문화 속에서, 플라톤은 부끄러움을 대화편의 라이프모티프(leitmotif)로 사용하며 그 과정에서 부끄러움의 복합적이고 양면적인 특성을 담아냈다. 이에 본 논문에서는 플라톤 대화편의 포괄적인 분석을 통해 플라톤의 부끄러움 개념을 재구성하고, 이로부터 플라톤 정치사상에서 부끄러움의 정치적 의미, 더 나아가 정치적 삶에서 부끄러움이 갖는 의미와 역할에 대한 함의를 이끌어내고자 한다.

플라톤의 부끄러움 개념을 재구성 함에 있어, 본 논문은 플라톤이

대화편에서 부끄러움을 활용하는 두 가지 방식을 분석의 토대로 하며, 세 가지 분석 단계를 거친다. 플라톤은 한편으로 부끄러움을 소크라테스와 대화자들이 나누는 대화의 소재로서 활용하는가 하면, 다른 한편으로는 보다 극적인 요소로서 소크라테스를 비롯한 등장인물들이 경험하는 심리 상태로 활용하기도 한다. 이를 토대로 첫 번째 분석 단계에서는 부끄러움이 대화의 소재로 다루어 질 때 대화내용을 통해 서술되는 부끄러움의 유사정의 (quasi-definition), 영혼삼분설에서의 위치, 기원을 분석한다. 두 번째 단계에서는 등장인물들이 부끄러움을 경험할 때 각각의 사례에서 나타나는 다양한 부끄러움의 모습들을 분석한다. 세 번째 단계에서는 앞선 두 단계의 분석을 토대로, 플라톤의 서술에서 드러나는 부끄러움과 덕목 간의 관계를 살펴본다.

위와 같은 분석을 통해 본 논문에서는 다음과 같은 점들을 확인할 수 있다. 우선 첫 번째 분석단계에서는 플라톤이 부끄러움 개념을 구상함에 있어 복잡성과 양면성에 대한 인지를 토대로 하고 있음을 살펴볼 수 있다. 플라톤은 부끄러움의 감정적, 인지적, 사회적 특성을 대화편 속에서 서술하고 있으며, 특히 부끄러움이 영혼의 세 부분 중에서 기개에 속한다고 밝힘으로써 부끄러움이 욕구와 연결되거나 이성에 연결됨에 따라 양면성을 띠 수 있음을 보여준다. 두 번째 단계에서는 부끄러움의 경험 사례들을 세 가지 유형으로 구분하여 살펴봄으로써, 적절한 방식으로 형성된 부끄러움을 경험할 경우 개인에게 긍정적인 변화를 가져온다는 것을 확인할 수 있다.

세 번째 단계에서는 부끄러움의 경험이 야기하는 변화가 보다 구체적으로 덕목의 함양임을 살펴볼 수 있다. 부끄러움은 각각의 덕목들이 발현되고 길러지는 데에 일종의 촉매제로 작용하는 것이다.

결론적으로, 플라톤의 부끄러움 개념은 시민교육에 있어 시민적 덕목 함양의 촉매제 역할을 한다는 점에서 그 정치적 의미를 찾을 수 있다. 부끄러움은 덕목 함양을 통해 개인의 영혼을 더 나은 삶의 방식으로 이끌어주는 동시에, 시민교육의 일환으로서 플라톤의 도시건설(city construction)에 중요한 역할을 한다. 이러한 부끄러움의 시민교육적 역할은, 텍스트를 통한 교육에서 채워지기 어려운 실천적 차원의 지식이 부끄러움의 경험을 통해 얻어질 수 있다는 점에서, 정치적 삶 전반에 있어서도 의미를 갖는다.

주요어: 부끄러움, 부끄러움의 정치학, 플라톤, 시민교육, 덕목

학번: 2013-20182