

On Happiness

A happy person is hard to find, and when you do hit upon such an individual, he or she stands out like a sore thumb, almost as though that person doesn't belong in society. Late this past summer that led a friend and I to have a discussion about what it means to be happy. I don't have as clue as to the details of how we got on the subject. It may have been a spin-off from previous discussions related to what's going on in the Church and how certain aspects of Plato's **Dialogues** might be of help in this regard. Regardless, there's always an urgency for talking about happiness: most of us aren't inclined to be that way, a fact to which anyone can testify. What makes the issue so pressing is that unhappiness is a universal phenomenon. I don't have new revelations on the matter, but simply wish to outline some thoughts which had preoccupied me of late. On the other hand, these reflections take a different approach by using what our Western tradition has had to offer, and that is right before our eyes should we take time to examine it. Sometimes the image of classical philosophy conjures up disembodied spirits holding forth while reclining at a banquet. Not exactly true, though doing philosophy requires withdrawal from the normal flow of activity to establish an atmosphere for the free flow of ideas. Once you come up with something viable you go out in the field and test them; should they fail, it's back to the drawing board and try again.

When talking about such a fundamental issue as happiness quickly you realize that it is open to a wide variety of interpretations. Actually, pondering a subject as happiness is best done alternating between dialogue and solitude where the two feed into each other. Once you launch into a heavy-duty discussion there emerges almost always, "Why didn't I think of that before? All the while it was sitting right there in front of me." After the initial shock of how thick we had been, we're lead to a genuine sense of awe or wonder, the first fruits of real philosophical give-and-take. If that newly discovered insight had been present all along it must be lurking somewhere in the shadows. This leads, in turn, to why we had missed the insight and where it might be right now, should we put it so in spacial terms. Suddenly our horizon (another spacial term) is expanded, and we're open for surprises. Forcing the matter would be deadly; instead, it's better to cultivate a spirit of receptivity for the emergence of these unconscious realities. Should we be earnest about seeking the truth, we realize that our discoveries—governed as they are by wonder and curiosity—reveal a pattern where everything falls into place at the right time. Nothing magical though it seems that way to the uninitiated eye. We're tapping into sources beyond normal comprehension which disclose themselves by certain patterns. Plato uses the word "form" to describe these patterns, a misunderstood word. The Greek is *eidōs* which implies a course of action or shape; as one scholar noted, *eidōs* is that which tends towards realization. It might be more appropriate to call these sources *re*-sources. By italicizing the prefix "re" I make the distinction between "source" as origin and "resource" as a supply (almost like a treasure house) to which we *re*-turn again and again and from which we can extract new material in order to function effectively. In other words, we can depart from our source and lose sight of it whereas we have constant access to our *re*-sources.

Because the subject of happiness is vast and has multiple access points, I start with some lesser examined cultural elements which have overshadowed happiness. Also I wish to avoid getting into psychological as well as spiritual matters, for those topics have been covered in great detail and are familiar to many people. One place to start is in line with a theme running throughout other essays on this Home Page, the West's classical tradition, much of which has been left by the wayside voluntarily or otherwise. Not that some 2,500 plus years of progress hadn't produced new insights into human nature—indeed they have—but the beginnings of this vast enterprise have retained their luster undimmed throughout the centuries, and great minds always refer to them. To be sure, classical insights into human nature have inspired succeeding generations and left footprints on our

collective consciousness even if these footprints are less than discernable. I should note, however, that they remained quite visible until some forty years ago, pretty much coinciding with the close of the Second Vatican Council. The reasons for this are multiple and complex, and I will touch upon some reasons a bit later. Gradually footprints of the classical tradition became less distinct, as though each succeeding wave of time has wore down their impressions. And that's really fast when you stack a mere forty years against over two thousand.

Now a generation has come to birth without having the classical tradition as an integral part of its collective consciousness. Though not all is doom and gloom, understandably one can feel this way under the shock of its rapid disappearance. Perhaps we had to distance ourselves from the influence of Greek and Rome and "get modern" compared with our more immediate predecessors. Usually such opportunities aren't appreciated when we're in the midst of a transition; it takes time to pass in order to appreciate them. I can recall the genuine sense of shock four decades ago when suddenly what had been a firm foundation became passé virtually overnight. My own experience may be recounted as follows. While I was going through the four years undergraduate course in the Classics (obviously the languages of Latin and Greek were at center stage), fellow students were majoring in sciences and business. They seemed to be rocketing ahead, clearly in the forefront of things, and those of us in the Classical Department sensed we were out of place. This presentiment manifested itself not so much in the classroom but in public places such as the cafeteria. There we overheard students in other majors discussing the possibility of joining such-and-such a firm or research lab after graduation. Not only did that make us feel awkward but that we had been dispossessed. Even if no one had spoken this way outright, awareness of our precarious situation was in the air even in the pre-graduation years. As the years rolled by and fellow classmates had attained influential positions, here I was stuck (mired?) in a field that offered little or no hope of advancement. Fortunately for me this classical training spilled over into patristics where it assumed new life. Both theology and philosophy (classical as well as medieval, at a later point) were injected into the mix which revealed how Christian theology developed. Thus the Classics took a natural path of evolution, passing to the next stage, as it were, in its maturation.

Now that a generation has matured without exposure to the classical tradition and experimented with modern ideas largely based upon hard science and psychology, a sense of loss is becoming clearer. This has turned out favorably for those who stuck it out in the classical wilderness; suddenly they found themselves in a position to offer fresh insights to alleviate that loss. Not that everyone should learn Greek and Latin, nor am I singling out classicists as special fonts of wisdom. More specifically, the loss requires renewed contact with some basic principles of Western Civilization represented by this discipline which had been abandoned for more fashionable trends. Admittedly it's not easy getting people to read Plato and Aristotle; their names conjure up an air of stuffiness compared with what appear more exciting books to read. Yes, many of these books will quote Plato and Aristotle—it's surprising how frequent the quotes are if you look in the index—but few readers will take the time and effort to delve deeper. Thus we are now in a position where these authors, although their names are known but their substance is otherwise forgotten, are recognized only as take-off points for better things. I should note that when speaking about the loss of the classical tradition, quite a few people sympathize. However, they unconsciously convey the fact that we've moved on. In other words, Plato and Aristotle, while acknowledged as important, are considered as belonging to "Philosophy 101."

The paperbacks I just mentioned can become obstacles because they throw at us popular spirituality peppered with catch-words and phrases from physics as well as psychology. Their flashy presentation makes it easier for us to grasp difficult concepts, a major reason why they fly off the shelves. Admittedly some of this material is attractive, but while interesting, the insights they offer tend not to

sink in. Instead, they became superficial commentaries on the modern condition. One major reason for their success are injections of Far Eastern thought, notably Zen Buddhism. Probably an attraction is that this blend of Eastern thought and physics, so familiar to us, employs words and concepts couched in a kind of pre-rational language. By pre-rational I mean the mythic sense where stories are the most important means of communicating information. Hence their added appeal. In this way people can enter an unexplored reality minus the burden of dogmatism which hooked itself onto the classical tradition at a later (Christian) stage. I'd say this last point is one of the chief hindrances to an appreciation of the Classical tradition; it re-enforces a perception of that stuffiness mentioned above, that such material is only for academics. Even worse, it became associated with the clergy commonly perceived as arrogant. From here it's one small step to view ancient writers as tools in the hand of the medieval Church which for some people is live and well in the twenty-first century Church.

These remarks cover a lot of territory and are incomplete yet at the same time intended to situate the context in which I wish to speak about happiness. Reading popular material can offer fuel to vague ideals as success and fulfilment. After all, the insights are based on scientific facts largely deterministic by nature which are passed on to us readers who accept them uncritically. You get the impression that the evidence against happiness is so stacked against us that to entertain the contrary is foolishness. On the other hand, the Christian tradition loudly proclaims that we were born to be happy even apart from the intimate connections of friends and family. Somewhere along the line this voice became muted or was overwhelmed by noise that it seemed phoney or pre-rational, maybe even irrational.

There remains the necessity of speaking about unhappiness and some of its root causes. It doesn't take much to gather that unhappiness is a form of living memories existing in the here-and-now. More specifically, they are traumatic or unpleasant memories, embarrassing events kept alive (even resurrected) in the present where they continue to exert their influence and govern future behavior. Rarely do you hear of people having good memories; by that I mean as influencing the present with their form for the purpose of governing it (By "form" I mean the more technical sense of *morphe* which is a telltale sign of beauty, not just a shape). Excluded are those memories which offer momentary, bittersweet glimpses into times and events which have had a positive effect, for example, from childhood. In the long run they make us forlorn and yearn for a past that can never be recaptured. The reason why we prefer unhappy memories is mysterious. I'm not sure we can even call it a preference since they come upon us so suddenly and have a way of fixating us with their unwanted presence. While each person's disposition varies and responds to traumas in different ways, equally they are affected by unhappy memories which are easier to retain. Not only are they present in the subconscious but are ready to project themselves into the present at a moment's notice. If you're a religious person, this projection has the added burden of guilt; fortunately the sense of sin which had been used as a club to keep people submissive has lost much of its clout. Guilt is re-enforced by sin, and quite a few memories can be misinterpreted in terms of a guilty conscience.

I touched upon the roots of unhappiness in a superficial way as a prelude to the main theme of this essay: what is it anyway, how do we conceive it nowadays, and how can we improve our understanding in light of our common Western tradition? We can start with the fairly universal assumption that we humans are born happy. Sages down the centuries have proclaimed this in one form or another. Instinctively we know it to be true but 1) don't believe it in light of overwhelming evidence about us and 2) even if we do believe the reports, we're at a loss as how to acquire such a blessed state. There are so many layers of misery which keep our innate state concealed and inaccessible. Thus we're stuck in-between something we know instinctively as true (as opposed to

wishing it to be true) and the hardcore evidence that says happiness is a construct of the imagination. If we're sincere in our inquiry, chances are that we meet a like-minded person who pops into our lives almost miraculously. Someone somewhere is out there to whom we're mysteriously attracted, and at the right time the meeting takes place. They are not co-incidences but are like invisible threads or connectors always present yet require sensitivity in order to become visible.

A few remarks about how I got into this issue of happiness might be in order, one way to approach a nebulous topic. With the benefit of hindsight, my experience with the Classics during the tumultuous early to mid 1960s was a microcosm of what had been going on in society. All my teachers were of the "old school" in the best sense. To them Classics was more than a job. It was a way of life, a *Weltanschauung*, so evident that students lucky enough to come under their spell were bound to be affected for life. I'm sure the same can be applied to science and business teachers, but due to the narrower focus of their professions they lacked the capacity to be absorbed as deeply into the personal lives of students compared with the classicists. While many of these good classicists (all were men as opposed to women) were roughly middle-aged at the time, they knew they were a dying breed, a fact picked up by us students. Some even urged us to get into classics permanently in order to carry on the torch despite the bleak prospects of making a living. It was to counter a feeling of something sneaking up behind us as a wave soon to break over us all and make us strangers in a strange land, a society uncertain where it was going. That was, of course, the denigration of liberal arts in general, its rather swift demise from being at the center of the educational process. The future looked more than bleak; prospects of earning a living suddenly were drying up. It was like being at the edge of a precipice from which you would one day be forced to jump. All this seems to have come to a head in 1968 when many dramatic events took place: the assassinations of Martin Luther King, Robert F. Kennedy, the death of Thomas Merton, the Tet Offensive in Viet Nam (plus growing opposition to the war there), the "death of God," race riots in the USA, the near-toppling of the French government as well as student riots in other European countries.

After college I got into a prolonged study of the Church Fathers, so prolonged that it continues to this very day. It was relatively easy to jump from the Classics to patristics because a reading knowledge of Greek and Latin was essential. This led to a study of German (I already had French), so between these two modern languages I had ready access to the best of secondary sources. At this time several friends and colleagues were delving into Eastern thought, Zen Buddhism in particular. It was all the rage and seemed to offer direct contact with transcendent reality minus the theological and dogmatic baggage associated with Christianity. I too dabbled in it a bit and found some insights refreshing. However, I was continuously watching people around me who were smitten by Eastern practices and teachings. With the passage of a few years (I was proceeding along with my patristic studies) it was evident that they had jumped into a field without knowledge of its contents, not in the bad sense where you could get your mind messed up but in reaction to their strict Catholic upbringing. Most have fallen away while only a few have stuck it out. Although I couldn't articulate it at the time, you couldn't get into Zen or any other Eastern tradition without understanding the roots of your own and without knowing the languages in which their writings had been composed. It's more than knowing Pali, Sanskrit or whatever, a subconscious shift in archetypes with which you had been born and later formed by your culture. As for the longer term ramifications, those engaged in things Eastern were marked by a false (immature might be a better adjective) liberation from their native tradition which often seemed unsettling. By contrast, there seem to be just a handful of people who appreciated Eastern thought; most of this small group never abandoned their Western roots but were able to balance the two traditions.

At the same time I knew that Catholicism had to reach out to other traditions in order to maintain its

relevancy. With this in mind I decided to study Sanskrit which involved the usual grammar books and flash cards. After all, Sanskrit is the heart of it all. This turned out to be a mind-boggling enterprise which I could have continued provided I drop Greek and Latin, not to mention struggling with German. Clearly a sustained effort was required, and I wasn't up to the challenge. Better, I could pursue Sanskrit but would be spreading myself too thin. Nevertheless, the possibility of how the Church might renew herself through new input from non-Western traditions remained. Friends and colleagues were in the forefront of such renewal, so I envied their activity while simultaneously I was glad not to be engaged with their hectic activity. This uneasy alliance of two conflicting feelings led to search for an alternative, one that would be somewhere in between. Then I hit upon the Syriac language which contained a whole body of Christian literature untapped except by a few scholars. Some works were translations from Greek texts whereas others were independent of the Greco-Roman world. In addition, the milieu in which Syriac flourished—east of the Mediterranean and further east, all the way to India through Iraq and Iran and finally into China—made this language a likely substitute for Sanskrit. If I couldn't drop my current studies for Sanskrit, why not try Syriac? It appeared a logical bridge between West and East, right smack in the middle. This turned out to be accurate, and I rejoice for having made the right decision. Incidentally, Syriac is a Semitic language related to Hebrew (which I knew at the time), so it made learning the language easier despite their very different looking scripts. I figured that if I got knowledge of a Semitic language springing from Biblical Hebrew (and Aramaic), I'd receive the added bonus of so much literature that hasn't seen the light of day for many years. And so the abandonment of Sanskrit for Syriac, reluctant as it was, paid off handsomely.

These pursuits were centered upon the Christian tradition in a way that continues to give an unrelenting flow of new insights I'd be hard pressed to find elsewhere. After some forty years of thoroughly enjoying patristics in the original languages, a nagging sense of not fully being at home started to creep in. This has nothing to do with alienation or boredom, far from it. My pursuits had been and remain exactly what I always wanted to do, immersion in the best that Christian literature had to offer. Still, that indefinable sense of being "far from home" remained. It took several months to discern what "home" meant, but it dawned that I had an inbuilt yearning for returning to the Classics in which I had been raised. Sure, Church Fathers quoted them in abundance. Familiarity with these texts revealed how they inserted them into important documents at the root of Christian literature. Familiarity with words and concepts in the original (Greek) language was extremely helpful in addition to Latin which enriched the way people thought in these languages. Perhaps it was this second-hand exposure to classical authors, valuable as it was, through the eyes of early Christian teachers that kept at bay that feeling of being away from home for so long. After a while I grew weary of this second-hand experience and wanted to trace the roots of my unease. Yet another barrier remained. In many ways patristic literature was more attractive, even advanced, compared with the Classics. Such was a prejudice I picked up over the years, hard to shake off. It was only after having several conversations with people of like mind that I took up reading the **Dialogues** of Plato. What made this attractive was the appearance of a new translation, **Plato: Complete Works** edited by John M. Cooper (Indianapolis, 1997). The more well-known translation by Jowett had been hanging around for years and badly required an update. As soon as I started reading, instinctively knew I was in familiar territory. The landscape didn't assume a home-like quality until I took a stab at reading the **Dialogues** in the original Greek. A difficult project, especially when starting out, which continues to this day but well worth the effort. After all, several decades had elapsed from when I had studied classical Greek opposed to later forms of it such as that of the fourth century.

Thus over the course of some fifty years beginning as an undergrad and continuing to this day I had embarked on what you might call an inverse journey: I started out with the Classics, moved on to

patristics and returned to the Classics. On occasion I wish I had not gone so long with such a gap between classics and patristics, but that's how it turned out. No regrets, really, but I found this lengthy interval an advantage as opposed to an exile. Long exposure to the Church Fathers enabled me to appreciate how they utilized that tradition—still close very to them—and to experience up close how its loss was affecting us in the present. I can't pinpoint with accuracy when my perception that the strictly Christian interpretation of reality started to wear thin. It grew imperceptibly as I became more familiar with the Greek and Syriac ways of thinking. In other words, it seemed that the Church Fathers were re-hashing the classical tradition. Actually, they had done a terrific job, but constantly viewing this tradition through their eyes impelled me to take a look at their sources minus (Christian) filters. The disadvantage of Christian literature, to use an awkward word, if you are following their principles over an extended period of time—is its imitative nature. Or more precisely, sometimes people find it difficult to get beyond this repetitive presentation without deeper probing. A little more questioning is required; not of the faith but of how we perceive elements of this faith of which the Church Fathers were an expanded commentary. Incidentally, faith boils down to the Apostle's Creed or even more simply, that Christ was born, died and rose from the dead. Of course, there's plenty of work to educate members of the Church as well as recruiting new ones. While the Church's basic teachings address themselves to every dimension of the human condition, the understanding of many people, even that of highly educated folks, remains at a primitive level. The same applies to those in ministry, only theirs is compounded by the repetitive nature of their work and continuously dealing with the basic tenets of the faith.

Putting the situation in this way may sound strange, but contact with those engaged in ministry seems to back up it. So much work in religious education is elementary. I made it a point over the past year to ask folks working within the Catholic Church—lay people, priests, nuns—how they were faring vis-a-vis the evangelical process. This questioning paralleled my own feeling that we need a new approach as to present Christianity. Many of these people in the front lines were devoting their entire lives to the basics and not moving much beyond that. It is an aspect of ministry you never hear about though one people love to discuss provided they have the chance and safe environment to do so. They've become weary with the basics and long to speak of deeper matters. Such opportunities are few and far between, so when they do arise, these good folks jump at it which encourages them to slog on. Conversations about higher matters or what lies beyond the basics aren't at all esoteric. Perhaps when the classical consciousness was more prevalent it was easier to make vital contacts and go deeper. While majoring in Classics I was a bit too young verify this but had a sense that people were able to speak more articulately since they were informed with a broader tradition. An example of this comes from Thoreau's writings when he quotes ancient writers, mythology included, in order to make analogies between them and the natural world. Thoreau existed in a milieu where ideas could be freely exchanged in the context of this classical body of literature without having to engage in weary, repetitive explanation.

Since I've always had a vested interest in the Church, I was interested to see if she had anything to say about happiness. The Gospels—alternately known as the Good News—in and by themselves are the essence of Christianity and where you'd expect to find the answer. However, you could almost say that the Gospels are an appendix to the Epistles of St. Paul. Should someone completely ignorant of Christianity hear some liturgical readings in church, chances are that he or she would claim Paul is the founder of that religion. He, in turn, was inspired by a lesser person, Jesus Christ. In other words, Paul's Epistles are both an enhancement and distortion of the Gospels. With St. Paul we have the first cleavage, as it were, between the essential message of Christ and the teachings that came after it. Here is one root of why the concept of happiness—so central to its classical tradition in Greece and the milieu in which Christianity matured—had taken second stage. Paul claimed that “philosophy” was at

odds with the new religion, and this was quickly carried over by the Desert Fathers, largely responsible for getting monasticism founded. “See to it that no one makes a prey of you by philosophy and empty deceit according to human tradition according to the elemental spirits of the universe and not according to Christ” [Col 2.8]. These elemental spirits or *ta stoicheia*...principles...may be Paul’s way of ridding Christianity of *daimones* which generally had a positive meaning. Parallel to this was an attempt to adopt aspects of Hellenistic philosophy conditioned in large part by the influence of Paul’s Epistles. Thus in many ways we are disciples of St. Paul and secondarily, of Jesus Christ. Come to think of it, this phenomenon occurred in one generation long before the Catholic tradition got off the ground. Christ was immediately transformed from a human being into a divine being who transcended our normal sphere of daily life.

While we might look for happiness within the Christian tradition, another option is looking not outside but *before* it or by examining some of the classical models on which our religion is founded. In that way we’ll be on familiar ground as opposed to straying into unknown territory where our ignorance can get us into unwanted trouble. It may be argued that every nook and cranny of this heritage had been gone over with a fine tooth comb. True in that most of the texts have been available for some time as well as an abundance of secondary sources, many of which are still being produced. At the same time work remains as how to appropriate these texts as ways of living not just within the scholarly context. There comes to book of Pierre Hadot, **What is Ancient Philosophy?**, currently enjoying success; it comes highly recommended. Since we’re dealing with insights into happiness, let’s turn attention to some of its classical expressions as found in the **Dialogues** of Plato, a good a place as any to start. There we don’t find a systematic exposition in accord with our modern sensibilities but how real people in real situations handled problems in dialogical fashion. You get bits and pieces of it, not whole and entire; frustrating at first but close enough to true life experience whether 2,500 years ago or the present. Such as matter as happiness cuts across centuries of human experience, a comforting thought in itself. We could pick out a key word from the Dialogues, *daimon*. At first this may alarm some people because our English “demon” is derived from it. True, but *daimon* has a very different meaning in the original Greek, actually, quite the opposite from its unfortunate English counterpart. It applies to intermediaries between the human and divine spheres, something akin to guiding spirits, personal intermediary beings or protective deities. In other words, *daimones* exist in an in-between realm where they partake both of spirit and matter. It seems that their connection with the latter gave rise to a sinister view coupled with animistic beliefs. From there it shouldn’t surprise us that *daimones* evolved into uncontrollable impulses afflicting us humans and quickly became endowed with a malign character. Modern psychology is familiar with the aftereffects yet seems to lack the sophistication and metaphysical insight into the nature of *daimones*.

I believe a key insight into getting a grip on the *daimones*—even before we attribute a form to them—is by appreciating the location to which they are traditionally assigned; as the last paragraph said, this place is in between heaven and earth. By “place” a physical location isn’t inferred which makes it harder to grasp what *daimones* are all about. At the same time they are more mysterious, both within and out of our reach. It may be objected that a *daimon* is a figure of imagination, something concocted, with no validity in the real world. One way of finding out is to see how superstitious we really are. Go out in a wooded area, preferably at night, and watch your emotions. They can go wild as we know well. Our imaginations concoct all sorts of monsters lurking in the bushes, rarely if ever positive feelings. I wonder why this is so; perhaps anthropologists attribute it to a throwback inherited from our ancestors, a survival technique. From there they can trace the development of supernatural beings which later evolved into a singular God. However, when out in the woods we don’t feel like ascribing to hypotheses. Rationally our minds may wish this to be true compared with how we feel deep down. From this experience we might get a grasp on what it means to be unhappy.

At least we've attributed the location of these feelings: not only are they within us but on that scale of in-betweenness they are situated "down here" on the earth as opposed to up in the heavens. Now return to the same spot during the day, quite a different atmosphere. No evil spirits lurking about now; most likely they have returned to the heavens from earth (or even under the earth). Another experiment is being in this place shortly prior to sunset. You can feel the place gradually shifting, the spirits getting ready to descend, so it's best to get out and head back to the security of civilization.

One thing we can be sure of from our experiment first at night and then during the day is that our experience is bounded...restricted...between heaven and earth. It is a limited sphere beyond which the unknown lies. This sense of place can be challenged scientifically both through physics (the very small) and the cosmological (the very big). With the former, we can split any piece of matter and find an infinite amount of particles. With the latter, we can voyage out beyond the furthest galaxies and find more, more of the same stuff, an endless pursuit. Thus we're stuck between a rock and a hard place. Both are infinite: one is in our midst and the other lies out there. While exploration of these two extremes is left to scientists, they do have an influence on how we go about our lives. Just the fact of knowing both exist can give rise to a general distress about what it means to be unhappy. Here we are living in between two poles, the infinitely small and the infinitely large. While harmless enough in the abstract, they set the stage for all sorts of things to happen. We might be able to live with such a strange dualism, yet they have an uncanny way of making us view the human condition as marred by so many afflictions. If this is so, it's a short step to view life as meaningless. Nobody in his or her right mind can be happy. No one has the right to it and if they think they do, they're crazy.

The idea of the infinite isn't modern. For example, the **Philebus** speaks of it as follows: "And the people of old, superior to us and living in closer proximity to the gods, have bequeathed us this tale, that whatever is said to be consists of the one and many, having in its nature limit and unlimitedness. Since this is the structure of things, we have to assume that there is in each case always one form for every one of them, and we must search for it, as we will indeed find it there. And once we have grasped it, we must look for two, as the case would have it, or if not, for three or some other number. And we must treat every one of those further unities in the same way, until it is not only established of the original unit that it is one, many and unlimited, but also how many kinds it is. For we must not grant the form of the unlimited to the plurality before we know the exact number of every plurality that lies between the unlimited and the one. Only then is it permitted to release each kind of unity into the unlimited and let it go. The gods, as I said, have left us this legacy of how to inquire and learn and teach one another" [16c-e].

Okay, so we live in between two infinities, a world view different from the ancients who saw heaven as one limit (above) and earth as another (below). In the bounded milieu of ancient Greece, society was ordered according to an end which everyone was able to comprehend and find his or her spot. Actually this society was situated within a broader *kosmos*, the starry heaven above. The *kosmo*-logical region was equally bounded but on a larger scale beyond which lay chaos. At the same time this chaos was not just disorder in the conventional sense as shared by the Hebrews. It was a harmony of beauty and loveliness as symbolized by the word *kosmos* from which we get the familiar *cosmos*) derives from a verb meaning "to arrange harmoniously," "to set in order." If something were *kosmios*, not only would it partake of good order it would be decorous and beautiful. Alluding to Plato's **Philebus** cited above, awareness of the infinite (closely akin to chaos) didn't escape either him or his predecessors. While fully acknowledging it (albeit untested scientifically according to our standards), they came to grips with the infinite and were able to do something positive. I'd almost say that if presented with modern scientific theories and equipment to comprehend both the microscopic and macroscopic worlds, they wouldn't be surprised: "We knew that already" or in Socrates' words

quoted in the footnote, “The gods, as I said, have left us this legacy of how to inquire and learn and teach one another.” Furthermore, they would challenge their visitors from the future with a question like, “What does your wonderful scientific evidence have to do with ordering society? How does it make people happy?”

If we look at either end of the spectrum of physical reality as embraced by modern science, focusing attention on just one can throw us into confusion, not to mention both. Two vastly different yet parallel infinities are too much to handle; science alone get a handle on them which is why *kosmos* is a helpful concept as already noted. The microcosmic level presents us with physical reality in a more concentrated form—take the release of atomic energy, for example—so we have to be extremely careful in our exploration. Maybe a re-appreciation of the word “atom” is called for. It means something undivided (*a-tomos*), the most fundamental building block of the physical world. We know that more complexity lay beyond the splitting of the atom, so the classical model of a nucleus surrounded by orbits of protons is outdated. Actually, it modeled the symmetry of the *kosmos*. No one knows where these subatomic particles will end (if ever); the same applies on the macrocosmic level which lies beyond our most powerful telescopes. Thus “atom” is a fine term describing the sense of limitation both in the scientific world and in spheres of human activity. As we well know, the release of explosive energy is powerful in the extreme and produces, well, genuine chaos. Everything within its reach is reduced to ashes, a kind of inverse Big Bang. Not that apparently endless subatomic levels should be left unexplored, rather, the atomic level is aesthetically appealing due to its form and elegance (i.e., it has a *morphe* and is *kosmios*). The same applies equally on the macrocosmic level. The form of a galaxy is just as elegant as an atom, actually not that dissimilar in form. A galaxy might be expanded to include clusters, but if we keep going out further, its elegant pattern becomes increasingly meaningless...more stuff with a decrease in form. Although we have the ability of probing the very small and very large, a danger lurks of throwing out a sense of beauty which is indicative of balance and order in our souls. While we can advance further, it just doesn’t seem to reverberate but ends in chaos.

Earlier I spoke of experimenting with our superstitious side, of being out in the woods at night, and considering how that stacks up with a rational understanding of the same environment taken for granted during the daylight hours. If we were to examine how our minds work under both conditions, we would find two completely different ways of perceiving the same reality. With the former, all sorts of fearful images normally kept at bay emerge which threaten to destroy us. Night is the time when these phantoms roam about with destructive intent; our identity which is maintained within defined boundaries comes crashing down with fearful images. Then the sun dawns and the phantoms disappear. We’re astonished at how we had given way to those nighttime fears. Thus experimenting with two radically experiences might give insight into how we set boundaries with regards to one physical place. Although this experiment relates to natural boundaries, it is indicative of how we can apply the same insight of boundedness on the three levels of body, mind and spirit. Instead of overstepping the limits of each (which we’re wont to do), just knowing that they have inbuilt parameters is helpful for maintaining order...and an order which is *kosmios*.

This experiment of two contrary experiences in one place gets to the heart of the matter. Because we are dealing with irrational elements beyond our control, an appreciation of the word *daimon* is in order. Of course, it does not have association with evil and therefore demons, our English word which comes directly from this Greek term. That’s one reason I decided to insert an extended list of that term after this essay. Thus *daimon* is a base-word, if you will, enabling us to get a firm foothold on a reality which has a positive meaning in Plato, many of which are inserted in the mouth of Socrates. In order to establish this point clearly, I give a quick distillation of the meaning of *daimon* contained in

the list. For the reader in haste, it will save time ploughing through the citations below:

Divine sign, happy state of affairs, spiritual activities, children of the gods, spiritual sign, spiritual manifestation, extraordinary happiness, divine force, guardian spirit, appointed spirit, superhuman (wisdom), good fortunes, divine sign, divine (workmanship), blessedness, man of the spirit, friend, divinity, blissful, to prosper, intermediary, mad, superhuman, splendid, guardian angel, to celebrate, valuable possession, successful.

Daimon contains a sense of beauty and proportion to which we may apply the adjective *kosmios*...beautiful and well-ordered...along with a keen sense of its limitations. That's what we humans seek instinctively and are content with despite words from the contrary, for it is something welling up from deep with our human nature. We function best when boundaries are laid down, a real challenge in a modern world with infinite choices. Since the *daimon* references listed below (those without the Greek prefix *eu-* specifically designate happiness) function as intermediates or agents of inspiration, they do so in between heaven and earth, not outside these limits. Thus we should become alert as to their form or *morphe* which by its very nature is bounded. This way of thinking is foreign to most of us, for we are more familiar with traditional Christian concepts even if we don't subscribe to them. Here the three virtues most loudly proclaimed are faith, hope and love. Nobody will deny their validity which are shared by other religions. The "problem"—and deliberately I put this word in parentheses—with faith, hope and love is that they are too open-ended. Because can expand into infinity, failure to implement them has a way of bouncing back at us. We are limited and can only believe so much, hope so much and love so much despite exhortations to the contrary. This tension between our finitude and the summons to always ascend higher does create noble specimens of humanity as we all know. At the same time the rest of us who aren't so gifted are afflicted with a sense of inferiority when compared with them. Thus infinite virtues conspire to effect an awareness of innate constrictions. I'll refrain from throwing in sin because further complicates the matter; presumably we're pretty familiar with its effects.

The virtues of faith, hope and love are meant to reflect the infinite nature of God in whose image and likeness we are made, so says the Bible and tradition. At the same time our lack of success at practicing them—which is made worse by comparing ourselves with others who are better—can produce a strange paradox. This consists in loving God while hating our souls, a spin on the well-known example of the Pharisee who considered himself better than the publican tucked away in the corner of the temple. It's relatively easy to love God because confirmation of it within this nebulous realm is hard to grasp. On the other hand, our human condition both as we are aware of it in ourselves and as other persons see it, is painfully obvious. So if we move from love of the infinite (God) to the concrete experience of ourselves, we find that much is lacking. This shift sounds abstract but for those practicing the spiritual life it's a familiar experience not unlike moving from day into night. On top of it we have evidence of the infinitely small and infinitely large in the universe as discussed earlier. It may not be explicit in daily life but lies in the background of our culture where bits and pieces of this fact can and do slip into our awareness. If such is physical evidence is true, how are we limited, frail creatures supposed to comport ourselves? We have two infinities on two different scales: the divine and the physical. This similarity is a potent combination and can wreak havoc when we attempt to make sense of the world about us.

Familiarity with the classical meaning of *daimon* reveals that God is "too monotheistic." At first glance an odd expression (hence the parentheses), but put this way in order to make a point. Perhaps introducing a healthy dose of plurality might help matters along. I don't mean that we should return to the gods (as Julian the so-called apostate Roman emperor did) but take a real hard look at our

Christian cosmology. As a friend with whom I've been discussing these matters had noted, this cosmology had been scoured of *daimones*. You could say that before the birth of Jesus Christ the ancient world was going along reasonably well as it made use of the *daimones*, and people were comfortable with them both on the popular and philosophical levels. Then Jesus Christ came on the scene and as one tradition records, at his birth all the oracles fell silent never to speak again. Actually the oracles continued speaking but in muted fashion. It took several centuries for them to really fade away. Some oracles have morphed into various forms of Gnosticism. From then on interpretations of the Christian message other than the orthodox one arose and continued to prosper in the shadows right down to today. These parallel interpretations aren't necessarily outright heresies or evil; many represent sincere attempts to interpret divine revelation. Perhaps if this surprisingly resilient tendency—in some respects it represents the innate human desire for a polytheistic way of viewing reality—were looked at creatively, not threateningly, we might be better off. Not all such interpretations should be reconciled with Christian orthodoxy. Nevertheless, we might look afresh at human aspirations for the divine that emerged shortly after the institution of the Church. After all, these aspirations don't indicate that they will be going away any time soon.

Not long after the Church got established the age of martyrs commenced quickly followed by the birth of monasticism. In some respects this movement was considered a continuation of the martyrs' witness. Both during and after the time of persecutions those who had been martyred became objects of instant veneration. We're talking about a phenomenon that developed early on in Christianity, a tradition which evolved into the veneration of saints. Despite interest in some quarters, it has faded from mainstream consciousness in modern times. Nowadays we look at it askance, perhaps in part from the influence of Protestantism and in other part due to its quaintness, but fail to realize how vital this veneration had been for the Church. Parallel to this early development was the new phenomenon of monasticism which caught the attention of Christians like nothing else. Records of the movement which came down to us from Egypt and other places like Syria were written in Greek, Coptic and Syriac. As anyone familiar with the history of monasticism knows, this movement quickly spread westwards into Latin speaking lands through such notables as John Cassian. The most famous western monk who legislated for countless generations after the fall of the Roman Empire was St. Benedict and his **Rule**. I mention the monastic movement because these monks (more specifically, hermits or those who lived in relative isolation) were beset by countless demons. It's a tradition parallel with the cult of saints which continued to develop and influence spiritual authors down to the present.

It's clear that if anyone went off into the desert like those first Egyptian hermits and resided there with minimal human contact some bizarre results were inevitable. Perhaps that's part of the reason why demons are found throughout monastic literature, a way of interpreting aberrant behavior. While that's perfectly fine, I remain intrigued what might have happened if the notion of *daimon* were carried over from the best of what the Greek philosophic tradition had to offer. Actually from time to time Greek philosophy crept into the lives of these men and women out in the desert. The influence of Origen and Evagrius Ponticus are the most famous examples. Most of them were illiterate whereas others were highly educated. There had always been a conflict when the latter group attempted to articulate their ascetical practices with the help of philosophical concepts. Despite these bright spots, all sorts of errors, even heresies, came to birth which were condemned roundly by many authors. Still, this doesn't preclude us from re-examining the process of Christian living with the help of the best of Greek philosophy to help it along. Perhaps wishful thinking, but it does stimulate the imagination as to what might have happened otherwise. We may have come off with a healthier interpretation of Christian asceticism and hence, Christian teaching. Well-know forebears such as Anthony the Great went into the desert in order to practice the Gospels to the letter. It sounds strange because people

associate Gospel principles within a social context. Then again, to put these principles into practice you have to “know thyself” thoroughly before seeing how they play out with other persons. Today we might not have hordes of people heading for the desert as once was the case, but a lot of spiritual searching is going on. Maybe in this new context we should reappraise the *daimones* without doing violence to Christian orthodoxy.

At the birth of Christ oracles ceased and *daimones* fell silent; better, they retreated into the shadows and shortly emerged thereafter as demons. It was clear to the first Christian apologists that suspect influences had to go in order to allow the new religion to emerge. On top of this Christianity trying to forge its identity apart from Judaism. Since Jesus Christ was perceived as God coming to earth in human form, other forms of divinity were negated; for the more enlightened apologists, they were fulfilled. Those who best imitated God-on-earth quickly formed a new pantheon, the martyrs and saints which filled the vacuum. After all Christ had ascended (back) into heaven, so here were his followers on earth remote from the heavenly places. Of course, earth was viewed differently, a place of exile. Heaven was the true home, and spiritual influences which bespoke the earth or worse—a mixture of earth and heaven—were reckoned as dangerous. Also Christ was the intermediary between God the Father and human beings on earth, so orthodox teaching allowed nothing to interfere with his mediation. However, holy men and women could be substitutes, a kind of intermediaries of divine grace responsible for granting admittance to what had once been inaccessible.

Because earth is our natural home and we are composed of its substance, mainstream Christianity regarded that this aspect of our human constitution was in need of reform or in a few isolated instances, banished altogether. On the other hand, heaven is our true home—the divine image and likeness being as close as we could get to it in this body—which often was set at odds against the earth. In order to fully realize the latter, the history of Christianity has witnessed a bewildering assortment of interpretations with regards to ascetical practices, some of which were extreme. As far as those practices adopted by the Church...if a man or woman came off them okay and had acquired a solid reputation for holiness, they in turn gathered disciples who indirectly impacted contemporary culture. In this fashion Christianity broadened itself out to reach a larger audience and affected institutions already established. This was a marvelous strategy which has largely lost its effectiveness today because religion is pretty much marginalized. Even those who have attained a degree of sanctity are generally not considered agents of cultural reform. The larger societal supports are no longer extant. Nevertheless, the essence of the original strategy was a living faith, hope and charity or means for partaking in and manifesting the divine nature. As far as the divine goes, it was universally accepted to be open-ended...in short, infinite...and put no limits on the practice of each virtue. Thus we have a paradox: on one hand a person always fell short of a goal and on the other, had an unlimited prospect of advancement at his or her disposal.

At the same time you have to wonder if this approach was a little too open-ended. While initially it might sound terrific that virtue has no bounds, maybe that word *daimon* can be inserted into the picture without overstepping the bounds of orthodox Christian teaching. From my experience of assembling the references below came a sense of rediscovering something not only basic about our Western heritage but the possibility of gaining new insight to be placed at the service of Christianity. I was rummaging through what amounted to some 258 references to *daimon* where a substantial majority has the prefix *eu-* which conveys the sense of goodness and balance. Just glancing at them makes this self-evident. I also got a feeling, indirectly at first, that although the context in which these dialogues occurred represented the best and brightest of Western Civilization, a sinister force was lurking in the background which hasn't diminished after 2,500 years. That is, the philosophical discussions in which the role of *daimones* were bantered about was a very small instance of human

intelligence achieving great insights into our condition. Around these thinkers were other cultures, notably Persia, which hadn't a clue as to their content and were based on a mythic, pre-rational as well as authoritarian outlook. While we've come a long way from that, dark, irrational tendencies in the human spirit are still present which would revolt at such enlightened discussions. Generally speaking, they are too "liberal," a term which the West once held in high regard but is now considered subversive.

Both the non-Greek societies contemporaneous with Plato and current modern preferences for the irrational and dictatorial (especially in the religious sphere) have lost a positive appreciation of the *daimones*. Not only did these societies lack the appropriate terminology but were at the mercy of non-human influences which we'd call demons. But when Christianity came on the scene, people had the "advantage" of Jesus Christ. He was the victor *par excellence* who once and for all squelched the daimonic voices and oracles which mediated them. If we live in a cosmology—I prefer this term over "world" because it's more inclusive besides being based in that *kosmos* as already discussed—where the *daimones* have been suppressed in favor of a monolithic cosmology, anything pluralistic as represented by these spirits has no place whatsoever. Fine if the negative elements were isolated and defined, but this seems to be a case of throwing out the baby with the bath water. Even the mostly positive *daimones* were too competitive for a single divinity. Note that one of the most common Hebrew names for God is *'Elohyim* which is in the plural. Perhaps it represents a remnant of the innate human preference for plurality which struggled throughout Israel's history to maintain the monotheistic character of (the singular) God. It is also interesting that *'Elohyim* remained common usage throughout the Bible.

It took a good four centuries for Christianity to work out its theology which had to deal with three divine persons, i.e., the Trinity. What complicated the matter—the source of countless heresies—was that one of these persons (Jesus Christ) gradually was considered to be God who participated in the same divine nature as the other two persons. Here's enough mixture of (divine) unity and (earthly) plurality to boggle anyone's mind, and it's no small wonder that theologians were able to work out the details coherently. Even before this took a more definitive form Christianity gave birth, as noted earlier, to martyrs and shortly thereafter saints, who partook of the divine nature without becoming God. This phenomenon happened prior to a clear understanding of the person and nature of Jesus Christ. Such holy men and women simply lived the Gospel and witnessed to its fruits, namely, that it worked and inspired others to follow them. So right away we have "*daimones*" present in the popular Christian cosmology. I put that word in parentheses deliberately because it wasn't employed by the early Christians and would have been frowned upon if not condemned roundly by their leaders. What would have happened if the movement to elevate holy men and women into saints took a different direction? What would have happened if the classical Greek idea of *daimon* had taken root or was allowed a place along with the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, let alone angels and other spiritual beings? Then again, maybe angels (they were adopted from the Jewish heritage with which early Christianity was intimately linked) were a way of translating *daimones* into an acceptable world view. After all, *mal'ak/aggelos* in Hebrew and Greek respectively means "messenger" or a being sent by God to earth; both Testaments are full of instances where they act as intermediaries. The Book of Revelation has an abundance of angels, more than any other book in the Bible. A quick count shows that there are seventy-seven references. This is interesting, for Revelation deals with future kingdom of God, that is, in heaven as opposed to being on earth...and for the ancient Greeks, the *daimones* operated not so much in heaven but in-between heaven and earth. And so, the human heart has an innate desire to bridge the world of spirit and matter even though Christianity makes a clear distinction between heaven and earth. Despite protestations from proponents of monotheistic orthodoxy, some forms of spiritual entities invariably creep in. Of course, much of this insinuation comes within the context of

an infinite God above and a bounded earth below.

Essentially this larger sphere of divine infinity and human finiteness is of concern in this short document. They have been considered to be at such odds with each other (witness the wrangling of early Church councils concerning the human and divine natures in Jesus Christ) that still we are grappling with this mystery. At this juncture I bring up the hackneyed exhortation, "Think outside the box." It's used as a way to get people to entertain ideas not within their field of operation. If we take a positive view of this metaphor, thinking outside the box is equivalent with looking at things from the vantage point of infinity, that is to say, God's position. But if we consider in positive fashion it's opposite—"think *inside* the box"—we could use the idiom for thinking in the realm of boundedness. This is what I am trying to get at, a reappraisal of how we operate within the confines of a given system instead of outside it. I believe that deliberately opting to circumscribe...not confine...our world view when it comes to things spiritual is a helpful, indeed healthy, way of incorporating both our human condition and the *daimones* which make their home there. We can experiment and put the *daimones* outside the proverbial box, that is, within a system dominated by infinity or unboundedness. There they would run wild with energy unleashed and us at their mercy. Such a situation is not unlike digging into the atomic realm noted above. The classical picture of an atom in the sense of that-which-is-indivisible forms the basic building block of the physical world from which molecules are constructed. If we go beneath the atom—go beneath that which by its definition can not be cut—we're assaulted by a whole zoo of subatomic particles which, in turn, have others with no end in sight. Here is an inward or microcosmic path towards infinity. Not only are we going without a goal in sight but one which will unleash awesome power beyond our control.

It's easy to relate to an infinite God, one who shows us love. Although such infinite love is proclaimed almost daily in the liturgy, barely is it understood and like anything excessive, has a strange way of making us turn to its opposite. Perhaps this is natural inclination of trying to get a handle on something we can't grasp. Consider the opposite of infinite love, hatred. It, in turn, is analogous with hell (presented as infinite as divine love). The faculty by which we attune ourselves to divine love is the *psuche* or soul made in the divine image and likeness, a familiar biblical teaching. If we examine the *psuche*, we see that it partakes of divine infinitude yet simultaneously is confined by reason of well, being human and all that involves. In the concrete, loving the finite side of *psuche* which reflects the infinite God seems more a challenge than you'd first imagine. Actually you can end up hating your *psuche* because of its strange mixture of two contradictory elements. To help us out here, why not throw in some notions represented by the *daimones*? As the excerpts from the **Dialogues** below clearly bear witness, not only are they bounded—and thus not finite—but are *eu-daimones*. In other words, the *daimones* "are happiest" (*eu-*) when they function within a circumscribed environment.

I conclude this document by repeating that some basic, unappreciated insights from our common classical tradition have become lost. Reconsideration of them can help us out of a dilemma as the one just delineated, reconciliation of the infinite with infinite. Again, consider that popular saying, "think inside the box." Instead of thinking outside it, remain inside the box or inside both the way you perceive yourself, your behavior and how you conceive of God. The box, of course, is our familiar, circumscribed world. The image is easy comprehend and can be dispensed with if you're uncomfortable. First be honest and realize that you are happiest (*eudaimonos*) when functioning within bounded surroundings. Such boundedness more or less parallels familiar habits which give meaning to how we comport ourselves throughout the day. We know from experience that if something intervenes and upsets our schedule, we lose our balance. However, this type of habitual behavior pales in comparison with the daimonic one I have been putting forth. To realize our *daimon* and to thus become *eudaimonos* is more than a habit. It is a conscious effort to realize something

both traditional and creative. Best of all, its realization takes place in familiar territory—our limited condition—or that “in between land” with heaven above and earth below. After all, that’s where the *daimones* live.

Daimon: English References in Plato’s Dialogues

Euthyphro

-I understand, Socrates. This is because you say that the divine sign (to daimonion) keeps coming to you. 3.b.5

Apology

-Socrates is guilty of corrupting the young and of not believing in the gods in whom the city believes, but in other new spiritual things (*hetera daimonia kaina*)? 24.c.1

-It would be a very happy state of affairs (*eudaimonia*) if only one person corrupted our youth, while the others improved them. 25.b.7

-Or is it obvious from your deposition that it is by teaching them not to believe in the gods in whom the city believes but in other new spiritual things (*hetera daimonia kaina*) ? 26.b.5

-Does any man believe in spiritual activities (*daimonia*) who does not believe in spirits (*daimonas*)? No one. 27.c.1

-But if I believe in spiritual things (*daimonia*) I must quite inevitably believe in spirits (*daimonia*). 27.c.6

-Do we not believe spirits (*daimonas*) to be either gods or the children of gods? 27.d.1

-If on the other hand the spirits (*daimones*) are children of the gods, bastard children of the gods by nymphs or some other mothers, what man would believe children of the gods to exist, but not gods? 27.d.7

-There is no way in which you could persuade anyone of even small intelligence that it is possible for one and the same man to believe in spiritual (*daimonia*) but not also in divine things, and then again for that same man to believe neither in spirits (*daimonas*) nor in gods nor in heros. 27.e.7

-I have a divine or spiritual (*daimonion*) sign which Meletus has ridiculed in his deposition. 31.d.1

-The Olympian victor makes you think yourself happy (*eudaimonas*); I make you happy. 36.d.9

-At all previous times my familiar prophetic power, my spiritual (*daimoniou*) manifestation, frequently opposed me, even in small manners, when I was about to do something wrong 40.a.4

-It would be an extraordinary happiness (*eudaimonias*) to talk with them, to keep company with them and examine them. 41.c.4

Crito

-Often in the past throughout my life, I have considered the way you live happy (*eudaimonisa*), and especially so now that you bear your present misfortune so easily and lightly. 43.b.7

Phaedo

-A soul in this state makes its way to the invisible, which is like itself, the divine and immortal and

wise, and arriving there it can be happy (eudaimoni). 81.a.6

-The happiest (eudaimonestatoi) of these, who will also have the best destination, are those who have practiced popular and social virtue, which they call moderation and justice and which was developed by habit and practice, without philosophy or understanding. 82.a.10

-As for their capacity of being in the best place they could possibly be put, this they do not look for, nor do they believe it to have any divine (daimonian) force, but they believe that they will some time discover a stronger and more immortal Atlas to hold everything together more. 99.c.2

-When each person dies, the guardian spirit (daimon) who was allotted to him in life proceeds to lead him to a certain place...after being judged, proceed to the underworld with the guide who has been appointed to lead them thither from here. 107.d.6

-The soul that is passionately attached to the body hovers around it and the visible world for a long time, struggling and suffering much until it is led away by force and with difficulty by its appointed spirit (daimonos). 108.b.3

-These (precious stones) stand out, being numerous and massive and occurring everywhere, so that the earth is a slight for the blessed (eudaimonon). 111.a.3

-They see the sun and moon and stars as they are, and in other ways their happiness (eudaimonian) is in accord with this. 111.c.3

-When the dead arrive at the place to which each has been led by his guardian spirit (daimon), they are first judge as to whether they led a good and pious life. 113.d.2

-I shall no longer be with you but will leave you to go and enjoy some good fortunes (eudaimonias) of the blessed. 115.d.4

Cratylus

-He must have been inspired, because it looks as though he has not only filled my ears with his superhuman (daimonias) wisdom but taken possession of my soul as well. 396.d.7

-(Socrates quotes Hesiod):

Since this race has been eclipsed by fate,
They are called sacred daemons (daimones);
They live on earth and are good,
Warding off evil and guarding mortal men. 398.a.1

-It is principally because daemons (daimones) are wise and knowing (daimones), I think, that Hesiod says they are named "daemons" (daimones). 398.b.6

-And I myself assert, indeed, that every good man, whether alive or dead, is daemonic (daimonion), and is correctly called a "daemon" (daimona). 398.c.2

Theaetetus

-In some cases the divine sign (daimonion) that visits me forbids me to associate with them; in others, it permits me, and then they begin again to make progress. 151.a.4

-For an inquiry into kingship and into human happiness (eudaimonias) in general—what these two things are, and what, for a human being, is the proper method by which the one can be obtained and the other avoided. 175.c.5

-Then you have the other, the man who is keen and smart at doing all these jobs, but does not know how to strike up a song in his turn like a free man, or how to tune the strings of common speech to the fitting praise of the life of gods and of the happy (eudaimonon) among men. 176.a.1

Sophist

-He's (king of Persia) also uneducated and ugly, in just the ways that anyone who is going to be really

happy (eudaimona) has to be completely clean and beautiful. 230.e.3

-And there are copies of each of these things, as opposed to the things themselves, that also come about by divine (daimonia) workmanship. 266.b.7

Statesman

-As for living things, divine spirits (daimones) had divided them between themselves, like herdsmen, by kind and by herd. 271.d.7

-The judgement is easy, that those who lived then were far, far more fortunate (eudaimonian) than those who live now. 272.c.5

-So all the gods who ruled over the regions together with the greatest divinity (daimoni) , seeing immediately what was happening, let go in their turn the parts of the cosmos that belonged to their charge. 272.e.7

-Since we had been deprived of the god (daimonos) who possessed and pastured. 274.b.6

-He would be prized and would govern a constitution that would alone be correct in the strict sense, steering it through in happiness (eudaimonos). 301.d.5

-I call divine, when it comes to be in souls, that opinion about what is fine, just and good, and the opposed of these, which is really true and is guaranteed; it belongs to the class of the more than (daimonio) human. 309.c.8

Philebus

-That each of us will be trying to prove some possession or state of the soul to be the one that can render life happy (eudaimona) for all human beings. 11.d.6

-If anyone among us should choose otherwise, then he would do so involuntarily, in opposition to what is by nature truly choice-worthy, from ignorance or some unfortunate (ouk eudaimonos) necessity. 22.b.8

-And he calls them (pleasures) supreme and considers as the happiest (eudaimonestaton) of all mortals whoever lives in continuous enjoyment of them, as much as possible. 47.b.7

Symposium

-I say Love is the most ancient of the gods, the most honored, and the most powerful in helping man gain virtue and blessedness (eudaimonias), whether they are alive or have passed away. 180.b.7

-Yet even so it is far greater when Love is directed, in temperance and justice, toward the good, whether in heaven or on earth: happiness (eudaimonian) and good fortune, the bonds of human society, concord with the gods above—all these are among his gifts. 188.d.8

-For he loves the human race more than any other god, he stands by us in our troubles, and he cures those ills we humans are most happy (eudaimonia) to have mended. 189.d.2

-If we treat the gods with due reverence, he will restore to us our original nature, and by healing us, he will make us blessed and happy (eudaimonas). 193.d.5

-I maintain, then, that while all the gods are happy (eudaimonon), Love—if I may say so without giving offense—is the happiest (eudaimonestaton) of them all, for he is the most beautiful and the best. 195.a.5

-Well, by calling anyone happy (eudaimonas), don't you mean they possess good and beautiful things? 202.c.10

-He's (Love) a great spirit (daimon), Socrates. Everything spiritual (daimonion), you see, is in between god and mortal. 202.d.13

-He who is wise in any of these ways is a man of the spirit (daimonios), but he who is wise in any

other way, in a profession or any manual work, is merely a mechanic. These spirits (daimones) are many and various, then, and one of them is Love. 203.a.5

-My dear Socrates, that, then, is the nature of the spirit (daimonos) called Love. 204.b.8

-“This time it’s easier to come up with the answer,” I said. “He’ll have happiness (eudaimon).” 204.e.7

-That’s what makes happy people (hoi eudamones) happy (eudaimones), isn’t it—possessing good things. 205.a.1

-Every desire for good things or for happiness (eudaimonein) is the “supreme and treacherous love” in everyone. 205.d.2

-Some people are pregnant in body, and for this reason turn more to women and pursue love in that way, providing themselves through childbirth with immortality and remembrance and happiness (eudaomonian), as they think, for all time to come, while others are pregnant in soul. 208.e.4

Phaedrus

-It’s a miracle (daimonios), my friend; I’m in ecstasy. 234.d.1

-The fact, my dear friend (daimonie), that my breast is full and I feel I can make a different speech, even better than Lysias’. 235.c.5

-There are other troubles in life, of course, but some divinity (daimon) has mixed most of them with a dash of immediate pleasure. 240.a.9

-My friend, just as I was about to cross the river, the familiar divine (daimonion) sign came to me which, whenever it occurs, holds me back from something I am about to do. 242.b.9

-Following him (Zeus) is an army of gods and spirits (daimonon) arranged in eleven sections. 246.e.6

-Inside heaven are many wonderful places from which to look and many aisles which the blessed (eudaimonon) gods take up and back, each seeing to his own work, while anyone who is able and wishes to do so follows along, since jealousy has no place in the gods’ chorus. 247.a.5

-But beauty was radiant to see at that time when the souls, along with the glorious (eudaimoni) chorus (we were with Zeus, while others followed other gods), saw that blessed and spectacular vision and were ushered into the mystery that we may rightly call the most blessed of all. 250.b.6

-We who celebrated it were wholly perfect and free of all the troubles that awaited us in time to come, and we gazed in rapture at sacred revealed objects that were perfect and simple and unshakeable and blissful (eudaimona). 250.c.3

-This, then, is any true lover’s heart’s desire: if he follows that desire in the manner I described, this friend who has been driven mad by love will secure a consummation for the one he has befriended that is as beautiful and blissful (eudaimonike) as I said—if, of course, he captures him. 253.c.4

-Their lives are bright and happy (eudaimonein) as they travel together, and thanks to their love they will grow wings together when the time comes. 256.d.8

-But now, my friend (daimonie), look closely. 268.a.5

-Such discourse makes the seed forever immortal and renders the man who has it as happy (eudaimonein) as any human being can be. 277.a.3

Alcibiades

-I was prevented by some divine being (daimonion), the effect of which you’ll hear about later on. 103.a.5

-So it’s not walls or warships or shipyards that cities need, Alcibiades, if they are to prosper (eudaimonesein), nor is it numbers or size, without virtue. 134.b.8

-Well then, my good Alcibiades, if you are to prosper (eudaimonein), it isn’t supreme power you need to get for yourself or the city but virtue. 135.b.4

-Archelaus...killed his lover in order to make himself a king and a happy (eudaimon) man. 141.d.9

(from Second Alcibiades which is numbered consecutively from Alcibiades).

Theages

-There's a certain spiritual thing (daimonion) which, by divine dispensation, has been with me from childhood. It's a voice that, when it comes, always signals me to turn away from what I'm about to do but never prescribes anything. 128.d.3

-And then the voice came to me and I said to him, "No! Don't get up! For my familiar spiritual (daimonion) sign has come to me." 129.b.8

-I've told you all these things because this spiritual thing (daimoniou) has absolute power in my dealings with those who associate with me. 129.e.2

-Those whose association with me the power of the spiritual thing (daimoniou) assists. 129.e.8

-Let's test this spiritual thing (daimoniou) by associating with one another. 131.a.2

Charmides

-Your father's family...has been praised for us by Anacreon, Solon, and many other poets for superior beauty, virtue and everything else called happiness (eudaimonia). 158.a.1

-And with error rooted out and rightness in control, men so circumstanced would necessarily fare admirably and well in all their doing and, faring well, they would be happy (eudaimonas) 172.a.3

-But whether acting scientifically would make us fare well and be happy (eudaimonoimen), this we have yet to learn, my dear Critias. 173.d.4

-We no longer keep to the statement that the man who lives scientifically is happy (eudaimona). 173.e.6

-But rather you seem to me to define the happy man (ton eudaimona) as one who lives scientifically concerning certain specific things. 173.e.10

-You wretch, all this time you've been leading me right round in a circle and concealing from me that it was not living scientifically that was making us fare well and be happy (eudaimonein), even if we possessed all the sciences put together, but that we have to have this one science of good and evil. 174.c.1

-If you do have it (the charm), my advice to you would rather be to regard me as a babbler, incapable of finding out anything whatsoever by means of argument, and you yourself as being exactly as happy (eudaimonesteron) as you are temperate. 176.a.5

Lysis

-Then they would like you to be as happy (eudaimonestaton) as possible, right? 207.d.7

-Well, do you think a man is happy (eudaimon) if he's a slave and is not permitted to do whatever he likes? 207.e.1

-Well, then, if your father and mother love you and want you to be happy (eudaimona), it's clear that they must be extremely concerned to make sure that you are happy (eudaimonoies). 207.e.4

-Then why in the world do they so strangely prevent you from being happy (eudaimona) and doing what you like? 208.e.4

-But just then, like some kind of divine intermediaries (daimones), the guardians of Menexenus and Lysis were on the scene. 223.a.2

Euthydemus

-But when I got up, my customary divine (daimonion) sign put in an appearance. 272.e.4

- And would the possession of good things make us happy (eudaimonoimen) if they were of no advantage to us, or if they were of some? 280.b.7
- If a man had money and all the good things we were mentioning just now but made no use of them, would he be happy (eudaimonoi) as a result of having these good things? 280.d.3
- So it seems that the man who means to be happy (eudaimona) must not only have such goods but must use them too, or else there is no advantage in having them. 280.d.6
- Then are these two things, the possession of good things and the use of them, enough to make a man happy (eudaimona), Clinias? 280.e.1
- Since we all wish to be happy (eudaimones), and since we appear to become so by using things and using them rightly, and since knowledge was the source of rightness and good fortune, it seems to be necessary that every man should prepare himself by every means to become as wise as possible. 282.a.2
- Since you believe both that it (wisdom) can be taught and that it is the only existing thing which makes a man happy (eudaimona) and fortunate, surely you would agree that it is necessary to love wisdom and you mean to do this yourself. 282.c.9
- If we were to learn the art of writing speeches, is this the art which we would have to get if we are going to be happy (eudaimonas)? 289.c.8
- The art of generalship seems to me, I said, to be the one which, more than any other, a man would be happy (eudaimon) if he acquired. 290.b.2
- My good (daimonie) Crito. 291.a.3
- The kingly art...to see whether it might be the one which both provided and created happiness (eudaimonian), just there we got into a sort of labyrinth. 291.b.6
- This art (statesmanship) had to make them wise and to provide them with a share of knowledge if it was to be the one that benefitted them and made them happy (eudaimonas) 292.c.1
- We are in just as great difficulties as ever, or even worse, when it comes to finding out what that knowledge is which will make us happy (eudaimonas). 292.e.5
- Among the Scythians the happiest (eudaimonestatous) of all if he had three talents of gold in his stomach, and a talent in his skull, and a stater of gold in each eye. 299.e.4

Protagoras

- Current events quite suffice to do that, and to prove that many people who behave unjustly are happy (eudaimones). 470.d.3
- Is happiness (eudaimonia) determined entirely by that (education and justice)? 470.e.8
- I say that the admirable and good person, man or woman, is happy (eudaimona), but that the one who's unjust and wicked is miserable. 470.e.10
- For the heart of the matter is that of recognizing or failing to recognize who is happy (eudaimon) and who is not. 472.c.9
- You believe that it's possible for a man who behaves unjustly and who is unjust to be happy, since you believe Archelaus to be both unjust and happy (eudaimona). 472.d.3
- But if a man who acts unjustly doesn't get his due, on your reasoning, he'll be happy (eudaimon)? 472.e.2
- And again, you think that those who do what's unjust are happy (eudaimonas), so long as they don't pay what is due. 473.b.3
- In the end he's (a tyrant) impaled or tarred. Will he be happier (eudaimonesteros) if he hadn't got caught, had set himself up as a tyrant, and lived out his life ruling in his city...a person envied and counted happy (eudaimonizomenos)? 473.c.7
- In that case neither of them will ever be the happier (eudaimonesteros) one, neither the one who

gains tyrannical power unjustly, nor the one who pays what is due. 473.d.7

-Now, would a man be happiest (eudaimonestatos), as far as his body goes, if he's under treatment, or if he weren't even sick to begin with? 478.c.3

-Because happiness (eudaimonia) evidently isn't a matter of getting rid of something bad; it's rather a matter of not even contracting it to begin with. 478.c.5

-The happiest man (eudaimonestatos), then, is the one who doesn't have any badness in his soul, now that this has been shown to be the most serious kind of badness. 478.d.7

- You considered Archelaus happy (eudaimonizon), a man who committed the gravest crimes without paying what was due, whereas I took the opposite view. 479.d.8

-Well, my marvelous friend (daimonie). 489.d.1

-How could a man prove to be happy (eudaimon) if he's enslaved to anyone at all? 491.e.6

-The thing you claim to pursue is like this: wantonness, lack of discipline, and freedom, if available in good supply, are excellence and happiness (eudaimonia) 492.c.6

-So then, those who have no need of anything are wrongly said to be happy (eudaimones)? Yes, for in that case stones and corpses would be happiest (eudaimonestatoi). 492.e.3

-Do I persuade you at all, and are you changing your mind to believe that those who are orderly are happier (eudaimonesterous) than those who are undisciplined? 493.d.1

-Are you saying that the life of the undisciplined man is happier (eudaimonesteron) than that of the orderly man? 494.a.3

-Yes, and also having all other appetites and being able to fill them and enjoy it, and so live happily (eudaimonos). 494.c.3

-Tell me now first whether a man who has an itch and scratches it and can scratch to his heart's content, scratch his whole life long, can also live happily (eudaimonos). 494.c.8

-Will you have the nerve to say that they are happy (eudaimonas) as long as they have what they need to their hearts' content? 494.e.6

-Or is it the man who claims that those who enjoy themselves, however they may be doing it, are happy (eudaimonas), and doesn't discriminate between good kinds of pleasures and bad? 495.a.1

-Now, does he acquire and get rid of good things and happiness (eudaimonian), and their opposites, bad things and misery, successively too? 496.b.5

-You're a happy (eudaimon) man, Callicles, in that you've been initiated into the greater mysteries before the lesser. 497.c.3

-That the good man does well and admirably whatever he does, and that the man who does well is blessed and happy (eudaimona), while the corrupt man, the one who does badly, is miserable. 507.c.4

-And if it is true, then a person who wants to be happy (eudaimona) must evidently pursue and practice self-control. 507.d.1

-He must pay his due and must be disciplined, if he's to be happy (eudaimon). 507.d.5

-No, my strange friend (daimonie). 517.b.2

-When a man who has lived a just and pious life comes to his end, he goes to the Isles of the Blessed, to make his abode in complete happiness (eudaimonia), beyond the reach of evils. 523.b.2

-So, listen to me and follow me to where I am, and when you've come here you'll be happy (eudaimoneseis) both during life and at its end. 527.c.5

Meno

-In a word, all that the soul undertakes and endures, if directed by wisdom, ends in happiness (eudaimonian), but if directed by ignorance, it ends in the opposite. 88.c.3

-My good sir. (daimonie) 92.c.1

Ion

-Are you mad (daimonioi)? What evil is this that's upon you? 539.a.1, a quote from the **Odyssey**.

Menexenus

-For that man's life is best arranged for whom all, or nearly all, the things that promote happiness (eudaimonia) depend on himself. 247.e.7

Clitophon

-I will say this, Socrates, that while you're worth the world to someone who hasn't yet been converted to the pursuit of virtue, to someone who's already been converted you rather get in the way of his attaining happiness (eudaimona) by reaching the goal of virtue. 410.e.8

Republic

-Those it (injustice) rules do what is to the advantage of the other and stronger, and they make the one they serve happy (eudaimona), but themselves not at all. 343.c.8

-When someone, in addition to appropriating their possessions, kidnaps and enslaves the citizens as well, instead of these shameful names he is called happy (eudaimones) and blessed. 344.b.7

-We must now examine, as we proposed before, whether just people also live better and are happier (eudaimonesteroi) than unjust ones. 352.d.3

-It profits no one to be wretched but to be happy (eudaimon). 354.a.6

-For when I don't know what justice is, I'll hardly know whether it is a kind of virtue or not, or whether a person who has it is happy (eudaimon) or not happy (ouk eudaimon). 354.c.3

-Whether in public or private, they willingly honor vicious people who have wealth and other types of power and declare them to be happy (eudaimonizein) 364.a.7

-Since, then, "opinion forcibly overcomes truth" and "controls happiness (eudaimonias)," as the wise men say, I must surely turn entirely to it. 365.c.2, attributed to Simonides

-Therefore the daemonic (daimonion) and the divine are in every way free from falsehood. 382.e.6

-They say that many unjust people are happy (eudaimones) and many just ones wretched, that injustice is profitable if it escapes detection. 392.b.2

-How would you defend yourself, Socrates, if someone told you that you aren't making these men very happy (eudaimonas) and that it's their own fault? 419.a.2

-We'll say that it wouldn't be surprising if these people were happiest (eudaimonestatoi) just as they are, but that, in establishing our city, we aren't aiming to make any one group outstandingly happy (eudaimon) but to make the whole city so, as far as possible. 420.b.5

-We take ourselves, then, to be fashioning the happy (eudaimona) city, not picking out a few happy people and putting them in it, but making the whole city happy. 420.c.2

-You mustn't force us to give our guardians the kind of happiness (eudaimonian) that would make them something other than guardians. 420.d.6

-If the guardians of our laws and city are merely believed to be guardians but are not, you surely see that they'll destroy the city utterly, just as they alone have the opportunity to govern it well and make it happy (eudaimone). 420.a.7

-We should consider whether in setting up our guardians we are aiming to give them the greatest happiness (eudaimonas), or whether—since our aim is to see that the city as a whole has the greatest happiness (eudaimonia)—we must compel and persuade the auxiliaries and guardians to follow our other policy and be the best possible craftsmen at their own work. 421.b.3

-To look inside it (the city) and see where the justice and the injustice might be in it, what the

difference between them is, and which of the two the person who is to be happy (eudaimona) should possess, whether its possession is unnoticed by all the gods and human beings or not. 427.d.6

-Look for yourselves, you evil wretches (kakodaimones), take your fill of the beautiful sight! 440.a.3

-Our concern at the time was to make our guardians true guardians and the city the happiest (eudaimonestaten) we could, rather than looking to any one group within it and molding it for happiness (eudaimon). 466.a.4

-But a silly, adolescent idea of happiness (eudaimon) seizes him and incites him to use his power to take everything in the city for himself. 466.b.5

-Sacred demons (daimones) living upon the earth, noble spirits, protectors against evil, guardians of articulate mortals. 469.a.1, **Works and Days** by Hesoid

-Then we'll inquire from the god (Apollo) what kind of distinguished funeral we should give to daemonic (daimonious) people, and we'll follow his instructions. 469.a.4

-And for the remainder of time, we'll care for their graves and worship at them as we would at those of demons (daimonon). 469.a.8

-Finally, my own case is hardly worth mentioning—my daemonic (daimonion) sign—because it has happened to on one before me or to only a very few. 496.c.4

-When their strength should graze freely in the pastures of philosophy and do nothing else—I mean the ones who are to live happily (eudaimonos) and, in death, add a fitting destiny in that other place to the life they have lived. 498.c.3

-The city will never find happiness (eudaimoneseie) until its outline is sketched by painters who use the divine model. 500.e.2

-Don't you think that he'd count himself happy (eudaimonizein) for the change and pity the others (in the cave)? 516.c.6

-Not those who are rich in gold but those who are rich in the wealth that the happy (eudaimona) must have, namely, a good and rational life. 521.a.3

-And we say that anything has that tendency if it compels the soul to turn itself around towards the region in which lies the happiest (eudaimonestaton) of the things that are, the one the soul must see at any cost. 526.e.3

-But that would be a superhuman (daimonion) task (to investigate which numbers are consonant and which are not). 531.c.5

-If the Pythia agrees, the city will publically establish memorials and sacrifices to him as a daemon (daimosin), but if not, then as a happy (eudaimosi) and divine human being. 540.c.2

-Our aim was to observe them all, agree which man is best and which worst, and then determine whether the best is happiest (eudaimonestatos) and the worst most wretched or whether it's otherwise. 544.a.7

-And so happy (eudaimon) is he that he must be the enemy of them all, whether he wants to be or not, and plot against them until he has purged them from the city. 567.c.1

-It's clear to everyone that there is no city more wretched than one ruled by a tyrant and none more happy (eudaimonestera) than one ruled by kings. 576.e.5

-The son of Ariston has given as his verdict that the best, the most just, and the most happy (eudaimonestaton) is the most kingly, who rules like a king over himself. 580.b.9

-Poetic imitation...establishes them (desires) as rulers in us when they ought to wither and be ruled, for that way we'll become better and happier (eudaimonesteroi) rather than worse and more wretched. 606.d.6

-After the soul had left him, it traveled together with many others until they came to a marvelous (daimonion) place. 614.c.1

-We must always know how to choose the mean in such lives and how to avoid either of the extremes, as far as possible, both in this life and in all those beyond it. This is the way that a human being becomes happiest (eudaimonestatos). 619.b.1

-Ignoring the warning of the Speaker, he blamed chance, daemons (daimonas), or guardian spirits, and everything else for these evils but himself. 619.c.5

-After all the souls had chosen their lives, they went forward to Lachesis in the same order in which they had made their choices, and she assigned to each the daemon (daimona) it had chosen as guardian of its life and fulfiller of its choice. 620.d.8

Timaeus

-I was quite amazed as I realized how by some supernatural (daimonios) chance your ideas are on the mark. 25.e.4

-For its knowledge of and friendship with itself is enough. All this, then, explains why this world which he begat for himself is a blessed (eudaimona) god. 34.b.8

-As for the other spiritual beings (daimones), it is beyond our task to know and speak of how they came to be. 40.d.6

-If a person lived a good life (by mastering emotions), he would at the end return to his dwelling place in his companion star, to live a life of happiness (eudaimona) that agreed with his character. 42.b.4

-Two forms of cause, the divine and the necessary. First, the divine, for which we must search in all things if we are to gain a life of happiness (eudaimonos) to the extent that our nature allows, and second, the necessary, for which we must search for the sake of the divine. 69.a.1

-We ought to think of the most sovereign part of our soul as god's gift to us, given to be our guiding spirit (daimona). 90.a.3

-Constantly caring for his divine part as he does, keeping well-ordered the guiding spirit (daimona) that lives within him, he must indeed be supremely happy (eudaimona). 90.c.5

Critias

-But to those who were blind to the true way of life oriented to happiness (eudaimonian) it was at this time that they gave the semblance of being supremely beautiful and blessed. 121.b.5

Laws

-Pleasure and pain, you see, flow like two springs released by nature. If a man draws the right amount from the right one at the right time, he lives a happy life (eudaimonei). 636.e.1

-However, if he declared that the life of supreme justice was the most blessed, I imagine that everybody who heard him would want to know what splendid (eudaimonestaton) benefit, superior to pleasure, was to be found in this kind of life. 662.e.9

-Everyone who sets eyes on something big and strong and powerful immediately gets the feeling that if the owner knew how to take advantage of its size and scale he would get tremendous results and be a happy man (eudaimonoi). 686.e.8

-If a state is going to survive to enjoy all the happiness (eudaimonesein) that mankind can achieve, it is vitally necessary for it to distribute honors and marks of disgrace on a proper basis. 697.b.1

-This is the innate quality of our dictator must have, in addition to the others, if the state is going to get, as quickly and efficiently as possible, a political system that will enable it to live a life of supreme happiness (eudaimonestata). 710.b.7

-He appointed kings and rulers for our states; they were not men, but beings of a superior and more divine order—spirits (daimonas). 713.d.2

-The man who means to live in happiness (eudaimonesein) latches on to her (a god holding the beginning and end of all things) and follows her with meekness and humility. 716.a.3

-It is the conduct that fits his character as nothing else can, and it is his most effective way of

achieving a happy (eudaimona) life. 716.d.8

-And that power is possessed preeminently by the guardian spirit (daimon) or god. 730.a.1

-Let anyone who intends to be happy (eudaimon) and blessed be its partner (truth) from the start, so that he may live as much of his life as possible a man of truth. 730.c.3

-When one's guardian angel (daimonos) brings continued prosperity and when in times of trouble our guardians face difficulties as insurmountable as a high, sheer cliff. 732.c.5

-And the gods and spirits (daimonas) already established in the locality must be treated with the same respect. 740.b.1

-It's pretty well inevitable that happiness (eudaimonas) and virtue should come hand in hand. 742.e.5

-I'll never concede to them that the rich man can become really happy (eudaimona) without being virtuous as well. 743.a.2

-The whole point of our legislation was to allow the citizens to live supremely happy (eudaimonestatoi) lives with the greatest possible mutual friendship. 743.c.6

-But best of all will be the places where the breeze of heaven blows, where spirits (daimonon) hold possession of the land and greet with favor (or disfavor) the various people who come and settle there. 747.e.4

-After the gods we may similarly give the spirits (daimonas) and heroes their meed of praise and pray to each of them as appropriate. 801.e.3

-Some things Telemachus, your native wit will tell you,
And Heaven will prompt the rest. The very gods (daimon), I'm sure,
Have smiled upon your birth and helped to bring you up. 804.a.2, **Odyssey**

-The same state and the same citizens...should enjoy the same pleasures in the same fashion: that is the secret of a happy and blessed (eudaimonos) life. 816.d.2

-The necessities of what at least some practical and theoretical knowledge will always be essential for every god, spirit (daimon) or hero who means to take charge of human beings in a responsible fashion. 818.c.1

-The first requirement for a happy (eudaimonos) life is to do yourself no injury nor allow any to be done to you by others. 829.a.1

-The conquest of pleasure. If they win this battle, they'll have a happy (eudaimonos) life. 840.c.6

-In each village the settlers should first select a site for a market place with its temples for gods and their retinue of spirits (daimonon). 848.d.2

-We shall find that the man who means to be happy (eudaimona) should not seek simply to be wealthy, but to be wealthy in a way consistent with justice and self-control. 870.b.7

-But we should have due respect for the luck that has saved him from total ruin, and for his guardian angel (daimona) too who, who in pity for the attacker and the wounded man has stopped the injury of the latter from proving fatal...We should duly thank his guardian spirit (daimoni) and not obstruct its wishes. 877.a.3

-Age is always very much more highly regarded than youth, and this is so both among the gods and among men, if they intend to live in security and happiness (eudaimonein). 879.c.2

-You perverse fellow, one such part—a mere speck that nevertheless constantly contributes to the good of the whole—is you, you who have forgotten that nothing is created except to provide the entire universe with a life of prosperity (eudaimon). 903.c.4

-However, gods and spirits (daimones) are fighting on our side, the gods and spirits (daimonon) whose chattels we are. 906.a.7

-If a man leaves some piece of his own property somewhere...anyone who finds it should let it be, on the assumption that such things are under the protection of the goddess (daimona) of the wayside, to whom they are consecrated by law. 914.b.5

-Celebrating (eudaimonizontas, re. the dead priest) his glory in song throughout the day. 947.c.1

Epinomis

- The human race is, as a rule, neither blessed nor happy (eudaimon). 973.c.3
- Uranus...the god whom above all other it is most just to pray to and to honor, as all the other divinities (daimones) and gods do. 977.a.5
- Anyone lacking wisdom which is the greatest part of all virtue, can never become completely good or, in consequence, happy (eudaimon). 977.d.4
- Movement that is irrational...is wholly lacking in number, as is everything that shares in any evil. This is how anyone who is going to die happy (eudaimona) must think. 978.b.2
- All the living beings who could begin to comprehend number in relation to number, with the blessing (eudaimoni) of Good Fortune. 979.a.5
- The kinds of living things in the heavens—which is what we should claim the divine stars to be—have come to be, endowed with the finest body and the best and happiest (eudaimonestates) soul. 981.e.5
- As to the first gods, those that are visible, greatest, most honored, and most shapely seeing everywhere, we must declare that these are the stars together with all the celestial phenomena we perceive. After them and next in order beneath them are daimons (daimonas). 984.e.1
- Anyone who is happy (eudaimon) began by being struck with awe at this cosmos, and then conceived a passion for learning all that a mortal can. 986.c.5
- The blessed (eudaimoni) choir of the Muses and has bestowed upon us the use of concord and symmetry to promote play in the form of rhythm and harmony. 991.b.4
- For without them (diagram, complex system of numbers, harmony and revolution of stars) no one in cities will ever become happy (eudaimon). 992.a.4
- Having become one from many, he will be happy (eudaimona), most wise and blessed. 992.b.7
- That with but a few exceptions, humans are incapable of becoming perfectly blessed and happy (eudaimosi). 992.c.5
- Only those who are by nature godlike and moderate, who also possess the rest of virtue, and have understood all the subjects connected with the blessed science (i.e., astronomy) have obtained and possess all the gifts of the divinity (daimoniou) in adequate measure. 992.d.2
- None of us can avoid death, nor if any man could would he be happy (eudaimon), as people think. 334.e.4
- All mankind would have been convinced of the truth that no city nor individual can be happy (eudaimon) except by living in company with wisdom under the guidance of justice either from personal achievement of these virtues or from right training and education received under God-fearing rulers. 335.d.4
- But now some daemon (daimon) or avenging deity has fallen upon us. 336.b.4
- Let those who are aiming at tyrannical power shun and flee from what senseless and insatiate men call happiness (eudaimonisma). 354.c.4
- The sacred tradition that ranks them in this order (soul, body, wealth) might rightly be made a positive law among you, since it makes truly happy (eudaimonas) those who live by it; whereas the doctrine that the rich are the happy ones (eudaimonas) is a foolish saying of women and children. 355.c.2

Eryxias

- Can you tell me, Socrates, Eryxias, and Erasistratus, what the most valuable possession (eudaimonia) for person is? 393.e.5
- As it is, then, the same men are apparently the wisest, the most successful (eudaimonestatoi), the most prosperous, and the wealthiest, since it turns out that wisdom is the most valuable possession. 394.a.5

Axiochus

-No those who were inspired by a good daemon (daimon) during their lifetimes go to reside in a place for the pious. 371.c.6

-So whether above or below, Axiochus, you ought to be happy (eudaimonein), if you have lived piously. 372.a.7