(Additional observation on the passage of Book V immediately following the introduction of the philosopher-ruler proposition.)

Who are the philosophers?
Those who love the whole of knowledge.
What about the lovers of sights and lovers of sounds? (Philotheamons and philekers in Greek.)
They are just lovers of opinion (philodoxers), not lovers of knowledge (philosophers).
Proof:
Knowledge is of what is (or “being”). (Eleatic premise: you cannot know what in any way is not.)
Therefore, cognition of what is not (non-being) is ignorance.
What is it that is of that which is intermediate between what is and what is not?
Methodological discussion of the distinction of powers:
Powers are the things by means of which we can do things.
Powers are imperceptible, and therefore can be distinguished only by the things they are over.
There is no power darker than ignorance or brighter than knowledge.
While knowledge is infallible (because it is of being), opinion is what we call a cognitive state that is fallible.
Those who do not recognize the distinction between beautiful things and the beautiful itself are wrong, and therefore must be opining, not knowing (and likewise with the other forms). They cognize beautiful things, but not the beautiful itself.
Beautiful things are always also not-beautiful (for example), and therefore they are intermediate between being and not-being (later in the dialogue this is called “becoming.”)
Therefore the cognition of beautiful things is opinion, and those who love it are lovers of opinion. (If they love beautiful things, that is because they have not understood the distinction of these things from the beautiful itself.)

This entire argument is reminiscent of Diotima’s argument in the SYMPOSIUM.

BOOK 7

The parts of the Cave correspond to the parts of the Line (a number of misguided scholars have denied this).

Point of Cave: teaching is not filling the soul, but rather turning it towards the light (the Good).

[A physics professor of mine used the Cave to illustrate the special theory of relativity (the world of three dimensions is just a projection (image) of Minkowski four-space).]
What must the incipient philosopher study in order to have his soul turned towards the Good?

Math.

Experiences that lead the mind beyond their sensory objects: experiences of sensory contraries. Both contraries coincide in the same sensible, yet they are clearly not the same contrary—hence the mind must focus on them in themselves, beyond their existence in the sensory object.

Numbers themselves also contain the same duality—a unit is also an indefinite plurality. (Here he must be talking of sensible units.)

Hence the incipient philosopher must study numbers.

Also, geometry, stereometry (solid geometry), and mathematical astronomy (but not empirical astronomy or empirical harmony).

Beyond math, dialectic. (“But here, Glaucos, you cannot follow further.”)

Dialectic is the art of setting forth necessary and sufficient conditions for something being what it is.

THE BAD CITIES

Timocratic or timarchic (ideal: military honor—the value of the auxiliaries)

Oligarchic (ideal: wealth—possessing objects of necessary appetites)

Democratic (ideal: freedom—possessing objects of all natural appetites)

Tyrannical (ideal: possessing objects of unnatural appetites)

The philosopher-ruler is 729 (3 to the sixth power) steps ahead of the tyrant in happiness:

His soul is ordered, rather than disordered.

His soul is sustained by the real, not the apparent.

He prefers what is most preferable as judged by the best judges. (This argument was borrowed and used prominently by Mill in “Utilitarianism”.)

And likewise is the philosopher in the city of his own soul happier than the tyrannical soul.

BOOK 10
Digression on poetry and especially tragedy—were we right to ban it?

Cognitively, it focusses on images of images, rather than beings, and therefore is inferior to philosophy.

Emotively, it trains us to be dominated by desires and emotions.

But we are willing to entertain an able defender.

(Aristotle in POETICS. Since Aristotle rejects the Forms, he doesn’t buy the first criticism—and the emotive impact of tragedy is purgative and good.)

Back to main thread.

Thus justice is in its own right preferable to injustice, and not just as a means to other goods.

And this is also true not only in this life, but in the life after death, for all time.

The soul is immortal, since its own proper evil (vice) cannot destroy it.

The soul must be imbued with knowledge and virtue at its very core in order to fare well in the afterlife—especially to endure, if need be, its transition to its next incarnation in good health—the Myth of Er.