The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Incorporation of Several Dialogues in *Plato's Republic*

G. B. Hussey

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 02 / March 1896, pp 81 - 85
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00203272, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00203272

How to cite this article:

G. B. Hussey (1896). The Incorporation of Several Dialogues in *Plato's Republic*. The Classical Review, 10, pp 81-85 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00203272

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

MARCH 1896.

THE INCORPORATION OF SEVERAL DIALOGUES IN PLATO'S *REPUBLIC*.

IN Plato's introduction to the *Timaeus* (20 B-D) two of the speakers, Critias and Hermocrates, hold out to Socrates a promise that they will be leaders in new and later dialogues. Their opportunity to fulfil these engagements is to arise as soon as *Timaeus* has finished his discourse.

Yet, after promise of these two dialogues, Plato disappoints us in the case of each. There are no remains whatever of the *Hermocrates*. Of the *Critias* only the preface has been preserved, but no part of its main theme. This preface, judged from the style in which it is written, evidently belongs to the same period as the *Timaeus*, *Politicus*, and *Laws*: that is to say, among Plato's latest dialogues. Plutarch (*Solon*, 32) compares the story of Atlantis which it contains to the Olympieion at Athens that had then waited so many centuries for its completion. In the same exalted strain he says that Plato πρόθυρα μὲν μεγάλα καὶ περιβόλους καὶ αὐτὰς τῇ ἀρχῇ περιέθηκεν, οἷα λόγος οὐδεὶς ἄλλος ἔσχεν οὐδὲ μῦθος οὐδὲ ποίησις, ὧς δὲ ἀρξάμενος προκατέλυσε τοῦ ἔργου τὸν βίον.

Consequently it has been held by all scholars that these two missing dialogues were never written. For, had they been written, they would have been preserved. In our editions of Plato we have all his own dialogues and much more besides: nothing genuine has been lost, not even the fragment that was to introduce the *Critias*—such was the care taken by the members of the Academy to preserve the works of the founder.

NO. LXXXV. VOL. X.

Yet there is another hypothesis possible. These two dialogues may have been written, and we may now possess them in some form that we are not aware of. It is the purpose of this paper to show the greater probability of this second view, and the argument will be based on the polishings, readjustments, and combinations to which the Platonic dialogues seem to have been subjected during the long life of their author.

Historians, as we know, have often left their work incomplete. But with them the kind is different, and in many cases may not demand a definite ending. With philosophers, it is less the method of treatment and more the matter that seeks expression. The thing to be feared, if the latter reach an advanced age, is that they will write themselves out, like poets, rather than that they will carry any grand thoughts down with them to the grave. During the fifty or sixty years of Plato's literary career, there would seem to have been ample time to set down all his important thoughts, and even for repeating some of them under five or six different forms; as he has in fact done in not a few cases. As German students of Plato seem generally agreed, his last works were *fortgesponnen* out of those of his prime. Hence it seems probable that when Plato promises to give us new dialogues, he will not let them remain unwritten if they are of any value to the world. Even at the moment of promising them they have doubtless lain long in his mind, if they have not been already written out. Preface is usually written last, although placed first.

Consequently the *Critias* and *Hermocrates* were probably written before the preface of the *Timaeus*, in which they appear to be foretold.

Platonic students usually incline either to the theory of K. F. Hermann, that the dialogues show the evolution of Plato's thought, or to that of Schleiermacher which holds that they are *voussoirs*, each necessary to sustain the system. The truth, however, is probably to be found somewhere between these two extremes.

Hermann was right for the youth of Plato. The dialogues were at first written rapidly and as occasion prompted in order to bring their author into notice. At a later period his aim was rather to protect a reputation already formed by combining, co-ordinating, supplementing the thoughts to which he had previously given utterance, so as to bring them into a logical whole. Thus Schleiermacher was right in regard to Plato's later career. The philosopher's latter years were devoted to perfecting the system.

One of the methods he employed was to gather the various dialogues into groups. This was partly to prevent their being lost or scattered and partly to show in what order they were to be read; in short, to make large, united, and imposing, what had been small and separate. Like the drama of the fifth century, the dialogues were to be arranged in tetralogies or trilogies. For it was long ago recognized by Welcker that these divisions were not classifications of the Platonic dialogues originally made by Aristophanes of Byzantium and developed by Thrasyllus, but were merely extensions of a hint derived by them from Plato himself (Grote, *Plato* i. chap. vii.; Christ, *Gr. Lit.* 2nd ed. p. 373).

Thus there is a trilogy intended by Plato in the *Theaetetus*, *Sophist*, *Statesman*; and, from remarks made at *Sophist* 217 A and *Statesman* 257 A, a dialogue called the 'Philosopher' was to be added to them so as to form a tetralogy. The trial and death of Socrates is an incident that links together a second group of four dialogues. Then there is a third group containing the *Republic*, and this probably completes the list of such combinations as were intended by Plato himself. In the first group the dialogues are all in direct narrative, and in the third the narrative is in the indirect form. The second group employs both forms, and is, otherwise, less perfect than the first and third. In both of these last the marks that connect the dialogues are found only in the second and third of the series; and the

second and third of the series are written in a much later style than the first. Both of these groups were also planned as tetralogies, but exist actually as trilogies. In the third and last group or tetralogy the *Republic* was to stand first. Then were to follow the *Timaeus*, *Critias*, and *Hermocrates*. This plan or order of the dialogues is explained in the introduction to the *Timaeus*. Consequently, according to the argument used above, this introduction was probably the last part of the whole group to be committed to writing. The *Republic* was the first. The other two dialogues, if they were written at all, were written in the period between the *Republic* and the preface of the *Timaeus*.

The first dialogue in this series, the *Republic*, was the most well known, most criticized, most laughed at among all Plato's works. Contemporary references to it seem to show that it originally consisted of the first four books of what is now the *Republic*. But after the publication of these Plato went on building new defences and throwing up new ramparts before the position he had taken in these four. The fun made of the *Republic* by Theopompus in his *Stratitides*, and possibly the attacks of other comedians, endeared its four books beyond measure to their author. He reiterated part of them immediately in a fifth book. And the point there insisted upon returns again to our ears in the *Timaeus* and, as a still fainter echo, in the *Critias* (110 B). Five books, then, seem to have formed the original *Republic*, or *Πολιτεία* as it is called in the introduction of the *Timaeus*.

In this introduction we have a very careful analysis of these five books. It even goes so far as to borrow metaphors and similes from the *Republic*. Thus it calls the discussion a feast, in imitation of Book i., and compares the guardians to mercenaries, as in Book iv. Finally, toward the close of this introduction, Socrates asks: 'Have we now said enough for a brief summary of yesterday's discourse or do we feel that anything is lacking in our account?' *Timaeus* immediately replies: 'Not at all, you have described exactly what was said, Socrates.' And yet Socrates has gone no further than the fifth book, or half-way through the *Republic* as we have it in its present form.

Now we are told by ancient tradition that Plato edited two books of the *Republic* first, and that he was filing and retouching this dialogue on his very death-bed. Moreover, since the time of Hermann, when the form

and composition of the *Republic* was first seriously considered, various critics have argued that its parts were composed at different periods. Differences in both style and subject-matter seem to favour such a conclusion. These critics agree that the last five books fall mainly into two parts, vi.-vii. and viii.-ix.; with Book x. standing somewhat by itself. Hermann, *Gesch. und System*, pp. 537-541, makes four or five separate 'masses' of our *Republic*. His fivefold division was i., ii.-iv., viii.-ix., v.-vii., x. Siebeck, *Jahns Jahrb.* 1885, p. 225, adopts Hermann's fourfold division, i., ii.-iv., v.-ix., x., without change. Krohn, *Pl. Staat*, p. 261, gives the order i.-iv., viii.-ix., v., x., vi.-vii.; Pfeiderer, *Pl. Frage* (1888), p. 10, the order i.-v. + viii.-ix., x., vi.-vii.; and Chioppelli, *Ecclesiastuse*, pp. 110 ff., the order i.-iv., v., viii.-ix., vi.-vii.

In consequence of both the external tradition and the internal evidence of revision in the *Republic*, and of there being two chief divisions in that part of it which follows the fifth book, it seems probable, in the first place, that these parts were not there when the introduction of the *Timaeus* was written, and furthermore that they represent what Plato had once intended to call the '*Critias*' and '*Hermocrates*.'

Accordingly, these last two once existed as independent dialogues. At the time when Plato began grouping his works into tetralogies he tried to combine these two dialogues with the *Timaeus* and the first five books of the *Republic*. For this purpose he wrote the introduction to the *Timaeus* and to the *Critias*. The latter resulted merely in an expansion of a story in the *Timaeus*. Thus there was evidently some difficulty in finding new material. Whether for this, or for some other reason, the projected tetralogy failed and the substance of the *Critias* and *Hermocrates* was joined immediately to the five books of the original *Republic*. This proceeding, although creating the most majestic work in the history of philosophy, required a vast amount of harmonizing and readjusting of parts. It occupied Plato until his last moments and, in consequence, the introduction to the *Timaeus* and that to the *Critias* were allowed to stand as they remain to-day either from oversight or from a haughty disregard of broken promises.

In this way the *Republic* has come to be thrice the size of the ordinary Platonic dialogue. In making his work so large and comprehensive, Plato has forgotten the limits which the nature of man puts to continuous conversation. While the other

Platonic dialogues would take from two to four hours for their oral delivery, the *Republic* is found to require twelve. It is quite unreasonable to suppose a company of eight or ten persons enduring a discussion of this length without a break. Although less than one third of the size of the *Republic*, the *Timaeus* is called by its author 'a long journey.'

Like the *Republic* in length are the *Laws*. They too are nothing but a synthesis of various dialogues and treatises put together, as tradition tells us, after Plato's death by Philip of Opus. The *Laws* have, however, been studied from this point of view by only a very few critics. Among these Zeller and Bruns stand easily first. The former finds that the end of i. and the end of ii. stand with vii. rather than in their present situations. The first four books of the *Laws*, which Plato calls the 'prelude,' would form a good-sized dialogue by themselves. Yet even they contain very discordant elements. The construction of the *Laws* was checked in the process of combining the materials, rather than at a time when these were themselves unready. At the same time, it is more difficult to tell just what these component parts are, because they all seem to belong to about the same period.

Books viii.-ix. of the *Republic* describe Plato's theory of the evolution of government. It may have been urged by opponents that no historical facts bore out his theory. For in fact there were none. In order to help the matter, Plato in the *Laws* appeals to certain antediluvian and mythical conditions to sustain his point. The same effort was evidently to be made in the *Critias* by means of the myth of Atlantis and certain traditions of ancient Athens. The difficulty of thus weaving together the mythical and the theoretic, and making a strong case out of them, perhaps accounts partly for the incompleteness of the *Critias*.

The name *Critias* was eminently suitable for a dialogue such as is contained in Books viii. and ix. The historical *Critias*, like the author of these books, had the most bitter hatred of democracy. He had led in revolutions and in plots to overthrow the Athenian state. Besides this he was the author of a work on constitutions, and some verses of a poem (composed by him) on this subject still remain. He would therefore be a person well suited to conduct a dialogue on the state. He was well adapted to describe it, as it lapsed from the perfect government of a mythical Athens to the hateful democracy that in the end destroyed him.

Books vi. and vii. of the *Republic* treat of the philosopher-king. Now in the group *Theaetetus*, *Sophist*, *Statesman*, the concluding member of the tetralogy was to be the dialogue *Philosopher*. Even as far back as 1846 Ludwig Spengel conjectured that this was nothing less than what now stands in the *Republic* as vi. and vii. We have now added to this the further conjecture that this dialogue was the *Hermocrates* during an intermediate period: Plato tried to make with it the tail-piece first of one tetralogy—calling it the *Philosopher*—and then of another—now calling it the *Hermocrates*; finally he allowed it to be absorbed into the *Republic*.

Why Hermocrates was chosen as a leader, is not so evident. Possibly it was through a desire for symmetry. For thus two parts of the tetralogy would be conducted by men from the West, two by Athenians. We are told by the scholiast that Hermocrates combined statesmanship and philosophy. If this statement has any foundation, he would be the right man to hold discourse on the philosopher-king, as contemplated in the *Sophist* and realized, in a manner, in Books vi. and vii. of the *Republic*.

It will, doubtless, seem very arbitrary thus to shift about a dialogue, change its name and its speakers, and transfer it from a tetralogy of dialogues composed in the direct form of narrative to another group in the indirect. An examination, however, of Plato's method of composing a dialogue will show that the changes here mentioned are external. The thought and the essential form of expressing it could easily remain the same during all such alterations.

The Platonic dialogues were, generally speaking, an imitation of the Greek drama; but were not, like it, intended primarily for acting. As almost all the glory of letters during the fifth century at Athens was centred in the drama, Plato allowed his philosophy to take as far as possible that form. The chief difference was that he wrote to be read and in prose: the dramatic authors wrote in verse and for acting.

A large part of Plato's works are thus in direct dialogue with the abbreviated name of the speaker placed just before his own words. In the *Theaetetus* (143 B, C) this question of the direct and indirect form is discussed, and there, in the note-book of Euclides, the preference is given to the direct form. This was, however, merely for the sake of brevity, and in spite of the fact that the story was told to him by Socrates in the indirect form. Teichmüller, *Lit.*

Fehden ii. pp. 13 and 309, and Schöne, *Plat. Protag.* (1862), p. 8, in arguing the question of the chronology of the dialogues, make use of this very passage. Yet, curiously enough, as Zeller notices, they arrive at opposite conclusions. Teichmüller regards the direct dialogue as the cruder in form, the later in date. Schöne regards the direct dialogue as the more finished artistically, the earlier chronologically.

The truth probably lies just between them. The indirect form is more perfect in finish. For those that are set in it are Plato's most polished works. The *Phaedo*, *Euthydemus*, *Protagoras*, *Charmides* and *Symposium*, not to speak of the *Republic*, make up a list in which there are at least four that from a literary point of view are each superior to any other dialogue of Plato. The dialogues of Xenophon are also in the indirect form; and he is above all a writer strong on the artistic side.

Secondly, the indirect dialogues, as far as form is concerned, are a later development with Plato than the direct ones. In the early period he wrote intending to have his dialogue circulated in manuscript among a reading public. In the same way Landor's *Imaginary Conversations* are written for circulation. When his popularity had increased, there must have arisen in Plato's mind a desire that his best dialogues should be in such form that they could be read aloud and reach the public through its ears. Isocrates, his rival, was winning great favour by having his orations read in this way. Thus Plato turned away slightly from imitating the drama, and put his dialogues into a form more akin to oratory or to prose narrative. He consequently struck out the abbreviated names of speakers, which made reading aloud comparatively difficult, and inserted the phrases 'said I,' 'said he' and similar expressions in their place. He did not do this, however, quite thoroughly. Small pieces of direct dialogue were still kept at the beginnings and ends of some of the indirect dialogues, as a sort of reminder of the earlier form. Besides the direct and indirect dialogue Plato finally tried a third form. This was the continuous treatise, uninterrupted by question and answer. This is found in the *Timaeus* and in some of the books of the *Laws*. And, like the indirect dialogue, it is suited for reading aloud before an audience.

Plato thus wrote a large number of his dialogues in the direct form and continued to do so probably to the end of his life. But meantime a change of relation toward

his audience caused him to prefer the indirect form, and he recast some of his more popular works in this new mould. Thus in form they belong to a late period, while in content they may fit into various earlier stages of his literary career. Probably at about the same time with this change to the narrative form came also the desire for grouping the dialogues. A group naturally should have but one form for all its members. Consequently, in the group of the *Theaetetus*, *Sophist*, *Statesman*, and *Philosopher*, the *Philosopher* would evidently have been a direct dialogue. But if, as supposed above, it was afterward fused into our present *Republic* it was then made indirect in form.

In brief, the result of this argument is, that a Platonic dialogue, irrespective of the date of the original composition, finally had one of three forms:—

- (a) direct dialogue—used at all periods ;
- (β) indirect dialogue—made by recasting the direct dialogue ; and
- (γ) continuous discourse—represented by the *Timaeus* and parts of the *Laws*.

In his desire to unite his dialogues into larger groups, Plato promised a tetralogy, (a) *Theaetetus*, *Sophist*, *Statesman*, *Philosopher*. Later he took away the *Philosopher*, and with the intention of calling it Hermocrates, projected a tetralogy (b), *Republic* (i.-v.), *Timaeus*, *Critias*, *Hermocrates*. After dropping the names of the last two and fusing them with the first the result was (c), the *Republic* (i.-x.) and the *Timaeus*, as we have them at the present day.

G. B. HUSSEY.

University of Chicago.

THE CALENDAR IN THE *TRACHINIAE* OF SOPHOCLES.

IN submitting some observations upon the chronological framework of the story adopted by Sophocles in the *Trachiniae*, I desire to guard at once against a misunderstanding which is obvious and possibly prejudicial. In the present state of mythological controversy it may be difficult to advance the proposition that a certain Heracleian legend is closely connected with a certain development of the Calendar, without being suspected of a desire to fortify the theory which makes the hero himself a symbol and representative of the sun. Be it said therefore emphatically, that with this theory, or with any Heracles other than the human combatant familiar to Greek legend as we actually know it, we have for the present not the smallest concern. Our proposition is simply that, in respect of the chronological framework, the story presented in the *Trachiniae* exhibits and is founded upon a certain calendar, and certain institutions relating to the calendar, which existed when the story was first thrown into this shape ; and that this fact, interesting in itself as a piece of historical evidence, is not without significance even for the reader of Sophocles, as accounting for some peculiarities of structure and expression, which were naturally accepted by the poet from his traditional authority, but would not be justifiable if we supposed them invented by him for the purpose of his play.

Manifestly all this may be true, whether the hero was or was not by remote origin symbolic of the sun, or symbolic at all. That has nothing to do with the matter.

The story of the *Trachiniae*, as compared with other legends of the Attic stage, presents a chronology uncommonly copious and precise. The event of the play is the death of the hero, agreeing in date with the terms of an oracle, received by himself at Dodona, which, with oracular ambiguity, fixed 'the end of his labours' at the completion of the twelfth year from the date of the prophecy. His wanderings occupied, with the exception of visits to his home 'rare as those of the husbandman at seed-time and harvest to a distant farm', the whole of his time, and from the last of these absences he returns only to die. At his last departure he solemnly delivered to his wife the tablet containing the oracle, explaining to her that there wanted then 'a year and three months' to the date fixed, so that if by that time he were not heard of, she must presume his death, for which case he made disposition. At the opening of the play the prescribed period has elapsed, that is to say, 'fifteen months' according to the wife, though another speaker marks the duration as 'twelve months' (*Trach.* 44 foll., 155 foll., 647 foll., 821 foll., 1164 foll.).

Now, as compared with the habits of ancient