

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](#)



Lutoslawski on the Genuineness and Order of the Platonic Dialogues *Ueber die Echtheit, Reihenfolge und logische. Theorien von Plato's drei ersten Tetralogien*, W. von Lutoslawski. Pp. 48. W. Lutoslawski. O trzech pierwszych tetralogiach Platona. (Sur les trois premières títalogies de Platon.) Pp.10.

Lewis Campbell

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 01 / February 1896, pp 40 - 42

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00203065, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00203065

How to cite this article:

Lewis Campbell (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 40-42 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00203065

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

LUTOSLAWSKI ON THE GENUINENESS AND ORDER OF THE PLATONIC DIALOGUES.

Ueber die Echtheit, Reihenfolge und logische Theorien von Plato's drei ersten Tetralogien, von W. LUTOSLAWSKI. Pp. 48. W. LUTOSLAWSKI. O trzech pierwszych tetralogiach Platona. (Sur les trois premières tétralogies de Platon.) Pp. 10.

THE former of these two articles, in German, appeared in the *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* last October; the latter, in French, was published at Cracow, in the *Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de Cracovie*, in November.

In both the writer aims at making known to European scholars the main drift of a work which he has produced in the Polish language, and hopes soon to bring out in German; *On the Logical Element in the Philosophy of Plato*,—a contribution, in short, to the history of Logic.

As, in dealing with the Platonic dialogues, M. Lutoslawski starts from the Thrasyllean Canon, which he is very far from believing to be authentic,—and as English students, in spite of Mr. Grote, are unaccustomed to this mode of treatment, it may be of some service to readers of the *Classical Review* that I should indicate briefly the most essential points in the author's method. Those who care to pursue the subject further may then consult the *Archiv* for themselves.

And first I may perhaps be excused if I say something of the writer, who is at present little known in England. He is a Polish gentleman who has devoted himself to the study of Philosophy. After some years in Germany, where he had the privilege, I believe, of being the pupil of Teichmüller, he spent several months in England, chiefly at the British Museum. Here he made himself acquainted with all the Platonic Literature he could lay his hands on; and was surprised to find that independent work had been done in Great Britain, of which he had heard nothing from his German teachers. In particular, having already realized both the importance and the difficulty of the question of the chronological order, from which that of genuineness could not be dis severed, he found light for the first time in the Introductions to an edition of the *Sophist* and *Politicus* which had issued from the Clarendon Press in 1867. About 1890 he was appointed to a Professorship of

Philosophy at Kazan in Russia, where he worked diligently at his book on the Logic of Plato.

I had never heard either of M. Lutoslawski or (to my shame be it spoken) of the University of Kazan; and a universal silence on the subject had convinced me that what I had believed to be my demonstration of the relative position of the chief dialectical Dialogues had met with no acceptance anywhere. What therefore was my surprise at receiving, in 1892, from an unknown Professor of Kazan, a long letter, in good English, declaring unreservedly his adhesion to my view. I have since had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of the writer, whose enthusiasm appeared to me to be equalled by his native force of mind, his independence of judgment, his practical energy, and his candid love of Truth; and as he was still young, it seemed that much was to be expected from him, νέων γὰρ πάντες οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ πύου.

Accepting, then, as the cardinal point of any attempt to determine the order of the Platonic Dialogues, the proved hypothesis, that the *Sophist*, *Politicus*, and *Philebus*, as well as the *Timæus* and *Cratylus*, are intermediate between the *Republic* and the *Laws*, M. Lutoslawski has prosecuted his study of the Platonic question, neglecting no aid from any quarter, but concentrating his own attention, as Ueberweg had done, on the logical aspect of the several Dialogues. While acknowledging the value of the argument from style, and also of the statistical proofs which have subsequently pointed the same way, and not ignoring such arguments as those of Felice Tocco, which turn on metaphysical points of view, he observes with truth that the logical content, regarded both in its quality and quantity, affords a surer basis of comparison than this last: and it is of this, in accordance with the main purpose of his work, that he speaks most fully.

Like other advocates of test theories, he perhaps sometimes carries his proofs a little too far, ignoring counter arguments which might be adduced; but his theory in its main outline has much that is both striking and conclusive. Take, for example, his exposition of the relative positions of the *Cratylus*, *Phædo*, and *Theætetus*,—which may be abridged as follows:—

'The *Cratylus* is logically less important

than the *Phaedo*, especially since the polemical character of the former Dialogue makes it difficult to distinguish Plato's serious meaning from what is only playfully advanced. Supposing the existence of truth and error, words may be rightly or falsely applied; but things themselves have a permanent essence that is independent of our modes of expression. If Protagoras were right, and all things were as they appeared, one could not be sure whether men were noble or worthless, and there could be no such thing as reason. But all human activity has a reality that is independent of impressions. This reality, however, is not always understood by the maker of words. The dialectician only, who uses them with knowledge, can be a competent judge: not so the poet or the sophist. From words Plato proceeds to roots and elementary sounds, but concludes that speech is not of divine origin, and that the philosopher must not rely on words only, but on ideas. The idea of the Beautiful remains unchangeably, whatever may be its imperfect forms or expressions. Unless this vision of the Ideas had something in it, both subject and object would be inconceivable, as being in perpetual flux.—These thoughts have some relation to the *Phaedo*, but rather lead up to it than presuppose it. For in the *Phaedo*, what in the *Cratylus* is suggested as a possibility, is regarded as a familiar truth. In dialectic the mind beholds reality as in a mirror, and rises out of sensible impressions to the conception of those perfect forms which they imperfectly represent. The idea is present in the particulars which partake of it, and of which they are dim and battered copies. Plato says distinctly that the expressions μέγας, παρουσία, κοινωνία, indicate less clearly the law of thought which he has discovered than the simple statement τῷ καλῷ τὰ καλὰ γίνονται καλά. And he insists that first principles must be clearly distinguished from their consequences, and that we must rise from hypothesis to hypothesis until we reach a truth that is independent of all hypothesis. As such an absolute truth Plato affirms the existence of ideas of the reason that are independent of sense, and through which the mind interprets her experience. These ideas are lasting, and can never pass into their opposites.

'Teichmüller has shown that the *Phaedo* is later than the *Symposium*. On the other hand there is good reason to regard it as earlier than the *Theaetetus*. If both Dialogues are compared with regard to the

theory of sensation, we observe that Plato in the *Theaetetus* thinks less slightly of the function of sense than in the *Phaedo*. The senses lead us certainly not to knowledge but only to opinion, but it is not easy to prove the falsehood of opinion, whereas in the *Phaedo* all value is curtly denied to sensible impressions. This brings the *Theaetetus* much nearer to the *Timaeus* than to the *Phaedo*, and may be regarded as an indication of the comparative lateness of the *Theaetetus* in its final shape. In the *Theaetetus* as in the *Phaedo* ideas can never pass into their opposites. The question of the existence of falsehood, briefly touched on in the *Cratylus*, is handled at length in the *Theaetetus*, and the criticism of Heraclitus and Protagoras, to which the *Cratylus* points, and which is there postponed, is finally disposed of in the *Theaetetus*. In the latter Dialogue the relation of sensation to conception is also far more distinct. The objects of sensible perception are specific, but the general notions concerning these, as to their being or not being, likeness or unlikeness, identity or difference, unity and number, are intuitions of the mind, arrived at not immediately, but through a rational process, which is the prerogative of man, and, in its perfection, of a few only amongst mankind. The philosopher of the *Theaetetus* resembles the philosopher of the *Phaedo*, in standing aloof from the world, but the image of him there involves far greater maturity of analytic thought. The *Theaetetus* belongs to the important central group of Dialogues which includes it with the *Phaedrus* and the *Republic*.'

Perhaps the most original part of Lutoslawski's contribution to the whole problem, is his reasoning on the very difficult question of the position of the *Phaedrus*. He observes that although Grote and W. H. Thompson called attention to the logical element in the *Phaedrus*, and although Teichmüller spoke of it as a hymn to Dialectic, and Lucas, in his special work on the Theory of Logical Divisions in Plato, had this Dialogue immediately in his eye, no one has taken the trouble to bring into one view the logical theories of the *Phaedrus*, and compare them with those of other Dialogues. If those who have confidently fixed the date of its composition—some in the twentieth, some in the fiftieth, year of Plato's life—had taken instead of doubtful external relations the logical content of the Dialogue as a criterion of maturity, so wide a difference of opinion

would hardly have been possible; since, as Thompson rightly observed, Plato in the *Phaedrus* sets forth those very principles and views which he brings to their application for the first time in his latest writings. Our author follows up an acute analysis of the dialogue, which I have not room to quote, with the remark that Thompson, in his edition of the *Gorgias*, has shown by unanswerable arguments that the *Gorgias* is prior to the *Phaedrus*, and his arguments have been so corroborated by Siebeck, Natorp, and Dümmler, that even Zeller has relinquished his former opinion, about the relation of the two Dialogues to each other, and now acknowledges the priority of the *Gorgias*; although Thompson's meritorious investigations seem to be as little known in Germany as those of the Oxford editors of the *Sophist* and the *Apology*.

One special merit of M. Lutoslawski's work is its comprehensiveness. His isolation, combined with his great industry, has been turned by him to excellent account. German philology is sufficient to itself, and English students have been too ready to accept it as all-sufficient. This Polish thinker, in looking beyond his immediate horizon, has an eye for what has been done in England and in Italy, as well as in Germany,—in the last century as well as in the present; and,

while his own speculations have turned chiefly on that growth of dialectic of which, as he generously reminds me, I had spoken in 1867, he acknowledges the force of the cumulative argument from style and 'Sprach-statistik' as a valuable aid. He rightly observes that the mere counting of particles or even of words and phrases is inconclusive when taken alone; but he is ready to contend that when the stylistic method, the statistical method, and the method of logical comparisons, are found to point all the same way, the resulting evidence of these concomitant variations is overwhelming. In this I believe that he is right, and that notwithstanding the high authority of Zeller, which yet holds the field, his theory, in its main outlines, will be ultimately accepted. In common with W. H. Thompson, he attaches more importance to the Platonic Epistles than I am inclined to give them, and some of his conclusions are more precise than the available evidence seems to me to warrant; but this detracts little from the intrinsic value of his labours on the whole. I am not a Polish scholar, and look forward with much interest to the German version of his book. Meanwhile I must content myself with calling attention to the account of it which he has given in the writings named at the head of this article.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF'S *HERACLES* OF EURIPIDES.¹

THE republication, in a modified form, of this highly important book will of itself attract the notice of those who read the *Classical Review*, and on practical grounds would scarcely call for more than a simple record. But I gladly accept the invitation to comment on it at more length, as it gives me the opportunity to repair an omission. Though I have long ago expressed, both in and out of season, my admiration for the book and gratitude to the author, I could wish, on reading it again, that I had happened to do so in the course of my recent essays on the poet: for my debt appears to me now even larger and more precisely estimable than I was aware. To others must be left the business of assailing weak points,

and making minor corrections; mine is to insist on this, that the sort of interest which the editor feels in the figures of mythology is just that sort of interest which Euripides felt, whereas modern Hellenists with scarcely an exception, and many, as we may guess, in the ancient world too, have been and still are debarred from this interest by others incompatible with it, and for want of it have praised or blamed the poet blindly and without illumination.

Of the changes made in the present edition one only calls for mention. The chapter on the origin and history of tragedy, which at first formed part of the introduction, has now been detached; and is to be developed in another work. This is a gain; for that essay contained, as it seemed to me, a disproportionate quantity of disputable matter, and might affect unjustly the doc-

¹ Euripides: *Herakles*: erklärt von Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. Zweite Bearbeitung. 2 vols. Berlin, Weidmann. 1895. 16 Mk.