# PLATO'S REPUBLIC TUTORIAL READING AND ESSAYS

*Damien Storey*

2016

~

## CONTENTS


Introduction 2
- Reading 2
- Essay 2
- Some basics of typography 4
- Referencing 4
- Plagiarism 5

Week 1 The challange 6

Week 2 Justice in city and soul 8

Week 3 The psychology of the *Republic* 11

Week 4 Knowledge and belief 13

Week 5 The images of the Sun, Line, and Cave 14

Week 6 Justice, happiness, *&* rule 15

Week 7 Plato's criticism of poetry 1 16

Week 8 Plato's criticism of poetry 2 17

# INTRODUCTION

## READING

Generally the reading is given in the order in which I'd suggest reading it. It's important that you read it all: if you leave any out, you're likely to have a gap in your understanding of the topic that will make it very difficult to answer the essay question. (Note also that for the vast majority of papers, reading them once is not enough: there are very few papers that I could understand after one reading.) Let me know if there's any week in which you think I've assigned too much (or too little) reading.

## ESSAY

Your essays should be something like 2000 words; that's about four single spaced pages. More or less is fine, but keep it under 2500 words. When you email your essay to me, *cc everyone else in your tutorial group*. And be sure to read *and think about* your tutorial peers' essays. Email your essay to me by 6 PM the day before the tutorial (unless I specify another time); I won't read late essays.

Please pay close attention to the following advice, especially 1 and 2. They try to cater for the most common and most easily solved problems I find in students' essays. Please take them seriously.

1 *Explain*. In short: explain *everything*. It should be possible for an intelligent peer who hasn't studied philosophy to fully understand your essay without needing read the authors you're writing about. So, for example: if you use a technical term or mention a concept that has particular significance for an author, make sure you clearly define/explain it; similarly, for any argument or position you discuss, you must clearly explain it to your reader. This is partly because good academic writing should be explicit and easily understood, but this is not the only or even the main reason. Rather, your ability to explain the ideas you're discussing—clearly, precisely, and succinctly—is one of the principal things you're being assessed on. You might well know, say, what a categorical imperative is, but you need to *show* that you know it and how precisely you know it. Explaining even small, simple ideas well is a lot harder than you might think; don't underestimate how important it is, and how much work it takes.

2 *Justify*. Assume that for every claim you make, the reader is asking 'why should I believe that?' In a philosophy essay, there should always be an excellent answer to this question. You should consider this to be, above all else, your aim when writing an essay. The worst thing you can do is to make bold assertions without defending them, and the second worst is to make bold assertions and defend them weakly. Note that this includes interpretive claims: if you write 'Plato believes that p', you need to show your reader, perhaps by giving a supporting quote, that this is indeed something Plato believes.

   *A bad essay*: 'p!'
   *A good essay*: 'For reasons x, y, and z, it seems that p.'

*An excellent essay*: 'Reasons x, y, and z give us good grounds for thinking that p, although someone might offer an objection along the following lines … However, I think there is a promising response to this objection …'

3 *Use headings*. Before you start writing, sketch a structure for your essay. When writing, use headings that reflect this structure. A typical essay might have 2–4 headings.

4 *First understand, then assess*. Be careful not to rush into criticisms of what you read before you've fully understood it. Approach everything you read with charity. That is, assume (since it's likely) that the author has thought intelligently and carefully about what they've written, so is unlikely to have made obvious mistakes. For example, if you notice a *prima facie* objection to something you're reading, read it again carefully to see if there's a way to understand it that avoids the objection or try to think of a plausible implicit assumption the author might have made that caters for the objection.

5 *Go from general to particular*. The topics we'll look at are broad. One could reasonably spend years writing hundreds of pages about them—you only have a few pages and one week. This presents a challenge: on the one hand, you want to cover the whole topic, showing that you're familiar with all the major issues that arise; on the other hand, you want to do more than simply scratch the surface, never looking at anything in detail. This can be a difficult balance to achieve, but in general it is much better to *err on the side of detail*. A good approach might be to devote about the first third or half of your essay to a more general discussion and then use the last half or two-thirds to examine one or two smaller points in much greater detail—you might, for example, focus on one argument, premise, or objection that you think is especially important or interesting.

6 *Ensure your conclusions reflect your arguments.* You might have been taught that strong, persuasive prose requires confident assertions, rather than hesitant, qualified ones. This is not the case in philosophy: your assertions should reflect the actual degree of confidence that is warranted by the evidence you've provided. Decisive arguments are rare—even rarer are decisive arguments in just a few lines of a student's essay. So be very careful not to mistake considerations that give us a good reason for believing that p for an argument that conclusively proves that p. A good essay is likely to have a large range of (appropriate) qualifying phrases: 'this shows decisively that p'; 'this is a strong reason to believe that p'; 'this suggests that p'; 'this makes it less implausible that p'; and so forth. Be especially careful with 'factive' or 'success' verbs like refute or prove.

7 *Use quotes*. Especially in historical subjects, including quotes from the relevant primary texts can be an excellent way to illustrate, justify, and give some focus to your discussion. One way (of many ways) to use a quote would be the following: make a claim; present a quote that you think backs up the claim; and then explain and interpret the text of the quote in order to show that and why it backs up your claim. Two cautions: first, quotes from secondary sources are less useful; second, avoid using a quote as a way of *saying* something—rather, a quote should be presented as evidence *about which* you have something to say.

## SOME BASICS OF TYPOGRAPHY

The following are a few typographic conventions worth learning. They are not mandatory, but if you ignore them I'll be annoyed; unfortunately, it won't affect your mark or report, because no one else cares.

1. *Indent paragraphs.* But do not indent the opening paragraph of the document or the first paragraph after a section heading. You may instead—not in addition—separate paragraphs with a blank line, although this is better suited to list-like texts, such as legal documents, than continuous prose.
2. *Use single line spacing.* It's easier to read. Double spacing is only necessary when a printed copy of you work will be annotated.
3. *A footnote mark is always placed after punctuation.*[1] It is almost always best to place a footnote at the end of the sentence, *after* the sentence-ending full stop, even if you are referring to something earlier in the sentence. Avoid consecutive footnotes; instead, place all information in one footnote if possible.
4. *Indicate quotes with either quotation marks or by using a block quote.* Extra flourishes, such as italicising, are unnecessary. And never place a block quote within quotation marks.
5. *Learn the difference between a hyphen (-), en-dash (–), and em-dash (—).* Use an en-dash like'to' in ranges of dates or numbers (e.g. 87–142) and to express certain relationships between words: for example, an 'on–off switch' or 'Irish–American relations'. Either an en- or em-dash can be used to indicate a parenthetical phrase. If you use an en-dash, add a space either side – like so – but em-dashes are always unspaced—like so.
6. *Make ellipses with three full stops separated by spaces.* Like this . . . , with a space either side. You will most commonly use an ellipsis to indicate portions of text that you've omitted from quotes. Don't omit any sentence-ending full stops that precede an ellipsis (i.e. together they make four stops). For example:

   > [P]articular care needs to be exercised when eliding text to ensure that the sense of the original is not lost . . . A deletion must not result in a statement alien to the original material. . . . Accuracy of sense and emphasis must accompany accuracy of transcription. (*CMS*, 16th, 13.49)

7. *Use a single space after full-stops.* A double space, once common, is now rightly recognised as unnecessary.

## REFERENCING

In your essays you should reference both quotes and claims or arguments that originate from one of the authors you've been reading. You should also have a bibliography of all the works you've referred to in the text.

1. This includes full stops, commas, colons, semi-colons, and quotations marks.

You can use whatever bibliographical style you choose, so long as it's consistent. The following is an example of a typical author–year referencing style, starting with what the bibliography will look like:

**Book:** Author (Year) *Title*, Place: Publisher.

> Fine, G. (1993) *On Ideas*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
>
> Freeman, S. (ed.) (2003) *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Article:** Author (Year) 'Title', *Journal*, Volume, pp. Pages.

> Irwin, T.H. (1977) 'Plato's Heracleiteanism', *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 27, pp. 1–13.

**Article in book:** Author (Year) 'Article Title' in Editor(s) (ed(s).) *Book Title*, Place: Publisher.

> Scanlon, T.M. (2003) 'Rawls on Justification' in S. Freeman (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

**In-text citation**: (Author, Year, Page(s))

> It has been argued that the charge of conservativism laid against Rawls' idea of reflective equilibrium is unsound (Scanlon, 2003, pp. 150–151).
>
> Scanlon argues that the charge of conservativism laid against Rawls' reflective equilibrium is unsound (2003, pp. 150–151).

### PLAGIARISM

The university guidelines are here: www.admin.ox.ac.uk/epsc/plagiarism. From the college regulations:

> Plagiarism is the presentation of someone else's work without acknowledgement as if it were your own. Typically, this involves copying an essay from another student or from the Internet, or copying passages from a book without quotation marks and a clear page reference. It is a very serious offence to plagiarise someone else's work, and there are serious academic penalties which may include the offender being sent down from the College and the University. … Please also be aware that poor academic work practices, such as copying sections directly from academic articles into your notes for information, might lead to unintentional plagiarism, but that this unintentional offence will still be dealt with severely by the University as 'reckless' plagiarism.

Two good reasons not to plagiarise. 1. I'll spot it. It's really easy. 2. If you think about it, there is really no advantage to plagiarising an essay, just serious disadvantage if you're caught. The most you'll gain, if you're lucky, is to make me believe that you wrote an essay when you didn't—but why would you care what I believe? If you genuinely can't write an essay for whatever reason, try to write part of an essay, some notes, or—in the worst case—nothing.

## WEEK 1: THE CHALLANGE

The aim this week is to get a clear idea of the question that the *Republic* aims to answer, and to reflect a little on the unusual role book 1 plays in setting up this question. In book 1, we find a range of common views of justice, culminating in Thrasymachus' might-is-right view. Socrates responds to Thrasymachus, defending justice against injustice, but then, in book 2, Glaucon and Adeimantus express dissatisfaction with his response, and renew the challenge against justice, requiring Socrates to begin again with a new kind of response.

### READING

Lots of reading, so you should make a start over the break!

1 *Republic*: book 1–3 [read up to 369A especially carefully]
2 Plato's *Gorgias* 482D–484C (Callicles' speech) and the pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Clitophon*
3 J. Annas, *An Introduction to Plato's Republic* (Oxford: OUP, 1981), chapters 1–4
4 D. Scott, 'Platonic Pessimism and Moral Education' *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 17 (1999) 15–36
5 T. Irwin, '*Republic* 2: Questions About Justice' in G. Fine (ed.) *Plato 2: Ethics, Politics, Religion, and the Soul* (Oxford: OUP, 1999)
6 C. Shield, 'Plato's Challenge: the Case against Justice in *Republic* II' in G. Santas (ed.) *The Blackwell Guide to Plato's* Republic

Optional reading:

7 Irwin, *Plato's Ethics*, chapter 11 & 12
8 R. Barney, 'Callicles and Thrasymachus', *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*
9 R. Barney, 'Socrates' Refutation of Thrasymachus' in G. Santas (ed.) *The Blackwell Guide to Plato's* Republic (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006)

### TO THINK ABOUT

1 What contribution does book 1 make to *Republic* as a whole? Note that (1) its style is quite different, being closer to the earlier, aporetic dialogues, and (2) Socrates' main interlocutor, Thrasymachus, has a very different temperament than his interlocutors in books 2–10, Glaucon and Adeimantus. (Scott's article, reading 5, is very helpful on this.)
2 Is Thrasymachus advancing one consistent definition of justice, or two conflicting ones? How does his ideas of justice and injustice compare with Callicles'? What do the disagreements between Socrates and Thrasymachus reveal about their respective understandings of, on the one hand, justice and, on the other, advantage or benefit? Pay close attention to Socrates' argument concerning the

function of the soul at 352D–354A—what kind of view of virtue and justice does this suggest?

3 Why is Glaucon dissatisfied with Socrates' response to Thrasymachus? In what ways does he 'renew the challenge of Thrasymachus' and in what ways is the challenge he and Adeimantus pose different from Thrasymachus'?

4 What are Glaucon's three classes of goods? Be sure that you can define each class carefully, and explain for each of the examples given in the text why it counts as an example of the relevant kind of good. Why is this division important for Glaucon's challenge to Socrates? Why does Socrates put justice in the second category, and conventional morality put it in the third? What do Glaucon and Adeimantus mean when they say they want to hear justice praised 'by itself'?

ESSAY

In what sense does Glaucon 'renew the argument of Thrasymachus'? [2003 exam]

## WEEK 2: JUSTICE IN CITY AND SOUL

This week you'll be looking more closely at justice in the city and soul: how they are related and what each is. I've assigned both an essay and a gobbet, but the gobbet is highly relevant to the essay so should help rather than add extra work. Nonetheless, do them separately, writing about a page for the gobbet (arguments in your gobbet commentary can be made again in your essay, if relevant).

Your principal aim this week should be to understand how the city–soul analogy works—why does Plato think that this method will make it easier to discover what justice is? Be sure to try to answer this question by carefully reading the primary text; engage *critically* with the secondary literature, testing the claims you find there against what you've found in the text. A second aim this week is to get an initial grasp of Plato's account of what justice is, a topic we'll return to in week 6.

### READING

1 *Republic*, book 3 from 410A, book 4, and book 8 [concentrate on book 4; in book 8 we find Plato's account of the relation between various *un*just states and corresponding unjust characters; the chunk we pass over this week, 369A–410A, includes Socrates' criticism of imitative poetry and outline of the early education of the *kallipolis*—we'll come back to this when we look at book 10]

2 Annas, chapter 5

3 G. Santas 'Methods of Reasoning about Justice in the *Republic*' in Santas (ed) *The Blackwell Guide to Plato's Republic* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006)

4 B. Williams, 'The Analogy of City and Soul in Plato's *Republic*' in G. Fine (ed.) *Plato 2: Ethics, Politics, Religion, and the Soul* (Oxford: OUP, 1999); also in R. Kraut (ed.) *Plato's Republic: Critical Essays* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997) and E.N. Lee *et al.* (eds.) *Exegesis and Argument*, *Phronesis* Suppl. I (1973) pp. 199–206

5 N. Dahl, 'Plato's Defence of Justice' in G. Fine (ed.) *Plato 2: Ethics, Politics, Religion, and the Soul* (Oxford: OUP, 1999); also in *Philosophy & Phenomenological Research* 51 (1991) 809–834 [Not so much on the city–soul analogy, but this will give you an idea of some of the issues surrounding Plato's—quite unusual—account of justice.]

Optional reading:

5 N. Smith, 'Plato's Analogy of Soul and State' *Journal of Ethics* 3 (1999): 31–49; also in Wagner, E. (ed) *Essays on Plato's Psychology* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2001) 115–136

6 J. Lear, 'Inside and Outside the *Republic*', *Phronesis* 37 (1992) pp. 184–215; also in R. Kraut (ed.) *Plato's* Republic*: Critical Essays* and J. Lear *Open Minded* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1999)

7 G.R.F. Ferrari, *City and Soul in Plato's Republic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003)

TASK

Write out two definitions—political and individual—for each the four virtues that Plato investigates in book 4: courage, moderation, wisdom, and justice.

ESSAY

> 'So, let's apply what has come to light in the city to an individual, and if it is accepted there, all will be well. But if something different is found in the individual, then we must go back and test that on the city. And if we do this, and compare them side by side, we might well make justice light up as if we were rubbing fire-sticks together' (434E–435A). Is this how the city–soul analogy is supposed to work?

GOBBET

> Well, then, we are surely compelled to agree that each of us has within himself the same forms and characteristics as the city? Where else would they come from? It would be ridiculous for anyone to think that spiritedness didn't come to be in cities from such individuals as the Thracians, Scythians, and others who live to the north of us who are thought to possess spirit, or that the same isn't true of the love of learning, which is mostly associated with our part of the world, or of the love of money, which one might say is conspicuously displayed by the Phoenicians and Egyptians. (435E1–10; cf. 544D5–E2)

Think about whether or not Bernard Williams (reading 3) is right that this passage shows us that Plato adheres to the 'whole–part' principle: A city is F iff its citizens are F? If so, how does this relate to the 'same name–same account' principle: the account of a city's being F is the same as that of a person's being F (see 435A–B).

Some advice on gobbets. When tackling a gobbet be careful not to just summarise what it says or to discuss the surrounding passage without making the given passage central to your answer. A good strategy, I think, is to first briefly give the context, then briefly outline anything one would need to know to understand the passage (e.g. if the word 'Form' is used in a Plato gobbet, tell us what a Form is), and then finally, and at more length, do either or both of the following:

(a) Give, where possible, a close textual reading of the passage. Perhaps the passage has two possible readings one has to decide between, uses a metaphor or analogy that needs careful explication, or has a difficult sentence that needs to be deciphered. These are just examples: a detailed look at a passage will bring up many surprises. The important thing is that you carefully engage with the text, showing that you realise that even a few lines can give rise to many interpretive difficulties.

(b) Treat the passage like a mini-question, inviting a concise but convincing discussion of some philosophical question that the passage raises. Perhaps you could give a brief exposition of one of the claims the passage makes, together with either some reasons the author might have for believing the claim or a good objection to it. The trick is to find the right question for the passage. For example, if an Aristotle gobbet mentions virtue, that does not necessarily mean that you can treat it as a ques-

tion about what Aristotle thought virtue is: be sure to keep your discussion specific to the point the passage is making.

Depending on the passage, either (a) or (b) or both might be appropriate. Often—and this is usually the best kind of answer—the textual issues of (a) will serve as a basis for the mini-question of (b).

## WEEK 3: THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE *REPUBLIC*

This week we look in more detail at Socrates' theory of the soul, focusing on his argument for the division of the soul and whether it results in a defensible psychological theory.

### READING

1 *Republic*: book 4 (read *very* carefully); books 8 and 9

2 H. Lorenz 'The Analysis of the Soul in Plato's *Republic*' in G. Santas (ed.) *The Blackwell Guide to Plato's* Republic

3 J. Cooper 'Plato's Theory of Human Motivation', *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 1 (1984) pp. 3–21; also in G. Fine (ed.) *Plato* 2

4 J. Moss 'Appearances and Calculation: Plato's Division of the Soul' *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 34 (2008) 35–68

Optional reading:

6 H. Lorenz, *The Brute Within* (Oxford: OUP, 2006), especially part 1

The main argument for the division is in book 4. In book 8 and 9 we find claims about the parts of the soul that give us a fuller picture of Plato's psychology. Your focus should be on book 4, but you should also read 8 and 9 carefully, making notes about the various hints about the nature of the parts of the soul that are dotted around the text. If your feeling especially virtuous, you could also look at book 10 602C–603A where we find a new kind of argument for the division of the soul.

### TO THINK ABOUT

> Let no one catch us unprepared or disturb us by claiming that no one has an appetite for drink but rather good drink, nor food but good food, on the grounds that everyone after all has appetite for good things, so that if thirst is an appetite, it will be an appetite for good drink or whatever, and similarly with the others (438A)

Optional reading: Plato, *Protagoras* 351B–END; Michael Morris, (2006) 'Akrasia in the *Protagoras* and the *Republic*' *Phronesis* (the part of this paper that is especially relevant is, approximately, p. 220 ff).

You don't need to write anything for this, but we'll discuss the passage so think about it carefully.

### ESSAY

Two parts—*do both*:

A Outline and assess Plato's argument for the tripartite soul in book 4

B Discuss *one* feature of Plato's discussion of the soul that you find especially interesting or controversial

Take the following barrage of questions as a loose guide. You should emphatically *not* try to answer all of these in your essay—think about all of them as you read but pick only one, maybe two, to consider in *detail* in the second half of your essay. If you're interested in a question not listed, feel free to consider that instead:

What kind (or kinds) of opposition is illustrated by Plato's examples of the spinning top, archer, and playful man? Do Plato's examples of motivational conflict—the thirsty person, Leontius, Odysseus—really show that there are separate parts of the soul? What role does the premise introduced at 436B8–9, which is sometimes called the 'Principle of Opposites', play in Plato's argument? Does it apply to these cases? If so, how?

In book 8 Plato claims that the rational part of the soul has its own desires: why doesn't he say, with Hume, that reason's job is simply to figure out how to satisfy our desires? Do the examples he gives us show that Hume's account won't work? Is the rational part doing more than simply calculating how to satisfy the desires of the other parts?

What does Plato mean by 'parts' of the soul? Sometimes he talks about the parts as if they are each psychological subjects and/or agents in their own right or even as if they are little homunculi inside us: is this just a metaphor—a kind of expedient personification—or should we take him literally? Who am *I*: a part of the soul, the whole soul, something above the soul, something else?

What is supposed to be distinctive about reason's desires that make them count as rational? What cognitive abilities do the lower parts of the soul have? Is the appetitive part capable of means-end reasoning? Why might the lower parts require cognitive abilities? How do the three parts of the soul communicate?

Is Plato right to distinguish spirit as a separate part? Consider spirit's role in the 'musical education' (books 2 and 3) and the political analogies in book 8.

## WEEK 4: KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF

We turn this week to Plato's closely related epistemology and metaphysics. Keep a close eye on the ethical implications of his distinction between knowledge and belief (consider the 'lovers of sights and sounds' in book 5 carefully).

### READING

1 *Republic* Book 5 (you might also look at Plato's *Meno* 97A–98B)

2 Annas, Chapter 8

3 D.C. Lee 'Interpreting Plato's *Republic*: Knowledge and Belief' *Philosophy Compass* 5/10 (2010) 854–864

4 G. Fine 'Knowledge and Belief in Republic V–VII' in G. Fine (ed.) *Plato 1: Metaphysics and Epistemology* (Oxford: OUP, 1999); also in S. Everson (ed.) *Epistemology* (Companions to Ancient Thought 1) (Cambridge: CUP, 1990) [The first few sections of this paper, concerning book 5, are most relevant for this week's topic, but read the rest since it will be relevant to next week's topic]

5 F. Gonzalez 'Propositions or Objects? A Critique of Gail Fine', *Phronesis* 41 (1996) pp. 245–275 [This is a very difficult paper. If you're finding it too challenging, focus on Gonzalez's specific criticisms of Fine's reading]

### TO THINK ABOUT

How does Plato's idea of knowledge differ from modern accounts of knowledge as justified, true belief? Why does Plato think the Forms are important for knowledge? Is Plato referring to what we commonly call knowledge or knowledge in some special sense? Does Plato think that knowledge is a kind of belief?

### ESSAY

> Outline Plato's distinction between belief and knowledge. What does Plato mean when he says belief is of 'what both is and is not'?

This essay should involve a detailed arbitration between Fine and Gonzalez. Both are difficult arguments and should be read very carefully. Try to decide which of the interpretations succeeds to both explain the text and render Plato's philosophical position coherent. Be sure to show why you find either position more plausible (or neither) with key quotes from the *Republic*.

*Your essay should present at least two solid reasons, together with clear textual evidence, both for and against each interpretation.*

## WEEK 5: THE IMAGES OF THE SUN, LINE, AND CAVE

This week we turn to the *Republic*'s famous images of the Sun, Line, and Cave. These are highly metaphorical, but we should hope to be able to extract—if we muster all our skills of textual interpretation—coherent and interesting philosophical claims. Think about, to take just one example, what it adds to last week's distinction between belief and knowledge.

READING

1 *Republic*: books 6 and 7 [read *many* times]
2 Annas, chapters 9 and 10
3 G. Fine, 'Knowledge and Belief in Republic V–VII' [Same as last week, but this week focus on Fine's duscussion of books 6 and 7]
4 N. Smith 'Plato's Divided Line' *Ancient Philosophy* 16 (1996) pp. 25–46
5 J. Malcolm 'The Line and The Cave', *Phronesis* 7 (1962) pp. 38–45

Optional reading:

6 V. Karasmanis 'Plato's *Republic*: The Line and The Cave', *Apeiron* 21 (1988) pp. 147–171
7 J.R.S. Wilson, 'The Contents of the Cave' *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, supp. vol. 11 (1976) 117–127

ESSAY:

> 'This whole image [of the cave] … must be fitted together with what we said before.' How?

Be very careful to go beyond the allegory when interpreting the Line and Cave: your task is to find the philosophical claims that these allegories elucidate. And be sure to present clear *textual* evidence to support your answer to the essay question.

## WEEK 6: JUSTICE, HAPPINESS, & RULE

This week we're looking at a few related questions about justice. After they have learned about the good, the guardians must return to the cave to rule. But apparently they don't want to go and would be happier just philosophising, so they must be 'compelled'. This is puzzling, since returning is said to be just and the aim of the *Republic* is to show that justice is always in one's interest. This raises questions about justice and its relation to, on the one hand, one's own good and, on the other, another's good, or a city's good.

### READING

1 *Republic*: book 4; book 7 (esp. 519B–521C); and book 9 (esp 576–587)

2 D. Sachs, 'A Fallacy in Plato's *Republic*', *Philosophical Review* LXXII (1963) 141–158, reprinted in Sesonske, A. (ed) *Plato's Republic: Interpretation and Criticism* (Wadsworth 1966) 66–81

3 Sedley, D. 'Philosophy, the Forms and the Art of Ruling' in G.R.F Ferrari (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Plato's* Republic (Cambridge: CUP, 2007)

4 N. Smith, 'Return to the Cave' in M.L. McPherran (ed) *Plato's Republic: A Critical Guide* (Cambridge: CUP, 2010)

5 N. Dahl 'Plato's Defence of Justice' in G. Fine (ed.) *Plato 2: Ethics, Politics, Religion, and the Soul* (Oxford: OUP, 1999); also in *Philosophy & Phenomenological Research* 51 (1991) 809–834 [You read this in week 2—but read it again.]

Optional reading:

6 R. Kraut, 'The Defense of Justice in Plato's *Republic*' in R. Kraut (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Plato* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992)

### GOBBET

> Suppose, then, that someone came up to us while we were painting a statue and objected that, because we had painted the eyes (which are the most beautiful part) black rather than purple, we had not applied the most beautiful colours to the most beautiful parts of the statue. We'd think it reasonable to offer the following defence: 'You mustn't expect us to paint the eyes so beautifully that they no longer appear to be eyes at all, and the same with the other parts. Rather you must look to see whether by dealing with each part appropriately, we are making the whole statue beautiful.' Similarly, you mustn't force us to give our guardians the kind of happiness that would make them something other than guardians. (420C–D)

### ESSAY

> Why, in Plato's view, should a person be just? How, if at all, does your answer help to explain the guardians' reluctant willingness to rule?

## WEEK 7: PLATO'S CRITICISM OF POETRY 1

In the final book of the *Republic* Plato brings his metaphysics, epistemology, and psychology to bear on a single practical question—should there be imitative poetry in the *kallipolis*?

READING:

1. *Republic* book 10. Also take another look at the discussion of poetry in books 2–3.
2. J. Moss 'What Is Imitative Poetry and Why Is It Bad?' in G.R.F Ferrari (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Plato's* Republic (Cambridge: CUP, 2007)
3. A. Nehamas 'Plato on Imitation and Poetry in *Republic* 10' in J. M. E. Moravcsik & P. Temko (eds.) *Plato on Beauty, Wisdom, and the Arts* (New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1982)
4. You should also read at least Lecture 1 of the following, which is a fantastic paper, but long: M.F. Burnyeat 'Culture and Society in Plato's *Republic*', *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, 1997

TO THINK ABOUT:

> 'Imitation is (1) an inferior thing that (2) consorts with an inferior thing to (3) produce an inferior thing' (*phaulê ara phaulô suyyiynomenê phaula genna hê mimêtikê*; 603B4)

What arguments does Socrates use to justify (1) and (2), and why does he think these establish (3)? Although you don't have an essay this week, it's really important that you think carefully about this question—make notes and bring them to the tutorial.

Next week you'll choose your own essay title on book 10. As you read this week, start thinking about what question you'd like to answer. In the tutorial we'll discuss your exact question and any additional reading that might be helpful.

## WEEK 8: PLATO'S CRITICISM OF POETRY 2

This week you'll be writing an essay on the question relating to imitative poetry in the *Republic* that you chose last week.

READING:

Same as last week—do read it all again—though this time finish the Burnyeat paper and read, if any, the additional articles I've recommend for your chosen essay question.