

The exam will be two hours and forty minutes. The first thirty minutes will be devoted to Greek philosophical terms; the next two hours will be devoted to two essay questions (one hour per essay).

I. Greek Terms (40 minutes)

Define each one of the terms below: provide a range of English translations that approximate Plato's usage of these terms, discuss the context in which Plato uses them, and show their philosophical significance for him. Terms grouped together should be discussed together.

- i. ἔργον, τέλος
- ii. μουσική, ποιήσις, μίμησις
- iii. λόγος, λογισμός, τὸ λογιστικόν
- iv. εἶδος, ἰδέα
- v. φιλόσοφος, φιλοτίμος, φιλοχρήματος
- vi. ἀθανασία

II. Essay Questions (120 minutes)

You must answer two essay questions, one from Section IIa and one from Section IIb. Divide your time between these essays as you see fit. Do not answer two questions from IIa or two questions from IIb; this will result in failure of the exam.

IIa

1. What is Socrates' definition of justice at the end of Book 4 of *Republic*? How does this definition not only answer the question—What is justice?—with which the dialogue began in Book 1, but also answer Glaucon's challenge—Show that perfect justice is preferable to perfect injustice—with which the dialogue resumed in Book 2? Is either answer successful? If not, what are their shortcomings? How are these shortcomings remedied by the subsequent discussions of the dialogue? Do these remedies work? Why or why not? Whether or not they do, how does this definition of justice sublate both the conclusion of the function argument in Book 1 and the principle of specialization in Book 2? How, moreover, does this definition sublate the various definitions proffered but rejected in Book 1? Are any of these sublations circular arguments? If not, what is the value of sublation as a philosophical technique?

2. In Book 9 Socrates finally presents his response to Glaucon's challenge, his argument that justice is good for its own sake, whatever its consequences. Indeed, his argument is supposed to convince us that real justice with the appearance of injustice (and thus punishments) is preferable even to real injustice that has assumed the appearance (and thus the rewards) of justice. Of his three arguments—the comparison of the philosopher and the tyrant, the decision of competent judges, namely philosophers, and finally the purity and truth of philosophic pleasure—he is most confident in the third. How does this third argument work, and is it sound? What are the objects of pure and true pleasure, and what is the subject of this pleasure? In what way do both these objects and this subject respect the principle of opposites (or principle of non-contradiction)? How, then, does the distinction between real and illusory pleasure, not to mention the distinction between real and illusory justice, in sum, the deepest of all distinctions in the dialogue, depend on a logical principle?

IIb

3. In Books 8–9 Socrates resumes where he left off, at the end of Book 4, by describing the decline of his utopia into four degenerate regimes: timocracy, oligarchy, democracy, and tyranny. Describe the most important features of each constitution, and why Socrates thinks each one emerges from its predecessor. If this story is more than an amusing narrative, is there a logic of decline at work, one or more principles of politics that predict the trajectory of any political society? If so, what are these principles, and how integral are they to the rest of the Socrates' views in *Republic*, especially his psychology? After all, for every political constitution there is a correlative character, a psychological constitution. Describe the most important features of each of these, and why Socrates thinks each one emerges from its predecessor. What, if any, are the principles of psychological decline? How similar are these principles to those of political decline, and how are they inter-related? Finally, which story, if either, is primary: the political or the psychological?
4. At the heart of *Republic* is a memorable—indeed, an unforgettable—story: the Cave. We have considered the many ways in which this story condenses the most important lessons of the dialogue, lessons in ontology, epistemology, politics, psychology, and aesthetics. But perhaps most important of all these lessons is pedagogical; the Cave illustrates the education of the philosopher. Lest we forget: *Republic* itself is a pedagogical exercise, in which Plato is teaching us, his readers, to become philosophers. In this way, the Cave story is our story as we read the dialogue itself—our painful going up and our bewildering return below. Tell these two stories together, the story of being educated by this dialogue, from its first Book to its last, alongside the story of the philosopher who is educated within it, in Book 7. Draw upon your knowledge of those doctrines mentioned above, and, when most pertinent, the arguments Socrates uses to develop and defend them. But also draw upon our consideration of this dialogue as a work of art, as an artfully composed conversation, a special sort of conversation whose goal is to change the structure of your soul.