Emotion in the Tripartite Soul: A New Translation of Plato's *Republic* 4:439-443

Introduction

In this famous passage, Socrates and Glaucon conclude that the human soul (ψυχή) is made up of three parts. The soul of a just man, like the just *polis*, is one in which each of its constituent parts serves its proper function and does not interfere with the work of the others. This translation is, as a rule, a close one; its chief innovation is in the English words it uses to name the parts of the soul. Most significantly, I choose to translate the third part (τὸ θυμοειδές, typically rendered as the "spirited" or "passionate" part of the soul) as the "emotional" part throughout. In this introduction, I argue for the inadequacy of both "spirited" and "passionate," and attempt to justify my choice of "emotional"— all with careful reference to the Greek text.

In Plato's words, and in the words of the commentators and translators I consult, the three parts of the soul are as follows:

PLATO	Adam (1902)	Shorey (1930)	Bloom (1968)	Annas (1981)	Waterfield (1993)	Griffith (2000)
τὸ λογιστικόν	n/a	rational	calculating	reason	rational	rational
τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν	appetitive	appetitive	desiring	desire	desirous	desiring
τὸ θυμοειδές	n/a	spirited	spirited	spirit	passionate	spirited

With the exception of Annas' commentary, these translations employ either an adjective (e.g., "desirous") or a participle

(e.g., "desiring") to describe each part of the soul.[1] The main object of translations like these is, of course, to use whichever word most closely approximates the sense of the Greek. But the question does arise: how should the elements be identified? Adjectives tend to suggest that the parts have an essential nature, and that the chosen adjectives should describe the state of their being. Alternatively, participles might be more in line with Plato's tendency to identify the parts by what they *do* rather than what they *are*. The λογιστικόν is so named "by virtue of the fact that it thinks rationally" (ᾧ λογίζεται, 439d), as the ἐπιθυμητικόν is named "because it craves sex, gets hungry and thirsty" (ᾧ ἐρᾷ τε καὶ πεινῇ καὶ διψῇ, 439d), and so on.

When it comes to the third part, the θυμοειδές, translators almost exclusively prefer an adjective over a participle. Plato names the first two parts of the soul with -ικὸν adjectives — familiar from his frequent references to crafts and craftsmen (e.g., ἡ τέχνη ἰατρικὴ, λογιστικός) — which function rather like participles in that they describe their subjects according to the functions they serve. τὸ θυμοειδές, by contrast, does not come from an -ικὸν adjective, but from "θυμοειδής." This adjective appears twice prior to the discourse on the soul. First, as a simple adjective, Socrates posited that men and animals alike must be *thumoeidic* if they are to be brave fighters, and so too with the guardians (375a-e). In the second case, Plato used the substantive neuter τὸ θυμοειδές, apparently

[1] James Adam, translator, *The Republic of Plato* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010); Paul Shorey, translator, *The Republic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1982); Allan Bloom, translator, *The Republic of Plato,* 2nd ed. (New York: Basic Books, 1991); Julia Annas, *An Introduction to Plato's Republic* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981); Robin Waterfield, translator, *Republic* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1993); Tom Griffith, translator, *The Republic*, ed. G.R.F. Ferrari (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000).

anticipating it as a constituent part of the soul. Socrates said that people do physical exercise and take in the arts to train *the thumoeidic part* of their nature (πρὸς τὸ θυμοειδὲς τῆς φύσεως, 410b). As Adam points out, θυμοειδές is used in both cases to describe the source of courage or bravery, as a counterpart to the source of wisdom (φιλόσοφον).[2] Still, Socrates asked about the third part on the same active terms as he had for the first two: "I want to know whether the part that has to do with emotion, and by which we become emotional, is a third thing" (τὸ δὲ δὴ τοῦ θυμοῦ καὶ ᾧ θυμούμεθα, 439e).

In the end, the lexica can only fully capture the meaning(s) of θυμός with a tableau of English words: "soul," "courage," "mind," "heart," "will," and of course, "spirit" and "passion." The translations I consult opt primarily for "spirit," and secondarily for "passion." The "spirited part" of Bloom and Griffith works well for readers of Greek who can consult the original for context. But references to "spirit" and especially Annas' "*the* spirit" come with religious and non-religious connotations that make the possibility of misinterpretation by the average reader high enough to warrant a search for alternatives.

Waterfield's "passionate part" is the next best option, but I submit that "passion" ultimately misses the mark of Plato's τὸ θυμοειδὲς. For many English-speaking laypersons, "passion" left unqualified will give a sense that is either (1) too suggestive of love and sex, or (2) too positive. Nothing in Waterfield's translation or Annas' commentary purposefully misleads the reader in either of these directions. However, the fact is that a

[2] Its use to describe a part of the soul is, at least according to Adam, "more intellectual," as it will be made the ally of the λογιστικόν. See Adam, *Republic,* n. 439e.

translator cannot control which associations each reader brings to the text. References to passion in connection with romantic love are common in today's English. It is indisputable that sexual passion would be firmly under the jurisdiction of Plato's ἐπιθυμητικόν, not the θυμοειδές. Also common are uses of passion that carry a non-sexual sense of "love," implying a natural liking or desire for something or devotion to an activity. Talk of one's "passion" has become an almost cliché way to describe something a person enjoys doing or pursues with vigor. "Passion" in this sense is not entirely antithetical to the essence of Plato's θυμός, but I find it exceedingly difficult to reconcile it with the earlier uses of θυμοειδές to mean strictly "brave" or "courageous" (375a-e).

When qualified or doing the qualifying, "passion" can of course have a negative sense. "Passionately upset," or "crime of passion," certainly do not connote anything positive. In the first case, though, passion is used to qualify and intensify another emotion (i.e., upset). It does not suggest a particular cause or mode for being upset, but only the intensity of the emotion. In the second case, a "crime of passion" is one committed with a lack of restraint, with passion connoting something of psychological or emotional distress.

My contention is that "passion" and "passionate," without qualification, do not faithfully represent Plato's θυμοειδές. All the same, I admit that "emotion" and "emotional" are not perfect alternatives, and I can foresee two grounds on which they are vulnerable to criticism. First, "emotion" might suggest a view of the human psyche informed by modern psychology and therefore alien to Plato. We have in English both the general concept of emotion along with particular emotions

like anger, ambivalence, or joy, which in turn might correspond to feelings or moods. It should be clear that my use of "emotion" in this translation is neither informed by nor should it point the reader to any specific insights from modern psychology.

Second, whether or not the reader sees emotion as a problematic interpolation from modern social science, he might consider it to be simply the irrational antithesis to reason. To do something "out of emotion" is to be under the influence of a force other than rationality. If one thinks of emotion only in this way, the θυμοειδές could not be the ally of reason against the part of the soul beholden to desire, as Socrates argues it must be. Plato at no point insinuates that emotion and reason are allies because they are essentially similar; in fact, Glaucon cites the example of newborn children and Socrates adds a line from Homer to demonstrate that the λογιστικόν and θυμοειδές are distinct (441a-b).[3] It is the *desirous* part which Socrates calls unambiguously "the irrational part" (ἀλόγιστόν τε καὶ ἐπιθυμητικόν, 439d). Experience is evidence enough that emotion is not always irrational; we often have good reasons for being angry, joyful, or otherwise.

There is, moreover, a close connection between θυμός and anger which is best captured by "emotion." With the story of Leontius, Socrates established that the θυμοειδές is different from the ἐπιθυμητικόν (439e-440a). His exegesis is to the point:

> *Οὗτος μέντοι, ὁ λόγος σημαίνει τὴν ὀργὴν πολεμεῖν ἐνίοτε ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ὡς ἄλλο ὂν ἄλλῳ.*
>
> *This story indicates that anger is sometimes at odds with our desires, as one thing against another*.[4]

[3] Homer, *Odyssey,* 20.17: στῆθος δὲ πλήξας κραδίην ἠνίπαπε μύθῳ
[4] Plato, *Republic,* 440a.

It seems incongruous at first to say that ὀργὴ (instead of θυμός) fights against desire, and this suspicion has some support in the manuscript tradition.[5] However the point here need not be overly complicated: the θυμοειδές — the part of the soul which has to do with the θυμός — also has something to do with ὀργὴ. In a second instance, Socrates closely associates the θυμός with anger in the verbs ζέω and χαλεπαίνω (440c). He says that a man who has been mistreated, "boils over with anger" and "is furious," thanks to the θυμός.[6] Of course, θυμόω appears across period and genre as "to make angry," and in the middle-passive "to be wroth or angry."[7]

As one of the strongest valences of the θυμός is anger, so also in English does anger fall within the realm of emotion. Indeed, Socrates finds proof in Homer that "the part that thinks rationally about what's better and worse … rebukes the part that is irrationally angry," by which he means the θυμοειδές (441c). The kind of irrational anger that works against reason is, for many modern English speakers, a function of emotion. Yet, just as anger is not the only aspect of θυμός, anger is not the only emotion. The θυμοειδές gets angry, but it also inspires courage. It must, in other words, get both positively and negatively stirred up, and this range of positive and negative possibilities is captured well by "emotion." To this point, Glaucon suggests that young children, alternating as they do between temper

[5] One of the 15th century manuscripts that Adam consults reads τὸν θυμόν, though he does not follow it. His explanation is: "If anger fights with desire, the source of anger, θυμοειδές, must be different from that of desire, ἐπιθυμητικόν." Adam, *Republic,* n. 440a.
[6] See my note on this sentence in the translation below, as the matter is not uncontroversial. Adam's explanation raises questions as to whether Plato thinks of the ἐπιθυμητικόν or any other part of the soul strictly as the *source* of its defining characteristic.
[7] See LSJ, θυμόω, A. II.

tantrums and cheerfulness, display θυμός not yet moderated by reason, and Socrates accepts the example.[8] I am convinced that most English speakers would describe this as a function of emotion before they would describe it as a manifestation of passion.

To compound the point, Socrates suggests that the θυμοειδές will be the auxiliary to the rational part "unless it has been corrupted by a bad upbringing" (441a). The deficiency Plato envisions here would, I suspect, be considered an issue of emotion by most modern English speakers. It is commonly held, for example, that a person may be "emotionally unstable" if he was subjected to bad parenting or some kind of abuse during his formative years.

Finally, the ethical dimension of Plato's θυμοειδές provides yet another reason for preferring "emotion." Adam observes that Plato presents the θυμοειδές with "its ethical connotation … intensified," because Socrates attributes to the θυμός one's "moral indignation" when he has been treated unjustly.[9] While anger is the emotion that grips the man who has been mistreated in Socrates' example, other emotions may arise in response to perceived injustices. One can think of several instances where "passionate" would fail to represent the way a person responds to an unfair situation: someone grieving the untimely loss of a loved one is much more likely to be "emotional" than "passionate," much as victims of abuse may have a host of emotional responses that English speakers would not describe as passion.

[8] Plato, *Republic,* 441a-b
[9] Adam, *Republic,* n. 439e.

Whether "emotion" works in close conjunction with "anger" as a replacement for "passion" is, ultimately, for critical readers to decide. I will not count it as a failure if my translation does not withstand examination, as long as my mistakes give the reader a reason to think more deeply about Plato's tripartite soul and, perhaps, to arrive at some conclusions of his own.

Translation[10]

"So, Glaucon, I'd say that the soul of the person who is thirsty, inasmuch as he is thirsty, wants nothing other than to drink. [439b] It grasps for this, and sets itself upon getting it."
"That much is clear, Socrates."
"Then, if at some point something pulls against it when it is thirsty, wouldn't that be something else in his soul, something other than that part which is thirsty and which compels him, like that of some animal, to drink? For, as we say, when it comes to one thing at one point in time, the same thing could not possibly act in opposition to itself."
"Of course not."
"In the same way, I suppose, it doesn't work well to say that the archer's hands, at the same time, push the bow away from him and draw it toward him. We have to say that one hand pushes it out, and the [439c] other pulls it close."
"By all means, yes," he said.
"Should we say that there are times when people, though they are thirsty, refuse to drink?"
"Definitely," he said, "there are many such cases. It happens often, in fact."

[10] Note: Stephanus pages follow the Oxford Classical Text edition of Slings (2003). They are provided here in the body of the text at roughly the beginning of each Stephanus page.

"So how," I asked, "can one explain these cases? Isn't there one thing present in their souls which is urging them to drink, but also one thing that holds them back from drinking, a separate thing, which has control over the thing that urges them to drink?" [11]

"It seems that way to me," he said.

"So is it not the case that the thing that restrains people in such cases is born in a person, when it comes to exist, [439d] as a product of reason? But the things that push and pull show up thanks to trouble and disorders?"[12]

"It appears so."

"Indeed it's not unreasonable for us to expect that these are two things, and that they are different from one another. One we call the rational part of the soul, by virtue of the fact that it makes rational decisions. The other, because it craves sex, gets hungry and thirsty, and is excited by the other types of desire, we call the irrational part. It's the part that craves things,[13] companion of gratifications and pleasures."

---

[11] See LSJ κρατέω I.3, with gen. = rule over, be lord over, be master over. Waterfield has "overcomes," which does not have the valence of *being in control*, but in modern English implies simply *winning out over* another in a struggle. Likewise, Griffith takes the participle adjectivally: "is stronger than," which is also unsatisfying. In 441e the rational part will be given the responsibility of "ruling" among the other parts of the soul, and in 442a both the rational and desirous parts will be charged with maintaining control over the emotional part. It is, in my view, reasonable to anticipate this aspect of Socrates' argument here. His word choice is suggestive of political control.

[12] Adam suggests that these are "impulses *engendered by* particular conditions and disease;" Ferrari: "the products of feelings and disorders;" Waterfield: "[they] occur thanks to afflictions and diseased states." In either case, a contrast is being drawn: the part that restrains is born out of reason, whereas the impulses are born out of experiencing troubles and disorders. The language used here is that commonly used for physical birth.

[13] Waterfield: "the desirous part;" Griffith: "the desiring part." Adam and Shorey have the wonderfully Victorian "appetitive part." My choice of "craving" is rooted in what I sense is the more common idiom in

"It's perfectly reasonable for us to think about it this way," he said.

[439e] "Well then," I said, "let these be marked out for us as the two natures which exist in the soul. But I want to know whether the part that has to do with emotion, and by which we become emotional, is a third thing. Or, if it's not, with which of these other two it would share the same nature."

"Perhaps," he said, "with the second, that is, with the craving part."

"On the other hand, though, I heard something that I now have some faith in. Once, Leontius the son of Aglaeon was coming back up from the Piraeus, along the outer side of the North Wall, and saw some corpses lying before the public executioner. He had an urge to look on, but at the same time he was hardly able to bear it, and turned himself away. [440a] And all the while he was quarrelling within himself and keeping his face covered. But when he was overcome by the urge to look, he forced his eyes wide-open, ran up to the corpses, and said "There you go, wretched eyes, have your fill of this beautiful sight!"

"Yes," he said, "I heard about that, too."

"What this story must certainly mean," I said, "is that anger is sometimes at odds with our desires, as one thing against another."

"Yes, that's what it means," he said.

---

today's English. "Desire" has largely fallen out of conversational use and, accordingly, lost some of the intensity Plato must intend. Still, the reader will notice that here and hereafter I retain "desire(s)" as the translation for "ἐπιθυμία(ι)." It seems that "craving" and "desire," and occasionally "urge" guarantee the right sense when taken together.

"Then," I said, "don't we also see the same effect in many other cases, whenever desires compel a man to act irrationally? [440b] That man berates himself and becomes angry at the thing inside him that compelled him to act that way, and as these two are fighting it out, aren't this man's emotions in fact fighting as an ally to his reason? But I suppose you wouldn't say that you've ever seen it happen—in yourself or in anyone else—where that sort of self-critical emotion teams up with a person's desires and causes him to do something, though his reason tells him that such a thing should not be done?"

"By god no," he said, "I haven't."

"What about when someone thinks he has acted unjustly? [440c] The better the man he is, though being subjected to hunger and thirst, and suffering any other thing like these, the less he can be angered by that man whom he thinks to be subjecting him to these things justly, and, as I say, he won't let his emotions get stirred up in response to this treatment. Right?"

"That's right," he said.

"But what about when someone believes that he has been treated unjustly by someone else? Isn't it true that in this case he boils over with anger, is absolutely furious, and allies himself with what seems to be just? [14] Moreover, by suffering

[14] The subject here and throughout this paragraph is unclear. Is it the θυμός, or is it the person (τις) who thinks he has been mistreated? Bloom maintains θυμός as the subject throughout the entire paragraph, so the θυμός suffers hunger, prevails, and is called back by reason. Griffith maintains "he" as the subject throughout. Waterfield stakes out a confused middle. He has θυμός as the subject at first: "your passion boils and rages, and fights for what *you* regard as right. Then hunger, cold, and other sufferings make *you* stand firm and conquer them, and only success or death can stop *it* fighting the good

through hunger and cold and all such things with patience, he prevails and does not let go of his noble aims until he gets what he wants or dies trying. [440d] Or, I suppose, until he is called back by his own reason and calmed down, like a dog called back by its shepherd. Yes?"

"Certainly," he said, "I think that things are as you've been saying. What's more, I remember that in our city we made the guards exactly like dogs, and put them under the control of the rulers, since, as it were, they're the shepherds of the city."

"Ah!" I said, "you understand what I am trying to say. But I wonder if you've also considered this other aspect, in addition to that one …"

"What other aspect?"

[440e] "That it has turned out completely opposite to what we were saying earlier about the emotional part of the soul. For back then we were thinking that it was some aspect of that craving part of the soul. But now we are saying that that must be far from the truth. Instead, we'll say that in the state of conflict within the soul the emotional part takes up arms alongside the rational part."

"All things considered, I think that's right."

---

fight, unless it is recalled by your rational mind …." There is little support in the Greek for mixing subjects like this; the whole paragraph is a string of parallel clauses connected simply by "καὶ" and no indications of a subject change. Adam is with Griffith, and does not think that θυμός is the subject at all. Socrates introduces this second question with "What about when someone believes that he has been treated unjustly?" There follows nothing explicit to require a subject change to θυμός, though it is possible that this is what Socrates means. What is indisputable, even if one maintains the man as the subject like I have done, is that the man experiences these things under the influence of the θυμός. Reading a type of synecdoche is tricky, but defensible. Ἐν τούτῳ is easily rendered as "in this case," as all three translators do.

"So, is it something different from the rational part as well, or it is some aspect of it? In that case there would not be three parts in a soul but two, the rational and the craving. Or, is it exactly as it is in the city, where three classes of people hold it together: [441a] the one that works for money, the one that guards and fights, and the one that gives counsel? Likewise in the soul, this third part would be the spirited, emotional part, being by nature the aide-de-camp to the rational part, unless it was corrupted by a bad upbringing?"

"Yes, it must be a third part."

"Right," I said. "That is, if it turns up as something other than the rational part, in the same way as it appeared to be different from the craving part."

"Well it isn't hard to show that. I mean, one can see it in young children: the instant they are born they are full of spirit and emotion.[15] Some never seem to me to get possession of their reasoning faculties, [441b] but most of them do eventually."

"Yes, by god, you've said it well. And even among animals one could see what you're talking about, and that it is as you say it is. In addition to these examples, and what we said previously, that verse of Homer's will also testify:

Striking his breast, he reproved his heart with a word.[16]

Here, Homer has clearly made it so that one part is rebuking another part, [441c] and it's the part that thinks rationally

[15] Bloom and Griffith both have "spirit;" Waterfield has "a copious amount of passion." The word is θυμός, so I maintain my use of "emotion."

[16] Homer, *Odyssey,* 20:17. This type of poetic quotation, amounting to little more than an artistic formulation of something that has already been explained in non-poetic terms, is often employed by Socrates. Here, the quotation is given "in addition to these examples," which are those of crying children and animals.

about what's better and worse that rebukes the part that is irrationally angry."

"You're exactly right," he said.

"Well then," I said, "it took some work, but I'd say we've made it over to the other side. We pretty well agree that the same classes that exist in the city also exist in the soul of each individual, and their number is likewise the same."

"That's right."

"And we agreed as to how the city was wise, and what made it wise, so doesn't it follow, necessarily, that the individual is wise in the same way and by virtue of the same thing that made the city wise?"

"How's that?"

"Think about how an individual is brave, and what makes him brave. Wouldn't we say that a city is brave in the same way, and because of the same thing? [441d] And, likewise, we'd say that they both share all the other characteristics that have to do with virtue?"

"Yes, of course."

"And when it comes to the just man, I suppose, Glaucon, that we'll say that he is just in the very same way that the city was just."

"There's no way around it."

"But surely we haven't forgotten that the city was just by virtue of the fact that each of the three parts that exist within it has its own job to do."[17]

[17] The basic construction is: ἕκαστον πράττειν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ. There are several approaches to translating it. Griffith has "performing its own function/proper task," and Waterfield uses "doing its own job," while Bloom opts for a particularly barbed English idiom: "minds its own business." The latter has a unique connotation in English that, in my view, imposes an unnecessary harshness on the Greek. I also use

"We don't seem to have forgotten this, as far as I can tell."
"So we've got to remember that the same goes for each one of us. Anyone whose several parts within him attend to their own tasks will be a just man and, likewise, attend to his own tasks."
"Of course," he said, "we've got to keep this in mind."
"Therefore it belongs to the rational part to rule, because it is wise and has foresight on behalf of the entire soul, but it is the role of the emotional part to be an assistant to it and its ally, right?"
"Right."
"So isn't it the case, as we were saying, that a mix of music and gymnastics will put them in harmony with each other? It will raise the pitch of the rational part, [442a] nourishing it with fine ideas and lessons, and also bring the emotional part down a few pitches, soothing it, and subduing it with harmony and rhythm?"
"Exactly right," he said.
"And when the two of them have been brought up in this way, and they have studied and been trained to carry out their functions without error, they will be put in charge of the craving part. This really is the largest part[18] of the soul in each person and, by nature, the greediest for money. The other two will have to watch out that it not fill itself with so-called 'pleasures' of the body. If it becomes strong, they'll have to make sure that it doesn't fail to do [442b] its own tasks and

"attend to his/their own task(s)," which is not substantially different from "has its own job to do."
[18] Griffith has "the largest element of the soul;" Bloom has "most of the soul;" Waterfield: "the major constituent of an individual's mind." All share some quantitative notion of great size or proportion, without a suggestion of qualitative greatness.

try to enslave and rule over those things which do not belong to its kind, and thereby overthrow the ordered life of every person in its entirety."

"Absolutely."

"And so," I said, "wouldn't these two be the very best at defending against external enemies on behalf of the entire soul and the body, since the one part does the planning, and the other part inspires the fighting, following its ruler and accomplishing with bravery the plans that were made?"

"They certainly would."

"And, I suppose, we call each person 'brave' because of the spirited, emotional part, [442c] whenever it preserves through pains and pleasures that which is commanded by reason,[19] whether something frightening or not."[20]

"Right," he said.

"But we call him 'wise' with respect to that small part, which rules within him and which commands him to do this or that, the part which even has within itself the knowledge of what is beneficial to each of the three parts and to the whole."

"Certainly."

---

[19] Two 15th century manuscripts consulted by Adam (Ξ, *q*[2]) have "ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου;" others, and all those consulted by Slings, have ὑπὸ τῶν λόγων. Accordingly, Adam opts for the former, Slings for the latter. One might end up with the same translation regardless of which variant is chosen, but note Bloom's unique reading of "the speeches" in n. 17 above.

[20] τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν λόγων παραγγελθὲν δεινόν τε καὶ μή**:** taken by Bloom as "what has been proclaimed by the speeches *about that which is terrible and that which is not;*" Griffith has "the instructions given to it by reason *about what is to be feared and what is not*," and Waterfield is quite similar to Griffith. Though they don't alter the sense drastically, the use of "about" seems to add an unnecessary layer. Another option is to take δεινόν τε καὶ μή in direct apposition with τὸ παραγγελθὲν, as I have done.

"What's next? Don't we call him 'self-disciplined' with respect to the affection and harmony between these parts, [442d] whenever the one in control and the two being controlled agree completely that the rational part of the soul must be the ruler, and that the others should not stir up a revolt against him?"

"That's right, discipline is nothing other than this; it's the same in the city and in the individual."

"Then certainly the just man, about whom we're always talking, will also be this way when it comes to self-discipline."

"It's absolutely necessary."

"So tell me, has our idea – that justice doesn't seem to be anything other than that thing which appeared in the city – had its edge blunted?"

"It doesn't seem like it. Not to me, anyway."

"Well, if some part of our souls still disputes the idea, [442e] we might firm up our case by offering some examples from common experience."

"Such as?"

"Take that city, and the man who has been born and raised akin to it. Imagine if we had to agree whether it seemed that such a man as this one would steal some gold or silver which he had accepted as a deposit. [443a] Would anyone think that our man did this, rather than any number of people who are not of his sort?"

"No one would think that," he said.

"So this man would have no part in temple-robberies, thefts, or betrayals; neither the private betrayal of his friends nor the public betrayal of his country?"

"No part at all, that's right."

"And indeed he would not be the least bit untrustworthy when it comes to oaths and all other agreements."
"How could he be?"

"So illicit affairs, neglect of his parents, or disregard for the gods will be found with anyone else before a man like this?"

"That's right, anyone besides him," he said.

[443b] "And isn't the reason for all of this that each of those parts within him attends to its own tasks, both its obligations as ruler and its obligations as subject?"

"This has to be the reason; there's no other explanation."

"So are you still looking for justice to be something other than the power which produces men and cities of this sort?"

"By god," he said, "I'm certainly not."

"So finally, then, our dream has come true. We said as soon as we began the organization of our city that we suspected it would be thanks to [443c] some god that we might possibly hit upon the origin of justice and some model of it."

"There's no doubt about it."

"So then, Glaucon, this was an image of justice, and that's why it's useful. I mean the fact that the cobbler is by nature right to makes shoes and not to do anything else, and the same goes for the builder and building, and so on and so forth."

"Yes, I suppose that's right."

"So the truth is that justice was something like this, as it seems. But it's not something concerned with one's external actions, rather it has to do with internal action. [443d] It is, truly, about one's own self and his own affairs, and not allowing each part in him to do the work that belongs to another or to meddle in the affairs of the other parts which are in the soul."

Zachary D. Heater
Duke University
zdh2@duke.edu

Works Cited

Adam, J. *The* Republic *of Plato: Edited with Critical Notes, Commentary, and Appendices.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Annas, J. *An Introduction to Plato's* Republic. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

Bloom, A., translator. *The Republic of Plato*. 2nd ed. New York: Basic Books, [1968] 1991.

Griffith, T., translator. *The Republic.* Ed. G.R.F. Ferrari. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Liddell, H.G., and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon: revised and augmented throughou*t. Edited by H.S. Jones and R. McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

Plato. *Republic*. Edited by S.R. Slings. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003.

Shorey, P., translator. *Republic*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, [1930] 1982.

Waterfield, R., translator. *Republic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.