

Σωφροσύνη in the *Republic* and the *Charmides*:  
a dogmatic and aporetic points of view.

Already in the antiquity the Platonic scholars developed a division of the *Corpus Platonicum* into groups on the basis of the genre variety. We can name Albinus, Diogenes Laertius, the *Anonymous prolegomena to Platonic philosophy* etc. But the ancient scholars did not have as an objective a historical reconstruction of Plato's works. To obtain this objective we should suppose another criterion of the subdivision of the *Corpus*, still considering as an important factor the variety of genres.

The only absolute reference points that we can rely on are the *Republic* and the *Laws*. Chronologically between them there is another independent block: the unfinished triads, as *Timaeus-Critias-Hermocrates* and *Sophist-Politicus-Philosophus*. In these three groups is evident the intention of Plato to elaborate new forms of dialogue: the *Republic* is a reported dialogue, the *Laws* – a direct dramatic one, and the triads also represent a new literary idea. All these works are rich from dogmatic point of view.

Almost all the other, minor, dialogues can be referred to these blocks, broadly speaking, in two ways. Firstly, it is possible to distinguish the dialogues that accumulate the material for further work. E.g., in *Gorgias* we find material concerning the state accumulated for the *Republic* and *Minos* represents this type of dialogue for the *Laws* (and there are much more examples). Secondly, there are dialogues that reflect the disputes in the Academy during each period. Taken in themselves, they present problems for the interpretation, but supposing that they don't contain the doctrine itself, but show only the school discussion of some questions, important for Plato in each period, the situation clears up. The example for the *Laws* is *Philebus*, for the second period – *Parmenides*, and for the *Republic* - *Euthydemus*, *Lysis*, *Charmides*.

In my future paper will be treated the first period. So, *Euthydemus*, *Lysis* and *Charmides* were written during the work on the *Republic*. All these dialogues have the same form as the *Republic*: they are reported, and reported by Socrates himself. Then, they are often called "aporetic", because they only pose a problem, but do not solve it. It will not amaze us if we don't consider their genre as "dogmatic". The dogmatic *Republic* gives the answers to the questions of these dialogues. To show it, I will use in my future paper *Charmides*, that poses a question "What is temperance", but does not answer it, and does not aim to do it. The answer we can find in the *Republic*. My purpose is to show, on the example of the concept of temperance, the difference of the two genres, in which Plato worked. The work on the *Republic* causes a discussion in the Academy and, on the other hand, solves the school aporias. The aporetic dialogues in the school discussion examine the special problems, concerned with the *Republic*, and leave for the *Republic* the answers to them. So, Plato appears as a dogmatist and a pedagogue as well.

*Anastasia Zolotukhina*