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 storical 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 refered 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 intself, 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.
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