

**Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”
Faculty of Philosophy**

**To(wards) the Concepts τὸ δίκαιον and ἡ δικαιοσύνη
in the Practical Philosophy of Aristotle**

Summary of

**Dissertation for the acquisition of the degree
*Doctor habilis***

Dimka Gicheva-Gocheva

Sofia

2019

Table of Contents:

Introduction: Why is the preposition *to*? Why *to(wards)* and before Aristotle? *Status quaestionis*. Conceptual delineations, defining of the scope and the intentions of the studyp. 6

Chapter one: The just and justice according to the historiographers and in the perfect Attic tragedy

Part 1. Herodotus on τὸ δίκαιον and ἡ δικαιοσύνη.....	p. 17
1.1. The unjust as <i>casus belli gerendi</i> and trigger of the histories.....	p. 20
1. 2. <i>Aufheben</i> of the mythological – the story of Helen.....	p. 22
1. 3. Dreams, oracles, profecies – where is the just among them.....	p. 25
1. 4. Answer one: There is justice coming from beyond	p. 28
1. 5. Answer two: Justice is attained in the right judicial judgement.....	p. 31
1. 6. Answer three: Justice in the family relations.....	p. 34
1. 7. Answer four: The just in a community of men.....	p. 36
1. 8. The just and the rule of majority.....	p. 39
1. 9. Freedom as core value for the Greeks; differences between Europe and Asia.....	p. 42
Part 2. τὸ δίκαιον and ἡ δικαιοσύνη in the <i>History of the Peloponnesian War</i>	p. 50
2. 1. Thucydides as father of the contemporary history (Zeitgeschichte).....	p. 51
2. 2. His philosophy of history.....	p. 53
2. 3. Thucydides as one of the sophists. Mapping the speeches in the text.....	p. 57
2. 4. Philosophizing in the antilogies	p. 62
2. 5. Man as measure of all things, including those, which engender war.....	p. 66
2. 6. Humanism and moralism, instead of relativism.....	p. 67
2. 7. Thucydides' „reflection on the method”.....	p. 71
2.8. Apology of the sophists, Herodotus and Thucydides.....	p. 76
2. 9. How is <i>justice</i> possible as <i>personal virtue</i> and how is <i>the just</i> possible as <i>principle in a community</i> ?.....	p. 86

Part 3: Sophocles: Antigone and the justice from beyond..... p. 94

Chapter two: τὸ δίκαιον and ἡ δικαιοσύνη from Plato to Aristotle

Part 1. Ontology of τὸ δίκαιον and ἡ δικαιοσύνη in the *Republic*p.109

1. 1. *Whose justice?*, or who is the subject of just and justicep. 113

1. 2. τὸ δίκαιον as a set of principles and regulations for the life in a community and ἡ δικαιοσύνη as personal virtue p. 113

1. 3. The Pre-Socratic ontology of Dike – the Rightp. 123

1. 4. The Sophistic-Socratic counterpoint in the *Republic*..... p. 124

1. 5. The ontological answer: Justice is possible. The just is possible p. 130

Part 2. The personification of the virtues in the “Persian story-paradigm”, told by Socrates in the *Alcibiades*.....p. 137

2. 1. Socrates and Alcibiades. Socrates and Plato..... p. 137

2. 2. The interest of the Academy in Persia. The interest of Aristotle in the East.....p. 139

2. 3. The moral of the „Persian exemplary narration”p. 141

Part 3. The political structures (governances) – the definitive condition for the attainment of the just

3. 1. The political thinking in the dialogues and the letters of Plato..... p. 145

3. 2. Forms of the political government in the *Republic*..... p.146

a. The ontological and cosmic explanation..... p. 149

b. Timocracy and timocrats..... p. 150

c. Oligarchy and oligarchs..... p. 151

d. Democracy and democrats..... p. 152

e. Democracy is a façade p. 153

f. Who are the drones and what are they doing.....p. 156

g. Tyranny and tyrants.....p. 159

3. 3. The suspension of the laws. Apology of the authoritarian rule in the <i>Statesman</i>	p. 161
3. 4. Where is the political thinking of Aristotle?.....	p. 167
3. 5. The conceptions of Aristotle as negations and continuation of the Platonic hints.....	p. 168
3. 6. The contribution of Aristotle to the political theory.....	p. 170
3. 7. Forms of oligarchy in the <i>Politics</i>	p. 173

Chapter three: Towards the conceptualization of **τὸ δίκαιον and ἡ δικαιοσύνη** within *Corpus Aristotelicum*. Towards the just: the constitutional history of Athens. Towards justice: the anthropology as fundament of the practical philosophy. Book Epsilon of the NE: translation in Bulgarian with parallel Greek text

Part 1. How is the just possible and gradually approached? The <i>Athenian Constitution</i> between philosophy, history and constitutional theory.....	p. 183
1.1. The political governance(s) in Herodotus	p. 184
1.2. The political governance(s) in Thucydides	p. 185
1.3. From Plato to Aristotle: from the normativity of a prescription to the realism of a description.....	p. 189

2. 1. Evolution and progress in the empowered institutions in Athens.....	p. 192
2. 2. How is the independence of the judiciary possible?.....	p. 205

Part 2. The anthropology correlated to the ethics: the modal triad in the soul and the body	p. 211
--	--------

2.1. The cosmos: perfect body without soul	p. 214
2.2. The living creatures and their perfect bodies.....	p. 217
2.3. The polemical beginning of <i>On the Soul</i>	p. 222
2.4. The problem of the body.....	p. 227
2.5. The soul as principle of life.....	p. 231
2.6. The mystery of nous: the divine in man	c. 238

Part 3. Nicomachean ethics, Book Epsilon	p. 242
---	--------

3. 1. Translation in Bulgarian with parallel Greek text	
3. 2. Commentary to the translation.....	p. 283

Conclusion: Man must be virtuous and ought to act justly because man is endowed with immortal nous. τὸ δίκαιον and ἡ δικαιοσύνη are possible.

Everybody knows by heart.....293

Virtue as ἔξις and τὸ δίκαιον.....	299
ἡ δικαιοσύνη and ἡ φρόνησις.....	301
The actuality of Aristotle for	304
Bibliographies and internet resources.....	313

The dissertation is written and submitted in Bulgarian.

It has been accepted as ready at the departmental council of the Department of Logic, Ethics and Aesthetic at the Faculty of Philosophy in the Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski” on the 23rd of April, and approved for public approbation at the same Department on the 11th of June 2019.

It consists of introduction, three chapters, conclusion and bibliographies.

The bibliographies include 445 titles (in Bulgarian, Russian, English, German, French, ancient Greek and Latin, plus 20 internet resources) of original writings and translations of the ancient authors, and secondary interpretations - books and articles.

Summary of the Main Theses

Introduction to the problem: why *to(wards)* and before Aristotle

Πᾶσα τέχνη καὶ πᾶσα μέθοδος, ὁμοίως δὲ πράξις τε καὶ προαίρεσις, ἀγαθοῦ τινὸς ἐφίεσθαι δοκεῖ· διὸ καλῶς ἀπεφήναντο τὰγαθόν, οὗ πάντ' ἐφίεται. διαφορὰ δὲ τις φαίνεται τῶν τελῶν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ εἰσιν ἐνέργειαι, τὰ δὲ παρ' αὐτὰς ἔργα τινά. ὧν δ' εἰσὶ τέλη τινὰ παρὰ τὰς πράξεις, ἐν τούτοις βελτίω πέφυκε τῶν ἐνεργειῶν τὰ ἔργα. πολλῶν δὲ πράξεων οὐσῶν καὶ τεχνῶν καὶ ἐπιστημῶν πολλὰ γίνεται καὶ τὰ τέλη· ἰατρικῆς μὲν γὰρ ὑγίεια, ναυπηγικῆς δὲ πλοῖον, στρατηγικῆς δὲ νίκη, οἰκονομικῆς δὲ πλοῦτος¹.

NE, I, 1094 a 1-10

There are three thematic circles in the dissertation. The first of them is retrospective. The enormous influence of Aristotle on the thinkers in the following epochs, in all languages and all over the world is well known even to the pupils in the secondary schools. The reception of his philosophy and the interpretations of it are countless. That is why this writing is exclusively engaged not with the reception, but with a retrospection. *The main concern of the study is to answer to the asking: what does he inherit and adopt from some of the most important thinkers, who have written before him in Greek with respect to the conceptualization of the virtues, especially of justice?* The first and the second chapter of the study discuss this topic.

The second thematic circle is the rethinking of the adopted ideas from previous thinkers through original concepts of his own. How exactly is the philosophizing of the predecessors on τὸ δίκαιον and ἡ δικαιοσύνη reinvented in the *Nicomachean ethics* and the *Athenian Constitution*? From the very first lines of the *NE* and the motto chosen for the beginning of the dissertation it becomes evident: there is not mere reception and elaboration of ideas, anticipated by the two great historians, the best tragic author and his previous teacher. Everything inherited is embedded in his practical philosophy through the conceptual novelties of the triad δύναμις-ἐνέργεια-ἐντελέχεια. That is why the echo of this rethought heritage, reinforced with the strength of unique concepts and new terms, coined by him, is resounding till the present day. The word δύναμις has a variety of meanings before him, enriched with a number of fresh ones in his treatises, and the terms ἐνέργεια and ἐντελέχεια are created by him. They are results of his

¹Quoted after *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, Bekker, compared with the editions of Bywater (1890) and Susemihl.

linguistic creativity with prolific applications everywhere: in the first and the second philosophy; in the cosmology and the anthropology; in the poetic and the rhetorical theories; last, but not least, in the political and ethical reasoning. The key argument here is the defining of the virtues as ἐνέργειαι of the soul. The third chapter of the thesis is devoted to this topic.

The third thematic circle, which frames the whole study and hopefully makes it coherent and consistent, is declared in the title: τὸ δίκαιον and ἡ δικαιοσύνη. What is the difference between them? The traditional delineation, which has century long tradition and follows the Latin renderings *ius* and *iustitia*, treats ἡ δικαιοσύνη as the personal virtue *justice*. What about τὸ δίκαιον? Shall we understand it in the narrower sense of *law, lawful, right*, or shall we conceive it with a broader scope and stronger accent? One of the claims of the dissertation is that the weaker translation and conceptualization in many cases is proper, but the stronger one is better in many more cases. Thus, τὸ δίκαιον appears as a special correlational concept for the interpersonal (in the *Nicomachean ethics*) and inter-institutional interactions (in the *Politics* and *The Athenian Constitution*). Our contemporaries as MacIntyre and John Rawls write about these, but surely the great initiation of this precisely elaborated ethical and political couple of concepts is in the treatises of Aristotle, and even earlier: in Herodotus, Thucydides, Sophocles and Plato. That is why the preposition in the title is *to, towards*, and in the composition of the writing the translation of Book Epsilon of the *NE* is at the very end, preceding the conclusion.

Summary of
Chapter one: The just and justice according to the historiographers and in the perfect Attic tragedy

Part 1. Herodotus on τὸ δίκαιον and ἡ δικαιοσύνη²

² This part of the summary is published as article and for its linguistic precision I am indebted to Prof. Evgenia Pancheva: [The Influence of Herodotus on the Practical Philosophy of Aristotle](http://www.axiapublishers.com/ojs/index.php/labyrinth/article/view/49), *Labyrinth. An international journal for philosophy, value theory and sociocultural hermeneutics*, том:18, број:2, 2016, page 104-116.
<http://www.axiapublishers.com/ojs/index.php/labyrinth/article/view/49>

The *History* (or *The Histories* in some translations) of Herodotus (484-425 BC) is an encyclopedic source for the later anthropology and the practical philosophy of Aristotle. Its value is immeasurable and of utmost importance as a source for the Greek-Persian conflict in the 5th century BC and for its pre-history. However, the text is much more than the alpha of historiography. The immediate narrative of the warfare begins just in the last quarter of the work and in the other three preceding quarters Herodotus narrates about many different historical persons, powerful families, important dynasties and significant events. In detail and very attentively, he describes all possible aspects of the way of life of dozens of human communities. Some of them are Hellenic (Athenians, Euboeians, Spartans, Corinthians), others are not (Lydians, Medians, Persians, Egyptians, Phoenicians, Massagetae, Pelasgians, Scythians, Thracians). He describes without any cultural predilections and prejudices their dietary habits and/or the men's hairdresser-fashion and the clothes they wear. Even more precious than these life-style descriptions are his accounts of the customs and the habits, the mythological beliefs and the images of the gods they worship. In short, he provides voluminous material for all major peculiarities in the worldviews and the everyday practices of tens of communities in the decades, contemporary with the rise and decline of the Persian empire.

Another remark is to be added: The father of the idea of history has to be respected as the founder of anthropology, as well. The nine books of his work, called by him after the nine Muses, are labeled *History* much later, and even their translation in English as *The Histories*, in the plural, by George Rawlinson, is quite indicative³. In addition to the abundant historical material and the accurate insights into the multiple dimensions of human existence, they are an extraordinary encyclopedia of the origin of the Greek knowledge of geography, zoology and of everything related to Egypt.

Last, but not least, the method of the historiographer is the weaving of the 'great' political history with the hundreds of smaller personal, family and/or dynasty stories – countless narratives mainly not of full biographies, but of telling episodes of fatal importance for the destinies of the humans, engendering the fabric of the 'great' history. Thus the writing acquires depth and value not only as anthropological and historical chef-d'oeuvre but also as a sketch of the ancient philosophy of life and philosophy of history.⁴

³ This text quotes his translation. Herodotus. *The Histories*. Translated by George Rawlinson (1858) with an Introduction by Rosalind Thomas. London: David Campbell Publishers, 1997.

⁴ More on this point in Karl Reinhardt's *Vermächtnis der Antike* (see Reinhardt 1960) and Richard Winton's *Herodotus*, (see Winton 2000).

Why it is worth looking back at Herodotus as an ancestor of some ethical ideas in Plato and Aristotle?

The influence of Herodotus on Plato and on the practical philosophy of Aristotle, conceived as inseparable unity of political, ethical and anthropological thinking is obvious, although in different facets. Its traces are more visible and explicit in Aristotle, and somewhat hidden in the delicate texture of the Platonic dialogues. In contrast to *De anima*, whose book Alpha abolishes with devastating criticism absolutely everything, proposed by the previous thinkers on the soul-body problems, the practical philosophy of Aristotle is indebted to many of his predecessors, mainly to Herodotus, Thucydides, Sophocles and Plato. Maybe the most impressive concept in the heritage, left by Herodotus for both Plato and Aristotle, is the differentiation between ἡ δικαιοσύνη and τὸ δίκαιον: ἡ δικαιοσύνη is justice, the individual autonomous self-sufficient *virtue*, whereas τὸ δίκαιον is the *correlational* ethical, juridical or political *result* of interpersonal interaction between at least two agents⁵.

Two great ideas from the thesaurus of Herodotus are cherished only by Plato and neglected by Aristotle: the first one is the causal theonomy in the course of the historical events and the second is the relativity of the human narration of the past. The latter is easier to explain, because it is stated clearly in the very first pages of the *History*: the Hellenes, the Persians and the Phoenicians have three completely different versions for the causes, the origin, the happening and the development of the same events. Herodotus stays at a distance from the epic and mythology. For him the real events and the real persons are unmasked in their deeds and “*human happiness never continues long in one stay*” (I, 5).

The causal theonomy mentioned above is striking in the instructive stories of the rise and fall of the greatest Lydian and Persian kings: Croesus the Lydian, Cyrus the Great, his son and successor Cambyses; Darius and Xerxes. Herodotus summarizes the moral of them in the sentence: ὡς τῶν μεγάλων ἀδικημάτων μεγάλοι εἰσὶ καὶ αἱ τιμωρίαι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν. *When great wrongs are done, the gods will surely visit them with great punishments* (II, 120, 10). It is not difficult to see how these stories of the fall of rulers, who are punished for their cruel atrocities, and even for the deeds of their far remote predecessors, are echoed in the final myths of the *Republic* (614b-621d) and the *Gorgias* (522e-527a). Indeed, Plato mirrors the moral of Herodotus' stories of the severely

⁵ The largest possible mapping of the wider context of the Greek thinking of justice and the just is available in the several volumes of Erik Wolf's. *Griechisches Rechtsdenken*. (see Wolf 1950-1970).

punished rulers with a greater emphasis on the deserved retribution, provoked by their own wickedness, rather than on the family guiltiness.

As a distinguished mark of this causal theonomy-framework of the stories, especially of the rulers, the reader of the masterpiece encounters several astonishing examples of the power of the providence and its prophecy in dreams, oracles and signs. The credo of Herodotus is expressed in the famous: ἐν τῇ γὰρ ἀνθρωπότηϊ φύσι οὐκ ἐνῆν ἄρα τὸ μέλλον γίγνεσθαι ἀποτρέπειν. *It is impossible for men to turn aside the coming fate* (III, 65, 10-11). Some examples are to be mentioned: 1. The death of the son of Croesus (I, 34-45); 2. The failed attempt of Astyages to change his destiny (after a dream of a sexual intercourse with his daughter); which was a prophecy that his grandson will run over Asia, but will deprive him of the power as well. (I, 107, 108). 3. Cambyses, frightened by a dream, also tried to escape from the predicted future. 4. Also, the unveiling of the future through the bird-prophecy for the new-coming dynasty: the seven pairs of hawks tearing the two pairs of vultures (III, 76).

This part of the summary should be finished, however, by pointing out that Plato and Aristotle remained indifferent to some admirable sparks of humanism, expressed by the sophists and Herodotus, who was a close friend at least with one of them, Protagoras. These ideas, unfortunately neglected by Plato and Aristotle, are Herodotus' convictions and statements that there is *one and universal human nature*, which is inherent in all human beings, irrespectively of their origin and tongue. The readers find the relevant passages on the human nature in plenty of stories: a) to begin with, in the conversation between Solon and Croesus (I, 29-33); b) in the conversations and the letters, exchanged between the tyrant Periander and his son Lycophron, and between Lycophron and his anonymous sister (III, 52): the passionate appeal of the anonymous sister brings the message that the fatal feuds in a family must be ended, because *we are all just mortal humans*; c) in the conversations between Xerxes and his uncle Artabanus (VII, 45) and between Xerxes and Demaratus (VII, 101-104); d) in the unbelievable reversals in the life of the Egyptian Amasis and his golden sink (II, 172); and, e) the letter of the same Amasis to the tyrant Polycrates (III, 40).

Although his personal story is one of the very few examples in the *Histories* for the generosity of the benevolent fate, the happy vicissitudes have not deprived him of the sober wisdom concerning not only the uncertainty of power, but also the fragility of human beings in every aspect of their existence. πᾶν ἐστὶ ἀνθρώπος συμφορῆ. *Hence man is wholly accident* (I, 32)⁶.

⁶ Compare with Pindar, VIIIth *Pythian Ode*.

Fundamentals of the thinking of ἡ δικαιοσύνη and τὸ δίκαιον in the *Histories*

For the sake of conciseness several fundamental ideas of Herodotus, adopted later by Aristotle, will be briefly sketched as follows. Let us begin with the unjust as *casus belli gerendi*, with which the chain of the great conflict is conceived: one unjust deed was followed by another, by a third and then by one more unjust deed (I, 2, 1-3). Herodotus is positive: the sequence of unjust events and the sequel of reciprocal acts of revenge do not lead to a just solution and do not resolve any conflict righteously. See (in I, 2) the report of the successive kidnappings of Io and Europe; of Medea and Helen. This message sounds already as conviction in the second book, where Herodotus proposes an alternative to the epic of Homer with his version of the real and true story of the beautiful Helen. It is worth comparing Herodotus' apology of Helen in this alternative story (II, 113-115) with the *Enkomion for Helen* by Gorgias⁷.

The just as a result of subjective human judgment

There are at least three examples in the *Histories*, which might be read as the foundation of the Greek juridical and philosophical thinking of the subjective role of the person who judges properly (or not) for the attainment (or the failure) of a justified decision: a)The verdict of the judge Proteus in Egypt, reported in the true history of Helen and Menelaus; Proteus issued what is to be done after the awful crime, committed by Alexander in Egypt; b) the story of the gradual rise of Deioces from a humble judge to the power of authoritarian ruler (I, 100); c) the depiction of the merciful Egyptian ruler Mycerinus, son of Cheops (II, 129).

If we remove all the details from these stories, we will see that beneath them lies an important idea, later developed by Aristotle in book Epsilon of the *Nicomachean Ethics* as one of the forms of the just. The just in the decision of any judge is a possibility, which might be actualized, but also might not be.(II, 31) NE, E: ὁ γὰρ δικαστῆς βούλεται εἶναι οἷον δίκαιον ἔμψυχον (1132a21-22). *A judge is meant to be, as it were, justice personified*⁸, sums up Aristotle. The readers familiar with Herodotus are reminded at this point of the prototypes or the impressive personifications of the embodiment of the just, portrayed by Herodotus.

⁷ See also Diels-Kranz 1934, S. 288, 294.

⁸ Here and elsewhere in the paper the translation of Roger Crisp is quoted (see Aristotle 2000).

There are also shocking pages in the *Histories* of quite the opposite. Let us recall this horrifying episode: Cambyses punishes cruelly the corrupt judge Sisamnes, but puts his son Otanes in his place (V, 25): *Therefore Cambyses slew and flayed Sisamnes, and cutting his skin into strips, stretched them across the seat of the throne whereon he had been wont to sit when he heard causes. Having so done Cambyses appointed the son of Sisamnes to be judge in his father's room, and bade him never forget in what way his seat was cushioned.*

Another similar, but not analogical example is the punishment, imposed by Darius, who ordered the crucifixion of Sandoces, but later interrupted the torture (VII, 194) because the punishment must be commensurable with the crime. The commensurability of the crime (or in milder cases of the unjust deed), the wrong doing with the punishment becomes one of the milestones in the *NE*, book Epsilon. The just solution of any case is in the middle between the wrong or the unjust deed and becoming a victim of wrong or unjust judgment.⁹

The just in the family

Earlier in this text, in the mapping of the relevant passages with regard to the idea of the (universal) human nature in the *Histories*, the correspondence between Lycophron, the son of Periander, and his anonymous sister was mentioned. A passage from her appeal is worth quoting: *παῦσαι σεωυτὸν ζημιῶν. φιλοτιμὴ κτῆμα σκαιόν. μὴ τῷ κακῷ το κακὸν ἰῶ. πολλοὶ τῶν δικαίων τὰ ἐπιεικέστερα προτιθεῖσι. πολλοὶ δὲ ἦδε τὰ μητρῷα διζήμενοι τὰ πατρῷα ἀπέβαλον.*¹⁰ ... *cease to punish thyself. It is scant gain, this obstinacy. Why seek to cure evil by evil? Mercy, remember, is by many set above justice. Many, also, while pushing their mother's claims have forfeited their father's fortune* (III, 53, transl. by Rawlinson).

The message of the compassionate sister, who remains unnamed, deserves very attentive inspection, because in these several lines it sketches the prototype of two conceptions, later enriched by Aristotle. One of them is the appraisal of the merciful just, the indulgent, τὸ ἐπιεικές, as the supreme form of the just in the *NE*. In the English translations of the *NE* (see Rackham 1996, Chase 1934, Crisp 2000) *the equitable prevails*

⁹ ἡ δικαιοπραγία μέσον ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀδικεῖν καὶ ἀδικεῖσθαι (1133b29-30), *Acting justly is a mean between committing injustice and suffering it* (transl. by Crisp); this is the conclusion of an argument from a previous chapter.

¹⁰ τὰ ἐπιεικέστερα in the *Histories* is reflected in the *NE*, E, ch. 14 as the more abstract concept τὸ ἐπιεικές: the supreme form of the just is the indulgent, which is not the proper and the commensurable judgment, but the merciful and milder one (*NE* 1137a30-1138a2).

as a rendering of τὸ ἐπιεικές. The same Latin root is seen in the term, used in the French translation by sister Pascale-Dominique Nau: *l'équitable*¹¹. The translation in German by Franz Dirlmeier uses *das Gütige* for τὸ ἐπιεικές and *das Gerechte* for τὸ δίκαιον (Dirlmeier 1979).

In the newest translation in English, done by Sarah Broadie and Christopher Rowe τὸ ἐπιεικές is translated as *the reasonable* (Broadie and Rowe 2002). Other possible options, suggested by the context might be *the indulgent, the merciful, the milder just, the temperate*. In the address of the anonymous sister to her brother it is said that *mercy is above justice*, as quoted above. Precisely this is the point of Aristotle's reasoning in a very long chapter in book Epsilon of the *Nicomachean Ethics* (NE 1137a 31-1138a3), in which he discusses τὸ ἐπιεικές. The essence of his understanding is that the supreme, the best, the unsurpassable form of the just is the milder, the merciful, the indulgent just.

κρεῖττον τὸ ἐπιεικές. διὸ δίκαιον μὲν ἐστὶ, καὶ βέλτιόν τινος δικαίου, οὐ τοῦ ἀπλῶς δὲ ἀλλὰ τοῦ διὰ τὸ ἀπλῶς ἀμαρτήματος. καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ φύσις ἢ τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς, ἐπανόρθωμα νόμου, ἢ ἐλλείπει διὰ το καθόλου (1137 b 24-27). *What is equitable, therefore, is just, and better than one kind of justice. But it is not better than unqualified justice, only better than the error that results from its lacking qualification. And this is the very nature of what is equitable – a correction of law, where it is deficient on account of its universality.* (transl. by Roger Crisp)

The other remarkable idea in the appeal of the anonymous sister is the supremacy of the rights and the power of the man-and-the-father in the family. This idea is exposed briefly as consideration about τὸ πατρικὸν δίκαιον in the *NE* (book E, ch. 6) and at a considerable length in book Alpha of the *Politics* (book A, ch.12) as one of the unquestionable principles of the political science according to Aristotle.

Another tricky question from the thematic circle of the just in the family, found in the *Histories*, concerns the heir of the throne: when a ruler has a polygamous family and many spouses, which one of his sons, born of different mothers, has the right to inherit the father? The eldest of all the children or the first one born after the father's ascension to the throne? The just solution of this question has triggered feuds and bloodshed in many dynasties throughout the millennia. Herodotus reports reservedly, without any partial comments, that the decision was taken according to the following definition, borrowed from Spartan law: the son, who was born after his father had become the

¹¹ Available on the internet:

https://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/%C3%89thique_%C3%A0_Nicomaque, accessed on the 8th of January 2017.

actual king, should be heir to the empire, rather than the sons, born before him by the other spouses, because at their birth the father still was a private person and did not rule the state (VII, 2-4).

The just in the human community

The real foundation of the political thinking on the different types of the self-organization of a community is discussed on several significant pages of the *Histories* (III, 80-82), in the famous triologue, in which collocutors are Otanes, Megabyzus and Darius.

The first to speak is Otanes, the unhappy child, who has witnessed the terrible death of his corrupt father: it is no wonder that after such a shocking experience in his childhood the first speaker should glorify τὸ πλῆθος opposed to μουναρχίη. Indeed, we cannot expect argumentation and concepts, clarified by definitions in Herodotus. He narrates short rather suggestive stories, bearing sense, which will later engender political or ethical concepts. It is not by chance that the speech in favour of the rule of the many should be delivered not by anyone else but by Otanes. This reveals the talent of the historiographer, who is a writer as well. Otanes is the judge who has inherited the position of his corrupt and severely punished father. His accusation of the excesses of the unbounded monarchic power is to be expected and the motives for it are both negative and psychological. The power of the one is detrimental to himself, because it is the source of arrogance, cruelty and disdain. In the speech of Otanes the emphasis is laid on the psychological degradation of the ruler, who enjoys absolute power. Its devastating effects fall much more on himself, than the arbitrariness and the atrocities, which destroy the lives of his victims. Of course, Otanes combines the denial of the one form with a praise of another and offers a positive enumeration of the five essential merits of the opposite to the monarchy: the rule of the many. *“The rule of the many, on the other hand, has, in the first place, the fairest of names, to wit, isonomy; and further it is free from all those outrages which a king is wont to commit. There, places are given by lot, the magistrate is answerable for what he does, and measures rest with the commonalty. I vote, therefore, that we do away with monarchy, and raise the people to power. For the people are all in all.”*

After him, Megabyzus praises the rule of ἀρίστων δὲ ἀνδρῶν, opposed to ὀλιγαρχίη. The speech of the second noble collocutor provides a real example of dialectical *Aufheben*, because it partially preserves and partially discards what has been already said: the monarchy is bad, he agrees, but at the same time he disagrees that the supreme power should be concentrated in the majority. *“For there is nothing so void of understanding, nothing so full of wantonness, as the unwieldy rabble. It were folly not to be*

borne, for men, while seeking to escape the wantonness of a tyrant, to give themselves up to the wantonness of a rude unbridled mob... Let the enemies of the Persians be ruled by democracies; but let us choose out from the citizens a certain number of the worthiest, and put the government into their hands." (III, 81)

Darius is the last to speak in the trialogue and his speech is also dialectical development of the previous statements: he supports the negative evaluation of the rule of the many, proposed by Megabyzus, but rejects the appraisal of the aristocracy as the best form of political governance. On the day after, he will become the new king with treachery and falsification, because he convinces the other four participants who remain silent in the dispute, but are entirely persuaded by him and vote in favour of his opinion: thus the champion in the debate is Darius, who proclaims the monarchy as the best form of governance, opposed to the power of the people/demos (III, 85).

The third opinion is also much more psychologically grounded than politically elaborated. Like the first speaker Otanes, the third one Darius emphasizes the personal degradation of the ruling figures, who inevitably become the first victims of the concentration of power not only in the hands of a minority, but even in the rule of the many. The disastrous consequences of the oligarchic and the democratic political orders likewise, according to Darius, too are much more detrimental to the ones, who rule than to the human community governed by them. *"In oligarchies, where men vie with each other in the service of the commonwealth, fierce enmities are apt to arise between man and man, each wishing to be a leader, and to carry his own measures; whence violent quarrels come, which lead to open strife, often ending with bloodshed... Again, in a democracy, it is impossible but that there will be malpractices: these malpractices however do not lead to enmities, but to close friendships, which are formed among those engaged in them, who must hold well together to carry on their villainies."* (III, 82)

The closer inspection of the precise words, used by the three noble Persians in this political debate on the best form of governance, supports more decisive observations and conclusions: the six basic political forms – the three good ones and their three opposites, later laid down as fundamental by Aristotle, are sketched in this conversation. The speech of Otanes points out the advantages in the rule of the majority, τὸ πλῆθος - the rule of the many, later called democracy, and to the enormous dangers in its contrary, which he labels μουναρχίη, but in fact means its distorted form, the tyranny. Megabyzus advocates the rule of ἀρίστων δὲ ἀνδρῶν – the aristocracy and blames the power of the unbridled mob, later labelled the bad or the deviated democracy. Darius properly describes the psychological mechanisms in the group of the ruling men, which in his view transforms any aristocracy into oligarchy, and declares that monarchy is the best.

The conversation of the three Persians is reflected with some variations and new arrangements by Plato in the *Republic* (in the VIIIth book, with the addition of timocracy to the forms of the political orders) and in the *Statesman* (291d-292e), but there is no complete overlap, because in the *Republic* one more type is added, whereas in the *Statesman* one form (not surprisingly the good form of the rule of the many) is missing. These six forms, sketched by Herodotus in the dialogue of three Persian noblemen, are the focal points of Aristotle's meticulous analysis, developed at length in the *Politics* from the middle of the third book to the end of the sixth.

The just in the rule of the majority

The Aristotelean account of the great advantages of democracy, the rule of the many, called *politeia* in his typology in the *Politics*, is greatly influenced by Herodotus:

1. In the view of Otanes the inherent feature of the rule of majority is stated to be *ισονομία* – literally, the equity of all in respect of the requirements of the laws; the germane idea of the rule of law; 2. What a monarch does, never occurs under the rule of the many. The bitter experience of Otanes and his childhood trauma obviously influenced him to insist on this, but in tens of other stories in the *Histories* Herodotus narrates that there are perilous consequences of the unlimited power of a person first on himself. The boundless power of a ruler leads him to madness and disaster. 3. Another valuable characteristic in the rule of the many, according to Otanes, is the distribution of many public duties, positions and responsibilities by the lot - *πάλω μὲν γὰρ ἀρχὰς ἄρχει*. 4. Even more important is the responsibility for these responsibilities, or translated into our modern parlance, the accountability of the persons, who have been in charge: *ὑπεύθυνον δὲ ἀρχὴν ἔχει* – the power is held into account, it is responsible. 5. Last in the speech of Otanes is the mode of decision-taking: all problems are discussed and resolved in common *βουλευματα δὲ πάντα ἐς κοινὸν ἀναφέρει*. This might be read as the first advocacy of the deliberative democracy.

Later on in the fifth book of the *Histories*, two other important factors for the democratic developments in Athens and its subsequent leadership among the city-states are mentioned: *ἡ ἰσηγορίη ὡς ἐστὶ χρῆμα σπουδαῖον... ἀπαλλαχθέντες δὲ τυράννων μακροῦ πρώτοι ἐγένοντο* (V, 78)¹². Firstly, *ἡ ἰσηγορίη*, the equity-and-equality of the

¹² See the pertinent commentaries of Robert W. Wallace and Paul Cartledge on this subject in *The Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*. (Raaflaub, Kurt A., Josiah Ober, and Robert W. Wallace 2007).

citizens on the agora, the participation of the citizens in the arguing and the decision-making of the public matters; and, secondly, the abolishment of the tyrants' regime, the hostility and the resistance to many despotic authoritarian practices - these are the healthy strengths of the Athenians, which lead their city-state not only to the economic prosperity, but also to the military and the political supremacy among the Greek communities.

The abolishment of the tyranny, which is the worst of all political orders, made Athens the mightiest Greek polis in the military aspect. The freedom of the citizens and the chances they received to work for the fulfillment of their private entrepreneurs enhanced the economic prosperity of the city as well. The work for the family property and the personal household, and not for the tyrant, who would expropriate the gain, became the basis of the Athenian polis. Another meaning of the concept ἡ ἰσηγορίη is to be pointed out. It means not only *equity of the free men on the agora, the right to be equally eligible and to elect* like all the rest free citizens. It signifies also *the equity to participate and to cooperate* in the exertion of the political power. Last, but not least it means *freedom of speech*, the equity of all deliberative positions of all free citizens, expressed in the public debates, in the discussions and the taking of decisions, especially the ones, passed by the assembly.

All of them are marked as the inner engines of the glory and the positive changes in the polis by Aristotle in *The politeia of the Athenians*. Once more we see how brilliant examples of stories, used as instruments by the narrative method in the *History* of Herodotus, become implicit concepts in an Aristotelian text. In the institutional history and the constitutional stages in the development of Athens, the warfare is just mentioned: the Greek-Persian wars and the Peloponnesian war are just referred to, because *The politeia of the Athenians* was meant to be a sketch of the successive forms of the institutional self-governance of the city-state and not a political history. In this brief survey of the constitutional progressive development of Athens many of the explanations of the political evolution of the city-state are in harmony with the ones, proclaimed as the most influential ones by Herodotus.

*

Herodotus is a true anthropologist, political and ethical thinker, and philosopher of history. He is not just a modest historiographer of chronicles, because in all the stories he looks for the real understanding of man and the causes of the events. His main concern always is the answer to the question "*why did it happen*", and not just "*what and how did it happen*". He is confident in the answers for the causes of the victory (VII 138-139): the Athenians saved the whole Hellas, because they were free. Earlier in the same

book (VII 102) he writes that in contrast to the enormous wealth and territory of the empire of the invaders¹³, poverty was always a neighbor to Hellas, but nevertheless the virtue of the Greeks was firm and invincible. However, the liberty of the majority of the Greek city-states, and the resistance to the despotic and authoritarian rules in the bigger part of them¹⁴ was never a source of anarchy, because the master which all of them obeyed unconditionally was the law (104). The divided and competing city-states reached some form of unity not only because they were threatened by the mighty enemy, but also because of the underlying bonds between them. For the shaping out of the united Hellas VII (136), the engendering prerequisite was that all those formerly conflicting city-states were inhabited by people, who have the same blood, the same tongue, the same sanctuaries and temples devoted to the same gods; the same habits, rituals and traditions (VIII, 144; see also Fritz 1967, 243 and Jäger 1973, XV). However, his most important moral is: *“There was nothing they had so much at heart as the salvation of Greece, and they knew that, if they quarreled among themselves among the command, Greece would be brought to ruin.”* (VIII, 3)¹⁵.

Summary of

Part 2. ἡ δικαιοσύνη and τὸ δίκαιον in *The History of the Peloponnesian War*

Thucydides is the father of the *Zeitgeschichte* or contemporary history, but he is also the founder of one of the main genera of philosophy of history, and receives polar

¹³ The number of the invaders is exactly 5 283 220 (VII, 186).

¹⁴ *Surely the heaven will soon be below, and the earth above, and men will henceforth live in the sea, and fish take their place upon the dry land, since you, Lacedaemonians, propose to put down free governments in the cities of Greece, and to set up tyrannies in their room. There is nothing in the whole world so unjust, nothing so bloody, as a tyranny* (V, 92). There are ‘small’ exemplary stories (of some deeds) of more than 50 tyrants in more than 50 Greek polices in the *History*.

¹⁵ See also Christopher Pelling on *Le Miroir d’Hérodote* (Pelling 1988)

evaluations till the present moment (e. g. negative – by Collingwood¹⁶; positive – by Koselleck¹⁷. He also might be read as a philosopher and one of the best representatives of the sophistic movement¹⁸. This makes him an important source for the more contextualized study of the ancient philosophy, as well. The best proof for that are the speeches in his work. In the dissertation a full mapping and general assessment of the speeches is outlined. They are more than 50 and 10 of them are pairs of speeches, antilogies. Attention is drawn to the circumstances: who are the historical persons, who deliver them; to what audiences are they addressed; in what place (assembly; battle field; funeral ceremony at a cemetery etc.). It is stressed that they have been strongly edited by the historian (the ones from the initial period of the war) or entirely composed by him. The majority of them are deliberative, and the most valuable of them for the history of the ancient philosophy and rhetoric are the ten pairs of opposed speeches. Their composition, method and style indicate his kinship with the sophists. Many of them are delivered at one and the same time, on one and the same place and address the same audience, and the speakers elaborate contrary theses. That is why Thucydides provides excellent material for the understanding what it was “to make the weaker part stronger”¹⁹.

Reflection on the method and apology of the sophists

In a famous passage in *The History...* he reflects on the method, used by him, pointing out that the aim is high: to search for the truth. It is realistically corrected with

¹⁶ Quoted after Р. Дж. Колингууд. *Идеята за историята*. С., Евразия, 1995 г., превод Инна Колева. С. 31-32. R. G. Collingwood. *The Idea of History*. Oxford UPress, (1946), 1992-10th ed. p. 29-30.

¹⁷ Quoted after Райнхарт Козелек. *Пластовете на времето*. С., 2002, Дом на науките за човека и обществото. Превод от немски Христо Тодоров. С. 425-427.

¹⁸ Werner Jaeger. *PAIDEIA. The Ideals of Greek culture. Vol.I: Archaic Greece. The Mind of Athens*. Second ed. Oxford UPress, 1965. *Thucydides: Political Philosopher*. P. 382-414. Erik Wolf. *Griechisches Rechtsdenken*. Band I-IV. 1950-1970. Vittorio Klostermann. Frankfurt am Main. Band III, 2: *Die Umformung des Rechtsgedankens durch Historik und Rhetorik*. Teil I: Das Rechtsdenken der Historik. 4 Kapitel: Thukydides – S. 50-139.

¹⁹ For an interpretation different from mine pacifist reading see Walter Reese-Schäfer. *Antike politische Philosophie. Zur Einführung*. Hamburg, 1998, Junius Verlag. 3. *Machtspolitik und Krieg: Die politische Wissenschaft bei Thukydides*. S. 37-48.

the search for punctuality as much as possible ὅσον δυνατόν ἀκριβείᾳ περὶ ἐκάστου ἐπεξελθών. In my view the moral of his opus is: there *is* truth, but it is extremely difficult to be found; there *were* highest values in the life of the Greeks – peace and liberty, justice and equity – in the internal affairs in the polis, and in the external relations between the city-states. But all these values, achieved temporarily after the Persian wars, are forever lost.

In the Bulgarian and foreign scholarship there are many negative assessments of the sophistic. In the dissertation I insist on the opposite, on the appraisal and the positive evaluation, standing in a continuity of a long tradition: Hegel, Jaeger, Popper, J. De Romilly, Kerferd, Decleva Caizzi, S. Broadie, Raaflaub, Ober and Wallace, and the Bulgarian professors in ancient philosophy Ivan Georgov and Radi Radev²⁰.

How are the just and justice possible?

The History of the Peloponnesian War is a sad and depressive book, but it is not totally nihilistic, because there are several persons, who are embodiment of the most cherished virtues. They exemplify the possibility of speaking and acting courageously, with sober reasoning and justice. In the dissertation Nicias is characterized as the perfect personification of ἡ δικαιοσύνη and ἡ φρόνησις.

Pericles is neither the chief personage, nor a paradigm of virtues. On the contrary, in the circumstance of force major, in the disasters caused by the plague and the famine, he exercised authoritarian power and “democracy” turned out to be an empty word. Justice as the summit of the human virtues is seen in the politician and military commander Nicias, whereas Alcibiades is the personalization of absolute evil: he is an arrogant man; aggressive citizen; lying politician and manipulator in the assembly, delivering deceptive speeches with detrimental consequences; he is a poor tactic and deplorable strategist²¹. Nicias is depicted as an icon of the dianoethic virtues, mostly of justice. He acts justly to himself too, escaping the trap of the self-accusation

²⁰ See Josiah Ober. *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens. Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule*. Princeton UPress, 2002. Chapter 2: Public Speech and Brute Fact: Thucydides. A. Subject and Author. 3: Human Nature: Individual and Collective Interests. p. 67 ff.

²¹ Stressed many times by Kierkegaard (*On the concept of justice*) and Gregory Vlastos (Socrates and Vietnam). Quoted in their Bulgarian translations: *Върху понятието за ирония*. See Грегъри Властос. *Сократ и Виетнам*. In: *Алтера Академика*. Година II, кн. 2 (6). Лято 2008. с. 55-62, also the commentary of Georgi Iliev on Vlastos, p. 63-69.

in a crucial moment of the war (VII, 48²²). He is also mastering the irony as conscious intellectual pretending, which is dianoethically vindicated.

The Athenians and their allies had lost the war, but this was not a sign of the victory of the military-oligarchic governances over the democratic ones. On the contrary, the democratic state in Athens was (according to the famous funeral speech by Pericles):

- * rule of the majority over the minority;
- * governance under the supremacy of law and equity of all citizens in their private intercourses, in their trade and property-enterprises;
- * selection of men for the public duties by meritocratic criteria and not by origin;
- * access even of the poorest citizens to the positions of public officials, if they possess the necessary qualities and skills;
- * freedom is the highest value ;
- * acceptance of the foreigners without prejudices; (of course, all these are embellished and idealized, especially the last one: Athens had not been so closed and xenophobic as Sparta, but foreigners had been deprived of rights, enjoyed by the free men, born in the polis);
- * special cares and attention for the development of education, culture and the arts, in contrast to the excess of military training in the cities of the enemies.

Last, but not least, the governance of Syracuse – the city-state of utmost importance in the final phase of the war, had also been democratic. The democratic rule in Syracuse won the victory over the Athenian democracy, because the peaceful defense is just, and the military aggression is unjust.

The imperial expansion of Athens is buried in the open stone-mines in Syracuse, where thousands of warriors die without food and water under the burning sun. But this does not happen by chance. In the national assembly of Syracuse democracy is debated even more argumentatively than in Athens. The most just governance is the democratic one.

Summary of

Chapter two: τὸ δίκαιον and ἡ δικαιοσύνη from Plato to Aristotle

Whose justice?, or the subject of justice and just

The majority of the contemporary social thinkers and some philosophers, too, conceive of justice in a manner quite different from the one peculiar to the great ancient minds. E. g. John Rawls defines *justice* as the greatest merit of the public institutions²³. What Rawls and many others nowadays call *justice* is not *justice*, but the *just* for Plato and Aristotle. Thus, the dialogue on focus in the second chapter of the dissertation is the *Republic*, because the two concepts in it are conceived not only ethically, but also in the frame of the polis, in an eschatological perspective, and above all – ontologically²⁴.

On the just is the subtitle of the *Republic*²⁵. What Plato designates with the substantiated adjective in the *neutrum* is the general concept for the communal governance of the polis as city-state, and the noun in the *feminine* is firmly the label for the individual virtue, which is of highest value not only for Plato and not only in this dialogue, but for Aristotle as well. Subject of the justice is the individual person, subject of the just is the polis. In order to justify this claim, a map is included²⁶.

The literary brilliance of the dialogue is enchanting²⁷. The place of the *Republic* in the context of *Protagoras*, *Phaedo*, *Phaedrus* and the *Symposium* is also discussed²⁸. In few

²³ In the dissertation his popular book is quoted and discussed in the translation done by Iskra Velinova and Plamen Ivanov. *Теория на справедливостта*. изд. "София – С. А.", 1998 г., с. 11.

²⁴ For the opposite view see. Richard Kraut, *The defense of justice in Plato's Republic*. In: *The Cambridge Companion to Plato*. Ed. by Richard Kraut, 1992, 2005, p. 311-337.

²⁵ *Platonis Dialogi secundum Thrasylli Tetralogias dispositi ex recognitione Caroli Friderici Hermanni*. Vol. IV, Lipsiae, in aedibus B. G. Teubneri. MDCCCLXXXIII.

²⁶ The inspiration for the mapping as a fruitful method for a study comes from Myles Burnyeat. *A Map of Metaphysics Zeta*. Mathesis Publications. Pittsburgh. 2001.

²⁷ See Франсоаз Фронтизи-Дюкру. *От окото до виждането: един гръцки преглед*. В: Следва, 2004/10, с. 10-20; Лидия Денкова. *Погледът в неговата свършена простота*. В: Следва, 2006/14, с. 56-63.

²⁸ Important references are: *Plato's Dialogues. New studies and interpretations*. Ed. By Gerald Press, 1993, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, USA. Myles Burnyeat, *The Theaetetus of Plato*. With a translation of Plato's *Theaetetus* by M. J. Levett, revised By Myles Burnyeat. Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis/Cambridgep 1990; Б.Богданов, *Философско съдържание и художествена форма в диалозите на Платон*, в: *Платон. Диалози*. Том II, С., 1982 г., "Наука и изкуство"; *За стратегиите на философския текст и определемостта на философията*. Платоновият Федър, в: Б. Богданов, *Промяната в*

paragraphs the most important pre-Socratic poetic works on *Dike* and *adikia* are brought to mind, but the real accent is put on the Sophistic-Socratic juxtaposition in the *Republic*.

The map:

Text 1 Πάνυ μὲν οὖν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ. ἀλλά μοι ἔτι τοσόνδε εἶπέ· τί μέγιστον οἶει ἀγαθὸν ἀπολελαυκέναι τοῦ πολλὴν οὐσίαν κεκτῆσθαι; 330 d

Text 2 οἱ τε γὰρ λεγόμενοι μῦθοι περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἄιδου, ὡς τὸν ἐνθάδε ἀδικήσαντα δεῖ ἐκεῖ διδόναι δίκην, καταγελώμενοι τέως, τότε δὴ στρέφουσιν αὐτοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν μὴ ἀληθεῖς ὦσιν· καὶ αὐτός ἦτοι ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ γήρωσ ἀσθενείας ἢ καὶ ὥσπερ ἤδη ἐγγυτέρω ὢν τῶν ἐκεῖ μᾶλλον τι καθορᾶ αὐτὰ ὑποψίας δ' οὖν καὶ δείματος μεστὸς γίγνεται καὶ ἀναλογίζεται ἤδη καὶ σκοπεῖ εἴ τινά τι ἠδίκησεν. 330d-e

Text 3 ὁ μὲν οὖν εὐρίσκων ἑαυτοῦ ἐν τῷ βίῳ πολλὰ ἀδικήματα καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπῶν, ὥσπερ οἱ παῖδες, θαμὰ ἐγειρόμενος δειμαίνει καὶ ζῆ μετὰ κακῆς ἐλπίδος· τῷ δὲ μὴδὲν ἑαυτῷ ἀδικὸν συνειδῶτι ἠδεῖα ἐλπίς ἀεὶ πάρεστι καὶ ἀγαθὴ γηροτρόφος, ὡς καὶ Πίνδαρος λέγει. χαριέντως γάρ τοι, ὦ Σώκρατες, τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνος εἶπεν, ὅτι ὅς ἂν δικάϊως καὶ ὀσίως τὸν βίον διαγάγῃ, 330e–331a

Text 4 Παγκάλως, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, λέγεις, ὦ Κέφαλε. τοῦτο δ' αὐτό, τὴν δικαιοσύνην, πότερα τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐτὸ φήσομεν εἶναι ἀπλῶς οὕτως καὶ τὸ ἀποδιδόναι ἂν τίς τι παρά του λάβῃ, ἢ καὶ αὐτὰ ταῦτα ἔστιν ἐνίοτε μὲν δικάϊως, ἐνίοτε δὲ ἀδίκως ποιεῖν, οἷον τοιόνδε λέγω· πᾶς ἂν που εἴποι, εἴ τις λάβοι παρά φίλου ἀνδρὸς σωφρονοῦντος ὄπλα, εἰ μανεῖς ἀπαιτοῖ, ὅτι οὔτε χρῆ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀποδιδόναι, οὔτε δίκαιος ἂν εἴῃ ὁ ἀποδιδούς, οὐδ' αὖ πρὸς τὸν οὕτως ἔχοντα πάντα ἐθέλων τάληθῆ λέγειν. 331c

Text 5 Οὐκ ἄρα οὗτος ὅρος ἐστὶν δικαιοσύνης, ἀληθῆ τε λέγειν καὶ ἂ ἂν λάβῃ τις ἀποδιδόναι. 331d

Text 6 Λέγε δὴ, εἶπον ἐγώ, σὺ ὁ τοῦ λόγου κληρονόμος, τί φῆς τὸν Σιμωνίδην λέγοντα ὀρθῶς λέγειν περὶ δικαιοσύνης,

ἽΟτι, ἦ δ' ὅς, τὸ τὰ ὀφειλόμενα ἐκάστω ἀποδιδόναι δίκαιόν ἐστι· τοῦτο λέγων δοκεῖ ἔμοιγε καλῶς λέγειν. 331e

Text 7 ἼΑλλο δὴ τι ἢ τὸ τοιοῦτον, ὡς ἔοικεν, λέγει Σιμωνίδης τὸ τὰ ὀφειλόμενα δίκαιον εἶναι ἀποδιδόναι. 332a

живота и текста, С., 1998, Изд. "Отворено общество". Derrida. *La pharmacie de Platon. Tel Quel*, 1968, No 32, 33, *Platon. PHÈDRE*, Traduction inédite, introduction et notes par Luc Brisson, 1989; Part of this writing of Derrida is translated into Bulgarian by Lubomira Radoilska. In: *Език и литература*, 5-6/1996.

Text 8 Ἡνιζατο ἄρα, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ὁ Σιμωνίδης ποιητικῶς τὸ δίκαιον ὃ εἶη. διενοεῖτο μὲν γάρ, ὡς φαίνεται, ὅτι τοῦτ' εἶη δίκαιον, τὸ προσήκον ἐκάστω ἀποδιδόναι, τοῦτο δὲ ὠνόμασεν ὀφειλόμενον. 332b-c

Text 9 Εἶεν ἡ οὖν δὴ τίσιν τί ἀποδιδούσα τέχνη δικαιοσύνη ἂν καλοῖτο;

Εἰ μὲν τι, ἔφη, δεῖ ἀκολουθεῖν, ὦ Σώκρατες, τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν εἰρημένους, ἢ τοῖς φίλοις τε καὶ ἐχθροῖς ὠφελίας τε καὶ βλάβας ἀποδιδούσα. 332c-d

Text 10 Τί δὲ ὁ δίκαιος, ἐν τίνι πράξει καὶ πρὸς τί ἔργον δυνατώτατος φίλους ὠφελεῖν καὶ ἐχθροὺς βλάπτειν; 332 e

Text 11 Καὶ περὶ τᾶλλα δὴ πάντα ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐκάστου ἐν μὲν χρήσει ἄχρηστος, ἐν δ' ἄχρηστία χρήσιμος;

Κινδυνεύει.

Οὐκ ἂν οὖν, ὦ φίλε, πάνυ γέ τι σπουδαῖον εἶη ἡ δικαιοσύνη, εἰ πρὸς τὰ ἄχρηστα χρήσιμον ὄν τυγχάνει. 333d

Text 12 ἔοικεν οὖν ἡ δικαιοσύνη καὶ κατὰ σὲ καὶ καθ' Ὅμηρον καὶ κατὰ Σιμωνίδην κλεπτική τις εἶναι, ἐπ' ὠφελία μέντοι τῶν φίλων καὶ ἐπὶ βλάβῃ τῶν ἐχθρῶν. οὐχ οὕτως ἔλεγε; 334b

Text 13 Ἀλλὰ μὴν οἶ γε ἀγαθοὶ δίκαιοί τε καὶ οἶοι μὴ ἀδικεῖν; 334d

Text 14 Ἀλλ' ἡ δικαιοσύνη οὐκ ἀνθρωπεῖα ἀρετή; 335b

Text 15 Τίθεται δέ γε τοὺς νόμους ἐκάστη ἡ ἀρχὴ πρὸς τὸ αὐτῇ συμφέρον, δημοκρατία μὲν δημοκρατικούς, τυραννὶς δὲ τυραννικούς, καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι οὕτως· θέμεναι δὲ ἀπέφηναν τοῦτο δίκαιον τοῖς ἀρχομένοις εἶναι, τὸ σφίσι συμφέρον, καὶ τὸν τούτου ἐκβαίνοντα κολάζουσιν ὡς παρανομοῦντά τε καὶ ἀδικοῦντα. τοῦτ' οὖν ἐστίν, ὦ βέλτιστε, ὃ λέγω ἐν ἀπάσαις ταῖς πόλεσιν ταῦτόν εἶναι δίκαιον, τὸ τῆς καθεστηκυίας ἀρχῆς συμφέρον· αὕτη δὲ που κρατεῖ, ὥστε συμβαίνει τῷ ὀρθῶς λογιζομένῳ πανταχοῦ εἶναι τὸ αὐτὸ δίκαιον, τὸ τοῦ κρείττονος συμφέρον. 338d-e

Text 16 Πεφυκέναι γὰρ δὴ φασιν τὸ μὲν ἀδικεῖν ἀγαθόν, τὸ δὲ ἀδικεῖσθαι κακόν, πλέονι δὲ κακῷ ὑπερβάλλειν τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι ἢ ἀγαθῷ τὸ ἀδικεῖν, ὥστ' ἐπειδὴν ἀλλήλους ἀδικῶσί τε καὶ ἀδικῶνται καὶ ἀμφοτέρων γεύωνται, τοῖς μὴ δυναμένοις τὸ μὲν ἐκφεύγειν τὸ δὲ αἰρεῖν δοκεῖ λυσιτελεῖν συνθέσθαι ἀλλήλοις μῆτ' ἀδικεῖν μῆτ' ἀδικεῖσθαι· καὶ ἐντεῦθεν δὴ ἄρξασθαι νόμους τίθεσθαι καὶ συνθήκας αὐτῶν, καὶ ὀνομάσαι τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἐπίταγμα νόμιμόν τε καὶ δίκαιον· καὶ εἶναι δὴ ταύτην γένεσίν τε καὶ οὐσίαν δικαιοσύνης, μεταξύ οὐσαν τοῦ μὲν ἀρίστου ὄντος, ἐὰν ἀδικῶν μὴ διδῷ δίκην, τοῦ δ' κακίστου, ἐὰν ἀδικούμενος τιμωρεῖσθαι ἀδύνατος ἦ· τὸ δὲ δίκαιον ἐν μέσῳ ὄν τούτων ἀμφοτέρων ἀγαπᾶσθαι οὐχ ὡς ἀγαθόν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀρρωστία τοῦ ἀδικεῖν τιμώμενον· ἐπεὶ τὸν δυνάμενον αὐτὸ ποιεῖν καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἄνδρα οὐδ' ἂν ἐνί ποτε συνθέσθαι τὸ μῆτε

ἀδικεῖν μήτε ἀδικεῖσθαι· μαινέσθαι γὰρ ἄν. ἢ μὲν οὖν *δὴ φύσις δικαιοσύνης*, ὧ Σώκρατες, αὐτὴ τε καὶ τοιαύτη, καὶ ἐξ ὧν πέφυκε τοιαῦτα, ὡς ὁ λόγος.

Ὡς δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐπιτηδεύοντες ἀδυναμία τοῦ ἀδικεῖν ἄκοντες αὐτὸ ἐπιτηδεύουσι, μάλιστα ἂν αἰσθοίμεθα, εἰ τοιόνδε ποιήσασιν τῇ διανοίᾳ· δόντες ἐξουσίαν ἑκάτερω ποιεῖν ὅτι ἂν βούληται, *τῷ τε δίκαιῳ καὶ τῷ ἀδίκῳ*, εἴτ' ἐπακολουθήσασιν θεώμενοι ποῖ ἢ ἐπιθυμία ἑκάτερον ἄξει. ἐπ' αὐτοφῶρῳ οὖν λάβοιμεν ἂν τὸν δίκαιον τῷ ἀδίκῳ εἰς ταῦτον ἰόντα διὰ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ὃ πᾶσα φύσις διώκειν πέφυκεν ὡς ἀγαθόν, νόμῳ δὲ βία παράγεται ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ ἴσου τιμῆν. 358e–359e

Text 17 καίτοι μέγα τοῦτο τεκμήριον ἂν φαίη τις ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐκῶν δίκαιος ἀλλ' ἀναγκαζόμενος, ὡς οὐκ ἀγαθοῦ ἰδίᾳ ὄντος, ἐπεὶ ὅπου γ' ἂν οἴηται ἕκαστος οἶός τε ἔσεσθαι ἀδικεῖν, ἀδικεῖν. λυσιτελεῖν γὰρ δὴ οἶεται πᾶς ἀνὴρ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἰδίᾳ τὴν ἀδικίαν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ἀληθῆ οἰόμενος, ὡς φήσει ὁ περὶ τοῦ τοιούτου λόγου λέγων· ἐπεὶ εἴ τις τοιαύτης ἐξουσίας ἐπιλαβόμενος *μηδὲν ποτε ἐθέλοι ἀδικῆσαι* μηδὲ ἄψαιτο τῶν ἀλλοτρίων, ἀθλιώτατος μὲν ἂν δόξειεν εἶναι τοῖς αἰσθανομένοις καὶ ἀνοητότατος, ἐπαινοῖεν δ' ἂν αὐτὸν ἀλλήλων ἐναντίον ἐξαπατῶντες ἀλλήλους *διὰ τὸν τοῦ ἀδικεῖσθαι φόβον*. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν δὴ οὕτω. 360 c-d

Text 18 Οὐ δὴ ἀλόγως, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἀξιόσομεν αὐτὰ διττὰ τε καὶ ἕτερα ἀλλήλων εἶναι, τὸ μὲν ᾧ λογίζεται λογιστικὸν προσαγορεύοντες τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸ δὲ ᾧ ἐρᾷ τε καὶ πεινῇ καὶ διψῇ καὶ περὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἐπιθυμίας ἐπτόηται ἀλόγιστόν τε καὶ ἐπιθυμητικόν, πληρώσεών τινων καὶ ἡδονῶν ἑταῖρον.

Οὐκ, ἀλλ' εἰκότως, ἔφη, ἡγοίμεθ' ἂν οὕτως.

Ταῦτα μὲν τοίνυν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, *δύο* ἡμῖν ὠρίσθω *εἶδη ἐν ψυχῇ ἐνόντα*· τὸ δ' δὴ τοῦ θυμοῦ καὶ ᾧ θυμούμεθα πότερον τρίτον, ἢ τούτων ποτέρῳ ἂν εἴη ὁμοφύεσ; 439 d –

Text 19 Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἕτερον ὄν καὶ τούτου, ἢ λογιστικοῦ τι εἶδος, ὥστε *μὴ τρία ἀλλὰ δύο εἶδη εἶναι ἐν ψυχῇ*, λογιστικὸν καὶ ἐπιθυμητικόν; ἢ καθάπερ ἐν τῇ πόλει συνείχεν αὐτὴν τρία ὄντα γένη, χρηματιστικόν, ἐπικουρητικόν, βουλευτικόν, οὕτως καὶ ἐν ψυχῇ τρίτον τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ θυμοειδές, ἐπίκουρον ὄν τῷ λογιστικῷ φύσει, ἐὰν μὴ ὑπὸ κακῆς τροφῆς διαφθαρή; 440e-441a

Text 20 Ταῦτα μὲν ἄρα, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, μόγις διανενοίκαμεν, καὶ ἡμῖν ἐπιεικῶς ὠμολόγηται τὰ αὐτὰ μὲν ἐν πόλει, τὰ αὐτὰ δ' ἐν ἐνὸς ἐκάστου *τῇ ψυχῇ γένη ἐνεῖναι* καὶ ἴσα τὸν ἀριθμόν. 441c

Text 21 Τέλεον ἄρα ἡμῖν τὸ ἐνύπνιον ἀποτετέλεσται, ὃ ἔφαμεν ὑποπτεῦσαι ὡς εὐθὺς ἀρχόμενοι τῆς πόλεως οἰκίζειν κατὰ θεὸν τινα εἰς *ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τύπον τινὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης* κινδυνεύομεν ἐμβεβηκέναι.

Παντάπασι μὲν οὖν.

Τὸ δὲ γε ἦν ἄρα, ὧ Γλαύκων δι' ὃ καὶ ὠφελεῖ *εἰδῶλόν τι τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, τὸ τὸν μὲν σκυτοτομικὸν φύσει ὀρθῶς ἔχειν σκυτοτομεῖν καὶ ἄλλο μηδὲν πράττειν, τὸν δὲ τεκτονικὸν τεκταίνεσθαι, καὶ τᾶλλα δὴ οὕτως.

Φαίνεται.

Τὸ δέ γε ἀληθές, τοιοῦτόν τι ἦν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἀλλ' οὐ περὶ τὴν ἕξω πράξιν τῶν αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὴν ἐντός, ὡς ἀληθῶς περὶ ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ, μὴ ἐάσαντα τὰλλότρια πράττειν ἕκαστον ἐν αὐτῷ μηδὲ πολυπραγμονεῖν πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ γένη, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὄντι τὰ οἰκεῖα εὖ θέμενον καὶ ἄρξαντα αὐτὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ κοσμήσαντα καὶ φίλον γενόμενον ἑαυτῷ καὶ συναρμόσαντα τρία ὄντα, ὥσπερ ὄρους τρεῖς ἀρμονίας ἀτεχνῶς, νεάτης τε καὶ ὑπάτης καὶ μέσης, καὶ εἰ ἄλλα ἄττα μεταξὺ τυγχάνει ὄντα, πάντα ταῦτα συνδῆσαντα καὶ παντάπασιν ἓνα γενόμενον ἐκ πολλῶν, σώφρονα καὶ ἡρμοσμένον, οὕτω δὲ πράττειν ἤδη, ἐάν τι πράττη ἢ περὶ χρημάτων κτήσιν ἢ περὶ σώματος θεραπείαν ἢ καὶ πολιτικόν τι ἢ περὶ τὰ ἴδια συμβόλαια, ἐν πάσι τούτοις ἡγούμενον καὶ ὀνομάζοντα *δικαίαν μὲν καὶ καλὴν πράξιν* ἢ ἂν ταύτην τὴν ἕξιν σφῶζι τε καὶ συναπεργάζεται, σοφίαν δὲ τὴν ἐπιστατοῦσαν ταύτη τῇ πράξει ἐπιστήμην, ἀδικον δ' ἐπὶ πράξιν ἢ ἂν ἀεὶ ταύτην λύη, ἀμαθίαν δὲ τὴν ταύτη αὖ ἐπιστατοῦσαν δόξαν.

443b-444a

Text 22 Οὐκοῦν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, τά τε ἄλλα ἀπελυσάμεθα ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, καὶ οὐ τοὺς μισθοὺς οὐδὲ τὰς δόξας δικαιοσύνης ἐπὶνέκαμεν, ὥσπερ Ἡσίοδόν τε καὶ Ὀμηρον ὑμεῖς ἔφατε, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ δικαιοσύνην αὐτῇ ψυχῇ ἄριστον ἠύρομεν, καὶ ποιητέον εἶναι αὐτῇ τὰ δίκαια, ἐάντ' ἔχη τὸν Γύγου δακτύλιον, ἐάντε μή, καὶ πρὸς τοιοῦτῳ δακτυλίῳ τὴν Ἄιδος κυνῆν; 612 b

The ontological answer: justice is a possibility; the just is possible

In this part of the dissertation I fully rely on the profound study of Fernanda Decleva Caizzi. She suggests that in the *Republic* Plato hints to theories, elaborated by highly gifted intellectuals, who have exercised cultural influence, too. In her view what Herodotus describes as the story of Gyges, is a version of a writing, belonging to Protagoras, and what Glaucon expresses in the dialogue is version of a well-known work of Antiphon²⁹. The peripatetician Aristoxenus holds that not only the views of the two brothers, but much more of the hypotheses in the *Republic*, have already been developed at length by Protagoras in his *Antilogika!* (D. L. III, 37). Even though the accurate and the actual prototypes of the exposed theses are uncertain, what matters is: in the dialogue all possible and conceivable conceptions of the just and justice are dramatized³⁰. They are personalized by the various participants in the dramaturgy of the philosophical play.

²⁹ Op.cit. in the Bibliography at the end of the summary, p. 316.

³⁰ D. L., III, 37.

Socrates does not deliver *enkomion* or *eulogy*, but responds to the sophistic challenge not as a rhetorician, but as a philosopher. Several myths and many micro-dialogues with specific topics convince the *dramatis personae* in his main claim: Justice and just are *possibilities*, but whether they shall be actualized or not, depends on: a) the soul of the person, if (s)he is aiming at *justice*; b) the governance in the polis, if the goal is the *just* .

1. Justice is defined as attunement of the three genera of the soul in a harmony (443c-444a, see text 21 in the map). In texts 18, 19, 20, 21 in the map there are sufficient examples, in which we read not about *three parts*, but about three *eide*, or even *genera* of the soul³¹.
2. Extremely intriguing is the incessant dialectical play of the questions: whether the effort to cultivate justice in the soul is demanded for the achievement of the just in the polis; or, vice versa, the structure, the order and the governance of any *politeia* has to be just as a necessary prerequisite for the cultivating of the personal virtue justice?
3. But the third conclusion of this sub-chapter is the most important one: what everyone has done in this terrestrial embodiment of the soul, succeeding or failing to become just, is determinative for the after-life. The final pages of the *Gorgias*, the *Timaeus*, and the *Republic* (525 e-527 c) are explicit enough.

Part two. The personification of the virtues in the “Persian story” in *Alcibiades*

We shall nowhere find a realistic portrayal of Alcibiades in the dialogues. Instead we have to search for it in Thucydides. Plato never strived to dull realistic depictions of the personages in his masterpieces, but rather looked for provocations, challenging the

³¹ Filip Karfík. *What the Mortal Parts of the Soul Really Are*. In: *RHIZAI*. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy and Science. Vol. II, No 2, 2005, p. 197-218. Karfík, Filip. *Die Beseelung des Kosmos. Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie, Seelenlehre und Theologie in Platons Phaidon und Timaios*. K. G. Saur, München und Leipzig, 2004. M. F. Burnyeat. *Plato on why mathematics is good for the soul*. In: British Academy Symposium, 2004, *Mathematics and Necessity: Essays in the History of Philosophy*, ed. Timothy Smiley.

readers to guess whose the views actually are, pronounced by one or another mouth-piece.³²

In this subchapter of the thesis the interest of Plato, Aristotle and the Academy in the eastern (esp. Indian, Babylonian and Persian) ideas is also commented³³.

In a section of *Alcibiades* (121 a and further) Socrates instructs his favourite young follower, pointing out an example from the Persian political practice. This paradigm deserves to be adhered to, because it is undoubtedly superior to the Athenian habits³⁴. The Persian example in this dialogue is an example of fantastic irony. The only realistic testimony in it is the sentence about the cares, received by the young heirs of the throne, after their 7th year and the overwhelming importance of the hunting and the riding.

121 e: *But when he accomplishes his 14th year, he receives as four tutors four men, selected as the best, the noblest among the Persians (εἰσὶ δὲ ἐξελεγμένοι Περσῶν οἱ ἄριστοι δόξαντες ἐν ἡλικίᾳ τέτταρες) – the wisest, the most just, the smartest and the most courageous (ὁ τε σοφώτατος καὶ ὁ δικαιοτάτος καὶ ὁ σωφρονέστατος καὶ ὁ ἀνδρειότατος).*

The most just sage trains and demands from the future ruler the ability ἀληθεύειν διὰ παντὸς τοῦ βίου, to tell the truth and act accordingly to the truth in the course of all his life.

Of course, the four noblest Persian sages are embodiments of the four most important virtues and in the plot of the dialogue this line is interwoven with the insistence on the indispensability of self-reflection, self-inspection and self-cognition for every decent human person. Not only for the ambitious ones, who pursue political careers.

For the participants in the dialogues and the literary peculiarities see Панова 2005, Nightingale 2004, Nails 2002.

³³ I have written on the topic in my first book *В лабиринта на Платон и Аристотел*, С., 1994 г. УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“. For the fragments from and on the early dialogues of Aristotle see: W. D. Ross. *Aristotelis Fragmenta Selecta*. Oxford, 1955; W. G. Rabinowitz. *Aristotle's Protrepticus and the Sources of its Reconstruction*. Berkeley and Cambridge, 1957; Düring, Ingemar. *Aristotle's Protrepticus and the Sources of its Reconstruction*. Göteborg. 1961; Untersteiner, Mario. *Aristotele. Della filosofia*. Roma, 1963. Excellent exposition of the history of the virtue ethics of the rulers – in the four books of Анастас Герджиков от 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007.

³⁴ For the larger context of these see the relevant chapters in Rowe, Christopher and Malcolm Schofield (ed.), 2000. *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Vlastos, Gregory. *Studies in Greek Philosophy*. Vol. I, II: *Socrates, Plato and their Tradition*. Princeton UPress, 1995. Ed. by Daniel Graham.

Summary of

Chapter three: Towards the conceptualization of **τὸ δίκαιον and ἡ δικαιοσύνη** within *Corpus Aristotelicum*. Towards just: the constitutional history of Athens. Towards justice: the anthropology as fundament of the practical philosophy. Book *Epsilon* of the *NE*: translation in Bulgarian with parallel Greek text

The most important conceptual instruments, elaborated in the *Politics* and applied in the history of the constitutional changes in Athens, in the second and the third chapters of the dissertation are formulated as follows:

1. Every free-born man must be citizen;
2. Every citizen should have the right to participate in the judiciary and the legislative institutions, in all forms and levels of the deliberative decision-making-and-taking;
3. The city-state should be a self-sufficient community of people, who possess personal and private property, and share in the public property. The aim of the state is the good life of all its inhabitants, not only of the citizens;
4. Man as citizen should possess virtues, which are specific *political virtues*;
5. The political power is the power, exercised over free men, equal in origin;
6. The supreme power is the one governing the city-state; (III, 6)
7. The governmental structure is the organization of the governing offices and duties – how they are divided, checked and balanced; who is responsible for what, and what the aim of every community is (IV, 1);
8. The laws are a separate factor, different from the factors defining the governance. The persons, exercising all kinds of duties, should act according to the laws and avoid any infringement; (IV, 1)
9. The institutions and the duties are above the persons. There should be differentiation between the institutional office and the person executing it. The collective governing bodies are better than the individual or the group (aristocratic or oligarchic) governing.
10. The institutions must be regulated by strong rules and order, and everything in them must be subdued to the supremacy of the laws. Any changes in them, forced by the persons, who temporarily are in charge, should be inadmissible. (III, 11 and f.)
11. The middle class in the city-state is of utmost importance. The best political community is the one, dominated by the middle class; good governance is possible in states, in which the middle class is more numerous and more powerful than the other two classes – the poor and the rich. (*Politics*, IV, 11)

12. Alpha and omega of the state governance is the check and balance of the three powers: executive, legislative and judiciary.

Evolution and progress in the empowered institutions in Athens

The historical narrative in Book Alpha of *The Athenian Constitution* is schematized and evidently not interested in the evolving of the historical events themselves, but in the change and the development of the institutions. The conceptual kernel of the apparatus, coined in the *Politics*, guides the characteristics, shaping the 11 successive constitutional forms of the governance in the city-state of Athens:

1. The bigger the number of free citizens-men, regardless of their property or poverty, who have participated in the exercise of public duties, the better the polis has become.
2. The more the duties have been distributed by lot, the better the polis has become.
3. The smaller the number of the duties is, appointed by the Areopagus, the better the polis becomes.
4. The shorter the mandates of offices and duties are – the better for the polis.
5. The more the principle of rotation and the lot are applied – the better for the polis.

Three traces give spirit to *The Athenian constitution*: 1. There is optimism in it; 2. It is Athenian-centered and full of sympathy for it, in contrast to the skepticism of Thucydides and Plato; 3. There is a strong suggestion that the historical progress is irreversible, despite the minor and temporary bloody interruptions.

Part 2. The anthropology correlated to the ethics: the modal triad in the soul and the body³⁵

Aristotle begins the discussion of the concept of the soul in his eponymous treatise with the modest word '*historia*' (περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἱστορίαν) as if he warns the readers that what will be undertaken in the beginning is not a survey or a study, but rather a

³⁵ This part of the summary of the dissertation is an excerpt from an article, included in a volume, edited by Assoc. Prof. Svetla Slaveva-Griffin and Prof. Ilaria Ramella, entitled *Lovers of the Soul, Lovers of the Body*, forthcoming in the HUP.

description or a narration, that is, a mere exposition³⁶. From hereon until the end of book Alpha one by one he exposes and rejects the opinions of almost all philosophers

Having overthrown all previous views and opinions on the basics, he had to propose something new. And he did it in the beginning of Book Beta.

Among substances are by general consent reckoned bodies and especially natural bodies; for they are the principles of all other bodies. Of natural bodies some have life in them, others not; by life we mean self-nutrition and growth (with its correlative decay). It follows that every natural body which has life in it is a substance in the sense of a composite. But since it is also a body of such and such a kind, viz. having life, the body cannot be soul; the body is the subject or matter, not what is attributed to it. Hence the soul must be a substance in the sense of the form of a natural body having life potentially within it. But substance is actuality, and thus soul is the actuality of a body as above characterized. Now the word actuality has two senses corresponding respectively to the possession of knowledge and the actual exercise of knowledge. It is obvious that the soul is actuality in the first sense, viz.

³⁶ In the last half of a century enormous amount of secondary literature on Aristotle's *De anima* has been accumulated, especially on the problems, concerning what nowadays is conceived as epistemology, philosophy of mind and cognitive psychology. There are at least three types of approaches in the English language scholarship, resulting in interpretations, meta-interpretations and even meta-meta-interpretations. See: e.g. the volumes, edited by Mansion 1961, Lloyd and Owen 1978; Barnes, Schofield and Sorabji 1975-1979. The second wave in this trend, the ardent polemical or the calm informative meta-interpretative writings were focused more on the debate with the first group of interpreters, than on the immediate classical (ancient and medieval) approach to the *Corpus Aristotelicum*, e. g. the report of Christopher Shields on the recent literature, accompanying the translation of Hamlyn; also, the collection, edited by Nussbaum and Rorty 1995. The meta-meta-interpretations are the writings, in which the report of the debates between the various scholars' opinions in the previous decades totally dominates the paper, e.g. the article of Gareth Matthews in Shields (ed.), 2003. Writing on this topic, the greatest inspiration for me and helpful elucidation of the puzzles came from the chapters on Plato and Aristotle in the Blackwell's volume, *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*, ed. by Mary Louise Gill and Pierre Pellegrin, 2006, and also the articles by Shields, Modrak and Caston in *A Companion to Aristotle*. In Anagnostopoulos (ed.) 2009; also, the analyses of Patzig and Shields among the articles on Aristotle in the volume, edited by Dorothea Frede and B. Reis 2009; in a similar perspective as the one of the present paper - the modal ontology as a clue to the understanding of *De anima* - is the illuminative scholarly study of Thomas Johansen *The Powers of Aristotle's Soul*, 2012.

that of knowledge as possessed, ... That is why the soul is the first grade of actuality of a natural body having life potentially in it. (412 a 11-28, translation by Smith;³⁷)

We can summarize the main points of the above passage as:

1. The concept of life is the decisive criterion according to which there are natural bodies, possessing life, and others, deprived of life.
2. Life is the disposition of natural bodies to self-nourishment, growth and decay.
3. The last three are the capacities through which life manifests itself and which lay the foundation of the two succeeding conclusions.
4. Every natural body, participating in life, is a composite substantial being.
5. From the above it follows that, in the living composite being, the soul is not a body.
6. The body is the subject or matter, not what is attributed to it (according to Smith's translation quoted above) or "the body is not something predicated of a subject, but exists rather as subject and matter" (Hamlyn's translation)³⁸.
7. It is necessary for the soul to be a non-composite substantial being as the form/*eidos* of a natural body, possessing life in potentiality.
8. The substantial being is *entelecheia*.
9. *Entelecheia* is twofold: one form is comparable to the knowledge, which is already attained and possessed, but is not always or constantly used, as when we sleep, for instance; the other is the active practice of knowledge, as when we theorize.
10. For the above reason, the soul is the first *entelecheia* of the natural body, possessing life potentially³⁹.

The soul as principle of life

τὸ δὲ ζῆν τοῖς ζῶσι τὸ εἶναι ἐστίν, αἰτία δὲ καὶ ἀρχὴ τούτου ἡ ψυχὴ
415b12-14

*For the living creatures to be is to live;
the soul is cause and principle of this.*

Aristotle starts with the exposition of his own views in the beginning of the second book of the *On the Soul*: from this point till the end of the text he explains the soul as principle of life, nature, cause and substantial being, but most often as the substantial agent in the substantial beings. To this end, he develops the conceptual triad of δύναμις-

³⁷ Available at the Classics Archive <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/soul.html>, accessed on the 27th of November 2015.

³⁸ οὐ γάρ ἐστι τῶν καθ' ὑποκειμένου τὸ σῶμα, μᾶλλον δ' ὡς ὑποκείμενον καὶ ὕλη.

³⁹ διὸ ἡ ψυχὴ ἐστίν ἐντελέχεια σώματος φυσικοῦ δυνάμει ζωὴν ἔχοντος.

ἐνέργεια-ἐντελέχεια . No one has done so before him, because *energeia* and *entelechia* have been purposefully coined by him, whereas δύναμις has been around for awhile, but it does not have the specific ontological and modal meaning Aristotle assigns to it in the triad.

The noun δύναμις and a number of cognate verbs, appear in the most difficult mathematical puzzle in the *Theaetetus*. The three pages, confined between 147c–148e, cause a headache, but also inspire both the readers of the original and its translators⁴⁰. In the *Epinomis* (986a5), the word occurs in the plural and designates the most divine celestial dwellers, the planets. At first glance, Aristotle almost completely neglects the geometrical and the astronomical meaning of the word and restores its initial etymological range denoting, “power” and “might”. At a second glance, however, we may recognize the kernels of the future Aristotelian dynamic conceptualization of the term both in the mathematical task about the incommensurable lines and its solution by the 17 triangles (proposed by the young Theaetetus); and also in the passage of the *Epinomis*, implying a dynamic self-movement of the planets, instead of the proposed static one as found in the *On the heavens*.

In book Delta, among the vocabulary of the 30 most used philosophical terms by Aristotle, we find several entries on the meaning of δύναμις :

1. The beginning of the movement or the principle of change, which is in something else or is in the changed, but inasmuch as *it might be* different (*Met.* 1019a15-16).
2. The beginning of the movement or the principle of change, which is in something else or in the changed entity, inasmuch as *it is different*. The important condition Aristotle raises here is that this passive-and-positive disposition to changes from outside occurs only in cases, when the changes lead to a better state (*Met.* 1019a19-23).
3. The ability to reach a completion and to come to a successful end in a process of a change (*Met.* 1019a23-24), which has been chosen or preferred by the entity itself.
4. With regard to the changes, which are undergone by a passive entity, *dunameis* are the dispositions to remain unchanged, literally passionless; they are the passive powers of the entity to oppose to a negative change; they are the resistance forces of the thing to deteriorate in a worse state (*Met.* 1019a26-29); they are the ontological forces, which preserve the things in a certain state, when their change entails worsening.

⁴⁰ See the translation of Florence Margaret Jane Levett of the dialogue and the commentary to it by Myles Burnyeat in his book on *The THEAETETUS*, 1990. p. 266.

The axiological accents on the third and the fourth entry in the vocabulary are due to the unquestionable ontological superiority of Aristotle's understanding of teleology.

The other two elements of the conceptual triad are the landmarks of Aristotle's metaphysics. Coined by him, they have become the bearers of the heaviest philosophical tasks in his ontology, natural philosophy and psychology. In the realm of theology, ἐνέργεια performs two crucial explanatory functions. First, in the most theological book of the *Metaphysics*, book Lambda (7.1072b27), the incessant activity and the perpetual actualization of the supreme first cause and final end, the nous, is life. Life is the phenomenon of the active thinking of the thinking thought. Life all over the eternal Whole is the manifestation of the activity of the supreme immaterial form in it, engaged in the endless act of pure thinking. Not less important is the other employment of the concept. Not only the highest being in the cosmos, but every single entity in it, alive or not, produced by art or naturally engendered, has come into existence, because of the priority of the activity and its greater ontological importance, compared with passive matter or the potential changes and processes (*Met.* Theta, 8.1049b24-25; 9.1051a4-5).

The first of the two concepts has found its way through the centuries, although initially marginalized. Nowadays its meaning spreads over enormous range of usages – starting from theology, philosophy, physics and engineering through all the arts and sciences. The word 'energy' is everywhere. The other one is less lucky. The misunderstanding of ἐντελέχεια and its reduction and identification with ἐνέργεια permeates the reception of Aristotle in the Latin West.

The concept ἐνέργεια is mostly used in the explanation of the cognitive activities and epistemic aspects of life of humans and animals. As explained above, all plants are endowed with the capacity of only one sense-perception, i.e. the touch. Through their roots, leaves and trunks they receive water, nutritive stuff, and light. The animals share with humans four other more complex sense-perceptions. They have the natural disposition not only to touch, but also to hear, to see, to smell and to taste. All these powers, abilities and faculties to perceive and to discern, to recollect and remember become active and actualized under certain circumstances and conditions: ἐνέργεια refers to the various *aspects* of the epistemological and the psychological activities of the living beings (in the animal kingdom and the human genus), whereas ἐντελέχεια is the more general metaphysical designation of the ensouled body, enjoying life, of "the entirety and the fulfilled perfection of the living monad."⁴¹

⁴¹ A proper map or an appendix is needed in order to vindicate such a delineation, which might happen in a book, not in a short sketch like this one, yet compare the following places and passages for ἐντελέχεια 413 b 16-20; 414 a 18-19; 414 a 25-27; 414 b 8-15; and the very long passage 417 a 21-417 b 27, where the sense perceptions, the thinking and the understanding are discussed

In the definition of the soul in the beginning of Book Beta, the ordinal number “first”, attached to the concept ἐντελέχεια, might be understood as the ontological primacy and self-sufficiency of the living organism in its entirety and capability to perceive and/or think, and/or imagine, and/or consider, and/or move. Ἐντελέχεια is the first in respect of its ontological importance and significance. Especially elucidating is the example, given in 413b16-20: there are activities, performed by the parts of some dissected creatures; among the so-called ‘*insected, entoma*’. The living creatures cannot participate in life and be alive neither without bodies, nor without souls, with all their aspects and activities, both psychic and cognitive⁴².

The mystery of *Nous* in the Reign of Life

For Aristotle, the soul does not outlive the body, it ensouls because it is precisely the fulfillment-perfection-completion of the body. He could not find satisfaction in any materialistic or atheistic cosmological worldview. On the contrary, he firmly believed in immortality, but in the immortality of *Nous*, and not of soul⁴³. In vain we may search in his texts answers to the questions of whence this active nous comes from and where it goes after the body dies. It is not clear either what its ontological status is before or after its co-operation with our ensouled body. Unambiguous are only the following places in the *On the Soul*:

1. *Nous* is more divine and unaffected (by feelings, passions and sense perceptions) than the joint entity of the soul-with-body; for this reason, the *Nous* neither recollects nor loves after the extinction of the body-and-the-soul compound (408b25-29).
2. *Nous* is unmixed with the soul-in-the-body (429a18).
3. *Nous* is defined as “that thanks to which the soul is reasoning and supposing” (429a23).
4. *Nous* is passionless, or unaffected by anything, yet in a kind of deprivation, different from the absence of sensitivity (429a29-31).

in general; also, the remarkable definition of light as ἐντελέχεια in 418 b29- 419 a 11; for ἐνέργεια see: 417 a 13-17; 419 b 3-11; 422 a 17-19; 425 b26-426 a 19;

⁴² The cognitive problems are not in the focus of the present study; for respectable scholarly interpretations of many of them among the newer authors see the volumes edited by Lloyd and Owen 1978, and Nussbaum and Rorty 1995, Gregorić 2007, Johansen 2012, Polansky 2007, Wijsenbeek-Wijler 1978.

⁴³ Aristotle did believe in the immortality of the soul in its entirety when he was a member of the Academy. The windings of his theories on the soul and the vicissitudes of his intellectual biography are described, named and estimated differently by Nuyens 1973 (1948), Lefèvre 1971, 1972, Pellegrin 2009; not to forget the totally opposed stories of his theoretical life, narrated in the books of Jaeger 1934 and Düring 1966.

5. *Nous* is completely detached from the soul, from all its sense perceptions, emotions, imagining, reasoning, understanding, memories and recollections; yet because of it the soul can reach the highest possible thinking and comprehending.
6. *Nous* is also intelligible as all other intelligibles; among the intelligibles, which are without matter, to think and to be thought of are the same (430a2-4).
7. There is *an active*, or even *activating nous*, *intellectus agens separatus*, comparable to the light which makes the colors-in-potency to become actual visible colors. Precisely this *nous* is detached, untouchable and pure, its essence being actuality (430a16-19).
8. Exactly this activating *nous* is always separated, and only and solely this part of the human being is immortal and eternal, not remembering anything of the previous life (430a22-25).
9. Not the whole of the *nous*, but this one, whose formal cause corresponds to the essence of its being (*nous*), attains the truth (430b28-30).
10. *Nous* is the *eidos* of all *eidē* (432a1-3).

Conclusion

In the conclusion of the doctoral thesis several final points are stressed and the most important is: the divine nature and the immortality of *nous* demand from us to behave properly, to be virtuous and just.

The writing finishes with a passage from the last pages of the *NE*:

If, then, intelligence is something divine as compared to a human being, so too a life lived in accordance with this will be divine as compared to a human life. One should not follow the advice of those who say 'Human you are, think human thoughts' and 'Mortals you are, think mortal' ones, but instead, so far as it is possible, assimilate to the immortals and do everything with the aim of living in accordance with what is highest of the things in us; for even if it is small in bulk, the degree to which it surpasses everything in power and dignity is far greater. And each of us would seem actually to be this, given that each is his authoritative and better element; it would be a strange thing, then, if one chose, not one's own life, but that of something else. Again, what was said before will fit with the present case too: what belongs to each kind of creature by nature is best and most pleasant for each; for man, then, the life in accordance with intelligence is so too, given that man is this most of all. This life, then, will also be happiest.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ The translation of Sarah Broadie and Christopher Rowe is quoted.

οὐ χρῆ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς παραινούντας ἀνθρώπινα φρονεῖν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα οὐδὲ θνητὰ τὸν θνητόν, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ὅσον ἐνδέχεται ἀθανατίζειν καὶ πάντα ποιεῖν πρὸς τὸ ζῆν κατὰ τὸ κράτιστον τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ· εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῷ ὄγκῳ μικρόν ἐστι, δυνάμει καὶ τιμιότητι πολὺ μᾶλλον πάντων ὑπερέχει. δόξειε δ' ἂν καὶ εἶναι ἕκαστος τοῦτο, εἴπερ τὸ κύριον καὶ ἄμεινον. ἄτοπον οὖν γίνοιτ' ἂν, εἰ μὴ τὸν αὐτοῦ βίον αἰροῖτο ἀλλὰ τινος ἄλλου. τὸ λεχθέν τε πρότερον ἀρμόσει καὶ νῦν· τὸ γὰρ οἰκεῖον ἕκαστῳ τῇ φύσει κράτιστον καὶ ἥδιστόν ἐστιν ἕκαστῳ· καὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δὴ ὁ κατὰ τὸν νοῦν βίος, εἴπερ τοῦτο μάλιστα ἄνθρωπος. οὗτος ἄρα καὶ εὐδαιμονέστατος. (1177 b 31-1178 a 8)

Expression of gratitude: The English version of the summary was linguistically edited by Dr. Lidia Gocheva, alumna of the Harvard University.

Bibliography and internet resources

Editions of the treatises of Aristotle and translations in modern languages:

Aristotelis Opera omnia, edidit Academia Regia Borusica. Vol. I-II *Aristotelis opera Graece* ed. I. Bekker, Berlin 1831; vol. V. *Index Aristotelicus*, ed. H. Bonitz, Berlin 1870.

Barnes, J. (ed.) *The Revised Oxford Translation of Aristotle*, 2 vols. Princeton 1984.

Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea, ed. I. Bywater. Oxonii, 1890.

Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea, recognovit Franciscus Susemihl. Editio altera. Curavit Otto Apelt. Lipsiae, in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, MCMIII.

Aristotelis Ethica Eudemia. Adiecto de virtutibus et vitiis libello. Recognovit Franciscus Susemihl. Lipsiae, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, 1884.

Aristotelis Ethica Eudemia. Recensuerunt brevique adnotatione critica instruxerunt R. R. Walzer, J. M. Mingay. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1991.

Aristotle. *Eudemian Ethics*. Books I, II and VII. Translated with a Commentary by Michael Woods. Clarendon Aristotle Series, 1982, 2005.

Aristotle. *The Athenian Constitution. The Eudemian Ethics. On virtues and Vices*. The Loeb Classical Library – отук нагатак ще се съкращава като LCL. Ed. by T. E. Page, E. Capps, W. H. D. Rouse. Transl. by H. Rackham. 1935.

The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle. Translated by D.P. Chase. London & Toronto, published by J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd. (1911), (1934).

Aristotle. *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated with Notes by Harris Rackham. Wordsworth Classics of World Literature. 1996.

Aristotle. *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated and edited by Roger Crisp. Cambridge Upress, 2000.

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translation, Introduction and Commentary Sarah Broadie and Christopher Rowe. Oxford Upress, 2002.

Aristoteles. *Die Nikomachische Ethik*. Eingeleitet und Übertragen von Olof Gigon. Artemis Verlag Zürich, 1951.

Aristoteles. *Die Nikomachische Ethik*. Übertragen von Franz Dirlmeier. Berlin, 1979.

Aristote. *L'Éthique a Nicomaque*. Introduction, traduction et commentaire par R.A. Gauthier (op.p.) et Jean Yves Jolif (op.p.). Publications universitaires de Louvain, 1958.

Aristotelis De anima. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit W.D. Ross, Oxonii, e typographeo Clarendoniano, 1959, (1956).

Aristote. *De l'âme*. Texte établi par A. Jannone. Traduction et notes de E. Barbotin. Paris, Les belles lettres. 1995.

Aristotle. *De anima*. Books II and III. Translation with Introduction and Notes by D. W. Hamlyn. With a *Report on Recent Work* by Christopher Shields. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2002 (1968).

Aristoteles. *Über die Seele*. Übersetzt von Willy Theiler. Berlin. Akademie Verlag. Vierte Auflage. 1973.

Aristotle. *De caelo*. Translated by J. L. Stocks. *De generatione et corruptione*. Translated by Harold H. Joachim. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1922.

Aristoteles. *Vom Himmel. Von der Seele. Von der Dichtkunst*. Eingeleitet und neuübertragen von Olof Gigon. Artemis-Verlag, Zurich. 1950.

Aristotelis Physica. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit W. D. Ross. Oxonii, e typographeo Clarendoniano, 1950, 1959, 1960.

Aristotle. *Generation of animals*. The LCL. Ed. by T. E. Page with an English Translation by A. L. Peck. Harvard Univ. Press, 1963,(1942).

Aristotle. *Parts of animals*. The LCL. Ed. by G. P. Goold. Translation, commentaries and appendixes by A. L. Peck. *Movement of animals. Progression of animals*. Translation by E. S. Forster. Harvard UPress, 1963,(1942).

Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. The LCL. Ed. by G. P. Goold. Translation Hugh Tredennick. Harvard UPress, 1989,(1933).

Aristotle. *Historia animalium I*. Books I-III. Ed. by G. P. Goold. Translated by A. L. Peck 1979 (1965).

Historia animalium II. Books IV-VI. Ed. by G. P. Goold. Translated by A. L. Peck. 1984 (1970). *History of animals*. Books VII-X. Edited and translated by D. M. Balme. Prepared for publication by Allan Gotthelf. 1991. The LCL. Harvard UPress.

Aristotle. *On the Heavens*. The LCL. With an English Translation by W. K. C. Guthrie. Harvard UPress, 1945, 2000.

Aristote. Du ciel. Texte établi et traduit par Paul Moraux. Introduction Paul Moraux. Paris, Les belles lettres, 1965.

Aristotelis De caelo. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit D. J. Allan, Oxonii, e typographeo Clarendoniano, 1961, (1936).

Аристотель. *Сочинения в 4-х томах.* Академия наук СССР. Институт философии. Изд. "Мысль":

Том I: *Метафизика.* Пер. А. В. Кубицкий. *О душе.* Пер. П. С. Попов. 1976.

Том III: *Физика.* Перев. В. П. Карпов. *О небе.* Перев. А. В. Лебедев. *О возникновении и уничтожении.* Перев. Т. А. Миллер. *Метеорология.* Перев. Н. В. Брагинска. Вст. ст. И. Д. Рожанский, 1981.

Том IV: *Никомахова этика.* Пер. Н. В. Брагинской. *Большая этика.* Пер. Т. А. Миллер. Вст. ст. Ф. Х. Кессиди и А. И. Доватур. 1983.

Aristotle. On the Heavens. The LCL. With an English Transl. by W. K. C. Guthrie. Harvard UPress, 1945, 2000.

O. Longo. *Aristotele. De caelo.* Florence, 1961.

J. L. Stocks's translation of *Aristotle. De caelo:* <http://classics.mit.edu/Browse/browse-Aristotle.html>

Aristotle. On Sophistical Refutations. On coming-to-be and passing-away. The LCL. Ed. by T. E. Page, transl. by E. S. Forster. *On the cosmos.* Translated by D. J. Furley, 1965 (1955).

Aristotle. Physics, Books I and II. Transl. by William Charlton's. Clarendon Aristotle Series, 1984.

Aristotle. Metaphysics, LCL, vol. XVII, XVIII, 1989 (1933), ed. by G. P. Goold. Translated by Hugh Tredennick.

Aristotle. Physics. Vol. I, vol. II, transl. by Philip H. Wicksteed and F. M. Cornford. LCL. Reprinted 1980.

Aristote. Physique. I-IV. Texte établi et traduit par Henry Carteron. Septième tirage. Paris. Les belles lettres. 1990. prem. édition 1926.

Aristote. La Métaphysique. Traduction de Jules Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire, revue et annotée par Paul Mathias. Introduction et dossier de Jean-Louis Poirier. Presses Pocket. 1991.

Aristoteles. Die Physik. Hamburg, 1995. Übersetzt von Hans Günther Zekl.

Translations in Bulgarian of the Aristotelian treatises:

Аристотел. *Атинската държавна уредба.* Превод, предговор и коментар Гаврил Кацаров. В: „Българска библиотека“ №5, С., издава Българското Книжовно Дружество, 1904.

Факсимилно преиздадено в: Гаврил Кацаров. *ИЗБРАНИ СЪЧИНЕНИЯ.* ТОМ II. Съст. доц. д-р Петър Делев. С., УИ „Св. Кл. Охридски“, 2004, с.803-898. (трето електронно издание: https://projectoria.com/product/product?path=59&product_id=52).

Аристотел. *Атинската полития.* Превод Цветана Панициду и Хари Паницидис (предговор и коментар Хари Паницидис). С., ИК „Христо Ботев“, 1993.

Поетиката на Аристотеля (второ поправ. и допълн. изд.). Превод и коментар Кръстьо Генов и Петър Радев. С., книгоизд-во „Хемус“, 1943, 1947.

Аристотел. *За поетическото изкуство*. Превод и въстъпит. студия Александър Ничев, С., „Наука и изкуство“, 1975. Второ изд. С., „Софи-Р“, 1993; трето изд. С., „Захарий Стоянов“, 2013.

Аристотел. *Поетика*. Превод, предговор и бележки Георги Гочев. С., „Изток-Запад“, 2016.
Аристотел. *Реторика*. Превод и въстъпит. студия Александър Ничев, С., „Наука и изкуство“, 1986. Второ изд. С., „Софи-Р“, 1993; трето изд. С., „Захарий Стоянов“, 2013.

Аристотел. *Никомахова етика*. Превод Теменуца Ангелова (ред. Искра Генчева, научна ред. и коментар Ради Радев). С., „Гал-Ико“, 1993.

Аристотел. *Политика*. Превод Анастас Герджиков (предговори на Богдан Богданов и Олоф Гигон). С., изд. „Отворено общество“, 1995.

Аристотел. *За душата*. Превод д-р Марко Марков (въстъпит. студия Ради Радев). С., „Наука и изкуство“, 1979. Второ изд. С., „ЛИК“, 2006).

Аристотел. *Метафизика*. Превод на кн. I-III и кн. X-XIV: Николай Гочев; превод на кн. IV-IX: Иван Христов (предговори: Димка Гочева, Николай Гочев, Иван Христов). С., „Сонм“, 2000.

Аристотел. *Категории*. Превод, въстъпит. студия и коментар Иван Христов, С., „Наука и изкуство“ и Фондация „Отворено общество“, 1992. Второ изд. в двуезичното издание на Аристотел. *СЪЧИНЕНИЯ В ШЕСТ ТОМА*. ТОМ I, част 1. С.: „Захарий Стоянов“, 2008.

Аристотел. *Аналитики*. том I съдържа: *За тълкуването и Първа аналитика*. Превод, предговор, коментар и библиография Иван Христов. С., ИК „Христо Ботев“, 1997. Второ изд. в двуезичното издание на Аристотел. *СЪЧИНЕНИЯ В ШЕСТ ТОМА*. ТОМ I, част 1. С.: „Захарий Стоянов“, 2008.

Аристотел. *Топика*. Превод и коментар Иван Христов (като приложения съдържа статии на: Л. Елдърс, А. Фрагщайн, С. Мансион, Дж. Е. Л. Оуен, В.А. дьо Патер, Ф. Солмсън и К. Дж. дьо Вогел). С., „Захарий Стоянов“. 1998. Второ изд. в двуезичното издание на Аристотел. *СЪЧИНЕНИЯ В ШЕСТ ТОМА*. ТОМ I, част 2. С.: „Захарий Стоянов“, 2009.

Аристотел. *Физиогномика*. Превод и послеслов Хари Паницидис. С.: „ЛИК“ и „Вермеер“, 1998. Второ изд. С.: „ЛИК“, 2006.

Аристотел. *За небето. За възникването и загиването*. Превод, бележки и индекс към *За небето*: Димка Гочева; превод, бележки и индекс към *За възникването и загиването*: Димитър Илиев. (ред. Владимир Маринов, послеслов Мария Николова, въстъпит. студия и библиография Димка Гочева). С., „Сонм“, 2006 г.

Аристотел. *СЪЧИНЕНИЯ В ШЕСТ ТОМА*.

ТОМ I: *ОРГАНОН*; част 1: *Категории, За тълкуването, Първа аналитика*; част 2: *Втора аналитика, Топика, За софистическите опровержения*. Превод, коментар, индекс и библиография Иван Христов. С., „Захарий Стоянов“, 2007 и 2009.

ТОМ II: *НАТУРФИЛОСОФСКИ И ЕСТЕСТВЕНО НАУЧНИ СЪЧИНЕНИЯ*; част 1: *Физика*. Превод, предговор, бележки и индекси Цочо Бояджиев (ред. и бележки Иван Христов). С., „Захарий Стоянов“, 2012.

ТОМ II: *НАТУРФИЛОСОФСКИ И ЕСТЕСТВЕНО НАУЧНИ СЪЧИНЕНИЯ*; част IV: *За душата. *Parva naturalia**. Превод, предговор и бележки Цочо Бояджиев. Иван Христов, бележки на редактора и показалци, С., „Захарий Стоянов“, 2018.

Псевдо-Аристотел. *Реторика към Александър*. Превод Георги Гочев (ред. Николай Гочев). С., „Сонм“, 2004.

ИКОНОМИКА. АНТИЧНИ АВТОРИ ЗА СТОПАНСТВОТО.

Съдържа: Аристотел, Псевдо-Аристотел, Ксенофонт и Хиерокъл. Превод от стгр. и лат. Георги Гочев (ред. Николай Гочев). С., „Сонм“, 2006.

Аристотел. *Метафизика*. Превод и индекс на кн. I-III и кн. X-XIV: Николай Гочев. Редакция на превода, коментар, две встъпителни студии и библиографии Димка Гичева-Гочева. , „Дива 2007“, 2017.

Псевдо-Аристотел. *Природонаучни проблеми* (XXX, 1, 953a10 – 955a40) В: Пирон. *Академично електронно списание за изкуство и култура*. Бр. 16: <http://piron.culturecenter-su.org/aristotle-problems/>

Превод Богдана Паскалева, ред. Д. Гочева. Водещ редактор на броя Георги Герджиков. С коментар на Б. Паскалева: *Излишната меланхолия*.

Interpretations and other relevant titles:

Аннас, Джулия. *Античната философия*. С., изд. „Захарий Стоянов“, превод Капка Герганова. 2007.

Арент, Хана. *Човешката ситуация*. С., ИК „Критика и хуманизъм“, прев. Константин Янакиев. 1997.

Артог, Франсоа. *Свидетелят и историкът*. В: *История. Разказ. Памет*. С., Дом на науките за човека и обществото. Съст. Ивайло Знеполски, 2001.

Балабанов, Ал. *История на класическата литература*. Второ преработено издание. Пловдив, Книгоиздателство Хр. Г. Данов. 1917.

Богданов, Богдан. *Литературата на елинизма*. С., „Анубис“, 1979, 1997.

Богданов, Б. *За културно-историческата основа на философията, или за философията като философствуване*. В: сп. „Философска мисъл“, кн.11/1985.

Богданов, Богдан, съст. *Традиция. Литература. Действителност. Проблеми на старогръцката литература в световното литературознание*. С., изд. „Наука и изкуство“. 1984.

Богданов, Б. *История на старогръцката култура*. С., „Наука и изкуство“, 1989.

Богданов, Б. *Старогръцката литература. Исторически особености и жанрово многообразие*. С., „Просвета“, 1992.

Богданов, Б. *Отделно и заедно*. С., „Планета-3“, 2005.

Богданов, Б. *От Омир до Еврипид*. Пловдив, Пловдивско УИ. 1993.

Богданов, Б. *Мит и литература* (1). Второ допълнено издание. С., изд. „Хемус“, 1998.

Богданов, Б. *Разказ, време и реалност в старогръцката литература*. Пловдив, изд. „Жанет 45“, 2012.

Богданов, Богдан. *Философско съдържание и художествена форма в диалозите на Платон*, в: *Платон. Диалози*. Том II, С., 1982 г., „Наука и изкуство“.

Богданов, Богдан. *За стратегиите на философския текст и определимостта на философията. Платоновият Федър*, в: Богданов, Богдан. *Промяната в живота и текста*, С., 1998, Изд. „Отворено общество“.

- Ботева, Дияна. *Проблеми на тракийската история и култура. Нов поглед върху сведения на Херодот и Тукидид*. С., „Гутенберг“, 2000.
- Бояджиев, Цочо. *Неписаното учение на Платон*. С., „Наука и изкуство“, 1984.
- Бояджиев, Ц. *Античната философия като феномен на културата*. С., „Любомъдрие“, 1994.
- Буркхард, Якоб. *Културистория на Гърция* на Якоб Буркхард. С., „Клио“, превод Владимир Свинтила. 1998.
- Вацов, Димитър. *Онтология на утвърждаването. Ницше като задача*. С., „Изток-Запад“, 2003.
- Вернан, Жан-Пиер. *Мит и мислене при древните гърци*. ИК „Критика и хуманизъм“, С., 1998 г. Превод Любомира Радоилска.
- Видал-Наке, Пиер. *Форми на мислене и форми на общество в гръцкия свят*. С., УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“. Превод Галина Вълчинова. 2001.
- Видева, Недялка. *Аристотел и/или Хюм*. В: *ИСТИНАТА, ДОБРОТО И КРАСОТАТА. ФИЛОСОФСКИ ПРОЧИТИ* (Сб. в памет на проф. Исак Паси, проф. Добрин Спасов, проф. Кирил Нешев. Съст. П. Горанов). С., УИ „Св. Кл. Охридски“, 2014.
- Видева, Н. *Етика и право* (Учебник, в съавт. с П. Горанов). С., „Минерва“, 2002.
- Видева, Н. *Етическия натурализъм на Филипа Фут*. с. 13- 27. В: Филипа Фут. *Възраждането на добродетелта*. Съставители Мария Стойчева и Недялка Видева. С., „Сиби“, 1998.
- Видински, Васил. *Случайности. Историческа типология*. С., УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2017.
- Властос, Грегъри. *Сократ и Виетнам*. В: *Алтера Академика*. Година II, кн. 2 (6). Лято 2008. с. 55-62, както и коментара на Георги Илиев *Събитията около Сократ и Властос* в същия брой на списанието, с. 63-69.
- Вълчев, Даниел. *Студии по история на европейската философия на правото*. С., „Сиби“, 1999.
- Вълчев, Даниел. *Ред, закон и държава в учението на Платон – Космос*. В: *Съвременно право*, 2009/6.
- Вълчев, Даниел. *Ред, закон и държава в учението на Платон – Полис*. В: *Съвременно право*, 2010/2.
- Гадамер, Ханс-Георг. *Актуалността на красивото. Изкуството като игра, символ и празник*. С., „Критика и хуманизъм“, превод Димитър Денков, 2000.
- Гадамер, Ханс-Георг. *Истина и метод. Основни черти на една философска херменевтика*. Плевен, „ЕА“, превод Димитър Денков. Послеслов Димитър Денков и Христо Тодоров, 1997.
- Гадамер, Ханс-Георг. *История и херменевтика*. С., изд. „Гал-Ико“. Съставителство, превод и предговор Христо Тодоров, 1994.
- Георгиев, Борислав (съст. и превод). *Старогръцка лирика*. С., „Отечество“, 1985.
- Георгов, Иван. *История на философията. Първи томъ: Древна философия*. С., Университетска библиотека №49. 1925
- Герджиков, Анастас. *Clementia. Образът на принцепса в римската литература и идеологията на ранния принципат*. С., УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2004.
- Герджиков, Анастас. *Качествата на императора според корпуса на латинските панегирици*. С., „Изток-Запад“, 2007.

- Герджиков, Анастас. *Огледалото на владетеля. Възникване и развитие на жанра Speculum regale в античността и ранното средновековие*. Изд. "Кармен 2005", С., 2006.
- Герджиков, Анастас. *Развитие на жанра Speculum regale през XII и XIII век*. Изд. "Кармен 2005", С., 2006.
- Герджиков, Анастас. *Структура и цел на I кн. на Аристотеловата Политика*. В: *ΣΥΜΠΡΟΣΙΟΝ, или античност и хуманитаристика*. Изследвания в чест на Б. Богданов. С., изд. „Сонм“, съст. В. Герджикова, Н. Гочев, Йоана Сиракова, 2000.
- Герджикова, Виолета. *Идеи и понятия за култура у Тукидид*. В: *Годишник на СУ "Св. Климент Охридски"*, ФКНФ, книга 1-2, том 90, С. 2003. с. 5-53.
- Герджикова, Виолета. *Thucydides modernus*. В: *ΣΥΜΠΡΟΣΙΟΝ, или античност и хуманитаристика*. Изследвания в чест на Б. Богданов. С., 2000, изд. „Сонм“, съст. В. Герджикова, Н. Гочев, Йоана Сиракова.
- Гичева, Димка. *В лабиринта на Платон и Аристотел*. С., УИ "Св. Климент Охридски", 1994.
- Гичева-Гочева, Димка. *Нови опити върху Аристотеловия телеологизъм*. С. ЛИК, 1999.
- Гичева-Гочева, Д., Иван Колев и Хари Паницидис (съст.). *Предизвикателството Аристотел*. С., УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2018.
- Горгий. *Похвална реч за Елена. Защитна реч в полза на Паламед*. Превод Драга Сапаревска. В: *Антология на ораторската реч. Книга втора: Оратори на древна Гърция и Рим*. Съст. Величко Руменчев. С., С., УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2012.
- Гочев, Николай. *ΠΟΙΗΣΙΣ. Класически и съвременни опити по теория на старогръцката литература*. Том I: *Аристотел и Хегел*. С., "Сонм". 2004,
- Гочев, Николай. *Писма до Егина*. С., изд. „Сонм“, 2006.
- Гочев, Николай. *Херодот и частите на света*. В: *ORIENTALIA*. Списание за изтока. 2005/2.
- Гочев, Николай. *Александрия. Разкази за хора, книги и градове*. Изд. „Сонм“, 2002.
- Гочев, Николай. *Александрия II*. С., УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2017.
- Гочев, Николай. *Фантастичното през античността*. С., УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2018.
- Гочев, Николай. *Непубликувани преводи и индекси към тях на всички книги от Метафизика на Аристотел, Епиномис на Платон и Стобеевите херметически фрагменти*. Гочева, Димка (съст.). *Политическата мисъл на европейското "минало"*. С., 2010, УИ "Св. Климент Охридски". Научни ред.: Иглика Милушева и Невена Панова. С текстове от: Галина Иванова, Елена Георгиева, Иглика Милушева, Георги Янков, Димка Гочева, Николай Гочев.
- Гочева, Д. *ΠΟΙΚΙΛΙΑ. Една книга за класическите гръцки мислители*. С., УИ „Св. Кл. Охридски“, 2013.
- Дафов, Веселин и Цветина Рачева (съст.) *Онтологични ситуации. Сборник в чест на проф. Александър Андонов*. С., 2010. УИ "Св. Климент Охридски".
- Делчев, Красимир. *Историософията на Херодот*. В: *Философски алтернативи*, 2005/6.
- Денкова, Лидия. *Погледът в неговата свършена простота*. В: *Следва*, 2006/14, с. 56-63.
- Денкова, Лидия. *Етика. Начален курс*. Изд. Планета 3, НБУ. С., 2003.
- Дерида, Жак. *Аптеката на Платон (частичен превод)*. В: "Език и литература"/ 5-6, 1996. Превод Любомира Радоилска.
- Димитрова, Мария. *Социалността и справедливостта. Екзистенциално-феноменологичен подход*. С., Център „Академична общност в гражданското общество“, 2009.

- Диоген Лаерций. *Животът на философите*. С., 1985, изд. "Народна култура", съставителство и превод Тодор Томов, предговор Цочо Бояджиев, II изд., С., 2002, "Планета-3".
- Доватур, Аристид. *Политика и политики Аристотеля*. Москва, „Наука“, 1965.
- Еврипид. *Избрани трагедии*. С., Колекция АРХЕТИП. Фондация за българска литература. Превод и предговор Доротея Табакова и Тамара Кръстева. 2008,,
- Еврипид. *Трагедии*. С., изд. „Ерго“. Превод и обяснителни бележки Доротея Табакова и Тамара Кръстева. 2012.
- Еко, Умберто. *Как се пише дипломна работа*. Превод Стефан Станчев, С., ИК „Александър Панов“, 1999.
- Есхил. *Трагедии*. С., 1967, изд. „Народна култура“. Превод, предговор и бележки Александър Ничев. С., второ изд. 1982,
- Зелински, Т. *Античният свят и ние. Популярни лекции*. С., Книгоиздателство "Просвета", 1920 г. Преведе И.Г. Раев с увод от проф. д-р Г. И. Кацаров.
- Знеполски, Боян. *Херменевтични парадигми*. С., Изд. група „Агата-А“, 2004.
- Иванов, Вячеслав. *Дионис и прадионисийство*. Санкт-Петербург, изд. „Алетейя“. 2000.
- Иванов, Вячеслав. *Елинската религия на страдащия бог*. Превод и коментар Явор Гърдев. Дипломна работа, защитена в НГДЕК, непубликуван ръкопис, 1991.
- Иванова, Галина. *Софистите и Платоновият диалог. Възможности за допускане на другостта*. В: *Политическата мисъл на европейското „минало“*, цит.изд.
- Иванова, Галина. Автореферат на дисертация *Литературната рефлексия върху проблема за истината. Истина и разбиране у Ницше, Хайдегер и Гадамер*: https://www.uni-sofia.bg/index.php/bul/universitet_t/fakulteti/fakultet_po_slavyanski_filologii/specialnosti/doktoranti/pridobivane_na_obrazovatelna_i_nauchna_stepen_doktor/arhiv/galina_kojcheva_ivanov_a_fakultet_po_slavyanski_filologii
- Игов, Атанас. *Понятието власт в Законите на Платон*. Магистърска теза, непубликуван ръкопис. Защитена в спец. Философия, СУ, 2002.
- Изократ. *Речи*. С., 2008, Колекция АРХЕТИП. Превод и предговор Виолета Герджикова и Николай Шаранков.
- Ирибаджаков, Николай. *Социологическата мисъл на древния свят. Том III: Софистика и материализъм. Метеките във философията*. С., "Партиздат". 1982.
- Йотов, Стилиан. *Равенство и егалитаризъм*. С., „Агата-А“, 2004.
- Йотов, Стилиан. *Хабермас и претенциите на автономията*, С., „Агата-А“, 2006.
- Йотов, Стилиан. *Справедливост и уважение. Опити да се върви напред с Кант*. С., „Критика и хуманизъм“, 2001.
- Кародърс, Томас. *Краят на парадигмата на прехода*. В: *Разум*. Превод Ирена Алексиева. 2003/1, с. 18-33.
- Кацаров, Гаврил. *Избрани съчинения*.
Том I. Съст. доц. д-р Петър Делев и д-р Тодор Попнеделев. УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, С., Университетска библиотека № 390. Приноси към историята на древността. Първа редица,

С., 1920, III. *Тукидид*. С. 633-644. 2001. Том II. Съст. доц. д-р Петър Делев. Университетска библиотека № 390. С., 2004.

Кашъмов, Александър и Илия Панчовски (съст.). *Питагор и питагорейците*. Превод: Александър Кашъмов, Илия Панчовски, Стоян Терзийски. С., „ЛИК“, 1994.

Киркегор, Сьорен. *Избрани произведения. Отражение на античното трагично в модерното трагично и Дневник на прелъстителя*. В: Том I. Или-или; и *Естетическата валидност на брака*. В: Том II. Или-или. С., „Народна култура“, превод Стефан Начев, вст. ст. и съставителство Исак Паси. 1991.

Киркегор, Сьорен. *Върху понятието за ирония*. С., „УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, превод Стефан Начев, вст. ст. Исак Паси, 1993.

Козелек, Райнхарт. *Пластовете на времето*. Дом на науките за човека и обществото. Превод Христо Тодоров. Ред. Стилиян Йотов. С., 2002.

Колингууд, Р. Дж. *Идеята за историята*. С., „Евразия“, превод Ина Колева. 1995.

Ксенофонт. *Исторически съчинения*. Превод Милко Мирчев и Румен Стефанов. Предговор и редакция Богдан Богданов. С., „Наука и изкуство“. 1984,

Ксенофонт. *Сократически съчинения*. Съст. и превод Румен Стефанов. С., „Народна култура“, предговор Цочо Бояджиев. 1985.

Ксенофонт. *Киропедия*. Превод и предговор Владимир Атанасов. С., „Народна култура“, 1995.

Ксенофонт. *Атинската държавна уредба. Лакедемонската държавна уредба*. С., „Изток-Запад“, превод Мирена Славова, 2016.

Лосев, Алексей Ф. *Античната философия истории*. М., „Наука“, 1977.

Лосев, А. Ф. *Миф. Число. Сущност*. М., „Мисъл“, 1994.

Макинтайър, Аласдър. *След добродетелта*. С., ИК „Критика и хуманизъм“, прев. Любомира Радоилска. 1999.

Манчев, Боян. *Логика на политическото*. С., Фондация за хуманитарни и социални изследвания и изд-во „Изток-Запад“, 2012.

Минева, Силвия (съст., встъпит. студия и превод). *Стоици. Фрагменти*. С.: „ЛИК“, 1995. Второ дигитално издание на ел. адрес:
https://projectoria.com/product/product?path=64&product_id=88.

Минева, С. *Постмодерни дискурси на етиката 2*. С., „Проектория“, 2013.

Митева, Евелина. *Антропологията на Алберт Велики*. С., УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2016.

Михалчев, Димитър. *Форма и отношение. Принос към учението за познанието*. том I. С., изд. на СУ, 1914.

Михалчев, Д. *Към въпроса за относителността на истината*. В: „Годишник на СУ“, том XXXIII (ИФФ). С., УИ „Св. Кл. Охридски“, 1936/37, с.1-54.

Наке, Пиер-Видал. *Черния ловец. Форми на мислене и форми на общество в гръцкия свят*. С., УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, превод Галина Вълчинова, 2001.

Николова, Анна, съст. *Преводна рецепция на европейските литератури в България. Том III: Класическа литература*. С., Академично изд. „Проф. Марин Дринов“. 2002.

Ничев, Александър. *Gegen einen platonisierten Aristoteles* (Рецензия на Й. Денигер. *Wahres Sein in der Philosophie des Aristoteles*, 1961). В: „Годишник на СУ“ (Ф-т по западни филологии), том LXI/2, с.19-27.

Ничев, Александър. *L'énigme de la catharsis tragique dans Aristote*. Sofia, Éditions de l'Académie Bulgare des Sciences, 1970.

Ничев, Александър. *La catharsis tragique d'Aristote. Nouvelles contributions*. Sofia, Éditions de l'Université de Sofia, 1982.

Ницше, Фридрих. *Раждането на трагедията, или елинизъм и песимизъм*. С., 1990, „Наука и изкуство“, превод Харитина Костова-Добрева. Предговор и съставител Исак Паси.

Обър, Джосая. *Уроците на Атина*:

<http://www.mediatimesreview.com/july06/Athens.php> - в момента недостъпен, 30 ноември 2018.

Омир. *Илиада*. Превод Блага Димитрова и Ал. Милев. С., „Народна култура“, 1969.

Омир. *Одисея*. Превод Георги Батаклиев. С., „Народна култура“, 1981.

Пиндар. *Питийски оди*. С., 2011, изд. „Стигмати“. Превод, предговор и коментар Яна Букова.

Панова, Невена. *Платоновият диалог. Ситуации и елементи на събеседването*. С., „Сонм“, 2005.

Панова, Невена. *МИМЕОПОЛИС. Върху Платоновата политическа и литературна теория на подражанието*. С., „Сонм“, 2012.

Панова, Невена. *Аристотел и поетите. Наблюдения върху Аристотеловите поетически препратки*. В: *Предизвикателството Аристотел*. Цит. изд.

Панчовски, Илия. *Хераклитови фрагменти* (в посмъртно публикуваната книга са включени няколко статии от студентските години, преводът му на гл.5 от *Категории* на Аристотел, както и дипломната работа на Илия Панчовски: *Аргументацията в спора: проблемът за аналогията. Софистическите провокации към философията*). С., „ЛИК“, 2000.

Панчовски, Илия. Panchovski, Iliya. *The Pattern of Classification of the Sciences in the 'Didascalicon' of Hugh of Saint Victor. Analysis of its Methodology in the Context of the Restoration*. MA Thesis in Medieval Studies. The Central European University. Budapest, January 1996 (приложение към сп. „Критика и хуманизъм“, 1/2001).

Питагор и питагорейците. Съст. Александър Кашъмов и Илия Панчовски. С., 1994, „ЛИК“, Библиотека „Касталия“. Превод Ал. Кашъмов, Илия Панчовски и Стоян Терзийски.

Платон. *Диалози*. „Наука и изкуство“:

Том I. С., 1979. *Апология на Сократ. Критон. Евтифрон. Малкият Хипий. Ион. Големият Хипий. Алкивиад. Хармид. Лахет. Лизис. Протагор*. Преведени от Богдан Богданов и Георги Михайлов. Вст. ст. Георги Михайлов.

Том II. С., 1982. *Горгий. Евтидем. Менон. Менексен. Кратил. Федон. Пирът. Федър*. Преведени от Георги Михайлов, Богдан Богданов, Петър Димитров. Вст. ст. Богдан Богданов.

Том III. С., 1981. *Държавата*. Превод Александър Милев. Послеслов Ради Радев.

Том IV. С., 1990. *Парменид. Теетет. Софистът. Държавникът. Филеб. Тимей. Критий*. Преведени от Цочо Бояджиев, Богдан Богданов, Донка Марковска и Георги Михайлов. Вст. ст. Цочо Бояджиев.

Платон. *Законои*. Превод, бележки, библиография и индекс: Невена Панова (кн. I-IV, VI-VII) и Георги Гочев (кн.V, VIII-XII). Редактор Георги Гочев (I, III, IV, VI и VII) и Николай Гочев (кн. II, V, VIII-XII). Предговор Богдан Богданов. Встъп. студия Георги Гочев

Под общата редакция на Николай Гочев. Библиотека „ДЕЛОС“, С., „Сонм“, 2006.

Платон. *Седмо писмо. Платон поздравява роднините и съмишлениците на Дион*. Превод Стоян Терзийски. В: *Продължаващата античност*. „Критика и хуманизъм“. 2002, кн. 13, 207-231.

Водещ редактор на броя: Доротея Табакова.

Полибий. *Всеобща история*. Том I, II, III. Превод Валерий Русинов. Главен редактор и предговор Александър Фол. С., 2001, 20002, 2003. ИК „Рал Колобър“.

Попов, Стефан. *Идеята за Европа през вековете*. С., ЕТ „Юлиана–М“, 1999.

Попър, Карл. *Отвореното общество и неговите врагове*. Том I: *Магията на Платон*, том II: *Хегел и Маркс*, прев. Камен Лозев. С., изд. „Отворено общество“ и изд. „Златорогъ“. 1993.

Портокалска, Моника. *Причините и началата в Метафизика на Аристотел*. Непубликувана магистърска теза, защитена през 2001 г.

Радев, Ради. *Материалистически положения в гносеологията на Аристотел*. С., „Наука и изкуство“, 1961.

Радев, Ради. *Из историята на арабската философия*. С., „Наука и изкуство“, 1966.

Радев, Ради. *Критика на неотолизма*. С., „Наука и изкуство“, 1970.

Радев, Ради. (съст. и встъпителна студия) *Антична философия. Антология*. Превод: Христо Данов. С., „Наука и изкуство“, 1977, 1988. Стара Загора, „Идея“, 1994.

Радев, Ради. *Сократ. Живот и дело*. С., „Партиздат“. Съставителство на приложението Ради Радев. Превод Христо Данов, 1980.

Радев, Ради. *История на античната философия*. С., „Наука и изкуство“, част I, 1981; част II, 1983.

Радев, Ради. *Латинският Аристотел*. С., „Партиздат“. Съставителство на приложението Ради Радев. Превод Лидия Денкова, Румен Даскалов, Маргарита Кискинова. 1982.

Радев, Ради. *Хераклит. Живот и дело*. С., „Партиздат“. В приложението: фрагменти от и за Хераклит. Съставителство и превод Ради Радев. 1986.

Радев, Ради. *Аристотел*. С., 1988, изд. „Народна просвета“. Съставителство на приложението Ради Радев. Превод Марко Марков и Теменуга Ангелова.

Радев, Ради. *Аристотел. Историческата съдба на неговата философия*. УИ „Климент Охридски“, С., 1989.

Радев, Ради. (съст. и встъпителна студия) *Средновековна философия. Антология*. Стара Загора, изд. „Идея“. Превод Христо Данов, Теменуга Михайлова, 1994.

Радоилска, Любомира. Съставителство, превод и предговор на изданието *Елеати. Фрагменти*, изд. „ЛИК“, С., 1996.

Статии и студии на Л. Радоилска за актуалността на аристотелизма в етиката и съвременната биоетика:
<http://www.phil.cam.ac.uk/people/teaching-research-pages/radoilska>;
<http://www.radoilska.com/>.

Рак, И. В. (сост.). *Авеста в русских переводах*. 1861-1996. СПб, 1998, „Журнал Нева“, ИТД „Летний Сад“.

Рикьор, Пол. *Справедливото между законното и доброто*. В: Пол Рикьор. *Прочити*. УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, С., съст. Владимир Градев, превод Ирена Кръстева и Атанас Желев. 1996.

Рикьор, Пол. *История и истина*. С., изд. „Аргес“, превод Жорж Йовчев. 1993.

Рикъор, Пол. *Живата метафора*. С., изд. „ЛИК“, превод Васил Пенчев, ред. Дора Минева. 1994.

Рикъор, Пол. *Прочити*. Съст. Владимир Градев. С., УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, превод Ирена Кръстева и Атанас Желев. 1996.

Ролс, Джон. *Теория на справедливостта*, С., изд. “София – С. А”., прев. д-р Искра Велинова, Пламен Иванов. 1998.

Ролс, Джон. *Политическият либерализъм*, С., “Обсидиан”, превод Кольо Коев. 1999.

Рорти, Ричард. *Случайност, ирония и солидарност*, С., 1998, ИК “Критика и хуманизъм”, прев. Ина Мерджанова.

Саръилиев, Иван. *Аристотел* (разчел, редактирал и подготвил за печат Андрей Ташев; предговор Владимир Маринов.). С., изд. център „Боян Пенев“. 2013.

Саръилиев, Иван. *Философията на Сократ*. С., Университетска печатница, 1947.

Славейков, Пенчо. *Събрани съчинения*. Том 7: Преводи. С., изд. „Български писател“.

Антигона. Трагедия от Софокъл, с. 263-332. 1959.

Софокъл. *Трагедии*. С., Изд. на БАН. Превод, предговор “Софокъл и ние”, и бележки Александър Ничев, 1956.

Софокъл. *Трагедии*. С., изд. „Народна култура“. Афористичен предговор, превод и бележки Александър Ничев, 1982.

Софокъл. *Антигона*. Превод от старогръцки Николай Гочев. Поетичен превод на някои фрагменти Кирил Мерджански. В: СФУМАТО. Издание за театър и театрална теория. Година I, брой 1. 1998. Рекламно издателски кабинет „Пони“.

Софокъл. *Антигона*. Превод и паралелен гръцки текст, възпроизведен по изданието на Август Бьок от 1843 г. Предговор Николай Гочев. Послеслов Димка Гичева-Гочева. Компютърен набор на старогръцкия текст Цена Желязкова и Димка Гичева-Гочева. С., „Проектория“, 2014.

Спасова, Камелия. *Събитие и пример у Платон и Аристотел*. С., Фондация „Литературен вестник“, 2012.

Тодоров, Христо. *История, историчност, историзъм*. В: *История. Разказ. Памет*. С., 2001, Дом на науките за човека и обществото. Съставител Ивайло Знеполски.

Тодорова, Волга. *Параметри на моралния избор при Аристотел*. В: *ТРАЕКТОРИИ НА ЕТИКАТА*. С., УИ „Св. Кл. Охридски“, 2007.

Тодорова, В. *По някои аспекти на категорията добродетел в древногръцката етика*. В: „Годишник на СУ“, том LXVII (ФФ; кн. Философия), С., УИ „Св. Кл. Охридски“, 1973, с.159-206.

Тодорова, Мария (съст. и предговор). *Историци за историята*. С., УИ “Кл. Охридски”. Текстовете от Фридрих Майнеке, Йохан Хьойзинха, Бенедето Кроче, Валтер Бенямин, Марк Блок, Люсиен Февр, Р. Дж. Колингууд, Фернан Бродел, Едуард Халет Кар, Жак льо Гоф, Ерик Хобсбом и др. 1988.

Тойнби, Арнълд. *Подбрано*. УИ “Св. Климент Охридски”, С., 1992. Превод и послеслов Лиляна Симеонова.

Тукидид. *История на Пелопонеската война*. С., 1979, “Наука и изкуство”. Превод Милко Мирчев. Предговор и коментар Христо Данов.

Тукидид. *Избрани страници*. Съставителство и превод Светлана Янакиева. Предговор Александър Фол. С., „Народна култура“, 1988.

Фронтизи-Дюкру, Франсоаз. *От окото до виждането: един гръцки преглед*. В: Следва, 2004/10, с. 10-20.

Фут, Филипа. *Възраждането на добродетелта*. Съставители Мария Стойчева и Недялка Видева. С., „Сиби“, 1998.

Хайдегер, Мартин. *Платоновото учение за истината* (превод Христо Тодоров). В: *Мартин Хайдегер. Същности*. Димитър Денков, Христо Тодоров - съставителство и превод. Изд. ГАЛ-ИКО, 1993, 1999.

Хайек, Фридрих А. *Право, законодателство и свобода*. УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, С., 1996, Том I: *Правни норми и правов ред*, прев. Александър Кацарски; том II: *Илюзията на социалната справедливост*, С., 1998, прев. Александър Кацарски; том III: *Политическият ред на свободния народ*, С., 1998, прев. Румяна Коларова.

Хегел, Г.В.Ф. *История на философията*. С., „НИ“, II-ро изд., том I, II, III. Превод Генчо Дончев, ред. Кирил Д. Дарковски. Встъп. студия Генчо Дончев. 1982.

Хегел, Г.В.Ф. *Естетика*. С., том I и том II - 1969, Изд. На БКП. Превод Генчо Дончев. 1967.

Хегел, Г. В. Ф. *Философия на историята*. Том I: *Духът на Изтока*. Том II: *Духът на Европа*. С., „Евразия“, преводач не е посочен, 1995.

Хегел. *Разумът в историята*. Встъп. студия, превод, обяснителни бележки и показалец Генчо Дончев. С., „ЛИК“, 1996.

Хезиод. *Теогония. Дела и дни. Омирови химни*. С., 1988, НК. Превод Станка Недялкова.

Хераклит. Превод на избрани фрагменти в: Илия Панчовски. *Хераклитови фрагменти*, С., 2000, изд. „ЛИК“.

Херодот. *История*. Част I и II. С., превод Петър Димитров, С., ДИНИ, 1990. Второ изд. : С., Издателство на НБУ, 2010.

Херодот. *Исторически новели*. С., „Народна култура“, превод Доротей Гетов, ред. и предговор Петър Димитров, 1982.

Хьолдерлин, Фридрих. *Божествен огън*. Подбрал и претворил от немски Кръстьо Станишев, Poesie, 2000.

Цицерон. *Етически трактати*. С., 1984, „Народна култура“. Прев. Юдит Филипова, предговор Анна Николова.

Цицерон. *За държавата. За законите*. Превод и предговор Мария Костова. С., СОФИ – Р, 1994.

Фол, Александър. *Тракийската култура: казано и премълчано*. С., „Борина“, 1995.

Шаму, Франсоа. *Гръцката цивилизация*. С., изд. „Български художник“, III гл.: *Архаичната епоха (от VIII до VI в.)* и VII гл.: *Гражданинът в държавата-град*. 1979.

Янко Янков. *Политически и правни учения. Древна Европа. Гърция*. Том II, във виртуалното пространство на адрес: <http://iankov.blogspot.com/>

Янев, Янко. Хегел. С., „ЛИК“, 1996.

Ackrill, J. L. *Essays on Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford UPress, 1997.

Anagnostopoulos, G. (ed.) *A Companion to Aristotle*. Wiley-Blackwell. 2009.

Aquinas. *On Law, Morality and Politics*. Second Edition. Translated by Richard J. Regan. Edited, with Introduction, Notes and Glossary by William P. Baumgarth and Richard J. Regan. Hackett Publishing Company, Inc. 2002, Indianapolis/Cambridge.

Aquinas, Thomas. *A Commentary on Aristotle's De anima*. Translated by Robert Pasnau. Yale UPress. 1999.

Arnim, H. von. *Die Entstehung der Gotteslehre des Aristoteles*, Wien und Leipzig, 1931.

Arnoldt, U. *Die Entelechie. Systematik bei Platon und Aristoteles*, Wien und München, 1960, S. 141–240.

Aubenque, P. *Le problème de l'être chez Aristote. Essai sur la problématique aristotélicienne*. Paris, 1962.

Aubry, Gwenaëlle: <http://umr8230.vjf.cnrs.fr/spip.php?article26&lang=fr>

Balme, D. *Aristotle's Use of the Teleological Explanation*, London, 1965.

Balme, D. *ARISTOTLE's use of Differentiae in Zoology*. – In: *Aristote et les problèmes de méthode (op. cit.)*, *Articles on Aristotle (op. cit.)*.

Balme, D. *Development of Biology in Aristotle and Theophrastus. Theory of Spontaneous Generation*, PHRONESIS, VII, 1962.

Barker, Ernst. *The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle*. 1959.

Barnes, J., M. Schofield and R. Sorabji (ed.). *Articles on Aristotle*. London, vol. I-IV, 1975-1979.

Barnes, Jonathan (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle*. Cambridge UPress, 1995.

Barnes, Jonathan. *The Presocratic Philosophers. Vol. 2: Empedocles to Democritus*. London, Henley and Boston. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

Bartels, Myrthe. *Plato's Pragmatic Project. A Reading of Plato's "Laws"*. Hermes, Einzelschriften. Band 111, 2017.

Bielawski, Józef. *Lettre d'Aristote à Alexandre sur la politique envers les cités*. Texte arabe établi et traduit par Józef Bielawski. Commentaire de Marian Plezia. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków, 1973.

Boudouris, Konstantine (ed.). *World Congress in Philosophy. The Philosophy of Aristotle. Abstracts*. Athens, National Assembly Press, 2016.

Bodnár, István. *Teleology Across Natures*. In: *Rhizai*, vol. II. No1, 2005. p. 9-30.

Bodnár, István and Pierre Pellegrin. *Aristotle on Nature*. In: Gill, Mary Louise and Pierre Pellegrin (eds.). *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*. Blackwell Publishing 2006.

Bos, Abraham. *The Soul and its Instrumental Body. A Reinterpretation of Aristotle's philosophy of Living Nature*. Brill, 2003.

Boys-Stones, G. R. and Haubold, J. H. (eds.) . *Plato and Hesiod*. Oxford UPress, 2010.

Brentano, Fr. *On the Several Senses of Being in Aristotle*, Berkeley, 1975 (*Von der mannigfachen Bedeutungen des Seindens nach Aristoteles*, 1862).

- Brentano, Fr. *Aristoteles und seine Weltanschauung*, Hamburg, 1977 (1911).
- Brisson, L. *Le même et l'autre dans la structure ontologique du „Timée“ de Platon*, Paris, 1974.
- Brisson, L. *Platon. Timée. Critias*. Paris, 1992. Traduction inédite, introduction et notes par Luc Brisson.
- Brisson, L., W. Meyerstein. *Inventing the Universe. Plato's „Timaeus“, the Big Bang and the Problem of Scientific knowledge*, Albany, 1995.
- Brisson, Luc. *Lectures de Platon*. Paris, Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 2000.
- Brisson, Luc. *Platon. Les mots et les mythes*. Librairie Fr. Maspero, Paris, 1982.
- Brisson, Luc Platon. *PHÈDRE*, Traduction inédite, introduction et notes par Luc Brisson, 1989, Flammarion.
- Broadie, Sarah: *The Sophists and Socrates*. In Sedley (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*, op. cit.
- Brunschwig, Jacques and Geoffrey E. R. Lloyd (eds.) *A Guide to Greek Thought. Major Figures and Trends*. The Belknap Press of Harvard UPress. 2003.
- Burnyeat, Myles. *A Map of Metaphysics Zeta*. Mathesis Publications. Pittsburgh. 2001.
- Burnyeat, Myles. *The Theaetetus of Plato. With a translation of Plato's Theaetetus by M. J. Levett*, revised by Myles Burnyeat. Hackett Publishing Company. Indianapolis/Cambridge. 1990.
- Burnyeat, Myles. *Utopia and phantasy: the practicability of Plato's ideally just city*. In: *Plato. Oxford Readings in Philosophy series*. Ed. by Gail Fine, p. 779-790.
- Burnyeat, Myles. *Aristotle on Learning to be Good*. In: *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*. Ed. by A. O. Rorty. Univeristy of California Press, 1980.
- Burnyeat, Myles and others. *Notes on books Eta and Theta of Aristotle's Metaphysics*. Study Aids Monograph No4, Oxford, 1984.
- Burnyeat, Myles and others. *Notes on book Zeta*. Study Aids Monograph No1, Oxford, 1979.
- Burnyeat, Myles. *Plato on why mathematics is good for the soul*. In: *British Academy Symposium, 2004, Mathematics and necessity. Essays in the history of Philosophy*. Ed. By Timothy Smiley.
- Burns, J.H. (ed.). *The Cambridge History of Mediaeval Political Thought. 350-1450*. CUP. 1988, 2005.
- Byl, S. *Recherches sur les grands traités biologiques d'Aristote: sources écrites et préjugés*. Académie royale de Belgique, 1980.

- Canto-Sperber, Monique. *Éthiques grecques*. Presses Universitaires de France, 2001.
- Cartledge, Paul. *Democracy, Origins of: Contribution to a Debate*. In: Kurt A. Raaflaub, Josiah Ober and Robert W. Wallace (ed.). *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*. With chapters by Paul Cartledge and Cynthia Farrar. University of California Press, 2007.
- Cherniss. H. *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy*, New York, 1944.
- Cherniss. H. *Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy*, New York, 1971.
- Cherniss. H. *The Riddle of the Early Academy*, Baltimore, 1933 (*Die Ältere Akademie*, Heidelberg, 1966).
- Cleary, John J. *Aristotle and Mathematics. Aporetic Method in Cosmology and Metaphysics*. Vorwort von Hans-Georg Gadamer. E. J. Brill. Leiden-New York-Köln. 1995.
- Collingwood, R. G. *The Idea of History*. Oxford UPress, (1946), 1992-10th ed.
- Collins, Susan D. *Justice and the Dilemma of Moral Virtue in Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. In: Tessitore, Aristide (ed.). *Aristotle and Modern Politics. The Persistence of Political Philosophy*. University of Notre Dame Press. Notre Dame, Indiana, 2002. p. 105-129.
- Copleston, Fr. *A History of Philosophy*, London, v. I, v. II, 1976, v. III, 1968.
- Crisp, Roger and Trevor J. Saunders. *Aristotle: Ethics and politics*. In: Furley, David (ed.) *Routledge History of Philosophy*. Vol. II. *From Aristotle to Augustine*. 1997. p. 109-146.
- Day, James and Mortimer Chambers. *Aristotle's History of Athenian Democracy*. University of California Publications in History. Vol. LXXIII, 1962.
- Decleva Caizzi, Fernanda. *Protagoras and Antiphon: Sophistic debates on justice*. In: *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek philosophy*. Edited by A. A. Long. Cambridge UPress, 1999. p. 311-332.
- De Romilly, J. *The Great Sophists in Periclean Athens*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992, 2002.
- De Haas, Frans and Jaap Mansfeld (editors). *Aristotle: On Generation and Corruption*. Book I, Symposium Aristotelicum. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2004.
- Derrida, Jacques. *La pharmacie de Platon*. (Tel Quel, 1968, No 32, 33). In: *Platon. PHÈDRE*, Traduction inédite, introduction et notes par Luc Brisson, 1989, Flammarion. P. 257-403.
- Dick, D. R. *Early Greek Astronomy to Aristotle*, Ithaca, New York, 1970.
- Diels, H-W. Kranz (hrsg.). *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. fünfte Aufl., Berlin, 1934, Bd. I und II.
- Dodds, Eduard. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. University of California Press, 1962.
- Duhem, Pierre. *Le Système du Monde. Histoire des doctrines cosmologiques de Platon à Copernic. Tome I: La cosmologie hellénique*, 1913, Paris.
https://openlibrary.org/books/OL23311978M/Le_syst%C3%A8me_du_monde

- Düring, Ing. *Aristoteles. Darstellung und Interpretation seines Denkens*, Heidelberg, 1966.
- Düring, Ing. and G. E. L. Owen (ed.). *Aristotle and Plato in the mid-fourth Century*. Papers of the Symposium Aristotelicum held at Oxford in August, 1957. Göteborg, 1957.
- Düring, Ing. *Aristotle's Protrepticus and the Sources of its Reconstruction*, Göteborg, 1961.
- Dunn, John, Ian Harris (editors). *Great Political Thinkers. Aristotle*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 1997, Vol. I, vol. II.
- Easterling, P. E. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. CUPress, 1997, 2004.
- Elders, Leo. *Aristotle's Cosmology. A commentary on the De caelo*. Assen, 1966.
- Elders, Leo. *Aristotle's Theology. A commentary on Book Lambda of the Metaphysics*. Van Corcum, Assen, 1972.
- Engels, E.-M. *Die Teleologie des Lebendigen*, Berlin, 1982.
- Eucken, R. *Geschichte der philosophischen Terminologie*, Hildesheim, 1964 (1879).
- Fleischer, Margot. *Hermeneutische Anthropologie: Platon, Aristoteles*. Berlin, 1976.
- Frede, Dorothea and B. Reis (eds.). *Body and Soul in Ancient Philosophy*. Walter de Gruyter. Berlin, New York, 2009.
- Frede, Michael, G. Patzig. *Aristoteles, Metaphysik, Buch Z, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar, Band I, II*, München, 1988.
- Frede, Michael. *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*. Minneapolis, 1987.
- Frede, Michael. Aristotle on Thinking. In: *Rhizai*, 2008, vol. V, No2. p. 287-302.
- Fritz, Kurt von. *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung. Band I: Von den Anfängen bis Thukydides*. Berlin, De Gruyter, 1967.
- Furley, David (ed.) *Routledge History of Philosophy. Vol. II. From Aristotle to Augustine*. 1997.
- Furth, Montgomery. *Substance, Form and Psyche: an Aristotelean Metaphysics*. CUPress, 1988.
- Gadamer. *A Century of Philosophy. A Conversation with Riccardo Dottori*. Continuum. New York, London, 2006.
- Gill, Mary Louise and Pierre Pellegrin (eds.). *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*. Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Gilson, Ét. *L'être et l'essence*, Paris, 1974.
- Gilson, Ét. *D'Aristote à Darwin et retour. Essai sur quelques constantes de la biophilosophie*, Paris, Vrin, 1971.
- Gomperz, Th. *A History of Ancient Philosophy*, v. IV, London, 1969.
- Gotthelf, A. (ed.) *Aristotle on Nature and Living Things*. Bristol, Pittsburgh, 1985.
- Gotthelf, A., J. G. Lennox (ed.) *Philosophical Issues in Aristotle's Biology*. Cambridge 1987.
- Graham, D. W. *Aristotle's Two Systems*, Oxford, 1987.

Gregorić, Pavel. *Aristotle on the Common Sense*. Oxford UP. 2007.

Guthrie, W. K. C. *A History of Greek Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, vol. I – VI, 1970 –1983.

Happ, H. *Hyle. Studien zum aristotelischen Materie-Begriff*, W. de Gruyter, 1971.

Hartmann, N. *Zur Lehre vom Eidos bei Platon und Aristoteles*, Berlin, 1941.

Harrison, A.R.W. *Aristotle's Nichomachean Ethics, Book V, and the Law of Athens*. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, LXXVII (1), 42-7.; and in: Dunn, John, Ian Harris (eds). *Great Political Thinkers. Aristotle*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 1997, Vol. I, p. 167-72.

Havlíček, Aleš and Filip Karfík (ed). *Plato's Protagoras. Proceedings of the third Symposium Platonicum Pragense*. Prague, OIKOUMENH, 2003.

Havlíček, Aleš and Filip Karfík (ed). *The Republic and the Laws of Plato. Proceedings of the First Symposium Platonicum Pragense*. Prague, OIKOUMENH, 1998.

Heidegger, M. *Vom Wesen und Begriff der φύσις. Aristoteles, Physik, B, I*. In: *Wegmarken*, Fr. am Main, 1978 (2 Aufl.).

Heidegger, M. *Plato's Sophist*. Translated by Richard Rojcewicz and André Schuwer. Indiana UPress, 1997. (*Platon: Sophistes*, Gesamtausgabe, Band 19, 1992).

Herodotus. *Historiae*, ed. Ph.-E. Legrand, Hérodote. *Histoires*, 9 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1:1932; 2:1930; 3:1939; 4 (3rd edn.):1960; 5:1946; 6:1948; 7:1951; 8:1953; 9:1954 (repr. 1:1970; 2:1963; 3:1967; 5:1968; 6:1963; 7:1963; 8:1964; 9:1968).

Herodotus. *The Histories*. London: David Campbell Publishers, 1997. Translated by George Rawlinson (1858) with an Introduction by Rosalind Thomas. 1997.

Irwin, Terence H. [Reason and Responsibility in Aristotle. The Metaphysical and Psychological Basis of Aristotle's Ethics](#). In: Rorty, A (ed.) *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*. University of California Press, 1980.

Jaeger, W. *Aristoteles. Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung*, Berlin, 1923. (*Aristotle. Fundamentals of the History of his Development*, Oxford, 1934).

Jaeger, W. *Die Theologie der frühen Griechischen Denker*, Stuttgart, 1964.

Jaeger, W. *Das Pneuma im Lykeion*, HERMES, 48, 1913.

Jaeger, Werner. *PAIDEIA. The Ideals of Greek culture. Vol.I: Archaic Greece. The Mind of Athens*. Second ed. Oxford UPress, 1965

Johansen, Thomas K. *The Powers of Aristotle's Soul*. Oxford UPress, 2012.

Johnson, Curtis N. *Aristotle's Theory of the State*. 1990.

- Johnson, E. *The Argument of Aristotle's Metaphysics*, New York, 1906.
- Karfiík, Filip. *Die Beseelung des Kosmos. Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie, Seelenlehre und Theologie in Platons Phaidon und Timaios*. K. G. Saur, Muenchen und Leipzig, 2004.
- Karfiík, Filip. *What the mortal parts of the soul really are?* In: Rhizai. A journal for ancient philosophy and science. Vol. II, No2, p. 197-218.
- Kerferd, G. B (ed.). *The Sophists and their Legacy. Hermes. Zeitschrift fuer Classische Philologie. Heft 44, 1981.*
- Kerferd, G. B (ed.). *The Sophistic Movement*. CUPress, 1981, 1999, 2001.
- Kirk, G.S., J. E. Raven and M. Schofield. *The Presocratic Philosophers*. Second Edition. CUP, 2006.
- Kirwan, Cristopher. *Translation and Notes of Aristotle's Metaphysics. Books G-D-E. Oxford, 1971, 1993.*
- Krämer, H.-J. *Grundbegriffe akademischer Dialektik in den biologischen Schriften von Aristoteles und Teophrast*. Rheinisches Museum, 1968.
The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy (ed. by Kretzman and others, 1988)
- Kraut, Richard. *Aristotle. Political Philosophy*. Oxford UPress, 2002.
- Kraut, Richard (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Plato*. Cambridge UPress, 2005.
- Kullmann, Wolfgang. *Aristoteles und die moderne Wissenschaft*. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 1998.
- Kullmann, Wolfgang. *Wissenschaft und Methode: Interpretationen zur aristotelischen Theorie der Naturwissenschaft*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1974.
- Laks, A., M. Schofield (eds.) *Justice and Generosity: Studies in Hellenistic Social and Political Philosophy*. Cambridge UPress, 1995.
- Laubier, Patrick de. *Une alternative sociologique: Aristote-Marx*. Paris. 1987.
- Lear, Gabriel Richardson. *Happy Lives and the Highest Good. An Essay on Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. Princeton and Oxford. 2004.
- Lefèvre, Ch. *Sur l'évolution d'Aristote en psychologie*, Louvain, 1972.
- Lefèvre, Ch. *Quinta natura et psychologie aristotélicienne*. – *Revue philosophique de Louvain*, 69, 1971.
- Lehmann, Gustav Adolf. *Ansätze zu einer Theorie des griechischen Bundesstaates bei Aristoteles und Polybios*. Goettingen, 2001.

- Leunissen, Mariska. *Explanation and Teleology in Aristotle's Science of Nature*. Cambridge UPress, 2010.
- Lloyd, G. E. R. *Aristotle: the Growth and Structure of his Thought*, Cambridge, 1968.
- Lloyd, G. E. R. and G. E. L. Owen (eds). *Aristotle on Mind and the Senses*. Proceedings of the 7th Symposium Aristotelicum, ed. G. E. R., Cambridge, 1978.
- Long, A. A (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek philosophy*. Cambridge UPress, 1999.
- Loraux, Nikole. *The Divided City. On Memory and Forgetting in Ancient Athens*. Zone Books. New York, 2006.
- MacIntyre. *A Short History of Ethics*. Routledge Classics, 2006 (1967). London and New York.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* Duckworth, 1988.
- Mansion, S (ed.). *Aristote et les problèmes de méthode*. Proceedings of the 2nd Symposium Aristotelicum, ed. S. Mansion, Louvain, 1961.
- Mara M., Gerald. *The Culture of Democracy. Aristotle's Athenaion Politeia as Political Theory*. In: *Aristotle and Modern Politics. The Persistence of Political Philosophy*. Tessitore, Aristide (editor). University of Notre Dame Press. Indiana, 2002. p. 307-339.
- Miller, Fred D., Jr. *Aristotelian Autonomy*. In: *Aristotle and Modern Politics...* op.cit.
- Moore, John M. *Aristotle and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy*. University of California press, 1975.
- Maritain, J., *On the Use of Philosophy*. Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Maritain, J., *Science and Wisdom*. The Centenary Press, London, 1940, 1944.
- Mulgan, Richard. *Aristotle and the Political Role of Women*. In: *Great Political Thinkers. Aristotle*. Ed. By John Dunn and Ian Harris. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 1997. vol. I. p. 568-591.
- Nails, Debra. *The People of Plato. A Prosopography of Plato and other Socratics*. Hackett Pub., 2002.
- Ničev, Alexandre. *L'énigme de la catharsis tragique dans Aristote*. Sofia, Éditions de l' Académie Bulgare des Sciences, 1970.
- Ničev, Alexandre. *La catharsis tragique d' Aristote. Nouvelles contributions*. Sofia, Éditions de l' Université de Sofia "Kliment Ohridski", 1982.
- Nightingale, A. W. *Spectacles of Truth in Classical Greek Philosophy. Theoria in its Cultural Context*. CUPress, 2004.
- Nussbaum, Martha and A. O. Rorty (eds.). *Essays on Aristotle's De anima*. 1995.
- Nuyens, Fr. *L'évolution de la psychologie d'Aristote*, Louvain, 1948, 1973 (*Ontwikkelingsmomenten in de zielkunde van Aristoteles*, Amsterdam, 1939).
- Ober, Josiah. *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens. Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule*. Princeton UPress. 1998, 2002.
- Ober, Josiah and Charles Hedrick (eds.). *DEMOKRATIA. A conversation on democracies, ancient and modern*. Princeton UPress, 1996.

O'Connor, David K. *Leo Strauss's Aristotle and Martin Heidegger's Politics*. In: *Aristotle and Modern Politics...* op.cit.. 162-207.

Owens, J. *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian "Metaphysics"*, Toronto, 1978 (3rd ed.).

Pagden, Anthony (ed.). *The Idea of Europe. From Antiquity to the European Union*. Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Cambridge UPress, 2002.

Platonis Dialogi secundum Thrasylli Tetralogias dispositi ex recognitione Caroli Friderici Hermanni. Vol. I-VI, Lipsiae, in aedibus B. G. Teubneri. MDCCCLXXXIII.

Peck, A. L. *The Connate Pneuma, an Essential Factor in Aristotle's Solution to the Problems of Reproduction and Sensation*, Oxford, 1953.

Pellegrin, Pierre. *Le vocabulaire d'Aristote*. Eclipses 2009.

Pellegrin, Pierre. *Aristotle's Classification of animals. Biology and the Conceptual Unity of the Aristotelian Corpus*. University of California Press, 1986.

Pelling, Christopher. *East Is East And West Is West - Or Are They? National Stereotypes In Herodotus*. <http://www.dur.ac.uk/Classics/histos/1997/pelling.html>.

Polansky, Ronald. *Aristotle's De anima*. Cambridge UPress, 2007.

Press, Gerald (ed.) *Plato's Dialogues. New studies and interpretations*. 1993, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, USA.

Quinn, F. X. *Theory of spontaneous generation according to the ancients*. In: *The Classical Bulletin*, Saint-Louis, 1964.

Raaflaub, Kurt, A. Josiah Ober and Robert W. Wallace. *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*. University of California Press, 2007.

Rabinowitz, W. G. *Aristotle's Protrepticus and the Sources of its Reconstruction*. Berkeley and Cambridge, 1957.

Radoilska, Lubomira. *Addiction and Weakness of Will*. Oxford UPress, 2013

(<https://global.oup.com/academic/product/addiction-and-weakness-of-will-9780199641963?cc=us&lang=en&>).

Radoilska, L. *L'actualité d'Aristote en morale*. Presses Universitaires de France, 2007 (ел. адрес: https://www.puf.com/content/L_actualit%C3%A9_dAristote_en_morale).

Rapp, Christof. *Aristoteles. Zur Einführung*. Junius-Verlag, Hamburg. 2012.

Rapp, Christof und Tim Wagner, Hrsg., *Wissen und Bildung in der antiken Philosophie*. Stuttgart, Weimer, Metzler, 2006.

Rapp, Christof. Handout for the seminar on the virtues in the *Eudemian ethics*, held on the 28th of February 2017, Sofia University.

Rapp, Christof und Claus Korcilius, Hrsg. *Aristoteles. Handbuch. Leben-Werk-Wirkung*. Stuttgart, Weimer, Metzler, 2011.

Redlow, Goetz. *Theoria. Theoretische und praktische Lebensauffassung im philosophischen Denken der Antike*. Berlin, Deutscher Verlag, 1966.

Reese-Schäfer, Walter. *Antike politische Philosophie. Zur Einführung*. Hamburg, Junius Verlag, 1998.

Reinhardt, Karl. *Vermächtnis der Antike. Gesammelte Essays zur Philosophie und Geschichtsschreibung*. Hrsg. Von Carl Becker. Vandenhoech&Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1960. *Herodots Persergeschichten, Gyges und sein Ring*, S.133 – 183.

Rolfes, E. *Die Philosophie des Aristoteles als Naturerklärung und Weltanschauung*, Leipzig, 1923;

Ross, W. D. *Aristotelis Fragmenta Selecta*, Oxford, 1955.

Routila, L. *Die aristotelische Idee der ersten Philosophie. Untersuchungen zur ontotheologischen Verfassung der Metaphysik des Aristoteles*, Amsterdam, 1969.

Rowe, Christopher and Malcolm Schofield (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*, 2000.

Rowe, Christopher. *International Plato Studies. Reading the "Statesman". Proceedings of the Third Symposium Platonicum*, Bristol. Berlin, Academia Verlag, 1995.

Schüssler, Ingeborg. *Aristoteles, Philosophie und Wissenschaft*. 1982.

Sedley, David. *Hesiod's Theogony and Plato's Timaeus*. In: Boys-Stones, G. R. and Haubold, J. H. (eds.) . *Plato and Hesiod*. Oxford UPress, 2010.

Sedley, David (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*. Cambridge UPress, 2003, 2004.

Šegvić, Heda. *Protagoras' Political Art*. In: *Rhizai*, Journal for ancient philosophy and science, 2004, 2.

Seidel, Helmut. *Zum Verhaeltnis von Karl Marx zu Aristoteles*. Leipzig, Tuebner, 1979.

Shields, Christopher (ed.) *The Blackwell Guide to Ancient Philosophy*. Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Scheffel, W. *Aspekte der Platonischen Kosmologie*. Leiden, 1976.

Schmitz, H. *Die Ideenlehre des Aristoteles*. Bonn, Bd., I, II, III, 1985.

Seel, G. *Die Aristotelische Modaltheorie*. Berlin, 1982.

Solmsen, F. *The Vital Heat, the Inborn Pneuma and the Aether*. *Journal for the History of Science*, LXXVII, 1957.

Sorabji, Richard. *Necessity, Cause and Blame. Perspectives on Aristotle's Theory*. Duckworth, 1980.

Spaemann, R., R. Low. *Die Frage Wozu? Geschichte und Wiederentdeckung des teleologischen Denkens*, München, 1981.

Stavrianeas, Stasinios. *Spontaneous Generation in Aristotle's Biology*. In: *Rhizai*, vol. V, No2, 2008, p. 303-338.

- Stenzel, J. *Metaphysik des Altertums*, München-Wien, 1931.
<https://archive.org/details/metaphysikdesalt00sten>
- Tarán, L. *Academica: Plato, Philip of Opus and the Pseudo-Platonic Epinomis*. 1975. *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society*, vol.107.
- Tessitore, Aristide (ed.) *Aristotle and Modern Politics. The Persistence of Political Philosophy*. University of Notre Dame Press. Indiana, 2002.
- Theiler, W. *Zur Geschichte der teleologischen Naturbetrachtung bis auf Aristoteles*, Berlin, 1965. (2 Aufl.)
- Tipton, Jason A. *Philosophical Biology in Aristotle's Parts of Animals*. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 26. Springer, 2014.
- Thomson, George. *Studies in ancient Greek society. The first philosophers*. London, 1977.
- Thucydides. *Historiae*. In: *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Ed. H.S. Jones and J.E. Powell, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1942, vol. I, II.
- Trude, P. *Der Begriff der Gerechtigkeit in der aristotelischen Rechts- und Staatsphilosophie*. Berlin, De Gruyter, 1955.
- Untersteiner, Mario. *Aristotele. Della filosofia*. Roma, 1963.
- Van Riel, Gerd and Pierre Destrée. *Ancient Perspectives on Aristotle's De anima*. Leuven UPress, 2009.
- Vlastos, Gregory. *Studies in Greek Philosophy. Vol. I, II: Socrates, Plato and their Tradition*. Princeton UPress, 1995. Ed. by Daniel Graham.
- Wallace, Robert. *Revolutions and a New Order in Solonian Athens and Archaic Greece*. In: Raaflaub, Ober and Wallace (eds.). *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*. Op. cit.
- Webster, T.B. L. *Political Interpretations in Greek Literature*. Manchester, 1948.
- Wijsenbeek-Wijler, H. *Aristotle's Concept of Soul, Sleep and Dreams*. Adolf M. Hakkert Publisher, Amsterdam. 1978.
- Wolf, Erik. *Griechisches Rechtsdenken*. Vittorio Klostermann. Frankfurt am Main. (1950-1970)
 Band I: *Vorsokratiker und frühe Dichter*; Band II: *Rechtsphilosophie und Rechtsdichtung im Zeitalter der Sophistik*; Band III, 1: *Rechtsphilosophie der Sokratik und Rechtsdichtung der alten Komödie*; Band III, 2: *Die Umformung des Rechtgedankens durch Historik und Rhetorik*; Band IV, 1: *Platon. Frühdialoge und Politeia*; Band IV, 2: *Platon. Dialoge der Mittleren und späteren Zeit. Briefe*.
- Yack, Bernard. *A Reinterpretation of Aristotle's Political Teleology*. In: *Great Political Thinkers. Aristotle*. Ed. By John Dunn and Ian Harris. p. 458-476.

Mostly used internet resources:

Thesaurus linguae graece: a Digital Library of Greek Literature: <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/>
 The project ARION: reception and translation of the ancient drama in Bulgaria: <http://arionbg.info/>

The website of the Department of Classics, Sofia University: <http://kkf.proclassics.org/index.php>

The project Teseus: <http://theseus.proclassics.org/>

Romulus Bulgaricus: <http://romulus-bg.net/>

Masters' programme in ancient culture and literature: <http://antichnost.blogspot.com/>

Blog of Assoc. Prof. Nikolai Gochev for the study of ancient Greek literature and philosophy:

<http://literaturasu.blogspot.com/>

Websites of congresses and conferences, dedicated to the anniversary of Aristotle in 2016:

[World Congress "ARISTOTLE 2400 YEARS", Thessaloniki, May 23-28, 2016](#)

[The Philosophy of Aristotle, Athens, 10-15 July 2016](#)

[International Conference 2400 ARISTOTLE University of Bucharest, Faculty of Philosophy, Bucharest, Romania November 25 – 26, 2016](#)

[Ten conferences in Europe and the USA with the common topic "Aristotle today"](#)

International conference on the *Nikomachean Ethics*, Sankt Petersburg, 18 and 19 November 2016

<https://aristotlesofia.files.wordpress.com/2016/08/st-petersburg-programme.pdf>

Conference *The Challenge: Aristotle*, Sofia University, 28-30 November 2016

<https://aristotlesofia.wordpress.com/>

<http://classics.mit.edu/Browse/index.html>

Website of the [Association for the development of the university classical education](#)

[History of Philosophy without any Gaps: Audiolectures by Peter Adamson](#)
