

Dialectic and Time: Paradigm and Measurement in Plato's *Statesman*

Masahito TAKAHASHI

Plato not only elaborates upon the method of dialectics in his later dialogues but also seems to be tackling some questions about time. However, how can we reconcile the method, which seeks to capture what is thought to exist in a state of stillness, with the dynamic nature of time? To answer this question, I believe that examining the *Statesman* would be beneficial for this purpose, as it is rich in methodological reflection.

In section 1 I point out that the concepts of “dreaming” and “waking” in the *Statesman* is different from that in the *Republic*, because while Plato sharply distinguishes “dreaming” from “waking” in his second largest dialogue, he makes his new main character, the “Eleatic Stranger (ES)”, expresses perplexity, murmuring that they might be a continuum, or inextricably linked.

In order to clear the point ES tells young Socrates that they need “a paradigm of a paradigm”, which ES illustrates with children’s learning of letters. ES continues to indicate that paradigms should be smaller than, and distant from, the very topic of the discussion. In section 2 I interpret these conditions. They should be small because the smaller they are the easier they are treated; but why should they be distant? Why can the distant thing be a paradigm of the topic? The myth, I suggest, provides us with an answer. ES states definitely that he has introduced the myth to clarify the difference between the statesman in the age of Kronos, when gods and daemons take care of human beings, and that in the age of Zeus, when they manage to survive without gods’ help. But I would like to point out that even in the age of Zeus both gods are helping human race by having taught technology and the (unnamed) god keeps the universe away from sinking into “the boundless sea of unlikeness”. Thanks to the (unnamed) god, the universe does not perish but is still saved, being built on a delicate balance of similarities and dissimilarities. I maintain that it is this balance that makes it possible for a distant, seemingly irrelevant thing to be a proper paradigm.

In section 3 I discuss the measurement ($\tauὸ \muέτρειον$). With a textual analysis I interpret that while the measurement should come into being, the measurement itself is being ($\tauὸ ὄν$). And I would like to suggest the discussion, which Plato describe in his *Philebus* as “a certain order of non-objects that beautifully dominates the body with soul”, could be such a measurement.