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ABSTRACT

PHILOSOPHICAL SPACING [PS]: ITS FUNCTION AND COMPOSITION IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL DIALECTICS OF MATTHEW LIPMAN’S PHILOSOPHICAL NOVELS FOR CHILDREN

MAY, 1989

LILLIAN GREELEY, B.A., TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

M.A., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT BOSTON

Directed by: Professor John Murray

Philosophical Spacing [PS], a phenomenon found in the philosophic dialectic, is defined as a space or break from the formal work of the philosophical dialectic, and is suspected to be a necessary interval which permits higher order cognitive processing to take place so that the analytical work of the dialectic can develop. An example of modern philosophical dialectics, the philosophical novels for children by Matthew Lipman, was analyzed to study the structural and contextual nature of PS in order to complement a study in progress of the philosophical dialectics of the Earliest Socratic Dialogues. Using a structural analysis of 21 randomly chosen philosophical dialectics to study the position of PS in the philosophical dialectic, PS was found to occur with consistent regularity in a majority of the segment structures of these philosophical dialectics. Using
a contextual analysis of 147 randomly chosen PSs to study its qualitative composition, PS was found to be comprised of positive and negative synergetic combinations of elements, of which 7 were identified. An interrater reliability test, scored with Cohen's Kappa statistic, confirms the study's reliability. It was found that a sample of contemporary dialectics, the philosophical dialectics in the philosophical novels for children by Matthew Lipman, confirms the existence and use of PS in the philosophical dialectic.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A clear understanding of the philosophical dialectical method has been elusive. Part of the reason for this is that Socrates, who developed it into a tool of inquiry, did not write about it, and his pupil, Plato, in trying to explicate Socrates' use of it, may not have shared Socrates' same understanding of its value, for he uses "dialectic" in 6 different ways within the Platonic Dialogues. Richard Robinson further suggests that "Plato never became accurately aware of how much he was straining and distorting the Socratic views by the interference of his own distinct personality." It is generally held that the Earliest Socratic Dialogues, so called because they are believed to have been written earliest, reflect Plato's attempt to transcribe Socrates' teaching most reliably, while the Middle Dialogues are held to reflect Plato's attempt to interpret and elaborate Socrates' teachings, and the Latest Dialogues are held to reflect Plato's own thinking. For this reason, some modern philosophy scholars suggest that we go back to the earliest Greek thought, especially Socrates', if we are to understand the original intent of his philosophy, as well as his intent in using the philosophical dialectical method.
Despite the lack of a formal definition of the philosophical dialectic, an informal understanding and usage of it is taken to mean a style of reciprocal discourse about a subject, using a logical argumentative line of definition and reasoning by means of a questioning and answering method. All analyses of the philosophical dialectic rely on the analysis of the development of the reasoned argument.

However, there may be another way to analyze the philosophical dialectic, relying not primarily on its argumentative proceedings, but on a description of the breaks within the argumentative proceedings. While this has never been observed before, recent Wait-time literature casts interest on the phenomenon of waiting breaks within classroom discussion. By studying the breaks within the philosophical dialectic, a new perspective on what is happening during the process of developing a philosophical dialectic might be found. The Wait-time literature focuses on the positive educative value of waiting 2.7 - 5 seconds, optimally, after a question is either asked or answered. It is suspected that these wait-time pauses permit higher order cognitive processing to occur. The psycholinguistic literature reports that pauses may either be "filled" or "silent" pauses. While there has not been much research into what may constitute a filled pause, the newly observed phenomenon of
breaks within the philosophical dialectic may spur interest in this area. I have named these breaks in the philosophical dialectic "Philosophical Spacing" [PS].

This thesis concentrates on a narrow and discrete part of the creative process that is suspected to be in the philosophical dialectic. This narrow area, while a subset of the philosophical dialectic, is the subject of this focused study for it is expected to have important translatable and heuristic value for other educative and creative development, those areas that emphasize the need for and value of specific and necessary physical time for creative development during the educative process.

"Creativity" can cover a wide spectrum, from simple problem-solving techniques to existential participation in the creating of one's reality. It is the latter understanding that is supported in this study. Creativity, in this tradition, is not a technique-directed thinking process, but is a way to actively engage the person's whole being and potential, and as such, it is understood as a philosophical approach to being and one's relationship to the world.

It is my understanding that the Socratic dialectical method captures and realizes, in its "realized metaphysics," an understanding of the essence of how man proceeds to
mediate and realize or, actualizes, his being and his world, for it requires a continual and conscious examination of its own foundations and relationships to others, thus serving as man's mode of access to his world, similar to the Heideggerian tradition of understanding man's being in the world. It is not just a thinking process: it participates in the creation of reality by being the way reality is transformed, and is primarily dependent on the process of philosophical inquiry which creates the question which creates the form of the answer, which is developed and built upon in reality, creating and bringing an actualized metaphysics into being, into existence.

The intent of this study is to analyze an unscrutinized aspect of the educative creative process of the dialectical method in detail by close analysis. The dialectical method is a learning process, and as such is open to educational research scrutiny. Since a clear understanding of its working process is not known, as found by a literature search of this area, it is a fertile area for research. Despite claims of educators that they use the dialectical method of teaching, on close examination, it is not the dialectical method that is being used, but a question and answer style of education. Nor is it the method that the seminar style method of teaching was developed to promote. The words,
"seminar," the root of which means "seed," and "education," the root of which means "to lead or draw out," suggest that education was envisioned as an active process. It is this active process of learning that is being examined. The dialectical method is an excellent window by which to understand the creative learning process, for its essence demands grappling with and assessing new ideas and understandings. By a close examination of this creative process, insight into it is expected.

It is suspected that the phenomenon of Philosophical Spacing [PS] in the philosophical dialectic is a place in the dialectic that allows the creative work of the analysis to develop. While this has not been researched before, there has been work done on the necessary pauses within speech and within classrooms, both in the psycholinguistic and Wait-time literatures, (i.e., filled and silent pauses), which suggests that they are necessary and purposive periods for certain cognitive processes to reach fruition. Basic creative development, including even the broadest and most elemental forms of response, is suspected to be carried out during these periods. It is expected that, as another such phenomenon, PS will join this category. By focussing on this discrete and unexamined area, it is hoped that this study will contribute to the field of creativity by providing both
a methodological window and a substantive understanding of the creative process which may prove fruitful both to the creative process of the philosophical dialectic, as well as to the creative process itself.

This thesis provides the groundwork for another study of the philosophical dialectic, enabling a description of PS to be developed from the structural and contextual analysis of PS, both in the philosophical dialectics of Matthew Lipman's philosophical novels for children and in the philosophical dialectics of the Earliest Socratic Dialogues. The scope of this thesis, however, is limited to the analyses conducted with the philosophical dialectics in the philosophical novels for children developed as a program of philosophy curriculum for K-12 by Matthew Lipman, Director of the Institute for the Advancement for Children at Montclair State College, New Jersey.

In order to determine the contemporary usage of the philosophical dialectical model, analysis of a representative sample of modern dialectics, those of Matthew Lipman, will be done. This will serve 1) to either substantiate or undermine the relevance of the Socratic dialectical method as a model for contemporary philosophical dialectics; 2) to further our understanding of the philosophical dialectical method in terms of its structure and composition; and, 3) to
further clarify and assess the role of the philosophical dialectical method within the classroom, both in its current practice and future effectiveness.

A. An Example of Philosophical Spacing (PS)

An example of PS is as follows (the work of the dialectic is unlined and the PS components are underlined):

And Euthydemus said, There are people you call teachers aren't there?
He agreed.
The teachers are teachers of the learners; for example, the music master and the grammar master were teachers of you and the other boys, and you were learners?
He said yes.
Of course at the time when you were learning, you did not know the things you were learning?
No, he said.
Then you were wise when you did not know these things?
Certainly no, said he.
If not wise, then ignorant?
Yes.
So the boys, while learning what you did not know, were ignorant and were learning?
The boy nodded.
So the ignorant learn, my dear Clinias, not the wise as you suppose. When he said this, it was like conductor and chorus—he signalled, and they all cheered and laughed. I mean Dionysodorus and Euthydemus and their followers. Then before the boy could take one good breath, Dionysodorus took over and said, What happened to you, my dear Clinias, when the grammar man dictated to you? Which of the boys learned the things dictated, wise or ignorant? The wise ones, said Clinias. The wise ones learn and not the ignorant, and you answered wrong just now to my brother. Then indeed the two men's admirers laughed loud and long, applauding their wisdom but all the rest of us were dumb-struck and had nothing to say. Euthydemus noticed that we were dumb-
struck and wanted us to admire him more; so he would not let the boy alone but went on asking, doubling and twisting around the same question like a clever dancer. He said, Do the learners learn what they know, or what they don’t know? And Dionysodorus whispered softly again to me, here’s another, Socrates, just like the first. Good heavens, I said, really I thought that first one of yours a fine question.7

This phenomenon has prompted interest in examining PS so that its definition and the assessment of its possible value to education may proceed.

B. The Background Development of PS

Before analyzing the structural context and qualitative content of PS, a brief history of the background study that suggested the existence of PS will be reviewed. In 1982 and 1983, I became interested in the "fun" parts of the Platonic Dialogues, those in which Socrates gives us humorous peeks into ancient Greek culture and life, such as embarrassment over love’s strifes:

So, I added, Hippothales, son of Hieronymus, there is no longer any need for you to tell me whether you are in love or not, since I am sure you are not only in love, but pretty far gone in it too by this time.... On hearing this, he blushed still more deeply than before,.... 8 or the absurdity of Greek philosophers, in quest of epistemological clarity, quibbling over their mothers’ and fathers’ resemblances to sea urchins and dogs ("Then you are
the brother of gudeons and puppy dogs and little pigs! said Ctesippus.)9 After seeing these bits of humor again appear in other philosophical dialectics, the idea arose that they might provide a function of relief from the formal work of the dialectic. At this point, I took them seriously and found, on analysis of 3 philosophical dialectics, 2 written and 1 oral, that they occurred with periodic regularity (consistently in the same places in the dialectic).10 I named them "Philosophical Spacing [PS]," thinking that they provided a physical space away from the formal work of the dialectic, a break in the work, a place to rest from the work. Subsequently, I have found that there can be non-humorous PS (NH-PS) which function in the same way. In order to see how PS functions, in the original study of 3 dialectics, I developed a coding schema to analyze separate components within the dialectic, suggested from the dialectics themselves.

In subsequent analyses, I have changed the original coding schema to eliminate "Atopon [A]," a classification used to describe a standstill of thought, a startle or jolt, for I think now, as I had thought then, that it is an extension of degree of "New [NEW]," and because the component Atopon [A] does not occur as readily as I had originally thought that it did. This is the only change in the original
coding schema which is used in this and other subsequent analyses. Following is the original Coding Schema that enabled the analysis of the philosophical dialectic, suggesting the potential significance of PS.

**ORIGINAL CODING SCHEMA**

**Code Letters:**

1) I-NEC  
   Initial-Necessary query to initiate "Proceed with philosophical exploration dialectic"

2) A  
   Atopon: startle; jolt; standstill of thought

3) NEC  
   NECessary query to initiate "Proceed with philosophical exploration dialectic"; (it may be a statement which provokes or supports a question)

4) P  
   Proceed with the philosophical exploration dialectic

5) PS  
   Philosophical Spacing, a rest or break from the formal work of the dialectic; a suspension of the philosophical exploration

6) NW  
   NEW or different understanding of the subject matter

When the 3 dialectics had been analyzed according to this schema, the components were then organized into segments, recurring patterns of components, and the emergent pattern was as follows:
This analysis suggested that PS might not be a random occurrence, a casual comic relief in the dialectic as I had suspected, but may instead be an integral part. Subsequently, in 1984-5, during an ethnographic research study of a middle school’s philosophy program, I concentrated on this aspect of their philosophical dialectics, and found that PS did not occur in them. It appeared to me that, instead of teaching philosophy with the philosophical dialectical method, one teacher was using a Rogerian psychotherapeutic technique of rephrasing and questioning, another was using an order of discussion to discuss philosophical subjects, and another was supervising a free-floating discussion of any interesting subject. It did not seem to me that they were teaching philosophy by the philosophical dialectical method, for there was no spirit of genuine grappling or wrestling with the
subject for a new or clearer understanding, as we would expect from those doing philosophy: it resembled a discussion about philosophical issues more than a philosophical dialectic (Kierkegaard’s story about the sign in the signmaker’s window, "Philosophy done here," came to mind.) At this point I began to wonder if PS might be connected to the intrinsic nature of the dialectical process of philosophy; moreso: might PS be the source of power in the philosophical dialectic?

Fred Lawrence, in explicating and responding to Hans­Georg Gadamer's work, captures both the Socratic-Heideggerian tradition of understanding the meaning of the philosophical dialectic and the flavor of the philosophical excitement and existential evocation of the question within the dialectic, a defining characteristic of this philosophical tradition’s understanding of it. In doing so, he also provides an example of how philosophers and cognitive psychologists are traveling on different rails of the same track, both being concerned about the generation and explication of the thinking process:

The heart of the process of dialectic is both the heart of the attainment of knowledge, in general, as well as the driving power behind any genuine conversation or dialogue, asking questions..... Hitting upon the right answer, the correct understanding of any given issue, therefore, is revealed by a Socratic-Platonic dialogue to be less a matter of one’s being clever at giving answers than the infinitely more difficult ability to really ask questions, to suspend
the subject matter in its possibilities among various alternatives..... the true dialectician’s distinction is his awareness that he does not know the outcome of the diverse lines of thinking that may unfold in the course of discussion..... Questioning.... is an attentive listening.... every exertion of the desire to understand begins at the point when something one encounters strikes one as alien, challenging, disorienting. The Greeks had a very beautiful word for that whereby our understanding is jolted to a standstill. They called it the atopon, ἄτοπον, the 'placeless,' that which is not to be brought under the schematisms of our intelligent expectation which therefore leaves one startled, this not getting any further on the basis of the pre-schematized expectations of our own world-orientation which calls us to take thought. This being startled is so relative and so much related to knowledge in a deeper penetrating into the subject matter. Evidently the whole point is this being startled in wonder and not getting anywhere in understanding, is always coming through, knowing or discerning.... questioning does seek intelligibility, but the genuine actuation of its quest ever incorporates this determinate negative moment whose varying integration in a new and better answer will always generate still another question with its determinate negative moment. Questioning can never have to do with rehearsing potential behavior because questioning is not positive [certain], but a genuine trying out of possibilities in the sense of giving them a chance.... The inner word is not formed after knowledge is finished, but is the performance, the actuation...of knowledge itself and word comes to presence as the perfection of thinking in speculative identity with the subject matter.12

These considerations are the source of this present study.
CHAPTER II

THE METHODOLOGY USED TO ANALYZE THE PHENOMENON OF PHILOSOPHICAL SPACING [PS]

The phenomenon of Philosophical Spacing [PS] may be explored by two separate analyses. The first analysis is designed to identify the relationship of PS to the other components of the philosophical dialectic. For this reason, the analysis has been also called the structural analysis of PS. The second analysis is designed to identify the differing qualitative elements that comprise PS. For this reason, the analysis has also been called the contextual analysis.

A. Terms

Before proceeding to explicate these analyses, clarity requires a definition of the terms used in them. Following are several of the key vocabulary and their definitions as they are used in this study:

PHILOSOPHICAL DIALOGUE refers to the entire philosophical book or novel.

While PHILOSOPHICAL DIALECTIC refers to an explorative method of philosophical discourse, usually concerned with definition and clarification of an idea, specifically in these analyses, it refers to one part
of a dialogue that is concerned with a particular and limited subject matter or idea, shown by either the natural beginning of a dialogue or a specific change of subject matter within it. Many different philosophical dialectics may be included in one philosophical dialogue.

COMPONENT refers to any of five different discrete parts of the philosophical dialectic. COMPONENTS are comprised of dialogue or discourse reflecting any of the following five component categories:

1) I-NEC  Initial-NECessary query to initiate "Proceed with philosophical exploration dialectic"
2) NEC    NECessary query to initiate "Proceed with philosophical exploration dialectic"; (it may be a statement which provokes or supports a question)
3) P      Proceed with the philosophical exploration dialectic
4) PS     Philosophical Spacing, a rest or break from the formal work of the dialectic; a suspension of the philosophical exploration
5) NEW    NEW or different understanding of the subject matter

These categories were developed by a previous pilot study analysis of philosophical dialectics and are basically descriptions of the five separate functions that are found in the philosophical dialectic.

SEGMENT refers to a grouping of components within the philosophical dialectic. There appears to be a further grouping of segments into Beginning, Middle and Concluding Segments, with specific characteristics to each.
ELEMENT refers to an irreducible quality of which a PS is comprised. Seven elements, or categories of irreducible qualities, have been discerned in a prior analysis of the PS of the Earliest Socratic Dialogues. They are:

- EMOTION [E]
- BEING PRESENT [BP]
- EMOTION AND BEING PRESENT [E&BP]
- CONTENT [CT]
- CONFUSION [CN]
- REST [R]
- CLOSURE [CE]

COMBINATIONS refer to combinations of the elements within one PS, for the elements usually do not occur singularly, but in combination with one or more elements.

Given these tentative definitions, it is now possible to explain:

1) how the structural analysis, the identification and position of PS within a philosophical dialectic, may proceed;

2) how the contextual analysis, the identification of the elements of PS, may proceed; and

3) the reliability of these analyses, as the Interrater Reliability Tests demonstrate.

B. The Structural Analysis: The Identification of PS Within a Philosophical Dialectic

a) Rationale. By determining the position and frequency of PS within a philosophical dialectic, the
value of PS may be assessed, for determination can then be made about whether PS is either an anomaly or an integral component of the philosophical dialectic. Towards this assessment, a Coding Schema, a simple and direct abbreviation of the descriptions of the functions of the components of the philosophical dialectic, as defined above, was developed.

While the philosophical dialectic is an exploration of a subject by means of a question and answer method, it does not conform to a strict one-question, one-answer format, for its exploration method varies. A question may be explored by several "answer"-type statements, or, a question may serve as an introductory statement for further exploration. While there are several formats that the philosophical dialectic uses, they invariably use the same five basic components.

When the components of a dialectic have been analyzed into the five categories, the analysis proceeds to study how the functions interrelate: What is the sequence they occur in? Do the functions always occur in the same sequence? Are there some sequences that occur more frequently than others? Does the position of the sequence in the dialectic have any influence on the order of the dialectic? What segments, or combinations of components, emerge? In what order? How frequently? What is the pattern of a philosophical dialectic? And finally, Can a structure of the philosophical
dialectic be discerned? While each of these questions can lead to an individual study, a preliminary study of them suggests that it is possible to discern a structure of the philosophical dialectic.

2) Identification of components, including PS, in the philosophical dialogues. In order to analyze the function of PS in a dialectic, not only is identification of the component of PS necessary, but identification of the other four components are needed as well. While preliminary readings and analyses were being done, components of the philosophical dialectic were begun to be discerned by the differing functions they performed and abbreviations of the descriptive functions served as the coding schema.

The directed question is shortened to "NEC," the first three letters of the description of the function of the component, "Necessary query to initiate 'Proceed with philosophical exploration dialectic.'" "Proceed with philosophical exploration dialectic," shortened to "P," derived from the first letter of this component, describes an answering function within the philosophical dialectic. A minor variation of "NEC" is "I-NEC," the "Initial-Necessary query to initiate 'Proceed with philosophical exploration dialectic'," which is designated to the first question in the
philosophical dialectic. A special designation for the first question in the philosophical dialectic is beneficial because it makes identification of the beginning segment and the dialectic possible. It usually directs the subject for exploration by the dialectic, and, in a developing dialogue, it changes the exploration subject of different dialectics.

In addition to I-NEC, NEC and P, two other components suggested themselves: "New or different understanding of the subject matter," or "NEW," and "Philosophical Spacing," or "PS." "NEW" is designated to be a new understanding or insight into the philosophical exploratory work that has just preceded it. Sometimes it is only a shift of weight to one side of an issue rather than another, based on the preceding analytical work of the dialectic. The designation of the component category "NEW" can only be made if 1] supporting work has preceded it, 2] if it introduces a new premise within the dialectic, usually to be philosophically explored, or, sometimes, 3] if it is a substantive closure to a dialectic.

"Philosophical Spacing," or "PS," is a definite break in or space away from the formal work of the philosophical dialectic, a definite suspension of the philosophical exploration. It was first observed as a "fun" part of the
dialectic, where it seemed that a rest was necessitated. Often it is humorous, or an aside, or a practical matter.

Because consensual identification of PS and its elements are critical to this study, an interrater reliability test has been designed to test its reliability (see section D).

3) **The identification of components into segments in the philosophical dialectic.** When a philosophical dialectic is analyzed into the five component codes, further study suggests that a grouping of components, called segments, may be made.

It was originally thought that PS began every segment, for the analytical work of the dialectic was thought to be the development of an active rest, a break, a space, for my original hypothesis was that PS serves the function of a necessary break or rest from the analytical work of the philosophical dialectic so that something like a "brain recharge" could enable the analytical work to continue. However, in the original pilot study analysis, I had started the dialectic with "I-NEC," and not with PS, for at the time, it seemed that the work of the dialectic began with work, I-NEC. After preliminary work with a second analysis, the possibility that I-NEC also arises from a PS became an issue
for me, for I was not sure whether a PS was part of the previous dialectic or the one at hand.

After a long deliberation about this problem, I have decided to start the dialectics of the present analysis with PS for two reasons: 1) the first dialectics in the Socratic Dialogues usually start with PS, and, 2) the dynamics of a single PS being both the previous dialectic's concluding PS as well as the beginning PS of the dialectic at hand, are unclear to me at the present time; however, the observation that it occurs this way has been made. Therefore, a starting point to determine segment structure is to have PS serve either as a signal to begin a new segment or as a concluding signal. On preliminary examination of other dialectics, it appears that slight variations occur as well. While basic segmental pattern structures seem to be uniformly maintained throughout the dialectics, spontaneous variational changes also occur. This structural analysis provides a methodology to study the position and frequency of occurrences of PS. When a random sample of 21 philosophical dialectics from the philosophical novels for children by Matthew Lipman are analyzed, patterns and trends are able to be discerned, suggesting a structure of the philosophical dialectic, as well as the role that PS serves in it.
4) **The identification of the philosophical dialectic.** Selections of separate philosophical dialectics were made according to the following criteria: 1) the beginning of the philosophical dialectic either starts a) at the beginning of a dialogue, or, b) at a PS that serves a dual function of concluding a previous dialectic and beginning a new dialectic. Similarly, 2) the conclusion of the philosophical dialectic is determined by either a) a natural conclusion of the dialogue, or, b) by a clear change of subject matter within the dialogue, or, most commonly, c) by a PS that serves a dual function of ending a previous dialectic and beginning a new dialectic.

It is usually the case that PSs both begin and conclude philosophical dialectics. However, the identification of philosophical dialectics for this study does not depend on this factor, but solely on the clear change of subject matter within the dialogue. Consequently, the position and frequency of PS within the philosophical dialectic are not dependent on any influence except the change of subject matter, the integrity of the philosophical dialectic itself.
C. The Contextual Analysis: The Identification of PS Elements

1) Rationale. After the position and frequency of PSs in the philosophical dialectics had been determined to be of significance to the structure of the philosophical dialectic, an indepth study to determine their qualitative composition was planned so that further insight into the nature of the phenomenon of PS may be obtained. As with the structural analysis, descriptions of the functions of the elements became the criteria for determining the qualitative composition of the PSs, for the primary purpose of this study is to describe and define the function and composition of PS.

2) The identification of PS elements. Seven elements that comprise the component of Philosophical Spacing [PS] were found: Emotion [E], Being Present [BP], Emotion and Being Present [E&BP], Content [CT], Confusion [CN], Rest [R], and Closure [CE]. A Coding Schema to identify these elements was developed by analyzing the descriptions of individual Philosophical Spacings found in the Earliest Socratic Dialogues to analyze what functions PS serves. As was done with the component codes of the dialectic,
descriptions of the functions that the PS serve were made. The descriptions of the kinds of functions that PS serves became the PS element categories, as well as the element criteria. Here, too, it was observed that only a limited number of functions were served, six, but because the component category of "Emotion and Being Present" occurred so frequently, it seemed to suggest itself as another category, so seven were finally classified.

Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, in suggesting an inductive methodology of theory development, "grounded theory," stress that, if an analyst is "To master his data, he is forced to engage in reduction of terminology," in order "to bring out underlying uniformities and diversities." 13 While in the process of delineating PSs, comparisons among them led to initial tentative category suggestions and then to firmer category definitions, an initial developmental process in the generation of theory.14 As categories developed, modifications continued. An important modificational process used in the development of the PS element categories is reduction, the discovery of "...underlying uniformities in the original set of categories of their properties [which can then be used to] formulate the theory with a smaller set of higher level concepts."15 My original attempt to organize the PSs began as a compilation
of expressions of humor and confusion. By the initial PS delineation of the 6th Dialogue, Gorgias, a quality of "Being Present" was being observed and I started to categorize PSs with it. The consideration of "Content" as a category also suggested itself at this same time, with a note made next to a PS, "PS by content?" It occurred about one-third of the way through the initial preliminary survey. The note precedes the following excerpt from Gorgias:

Children of the jury, this fellow has done all of you abundant harm, and the youngest among you he is ruining by surgery and cautery, and he bewilders you by staring and asking you, giving you bitter draughts and compelling you to hunger and thirst, whereas I used to feast you with plenty of sweetmeats of every kind.16

At this time, "description" as a category was also being considered. It was later discarded in favor of "Content." By the next Dialogue, Protagoras, a note was made, showing a decision to use "Content" as a category: "PS by Content:," with no question mark, and a short space later, "by Content:". Similarly, in the following Dialogue, Euthydemus, the note simply says, "content:". This is an example of how the initial search for descriptive categories of PS progressed: decisions were made along the way by comparing PSs to the emerging category comparisons. At this point, I was not aware that most of the PS are comprised of multiple combinations, so my next step of reduction was to search for
obvious general categories. The preliminary categories were: Emotion, Strong and Weak; Confusion; Being Present; Combination PS; Need for closure/Summing up; Description/content; Humor; PS in a PS; Rest. On further analysis, the categories were modified to six categories: Emotion, Being Present, Content, Confusion, Rest and Closure, all from the preliminary analysis. However, when I started to work with them, it was difficult to distinguish some PSs into categories of either Emotion or Being Present, for they appeared intertwined, which is why this characteristic became the seventh category, Emotion and Being Present, a final modification to the categories. Subsequently, the question arose, If Emotion and Being Present are combined, are the single categories of Emotion and Being Present necessary? The answer had to be yes, for there are examples of each without the other. During the classification of the PSs into these seven categories, criteria for the categories sharpened when comparisons of PS to the categories were made, and the sharpened criteria for the category then became its definition. The result of the development of these descriptions into element categories of PS and their criteria follows, containing a list of the seven elements of PS, their definitions and guiding questions to discern them:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT CODE</th>
<th>ELEMENT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>GUIDE QUESTION(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EMOTION</td>
<td>The category &quot;2,&quot; or &quot;Emotion,&quot; refers to any emotion, intended or unintended, that is associated with the dialectic or its content. It is likely to be described as a mood or feeling, such as anger or happiness. The emotion is often related to the speaker, listener, writer, or reader, and is characterized by a physical, mental, or emotional state or experience. It may be an expression of an emotional reaction if it is emotional, but not if it is merely a description of emotion.</td>
<td>Is any emotion suggested in this PS? Is this PS homogenous or key sentences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BEING PRESENT</td>
<td>The category &quot;BP,&quot; or &quot;Being Present,&quot; refers to a quality of immediacy, attention, or focused awareness of the present experience. While it does not require the action to be in our immediate present, although it can, it does require that the content of the PS must have happened in the present of its time of reporting. More than just asking a question or making a statement, it requires a new change from the previous material, producing a new sense of immediacy, attention, or focused awareness of the present experience. It may be a description of an action or reaction.</td>
<td>In this PS, has the mood of the dialectic changed from one which it is a good sense of awareness or action? Is the PS conative or calls for specific actions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (EMOTION AND BEING PRESENT) (EAMP)</td>
<td>The category of &quot;EAMP,&quot; or &quot;Emotion and Being Present,&quot; is necessary because the combination of both components provides a unique effect in PS that does not occur in either component alone, and it occurs more frequently than either component alone. It is a combination of the qualities defined in &quot;EM&quot; and &quot;BP&quot; that makes it difficult to signify either with clarity. If any emotion and a sense of immediacy occurs in the same PS, the category &quot;EAMP&quot; is used.</td>
<td>Are both Emotion and Being Present present in this PS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CORRECT</td>
<td>The category &quot;CT,&quot; or &quot;Correct,&quot; refers to a reported thing or action that provides a break from the defining and clarifying work of the dialectic. It is frequently humorous or it may provide a description about everyday life. While it may be humorous or about everyday life, it always refers to something different from the previous work of the dialectic. It must be a primary object of the PS.</td>
<td>Is the thing or action that is reported in this PS very different from the immediate preceding work of the dialectic? Does the thing or action have little philosophical significance in this dialectic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CONFUSION</td>
<td>The category &quot;CN,&quot; or &quot;Confusion,&quot; refers to an explicit statement of confusion about someone within the dialectic or in discussing some confusion. Only when confusion is explicitly stated does the category of &quot;CN&quot; apply to a PS. A lesser degree of confusion may be an expression of deliberation, when one has not yet made a decision, or, finally it may be an expression of not being satisfied.</td>
<td>Is someone either showing or stating an opinion of contradiction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EXIT</td>
<td>The category &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;Exit,&quot; refers to an explicit statement in the PS that refers to a need for fact.</td>
<td>Is a need for rest clearly stated in this PS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CLOSURE</td>
<td>The category &quot;C,&quot; or &quot;Closure,&quot; refers to an obvious need to wind up or bring the issue under discussion to some preliminary or final closure. It usually is used to redefine or clarify the subject under discussion, but it can also be a description of an expression of finality.</td>
<td>In a need for closure either overtly or covertly expressed is there a rounding up, a reclarification or a reevaluation in this PS?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An example using this contextual coding schema to identify the elements, or qualities, of PS serves to illustrate it:
What followed, Ctes, now that I decided properly, it is not a small question to mock and mock weapon in particular great so I just began my description you please so, by showing the lakes and meandering paths! Well, Dysterusia began something like

Well, Euthydemus began something like:

"The wise a large question; in the boy blushed, and instead of at the issue. Seeing that he was troubled i.e., did not express more sure and awake. I have seen what you fear, perhaps we see you at all.

Just then, Dysterusia walked over me, and whispered in my ear, yet, "let him face, boy, what he's about. Because, I supposed that whatever the past appears, he will be satisfied.

While he spoke, Ctesias made by answer, so that no chance as much the boy to make up, and he answered that the wise were the learned.

When he said this, it was poor conductor and chose as a step, and they all appeared and duped, I mean Dysterusia and Euthydemus and their followers. Then since the boy could have good branch, Dysterusia took over and sent.

Then indeed the two men's actions, wrapped head and legs, applying their vision, but, while rest of us were drowned quick and had nothing to say. Euthydemus noticed that we were sure quick and wanted us to assure them more as we would let the boy alone, but more on having, duped, and hearing around the same question for a quarter circle."

And Dysterusia's appearance thirty is the agent, Hera, whether, Dysterusia, say the fled. Good heaven, I said, I only thought that

less the boy no one a plowman?

If all our desires are like that, Dysterusia no escaped now, I said, will see why you have such a reputation among your peers!

The wind had scarcely gone out of its reach, when Dysterusia caught it a last and shed him, at the boy, saying, Euthydemus is looking you, my dear Citines.

Now, Euthydemus was getting ready to give the young man the third kid in his wrestlers, which I knew the boy was out of his depth, and agreed to give him time to rest but he might notice us down well I said, to encourage him, for their Citines, do not understand if the arguments another language to you. Perhaps you do not understand what mechanics you play with. They are doing by either as the Conqueror in their initiation, when the so-called in initiation is about initiate. There is nothing and there also, as you know now have been initiated and now there are only standing maid in doing

meaning in initiation afterwards. So consider now you are turning the beginnings of the obvious ease, for you must learn this at all, and Practice says, the right use of words. What this exact what you are not knowing if you know, because you did not know the whole use the west prayer in the same sense, that when they have knowledge at the understanding about some, and then afterwards also, what you which having the knowledge: uses the knowledge to examine this same thing done or present. The second is evidenced understanding rather than learning, that somehow it is a well-learned thing. But now thinks this, as he knew how they hold the same words to applying to people in apparent senses, as one who would and one who would not, it was much put the same in the second omission in which they skilled you whatever details know what or how you play; Well, all to be just a little game at learning, and they vary you are playing with you! I call it a game, because I came from

shaped such things as and eat at them, one would be no means knowing the things really in, but would be able to play with people because of the greatest sense of the words, tripping them up and playing them up Belle, just as someone pulls it aside anyway; this one side is going it left down, and then people nail you why when they see him lying on his back. So you must remember that at this time it came on the past of these gentlemen, and I feel sure, Ctesias, that from now on in no-philosophers can we show you serious things, and I tell you there is a success to what they proposed it to provide, you remember they said they would demonstrate their gift in drawing you on, got to it! I suppose they thought better to beg by paying you.

Then, my dear Dysterusia and Dysterusia, let your play and have perhaps we just had enough but your nice democracy by attracting the boy and allowing him thoroughly practice wisdom and virtue.

But we will show by you prevention of it, is the kind of thing I always to me hear. If you then lift skin and adjust in doing this, don't look at me! I was sure it; it came from your wishes, and let us don't enough to make a rough skin upon you. Putting with the lone, and give without looking, but you rest your paper. And so for Euthydemus, answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[EMOTION], CN</th>
<th>(Emotion and Being Present), Confusion</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Euthydemus</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Because the identification of PS elements is critical to this study, an interrater reliability study has been designed to test its reliability (see section D).

When the elements of the 147 randomly selected instances of PS from Matthew Lipman’s philosophical novels for children are analyzed with this coding schema, trends and patterns of elements and their combinations yield an understanding of the function and composition of the phenomenon of PS.

D. Validity and Reliability.

1) Discussion. The type of social science research used in this study is descriptive research, for its goal is to simply describe the facts of the functions and composition of PS systematically, allowing a purely descriptive understanding of PS to emerge. The implications of this study, including potentially interesting relationships of PS to other dynamics cannot be proven with this type of research, but merely suggested. Inasmuch as the point of this study is only to determine the nature of PS, it appears to be an appropriate approach. Because the study focuses on a theory, or construct, that PS is an important phenomenon, construct validity, rather than content (or face), concurrent or predictive validity is used, for it corresponds to the
theory or construct of PS, and thus is more a test of the theory rather than the test itself, which also seems appropriate.

Before dealing with the particular details of the data collection instruments I am using, it may be appropriate to review the internal and external threats to validity that may affect results, so that the necessary issues are addressed. Of the internal threats to validity (concerned with confidence that a particular factor is the determining one), such as history, maturational factors, testing effects, instrumentation, statistical regression effects, selection effects and mortality or attrition, only one is relevant to this study. The selection effects, when expedience on the part of the experimenter governs sample selection, was avoided through random selection of philosophical dialectics and Philosophical Spacings [PSs].

2) Interrater reliability tests. The only potential threat to the validity of the interrater reliability tests, selection effects, both and internal and external threat, is concerned with making sure that the sample population is not taken from an identical group, thus giving an unreliable assessment, and consequently invalidating the reliability of the interrater reliability tests. If this threat is found to
be real, it is serious.

So that this issue may be addressed, a brief description of the data collection instruments of the interrater reliability tests designed to assess the validity of the analytical methods used in my study is necessary. There are two critical analyses used to explore the function and composition of PS: 1) the identification of PS elements, the contextual analysis, and 2) the identification of PS within a philosophical dialectic, the structural analysis. It was decided that there should be a separate interrater reliability test for each of the two analyses so that their reliability, shown as agreement about where PSs are in the dialectic and about what elements comprise PS, might be assured.

a) Interrater reliability test for the identification of PS elements. An interrater reliability test to assess the reliability of the contextual analysis, developed to identify PS elements within a PS, was designed. Essentially, it consists of a training and a testing session. The training session includes going over, together with the rater, 1) an explanation of what PS is, including the element category for each PS element, including definitions, guide questions, and 2 examples selected as good examples of each
particular element; 2) the coding schema for PS elements; and, 3) a practice test, including 7 examples of PS to be coded for elements onto a practice answer sheet. The answers were discussed before the subject proceeded to the testing session. The testing session consists of a test, including 20 samples of PS, marked and numbered, 14% of the total population on 15 pages of text, with PSs marked and numbered, as well as an Answer Sheet, numbered 1-20.

In this interrater reliability test, there are three sample populations: 1) the rater sample, 2) the training sample, and 3) the testing sample. To address the issue of the potential threat of selection effects to the validity of this interrater test, i.e., to make sure that the sample population is not taken from an identical group, thus giving an unreliable assessment of the reliability of the analysis, each of the sample populations will be addressed.

1. The rater sample. Only one rater is necessary for an interrater reliability test. He was selected on the basis of 1] having a known philosophical interest and 2] formal philosophical training, and, 3] flexibility in thinking style.
ii. The training sample. The 7 training samples were selected with the intent that they be good examples of differing kinds of PS so that the process of identifying PSs might be learned. This sample is taken from an identical group, "good examples of PS," but its purpose exempts it from consideration as a potential threat, of selection effects, to the validity of the test.

iii. The testing sample. There are 147 identified PSs in the Earliest Socratic Dialogues, so my original plan was to use 50 samples for the first interrater reliability test. However, after seeing how much material the rater would have to read, close to 100 pages, it was judged to be impracticable, so I limited the testing protocol to 20 samples, 14% of the total population, involving 27 pages of reading. During preliminary analyses, the categories of Humorous and Non-Humorous PSs (H-PS and NH-PS) suggested themselves, and, yet unsure of their potential, I analyzed these categories in. Still unaware of its significance, I elected to preserve its potential significance by using a Stratified Random Sampling, where the population is divided into strata, or subgroups (here H-PS and NH-PS) and then a random sample, using a proportional allocation method, where a proportion of each subgroup is
used (here 2/3 H-PS and 1/3 NH-PS), was collected. The Stratified Random Sampling protocol was selected because it can be more precise than Simple Random Sampling. Before collecting the random sample by picking cut-out numbers from an envelope, I eliminated the PSs selected for the training sample and the PSs selected for the other interrater reliability samples. Consequently, 13 H-PS and 7 NH-PS were selected for the interrater reliability test, and were numbered, for identification purposes, from 1-20.

The rater’s answers were scored using Cohen’s Kappa statistical analysis, which is used to correct for chance occurrence when computing reliability. The rater’s reliability score was .66. Because this was a somewhat low reliability score, the test was given to 3 other raters so that problematic coding areas could be identified. Areas of low correlation were identified and my coding was revised to reflect the consensus. Specifically, the consensus among the 4 raters, including the original rater suggested changes relating to an increased use of the element BP in my coding, and in a lesser degree, an increased use of E in my coding, and a decreased use of CT. When adjusted to this consensus, the rater’s reliability was found to be .79.

This concludes the discussion of the reliability of the interrater reliability test for the identification of PS
elements within a philosophical dialectic, by demonstrating that neither the subject, training nor the testing samples are compromised by the threat of selection effects to the reliability of this procedure.

b) **Interrater reliability test for the identification of PS within a philosophical dialectic.**

In this interrater reliability test, there are also 3 sample populations: 1) the subject sample, 2) the training sample, and, 3) the testing sample. To address the issue of the potential threat of selection effects to the reliability of this interrater reliability test, i.e., to make sure that the sample population is not taken from an identical group, thus giving an unreliable assessment of the reliability of the analyses, only the third sample population, the testing sample will be addressed formally, for the discussion of the first two sample populations, the subject sample and the training sample, applies equally to this interrater reliability test as it does to the first interrater reliability test, already discussed.

The testing sample was developed in the same procedural manner as in the other interrater reliability test, with a Stratified Random Sampling using a proportional allocation method, and as such, the same argument for the first interrater reliability test applies equally to the second
interrater reliability test as well. The protocol for the testing sample in the structural analysis is slightly different from the testing sample in the contextual analysis. The sample size for the structural analysis interrater reliability test is 20 randomly selected examples of PS in 27 pages. Because multiple PSs frequently occur on a single page, I blocked out the PSs that were not selected for the sample, so that only one unidentified and unnumbered PS appears on each page. This became the testing sample from which subjects were asked to identify PSs. This procedure insures that the potential threat of selection effects to the validity of the interrater reliability test is negated. A formal scoring protocol has not yet been developed, but informal analysis suggests that it is within the range of reliability.

It appears that the only conclusion that can be drawn, considering that threats to the reliability of the Interrater Reliability Test were shown to be unfounded, is that they are reliable interrater reliability tests, demonstrating the reliability of the study.

The only relevant potential threat to the validity of this study is the sample selection procedures of the 2 analyses, so each will be discussed separately.
i. The sample selection protocol used for the structural analysis, the identification of the PS component in the philosophical dialectic. It was decided that a sample of 21 philosophical dialectics would be used, so that the study might be correlated to another in progress. Three dialectics were selected from each of Matthew Lipman's 7 philosophical novels for children, totalling 21. The protocol used to select the dialectics was as follows:

1] determine the number of chapters in each philosophical novel and randomly select 3.

2] examine the randomly selected chapters to select a clearly defined philosophical dialectic in each chapter, according to the criteria for philosophical dialectic selection which had already been determined.

ii. The sample selection protocol used for the contextual analysis, the identification of the elements that comprise PS. It was decided that the sample size of the contextual analysis, in order to conform to the size of another analysis under way, would be a sample of 147 PSs. These were selected using the following protocol:

1] 21 pages from each of Matthew Lipman's 7 philosophical novels for children were randomly selected.

2] the number of PSs on each page were determined and
numbered. Then 1 PS was randomly selected from this number. If the PS began or concluded on a previous or following page, the PS location would be counted as having begun or concluded on the page that it began or concluded.

Therefore, considering that the interrater reliability tests and the sample selections are reliable, the analyses appear to be reliable.
ANALYSIS OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL DIALECTICS IN THE
PHILOSOPHICAL NOVELS OF MATTHEW LIPMAN

A. The Structural Analysis

Analysis of 21 randomly selected philosophical dialectics from the philosophical novels for children written by Matthew Lipman proceeded by randomly selecting 3 chapters from each of his 7 philosophical novels. After this selection was made, the chapters were reviewed to determine which particular philosophical dialectic from the chapter would be selected for analysis, basing the selection of the dialectic solely on the criteria of its evidently clear beginning and as well as on its evidently clear ending. This was done to insure replicability of the analysis. Following the selection of these 21 philosophical dialectics, each dialectic was analyzed into components, using the Component Code Schema. When this was completed, the components were then grouped according to their position in the dialectic, either into beginning, middle or concluding segments. The criteria used to assess uniformity for this process were:
1] Because the beginning segment of a philosophical dialectic usually begins with a PS, a criterion for the beginning segment is that the beginning segment begins with the PS that precedes the I-NEC component. However, this criterion, while holding in most cases, is not rigid, for sometimes it does not apply. Occasionally, a beginning segment omits a PS, and immediately begins with an I-NEC or P.

The other criterion that delineates the beginning segment is its conclusion at the dialectic's first NEW, or, in the case that the dialectic does not develop a NEW in its beginning, the conclusion is delineated at the end of the components preceding the first combination of NEC/P, for NEC/P usually indicates the work of the middle segment.

2] The middle segments were delineated simply by including all the segments of the dialectic except the beginning and concluding segments.

3] The criterion for the concluding segments was determined by the segment that began with the PS that immediately preceded the last NEW of the dialectic. Occasionally, the NEW was preceded instead by a NEC or NEC/P that did not belong to the middle segment, for it was determined that the concluding NEW could not begin a concluding segment by itself, since a NEW is hypothesized to
be developed from prior work within the dialectic.

After this analysis, the beginning, middle and concluding segments were analyzed for emergent structural similarities. Should anyone attempt this kind of analysis, (s)he will find that there are many and various ways to group the components into a segment. This analysis is only one way, an arbitrary one, relying on the observations that PS usually begins a segment, that "NEC" usually precedes "P," and that the segment usually ends with "NEW." There may be other and better ways to group them; however, it may be that any uniform way to group or order them will serve to allow discussion of their dynamics. In this initial attempt to categorize them, I just looked for patterns. While others' future patterns may prove to be more insightful, this categorization schema serves to initiate and promote discussion about the structural nature of the philosophical dialectic.

While "Q" for question and "A" for answer might have been used, I chose to use "NEC" and "P" instead so that the dynamics specifically refer to the dynamics of the philosophical dialectical system. This was done so that its integrity might be preserved by remaining intact and separate from other system's dynamics, at least until the results of the analyses are evaluated and determined to be the same as
a direct question and answer mode system.

There are several instances of multiple components constituting a single component position in the dialectic, i.e., P/NEC/NEW [see Appendix II.C., Dialectic Number 2]. In these cases, I counted each as a separate instance of occurrence, for it was necessary to preserve the occurrence of function. This is why totals may sometimes appear to disagree while in reality they do not.

Following is the result of my structural analysis, as developed from the analysis found in Appendix III.A.:

1) The beginning segment. The emergent structures of the beginning segments of Matthew Lipman’s philosophical dialectics in his philosophical novels for children appears to be:

1) a. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{I-NEC} \\
\text{OR}
\end{array}
\]

15 (71%)

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{OR}
\end{array}
\]

3 (14%)

c. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{I-NEC} \\
\text{PS} \\
\text{OR}
\end{array}
\]

2 (10%)

d. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P} \\
\text{I-NEC} \\
\text{OR}
\end{array}
\]

1 (5%)
Another way of grouping the data from section 2.a. is:

a. \[\frac{PS}{P}\] OR \[\frac{P}{P}\]
7(33%) 7(33%)

OR

b. \[\frac{PS}{NEC/P}\] &/:

i. \[\frac{PS}{NEC/P}\] OR
1(5%)

ii. \[\frac{PS}{NEC/P}\] OR
1(5%)

iii. \[\frac{PS}{NEC/P}\] OR
1(5%)
iv. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{NEC} \\
\text{PS} \\
\text{P} \\
\end{array}
\] OR 1(5%)

v. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{PS} \\
\text{P} \\
\end{array}
\] OR 1(5%)

c. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P/NEC} \\
\text{PS} \\
\end{array}
\]: 2(10%)

i. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P} \\
\text{NEC} \\
\text{PS} \\
\text{P} \\
\end{array}
\] OR 1(5%)

ii. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P} \\
\text{PS} \\
\text{NEC} \\
\text{PS} \\
\end{array}
\] OR 1(5%)

AND

3] a. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P} \\
\end{array}
\] OR 12(57%)

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NEW} \\
\text{NEW} \\
\text{P} \\
\end{array}
\] 7(33%) 2(10%) 9(43%)
From this analysis, the beginning segment structure may be summarized as:

1) $\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{I-NEC}
\end{array}$

2) $\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{PS/NEC} \\
\text{NEC}
\end{array}$

AND

$\begin{array}{c}
7(33\%) \\
9(43\%) \\
3(14\%) \\
4(19\%)
\end{array}$

3) $\begin{array}{c}
\text{P} \\
\text{NEW}
\end{array}$

AND

$\begin{array}{c}
12(57\%) \\
9(43\%)
\end{array}$

Thus, the outlined beginning segment of the philosophical dialectics of Matthew Lipman's philosophical novels for children emerges to be:

$\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{I-NEC}
\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{PS/NEC} \\
\text{NEC}
\end{array}$

AND

$\begin{array}{c}
18(86\%) \\
15(71\%) \\
16(76\%) \\
20(100\%) \\
10(48\%) \\
10(48\%) \\
12(57\%) \\
9(43\%)
\end{array}$

Further outlining produces this pattern:

$\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{I-NEC}
\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{PS/NEC} \\
\text{NEC}
\end{array}$

AND

$\begin{array}{c}
18(86\%) \\
16(76\%) \\
10(48\%) \\
17(81\%) \\
3(19\%) \\
12(57\%) \\
9(43\%)
\end{array}$
Merging the last 2 components of P because of identity of function, the final outlined structure of the beginning segment emerges to be:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{I-NEC} \\
\text{PS} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{NEW} \\
\end{array}
\]

2) The middle segment. The middle segment structure of Matthew Lipman’s philosophical dialectics in his philosophical novels for children emerges to be:

1) Middle segment, beginning part:

a. \[
\left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{AND} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{P} \\
\end{array} \right] \\
8(38%) \\
4(19%) \\
\]

b. \[
\left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{NEW} \\
\text{AND/OR} \\
\text{NEC} \\
\end{array} \right] \\
6(29%) \\
3(14%) \\
1(5%) \\
\]

Summarized, it appears as:

a. \[
\left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{AND} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{P} \\
\end{array} \right] \\
12(57%) \\
8(38%) \\
4(19%) \\
\]

b. \[
\left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{NEW} \\
\text{AND/OR} \\
\text{NEC} \\
\end{array} \right] \\
10(48%) \\
6(29%) \\
3(14%) \\
1(5%) \\
\]
b. \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{PS} \\ \text{AND} \\ \text{NEC} \end{array} \quad \text{OR} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{P} \\ \text{NEC} \end{array} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c} 10(48\%) \\ 6(29\%) \\ 3(14\%) \end{array} \]

Outlined, it appears as:

a. \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{NEC} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{P} \end{array} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c} 12(57\%) \\ 4(19\%) \\ 12(57\%) \end{array} \]
OR

b. \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{PS} \\ \text{NEC} \end{array} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c} 10(43\%) \\ 3(14\%) \\ 9(43\%) \end{array} \]

---

2) Middle segment, middle part:

a. \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{NEC} \\ \text{P} \end{array} \]
\[ 29(43\%) \]

b. \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{NEC} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \]
\[ 13(19\%) \]

OR

c. \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{PS} \\ \text{P} \end{array} \]
\[ 13(19\%) \]

OR

d. \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{PS} \\ \text{NEC} \end{array} \]
\[ 11(16\%) \]

OR

e. \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{P} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \]
\[ 1(1\%) \]

Summarized, it appears as:

a. \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{NEC} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \quad \text{OR} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{NEC} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c} 29(43\%) \\ 13(19\%) \end{array} \]

\AND/OR
b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{PS} \\
\text{P}
\end{array}
\]
\[
13(19\%) \\
11(16\%)
\]

24(36%)

Outlined, it appears as:

a. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{PS} \\
\text{P}
\end{array}
\]
\[
29(43\%) \\
13(19\%)
\]

42(63%)

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{NEC} \\
\text{P}
\end{array}
\]
\[
13(19\%) \\
11(16\%)
\]

24(36%)

3) Middle segment, concluding part:

a. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{NEC} \\
\text{P}
\end{array}
\]

6(32%)

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{P}
\end{array}
\]

5(26%)

c. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{NEW}
\end{array}
\]

3(16%)

d. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{NEW}
\end{array}
\]

2(11%)

e. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{PS}
\end{array}
\]

2(11%)

f. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{P}
\end{array}
\]

1(5%)

Summarized, it appears as:

a. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{NEC} \\
\text{P}
\end{array}
\]

6(32%)

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{P}
\end{array}
\]

4(21%)

c. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{NEW} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{NEC} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{PS}
\end{array}
\]

1(5%) \\
1(5%)
b. \[ \text{NNEC} \]  
\[ P \]  
\[ \text{OR} \]  
5(26%)  
\[ \text{OR} \]  

c. \[ \text{NNEC} \]  
\[ \text{NEW} \]  
\[ \text{PS} \]  
\[ \text{OR} \]  
3(16%)  
\[ \text{OR} \]  

d. \[ \text{NNEC} \]  
\[ \text{PS} \]  
\[ \text{OR} \]  
2(11%)  
\[ \text{OR} \]  

\[ \text{PS} \]  
\[ \text{NEW} \]  
\[ \text{AND} \]  
\[ \text{PS OR P} \]  
\[ \text{OR} \]  
2(11%)  

Outlined, it appears as:  

a. \[ \text{NNEC} \]  
\[ \text{AND} \]  
\[ P \text{ OR NEW OR PS} \]  
5(26%) 3(16%) 2(11%)  
\[ \text{OR} \]  

b. \[ \text{PS} \]  
\[ \text{AND} \]  
\[ \text{NEC AND} \]  
\[ P \text{ OR NEW OR PS} \]  
4(21%) 1(5%) 1(5%)  
\[ \text{OR} \]  
\[ \text{NEC AND} \]  
\[ \text{PS OR P} \]  
1(5%) 1(5%) 1(5%)  

With further outlining, it appears as:  

1] \[ \text{NNEC} \]  
\[ P \text{ OR NEW AND/OR PS} \]  
5(26%) 3(16%)  
10(53%)  
\[ \text{OR} \]  
\[ 5(27%) \]
3) The concluding segment. The concluding segment structure of the philosophical dialectics of the philosophical novels of Matthew Lipman emerges as:

1] a. i. $\text{NEC} \quad 5(25\%) \quad 11(55\%) \quad 20(100\%)$

OR

ii. $\text{NEC} \quad 4(20\%)$

OR

iii. $\text{NEC} \quad 1(5\%)

OR

iv. $\text{NEC} \quad 1(5\%)$

OR

b. i. $\text{PS} \quad 2(10\%) \quad 9(45\%)$

OR

ii. $\text{PS} \quad 5(25\%)$

OR

iii. $\text{PS} \quad 1(5\%)

OR

iv. $\text{PS/P/NEW} \quad 1(5\%)$
2) a. i. [NEW] 9(47%)  11(53%)  19(100%)  
    OR  
    ii. [NEW/NEC] 1(5%)  
    OR  
    iii. [P/NEW/PS] 1(5%)  
    OR  

b. i. [NEC] 4(21%)  7(37%)  
    OR  
    ii. [NEC/PS] 1(5%)  
    OR  
    iii. [NEC/NEW] 1(5%)  
    OR  
    iv. [NEC/NEW] 1(5%)  

b. i. [NEC] 4(21%)  6(30%)  
    OR  
    ii. [P/NEW/NEC] 1(5%)  
    OR  

3) a. [PS] 14(70%)  20(100%)  
    OR  
    b. i. [NEW/NEC] 4(21%)  6(30%)  
    OR  
    ii. [P/NEW/NEC] 1(5%)  
    OR  

The summarized emergent structure of the concluding segment thus appears as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20(100%)</td>
<td>PS AND/OR P</td>
<td>15(75%) 6(30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NEW OR NEC</td>
<td>12(60%)</td>
<td>8(40%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NEW OR NEC</td>
<td>5(25%)</td>
<td>17(85%)</td>
<td>12(60%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AND/OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outlined, the concluding segment appears as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15(75%)</td>
<td>6(30%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NEC OR NEW</td>
<td>8(40%)</td>
<td>12(60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NEC OR NEW</td>
<td>4(20%)</td>
<td>5(25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>15(75%)</td>
<td>11(55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS OR NEC</td>
<td>7(35%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>OR NEW</td>
<td>11(55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PS OR NEC</td>
<td>4(20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>OR NEW</td>
<td>5(25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS OR NEC</td>
<td>6(30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL PS:36</td>
<td>TOTAL NEC:22</td>
<td>TOTAL NEW:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further outlined, the emergent structure of the concluding segment of the philosophical dialectics of Matthew Lipman’s philosophical novels for children appears as:

1] $\begin{array}{c} \text{PS} \\ \text{NEW} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 15(75\%) \\ 11(55\%) \\ 20(100\%) \end{array}$ OR $\begin{array}{c} \text{NEC} \\ \text{NEW} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 11(55\%) \\ 11(55\%) \\ 20(100\%) \end{array}$

2] $\begin{array}{c} \text{NEC} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 18(86\%) \\ 16(76\%) \end{array}$ OR $\begin{array}{c} \text{NEC} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 12(57\%) \\ 4(19\%) \end{array}$

3] $\begin{array}{c} \text{NEC} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 10(48\%) \\ 3(14\%) \end{array}$ OR $\begin{array}{c} \text{NEC} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9(43\%) \\ 12(57\%) \end{array}$

4) **Summary.** The composite outlined structure of the philosophical dialectic of Matthew Lipman’s philosophical novels for children can now be depicted as:

1] **Beginning segment:**

   $\begin{array}{c} \text{PS} \\ \text{I-NEC} \\ \text{PS} \\ \text{P} \\ \text{NEW} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 18(86\%) \\ 16(76\%) \\ 10(48\%) \\ 17(81\%) \\ 9(43\%) \end{array}$

2] a. **Middle segment, beginning part:**

   $\begin{array}{c} \text{PS} \\ \text{NEC} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 12(57\%) \\ 4(19\%) \\ 12(57\%) \end{array}$ OR $\begin{array}{c} \text{PS} \\ \text{NEC} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 10(48\%) \\ 3(14\%) \end{array}$

b. **Middle segment, middle part:**

   $\begin{array}{c} \text{PS} \\ \text{NEC} \\ \text{PS} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 29(43\%) \\ 42(63\%) \\ 13(19\%) \end{array}$
AND/OR

ii. \[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{P} & \text{NEC} \\
13(19\%) & 11(16\%)
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{PS OR NEC}
\]

24(36\%)

c. Middle segment, concluding part:

i. \[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{P OR NEW}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{AND/OR PS}
\]

10(53\%)

5(26\%) 3(16\%)

5(27\%)

ii. \[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{PS} \\
\text{NEC AND/OR NEW}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{P OR PS}
\]

9(47\%)

6(32\%) 1(5\%)

6(31\%) 2(10\%)

3) Concluding segment:

i. \[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{PS} \\
\text{NEW}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{PS}
\]

15(75\%)

11(55\%)

20(100\%)

ii. \[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{NEW}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{PS}
\]

11(55\%)

11(55\%)

20(100\%)
Outlined, the emergent structure of the philosophical dialectic of Matthew Lipman’s philosophical novels for children thus appears to be:

1] \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{I-NEC} \\
\text{PS} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{NEW}
\end{array}
\]

2] \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{PS} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{NEC}
\end{array}
\]

3] \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{PS} \\
\text{P}
\end{array}
\]

4] \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P} \\
\text{PS} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{P}
\end{array}
\]

5] \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{NEC} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{NEW} \\
\text{AND/OR} \\
\text{PS}
\end{array}
\]

6] \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{AND/OR} \\
\text{NEW} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{PS}
\end{array}
\]

7] \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{OR} \\
\text{NEC} \\
\text{NEW} \\
\text{PS}
\end{array}
\]
Another outlining shows the emergent structure of the philosophical dialectic of Matthew Lipman’s philosophical novels for children to be:

1] \[ \text{PS} \]
   \[ \text{I-NEC} \]
   \[ \text{PS} \]
   \[ \text{P} \]
   \[ \text{NEW} \]

2] \[ \text{NEC} \]
   \[ \text{P} \]

3] \[ \text{NEC} \]
   \[ \text{P} \]

**AND/OR**

4] \[ \text{PS} \]
   \[ \text{P OR NEC} \]

5] \[ \text{NEC} \]
   \[ \text{P} \]
   \[ \text{PS} \]

6] \[ \text{PS} \]
   \[ \text{NEC} \]
   \[ \text{P} \]

7] \[ \text{PS} \]
   \[ \text{NEW} \]
   \[ \text{PS} \]
A final outlining solidifies the philosophical dialectic's emergent basic structural form as found in the philosophical dialectics of Matthew Lipman's philosophical novels for children to be:

1) 
   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{PS} \\
   \text{I-NEC} \\
   \text{PS} \\
   \text{P} \\
   \text{NEW} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

2) 
   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{NEC} \\
   \text{P} \\
   \text{NEC/P} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

3) 
   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{NEC} \\
   \text{P} \\
   \text{NEC/P} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

AND/OR

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{NEC} \\
\text{NEC/P} \\
\end{array}
\]

O R

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NEC} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{NEC/P} \\
\end{array}
\]

4) 
   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{PS} \\
   \text{NEC} \\
   \text{P} \\
   \text{NEC/P} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

5) 
   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{PS} \\
   \text{NEC} \\
   \text{P} \\
   \text{NEC/P} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

6) 
   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{PS} \\
   \text{NEW} \\
   \text{PS} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

Summarized, the structure of the Matthew Lipman philosophical dialectics has been found to be comprised of:

1) the beginning segment, which:
   a) begins with PS;
   b) has an Initial Necessary Query to begin philosophical exploration [I-NEC];
   c) has a PS before Proceed [P]; and
   d) ends with a NEW understand if the subject.

2) the middle segment which has the basic structure of NEC/P and/or PS/NEC/P.

3) the concluding segment which begins with PS, has a NEW, and concludes with PS.
B. The Contextual Analysis

A random sample of examples of Philosophical Spacings was selected to be analyzed for qualitative composition. In order to relate this study with another in progress, it was determined that a sample size of 147 PSs would be randomly selected from among the 7 philosophical novels for children that were developed by Matthew Lipman. Twenty-one PSs from each of the 7 books were selected by first determining the number of pages in each book and then randomly selecting 21 pages. After this, each of the pages selected was then analyzed for PSs. After determining the number of PSs on each page, a random selection from the number of PSs on each page was made to select the final PS sample.

For instance, in Harry, which has 96 pages, the first random selection from the number of pages was page 10. Following the same procedures for the other 20 pages, 21 random samples were selected, until each of the 7 books produced a random selection of 21 pages, bringing the total selection to 147 pages. When this initial selection was completed, each of the 147 pages was analyzed for the number of PSs found on each page. It was often the case that a single PS might start on a previous page or pages or continue onto the following page or pages, in which case the PS was recorded to begin or conclude on the actual page of its
beginning or conclusion, which is why some of the page numbers appear somewhat different from the actual page selection.

When the analysis of the number of PSs on each page had been done and the number of PSs determined, another random selection from the number of PSs on each page was done, so that 1 PS from each randomly selected page would constitute the sample selection.

From this sample, each PS was analyzed into element categories, of which there are determined to be 7:

1] Emotion [E]
2] Being Present [BP]
3] Emotion and Being Present [E&BP]
4] Content [CT]
5] Confusion [CN]
6] Rest [R]
7] Closure [CE]

These categories were developed in a previous study. The CRITERIA FOR ELEMENT CATEGORIES, which explains each element, is found in Appendix XVIII. In addition to this analysis, the categories of Humor and Non-Humor were also analyzed, for at this point, their role, while observed, is unknown. While Humor is categorized under the category of Emotion, for it elicits a pleasurable emotion, it is also
suspected to be more than a category of Emotion, but it is unclear at this time what role or function, if any, Humor serves in the phenomenon of PS.

When this analysis was completed, the composite element composition of the PS sample was then analyzed. In computing the percentages, integers were rounded off from the third decimal place. Following are the results of these analyses, which are appended:

1) **Analysis 1:** analysis of individual elements, alone and in combination, in the Matthew Lipman Dialectics (MLD) PS sample. The total PS sample of 147 PSs includes 268 element occurrences, alone (infrequently) and in combination with other elements. Summarized, CT occurs most frequently and R occurs least frequently than other elements. Occurrences of the individual elements, alone and in combination, are distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content (CT)</td>
<td>91(34%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion and Being Present (E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>78(29%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Present (BP)</td>
<td>63(24%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion (CN)</td>
<td>25(9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion (E)</td>
<td>5(2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure (CE)</td>
<td>4(1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest (R)</td>
<td>2(1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>268(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range of the number of PS elements in the sample of
7 books of the MLD analysis is spread evenly, 36-44 (13%-16%).

2) Analysis 2: total element composition of H&NH-PS. Summarized, the total H-PS element composition of the MLD sample is 106 (40%), while the total NH-PS element composition sample is 162 (60%).

The element composition of the H-PS category is distributed as following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-CT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-BP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-CN</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-CE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>40% (of the total PS population)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The element composition of the NH-PS category is distributed as following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. NH-BP</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. NH-CT</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-CN</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>60% (of the total PS population)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The element composition of the combined H&NH-PS category shows the following distribution:

1] CT 91(34%)
2] (E&BP) 78(29%)
3] BP 63(24%)
4] CN 25(9%)
5] E 5(2%)
6] CE 4(1%)
7] R 2(1%)

3) Analysis 1: H&NH-E. Summarized, the element E alone comprises only 6% of its total occurrence, but in combination with BP, it comprises 94% of its occasions. H-E elements are found in the following distribution:

1] (E&BP),CT 27(66%)
2] (E&BP) 7(18%)
3] (E&BP),CT,CN 3(8%)
4] A. E 1(3%)
   B. E,CT 1(3%)
   C. (E&BP),CN,CE 1(3%)
TOTAL 40(15% of the total PS population)

NH-E elements are found in the following distribution:

1] (E&BP),CT 19(44%)
2] (E&BP) 15(35%)
3] (E&BP),CN 4(9%)
4] E 3(7%)
5] A. (E&BP),CN,CT 1(2%)
   B. (E&BP),R 1(2%)
TOTAL 43(16% of the total PS population)
The combined H&NH-E element distribution is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CT</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A. E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. (E&amp;BP), CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. (E&amp;BP), CT, CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A. E, CT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. (E&amp;BP), CN, CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. (E&amp;BP), R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 83 (31% of the total PS population)

4) **Analysis 4: H&NH-BP.** Summarized, the element BP, alone, comprises 14% of its category, while 37% of BP occurs with the element E. The H-BP distribution is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BP, CT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CT, CN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A. BP, CN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. BP, CT, CN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A. BP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. BP, CT, CN, CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. (E&amp;BP), CN, CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. BP, CT, CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 51 (19% of the total PS population)
The NH-BP distribution is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BP, CT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BP, CN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A. (E&amp;BP), CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. BP, CT, CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A. BP, CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. (E&amp;BP), CT, CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. BP, R, CT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. (E&amp;BP), R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34% of the total PS population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combined distribution of H&NH-BP is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CT</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BP, CT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BP, CN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BP, CT, CN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A. (E&amp;BP), CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. (E&amp;BP), CT, CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A. BP, CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. BP, CT, CN, CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. BP, CT, R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. (E&amp;BP), CN, CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. BP, CT, CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. (E&amp;BP), R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>38% of the total PS population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) **Analysis 5: H&NH-(E&BP)**. Summarized, (E&BP) alone occurs 28% of the time, while combined with CT, it occurs 59% of the time. The distribution of H-(E&BP) is as follows:

| 1 | (E&BP), CT  | 27 (71%) |
| 2 | (E&BP)      | 7 (18%)  |
| 3 | (E&BP), CT, CN | 3 (8%)  |
| 4 | (E&BP), CN, CE | 1 (3%)  |

**TOTAL H-(E&BP)**: 38 (14% of the total PS population)

The distribution of NH-(E&BP) is as follows:

| 1 | (E&BP), CT  | 19 (48%) |
| 2 | (E&BP)      | 15 (38%) |
| 3 | (E&BP), CN  | 4 (10%)  |
| 4 | A. (E&BP), CT, CN | 1 (3%)  |
|    | B. (E&BP), R  | 1 (3%)  |

**TOTAL NH-(E&BP)**: 40 (15% of the total PS population)

The combined distribution of H&NH-(E&BP) is:

| 1 | (E&BP), CT  | 46 (59%) |
| 2 | (E&BF)      | 22 (28%) |
| 3 | A. (E&BP), CT, CN | 4 (5%)  |
| 4 | B. (E&BP), CN  | 4 (5%)  |
| 5 | A. (E&BP), CN, CE | 1 (1%)  |
|    | B. (E&BP), R  | 1 (1%)  |

**TOTAL** : 78 (29% of the total PS population)
6) **Analysis 6: H&NH-CT.** Summarized, while there are no instances of CT occurring alone, in combination with (E&BP), it occurs 51\% of the time, and in combination with BP, it occurs 34\% of the time. The distribution of H-CT is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP),CT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. E,CT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. BP,CT,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. BP,CT,CN,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 41 (15\% of the total PS population)

The distribution of NH-CT is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP),CT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. (E&amp;BP),CT,CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. BP,CT,R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 50 (19\% of the total PS population)

7) **Analysis 7: H&NH-CN.** Summarized, CN in combination with BP (32\%), and in combination with BP and CN (24\%), occurs most frequently. The distribution of H-CN is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP),CT,CN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. BP,CN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. BP,CT,CN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. BP,CT,CN,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. (E&amp;BP),CN,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 9 (3\% of the total PS population)
The distribution of NH-CN is as follows:

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BP, CN</td>
<td>6(38%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A. (E&amp;BP), CN</td>
<td>4(25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. BP, CT, CN</td>
<td>4(25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A. CN</td>
<td>1(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. (E&amp;BP), CT, CN</td>
<td>1(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 16(6% of the total PS population)

The total distribution of H&NH-CN combined is:

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BP, CN</td>
<td>8(32%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BP, CT, CN</td>
<td>6(24%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A. (E&amp;BP), CN</td>
<td>4(16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. (E&amp;BP), CT, CN</td>
<td>4(16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A. CN</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. BP, CT, CN, CE</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. (E&amp;BP), CN, CE</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 25(9% of the total PS population)

8) Analysis #1: H&NH-R. Summarized, there are no instances of H-R, and there are 2 instances of NH-R occurring in combination. The distribution of NH-R is as follows:

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BP, CT, R</td>
<td>1(50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP), R</td>
<td>1(50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 2(1% of the total PS population)

9) Analysis #2: H&NH-CE. Summarized, there are 3 instances of H-CE in combination, and 1 instance of NH-CE in combination. The distribution of H-CE is as follows:

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BP, CT, CE</td>
<td>1(33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BP, CT, CN, CE</td>
<td>1(33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CN, CE</td>
<td>1(33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 3(1% of the total PS population)
The distribution of NH-CE is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CE</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) **Analysis 10: summary analysis of individual elements: H&NH-PS.** Summarizing, out of the sample of 147 instances of PS, 36% are found to be H-PS and 64% are found to be NH-PS. The combination of H-(E&BP), CT comprises the largest category of H-PS, while the combination of NH-BP, CT comprises the largest category of NH-PS. The distribution of H-PS is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1] (E&amp;BP),CT</td>
<td>27(51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2] (E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>7(13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3] BP,CT</td>
<td>6(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4] (E&amp;BP),CT,CN</td>
<td>3(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5] A. BP,CN</td>
<td>2(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. BP,CT,CN</td>
<td>2(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6] A. E</td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. BP</td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. E,CT</td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. BP,CT,CE</td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. (E&amp;BP),CN,CE</td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. BP,CT,CN,CE</td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 53(36% of the total PS population)
The distribution of NH-PS is as follows:

1] BP, CT 25 (27%)
2] (E&BP), CT 19 (20%)
3] (E&BP) 15 (16%)
4] BP 13 (14%)
5] BP, CN 6 (6%)
6] A. (E&BP), CN 4 (4%)
   B. BP, CT, CN 4 (4%)
7] E 3 (3%)
8] A. CN 1 (1%)
   B. (E&BP), CT, CN 1 (1%)
   C. BP, CE 1 (1%)
   D. (E&BP), R 1 (1%)
   E. EP, CT, R 1 (1%)

TOTAL 94 (64% of the total PS population)

The distribution of H&NH-PS combined is:

1] (E&BP), CT 46 (31%)
2] BP, CT 31 (21%)
3] (E&BP) 22 (15%)
4] BP 14 (10%)
5] BP, CN 8 (5%)
6] BP, CT, CN 6 (4%)
7] A. E 4 (3%)
   B. (E&BP), CN 4 (3%)
   C. (E&BP), CT, CN 4 (3%)
8] A. CN 1 (1%)
   B. E, CT 1 (1%)
   C. BP, CT, CE 1 (1%)
   D. BP, CE 1 (1%)
   E. (E&EP), CN, CE 1 (1%)
   F. (E&BP), R 1 (1%)
   G. BP, CT, CN, CE 1 (1%)
   H. BP, CT, R 1 (1%)

TOTAL 147 (100%)
11) Analysis 11: ranked order

a) ranked order: H-PS, MLD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BP, CT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CT, CN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A. BP, CN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. BP, CT, CN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A. E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. E, CT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. (E&amp;BP), CN, CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. BP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. BP, CT, CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. BP, CT, CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36% of the total PS population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) ranked order: NH-PS elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BP, CT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BP, CN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CT, CN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A. (E&amp;BP), CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. BP, CT, CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A. (E&amp;BP), CT, CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. (E&amp;BP), R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. BP, CT, R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. BP, CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>64% of the total PS population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**c) ranked order: total H&NH-PS elements, MLD:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Element Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP),CT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NH-BP,CT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP),CT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NH-BP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A. H-BP,CT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. NH-BP,CN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A. NH-(E&amp;BP),CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. NH-BP,CT,CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A. H-BP,CN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. H-BP,CT,CN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A. H-E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. H-E,CT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. H-(E&amp;BP),CN,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. H-BP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. H-BP,CT,CN,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. H-BP,CT,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. NH-(E&amp;BP),CT,CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. NH-(E&amp;BP),R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. NH-BP,CT,R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. NH-BP,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K. NH-CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**d) ranked order: combined H&NH-PS elements, MLD:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Element Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP),CT</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BP,CT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BP,CN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BP,CT,CN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP),CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP),CT,CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>E,CT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP),CN,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>BP,CT,CN,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>BP,CT,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(E&amp;BP),R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>BP,CT,R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>BP,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 147
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS OF THE ANALYSES

A. The Structural Analysis

The structure of the philosophical dialectic is found to be finally outlined as:

1] \[ PS \\
2] \[ I-NEC \\
3] \[ PS \\
4] \[ P \\
5] \[ NEW \\

It is not surprising that NEC/P constitutes the majority of the work of the philosophical dialectic. However, that PS has been found to be a significant and integral component of the majority of the segments is an heretofore unobserved occurrence in the philosophical dialectic, and merits
attention.

It appears that while PS can occur anywhere in the structure of the dialectic, it plays a significant role in each of the sections of the dialectic, occurring twice in the beginning and concluding sections and at least twice in the middle section.

It may be that this structure can be understood as a trial and error cognitive process, by viewing the beginning segment as a trial experiment, a phenotype,22 a toe-testing, during which the model for an analysis is presented, which serves the function of an experimental instruction paradigm, demonstrating how the rest of the dialectic might possibly proceed. Perhaps it is a sensitization process for a later indepth process, similar in dynamic to the neural process of Long Term Potentiation (LTP), which is a process where a neuron, after stimulation by either an intense or a repetitious (at lower levels), stimulus, brings it to a critical threshold level, allowing the development of an ability to "remember" the stimulus on very little strength of another stimulus.23 This is suggested by viewing the beginning segment as a summarized version of the elongated process of the combined middle and concluding segments, which is a pattern of protracted NEC/P with a concluding NEW, regularly interspersed with PS.
The speculative hypothesis that has directed this study is that PS serves the cognitive process function of encoding cortical stimuli into an accessible and acceptable format for its developmentally necessary limbic system processing. While this hypothesis is not on trial here, this analysis does tend to support it, for PS has been shown in this thesis to be a necessary and integral component of the developmental process of the philosophical dialectic, for it occurs in the initial introductory model of the development of the dialectic, the beginning segment, as well as occurring liberally during its development. It also occurs, perhaps significantly, during the concluding segment, the closure of the philosophical inquiry, when a final resolve usually occurs. It is an important caveat that the specific outlined model of the philosophical dialectic should not be taken as a model to emulate when using the philosophical dialectic, for the actual working out of the dialectic may take any form, within the componential constraints, depending on the unique work required for an individual "problem" or inquiry that is needed to find a resolution to a perceived problem, i.e., the problem in question form [NRC]. Indeed, it is necessary to understand that the process may need many trials or attempts to come to a resolution, either to a premature or a final closure.
fine example of this is given in the philosophical dialectical process of the middle segments of Matthew Lipman's philosophical novels for children:

Middle Segments:

Dialectic #11

| PS | NEC | P | PS | P | PS | P | PS | P | PS | P |

Dialectic #6

| NEC | PS | P | PS | P | PS | P | PS | P | PS | P |

Here it can be seen that PS appears to work to keep the issue (P) (stimulus) active, or open, until it has been more thoroughly examined, or until a resolve (NEW) has been reached, thus facilitating the analytical work and development of the philosophical dialectic. The function of the component of PS in the philosophical dialectic is thus suspected to be that of a facilitator for the analytical work of the dialectic, effecting the function of facilitation, which appears to be an integral part of the philosophical
dialectic, as demonstrated in this analysis.

Another reason to think of the beginning segment as a phenotypical model is that it is often the case that when a new segment structure format is introduced, variations of it are explored, as shown in the following example: Middle Segments, Dialectic #3:

1) \[
\begin{array}{c}
PS \\
P \\
PS \\
P/KEW \\
\end{array}
\]

Segments 1 and 2 are the same, representing a period of stability.

2) \[
\begin{array}{c}
PS \\
P \\
PS \\
P/KEW \\
\end{array}
\]

3) \[
\begin{array}{c}
PS \\
P \\
NEC \\
P \\
\end{array}
\]

Segment 3 drops the second PS and starts a NEC/P dynamic.

4) \[
\begin{array}{c}
PS \\
P \\
NEC \\
PS \\
P \\
\end{array}
\]

Segment 4 introduces a PS between PS the NEC/P, and extends the P process.

5) \[
\begin{array}{c}
PS \\
P \\
NEC \\
P \\
\end{array}
\]

Segment 5 drops the recent PS acquisition and returns to a previous pattern.

6) \[
\begin{array}{c}
PS \\
NEC \\
P \\
P \\
\end{array}
\]

Segment 6 drops an initial P and adds another.

This dynamical exploratory process proliferates throughout the philosophical dialectic, allowing myriads of
patterns to be developed. However, it is not just in the same dialectic that patterns of structures can begin to emerge and develop, for a segment structure appears to emerge in one dialectic and then be developed in others, as is shown in these examples from the Middle Segments:

[All of these segment structures are found in the middle segments of the Matthew Lipman Dialectics; see Appendix II.]

While the dynamic of this process is still unclear, it should be pointed out that the nature of the segment structures may be suggestive of a developing dynamical process, and it may be that inquiry into this aspect of the
philosophical dialectic will yield promising results.

It cannot be left unsaid that one might observe that the patterns may reflect the brain processes of the author of the dialectics; however, this observation does not diminish the philosophical dialectical process; rather, it adds another interesting dimension to it.

In summary, it appears that the structural analysis of the philosophical dialectics in the philosophical novels of Matthew Lipman finds that:

1] PS is an integral component of the philosophical dialectic, occurring regularly in each section of the dialectic.

2] PS appears to enable the analytical work of the philosophical dialectic to proceed, for it systematically occurs in and around the structures of the basic analytical components of the philosophical dialectic, NEC, P and NEW in a regular and periodic pattern.

3] The philosophical dialectic appears to be a dynamical process, developing myriad variations around any given segment structure. It seems to have the capacity to try out an infinite variety of patterns during its course of searching for a resolve to an inquiry. [Perhaps at this point it might be appropriate to stress that in reference to the philosophical dialectic, the word "inquiry" is the
preferred word over the word "question," for "inquiry" connotes the open-ended potentiality of a question which is intrinsic to the nature of the philosophical dialectic, which easily can be lost if the word "question" is used; this is the reason that, instead of the terms, "question" and "answer," I chose to use the semantically awkward, but philosophically more precise, descriptive, "Necessary query to initiate 'Proceed with philosophical exploration'."

4] While the dynamics of the philosophical dialectic have been outlined, a definite step-by-step instruction by which to teach, learn and use the philosophical dialectic cannot be defined, for it appears that the dialectical process, which uses a myriad of various developing patterns to carry out its exploration, is not constrained to conform to such an understanding. Rather, it is as if one must learn the process by doing it, by experiencing and exploring its domain within one's own creative dynamic, for it is a creative process dependent on the very same creative abilities known to other areas of creative disciplines, and as such, it is open to the same kinds of critical scrutiny, which, while adding to its understanding, does not seem to be able to replace or reconstitute its basic nature.

It seems, then, that instruction of the philosophical dialectical method might proceed by supervised practice and
reciprocal analysis of the practice of the process of the philosophical method.

5] Since this study finds that "spacing" or a "break" from the analytical work of the philosophical dialectic, PS, is a necessary and intrinsic function of the philosophical dialectical process, and that PSs are not trivial occurrences as heretofore assumed, it seems justifiable to ask what cognitive process(es) is happening during these spaces or breaks. Toward this end, the contextual or qualitative compositional analysis of PS, designed to focus on this question, will now be addressed.
B. The Contextual Analysis

The ranked order of the total H&NH-PS sample in the philosophical dialectics of the philosophical novels of Matthew Lipman is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS ELEMENTS</th>
<th>NO. OF OCCURRENCES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP),CT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-BP,CT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP),CT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-BP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-BP,CT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-BP,CN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP),CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-BP,CT,CN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP),CT,CN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-BP,CN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-BP,CT,CN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-E,CT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP),CN,CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-BP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-BP,CT,CN,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-BF,CT,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP),CT,CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP),R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-BP,CT,R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-BP,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL H-PS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NH-PS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this analysis, it is evident that PS is not dependent on the factor of humor in the MLD, for it occurs
about two-thirds more frequently in non-humorous occasions. Given this fact, it may be profitable to look at the composition of the PSs, ignoring the H&NH factor. Following is a composite compositional breakdown of the occurrences of PS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS ELEMENTS</th>
<th>H&amp;NH-PS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP),CT</td>
<td>27+19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT</td>
<td>6+25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>7+15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>1+13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CN</td>
<td>2+6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CN</td>
<td>2+4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP),CN</td>
<td>0+4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CN,CT</td>
<td>3+1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1+3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E,CT</td>
<td>1+0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP),CN,CE</td>
<td>1+0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CN,CE</td>
<td>1+0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CE</td>
<td>1+0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP),R</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,R</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CE</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>53+94</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this table, it is seen that the combination of (E&BP),CT occurs in 31% of the PSs of the sample. The combination of BP,CT occurs second most frequently, in 21% of the PSs of the sample. Occurring third and fourth most frequently in PSs of the sample are the combinations of (E&BP) and BP (each alone), 15% and 10%, respectively. The rest of the combinations occur in 5% or less of the PSs.

The first 4 combinations comprise 77% of the instances.
of PS in the sample, and are comprised of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS ELEMENT IN COMBINATION</th>
<th>NO. OF OCCURRENCES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident that, in combination, the elements of BP, primarily, as well as CT and E, in lesser degrees, comprise major components in the phenomenon of PS in the philosophical dialectics of Matthew Lipman. Yet these elements, occurring alone, comprise much less of the PSs than they do in combination:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS ELEMENT ALONE</th>
<th>NO. OF OCCURRENCES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, there must be an unknown synergistic effect operative in combinations of elements of PS.

It appears likely that the combination of the elements of (E&BP) and CT acts synergistically, for alone (E&BP) occurs 15% of the time while in combination with CT it occurs 31% of the time, a 16% difference. The combination of the elements BP and CT also appears to act synergistically, for alone BP occurs 10% of the time and CT alone occurs not at all, yet in combination, they occur 21% of the time, an 11% and a 21% increase, respectively. It is unclear whether CT acts as a strong catalyst for BP or whether BP acts as a
strong catalyst for CT, or whether they equally strengthen each other, yet they do appear, both alone and in combination with other elements, to account for 62% of the total PS occurrences.

The element (E&BP) also appears to have a strong positive synergistic effect, both alone, 15%, (however, the fact that they are a combination element cannot be ignored) and in combination, for combined, it occurs in PSS 54% of the time. This synergistic effect is clearly evident when CT is added to (E&BP), (E&BP),CT. Without CT, (E&BP) occurs in the PSSs of Matthew Lipman 15% of the time; with CT,(E&BP) occurs 31% of the time, a 16% increase.

The element CN, while appearing not to have as much positive synergistic strength as others, does appear to be affected by a moderate synergistic effect in combination with BP, for CN alone occurs 1% of the time but in combination with BP, alone, it occurs 5% of the time, while in combination with BP and other elements, it occurs 10% of the time, a stronger showing than with the combination of (E&BP), 7%. Combined with CT, CN only occurs 3% of the time, and then only with BP or (E&BP). Interestingly, while CT contributes strength to the element (E&BP), CN reduces it: (E&BP) alone occurs 15% of the time, while (E&BP),CN occurs only 3% of the time, a 12% reduction.
All single elements, except the elements BP, E and (E&BP) occur alone less than they do in combination:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS ELEMENT</th>
<th>ALONE</th>
<th>IN COMBINATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This tends to suggest that these 4 elements, and probably all of the elements, have the capacity to serve different functions merely by either being in combination with other elements or by occurring alone, supporting the observation that elements of PS within the philosophical dialectic are operating with an unknown dynamic that may involve both positive and negative synergies, similar to neural models.

Negative synergistic effects can also be observed. The elements, R and CE seem to exert a negative synergy in combinations. It is clearly seen in the fact that the combination BP, CT occurs 21% of the time, while the combination BP, CT, CE occurs 1% of the time, a 20% difference. It is also seen in the combination BP, CT, CN, which occurs 4% of the time, while BP, CT, CN, CE occurs 1% of the time, and in the combination of BP, CT, which occurs 21% of the time, but in combination with CE, BP, CT, CE, it occurs only 1% of the time.

Similarly, R exerts a negative effect. The combination, (E&BP), occurs 15% of the time, but in combination with R,
(E&B), R, it occurs 1% of the time. In another example, the combination, BP, CT, occurs 21% of the time, while with R, BP, CT, R, it occurs 1% of the time.

It is important to remember that it is not the relationships of letters or abstractions that are being discussed, but the actual elements that comprise the composition of PSs, the component in the philosophical dialectic that enables or facilitates the analytical work of the dialectic to develop and progress. As such, these elements represent the componential anatomy necessary to understand how an idea is developed and what is happening during this critical developmental, or non-developmental, period. It may also represent the cognitive processes that are used for such a development or non-development.

Findings of the contextual analysis, the qualitative composition of PS elements, are:

1] In the philosophical dialectics of the philosophical novels for children by Matthew Lipman, humor does not appear to be a significant factor in the analysis of the composition of the component of Philosophical Spacing [PS].

2] The qualitative compositional analysis of PS elements suggests that there may be an unknown process operative at this level. A process is suspected because there are combinations of PS elements that have the
capability to act synergistically. Both positive (more numerous occasions of specific PS element combinations) and negative (less frequent occasions of specific PS element combinations) synergistic dynamics are observed.

3] While the dynamics of the synergistic process within the component of PS are unknown, synergies of the elements of PS within the philosophical dialectic appear to be:

a. positive synergies
   1. CT with (E&BP) or BP
   2. (E&BP) or BP, alone
b. negative synergies
   1. R or CE in combination
   2. CN, either alone or in combination
   3. E, either alone or in combination (excluding the element (E&BP))

4] The significance of the PS occurrences that fall in the under 5% range is not clear at this time. Clearly they are significant by fact of their existence: they have occurred in the philosophical dialectic, and as such they represent a pattern of occurrence that is possible. Yet until more understanding of the dynamics that are operative in the process used by the elements of PS is gained, it seems that a speculation cannot be attempted, except that the pattern must represent a function of PS.
This study suggests that the creative process in the development of a philosophical dialectic is dependent on the phenomenon of Philosophical Spacing. The philosophical dialectic requires a break from the formal work of the dialectic, PS, so that time is provided, it is suspected, for the necessary cognitive processing of the development of an issue, which may be related to the limitations of the Short Term Memory process. We have seen this same phenomenon at work in similar phenomena, specifically in the Wait-time research and literature and in the psycholinguistic phenomenon of "Filled Pauses." All suggest that higher level cognitive processing takes physical time to develop.

The Wait-time research finds that an optimal waiting period of 2.7 seconds to 5 seconds both after the teacher has asked a question and after the student responds, will produce an improved quality of performance, both by the student and the teacher. Mary Budd Rowe reports that when teachers begin the Wait-time procedure
...there are noticeable changes in speech and attitude outcomes.... the promptness of changes...suggests that the Wait-time variable must have pervasive connections to both cognitive and affective factors....We can suspect that time [in Wait-time pauses] is bought for more cognitive processing on the part of students....the consequences of lengthened pauses...would tend to favor Taylor's (1960) hypothesis that pauses serve a cognitive function.25

Further insight into the process is suggested by Rowe when she uses the term "to 'grow' a complex thought system," to explain what she thinks is happening during Wait-time.26 Obviously, she has a neural model in mind.

Sherry Rochester reports that H. Maclay and C.E. Osgood were the first to distinguish between silent pauses and filled pauses, finding that "...pauses of 'either type can occur in any position where the other occurs and [do] so frequently.'"27 While the types of "filled pauses" by Maclay and Osgood include utterances such as "er" or "uh" or "hmmmm" or "well," the possibility that they might also be extrapolated to include the kind of breaks found in PS has not yet been considered. It is also of interest to this study that in concluding an indepth literature review of hesitation phenomena, Rochester advises that "...it is wise to leave the search for units to engage in a pursuit of processes or operations which can and often do cooccur." 28

The dynamic of the pause has been interpreted in detail by a psychoanalytic philosophical psychologist, Rollo May,
and provides another valuable insight into the nature of the necessity of physical time required for cognitive processing to occur:

The length of time of the pause is, in principle, irrelevant. When we look at what actually happens in people's experience, we note that some pauses can be infinitesimally small. When I am giving a lecture, for example, I select one word rather than another in a pause that lasts for only a millisecond. In this pause a number of possible terms flash before my mind's eye. If I want to say the noise was 'loud,' I may consider in this fraction of a second such words as 'deafening,' 'startling,' or 'overwhelming.' Out of these I select one. All this happens so rapidly—strictly speaking, on the preconscious level—that I am aware of it only when I stop to think about it afterward. But something else, even more interesting, occurs in those small, multitudinous pauses as one speaks. This is the time when I 'listen' to the audience, when the audience influences me, when I 'hear' its reaction and ask silently, What connotations are they taking from my words? For any experienced lecturer the blank spaces that constitute the pauses between the words and sentences is the time of openness to the audience. At such times I find myself noting: There someone seems puzzled; here someone listens by tipping his head to one side so as not to miss any word; there in the back row—what every speaker dreads to see—is someone nodding in sleep. Every experienced speaker that I know is greatly helped by the cultivation of his awareness of facial expressions and other subtle aspects of unspoken communication from the audience.

Walt Whitman once remarked that 'the audience writes the poetry,' and in an even clearer sense the audience gives the lecture. The pause for milliseconds while one speaks is the locus of the speaker's freedom. The speaker may mold his speech this way or that, he may tell a joke to relax the audience, or—in a thrilling moment of which there cannot be too many in a lecturer's career—he may even be aware of a brand new idea coming to him from heaven knows where in the audience. [It] would seem that multitudes of us have [the capacity to be sensitive to communications on many different levels of which the average person is unaware], but we train ourselves (a process abetted by much contemporary education) to suppress this sensitivity to pauses. The pauses may be longer, for instance, when one is answering questions after a lecture. In response to a question, I may silently hem and
haw for a moment while different possible answers flash through my mind. At that time I do not usually think of Kierkegaard's proclamation 'Freedom is possibility,' but this is what I am living out in those moments of pause. The thrilling thing is that at such a time a new answer that I have never thought of may suddenly emerge.29

Recent brain research also corroborates the understanding that creative thinking requires a period of time in which to operate. Mortimer Mishkin, Chief of Neuropsychology Research at NIMH, reports that during the associative memory consolidation process, when the neuronal stations are progressively consolidating information from the sensory stations through the limbic system to the cortex via multi-modalities, and then, via various feedback systems, back to the sensory areas to be stored, there is a period when the brain cannot store or retrieve new memory, when the activity of memory consolidation is occurring over a period of time, when integration is taking place. Further, he reports that the associative memory process and other thought processes, including the creative process, are the same process.30 This may explain the necessity of an incubation or rest period within the creative process.

Thus it is clearly recognized that time within the inquiry and exploration process is required for higher level cognitive processing and creative development. While the
present study confirms, illustrates and underscores this necessity, some educators have also recognized this need.

Calvin W. Taylor, arguing for science education that encourages scientific creativity, asks for increased concern for the student’s style of creative processing:

Requiring a student to tell at any and every time what he is doing may work against effective deeper processes, such as successful incubations....If a student intuitively senses potential complications from premature verbalizing and resists such requirements, or if he is somewhat incapable of verbalizing during his own incubations, he may find himself in conflict with his teacher or with school requirements. But you, as a science educator, must have more understanding so that his incubation may have a greater chance of moving ahead without setbacks to a full and successful completion. Will you be prepared to respond suitably if such an unexpected, though intuitive, conclusion to postpone verbalizing is reached?

There is reason to think that much of the creative process is intuitive in nature and entails the work of the mind prior to formulation of the ‘stuff’ of the mind in expressive form. It is very likely preconscious, nonverbal and preverbal, and may involve a large sweeping, scanning, diffuse, free, deep, and powerful action of almost the whole mind..... How a person receives and processes information may be as important, if not more important, than the information itself.....[How the individual scientist] handles the information internally--how he stores it and interweaves it internally with other stuff already present--can also be done more creatively or less creatively. So we can ask to what degree his reception is creative, to what degree his central processes are creative, and to what degree his mode and form and expressional output are creative. Shouldn’t we be concerned about each of these processes, too, in our science students?

Jane Martin argues that the "Dependency thesis" of thinking and literacy, which holds that thinking is dependent on literacy,

...will cause educators to lose sight of thought which
is not language based. ... an overdependency on the written word has a high price: memory suffers, as do visual and oral skills. Most important, of all, thinking itself is diminished. ... if we value the intuitive mode of thinking, we must find ways to encourage and foster it even as we foster the rational mode. ... When thinking is taken seriously as a goal of education in the sciences, the arts and practical activities must all have access to it and routes must be charted through the gymnasium, the studio, the laboratory, the theater and the shop as well as through the classroom.32

The experience of query as primary is upheld by Justus Buchler, again an argument for necessary time to conduct the thinking process:

The first major job of a teacher, and maybe in the last analysis the only one, is to implant the spirit and experience of inquiry—or, better, of query...to designate probing in the widest possible sense... probing which can be directed toward making or acting no less than stating.... One of the maladies endemic to this generation of scholars is an impatience with 'unclear' speculation. The cries of 'metaphysical' and 'obscure' fly thick and fast, as though any sincere thinker were ever deliberately obscure or as though all metaphysics necessarily treated of the fantasies that positivists have in mind.... Students who are hesitant to volunteer in discussion are frequently grappling with more than they can readily formulate. When to encourage them to share their wealth and when to let them work through their ideas is a perennial problem. I am disposed habitually to trust their judgment more than my own..... it is imperative, academically, to do costly labor for small social fruits and to remember that even the student who has forgotten almost everything may now and then, from an influence remote to him, perceive the moral power of query.33

Reporting on the state of inquiry, or problem-finding, J.T. Dillon finds that

...schools, as Thelen (1972) remarked, 'collapse inquiry to mere problem solving,' .... One reviewer concluded that 'the shaping of student questioning skills has been a neglected feature of classroom learning' (Gail,1970).... There are grounds in logic and psychology for supposing that these so-called problem-events do not entail problematicity
and cannot produce a motivating and stimulating effect on student thought processes. (Dillon, 1978, 1982a, 1982b)

Again the type of thinking that is critical for a more significant kind of learning is argued for.

A picture of this kind of learning is given by Albert Einstein, in his famous response to Jacques Hadamard's creativity survey, confirming the thinking process as it has been presented:

(A) The words or the language, as they are written or spoken, do not seem to play any role in my mechanism of thought. The psychical entities which seem to serve as elements in thought are certain signs and more or less clear images which can be 'voluntarily' reproduced and combined. There is, of course, a certain connection between those elements and relevant logical concepts. It is also clear that the desire to arrive finally at logically connected concepts is the emotional basis of this rather vague play with the above mentioned elements. But taken from a psychological viewpoint, this combinatory play seems to be the essential feature in productive thought—before there is any connection with logical construction in words or other kinds of signs which can be communicated to others.

(B) The above mentioned elements are, in my case, of visual and some of muscular type. Conventional words or other signs have to be sought for laboriously only in a secondary stage, when the mentioned associative play is sufficiently established and can be reproduced at will.

(C) According to what has been said, the play with the mentioned elements is aimed to be analogous to certain logical connections one is searching for.

(D) Visual and motor. In a stage when words intervene at all, they are, in my case, purely auditive, but they interfere only in a secondary stage as already mentioned.

Einstein's "combinatory play" thinking mode is the same one referred to by Jane Martin when she quotes Gilbert Ryle's description of it:

The architect might try to think out his design for the
war-memorial by arranging and re-arranging toy bricks on the carpet; the sculptor might plan a statue in marble by modelling and remodelling a piece of plasticine. The motorist might weigh the pros and cons of different roads in his mind’s eye. The guide might be planning tomorrow’s climb, methodically scanning through a telescope the slopes, precipices and water-courses of the mountain from his hotel.36

The argument that an important but unscrutinized thinking style requires time away from its formal development style, so that the formal development can proceed, has been developed in this thesis. It has been demonstrated that an analysis of an example of a principle learning method, the philosophical dialectical method, suggests that the philosophical dialectical method depends on a time or space or break away from the analytical work of the dialectic, what I have named Philosophical Spacing (PS). Other examples of the kind of thinking style that alludes to a required time that is necessary for higher cognitive processing in the form of a break from its formal developmental work have been offered as collaborative support to demonstrate the merit and significance of such a dynamic. It is suggested that the phenomenon of Philosophical Spacing employs the same kind of creative and educative process that the above referred to spokespeople advocate, a creative learning process that allows and encourages the practice of speculation, by allowing the necessary physical time for its development, a neglected but practicable creative educational process.
FOOTNOTES

1. Richard Robinson, *Plato's Earlier Dialectic* (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1953), p. 70; Robinson quotes Plato about the dialectic: "[It is] the ideal method, whatever that may be." He further delineates the varied meanings for which Plato uses it:

1) "The resort to discussion" identified with the hypothetical method (Phaedo)
2) "that 'upward path' ... [which supersedes] the hypothetical method of mathematics." (Republic)
3) "synthesis and division" (Philebus)
4) "hypothesis" (Meno, Phaedo, Republic, Parmenides)
5) "division" (Phaedrus, Sophist, Statesman, Philebus)
6) "the search for 'what the thing is' ... [its] essence" (Parmenides)


2. Robinson, p.83.


4. Mary Budd Rowe, "Wait-Time: Slowing Down May Be A Way of Speeding Up!," *Journal of Teacher Education*, v.37, p.1, 1986, pp. 43-56. It is interesting that Rowe uses the term "to 'grow' a complex thought system," (p.3) to explain what she thinks is happening during Wait-Time.; see also: "Pausing Phenomena: Influence on the Quality of Instruction," *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, v.3, n.3, July 1974, pp.203-224: "It is as though the mapping of experience proceeds in pieces. Intrusion between the bursts by another player prevents the expression of a complete sequence.." (p.214), "... we can expect that time is bought for more cognitive processing ... This would tend to favor Taylor's hypothesis that pauses serve a cognitive function..", (p.223).

5. Rowe; see also: Sherry R. Rochester, "The Significance of Pauses in Spontaneous Speech," *Journal of*

6. H. Maclay and C.E. Osgood, "Hesitation Phenomena in Spontaneous Speech," Word, 15: 19-14, in Rochester, pp.64-65: "The possibility of a voiced pause corresponding in location and function to the silent pause was considered by Maclay and Osgood (1959).... They distinguished between silent pauses (SPs) and filled pauses (FPs).... pauses of 'either type can occur in any position where the other occurs and [do] so frequently.' (1959, p.39," p.64; Rochester reports that "... these studies demonstrate repeatedly that pauses are relevant to cognitive processing.", p.71; Rochester's conclusion is that "... it is wise to leave the search for units to engage in a pursuit of processes or operations which can and often do occur.", p.78.


17. Terry Tivnan, Lecture, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 10/24/83.

18. Tivnan, 10/3/83.


20. A .75 correlation is considered good.


27. Maclay and Osgood, in Rochester, p.64.


30. Mortimer Mishkin, "The Anatomy of Memory," Lecture, Harvard University, 12/2/87. After the lecture by Dr. Mishkin, Chief of Neuropsychology Research at NIMH, I asked him about a point he had made during his lecture, that during the associative memory consolidation process, when the neuronal stations are progressively consolidating information from the sensory stations through the limbic system to the cortex via multimodalities, and then, via various feedback systems, back to the sensory areas to be stored, there is a period when the brain cannot store or retrieve new memory, when the activity of memory consolidation is occurring over a period of time, when integration is taking place. My question to him was, "Is there a correlation between the associative memory process and other thought processes, such as the creative process?" He replied that the associative memory process for the creative process is the same process.
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# APPENDIX I. STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS, BEGINNING SEGMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 1</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 2</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 3</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 4</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 5</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 6</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>PS/P</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS/I-NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEC/P</td>
<td>NEC/P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS/P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 8</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 9</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 10</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 11</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 12</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 13</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 14</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 16</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 17</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 18</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 19</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 20</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>I-NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II.A. Structural Analysis, Middle Segment, Beginning Section

DIALECTIC NO. 1 DIALECTIC NO. 2 DIALECTIC NO. 3 DIALECTIC NO. 4 DIALECTIC NO. 5 DIALECTIC NO. 6 DIALECTIC NO. 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS</th>
<th>NEC</th>
<th>NEC</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>NEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIALECTIC NO. 8 DIALECTIC NO. 9 DIALECTIC NO. 10 DIALECTIC NO. 11 DIALECTIC NO. 12 DIALECTIC NO. 13 DIALECTIC NO. 14 DIALECTIC NO. 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEC</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>NEC</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>NEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIALECTIC NO. 16 DIALECTIC NO. 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEC</th>
<th>NEC</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>NEC</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIALECTIC NO. 18 DIALECTIC NO. 19 DIALECTIC NO. 20 DIALECTIC NO. 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEC</th>
<th>NEC</th>
<th>NEC</th>
<th>NEC</th>
<th>PS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II.C. Structural Analysis, Middle Segment,
Concluding Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialectic No. 1</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 2</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 3</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 4</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 5</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 6</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(NONE)</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS/NEC/NEW</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>NEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialectic No. 8</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 9</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 10</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 11</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 12</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 13</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 14</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEK</td>
<td>NEK</td>
<td>NEK</td>
<td>NEK</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEK/PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEK</td>
<td>NEK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialectic No. 16</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 17</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 18</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 19</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 20</th>
<th>Dialectic No. 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(NONE)</td>
<td>PS/NEK</td>
<td>PS/NEK</td>
<td>(NONE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEK</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS/NEK</td>
<td>(NONE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS/NEK</td>
<td>(NONE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III. Structural Analysis, Concluding Segment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 1</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 2</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 3</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 4</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 5</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 6</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEC/NEW</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 8</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 9</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 10</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 11</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 12</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 13</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 14</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS/PS</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 16</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 17</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 18</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 19</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 20</th>
<th>DIALECTIC NO. 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS/NEW/P</td>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>PS/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS/NEW/P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS/NEW/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I-I

I-I

°°
### Appendix IV. Contextual Analysis, Individual Elements, Alone and in Combination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>E&amp;B</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUKI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIXIE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIO&amp;GUS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELFIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E (E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>E,CT (E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>CT (E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>CH (E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>H (E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>H,CE TOTAL PERCENT TOT.EXCL.(E&amp;BP) PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT.EXCL.(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix VI. Contextual Analysis, NAME-E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E (E&amp;BP)</th>
<th>E,CT (E&amp;BP)</th>
<th>CT (E&amp;BP)</th>
<th>CH (E&amp;BP)</th>
<th>H (E&amp;BP)</th>
<th>H,CE TOTAL PERCENT TOT.EXCL.(E&amp;BP) PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT.EXCL.(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NAME-E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>271%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>531%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX VI. CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS, HH-BP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BP (-BP)</th>
<th>BP/C</th>
<th>BP/CH</th>
<th>BP/CX</th>
<th>BP/CH/CX</th>
<th>BP/CH/CX/CH</th>
<th>BP/CH/CX/CE</th>
<th>(BP/CH/CX/CH)</th>
<th>(BP/CH/CX/CE)</th>
<th>(BP/CH)</th>
<th>(CH)</th>
<th>(BP/CH/CX)</th>
<th>(BP/CH/CX/CH)</th>
<th>(BP/CH/CX/CE)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>PERCENT TOTAL EXCL. (-BP)</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT. EXCL. (-BP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH-BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARON</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT. EXCL. (-BP)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HH-BP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix VIII. Contextual Analysis, H&L - (E&BP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(E&amp;BP)</th>
<th>(E&amp;BP)</th>
<th>(E&amp;BP)</th>
<th>(E&amp;BP)</th>
<th>(E&amp;BP)</th>
<th>(E&amp;BP)</th>
<th>R TOTAL PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUKI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIXIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIOWGUS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELFIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUKI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIXIE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIOWGUS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELFIE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL H&amp;L-(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix II. Contextual Analysis, H&NH-CT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H-CT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L/CT</td>
<td>BP/CT</td>
<td>(E&amp;H),CT</td>
<td>BP/CT,CH</td>
<td>(E&amp;H),CT</td>
<td>BP/CT,CE</td>
<td>BP/CT,CE</td>
<td>BP/CT,CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUKI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIXIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMICUS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELFIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H&amp;NH-CT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL H&amp;NH-CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J. Contextual Analysis, H&HH-CN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>BP-CN (H&amp;B), CH</th>
<th>BP-CN (H&amp;B)</th>
<th>CT-CN (H&amp;B)</th>
<th>BP-CN</th>
<th>CT-CN</th>
<th>CE-CN (H&amp;B)</th>
<th>CH-CN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-CN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SULKI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUOGUS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELFIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-CN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SULKI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUOGUS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELFIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL H&HH-CN 1 1 4 6 4 1 1 25
PERCENT 41 321 161 241 161 41 41 91
## Appendix II. Contextual Analysis, H&H-R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H&amp;H-R</th>
<th>(H&amp;H)R TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U-H</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kio &amp; Gus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elfie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H&amp;H-R</th>
<th>(H&amp;H)R TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VH-R</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kio &amp; Gus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elfie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H&amp;H-R</th>
<th>(H&amp;H)R TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL H&amp;H-R</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BP, CT, CE</td>
<td>BP, CT</td>
<td>CH (CN, CE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H-CR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuKI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIXIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIO&amp;GUS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELFIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H-CR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuKI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIXIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIO&amp;GUS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELFIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL H&amp;H-CR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix III: Contextual Analysis: Summary Analysis of Individual Elements: BAE-PS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8-E</th>
<th>8-TP</th>
<th>8-UP</th>
<th>8-(EUP)</th>
<th>8-(EUPP)</th>
<th>8-CT</th>
<th>8-CP</th>
<th>8-CP,8-CN</th>
<th>8-SP,8-CN</th>
<th>8-SP,8-CN,8-CN</th>
<th>8-SP,8-CN,8-CN,8-CN</th>
<th>8-SP,8-CN,8-CN,8-CN,8-CN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL 8-TP | 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 |
| TOTAL 8-UP | 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 |
| PERCENT | 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8-TP,8-CN</th>
<th>8-TP,8-CN,8-CN</th>
<th>8-SP,8-CN,8-CN</th>
<th>8-SP,8-CN,8-CN,8-CN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL 8-TP,8-CN | 0 0 0 0 0 |
| TOTAL 8-SP,8-CN,8-CN | 0 0 0 0 0 |
| TOTAL 8-TP,8-CN,8-CN,8-CN | 0 0 0 0 0 |
| PERCENT | 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 0 |
Appendix IV. Contextual Analysis: Ranked Order, E-PS Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of PSs</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(EARP),CT</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EARP)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EARP),CT,CH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E,ST</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EARP),CH,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B-2**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CH,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EARP),CH,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B-CE**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CH,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EARP),CH,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B-BP**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(EARP),CT</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EARP)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EARP),CT,CH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CH,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B-CT**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(EARP),CT</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EARP)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EARP),CT,CH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E,ST</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CH,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B-CN**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(EARP),CT,CH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP,CT,CH,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EARP),CH,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV. B. Contentual Analysis: Ranked Order, ME-PS Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME-B</th>
<th></th>
<th>ME-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), CT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), CH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), CT, CH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME-Bp</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>RANKED ORDER:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP, CT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), CT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CT, CH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CT, R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, Cll</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), CT, CH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME-(EiBP)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), CT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), CH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), CT, CH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME-CT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP, CT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), CT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), CH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CT, CH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CT, R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME-CN</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP, CH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), CH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CT, CH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EiBP), CT, CH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF P5s</td>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP),CT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-BP,CT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP),CT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-BP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-BP,CT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-BP,CH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP),CH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-BP,CT,CH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP),CT,CH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-BP,CH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-BP,CT,CH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-E,CT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-(E&amp;BP),CH,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-BP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-BP,CT,CH,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-BP,CT,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP),CT,CH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-(E&amp;BP),B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-BP,CT,E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-BP,CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-CH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL H-PS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NH-PS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX XIV.B: RANKED ORDER, CONS. H&NH-PS ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Occurrences</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CT</td>
<td>27+19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CT</td>
<td>6+25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP)</td>
<td>7+15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>1+13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CH</td>
<td>2+6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CT, CH</td>
<td>2+4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CH</td>
<td>0+4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CT, CH</td>
<td>1+1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1+3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, CT</td>
<td>1+0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP), CH, CE</td>
<td>1+0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CT, CH, CE</td>
<td>1+0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CT, CE</td>
<td>1+0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E&amp;BP), R</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CT, R</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP, CE</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>53+94</strong></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV. Random Selection and Location of the Philosophical Dialectics Sample in the Philosophical Novels for Children by Matthew Lipman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Random Selection</th>
<th>Pages of Chapter No. of Pages in Dialectic No.</th>
<th>Dialectic Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Number</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>(using HL’s pagination and lineation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry (1974)</td>
<td>1 1-4</td>
<td>4 11 P1, L25-P2, L20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 48-52</td>
<td>4 13 P48, L13-P52, L13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa (1976)</td>
<td>1 1-9</td>
<td>9 14 P4, L20-P5, L24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Grades 7-12]</td>
<td>3 19-27</td>
<td>8 15 P20, L17-P22, L26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 89-94</td>
<td>9 16 P91, L8-P93, L24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suki (1978)</td>
<td>2 11-23</td>
<td>12 17 P11, L17-P13, L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Grades 8-12]</td>
<td>6 74-89</td>
<td>15 18 P76, L29-P79, L24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 119-132</td>
<td>13 19 P125, L15-P128, L12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max (1980)</td>
<td>6 58-66</td>
<td>8 10 P62, L1-P64, L19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Grades 9-12]</td>
<td>7 67-75</td>
<td>8 11 P67, L1-P69, L29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 76-86</td>
<td>10 12 P79, L29-P82, L9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixie (1981)</td>
<td>3 14-20</td>
<td>6 13 P16, L2-P17, L26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Grades 3-4]</td>
<td>4 21-28</td>
<td>7 14 P21, L1-P24, L26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 49-58</td>
<td>11 15 P53, L3-P55, L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kogos (1982)</td>
<td>3 16-23</td>
<td>7 16 P20, L13-P21, L10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Grade 2]</td>
<td>7 48-54</td>
<td>8 17 P50, L16-P52, L27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 60-69</td>
<td>9 18 P65, L2-P67, L20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 155-164</td>
<td>9 21 P162, L1-P164, L10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix XVI. Random Selection and Location of the PS Sample from the Philosophical Novels for Children by Matthew Lipman

#### Randomly Selected No. of PSs on Page Randomly Selected PS No. PS Location (Using ML’s pagination and lineation)

<p>| HARRY | 10 | 4   | 2   | P10,L12-P10,L13 |
|       | 16 | 5   | 2   | P16,L16-P16,L18 |
|       | 18 | 11  | 4   | P18,L11-P18,L11 |
|       | 24 | 5   | 1   | P24,L2-P24,L2  |
|       | 30 | 4   | 2   | P30,L9-P30,L9  |
|       | 34 | 3   | 6   | P34,L19-P34,L22 |
|       | 37 | 1   | 7   | P37,L5-P37,L27 |
|       | 42 | 4   | 8   | P42,L7-P42,L8  |
|       | 52 | 6   | 2   | P52L3-P52L3    |
|       | 58 | 2   | 10  | P58,L10-P58,L10|
|       | 59 | 2   | 11  | P59,L23-P59,L23|
|       | 62 | 5   | 11  | P62,L29-P62,L32|
|       | 70 | 7   | 13  | P70,L26-P70,L27|
|       | 72 | 8   | 14  | P72,L16-P72,L17|
|       | 74 | 4   | 15  | P74,L38-P74,L42|
|       | 81 | 5   | 16  | P81,L15-P81,L21|
|       | 88 | 2   | 17  | P88,L4-P88,L4  |
|       | 89 | 4   | 18  | P89,L26-P89,L26|
|       | 91 | 3   | 19  | P91,L23-P91,L23|
|       | 93 | 4   | 20  | P93,L16-P93,L19|
|       | 94 | 3   | 21  | P94,L19-P94,L18|
| LISA  | 5  | 6   | 22  | P5,L22-P5,L22 |
|       | 7  | 5   | 23  | P7,L19-P7,L20 |
|       | 8  | 5   | 24  | P8,L24-P8,L28 |
|       | 9  | 2   | 25  | P9,L12-P9,L12 |
|       | 13 | 9   | 26  | P13,L7-P13,L17|
|       | 16 | 3   | 27  | P16,L26-P16,L33|
|       | 26 | 5   | 28  | P25,L20-P26,L21|
|       | 42 | 4   | 29  | P42,L29-P42,L29|
|       | 45 | 4   | 30  | P45,L4-P45,L10 |
|       | 47 | 10  | 31  | P47,L20-P47,L21|
|       | 52 | 3   | 32  | P51,L29-P52,L33|
|       | 57 | 4   | 33  | P57,L20-P57,L20|
|       | 60 | 10  | 34  | P60,L27-P60,L28|
|       | 68 | 8   | 35  | P68,L14-P68,L19|
|       | 84 | 6   | 36  | P84,L29-P84,L31|
|       | 85 | 5   | 37  | P85,L11-P85,L11|
|       | 92 | 1   | 38  | P92,L6-P92,L56 |
|       | 91 | 7   | 39  | P91,L23-P91,L23|
|       | 93 | 5   | 40  | P93,L17-P93,L18|
|       | 94 | 8   | 41  | P94,L20-P94,L21|
|       | 96 | 9   | 42  | P96,L22-P96,L29|
| SUXI  | 15 | 5   | 1   | P15,L4-P15,L11|
|       | 16 | 5   | 1   | P16,L5-P16,L13 |
|       | 27 | 4   | 2   | P27,L7-P27,L7 |
|       | 31 | 10  | 8   | P31,L26-P31,L27|
|       | 37 | 3   | 47  | P37,L20-P37,L20|
|       | 46 | 3   | 48  | P46,L7-P48,L2  |
| 51 | 8 | 7 | 48 | P51, L25-P51, L25 |
| 58 | 1 | 1 | 50 | P58, L11-P59, L14 |
| 65 | 15 | 4 | 51 | P65, L7-P65, L7 |
| 72 | 1 | 1 | 52 | P71, L1-P73, L3 |
| 76 | 1 | 1 | 53 | P75, L8-P77, L13 |
| 78 | 9 | 1 | 54 | P77, L31-P78, L7 |
| 114 | 7 | 4 | 55 | P114, L7-P114, L7 |
| 117 | 1 | 4 | 56 | P117, L1-P117, L1 |
| 121 | 6 | 6 | 57 | P121, L51-P122, L14 |
| 124 | 5 | 1 | 58 | P124, L1-P124, L1 |
| 126 | 11 | 5 | 59 | P126, L12-P126, L14 |
| 132 | 2 | 1 | 60 | P132, L2-P132, L3 |
| 139 | 2 | 1 | 61 | P139, L3-P139, L22 |
| 144 | 2 | 1 | 62 | P144, L1-P144, L26 |
| 147 | 10 | 5 | 63 | P147, L13-P147, L19 |
| 2 | 13 | 10 | 64 | P2, L30-P2, L30 |
| 7 | 9 | 2 | 65 | P7, L2-P7, L2 |
| 12 | 12 | 2 | 66 | P12, L8-P12, L8 |
| 15 | 11 | 5 | 67 | P15, L15-P15, L15 |
| 16 | 19 | 12 | 68 | P16, L39-P16, L41 |
| 18 | 1 | 1 | 69 | P18, L4-P18, L11 |
| 22 | 8 | 4 | 70 | P22, L42-P23, L2 |
| 30 | 10 | 4 | 71 | P30, L23-P30, L23 |
| 36 | 9 | 7 | 72 | P36, L27-P36, L30 |
| 42 | 6 | 2 | 73 | P42, L12-P42, L12 |
| 46 | 10 | 1 | 74 | P46, L17-P46, L19 |
| 48 | 9 | 4 | 75 | P48, L14-P48, L14 |
| 59 | 10 | 4 | 76 | P59, L39-P59, L18 |
| 62 | 10 | 7 | 77 | P62, L29-P62, L29 |
| 67 | 1 | 1 | 78 | P67, L11-P68, L9 |
| 72 | 12 | 10 | 79 | P72, L35-P72, L16 |
| 77 | 2 | 2 | 80 | P77, L39-P77, L40 |
| 80 | 5 | 2 | 81 | P80, L21-P80, L22 |
| 81 | 5 | 5 | 82 | P81, L36-P81, L16 |
| 84 | 15 | 13 | 83 | P84, L34-P84, L14 |
| 95 | 6 | 7 | 84 | P95, L20-P95, L20 |
| 99 | 4 | 4 | 85 | P4, L2-P4, L6 |
| 13 | 1 | 1 | 86 | P13, L11-P13, L19 |
| 16 | 5 | 4 | 87 | P16, L16-P16, L19 |
| 17 | 2 | 2 | 88 | P17, L25-P17, L25 |
| 18 | 5 | 2 | 89 | P18, L10-P18, L11 |
| 21 | 1 | 1 | 90 | P21, L1-P21, L18 |
| 22 | 4 | 3 | 91 | P22, L9-P22, L11 |
| 29 | 4 | 4 | 92 | P29, L10-P29, L14 |
| 31 | 6 | 1 | 93 | P31, L1-P31, L1 |
| 34 | 1 | 1 | 94 | P34, L5-P34, L7 |
| 35 | 4 | 2 | 95 | P35, L5-P35, L5 |
| 37 | 1 | 1 | 96 | P37, L11-P40, L9 |
| 41 | 3 | 3 | 97 | P41, L12-P41, L13 |
| 55 | 4 | 4 | 98 | P55, L25-P55, L25 |
| 61 | 2 | 2 | 99 | P61, L8-P61, L14 |
| 63 | 1 | 1 | 100 | P63, L1-P64, L5 |
| 65 | 6 | 6 | 101 | P65, L19-P65, L21 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td><strong>P78</strong>, L8-P78, L8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td><strong>P82</strong>, L16-P82, L17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td><strong>P93</strong>, L14-P93, L19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td><strong>P95</strong>, L6-P95, L6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td><strong>P18</strong>, L23-P18, L23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td><strong>P19</strong>, L4-P19, L5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td><strong>P21</strong>, L6-P21, L20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td><strong>P22</strong>, L2-P22, L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td><strong>P28</strong>, L13-P28, L14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td><strong>P32</strong>, L1-P32, L14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td><strong>P33</strong>, L18-P33, L20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td><strong>P37</strong>, L6-P37, L11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td><strong>P59</strong>, L2-P59, L15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td><strong>P43</strong>, L24-P44, L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td><strong>P47</strong>, L24-P47, L23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td><strong>P50</strong>, L28-P50, L28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td><strong>P52</strong>, L17-P52, L17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td><strong>P55</strong>, L10-P55, L10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td><strong>P57</strong>, L7-P57, L7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>121</td>
<td><strong>P59</strong>, L13-P59, L17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td><strong>P60</strong>, L14-P60, L15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123</td>
<td><strong>P62</strong>, L12-P62, L13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124</td>
<td><strong>P71</strong>, L5-P71, L4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td><strong>P72</strong>, L5-P72, L8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td><strong>P76</strong>, L13-P76, L15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td><strong>P6</strong>, L1-P6, L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td><strong>P7</strong>, L7-P7, L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td><strong>P8</strong>, L7-P8, L16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td><strong>P19</strong>, L1-P20, L14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td><strong>P27</strong>, L3-P27, L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>132</td>
<td><strong>P33</strong>, L19-P35, L12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133</td>
<td><strong>P36</strong>, L1-P38, L16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>134</td>
<td><strong>P47</strong>, L17-P49, L15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td><strong>P51</strong>, L6-P52, L6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td><strong>P71</strong>, L5-P71, L13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>137</td>
<td><strong>P87</strong>, L7-P87, L7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td><strong>P89</strong>, L3-P89, L6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139</td>
<td><strong>P111</strong>, L7-P111, L8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td><strong>P128</strong>, L1-P130, L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141</td>
<td><strong>P153</strong>, L2-P153, L6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td><strong>P150</strong>, L1-P151, L6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td><strong>P158</strong>, L1-P161, P11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td><strong>P162</strong>, L1-P162, L6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td><strong>P165</strong>, L1-P165, L4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>146</td>
<td><strong>P170</strong>, L1-P179, L1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX XVII. CODING SCHEMA FOR PS ELEMENTS

CODING SCHEMA FOR PS ELEMENTS

EMOTION [E]
BEING PRESENT [BP]
EMOTION AND BEING PRESENT [EBP]
CONTENT [C]
CONFUSION [C]
REST [R]
CLOSEUP [C2]
Appendix VIII. Criteria for Element Categories

ELEMENT CATEGORIES ELEMENT CODE ELEMENT DESCRIPTION
1. EMOTION 
E The category "E" or "Emotion," refers to any feelings, emotions or ambiguous inner states that are likely to be expressed in a comment. "Emotion" may refer to the speaker's, listener's, writer's, or reader's perceived mental, inner or emotional state. "Happiness" is included in the category of "Emotion" because it elicits an expression of pleasure, and because inner and emotional expressions can't be separated since their range becomes transformed. It may be a description of an expression of an emotional reaction if it is verbal, but not if it is merely a description of emotion.

2. SPEECH PROGRESS 
S The category "SP" or "Speech Progress," refers to a quality of immediacy, situation or focused awareness of the present experience. While it does not require the action to be in the immediate present, although it can be, it does require that the context of the fit must have happened in the present of the time of reporting, here that just taking a position or making a statement, it requires a need change from the present narrative, producing a new sense of immediacy, situation or focused awareness of the present experience. It not be a description of an action or reaction.

3. (SOMATIC AND EMOTION PROGRESS) (SPM) The category of "SPM," or "Somatic and Emotion Progress," is mandatory because the combination of both components provides a unique effect in PS that does not occur in either component alone, and it actively moves toward the other component along that line. It is a combination of the qualities defined in "P" and "SP" that makes it difficult to picture either with clarity. If we assign but a sense of immediacy occurs in the PS, the category "SPM" is used.

4. CONCEPT 
C The category "C," or "Concept," refers to a rational thinking or action that provides a break from the defining and clarifying work of the dialectic. It is frequently homoiconic as it may provide a description about everyone else or ourselves. While it may be neither because nor about everyday life, it always refers to something different from the previous work of the dialectic. It may be a primary source of the PS.

5. CONCLUSION 
CH The category "CH," or "Conclusion," refers to an explicit statement of conclusion that occurs within the dialectic in expressing some evaluation. Only then conclusion is explicitly stated does the category of "CH" apply to a PS, a cause however conclusion may be an expression of deliberation, some one not that put to a decision, or, finally, it may be an expression of not being satisfied.

6. LIST 
L The category "L" or "List," refers to an explicit statement in the PS that refers to a need for part.

7. CONCEIVE 
C The category "C," or "Concept," refers to an action needed to sum up or bring the same inner discussion to some conclusion or final closure. It usually is used to reason or clarify the subject under discussion, but it can also be a description of an expansion of facility.

CULP SPECIFICATIONS
In any analysis presented in this PS?
Is this PS narrative in the original?
Appendix XIX.

A. Interrater Reliability Test No.1

1. Training Instructions for IRRT #1, Training Session
2. Training and Testing Material #1, IRRT #1: Coding Schema for PS Elements
3. Training and Testing Material #2, IRRT #1: Criteria for Element Categories
4. Training Material #3, IRRT #1: Training Test Dialectic
5. Training Material #4, IRRT #1: Answer Sheet
6. Testing Instructions for IRRT #1, Testing Session
7. Training and Testing Material #1, IRRT #1: Coding Schema for PS Elements
8. Testing Material #1, IRRT #1: Testing Dialectic with 20 marked Examples of PS
9. Testing Material #4, IRRT #1: Answer Sheet

B. Interrater Reliability Test No.2

1. Training Instructions for IRRT #2, Training Session
2. Training Material #1, IRRT #2: Example of a PS
3. Training Material #2, IRRT #2: 5 examples of PS in Context
4. Testing Instructions for IRRT #2, Testing Session
5. Testing Material #1, IRRT #2: Test: 20 Examples of PS in Context with Other PSs Marked
TRAINING INSTRUCTIONS FOR IRRT #1, TRAINING SESSION

1. Distribute "Training Material #1," and explain "Coding Schema for PS Elements sheet. Ask if the subject has any questions.

2. Distribute "Training Material #2, Criteria for Category Elements" and go over the definitions, guide questions and examples for each component code. Ask if the subject has any questions.

3. Distribute "Training Material #3, Training Dialectic" and "Training Material #4, Answer Sheet." Ask subject to code the 7 sample PS. Go over answers. For different answers, go through the decision-making process with the subject to make sure subject understands the coding schema.
CODING SCHEMA FOR PS ELEMENTS

EMOTION [E]
BEING PRESENT [BP]
EMOTION AND BEING PRESENT [E&BP]
CONTENT [CT]
CONFUSION [CN]
REST [R]
CLOSURE [CE]
TRAINING AND TESTING MATERIAL /2, IREP 11: CRITERIA FOR ELEMENT CATEGORIES

ELEMENT CATEGORIES AND THEIR CRITERIA

1. OCTIVE (O)
The category "O," or "Octic," refers to any emotion, located or unlocated space within the dialectic or its causes (the causes being likely to the learner from previous). "Octic" may apply to the speaker, listener, writer or reader, peripheral people, things or actions. "Octic" is located in the category of "Authorial" because it utilizes or by saying of pleasure, and because power and emotion (emotion) can't be separated since their masses move interrelated. It may be a description of an expression of an emotional reaction if it is emotional, but not if it is merely a description of emotion.

2. MAIN PRESENT (MP)
The category "MP," or "Main Present," refers to a quality of immediacy, attunement of focused awareness of the present experience. While it does not require the action to be in our immediate present, although it can be, it does require that the context of the PM has been experienced in the present of the time of reporting. Here we put a question of making a statement. It requires a good change from the previous moment, producing a new mode of immediacy, attunement or focused awareness of the present experience. It may be a description of a writing or reaction.

3. (OCTIVE AND MAIN PRESENT) (OMP)
The category of "OMP," or "Octic and Main Present," is necessary because the combination of both categories provides a unique affect. In PM that does not express in either component alone, and in writing, were frequently-these-elliptical-coupled-alone does. It is a combination of the particular defined as "O" and "MP," that makes it difficult to discuss either with clarity. If any writer and a state of immediacy occurs in the same PM, the category "OMP" is used.

4. CONTENT (CT)
The category "CT," or "Content," refers to a reported thing of action that provides a head of the delving and clarifying work of the dialectic. It is frequently toward us as it may provide a unifying about everyday life, culture, while it may be another unifying our about everyday life, it always refers to something different from the previous work of the dialectic. It may be a primary writer of the PM.

5. CONTENTION (CN)
The category "CN," or "Contestion," refers to an explicit statement of causative outrage between the dialectic or re-emphasizing some conclusion. Only when conclusion is explicitly stated from the category of "CN" apply to a PM. A larger degree of conclusion may be an expression of deliberation, when one has not yet made a decision, or likely in by an expression of not being satisfied.

6. ACT (A)
The category "A," or "Act," refers to an explicit statement in the PM that refers to a need for act.

7. CLOSURE (U)
The category "U," or "closure," refers to an obvious need to sum up or bring the issue when something to some preliminary or final closure. It usually is used to resolve or clarify the subject under discussion, but it can also be a description of an expression of clarity.

TRUE QUESTIONS

1. Is any emotion expressed in this PM?
2. Is this PM recognizable in any degree?
3. Are both Octic and Main Present present in this PM?
4. Is the thing or action that is reported in this PM very different from the immediacy providing work of the dialectic?
5. Does the thing or action have little philosophical significance in this dialectic?
6. Is someone either discussing or stating an experience of conclusion?
7. Is a need for more clearly stated in this PM?
8. Is a need for closure either explicitly or covertly expressed in there naming of a redefinition or a justification in this PM?
world to incline a man toward philosophy and the practice of virtue? 375
Yes, Socrates, we think so.
Very well, said I, leave the rest of the demonstration for another
time, and just demonstrate this one thing. Persuade this young man
that he must love wisdom and practice virtue, and you will oblige me
and all these. For the truth about this boy is that both I myself and
all these anxiously desire that he should become as good as a man
can be. This is the son of Axiochus and the grandson of the famous
Alcibiades, and cousin of the present Alcibiades; his name is Clinias. b
He is young; and we are afraid for him, as for other young men,
that someone may get in first and turn his mind in some other di-
rection, and ruin him. You have come, then, most fortunately. If you
do not mind, please make trial of the lad, and talk with him before us.

When I had spoken, almost in these very words, Euthydemus an-
swered bravely and boldly, Oh, we don’t mind, Socrates, if
he is only willing to answer.

Why, he is quite used to that, I said. These people here are al-
ways coming and talking with him and asking all sorts of questions;
so he is not at all shy in answering.

What followed, Crito, how could I describe properly? It is not a
small business to recall and repeat wisdom ineffably great! So I must
begin my description as the poets do, by invoking the Muses and
Memory herself!

Well, Euthydemus began something like this, I think.

Now Clinias, which of mankind are the learners, the wise or the
ignorant?

This was a large question; so the boy blushed, and looked at me
in doubt. Seeing that he was troubled I said, My dear Clinias, cheer up
and answer like a man, whichever you think, for perhaps it will do
you a deal of good.

Just then, Dionysodorus leaned over me, and whispered in my
ear, smiling all over his face, ‘Now look here, Socrates, I prophesy that:
whichever the lad answers, he will be refuted!’

While he spoke, Clinias made his answer, so I had no chance to
warn the boy to take care; and he answered that the wise were the learn-
ers.

And Euthydemus said, There are people you call teachers, aren’t
there?

He agreed.

The teachers are teachers of the learners; for example, the music
master and the grammar master were teachers of you and the other
boys, and you were learners?

He said yes.

Of course at the time when you were learning, you did not yet
know the things you were learning?

No, he said.
Then you were wise when you did not know these things?
Certainly not, said he.
If not wise, then ignorant?
Yes.
So you boys, while learning what you did not know, were igno­rant and were learning?
The boy nodded.
So the ignorant learn, my dear Clitiias, not the wise as you suppose.

When he said this, it was like conductor and chorus—he sig­naled, and they all cheered and laughed, I mean Dionysodorus and Euthydemus and their followers. Then before the boy could take one good breath, Dionysodorus took over and said. What happened, my dear Clitiias, when the grammar man dictated to you? Which of the boys learned the things dictated, wise or ignorant?

The wise ones, said Clitiias.
Then the wise ones learn and not the ignorant, and you answered wrong just now to my brother.

Then indeed the two men’s admirers laughed loud and long, ap­plauding their wisdom, but all the rest of us were dumb-struck and had nothing to say, Euthydemus noticed that we were dumb-struck and wanted us to admire him more; so he would not let the boy alone, but went on asking, doubling and twisting around the same question like a clever dancer. He said, Do the learners learn what they know, or what they don’t know?

And Dionysodorus whispered softly to me again, Here’s another, Socrates, just like the first.

Good heavens, I said, really I thought that first one of yours a fine question!
All our questions are like that, Socrates—no escape!
Now, I said, I can see why you have such a reputation among your pupils.

Meanwhile Clitiias answered. Euthydemus that the learners learned what they did not know, and he went on in the same way as before. Very well; do you not know your letters?

Yes, said Clitiias.
All of them, eh?
He agreed.
And when a teacher dictates anything, does he not dictate letters?
He agreed.
Then he dictates a bit of what you know, if you know them all?
He agreed to this too.
Very well, said he, you do not learn what someone dictates, but only the one who does not know letters learns them? Eh?

No, no, he said, I do learn them.
Then you learn what you know, since you know all the letters.

He agreed.

The word had scarcely come out of his mouth, when Dionysodorus caught it like a ball and aimed it again, at the boy, saying, Euthydemus is cheating you, my dear Clinias. Just tell me, is not learning getting knowledge of whatever one learns?

Clinias agreed.

But to know, he went on, is surely to have knowledge of something already?

He said yes.

Then not to know is not yet to have knowledge?

He agreed with this.

Well, are those who get anything, those who have it already, or those who have not?

Those who have not.

Have you not agreed that those who do not know belong also to this class, those who have not?

He nodded.

And the learners are of the class who get, not those who have?

He said yes.

Now Euthydemus was getting ready to give the young man the third fall in this wrestling match, but I saw the boy was out of his depth, and hoped to give him time to rest that he might not let us down; so I said, to encourage him, My dear Clinias, do not be surprised if the arguments appear strange to you. Perhaps you do not understand what our visitors are doing with you. They are doing the same as the Corybantes do in their initiations, when the one to be initiated is being enthroned. There is dancing and play there also, as you know if you have been initiated; and now these are only dancing round you in play, meaning to initiate you afterward. So consider now that you are hearing the beginnings of the sophistic ritual. For you must learn first of all, as Prodicus says, the right use of words; and this is just what the two visitors are showing to you, because you did not know that people use the word learn in two senses—first, when one has no knowledge at the beginning about something, and then afterward gets the knowledge, and second, when one already having the knowledge uses this knowledge to examine this same thing done or spoken. The second is called understanding rather than learning, but sometimes it is also called learning. But you missed this, as these show it; they hold the same word as applying to people in opposite senses, to one who knows and one who does not. It was much the same in the second question, in which they asked you whether people learn what they know or what they don’t. Well, all this is just a little game of learning, and so I say they are playing.
with you; I call it a game, because if one learned many such things or even all of them, one would be no nearer knowing what the things really are, but would be able to play with people because of the different sense of the words, tripping them up and turning them upside down, just as someone pulls a stool away when someone else is lying on his back. So you must consider that all this was a game on the part of these gentlemen, but I feel sure, Clinias, that from now on this distinguished pair will show you serious things, and I will give them a lead as to what they promised me to provide. You remember they said they would demonstrate their skill in drawing you on, but so far I suppose they thought it better to begin by playing with you.

Then, my dear Euthydemus and Dionysodorus, let your play end here—perhaps we have had enough—but now please demonstrate by attracting the boy and showing him how he must practice wisdom and virtue.

But first I will show to you what my notion of it is, and the sort of thing I should like to hear. If you think I am clumsy and ridiculous in doing this, don't laugh at me; I am only eager to listen to your wisdom, and so I will be daring enough to make a rough sketch before you. Put up with me then, and listen without laughing, both you and your pupils. And as for you, Master Clinias, answer:

Do we all wish to do well in the world? Or perhaps this is one of the questions which I feared you might laugh at, for it is foolish, no doubt, even to ask such things. Who in the world does not wish to do well?

Not a single one, said Clinias.

Very well, said I. Next then, since we all wish to do well, how could we do well? If we had plenty of good things, eh? Perhaps that is a sillier question than the other. For it is clear, I suppose, that that is true?

He agreed.

Very well, which shall we say are good for us, of all the things there are? This is an easy question, I think; it needs no solemn person to supply an answer, for everyone would tell us that to be rich is good.

What do you say?

Yes indeed, he said.

Also to be healthy, and to be handsome, and to have enough of all the other bodily blessings.

He thought so too.

Again, good birth and power and honor in your own country, these are clearly good?

He agreed.

Then what good things are left to us? What is it to be temperate and upright and brave? What do you think, in heaven's name, Clinias?
This was a big decision. As the boy hesitated, you laughed at the joke. Seeing she was pleased you smiled, and the boys behind swarmed you. From there she walked towards you, whispering you were a man, whatever you were, perhaps it was not so bad.

2... And when you realized you were the same, you walked further and further, to the point you ran. And when you fell, you stood up, not caring for the pain, just the joy of being alive.

Just stay, Outsiders stopped you to adjust their vision, but at the cost of all your weaknesses and had winning in mind.

 Outsiders nod. I will not stop you. And why should you? Your heart is here. Because you know that everything you have until now has led you to this moment, and you will not let anyone take that away from you. You are not the only thing you are, you are your past, your present, and your future. And you will not let anyone take that away from you.

3. When you asked, he was Homeless and had been signed until they all came together, and a voice said:

"Why do you think it is so?"

The boys said:

"Whatever you do, you will always be considered Outsiders and more." Then before the boy could even react, Outsiders took off and split.

4. Then instead of two men watching together quite and low, following their vision but at the cost of all your weaknesses and had winning in mind.
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1. Distribute to subject:
   1] "Testing Material #1, Coding Schema for Ps Elements
   2] "Testing Material #2, Criteria for Category Elements"
   3] "Testing Material #3, Testing Dialectic with 20 Marked Examples of PS"
   4] "Testing Material #4, Answer Sheet"

2. Ask subject to code the 20 marked PSs on the answer sheet with the help of the coding materials. Allow as much time as is necessary. Don’t discuss the answer, but questions of clarification may be answered.
CODING SCHEMA FOR PS ELEMENTS

- EMOTION
- BEING PRESENT
- EMOTION AND BEING PRESENT
- CONTENT
- CONFUSION
- REST
- CLOSURE

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{EMOTION} & \quad [E] \\
\text{BEING PRESENT} & \quad [BP] \\
\text{EMOTION AND BEING PRESENT} & \quad [E\&BP] \\
\text{CONTENT} & \quad [CT] \\
\text{CONFUSION} & \quad [CN] \\
\text{REST} & \quad [R] \\
\text{CLOSURE} & \quad [CE]
\end{align*}
\]
SOCRATES: But what knowledge does it teach? And what are we to do with it? For it must not be a contriver of any of those products which are neither good nor bad; it must impart no knowledge but itself alone. Can we say then what it is, and what we are to do with it? Would you like us to say it is the one by which we shall make other men good?

CRITO: Yes, certainly.

SOCRATES: And what shall these be good for, and how useful to us? Shall we say, to make others the same, and they to make others, and so on and on? And good at what? We cannot see, since we have despised what are generally said to be the works of statecraft, and as the proverb goes, it is always 'Corinthus, son of Zeus.' We are just as far from knowing, or rather, what is that knowledge which will make us happy.

CRITO: Yes, indeed, Socrates, it seems you got yourselves into a nice mess.

SOCRATES: Well all I could do, my dear man, since I found myself in this mess, was to cry and clamor, praying to the two visitors like a second pair of savior gods [Castor and Polydeuces], to save us, me and the boy, from this tempest of logic, and to play no more but to be serious, and show us which is the knowledge which once gained would bring us well through the rest of our life.

CRITO: What then? Was Euthydemus willing to show you?

SOCRATES: Why, of course! And he began, my good friend, in this magnificent fashion:

Which do you prefer, then, my dear Socrates? Shall I teach you this knowledge which has been puzzling you for so long, or shall I show that you have it?

Heaven bless us, my dear man! I said I. Can you do that?

That I can, said he.

Then show that I have it, I do beseech you, said I, for that is much easier than learning for an old man like me.

Very well, he said, just answer. Is there anything you do know?

Oh yes, I said, plenty of things, but only small ones.

Quite enough, said he. Then do you think it is possible for anything whatever of the things which are, not to be what it is?

Why no, I don't, said I.

You know something then? said he.

I do.

Then you are knowing, since you know?

Certainly, in that same something.

That makes no difference, he said. Isn't it necessary that you know everything since you are knowing?

Why, no indeed, I said. There are many other things I do not know.

Then if you do not know something, you are not knowing.

Not knowing that, my friend, said I.
EUTHYDEMUS
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Are you any the less not knowing? But just now you said you were knowing, and so you are really this very same you, and again not the same, in relation to the same things at the same time!

All right, Euthydemus! I said. As the proverb goes, 'You never say a word amiss, it's always either that or this!' And what then is my understanding of that knowledge we were looking for? I suppose it is this. It is impossible for the same thing both to be and not to be. If I know one thing I know all things, for I could not be knowing and not knowing at the same time. And so since I know everything, I have that knowledge too! There you are—isn't that what you tell us, isn't that your word of wisdom?

Look here, said he, you are refuting yourself, Socrates!

Well, but what about you, Euthydemus? I said. Weren't you in this same difficulty? Anyway, so long as I keep with you and with dear old Dionysodorus, I shall not feel at all vexed at any difficulty we get into! Tell me, don't you two know some of the things which are, and not know others of them?

By no means, said Dionysodorus.

What's that! said I. Don't you know anything?

Oh yes, we do, he said.

Then you know everything, I asked, since you know something?

Everything, he answered, and so do you. If you know one thing, you know all things.

O God! I said. Here's a wonder and a manifest miracle! Can it be that all the other men in the world know everything, or nothing?

Surely, he said, they cannot know some things and not others, or they would be at once knowing and not knowing.

Knowing what? I said.

Good heavens! I said. Good heavens, Dionysodorus! I see now that you are both earnest, and what a job I had to persuade you to take us in earnest! Do you both really and truly know everything? Carpenter and shoemaking, for instance?

Certainly, he said.

So you are able to stitch leather?

Yes, and to cobble too, he said.

And do you know things like these, the number of the stars, and the sand?

Certainly, he said. Do you think we would not admit that too?

Then Ctesippus broke in. Show me a proof, Dionysodorus, for God's sake, by which I may know that you two are telling the truth.

What shall I show you? he said.

Do you know how many teeth Euthydemus has, and does he know how many you have?

Is it not enough for you, he said, to be told that we know everything?

Not that, please, said Ctesippus. Just tell us this one thing more
and show you are speaking the truth; if you each say how many teeth
the other has, and if we count them and prove that you know, we will
at once believe all the rest.

They thought he was making fun, so they were unwilling, but
they kept on saying they knew everything, as Ctesippus asked them
one question after another without the smallest restraint. And he left
out nothing, not even the ugliest, but asked them if they knew that.
They faced up boldly against every question maintaining that they
did know, like wild boars charging against the spear thrust, so that I
also became quite incredulous, Crito, and at last I myself was driven
to ask if Dionysodorus knew how to dance.

He said, Oh yes!

Well, I said, I suppose you can’t do a sword dance, and roll about
on a wheel, at your age? Have you got that far in skill?

There’s nothing I can’t do, he said.

And do you know everything only now, I asked, or have you
known it always?

Always, he said.

Even when you were children, and as soon as you were born, did
you know everything?

Yes, they said, both together.

This seemed incredible to us, and Euthydemus asked, Do you not
believe it, Socrates?

I can only say, I replied, that you must be a wise pair.

But if you will answer me, he said, I will prove that you also ad-
mit these surprising things.

Oh, well, I said, I shall be very glad to be shown up like that. For
If I have been wise without knowing it myself, and if you will show
that I know everything and always did, what greater piece of luck
could I have in all my life?

Answer then, he said.

All right, ask away. I will answer.

Tell me then, Socrates, he said, are you knowing in something or
not?

I am.

Then do you know by that by which you are knowing, or by
something else?

By that by which I am knowing. I suppose you mean the soul, or
do you not mean this?

 Aren’t you ashamed, Socrates? he said. When you are asked one
question, do you ask another?

Oh dear, I said, what am I to do? I will do just as you tell me.

When I am not clear what you are asking, do you tell me to answer all
the same, and not to ask anything myself?

I suppose you conceive some notion in what I say?

Yes, I do, was my reply.
Then answer according to the notion which you conceive.

Well, I said, what if you mean it in one way when you ask, and I conceive my notion in another way, and then I answer according to my notion—is it enough for you if I answer not at all to the point?

Enough for me, he said, but however, not enough for you, as I take it.

Then, Euthydemus, I won't answer, I tell you that, said I, before I find out.

You will not answer, he said, according to your notion in each case, because you are more of an old fool than you need be, and will go on talking drivel.

Now I saw he was angry with me for picking holes in the phrases used, because he was trying to catch me in his net of words. So I remembered that Connus also is angry whenever I will not give way to him, and now he takes less trouble about me because he thinks me ignorant. And since I had the notion to be a pupil of this other one, I thought I ought to give way to him, or he might think me stupid and refuse to accept me. So I said, Well, Euthydemus, if you think it proper to do like this, so be it. For anyway you know dialectic far better than I do, who have only the skill of an outsider. Then ask again from the beginning.

Very well then, he said, answer again. Do you know what you know by something or not?

Yes, I said, by the soul.

There he goes again, said he, answering more than he is asked! I did not ask by what, but whether by something.

Oh well, I answered too much, I said, from want of education. Do forgive me; I will from now on answer simply. I know what I know by something.

Is it by this same thing always, he asked, or by this thing one time, and by another thing another time?

Always, I said, when I do know, it is by this thing.

Oh, do stop putting things in! he said.

But I don't want this 'always' to trip us up!

It will not trip us up, he said, but you, if anybody. But answer. Do you know always by this?

Always, I said, since I must take out the when.

Then you know always by this. But knowing always, do you know some things by this and other things by something else, or everything by this?

By this all things—all which I know, I replied.

Here we are again! he said. The old addition!

Well, I said, I take away that 'which I know.'

Oh, don't take away a single thing, he said. I don't ask of you any favors. But answer me. Could you know all things, if you did not know everything?
That would be a miracle! I said. He said then, Go on, add what you like, you admit that you know all things.

It seems like it. I said, since the words 'which I know' have been made powerless, and it seems I know everything.

Then also you have admitted that you know always by this thing by which you know, whether when you do know or however you like, for you have admitted that you know always, and at the same time everything. It is clear therefore that you knew as a child, and when you were born, and when you were begotten, and that before you came into being, and before heaven and earth came into being, you knew all things, since you always know. And by God, he said, you yourself always will know, and all things, if I choose.

Oh, do choose! I said. O my precious friend Euthydemus, if you are really and truly telling the truth. Only I don’t quite believe you can, unless your brother Dionysodorus here would choose too; if so, it may be all right. But tell me, both of you, I said, I would not dare to dispute with men of such miraculous genius and say that I do not know everything when you both say I do, but there are some things which, how can I say that I know, Euthydemus, such as that good men are unjust? If you please, do I know that or not?

You know it sure enough, said he. What? I said. That good men are not unjust.

Oh yes, I said, I knew that long ago, but that is not my question.

But where did I learn that good men are unjust? Nowhere, said Dionysodorus.

Then I don’t know this, I said.

Euthydemus said to his brother, You are spoiling the argument, and it will be shown up that this man does not know, and he will be at the same time knowing and not knowing.

Dionysodorus flushed red, and I said, But you, what do you mean, Euthydemus? Do you think your brother who knows everything was not right?

Dionysodorus quickly broke in with, Am I brother to Euthydemus?

I said, Let me be, my good man, until Euthydemus has taught me that I know that good men are unjust. Don’t grudge me the lesson.

You are running away, Socrates, said Dionysodorus, and don’t want to answer.

Naturally, I replied. I am not a match for either of you, so I am very likely I should run from the two! I am much weaker of course than Heracles, and he was not able to fight it out with the Hydra, a high-brow clever enough to produce many heads of argument instead of one if somebody cut one off, because another high-brow, just arrived from foreign parts I should think, came ashore out of the sea in
the shape of a crab, and kept causing much pain to the hero by talk­ing and biting at him on his left. So Heracles called in his nephew Iolaus to his help, and Iolaus helped him effectively. But if my Iolaus were to come, he would do more harm than good.

Answer now, said Dionysodorus, when you have done this incan­tation. Was Iolaus any more the nephew of Heracles than he was yours?

Well, the best thing for me is to answer you, Dionysodorus, I said. For you will never have done with your questions, I am pretty well sure of that, envious and interfering, to keep Euthydemus from teaching me that bit of wisdom.

Answer now, said he.

I answer now, said I, that Iolaus was the nephew of Heracles, but mine, I think, not one little bit. For my brother Patrocles was not his father, but one with a name something like that, Iphicles, was the brother of Heracles.

And Patrocles was yours? said he.

Yes, I said, we had one mother but not one father.

Then he is your brother and not your brother.

Not on the father's side, my dear man, I said, for his father was Chaeredemus, and mine Sophroniscus.

But Sophroniscus was father and Chaeredemus father?

Certainly, I said, one mine, and one his.

Then, said he, Chaeredemus was other than the father?

Than mine, I said.

Then was a father being other than a father? Are you the same as the stone?

I'm afraid you may prove me so, I said, but I don't think I am.

Then you are other than the stone? said he.

Other to be sure, said I.

Then being other than a stone, said he, you are not a stone?

And being other than gold, you are not gold?

That is all true.

So then Chaeredemus, he said, being other than a father, would not be a father.

Euthydemus now chimed in: I suppose if Chaeredemus is a father, Sophroniscus again being other than a father is not a father, so that you, Socrates, are fatherless.

Ctesippus took it on now, and said, But is not the father of you two in the same case? He is other than my father.

Not at all, said Euthydemus.

What said he. Is he the same?

The same to be sure.

I hope not. But, Euthydemus, is he only my father or the father of everyone in the world?
Father of the others too, he said. Or do you think the same man being a father is not a father?
I did not think so, said Ctesippus.
Eh, and that being gold a thing is not gold, or being a man one is not a man?
The two threads don’t match, as the proverb goes, Euthydemus, said Ctesippus. You tell a strange thing, if your father is father of all.
But he is.
Of men and horses and all the other animals?
All, replied Euthydemus.
And is your mother mother of all?
My mother too.
Of the sea urchins then, he said, since your mother is mother of the sea animals!
So is yours, he said.
Then you are brother of gudgeons and puppy dogs and little pigs, said Ctesippus.
So are you, said Euthydemus.
And a boar is your papa, and a dog!
Your papa too, he said.
Yes, and in a moment, if you would answer me, said Dionysodorus, you will admit these things yourself, Ctesippus. Just tell me, have you a dog?
Yes, and a very bad one, said Ctesippus.
Has he got puppies?
Very much so, he said, as bad as he is.
Then the dog is their father?
I have seen him myself, he said, on the job with the bitch.
Very well, isn’t the dog yours?
Certainly, he said.
Then being a father he is yours, so the dog becomes your father and you the puppies’ brother.
Dionysodorus quickly broke in again, that Ctesippus might not get in his retort first. One more little question. Do you beat this dog?
Ctesippus said with a laugh. No mistake, I do, for I can’t beat you!
Well, you beat your own father, the other said.
Well certainly, said Ctesippus, there would be much better reason for me to beat your father. What can have induced him to beget two such clever sons, Euthydemus? I wonder if much good has come from that cleverness of yours, for your father—and the puppy dogs’ father—to enjoy!
But he does not want a lot of good, Ctesippus, neither he nor you. Nor you yourself, Euthydemus?
Nor anyone else in the world, tell me, Ctesippus, do you think it good for a sick man to drink medicine, or not good, when he needs it?
Or that when he goes to war, he had better be armed than unarmed?
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1. Distribute Training Material #1, "Example of a PS," and explain what PS is.

2. Distribute Training Material #2, 5 examples of PS in context; ask subject to mark where each PS starts and ends by drawing a line through the exact words with a see-through marker. When the subject has finished, go over the test together and discuss areas of disagreement. Ask the subject if s(he) has any questions about the instructions or material; if so, discuss them.
And Euthydemus said, There are people you call teachers aren't there?
He agreed.
The teachers are teachers of the learners; for example, the music master and the grammar master were teachers of you and the other boys, and you were learners?
He said yes.
Of course at the time when you were learning, you did not yet know the things you were learning?
No, he said.
Then you were wise when you did not know these things?
Certainly no, said he.
If not wise, then ignorant?
Yes.
So you boys, while learning what you did not know, were ignorant and were learning?
The boy nodded.
So the ignorant learn, my dear Clinias, not the wise as you suppose.
When he said this, it was like conductor and chorus—he signaled, and they all cheered and laughed, I mean Dionysodorus and Euthydemus and their followers. Then before the boy could take one good breath, Dionysodorus took over and said, What happened, my dear Clinias, when the grammar man dictated to you? Which of the boys learned the things dictated, wise or ignorant?
The wise ones, said Clinias.
The wise ones learn and not the ignorant, and you answered wrong just now to my brother.
Then indeed the two men's admirers laughed loud and long, applauding their wisdom but all the rest of us were dumb-struck and had nothing to say. Euthydemus noticed that we were dumb-struck and wanted us to admire him more; so he would not let the boy alone but went on asking, doubling and twisting around the same question like a clever dancer. He said, Do the learners learn what they know, or what they don't know? And Dionysodorus whispered softly again to me, Here's another, Socrates, just like the first. Good heavens, I said, really I thought that first one of yours a fine question.
property, as we shall have the enjoyment of them. With regard to matters, on the other hand, into which we have acquired no insight, no one will ever allow us to act as we think proper, but all persons, to the best of their power, will hinder us from meddling with them—not only strangers, but even our own father and mother, and if we possess any nearer relation. And we ourselves, in these matters, shall be subject to others, and they will, in fact, the property of others as we shall derive no advantage from them. Do you allow this to be the case?

I do.

...Will anyone, then, count us his friends, will anyone love us in those matters in which we are not useful?

Indeed no.

According to this, then, not even you are loved by your own father, nor by anyone else by anyone else in the world, in so far as you or he is useful?

So it would appear, he said.

If, therefore, you acquire knowledge, my son, all men will be friendly to you, all men will be attached to you, for you will be useful and good. If not, you will have no friend in anyone, not even in your father or mother, or any of your own family. Now is it possible, Lysis, for a man to have a great idea of himself in those matters of which he has yet no idea?

How can he possibly? he replied.

And if you still require, as you do, an instructor, you are still without ideas.

This, he answered.

It cannot be, then, that you have a great idea of yourself, if as yet you have no idea.

No, truly, Socrates, I don’t see how I can.

On receiving this reply from Lysis, I turned my eyes on Hippocrates, and was on the point of making a great blunder. For it came into my head to say, This is the way, Hippocrates, that you should talk to your favorite, humbling and checking, instead of putting him up and pampering him, as you now do. However, on seeing him writhing with agitation at the turn the conversation was taking, I recollected that though standing so near, he didn’t wish to be seen by Lysis. So I recovered myself in time, and forbore to address him.

At this moment, too, Menexenus returned and took the seat by Lysis, from which he had previously arisen.

Whereupon Lysis, in a boyish fondling way, said to me in a low voice, so that Menexenus couldn’t hear, I say, Socrates, say over again to Menexenus what you have been saying to me.

No, Lysis, I replied, you must tell him that; you were certainly attending.
I should think I was too, he rejoined.

Try to remember it then, as well as you can, that you may give him a clear account of the whole, and if there's anything you forget, ask me about it some other day—the first time you meet me.

Well, I'll do as you tell me, Socrates, with all my heart; you may rely upon that. But say something else to him now, will you, that I, too, may hear it, till it's time for me to go home.

Well, I must do so, I replied, since it's you who bid me. But mind you come to my aid, if Menexenus tries to baffle me. You know, don't you, that he's fond of a dispute?

Oh yes, desperately, I know. And that's the very reason I want you to talk with him.

That I may make myself ridiculous, eh?

Oh dear, no, Socrates, but that you may put him down.

Put him down, indeed, cried I. That's no such easy matter. He's a resolute man, this, a scholar of Ctesippus'. And here's his master too, himself, to help him—don't you see?—Ctesippus.

Trouble yourself about no one, Socrates, he said, but begin, attack him...

As you will, said I.

As this point of our byplay Ctesippus cried out, What's that you two are feasting on by yourselves, without giving us a share?

Never fear, said I, you shall have a share. There's something I've said that Lysis here doesn't understand. He says, though, he thinks Menexenus knows, and bids me ask him.

Why don't you ask him then? he rejoined.

Just what I mean to do, I replied. Answer, Menexenus, the question I ask. From my earliest childhood I have had—

fancy—everyone has. One longs for horses...another for dogs...a third for money...a fourth for office. For my part I look on these matters with equanimity, but on the acquisition of friends, with all a lover's passion, and I would choose to obtain a good friend rather than the best quail or cock in the world; I should prefer one to both horse and dog—nay, I fully believe—that I would far sooner acquire a friend and companion than all the gold of Darius, yea, or than Darius himself.

self-so fond am I of friendship. On seeing, therefore, you and Lysis, I am lost in wonder, while I count you most happy at your being able, at your years, to acquire this treasure with such readiness and ease—in that you, Menexenus, have gained in early and true a friend in Lysis...and he, the same in you...while I on the contrary, am so far from making the acquisition, that I do not even know how one man becomes the friend of another, but wish on this very point to appeal to you as an connoisseur.] Answer me this. As soon as one man loves another, which of the two becomes the friend—the lover of the loved, or the loved of the lover? Or does it make no difference?

None in the world, that I can see, he replied.
LYSIMACHUS: You have seen the exhibition of the man fighting in armor, Nicias and Laches, but we did not tell you at the time the reason why my friend Melesias and I asked you to go with us and see him. I think that we may as well confess what this was, for we certainly ought not to have any reserve with you. Some laugh at the very notion of consulting others, and when they are asked will not say what they think. They guess at the wishes of the person who asks them, and answer according to his, and not according to their own opinion. But as we know that you are good judges, and will say exactly what you think, we have taken you into our counsels. The matter about which I am making all this preface is as follows. Melesias and I have each a son. That is his son, and he is named Thucydides, after his grandfather, and this is mine, who is also called after his grandfather, my father, Aristides. Now, we are resolved to take the greatest care of the youths, and not, like most fathers, to let them do as they please when they are no longer children, but we mean to begin at once and do the utmost that we can for them. And knowing you to have sons of your own, we thought that you of all men were most likely to have attended to their training and improvement, and, if perchance you have seldom given any thought to the subject, we may remind you that you ought to have done so, and would invite you to assist us in the fulfillment of a common duty. I will tell you, Nicias and Laches, even at the risk of being tedious, how we came to think of this.

Melesias and I live together, and our sons live with us. And now, as I was saying at first, we are going to be open with you. Both of us often talk to the lads about the many noble deeds which our own fathers did in war and peace—in managing the affairs of the allies, and those of the city—but neither of us has any deeds of his own which he can show. The truth is that we are ashamed of this contrast being seen by them, and we blame our fathers for letting us be spoiled in the days of our youth, while they were occupied with the concerns of others. And we urge all this upon the lads, pointing out to them that they will not grow up to honor if they are rebellious and take no pains about themselves, but that if they take pains they may, perhaps, become worthy of the names which they bear. They, on their part, promise to comply with our wishes, and our care is to discover what studies or pursuits are likely to be most improving to them.

Someone commended to us the art of fighting in armor, which he thought an excellent accomplishment for a young man to learn, and he praised the man whose exhibition you have seen, and told us to go and see him. And we determined that we would go, and get you to accompany us to see the sight—intending at the same time to ask you to From The Dialogues of Plato, translated with analyses and introductions by B. Jowett (4th edn., revised by order of the Jowett Copyright Trustees, Oxford, 1953; 1st edn., 1871).
advise us, and, if you wish, to share in our project for the education of our sons. That is the matter which we wanted to talk over with you, and we hope that you will give us your opinion about this art of fighting in armor, and about any other studies or pursuits which you would or would not recommend for a young man, and will tell us whether you would like to join in our proposal.

**NICIAS:** As far as I am concerned, Lysimachus and Melesias, I applaud your purpose and will gladly join with you, and I believe that you, Laches, will be equally glad.

**LACHES:** Certainly, Nicias, and I quite approve of the remark by which Lysimachus made about his own father and the father of Melesias, and which is applicable, not only to them, but to us, and to everyone who is occupied with public affairs. As he says, such persons are too apt to be negligent and careless of their own children and their private concerns. There is much truth in that remark of yours, Lysimachus. But why, besides consulting us, do you not consult our friend Socrates about the education of the youth? He is of the same deme with you, and is always passing his time in places where the youth have any noble study or pursuit, such as you are inquiring after...

**LYSIMACHUS:** Why, Laches, has Socrates ever attended to matters of this sort?

**LACHES:** Certainly, Lysimachus.

**LYSIMACHUS:** I am delighted to hear, Socrates, that you maintain the name of your father, who was a most excellent man, and I further rejoice at the prospect of our family ties being renewed.

**LACHES:** Indeed, Lysimachus, you ought not to give him up, for I can assure you that I have seen him maintaining, not only his
father's, but also his country's name. He was my companion in the retreat from Dellum, and I can tell you that if others had only been like him, the honour of our country would have been upheld; and the great defeat would never have occurred.

**PLATO:** "That was truly honorable to you, Socrates; given as it is by witnesses entitled to all credit; and for such qualities as those which you ascribe to your country, I hope that you will regard me as one of your warmest friends. You ought to have visited us long ago; as and made yourself at home with us, but now from this day forward, as we have at last found one another out, do as I say—come and make acquaintance with me, and with these young men; that you and yours may continue as my friends. I shall expect you to do so, and shall venture at some future time to remind you of your duty; But what say you all of the matter of which we were beginning to speak— the art of fighting in armor? Is it a practice in which the iads may be advantageously instructed?"

**SOCRATES:** I will endeavor to advise you, Lysimachus, as far as I can in this matter; and also in every way will comply with your wishes. I am older than you, and not so experienced; I think that I ought certainly to hear what my elders have to say; and to learn of them, and if I have anything to add, then I may venture to give my opinion and advice to you as well as to you, Nicias, that one mother of you all begin:

**SOCRATES:** I have no objection, Socrates; and my opinion is that the acquirement of this art is in many ways useful to young men. It is an advantage to them that instead of the favorite- amusements of their leisure hours they should have one which tends to improve their bodily health. No gymnastic could be better or harder exercise, and this, and the art of fighting, are of all arts most beneficial to a free man, for they who are thus exercised in the use of arms are the only persons being trained for the contest in which we are engaged; and in the accomplishment which it requires: Moreover in actual battle, when you have to fight in a list with a number of others, such an acquirement will be of some use, and will be of the greatest service whenever the ranks are broken and you have to fight singly, either in pursuit,

**PLATO:** when you are attacking someone who is defending himself; or in flight, when you have to defend yourself against an assailant. Certainly he who possessed the art could not meet with any harm at the hands of a single person, or perhaps of several; and in every case he would have a great advantage. Further, this sort of skill inclines a man to the love of other nobler lessons; for every man who has learned how to fight in armor will desire to learn the proper arrangement of an army, which is the sequel of the lesson. And when he has learned this, and his ambition is once fired, he will go on to learn the complete art of the general. There is no difficulty in seeing that the knowl-
edge and practice of other military arts will be honorable and valuable to a man, and this lesson may be the beginning of them.

Let me add a further advantage, which is by no means a slight one—that this science will make any man a great deal more daring and resolute in the field. And I will not disdain to mention, what by some may be thought to be a small matter—he will have a more impressive appearance at the right time, that is to say, at the time when his appearance, will strike terror into his enemies. My opinion then, Lysimachus, is, as I say, that the youths should be instructed in this art, and for the reasons which I have given. But Laches may take a different view, and I shall be very glad to hear what he has to say.

LACHUS: I should not like to maintain, Nicias, that any kind of knowledge is not to be learned, for all knowledge appears to be a good. And if, as the teachers of the art affirm, this use of arms is really a species of knowledge, and if it is such as Nicias describes, then it ought to be learned, but if not, and if those who profess to teach it are deceivers only, or if it be knowledge, but not of a valuable sort, then what is the use of learning it? I say this, because I think that if it had been really valuable, the Lacedaemonians, whose whole life is passed in finding out and practicing the arts which give them an advantage over other nations, in war, would have discovered this one. And even if they have not, still these professors of the art cannot have failed to discover, that, of all the Hellenes the Lacedaemonians have the greatest interest in such matters, and that a master of the art who was honored among them would be sure to make his fortune among other nations, just as a tragic poet who is honored among ourselves—which is the reason why he who fancies that he can write a tragedy does not go about exhibiting in the states outside Attica, but rushes hither straight, and exhibits at Athens, and this is natural. Whereas I perceive that these fighters in armor regard Lacedaemon as a sacred, inviolable, territory, which they do not touch with the point of their foot, but they make a circuit of the neighboring states, and would rather exhibit to any others than to the Spartans—and particularly to those who would themselves acknowledge that they are by no means first-rate in the arts of war.

Further, Lysimachus, I have encountered a good many of these gentlemen in actual service, and have taken their measure, which I can give you at once, for none of these masters of fence have ever been distinguished in war—there has been a sort of fatality about them; while in all other arts, the men of note have been always those who have practiced the art, these appear to be a most unfortunate exception. For example, this very Sissilas, whom you and I have just witnessed exhibiting in all that crowd and making such great professions of his powers. I had a better opportunity of seeing at another time making its actual battle a real exhibition of himself involuntarily. He was a marine on board a ship which charged a transport
vein, and was armed with a weapon; half spear, half scythe; the weapon was as singular as its owner. To make a long story short, I will only tell you what happened to this notable invention of the scythe-

164 vessel; and the scythe was caught in the rigging of the other ship; and much fastened, and he staggered; but was unable to get his weapon free. The two ships were passing one another. He first ran along his own ship, holding on to the spear, but as the other ship passed by and drew him after as he was holding near to the spear, he kept it slip through his hand until he retained only the end of the handle. The people in the transport clapped their hands, and laughed at his ridiculous figure, and when someone threw a stone, which fell on the deck at his feet, and he quitted his hold of the scythe-spear, the crew of his own trireme also burst out laughing; they could not refrain when they beheld the weapon waving in the air, suspended from the transport.

Now, do not deny that there may be something in such an art, as Nicias asserts, but I tell you my experience, and what I said at first. whether this be an art of which the advantage is so slight, or not an art at all but only an imposition, in either case such an acquisition is not worth having. For my opinion is that if the professor of this art be a coward, he will be likely to become rash, and his character will be only more clearly revealed; or if he be brave, and fall ever so little, other men will be on the watch, and he will be greatly traduced. For there is a jealousy of such pretenders, and unless a man be prominent in valor, he cannot help being ridiculous, if he says that he has this sort of skill. Such is my judgment, Lysimachus, on the subject of this art, but, as I said at first, ask Socrates, and don't let him go until he has given you his opinion of the matter.

LYSIMACHUS: I am going to ask this favor of you, Socrates, as it is the more necessary because the two counsel disagree; and some one is in a manner still needed who will decide between them. Had they agreed, no arbiter would have been required. But as each has his own way, and Nicias another, I should like to hear with which of your two friends you agree.

SOCRATES: What, Lysimachus, are you going to accept the opinion of the majority?

LYSIMACHUS: Why, yes, Socrates. What else am I to do?

SOCRATES: And would you do so too, Melesias? If you were decided about the gymnastic training of your son, would you follow the advice of the majority; or the opinions of the one who has been trained and exercised under a skillful master?

MELESIAS: The latter, Socrates, as would surely be reasonable.

SOCRATES: His one vote would be worth more than the vote of all us four.

MELESIAS: Presumably.
have been recited the notion of a relation to self is altogether inadmissible, and in other cases hardly credible—inadmissible, for example, in the case of magnitudes, numbers, and the like?

Very true.

But in the case of hearing and sight, or in the power of self-motion, and the power of heat to burn, and so on, this relation to self will be regarded as incredible by some, but perhaps not by others. In some great man, my friend, is wanted, who will satisfactorily determine for us whether there is nothing which has an inherent property of relation to self rather than to something else, or some things only and not others, and whether in this class of self-related things, if there be such a class, that science which is called wisdom or temperance is included. I altogether distrust my own power of determining these matters. I am not certain whether such a science of science can possibly exist, and even if it does undoubtedly exist, I should not acknowledge it to be wisdom or temperance; until I can also see whether such a science would or would not do us any good, for I have an impression that temperance is a benefit and a good. And therefore, O son of Callicles, if you maintain that temperance or wisdom is a science of science, and also of the absence of science, I will request you to show in the first place, as I was saying before, the possibility, and in the second place, the advantage, of such a science: And then perhaps you may satisfy me that you are right in your view of temperance.

[Critias heard me say this, and saw that I was in a difficulty, and as one person when another yawns in his presence catches the infection of yawning from him, so did he seem to be driven into a difficulty by my difficulty. But as he had a reputation to maintain, he was ashamed to admit before the company that he could not answer my challenge or determine the question at issue; and he made an unintelligible attempt to hide his perplexity.]

In order that the argument might proceed, I said to him, Well then, Critias, if you like, let us assume that this science of science is possible—whether the assumption is right or wrong may hereafter be investigated. Admitting its complete possibility, will you tell me how such a science enables us to distinguish what we know or do not know, which, as we were saying, is self-knowledge or wisdom? Was not that it?

Yes, Socrates, he said, and the rest I think follows. For he who has this science or knowledge which knows itself will become like the knowledge which he has, in the same way that he who has swiftness will be swift, and he who has beauty will be beautiful, and he who has knowledge will know. In the same way he who has that knowledge which is self-knowing, will know himself.

I do not doubt, I said, that a man will know himself, when he
Gorgias: Well then, you claim that you are an expert in the art of rhetoric and that you can make rhetoricians of others. Now just what is the scope of rhetoric? Weaving, for example, has to do with the making of garments. You agree?

Gorgias: Yes.

Socrates: And music with composing melodies?

Gorgias: Yes.

Socrates: [By Hera, Gorgias, I marvel at your answers; they could not be brief.]

Gorgias: Yes; I think I succeed pretty well, Socrates.

Socrates: Good, and now answer in the same way about rhetoric. What is the field of this science?

Gorgias: Words.

Socrates: Of what kind, Gorgias? Those that reveal to the sick what treatment will restore their health?

Gorgias: No.

Socrates: Then rhetoric is not concerned with every kind of words.

Gorgias: Certainly not.

Socrates: Yet it makes men able to speak.

Gorgias: Yes.

Socrates: And able to think also about the matter of their discourse?

Gorgias: Of course.

Socrates: Now does not the science of medicine, which we have just mentioned, make men able to think and to speak about their patients?

Gorgias: Assuredly.

Socrates: Then medicine also, it seems, is concerned with words.

Gorgias: Yes.

Socrates: Words about diseases?

Gorgias: Certainly.

Socrates: And is not gymnastics concerned with words that relate to good or bad bodily condition?

Gorgias: Undoubtedly.

Socrates: And so it is with the other arts also, Gorgias. Each of them is concerned with words that have to do with its own subject matter.

Gorgias: Evidently.

Socrates: Then, as the other arts have to do with words, why do you not call them by the name of 'rhetoric,' since you call rhetoric any art that is concerned with words?

Gorgias: Because all the knowledge of the other arts is in
I should say, in his capacity as a doctor.
And what would you hope to become?
A doctor.
And suppose your idea was to go to Polycitus of Argos or Phidias of Athens and pay them fees for your own benefit, and someone asked you in what capacity you thought of paying this money to them, what would you answer?
I should say, in their capacity as sculptors.
To make you what?
A sculptor, obviously.
Right, said I. Now here are you and I going to Protagoras prepared to pay him money as a fee for you—or if not, our friends' resources thrown in as well. If then, seeing us so full of enthusiasm, someone should ask, Tell me, Socrates and Hippocrates, what do you suppose Protagoras is, that you intend to pay him money? what should we answer him? What particular name do we bear attached to Protagoras in the sort of way that Phidias is called a sculptor and Homer a poet?
Well, Sophist, I suppose, Socrates, is the name generally given to him.
Then it is as a Sophist that we will go to him and pay him?
Yes.
And if you had to face the further question, What do you yourself hope to become by your association with Protagoras?
If I am to speak my real mind, I certainly should.
But wouldn't a man like you be ashamed, said I, to face your fellow countrymen as a Sophist?
Perhaps then this is not the kind of instruction you expect to get from Protagoras, but rather the kind you got from the schoolmasters who taught you letters and music and gymnastics. You didn't learn these for professional purposes, to become a practitioner, but in the way of liberal education, as a layman and a gentleman should.
That exactly describes, said he, the sort of instruction I expect from Protagoras.
Well then, I went on, do you understand what you are now going to do, or not?
In what respect?
I mean that you are going to entrust the care of your soul to a man who is, in your own words, a Sophist, though I should be surprised if you know just what a Sophist is. And yet if you don't know that, you don't know to whom you are entrusting your soul, nor whether he represents something good or bad.
I think I know, said he,
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knowledge, what seems to be necessary, you see, is that every man in every way shall try to become as wise as possible. Is not that correct?

Yes, he said.

b. And I suppose we think that he should get this from his father much rather than wealth, and from guardians and friends and especially from those who profess to be lovers, native or foreign; he should beg and beseech them to give him some wisdom. For wisdom's sake, Clinias, there is no disgrace, no reproach, in being servant and slave to a lover and to anyone, for a man willing to give honorable service in the passion to become wise. Don't you think so? I said.

I think you are quite right, he replied.

c. Yes, Clinias, I said, if only wisdom can be taught, if only it is not something that comes to men of itself—for that is a point we have not considered, that has not yet been agreed between me and you.

Well, Socrates, he said, I think wisdom can be taught.

[1 was delighted, and replied. Well said, admirable boy! I am much obliged to you for sparing me from a long inquiry on just that question, whether wisdom can or cannot be taught.] Now, then, since you think it can, and that wisdom alone in the wide world makes a man happy and fortunate, don't you say it is necessary to love wisdom, and don't you mean to do it yourself?

That I do, Socrates, he said, as hard as ever I can.

I was glad to hear it. And I said, There's my specimen, my dear Dionysodorus and Euthydemus, of the sort of thing I wish words of attraction to be: it is clumsy, perhaps, and too long, and tedious. Now then let either of you who wishes demonstrate the same thing for us.

d. doing it neatly like an artist. Or if you do not care to do that, then begin where I left off, and show the boy in due order whether he must get every knowledge, or if there is one single knowledge which he must get to be happy and a good man, and what this is. For as I said at the beginning, it would really mean a great deal to us that this young man should become wise and good.

e. That is what I said, Critio, and I paid particular attention to what should follow, and I watched how they would tackle the argument, and where they would begin, in trying to encourage the young man to practice wisdom and virtue. So Dionysodorus, the elder brother, began first, and we all watched him expecting to hear something wonderful there and then. As indeed we did. Critio; for it was a wonderful argument which the man was beginning, and it is worth your while to hear what sort of encouragement to virtue it was.

Tell me, Socrates, he said, and all you gentlemen here who say you desire that this young man should become wise, whether you are jesting in saying this, or do you truly and seriously desire it?

[This made me suppose that they thought we were jesting before, when we asked them to converse with the young man, and that this...
Socrates: But what knowledge does it teach? And what are we to do with it? For it must not be a contriver of any of those products which are neither good nor bad; it must impart no knowledge but itself alone. Can we say then what it is, and what we are to do with it? Would you like us to say it is the one by which we shall make other men good?

Crito: Yes, certainly.

Socrates: And what shall these be good for, and how useful to us? Shall we say, to make others the same, and they to make others, and so on and on? And good at what? We cannot see, since we have despised what are generally said to be the works of statecraft, and as the proverb goes, it is always 'Corinthus, son of Zeus.' We are just as far from knowing, or farther, what is that knowledge which will make us happy.

Crito: Yes, indeed, Socrates. It seems you got yourselves into a nice mess.

Socrates: Well, all I could do, my dear man, since I found myself in this mess, was to cry and despair, praying in the two visitors like a second pair of savior-gods (Castor and Polydeuces), to save us, me and the boy, from this tempest of logic, and to play no more but to be serious, and show to us which is the knowledge which once gained would bring us well through the rest of our life.

Crito: What then? Was Euthydemus willing to show you?

Socrates: Yes, of course! And he began: my good friend, in this magnificent fashion,

Which do you prefer, then, my dear Socrates? Shall I teach you this knowledge which has been puzzling you for so long, or shall I show that you have it?

[Heaven bless us, my dear man, I said I. Can you do that?

That I can, said he.

Then show that I have it, I do beseech you, I said, for that is much easier than learning for an old man like me.

Very well, he said, just answer: is there anything you do know?

Oh yes, I said, plenty of things, but only small ones.

Quite enough, said he. Then do you think it is possible for anything whatever of the things which are, not to be what it is?

Why no, I don’t, said I.

You know something then? said he.

I do.

Then you are knowing, since you know?

Certainly, in that same something.

That makes no difference, he said. Isn’t it necessary that you know everything since you are knowing?

Why, no indeed, I said. There are many other things I do not know.

Then if you do not know something, you are not knowing.

Not knowing that, my friend, said I.
or smaller, nearer or more distant—is it not in the first place a question of measurement, consisting as it does in a consideration of relative excess, defect, or equality?"

It must be.

"And if so, it must be a special skill or branch of knowledge."

Yes, they will agree.

That skill, or what branch of knowledge it is, we shall leave till later; the fact itself is enough for the purposes of the explanation which you have asked for from Protagoras and me. To remind you of your question, it arose because we two agreed that there was nothing more powerful than knowledge, but that wherever it is found it always has the mastery over pleasure and everything else. You on the other hand, who mistrust that pleasure often masters even the man who knows, asked us to say what this experience really is, if it is not being mastered by pleasure. If we had answered you straight off that it is ignorance, you would have laughed at us, but if you laugh at us now, you will be laughing at yourselves as well, for you have agreed that when people make a wrong choice of pleasures and pains—that is, of good and evil—the cause of their mistake is lack of knowledge. We can go further, and call it, as you have already agreed, a science of measurement, and you know yourselves that a wrong action which is done without knowledge is done in ignorance. So that is what being mastered by pleasure really is—ignorance, and most serious ignorance, the fault which Protagoras, Prodicus, and Hippias profess to cure. You on the other hand, because you believe it to be something else, neither go nor send your children to these Sophists: who are the experts in such matters. Holding that it is nothing that can be taught, you are careful with your money and withhold it from them—a bad policy both for yourselves and for the community."

That then is the answer we should make to the ordinary run of

people, and ask you—Hippias and Prodicus as well as Protagoras—for I want you to share our discussion—whether you think what I say is true.

They all agreed most emphatically that it was true.

You agree then, said I, that the pleasant is good and the painful bad. Let us ask exemption from Prodicus' precise verbal distinctions. Whether you call it pleasant, agreeable, or enjoyable, my dear Prodicus, or whatever name you like to apply to it, please answer in the sense of my request.

Prodicus laughed and assented, and so did the others.

Well, then is another point, I continued. All actions aimed at this end, namely a pleasant and painless life, must be fine actions, that is, good and beneficial.

They agreed.

Then if the pleasant is the good, no one who either knows or be-
same as ltv. And the old word ltv will be correctly given as ltv in corresponding modern letters. Assuming this foreign root view, and allowing for the change of the η and the insertion of the v, we have λνθων, which should have been μηνθουν or μνθον, and στιβων is the a negative of ltv (or slow), and has been improved into στιβων. Now the letter p, as I was saying, appeared to the imposer of names an excellent instrument for the expression of motion, and he frequently uses the letter for this purpose. For example, in the actual words pην and θνον he represents motion by p—also in the words τρισων (trembling), τρυγων (ragged), and again, in words such as κροισαν (stake), κροισαν (crush), κροισαν (break), κρατων (crumble), κρουμων (white). Of all these sorts of movements he generally finds an expression in the letter p, because, as I imagine, he had observed that the tongue was most agitated and least at rest in the pronunciation of this letter, which he therefore used in order to express motion, just as by the letter t he expresses the subtle elements which pass through all things. This is why he uses the letter as imitative of motion ltv, ltv. And there is another class of letters, η, ω, σ, and τ, of which the pronunciation is accompanied by great expenditure of breath; these are used in the imitation of such notions as ζνν (shivering), ζνν (seething), oτινεσ (to be shaken), οτινου (shock), and are always introduced by the giver of names when he wants to imitate what is φρονεται (windy). He seems to have thought that the closing and pressure of the tongue in the utterance of η and τ were expressive of binding and rest in a place. He further observed the liquid movement of η, in the pronunciation of which the tongue slips, and in this he found the expression of smoothness, as in κνοσαν (level), and in the word ενθυπλων (to slip) itself, λμπων (cleft), in the word κολλων (gluey), and the like; the heavier sound of υ detailed the slipping tongue, and the union of the two gave the notion of a glutinous clammy nature, as in γλυκον, γλυκον, γλυκιν (sleek), in the word ικτινως (gluey). Thus did the legislator, reducing all things into letters and syllables, and impressing on them names and signs, and out of them by imitation compounding other signs. That is my view, Hermogenes, of the truth of names, but I should like to hear what Cratylus has more to say.
tell me what your view is, and then you will either learn of Socrates,
or Socrates and I will learn of you.

CRATYLUS: Well, but surely, Hermogenes, you do not suppose
that you can learn, or I explain, any subject of importance all in a
moment—at any rate, not such a subject as language, which is, per-
haps, the very greatest of all.

HERMOCENESES: No, indeed, but, as Hesiod says, and I agree
with him, 'to add little to little' is worth while. And, therefore, if you
think that you can add anything at all, however small, to our knowl-
dge, take a little trouble and oblige Socrates, and me too, who cer-
tainly have a claim upon you.

SOCRATES: I am by no means positive, Cratylus, in the view
which Hermogenes and myself have worked out, and therefore do not
hesitate to say what you think, which if it be better than my own
point of view I shall gladly accept. And I should not be at all surprised to find
that you have found some better notion. For you have evidently re-
lected on these matters and have had teachers, and if you have really
a better theory of the truth of names, you may count me in the num-
ber of your disciples.

CRATYLUS: You are right, Socrates, in saying that I have made
a study of these matters, and I might possibly convert you into a dis-
ciple. But I fear that the opposite is more probable, and I already
find myself moved to say to you what Achilles in the 'Prayers' says to
Ajax,

Illustrious Ajax, son of Tela.men, lord of the people,
You appear to have spoken in all things much to my mind.*

And you, Socrates, appear to me to be an oracle, and to give answers
much to my mind, whether you are inspired by Euthyphro, or whether
some Muse may have long been an inhabitant of your breast, uncon-
sciously to yourself.

SOCRATES: Excellent Cratylus, I have long been wondering at
my own wisdom. I cannot trust myself. And I think that I ought to
stop and ask myself, What am I saying? For there is nothing worse
than self-deception—when the deceiver is always at home and always
with you—it is quite terrible, and therefore I ought often to retrace my
steps and endeavor to 'look fore and aft,' in the words of the aforesaid
Homer. And now let me see, where are we? Have we not been saying
that the correct name indicates the nature of the thing? Has this prop-
osition been sufficiently proved?

CRATYLUS: Yes, Socrates, what you say, as I am disposed to
think, is quite true.

SOCRATES: Names, then, are given in order to instruct?


** Iliad 1.345. 3.109.
EUTHYDEMUS

was the reason why they fared and did not take it seriously. So I told them still more earnestly that we were really serious about it.

Then Dionysodorus said, 'Take care, Socrates; you may have to deny what you say now.'

'I have taken care,' I replied. 'I shall never deny it.'

'Very well,' he said. 'You say you want him to become wise.'

'Most certainly.'

'But now,' said he, 'is Clinias wise or not?'

'He says, not yet,' I said. 'He's no boaster, you know.'

'And you people,' said Dionysodorus, 'want him to become wise, and not to be a dunce?'

'We agreed.'

'His wish is to become one that he is not, and no longer be one that he is.'

'I was troubled when I heard this, and he, seeing me troubled, took me up. One further word. Since you want him no longer to be one that he is, you want him to be destroyed, it seems! How can you wish him to become wise, and not to be a dunce?'

'We agreed.'

'Then, you wish him to become one that he is not, and no longer to be one that he is.'

'I was troubled when I heard this, and he, seeing me troubled, took me up. One further word. Since you want him no longer to be one that he is, you want him to be destroyed, it seems! How can you wish him to become wise, and not to be a dunce?'

'Very well,' he said. 'You say you want him to become wise.'

'Most certainly.'

'But now,' said he, 'is Clinias wise or not?'

'He says, not yet,' I said. 'He's no boaster, you know.'

'And you people,' said Dionysodorus, 'want him to become wise, and not to be a dunce?'

'We agreed.'

'Then, you wish him to become one that he is not, and no longer to be one that he is.'

'I was troubled when I heard this, and he, seeing me troubled, took me up. One further word. Since you want him no longer to be one that he is, you want him to be destroyed, it seems! How can you wish him to become wise, and not to be a dunce?'

'Very well,' he said. 'You say you want him to become wise.'

'Most certainly.'

'But now,' said he, 'is Clinias wise or not?'

'He says, not yet,' I said. 'He's no boaster, you know.'

'And you people,' said Dionysodorus, 'want him to become wise, and not to be a dunce?'

'We agreed.'

'Then, you wish him to become one that he is not, and no longer to be one that he is.'

'I was troubled when I heard this, and he, seeing me troubled, took me up. One further word. Since you want him no longer to be one that he is, you want him to be destroyed, it seems! How can you wish him to become wise, and not to be a dunce?'

'Very well,' he said. 'You say you want him to become wise.'

'Most certainly.'

'But now,' said he, 'is Clinias wise or not?'

'He says, not yet,' I said. 'He's no boaster, you know.'

'And you people,' said Dionysodorus, 'want him to become wise, and not to be a dunce?'

'We agreed.'

'Then, you wish him to become one that he is not, and no longer to be one that he is.'

'I was troubled when I heard this, and he, seeing me troubled, took me up. One further word. Since you want him no longer to be one that he is, you want him to be destroyed, it seems! How can you wish him to become wise, and not to be a dunce?'

'Very well,' he said. 'You say you want him to become wise.'

'Most certainly.'

'But now,' said he, 'is Clinias wise or not?'

'He says, not yet,' I said. 'He's no boaster, you know.'

'And you people,' said Dionysodorus, 'want him to become wise, and not to be a dunce?'

'We agreed.'

'Then, you wish him to become one that he is not, and no longer to be one that he is.'

'I was troubled when I heard this, and he, seeing me troubled, took me up. One further word. Since you want him no longer to be one that he is, you want him to be destroyed, it seems! How can you wish him to become wise, and not to be a dunce?'
What follows can hardly be called an argument. The two men cannot agree enough to be able to argue. They are too far apart. Finally Callicles is silenced, but nothing more, though Socrates’ intense desire to convince him, to convert him, grows clearer and clearer. In the end he is not reasoning with him, he is exhorting him, preaching to him. He must induce him to see that the good is altogether different from the safe. He begs him not to mind if someone insults and strikes him. “For heaven’s sake, let him and be of good cheer.” (Turn to him the other cheek.) You can suffer by doing right, but you can never suffer harm.

The reader remembers what Phaedo said before Socrates drank the poison, “It never occurred to me to feel sorry for him. He seemed quite happy.”

CALLICLES: There's nothing like asking him, Socrates, for that was one feature of his display, he bade any one of the company present just now ask any questions he pleased, and said he would answer all such questions.
SOCRATES: Splendid! Chaerephon, ask him.
CHAEREPHON: Ask him what?
SOCRATES: Who he is.
CHAEREPHON: What do you mean?
SOCRATES: Well, supposing he were a maker of shoes, he would surely answer you that he was a cobbler. You see what I mean, do you not?
CHAEREPHON: I see, and I will ask him. Tell me, Gorgias, is Callicles right in saying that you profess to answer any question you are asked?
GORGIAS: He is right, Chaerephon; that is the very statement I made just now, and I assure you that nobody has asked me a new question these many years.
CHAEREPHON: You must indeed be ready with your answers, Gorgias.
GORGIAS: You are at liberty to make the experiment, Chaerephon.
POLUS: Yes indeed, and upon me, if you wish, Chaerephon, for Gorgias, I think, is played out; he has already spoken at great length.
CHAEREPHON: Why, Polus, do you think you could answer better than Gorgias?
POLUS: What does that matter, if it is well enough for you?
CHAEREPHON: Not at all, but since you want to, you may answer.
POLUS: Proceed.
CHAEREPHON: If Gorgias were an expert in the same art as his brother Herodicus, what should we rightly call him? By the same professional name as his brother?
POLUS: Assuredly.
CHAEREPHON: Then we should be correct in calling him a doctor?
POLUS: Yes.
CHAEREPHON: And if he were skilled in the same art as Aristophon, son of Aglaophon, or Aristophon's brother, what should we rightly call him?
POLUS: Obviously a painter.
CHAEREPHON: But, as it is, in what craft is he expert, and by what name should we correctly call him?
POLUS: There are many arts, Chaerephon, among mankind experimentally devised by experience, for experience guides our life along the path of art, inexperience along the path of chance. And in each of these different arts different men partake in different ways.
SOCRATES: But foolish boldness and endurance appeared before to be base and hurtful to us?

LACHES: Quite true.

SOCRATES: Whereas courage was acknowledged to be a noble quality.

LACHES: True.

SOCRATES: And now on the contrary we are saying that the foolish endurance, which was before held in dishonor, is courage.

LACHES: So we are.

SOCRATES: Are we right in saying so?

LACHES: Indeed, Socrates, I am sure that we are not right.

SOCRATES: Then according to your statement, you and I, Laches, are not attuned to the Dorian mode, which is a harmony of words and deeds, for our deeds are not in accordance with our words. Anyone would say that we had courage who saw us in action, but not, I imagine, he who heard us talking about courage just now.

LACHES: That is most true.

SOCRATES: And is this condition of ours satisfactory?

LACHES: Quite the reverse.

SOCRATES: Suppose, however, that we admit the principle of which we are speaking to a certain extent?

LACHES: To what extent and what principle do you mean?

SOCRATES: The principle of endurance. If you agree, we too must endure and persevere in the inquiry, and then courage will not laugh at our faintheartedness in searching for courage, which after all may frequently be endurance.

LACHES: I am ready to go on, Socrates, and yet I am unused to investigations of this sort. But the spirit of controversy has been aroused in me by what has been said, and I am really grieved at being thus unable to express my meaning. For I fancy that I do know the nature of courage, but, somehow or other, she has slipped away from me, and I cannot get hold of her and tell her nature.

SOCRATES: But, my dear friend, should the good sportsman follow the track, and not give up?

LACHES: Certainly, he should.

SOCRATES: Shall we then invite Nicias to join us? He may be better at the sport than we are. What do you say?

LACHES: If I should like that.

SOCRATES: Come then, Nicias, and do what you can to help your friends, who are tossing on the waves of argument, and at the last gasp. You see our extremity, and may save us and also settle your own opinion, if you tell us what you think about courage.

NICIAS: I have been thinking, Socrates, that you and Laches are not defining courage in the right way, for you have forgotten an excellent saying which I have heard from your own lips.
...is also the cause of the world. Now a cause is that because of which anything is created, and someone comes and whispers in my ear that justice is rightly so called because partaking of the nature of the cause. And I begin, after hearing what he has said, to interrogate him gently. Well, my excellent friend, say I, but if all this be true, I still want to know what is justice. Thereupon they think that I ask tiresome questions, and am leaping over the barriers, and have been already sufficiently answered, and they try to satisfy me with one derision after another, and at length they quarrel. For one of them says that justice is the sun, and that he only is the piercing (ὀξύνωρα) and burning (κούρωτι) element which is the guardian of nature. And when I joyfully repeat this beautiful notion, I am answered by the seditious remark, What, is there no justice in the world when the sun is down? And when I earnestly beg my questioner to tell me his own honest opinion, he says, Fire in the abstract: But this is not very intelligible. Another says, No, not fire in the abstract, but the abstraction of heat in the fire. Another man professes to laugh at all this, and says, as Anaxagoras says, that justice is mind, for mind, as they say, has absolute power, and mixes with nothing, and orders all things, and passes through all things. At last, my friend, I find myself in far greater perplexity about the nature of justice than I was before I began to learn. But still I am of the opinion that the name, which has led me into this digression, was given to justice for the reasons which I have mentioned.

HERMOCENES: I think, Socrates, that you are not improvising now. You must have heard this from someone else.

SOCRATES: And not the rest?

HERMOCENES: Hardly.

SOCRATES: Well, then, let me go on in the hope of making you believe in the originality of the rest. What remains after justice? I do not think that we have as yet discussed courage (δυναμε). Injustice (αδικία), which is obviously nothing more than a hindrance to the penetrating principle (κούρωτιον), need not be considered. Well, then, the name of δυναμε seems to imply a battle—this battle is in the world of existence, and according to the doctrine of flux is only the counterflux (λυτικόν) of the world of existence, and according to the doctrine of flux is only the counterflux (λυτικόν) of the world of existence. If you extract the δ from δυναμε, the name at once signifies the thing, and you may clearly understand that δυναμε is not the stream opposed to every stream, but only to that which is contrary to justice, for otherwise courage would not have been praised. The words ὅμοιον (male) and ὅμοιον (man) also contain a similar allusion to the same principle of the upward flux (τοῦ ὑψώτερον ὅμοιον). ὁμοίως (woman) I suspect to be the same word as γυνή (birth); Ἐνδόσων (female) appears to be partly derived from ἔνδοσω (the teat), because the teat is like rain, and makes things flourish (τιθέμενον).

HERMOCENES: That is surely probable.

SOCRATES: Yes, and the very word ὑπόλοιπον (to flourish) seems
PLATO: GOLLECTED DIALOGUES

SOCRATES: What is it, Nicias?

NICIAS: I have often heard you say that 'Every man is good in that in which he is wise, and bad in that in which he is unwise.'

SOCRATES: That is certainly true, Nicias.

NICIAS: And therefore if the brave man is good, he is also wise.

SOCRATES: Do you hear him, Laches?

LACHES: Yes, I hear him—but I do not very well understand him.

SOCRATES: I think that I understand him, and he appears to me to mean that courage is a sort of wisdom.

LACHES: What sort of wisdom, Socrates?

SOCRATES: That is a question which you must ask of him.

LACHES: Yes.

SOCRATES: Tell him then, Nicias, what sort of wisdom you think courage to be, for you surely do not mean the wisdom which plays the flute?

NICIAS: Certainly not.

SOCRATES: Nor the wisdom which plays the lyre?

NICIAS: No.

SOCRATES: But what is this knowledge then, and of what?

LACHES: I think that you put the question to him very well, Socrates, and I would like him to say what is the nature of this knowledge or wisdom.

LACHES: Why strangely he is talking, Socrates.

SOCRATES: [How strangely he is talking, Socrates.]

LACHES: Why do you say so, Laches?

SOCRATES: That is just what Nicias denies.

LACHES: Yes, that is what he denies; that is where he is so silly.

SOCRATES: Suppose that we instruct instead of abusing him?

NICIAS: Certainly, Socrates, but having been proved to be talking nonsense himself, Laches wants to prove that I have been doing the same.

LACHES: Very true, Nicias, and you are talking nonsense, as I shall endeavor to show. Let me ask you a question. Do not physicians know the dangers of disease? Or do the courageous know them? Or are the physicians the same as the courageous?

NICIAS: Not at all.

LACHES: No more than the husbandmen who know the dangers of husbandry, or than other craftsmen, who have a knowledge of that which inspires them with fear or confidence in their own arts, and yet they are not courageous a whit the more for that.

SOCRATES: What do you think of Laches' argument, Nicias? He appears to be saying something of importance.
CALLICLES: I say then, to serve and minister.

SOCRATES: Then you invite me, my noble friend, to play the flatterer?

CALLICLES: Yes, if you prefer the most offensive term, for if you do not ... 

SOCRATES: Please do not say what you have said so often—that anyone who wishes will slay me, only for me to repeat in turn that then a villain will slay a good man, nor that anyone will rob me of anything I possess, only for me to repeat that, once he has robbed me, he will not know what to do with his spoil, but even as he robbed me unjustly, so too he will make an unjust use of it, and if unjust, shameful, and if shameful, wicked.

CALLICLES: How confident you seem, Socrates, that you can never experience any of these troubles whatever, as if you dwell apart and could never be haled into court by, it may be, some utterly mean and vile creature.

SOCRATES: Then I must indeed be a senseless person, Callicles, if I do not think that in this city anything whatever may happen to anybody. But this at least I know well, that if I am brought into court to face any such danger as you mention, it will be an evil man who prosecutes me—for no good man would drag a guiltless person into court—and it would not be surprising if I were put to death. Would you like me to tell you why I expect this?

CALLICLES: Certainly.

SOCRATES: I think that I am one of very few Athenians, not to say the only one, engaged in the true political art, and that of the men of today I alone practice statesmanship. Since therefore when I speak on any occasion it is not with a view to winning favor, but I aim at what is best, not what is most pleasant, and since I am unwilling to engage in those 'dainty devices' that you recommend, I shall have nothing to say for myself when in court. And the same figure occurs to me that I used in Plato. My trial will be like that of a doctor prosecuted by a cook before a jury of children. Just consider what kind of defense such a man could offer in such a predicament, if the plaintiff should accuse him in these terms: Children of the jury, this fellow has done all of you abundant harm, and the youngest among you he is ruining by surgery and surgery, and he bedevils you by starving and choking you, giving you bitter draughts and compelling you to hunger; whereas I used to feast you with plenty of sweetsmeats of every kind.

What do you think a doctor could find to say in such a desperate situation? If he spoke the truth and said, All this I did, children, in the interests of health, what a shout do you think such a jury would utter? Would it not be a loud one?

CALLICLES: Perhaps; one must suppose so.
have been recited the notion of a relation to self is altogether inadmissible, and in other cases hardly credible—inadmissible, for example, in the case of magnitudes, numbers, and the like?

Very true.

But in the case of hearing and sight, or in the power of self-motion, and the power of heat to burn, and so on, this relation to self will be regarded as incredible by some, but perhaps not by others. And some great man, my friend, is wanted, who will satisfactorily determine for us whether there is nothing which has an inherent property of relation to self rather than to something else, or some things only and not others, and whether in this class of self-related things, if there be such a class, that science which is called wisdom or temperance is included. I altogether distrust my own power of determining these matters. I am not certain whether such a science of science can possibly exist, and even if it does undoubtedly exist, I should not acknowledge it to be wisdom or temperance, until I can also see whether such a science would or would not do us any good, for I have an impression that temperance is a benefit and a good. And therefore, O son of Callicles, as you maintain that temperance or wisdom is a science of science, and also of the absence of science, I will request you to show in the first place, as I was saying before, the possibility, and in the second place, the advantage, of such a science. And then perhaps you may satisfy me that you are right in your view of temperance.

[Critias heard me say this, and saw that I was in a difficulty, and as one person when another yawns in his presence catches the infection of yawning from him, so did he seem to be driven into a difficulty by my difficulty. But as he had a reputation to maintain, he was ashamed to admit before the company that he could not answer my challenge or determine the question at issue, and he made an unintelligible attempt to hide his perplexity.]

In order that the argument might proceed, I said to him, Well then, Critias, if you like, let us assume that this science of science is possible—whether the assumption is right or wrong may hereafter be investigated. Admitting its complete possibility, will you tell me how such a science enables us to distinguish what we know or do not know, which, as we were saying, is self-knowledge or wisdom? Was not that it?

Yes, Socrates, he said, and the rest I think follows. For he who has this science or knowledge which knows itself will become like the knowledge which he has, in the same way that he who has swiftness will be swift, and he who has beauty will be beautiful, and he who has knowledge will know. In the same way he who has that knowledge which is self-knowing, will know himself.

I do not doubt, I said, that a man will know himself, when he
In every way, I replied, these songs have reference to you. If you succeed in winning such a youth as you describe, all that you have said and sung will redound to your honor, and be in fact your hymn of triumph, as if you had gained a victory in obtaining such a favorite. But if he escape your grasp, then the higher the eulogium you have passed on him, the greater will be the blessings which you will seem to have missed, and the greater consequently the ridicule you will incur. All connoisseurs, therefore, in matters of love, are careful of praising their favorites before they have won them, from their doubts as to the result of the affair. Moreover, your beauties, when lauded and made much of, become gorged with pride and arrogance. Don't you think so?

I do, he replied.

And the more arrogant they are, the harder they become to be caught?

"It is to be expected, at any rate.

And if by speech and song he renders it wild instead of luring it, he can be no favorite of the Muses, can he?"

"That he was a very sorry one, certainly.

And the more arrogant they are, the harder they become to be caught?"

I think not.

Have a care then, Hippothales, that you do not lay yourself open with your poetry to all these reproaches. And yet I am sure, that to a man who injured himself by his poetry, you would not be willing to accord the title of a good poet, so long as he did himself harm.

No, indeed, that would be too unreasonable, he replied. But it is on this very account, Socrates, that I put myself in your hands, and beg you to give me any advice you may have to bestow, as to the course of conduct or conversation that a lover ought to adopt in order to render himself agreeable to the object of his affection.

That were no such easy matter, I replied. But if you would bring me to speak with Lysis, perhaps I could give you a specimen of what you ought to say to him, in place of the speeches and songs which you are in the habit of treating him with, according to your friends here.

Well, there is no difficulty in that, he rejoined. If you will only go into the palaestra with Ctesippus, and sit down and begin to talk, I
have little doubt that he will come to you of his own accord, for he is singularly fond of listening. And, moreover, as they are keeping the Hermesia, boys and men are all mixed up together today. So he is pretty certain to join you. But if he does not, Ctesippus knows him, through his cousin Menexenus, who is Lysis' particular friend. You can get Ctesippus, therefore, to summon him, in case he does not come of himself.

This be our plan, I cried. And taking Ctesippus with me, I walked toward the palaestra, the rest following.

On entering we found that the boys had finished their sacrifices, and, the ceremony being now pretty well over, were playing together at knucklebones, all in their holiday dress. The greater part were carrying on their game in the court outside, but some of them were in a corner of the dressing room, playing at odd and even with a number of bones which they drew out of small baskets. Round these were stationed others looking on, among whom was Lysis, and he stood in the midst of boys and youths with a chaplet on his head, unmatched in face or form. You would say he was not beautiful merely, but even not of a noble mien. For ourselves, we withdrew to the opposite part of the room, and sitting down, as nothing was going on there, began to talk. While thus engaged, Lysis kept turning round and eyeing us, evidently wishing to join us. For some time though he remained in doubt, not liking to walk up alone. But when Menexenus looked in from his game in the court and on seeing Ctesippus and me came to sit down with us, Lysis also followed at sight of his friend, and took a seat by his side.

There came up, moreover, the rest of our party, among them Hippocrates, who, seeing them form into a good-sized group, screened himself behind them in a position where he did not think he could be seen by Lysis—so fearful was he of giving him offense. And thus placed near him, he listened to our conversation.

I began it by turning my eyes on Menexenus, and saying, 'Son of Demophon, which of you two is the elder?'

It is a disputed point, he replied.

And do you dispute, too, which is the better fellow?

Right heartily, was his answer.

And so too, I suppose, which is the more beautiful?

At this they both laughed.

I will not ask you, I added, which is the wealthier, for you are friends, are you not?

Oh dear, yest they both cried.

And friends, they tell us, share and share alike; so in this respect, at any rate, there will be no difference between you, if only you give me a true account of your friendship.

To this they both assented.

I was then proceeding to inquire which of the two excelled in 

Certainly, he answered.

Then here is my common or vulgar question, I said. For if we make no mistake either in doing or in speaking or in thinking, then what in God's name do you come here to teach, if that is so? Did you not say just now that you could impart virtue better than all the world to one who wanted to learn?

"Because what is being said now is very difficult—naturally, since it is said by very wise men—indeed this last thing is wholly difficult to deal with, as you say. For what do you mean, Dionysodorus, when you say, I don't know what to do with it? Isn't it clear you mean that I can't refute it? Just tell me, what else is the sense of the phrase, I don't know what to do with what is said?

But as to what you say, that is not very difficult to do with, he said. Just answer me.

Before you answer me, I said. Won't you answer? he said.

Is that fair?

Quite fair, he said.

On what reasoning? said I. Is not this your reasoning—that you visit us as one all-wise about words, and you know when you are bound to answer and when not, and now you will not answer anything since you perceive that you are not bound?

You just chatter, he said, without troubling to answer. Come, my good man, do as I say and answer; since you yourself admit that I am wise.

Then I must do as you say, said I, and I can't help it, as it seems, for you are master. Ask away.

Is there soul in things which have sense, when they have sense? Or have also the soulless things sense?

Only the things with soul.

Then do you know any phrase which has soul?

No indeed.

Then why did you ask me just now what sense my phrase had?

Oh, I said, it was simply a mistake I made through my stupidity—or perhaps it was not a mistake, and I was right in saying—but phrases have sense. So you say it was a mistake or not? For if it was a mistake, then you will not refute me although you are wise, and you do not know what to do with my saying, and if it was not a mistake, then you do not say right when you declare it is impossible to make a mistake, I am not now speaking of things you said last year. It seems really, I said, my dear Dionysodorus and Euthydemus, that our present talk is getting us no further, and it still is to speak the old
SOCRATES: Further, what about the art that serves the shipwrights? What result does it serve to produce?
EUTHYPHRO: Obviously, Socrates, the making of a ship.
SOCRATES: And that which serves the builders serves the building of a house?
EUTHYPHRO: Yes.
SOCRATES: Now tell me, best of friends, about the service of the gods. What result will this art serve to produce? You obviously know, since you profess to be the best informed among mankind on things divine?
EUTHYPHRO: Yes, Socrates, I say so, and I tell the truth.
SOCRATES: Then tell me, I adjure you, what is that supreme result which the gods produce when they employ our services?
EUTHYPHRO: They do many things and noble, Socrates.
SOCRATES: Just as the generals do, my friend. All the same you would have no trouble in summing up what they produce, by saying it is victory in war. Isn't it so?
EUTHYPHRO: Of course.
SOCRATES: And the farmers too, I take it, produce many fine results, but the net result of their production is the food they get from the earth.
EUTHYPHRO: Yes, surely.
SOCRATES: Well now, of the many fine and noble things which the gods produce, what is the sum of their production?
EUTHYPHRO: Just a little while ago I told you, Socrates, that the task is a light one to learn precisely how all these matters stand. I will, however, simply tell you this. If anyone knows how to say and do things pleasing to the gods in prayer and sacrifice, that is holiness, and such behavior saves the family in private life together with the common interests of the state. To do the opposite of things pleasing to the gods is impious, and this it is that upsets all and ruins everything.
SOCRATES: Surely, Euthyphro, if you had wished, you could have summed up what I asked for much more briefly. But the fact is that you are not eager to instruct me. That is clear. But a moment since, you were on the very point of telling me—and you slipped away. Had you given the answer, I would now have learned from you what holiness is, and would be content. As it is—for perforce the lover must follow the loved one wherever he leads the way—once more, how do you define the holy, and what is holiness? Don't you say that it is a science of sacrifice and prayer?
EUTHYPHRO: I do.
SOCRATES: Well, and is not sacrifice a giving to the gods, and prayer an asking them to give?
EUTHYPHRO: Precisely, Socrates.
EUTHYDEMUS

Are you any the less not knowing? But just now you said you were knowing, and so you are really this very same you, and again not the same, in relation to the same things at the same time!

All right, Euthydemus! I said. As the proverb goes, 'You never say a word amiss. It's always either that or this!' And what then is my understanding of that knowledge we were looking for? I suppose it's this. It is impossible for the same thing both to be and not to be. If I know one thing I know all things, for I could not be knowing and not knowing at the same time. And so since I know everything, I have that knowledge too. These you are—im't that what you tell us, isn't that your word of wisdom?

Look here, said he, you are refuting yourself, Socrates!

Well, but what about you, Euthydemus? I said. Weren't you in this same difficulty? Anyway, so long as I keep with you and with dear old Dionysodorus, I shall not feel at all vexed at any difficulty we get into! Tell me, don't you two know some of the things which are, and not know others of them?

By no means, said Dionysodorus.

What's that! said I. Don't you know anything?

Oh yes, we do, he said.

Then you know everything, I asked, since you know something? 294 Everything, he answered, and so do you. If you know one thing, you know all things.

[God! said. Here's a wonder and a manifest miracle! Can it be that all the other men in the world know everything, or nothing?]

Surely, he said, they cannot know some things and not others, or they would be at once knowing and not knowing.

Knowing what? I said.

Everyone, said he, knows everything, if he knows one thing.

[Good heavens! I said. Good heavens, Dionysodorus! I see now you are both in earnest, and what a job I had to persuade you to take us in earnest!] Do you both really and truly know everything? Carpentry and shoemaking, for instance?

Certainly, he said.

So you are able to stitch leather?

Yes, and to do cobbling too, he said.

And do you know things like these, the number of the stars, and the sand?

Certainly, he said. Do you think we would not admit that too?

Then Ctesippus broke in. Show me a proof, Dionysodorus, for God's sake, by which I may know that you two are telling the truth.

What shall I show you? he said.

Do you know how many teeth Euthydemus has, and does he know how many you have?

Is it not enough for you, he said, to be told that we know everything?

Not that, please, said Ctesippus. Just tell us this one thing more
that which looses (διω) the end (τέλος) of motion. Τελειόν (the advantageous) is derived from διωλείν, meaning that which creates and increases; this latter is a common Homeric word, and has a foreign character.

HERMOCNES: And what do you say of their opposites?

SOCRATES: Of such as mere negatives I hardly think that I need speak.

HERMOCNES: Which are they?

SOCRATES: The words διωμομένον (unexpedient), ένομική (unprofitable), ένουμική (unadvantageous), ένηρετής (ungainful).

HERMOCNES: True.

SOCRATES: I would rather take the words ένωμερέν (harfull), έγιυκή (hurtful).

HERMOCNES: Good.

SOCRATES: The word ένωμερέν is that which is said to hinder or harm (βλέπειν) the stream (τρέφον); βλέπειν is βουλόμενον ἐπίνων (seeking to hold or bind), for ἐπίνων is the same as ἐπιθεῖται, and ἐπιθεῖται is always a term of censure; βουλόμενον ἐπίνων ἔποιον (wanting to bind the stream) would properly be βουλαστήρεστος, and this, as I imagine, is improved into βουλαστήρεστος.

HERMOCNES: You bring out curious results, Socrates, in the use of names, and when I hear the word ένωμερέν I cannot help imagining that you are making your mouth into a flute, and puffing away as some prelude to Athena.

SOCRATES: That is the fault of the makers of the name, Hermogenes—not mine.

HERMOCNES: Very true; but what is the derivation of ζημιωτής?

SOCRATES: What is the meaning of ζημιωτής? Let me remark, Hermogenes, how right I was in saying that great changes are made in the meaning of words by putting in and pulling out letters; even a very slight permutation will sometimes give an entirely opposite sense. I may instance the word θέον, which occurs to me at the moment, and reminds me of what I was going to say to you, that the fine fashionable language of modern times has twisted and disguised and entirely altered the original meaning both of θέον and of ζημιωτής, which in the old language is clearly indicated.

HERMOCNES: What do you mean?

SOCRATES: I will try to explain. You are aware that our forefathers loved the sounds θ and θ, especially the women, who are most conservative of the ancient language, but now they change θ into η or ε, and ε into ζ—this is supposed to increase the grandeur of the sound.

HERMOCNES: How do you mean?

SOCRATES: For example, in very ancient times they called the day either ἦλπις or ἥλπα, which is called by us ἰλπα.

HERMOCNES: That is true.
Zeus is yours, and those other gods, are you free to sell them or give them or do what you will with them just as with the other animals?

Well, Crito, I was, so to speak, knocked out now by the argument, and lying speechless. But Ctesippus came to my help, and shouted, Bravo! O Heracles! What a fine speech!

And Dionysodorus said, Is Heracles a bravo or is the bravo Heracles?

Then Ctesippus said, O Poseidon, terrible Hephaestus! I praise the two men and their speech, so that they nearly wore themselves out. Hitherto there had been a real good noise at each point they made, but only from the admirers of Euthydemus, but now almost the very pillars in the Lyceum resounded with pleasure at the two men. I was ready myself to admit that I had never before in my life seen people as clever. I was altogether enslaved by their skill, and I began to praise and congratulate myself, saying, O happy pair, blessed are you for your wonderful genius, to have perfected so great a work so quickly and so soon! Your speeches are full of fine things, Euthydemus and Dionysodorus, but most magnificent of all is this, that you do not concern yourselves with the multitude of men, nor of solemn looks or great pretension, but only with those like yourselves. For I am quite sure that there are very few men like you who would appreciate these arguments, and all the rest know so little of them that they would feel more ashamed to refute others by such ways of speech than to refute themselves. Here is another thing in your way of speaking that shows public spirit and kindness. When you say that nothing is beautiful and good or white or so forth, and there are no differences at all, really and truly, you sew up the mouths of people, just as you profess to do, since however you not only sewing up other people's mouths, but seem to sew up your own also, you do a most graceful thing, which takes air offense from your words: Chief of all, you have everything to teach and thought out with such art, that in a very short time any man alive can learn it; I myself carefully watched Ctesippus, and I noticed that he was quickly able to copy you to the spot. One thing about your system, it is excellent for putting over quickly, but it is not suitable to exhibit in public. If I dare advise you, take care not to speak before a crowd, or they may learn it quickly and forget to thank you. The best thing would be for you two to argue against each other in private, or if there must be another then let it be one who will give you a free gift. Give the same advice to your pupils, if you are prudent, never to argue with anybody else but with you or themselves. What is rare, is dear, Euthydemus, but water, which is best, as Pindar said, is cheapest. If you please, I said, accept me and Clinias here as your pupils. After this talk, Crito and a little more we parted. You must be
Then answer according to the notion which you conceive.

Well, I said, what if you mean it in one way when you ask, and I conceive my notion in another way, and then I answer according to my notion—is it enough for you if I answer not at all to the point?

Enough for me, he said, but however, not enough for you, as I take it.

Then, Euthydemus. I won't answer, I tell you that, said I, before I find out.

You will not answer, he said, according to your notion in each case, because you are more of an old fool than you need be, and will go on talking drivel.

Now I saw he was angry with me for picking holes in the phrases he used, because he was trying to catch me with his net of words. So I remembered that Conon was also angry whenever I would not give way to him, and now he takes less trouble about me because he thinks me ignorant. And since I had the notion to be a pupil of this other one, I thought I ought to give way to him, or he might think me stupid and refuse to accept me. So I said, Well, Euthydemus: if you think it proper to do like this, so be it. For anyway you know dialectic far better than I do, who have only the skill of an outsider. Then ask again from the beginning.

Very well then, he said, answer again. Do you know what you know by something or not?

Yes, I said, by the soul. [There he goes again, said he, answering more than he is asked! I did not ask by what, but whether by something.

Oh well, I answered too much, I said, from want of education. Do forgive me; I will from now on answer simply—do I know what I know by something?

Is it by this same thing always, he asked, or by this thing one time, and by another thing another time?

Always, I said, when I do know, it is by this thing.

Oh, do stop putting things in the said—But I don't want this 'always' to trip us up! It will not trip us up, he said, but you, anybody. But answer! Do you know always by this?

Always, I said, since I must take out the when.

Then you know always by this. But knowing always, do you know some things by this and other things by something else, or everything by this?

By this all things—all which I know, I replied.

Here we are again, he said. The old addition.

Well, I said, I take away that 'which I know.'

Oh, don't take away a single thing, he said. I don't ask of you anything, but answer me. Could you know all things, if you did not know everything?
would be hard to conduct a discussion on these terms, but in the end
he agreed to answer.

Good, said. Now let us start from the beginning. You believe that
some people show temperance in doing wrong?

We will suppose so, he said.

And to show temperance is to show good sense?

Yes.

Which means that in doing wrong they have planned well?

So be it.

If their wrongdoing is successful or unsuccessful?

If it is successful.

You agree that some things are good?

Yes.

And do you mean by good these things which are beneficial to
men?

Not only those, he said. Even if they are not beneficial to me, I
call them good.

At this point I thought Protagoras was beginning to bristle, ready
for a quarrel and preparing to do battle with his answers. Seeing this
I became more cautious and proceeded gently with my questioning.

Do you mean things which are beneficial to no human being, or things
that are not beneficial at all? Do you call them good also?

Of course not, he said. But I know plenty of things—foods,
drinks, drugs, and many others—which are harmful to men, and
others which are beneficial, and others again which, as far as men are
concerned, are neither, but are harmful or beneficial to horses, and
others only to cattle or dogs. Some have no effect on animals, but only
on trees, and some again are good for the roots of trees but injurious
to the young growths. Manure, for instance, is good for all plants
when applied to their roots, but utterly destructive if put on the
shoots or young branches. Or take olive oil. It is very bad for plants,
and most inimical to the hair of all animals except man, whereas men
find it of service both to the hair and to the rest of the body. So diverse
and multiform is goodness that even with us the same thing is good
when applied externally but deadly when taken internally. Thus all the
doctors forbid the sick to use oil in preparing their food, except in the
very smallest quantities, just enough to counteract the disagreeable
smell which food and sauces may have for them.

The audience vigorously applauded this speech. Then said I, I'm
a forgetful son of man, Protagoras, and if someone speaks at length,
I lose the thread of the argument. If I were a little deaf, you would
recognize the necessity of raising your voice if you wanted to talk to
me. Now since you find me forgetful, cut down your answers and
make them shorter. If I am to follow you.

What do you mean by make your answers short? Am I to make
them shorter than the subject demands?
Yesterday evening we returned from the army at Potidaea, and having been a good while away, I thought that I should like to go and look at my old haunts. So I went into the palaestra of Taureas, which is over against the temple of Basile, and there I found a number of persons, most of whom I know, but not all. My visit was unexpected, and no sooner did they see me entering than they saluted me from afar on all sides, and Chaerephon, who always behaves like a madman, started up from among them and ran to me, seizing my hand and saying, How did you escape from the battle, Socrates? An engagement had taken place at Potidaea not long before we came away, of which the news had only just reached Athens.

Just as you see me now, I replied. There was a report, he said, that the engagement was very severe, and that many of our acquaintance had fallen.

That, I replied, was not far from the truth. I suppose, he said, that you were present.

I was. Then sit down here, and tell us the whole story, which as yet we have only heard imperfectly.

So saying he led me to a place by the side of Critias, the son of Callaeschrus, and when I had sat down and saluted him and the rest of the company, I told them the news from the army, and answered their several inquiries.

Then, when there had been enough of this, I, in my turn, began to make inquiries about matters at home—about the present state of philosophy, and about the youth. I asked whether any of them were remarkable for wisdom or beauty, or both.

Critias glanced at the door and saw some youths coming in, and disputing noisily with one another, followed by a crowd. Of the beauties, Socrates, he said, I fancy that you will soon be able to form a judgment. For those who are just entering are the advance guard and lovers of the great beauty of the day, as he is thought to be, and he is likely to be not far off himself.

Who is he, I said; and who is his father?

Charmides, he replied, is his name. He is my cousin, and the son of my uncle Glaucon. I rather think that you know him too, although he was not grown up at the time of your departure.

Certainly, I know him, I said, for he was remarkable even then when he was still a child, and I should imagine that by this time he must be almost a young man.

You will see, he said, in a moment what age he has reached and
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what he is like. He had scarcely said the word, when Charmides entered.

Now you know, my friend, that I am not good at measuring, and in the presence of the beautiful I am like a measuring line without marks, for almost all young persons appear to be beautiful in my eyes. But at that moment, when I saw him, I confess that I was quite astonished at his beauty and stature. All the company seemed to be enamored of him. Amazement and confusion reigned when he entered, and a second troop of lovers followed behind him. That grown-up men like ourselves should have been affected in this way was not surprising, but I observed the boys and saw that all of them, down to the very smallest, turned and looked at him, as if he had been a statue.

Charephon called me and said, What do you think of the young man, Socrates? Has he not a beautiful face?

Most beautiful, I said.

But you would think nothing of his face, he replied, if you could see his naked form; he is absolutely perfect.

And to this they all agreed.

Ye gods, I said, what a paragon, if he has only one other slight addition!

What is that? said Critias.

If he has a noble soul. And being of your house, Critias, he may be expected to have this.

He is as fair and good within, as he is without, replied Critias.

Then, before we see his body, should we not ask him to strip and show us his soul? He is surely just of an age at which he will like to talk.

That he will, said Critias, and I can tell you that he is indeed a philosopher already, and also a considerable poet, not in his own opinion only, but in that of others.

That, my dear Critias, I replied, is a distinction which has long been in your family, and is inherited by you from Solon. But why do you not call him, and show him to me? For even if he were younger than he is, there could be no impropriety in his talking to us before you, his guardian and cousin.

Very well, he said, then I will call him. And turning to the attendant, he said, Call Charmides, and tell him that I want him to come and see a physician about the illness of which he spoke to me the day before yesterday.

Then again addressing me, he added, He has been complaining lately of having a headache when he rises in the morning. Now why should you not make him believe that you know a cure for the headache?

Why not, I said, if only he will come.

He will be sure to come, he replied.
So he came as he was bidden. Great amusement was occasioned by everyone making room and pushing with might and main at his neighbor in order to sit next to him, until at the two ends of the row one had to get up and the other was rolled over sideways. And he came and sat down between Critias and me. But I, my friend, was beginning to feel awkward. My former bold belief in my powers of conversing naturally with him had vanished. And when Critias told him that I was the person who had the cure, he looked at me in an indescribable manner, and made as though to ask me a question. And all the people in the palaestra crowded about us, and at that moment, my good friend, I caught a sight of the inwards of his garment, and took the flame. Then I could no longer contain myself. I thought how well Cydias understood the nature of love, when, in speaking of a fair youth, he warns someone 'not to bring the fawn in the sight of the lion to be devoured by him,' for I felt that I had been overcome by a sort of wild-beast appetite. But still when he asked me if I knew the cure for the headache, I answered, though with an effort, that I did know.

And what is it? he said.

I replied that it was a kind of leaf, which required to be accompanied by a charm, and if a person would repeat the charm at the same time that he used the cure, he would be made whole, but that without the charm the leaf would be of no avail.

Then I will write out the charm from your dictation, he said.

With my consent? I said. Or without my consent?

With your consent, Socrates, he said, laughing.

Very good, I said. So you know my name, do you?

I ought to know you, he replied. For there is a great deal said about you among my companions, and I remember when I was a child seeing you in company with Critias here.

I am glad to find that you remember me, I said. For I shall now be more at home with you and shall be better able to explain the nature of the charm, about which I felt a difficulty before. For the charm will do more, Charmides, than only cure the headache. I dare say that you have heard eminent physicians say to a patient who comes to them with bad eyes, that they cannot undertake to cure his eyes by themselves, but that if his eyes are to be cured, his head must be treated too. And then again they say that to think of curing the head alone, and not the rest of the body also, is the height of folly. And arguing in this way they apply their regime to the whole body, and try to treat and heal the whole and the part together. Did you ever observe that this is what they say?

Yes, he said.

And they are right, and you would agree with them?

Yes, he said, certainly I should.

His approving answers reassured me, and I began by degrees to
regain confidence, and my natural heat returned to me. Such, Charmides, I said, is the nature of the charm, which I learned when serving with the army from one of the physicians of the Thracian king Zalmoxis who are said to be able even to give immortality. This Thracian told me that in these notions of theirs, which I was just now mentioning, the Greek physicians are quite right as far as they go, but Zalmoxis, he added, our king, who is also a god, says further, 'that as you ought not to attempt to cure the eyes without the head, or the head without the body, so neither ought you to attempt to cure the body without the soul. And this,' he said, 'is the reason why the cure of many diseases is unknown to the physicians of Hellas, because they disregard the whole, which ought to be studied also, for the part can never be well unless the whole is well.' For all good and evil, whether in the body or in the whole man, originates, as he declared, in the soul, and overflows from thence, as if from the head into the eyes. And therefore if the head and body are to be well, you must begin by curing the soul—that is the first and essential thing. And the cure of the soul, my dear youth, has to be effected by the use of certain charms, and these charms are fair words; and by them temperance is implanted in the soul, and where temperance comes and stays, there health is speedily imparted, not only to the head, but to the whole body. And when he taught me the cure and the charm he added, 'Let no one persuade you to cure his head, until he has first given you his soul to be cured by the charm. For this,' he said, 'is the great error of our day in the treatment of human beings, that men try to be physicians of health and temperance separately.' And he strictly enjoined me not to let anyone, however rich or noble or fair, persuade me to give him the cure, without the charm. Now I have sworn, and I must keep my oath, and therefore if you will allow me to apply the Thracian charm first to your soul, as the stranger directed, I will afterward proceed to apply the cure to your head. But if not, I do not know what I am to do with you, my dear Charmides.

Critias, when he heard this, said, 'The headache will be a blessing to my young cousin, if the pain in his head compels him to improve his mind. Yet I can tell you, Socrates, that Charmides is not only pre-eminent in beauty among his equals, but also in that quality for which you say you have the charm—temperance, is it not?'

Yes, I said.

Then let me tell you that he is the most temperate of the young men of today, and for his age inferior to none in any quality. Indeed, Charmides, I said, I think that you ought to excel others in all good qualities, for if I am not mistaken there is no one present who could easily point out two Athenian houses, whose union would be likely to produce a better or nobler scion than the two from which you are sprung. There is your father's house, which is descended from Critias, the son of Peopides, whose family has been commemorated
195
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195. In the panegyrics of Anacreon, Sopol, and many other poets, as fa-
mous for beauty and virtues and all other high fortune. And your
mother’s house is equally distinguished, for your maternal uncle, Py-
rikampes, is reputed never to have found his superior for stature and
beauty in Persia at the court of the Great King, or anywhere on the
continent of Asia in all the places to which he went as ambassador:
that whole family is not a whit inferior to the other. Having such an
example, you ought to be first in all things, and, sweet son of Clasuc-
your outward form is no dishonor to any of them. If in beauty you
add temperance, and if in other respects you are what Critias declares
you to be, then, dear Charmides, blessed is the son your mother bore.
And here lies the point. For if, as he declares, you have this gift of
temperance already, and are temperate enough, in that case you have
no need of any charms, whether of Zalboxis or of Abiris the Hyper-
borean, and I may as well let you have the cure of the head at once.
But if you have not yet acquired this quality, I must use the charm be-
fore I give you the medicine. Please, therefore, to inform me whether
you admit the truth of what Critias has been saying. Have you or
have you not this quality of temperance?

Charmides blushed, and the blush heightened his beauty, for
modesty is becoming in youth. He then made the graceful reply that
he really could not at once answer, either yes or no, to the question
d of which I had asked. For, said he, if I affirm that I am not temperate,
that would be a strange thing for me to say against myself, and also I
should give the lie to Critias, and to many others who, according to
him, think that I am temperate. But, on the other hand, if I say that I
am, I shall have to praise myself, which would be ill manners,
and therefore I do not know how to answer you.

I said to him, That is a natural reply, Charmides, and I think
that you and I ought together to inquire whether you have this quality
about which I am asking or not, and then you will not be compelled
e to say what you do not like; neither shall I rashly have recourse to
medicine. Therefore, if you please, I will share the inquiry with you,
but I will not press you if you would rather not.
There is nothing which I should like better, he said, and as far
as I am concerned you may proceed in the way which you think best.
I think, I said, that it would be best to approach the question in
this way: If temperance abides in you, you must have an opinion about
her. She must give some indication of her nature and qualities, which
may enable you to form a notion of her. Is not that true?
Yes, he said, that I think is true.
You know your native language, I said, and therefore you must be
able also to express your opinion.
Perhaps, he said.
In order, then, that we may form a conjecture whether you have