Metaphysics and Method in Plato’s *Statesman*

At the beginning of his *Metaphysics*, Aristotle attributed several strange-sounding theses to Plato. Generations of Plato scholars have assumed that these could not be found in the dialogues. In heated arguments, they have debated the significance of these claims, some arguing that they constituted an “unwritten teaching” and others maintaining that Aristotle was mistaken in attributing them to Plato. In his previous book-length study on Plato’s late ontology, Kenneth M. Sayre demonstrated that, despite differences in terminology, these claims correspond to themes developed by Plato in the *Parmenides* and the *Philebus*. In this book, he shows how this correspondence can be extended to key, but previously obscure, passages in the *Statesman*. He also examines the interpretative consequences for other sections of that dialogue, particularly those concerned with the practice of dialectical inquiry.

Kenneth M. Sayre is professor of philosophy and director of the Philosophic Institute at the University of Notre Dame. He has published sixteen previous books on a variety of philosophical topics, of which four are on Plato.
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