

DAVID L. SCHAEFER, JR.

The Legacy of Leo Strauss: A Bibliographic Introduction

If, then, there is some end of the things we do, which we desire for its own sake (everything else being desired for the sake of this) . . . clearly this must be the good and the chief good. Will not the knowledge of it, then, have a great influence on life? . . . It would seem to belong to the most authoritative art and that which is most truly the master art. And politics appears to be of this nature. . . . Since it legislates as to what we are to do and what we are to abstain from, the end of this science must include those of the other [sciences], so that this end must be the good for man.

Aristotle

Nicomachean Ethics 1094
(trans. Jowett)

I myself, . . . like anyone else who delights in a fine horse, bird, or dog, am even more delighted by good friends. If I have something to teach, I teach it and I introduce my associates to others from whom I believe they will get some benefit in their search for virtue. The treasures which the wise men of old have left in scrolls, we unroll and peruse together with our friends and we pick out any good we may discover. We think the gain is great if we become friends to one another.

Socrates, in Xenophon's
Memorabilia, 1.6
(trans. Benjamin)

I too speak as one who does not know but only conjectures; yet that there is a difference between right opinion and knowledge is not at all a conjecture with

me but something I would particularly assert that I knew; there are not many things of which I would say that.

Socrates, in Plato's
Meno., 98B.
(trans. Lamb)

Fine things are hard.

Socrates, and others, in
Plato's Republic.
(trans. Bloom)

PROFESSOR Leo Strauss, who died on October 18, 1973, was one of the handful of truly great thinkers of the twentieth century. In the eyes of many scholars, he was the foremost interpreter of political philosophy that this century has known. But the implications of his work range far beyond the confines of political philosophy, if that subject is understood narrowly as a particular academic field among many. In interpreting and explaining the thought of the great political philosophers and demonstrating its relevance to our time, Professor Strauss challenged the presuppositions that underlie all of the academic disciplines as they are presently understood, as well as revealing the shallowness of most of what passes for political thought in the present era.

David L. Schaefer is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Temple University. A former ISI Weaver Fellow, he received his doctorate from the University of Chicago, where he studied under Leo Strauss. He has contributed to *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* and *The Political Science Reviewer*.

Professor Strauss was not himself a political philosopher in the sense of one who explicitly sets forth a comprehensive political doctrine in his own name. The primary vehicle through which he conveyed his teaching was rather the interpretation and illumination of the writings of the great political philosophers from Plato through Nietzsche, as well as the criticism of contemporary scholarship dealing with politics, philosophy, history, and literature. His aim was not to persuade men to adopt a particular political position, but rather to acquaint them with the truly serious philosophic alternatives, and to encourage them to pursue philosophy themselves by studying the great philosophic works and considering the implications of these works for political life. But the depth and breadth of Professor Strauss's analyses and their implications might well justify us in terming him a political philosopher in the fullest sense.

Professor Strauss's accomplishment as a scholar was a twofold one. In the first place, he resurrected the study of political philosophy from its status, earlier in this century, as a merely antiquarian endeavor. Challenging the assumptions of the positivistic and historicist schools of thought, which denied the very possibility of political philosophy, he also demonstrated men's continuing need to engage in this study, if political life is not to be ruled entirely by irrational passion or prejudice. Secondly, Professor Strauss taught men once again *how* to study political philosophy, by making them aware of the depth and care which went into the writing of the great philosophic works, and the consequent need of a similar thoughtfulness and care on the part of the reader who wishes truly to understand these works. Of particular importance in the latter respect is Strauss's rediscovery of the techniques employed by the great thinkers from Plato through at least the 18th Century to conceal the deepest level of their own teachings from the careless reader—both to protect themselves against persecution for their political and religious views, and also (in some cases) to protect the generality of unphilosophic readers against dangerous truths that might be misunder-

stood or wrongly exploited by men who were not similarly devoted to the pursuit of truth.

In sheer volume alone, Professor Strauss's work is certainly impressive: a bibliography of his work published nine years before his death—and thus before a number of his works appeared—ran to six pages. But Strauss's accomplishment staggers the imagination when one realizes the meticulous care and scholarship that went into every one of his writings, from lengthy books to brief book reviews. The compression of thought that these works embody is such that each of his interpretations would itself require a lengthy interpretation in order for it to be fully understood.

IN this bibliographic essay I have aimed to give the general reader some idea of the scope and content of Professor Strauss's major works, and to indicate which of these works seem to constitute the best starting-points for students and scholars with various interests who wish to deepen their understanding of the fundamental human questions, and the great books dealing with those questions, that Strauss aimed to illuminate. Strauss never intended that his writings should be read independently of the great philosophic works that he analyzed. To rely on Strauss's interpretation of a book as a substitute for careful study of the book itself is the very antithesis of the philosophic spirit that Strauss aimed to inspire in his students and readers. Strauss adhered to the notion of education that was held by the great philosophers themselves: one cannot understand something unless one has been compelled to think through its grounds oneself.¹ It was partly for this reason, Strauss indicated, that the classical philosophers made the deepest level of their teaching so difficult of access to the reader: the truth is not a formula or doctrine to be memorized;

1. See Strauss's lecture "What Is Liberal Education?," published in C. Scott Fletcher (ed.), *Education for Social Responsibility* (Norton, 1961), and in Strauss's *Liberalism: Ancient and Modern* (Basic Books, 1968) also, his discussion of Plato's manner of writing in *The City and Man* (Rand McNally, 1964), pp. 52-62.

only by forcing the reader to emulate the process of reasoning that the author had had to go through could that author communicate his view of the truth to the reader. This fact will help one to understand why many of Strauss's writings are themselves so difficult. But if a reading of Strauss's commentaries is no substitute for the thoughtful study of the works he examined, it is equally true that a student who has been given no reason to suspect the level of thought that lies beneath the surface of these works—a student who has been taught to believe that the writings of Plato or Hobbes are nothing more than steps forward towards the culmination of philosophy in Wittgenstein's logic, or the liberation of mankind through Marcuse's beatific vision—is likely to pass over these works with no sense of what he is missing. Surely no one who has seriously considered one of Strauss's commentaries on Xenophon or Plato can dismiss the thought of those men as "irrelevant" or "outdated" (whether or not he agrees with it). Thus, while Strauss's writings serve to help illuminate the great books for those who already grasp their beauty and importance, they can also attract the beginning student to this study by raising questions in his mind that other would-be teachers have suppressed, and by making him aware of the magnitude of the difference between the way Plato understood philosophy and the way in which contemporary professors of philosophy understand Plato.

THE best general introduction to the thought of Leo Strauss, and to the nature of political philosophy as he understood it, is probably his essay "What Is Political Philosophy?". In this essay Strauss attempts to clarify the nature of the subject, to indicate the difficulties inherent in the contemporary objections to its possibility, and to characterize what Strauss saw as the two fundamental alternative "solutions" to "the problem of political philosophy": the "classical" view of Plato and Aristotle, and the "modern" approach initiated by Machiavelli and radicalized in two further "waves" of modernity exemplified by Rous-



Leo Strauss

seau and Nietzsche. With Nietzsche, in Strauss's view, "modern thought reaches its culmination," but a culmination which seems to undermine the possibility both of responsible politics and of political philosophy itself. Hence, Strauss argued throughout his mature years, there is the utmost need for a reconsideration of political philosophy in its original, classical form—a form which never aspired to make man "absolutely sovereign [over] nature," but which aimed to face the eternal, "primary issues" that modern thinkers, with a view to the "relief of man's estate," were later to endure.

The essay "What Is Political Philosophy?" appears in its full form in Strauss's book *"What Is Political Philosophy?" and Other Studies*, published by the Free Press (1959) (recently reprinted by the Greenwood Press). A shorter form of the essay also appeared in the *Journal of Politics*, Vol. XIX (August, 1957), and was issued as a Bobbs-Merrill Reprint. Two more essays in *"What Is Political Philosophy?" and Other Studies* are also of the greatest general interest: "Political Philosophy and History" and "On Classical Political Philosophy." (The latter essay is also available in the paperback *Plato: Totalitarian or Democrat?*, edited by T.L. Thorson

and published as a Spectrum paperback by Prentice-Hall.) *What Is Political Philosophy?* contains important studies of Alfarabi, Maimonides, Hobbes, and Locke, along with sixteen insightful book reviews in the fields of political philosophy and intellectual history, most of which were originally published in the journal *Social Research* during the years 1941-51.

The themes stated in the essay "What Is Political Philosophy?" are elaborated at greater length in Strauss's most comprehensive and general work, *Natural Right and History* (available as a Phoenix paperback, published by the University of Chicago Press). Chapters I and II of this book contains a trenchant critique of the historicist and positivist rejection of political philosophy, respectively. The insistence that political science must deal with questions of "value" is now much more widely heard than at the time when *Natural Right and History* was originally published. But unlike many of today's "post-behavioral" generation of social scientists, Strauss did not believe that the mere expression of "commitment" to a "value," or a feeling that it appealed to one's "conscience," was sufficient to legitimize that "value." Nor, unlike some well-meaning conservatives, did he regard positivism as something to be condemned merely by invoking a belief in "absolutes." All of philosophy was for Strauss a process of questioning—a questioning which must include as its objects even, or especially, man's most cherished "commitments," "feelings," and "absolutes." As Herbert Storing recently emphasized, Strauss was not a partisan of "values" at the expense of "facts"; his fundamental objection to the alleged "fact-value distinction" was that it obfuscated the fundamental human questions—questions as much of "fact" as of "value"—with which a true social science, one aimed at giving a realistic and rational account of the human situation, must deal.

The sobriety with which Strauss launched his radical critique of positivistic social science is exemplified in his meticulous analysis of the grounds of the "fact-value" distinction as set forth by its most thoughtful

exponent, Max Weber (a scholar for whom Strauss always held the greatest respect, despite his ultimate disagreement with Weber's views). The student who wishes to examine the grounds of positivistic social science could hardly do better than to study Chapter II of *Natural Right and History* carefully, and compare it with at least the following three selections from Weber's writings: "Politics As a Vocation" and "Science As a Vocation," both published in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (edited by Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills and published as a Galaxy paperback by the Oxford University Press), and "'Objectivity' in Social Science and Social Policy," an excerpt from Weber's *Methodology of the Social Sciences* included (along with Strauss's critique) in Maurice Natanson's *Philosophy of the Social Sciences: A Reader* (Random House, 1963).

Chapters III and IV of *Natural Right and History*, respectively entitled "The Origin of the Idea of Natural Right" and "Classic Natural Right," attempt to rediscover the ground and meaning of the classical "natural right" position from which all later "traditions" of political philosophy are ultimately derived. Strauss endeavors here to reconstruct the "natural," pre-scientific understanding of political things out of which philosophy arose, and to demonstrate the force of the classical view while weighing it most seriously against its contemporaneous alternatives. Readers of Chapter IV should note the subtlety of the classical "natural right" view as Strauss develops it, and its considerable divergence from later, and more rigid, "natural right" and "natural law" formulations.

Having stated the classical position, Strauss goes on in Chapter V of *Natural Right and History* to discuss the transformation of the idea of natural right by three key modern thinkers: Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Locke. While this discussion is immensely rewarding, Strauss indicated in a foreword to the most recent edition (1971) that he had later modified his interpretation of Hobbes and Locke, and had expressed his more recent thoughts in the essays on these thinkers that appear in *What Is Political Philosophy?*

The concluding chapter of *Natural Right and History* discusses "The Crisis of Modern Natural Right" in the thought of Rousseau and Burke. It was Strauss's contention that Rousseau's working out of the radical implications of the modern natural right position paved the way for, or necessitated, the ultimate rejection of nature as a standard in favor of "history" (a replacement towards which Burke's thought as well as Rousseau's clearly points). When the original hope that history could itself be a source of rational standards for human life proved to be unfounded, it in turn gave way to a radical historicism which asserts the relativity, or subjectivity, of all standards. Thus, the argument of *Natural Right and History* and of "What Is Political Philosophy?" each comes full circle: both the theoretical inconsistencies of historicism and its disastrous political consequences in the twentieth century compel us to reexamine the grounds on which the great thinkers of modernity rejected the classical natural right position. But such a reexamination would be inadequate unless it were based on the fullest possible understanding of the classical position itself, to the regaining of which Strauss devoted his enormous capacity and energy.

CENTRAL to Strauss's demonstration—in the face of a nearly universal prejudice to the contrary—of the continuing relevance of classical political philosophy to the fundamental and eternal human problems, was his rediscovery of the subtlety and conciseness of the ancients' manner of writing. Scholarship in Plato and Xenophon, in particular, suffered until Strauss's work from a failure to consider the peculiar characteristics of the philosophic dialogue. Whereas most contemporary analyses of classical philosophy attempted to separate out the "philosophical" parts of Plato's dialogues (e.g., the "doctrine of Ideas") from the "story" in which they had been placed, Strauss demonstrated the *essential connection* between speech and action that is present in a dialogue (as in a play, and in actual life), and the fundamental importance there-

fore of considering the dramatic situation of the dialogue with as much attention as is given to the arguments set forth by the interlocutors.

Strauss set forth a thematic discussion of the literary characteristics of the dialogue in the first pages of his essay on Plato's *Republic* in *The City and Man* (Rand McNally, 1964). But perhaps the best introduction to Strauss's method of explicating a classical text—especially because of the brevity of the text on which it is based—is his work *On Tyranny*, a study of Xenophon's dialogue *Hiero*. *On Tyranny*, which has been reprinted as a Cornell University Press paperback, includes the text of the dialogue in a new, literal translation, along with Professor Strauss's commentary. Strauss's analysis shows the *Hiero* to be a most penetrating analysis of the fundamental political problem of tyranny, and indicates the inseparability of an adequate analysis of this problem (as Xenophon saw it) from a comparison between the philosophic and the political ways of life. *On Tyranny* also includes a lengthy critique of the views set forth by Xenophon, and by Strauss, by the great Hegelian scholar Alexandre Kojève. The dialogue between Strauss and Kojève constitutes, as Allan Bloom notes in the Foreword, an outstanding confrontation between the principles of classical and modern political philosophy, as set forth by two of their outstanding interpreters. "The question debated," Bloom observes, "is whether human nature is unchanging and whether philosophy can move from the historic to the permanent."

Of assistance in grasping the issues in the controversy between Strauss and Kojève is the essay "Tyranny and Wisdom: A Comment on the Controversy between Leo Strauss and Alexandre Kojève," by Michael Grant, which appeared in the Spring, 1964, issue of *Social Research*. Also of interest are two articles by Victor Gourevitch, "Philosophy and Politics I and II," which appeared in the *Review of Metaphysics*, vol. XXII, nos. 1 and 2 (1968). Gourevitch attempts to identify Professor Strauss's own particular teaching by distinguishing what he believes

Strauss added to Xenophon from Strauss's interpretation proper of the dialogue. Regardless of the extent to which one is persuaded by Gourevitch's argument, it is certainly one of the most serious studies of Strauss's thought to have appeared.

IT is somewhat paradoxical that the philosopher to whose works Strauss devoted more of his interpretive writings than he did to any other thinker was not Plato or Aristotle, but the less renowned Xenophon. Strauss sought to demonstrate the depth of Xenophon's political understanding, which had been overlooked and obscured by deprecatory interpreters of the past two centuries. He did not contend, however, that Xenophon was of quite the same rank as Plato. Perhaps, in focusing on Xenophon's writings even more than he did on Plato's, Strauss wished to present the classical view of political things in a somewhat oblique manner. Or perhaps, because Xenophon's writings were less caked over with a patina of scholarly interpretations, and because they deal less directly than do Plato's dialogues with "metaphysical" questions that can so easily be turned into airy abstractions if severed from their political or human context, Strauss believed that these writings offer the contemporary reader a more direct route of access to the original, pre-"traditional" meaning of political philosophy. Be that as it may, Strauss's first published study of classical thought, "The Spirit of Sparta or the Taste of Xenophon" (published in the November, 1936, issue of *Social Research*) dealt with Xenophon's *Constitution of the Spartans*; and *On Tyranny*, originally published in 1948, was his first book on any of the ancients. In his last years, Strauss produced two more books on Xenophon: *Xenophon's Socratic Discourse*, a study of the *Oeconomicus*, and *Xenophon's Socrates*, an analysis of Xenophon's other Socratic writings. (Both of these books were published by the Cornell University Press and are available in paperback editions.) Strauss also set forth some observations on Xenophon's "historical" writings in a critical study entitled "Greek Historians," in the June, 1968, issue

of the *Review of Metaphysics*. At the time of his death, Strauss had completed a further study of these writings which has not yet been published.

Aside from his studies of Xenophon, the other two books which Professor Strauss wrote dealing wholly with classical thought (in addition to a study of Plato's *Laws* which is to be published in 1974) are *The City and Man* (Rand McNally) and *Socrates and Aristophanes* (Basic Books). The former volume contains a brief essay on Aristotle's *Politics* and longer chapters on the *Republic* and on Thucydides. *Socrates and Aristophanes* is an endeavor to further illuminate "the problem of Socrates," which Strauss saw as coeval with the problem of political philosophy, and the relation between political philosophy and poetry, through an analysis of Aristophanes's comedies.

AS Harry Jaffa emphasized in his memorial essay in the *National Review*, Strauss regarded Machiavelli as the key architect of modernity. It was Machiavelli who initiated the modern project of guaranteeing a radical improvement of the human condition through a certain kind of "enlightenment." Foremost, therefore, among Strauss's studies of modern political philosophy is his great, and incredibly complex, *Thoughts on Machiavelli*. With one masterly stroke Strauss rescued Machiavelli's thought from the obfuscations of those scholars who, unconscious of the subtlety of the philosopher's rhetoric, had reduced him to a mere theorist of "power politics" (i.e., a spouter of truisms) or a spokesman of the "Renaissance spirit" (whatever that might be). Revealing the depth and grandeur of the Machiavellian project, Strauss at the same time made evident its most serious questionableness—and hence made possible a truly radical questioning of the root principles of modern politics. It must be observed, however, that the overall structure and order of *Thoughts on Machiavelli* are exceedingly complex, not to say obscure. Thus, while even a first reading of this work will illuminate innumerable aspects of Machiavelli's teaching for the reader in a way that no other study has

done, it may be that (paradoxical as it may sound) a full understanding of *Thoughts on Machiavelli* could be obtained only after one had penetrated far into Machiavelli's own teaching, even while using Strauss's commentary as a guide. (A paperback edition of the study has been issued by the University of Washington Press.)

Two further studies of modern thinkers by Strauss should be mentioned here. *The Political Philosophy of Hobbes: Its Basis and Its Genesis*, Strauss's first publication to be issued in English (in 1936), is still an immensely valuable study, even though both the mode of analysis and the substantive interpretation of Hobbes's philosophy differ somewhat from that to be found in Strauss's later writings. In the book Strauss aimed to show that "the real basis of [Hobbes's] political philosophy is not modern science," but Hobbes's "pre-scientific" observation of human behavior. *The Political Philosophy of Hobbes* is now available as a Phoenix paperback, published by the University of Chicago Press.

Aside from brief book reviews, Strauss published no more studies dealing with modern political philosophy for eleven years after the appearance of the Hobbes book. When he did break his silence on the subject, however, his review article "On the Intention of Rousseau" (in the December, 1947, issue of *Social Research*) revolutionized Rousseau scholarship.² Discussing Rousseau's *First Discourse*, Strauss argued that the apparent contradictions in Rousseau's writings could be explained in light of an understanding of the philosopher's political intentions and his rhetoric—his art of speaking differently to different audiences, for reasons that Rousseau sets forth in the argument of the *Discourse* itself. Thus there is no need, Strauss showed, to have recourse to the kind of amateur psychoanalysis of Rousseau that, however much pleasure it

may give to patronizing scholars, stands in the way of an understanding of the important lessons Rousseau aimed to convey. "On the Intention of Rousseau" was recently reprinted in the paperback anthology *Hobbes and Rousseau: A Collection of Critical Essays*, edited by Maurice Cranston and Richard S. Peters.

In addition to *What Is Political Philosophy?*, two other collections of Strauss's essays have been published. One, *Persecution and the Art of Writing* (Free Press, 1952), examines the works of several medieval political philosophers. The first, title essay is of the greatest general interest in that it contains a thematic discussion of the techniques employed by the great political philosophers to conceal their deepest teachings from the generality of readers, and of the reasons for this concealment. (For Strauss's defense of his contention that the philosophers practiced "esoteric writing" against some of the major criticisms that have been leveled against this contention, see his essay "On a Forgotten Kind of Writing" in *What Is Political Philosophy?*) Another book of essays, *Liberalism: Ancient and Modern* (Basic Books, 1968), includes new studies of Lucretius and of Plato's *Minos*; Strauss's introduction to Maimonides's *Guide to the Perplexed*; two essays discussing the meaning and importance of liberal education; and the "Epilogue" which Strauss originally wrote for the book *Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics*, edited by Herbert Storing. In the "Epilogue," Strauss set forth a penetrating but highly controversial critique of what he believed to be the "Neronian" tendencies of contemporary political science.

FOR brief biographical information on Strauss, one may consult the Dedication of the Strauss *Festschrift*, *Ancients and Moderns*, edited by Joseph Cropsey (Basic Books, 1964); and Walter Berns's remarks in the *National Review* memorial, "The Achievement of Leo Strauss," which appeared in the issue of December 7, 1973. In 1965 Strauss set down a most interesting fragment of intellectual autobiography as a Preface to the English translation of his book *Spinoza's*

2. Cf. page 2 of the "Introduction" to *Hobbes and Rousseau: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. by Maurice Cranston and Richard S. Peters, (Anchor-Doubleday, 1972), citing the *Times Literary Supplement* on the influence of this article on Rousseau scholarship.

Critique of Religion (published by Schocken Books). The Preface discusses the "theological-political predicament" in which Strauss found himself as "a young Jew born and raised in Germany," at the time he originally wrote this study of Spinoza (1925-28). Strauss found it appropriate or necessary to add this Preface when the book was republished because his thought, and hence his interpretation of Spinoza, had since undergone a decisive change. The book had been based, Strauss notes in the Preface, on a premise which his later studies had led him to repudiate: "that a return to pre-modern philosophy is impossible." Appended to the book is a translation of Strauss's critique of Carl Schmitt's *Der Begriff des Politischen* (the critique was first published in 1932). It was in this essay that Strauss first gave expression to the "change of orientation" that led him to his reconsideration of classical and medieval political philosophy, and to a revised view of modern thought in the light of the classical alternative.

A further autobiographical account by Strauss appeared in the April, 1970, issue of *The College*, published by St. John's College (Annapolis, Maryland), where Strauss spent his last years as Scott Buchanan Distinguished Scholar-in-Residence. This account is in a transcription of an all-too-brief "giving of accounts" by Strauss and his long-time friend, and fellow classical scholar, Jacob Klein, which took place at St. John's in January of 1970. Strauss's discussion of his early philosophical interests in this exchange helps one to appreciate the significance of the reconsideration of Edmund Husserl's understanding of philosophy which Strauss published in the Summer, 1971, issue of *Interpretation: A Journal of Political Philosophy*, under the title "Philosophy as Rigorous Science and Political Philosophy."

Appreciation of Professor Strauss's work by four of his former students—Walter Berns, Herbert Storing, Harry Jaffa, and Werner Dannhauser—appeared in the December 7, 1973, issue of the *National Review*. Storing's essay is especially valuable to students of political science in clarifying the relation of Strauss's work to that discipline.

Jaffa illuminates Strauss's philosophical development, particularly his relation to Judaism; while Dannhauser stresses the respects in which, despite Strauss's agreement with contemporary conservatism on a number of practical political issues, Strauss's thought diverged from certain tenets or attitudes characteristic of conservatism.

Brief recollections of Strauss by his friends and colleagues at St. John's College have been published in the January, 1974, issue of *The College*.

A complete bibliography of Strauss's writings published up to 1964 will be found at the end of *Ancients and Moderns*. A few more of Strauss's publications having the widest general interest are listed below (in chronological order):

"Farabi's Plato," *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (New York: American Academy of Jewish Research, 1945), a study of the great Islamic philosopher's interpretation of Plato, revealing much of the nature of philosophy.

"On Collingwood's Philosophy of History," *Review of Metaphysics*, vol. V, no. 4 (June, 1952), a critical study of the thought of one of the leading exponents of historicism.

"Natural Law," an article by Strauss in the new *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*.

"Relativism," in Helmut Schoeck and James W. Wiggins, *Relativism and the Study of Man* (Van Nostrand, 1961).

"Jerusalem and Athens: Some Preliminary Reflections," *City College Papers* (N.Y.), no. 6 (1967). Partly reprinted in *Commentary*, June, 1967. Two lectures: the first comparing the Biblical and Greek philosophic accounts of the beginnings; the second discussing Socrates's relation to the prophets.

"Political Philosophy and the Crisis of Our Time," in George Graham and George Carey (eds.), *The Post-Behavioral Era* (McKay paperback, 1972). (Adapted from Strauss's contribution to Harold Spaeth, ed., *The Predicament of Modern Politics*, published in 1964.)

DESPITE the enormous range of Professor Strauss's published works, his teaching and his influence on other scholars spread over an even wider scope. Before concluding this discussion, it would therefore seem appropriate to allude to some of the many distinguished works of scholarship in political philosophy and related fields that have already been produced by former students of Strauss, and by other scholars whose work shows his enormous influence. These works may differ considerably in interpretation and point of view; what unites them is not a political doctrine, but a seriousness in attempting to comprehend by reason the great political issues and a sensitivity to the great thinkers' subtlety of writing. A small sampling of these works (listed alphabetically by author) includes:

Herodotean Inquiries, by Seth Benardete (Martinus Nijhoff, 1969), a study of Herodotus.

The Republic of Plato, translated with an extensive interpretive essay by Allan Bloom (Basic Books, 1968; available in paperback). The outstanding translation of this work, combining the highest degree of literalness with a beauty of expression.

Shakespeare's Politics, by Allan Bloom with Harry V. Jaffa (Basic Books, 1964). A study of Shakespeare's political teaching in *The Merchant of Venice*, *Othello*, *Julius Caesar*, and *King Lear*.

Ancients and Moderns, ed. by Joseph Cropsey (Basic Books, 1964), a collection of essays in honor of Strauss by a group of his former students and associates. Includes studies of Hobbes, Mill, Montesquieu, Plato's *Apology of Socrates*, Aristotle's *Poetics*, Shakespeare's *King John*, and *Gulliver's Travels*.

Polity and Economy: An Interpretation of the Principles of Adam Smith, by Joseph Cropsey (Martinus Nijhoff, paperback, 1957), a critical study of the political theory underlying modern capitalism.

Crisis of the House Divided: An Interpretation of the Issues in the Lincoln-

Douglas Debates, by Harry V. Jaffa, recently republished in a paperback edition by the University of Washington Press.

Statesmanship and Party Government: A Study of Burke and Bolingbroke, by Harvey Mansfield, Jr. (University of Chicago Press, 1965).

Plato's "Symposium," by Stanley Rosen (Yale University Press, 1968).

Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics, edited and jointly written by Herbert J. Storing (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962), which should be read in conjunction with the works discussed in it.

Peace Among the Willows: The Political Philosophy of Francis Bacon, by Howard White (Martinus Nijhoff, 1968).

Tocqueville and the Problem of Democracy, by Marvin Zetterbaum (Stanford University Press, 1967).

Many articles on political philosophy by former students and associates of Professor Strauss also appear regularly in *Interpretation: A Journal of Political Philosophy*, published by Martinus Nijhoff (P.O. Box 269, Lange Voorhout 9, The Hague, Netherlands).

THE student of political philosophy should find any of the works listed in this essay to be of great assistance in his quest for understanding of the most fundamental issues. But it must be reemphasized that the works listed here are mostly *commentaries* on the great works of political philosophy, and that it is on those works that the student must concentrate his attention if he is truly to acquire some of the wisdom that Leo Strauss has helped us to pursue. The *History of Political Philosophy* which Professor Strauss edited along with Joseph Cropsey (published by Rand McNally), and to which he contributed three essays, is most helpful in such an endeavor. It contains thoughtful introductory (though hardly elementary) studies on a number of the most important political philosophers, with lists of suggested readings in the philosophers' works at the end of each chapter. This textbook is unlike

any other in the field, in that the thought of each philosopher is taken seriously, as something from which one can learn much that is important, rather than as a phenomenon to be explained away by reference to some non-rational cause (the latter approach giving the reader a feeling of superiority, while in reality leaving him wholly confirmed in his prejudices). The student who devotes himself to reading the great philosophic works in the spirit which the authors of the *History of Political Philosophy* have adopted—without assuming that every phi-

losopher was inevitably "the child of his time" or that "values" cannot be rationally founded or criticized, but with the utmost attention to detail and to critical thinking in his reading—will find a vast storehouse of riches, far surpassing in value and in true pleasure most of the allegedly "relevant" but merely transient literature of the present day. It is for helping to make us aware of those riches, and for assisting us in learning how to unearth them, that we are, above all, indebted to Leo Strauss.

**The Graduate Faculty of
The New School for Social Research
announces a**

**LEO STRAUSS MEMORIAL MEETING
October 18, 1974**

Partial List of Participants:

*Seth Benardete
Erich Hula
Richard Kennington
Howard B. White*

For further information contact:

**Strauss Memorial
c/o Raymond Valle
Graduate Faculty
Dept. of Political Science
New School for Social Research
65 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10003**