with the precedence of myth. In other words, as a philosopher he endeavors to present a logos-oriented account of a myth in his own specific language, symbols and rituals which introduces the things that philosophy wants to.

Note

1- compare with Sallis, 1975, p. 316
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that unlike the individual and domestic cult that Kephalus practices, where in the following sentences of the introduction show itself in manifest and salient ways, the cult of Bendis is a civic and communal religion. What are the consequences of this fact for the rest of the Introduction and the dialogue as a whole?

Regarding the analogy between the stages of polis and religion, one could suppose polis as a complexity with different layers which are analogical to the related phases of religion. Therefore, if we take communities in this order: family, village and polis (Plato, 1967, 627A), there would be an appropriate imaginable analogical religion for each of them. Speaking of polis naturally, for instance, there would be an analogical religion for polis and it would not negate the other kinds. According to historical accounts, Bendis had been recognized and actualized as the polis religion in a very official and authorized way (Wijma: http://www. Archaeologie - online.de / bibliotheek/ tagungsberichte /2007/ introducing – new - god.2007)

This fact has a basic result for the further philosophical speculations of Socrates on polis; it means that a cult that is polis-friendly and not connected with οικος / house and village / κου is appropriate for political philosophy. Thereby, Socrates’ nodal point for ascending up toward house of Polemarchus is basically a communal religion. Moreover, it is not possible to limit the meaning and field of polis only to “politics” in its current meaning, i.e. it has an “inclusive” meaning that somehow is assumed “exclusive” or “city-state” by some Greek thinkers. And it seems that the title and content of “Politeia” signify to a new perspective on polis which is mentioned two times in regard to Bendis and her rituals. And thereby it encourages its readers to take its inclusiveness into consideration in terms of matter and form (dilonchos).

Conclusion

We have taken Book One as an Introduction to the whole of “Politeia” dialogue. And in this prologue, according to the structural reading, the subject-oriented set of Goddess (Bendis) is the core. Socrates does the rite of passage in the sacred sphere with the effect of inspiration for introducing his new philosophical perspective and conception of polis. In other words, in his initiation into the civil sacred sphere, Socrates speculates on the issues that he wants to represent through myth-logos (as he mentions later on) which partly has roots in myth and religion. Therefore, his account is not exclusively mythical or rational but both
Focusing on those specific symbols and rituals pertinent to this Goddess called Bendis we are going to the purpose of our discussion, and comprehend the overall structure of Politeia. Simultaneously, all of Bendis’ features as a whole have inspiring symbolic effects on Socrates, and it is possible to show this happening in the text by general and particular terms. It would be better to start with essential preliminaries. Bendis is a foreign Thracian Goddess and this fact may remind us of the “Alien Wisdom” which holds fascination for the Greeks or more precisely Athenians (although according to Strabo, comic writers are not so sympathetic to). Moreover, she symbolizes both moon / hunt; thereby a new version of living is realized, means that death and (re)birth is two sides of the same coin that is Janus-faced (Eliade, 1996, p. 115). Metaphorically, intellectual vitality and life needs both a symbolic death / birth and somehow Socrates is experiencing this by descending to Piraeus (the nodal place) continue to evolve into his rebirth and ascent consequently.

Interconnected with this conception of life, there are the related rituals of “torchlight race” on “horseback” as a new and strange issue. Here in the context of religious symbolism, “horse” can be considered as the carrier of the moon that companies her in the process of death and rebirth and “torchlight” as a micro imitation of “moon”. These motifs will be appropriated philosophically later on by Plato in the service of his own political philosophy in this dialogue, so that “horse” is interpreted as an image of “soul” (defining justice on its basis), and “torchlight” as the image of “sun” concretely (as the brother of moon) or the idea of Good abstractly (in connection with Goddess). Thereby this foreign Thracian Goddess is accompanied by her related rituals form, a meaningful construction about the basis of life and its end. This meaningful cultic network inspires Plato and he appropriates it in his own philosophical way: the basis of life is soul and its end is Goodness (Suzanne, http://plato-dialogues.org /email /950312_1.html.1996).

Considering the religious tenor of these two verbs that denote to vow and vision and the dialonchos quality of Goddess and her related rituals in the middle nodal point, we can get an overall picture of the significance of the Goddess. What is absent here is the flavor of the Greek and platonic philosophy, i.e. polis. It may be asked that if we accept this comment on the first lines of Plato’s introduction, would not it be too disconnected from polis? Can it be considered as the end of polis? Is this interpretation compatible with Plato’s philosophy? With regard to the historical data and also the content of the related sentences, we can say
this rather symbolic quality, I would mention the Greek word for religion. If it is appropriate to take the words εὐσεβεία or θεοσεβεία, etc. as the rather Greek equivalents of the Latin word “religion”, and then derive their verbal roots σεβ- and σοβ- from common Indo-European verbal root “liegu” that means “to move to” or “away from somebody or something” (without any positive or negative connotation), it seems that the Greek, however, have given this word of moving the special connotation of impressiveness (Petersmann, 2002, p. 48). Accordingly, Socrates’ Introduction begins with a verb that can denote both to its narrativeness and its religiosity. Thus, the mentioned direction (descending) is towards a middle nodal point where a Goddess with both religious and ultra-religious significance exists. This importance comes from her quality as dilonchos that has connotations for the title of dialogue and also provides a heuristic device for framing the main structure of Plato’s text (Sallis, 1975, pp. 313, 320).

Interestingly, Socrates sentences and words (apart from their symbols and related rituals) in regard to the Goddess somehow can give us hints for better understanding of the afore-mentioned two-foldedness. Socrates introduces his own practices with two essentially religious words which their meanings have the capacity to be extended and generalized to non-religious ones: προσευξομένος and θεασσάθαι. Form of “ευχησθαί” has been long used in Greek and is essentially religious but it is also used in neutral context. Therefore, it has taken these double interconnected meanings: to pray / to assert (Benveniste, 1973, pp. 489, 493). Here “to pray” is like the Latin “vow” in a hybrid of saying / acting and cannot be limited to one of them. Therefore, if we take moving down of Socrates from somewhere to the site of the Goddess as “a rite of passage” he has to do something there in order to speak of transition (both physically and mentally), and it seems that he would express this point by the verb προσευξομένος. At the same time, there is another verb with religious theme that is complementary to the first word: θεασσάθαι. This verb denotes to a specific kind of viewing divinity through which the concerned human, whose state of being is determined by this action, comes to a specific vision and comprehension. Therefore, the concerned human being defines his existence by a habitual and customary view of the divine in the festival of the Goddess.
it turns to be symbolic, then continues its movement for speculating and speaking about “haves-not” or “unknown” subjects. Accordingly, the starting verb Κατεβην ... shows a smooth and easy downward movement and departure of mind from rather clear above-mentioned position. This position has a specific relation with the place of nodal point that is mentioned and known. In other words, Socrates’ thought starts from some specified status toward place of symbols and lastly leads to some certain resting place for mind. It seems that this nodal middle point has certain mutual relevancies with previous and future stages and thereby it should be considered as the focus of the starting sentences of the Introduction. But how is it possible? With regard to the importance of this nodal point as the focal of this dialogical narrative, it is necessary to describe the method of reading which has led to this conclusion.

Generally, regarding characteristics of Plato’s text as interweaving of form and content, it seems more appropriate to read it structurally or to give it a structure for better understanding. It means that apart from the rest of Book One as introduction, when we read the first lines of the dialogue, a myth captures our eyes and mind (eye of mind) as a focal point that the sentences can be arranged around it. Accordingly, one can suppose these sentences as a myth-oriented set. Afterwards meaningful units should be specified in this set in the forms of phrases, sentences, clauses and then speculating about their relations. Consequently, there will be a definite construction (327a; 328a; besides 354a) that contains meaningful sentences (about ten sentences) that have certain various relations with each other (Harrison, 2007, pp. 291-292).

Having supposed this nodal point at the beginning of Politeia, we are to focus our discussion on it. To understand this “Goddess” better, I try to find out its connection with “religion”. Furthermore, it can be considered the ideal-type of how Plato looks at religion in his own Greek version. As a matter of fact, there is a particular characteristic in this goddess that makes it suitable for Plato to introduce his conception about religion through her. According to the classical resources, the poet Cratinus calls this Goddess διλογχος double-pointed / two-folded. This etymological meaning could be considered as a suitable historical hint for more speculation and engagement with dialogue. The introduction of διλονχος in this general vague way let our mind free to bring up many related options and alternatives. The essential point is the two-foldedness of the Goddess in its both concrete and abstract aspects. On the basis of
Introduction

One of the enigmatic and far-reaching features of the opening lines of *Politeia* introduction is Socrates’ narration of a Goddess [Bendis] and her festival [Bendideia] in Piraeus. The initial position of this opening is very thought-stimulating and relatively strange which demands sufficient justification. In this framework, it seems necessary to investigate this initial background of the script that is mainly concerned about the construction of Polis from a new perspective. According to common knowledge, Bendis is a Thracian goddess of the moon and hunts whom the Greeks identified usually as Artemis. According to this simple basic information, it is a foreign religion and cult that should be accepted and integrated (in the course of a process with different means) into what is considered as native Greek. Thus it could be cautiously said that what is appropriate for the Polis is a Polis-friendly religion that could be considered as a threshold for entrance into the Polis. Therefore, religion is allotted to Polis but the reverse is not true. Although the text initiates with religion, it is not meant to be religion for the sake of religion. And this point leads to the permanent basic question stating what the relation between *hiera* and *hosia* is and equally important what the role of *hiera* in *Politeia* is.

Κατέβην χθές εἰς Πειραιᾶ ...
προσευξόμενος τε τη θεω ... θεάσασθαι ...
—... οὐδὲ ἵστε ὅτι λαμπάς ἐσται πρός ἐσπέραν ἃφ ἰππὼν τηθεω;...(Πολιτεία Α 327α–328α)

Plato writes his introduction (Book One) to *Politeia* in a narrative form initiating with a verb that is basically biased with multilayered connotations. Needless to say, like any text, *Politeia* requires suitable specific prologue qualitatively and quantitatively. The overall format of this introduction and the rest of the text is narrative which has come in nutshell in Book Three 392a-398b (Halliwell in *Jonas Grethlein & Antonios Rengakos, 2009*, PP. 16, 17). Apart from details and issues around this part of dialogue, the role and function of narration in these introductory sentences are noteworthy. Plato’s narration shows the manner of thinking as a process and movement that starts from some vague “haves” or “known” status which leads to nodal point(s) in which
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As a rule, the introduction of scripts usually contains basic hints that through forthcoming lines will be explored and developed in more detail. The same is true about the introduction of Plato's Politeia or Republic Book One. The mentioned dialogue is about the constitution of polis in philosophical manner, but it does begin with a religious narration about a civic foreign religion and gradually develops into the philosophy of city-state. This occasion makes it necessary to have a deep look at this phenomenon and see what implicit points are contained. In this regard, it seems that the pair biera / hosia can provide a suitable conceptual framework for ordering and understanding of the introduction.
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