

THE GEOMETRY IN PLATO'S *MENO*

JOHN G. RATCLIFFE, SOPHIA STONE, AND STEVEN T. TSCHANTZ

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we analyze the two geometrical passages in Plato's *Meno*, (81c – 85c) and (86e4 – 87b2), from the points of view of a geometer in Plato's time and today. We give, in our opinion, a complete explanation of the difficult second geometrical passage. Our explanation solves an ingenious geometry puzzle that has baffled readers of Plato's *Meno* for over 2,400 years.

1. INTRODUCTION

Plato's *Meno* is the dialogue between Socrates and principally Meno, a young rich man from Thessaly, concerning Meno's question to Socrates as to whether virtue can be taught. To aid his arguments, Socrates employs the discussion of two geometry problems. The first problem is to construct a square with twice the area of a given square (82d4-e2). The second problem is to determine whether a given area can be inscribed in the form of a triangle within a given circle (86e4-87b2).

The passage in Plato's *Meno* concerning the second problem has confused and confounded commentators for over 500 years [18]. Sir Thomas Heath wrote in his classic history of Greek mathematics [9] that, as of 1861, there were at least thirty different interpretations of this passage [3]. In the appendix of Bluck's treatise [2] on Plato's *Meno*, Bluck surveys five interesting interpretations from 1867 to 1955. More recent surveys and discussions of the second problem are given in [12, 15, 16, 24].

The main result of this paper is that we give, in our opinion, a complete explanation of the second geometrical passage. Our main thesis is that Plato sketches a simple and beautiful solution of the second geometry problem, which he conceals from the reader by leaving out important information, in order to mislead the reader into a maze with no solution. In other words, the second geometrical passage is a geometry puzzle, with missing pieces, and a trap. The maze is the commonly accepted solution of the second geometry problem in terms of isosceles triangles, which, we will argue, Plato believed did not have an elementary solution.

In this paper, we give an elementary proof of Plato's simple and beautiful solution of the second geometry problem, which previously was thought not possible, because the commonly accepted solution is generally believed to be non-elementary. We also prove that the commonly accepted solution is non-elementary by showing that the area of the inscribed $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangle cannot be inscribed in the form of an isosceles triangle by using only straight lines and circles (i.e. by a straightedge and compass construction). Our explanation of the second geometrical passage solves an ingenious geometry puzzle that has baffled readers of Plato's *Meno* for over 2,400 years.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 01A20.

Key words and phrases. Area, Straightedge and compass construction, Inscribed triangle.

Even though the first geometrical passage is straightforward, it is important to analyze it because it sets the stage for the second geometrical passage, and plays an important role in understanding the second geometrical passage. The first passage contains hints as to why Plato sets his trap in the second passage, and hints on how to solve the second geometry problem.

The dialogue in these two geometrical passages constitutes the first two acts of a four-act play with a dramatic ending.

This paper is written for both mathematicians and philosophers, because Plato was first and foremost a philosopher. Our paper will show that he was also a competent geometer.

Our paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we discuss the *Elements* of Hippocrates of Chios. In Section 3, we discuss the concepts of length, angle measure, and area in Euclidean geometry. In Section 4, we discuss the solution of the first geometry problem (Act I). In Section 5, we discuss the mathematical and philosophical significance of the first geometrical passage. In Section 6, we discuss the commonly accepted solution of the second geometry problem in terms of isosceles triangles (Act 2). In Section 7, we prove that our example cannot be inscribed as an isosceles triangle. In Section 8, we explain what Plato would have known about the second geometry problem. In Section 9, we give our explanation of the second geometrical passage (Act 3). The final act is in Section 10.

2. THE *Elements* OF HIPPOCRATES OF CHIOS

In the next two sections, we give an introduction to Euclidean geometry from the point of view of the ancient Greeks so that the reader will be able to understand the geometrical propositions that we claim Plato knew. In this section, we give a historical introduction to Euclidean geometry, with emphasis on the geometrical tools that were available to Plato when he wrote the *Meno*. In his treatise on Plato's *Meno*, Bluck [2] estimates the date of the *Meno* to be c. –385.

Traditionally, the source of most of the contents of Book I (on triangles) and Book II (on rectangles) of Euclid's *Elements* is attributed to Pythagoras (c. 570 – c. 495 BC), and of Book III (on circles) to Hippocrates of Chios (c. 470 – c. 410 BC).

According to Heath, p 170 [9], Hippocrates of Chios wrote the first version of the *Elements*. Unfortunately, the *Elements* of Hippocrates has been lost having been completely supplanted by Euclid's *Elements*. Nevertheless, it is highly likely that the *Elements* of Hippocrates contained most of the contents of Books I, II, and III of Euclid's *Elements*.

Plato (c. 427 – c. 347 BC) of Athens would have been familiar with the *Elements* of Hippocrates because Hippocrates was active in Athens after –430 according to Boyer [2]. In particular, when the *Meno* was written (c. –385), Plato would have been familiar with the logical basis of the *Elements* of Hippocrates. That Plato would have been interested in the logical basis of the *Elements* of Hippocrates is clear from *Cratylus* 436d. We use the translation of C.D.C. Reeve in [19].

Socrates: Geometrical constructions often have a small unnoticed error at the beginning with which all the rest is perfectly consistent. That's why every man must think a lot about the first principles of any thing and investigate them thoroughly to see whether or not it's correct to assume them.

It is not hard to reconstruct the logical basis of the *Elements* of Hippocrates from the logical basis of Book I of Euclid's *Elements*, since the logical basis of the *Elements* of Hippocrates would have to support the proofs of most of the propositions in Book I of Euclid's *Elements*.

The logical basis of Book I of Euclid's *Elements* consists of 23 definitions, five postulates, and five common notions. The main body of Book I consists of 48 propositions and their proofs. We refer to a proposition in Euclid's *Elements* [7, 13] by its book number, in Roman numerals, followed by its proposition number.

Hippocrates taught geometry for money according to Heath [9]. Most likely, his *Elements* were written to be a textbook for his students. Book III of Euclid's *Elements* is well organized, and so we expect that Hippocrates' textbook was also well organized, and that it would have had some definitions, some postulates, and perhaps some common notions.

The basic definitions of plane geometry were refined, and some additions were made, during the period between the *Elements* of Hippocrates and the *Elements* of Euclid. Plato would have known most of these definitions, in some form, because he had a keen interest in geometry.

2.1. Definitions. We next consider the 23 definitions in Book I of Euclid's *Elements*. We give references to Plato's dialogues pertaining to these definitions, and we make some comments, and give some extra definitions that we will use in this paper. We use the translation of Euclid's *Elements* by Sir Thomas Heath [7].

I.Def.1. A **point** is that which has not part.

I.Def.2. A **line** is breadthless length.

I.Def.3. The extremities of a line are points.

I.Def.4. A **straight line** is a line which lies evenly with the points on itself.

According to Heath [7], the only definition of a straight line authenticated as pre-Euclidean is that of Plato. It appears in the *Parmenides* 137e: "straight is whatever has its middle in front of (i.e. so placed as to obstruct the view of) both its ends."

There are three types of straight lines. We call a straight line with two endpoints a **line segment**, with one endpoint a **ray**, and with no endpoints an **infinite straight line**.

I.Def.5. A **surface** is that which has length and breadth only.

I.Def.6. The extremities of a surface are lines.

I.Def.7. A **plane surface** is a surface which lies evenly with the straight lines on itself.

In *Republic* 528b, Plato writes: "After plane surfaces, we went on to revolving solids (i.e. solids of revolution) before dealing with solids by themselves."

I.Def.8. A **plane angle** is the inclination to one another of two lines in a plane which meet one another and do not lie in a straight line.

I.Def.9. And when the lines containing the angles are straight, the angle is called **rectilineal**.

The **vertex** of an angle is the point where the two lines that form the inclination of the angle meet, in I.Def.8.

I.Def.10. When a straight line set up on a straight line makes the adjacent angles equal to one another, each of the equal angles is **right**, and the straight line standing on the other is called a **perpendicular** to that on which it stands.

I.Def.11. An **obtuse angle** is an angle greater than a right angle.

I.Def.12. An **acute angle** is an angle less than a right angle.

In *Republic* 510c, Plato refers to “the three kinds of angles” in geometry. In *Timaeus* 53c, Plato writes “Every triangle, moreover, derives from two triangles, each of which has one right-angle, and two acute angles.”

I.Def.13. A **boundary** is that which is an extremity of anything.

I.Def.14. A **figure** is that which is contained by any boundary or boundaries.

In *Meno* 76a, Plato writes “that a shape (i.e. surface) is that which limits (i.e. is the boundary of) a solid.”

I.Def.15. A **circle** is a plane figure contained by one line such that all the straight lines falling upon it from one point among those lying within the figure are equal to one another;

I.Def.16. And the point is called the **center** of the circle.

In the *Parmenides* 137e, Plato writes: “Round is surely that whose extremities are equidistant in every direction from the middle.”

I.Def.17. A **diameter** of the circle is any straight line drawn through the center and terminated in both directions by the circumference of the circle, and such a straight line also bisects the circle.

The boundary of a circle is called its **circumference**. A **radius** of a circle is a line segment from the center to the circumference of the circle.

In *Republic* 546a, Plato mentions the circumferences of circles.

I.Def.18. A **semicircle** is the figure contained by the diameter and the circumference cut off by it. And the center of the semicircle is the same as that of the circle.

I.Def.19. **Rectilinear figures** are those which are contained by straight lines, **trilateral** figures being those contained by three, **quadrilateral** those contained by four, and **multilateral** those contained by more than four straight lines.

I.Def.20. Of trilateral figures, an **equilateral triangle** is that which has its three sides equal, an **isosceles triangle** that which has two of its sides alone equal, and a **scalene triangle** that which has its three sides unequal.

I.Def.21. Further, of trilateral figures, a **right-angled triangle** is that which has a right angle, an **obtuse-angled triangle** that which has an obtuse angle, and an **acute-angled triangle** that which has its three angles acute.

In *Timaeus* 54a, Plato writes about the isosceles right triangle and the scalene right triangle which is half of an equilateral triangle.

I.Def.22. Of quadrilateral figures, a **square** is that which is both equilateral and right-angled; an **oblong** that which is right-angled but not equilateral; a **rhombus** that which has its opposite sides and angles equal to one another but is neither equilateral nor right-angled. And let quadrilaterals other than these be called **trapezia**.

The first geometrical passage in the *Meno* is about squares. A **rectangle** is a right-angled quadrilateral. An oblong is a rectangle that is not a square. Rectangles appear in the second geometrical passage in the *Meno*.

I.Def.23. **Parallel** straight lines are straight lines which, being in the same plane and being produced indefinitely in both directions, do not meet one another in either direction.

2.2. **Postulates.** We consider the five postulates in Euclid's *Elements* next.

Let the following be postulated:

Post.1. To draw a straight line from any point to any point.

Post.2. To produce a finite straight line continuously in a straight line.

Post.3. To describe a circle with any center and distance.

Oenopides of Chios was an older contemporary of Hippocrates, and perhaps his geometry teacher. The first three postulates of Euclid's *Elements* are attributed to Oenopides in Szabó's time-line [22], and so it is highly likely that they appeared in the *Elements* of Hippocrates.

Post.4. That all right angles are equal to one another.

Postulate 4 may not have been in the *Elements* of Hippocrates because Hippocrates may have thought that it is obviously true. We will say more about Postulate 4 in the next section.

Post.5. That, if a straight line falling on two straight lines makes the interior angles on the same side less than two right angles, the two straight lines, if produced indefinitely, meet on that side on which are the angles less than the two right angles.

The comments on Postulate 5 (the parallel postulate) in [7] are extensive. Let us just say that it is generally believed that the parallel postulate, in its present form, is due to Euclid. Heath lists nine alternative versions of the parallel postulate in [7].

Some form of the parallel postulate must have been in the *Elements* of Hippocrates because all of the Propositions I.29 – I.48, except for I.31, in Book I of Euclid's *Elements* depend on the parallel postulate. This includes all the area Propositions I.34 – I.45. Plato must have been aware of some form of the parallel postulate because the second geometrical passage in the *Meno* is about areas of triangles.

2.3. **Common Notions.** The five common notions in Euclid's *Elements* are:

- C.N.1. Things which are equal to the same thing are also equal to one another.
- C.N.2. If equals be added to equals, the wholes are equal.
- C.N.3. If equals be subtracted from equals, the remainders are equal.
- C.N.4. Things which coincide with one another are equal to one another.
- C.N.5. The whole is greater than the part.

Joyce [13] lists 11 other common notions that are used in the proofs of the propositions in Book I of Euclid’s *Elements*, which indicate that the ancient Greeks understood inequalities and how to algebraically manipulate them.

Common Notion 4 is the basis of the **principle of superposition** which says that two figures are congruent if one figure can be superimpose (i.e moved and placed) on the other so as to coincide.

Euclid used the principle of superposition sparingly. In Books I – III, it is used only in the proofs of I.4, I.8 and III.24. The principle of superposition is the genesis of the modern definition of congruence: Two plane figures are *congruent* if there is a distance-preserving transformation (i.e. isometry) of the Euclidean plane that maps one figure onto the other.

In Euclid’s *Elements*, the term for “congruent” plane figures is “similar and equal (in area)”. Euclid does not use “similar and equal” in Book I because he does not define similarity until Book VI. Euclid uses only “equal (in area)”, although he means “congruent” until the area propositions begin with I.34.

2.4. Planar Constructions. The most important word in Euclid’s *Elements* is *given* or *datum* (δεδομένον). It occurs over and over again in the proofs of the propositions in the *Elements*. In the introduction to his treatise on Euclid’s *Data* [23], Taisbak makes the point that the word “given” meant to the ancient Greek geometers not only “given” in its modern sense (i.e. referring to the initial data of a geometry problem) but also “constructed” (i.e. referring to the data constructed from the initial data).

All the constructions of points, line segments, and circles in Euclid’s *Elements*, with some insignificant modifications, follow the rules of a planar construction, which the ancient Greeks called a construction by means of straight lines and circles.

It follows from Postulate 1 that a line segment is uniquely determined by its endpoints, and from Postulate 3 that a circle is uniquely determined by its center and a point on the circumference of the circle. Therefore, the initial data for a construction by means of straight lines and circles is a finite collection of points.

The rules for a planar construction are as follows: Starting from the initial data of a finite number of given constructed points, one may construct points, line segments, and circles according to the following six rules:

- (1) One may construct the line segment joining any two constructed points.
- (2) One may construct a line segment that extends a given line segment by any length in one direction.
- (3) One may construct a circle with center any constructed point and with radius the line segment joining the center to any other constructed point.
- (4) One may construct the point of intersection of two intersecting constructed line segments.
- (5) One may construct the one or two points of intersection of a constructed line segment intersecting the circumference of a constructed circle.

- (6) One may construct the one or two points of intersection of the circumferences of two intersecting constructed circles.

By applying these rules, one at a time, one can construct finite sets of constructed points, line segments, and circles, cf. [14, 17]. The first three rules are equivalent to the first three postulates of Euclid's *Elements*. The last three rules were obvious to the ancient Greeks. All the propositions in Euclid's *Elements* are proved by applying these six rules together with Postulates 4 and 5, definitions, and common notions, and citing earlier propositions.

There are two ways to understand the rules of a planar construction, one practical and the other theoretical. The practical way is as a set of rules to draw a diagram by means of straight lines and circles to illustrate a geometrical proof. In the not too distant past, straight lines were drawn with the aid of a straightedge, and circles were drawn with the aid of a compass. For this reason, a planar construction was called a *straightedge and compass construction*. Today diagrams are drawn by computer, with code based on Rules 1 – 6.

The theoretical way to understand the rules of a planar construction is as a set of rules to define points, line segments, and circles in a geometrical proof using Postulates 1, 2, 3, and Rules 4, 5, 6.

We attribute the genesis of the rules for a planar construction to Oenopides of Chios, since they are not much more than Postulates 1, 2, 3. Oenopides is credited by Proclus, p 283 of [20], with proving Proposition I.12 with a planar construction.

I.12: To draw a straight line perpendicular to a given infinite straight line from a given point not on it.

Before Oenopides, such a straight line would have been drawn with a carpenter's square (L-shaped instrument), according to Heath, p 175 [9]. In other words, the use of a carpenter's square to draw perpendicular lines is traditional, and is not necessary for a planar construction by Propositions I.11 and I.12.

On pp 175-6 of [9], Heath writes:

“It may be that Oenopide's significance lay in improvements of method from the point of view of theory; he may, for example, have been the first to lay down the restriction of the means permissible in constructions to the ruler and compasses, which became a canon of Greek geometry for all ‘plane’ constructions.”

It is highly likely that all the constructions of points, line segments, and circles in the *Elements* of Hippocrates of Chios followed the rules of a planar construction. This would have established the rules for a planar construction as the unwritten rules for constructing points, line segments, and circles in a geometrical proof.

That Plato required a geometrical construction to follow the rules for a planar construction (i.e. by means of straight lines and circles) is clear from *Philebus* 51c. We use the translation of Dorothea Frede in [19].

Socrates: By the beauty of a shape, I do not mean what the many might presuppose, namely that of a living being or of a picture. What I mean, what the argument demands, is rather something straight or round and what is constructed out of these with a compass, rule (i.e. ruler), and square, such as plane figures and solids.




FIGURE 1. The construction of an equilateral triangle

Those things I take it are not beautiful in a relative sense, as others are, but are by their very nature forever beautiful by themselves.

This passage also reveals that adhering to the rules of a planar construction was part of Plato's aesthetic view of theoretical geometry.

The most well-known planar construction is the proof of the first proposition in Euclid's *Elements*:

I.1. On a given finite straight line to construct an equilateral triangle.

Proposition I.1 plays an important role in the solution of the second geometry problem in the *Meno*. For this reason, we go over the proof of I.1 next.

Proof. The initial data is two given constructed points, A and B . See Figure 1. The line segment AB is constructed by Rule 1. The two circles in Figure 1 are constructed by two applications of Rule 3. The point C is constructed by Rule 6. The line segments AC and BC are constructed by two applications of Rule 1. The line segments AB and AC have the same length by I.Def.15 and 16, since they are radii of the same circle. Likewise, line segments AB and BC have the same length. Hence, line segments AC and BC have the same length by C.N.1. Therefore ABC is an equilateral triangle by I.Def.20. \square

All the propositions in Book I of Euclid's *Elements* logically depend on I.1 except for I.4, which relies on the principle of superposition. Proposition I.4 states that two triangles that satisfy the side-angle-side (SAS) condition are equal (congruent). Proposition I.1 is a much more satisfying first proposition than I.4 because it is a simple construction that is easy to understand, and it proves that the most symmetric (i.e. beautiful) triangle, the equilateral triangle, exists. This means that I.1 was most likely the first proposition of the *Elements* of Hippocrates.

3. LENGTH, ANGLE MEASURE, AND AREA IN EUCLIDEAN GEOMETRY

Synthetic Euclidean geometry is the geometry expounded in Euclid's *Elements*. Both geometry problems in the *Meno* are area problems in synthetic Euclidean geometry. In this section, we discuss the concepts of length, angle measure, and area in Euclidean geometry.



FIGURE 2. Plato's divided line

Metric Euclidean geometry is synthetic Euclidean geometry together with a line segment of unit length. This line segment is a standard measuring rod which one can use to *measure* (i.e. assign a numerical value to) the length of any line segment (in principle).

Initially, the Pythagoreans thought that the length of a line segment in metric Euclidean geometry is commensurable with the unit length (i.e. a rational multiple of the unit length), however, the discovery of the incommensurability of the length of the diagonal of a square with unit side-length (i.e. the irrationality of $\sqrt{2}$) made them realize that the problem of measuring the length of an arbitrary line segment was a difficult problem. Perhaps, this is why the ancient Greeks developed synthetic Euclidean geometry, which avoids this problem.

The problem of measuring the length of an arbitrary line segment was not fully solved until the advent of the modern era of mathematics, which began when Georg Cantor rigorously defined the real numbers in 1871, and eventually led to the geometric representation of the real numbers as points on a number line, which is an infinite straight line in metric Euclidean geometry.

3.1. Length. A line segment AB is said to be *partitioned* into a finite number of line segments if these line segments are the sections of the division of AB by a finite number of points in the interior of AB .

In synthetic Euclidean geometry, the *length* of a line segment is intrinsic rather than numerical. The basic properties of length are the following three properties:

- (1) Congruence Property: Two line segments have the same length if and only if they are congruent.
- (2) Additive Property: If a line segment is partitioned into a finite number of line segments, then the length of the line segment is the sum of the lengths of the line segments of the partition.
- (3) Comparison Property: If a line segment is partitioned into two line segments, then the length of the line segment is greater than the length of a line segment of the partition.

Property 1 is Euclid's definition of congruence for line segments: Two line segments are congruent if and only if they are equal (in length).

Property 2 is based on the common notion: The whole is the sum of its parts.

Property 3 is based on C.N.5: The whole is greater than the part.

There is a well-known partition of a line segment into four line segments in Plato's *Republic*, 509d-511e, of which much has been written.

Socrates: It is like a line divided into two unequal sections. Then divide each section – namely, that of visible, and that of intelligible – in the same ratio as the line.

Let AE be a line segment. See Figure 2. Let $|AE|$ denote the length of AE . Socrates asks us to construct a point C in the interior of AE so that $|CE| > |AC|$. The lengths of sections of AE represent the relative importance of various concepts

discussed in this passage of the *Republic*. For example, the inequality $|CE| > |AC|$ signifies that what is intelligible is more important than what is visible.

By the additive property of length, we have

$$(1) \quad |AE| = |AC| + |CE|.$$

Equation 1 is a formal sum that means only that the line segment AE is partitioned into the segments AC and CE , as in Figure 2. In metric Euclidean geometry, the lengths in Equation 1 have numerical values, and Equation 1 has its usual meaning as a numerical sum. For this reason, the ancient Greeks allowed equations and inequalities involving lengths in synthetic geometry to be manipulated algebraically, as if the lengths involved had numerical values, using Common Notions 1 – 5, and the common notions listed in [13] that are used in the proofs in Book I of Euclid's *Elements*.

The simplest way to construct a point C within AE so that $|CE| > |AC|$ is as follows: A line segment can be trisected (i.e. divided into three equal sections) by a planar construction, and so we can construct points C and M in the interior of AE such that AE is partitioned into the line segments AC, CM, ME such that $|AC| = |CM| = |ME|$. This means M is the midpoint of CE , and so $|CE| > |CM|$ by Property 3 of length. Hence $|CE| > |AC|$ as required by Socrates. We have that $|CE| = |CM| + |ME|$ by Property 2 of length, and so $|CE| = 2|AC|$.

Even though the length of a line segment is not assigned a numerical value in synthetic geometry, the ancient Greeks realized that the ratio of two lengths, such as $|CE|/|AC|$, can be assigned a numerical value, at least in certain cases. For example $|CE|/|AC| = 2$, since the equation $|CE| = 2|AC|$ makes sense in synthetic Euclidean geometry by saying that the length of CE is twice the length of AC . In other words, the equation $|CE|/|AC| = 2$ is independent of the choice of unit length in metric Euclidean geometry, and so $|CE|/|AC| = 2$ is a valid equation in synthetic Euclidean geometry.

Socrates next requires that the points B and D in Figure 2 be constructed so as to satisfy the equations

$$(2) \quad |BC|/|AB| = |DE|/|CD| = |CE|/|AC|.$$

The points B and D are constructed, in the same way that C is constructed, by trisecting the line segments AC and CE . We leave it as an exercise for the reader to prove that $|BC| = |CD|$, and so BC is congruent to CD by Property 1 of length.

The lengths of two line segments AB and CD are said to be *commensurable* if they can be measured by a common length, that is, there is a third line segment EF and positive integers m and n such that AB is partitioned into m line segments congruent to EF and CD is partitioned into n line segments congruent to EF . By Properties 1 and 2 of length, $|AB| = m|EF|$ and $|CD| = n|EF|$. Multiplying the first equation by n gives the equations

$$(3) \quad n|AB| = nm|EF| = mn|EF| = m|CD|,$$

and so $|AB|/|CD| = m/n$. In fact, the converse is true, and so two line segments AB and CD have commensurable lengths precisely when their ratio $|AB|/|CD|$ is a positive rational number.

The early Greek mathematicians did not work with equation $|AB|/|CD| = m/n$ because they avoided fractions. They thought of the equation $|AB|/|CD| = m/n$ as the proportion $|AB| : |CD| = m : n$ (i.e. $|AB|$ is to $|CD|$ so as m is to n).

3.2. Angle Measure. In this subsection, all angles are rectilinear plane angles. By definitions I.Def.8 and 9, a rectilinear plane angle is the inclination to one another of two straight lines in a plane which meet one another and do not lie in a straight line. This implies that all angles in Euclid's *Elements* are less than two right angles (i.e. less than 180°).

An angle $\angle ABC$, formed by two line segments AB and BC , is said to be *partitioned* into a finite number of angles if these angles are the inclinations formed by a division of the inclination of $\angle ABC$ by a finite number of line segments, with endpoint B , lying between AB and BC . Then all the angles of the partition have the same vertex B as $\angle ABC$.

In synthetic Euclidean geometry, the *measure* of an angle is both intrinsic and numerical. The basic properties of angle measure are the following three properties:

- (1) Congruence Property: Two angles have the same measure if and only if they are congruent.
- (2) Additive Property: If an angle is partitioned into a finite number of angles, then the measure of the angle is the sum of the measures of the angles of the partition.
- (3) Comparison Property: If an angle is partitioned into two angles, then the measure of the angle is greater than the measure of an angle of the partition.

Property 1 is Euclid's definition of congruence for angles: Two angles are congruent if and only if they are equal (in measure).

Property 2 is based on the common notion: The whole is the sum of its parts.

Property 3 is based on C.N.5: The whole is greater than the part.

Postulate 4 says that all right angles are equal (in measure). Postulate 4 allowed the ancient Greeks to use the right angle (i.e. 90°) as a unit angle with which to measure all angles. Initially they thought that the measure of any angle was commensurable to the measure of a right angle, that is, the measure of any angle was a positive rational multiple of the measure of a right angle. This is how they assigned a numerical value to the measure of an angle. For example, 45° is called half a right angle in the proof of II.9, and 60° is called one-third of two right angles in the proof of IV.15.

The ancient Greeks ran into a problem with their conjecture that the measure of any angle is commensurable to the measure of a right angle, when they could not find a planar construction to trisect (i.e. divide into three equal angles) an arbitrary angle, which would be possible if their conjecture were true. Trisecting an arbitrary angle by a planar construction became one of the famous unsolved geometry problems of antiquity that was not proved impossible to solve until the 19th century. For example, it is impossible to trisect 60° by a planar construction. For a discussion of the famous unsolved geometry problems of antiquity, and how they were proved to be impossible to solve, see [11, 14, 21].

3.3. Area. In this subsection, all figures are rectilinear plane figures (i.e. polygons). A figure F is said to be *partitioned* into a finite number of figures, say F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n ,




FIGURE 3. A parallelogram partitioned into two triangles

if F is the union of F_1, \dots, F_n , and for each pair of distinct indices i and j , the intersection of F_i and F_j is either empty, a point or a line segment.

For example, the parallelogram $ABCD$ in Figure 3 is partitioned into the triangles ABC and ACD . The concept of a partition of a figure was well known to the ancient Greeks. Three different partitions of a square occur in the first geometrical passage of the *Meno*.

In synthetic Euclidean plane geometry, the area of a figure is intrinsic rather than numerical. The basic properties of area are the following three properties:

- (1) Congruence Property: Congruent figures have the same area.
- (2) Additive Property: If a figure is partitioned into a finite number of figures, then the area of the figure is the sum of the areas of the figures of the partition.
- (3) Comparison Property: If a figure is partitioned into a finite number, greater than one, of figures, then the area of the figure is greater than the area of a figure of the partition.

Property 1 follows from Euclid's definition of congruence for figures: Two figures are congruent if and only if they are similar and equal (in area).

Property 2 is based on the common notion: The whole is the sum of its parts.

Property 3 is based on C.N.5: The whole is greater than the part.

As with lengths, the ancient Greeks allowed equations and inequalities involving areas to be manipulated algebraically, as if the areas involved had numerical values, using Common Notions 1 – 5, and the common notions listed in [13] that are used in the proofs in Book I of Euclid's *Elements*.

A **parallelogram** is a quadrilateral whose opposite sides are parallel. The first proposition in Euclid's *Elements* that deals with area is I.34:

I.34. In a parallelogram, the opposite sides and angles are equal, and a diagonal bisects its area.

Consider the parallelogram $ABCD$ in Figure 3 with diagonal AC . If F is a plane figure, let $|F|$ denote its area. The proof of I.34 proceeds by showing that triangle ABC is congruent to triangle ACD , and so $|ABC| = |ACD|$ by Property 1 of area. As $|ABCD| = |ABC| + |ACD|$ by Property 2 of area, we have that $|ABCD| = 2|ABC|$, which is what Euclid means by saying that the diagonal AC bisects the area of the parallelogram $ABCD$. This is a very clever argument because it does not assume any knowledge of how to compute the area of a parallelogram or a triangle in metric Euclidean geometry.



FIGURE 4. A rectangle with base length b and height length h 

FIGURE 5. A quadrilateral partitioned into two right triangles and a trapezoid

A **rectangle** is a right-angled quadrilateral. It follows from I.34 and I.32, which says that the sum of the angles of a triangle equals two right angles, that if one angle of a parallelogram is a right angle, then the parallelogram is a rectangle.

A **base** of a figure is a particular side of the figure (usually drawn horizontally).

VI.Def.4: The **height** of any parallelogram or triangle is the perpendicular drawn from the vertex to the base.

The most basic area formula in metric Euclidean geometry is the area formula for a rectangle. If $ABCD$ is a rectangle with base length $b = |AB|$ and height length $h = |BC|$, as in Figure 4, then the area of $ABCD$ is given by the formula:

$$(4) \quad |ABCD| = bh.$$

Formula 4 generalizes to parallelograms by a simple cut and paste argument that transforms a parallelogram into a rectangle with the same area, base, and height. Given a parallelogram $ABEF$, as in Figure 5, with the same base and height as the rectangle $ABCD$ in Figure 5, we cut the right triangle BEC from $ABEF$ and paste the congruent right triangle AFD to the trapezoid $ABCF$ to form the rectangle $ABCD$. By the congruence and additive properties of area, we have

$$(5) \quad |ABEF| = |ABCF| + |BEC| = |ABCF| + |AFD| = |ABCD|.$$

This formula is a special case of I.35:

I.35. Parallelograms which are on the same base and in the same parallels (i.e. with the same height length) have the same area.

The proof of I.35 also employs a cut and paste argument. Formula 4 is not in Euclid's *Elements* because it is a formula in metric geometry and not in synthetic geometry. The closest one gets to Formula 4 in Euclid's *Elements* is I.35, which only says that the area of a parallelogram is a function of its base length and height length.

To derive Formula 4, one needs VI.23 and the definition of a unit length. Proposition VI.23, says, in modern terminology, for the case of rectangles, that the ratio of the areas of two rectangles is the product of the ratio of their base lengths times the ratio of their height lengths, that is, if R_1 and R_2 are rectangles with base lengths b_1 and b_2 and height lengths h_1 and h_2 respectively, then

$$(6) \quad |R_1|/|R_2| = (b_1/b_2)(h_1/h_2).$$

Hence, if the second rectangle R_2 is a square with unit side-length, then all the denominators in Formula 6 are 1, and so we get Formula 4 for the rectangle R_1 .

Proposition VI.23 is nontrivial because its proof depends on Eudoxus' celebrated theory of proportions in Book V of Euclid's *Elements*. Nevertheless, Formula 4 was well known to the ancient Greeks because of its usefulness for measuring areas. Formula 4 plays a role in the first geometrical passage of the *Meno*.

We next consider a proposition that is used in the solution of the second geometry problem in the *Meno*, and would have been known to Plato. It follows immediately from Propositions VI.12 and VI.16. Book VI of Euclid's *Elements* is on similar figures, and most of its content was known in principle (i.e. without Eudoxus' firm foundation) in Plato's time according to Heath, p 217 of [9]. To emphasize that Proposition 3.1 would have been known to Plato, we give a proof that depends only on Book I of Euclid's *Elements*.

Proposition 3.1. *To construct a rectangle, with base a given line segment, whose area is equal to the area of a given rectangle.*

Proof. Let $ABCD$ be the given rectangle. We need to construct a rectangle $XYZW$, on the given line segment XY , whose area is equal to $|ABCD|$. There are three cases: $|XY| = |AB|$, $|XY| < |AB|$, and $|XY| > |AB|$. The proof of the first case is similar to the proof of I.46 (To describe a square on a given straight line), and can be skipped on first reading. The proof of the second case is much more interesting.

(1) Assume that $|XY| = |AB|$. Construct a line segment YE perpendicular to the line segment XY by I.11. Extend YE to YF by Rule 2 so that $|YF| > |BC|$. Construct a point Z in YF so that $|YZ| = |BC|$ by I.3. Construct YZ by Rule 1. Likewise, construct Z and ZW perpendicular to YZ on the same side as XY so that $|ZW| = |CD|$. Then ZW is parallel to XY by I.27. We have that $|AB| = |CD|$ by I.34, and so $|XY| = |ZW|$.

Construct the line segment XW by Rule 1. Then XW is parallel to YZ by I.33. Therefore $XYZW$ is a parallelogram; moreover, $XYZW$ is a rectangle, since XY is perpendicular to YZ .

Construct the diagonals AC and XZ . Then triangles ABC and XYZ are congruent by I.4 (SAS). Hence $|ABC| = |XYZ|$ by Property 1 of area. We have that $|XYZW| = 2|XYZ| = 2|ABC| = |ABCD|$ by I.34.

(2) We consider the second case next. Assume that $|XY| < |AB|$. By the first case and I.3, we may assume that $A = X$ and Y is in the interior of AB . Construct the line segment DY by Rule 1. See Figure 6. Then DY is not parallel to either AD or AB by I.Def.23, since DY intersects AD at D and AB at Y . Hence, any straight line parallel to DY is not parallel to AD and AB by I.30: Straight lines parallel to the same straight line are also parallel to one another. Hence, any infinite straight line parallel to DY will intersect the infinite straight lines that extend AD and AB by I.Def.23.




FIGURE 6. Transformation of a rectangle into another equal area rectangle

Construct a line segment parallel to DY through the point C by I.31, and extend this line by Rule 2 to intersect the extension of AB at the point E and the extension of AD at the point F by Rule 4. Construct a line segment parallel to AD through the point Y by I.31, and extend this line to intersect EF at the point Z by Rules 2 and 4. Construct a line segment parallel to AB through the point Z by I.31, and extend this line to intersect AF at the point W by Rules 2 and 4. Then $XYZW$ is a parallelogram. Moreover $XYZW$ is a rectangle, since $\angle DXY$ is a right angle.

The rectangle $ABCD$ has the same area as parallelogram $YECD$ by I.35, since they have the same base CD and are in the same horizontal parallels. The parallelograms $YECD$ and $YZFD$ have the same area by I.35, since they have the same base DY and are in the same diagonal parallels. The parallelogram $YZFD$ and the rectangle $XYZW$ have the same area by I.35, since they have the same base YZ and are in the same vertical parallels. Therefore $|XYZW| = |ABCD|$.

(3) The proof of the third case is the same as the proof of the second case, and is left to the reader, as is the custom in Euclid's *Elements*. \square

Let ABC be a triangle with base AB . The **altitude** of ABC from the vertex C to the base AB is the height CE from C to AB constructed by I.12 with E on the infinite straight line determined by AB . The foot E of the altitude CE is in the interior of AB if and only if $\angle CAB$ and $\angle CBA$ are both acute. If $\angle CAB$ is a right angle, then $E = A$. If $\angle CAB$ is obtuse, then E is in the exterior of AB from A .

These basic facts about altitudes were known to Plato because he says in *Timaeus* 53c that every triangle can be divided into two right triangles (by an altitude).

Another area formula of metric geometry that was well known to the ancient Greeks is the basic formula for the area of a triangle. If ABC is a triangle with base length $b = |AB|$ and height length $h = |CE|$, where CE is the altitude of ABC from C , then the area of ABC is given by the formula:

$$(7) \quad |ABC| = \frac{1}{2}bh.$$

Again, Formula 7 is not in Euclid's *Elements*; however, Formula 7 follows from Formula 4, for parallelograms, by I.34. Formula 7 plays a cameo role in the first geometrical passage of the *Meno*.




FIGURE 7. An isosceles triangle partitioned into four triangles

We next consider a proposition that is used in the solution of the second geometry problem in the *Meno*, and would have been known to Plato.

Proposition 3.2. *Let ABC and ABD be triangles with the same base AB . If the height length of ABC is less than the height length of ABD , then $|ABC| < |ABD|$.*

Proof. The heights of ABC and ABD are the altitudes EC and FD from the base AB . Construct the midpoint M of AB by I.10, and the line segment MD' perpendicular to AB on the same side as D such that $|MD'| = |ED|$ by I.11, Rule 2, and I.3. Construct AD' and BD' by Rule 1. Then $|ABD| = |ABD'|$ by I.37:

I.37. Triangles which are on the same base and in the same parallels (i.e. with the same height length) have the same area.

Construct point C' in the interior of MD' such that $|MC'| = |EC|$ by I.3. Construct AC' and BC' by Rule 1. Then $|ABC| = |ABC'|$ by I.37. Hence, we may assume that $D = D'$ and $C = C'$ to begin with. Then the triangle ABD , in Figure 7, is partitioned into the triangles ABC , ACD and BDC , and so $|ABC| < |ABD|$ by the comparison property of area. \square

There are three main points to be made by this section: (1) The two basic area formulas, Formulas 4 and 7, are not formulas in synthetic Euclidean geometry. (2) Formulas 4 and 7 were known to Plato, since they are used in the first geometrical passage in the *Meno*. (3) Formulas 4 and 7 were put on a firm theoretical foundation by Eudoxus' theory of proportions, by ancient Greek mathematical standards, and by the rigorous definition of the real numbers in the 19th century, by modern mathematical standards.

4. ACT 1: THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM OF DOUBLING A SQUARE

It is time to begin the first act of our play on the geometry in Plato's *Meno*: The solution of the problem of doubling a square (82b8 – 85b6). In order to set the stage, we begin with the following preamble from the *Meno* (81c5 – 81e1). We use the translation by George Grube in [19].

Socrates: As the soul is immortal, has been born often, and has seen all things here and in the underworld, there is nothing which it has not learned; so it is




FIGURE 8. A square partitioned into four congruent squares

in no way surprising that it can recollect the things it knew before, both about virtue and other things. As the whole of nature is akin, and the soul has learned everything, nothing prevents a man, after recalling one thing only – a process men called learning – discovering everything else for himself, if he is brave and does not tire of the search, for searching and learning are, as a whole, recollection.

In order to convince Meno of his theory of recollection, Socrates offers to show how he can get Meno's servant boy to recollect (i.e. discover) the solution of the problem of doubling a square, which is a problem in synthetic Euclidean geometry. Socrates does this by asking the servant boy a series of leading questions.

Socrates: Tell me now, boy, you know that a square figure is like this? (Socrates draws a square) – I do.

Socrates: A square then is a figure in which all these four sides are equal? – Yes indeed.

Socrates: And it also has these lines through the middle equal? (Figure 8) – Yes.

Socrates: And such a figure could be larger or smaller? – Certainly.

This is pertinent because the solution of the problem involves two larger squares. By making this remark, Socrates is paving the way for the boy to recollect (i.e. discover) the solution.

Socrates: If then this side were two feet, and this other side two feet, how many feet would the whole be? Consider it this way: if it were two feet this way, and only one foot that way, the figure would be once two feet? – Yes.

Here Socrates is declaring 1 foot to be the unit length, and so he is entering into the realm of metric Euclidean geometry. This enables Socrates to familiarize the boy with Formula 4 for the case of rectangles whose side lengths are multiples of 1 foot. Figure 8 is ideal for this purpose, because the boy can just count the smaller squares which now have area of 1 square foot. In particular, the rectangle with base of length 2 feet and height length 1 feet has area $2 \cdot 1 = 2$ (square) feet.

Socrates: But if it is two feet also that way, it would surely be twice two feet? – Yes.

Here Socrates is appealing to Formula 4 to determine the area of the bounding square in Figure 8, whose side-length is 2 feet.




FIGURE 9. A square partitioned into eight $45^\circ - 45^\circ$ right triangles

Socrates: How many feet is twice two feet? Work it out and tell me. – Four,
Socrates.

Socrates: Now we can have another figure twice the size of the this one, with four
sides equal like this one. – Yes.

Socrates: How many (square) feet will that be? – Eight.

Here is where Socrates begins to introduce the problem of doubling the square.

We now jump ahead to the solution of the problem illustrated in Figure 9. The initial given square is $AFOE$ with side-length 2. The boundary square $ABCD$ in Figure 9 is partitioned into four squares of side-length 2 feet, and so the side-length of the square $ABCD$ is 4 feet. Hence, its area is $4 \cdot 4 = 16$ square feet by Formula 4. Each of the four smaller squares is bisected by a diagonal, and the four diagonals form the square $EFGH$. In Figure 9, the square $EFGH$ is partitioned into four isosceles right triangles. Each of these triangles has area of $\frac{1}{2}(2 \cdot 2) = 2$ square feet by Formula 7. By the additive property of area, the square $EFGH$ has area equal to $4 \cdot 2 = 8$ square feet. The construction of the square $EFGH$ is the solution of the problem of doubling the square $AFOE$ of area 4 square feet.

Even though the construction of Figure 9 was only sketched by Socrates, Plato knew that it could be carried out following the rules of a planar construction, and so the solution of the problem was acceptable to Plato (i.e. valid).

The initial data of the problem consists of the two given constructed points A and F in Figure 9. The line segment AF is constructed by Rule 1. The square $AFOE$, which is to be doubled, is constructed via Proposition I.46: On a given line segment (AF) to describe a square. We leave the rest of the planar construction of Figure 9 to the reader.

The solution of the problem of doubling a square is the construction of the diagram in Figure 9. This construction depends only on the intrinsic area of the initial given square $AFOE$ and not on its numerical value with respect to a unit length, and so we have a solution of the problem of doubling an arbitrary square in the realm of synthetic Euclidean geometry.

5. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FIRST GEOMETRICAL PASSAGE

In this section, we discuss the mathematical and philosophical significance of the first geometrical passage in the *Meno*. We begin with the mathematical significance.

5.1. Primer on Area. Both geometry problems in the *Meno* are concerned with the area of a polygon. First of all, the first passage is a primer on the concept of area. The two basic properties of area, the congruence property and the additive property, are used. The congruence property of area is used to conclude that the four small squares in Figure 9 all have the same area. The additive property of area is used to conclude that the area of the square $EFGH$ in Figure 9 is equal to the sum of areas of the four isosceles right triangles that partition $EFGH$. The basic area formulas in metric Euclidean geometry, Formulas 4 and 7, are used. Formula 4 is used to compute the areas of the four small squares in Figure 9. Formula 7 is used to compute the areas of the isosceles right triangles in Figure 9. This primer helps the reader to more fully understand the concept of area in preparation for the more difficult second geometrical passage.

5.2. Significance of the Geometry Problem. The second mathematical purpose for the first geometrical passage is to present a simple but beautiful and profound geometry problem. The problem of doubling a square is simple because it is easy to understand. The problem is beautiful because of the symmetry in the problem determined by the symmetry of the (ideal) square, which is the regular polygon that is the most easy to comprehend.

The area of a square is the most basic concept in the theory of area. The initial goal of the theory of area in Euclid's *Elements* is to prove the final proposition in Book II, II.14: To construct a square of area equal to that of a given rectilinear figure (i.e. to transform an area to its most basic form).

The solution of the problem of doubling a square is easy to understand, since the solution is the construction of Figure 9; however, the solution does have a twist (literally and geometrically), the doubled square $EFGH$ is rotated by 45 degrees with respect to the initial given square $AFOE$. This geometric twist is what is responsible for the profound aspect of this problem. The side-length of the rotated square $EFGH$ is $\sqrt{8}$ feet, and $\sqrt{8}$ feet is incommensurable with 1 foot (i.e. $\sqrt{8}$ is an irrational number).

The discovery of irrational numbers by the Pythagoreans is one of the most profound mathematical discoveries of the ancient Greeks. Árpád Szabó believes, cf. p 93 of [22], that the problem of doubling the square may have led to the discovery of the irrationality of $\sqrt{2}$.

There is no doubt that Plato knew that $\sqrt{8}$ is irrational when he wrote the *Meno*. We know that Plato credits Theodorus of Cyrene with proving that $\sqrt{8}$ is irrational in *Theaetetus* 147d. The proof is very easy, since $\sqrt{8} = 2\sqrt{2}$, and Theodorus would have pointed out that a diagonal of the bounding square in Figure 8, which has length $\sqrt{8}$ feet, is partitioned in half by diagonals of two of the smaller squares, which have length $\sqrt{2}$ feet. Theodorus already knew that $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational, and so $2\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.

The irrationality of $\sqrt{8}$ is lurking in the background of the dialogue of the *Meno*. Socrates first asks the servant boy what the side-length of the double square should be. The boy makes the standard mistake by saying 4 feet, which is double the side-length of the initial square. Socrates points out that (by Formula 4) the area of such a square would be 16 square feet which is greater than 8 feet. What Plato has established is that $4 < 8 < 16$, and so $2 < \sqrt{8} < 4$. Socrates then asks the boy to make another guess, and of course, he makes the next obvious guess, 3 feet.

However, Socrates points out that $8 < 9$, and so $\sqrt{8} < 3$. It is worth noting that 3 is a fair approximation to $\sqrt{8}$, since $\sqrt{8}$ is approximately 2.82843.

What Socrates says next in 84a is quite revealing.

Socrates: But on how long a line? Try to tell us exactly, and if you do not want to work it out, show me from what line. – By Zeus, Socrates, I do not know.

The line that Socrates wants the boy to point out is one of the sides of the square $EFGH$ in Figure 9 such as EF . Here Plato reveals that he knows that the numerical value of $\sqrt{8}$ can only be approximated by rational numbers, and so the length of the desired line cannot be worked out exactly by the boy. Hence, the only way for the boy to specify the side-length of $EFGH$ exactly is by giving its intrinsic value as the length of a constructed line segment in Figure 9 such as EF .

5.3. The Problem of Incommensurability. There is a third mathematical purpose for the first geometrical passage in the *Meno*, which is less obvious, but is perhaps more significant. Plato builds a narrative around the problem of doubling a square in the *Meno* because he wants to highlight the problem of assigning a numerical value to the ratio of diagonal-length to side-length of a square (i.e. $\sqrt{2}$). Plato encountered this problem when he realized that he cannot use Formula 4 to compute the area of the square $EFGH$ in Figure 9 because its side-length, $2\sqrt{2}$ feet, did not have a well-defined numerical value. Instead, Plato uses the additive property of area to compute the area of the square $EFGH$.

The geometrical passages in the *Meno* were probably written with the members of the Academy in mind. One of the most brilliant members of Plato’s Academy was Eudoxus of Cnidas. Bluck [2] estimates the date of the *Meno* to be c. –385, which is before the date of Eudoxus’ theory of proportions, which is c. –360 in Boyer’s time-line [4].

Eudoxus put the theory of proportions (i.e. ratios) on a firm theoretical foundation. Eudoxus’ theory of proportions is brilliantly expounded in Book V of Euclid’s *Elements*, and applied in Book VI to prove Proposition VI.23, which puts the most basic area formula in metric Euclidean geometry, Formula 4, on a firm theoretical foundation by the mathematical standards of the ancient Greeks.

Plato’s first geometrical passage in the *Meno*, and the problem of incommensurability which it highlights, may have spurred Eudoxus to develop his theory of proportions. In support of this idea, we have the following quote from Philodemus’ *History of the Academy* (1st cent. BC) that appears on p 219 of [25]:

“At this time the mathematical sciences were also greatly advanced, with Plato being the architect of this development; he set problems for the mathematicians, who in turn eagerly studied them. In this way, $\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\alpha$ (the theory of proportions?) and research on definitions reached their peak, as Eudoxus of Cnidus and his students completely revised the old theory of Hippocrates of Chios.”

The Greek word $\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\alpha$ occurs only once in the entire corpus of Greek writing that we have available in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae - the digital library of Greek literature, which is why a question mark is placed after its translation. It is not hard to translate $\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\alpha$. In ancient Greek $\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\nu$ means “measure”

and λόγος means “ratio”, and so μετρολογία literally means “the measurement of ratios”.

The theory of proportions predates Eudoxus. Proclus, p 66 of [20], attributes its discovery to Pythagorus. Philodemus is referring to a more specific and difficult part of the theory of proportions, the theory of the measurement of ratios.

Heath, pp 153-4 [9], writes:

“The method of proportions, was not in its full extent available to the Pythagoreans because their theory of proportion was only applicable to commensurable magnitudes (Eudoxus was the first to establish the general theory, applicable to commensurables and incommensurables alike, which we find in Eucl. V, VI). Yet it cannot be doubted that they used the method quite freely before the discovery of the irrational showed them that they were building on an insecure and inadequate foundation.”

Eudoxus’ definitions of proportionality, V.Def.3 – 7, are the corner stone for his foundation of the theory of the measurement of ratios in synthetic Euclidean geometry, and the measurement of magnitudes, such as length and area, in metric Euclidean geometry. Eudoxus’ foundation held firm until it was rebuilt in the modern era using more sophisticated, set-theoretical based, mathematical theories.

5.4. The Problem of Doubling the Cube. Another problem that Plato may have set to his students at the Academy is the solid version of the problem of doubling the square – the problem of doubling the cube. That Plato would have been interested in this problem is clear from *Republic* 528b. We use the translation by G.M.A. Grube and C.D.C. Reeve in [19].

Socrates: But the right thing to do is to take up the third dimension right after the second. And this, I suppose, consists of cubes and whatever shares in depth.

In this subsection, we will discuss how work on the problem of doubling the cube led to an important development in mathematics and physics. This problem will play an important role in our explanation of the second geometrical passage.

The problem of doubling the cube is the problem of constructing a cube of twice the volume of a given cube by a planar construction. If a cube has side-length s , then the doubled cube has side-length $\sqrt[3]{2}s$. Therefore, the problem of doubling a cube is equivalent to the problem of constructing line segments of length x and y such that $y/x = \sqrt[3]{2}$ (i.e. $y^3/x^3 = 2$), by VI.12.

Hippocrates of Chios became famous for reducing the problem of doubling the cube to the problem: For a given line segment of length a , construct line segments of lengths x and y by a planar construction such that

$$a : x = x : y = y : 2a.$$

Proclus on p 167 of [20] says:

“Reduction” is a transition from a problem or a theorem to another which, if known or constructed, will make the original proposition evident. For example, to solve the problem of doubling the cube geometers shifted their inquiry to another on which this depends, namely, the finding of two mean proportionals; and thenceforth they devoted their efforts to discovering how to find two means in continuous proportion

between two given straight lines. They say that the first to effect reduction of difficult constructions was Hippocrates of Chios who also squared the lune and made many other discoveries in geometry, being a man of genius when it came to constructions, if there ever was one.

The proportions $a : x = x : y = y : 2a$ are equivalent to the equations

$$a/x = x/y = y/(2a),$$

which are equivalent to the equations $ay = x^2$ and $2ax = y^2$. This means that x is the geometric mean of a and y , and y is the geometric mean of x and $2a$. Multiplying the equations $ay = x^2$ and $y^2 = 2ax$ gives the equation $ay^3 = 2ax^3$, which is equivalent to the equation $y/x = \sqrt[3]{2}$, from which you can double the cube.

Conversely, suppose that you can double the cube. Then you can construct line segments of lengths x and y such that $y/x = \sqrt[3]{2}$, and a line segment of length c such that $x : y = y : c$ (i.e. $xc = y^2$) by VI.11. Next, construct $a = c/2$ by I.10. Then

$$ay = (c/2)y = (y^2/(2x))y = y^3/(2x) = (2x^3)/(2x) = x^2.$$

Therefore $a : x = x : y = y : 2a$. We leave it as an exercise for the reader to prove that $a : x = x : y = y : 2a$ implies that for a given line segment of length b , one can construct line segments of lengths u and v such that $b : u = u : v = v : 2b$, which completes the reduction.

Hippocrates was not able to construct line segments of lengths x and y such that $a : x = x : y = y : 2a$ for any line segment of length a by a planar construction. That Plato considered the problem of doubling the cube by a planar construction to be unsolved is clear from *Republic* 528d-e. We use the translation by G.M.A. Grube and C.D.C. Reeve in [19].

Socrates: The subject dealing with depth was next. But because it is in a ridiculous state, I passed it by and spoke of astronomy (which deals with the motion of things having depth) after geometry.

The problem of doubling the cube eventually came to the attention of Plato's friend Archytas of Tarentum who produced an amazing 3-dimensional solution, which is described on pp 246-249 of [9]. Plato rejected the solution of Archytas because it was not a planar construction.

Eudoxus may have given the problem of doubling the cube to his student Menaechmus, who found two solutions, which are described on pp 251-255 of [9]. The first constructs a point as the intersection of a parabola and a hyperbola. The second constructs a point as the intersection of two parabolas.

A geometric construction by means of straight lines, circles, and in addition, ellipses, parabolas, or hyperbolas is called a *solid construction*.

Menaechmus (fl. c. -350) is credited with the discovery of the noncircular conic sections, that is, ellipses, parabola, and hyperbolas.

Conic sections are important not only in mathematics, but also in physics. The orbits of the planets were eventually shown to be ellipses. Conic sections of all types occur as the orbit of a mass moving under the action of a central force inversely proportional to the square of the distance from the center, such as the gravitational force or the electrostatic force.

The first geometrical passage in the *Meno* may have played a role in promoting the problem of doubling the cube. The problem of doubling the cube by a planar construction was proved to be impossible in the 19th century; nevertheless, Menaechmus' solution of the problem by a solid construction led to an important discovery in mathematics and physics – the discovery of ellipses, parabolas, and hyperbolas.

5.5. Philosophical Significance. The initial question put to Socrates by Meno is whether or not virtue can be taught. We pick up the dialogue in 81d before the preamble to the first geometrical passage.

Socrates: So now I do not know what virtue is; perhaps you knew before you contacted me, but now you are certainly like one who does not know. Nevertheless, I want to examine and seek with you what it may be.

Meno then confronts Socrates with the learner's paradox or according to some, the paradox of inquiry:

Meno: How will you look for it (virtue), Socrates, when you do not know at all what it is? How will you aim to search for something you do not know at all? If you should meet with it, how will you know that this is the thing that you did not know?

To counter Meno's paradox, Socrates employs his theory of recollection to get around Meno's paradox by recasting learning as recollection. To a modern reader, Socrates' theory of recollection at first seems farfetched; however, a careful reading of the preamble proves otherwise. The most important part of the preamble is the second sentence:

Socrates: As the whole of nature is akin, and the soul has learned everything, nothing prevents a man, after recalling one thing only – a process men called learning – discovering everything else for himself, if he is brave and does not tire of the search, for searching and learning are, as a whole, recollection.

What Socrates is saying is that the ability to learn is present in all human beings from birth. We need only to recollect (i.e. realize) that we have the ability to learn. After this one and only one recollection, we can begin the process of discovering truth. For Plato, truth resides in the world of Forms (i.e. abstract ideas), which can be discovered only by reason. Plato uses the solution of a geometrical problem to illustrate the process of learning (i.e. discovering truth). In *Republic* 527b, Plato writes: “for geometry is knowledge of what always is.”

Most research mathematicians believe that they discover mathematics, which resides in the ideal world of abstract ideas. Plato's theory of the Forms resonates with such beliefs. Mathematicians say that the Pythagoreans discovered the irrationality of $\sqrt{2}$. They do not say that the Pythagoreans created the irrationality of $\sqrt{2}$, because they believe that the irrationality of $\sqrt{2}$ is a mathematical fact that is independent of time and space.

6. ACT 2: THE SECOND GEOMETRICAL PASSAGE

We are now ready for the second act of our play: The Second Geometrical Passage. The second act consists of the following short dialogue of Socrates (86e4 – 87b2), which is read first from the stage, followed by a discussion by the narrator. We use the translation of George Grube in [19].

Socrates: For example, if they (geometers) are asked whether a specific area can be inscribed in the form of a triangle within a given circle, one of them might say: “I do not yet know whether this area has that property, but I think, I have, as it were, a hypothesis that is of use for the problem, namely this: If that area is such that when one has applied it as a rectangle to the given straight line in the circle it is deficient by a figure similar to the very figure which is applied, then I think one alternative results, whereas another results if it is impossible for this to happen. So, by using this hypothesis, I am willing to tell you what results with regard to inscribing it in the circle – that is, whether it is impossible or not.”

6.1. Definitions. In order to understand this passage, we need some basic definitions and propositions from Book IV (on inscribed figures), Book V (on proportions), and Book VI (on similar figures) of Euclid’s *Elements*. It is clear from this passage that Plato was familiar with this material. Most of it was probably in the *Elements* of Hippocrates. Heath summarizes what parts of Euclid’s *Elements* would have been known to Plato on pp 216-217 of [9], which ends as follows:

“There is probably little in the whole compass of the *Elements* of Euclid, except the new theory of proportions due to Eudoxus and its consequences, which was not in substance included in the recognized content of geometry and arithmetic by Plato’s time, although the form and arrangement of the subject matter, and the methods employed in particular cases were different from what we find in Euclid.”

IV.Def.3: A rectilinear figure is said to be **inscribed** in a circle when each angle (i.e. vertex) of the inscribed figure lies on the circumference of the circle.

IV.Def.4: A rectilinear figure is said to be **circumscribed** about a circle when each side of the circumscribed figure touches (i.e. is tangent to) the circumference of the circle

IV.Def.6: A circle is said to be **circumscribed** about a figure when the circumference of the circle passes through each angle (i.e. vertex) of the figure about which it is circumscribed.

V.Def.6: Let magnitudes which have the same ratio be called **proportional**.

VI.Def.1: **Similar** rectilinear figures are such as have their angles severally (i.e. consecutively) equal and the sides about the equal angles proportional.

6.2. The Second Geometry Problem. The second geometrical passage begins with the geometry problem: To determine whether a given area can be inscribed in the form of a triangle within a given circle. The problem is to find necessary and sufficient conditions so that a given area can be inscribed in the form of a triangle within a given circle. The given area would have been represented by the area of a given polygon P . The initial data for this problem consists of a finite set of given constructed points, from which the polygon P can be constructed by applications of Rule 1, and two given constructed points from which the given circle is constructed

by Rule 3. This initial part of the passage is clear. What is unclear is the meaning of what follows after “namely this:”

The reason that this passage has been so hard to interpret correctly is because there is missing information: (1) There is no diagram. (2) The given straight line is not specified. (3) The phrase “similar to” is vague, since, as Farquharson, p 24 [8], points out, Plato uses the word $\text{o}\acute{\iota}\omega\text{n}$ (like) instead of $\text{\textcircled{d}}\mu\text{o}\text{i}\text{o}\text{n}$ (similar, as in Euclid’s *Elements*). However, Plato is a careful writer. We believe that Plato intentionally left out this information, because he meant the second geometrical passage to be a puzzle, with missing pieces, that are left out to lead the reader into a trap.

6.3. The Standard Mistake. There is an expression among mathematics teachers called “the standard mistake.” This is the mistake that students most often make in an attempt to solve a problem. Let us return to the first geometrical passage at 82d where we left off in §4.

Socrates: Come now, try to tell me how long each side of this (square) will be. The side of this (square) is two feet. What about each side of the one which is its double? – Obviously, Socrates, it will be twice the length.

The boy makes the standard mistake by guessing that the side-length of the doubled square should be double the side-length of the given square. What Plato wants readers of the second geometrical passage to do first is make the standard mistake. Plato does this by not specifying the given straight line and being vague by using the word $\text{o}\acute{\iota}\omega\text{n}$ (like) instead of the more precise word $\text{\textcircled{d}}\mu\text{o}\text{i}\text{o}\text{n}$ (similar).

The standard mistake is to assume that the given straight line is the most obvious given line, the diameter of the given circle that is determined by the two points that determine the circle. This is a trap that has caught almost everyone who has attempted to give an explanation of the second geometrical passage. The standard mistake leads to the commonly accepted explanation of the second geometrical passage in terms of isosceles triangles, which we describe next.

6.4. The Commonly Accepted Explanation. In this explanation, the given straight line is the diameter AD of the given circle, where the initial data for the problem is the point A and the center of the circle. See Figure 10. The point D and the line segment AD are easily constructed by Rules 2, 5, and 1. We can represent the given area by the area of a square S by II.14. We want to construct an isosceles or equilateral triangle ABC inscribed in the given circle such that $|ABC| = |S|$.

If the area of S is too large, then this will not be possible. One obvious necessary condition for the triangle ABC to exist is that the side-length s of S be less than the diameter d of the given circle, since the circle is within a square of side-length d circumscribing the circle by IV.7. Hence, we may assume $s < d$.

We construct a point E in the interior of AD so that $|AE| = s$ by I.3. Construct a square $AEFG$ by I.46. Then $AEFG$ is congruent to S by the principle of superposition, and so $|AEFG| = |S|$ by the congruence property of area.

The commonly accepted explanation of the passage now says that the necessary and sufficient condition to inscribe $|S|$ in the form of an isosceles triangle ABC in the given circle is to construct a point H in the interior of AD and a rectangle $AHCK$ on the same side of AD as $AEFG$ such that $|AHCK| = |S|$ and $AHCK$ is similar to the rectangle $CHDJ$.




FIGURE 10. The commonly accepted solution of the second problem

Suppose, for the sake of argument, that such a point H and rectangle $AHCK$ can be constructed (this is where the trap springs, since this is not possible, in general, by a planar construction). Then right triangle AHC is equiangular to the right triangle CHD by VI.6. Therefore $\angle ACD$ is a right angle by I.32. Hence AD is a diameter of the circumscribed circle of the triangle ACD by the addendum to IV.5. The circumscribed circle of the triangle ACD is unique by the proof of III.1. Therefore, the given circle is the circumscribed circle of the triangle ACD , and so C is on the circumference of the given circle. We construct the point B by extending CH until it intersects the given circle at the point B . Then the triangle ABC is inscribed in the given circle. The point H bisects BC by III.3, and so the right triangle AHC is congruent to right triangle AHB by I.4 (SAS). Therefore, triangle ABC is isosceles or equilateral. Moreover $|ABC| = |AHCK| = |S|$ by I.34.

Conversely, suppose that $|S|$ can be inscribed in the form of an isosceles or equilateral triangle ABC in the given circle so that the diameter AD bisects side BC at the point H by a planar construction. Then $\angle AHB = \angle AHC$ by I.8. Therefore AH is perpendicular to BC by I.Def.10. Hence $\angle ACD$ is a right angle by the corollary of IV.5. Therefore, the right triangle AHC is similar to the right triangle CHD by VI.8. Hence, the rectangles $AHCK$ and $CHDJ$ are similar. Finally $|AHCK| = |ABC| = |S|$ by I.34. There are no problems with this (converse) part of the argument.

The points F and C in Figure 10 are on a hyperbola with asymptotes the perpendicular infinite straight lines determined by AD and AG , since by Formula 4,

$$|AE||EF| = |S| = |AH||HC|.$$

The way that Heath proposes, on p 300 of [9], to construct the point H is to construct C as a point of intersection of the hyperbola with the given circle, and H as the foot of the perpendicular from C to AD by I.12. Heath goes on to say that the intersection of the hyperbola with the given circle will be either two points when ABC is isosceles, one point when ABC is equilateral, or empty when ABC does not exist.

There are several problems with this solid construction of the triangle ABC .

- (1) Hyperbolas had not yet been discovered when the *Meno* was written.
- (2) Plato demands a planar construction in *Philebus* 51c.
- (3) Plato had a good reason to believe that the construction of the isosceles triangle ABC cannot be accomplished in general with a planar construction.
- (4) The construction of the isosceles triangle ABC cannot be accomplished in general with a planar construction.

Only Problem 2 and 3 are relevant to our argument that Plato set a trap in the second geometrical passage. We discuss Problem 3 next.

6.5. Why Plato knew he set a Trap. We need to construct the points H and C in Figure 10 by a planar construction so that $AHCK$ is a rectangle similar to the rectangle $CHDJ$, and $|AHCK| = |AEFG|$. Let $s = |AE|$, $x = |AH|$, $d = |AD|$, and $y = |HC|$. Then we need that $x/y = y/(d-x)$ and $xy = s^2$. This is equivalent to solving the system of proportions

$$x : y = y : d - x \quad \text{and} \quad x : s = s : y$$

for the unknown variable lengths x and y by a planar construction.

Both of these proportions are geometric mean proportions of the form $a : b = b : c$. If two, out of the three lengths a, b, c , are constructible by a planar construction, then the third length is constructible by a planar construction by either VI.12 or VI.13. However, both proportions $x : y = y : d - x$ and $x : s = s : y$ involve both unknowns x and y , and so neither of the unknowns x or y can be constructed by an obvious planar construction.

This impasse is similar to the impasse in Hippocrates' reduction of the problem of doubling the cube to solving the system of proportions

$$a : x = x : y \quad \text{and} \quad x : y = y : 2a$$

for the unknown variables x and y by a planar construction. For this reason, Plato would have felt confident that there was no easy escape from the trap that he had set in the second geometrical passage.

That Plato understood geometric mean proportions can be seen in his divided line described in *Republic* 509d and illustrated in Figure 2. We show next that the lengths of the two middle sections of Plato's divided line are the same, and are equal to the geometric mean of the lengths of the two outside sections of the line.

The given data for Plato's divided line are the endpoints A and E of the line and a point C within the line AE that is not the midpoint. The point B within AC and the point D within CE are specified by the proportions

$$|BC| : |AB| = |DE| : |CD| = |CE| : |AC|.$$

The points B and D can be constructed by VI.10. Let $a = |AB|$, $b = |BC|$, $c = |CD|$, and $d = |DE|$. Then we have the system of proportions

$$b : a = d : c = (c + d) : (a + b).$$

By V.12, we have that

$$b : a = d : c = (b + d) : (a + c).$$

Therefore, we have that

$$(c + d) : (a + b) = (b + d) : (a + c).$$

On the contrary, suppose that $b \neq c$. Then either $b < c$ or $c < b$.

First assume that $b < c$, then by V.8, we have the contradiction

$$(b + d) : (a + c) < (c + d) : (a + c) < (c + d) : (a + b).$$

Now assume that $c < b$, then by V.8, we have the contradiction

$$(c + d) : (a + b) < (b + d) : (a + b) < (b + d) : (a + c).$$

Therefore, we must have $b = c$.

This argument is so easy and natural using the well-known theory of proportions that there is little doubt that Plato knew that $b = c$. In particular, Plato would have known that the given proportion $d : c = b : a$ is the geometric mean proportion $d : b = b : a$, and that $b = c$ is the geometric mean of a and d .

That Plato understood proportions is also clear from *Parmenides* 154d. We use the translation of Mary Louise Gill and Paul Ryan in [19].

Parmenides: Go back and consider: if we add equal time to more and less time, will the more differ from the less by an equal or a smaller fraction? – “A smaller.”

In the context of proportions, a difference is interpreted as a ratio, as attested by Heath’s interpretation on p 294 of [9]: If $a > b$, then $(a + c) : (b + c) < a : b$.

6.6. Why Plato set a Trap. To understand why Plato set his trap, we pick up the dialogue in the first geometrical passage at 84a right after we left off in §5.2.

Socrates: You realize, Meno, what point he has reached in his recollection. At first he did not know what the basic line of the eight-foot square was; even now he does not yet know, but then he thought he knew, and answered confidently as if he did know, and he did not think himself at a loss, but now he does think himself at a loss, and as he does not know, neither does he think he knows.

Here Plato is referring to the standard mistake that the servant boy made, and the standard mistake that readers of the second geometrical passage will make.

Meno: That is true.

Socrates: So he is now in a better position with regard to the matter he does not know?

Meno: I agree with that too.

Socrates: Have we done him any harm by making him perplexed and numb as the torpedo fish does?

Meno: I do not think so.

Socrates: Indeed, we have probably achieved something relevant to finding out how matters stand, for now, as he does not know, he would be glad to find out, whereas before he thought he could easily make many fine speeches to large audiences about the square of double size and said that it must have a base twice as long.

How well Plato knew human nature. The standard mistake for the second geometrical passage was published in [1, 5, 6, 9, 15].

Meno: So it seems.




FIGURE 11. The inscription of a $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangle in a circle

Socrates: Do you think that before he would have tried to find out that which he thought he knew though he did not, before he fell into perplexity and realized he did not know and longed to know?

Meno: I do not think so, Socrates.

Socrates: Has he then benefitted from being numbed?

Meno: I think so.

The reason Plato set his trap in the second geometrical passage is that he wanted you to fall into perplexity and realize that you did not know and that you longed to know. In other words, Plato wanted the torpedo fish to sting you, so that you would become numb and open to further discovery.

The second geometrical passage is a teaching tool. Plato wanted to first break down a student by leading the student into making a mistake, before he built the student up by leading the student to the correct non-obvious solution, as Socrates does in the first geometrical passage.

7. ON THE $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ RIGHT TRIANGLE

In this section, we prove by modern methods that the standard mistake, in interpreting the second geometrical passage, leads to an inscription that can not be achieved by a planar construction. This has not been proved before to the best of our knowledge. More specifically, we prove that the area of a $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangle inscribed in a given circle can not be inscribed in the form of an isosceles or equilateral triangle in the given circle by a planar construction. The first step is to prove the next proposition by classical methods.

Proposition 7.1. *A $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangle can be inscribed in a given circle, by a planar construction, starting from the initial data used to construct the given circle, namely a point A on the circumference of the given circle and the center O of the given circle.*

Proof. Construct the line segment AO by Rule 1. Construct point B by extending AO to intersect the circumference of the circle in the point B by Rules 2 and 5.

Construct line segment AB by Rule 1. Construct the equilateral triangle ABC by I.1. The point C is in the exterior of the circle, since the height OC of the $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangle AOC is greater than the radius AO of the given circle by I.19. The line segment AC intersects the circumference of the circle in a point in the interior of AC by III.16, since $\angle CAB$ is acute. Construct the point D by Rule 5 as the intersection of AC and the circumference of the circle. Then $\angle ADB$ is right by III.31. As $\angle DAB$ is 60° , we have that $\angle ABD$ is 30° by I.32. Therefore ABD is a $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangle inscribed in the given circle. \square

In the 19th century, the algebraic theory of fields was used to prove that the following construction problems from antiquity are impossible to solve by a planar construction:

- (1) To trisect a 60° angle (Theorem 5.L of [11]).
- (2) To double a given cube (Theorem 5.M of [11]).
- (3) To inscribe a regular septagon in a given circle (Theorem 5.N of [11]).

We will use the algebraic theory of fields to prove the next proposition.

Proposition 7.2. *The area of a $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangle inscribed in a given circle by a planar construction starting from the initial data used to construct the circle, namely a point A on the circumference of the given circle and the center O of the given circle, can not be inscribed in the form of an isosceles or equilateral triangle in the given circle by a planar construction.*

Proof. The initial data consists of the two points A and O . This situation is analyzed in §5.4 of [11]. We set up a coordinate system by letting $A = (0, 0)$ and $O = (1, 0)$. Then the area of the $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangle inscribed in a given circle, as in Figure 11, is $\sqrt{3}/2$. On the contrary, assume that the area $\sqrt{3}/2$ can be inscribed in the form of an isosceles or equilateral triangle ABC in the given unit circle by a planar construction. See Figure 10. We will derive a contradiction.

Let $H = (x, 0)$ be the midpoint of side BC . Then x is the height length of the triangle ABC from the base BC . The height length x satisfies the equation $x^2(2x - x^2) = 3/4$ according to Heath, p 301 [9]. The polynomial $p(x) = x^4 - 2x^3 + 3/4$ has four roots r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4 , with r_1 and r_2 real, corresponding to the two possible x -coordinates of H , and r_3 and r_4 complex. The polynomial $p(x)$ is irreducible over the field \mathbb{Q} of rational numbers, and so $p(x)$ is the minimal polynomial over \mathbb{Q} for each of its roots.

Let $K = \mathbb{Q}(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4)$ be the splitting field of the polynomial $p(x)$. By a standard algorithm, we computed the degree of K over \mathbb{Q} , that is $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$, to be 24. The field extension K/\mathbb{Q} is normal by Theorem 5.U of [11]. The Galois group $G = G(K, \mathbb{Q})$ has order $[K : \mathbb{Q}] = 24$ by Theorem 5.T of [11]. The group G acts on the four roots of $p(x)$, as a permutation group, and so G is a subgroup of the symmetric group S_4 , but S_4 has order 24, and so $G = S_4$.

Let r be one of the real roots of $p(x)$. Then $[\mathbb{Q}(r) : \mathbb{Q}] = 4$, since the degree of the minimal polynomial $p(x)$ of r is 4, by Theorem 5.C of [11]. The real number r is constructible in the sense of §5.4 of [11]. Hence $\mathbb{Q}(r)$ has a subfield E of index 2 by Theorem 5.K of [11].

By the fundamental theorem of Galois theory, there is a subgroup H of G such that E is the subfield of K that is stabilized by H and $[G : H] = [E : \mathbb{Q}] = 2$ by Theorems 5.T and 5.V of [11]. The only subgroup of S_4 of index 2 is the alternating group A_4 , and so $H = A_4$.

By the fundamental theorem of Galois theory, there is a subgroup I of G such that $\mathbb{Q}(r)$ is the subfield of K that is stabilized by I and $[G : I] = [\mathbb{Q}(r) : \mathbb{Q}] = 4$. As $\mathbb{Q}(r) \supset E$, we have that $I \subset H = A_4$, and by Theorem 5.A of [11], we have

$$[H : I] = [G : I]/[G : H] = [\mathbb{Q}(r) : \mathbb{Q}]/[E : \mathbb{Q}] = [\mathbb{Q}(r) : E] = 2.$$

However, the alternating group A_4 does not have a subgroup of index 2, which is a contradiction. Therefore, the area $\sqrt{3}/2$ can not be inscribed in the form of an isosceles or equilateral triangle in the given unit circle by a planar construction. \square

Proposition 7.2 means that the standard mistake is really a mistake. In other words, there is no escape from Plato's trap, except to admit defeat.

Plato would have liked the proof of Proposition 7.2 because the symmetric group S_4 is the group of symmetries of the regular tetrahedron. In *Timeaus* 54d-e, Plato describes how the surface of a regular tetrahedron is partitioned into twenty-four $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangles each of which is an elementary triangle of the tetrahedron. The group of symmetries of the regular tetrahedron acts simply transitively on these 24 triangles. Therefore, these 24 triangles correspond to the 24 elements of S_4 .

8. WHAT PLATO WOULD HAVE KNOWN ABOUT THE SECOND PROBLEM

Our main thesis is that Plato sketches a simple beautiful solution of the geometry problem in the second geometrical passage of the *Meno*, which he conceals by leaving out important information, in order to mislead the reader into making the standard mistake, which does not lead to a solution. Plato's solution is not obvious in direct analogy to what happens in the first geometrical passage. In this section, we discuss the preliminary propositions that are necessary for Plato's simple beautiful solution.

The second geometry problem in the *Meno* is to determine whether a given area can be inscribed in the form of a triangle within a given circle. What Plato is asking for are necessary and sufficient conditions on a given area for it to be inscribed in the form of a triangle within a given circle by a planar construction.

The necessary and sufficient conditions are easily found using the methods of calculus. A given area can be inscribed in the form of a triangle in a given circle if and only if the area is less than or equal to the area of an equilateral triangle inscribed in the given circle.

Plato would have known the following four propositions, because they are necessary for the solution of the second geometry problem, and their proofs require only a working knowledge of the contents of Books I and III of Euclid's *Elements*, which Plato would have possessed, since he had a keen interest in geometry.

Proposition 8.1. *To inscribe an equilateral triangle in a given circle.*

Proposition 8.2. *If two equilateral triangles are inscribed in a given circle, then they have the same area.*

Proposition 8.3. *If a non-equilateral triangle is inscribed in a given circle, then its area is less than the area of an equilateral triangle inscribed in the given circle.*

Proposition 8.4. *The greatest area of an inscribed triangle in a given circle is that of an inscribed equilateral triangle in the given circle.*




FIGURE 12. The inscription of an equilateral triangle in a circle

We will analyze each of these propositions below. Our main conclusions are:

- (1) Proposition 8.1 was well known to the ancient Greeks.
- (2) Proposition 8.2 is an easy exercise.
- (3) Proposition 8.3 is nontrivial, but elementary.
- (4) Proposition 8.4 follows immediately from Propositions 8.1, 8.2, and 8.3.

8.1. Proposition 8.1. In Book IV of Euclid's *Elements*, the construction of a regular n -gon, inscribed in a given circle, is given for $n = 4, 5, 6$. Proposition 8.1, which is the missing case, $n = 3$, was probably in an earlier version of the *Elements*, but was replaced by Euclid with the more general Proposition IV.2 for inscribing triangles.

Proposition IV.2 is nontrivial, and may not have been available to Plato, and so we give next a more elementary proof of Proposition 8.1, which uses only propositions in Book I of Euclid's *Elements*, in order to support our claim that Proposition 8.1 was well known to the ancient Greeks.

Proof. The initial data consists of the two given constructed points O and A in Figure 12 from which the given circle is constructed by Rule 3. The line segment OA is constructed by Rule 1. The equilateral triangles OAB , OBC , OCD , ODE , OEF , OFG are constructed in order by I.1. All these equilateral triangles are congruent because each triangle shares a common side with the next triangle in the order that they are constructed. These triangles are equiangular by I.19. Therefore, all their angles are 60° by I.32.

In Proposition IV.15, an angle of 60° is referred to as one-third of two right angles. Hence, the angles of OAB , OBC , OCD at the center O add up to two right angles. Likewise, the angles of ODE , OEF , OFG at the center O add up to two right angles. Hence, the angles of the six triangles at the center O add up to four right angles. Therefore, $OG = OA$, and so $G = A$.

That six congruent equilateral triangles fit together at a common vertex was known to the Pythagoreans according to Proclus, p 238 of [20]:

“The porism that we are now discussing, in teaching us that the space about a point can be divided into angles equal to four right angles, forms the basis of that paradoxical theorem which proves that only the following three (regular) polygons can fill up the space about a point: the equilateral triangle, the square, and the equilateral equiangular hexagon. The equilateral triangle, however, must be taken six times, for six angles, each two-thirds of a right angle, will make four right angles; . . . This theorem is Pythagorean.”

The line segments OA, OB, OC, OD, OE, OF are congruent, and so they are radii of the given circle. Hence A, B, C, D, E, F are on the circumference of the given circle. The angles of the isosceles triangles ACO, CEO, EAO at the center O are 120° . Therefore, they are congruent by I.4 (SAS). Hence, AC, CE, EA are congruent. Therefore, the inscribed triangle ACE in the given circle is equilateral. \square

8.2. Proposition 8.2. Proposition 8.2 was probably an exercise.

Proof. Each of the inscribed equilateral triangles partitions the circumference of the given circle into three congruent arcs by III.24. Therefore, these six arcs are all congruent. Hence, all six sides of the triangles are congruent by III.29. Therefore, the two triangles are congruent by I.8 and I.4 (SAS), and so they have the same area by the congruence property of area. \square

8.3. Proposition 8.3. Proposition 8.3 is used to prove Proposition 8.4. Proposition 8.3 is not obvious and its proof is nontrivial, and so we do not expect the ancient Greeks to have been familiar with it. However, as Proposition 8.4 is the pivot on which the solution of the second geometry problem turns, we do believe that Plato knew how to prove Proposition 8.3, since its proof is elementary. The first step is to prove the following lemma:

Lemma 8.5. *Let ABC be a triangle inscribed in a given circle, and let DE be the diameter of the circle that is the perpendicular bisector of AB , with C and D on the same side of AB . Then ABD is an isosceles or equilateral triangle inscribed in the given circle, with base AB . If $|AC| \neq |BC|$, then $|ABC| < |ABD|$.*

Proof. Consider a triangle ABC inscribed in the circle in Figure 13 with base AB . Construct the midpoint M of AB by I.10. Construct a line segment perpendicular to AB at M by I.11, and extend it to a chord DE of the given circle by Rules 2 and 5. Then DE is a diameter of the given circle by the proof of III.1. By relabeling DE , if necessary, we assume that D is on the same side of AB as C . The triangles AMD and BMD are congruent by I.4 (SAS). Hence $|AD| = |BD|$. Therefore, triangle ABD is either isosceles or equilateral with base AB .

Suppose $|AC| \neq |BC|$. Then $C \neq D$. By relabeling AB , if necessary, we may assume that C is on the same side of DE as A , as in Figure 13. The triangles ABC and ABD have the same base AB , and the height of ABC is obviously less than the height of ABD . Hence $|ABC| < |ABD|$ by Proposition 3.2. However, Plato believed that truth can only be discovered by reason and not by the senses.

We complete the proof as follows: Construct a line segment GD perpendicular to the diameter DE in the same side of DE as A by I.11. See Figure 14. Then GD is tangent to the given circle at D by the Porism (Corollary) of III.16. Construct a line segment CF perpendicular to DE so that F is on the infinite straight line




FIGURE 13. Two triangles inscribed in a circle with the same base




FIGURE 14. Comparing the heights of the two triangles in Figure 13

determined by DE by I.12. Then CF is parallel to AM and GD by I.27. Now AM and GD are parallel by I.30. Hence, the line segments AM , CF , and GD are parallel.

All the points on the given circle, except for D , are in the same side of the tangent GD . Hence A and C are in the same side of GD . The points C and D are in the same side of AM . Therefore C is between AM and GD . Hence CF is between AM and GD . Therefore F is between M and D , and so $|MF| < |MD|$ by the comparison property of length. The height length of triangle ABC is $|MF|$ and the height length of triangle ABD is $|MD|$. Hence $|ABC| < |ABD|$ by Proposition 3.2. \square




FIGURE 15. Comparing the heights of three triangles inscribed in a circle

We now take stock of what we have just proved: If an inscribed triangle is not equilateral, then its area is not the greatest area of an inscribed triangle in the given circle. This statement is equivalent to the contrapositive statement: If the area of an inscribed triangle is the greatest area of an inscribed triangle in the given circle, then the triangle must be equilateral. This observation, based on Figure 13, is so elementary, that there is no doubt that Plato was aware of it.

For a modern mathematician this observation proves Proposition 8.3 almost immediately, since a continuous function defined on a closed interval achieves its maximum value on the interval. Of course, Plato did not have such advance mathematics to finish off the proof of Proposition 8.3; however, his intuition would have told him:

The Heuristic Argument: An inscribed triangle of greatest area in the given circle must exist, because it would be the most beautiful triangle of them all, an equilateral triangle.

The heuristic argument would have motivated Plato to find a proof of Proposition 8.3. Plato's occupation was philosopher and not mathematician, and so he probably would have consulted an experienced geometer such as his friend Theaetetus (c. 414 – c. 369 BC) of Athens or he would have handed off this problem to a student as suggested by the quote from Philodemus' *History of the Academy* in §5.3.

Before we start the proof of Proposition 8.3, we need to first prove a refinement of Lemma 8.5. Lemma 8.6 is another obviously true lemma whose synthetic proof is delicate, since it involves betweenness arguments. Nevertheless, the proofs of Lemmas 8.5 and 8.6 would be straightforward for a geometer in Plato's time.

Lemma 8.6. *Let ABC be a triangle inscribed in a given circle, and let DE be the diameter of the circle that is the perpendicular bisector of AB , with C and D on the same side of AB . Then ABD is an isosceles or equilateral triangle inscribed in*

the given circle, with base AB . If $C \neq D$ and X is a point in the interior of the arc CD of the circumference of the given circle, then $|ABC| < |ABX| < |ABD|$.

Proof. The triangle ABD in Figure 15 is an isosceles or equilateral triangle inscribed in the given circle with base AB by Lemma 8.5. The angles of triangle ABD at the base are equal by I.5.

By relabeling AB , if necessary, we may assume that C is on the same side of DE as B . By the comparison property of angles and I.5, we have

$$\angle BAC < \angle BAD = \angle DBA < \angle CBA.$$

Hence $|BC| < |AC|$ by I.19.

Let M be the midpoint of AB , and let F be the foot of the perpendicular from C to the infinite straight line containing DE . Then F is between M and D by the proof of Lemma 8.5 (which is left-right symmetric).

Let DG be a tangent line to the given circle at D with G on the same side of DE as B . All the points of the arc CD , except for D , are on the same side of DG as all the points of the circle, except for D . All the points of the arc CD , except for C , are on the same side of FC as D , since the infinite straight line containing FC does not cut the arc CD . Therefore, the interior of the arc CD lies between DG and FC . Hence, the point X lies between DG and FC .

Let H be the foot of the perpendicular from X to the infinite straight line containing DE . Then HX is parallel to DG and FC by I.27, and so HX , DG and FC are parallel by I.30. As X lies between DG and FC , we have that HX lies between DG and FC . Therefore H is between F and D .

Hence, H is on the opposite side of F from M , and so F is between M and H . By the comparison and additive properties of length, we have that

$$|MF| < |MH| = |MF| + |FH| < |MF| + |FD| = |MD|$$

The height lengths of the triangles ABC , ABX , ABD are $|MF|$, $|MH|$, $|MD|$ respectively. Therefore $|ABC| < |ABX| < |ABD|$ by Proposition 3.2. \square

8.4. Proof of Proposition 8.3. Let ABC be a non-equilateral triangle inscribed in the given circle. We want to prove that the area of ABC is less than the area of an equilateral triangle inscribed in the given circle.

To begin with, construct the point D on the circumference of the given circle on the same side of AB as C such that ABD is an isosceles or equilateral triangle ABD with base AB as in the proof of Lemma 8.5. There are three cases to consider.

(1) Assume that some angle of ABC is equal to 60° . By relabeling ABC , if necessary, we may assume that $\angle BCA = 60^\circ$. See Figure 13. Then $\angle ADB = \angle ACB = 60^\circ$ by III.21, and $\angle BAD = \angle DBA = 60^\circ$ by I.5 and I.32. Hence ABD is equiangular, and so ABD is equilateral by I.18. Therefore, $C \neq D$, since ABC is non-equilateral. Hence $|ABC| < |ABD|$ by Lemma 8.6, with ABD equilateral. Therefore, we may assume that no angle of ABC is equal to 60° .

The sum of the angles of ABC is 180° by I.32, and so some angle of ABC is less than 60° and some angle of ABC is greater than 60° . The third angle is either less than 60° or greater than 60° . Hence, two of the angles of ABC are less than 60° or two of the angles of ABC are greater than 60° .

(2) Next, assume that two of the angles of ABC are greater than 60° and the third is less than 60° . By relabeling ABC , if necessary, we may assume that $\angle BAC < 60^\circ$. Then $\angle CBA > 60^\circ$ and $\angle ACB > 60^\circ$.

The diameter ED enters the triangle ABC at the midpoint M of AB , and so must exit ABC at a point G . Triangle AMG is congruent to triangle BMG by I.4 (SAS). Hence, triangle ABG is either isosceles or equilateral with base AB . Therefore, the base angles of ABG are equal by I.5 or I.19. Hence $G \neq C$, since the angles of ABC at the base AB are not equal. We claim that G is in the interior of AC . On the contrary, assume that G is in the interior of BC . Then by the comparison property of angles, $\angle BAG < \angle BAC < 60^\circ$. Hence, $\angle GBA = \angle BAG < 60^\circ$. However $\angle GBA = \angle CBA > 60^\circ$, which is a contradiction. Therefore G must be in the interior of AC as in Figure 16. Therefore DE cuts AC , and so C is on the same side of DE as B .

We have that $\angle ADB = \angle ACB$ by III.21, and so $\angle ADB > 60^\circ$. Hence, we have $\angle BAD = \angle DBA < 60^\circ$, since triangle ABD is isosceles. Let O be the center of the given circle. Then $\angle DOA < 120^\circ$ by III.20.

Inscribe an equilateral triangle AYX in the given circle by Proposition 8.1. See Figure 16. Construct the midpoint N of XY by I.10. Then $\angle ANX = \angle ANY$ by I.8. Hence AN is the perpendicular bisector of XY by I.Def.10. Construct F on the circumference of the given circle by extending AN . Then AF is a diameter of the circle by the proof of III.1.

Now $D \neq F$, since O is on the diameter DE , and DE bisects triangle ABD , and so O is not in AD . By relabeling AYX , if necessary, we may assume that X and D are on the same side of AF .

Now AYX is equiangular by I.19, and so each angle of AYX is 60° by I.32. Hence $\angle XOA = 120^\circ$ by III.20.

Suppose that C is on the same side of AF as D . Then $\angle CBA < 90^\circ$ by III.31, which we need to use III.20. Hence $\angle COA = 2\angle CBA$ by III.20, and so $\angle COA > 120^\circ$. Therefore $\angle DOA < \angle XOA < \angle COA$, and so X is in the interior of the arc CD . If $C = F$ or C is on the opposite side of AF than D , then again X is in the interior of the arc CD , since X is on the same side of AF as D . Thus, for all possible C , we have that X is in the interior of the arc CD . Therefore $|ABC| < |ABX|$ by Lemma 8.6.



Now $\angle BAX < \angle BAD$ by the comparison property of angles, and so we have $\angle BAX < \angle BAD < 60^\circ$. Therefore $\angle BOX < 120^\circ$ by III.20. Hence B is in the interior of the arc YX . Therefore B and Y are on the same side of XA . Hence, with respect to the base XA , we have that $|ABX| < |AYX|$ by Lemma 8.6, since AYX is equilateral. Therefore $|ABC| < |ABX| < |AYX|$, with AYX equilateral.

(3) Next, assume that two of the angles of ABC are less than 60° and the third is greater than 60° . By relabeling ABC , if necessary, we may assume that $\angle BAC > 60^\circ$. Then $\angle CBA < 60^\circ$ and $\angle ACB < 60^\circ$. Now C is on the same side of DE as A by the same argument by contradiction as in the previous case.

We have that $\angle ADB = \angle ACB$ by III.21, and so $\angle ADB < 60^\circ$. Hence, we have $90^\circ > \angle BAD = \angle DBA > 60^\circ$, since triangle ABD is isosceles. Let O be the center of the given circle. Then $\angle DOA > 120^\circ$ by III.20.

Inscribe an equilateral triangle AYX in the given circle by Proposition 8.1. See Figure 17. As in the previous case, construct the diameter AF as the perpendicular bisector of XY . Then $D \neq F$ as in the previous case. By relabeling AYX , if necessary, we may assume that D and X are on the same side of AF .

Each angle of AYX is 60° as in the previous case. Hence $\angle XOA = 120^\circ$ by III.20.

FIGURE 16. The figure for the case that $\angle BAC$ is less than 60° FIGURE 17. The figure for the case that $\angle BAC$ is greater than 60°

As $\angle CBA < 60^\circ$, we have that $\angle COA < 120^\circ$ by III.20. Therefore, we have $\angle COA < \angle XOA < \angle DOA$, and so X is in the interior of the arc DC . Hence $|ABC| < |ABX|$ by Lemma 8.6.

Now diameter DE cuts diameter AF at O . Hence, the midpoint of AB is on the other side of AF than D and X . Hence, the line segment AB , except for A , is on the same side of AF as Y . Therefore B is on the same side of AF as Y .

Now $\angle AXB = \angle ACB$ by III.21., and so $\angle AXB < 60^\circ$. Therefore $\angle AOB < 120^\circ$ by III.20. Hence B is in the interior of the arc AY . Therefore B and Y are on the same side of XA . Hence $|ABX| < |AYX|$ by Lemma 8.6, since AYX is equilateral. Therefore $|ABC| < |ABX| < |AYX|$, with AYX equilateral. \square

The proof of Proposition 8.3 uses only the propositions in Books I and III of Euclid's *Elements*, and so is elementary (i.e. uses only planar constructions). Although the proof of Proposition 8.3 is complicated, the triangles in Figures 16 and 17 are natural, and once they are constructed, the proof is straightforward. For an experienced geometer of Plato's time, proving Proposition 8.3, motivated by the heuristic argument, would have taken no longer than a few days.

8.5. **Proposition 8.4.** Proposition 8.4 follows immediately from Propositions 8.1, 8.2, and 8.3. Proposition 8.1 is the key to the solution of the second geometry problem in the *Meno*. Proposition 8.4 is the hinge of the solution.

9. ACT 3: THE SOLUTION OF THE SECOND GEOMETRY PROBLEM

We are now ready for the third act of our play: The solution of the second geometry problem. The third act begins with the narrator rereading the second geometrical passage, and follows with an explanation of the passage.

Socrates: For example, if they (geometers) are asked whether a specific area can be inscribed in the form of a triangle within a given circle, one of them might say: "I do not yet know whether this area has that property, but I think, I have, as it were, a hypothesis that is of use for the problem, namely this: If that area is such that when one has applied it as a rectangle to the given straight line in the circle it is deficient by a figure similar to the very figure which is applied, then I think one alternative results, whereas another results if it is impossible for this to happen. So, by using this hypothesis, I am willing to tell you what results with regard to inscribing it in the circle – that is, whether it is impossible or not."

The passage begins with the geometry problem: To determine whether a given area can be inscribed in the form of a triangle within a given circle. The problem is to find necessary and sufficient conditions so that a given area can be inscribed in the form of a triangle within a given circle. The given area would have been represented by the area of a given polygon P . The initial data for this problem consists of a finite set of given constructed points, from which the polygon P can be constructed by applications of Rule 1, and two given constructed points from which the given circle is constructed by Rule 3.

9.1. **Our Explanation of the Second Geometrical Passage.** After Socrates states the geometry problem, he draws a circle, the polygon P outside of the circle, and an equilateral triangle inscribed in the circle. Socrates did not say anything about the equilateral triangle because he wanted Meno to discover that it is the key to the solution. Meno did not say anything about the equilateral triangle because he would have thought it was an example. Meno would have known that an equilateral triangle can be inscribed in the circle, starting from the two given points used to construct the circle, since Proposition 8.1 was well known.

The main body of the passage, in quotation marks, is a description of the solution of the problem. The most important, and least understood, part of the passage is the phrase "the given straight line in the circle". In the introduction to his treatise on Euclid's *Data* [23], Taisbak makes the point that the word "given" or *datum* (δεδομένον) meant to the ancient Greek geometers not only "given" in its modern sense (i.e. referring to the initial data of a geometry problem) but also "constructed"

(i.e. referring to the data constructed from the initial data following the six rules for a planar construction in §2.4).

There are no straight lines in the circle in the initial data. This means that “the given straight line in the circle” should be translated as “the constructed straight line in the circle”. This phrase refers to one of the sides of the inscribed equilateral triangle, which Socrates points out, and uses as a reference base for his description of the solution of the problem.

The philologist Farquharson points out on p 24 of [8] that Plato uses the word $\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu$ (like) instead of $\delta\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\nu$ (similar, as in Euclid’s *Elements*). The translation of $\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu$ as “similar” by Grube in [19] is based on Heath’s translation on p 299 of [9], which he made to fit his interpretation of the second geometrical passage in [9] (same as in §6.4). We will replace “similar” by “like” because it better fits our interpretation of “like” as “congruent”, which is the same interpretation made by Farquharson in [8].

9.2. Plato’s Simple Beautiful Solution of the Geometry Problem. We next describe the simple and beautiful solution of the problem which Socrates sketches as he is talking. The initial two given constructed points, from which the given circle is constructed, are the center of the circle and a point A on the circumference of the circle. See Figure 18. We begin with the inscription part of the solution.

Construct the equilateral triangle ABD by Proposition 8.1. Construct the midpoint M of AB by I.10. Construct a rectangle R whose area is equal to the area of the given polygon P by I.45:

I.45: To construct a parallelogram with the same area as a given rectilinear figure (P) in a given rectilinear angle (90°).

Construct the rectangle $AMNF$ whose area is equal to the area of R (and P), on the same side of AB as D , by Proposition 3.1. Construct the rectangle $MBEN$. Then $|AMNF| = |MBEN|$ by I.36. Now AM is congruent to MB , since M bisects AB , and the opposite sides of rectangles $AMNF$ and $MBEN$ are congruent by I.34. Therefore, the rectangle $AMNF$ is congruent to the rectangle $MBEN$ by the principle of superposition.

If N is below D or $N = D$ in Figure 18, construct the point C by intersecting FN with the circumference of the circle if F is outside the circle, as in Figure 18, or letting $C = F$ if F is on the circumference of the circle, or by extending FN to the left and intersecting the extended line segment with the circumference of the circle if F is within the circle. Then $|ABC| = |AMNF| = |P|$ by I.41:

I.41: If a parallelogram ($ABEF$) has the same base (AB) with a triangle (ABC) and is in the same parallels (with the same height length), then the area of the parallelogram ($ABEF$) is twice the area of the triangle (ABC).

Therefore, the specific area ($|P|$) can be inscribed in the form of a triangle (ABC) within the given circle; moreover $|ABC| \leq |ABD|$ by Proposition 3.2 and I.37. This completes the inscription part of the solution.

We next recall the first definition in Book II (on rectangles) in Euclid’s *Elements*.




FIGURE 18. The missing diagram for the second geometry problem

II.Def.1. Any rectangular parallelogram is said to be **contained** by the two straight lines (i.e. sides) containing the right angle.

This definition reminds us that a rectangle is completely determined by a base and a height (i.e. a side perpendicular to the base).

We now have the following interpretation (in parenthesis) of the hypothesis in the second geometrical passage after “namely this:”

If that area ($|P|$) is such that when one has applied it as a rectangle ($AMNF$) to the given straight line (AB) in the circle (so that the base AM and the height MN are in the circle) it is deficient by a figure ($MBEN$) like (congruent) to the very figure ($AMNF$) which is applied, then I think one alternative results (N is below D or $N = D$, and therefore the area of P can be inscribed in the form of the triangle ABC in the given circle by the inscription part of the solution), whereas another results if it is impossible for this to happen (N is above D , and so $|P| = |AMNF| > |ABD|$, and therefore the area $|P|$ cannot be inscribed in the form of a triangle in the given circle by Proposition 8.4).

Plato’s solution of the second geometry problem has a strong uniqueness property:

Uniqueness Property: If the given straight line (i.e. chord) of the given circle satisfies the hypothesis in the second geometrical passage in such a way that the inscribed triangle always has the given line as a side, then the given line must be a side of an equilateral triangle inscribed in the given circle.

On the contrary, suppose that the given straight line AB , in Figure 18, is not the side of an equilateral triangle inscribed in the given circle. Then the area of the isosceles triangle ABD in Figure 18 is less than the area of an equilateral triangle

T inscribed in the given circle by Proposition 8.3. Hence, if the given area $|P|$ is such that $|P| = |T|$, then

$$|ABD| < |T| = |P| = |AMNF|.$$

In which case N is above D in Figure 18, and so the area can not be inscribed in the form of a triangle by the second half of the hypothesis. However, since $|P| = |T|$, we know that $|P|$ can be inscribed in the form of an equilateral triangle in the given circle by Proposition 8.1, which is a contradiction, since $|P|$ cannot be both inscribable and non-inscribable in the form of a triangle in the given circle. Therefore AB must be a side of an equilateral triangle inscribed in the given circle.

The solution of the geometry problem in this passage is the following proposition:

Proposition 9.1. *A given area can be inscribed in the form of a triangle within a given circle if and only if the area is less than or equal to the area of an equilateral triangle inscribed in the given circle.*

The proof of Proposition 9.1 that we give in this paper uses only propositions in Books I and III of Euclid’s *Elements*, and so is elementary (i.e. uses only planar constructions). Our elementary proof of Proposition 9.1 runs contrary to the beliefs of both Heath, p 301 [9], and Knorr, p 73 [15], that this geometry problem is not solvable by elementary Euclidean methods (i.e. using only planar constructions). On p 301 of [9], Heath writes:

“I am tempted to believe that we have here an allusion to another actual problem, requiring more than the straight line and circle for its solution, which had exercised the minds of geometers by the time of Plato, the problem, namely, of inscribing in a circle a triangle equal to a given area, a problem which was still awaiting a solution.”

Heath’s timid yet erroneous opinion on the solvability of the second geometry problem, caused by him making the “standard mistake,” led many to believe that Plato had not solved the second geometry problem. This also caused much confusion on the nature of the hypothesis in the second geometrical passage. Our interpretation says that the hypothesis is a mathematical “if and only if” statement just like in Hippocrates’ reduction of the problem of doubling the cube: The cube can be doubled if and only if given a line segment of length a , line segments of lengths x and y can be constructed such that $a : x = x : y = y : 2a$. Undoubtedly, Hippocrates is one of the geometers that Socrates is referring to in the second geometrical passage.

We believe that Plato knew how to prove Proposition 9.1, since he was familiar with most of the contents of Books I and III of Euclid’s *Elements*, and he indicates in the second geometrical passage that he knew the proof of Proposition 9.1.

The proof of the “if part” of Proposition 9.1 is the construction of Figure 18, which Socrates describes and would have sketched for Meno. Socrates does not prove the “only if” part of Proposition 9.1, which follows from Proposition 8.4, whose proof is long and complicated. Socrates does not sketch the proof of Proposition 8.4, because it would have derailed his train of thought in the *Meno*. However, Socrates does indicate that the “only if” part of Proposition 9.1 is true, in the

second half of the hypothesis, and so it is fair to say that Socrates (Plato) sketches a complete solution of the geometry problem in the second geometrical passage.

9.3. The Missing Diagram. The main reason this geometrical passage has been so hard to interpret correctly is because the Rosetta Stone for the passage, Figure 18, is not present in our copies of the *Meno*. Either there was a diagram accompanying the second geometrical passage, and it was lost, or Plato left it out intentionally. It is unlikely that the diagram was lost, since Plato's works were held in such high regard. A more likely explanation is that Plato wanted the reader to discover the diagram and its key, the inscribed equilateral triangle.

That Plato would intentionally leave out the diagram for the second geometry problem is in keeping with his philosophy of learning. In Plato's *Seventh Letter*, which some believe was not written by Plato, but by someone who knew him well (cf. p 1635 [19]), is the following passage (*Letter VII*, 341c-e). We use the translation by Glenn R. Morrow in [19].

Plato: There is no writing of mine about these matters, nor will there ever be one. For this knowledge is not something that can be put into words like other sciences; but after long-continued intercourse between teacher and pupil, in joint pursuit of the subject, suddenly, like a light flashing forth when a fire is kindled, it is born in the soul and straightway nourishes itself. And this too I know: if these matters are to be expounded at all in books or lectures, they would best come from me. ... But I do not think that the 'examination' as it is called, of these questions would be of any benefit to men, except a few, i.e., to those who could with a little guidance discover the truth by themselves.

We believe that Plato expected a student, attempting to solve the second geometry problem, to get caught in his trap by making the standard mistake of choosing the most obvious "given straight line" – a diameter of the circle, in direct analogy with what happens in the first geometrical passage.

After the student admits their mistake, Plato probably advised the student to carefully reread the first geometrical passage, where Plato had planted hints as to the nature of the correct "given straight line." These hints will be explained in the next section. The correct choice of the "given straight line" is not obvious – a side of an inscribed equilateral triangle in the given circle, in direct analogy with what happens in the first geometrical passage, where the correct choice of the straight line is the non-obvious diagonal line.

Finding the correct choice of the "given straight line" is the key to solving the second geometry problem. Finding the simple beautiful solution, described in §9.2, probably required several, if not many, conversations between Plato and his student before the light of the discovery of the solution finally flashed forth from the student's soul, as Plato says in the above passage from his *Seventh Letter*.

9.4. Summary. We believe that our solution of the geometry problem in the second geometrical passage is the correct explanation of the second geometrical passage because (1) it is simple, elegant, and uses only geometry that Plato would have known (2) it matches the Greek very well, and (3) the commonly accepted solution in §6.4 is much more complicated, and would not have been acceptable to Plato, because it does not obey the rules of a planar construction, as demanded by Plato in *Philebus* 51c.

9.5. Final Remarks. The second geometrical passage is an elaborate geometry puzzle – fill in the missing pieces, and solve the geometry problem. This puzzle was probably solved many times in antiquity when geometers were well trained in synthetic geometry. It is surprising that this puzzle had not been solved before during the modern era. Farquharson had the solution in his grasp when he embedded the essential features of Figure 18 in his diagram on p 22 of [8], but he did not see the solution. Heijboer discusses the possibility of the “given straight line” being a side of an equilateral triangle on p 97 of [10], but he did not pursue the idea. Knorr had the most difficult piece of the puzzle, a synthetic proof of Proposition 8.3 on pp 92-3 of [15], but he did not solve the puzzle because he was thrown off track by the authority of Sir Thomas Heath’s remarks on p 301 [9]. In hindsight, we see that all the pieces of the puzzle are scattered in the literature on Plato’s *Meno*, but no one put the pieces together. We certainly didn’t. We solved the puzzle first, and did the literature search afterwards.

10. ACT 4: THE SQUARE AND THE EQUILATERAL TRIANGLE

It is time for the final act of our play: The square and the equilateral triangle. The narrator returns to the stage and resumes his explanation of the second geometrical passage in Plato’s *Meno*.

The main mystery in the second geometrical passage is: What is the given straight line, i.e. chord, in the circle? This final act in our play is about the three hints that Plato gives in the first geometrical passage about the nature of the mysterious chord in the second geometrical passage.

These hints are in plain view, but they are subtle.

10.1. First Hint: The last line of the preamble to the first geometrical passage:

Socrates: – a process men call learning – discovering everything else for himself, if he is brave and does not tire of the search, for searching and learning are as a whole recollection.

Recall that the given straight line, in the very first proposition in the *Elements*, is the base of the constructed equilateral triangle.

To fully understand the second and third hints, we must go forward in time from the *Meno*.

10.2. Fire, Air, Water, Earth, and the Universe. In Plato’s dialogue *Timaeus*, which was written after the *Meno*, Plato describes many of the things he had learned or discovered in his life. In the passage (53c-57d), he gives his models for the four elements of antiquity: Fire, Air, Water, and Earth. Plato says that the four elements are made up of tiny particles bounded by rectilinear surfaces, and rectilinear surfaces are composed (i.e. partitioned) into triangles; furthermore, every triangle is divided into two right triangles, and of these right triangles the most excellent are the half square (i.e. the $45^\circ - 45^\circ$ right triangle) and the half equilateral triangle (i.e. the $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangle).

Plato then describes the partition of an equilateral triangle into six $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangles corresponding to the partition of the equilateral triangle ACE in

Figure 12. He also describes the partition of a square into four $45^\circ - 45^\circ$ triangles corresponding to the partition of the square $EFGH$ in Figure 9.

Plato then describes the four Platonic solids: the regular tetrahedron, the regular octahedron, the regular icosahedron, and the cube. The boundaries of the first three Platonic solids are partitioned into 4, 8, and 20 equilateral triangles respectively, and therefore into 24, 48, and 120 elementary $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangles. As explained at the end of §7 for the regular tetrahedron, these triangles correspond to the symmetries of these three Platonic Solids. The boundary of the fourth Platonic solid, the cube, is partitioned into 6 squares, and therefore into 24 elementary $45^\circ - 45^\circ$ right triangles. These 24 triangles correspond to the 24 rotational symmetries of the cube.

Plato then says that each of the four elements is made up of tiny particles that are regular polyhedra with the particles of fire, air, water, and earth being regular tetrahedra, regular octahedra, regular icosahedra, and cubes respectively. Plato assigns to the fifth Platonic solid, the regular dodecahedron, the role of representing the universe.

The first three elements interact by their particles decomposing into elementary $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangles, and then reassembling to form particles of possibly other elements. The fourth element, earth, is inert, since its elementary $45^\circ - 45^\circ$ right triangles can only reassemble into other particles of earth.

The $45^\circ - 45^\circ$ and $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangles were very important to Plato because they represent the building blocks of matter and energy in his world view.

Plato's idea of using the first four Platonic solids to explain the interactions of the four elements, fire, air, water, and earth, may seem farfetched to us; nevertheless, Plato had very good intuition about mathematics, based mostly on the beauty of symmetry. Plato's partition of the boundary of one of the first three Platonic solids into elementary triangles is really a description of the symmetry group of the solid, which is a finite Coxeter group. Finite Coxeter groups describe the internal structure of compact Lie groups, on which particle theory in physics is based. In hindsight, we see that Plato was steering the ship of science in the right direction 2400 years ago.

10.3. The Second Hint. The second hint begins with the recollection of the first two definitions on inscribed figures:

IV.1. A rectilinear figure is said to be **inscribed** in a **rectilinear figure** when the respective angles (i.e. vertices) of the inscribed figure lie on the respective sides of that in which it is inscribed.

IV.2. Similarly a figure is said to be **circumscribed about a figure** when the respective sides of the circumscribed figure pass through the respective angles (i.e. vertices) of that about which it is circumscribed.

Definitions IV.1 and IV.2 are not used in Euclid's *Elements*. They were probably meant for exercises, and special occasions like now.

Second Hint: The square $EFGH$ is inscribed in the square $ABCD$ in Figure 9, and the area of $ABCD$ is twice the area of $EFGH$.




FIGURE 19. The inscription of a square in a doubled square

The solution of the problem of doubling the square $EFGH$ is equivalent to the inscription construction illustrated in Figure 19. The second geometry problem is about inscribing triangles. The first geometry problem can be recast as a problem about inscribing squares, in direct analogy with the second geometry problem.

10.4. **The Third Hint:** The dialogue in 85b between Socrates and the boy:

Socrates: Based on what line? – This one.

Socrates: That is, on the line that stretches from corner to corner of the four-foot figure? – Yes – Clever men call this the diagonal, so that if diagonal is its name, you say that the doubled figure ($EFGH$) would be based on the diagonal? – Yes – Most certainly, Socrates.

The diagonal line that Socrates is referring to is the diagonal EF of the original square $AFOE$ in Figure 9. The goal of the construction illustrated in Figure 19 is to inscribe the square $EFGH$ in the doubled square $ABCD$ starting from the given straight line EF hinted by Plato. The order of the construction is important, because it reveals something very interesting, and so we will go through the construction step by step.

- (1) Construct the square $EFGH$ by I.46: To describe a square on a given straight line.
- (2) Construct the midpoint M of the line segment EF by I.10.
- (3) Construct a circle with center M and radius EM by Rule 3 (circle is not shown in Figure 19 in order not to be a distraction).
- (4) Construct a line segment MP perpendicular to EF with P in the opposite side of EF from the square $EFGH$ by I.11 (say, in the interior of MA).
- (5) Extend MP until it intersects the circumference of the circle by Rule 2.
- (6) Construct the point A as the intersection of the extension of MP and the circumference of the circle by Rule 5.
- (7) Construct the line segments AE and AF by two applications of Rule 1.




FIGURE 20. An inscribed equilateral triangle supported by a pedestal

- (8) Construct line segments parallel to AE and AF at the points H and G respectively by I.31.
- (9) Extend the line segments constructed in Step 8 and the line segments AE and AF by Rule 2 so that they intersect at the points B, C, D .
- (10) Construct the points B, C, D by Rule 4.

There are still some details to check, such as, proving that $ABCD$ is a square using the propositions of Book I of the *Elements*, but these are routine, and are left to the reader.

Let us break down the construction. First, we constructed the square $EFGH$ on the given line EF . Next, we constructed the isosceles right triangle AFE , which is bisected into two $45^\circ - 45^\circ$ right triangles by Step 5 of the construction.

We call the isosceles triangle AFE a **pedestal** (a new geometrical term derived from the primary meaning of “pedestal”: the base or support on which a statue, obelisk, or column is mounted). The pedestal AFE supports the given straight line EF and the given square $EFGH$. The pedestal AFE also supports the doubled square $ABCD$, since the sides of AFE are used to construct the sides of $ABCD$ in a unique way.

The analogous diagram, Figure 20, that is embedded in Figure 12, shows you the location of the given straight line for the second geometry problem. The given straight line is the line segment AC that is supported by the pedestal ABC , which is an isosceles triangle that is bisected into two $30^\circ - 60^\circ$ right triangles. The pedestal ABC supports the inscribed equilateral triangle ACE , which has maximal area among all the inscribed triangles in the given circle. The pedestal ABC also supports the given circle, since it is the circumscribed circle of the triangle ABC .

10.5. Lloyd’s Initiation Theory. In his well written article [16] on the second geometrical passage, Sir Geoffrey Ernest Richard Lloyd proposes the theory that the second geometrical passage was part of an initiation. On p 178 of [16], he writes:

“What we are given, at this point in the *Meno*, is an ultra-obscure mathematical example, and when we go through it, puzzling our way through the obscurities, the indeterminacies, the omissions, we find we have gone *through an initiation*.”

On p 179 of [16], Lloyd writes:

“But by initiation I mean rather the process whereby the initiates themselves come to see some subject in a quite different light. They may even discover that what they had been taught, or what they thought they had learnt, at an early stage in the process, later turns out to be quite false.”

On p 180 of [16], Lloyd writes:

“The relevance of the theme of initiation to the mathematical example of *Meno* 86e ff might, then, speculatively, be represented as follows. Once you go through the example – and you will probably need a guide to help you – and you investigate different possibilities and finally see how it may work, once you have been through that process and look back at what Plato had originally given you in the text, you see *that* in a quite different light.”

We find Lloyd’s initiation theory quite appealing. Solving the puzzle in the second geometrical passage could very well have been an initiation to becoming a member of the Academy. We can only imagine that after an initiate solved the puzzle, there would have been a rite of passage ceremony. During which Plato would have taken the initiate and the members of the Academy at night into an inner courtyard, and lit a fire on a central pedestal. The initiate and the members of the Academy would have formed a circle around the fire, and after much ceremony and invocation, all but the initiate would have lit torches from the central fire, and then all would have walked to a far wall. A curtain would have been pulled aside revealing a mural of the eternal flame of truth illustrated in Figure 21. Plato would have then handed his torch to the initiate, and declared the initiate a member of the Academy.

10.6. From Darkness to Light. We now complete the $A\Omega$ of our story with the pre-preamble at 81b to the first geometrical passage:

*Persephone will return to the sun above in the ninth year
the souls of those from whom
she will exact punishment for old miseries,
and from these come noble kings,
mighty in strength and greatest in wisdom,
and for the rest of time men will call them sacred heroes.*

Some of the sacred heroes that endured the rigors and observed the rites of Plato’s Academy are: Theaetetus, Eudoxes, Menaechmus, and of course, Aristotle.

Acknowledgment. We wish to thank William Altman for suggesting the problem of describing the missing diagram in the second geometrical passage in Plato’s *Meno*




FIGURE 21. The eternal flame of truth

when Sophia Stone gave her talk, “What Socrates Teaches,” at the invited symposium, jointly sponsored by the International Plato Society and the International Socrates Society at the Central A.P.A. in 2021.

We also wish to thank the participants Masato Ishida, John Long, Peter Moore, Joseph Novak, and Bodhi Stone of Sophia Stone’s reading group on mathematics and philosophy for their expert commentary on Plato’s *Meno*, *Republic*, *Theaetetus*, *Parmenides*, *Timaeus*, and *Philebus*.

REFERENCES

- [1] August, E. F. (1829). *Zur Kenntniss der geometrischen Methode der Alten*. In: *Zwei Abhandlungen physicalischen und mathematischen Inhalts*, Dieterichschen Buchdruckerei, Berlin. Reviewed by Wex, C. (1830). *Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* **12**, 190-207.
- [2] Bluck, R. S. (1961). *Plato’s Meno*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [3] Blass, C. (1861). *De Platone mathematico*, Bonnae, Typis C. Georgi.
- [4] Boyer, C. B. (1985). *A History of Mathematics*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton NJ.
- [5] Butcher, S. H. (1888). *The geometrical problem of the Meno (p. 86e–87a)*, *J. Philology* **17**, 219-225.
- [6] Cook Wilson, J. (1903). *On the geometrical problem in Plato’s Meno, 86e sqq.* *J. Philology* **28**, 222-240.
- [7] Euclid, (1956). *The Thirteen Books of the Elements, 2nd Edition*, translated with introduction and commentary by Sir Thomas Heath, Dover, New York.
- [8] Farquharson, A.S.L. (1923). *Socrates’ diagram in the Meno of Plato*, *Class. Quart.* **17**, 21-26.
- [9] Heath, T. (1981). *A History of Greek Mathematics*, Vol I. Corrected reprint of the 1921 original, Dover, New York.
- [10] Heijboer, A., Heyboer, A. (1955). *Plato “Meno” 86e – 87a*, *Mnemosyne*, **8**, 89-122.
- [11] Herstein, I. N. (1964). *Topics in Algebra*, Blaisdell Publishing Co., New York.
- [12] Iwata, N. (2015). *Plato on Geometrical Hypothesis in the Meno*, *Apeiron* **48**, 1-19.
- [13] Joyce, D. E. (1998). *Euclid’s Elements*, <https://mathcs.clarku.edu/~djoyce/elements/elements.html>
- [14] Kazarinoff, N. D. (2003). *Ruler and the Round, Classic Problems in Geometric Constructions*, Dover, Mineola.
- [15] Knorr, W. R. (1986). *The Ancient Tradition of Geometric Problems*, Birkhäuser, Boston.
- [16] Lloyd, G.E.R. (1992). *The Meno and the Mysteries of Mathematics*, *Phronesis* **37**, 166-183.
- [17] Martin, G. E. (1998). *Geometric Constructions*, Springer, New York.

- [18] Patze, W.F.P. (1832). *Commentatio de loco mathematico in Platonis Menone*, Susati, Typis Nassianis.
- [19] Plato, (1997). *Complete Works*, Edited by John M. Cooper, Associate Editor D. S. Hutchinson, Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis.
- [20] Proclus, (1970). *A Commentary on the First Book of Euclid's Elements*, translated with Introduction and Notes by Glenn R. Morrow, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton NJ.
- [21] Richeson, D. S. (2019). *Tales of Impossibility, The 2000-year Quest to Solve the Mathematical Problems of Antiquity*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton NJ.
- [22] Szabó, Á. (1973). *The Beginnings of Greek Mathematics*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- [23] Taisbak, C. M. (2003). *Euclid's Data, ΔΕΔΟΜΕΝΑ, or the Importance of Being Given*, Museum Tusulanum Press, Copenhagen.
- [24] Wolfsdorf, D. (2008). *The Method ἐξ ὑποθέσεως at Meno 86e1-87d8*, *Phronesis* **53**, 35-64.
- [25] Zhmud, L. (1998). *Plato as "Architect of Science"*, *Phronesis* **43**, 211-244.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TN 37240, USA,
Email address: j.g.ratcliffe@vanderbilt.edu, steven.tschantz@vanderbilt.edu

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE, LYNN UNIVERSITY, BOCA RATON, FL 33431, USA
Email address: ssstone@lynn.edu