

Plato and Tim O'Brien on Courage

Mio Yamada (Nagoya University)

1 Tim O'Brien in the Vietnam War and Socrates in Plato

An American novelist, Tim O'Brien, was drafted in 1968 into the United States Army to serve from 1969 to 1970 in the Vietnam War (1955-1975). One year before his arrival to Vietnam (1968) the My Lai Massacre took place, the atrocity and injustice of which created the hostile atmosphere for him and other soldiers to survive.

After returning home in 1973, when the Vietnam War was still being fought, Tim O'Brien published his first book, *If I Die in a Combat Zone, Box Me Up and Ship Me Home* (*If I Die*, henceforth). Later in 1990 he published another book also dealing with the Vietnam War, *The Things They Carried* (*Things*, henceforth), a collection of short stories in which a platoon of American soldiers appears.

In these works Tim O'Brien frequently uses Plato's works. *If I Die* has references to Plato's *Crito*, *Apology*, *Gorgias*, *Lysis*, and *Republic*. *Things* also has a reference to Plato's *Republic*.⁽¹⁾ Moreover, in *If I Die* he introduces a character who has the same name as Socrates' antagonist (Callicles in the *Gorgias*). The problem for O'Brien in *If I Die* was the problem of "conscience and philosophy and intellect and emotion and fear and physical hurt and desire to live chastened by a desire to be good" (54), and his talk about the war with his friend in summer was "The summer conversation, spiked with plenty of references to the philosophers and academicians of war" (17). The work, *If I Die* is supposed to be a result of Tim O'Brien's own dialogue with such characters in Plato's Dialogues as Socrates and Callicles.

2. Struggle against the Reality of Death

If I Die and *Things* have very similar plots. In both stories, the main character is a young soldier named Tim O'Brien, the same name as the author, who was drafted to the Vietnam War and felt guilt about his participating in the war. However, there are two differences between them. First,

Tim of *If I Die* is not a writer. Second, there are many references in *If I Die* to such Plato's works as *Gorgias*, *Lysis*, *Apology*, *Crito*, and *Republic*. On the other hand, *Things* refers only to Plato's *Republic* in a short story, "On the Rainy River". But the reference to Plato in *Things* indicates that the author has not lost his concern toward Plato.

The second difference is as follows. Tim of *If I Die* only passively suffers in the war that he thinks is wrong, and does not try to find solution to his sufferings; he just wonders what is just or what is courage, and tries to find some answer, relying on many philosophers and novelists and academicians. However, in *Things*, Tim does not depend on someone's thought, but begins to search his own answer.

The author writes some confusing stories in *Things*. In "Good Form" the author writes about the killing of a man. But he says almost everything else is invented: "But listen. Even that story is made up" ("Good Form", 171). Moreover, after all the stories about the death of Kiowa, a very conscientious American soldier, who is a native American, are written, the author adds this comment: "I want to make it clear that Norman Bowker, his former comrade, was in no way responsible for what happened to Kiowa. Norman did not experience a failure of nerve that night. That part of the story is my own" ("Note", 154). What did the author intend by this comment?

Socrates says in the *Gorgias*, "Listen, then, as story-tellers say, to a very pretty tale, which I dare say that you may be disposed to regard as a fable only, but which, as I believe, is a true tale, for I mean to speak the truth" (*Gorgias*, 523a). The story Socrates relates is that of judgement after death, according to which for the purpose of rectifying the situation that judges with bodies had been deceived by the outside good appearance of unjust people and false witnesses, Zeus decided to deprive men of the foreknowledge of death, to get them entirely stripped before they are judged, and finally to enable the judge with his naked souls to pierce into the other naked souls when they are judged. He thus appointed his three sons for the office of judgement: Rhadamanthus judges those who come from Asia, Aeacus those from Europe, and Minos works as the court of appeal, so that the judgement respecting the last journey of men will be as just as possible.

When Socrates tells this kind of parables, his aim is principally to make his partner of dialogue understand some important truth. I think when the narrator in *Things*, Tim, says "But listen. Even that story is made up" ("Good Form", 171), he is suggesting that the made-up story includes some important truth. As long as this truth is handed to someone, it doesn't matter whether that

what is related there happened actually.

Socrates is a real person in history, but he did not leave any literary work of his own. There is no clue that Socrates was really like the person that Plato described in his works. It is the same in *Things*, there is no evidence that Tim is really the person like the actual author in real world. This is a device to make readers get to the truth. To make the character named Tim O'Brien appear in the story leads readers to think about the story's connection to the reality. When readers notice that the main character has the same name as the author of the book, they try to find which part of the book is real, so as to approach the truth. Whether the truth they found out actually took place or not is not significant. The author defines this kind of truth as story-truth.

Story-truth can be seen clearly in this text:

Yet even if it did happen—and may be it did, anything's possible—even then you know it cannot be true, because a true war story doesn't depend on that kind of truth. Absolute occurrence is irrelevant. A thing may happen and be a total lie; another thing may not happen and be truer than the truth. ("How to Tell a True War Story", 79-80)

In this episode, Tim is reminded of Linda, who passed away at the age of nine when he was a little boy. After she dies, he goes into the dream world. In that world she is not dead. Tim and Linda enjoy skating, and he often talks with her. As Herzog indicates, by saying, "story-truth requires the author to employ imagination to reveal emotional truths transcending the limits of memory and facts" (122), his imagination makes it possible to let her act animatedly, as if she is alive. "Do I *look* dead?" she says to him, and he denies it ("The Lives of the Dead", 231). He regards her as a living person. He goes to bed to meet her, because in his dream she still lives and he can talk with her. He never says it is fancy. To Timmy, young Tim O'Brien, what was true was her living.

In *Things*, many characters die. However, Tim does not think they are dead. They are still alive in Tim's stories. In "Lives of the Dead", when Linda dies at age nine, he says: "But I can steal her soul. I can revive, at least briefly, that which is absolute and unchanging. In a story, miracles can happen ... I needed that kind of miracle" ("The Lives of the Dead", 224). Why stories can make dead people alive once more is explained. In Tim's view to the life, lives don't rely on whether their hearts beat, or their bodies warm. Human souls wouldn't vanish just because they set for the

journey to heaven. In fact, O'Brien notes in an interview, "If there is a theme to the whole book it has to do with the fact that stories can save our lives ... the livingness that's there as you read and that linger after" (Herzog, 124). It also includes the answer to what does "a true story that never happened" mean. The resurrection of Linda is a true story, yet it never happens. What is revived is not her body, but her absolute and unchanging identity. In a sense she still lives and in another sense she is still dead. It is contradictory. Nevertheless, this antinomy embodies the very meaning of "a true story that never happened" ("How to Tell a True War Story", 80). His countermeasure against death is giving them new identities like Linda. She is dead, and that fact cannot be denied. However, given the new identity by Tim as a writer, she can talk with Tim. She is alive in the other world.

For the author, the exact facts do not have more valuable meaning than story-truth, for everyone can write about happening-truth. Of course it requires the knowledge about what happened. The simple facts of history do not bring us raw feelings. The author says "I want you to feel what I felt. I want you to know why story-truth is truer sometimes than happening-truth" ("Good Form", 172). According to these sentences, feeling is one of the most important things for the author. Moreover, feeling has an important role in the truth. "A true war story, if truly told, makes the stomach believe" ("How to Tell a True War Story", 74). It does not matter whether it happened or not. What matters is whether you can believe it or not.

Moreover, writing story-truth is good for Tim's mental health. It is another way to ease the pain that Tim got in the war. As a writer, Tim writes his feelings and thoughts in his books. Pennebaker says psychologists tend to be confessed from strangers their past stories. He also says studies suggest that bartenders, taxi drivers, prostitutes and hairdressers serve as listeners to people's confessions.

Why do people tell their deepest thoughts and feelings to strangers but not to their spouses or friends? It's not that they trust the listeners, or even that listeners are nonjudgmental. Rather, according to the classic sociologist Georg Simmel, it is freedom from recrimination. (Pennebaker 113)

There is also an experiment once conducted in which people were given an opportunity to confess

their true feelings. Participants talked to a person in a small space separated by a curtain. During the experiment, they remained on guard entire time. Yet if it is a tape recorder to which they have to confess their true feelings, they tend to confess more deep thoughts rather than when it is a person behind a curtain. "People readily opened up when talking into a tape recorder, even though they didn't know who would ever listen to the tape" (Pennebaker 111). The very same thing occurs to Tim O'Brien. He cannot tell about his experience to his families and friends. However, he writes his deep emotions through the stories. Those stories will be read by those who have no relationship with him. When he is asked from his nine-year-old daughter whether he killed somebody or not, he says, "Of course not" ("Good Form", 172). He lies to her. He continues as follows: "I want to tell her exactly what happened or what I remember happening" ("Ambush", 125). He wants to confess his true feelings and memories, but he cannot because it may hurt his daughter's feelings, and affect their long-term relationship. It is also hard to tell it to friends. According to Pennebaker, after providing some supports to those who have traumas, "Their friends and coworker began to avoid them. Casual conversations became stilted because no one wanted to broach the topic of death" (Pennebaker 105). On the contrary, readers of novels will never affect his relationships. They would judge something through reading his stories, but mostly those judgments do not reach to the author, like a tape recorder experiment. This anonymity helps Tim to express his true feelings outside.

When the author faces the death, he cannot look away from the fact. However, as a writer, he finds other ways to overcome these pains. He writes his feelings and tells what he thinks is the truth, and these processes cure him from the agony of the war. He finds out the way to make dead people undead to some extent. This was exactly Plato did after he had experienced Socrates' death, the death the master suffered as the result of unjust death-sentence by his fellow Athenians.⁽²⁾

Tim O'Brien is inspired both by Plato's attitude toward Socrates' death and by his use of parables to persuade people about the true reality of the world. This effect he received from Plato impregnates his thought deeply, and he has found his original salvation in writing novels, which the significant power of story-truth could bring, not the superficial power of happening-truth. The dead people remain dead, and neither Plato nor Tim could forget about them, but it doesn't matter. They found another world that could ease their pain. In story-truth, they could talk with Socrates or with Linda and other soldiers, those who are dead now. That is the thing they tried to

achieve through their stories.

3 Struggle—Justice and Fear through the War

Plato tried everything to prevent the death sentence against Socrates. He proposed a fine of thirty minas (*Apology* 38b). He is supposed to have shared the feeling of Crito that Socrates should escape from the prison, not to die an unjust death (cf. *Crito*). Plato's *Crito* begins with Socrates' bewilderment, "Why have you come at this time, Crito?" (43a). Crito had been watching Socrates asleep. He says in 43b:

I have been wondering at you for some time, seeing how sweetly you sleep; and I purposely refrained from waking you, that you might pass the time as pleasantly as possible. I have often thought throughout your life hitherto that you were of a happy disposition, and I think so more than ever in this resent misfortune, since you bear it so easily and calmly.

Socrates' reply is that "it would be absurd if at my age I were disturbed because I must die now" (43b). On the other hand, Tim was deeply disturbed by the danger of death. Just as the death Socrates encountered was unjustly imposed on him, the war which Tim was drafted to fight when he was twenty-years old was or at least seemed to him to be wrong ("On the Rainy River," 38).

Then, just as Crito tried to enable Socrates to escape from the prison, an old man helped Tim, taking him to the lake, so as for Tim to be able to go across the border to Canada. At that time many young people who were drafted to fight in the Vietnam War escaped to Canada. They could escape the draft if they went to foreign countries. Tim thought the Vietnam War was wrong, just as Socrates thought that the death sentence was wrong. He thought that participation in the wrong war is terrible thing. Therefore, escape to Canada meant for him to follow his conscience. However, he did not. The reason is explained in the following text:

All those eyes on me—the town, the whole universe—and I couldn't risk the embarrassment. It was as if there were an audience to my life, the swirl of faces along the river, and in my head I could hear people screaming at me. Traitor! They yelled. Turncoat! Pussy! I felt blush. I

couldn't tolerate it. I couldn't endure the mockery, or the disgrace, or patriotic ridicule...It had nothing to do with the morality. Embarrassment, that's all it was. ("On the Rainy River", 57)

In this scene, he is surrounded by various people all of sudden. They are his family, his girlfriend who died in his childhood, and his mates who meet in the Vietnam War in the future. These people are all related with Tim. This suggests to him that, if he runs away, his friends and family will despise him until he dies. Such curses as traitors may suffer will haunt him forever. Finally, he gives up going to Canada. He says it had nothing to the morality in this quotation, and "it" does not mean escaping to Canada. It means why he decided to stay the state and decided to participate in the war. In this decision there is no moral at all, the reason is that the decision is made by fear and embarrassment. His conscience always leads him to Canada in "On the Rainy River."

This "embarrassment" means that he felt great shame at being a coward, but also, he feared to be given the cold shoulder. It gave Tim the feeling of guilt just to participate in the war. Smith also notices about that and explains as "The repetition of the phrase 'I was present' indicates O'Brien's deep-seated guilt over the mere fact of his participation in the war" (Smith 106). Tim's sense of justice forbade him to go to the Vietnam War. He should not obey the draft. But the fear overpowered his conscience, so Tim goes to the direction contrary to that toward which he should head, against his conscience.

In "On the Rainy River" there are two conflicts in Tim's mind. One is brought by a letter. First, he receives the letter that demands his participation in the Vietnam War. He never wanted to participate in the war. For that reason he tried to run away. According to Jones, the author of *War and Novelist: Appraising the American War Novel*, people tend to think about philosophical problems.

The problem of the ethical "ought" dominates many of these novels; orthodox Christianity is of diminishing importance, colliding with Plato, Kant, Spinoza, Nietzsche or from variants of existentialism. But seldom far from the foreground of any of the war novels is the predicament of the individual who attempts to conduct himself in accordance with rationally coherent set of beliefs. (Jones, 15)

As Jones points out, the war novels tend to contain ethical problems based on the thoughts of philosophers.

In Tim's case the voice of the many made him choose the course that might lead to the object of fear, death, while in Socrates' case the voice of the many Crito hoped would lead to the escape from death, for he says as follows (44b-d).

Many persons who do not know you and me well will think I could have saved you if I had been willing to spend money, but that I would not take the trouble. And yet what reputation could be more disgraceful than that of considering one's money of more importance than one's friends? For most people will not believe that we were eager to help you to go away from here, but you refused. . . . this very trouble we are in now shows that the public is able to accomplish not by any means the least, but almost the greatest of evils, if one has a bad reputation with it.

Tim followed the rules and chose the road that might lead to death just because of his fear of the majority, while Socrates followed the laws and chose the road that would certainly lead to his death, not because of the fear of the majority, but just because he continued to hold his principle that it is never right or honorable to do wrong and we ought not even to requite wrong with wrong, as the world thinks, since we must not do wrong at all (49a-b).

In "On the Rainy River", "a kind-faced woman carrying an umbrella and a copy of Plato's *Republic*", which discusses about the definition of justice, appears ("On the Rainy River", 56). The *Republic* is also quoted in *If I Die*, in chapter 22 entitled "Courage Is a Certain Kind of Preserving". Chapter 3 of *If I die* also discusses the problem of escaping to Canada to avoid being drafted, just as "On the Rainy River" in *Things*.

The title of chapter 22 in *If I die* is taken from a dialogue between Socrates and Glaucon. It is from Socrates' talk about courage and his attempt to define it. Glaucon asks Socrates what he means by "courage is a certain kind of preserving" (*If I die*, 185). The quotation ends with the answer from Socrates: "The preserving of the opinion produced by law through education about what—and what sort of things—is terrible . . ." (*If I die*, 185). However, this text still continues in the *Republic* as follows (429b-429c):

Of the opinion respecting things to be feared, what they are and of what nature, which the law implants through education; and I mean by the words 'under all circumstances' to intimate that in pleasure or in pain, or under the influence of desire or fear, a man preserves, and does not lose this opinion.

This quotation suggests that Tim's actions are based on courage as the preserving of the opinion produced by law through education about what is to be feared. When he was drafted to the Vietnam War, he thought about Socrates in the *Crito*.

For twenty-one years I'd lived under its laws, accepted its education, eaten its food, wasted and guzzled its water, slept well at night ... I remembered Plato's *Crito*, when Socrates, facing certain death—execution, not war—had the chance to escape. But he reminded himself that he had seventy years in which he could have left the country, if he were not satisfied or felt the agreements he'd made up with it were not unfair. He had not chosen Sparta or Crete. And, I reminded myself, I hadn't thought much about Canada until that summer. (*If I die*, 18-19)

Like Tim in "On the Rainy River" he could not find the reason for going to the war. In the *Crito* Socrates considered whether it is proper for him to escape, starting from the principle that if it is clearly right to escape, then he will make the attempt, but if not, he will abstain from it. When considering this question he assumed the situation where he is inquired by the law and the state themselves. The law and the state tell Socrates, "whoever of you stay here, seeing how we administer justice and how we govern the state in other respects, has thereby entered an agreement with us to do what we command" (*Crito*, 51e). Moreover, the state and the law complain that he who disobeys them is thrice wrong, because in disobeying them he is disobeying his parents, because they are the authors of his education, and because he has made an agreement with them to obey their commands.

Tim felt the same way toward the state and the law. When arguing with Major Callicles, Tim said, "But sir, the law says killing civilians is wrong. We're taught that, even by the army" (191). It indicates that the education from the state formed Tim's idea of justice, just as Socrates referred to his education in talking about justice in the *Crito*. Tim and Socrates were in this respect in the

similar situation. However, there is a crucial difference between them, which has to do with their reason for not attempting to escape. It concerns fear.

Regardless of the fact that Tim is close to Socrates, Socrates is not afraid of the execution and death, in contrast to Tim. He is rather afraid of wrong-doing than of his own death. Socrates explains in the *Apology* as follows (29b):

For to fear death, gentleman, is nothing else than to think one is wise when one is not; for it is thinking one knows what one does not know. For no one knows whether death be not even the greatest of all blessings to me, but they fear it as if it is the greatest of evils ... I shall never fear or avoid those things concerning which I do not know whether they are good or bad.

This quotation also shows knowledge is more important than anything. Socrates claims in the *Apology* that “I much prefer to die after such a defense than to live after a defense of the other sort. For neither in the court nor in war ought I or any other man to plan to escape death by every possible means. (*Apology*, 38e-39a). “A defense of the other sort” (*Apology*, 39a) means exaggerate the misfortune of the situation that surrounded him at that time. For Socrates there was nothing to fear but making a mistake by taking something uncertain for granted. This sense of value is greatly different from that of Tim. He was terrified when he faced the danger of death.

The fear against morality is also seen in “The Man I Killed” and “Ambush”. In these two stories, Tim kills a Vietnamese boy. When the boy happened to pass by Tim and his comrades, Tim did not notice their existence. If Tim had done nothing to him and just watched him passing by, neither of them wouldn’t have got hurt, and everything would have been okay. However, Tim couldn’t ignore the boy. Tim remembers the incident as follows: “I did not see him as the enemy; I did not ponder issues of morality or politics or military duty... I was terrified. There were no thoughts about killing” (“Ambush”, 126-27). Just because he was terrified, he killed the boy. The fear toward death exceeded everything else in his mind. The reason why he killed this Vietnamese boy was that he thought he might get killed by him. He was under sway of fear toward death, contrary to Socrates. Fear is a dominating element in Tim O’Brien’s books that controls their characters’ acts. However, they do not like the dominance of fear. Clearly Tim feels guilty toward the Vietnamese boy. Let me quote from Jones (163).

Guilt appears in three palpably forms. The most prevalent is guilt for killing another human being—the absolute fact of murder, regardless of motive. Another manifestation is the religious-sexual guilt that has been endemic to contemporary American literature. Finally, there is social guilt, caused by the failure to perform well in combat or by feelings of responsibility for the death of others.

The religious-sexual guilt does not appear in *Things*, but other two are seen in several stories. Norman and Tim feel the responsibility toward Kiowa's death. Lieutenant Cross also has guilt to the death of Ted Lavender, and so on. The sense of guilt is seen in the whole story of *Things*.

In chapter 22 of *If I die*, Tim argues with Major Callicles what is right or wrong. This chapter includes not only the quotation of Plato's *Republic*, but also has some connection with Plato's *Gorgias*, where also "Callicles" as a major interlocutor. Major Callicles argues about courage as follows (195).

"You know what courage is? I can tell you that. It's not standing around passively hoping for things to happen right; it's going out and being tough and sharp-thinking' and making things happen right."

He grabbed his helmet, leaving the problem of what is right unresolved, and went on up to the officers' club.

Callicles and Tim never reached the agreement concerning this problem. The same thing happens in the *Gorgias*, concerning which Irwin comments as follows (131):

The *Protagoras* solved this problem, if the elenchus is to show the pleasure is final good, and that a science of pleasure is possible. The *Gorgias* abandons both claims without replacing them with other claims to solve the problem...The *Protagoras*'s views are rejected, but questions they tried to answer are still unanswered. The Socratic defense against Callicles shows the incoherence in Callicles' defense of an unjust way of life, but does not vindicate justice.

In the *Gorgias*, Socrates argues about justice with Gorgias, Polus, and Callicles. After some arguments about what is just, Callicles in the *Gorgias* says “How tyrannical you are! I wish that you and your argument would rest, or that you would get someone else to argue with you” (506), and throws argument away like Callicles in *If I die*. After that, Socrates starts to question and answer himself, and through this process he expresses his own opinion about justice, which is solid, in contrast to Tim, who cannot sufficiently cope with Callicles. He does not have any firm thought about justice. Also, in contrast with Socrates and Callicles, who are free to talk anything without any hesitation, Major Callicles is senior to Tim in rank and Tim is not able to discuss with Major Callicles frankly.

Tim always considers about justice. But in both *Things* and *If I die* he cannot find what is right. How can we judge whether something is right or not? There must be a basis to rely on. The reason why Tim suffers during these stories relates this question. There might be no answer, just as Callicles and Tim cannot find it.

Socrates says in the *Apology* as follows (39a):

In battles it is often plain that a man might avoid death by throwing down his arms and begging mercy of his pursuers; and there are many means of escaping death in dangers of various kinds if one is willing to do and say anything. But, gentlemen, it is not hard to escape death. It is much harder to wickedness, for that runs faster than death.

It is beyond any doubt that Tim O'Brien knows this passage. Tim was just like Socrates, being put in the middle between wickedness and death. What made the problem complicated in his case was that although to go to the war was not a right thing when it was considered in the context of his education since childhood, it could be a right thing when seen from another point of view, because going to the war means to obey the state that educated him. In the *Crito* it was right to obey the law and the order given to Socrates.

Tim wavered between fear and conscience, and he suffered from the conflict between the state and the individual, and tried to struggle against them. To stand against the conflict, Tim used the thought of Plato, and tried to act like Socrates in *Crito* and *Apology*. However, he could not act

like Socrates because of his fear toward death and the majority, which brought him much pain. He could not find how to solve the problem.

4 Linda as the Socratic Dialogue Partner for Tim

But Plato emphasizes the importance of examining one's own life, saying that "the unexamined life is not worth living" (38a). Even if this examination happens to end in failure, without reaching any definite solution, it will not matter at all: it is worth living as long as the life is fully examined. And in Tim's case the most appropriate way to examine his life and the state of the soul was to write stories.

Although the author put emphasis in *If I die* on the questions of what is just and what is right, these questions have become less conspicuous in *Things*. This suggests that he no longer tried to search the answer, but instead began to create his own answer(s). For this purpose Linda, who did not appear in *If I die*, had an important role.

We, human beings, are unable to forget the time we spent together with our beloved dead people and the pains of us as well as of those people. Tim could not forget his beloved people, and thus came to create the new world surrounding them in which they are still living, through writing his own stories. This new world is based on Platonic Forms. They play the role of concepts, using the strong power of story-truth. In "Lives of the Dead", Linda says being dead is like "being inside a book that nobody's reading" ("The Lives of the Dead", 232). Actually, she is now in the book of Tim O'Brien. When they are in books and somebody read them, Linda and other dead people come back from death.

Moreover, Linda is the only person who has nothing to do with the Vietnam War. Other people are soldiers, and friends of soldiers and families of soldiers. On the contrary, Linda died before the Vietnam War began, so she does not have the relation to the war, but her presence is necessary for the author. Once people go to the war, they never go back to people as they used to be. Like being dead, it is irreversible thing. However, the author tried to reverse both of them.

The author calls the nine-year-old Tim as Timmy. When Timmy and Linda were children, she passed away because of her disease. Tim's daughter in "Good Form" is also nine years old and does not know about the war. They are innocent. Tim's innocence was lost during war, and

Timmy was also lost in Tim's mind. However, Timmy can also return to life in the story, like dead soldiers. The innocence that was lost in the war has the possibility of returning. The author, who also went to the Vietnam War like Tim tried to restore it through stories. That's why the author used his own name for the main character of *Things*. Through writing and creating the story of struggling against the unjust and death, the author tried to save himself from the pains of the war, just as Plato tried through writing Socratic dialogues to understand the meaning of life and death of Socrates.

Notes

- (1) The translation of Plato used are as follows: for *Apology* and *Crito* Harold North Fowler, for *Republic* John Llewelyn Davis and David James Vaughan, and for *Gorgias* B. Jowett.
- (2) On this question, cf. Y.Y. Kanayama, "Socrates' Humaneness: What Socrates' Last Words Meant".

References

- Herzog, Tobey C., *Tim O'Brien*. London: Twayne, 1997.
- Irwin, Terence, *Plato's Moral Theory: The Early and Middle Dialogues*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977.
- Jones, Peter G., *War and the Novelist: Appraising the American War Novel*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1976.
- Kanayama, Yasuhira, Y., "Socrates' Humaneness: What Socrates' Last Words Meant", *Frontiers of Philosophy in China*, 2019, 111-132
- O'Brien, Tim, *The Things They Carried*. Boston: Mariner Books, 2009.
- . *If I Die in the Combat Zone, Box Me Up and Ship Me Home*. New York: Dell, 1973.
- Pennebaker, James C., *Opening Up: The Healing Power of Expressing Emotions*. New York: Guilford, 1997.
- Plato. *Apology*. Trans. Fowler, Harold North. *The Loeb Classical Library, Plato I*. Ed. Goold, G.P. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999. 61-146.

- . *Crito*. Trans. Fowler, Harold North. *The Loeb Classical Library, Plato I*. Ed. Goold, G.P. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999. 147-93.
- . *Gorgias*. Trans. Jowette, B. *The Dialogues of Plato*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1924. 267-422.
- . *The Republic of Plato*. Trans. Davis, John LLevelyn., Vaughan, David James. London: Macmillan, 1950.
- Smith, Patrick A., *Tim O'Brien: A Critical Comparison*. London: Greenwood, 2005.

