

The aim of this essay is to investigate the relation between Plato's dialogues the *Republic* and the *Laws* because of apparent differences of ideal cities, which are depicted in them in speech. The city of the *Republic* is designed to be ruled by sovereign ruler or group of them. On the other side, the city of the *Laws* is designed to be ruled by the rule of law, which must be supreme. First intention of this essay is, after short overview of both cities, to examine so called biographic interpretation which tries to explain the differences of both dialogues by Plato's life experiences. The second interpretation to examine holds that the city of the *Republic* is just theoretical sketch which is not realizable and the city of the *Laws* is its humanly possible realization. The rest of this essay tries to use previous results and develop some more specific grasps of possible relations of both cities especially by reading several important and influential passages. Finally the advantages and disadvantages of all interpretations are considered and the most apparent solution is suggested. That is, both dialogues are in mutual harmony concerning the main philosophical positions, i.e. conception of virtue, soul, human nature and reason. The difference of these dialogues is caused by their different perspectives on the same ideas, different situation of speakers and different tasks to solve.