

Gabriele Cornelli (Ed.)

Plato's Styles and Characters

Beiträge zur Altertumskunde



Herausgegeben von Michael Erler, Dorothee Gall,
Ludwig Koenen und Clemens Zintzen

Band 341

Plato's Styles and Characters



Between Literature and Philosophy

Edited by
Gabriele Cornelli

DE GRUYTER

The publication of this book has been supported by the International Plato Society, the Archai UNESCO Chair / Universidade de Brasília and the CAPES/ Coordenação de aperfeiçoamento de pessoal de nível superior/ Ministry of Education/Brazil.



Organização das Nações Unidas para a Educação, a Ciência e a Cultura

- Cátedra Unesco Archai:
- sobre as origens do
- pensamento ocidental – UnB
- Estabelecida em 2011



ISBN 978-3-11-044403-2
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-044560-2
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-043654-9
ISSN 1616-0452

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2016 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Printing and binding: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
☉ Printed on acid-free paper
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com



To Samuel Scolnicov[†] (1941–2014)

Table of Contents

Introduction — 1

Plato's Literary Style

Samuel Scolnicov

Beyond Language and Literature — 5

Raúl Gutiérrez

The Three Waves of Dialectic in the *Republic* — 15

Mary Louise Gill

Plato's Unfinished Trilogy: *Timaeus–Critias–Hermocrates* — 33

María Angélica Fierro

The Myth of the Winged Chariot in the *Phaedrus*: A Vehicle for Philosophical Thinking — 47

Lucas Soares

Perspectivism, Proleptic Writing and Generic *agón*: Three Readings of the *Symposium* — 63

Graciela E. Marcos de Pinotti

Plato's Argumentative Strategies in *Theaetetus* and *Sophist* — 77

José Trindade Santos

"Reading Plato's *Sophist*" — 89

Other Genres and Traditions

Michael Erler

Detailed Completeness and Pleasure of the Narrative. Some Remarks on the Narrative Tradition and Plato — 103

Dino De Sanctis

The meeting scenes in the *incipit* of Plato's dialogue — 119

Gilmário Guerreiro da Costa

The Philosophical Writing and the Drama of Knowledge in Plato — 137

Marcus Mota

Comic Dramaturgy in Plato: Observations from the *Ion* — 157

Mario Regali

Amicus Homerus: Allusive Art in Plato's Incipit to Book X of the Republic (595a – c) — 173

Fernando Muniz

Performance and Elenchos in Plato's *Ion* — 187

Mauro Tulli

Plato and the Catalogue Form in *Ion* — 203

Fernando Santoro

Orphic Aristophanes at Plato's Symposium — 211

Álvaro Vallejo Campos

Socrates as a physician of the soul — 227

Silvio Marino

The Style of Medical Writing in the Speech of Eryximachus: Imitation and Contamination — 241

Esteban Bieda

Gorgias, the eighth orator. Gorgianic echoes in Agathon's Speech in the Symposium — 253

Beatriz Bossi

Plato's *Phaedrus*: A Play Inside the Play — 263

Plato's Characters

Gabriele Cornelli

He longs for him, he hates him and he wants him for himself: The Alcibiades Case between Socrates and Plato — 281

Debra Nails

Five Platonic Characters — 297

Francisco Bravo

Who Is Plato's Callicles and What Does He Teach? — 317

Michele Corradi

Doing business with Protagoras (*Prot.* 313e): Plato and the Construction of a Character — 335

Marcelo D. Boeri

Theaetetus and Protarchus: two philosophical characters or what a philosophical soul should do — 357

Christian Keime

The Role of Diotima in the *Symposium*: The Dialogue and Its Double — 379

Contributors — 401

Citations Index — 407

Author Index — 411

Subject Index — 419

Mauro Tulli

Plato and the Catalogue Form in *Ion*

Socrates states in *Ion* that the master of τέχνη, in arithmetic or medicine for instance, may be a judge of both a negative and positive speech¹. This certainly affects ποιητική (531d4–532b7). But, for the recitation or the interpretation, the text of Homer inspires Ion, while that of Hesiod and Archilocus makes him dull (532b8–c4). Socrates indicates why: Ion reacts to the text Homer and not to that of Hesiod and Archilocus because he does not own τέχνη. In a well-defined field, τέχνη offers a model both for a positive and negative speech, it is a ὅλον that encompasses every type of opposition². This is the result of research, σκέψις (532c5–d3). Ion believes it to be on the basis of knowledge, but Socrates emphasises it as an ιδιότης. Research, σκέψις, advances alongside common sense, τάληθῆ λέγω (532d4–e4)³. This gives rise to a systematic development in terms of painting, sculpture and music, in particular the τέχνη of the flute, the τέχνη of the cithara, the τέχνη of song accompanied by the cithara and the τέχνη of rhapsodists (532e4–533c3).

A systematic development that has nourished more than a few doubts among scholars. Certainly, it is not rigorous, confusing as it does the judge with the author⁴. In a well-defined field, the judge of both a positive and negative speech is the author. The τέχνη by which the judge has the function of judge is but the indispensable τέχνη for painting, sculpture and music. But prior to the *Republic*, this is the concept of τέχνη. The necessity of establishing the boundary that separates τέχνη from τέχνη leads to a concrete flattening of the individual figures that Plato refers to. With regard to painting, sculpture and music, the author is indeed the judge or the judge is indeed the author.

In *Gorgias*, Plato immediately points out the central issue (449c9–450c2). Does rhetoric own a well-defined field, περὶ τί τῶν ὄντων τυγχάνει οὔσα? It makes little sense, however, to distinguish the judge: in *Laches*, the judge advances thanks to τέχνη, rather than following the majority's opinion (184d5–185b8). Unmasking the false, ἐξετάσαι, for medicine, politics and music, is a difficult task. In *Charmides* the judge of both a positive and negative speech is the author

¹ See Heitsch (1992, pp. 88–101).

² For the translation of ὅλον, Rijksbaron (2007, pp. 152–153).

³ Giannantoni (2005, pp. 89–140) points out the essential role of τάληθῆ λέγω for the portrait of Socrates in the *Apology*.

⁴ See Janaway (1992, pp. 1–23): according to Capuccino (2005, pp. 171–206), the author possesses only a τέχνη, while the judge has ἐπιστήμη.

that possesses τέχνη, for the ἰατρός, the ἰατρός is the judge (169c3–171c10): the attempt to identify τέχνη for excellence in σωφροσύνη does not ensure a result, because it is sterile by means of σωφροσύνη to isolate the δίκαιον⁵. From this derives a concept of τέχνη lacking in nuance, tied to the concrete problem. And in *Ion* the concrete problem indicates τέχνη as ὅλον, that is, knowledge that encompasses every type of opposition: for the author or the judge⁶. A refusal of Hesiod and Archilocus is not plausible. Plato suggests a well-defined field both for the text of Homer and for that of Hesiod and Archilocus, a ὅλον for which the τέχνη, the ποιητική, for the author or the judge is unique⁷.

A systematic development: painting, sculpture and music, τέχνη after τέχνη, with the τέχνη of the rhapsodists that Ion, who manages to re-experience the text of Homer and not that of Hesiod or Archilocus, does not own. Book II of the *Republic* offers a very similar passage (372c3–373d3): Plato suggests painting for τέχνη and, with the scheme in *Ion*, music, in particular the τέχνη of rhapsodists⁸. But a problem arises. The mode of articulation here lies in the framework of μίμησις. For painting, sculpture and music, a link with the μίμησις in *Ion* is missing⁹.

The analytical solution is not convincing: Plato discovers the function of μίμησις in *Republic*, after the investigation in *Ion*. Certainly, by the end of *Ion* he arrives at πρέπον, that is, the appropriate speech for the slave and for the master, for the βουκόλος and for the κυβερνήτης, while passing over μίμησις (539d5–540d3)¹⁰. But the debate on μίμησις is already widespread before *Republic* and *Ion*, in the intellectual climate dominated by dramatic production. In *The-smophoriazusae* Aristophanes' comic vein blossoms through μίμησις towards the effeminate Agathon (146–170), from μίμησις descends Damon's prompt support for music, with the canon of excellence, ἦθος (16 Lasserre)¹¹.

Criticism has mostly perceived an argumentative device. A link with μίμησις in *Ion* is missing because the function of μίμησις is not reconcilable with the friction between ἐνθουσιασμός and τέχνη¹². *Ion* indicates the magnetic force of Homer, which comes down to us link by link from a god, and whose final victim

5 On the ἰατρός in Plato, Vegetti (1995, pp. 3–48).

6 See Cambiano (1966, pp. 284–305).

7 In *Timaeus*, Socrates takes the role of the judge, thanks to the knowledge displayed in *Republic*: Regali (2012, pp. 43–56).

8 On μίμησις and τέχνη in Book II of the *Republic*, Cerri (1996², pp. 35–66).

9 See Diller (1971, pp. 201–219).

10 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1969⁴, pp. 32–46) advances here with his biographical approach.

11 On μίμησις before Plato and its echoes in Book III of the *Republic*, Tulli (2013, pp. 314–318).

12 See Flashar (1958, pp. 36–54) and Halliwell (2002, pp. 37–71).

is the dreamy listener (533c4–535a5). But integrating the function of μίμησις into the function of ἐνθουσιασμός is not plausible. Plato underlines the condition of τέχνη for μίμησις in Book X of the *Republic* (600c3–602b11). Above and beyond *Ion*, Plato separates the τέχνη of creation, the τέχνη of usage and the τέχνη of μίμησις, leading to an ever-increasing discrepancy with the ideal¹³. Certainly, for the recitation or the interpretation of Homer the contribution of μίμησις is indispensable. The text of Homer for Book III of the *Republic* has its foundations in μίμησις, in particular in the μίμησις of the figures of the myth, Chryses or Agamemnon (392c7–393b3). The investigation of μίμησις which, on account of the fleeting material order of things, arises with the text of Homer, is similar in Book X of the *Republic*, following the pages on κλίνη, the triple bed (598d8–600c2)¹⁴. And *Ion*? He goes on, struck by ἐνθουσιασμός and lacking in τέχνη. But the result achieved in the recitation or the interpretation of Homer is positive. As far as μίμησις is concerned, a manageable field is lacking¹⁵.

An argumentative device always occurs in relation to the overall literary setup. What argument may be put forward on the μίμησις compared to the ἦθος that *Ion* has? Criticism indicates in the *corpus* the importance of the individual figures that Socrates attracts in his research. Gorgias, Charmides, Protagoras or Timaeus: the plot that Plato offers depends on the individual figures¹⁶. The conflict between ἐνθουσιασμός and τέχνη, between blind, ineluctable adherence to the text of Homer and knowledge, fertile both for the text of Homer and that of Hesiod and Archilocus, is the code that animates *Ion*, which makes his ἦθος so concrete.

Painting, sculpture and music: the style gains pace, which, steady for painting, upbeat for sculpture, suffocates articulation for music: a vortex for the τέχνη of the flute, the τέχνη of the cithara and the τέχνη of rhapsodists. Studies here see a link with Democritus. The style has quickened in pace because Plato offers a resumé of an already widespread text, the *Mikros Diakosmos*¹⁷. Plutarch recalls for Democritus, with *De Sollertia*, a passage on song that does not omit the function of μίμησις: the τέχνη of song for the μίμησις of swan and nightingale (974a–d). With the support of Lucretius (V 1379–1435), the passage is mostly accredited to *Mikros Diakosmos* (68B154 DK)¹⁸. And a link with Democritus emerges in *Ion*, with unclear nuances, for ἐνθουσιασμός (68B18 DK). From this arises the

¹³ On the *Sophist* (218b6–221c5), Balansard (2001, pp. 118–139).

¹⁴ On the role of the κλίνη, Palumbo (2008, pp. 488–543).

¹⁵ See Pöhlmann (1976, pp. 191–208).

¹⁶ On the characterization of Socrates and the individual figures, Blondell (2002, pp. 1–112).

¹⁷ See Schweitzer (1932, pp. 20–31).

¹⁸ See Reinhardt (1960, pp. 114–132).

model: Plato proceeds with *Mikros Diakosmos* and stays silent in *Ion* on μίμησις, in Book II of the *Republic* on ἐνθουσιασμός, with a fertile selection. But the basis is weak. Plato in *Ion* certainly does not observe the result of ἐνθουσιασμός for painting, sculpture and music. It makes no sense to meditate in Book II of the *Republic* on the μίμησις that Plutarch claims for Democritus, on the μίμησις of swan and nightingale.

However, there is one problem: the author that Socrates indicates for painting, sculpture and music. For painting, Polygnotus, following the apprenticeship with his father, invited to Athens by Cimon, active in Delphi and, at the time of *Ion*, enjoying great fame for the psychological examination, the ἦθος, of the individual figures¹⁹. But, for sculpture, the systematic use of antedating emerges: before Theodorus of Samos, the εὐρητής for iron and bronze, Daedalus, celebrated in the *Iliad* for Knossos and Ariadne, for the χορός of dance (XVIII 590–606), and Epeius, praised in the *Odyssey* for the Trojan horse, deceitful wood (VIII 492–495, XI 523–532). Not Fidias, not Polykleitos, in *Protagoras* not forgotten (311a8–312b6)²⁰. And finally, for music, the selection surprises: Olympus is the paradigm for the τέχνη of the flute, Socrates recalls Thamyras for the τέχνη of the cithara, in the *Iliad* mutilated for ὕβρις (II 591–602), Orpheus is the paradigm for the τέχνη of song, Socrates recalls Phemios for the τέχνη of rhapsodists, a symposium in the *Odyssey* between Telemachus and Penelope, with violence or sorrow (I 153–162, I 325–359). Why not Damon or Timotheos? A panorama mostly anchored to the text of Homer and to the time that the text of Homer suggests. By all means, Polygnotus. But for sculpture and music, the focus is on the origin, without the least consideration for the time, which does actually involve Socrates, for the classical production. The systematic use of antedating has an indisputable result: it collocates Ion among the figures of a glorious past, Daedalus and Thamyras or Epeius and Orpheus. It is not difficult to notice the shadows of the cultural climate that Ion offers²¹. Socrates underlines this. For painting, sculpture and music, the panorama, elaborated in the 4th century, established in the 5th, is dominated by archaic production, because Ion here possesses a paradigm for the recitation or the interpretation: the text of Homer.

The link with archaic production emerges immediately through form. Plato proceeds by means of parallel structures, with the repetition of more than one segment. It is a catalogue: the concept of τέχνη possesses a phonic strength and it is not difficult to notice, for painting, sculpture and music, a concrete

¹⁹ For the references of Plato, Keuls (1978, pp. 88–109).

²⁰ See Tobin (1975, pp. 307–321).

²¹ According to Murray (1996, pp. 104–112), “more than a little irony” shines here.

entry²². For painting, Plato recalls the result that he indicates for ποιητική. The sequence is very similar: ποιητική γὰρ πού ἐστὶν τὸ ὄλον (532c6–7) before γραφική γὰρ τίς ἐστὶ τέχνη τὸ ὄλον (532e4–5). Has Ion met a good and capable judge of painting, sculpture and music? Soon the flurry of questions on painting becomes more pressing, for painting ἤδη οὖν τινα εἶδες ὅστις (532e7), for sculpture with ἤδη τιν' εἶδες ὅστις (533a7), for music, and in particular for the τέχνη of rhapsodists, οὐδεπώποτ' εἶδες ἄνδρα ὅστις (533b7)²³. Ion states that the text of Hesiod and Archilocus induces torpor: οὔτε προσέχω τὸν νοῦν ἀδυνατῶ τε καὶ ὀτιοῦν συμβαλέσθαι λόγου ἄξιον, ἀλλ' ἀτεχνῶς νυστάζω (532b9–c1). The sequence is a paradigm for the judge that Ion certainly has not met. Plato recalls it for painting, νυστάζει τε καὶ ἀπορεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἔχει ὅτι συμβάληται (533a2–3), for sculpture with ἀπορεῖ τε καὶ νυστάζει, οὐκ ἔχων ὅτι εἴπη (533b4), for music, in particular for the τέχνη of rhapsodists, ἀπορεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἔχει συμβαλέσθαι (533c2–3). But for the recitation or the interpretation, the text of Homer kindles Ion: from εὐθύς τε ἐγρήγορα καὶ προσέχω τὸν νοῦν καὶ εὐπορῶ ὅτι λέγω (532c3–4) arises ἐγρήγορέν τε καὶ προσέχει τὸν νοῦν καὶ εὐπορεῖ ὅτι εἴπη (533a5) for painting. The model is polarized, marked by parallel structures: the crucial point here is δεινός, a term that Plato offers for painting, δεινός ἐστὶν ἀποφαίνειν (532e8–9), for sculpture with δεινός ἐστὶν ἐξηγεῖσθαι (533b2), for music, in particular after the mention of Olympus, with δεινός ἐστὶν ἐξηγεῖσθαι (533b8)²⁴. Form pervades explanation after explanation. It is plausible at this stage to postulate a good capable judge only with regard to Polygnotus and Daedalus, Epeius and Theodorus? With emphatic force for painting, ἐνὸς μόνου (533a4): for sculpture a more balanced ἐνὸς πέρι (533b2).

But one may progress. In the frame of archaic production, the *incipit*, the exhortative λάβωμεν (532e4), recalls the invocation: for example the invocation that, in the *Iliad*, opens the catalogue of the ships (II 484–493) or that, at the end of the *Theogony* of Hesiod, makes the catalogue of women natural (1019–1022). And the *incipit* reaches us interwoven with the quantitative problem, ἀπασῶν, with the result of research, σκέψις (532c5–d3)²⁵. The catalogue indicates the style achieved through paratactic accumulation. With ἢ Plato separates the Daedalus, Epeius, Theodorus sequence (533a7–b2) and the Olympus, Thamyris, Orpheus, Phemius sequence (533b7–c1), with οὐδέ he underlines the result for music, in particular the τέχνη of the flute, the τέχνη of the cithara, the τέχνη

²² On the function of item, entry and rubric in a catalogue, Sammons (2010, pp. 3–22).

²³ For similar questions in the text of Homer, Edwards (1980, pp. 81–105).

²⁴ On δεινός ἐπαινέτης as adequate adulation of Ion, Lowenstam (1993, pp. 19–32).

²⁵ For the quantitative problem in the invocation which opens the catalogue, Minton (1962, pp. 188–212) and De Sanctis (2006, pp. 11–33).

of song with the cithara and the τέχνη of rhapsodists (533b6–7): ἦ after ἦ, step by step, οὐδέ after οὐδέ, the discourse that Plato offers on ἐνθουσιασμός reaches us with plastic force.

This discourse is rendered concrete by the systematic use of antedating. With the frame of ἐνθουσιασμός, Plato wishes to project Ion onto archaic production, connected with the god and the origin of inspiration. In the *Iliad*, knowledge, a knowledge of the past that the author does not own, reaches us from the abode of the god (I 1–7, II 484–493, II 760–762, XI 218–220, XIV 508–510). With the invocation, the author obtains knowledge, which is indispensable for the narration. Certainly, in the *Odyssey*, the direction is mostly similar (I 1–10, VIII 72–78, VIII 471–498, XVII 518–521). A knowledge that flows through invocation, which is a concrete favour by the god.

It is not difficult, however, to observe a sign of a rather important dynamic. Phemius is guided by νόος (I 345–349), Demodocus by θυμός (VIII 40–45). The implacable massacre descends on the μνηστῆρες and does not involve Phemius who in the song, even if constrained by the μνηστῆρες, is αὐτοδίδακτος: he possesses knowledge and does not neglect research (XXII 344–353)²⁶. In the proem to the *Theogony*, the knowledge arrives unexpectedly to Hesiod (22–34). But it nevertheless arises from a selection, because the shepherd destined for song is not common on the barren slopes of Helicon. Criticism has perceived here an ‘I’ that, in the proem to the *Erga*, indicates in Zeus not just knowledge, but an ally for the rebuilding of a pact on the basis of δίκη (1–10)²⁷. Tradition no longer has any sense. Soon, with the πανάριστος, the conscience of Hesiod goes beyond Zeus (293–297)²⁸. But Parmenides brings it to the zenith. He transfers νόος, Phemius, and θυμός, Demodocus, to the proem, and indeed with the image of the ὁδός, collocates the πανάριστος of Hesiod there (28B1, 1–5 DK)²⁹. In the proem, which in the code of archaic production contained the invocation. Parmenides passes beyond the shadows guided by θυμός: tradition offers the code to ensheath in solemn elegance the knowledge gained through research³⁰.

With the frame of ἐνθουσιασμός, Plato conceals a slow development. Ion indicates the magnetic force of Homer, which reaches down link by link from the god and eventually lights on the dreamy listener as victim. Plato certainly recalls the condition of the *Iliad*, through the invocation of the god for song, and the condition of the *Odyssey*, through the inspiration that the author without merit

²⁶ On the peculiar combination with the support of Zeus, Danek (1998, pp. 435–438).

²⁷ See Thalmann (1984, pp. 33–77).

²⁸ See Arrighetti (2006, pp. 3–27).

²⁹ For the relevance of this choice, Giuliano (2005, pp. 137–218).

³⁰ See Tulli (2000, pp. 65–81).

asks for. Daedalus and Thamyris or Epeius and Orpheus: a glorious past that Ion suggests because he is lacking in τέχνη and in thrall to the god. And the glorious past emerges through the form for excellence of archaic production: the catalogue. Phemius, αὐτοδίδακτος, is not reconcilable with the frame of ἐνθουσιασμός. Plato collocates Ion before Hesiod: Socrates is the πανάριστος of Hesiod, whose purpose is philosophy.

Works Cited

- Arrighetti, G 2006, *Poesia, poetiche e storia nella riflessione dei Greci*, Giardini, Pisa.
- Balansard, A 2001, *Technè dans les dialogues de Platon*, Academia Verlag, Sankt Augustin.
- Blondell, R 2002, *The Play of Character in Plato's Dialogues*, CUP, Cambridge.
- Cambiano, G 1966, 'Dialettica, medicina, retorica nel Fedro platonico', *Rivista di Filosofia* 57, pp. 284–305.
- Capuccino, C 2005, *Filosofi e rapsodi*, CLUEB, Bologna.
- Cerri, G 1996², *Platone sociologo della comunicazione*, Argo, Lecce.
- Danek, G 1998, *Epos und Zitat*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien.
- De Sanctis, D 2006, Tecnica compositiva nel *Catalogo* di Esiodo, in G Arrighetti & M Tulli (eds), *Esegesi letteraria e riflessione sulla lingua nella cultura greca*, Giardini, Pisa, pp. 11–33.
- Diller, H 1971, 'Probleme des platonischen *Ion*', *Hermes* 83 (1955), pp. 171–187, now in *Kleine Schriften zur antiken Literatur*, Beck, München, pp. 201–219.
- Edwards, M W 1980, 'The Structure of Homeric Catalogues', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 110, pp. 81–105.
- Flashar, H 1958, *Der Dialog Ion als Zeugnis platonischer Philosophie*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.
- Giannantoni, G 2005, *Dialogo socratico e nascita della dialettica nella filosofia di Platone*, Bibliopolis, Napoli.
- Giuliano, F M 2005, *Platone e la poesia*, Academia Verlag, Sankt Augustin.
- Halliwell, S 2002, *The Aesthetics of Mimesis*, Princeton University Press, Princeton-Oxford.
- Heitsch, E 1992, 'Die Argumentationsstruktur im *Ion*', *Rheinisches Museum* n. F. 133 (1990), pp. 243–259, now in *Wege zu Platon*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, pp. 88–101.
- Janaway, C 1992, 'Craft and Fineness in Plato's *Ion*', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 10, pp. 1–23.
- Keuls, E C 1978, *Plato and Greek Painting*, Brill, Leiden.
- Lowenstam, S 1993, 'Is Literary Criticism an Illegitimate Discipline? A Fallacious Argument in Plato's *Ion*', *Ramus* 22, pp. 19–32.
- Minton, W W 1962, 'Invocation and Catalogue in Hesiod and Homer', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 93, pp. 188–212.
- Murray, P 1996, *Plato on Poetry*, CUP, Cambridge.
- Palumbo, L 2008, *Mimesis*, Loffredo, Napoli.
- Pöhlmann, E 1976, 'Enthusiasmus und Mimesis: zum platonischen *Ion*', *Gymnasium* 83, pp. 191–208.

- Regali, M 2012, *Il poeta e il demiurgo*, Academia Verlag, Sankt Augustin.
- Reinhardt, K 1960, 'Hekataios von Abdera und Demokrit', *Hermes* 47 (1912), pp. 492–513, now in *Vermächtnis der Antike*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, pp. 114–132.
- Rijksbaron, A 2007, *Plato, Ion*, Brill, Leiden-Boston.
- Sammons, B 2010, *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue*, OUP, Oxford.
- Schweitzer, B 1932, *Xenokrates von Athen*, Niemeyer, Halle.
- Thalmann, W G 1984, *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore-London.
- Tobin, R 1975, 'The Canon of Polycleitos', *American Journal of Archeology* 79, pp. 307–321.
- Tulli, M 2000, Esiodo nella memoria di Parmenide, in G Arrighetti & M Tulli (eds), *Letteratura e riflessione sulla letteratura nella cultura classica*, Giardini, Pisa, pp. 65–81.
- Tulli, M 2013, 'La μίμησις nel III libro della *Repubblica*: il rapporto di Platone con la tradizione', in N Notomi & L Brisson (eds), *Dialogues on Plato's Politeia*, Academia Verlag, Sankt Augustin, pp. 314–318.
- Vegetti, M 1995, *La medicina in Platone*, Cardo, Venezia.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U 1969⁴, *Platon*, II, Weidmann, Dublin-Zürich.