

Of Gods, Philosophers, and Charioteers: Content and Form in Parmenides' Proem and Plato's *Phaedrus*

SVETLA SLAVEVA-GRIFFIN

The Florida State University

SUMMARY: This article examines the ways in which Parmenides and Plato avail themselves of the literary motif of the charioteer's journey for philosophical discourse. I argue that the *Phaedrus*' myth of the soul as a charioteer exemplifies Plato's literary and philosophic appropriation of the charioteer allegory in Parmenides' proem and of Parmenides' concept of being, showing how the literary study of intertexts can be applied to questions of both content and form in philosophy.

THE ALLEGORY OF THE CHARIOTEER'S JOURNEY in Parmenides' proem and Plato's *Phaedrus* deserves the attention of both philosophers and literary critics. Regarding content, Plato bases his concept of the immortality of the soul upon Parmenides' concept of true being: the soul is a self-moving first principle that cannot be destroyed or come into being (*Phdr.* 245c5–e1) and is therefore kindred to Parmenides' ungenerated, imperishable, whole, steadfast, and complete being (B8.3–4).¹ Regarding form, Plato employs the allegory of the charioteer's journey to illustrate the immortal nature of the soul (*Phdr.* 246a6–b4), alluding thereby to Parmenides' account of the chariot journey of a young philosopher beyond sense-perceptible reality to the realm of eternal existence (B1.1–5). I shall examine the close relationship between Plato's myth of the soul as a charioteer in the *Phaedrus* and the charioteer's journey in Parmenides. I shall also draw attention to the literary tradition of the theme prior to Parmenides, and particularly to its presence in Homer, in order to situate the interconnection of the two philosophical texts in the context of their generic differences and similarities. The current examination entails the study of (a) Parmenides' adoption and adaptation of the Homeric

¹ Text and translations of Parmenides are Gallop's.

theme of a charioteer's journey in the allegory of a philosopher's search for true knowledge; and (b) Plato's literary and philosophical use of Parmenides' allegory in the account of the immortality of the soul (*Phdr.* 245c5–47a2).

I. INTERTEXTUALITY AND INTERCONCEPTUALITY

In the past century the study of allusion and intertextuality has repeatedly borne fruit in the analysis of poetic texts both Greek and Latin, but prose, and philosophy in particular, presents road blocks on these paths of literary criticism. The study of philosophy focuses on the development and the content of ideas rather than on the form in which ideas are expressed. Moreover, the study of the connection of concepts over time is the purview of historians of philosophy rather than literary critics. But what does one do with the genre of Plato's dialogues? Is the philosophical content exclusive of literary form, or are they necessarily connected? If a complete understanding of the concepts of Plato's philosophy is in fact contingent upon their literary presentation, including allusions to previous philosophical texts, then one requires a literary theory that examines the development of form *and* content over time.² Intertextuality as it is understood today is not sufficient to serve as the critical tool for this study. What is needed is a mechanism that synthesizes content, as an object of historians of philosophy, and form, as an object of literary criticism. In the present paper I employ the term "interconceptuality" to refer to the symbiosis between the development of a philosophical concept and its literary forms. I examine the interdependence between philosophical concept and literary form in the theme of a charioteer's journey in the *Phaedrus*, which constitutes a conceptually- and literarily-informed example of Platonic interconceptuality.³

II. THE CHARIOTEER'S JOURNEY IN PARMENIDES AND PLATO

The statement that Parmenides and Plato avail themselves of the rich literary tradition of a charioteer's journey present in archaic and epic poetry may seem bold and even far-fetched, though less so for the former than for the latter. Scholars have studied the Homeric influence on Parmenides' poem with a

² These questions are addressed with fruitful results in the works of Nightingale and Osborne. For an overview of Plato and intertextual theory see Nightingale 3–12.

³ Osborne likens the interdependence of concept and rhetoric to the Platonic view of the relation between Form and Image. In this light, "interconceptuality" is the application of a philosophical concept as Form onto literary form as Image. On the relation between Platonic discourse and Platonic thought in the *Timaeus* see Osborne 179–84.

significant degree of agreement.⁴ This homogeneity, however, does not extend to the traditional view of the literary qualities of Plato's dialogues.⁵ But the fact that both the father of the Eleatic school and the founder of the Academy employ the charioteer allegory to introduce a new—and here philosophical—type of journey deserves consideration. For Parmenides, this is the journey of the well-informed mind, freed from the chains of beliefs and sense-perceptions, to the realm of reason and true existence (B1 and B8). For Plato, this is the journey of the souls of gods and men to the region above the sky, “occupied by being which really is” (*Phdr.* 247c7).

In Parmenides' proem (B1),⁶ a young man, drawn by swift horses and guided by divine assistants, journeys upwards to the gates of Night and Day. There he is greeted by an anonymous goddess who reveals to him, in a didactic manner, the path of persuasion, which learned men should take to acquire knowledge of what being is (B1.1–5):

ἵπποι ταί με φέρουσιν, ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ θυμὸς ἰκάνοι,
πέμπον, ἐπεὶ μ' ἐς ὁδὸν βῆσαν πολύφημον ἄγουσαι
δαίμονος, ἥ κατὰ πάντ' ἄσινῃ⁷ φέρει εἰδότα φῶτα·
τῇ φερόμην· τῇ γάρ με πολύφραστοι φέρον ἵπποι
ἄρμα τιταίνουσαι, κούραι δ' ὁδὸν ἡγεμόνευον.

The mares that carry me as far as impulse might reach,⁸
Were taking me, when they brought and placed me upon the much-speaking route
Of the goddess, that carries everywhere unscathed the man who knows;
Thereon was I carried, for thereon the much-guided mares were carrying me,
Straining to pull the chariot, and maidens were leading the way.

⁴ Below n. 22.

⁵ For Plato and the Greek literary tradition see Nightingale's *Genres in Dialogue: Plato and the Construct of Philosophy*, along with Bacon's essays “Socrates Crowned,” and “The Poetry of *Phaedo*,” and Osborne's article “Space, Time, Shape, and Direction: Creative Discourse in the *Timaeus*.”

⁶ The title “On Nature” (ΠΕΡΙ ΦΥΣΕΩΣ) often assigned to Parmenides' poem is superficial and misrepresents the tenets of Eleatic subjectivism; see Coxon 156–57, Gallop 4–5, Guthrie 2: 1–79.

⁷ Mourelatos (1970: 22 n. 31) and Gallop emend the MSS' ἄσινῃ with ἄσινῃ, D-K with ἄσση.

⁸ In agreement with Stein 771 I take ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ θυμὸς ἰκάνοι to refer to ἵπποι ταί με φέρουσιν ... πέμπον and not to the poet himself as interpreted by Tarán 10, “as far as ever my heart may desire,” and Coxon 44, “as far as ever my spirit reached.” The syntax and imagery of the first lines highlight the presence of the mares, not of the poet. Moreover the general impression of the scene makes the poet a passenger, a passive receiver of the journey. Gallop 49 translates the phrase neutrally with “as far as impulse might reach.”

In the *Phaedrus*, Plato compares the nature of the soul to the dynamic relation between a charioteer and his pair of horses, journeying to the realm of eternal existence (*Phdr.* 246a6–b4):

εοικέτω δὴ συμφύτῳ δυνάμει ὑποπτέρου ζεύγους τε καὶ ἡνιόχου. θεῶν μὲν οὖν ἵπποι τε καὶ ἡνίοχοι πάντες αὐτοὶ τε ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ἐξ ἀγαθῶν, τὸ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων μέμικται. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἡμῶν ὁ ἄρχων συνωρίδος ἡνιοχεῖ, εἶτα τῶν ἵππων ὁ μὲν αὐτῷ καλός τε καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐκ τοιούτων, ὁ δ' ἐξ ἐναντίων τε καὶ ἐναντίος· χαλεπὴ δὴ καὶ δύσκολος ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἡ περὶ ἡμᾶς ἡνιόχησις.

Let it then resemble the combined power of a winged team of horses and their charioteer. Now in the case of gods, horses and charioteers are all both good and of good stock; whereas in the case of the rest there is a mixture. In the first place our driver has charge of a pair; secondly one of them he finds noble and good, and of similar stock, while the other is of the opposite stock, and opposite in its nature; so that the driving in our case is necessarily difficult and troublesome.⁹

In the following pages I examine the interconnectedness of philosophical content and literary form in these two works. Even the juxtaposition above reveals some distinctive parallels between the passages. First, in Parmenides, the charioteer is a young, inexperienced philosopher-passenger guided by divine maidens to the realm of a deity who proclaims to him the philosophical truth he is seeking. In Plato, too, the charioteer has a philosophic purpose, the literary personification being part of an extended image that conveys (in the case of mortals) the control exercised by the rational part of the soul over its spirited and appetitive counterparts and (in the case of gods) the accord among all parts of the soul. Second, in both authors the charioteer's journey represents travel beyond the beaten paths of human perception in a search for what true being is. Third, the destination of the two journeys is the realm of thought and eternal existence, which, in Parmenides, explicates the doctrine of being as the sole subject of thought and speech (B8.1–42),¹⁰ and, in Plato, explains the distinction between the souls of gods and men (*Phdr.* 246–47).

⁹ Burnet's text (1901); Rowe's translation (1986a).

¹⁰ Ancient and modern commentators agree that the charioteer's journey symbolizes the "genuine way of inquiry" or "journey of persuasion" and that it is an allegory, "in which the mares and the Heliades are consciously chosen symbols for aspects of the poet's individuality, the gates are the obstacles between men and truth, and the regions of darkness and light are the conditions of ignorance and knowledge" (Coxon 13). Commentators do not agree, however, on what its sources of influence are. Among the proposed solutions are the Pythagorean *katharsis*, Coxon 14–17; Hesiod's cosmology and a journey of *katabasis* relating to the myth of Er, Morrison 60–65; Orphic mysticism, Voegelin 205;

Scholars have seen a relationship between Plato's view of the immortality of the soul and Parmenides' view that being is eternal, self-moving, and unoriginated.¹¹ Plato's concept of the soul as a self-moving and thus eternal entity reinforces Parmenides' doctrine of true existence beyond sense-perceptible reality.¹² In this interrelated philosophical context, the fact that both authors employ the same literary form is of primary importance for understanding the mechanism of appropriation in Plato's dialogue. The charioteer's journey in Parmenides and Plato is an allegory that unites the two philosophical texts literarily. It thus serves as an example of an interconceptual relation between philosophical texts, representing a symbiosis of evolving content and literary form.

III. THE CHARIOTEER'S JOURNEY IN HOMER AND PARMENIDES

The charioteer's journey thematizes a large number of ideas in archaic lyric and epic poetry:¹³ the chariot-rides of gods and men in the *Iliad*,¹⁴ the personal quest of Telemachus searching for his long-missing father and for social approval to restore the wealth of Odysseus' household,¹⁵ the aggressive impetus of passionate love depicted in Sappho's image of golden Aphrodite ruling the hearts of mortals while flying on a winged chariot across the heavens,¹⁶ Pindar's chariot of the Muses celebrating Epharmostos' Olympic victory.¹⁷

shamanistic rapture, Cornford 1952: 118. For a comprehensive survey of interpretations see Tarán 17–31 and more recently Curd 18–23. The influence of Empedocles' chariot on Parmenides is denied by Allen 29 and Tarán 18 and ignored by Coxon and Gallop. Although the discussion of the influences on Parmenides is inconclusive, I am most convinced by Voegelin (chh. 5 and 7) that the journey is an allegory of the transition from *mythos* to *logos* or "from myth to metaphysics."

¹¹ This relationship is discussed in every study of Plato's "psychology." A short list should include at least Chaigmet, Robinson, and Hackforth 1952; for the studies of the myth of the soul-charioteer in general see section iv below.

¹² Later Platonic and Neoplatonic interpretations refer to the *Phaedrus* as the foundation of Plato's understanding of the soul. See below n. 67 and Biellemeier.

¹³ Allen 3–4 also lists many examples of a charioteer's journey in Middle Eastern and Eastern literature: the chariot of the god Krishna in the *Bhagavad Gita*; the fiery chariot bringing Elias to heaven in *Kings* 2.2.11–12; the chariot of the cherubim in *Ezek.* 1.15–25 and 10.8–22; the four-horse chariot that John sees in *Rev.* 6.2–8 and 19.11. Parmenides' journey most attracts the attention of Marsilio Ficino, the fifteenth-century commentator and translator of the *Phaedrus* (in *Phdr.* 246AB).

¹⁴ Those of Athena and Hera (*Il.* 5.719–52), of Zeus (*Il.* 8.41–50, 438–40), and of Poseidon (*Il.* 13.23–38); mentioned by Tarán 19 and Allen 29 n. 3.

¹⁵ The *Telemachia* occupies *Od.* 1–4 and part of 15, according to Clarke's division.

¹⁶ Fr. 1.9 (Lobel and Page).

¹⁷ O. 9.80–81. Cf. *I.* 2.1–3 and 8.62 (Race); noted by Morrison 60.

These few examples, although not exhaustive, should suffice to demonstrate the semantic wealth of the theme,¹⁸ which can denote both human and divine experiences: it can represent the imaginary motion of the gods in the sky, characterizing their divine nature, or the brush with immortality of Olympian athletes at the celebration of their chariot victories, or the coming of age of a young man gaining the respect and *kleos* of an adult.¹⁹ In short, the charioteer theme provides Parmenides (and later Plato) with a medium of allegorical expression capable of presenting ideas that stretch beyond the conventional comprehension of sense-perceptible reality.²⁰

The poetic tradition most important for Parmenides' (and later Plato's) allegory of the soul as charioteer is that of Homer,²¹ specifically Zeus' chariot ride at *Il.* 8.41–52, the gates of heaven through which Hera's chariot passes at *Il.* 5.748–52, and Telemachus' journey from Pylos to Sparta in Book 3 of the *Odyssey*.²²

Zeus rides his chariot across the heavens to observe the battle between Achaeans and Trojans (*Il.* 8.41–52).²³ The episode provides a transition in the narrative, concluding the divine assembly at the beginning of Book 8 and introducing the mortal battles that occupy the rest of the book (*Il.* 8.41–46):

ὥς εἰπὼν ὑπ' ὄχεσφι τιτύσκετο χαλκόποδ' ἵππῳ,
ὠκυπέτα, χρυσέησιν ἐθείρησιν κομόωντε,
χρυσὸν δ' αὐτὸς ἔδυνε περὶ χροί, γέντο δ' ἰμάσθλην
χρυσείην εὖτυκτον, ἐοῦ δ' ἐπεβήσετο δίφρου.
μάστιξεν δ' ἐλάαν· τῷ δ' οὐκ ἄέκοντε πετέσθην²⁴
μεσσηγὺς γαίης τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἄστερόεντος.

He spoke, and under the chariot harnessed his bronze-shod horses,
flying-footed, with long manes streaming of gold; and he put on

¹⁸ Morrison 60 adds the chariot appearances in Alcaeus (fr. 1c, Lobel and Page), Empedocles (D-K B3), and Bacchylides (5.176).

¹⁹ To this list one should add the most famous literary journey of all, Odysseus' *nostos*. The parallel between Odysseus and Parmenides' philosopher is examined by Havelock.

²⁰ Since the scope of the current examination focuses on the literary appropriation of this theme in philosophic discourse, the above list is intended only to contextualize the charioteer's journey in Parmenides and the *Phaedrus* within their poetic tradition, not to establish the theme as a literary motif, although the significance of the latter still awaits its enlightenment.

²¹ See, e.g., Brisson 7–11, Allen 1–10, Tarán 19.

²² The presence of epic style and vocabulary in the proem has been widely acknowledged and documented. For discussion of Parmenides' debt to Homeric poetry see Mourelatos 1970: 1–46, esp. 8–10, Havelock 133–43, Coxon 7–11, Gallop 4–5, Floyd 251–60, and Tarán ad loc. Coxon lists about 200 epic allusions from Homer and fewer from Hesiod. For Parmenides' debt to Hesiod's *Theogony* see Morrison 60–65 and Pellikaan-Engel 6–10.

²³ For the frequency and the pattern of gods' rides see Kirk 98–99.

²⁴ Line 45 is repeated in the description of Telemachus' ride in *Od.* 3.494.

clothing of gold about his own body, and took up the golden lash, carefully compacted, and climbed up into his chariot, and whipped them into a run, and they winged their way unreluctant through the space between the earth and the starry heaven.²⁵

Zeus' royal status and the authority of his words are reflected symbolically in the glittering of the gold in the horses' manes, his clothes, and the lash: χρυσέησιν ἐθείρησιν, χρυσὸν δ' αὐτὸς ἔδυνε, ἰμάσθλην χρυσεῖην.²⁶ The larger sequence of events in this scene comprises Zeus' address to the assembly of the gods, his threat to throw any deity who disobeys him through the gates of Tartarus, and his chariot trip to Mt. Ida.

Parmenides in his proem follows the same sequence of events, but in reverse order: the passenger's chariot-ride, his passage through the gates of Night and Day, and his arrival at the nameless goddess' house. While the Homeric scene concludes with a chariot-ride to Mt. Ida from which Zeus watches the affairs of men, Parmenides' scene begins with the impulse of the mares pulling a chariot carrying a young man to a place beyond the gates of Night and Day where the goddess exposes the truth of being to him.

As Zeus directs his chariot "through the space between the earth and the starry heaven" (*Il.* 8.46), so Parmenides' philosopher journeys "upon the much-speaking route Of the goddess, that carries everywhere unscathed the man who knows" (B1.2–3) and passes with the help of the Heliades through "the gates of the paths of Night and Day" to arrive at the home of the goddess (B1.9–27). The realm to which Parmenides' charioteer is traveling is a realm beyond human perception and experience, a realm closer to the region in the sky governed by Zeus (B1.11–20):

ἔνθα πύλαι Νυκτός τε καὶ Ἡματός εἰσι κελεύθων,
καὶ σφας ὑπέρθυρον ἄμφις ἔχει καὶ λάινος οὐδός·
αὐταὶ δ' αἰθέριαι πλῆνται μεγάλοισι θυρέτροις·
τῶν δὲ Δίκη πολύποινος ἔχει κληῖδας ἀμοιβούς.
τὴν δὴ παρφάμεναι κοῦραι μαλακοῖσι λόγοισιν
πεῖσαν ἐπιφραδέως, ὥς σφιν βαλανωτὸν ὄχηα
ἄπτερέως ὥσειε πυλέων ἄπο· ταὶ δὲ θυρέτρων

²⁵ Text is Monro and Allen; the translation is Lattimore's. Verses 41–44 are repeated in Poseidon's chariot scene in *Il.* 13.23–26. On the thematic importance of this repetition for the poem see Kirk 301–2.

²⁶ The chariot rides of Athena, Hera, Aphrodite, and Poseidon share details. Cf. δῖφρος δὲ χρυσεοῖσι καὶ ἀργυρέοισιν ἰμᾶσιν and χρύσειον καλὸν ζυγόν, *Il.* 5.727 and 730. What makes Zeus' chariot ride particularly important for our examination is the fact that Zeus is the king of gods and men: his chariot ride symbolizes the separation between the worlds of gods and mortals.

χάσμ' ἀχανὲς ποίησαν ἀναπτάμεναι πολυχάλκους
 ἄξονας ἐν σύριγξιν ἀμοιβαδὸν εἰλίζασαι
 γόμφοις καὶ περόνησιν ἀρηρότε·

There are the gates of the paths of Night and Day,
 And a lintel and a threshold of stone surround them,
 And the aetherial gates themselves are filled with great doors;
 And for these Justice, much-avenging, holds the keys of retribution.
 Coaxing her with gentle words, the maidens
 Did cunningly persuade her that she should push back the bolted bar for them
 Swiftly from the gates; and these made of the doors
 A gaping gap as they were open wide,
 Swinging in turn in their sockets the brazen posts
 Fitted with rivets and pins.²⁷

Parmenides' verses allude to the description of the gates of the heavens through which Hera's chariot passes to reach the house of the gods, where she finds Zeus sitting "upon the highest peak of rugged Olympus" (*Il.* 5.748–52):

Ἥρη δὲ μάστιγι θοῶς ἐπεμαίετ' ἄρ' ἵππους·
 αὐτόμαται δὲ πύλαι μύκον οὐρανοῦ, ἃς ἔχον ὦραι,
 τῆς ἐπιτέτραπται μέγας οὐρανὸς Οὐλύμπός τε,
 ἡμὲν ἀνακλίνειν πυκινὸν νέφος ἥδ' ἐπιθεῖναι.
 τῇ ῥα δι' αὐτῶν κεντρηνεκέας ἔχον ἵππους·

Hera laid the lash swiftly on the horses; and moving
 Of themselves groaned the gates of the sky that the Hours guarded,
 Those Hours to whose charge is given the huge sky and Olympus,
 To open up the dense darkness or again to close it.
 Through the way between they held the speed of their goaded horses.

Parmenides' gates (πύλαι ... αἰθέριαι) in B1.11–13 are aetherial, that is, belonging to the heavens, recalling "the gates of the sky" (πύλαι ... οὐρανοῦ) in *Il.* 5.749. Next, in B1.11, the gates are "of the paths of Night and Day" (πύλαι Νυκτός τε καὶ Ἡματός εἰσι κελεύθων), alluding to gates that either open or close "the dense darkness" (*Il.* 5.751 πυκινὸν νέφος) that separates the dark world of men from the lighted realm of Zeus.²⁸ Both sets of gates have female guardians, the Homeric gates being guarded by the Hours, who alone possess the power to open or shut the entrance to the realm of light (*Il.* 5.751), Parmenides'

²⁷ On Homeric allusions in this passage see esp. Coxon 161–65. I would like to extend the statement he makes (161) about the language of line 11, that it "is deliberately chosen and only attention to the implied allusions will reveal the sense," to the entire passage here quoted.

²⁸ For the emphasis on the physical features of gates that separate darkness from (relative) light one may also compare the gates of Tartarus, which mark the entrance to the

gates by the Heliades, the guiding companions of Parmenides' charioteer, who alone are able to charm "the much-avenging Justice" (Δίκη πολύποινος) and persuade her "to push back the bolted bar for them swiftly from the gates" (B1.16–17 ὥς σφιν βαλανωτὸν ὀχῆα / ἀπτερῶς ὥσειε πυλέων ἄπο).²⁹

As Zeus regulates the relation between the worlds of mortals and immortals in *Il.* 8.5–27, so the knowledge that the nameless goddess bestows upon Parmenides' charioteer regulates the distinction between true knowledge and false opinion, and between a philosopher and a common man (B6.1–9):

χρὴ τὸ λέγειν τε νοεῖν τ' ἐὼν ἔμμεναι· ἔστι γὰρ εἶναι,
μηδὲν δ' οὐκ ἔστιν· τά σ' ἐγὼ φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα.
πρώτης γὰρ σ' ἀφ' ὁδοῦ ταύτης διζήσιος (εἵργω),
αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἀπὸ τῆς, ἣν δὴ βροτοὶ εἰδότες οὐδὲν
πλάττονται, δίκρανοι· ἀμηχανίη γὰρ ἐν αὐτῶν
στήθεσιν ἰθύνει πλακτὸν νόον· οἱ δὲ φοροῦνται
κωφοὶ ὁμῶς τυφλοὶ τε, τεθηπότες, ἄκριτα φῦλα,
οἷς τὸ πέλειν τε καὶ οὐκ εἶναι ταὐτὸν νενόμισται
κοῦ ταὐτόν· πάντων δὲ παλίντροπὸς ἐστὶ κέλευθος.

It must be that what is there for speaking and thinking of *is*; for [it] is there to be,
Whereas nothing is not; that is what I bid you consider,
For <I restrain> you from that first route of inquiry,
And then also from this one, on which mortals knowing nothing
Wander, two-headed; for helplessness in their
Breasts guides their distracted mind; and they are carried
Deaf and blind alike, dazed, uncritical tribes,
By whom being and not-being have been thought both the same
And not the same; and the path of all is backward-turning.

The goddess who speaks here, although omitting to reveal her identity, does reveal the substantial differences between the kinds of knowledge that men obtain. Her instructions separate the world of mortals from the realm of true existence, and the philosopher-charioteer, understanding the distinction between true knowledge and false beliefs, is prepared to take the route to the truth of being.

deep and murky pit (βέρεθρον) that lies below Hades: *Il.* 8.15–16 ἔνθα σιδήρεαι τε πύλαι καὶ χάλκεος οὐδός, / τόσσον ἔνερθ' Ἀίδεω ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης; "there are gates of iron and a brazen threshold, As far beneath the house of Hades as from earth the sky lies."

²⁹ The terminal position of ὀχῆα in line 16 may facilitate a pun: Parmenides' ὀχῆα, which represents an obstacle to the charioteer's passage through the gates in B1, may allude to Homer's ὄχρα φλόγεα carrying Athena in *Il.* 5.745, as if the bar of the gates visually opens to let the chariot of the goddess through, followed by the Eleatic charioteer himself. Coxon 160 erroneously attributes the chariot not to Athena but to Hera.

Another parallel between *Il.* 8.41–46 and Parmenides’ proem is the emphasis on authority. While Homer describes the shining of gold in Zeus’ clothes, lash, and the manes of his horses in order to accentuate his divine superiority, Parmenides writes of “much-discerning” mares and “the much-speaking” road to establish the philosophical superiority of his doctrine and the legitimacy of the philosopher’s journey. Both epithets have Homeric overtones, πολύφραστοι being a pun on Achilles’ address to his horses (*Il.* 19.401 φράζεσθε σαωσέμεν ἡνιοχῆα, “take care to bring your charioteer back”), πολύφημον recalling the name of Phemius, the famous rhapsode who entertains the crowd of the suitors in Book 1 of the *Odyssey*.³⁰

Parmenides’ adaptation of Homer’s depictions of divine chariot-rides for his own philosophic charioteer represents the subject of the poem and Eleatic philosophy itself as pertinent to the realm of eternal existence. But mortal chariot rides, too, underlie the proem. Havelock and Mourelatos have examined the relation between Parmenides’ charioteer and Odysseus;³¹ I consider the relationship between Telemachus, a less visible character in the *Odyssey*, and Parmenides’ charioteer.³²

The journeys of Telemachus and Parmenides’ charioteer share much: the role of the accompanying characters, the passivity of the charioteer, the speed of the horses pulling their chariots, and the notion of Night and Day. The *Telemachia* offers an epic portrayal of a story of a coming of age.³³ Telemachus is in need of knowledge—knowledge about his own status, his fate, and his future—and this need propels him beyond his father’s household and beyond Ithaca itself.³⁴ After his stay in Pylos, Odysseus’ son is accompanied solely by Nestor’s son, Peisistratus, who, having already learned from his own father the road to *kleos*, takes up the role as an experienced charioteer directing the path of Telemachus’ journey (*Od.* 3.473–85). Peisistratus’ constant epithet “a leader of men” (*Od.* 3.482 ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν) reveals his heroic reputation, and also emphasizes the particular role he performs in the scene: to be a leader of Telemachus himself. Peisistratus has already found out and achieved his

³⁰ Noted by Coxon 159.

³¹ Havelock, Mourelatos 1970.

³² Also the chariot of Achilles: *Il.* 16.148–54, 19.392–417.

³³ Telemachus’ role in the *Odyssey* has received numerous interpretations, some more persuasive than others. Convincing are Martin, who considers the *Telemachia* as a representation of the twilight of the heroic age; Thalmann, who envisions the story of Telemachus as a paradigm of a tale of coming of age; Murnaghan, who, after Peradotto and Felson, argues that Telemachus plays the role of the internal audience in the *Odyssey*.

³⁴ Clarke 131–42, Thalmann 37–40, Murnaghan 143–47.

status as Nestor's successful heir, while Telemachus has yet to make his *kleos* journey.³⁵ Peisistratus provides Telemachus with the knowledge and personal experience to complete his trip.

Parmenides gives similar meaning to the relations between the charioteer and the Heliades, and the charioteer and the nameless goddess. The image of a young man on a quest to discover his own self creates a personal dimension in the proem.³⁶ The charioteer himself gives his account of the journey in a first-person narrative. Like Telemachus, the philosopher-charioteer is young (addressed by the goddess as ὦ κοῦρ') and inexperienced (the goddess holds his hand while delivering her manifesto).³⁷ In the frenetic setting of Parmenides' journey, the young philosopher³⁸ is the only passive participant in the scene: he is "carried" by the mares (five times in the first four lines),³⁹ the Heliades lead the way, and the goddess holds his hand.

What are Parmenides' motives in placing the young philosopher in the back of the action? Is this poem not an explication of Parmenides' own philosophy and, if so, should it not be presented actively? To answer these questions, one has to consider the setting of the proem within the conventions of its Homeric framework. In the scene of the inception of Telemachus' journey,

³⁵ If Platonized, the participation of Athena, Nestor, and Peisistratus in Telemachus' journey acquires paradigmatic philosophical symbolism. The disguised Athena, possessing divine knowledge, inspires Telemachus to embark upon the journey and ultimately upon his fate as an adult, while Nestor and Peisistratus provide him with knowledge, "within human capacities" (*Phdr.* 246a5), to complete his journey.

³⁶ Exploring the political ramifications of the transition from myth to philosophy, Voegelin 166–68 concludes: "Under these historically unique circumstances the transition from archaic to classic Hellas could assume the form of intellectual adventures by individuals, unhampered by the pressure of hierarchies which tend to preserve traditions." Parmenides' journey falls in Voegelin's fourth type of intellectual adventure—the founding of a philosophical "school" (Voegelin's quotation marks).

³⁷ See B1.24–26. Murnaghan 133–42, drawing upon Peradotto, Felson, and Martin, entertains the thought that the *Odyssey* is meant for Telemachus as the internal or external reader and spectator.

³⁸ With whom, perhaps, Parmenides identifies himself—in the strict sense that the literary persona of the young passenger in the chariot is philosophically inclined, as is his author. For the reading of the proem as a symbol of Parmenides' own intellectual quest to discover the essence of true existence see Tarán 25. Also worth mentioning is Burnet's interpretation (1908: 171) that the poem is an allegorical description of "Parmenides' conversion from some form of error [deriving from an Orphic practice] to what he held to be the truth."

³⁹ B1.1: με φέρουσιν; B1.2: μ' ἐς ὁδὸν βῆσαν πολύφημον ἄγουσαι; B1.3: φέρει εἰδότα φῶτα; B1.4: τῇ φερόμην; B1.4: με πολύφραστοι φέρον ἵπποι.

the young and inexperienced son of Odysseus cannot complete his journey successfully without the knowledgeable guidance of Peisistratus.⁴⁰ And the primary instigator of Telemachus' journey is the goddess of wisdom herself, the owl-eyed Athena. Following the pattern of the Homeric scene, Parmenides creates a similar setting, juxtaposing a young man's *kleos* to an intellectual inquiry⁴¹ in which the maiden charioteers, daughters of Helios, guide the ignorant philosopher to the nameless goddess, the light, and eternal existence.⁴² Just as Athena inspires and directs Telemachus' actions so that he "may hear of his father" (*Od.* 3.15 ὄφρα πύθῃαι / πατρός), so Parmenides' goddess guides the charioteer's journey "to learn all things" (B1.28 πάντα πυθέσθαι) so that he may know the correct route while judging "by reasoning" (B7.5 κρίναι ... λόγῳ).⁴³ The young seeker of wisdom receives instruction from the goddess: B1.28–30 χρεὼ δέ σε πάντα πυθέσθαι / ἡμὲν ἀληθείης εὐπειθέος ἀτρεμεῖς ἦτορ / ἥδ' ἔβροτῶν δόξας "And it is right that you should learn all things, Both the steadfast heart of persuasive truth, And the beliefs of mortals." It is not Parmenides who explicates the tenets of his philosophy. The passivity of the young philosopher on his quest to acquire the truth of existential knowledge conveys, in an epic way, Parmenides' claim to philosophical authority, justified by the epistemological authority of his omniscient goddess; she herself passes down the knowledge of true existence in B2.1–8.

Since, as was noted by Voegelin, "Parmenides has no predecessors, and his concept of Being has no prehistory," the Eleatic had to embed his new ideas in a persuasive form. This form is the literary tradition of Homer. Parmenides' young philosopher is a new kind of epic hero who, having embarked upon the road towards knowledge of true existence, completes his intellectual *anabasis* to the realm of thought. This road is bright, straight, and uplifting, as

⁴⁰ Telemachus' passive "activity" is discussed by Clarke 137: "Homer has succeeded in packing a version of the *Odyssey* into a little more than two books, all in the passive voice."

⁴¹ This point weighs more heavily if one takes into account that Parmenides is the first philosopher to invent the concept of Being; Voegelin 208.

⁴² As was noted above, the identity of Parmenides' goddess remains unknown. Numerous identifications are offered by ancient and modern commentators: Proclus names her Hypsipyle since she is the keeper of the lofty gates of night and day (*in Prm.* 640.39); Voegelin, Morrison, Mansfeld, and Popper, in the footsteps of Hesiod, refer to her as Dike; Pugliese Caratelli identifies her as Mnemosyne; Heidegger calls her the Goddess of Truth, Ἀληθεία, a personification that, I think, depicts most closely her role in the poem; Hirsch in his study of the *Phaedrus* entitles his chapter on the charioteer myth "Ἀληθεία."

⁴³ According to Gallop 6: "the guidance that she [the nameless goddess] will offer him is clearly to be patterned upon the supernatural directives given to mortal adventurers in the *Odyssey*," referring to the directions given by Athena to Telemachus in *Od.* 1, and Hermes and Ino to Odysseus in *Od.* 5.

are the paths of the rosy-fingered Dawn and Zeus' chariot.⁴⁴ Parmenides employs these Homeric elements in the conventional form of epic hexameter in order to communicate conceptually with his Presocratic audience.⁴⁵ He composes his philosophic exegesis in verse because this is the common means of literary expression available to the creative mind in the century before Plato.⁴⁶ The repertoire of the epic genre not only provides the first Eleatic philosopher with the literary merits of meter and vocabulary, it also equips him with ready-made array of symbols and allegories that enable the old conventions of form to express new content.⁴⁷

IV. THE ALLEGORY OF THE CHARIOTEER IN PLATO

The allegory of the soul as a charioteer has a specific exemplary meaning in the *Phaedrus*. It demonstrates the best kind of speech about love, that inspired by the Muses, in response to the polished, yet uninspired speeches by Lysias and Socrates himself. The introduction of the speech in the dialogue lists the two components that make the best kind of speech and literature in general: the first is inspiration that is "a kind of madness," which comes from the Muses; the other is "a delicate, pure soul, arousing into a Bacchic dance regarding lyric and other kinds of poetry" (*Phdr.* 245a1–3). The purpose of this best kind of discourse is "to educate posterity while adorning the countless deeds of their predecessors" (*Phdr.* 245a4–5).⁴⁸ We should keep in mind this propaedeutic context since it determines the goal of Plato's appropriation of the charioteer theme.

Let us begin our investigation of Plato's use of the theme with Nussbaum's assertion of the inseparability of concept and form. "Literary form is not sepa-

⁴⁴ The other road, against which the nameless goddess warns him, descends towards the darkness of physical reality and leads back to the realm of darkness from which he has just arrived, passing through the gates of Night and Day. This road is the non-philosophical *katabasis* to the world of false beliefs "in which there is no true trust" (B1.30; on *katabasis* here see Cornford 1991: 214–16).

⁴⁵ Parmenides is criticized by Proclus for writing "more like prose than poetry" (*in Prm.* 8.44–45) and by Plutarch for "borrowing from poetic art its metre and lofty style, as a vehicle in order to avoid the prosaic" (*Mor.* 16C): see Gallop 4 and 109. Plato is praised at Arist. *Rh.* 1408b17–20, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.81, and Cic. *Brut.* 121–22 for writing poetry-like prose.

⁴⁶ Floyd 263 argues that Parmenides wrote in verse "as an integration of apparent contraries into his argument, as Dio Chrysostom 53.5 suggests concerning Homer."

⁴⁷ Mourelatos 1970: 39 describes the relation between form and content as "in one sense external and incidental but in another internal and essential." The "internal and essential" relation is our interest here. He concludes, too, that "Parmenides uses old words, old motifs, old themes, and old images precisely in order to think new thoughts in and through them." For the opposite view see Wilamowitz 62 and Reinhardt 64–88.

⁴⁸ For interpretation of the *Phaedrus* as a philosophical defense of writing see Burger, Ferrari, Helmbold and Holther, Heath 1989a and 1989b, Rowe 1986b and 1989.

rable from philosophical content, but is, itself, a part of content—an integral part, then, of the search for and the statement of truth.”⁴⁹ The charioteer allegory is a clear example of the interaction between philosophical content and literary form.

The philosophical content underlying the allegory is presented in the analytical proof of the proposition that the soul is immortal at *Phdr.* 245c5–9 (referred to hereinafter as Passage A):⁵⁰

Ψυχὴ πᾶσα ἀθάνατος. τὸ γὰρ ἀεικίνητον ἀθάνατον· τὸ δ’ ἄλλο κινουὶν καὶ ὑπ’ ἄλλου κινούμενον, παῦλαν ἔχον κινήσεως, παῦλαν ἔχει ζωῆς. μόνον δὴ τὸ αὐτὸ κινουὶν, ἅτε οὐκ ἀπολείπον ἑαυτό, οὐποτε λήγει κινούμενον ...

All soul is immortal.⁵¹ For that which is always in movement is immortal; that which moves something else and is moved by something else, in ceasing from movement, ceases from living. Only that which moves itself, because it does not abandon itself, never stops moving.

This analysis takes the primary form of philosophical exegesis.⁵² The proof of the immortality of the soul follows a progression of statements, A to B to C:⁵³

- A. If X is ever-moving (ἀεικίνητον), then X is immortal (ἀθάνατον).
- B. If X is self-moving (τὸ αὐτὸ κινουὶν), then X is ever-moving (οὐποτε λήγει κινούμενον).
- C. Soul is self-moving (τὸν ὑφ’ ἑαυτοῦ κινούμενον), so soul is immortal (ἀθάνατος).

The logical sequence of the argument proves the superiority of the soul over the body and yet connects ψυχὴ πᾶσα and πᾶν σῶμα as counterparts in a universal relation (*Phdr.* 245e2–46a2).⁵⁴

⁴⁹ Nussbaum 3; similarly, on 4, “Finding and shaping the words is a matter of finding the appropriate and, so to speak, the honorable, fit between conception and expression.”

⁵⁰ According to Nussbaum 3, this kind of analysis is done “in the language of conventional philosophical prose, a style remarkably flat and lacking in wonder.”

⁵¹ πᾶσα as “all” seems to be preferable here, while in the following exegesis πᾶσα seems to denote “every.” De Vries 121 comments that πᾶσα is collective as well as distributive. Rowe 1986a: 59 and Hackforth 1955: 492 translate it here with “all,” Nehamas and Woodruff 29 with “every.”

⁵² Referred to as “the expository structure conventional to philosophy” by Nussbaum 3; cf. Tanner 458–66. See also the formulations of Ricoeur and Derrida, quoted below.

⁵³ Analysis of the steps of the proof usually precedes any discussion of the myth. Perhaps this is evidence of the fact that the content and the form of the myth “are bound together” even in their interpretation. For analysis see Taylor 306–7, Hackforth 1952: 64–68, Robinson 112–15, Guthrie 2: 419–21, Hirsch 263, Heitsch 105–9.

⁵⁴ Plato’s concept of the immortality of the soul is related notably in *Phaedo*, *Republic* X, *Timaeus*, and *Laws*.

ἀθανάτου δὲ πεφασμένου τοῦ ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ κινουμένου, ψυχῆς οὐσίαν τε καὶ λόγον τοῦτον αὐτόν τις λέγων οὐκ αἰσχυνεῖται. πᾶν γὰρ σῶμα, ᾧ μὲν ἔξωθεν τὸ κινεῖσθαι, ἄψυχον, ᾧ δὲ ἔνδοθεν αὐτῷ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἔμψυχον, ὡς ταύτης οὔσης φύσεως ψυχῆς· εἰ δ' ἔστιν τοῦτο οὕτως ἔχον, μὴ ἄλλο τι εἶναι τὸ αὐτὸ ἑαυτὸ κινεῖν ἢ ψυχὴν, ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀγέννητόν τε καὶ ἀθάνατον ψυχὴ ἂν εἴη.

And since that which is moved by itself has been shown to be immortal, it will incur no shame to say that this is the essence and the definition of soul. For all body which has its source of motion outside itself is soulless, whereas that which has it within itself and from itself is ensouled, this being the nature of soul; and if this is so—that that which moves itself is nothing other than soul, soul will be necessarily something which neither comes into being nor dies.

The proof of the soul's immortality is concerned exclusively with the idea of motion: immortality is the ability of a thing to move itself within itself.

The self-moving essence of the soul is illustrated with the allegory of the charioteer (*Phdr.* 246a3–4): Περὶ μὲν οὖν ἀθανασίας αὐτῆς ἱκανῶς· περὶ δὲ τῆς ιδέας αὐτῆς ὧδε λεκτέον “About its immortality, then, enough has been said; about its form we must say the following.” The meaning of *ιδέα* as a “form” or “semblance” or “the look of a thing” points out the relation between the concept of the immortality of the soul and the following allegory of the charioteer: the charioteer allegory, as an image, offers a different, visually-enriched explanation of the subject of Passage A, as is clear from *Phdr.* 246a4–6. “To say what kind of thing it is would require a long exposition and one calling for utterly superhuman powers (οἷον μὲν ἔστι, πάντα πάντως θείας εἶναι καὶ μακρὰς διηγέσεως); to say what it resembles requires a shorter one, and one within human capacities. So let us speak in the latter way” (ᾧ δὲ ἔοικεν, ἀνθρωπίνης τε καὶ ἐλάττονος· ταύτη οὖν λέγωμεν.⁵⁵ Rowe's translation of *ἀνθρωπίνη* as “within human capacities” captures the essence of Plato's theory of forms, expressed literarily: the concept in its intelligible form can be understood divinely; mere mortals must make do with an image of this concept that is both divinely inspired and based on the literary tradition (*Phdr.* 246a6–b4, which is quoted in section 11 above and referred to hereinafter as Passage B).

The allegory of the soul as “the combined power of a winged team of horses and their charioteer” (*Phdr.* 246a6–7 συμφύτῳ δυνάμει ὑποπτέρου ζεύγους

⁵⁵ Formulated also by Tanner 466 who, perhaps unintentionally, draws upon Plato's admission of the necessity of *πάντη πάντως θείας εἶναι* to convey thoroughly the truth about the soul: “What is needed is a recognition that there are other modes of rigor and precision than quasi-formal ones, and ways of being profound that do not require near-unintelligibility.” See also Nussbaum 20 n. 33.

τε καὶ ἡνιόχου) conveys figuratively the idea, explained at *R.* 439d4–41a3, that the soul consists of three parts. The charioteer (ἡνίοχος) personifies the reasoning part (*R.* 439d5 τὸ λογιστικόν), the good horse (*Phdr.* 246b2–3 τῶν ἵππων ὁ μὲν αὐτῷ καλὸς τε καὶ ἀγαθός) represents the spirited part (*R.* 441a2 τὸ θυμοειδές), and the bad horse (*Phdr.* 246b3 ὁ δ' ἐξ ἐναντίων τε καὶ ἐναντίος) embodies the appetitive part (*R.* 440e10 τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν).⁵⁶

The fact that both Parmenides' proem and Plato's myth involve the idea of a charioteer and his horses journeying to a realm of true existence beyond sense-perceptual reality cannot be ignored or dismissed as literary coincidence: both allegories function in a strictly theoretical context, explaining concepts related to the realm of true existence by means of the same literary device.

But even if the metaphor is a vehicle of literary expression suitable for rendering the abstract, metaphysical nature of the soul into an ἀνθρωπίνη form, why does Plato select so traditionally poetic a trope as the metaphor of a charioteer? There are three parts to the reason for this seemingly un-Platonic decision: the first, concerning the use of metaphor as an explanatory method, is employed by scholars of philosophy, language, and semiotics; the second, concerning the use of metaphor in Platonic myth, is employed by scholars of Plato and classical philology; the third concerns Parmenides' influence on Plato's account of the soul's journey.

At *Poetics* 1457b6–9 Aristotle defines metaphor as “the application of a word (ἐπιφορά) that belongs to another thing: either from genus to species, species to species, or by analogy.”⁵⁷ The new-born discipline of “metaphorology,”⁵⁸ promoted by Ricoeur, Eco, and Derrida, exposes the intrinsic semantic and semiotic relations that are brought up by the transference of meanings from one thing to another.⁵⁹ While Eco understands metaphor as an enrichment of literary discourse, Derrida subsumes metaphor to philosophical discourse. In Derrida's terms, philosophy is “a process of metaphorization,”⁶⁰ a view especially relevant to metaphysics.

To read within a concept the hidden history of metaphor is to privilege *diachrony* at the expense of system, and is also to invest in the *symbolist* conception of language that we have pointed out in passing: no matter how deeply buried,

⁵⁶ This conceptual relation between the allegory and the tripartite division of the soul has influenced the interpretation of Parmenides: Coxon 13–17 refers to the soul-charioteer in the *Phaedrus* to give a possible interpretation of the journey of Parmenides' charioteer.

⁵⁷ Halliwell's translation. On metaphor see also *Rh.* 1405a3.

⁵⁸ Eco's coinage.

⁵⁹ Snell in his chapter on the transition from myth to *logos*, 190–226, examines the nature of comparison as a foundation for the use of metaphor in philosophical texts.

⁶⁰ Derrida 211–15.

the link of the signifier to the signified has had both to be and to remain a link of natural necessity, of analogical participation, of resemblance.⁶¹

In an attempt to reconcile⁶² "the ancient quarrel" between philosophy and poetry and its modern permutations, Rorty, Nussbaum, and Edmundson propose a dialectical understanding of the necessary connectedness between philosophy and poetry: "conception and form are bound together."⁶³ These theories illuminate Plato's undertaking in Passage A and Passage B. If, according to Derrida, metaphor is "a link of natural necessity," inherent to philosophical discourse, then when Passage B creates an image (*Phdr.* 246a3 ἰδέα) of the account in Passage A with the use of the charioteer allegory, it offers a different explanation of the immortality of the soul and unites itself with Passage A to become "an integral part" of this concept.⁶⁴ The metaphoric presentation of motion in the allegory in Passage B (*Phdr.* 246a6–7 "Let it resemble the combined power of a winged team of horses and their charioteer") is based on the view of the immortality of the soul in Passage A, that is, "all soul is immortal; for that which is ever-moving is immortal" (*Phdr.* 245c5–9).

The analytical proof of the immortality of the soul (*Phdr.* 245c5–9) requires an illustration of its argument. This illustration is presented in the allegory of the soul (*Phdr.* 246a6–48a), which provides a suitable example of Nussbaum's "fit between content and form." The charioteer myth has received a wide range of interpretations and is included in every study of Platonic myth from Deuschle to Morgan.⁶⁵ Scholars acknowledge the conceptual relation between the charioteer myth and the proof of the soul's immortality: the charioteer's journey is a different, literarily-informed explanation of the exegesis in Passage A. The image of a charioteer and his pair of horses crossing the heavens embodies in a visual form that which is self-moving and above sense-perceptible reality. The details of this image explicate the immortal nature of the soul in gods and men. In the case of gods, the charioteer and his horses "are all

⁶¹ Derrida 215.

⁶² Edmundson makes a successful attempt at revitalizing the theoretical evaluation of poetry with his *Literature against Philosophy, Plato to Derrida: A Defense of Poetry*.

⁶³ This approach dismisses the antagonism between the two modes of discourse and begins, according to Nussbaum 22, "to recover, in the domain of the ethical, very broadly and inclusively construed, the sense of the deep connection between content and form that animated the ancient quarrel and that has usually been present in the greatest thinkers, whether they were friends of literature or not and whether or not they wrote in a 'literary' way."

⁶⁴ Mourelatos 1973: 70 is on the same track suggesting that the "speculative metaphor" creates a new, philosophically bound, meaning in Parmenides.

⁶⁵ That is, from 1854 with the publication of *Die platonischen Mythen, insbesondere der Mythen im Platos Phädrus* to 2000 with the publication of *Myth and Philosophy from the Presocratics to Plato*. For a diachronic analysis see Moors 1–24.

both good and of good stock" (*Phdr.* 246a7–8 θεῶν μὲν οὖν ἵπποι τε καὶ ἡνίοχοι πάντες αὐτοὶ τε ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ἐξ ἀγαθῶν). They constitute a winged team that "travels above the earth and governs the whole cosmos" (*Phdr.* 246c1–2 ἐπτερωμένη μετεωροπορεῖ τε καὶ πάντα τὸν κόσμον διοικεῖ). The example that Plato gives for the accord between the charioteer and his horses is Zeus' journey: "First in the heavens travels Zeus, the great leader, driving a winged chariot, putting all things in order and caring for all" (*Phdr.* 246e4–6 ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας ἡγεμὼν ἐν οὐρανῷ Ζεὺς, ἐλαύνων πτηνὸν ἄρμα, πρῶτος πορεύεται, διακοσμῶν πάντα καὶ ἐπιμελούμενος). In the case of men, the quality of the horses is mixed: the charioteer guides a pair, but "he finds one of them both noble and good, and of similar stock, while the other is of opposite stock and opposite in its nature" (*Phdr.* 246b1–3 ὁ ἄρχων συνωρίδος ἡνιοχεῖ, εἶτα τῶν ἵππων ὁ μὲν αὐτῷ καλὸς τε καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐκ τοιούτων, ὁ δ' ἐξ ἐναντίων τε καὶ ἐναντίος). Thus driving a chariot in the case of mortals is difficult and troublesome (*Phdr.* 246b4 χαλεπὴ δὴ καὶ δύσκολος ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἡ περὶ ἡμᾶς ἡνιόχησις). These details in Passage B explicate the complexities of the self-moving nature of the soul in gods and men.

V. PLATO AND PARMENIDES

Scholars treat Parmenides' preminent role in the development of Plato's philosophy almost with the certainty of a historical fact. A point of contention, however, is the extent to which Plato appropriates Parmenides' ideas.⁶⁶ Similar uncertainty covers the details of Plato's use of Parmenides' proem in the *Phaedrus*' myth. It is ironic, I think, that scholars and commentators have used Plato's allegory to clarify the symbolism of Parmenides' journey but not vice versa.⁶⁷ In the following pages I examine the textual and conceptual relations between the proem and the Platonic myth of the charioteer in the hope of broadening our understanding of Plato's awareness and appropriation of the literary tradition and in order to open up a new area for studies of Parmenides' proem, one that would engage Parmenides in explicating Plato.⁶⁸

The first point of our comparative analysis concerns the nature of the relationship between a charioteer and his horses in Parmenides and Plato. In

⁶⁶ Palmer's study of Plato's reception of Parmenides addresses this and other problems of Plato's understanding of Parmenides with originality and keen insights. For studies of Plato-Parmenides relations see esp. 1–16.

⁶⁷ Except Coxon 13–14 referring to Proclus in *Prm.* 703 and Simplicius in *de Cael.* 556.12.

⁶⁸ Coxon 16 notices the close connection between Parmenides' journey and Plato's account of the philosophic life in the *Phaedo* 64a–69e.

Parmenides, the mares enter the first verse of the poem characterized as capable of taking their passenger as far as impulse might reach (B1.1 ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ θυμός ἰκάνοι). They are the active participants in the journey as they carry (φέρουσιν), send (πέμπον), lead (ἄγουσαι), and exert themselves (τιταίνουσαι) in taking their passenger toward the house of the nameless goddess. The horses are present in the proem with their θυμός, which is the source of the charioteer's motion. "Much-discerning" (πολύφραστοι), they lead the chariot (φέρον ... ἄρμα) in accord. Their passenger is introduced in the third verse of the proem as "a knowing man" (εἰδότα φῶτα), although he himself does not direct the path of the chariot.⁶⁹ It is later in the proem that we are informed of what constitutes this man's knowledge: he has learned the route of persuasion leading him to the truth of what being is. The third set of participants in the proem are the Heliades, "immortal charioteers" (B1.24 ἀθανάτοισι ... ἡνιόχοισιν) guiding the path of the mares (B1.5 κοῦραι δ' ὁδὸν ἡγεμόνευον) and coaxing the "much-avenging Justice" (B1.15–16 τὴν δὴ παρφάμεναι κοῦραι μαλακοῖσι λόγοισιν / πείσαν ἐπιφραδέως) to open the gates of Night and Day. The team—horses, passenger, Heliades—works together to reach its destination. All of them possess characteristics of intellectual power (the horses are "much-discerning," πολύφραστοι, the passenger is "knowing," εἰδότα, and the immortal charioteers "persuade cunningly," πείσαν ἐπιφραδέως). This enables them to complete the journey beyond the darkness of common men's beliefs and to reach the realm of the gods.

Now let us consider Plato's team. It is made from "the combined power of a winged team of horses and their charioteer" (*Phdr.* 246a6–7 συμφύτω δυνάμει ὑποπτέρου ζεύγους τε καὶ ἡνιόχου). In the case of the gods, the horses and the charioteer are noble, good, and of similar nature (*Phdr.* 246a7–8 θεῶν μὲν οὖν ἵπποι τε καὶ ἡνιόχοι πάντες αὐτοὶ τε ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ἐξ ἀγαθῶν); their journey is easy and accomplished in accord (*Phdr.* 247b1–2 τὰ μὲν θεῶν ὁχήματα ἰσορρόπως εὐήνια ὄντα ῥαδίως πορεύεται). In the case of men, the horses and the charioteer are opposite and of opposite nature (*Phdr.* 246b3 ὁ δ' ἐξ ἐναντίων τε καὶ ἐναντίος); their journey is therefore difficult and troublesome (*Phdr.* 246b4 χαλεπὴ δὴ καὶ δύσκολος ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἢ περὶ ἡμᾶς ἡνιόχησις).

There are some striking similarities in the language and style of the two authors. As Plato introduces his team by mentioning the horses first and then the charioteer, so Parmenides begins his poem with a reference to the horses first and then their passenger. The reason for such a peculiar arrangement lies in the emphasis on the horses' θυμός. In Parmenides, the horses follow their

⁶⁹ Coxon 158.

θυμός as far as its impulse might reach (B1.1). In Plato, the good and the bad horse are distinguished by the obedience to their charioteer that is a characteristic of their θυμός: the good horse makes the chariots of the gods “well-balanced and easily controlled” (*Phdr.* 247b2 ἰσορρόπως εὐήνῃα ὄντα ῥαδίως), while the bad horse weighs the chariots of men down, pulling them toward the earth, if he has not been well trained by his charioteer (*Phdr.* 247b3–5 βρίθει γὰρ ὁ τῆς κάκης ἵππος μετέχων, ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ῥέπων τε καὶ βαρύνων ᾧ μὴ καλῶς ἦν τεθραμμένος τῶν ἡνιόχων). The allusiveness of the distinction between the two horses is clarified by the terminology of the three parts of the soul at *R.* 439d5–41a2 (discussed in part IV above). τὸ θυμοειδές (*R.* 441a2) is the second part, which is in charge of elevated emotions and a natural ally of the first, reasoning, part (*R.* 439d5 τὸ λογιστικόν); τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν (*R.* 440e10) is the third part, which gives expression to appetitive desires against the reasoning part. Finally, Plato’s charioteer represents the reasoning part of the soul, which is able to guide the path of the chariot toward the realm of true existence. He has charge of the pair of horses: in the case of gods, the charioteer performs his task easily, supported by the agreement of his pair (*Phdr.* 247a4–6) while, in the case of men, the charioteer “has charge of the pair” (*Phdr.* 246b1–2 καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἡμῶν ὁ ἄρχων συνωρίδος ἡνιοχεῖ) and yet steers it with difficulty onto the right path (*Phdr.* 246b4). In guiding his team Plato’s charioteer and the reasoning part of the soul perform the same role as the immortal companions of Parmenides’ charioteer, i.e., to direct the path of the chariot and the horses. In the case of the gods, Plato’s charioteer acts like the Heliades who lead the chariot with ease and cunningly persuade Justice to let them through the gates of Night and Day. In the case of men, Plato’s charioteer resembles the “knowing” passenger in Parmenides’ team, for he has to train the bad horse to obey his direction (*Phdr.* 247b4–5 μὴ καλῶς ἦν τεθραμμένος τῶν ἡνιόχων).

The culminating point in this comparative analysis is Plato’s description of Zeus’ chariot-ride as a leading example for the gods’ happy movement in the sky (*Phdr.* 246e4–47a5):

ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας ἡγεμὼν ἐν οὐρανῷ Ζεὺς, ἐλαύνων πτηνὸν ἄρμα, πρῶτος πορεύεται, διακοσμῶν πάντα καὶ ἐπιμελούμενος· τῷ δ’ ἔπεται στρατιὰ θεῶν τε καὶ δαιμόνων, κατὰ ἑνδεκα μέρη κεκοσμημένη. μένει γὰρ Ἑστία ἐν θεῶν οἴκῳ μόνη· τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ὅσοι ἐν τῷ τῶν δώδεκα ἀριθμῷ τεταγμένοι θεοὶ ἄρχοντες ἡγοῦνται κατὰ τάξιν ἣν ἕκαστος ἐτάχθη. πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν καὶ μακάριοι θέαι τε καὶ διέξοδοι ἐντὸς οὐρανοῦ, ὥς θεῶν γένος εὐδαιμόνων ἐπιστρέφεται ...

First in the heavens travels Zeus, the great leader, driving a winged chariot, putting all things in order and caring for all; after him there follows an army of

gods and divinities, ordered in eleven companies. For Hestia remains in the house of the gods alone; of the rest, all those who have their place among the number of the twelve take the lead as commanders in the station given to each. Many, then, and blessed are the paths to be seen along which the happy race of gods turn within the heavens ...

The passage describes the harmony of the rides of the gods' souls, referring specifically to the ride of Zeus, who is the only deity (besides Hestia, who does not travel on a chariot) named in the text. Plato's choice here is appropriate: Zeus is "the great leader" (ὁ μέγας ἡγεμών) of gods and men, and in this context his chariot ride is most important and representative for all chariot rides of the gods. Plato's choice, however, I would argue, is not simply appropriate. If one relates the overall positive description and language of this passage to Parmenides' portrayal of the gods (especially the Heliades, who also "lead," ἡγεμόνευον, the way in B1.5) and his adaptation of the Homeric theme of divine chariot rides (especially the one of Zeus in B1), one perceives the passage's sophisticated literary identity and places it in the tradition of Homer and Parmenides.

Is it possible that Plato selects Zeus as an example for his chariot ride as a reference to Parmenides' use of Zeus' episode in Book 8 of the *Iliad*? Although this claim is and always will be speculative, even to conceive of its possible validity draws attention to the relationship between the episodes in Parmenides and Plato and yields some fruitful discoveries. The resemblance between the two divine charioteers and their pairs of horses lies in the knowledgeable leading of the charioteer and the good spirit of his horses in both journeys: in Plato, the gods lead the chariots (*Phdr.* 247a3 θεοὶ ἄρχοντες ἡγούμενοι), while in Parmenides, the Heliades lead the way of the chariot (B1.5 κοῦραι δ' ὁδὸν ἡγεμόνευον). Moreover, Zeus rides on his chariot (*Phdr.* 246e4–5 ἐλάυνων πτηνὸν ἄρμα), while the Heliades "drive the chariot and mares along the broad way" (B1.21 ἰθὺς ἔχον κοῦραι κατ' ἀμαξιτὸν ἄρμα καὶ ἵππους). But there are also differences. Plato uses the criterion of accord between the charioteer and his pair to distinguish the different conditions of "chariot driving" in the souls of gods and men. For Parmenides this distinction is unnecessary: in his divine equipage there is accord between the charioteers and the mares, while the young philosopher whom the team carries to the nameless goddess is knowledgeable, that is, he understands the right way to wisdom (B1.3). In the *Phaedrus*, Plato overrides the personal dimension of Parmenides' philosopher-charioteer and extends the allegory to include gods and not-so-knowledgeable but philosophically-inclined men in order to present the universal meaning of the soul's immortality. In other words, Plato's topic, the concept of the soul, universal and individual, incorporates Parmenides' literary allegory.

The philosophical component of Parmenides' allegory is represented in Plato's description of the realm to which the charioteer travels (*Phdr.* 247c6–d1):

ἡ γὰρ ἀχρώματός τε καὶ ἀσχημάτιστος καὶ ἀναφής οὐσία ὄντως οὐδα,
 ψυχῆς κυβερνήτῃ μόνῳ θεατῇ νῶ, περὶ ἣν τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἐπιστήμης
 γένος, τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τόπον.

This region is occupied by being which really is, which is without colour or shape, intangible, observable by the steersman of the soul alone, by intellect, and to which the class of true knowledge relates.

The destination of the chariot-rides of gods and men contains true being (οὐσία ὄντως οὐδα) or eternal existence. Gods, owing to their unanimous team of a charioteer and his horses, are able to reach the outer part of the heavens, from which they are able to gaze on the region outside the heavens (*Phdr.* 247b7–c2). This region recalls the realm of true being, which Parmenides' goddess describes in her instructions to the charioteer (B4.1–4):

λεῦσσε δ' ὅμως ἀπεόντα νόῳ παρεόντα βεβαίως·
 οὐ γὰρ ἀποτμήξει τὸ ἐὸν τοῦ ἐόντος ἔχουσθαι
 οὔτε σκιδνάμενον πάντῃ πάντως κατὰ κόσμον
 οὔτε συνιστάμενον.

Look upon things which, though far off, are yet firmly present to the mind;
 For you shall not cut off what-is from holding fast to what-is,
 For it neither disperses itself in every way everywhere in order,
 Nor gathers itself together.

The conceptual similarities between the two regions were discussed by Solmsen in connection with the relationship between Parmenides' account of being and Plato's description of the form of beauty in the *Symposium*, that is, true being is ungenerated, imperishable, whole, steadfast, and complete (B8.1–6).⁷⁰ The connection between Plato's realm of true existence in the *Phaedrus* and Parmenides' presentation of the route of persuasion only strengthens the philosophical relationship between the two concepts. In Plato and Parmenides, the realm is above the region that is inhabited by the gods and far distant from "the beaten tracks of common men." Plato follows the distinction, established by Homer in Book 8 of the *Iliad* and Parmenides in B1, between the dark world of mortals and the bright realm of the gods. The epic poet makes this distinction apparent in the concluding scene of Zeus'

⁷⁰ Solmsen 64–70. Curd 75–94, especially 84–86, examines each one of the characteristics. For a discussion of the Parmenidean elements in Plato's understanding of the immortality of the soul see Hackforth 1955: 84–86.

chariot ride, in which the king of gods and mortals observes the battle of men below him. The philosophers reverse the direction from which the charioteers observe the goal of their journeys: Parmenides' charioteer reaches the goddess' house, where he learns the path of persuasion: "For it lies far indeed from the beaten track of men" (B1.27 ἡ γὰρ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων ἐκτὸς πάτου ἐστίν); the souls of Plato's divine charioteers reach the top of the heavens, from which they gaze (θεωροῦσι) at the region above the heavens (*Phdr.* 247c1–3 τὸν δὲ ὑπερουράνιον τόπον).

Parmenides and Plato associate their charioteers' journeys with the ride of Zeus in order to establish that true being belongs to a region closer to the dwelling place of the gods than to that of men. This region is accessible only through the power of intellect in its role as the guiding principle of persuasion and knowledge: in Parmenides, the charioteer looks "upon things which, though far off, are firmly present to the mind" (B4.1 νόῳ παρεόντα βεβαίως) and in Plato, the divine charioteer gazes at true being "observable by the steersman of the soul alone, by intellect, and to which the class of true knowledge relates" (*Phdr.* 247c7–9 ψυχῆς κυβερνήτῃ μόνῳ θεατῇ νῶ, περὶ ἣν τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἐπιστήμης γένος, τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τόπον). The journey of the divine charioteer in the *Phaedrus* places the journey of Parmenides' charioteer in the broader context of Plato's understanding of the soul. Plato's allegory not only presents a different interpretation of the proof of the immortality of the soul but also creates an image embodying the literary tradition it continues.

VI. CONCLUSION

In the *Phaedrus*, Plato interweaves Parmenides' untraditional epic with the concept of eternal being, thus creating a metaphor that conveys his own original view of the soul's immortality in a traditionally poetic form. The powerful image of Plato's allegory of the soul as a charioteer springs from the innate relation of metaphor with philosophical discourse, from the capacity of myth to serve as an explanatory vehicle, and from Plato's literary awareness. The allegory conveys a philosophically-informed image⁷¹ of the nature and experiences of the soul. As Telemachus journeys to self-discovery, so Parmenides' charioteer reaches the realm of the intelligible above the false "opinions of mortals" (B1.30), and the mortal soul in the *Phaedrus* struggles to reconcile its opposite natures in order to realize its true, immortal, existence.

⁷¹ Morgan 215–16, the myth of the charioteer "presents a philosophically-informed image of the nature and experiences of the Soul. It is characterized by nascent philosophical method and by the reasoned (non-arbitrary) creation of likenesses."

While Telemachus is guided by Peisistratus to learn the path toward *kleos*, Parmenides' philosopher learns what true existence is, and the young Phaedrus is enchanted by Socrates' palinode to love to recognize the divine essence of his soul. The allegory creates a metaphorical reality in which form and content merge to express a philosophically unified meaning.

The charioteers' journeys presented in Homer, Parmenides, and Plato mark three different levels of connectedness between content and form. The first is the epic journeys of the gods and Telemachus, symbolizing respectively the divine supreme power and the personal growth of Odysseus' son from a helpless youth to a respectable heir. The second is Parmenides' appropriation of the Homeric journey in order to portray the existence of everlasting reality and to establish the authority of a philosopher's quest to uncover the truth of this eternal existence; Parmenides' journey also represents the ideological growth of the Eleatic philosopher beyond the common man's belief in sense-perceptible reality. Third is Plato's appropriation of Parmenides' charioteer to develop his understanding of existence, exemplified in the soul's immortality. The almost autobiographical account of Parmenides' journey to unveil the doctrine of true being beyond sensual reality sets the philosophical and literary background that enables Plato to associate his concept of the soul with the realm of Parmenides' true existence. The poetic idea of the transition from mortality to immortality is transformed into the philosophic idea of the transition from physical to metaphysical existence, thus crossing the literary genres from poetry to prose to unite them in one tradition.

The conceptual maturation of the allegory symbolizing both the charioteer-philosopher's growth as a hero and the soul's immortality progresses not only through different literary genres but also through evolving philosophic ideas from Parmenides to Plato. The allegory of the charioteer conducts an "iconic discourse,"⁷² exemplifying effectively the dialectic of philosophical thought and literary form. The journey of a charioteer in Parmenides and Plato represents a new kind of a heroic quest: the quest of the philosopher's mind to separate itself from the popular beliefs of sensible reality and, through contemplative introspection, to enter the realm of metaphysical existence. Parmenides' knowledge of true existence completes the philosopher's journey to the realm of the intelligible; the soul of Plato's philosopher, being closer to the divine charioteer, reaches the heights of its immortal nature.

Plato appropriates the charioteer theme with awareness of its philosophical implications in Parmenides' allegory and of its Homeric tradition. This kind of awareness creates a new form of interaction between texts. The philo-

⁷² Using Barthes' terminology from 1985: 192–93 and 201–4.

sophical milieu of the allegory of a charioteer in Parmenides and the *Phaedrus* requires a new form of relationship between the allegory, the concept that it explains, and its tradition. This new kind of relationship becomes a matter of particular importance when it involves representation of an evolving concept in a literary form that is already established. Such dual interaction between content and form represents a higher order of connectedness than intertextuality. And since it refers to matters of philosophical discourse and it is determined by the development of philosophic ideas, it should, I argue, be called "interconceptuality."⁷³

WORKS CITED

- Allen, M. 1981. *Marsilio Ficino and the Phaedran Charioteer*. Berkeley.
- Bacon, H. H. 1959. "Socrates Crowned." *Virginia Quarterly Review* 35: 415–30.
- . 1990. "The Poetry of *Phaedo*." In M. Griffiths and D. J. Mastronarde, eds., *Cabinet of the Muses*. Atlanta. 147–62.
- Barthes, R. 1985. "Rhetoric of the Image." In R. E. Innis, ed., *Semiotics: An Introductory Anthology*. Bloomington. 192–204.
- Bielmeier, P. A. 1930. *Die neuplatonische Phaidrosinterpretation*. Paderborn.
- Brisson, L. 1998 (French original 1982). *Plato the Myth Maker*. Trans. G. Naddaf. Chicago.
- Burger, R. 1980. *Plato's Phaedrus: A Defense of a Philosophic Art of Writing*. Tuscaloosa.
- Burnet, J. 1901. *Platonis opera*. Vol. 2. Oxford.
- . 1908. *Early Greek Philosophy*. 2nd ed. London.
- Chaignet, A.-E. 1966 (original publication 1862). *De la psychologie de Platon*. Brussels.
- Clarke, H. W. 1999. "Telemachus and the *Telemachia*." In I. J. F. de Jong, ed., *Homer. Critical Assessments*. Vol. III: *Literary Interpretation*. London. (= *AJP* 84 (1963): 129–45)
- Cornford, F. M. 1952. *Principium sapientiae: The Origins of Greek Philosophical Thought*. Cambridge.
- . 1991 (original publication 1912). *From Religion to Philosophy: A Study in the Origins of Western Speculation*. Princeton.
- Coxon, A. H. 1986. *The Fragments of Parmenides: A Critical Text with Introduction, Translation, the Ancient Testimonia and a Commentary*. Phronesis. Supplementary volume 3. Assen.
- Curd, P. 1998. *The Legacy of Parmenides: Eleatic Monism and Later Presocratic Thought*. Princeton.

⁷³ The journey of this article is itself long and convoluted. An earlier version was delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South (Provo 2001). I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the anonymous readers of *TAPA* and John Finamore for their comments on the content, to Nancy de Grummond for her help on matters of language and style, and above all to Cynthia Damon, who so skillfully charioteered this project to completion. Any errors, however, are the author's sole responsibility.

- De Vries, G. J. 1969. *A Commentary on the Phaedrus of Plato*. Amsterdam.
- Derrida, J. 1982 (French original 1972). "White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy." In *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. with additional notes by A. Bass. Chicago.
- Deuschle, J. 1854. *Die platonischen Mythen, insbesondere der Mythos im platonischen Phädrus*. Hanau.
- Diels, H. 1956–59. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 8th ed. by W. Kranz. 3 vols. Berlin.
- Eco, U. 1984. *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. Bloomington.
- Edmundson, M. 1995. *Literature against Philosophy, Plato to Derrida: A Defense of Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Felson, N. 1994. *Regarding Penelope: From Character to Poetics*. Princeton.
- Ferrari, G. R. F. 1987. *Listening to the Cicadas: A Study of Plato's Phaedrus*. Cambridge.
- Floyd, E. D. 1992. "Why Parmenides Wrote in Verse." *AncPhil* 12: 251–65.
- Gallop, D. 1984. *Parmenides of Elea: Fragments. A Text and Translation with an Introduction*. Phoenix Suppl. 18. Toronto.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. 1962–81. *A History of Greek Philosophy*. 6 vols. Cambridge.
- Hackforth, R. 1952. *Plato's Phaedrus, Translated with Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge.
- . 1955. *Plato's Phaedo, Translated with Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Halliwell, S., ed. and trans. 1995. *Aristotle. Poetics*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- Havelock, E. 1958. "Parmenides and Odysseus." *HSCP* 63: 133–43.
- Heath, M. 1989a. "The Unity of Plato's *Phaedrus*." *OSAPh* 7: 151–73.
- . 1989b. "The Unity of the *Phaedrus*: A Postscript." *OSAPh* 7: 189–91.
- Heidegger, M. 1992 (German original 1942–43). *Parmenides*. Trans. A. Schuwer and R. Rojcewicz. Bloomington.
- Heitsch, E. 1993. *Platon. Phaidros. Übersetzung und Kommentar*. In E. Heitsch and C. W. Müller, eds., *Platon. Werke. Übersetzung und Kommentar* III.4. Göttingen.
- Helmbold, W. C., and W. B. Holther. 1952. "The Unity of the *Phaedrus*." *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 14: 387–417.
- Hirsch, W. 1971. *Platons Weg zum Mythos*. Berlin.
- Kirk, G. S. 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume II: Books 5–8*. Cambridge.
- Lattimore, R. 1951. *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago.
- Mansfeld, J. 1964. *Die Offenbarung des Parmenides und die menschlichen Welt*. Assen.
- Martin, R. P. 1993. "Telemachus and the Last Hero Song." *Colby Quarterly* 29: 222–40.
- Monro, D. B., and T. W. Allen, eds. 1920. *Homeri opera*. Vol. 1. 3rd ed. Oxford.
- Moors, K. F. 1982. *Platonic Myth: An Introductory Study*. Washington, D.C.
- Morgan, K. 2000. *Myth and Philosophy from the Presocratics to Plato*. Cambridge.
- Morrison, J. S. 1955. "Parmenides and Er." *JHS* 75: 60–68.
- Mourelatos, A. P. D. 1970. *The Route of Parmenides: A Study of Words, Image, and Argument in the Fragments*. New Haven.
- Mourelatos, A. P. D., E. N. Lee, and R. M. Rorty. 1973. *Exegesis and Argument: Studies in Greek Philosophy Presented to Gregory Vlastos*. Assen.
- Murnaghan, S. 2002. "The Trials of Telemachus: Who Was the *Odyssey* Meant For?" *Arethusa* 35: 133–53.
- Nehamas, A., and P. Woodruff. 1995. *Plato. Phaedrus. Translated with Introduction and Notes*. Indianapolis.

- Nightingale, A. W. 1995. *Genres in Dialogue: Plato and the Construct of Philosophy*. Cambridge.
- Nussbaum, M. C. 1990. *Love's Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature*. New York.
- Osborne, C. 1996. "Space, Time, Shape, and Direction: Creative Discourse in the *Timaeus*." In C. Gill and M. M. McCabe, eds., *Form and Argument in Late Plato*. Oxford. 179–212.
- Palmer, J. A. 1999. *Plato's Reception of Parmenides*. Oxford.
- Pellikaan-Engel, M. E. 1974. *Hesiod and Parmenides: A New View on their Cosmologies and on Parmenides' Proem*. Amsterdam.
- Peradotto, J. 1990. *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Popper, K. R. 1992. "How the Moon Might Throw Some of Her Light upon the Two Ways of Parmenides." *CQ* 42: 12–19.
- Pugliese Caratelli, G. 1988. "La $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ di Parmenide." *Parola del passato* 43: 337–46.
- Race, W. 1997. *Pindar. Olympian Odes. Pythian Odes*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- Reinhardt, K. 1916. *Parmenides und die Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Ricoeur, P. 1977 (French original 1975). *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language*. Trans. R. Czerny, K. McLaughlin, and J. Costello, SJ. Toronto.
- Robinson, T. M. 1970. *Plato's Psychology*. Toronto.
- Rorty, R. 1989. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. Cambridge.
- Rowe, C. J. 1986a. *Plato, Phaedrus with Translation and Commentary*. Warminster.
- . 1986b. "The Argument and Structure of Plato's *Phaedrus*." *PCPS* 212: 106–25.
- . 1989. "The Unity of the *Phaedrus*: A Reply to Heath." *OSAPh* 7: 175–88.
- Snell, B. 1982 (German original 1946; original publication 1960). *The Discovery of the Mind in Greek Philosophy and Literature*. Trans. T. G. Rosenmeyer. New York.
- Solmsen, F. 1971. "Parmenides and the Description of Perfect Beauty in Plato's *Symposium*." *AJP* 92: 62–70.
- Stein, H. 1867. "Die Fragmente des Parmenides." In *Symbola philologorum bonnensium in honorem Friderici Ritschelii collecta*. Vol. 2. Leipzig.
- Tanner, M. 1980. "The Language of Philosophy." In L. Michaels and C. Ricks, eds., *The State of the Language*. Berkeley. 458–66.
- Tarán, L. 1965. *Parmenides: A Text with Translation, Commentary, and Critical Essays*. Princeton.
- Taylor, A. E. 1936 (original publication 1926). *Plato: The Man and His Work*. New York.
- Thalmann, W. G. 1992. *The Odyssey: An Epic of Return*. New York.
- Voegelin, E. 1957. *Order and History. Volume Two: The World of the Polis*. Baton Rouge.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U., et al. 1905. "Die griechische Literatur des Altertums." In *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache*. Berlin. 1–236.