

Theory and History of Ontology (www.ontology.co) by Raul Corazzon | e-mail: rc@ontology.co

Il *Parmenide* di Platone. Bibliografia degli studi Italiani

Contents of this Section

The Philosophy of Plato

This part of the section [History of Ontology](#) includes the following pages:

[Plato: Bibliographical Resources on Selected Dialogues](#)

[Plato's *Parmenides* and the Dilemma of Participation](#)

[Annotated Bibliography of studies on Plato's *Parmenides* in English:](#)

[Plato's *Parmenides*. Annotated bibliography \(A - Bru\)](#)

[Plato's *Parmenides*. Annotated bibliography \(But - For\)](#)

[Plato's *Parmenides*. Annotated bibliography \(Fri - Lam\)](#)

[Plato's *Parmenides*. Annotated bibliography \(Lar - Pet\)](#)

[Plato's *Parmenides*. Annotated bibliography \(Pin - Spr\)](#)

[Plato's *Parmenides*. Annotated bibliography \(Ste - Z\)](#)

[Le *Parménide* de Platon. Bibliographie des études en Français](#)

[Il *Parmenide* di Platone. Bibliografia degli studi in Italiano \(Current page\)](#)

[Platon *Parmenides*. Bibliographie des Deutschen Studien](#)

[Annotated Bibliography of studies on the *Third Man Argument* in English:](#)

[Third Man Argument. Annotated bibliography \(A - Mat\)](#)

[Third Man Argument. Annotated bibliography \(Mei - Z\)](#)

Third Man Argument. Bibliography of studies in French, Italian and German

Semantics, Predication, Truth and Falsehood in Plato's *Sophist*

Annotated bibliography of studies on Plato's *Sophist* in English:

Plato's *Sophist*. Annotated bibliography (A - Bos)

Plato's *Sophist*. Annotated bibliography (Bra - Cur)

Plato's *Sophist*. Annotated bibliography (Dan Gia)

Plato's *Sophist*. Annotated bibliography (Gib - Joh)

Plato's *Sophist*. Annotated bibliography (Jor - Mal)

Plato's *Sophist*. Annotated bibliography (Mar - Not)

Plato's *Sophist*. Annotated bibliography (O'Br - Pro)

Plato's *Sophist*. Annotated bibliography (Prz - Shu)

Plato's *Sophist*. Annotated bibliography (Sil - Zuc)

Bibliographies on Plato's *Sophist* in other languages:

Platon: *Sophiste*. Bibliographie des études en Français (A - L)

Platon: *Sophiste*. Bibliographie des études en Français (M - Z)

Platon: *Sophistes*. Ausgewählte Studien in Deutsch

Platone: *Sofista*. Bibliografia degli studi in Italiano

Platón: *Sofista*. Bibliografía de estudios en Español

Platão: *Sofista*. Bibliografia dos estudos em Português

Index of the Section: Ancient Philosophy from the Presocratics to the Hellenistic Period



Annotated bibliography of the studies in English: Complete PDF Version on the website [Academia.edu](https://www.academia.edu)

Bibliografia degli studi in Italiano

1. "Lecture del 'Parmenide'. Sullo statuto ontologico di idee e relazioni." 2016. *Fogli di filosofia* no. 8.
 Indice: Niccolò Argentieri: Affinità generica, differenza specifica: matematica e dialettica 1; Augusto Di Benedetto: Relativi e relazioni nel *Parmenide* di Platone 16; Giacomo Lorenzon: Uno nell'essere, due nel pensiero: osservazioni per una lettura onto-epistemologica del *Parmenide* di Platone 44; Clelia Crialesi: La γυνάσια matematica del *Parmenide*: alcuni esempi di "esercizi mentali" 65; Massimiliano Biscuso: Il tempo, la contraddizione esistente: il debito della trattazione hegeliana dello *jetzt* nei confronti di Platone e Aristotele 85; Marcello Catarzi: Gli "uno" di Rickert tra logica e numero: un percorso parallelo al *Parmenide* nonostante l'autore 111; Pier Giorgio Dionisi: La stessa, la stessima. Sellars e l'argomento del Terzo uomo 177;
Translations: Ryle e il Parmenide di Platone
 Lorenzo Giovannetti: Ryle, Platone e il *Parmenide* 206; Gilbert Ryle: Il *Parmenide* di Platone (traduzione di Lorenzo Giovannetti) 239-294.
2. Adorno, Francesco. 1988. "Da Platone a Parmenide, da Parmenide a Platone." *La Parola del passato* no. 43:7–18.
 "Presents a study of the influence of Parmenidean philosophy on the formation of Plato's metaphysics." [N.]
3. Alberti, Giovanni. 2019. *Marsilio Ficino interprete del Parmenide*. Pisa: ETS.
4. Armario, Gabriella. 2016. *La dottrina platonica delle idee tra il Parmenide e il Timeo*. Roma: Stamen.
5. Aronadio, Francesco. 1985. "Il *Parmenide* e la sintassi dell'εἶδος." *Elenchos* no. 6:333–355.
6. ———. 2022. "La duplice accezione dell'espressione *me esti* nella V e nella VI ipotesi del *Parmenide*." In *Plato's Parmenides: Selected Papers of the Twelfth Symposium Platonicum*, edited by Brisson, Luc, Macé, Arnaud and Renault, Olivier, 423–430. Baden-Baden: Academia Verlag.
 Abstract: "The paper focuses on the incipit of the fifth and sixth hypotheses and examines the role played by the semantic value of the expression *me esti* in the initial arrangement of the two hypotheses. The analysis starts from the incipit of the sixth hypothesis. The occurrences of *verba dicendi* in these lines which have as their object the expression *me esti* indicate that the argumentation of this hypothesis is located in a linguistic dimension: "not-being" is here considered primarily as the referent of a linguistic locution. The incipit of the fifth hypothesis has different characteristics: its initial arrangement is not linguistic; instead it involves a cognitive act: "not-being" is understood as an object of thought. An interesting aspect of these two ways of arranging the hypotheses deserves attention: the hypotheses show the same characteristics as a passage of the *Sophist* (237b7-239a11), in which the question of "not-being" is addressed for the first time in the dialogue through a sequence of three arguments. The paper indicates the correspondences between the sixth hypothesis and the first argument and between the fifth hypothesis and the second argument. In the light of this parallelism, the two hypotheses are further evidence of a phase of reflection

by Plato on the use of the verb "to be" and of negation. Albeit in the aporetic perspective that characterizes the whole *pragmateia*, the initial arrangements of the two hypotheses are a sign of Plato's awareness that the question of not-being cannot be addressed or set aside by limiting it to a purely linguistic or cognitive dimension. For the language, with its double face – (cognitive) intentionality and (presumably linguistic) referentiality –, presents us with radically conflicting, irreconcilable and inconclusive options."

7. Barbanti, Maria. 2002. "La teologia di Origene e la prima ipotesi del *Parmenide*." In *Il Parmenide di Platone e la sua tradizione*, edited by Barbanti, Maria and Romano, Francesco, 249–280. Catania: CUECM.
8. Barbanti, Maria, and Romano, Francesco, eds. 2002. *Il Parmenide di Platone e la sua tradizione*. Catania: CUECM.
Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale del centro di Ricerca sul Neoplatonismo. Università degli Studi di Catania, 31 maggio - 2 giugno 2001.
Indice: Maria Barbanti, Francesco Romano: Prefazione 7; Carlos Steel: Une histoire de l'interprétation du *Parménide* dans l'antiquité 11; Luc Brisson: S'il (= le monde) est un. La seconde partie du *Parménide* de Platon considérée du point de vue de Parménide et de Zénon 41; Maurizio Migliori: L'unità del *Parmenide* e il suo intento protrettico 59; Franco Ferrari: Unità e oggetto del *Parmenide*. Problemi e proposte 85; Giovanni Casertano: Ogni uno di fronte a gioventù e vecchiaia 109; Franco Trabattoni: L'errore di Socrate 143; R. Loredana Cardullo: Il *Peri Ideon* di Aristotele e il *Parmenide* di Platone, ovvero: da un comune tentativo di "salvare" le idee verso un inevitabile scontro dottrinale 155; Eva Di Stefano: Il *Parmenide* di Platone e il *Didaskalikos* di Alcinoos 185; Francesco Romano: La probabile esegesi pitagorizzante (accademica, medioplatonica e neopitagorica) del *Parmenide* di Platone 197; Maria Barbanti: La teologia di Origene e la prima ipotesi del *Parmenide* 249; Gerald Bechtel: Speusippus and the *Anonymous Commentary on Plato's Parmenides*: how can the One be a Minimum? 281; Alessandro Linguiti: Sulla datazione del *Commento al Parmenide* di Bobbio. Un'analisi lessicale 307; Jean Pépin: Le *Parménide* dans les *Sentences* de Porphyre 323; John Dillon: Iamblichus' identifications of the subject-matters of the hypotheses 329; John J. Cleary: Proclus' elaborate defense of Platonic Ideas 341; Lambros Coulobaritsis: Georges Pachymere et le *Parménide* de Platon 355; Concetto Martello: Riflessi del *Parmenide* in Giovanni Eriugena 371; Werner Beierwaltes: L'interpretazione ficiniana del *Parmenide* platonico 389; Annalisa Raponi: Natorp e il *Parmenide* di Platone 411; Piero Di Giovanni: Il "Parmenide" di Platone nell'opera di Enzo Paci 425; Paolo Manganaro: Parmenide tra Heidegger e Platone 447-456.
9. Belardi, Walter. 1997. "Dal "non essere" parmenideo all' "alterità" platonica: un caso di paralogismo verbale." *Rendiconti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* no. 9a:633–747.
10. Berti, Enrico. 1971. "Struttura e significato del *Parmenide* di Platone." *Giornale di Metafisica* no. 26:497–527.
Ristampato in: E. Berti, *Studi aristotelici*, L'Aquila: Japadre 1975 pp. 297-327 (nuova edizione riveduta e ampliata Brescia: Morcelliana 2012).
11. ———. 2002. "L'essere e le sue regioni: da Parmenide ad Aristotele." In *Enosis kai philia = Unione e amicizia: omaggio a Francesco Romano*, edited by Barbanti, Maria, Giardina, Giovanna and Manganaro, Paolo, 25–41. Catania: Edizioni CUECM.
Ristampato in E. Berti, *Nuovi studi aristotelici*, Vol. I, Brescia: Morcelliana, 2004, pp. 345-363.
12. Bianchetti, Matteo, and Storace, Erasmo, eds. 2004. *Platone e l'ontologia. Il Parmenide e il Sofista*. Milano: Albo Versorio.
Indice: Matteo Bianchetti, Erasmo Silvio Storace: Presentazione 9; Prima parte.

Enrico Berti: Elementi di ontologia nel *Parmenide* e nel *Sofista* 15; Giovanni Casertano: Il falso: un'esistenza che non esiste tra cose esistenti 23; Francesco Fronterotta: Pensare la differenza. Statuto dell'essere e definizione del diverso nel *Sofista* di Platone 39; Maurizio Migliori: Non è l'ontologia il vero cuore del *Parmenide* e del *Sofista* 65; Mario Vegetti: Struttura e funzioni della dicotomia nel *Sofista* 95;

Seconda parte.

Vincenzo Vitiello: Incontro sul *Parmenide* e il *Sofista* 107; Carlo Sini: Il significato politico dell'ontologia di Platone 115;

Nota bio-bibliografica 121-123.

13. Bordini, Pierpaolo. 2003. "La commedia di un vecchio ambizioso: esiti di un approccio dialogico al *Parmenide* di Platone." *Acme* no. 56:39–63.
14. ———. 2008. "Una dottrina (platonica) della verità: oggetto, implicazioni e bersagli dell'esercizio dialettico del *Parmenide*." *Giornale Critico della Filosofia Italiana*:479–507.
15. Calabi, Francesca. 2016. "Il *Parmenide* e Filone di Alessandria." *Chôra* no. 14:251–267.
 Résumé : "Cet article s'interroge sur la possibilité de dénicher des relations entre le *Parménide* platonicien et l'oeuvre de Philon d'Alexandrie. Le dialogue platonicien n'est jamais explicitement nommé ni cité par Philon. Il y a une discussion entre chercheurs modernes sur la connaissance que l'Alexandrin peut en avoir eu. D'un côté, Runia pense que le *Parménide* n'était pas très connu au premier siècle, d'un autre côté, Whittaker considère que, à propos de la transcendance divine, Philon peut avoir fait référence à la première hypothèse du *Parménide* avec la médiation du Pythagorisme platonisant de son époque. Quant à Dillon, il voit une forte influence du dialogue sur le Platonisme Alexandrin pré-philonien. De mon côté, je pense qu'on trouve chez Philon des argumentations qu'on peut comparer avec les deux premières hypothèses du *Parménide*. On ne peut probablement pas déterminer s'il s'agit d'une influence directe ou pas, si certains thèmes viennent du texte platonicien ou d'autres sources. Ce que je chercherai à voir est si Philon utilise – revus et reformulés dans un langage adapté à l'exégèse biblique – des arguments qui rappellent le texte platonicien. Dans ses thèses de théologie négative on trouve parfois des allégations qui semblent ne pas s'accorder trop avec le texte biblique. Elles en reprennent caractères et aspects, mais avec des nuances différentes eu égard à celles du texte originaire. Dans cette perspective, j'essaierai de rapprocher des textes de Philon et quelques passages du *Parménide*. Naturellement, je ne prétends pas trouver une pleine correspondance entre ces textes. Il s'agit de suggestions, sans que je ne m'attende à donner une réponse univoque à une question peut être indécidable. La mienne est une simple hypothèse de lecture."
16. Calogero, Guido. 1932. *Studi sull'Eleatismo*. Roma: Tipografia del Senato del dott. G. Bardi.
 Seconda edizione con due nuove appendici, Firenze, La Nuova Italia, 1977; la prima edizione è stata tradotta in tedesco da Wolfgang Raible: *Studien über den Eleatismus* Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970.
 Indice: Avvertenza alla prima edizione VII; Avvertenza a questa nuova edizione IX-XIX; I. Parmenide 1; II. Melisso 69; III: Zenone 105; Iv. Gorgia 189; V. Il "Parmenide" platonico 269; Appendici. I. Senofane, Eschilo e la prima definizione dell'onnipotenza di Dio (Guido Calogero); II. Recensione di Kurt von Fritz agli *Studi sull'eleatismo* di Guido Calogero 335; Indice dei nomi e dei luoghi 361-366.
17. ———. 1974. "Plotino, Parmenide e il '*Parmenide*'." In *Plotino e il neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente (Roma, 5-9 ottobre 1970)*, 49–59. Roma: Accademia nazionale dei Lincei.
18. Cardelli, Emanuela. 2008. *Eidos, tra diversità e molteplicità: uno studio dal Parmenide di Platone*. Roma: Aracne.

19. Cardullo, R. Loredana. 2002. "Il *Peri Ideon* di Aristotele e il *Parmenide* di Platone, ovvero: da un comune tentativo di "salvare" le idee verso un inevitabile scontro dottrinale." In *Il Parmenide di Platone e la sua tradizione*, edited by Barbanti, Maria and Romano, Francesco, 155–184. Catania: CUECM.
20. Casertano, Giovanni. 2009. "Verità e realtà nel *Sofista* e nel *Parmenide* platonici." In *Gli Antichi e noi. Scritti in onore di Antonio Mario Battezzatore*, edited by Lapini, Walter, Maluza, Luciano and Letterio, Mauro, 31–44. Genova: Glauco Brigati.
21. Casertano, Giovanni [et al.]. 2015. *Da Parmenide di Elea al Parmenide di Platone*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag.
A cura di Francesca Gambetti e Stefania Giombini.
22. Cassio, Albio Cesare. 1996. "Da Elea a Hipponion e Leontinoi: Lingua di Parmenide e testi epigrafici." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* no. 113:14–20.
23. Cavarero, Adriana. 1988. "Platone e Hegel interpreti di Parmenide." *La Parola del passato* no. 43:81–99.
24. Chiaradonna, Riccardo. 2012. "Nota su partecipazione e atto d'essere nel neoplatonismo: l'anonimo « Commento al Parmenide » " *Studia Graeco-Arabica* no. 2:87–97.
25. Chiereghin, Franco. 1995. "Il "Parmenide" di Platone alle origini della dialettica hegeliana." *Verifiche: Rivista Trimestrale di Scienze Umane* no. 24:243–272.
26. Corradi, Michele. 2022. "Il *Parmenide* di Platone fra il *Περὶ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος* di Gorgia e il *Περὶ τοῦ ὄντος* di Protagora: l'ombra dei sofisti nella *γυμνασία*." In *Plato's Parmenides: Selected Papers of the Twelfth Symposium Platonicum*, edited by Brisson, Luc, Macé, Arnaud and Renault, Olivier, 115–121. Baden-Baden: Academia Verlag.
Abstract: "As many commentators have highlighted, the reinterpretation of Eleatic theories is crucial in the development of many sophistic doctrines. Moreover, the sophistic interpretation of Eleatism plays an important role in Plato's dialogues, particularly in the *Parmenides*. This contribution analyses the presence of material deriving from two of the most important sophists, Gorgias and Protagoras, in the *Parmenides*. Modern commentators have underlined that the argumentative strategy used by Parmenides in the first hypotheses presents characteristics similar to Gorgias' *Περὶ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος*. More specific contact points can be singled out, in particular at 138a-b, 138b-139a and 141e-142a. If the presence of Gorgian echoes is generally detected by modern interpreters, references to Protagoras are more difficult to determine. According to an extract from Porphyry's *Φιλολόγος ἀκρόασις* (ap. Eus. PE X 3, 24-25 = 410 F Smith = 80 B 2 DK = 31 R 2 LM) Plato would have drawn from Protagoras' *Περὶ τοῦ ὄντος* the arguments used against those who claim the unity of being, probably for the *Parmenides*. Where in the dialogue Porphyry might have discovered any presence of Protagorean material? The ensemble of the *γυμνασία* could be considered an application of the Protagorean antilogical principle according to which on each thesis, in this case that of unity of being, it is possible to develop two opposing arguments. More specifically, in the first hypothesis the reference to measurement in 140b-d and the analysis of the three temporal declinations of being through the corresponding verbal forms in 141d-e, the problem of the impossibility of falsehood in the fifth hypothesis (161e-162a) and the relativistic notion of being in the seventh hypothesis (165c) could contain some allusions to Protagoras' doctrines."
27. d'Hoine, Pieter. 2017. "Parmenide neoplatonico: intorno a un nuovo studio sulla presenza di Parmenide nel commento alla *Fisica* di Simplicio." *Méthexis. International Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 28:188–198.
A proposaito del libro di Ivan A. Licciardi, *Parmenide tràdito, Parmenide tradito nel commentario di Simplicio alla Fisica di Aristotele* (Symbolon 42), Sankt

- Augustin, Academia Verlag, 2016.
28. De Brasi, Diego. 2016. "Giovani e vecchi nel *Parmenide*: alcune riflessioni sugli aspetti letterari del dialogo." *Philologus* no. 160:33–58.
Abstract: "The objective of this contribution is a brief study of the characteristics of the interlocutors of Plato's *Parmenides*, with particular attention paid to aspects concerning the age and attitude of the younger characters towards philosophy. On the one hand the article aims to demonstrate how Plato in the *Parmenides* puts on stage a protreptic philosophy, by emphasising how a group of young people involved in the discussion between Zeno, Socrates, and Parmenides represented in the dialogue react (or reacted) to it. On the other hand the article proposes useful elements for a questioning of Parmenides' role in the dialogue: many interpreters read in this the acknowledgement of Plato's debt to Eleatism. A careful reading of the characterisation of Parmenides as old master, and a cursory analysis of the second part of the text reveal nevertheless that Plato's attitude towards Eleatism is not entirely positive, and indeed is even deliberately ambiguous."
 29. De Piano, Sergio. 2016. "Dalle ipotesi alle ipostasi: il libro VI del *Commentario* di Proclo al *Parmenide* di Platone." In *Princeps philosophorum. Platone nell'Occidente tardo-antico, medievale e umanistico*, edited by Borriello, Maria and Vitale, Angelo Maria, 125–152. Roma: Città Nuova.
 30. Di Lorenzo, Carmen. 2022. "Il numero come prototipo di pluralità unificata (*Prm.*147a3-6)." In *Plato's Parmenides: Selected Papers of the Twelfth Symposium Platonicum*, edited by Brisson, Luc, Macé, Arnaud and Renault, Olivier, 355–360. Baden-Baden: Academia Verlag.
Abstract: "As it is well known, the second series of deductions related to the first hypothesis "the one is" (*Prm.*142b1-157b5) aims at examining the consequences for the "one" in relation to the others, i.e. for the "one" that participates in being. Within such a theoretical scenario, the being assigned to the "one" is clearly participative, for which whatever the "one" may be, that is whatever predicate is assigned to it, its being is linked to participating in that specific character. In this second deduction, the "one" participates in properties which are considered as parts belonging to it. The whole sequence can be divided into two parts: in the first, a notion of whole as the mere sum of its constituting parts is employed. If the whole represents all the parts, then the "one" (which is the whole), if identical to the parts intended as a collection of elements, loses its individuality; and in the second part of the exercise, we can find another notion of whole according to which the whole is more than the sum of its parts. With these assumptions, the aim of this study is to draw attention to the fact that within the framework representing this second series of deductions related to the first hypothesis "the one is", and based on the assumption of a holistic and structural supposition, Plato formulates a conception of the number as a "unified plurality" (see *Prm.*147a3-6). In particular, Plato seems to want to establish a bi-univocal correspondence between the fact that an entity results determined due to the limiting action exercised by the "one", and the possibility that we may "have number" of it (*Prm.* 147a6, ἀριθμὸν γε ἔχοντα)."
 31. Di Stefano, Eva. 2002. "Il *Parmenide* di Platone e il *Didaskalikos* di Alcinoos." In *Il Parmenide di Platone e la sua tradizione*, edited by Barbanti, Maria and Romano, Francesco, 185–195. Catania: CUECM.
 32. Donà, Massimo. 2003. *Aporie platoniche: saggio sul Parmenide*. Roma: Città Nuova.
 33. Fazzo, Silvia. 2020. "Una versione progredita della teoria delle idee nel papiro di Ai Khanoum una scoperta nella scoperta." *Elenchos* no. 41:157–163.
Abstract: "The paper firstly focuses on a rare vox, that is, the verb μετίσχω, as a new finding in two different sources: the Π text of *Methaphysics Lambda* 1075b19 and the "Ai Khanoum philosophical papyrus" (not only at column II.9, but arguably at II.11 and IV.8–9 as well). Using the verb μετίσχω testifies for a "2.0 version" of the theory of ideas, in a subsequent phase to Plato's *Parmenides*. Xenocrates is likely to

have played a role. This suggests a deeper connection than previously thought between Aristotelian theories and Plato's Academy."

34. Ferrari, Franco. 2005. "Parmenide, il Parmenide di Platone e la teoria delle idee." *Athenaeum* no. 93:367–396.
Abstract: "Il contributo fornisce una analisi dettagliata delle obiezioni che il personaggio di Parmenide rivolge a Socrate nella prima parte del *Parmenide* platonico. L'autore si propone di dimostrare che si tratta di obiezioni che assumono un punto di vista teorico sostanzialmente anti-platonico. In particolare esse presuppongono una single-world ontologia, che, pur ammettendo l'esistenza delle forme intelligibili, considera queste entità in termini spaziali e temporali, cioè come doppioni dei fenomeni. Sia il dilemma della partecipazione, sia le due versioni dell'argomento del terzo uomo, sia infine aporia maggiore relativa alla presunta inconoscibilità delle idee assumono un punto di vista estraneo alla filosofia di Platone. Tutte queste obiezioni ammettono una soluzione "platonica". In conclusione la prima parte del *Parmenide* intende mostrare negativamente come si debba considerare le entità intelligibili."
35. ———. 2009. "Parmenide «antiplatonico». Riflessioni sul *Parmenide* di Platone." *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* no. 51:315–330.
36. ———. 2010. "Equiparazionismo ontologico e deduttivismo: l'eredità di Parmenide nella *gymnasia* del *Parmenide*." In *Il quinto secolo. Studi di filosofia antica in onore di Livio Rossetti*, edited by Giombini, Stefania and Marcacci, Flavia. Perugia: Acquaplano.
37. ———. 2019. "« Homologia » e dialettica in Platone." *Antiquorum Philosophia* no. 13:23–44.
Abstract: "According to the *Republic* (books vi and vii) and the *Cratylus*, *homologia*, in neither of its meanings – i.e. agreement on the one hand, and formal coherence and consistency on the other, – can be identified with philosophical knowledge (*episteme*), that is, with dialectic. The reason is that *homologia* represents a hypothetical procedure unable to reach an anhypothetical principle, and therefore to acquire certainty and truth. However, in Plato's dialogues there are numerous examples of *homologia* within philosophical and dialectical sections: in some cases it is fallacious *homologia*, which leads to unacceptable consequences (*Parmenides*); in other cases, instead, Plato seems to admit the existence of dialectical *homologia*, that is, of an agreement on a non-hypothetical principle (*Sophist*). Moreover, dialectic seems to display a degree of coherence superior to that of the other disciplines (i.e. mathematical sciences). The conclusion is that *homologia* (agreement and coherence) cannot be considered foreign to dialectic."
38. ———. 2022. "La maschera di Parmenide: Riduzionismo ed equiparazionismo nella prima parte del *Parmenide* di Platone." *Philologia Philosophica*:1–22.
Abstract: "*The Mask of Parmenides: Reduction and Equalization in the First Part of Plato's Parmenides*. The paper aims to show that all the arguments against the theory of forms in the first part of Plato's *Parmenides* are actually inconsistent. They do not express Plato's point of view, but are the consequence of the assumption of a fallacious philosophical attitude (a single-world ontology). Consequently, the figure of Parmenides cannot be considered as the re-founder of the theory of forms, but the mouthpiece of a wrong way of understanding Plato's doctrine."
39. Ferro, Francesco. 2022. "La dottrina eleatica dell'Uno-tutto nel primo λόγος di Zenone." In *Plato's Parmenides: Selected Papers of the Twelfth Symposium Platonicum*, edited by Brisson, Luc, Macé, Arnaud and Renault, Olivier, 75–82. Baden-Baden: Academia Verlag.
Abstract: "The logical-philosophical discussions of the dialogue unfold through a close engagement with the leading representatives of the so-called Eleatic school,

Parmenides and Zeno.

At the beginning, Socrates and Zeno discuss the demonstration of the impossibility of multiplicity by analysing the first of Zeno's λόγοι in support of this thesis. However, in the belief that this demonstration is simply fallacious, some scholars have overlooked the real reason why Socrates feels forced to refute it by bringing into play the doctrine of forms, the cornerstone of Platonic thought. Some scholars have also denied that Zeno's thesis conforms to the doctrine of the One-All (attributed in the dialogue to Parmenides' Poem), which according to Socrates constitutes the substance of Zeno's text. But to adopt such a reading is not only to fail to understand Socrates' interpretation, but ultimately to lose sight of the meaning and significance of this discussion within the overall economy of the dialogue. In this paper I wish to reinterpret the demonstration attributed to Zeno, in order to illustrate its consistency starting precisely from its congruity with the logical-ontological assumptions of the metaphysics of the One-All, which identifies being with the one and admits only identical predication. On this basis, all that is and exists is a single thing, simple, self-identical and eternal, and any form of differentiation or multiplicity turns out to be completely contradictory: for example, as Zeno shows in the first of his λόγοι, if the many are, each of them will be in itself being and ὁμοιος, but at the same time and according to the same respect also the opposite, resulting identical to itself and different from itself. In this way, the Eleatic doctrine explicitly opposes Platonic speculation, and it becomes fully understandable the reason why from the very beginning of the dialogue Socrates contrasts it by admitting different levels of reality and the possibility of attributive predication."

40. Ficino, Marsilio. 2012. *Commento al Parmenide di Platone*. Firenze: Olschki. Premessa, introduzione, traduzione e note di Francesca Lazzarin ; prefazione di Alfonso Ingegno.
41. Forcignanò, Filippo. 2010. "« Illimitata pluralità »: l'argomento del regresso in *Parm.* 132a-b2." *Acme: Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Milano* no. 63:31–74.
42. ———. 2016. "Idee e concetti. A proposito di un passo del *Parmenide* di Platone." *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* no. 108:649–671.
43. Fronterotta, Francesco. 1994. "Essere, tempo e pensiero: Parmenide e l' «origine dell'ontologia»." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Lettere e Filosofia* no. 24:835–871.
44. ———. 1996. "Auto-predicazione e auto-partecipazione delle idee in Platone." *Elenchos* no. 17:21–36.
45. ———. 1998. *Guida alla lettura del Parmenide di Platone*. Bari: Laterza.
46. ———. 2000. "La dottrina eleatica dell' 'unità del tutto': Parmenide, il 'Parmenide' platonico e Aristotele." *Annali dell'Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici* no. 17:31–53.
47. ———. 2001. *Methexis. La teoria platonica delle idee e la partecipazione delle cose empiriche. Dai dialoghi giovanili al Parmenide*. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.
48. ———. 2011. "ὑπόθεσις e διαλέγεσθαι: metodo ipotetico e metodo dialettico in Platone " In *Argument from Hypothesis in Ancient Philosophy*, edited by Longo, Angela and Del Forno, Davide, 43–74. Napoli: Bibliopolis.
49. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1984. "Il *Parmenide* platonico e la sua influenza." In *Studi platonici. Volume II*, 265–278. Casale Monferrato: Marietti.
50. Gatto, Alfredo. 2008. *L'utopia dell'istante: temporalità e ontologia nel Parmenide di Platone*. Milano: Albo versorio.

51. Girgenti, Giuseppe. 1994. "L'identità di uno ed essere nel *Commentario al Parmenide* di Porfirio e la recezione in Vittorino, Boezio e Agostino." *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* no. 86:665–688.
52. Granieri, Roberto. 2022. "Riferimento, essere e partecipazione. *Prm.* 160b4-163b5 e il *Sofista*." In *Plato's Parmenides: Selected Papers of the Twelfth Symposium Platonicum*, edited by Brisson, Luc, Macé, Arnaud and Renault, Olivier, 409–421. Baden-Baden: Academia Verlag.
Abstract: "This paper examines the fifth deduction (160b4-163b5) of the second part of the *Parmenides* and its connection with the *Sophist*. I argue that, far from providing us with clear formulations of arguments and theses developed in the *Sophist*, D5 aims at stimulating us to reflect on two main problems, which are relevant to the ontology and the theory of predication of the *Sophist*: first, the ontological requirements of the extra-linguistic correlates of contentful thought and meaningful speech; second, the function of being in the mechanism of the relation of participation."
53. Heidegger, Martin. 2022. *L'inizio della filosofia occidentale. Interpretazione di Anassimandro e Parmenide*. Milano: Adelphi.
A cura di Peter Trawny. Edizione italiana a cura di Giovanni Gurisatti.
"Tenuto nel 1932 e dedicato all'interpretazione di Anassimandro e Parmenide – insieme a Eraclito i «pensatori iniziali» della filosofia occidentale –, questo corso universitario rappresenta una vera e propria cesura nel percorso di Heidegger dopo *Essere e tempo*, e si inserisce nella celebre «svolta» inaugurata dal saggio del 1930 sull'Essenza della verità. Compito della filosofia è ormai per Heidegger, impegnato nella ricerca di tale essenza, quello di rievocare la forza delle parole più elementari del pensiero delle origini – *phýsis, alétheia, noûs, lógos* – mediante una comprensione prefilosofica, cioè preplatonica e prearistotelica, del fenomeno della verità. Si tratta cioè di compiere quel passo indietro che permette di ripensare in modo ancora più iniziale l'inizio del pensiero occidentale, prima della soglia che dà accesso alla storia della metafisica: non già per operare una ricostruzione filologica e storiografica, ma nella prospettiva che tale «inizio più iniziale» possa essere «ripetuto» e, soprattutto, trasformato in un nuovo inizio, promosso da un'umanità futura in modo ancora più originario. Sicché, conclude Heidegger, «l'inizio non sta più dietro di noi, alle nostre spalle, bensì sta davanti a noi in quanto compito essenziale della nostra più propria essenza».
54. Lapini, Walter. 2003. "'Ma non uguale all'altro' (*Parmen.* B8.58-59)." In *Studi di filologia filosofica greca*, 73–89. Firenze: Olschki.
55. Leszl, Walter. 1975. *Il "De Ideis" di Aristotele e la teoria platonica delle Idee*. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki.
Edizione critica del testo a cura di Dieter Harlfinger.
56. Li Volsi, Rocco. 1997. *Commentario al Parmenide di Platone*. Treviso: Tipografia Artigiana Cappellazzo.
57. Licciardi, Ivan Adriano. 2016. *Parmenide tradito, Parmenide tradito nel Commentario di Simplicio alla Fisica di Aristotele*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag.
58. ———. 2016. "Il *Parmenide* e il *Sofista* di Platone riletti da Simplicio." In *Princeps philosophorum. Platone nell'Occidente tardo-antico, medievale e umanistico*, edited by Borriello, Maria and Vitale, Angelo Maria, 171–188. Roma: Città Nuova.
59. ———. 2017. *Critica dell'apparente e critica apparente: Simplicio interprete di Parmenide nel Commentario al De Caelo di Aristotele*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag.
60. ———. 2022. "Simplicio, in *Cael.* 556, 3-560, 10, a margine di Platone, *Prm.* 135b8-c1. Prolegomeni a una genealogia del parallelismo onto-epistemologico." In *Plato's Parmenides: Selected Papers of the Twelfth Symposium Platonicum*, edited

by Brisson, Luc, Macé, Arnaud and Renault, Olivier, 517–523. Baden-Baden: Academia Verlag.

Abstract: "Simplicius, in *Cael.* 556,3-560,10 interprets *Cael.* III 1, 298b14-24, in which Aristotle criticizes Parmenides and Melissus, who deny coming-to-be and consider it only an apparent phenomenon. On the one hand, Aristotle asserts that the Eleatics realized that the condition for a science of being can be that the latter refers to ungenerated and immobile, and therefore ontologically stable, objects; on the other hand, at the same time, they do not admit any other essence aside from sensible beings. Aristotle concludes by saying that the Eleatics came to believe that generation is only apparent, and that they proceeded on the assumption of the isomorphism between the stability of the object and the incontrovertibility of science itself. All in all, Aristotle has pointed out that the Eleatics mixed physics and metaphysics. Simplicius demonstrates that Aristotle's criticism is not aimed to refute Parmenides, but to prevent superficial listeners from being misled by the outward aspects of his doctrines, because Parmenides' investigation is metaphysical and regards the intelligible world. Simplicius quotes *Prm.* 135b8-c1, where Parmenides, turning towards Socrates, says that whoever denies the theory of ideas, that is the theory that admits eternal entities which exist separately, will be quite at a loss, since there can be no science of the things that always flow, that is of the sensible. This is the reason why Plato, before Simplicius, identifies a theoretical continuity between Eleaticism and his own philosophy, finding in Parmenides a supporter of the onto-epistemological parallelism. In Simplicius' opinion the historical Parmenides and the platonic Parmenides coincide, so the platonic passage shows that Eleatics were the first philosophers that admitted the principle of the onto-epistemological parallelism."

61. Linguiti, Alessandro. 2002. "Sulla datazione del commento al *Parmenide* di Bobbio. Un'analisi lessicale." In *Il Parmenide di Platone e la sua tradizione*, edited by Barbanti, Maria and Romano, Francesco, 307–322. Catania: CUECM.
62. Luchetti, Claudia. 2022. "La Noesi nascosta. Sulla presenza della teoria platonica dell'Anima nella γυμνασία del *Parmenide* (142a-144e, 155e-157b, 157b-159b)." In *Plato's Parmenides: Selected Papers of the Twelfth Symposium Platonicum*, edited by Brisson, Luc, Macé, Arnaud and Renault, Olivier, 401–407. Baden-Baden: Academia Verlag.
 Abstract: "Plato's conception of the soul and its intellectual activity, besides the references in the first part of the *Parmenides*, remains important in the section devoted to the dialectical γυμνασία.
 1) The lead actor in the transition from the first deduction (137c ff.) to the second (142a ff.) is thought (διάνοια): without this intellectual activity it would not be possible to move from the level of the absolute one, a unity without structure and not even existing, to the level of the manifold one that truly is, or from an unreflected unity to a unity thought of as dialectically structured, the Platonic εἶδος.
 2) A deepening of the role of the soul's thinking activity is provided in the corollary (155e-157b). A self-produced change, that will never force Ideas to transform essentially, and will be limited to a passage between movement and rest is possible. The μεταβολή between these, occurring in the extratemporal dimension of ἐξαιφνης, can only be a κίνησις ἀκίνητος. This conceptual fusion is coherent with the definition of the soul as ἀρχὴ κινήσεως καὶ μεταβολῆς given both in *Phaedrus* and *Laws*. So, the corollary supports the conception of an intelligible being endowed with a principle of intellectual/psychic movement.
 3) In the fourth deduction, Plato suggests a "conceptual experiment" (158c) where thought serves as an instrument to distinguish the one or limit from the limitless. Here, the activity of thinking stands out as an irreplaceable instrument of ontological and of metaphysical analysis of ideal being. In conclusion, the chosen texts clearly show the presence and the theoretical importance of a psychic/intellectual movement in the background of the second part of the *Parmenides* and allow us to see the deep continuity with Plato's characterization of intelligible being in the Sophist as including life, intelligence and movement, which

- would be impossible without soul."
63. Mazzara, Giuseppe. 2022. "Platone, Prm. 133b4–c1 / 134e9–135b2. Quali *logoi* nella *gymnasia* per un *tis* refrattario alla persuasione e sensibile alle contraddizioni come Antistene?" *Peitho. Examina Antiqua* no. 13:83–124.
Abstract: "In this study, I show how Plato in the *Parmenides* reprises the encounter with the *Phaedo*'s Antisthenes, whom I elsewhere assumed to be one of the various *tis* that get examined in the dialogue. Now, with the *Parmenides*' *tis*, a similar situation arises: this Antisthenes embodies such characteristics as being "an expert in many areas", "not without natural gifts" and "capable of following with critical intelligence" the *logoi* taken from "distant premises." In the four *logoi* of the *gymnasia*, I highlight how Plato, in developing his exercise, proceeds on his own way without openly arguing with any *tis* and how, despite his detached attitude, *his hodos*, while interweaving with that of his colleague Antisthenes, enters into a conflict. I then demonstrate how the two paths, despite having a common aporetic beginning (the objections of Gorgias to Parmenides and the testimony of Proclus against Antisthenes), at times overlap and at times are mutually exclusive. From this, I also argue that whoever wrote the dialogue must have been aware that the path, although apparently linear and rectilinear, was in fact bumpy and tortuous."
64. ———. 2024. "Il doppio ruolo di Parmenide nel *Parmenide* di Platone: obiettare alla teoria delle idee e portarvi aiuto come un nuovo Zenone." *Peitho. Examina Antiqua* no. 15:187–208.
Abstract: "Two of the greatest interpreters of Parmenides, Giovanni Casertano and Franco Ferrari, have given opposite interpretations of the role of the character of Parmenides. For Ferrari, Parmenides would only be a critic of ideas, as he equates them with their sensitive participants (thus, he could not be considered one of the *prosopa* of Plato). For Casertano, on the other hand, Parmenides expresses the 'metaphysical' aspects of ideas in accordance with the young Socrates' discourse on the "prodigy" in the initial part of the dialogue. Neither of the two interpretations presents a Parmenides that represents the figure of Plato adequate for the "dramatic" development of the dialogue. If, on the other hand, we regard them both as integral parts, the image and role of Parmenides could be more appropriate to the bipolar structure of the dialogue and of Plato himself. To this end, I have assumed that Plato unifies in Parmenides his dialectical-deductive method with that of Zeno: the aporetic-paradoxical one that is more open than his to finding ways of escape from any paradoxical arguments. It would be for this reason that Parmenides encourages the young and inexperienced Socrates to follow Zeno's *tropos* when defining virtue, also because it was Socrates himself, in the final part of his discourse on the "prodigy," who praised Zeno for the double courage shown first in criticizing the common sense and the principles of current physics and then in overcoming the contrast between these principles and the more specific mathematizing logic. I identify in this praise of Socrates an assumption, on the part of Parmenides, that the burden of bringing back into ideas the courageous behaviour that Zeno showed in the world of the sensible. I agree with Vlastos in considering Parmenides to be "the manifesto of Plato's self-criticism," and in viewing this Parmenides as the *prosopon* of a Plato that is willing both to level self-criticism at his own stance and to give voice to those who do not think like him and even to those who reject his position."
65. Migliori, Maurizio. 1990. *Dialettica e verità. Commentario filosofico al Parmenide di Platone*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
66. ———. 1994. "Il *Parmenide* et le dottrine non scritte." In *Verso una nuova immagine di Platone*, edited by Reale, Giovanni, 165–222. Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
67. ———. 2001. "Dialettica e teoria dei principi nel *Parmenide* e nel *Filebo* di Platone." *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e filosofia, Università degli studi di Macerata*:55–103.

68. Mignucci, Mario. 1988. "Platone e i relativi." *Elenchos. Rivista di Studi sul Pensiero Antico* no. 9:259–294.
Traduzione inglese: "Relatives in Plato" in: *Ancient Logic, Language, and Metaphysics: Selected Essays by Mario Mignucci*, Edited by Andrea Falcon and Pierdaniele Giaretta, New York: Routledge 2020, Chapter 14.
69. Montevechi, Federica. 2021. "L'Uomo divino: azione e conoscenza in Eraclito, Parmenide e Zenone." In *Penser les dieux avec les présocratiques*, edited by Saetta Cottone, Rossella 113–127. Paris: Rue d'Ulm.
70. Motta, Anna. 2022. "La peculiare solennità dell'isagoge procliana al *Parmenide* di Platone." In *Plato's Parmenides: Selected Papers of the Twelfth Symposium Platonicum*, edited by Brisson, Luc, Macé, Arnaud and Renault, Olivier, 509–516. Baden-Baden: Academia Verlag.
Abstract: "Proclus' exemplary introduction to the *Parmenides* is based on the use of a language fluctuating between two semantic fields, the poetic-mystagogical field and the scientific one, in such a way as to combine perspectives that are convergent rather than contradictory. This is particularly significant because it is as though in the introduction itself the content of the dialogue, even before being made explicit, were presented by Proclus through an image that encapsulates the poetry of the theologians and which serves the philosophical function of allowing the reader to evaluate the connection between the content of the dialogue and the exegetical method used. The dialogue is divided into two parts which are not easy to reconcile, as so is Proclus' introduction to the *Parmenides* – the focus of this paper. The introduction, which features an invocation to the gods and discusses certain preliminary questions, combines mystagogical poetry and methodological guidelines in the pursuit of a single target associated with the one and only σκοπός of the dialogue. As I will show, by identifying this target, it is possible to redefine the unity and the importance of the *Parmenides* within the methodological as well as doctrinal framework of Neoplatonism."
71. Nonvel Pieri, Stefania. 2012. "Parmenide nei dialoghi di Platone." In *Λόγον διδόναι. La filosofia come esercizio del render ragione. Studi in onore di Giovanni Casertano*, edited by Palumbo, Lidia, 361–371. Loffredo: Napoli.
72. Paci, Enzo. 1938. *Il significato del Parmenide nella filosofia di Platone*. Milano: Principato.
Seconda edizione: Milano, Bompiani 1988.
73. Palumbo, Lidia. 2022. "Il prologo come chiave di interpretazione del dialogo intero." In *Plato's Parmenides: Selected Papers of the Twelfth Symposium Platonicum*, edited by Brisson, Luc, Macé, Arnaud and Renault, Olivier, 33–40. Baden-Baden: Academia Verlag.
Abstract: "The aim of this paper is to demonstrate that the *Parmenides*' prologue has two levels of speech, which convey two different points of view: one Socratic and the other non-Socratic.
On the first level, Cephalus tells his desire to listen to the conversation between Socrates, Zeno and Parmenides. The second level consists in the account of that conversation which is narrated by Pythodorus and Antiphon, and expresses Pythodorus' point of view. The usefulness of this distinction lies in the fact that on the first level the reader can find an interpretation of the speeches narrated on the second. In the *Parmenides*, Plato not only presents a fiction, but also gives the reader the tools to interpret it. My hypothesis is that Pythodorus is the bearer of a sophistic point of view inherited from Zeno, whose pupil he was. Such a sophistic point of view affects the fiction, in such a way that it seems, but only seems, that Socrates is refuted by Parmenides and Zeno, who appear to prevail in the discussion of the forms. And in the end, it seems, but only seems, that Parmenides, with his gymnasia, gives Socrates a dialectic lesson. Pythodorus' point of view affects not only the fiction, but also its interpretation by scholars, who tend to regard the *Parmenides* as expressing Plato's self-criticism about his theory of forms."

74. Petrucci, Federico M. 2022. "Una lettura stoica della "più grande difficoltà" del *Parmenide*." In *Plato's Parmenides: Selected Papers of the Twelfth Symposium Platonicum*, edited by Brisson, Luc, Macé, Arnaud and Renault, Olivier, 469–482. Baden-Baden: Academia Verlag.
Abstract: "This paper aims to show that the *Parmenides*' 'greatest difficulty' (133b4-135b2) outlines the philosophical agenda which led the Stoics to elaborate some crucial nuclei of their theology and ontology. More specifically, I will indicate that the Stoic theory of God as an immanent cause of the world and its contacts with the so-called theory of categories satisfy the requirements which *Parmenides* establishes in order for an ontological model to effectively account for the existence of beings and their qualifications."
75. Pezzolato, Marco. 1992. "La funzione e la portata della critica alle Idee nel *Parmenide* di Platone: dalle teorie alla teoria dei Principi." *Rivista di Filosofia Neoscolastica* no. 84:343–409.
76. Pucci, Nadia. 2004. "Parmenide 161 D : l'eguaglianza come «metaxú» fra grande e piccolo." *AION. Annali dell'Università degli studi di Napoli 'l'Orientale'* no. 26:153–187.
77. Regali, Mario. 2022. "Parmenide e il cavallo di Ibyco: l'immagine dell'eros senile per la dialettica (*Prm.* 136e-137c)." In *Plato's Parmenides: Selected Papers of the Twelfth Symposium Platonicum*, edited by Brisson, Luc, Macé, Arnaud and Renault, Olivier, 43–49. Baden-Baden: Academia Verlag.
Abstract: "The role that Ibycus plays in the *Parmenides* is extremely relevant: on the paraphrase of his poetry Plato builds a pivotal scene which bears the greatest importance both for the characterization of *Parmenides* and for the articulation between the dialogue's two sections.
In Ibycus' fragment (287 PMGF) the old poet is called again to the challenge of love and trembles with fear like an old horse who is scared before another race (136e-137c). *Parmenides* understands well the ἀπεικασία that Ibycus establishes between himself, now old and forced to love, and the trembling aged horse who is about to enter the agon; in the same way *Parmenides* fears the commitment he has to face: to cross such a "sea of λόγοι" with the burden of age which now oppresses him.
Through the paraphrase of Ibycus' poetry, Plato then builds for *Parmenides* the mask of the old master who is trembling for the erotic challenge with the young pupil Aristotle; once again Plato's reader meets the metaphor of philosophical paideia as erotic relationship, a motif which informs the Symposium itself, the two Alcibiades, and many other works of first generation Socratics about the young Alcibiades (e.g. Aeschines). But with the image of the "old lover" Plato distinguishes clearly *Parmenides*' attitude from Socrates' philosophical eros: it is not by chance that Aristotle the young is asked to facilitate *Parmenides*' task, avoiding digressions and offering him moments to rest (137b6-8). Through Ibycus' image Plato offers a portrait of *Parmenides* which is radically different from the erotic Socrates we know from the Charmides or the Symposium. This allows us to add a clue in favor of the thesis that sees in the gymnasium with Aristotle the young only an introductory and preparatory activity, which does not imply a programmatic turning point by abandoning the Forms."
PMGF = Malcolm Davies (ed.), *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1991.
78. Ricci, Vittorio. 2022. "Sul cosiddetto "argomento del terzo uomo" (TMA) nel *Parmenide*." In *Plato's Parmenides: Selected Papers of the Twelfth Symposium Platonicum*, edited by Brisson, Luc, Macé, Arnaud and Renault, Olivier, 239–244. Baden-Baden: Academia Verlag.
Abstract: "The analysis aims at proving unfounded the common evaluation of the 3rd aporia and the 5th aporia in the *Parmenides* (respectively 132a1-b2 and 132c12-133a3) as third man arguments (TMA), or at least its exemplifications. Firstly, Plato's texts show a great linguistic difference compared to those reported almost

exclusively by Alexander of Aphrodisias in *Metaph.* 83,34-85,12, in particular the complete absence of terms τρίτος ἄνθρωπος or a middle term between eidetic entity and relating sensible beings along with no (at least explicit) hint at the predication. Plato simply speaks of a second idea, completely identical to the first (original, true) idea and, at the same time, completely different from it (in flagrant self-contradictory mode) so to ingenerate the regressus in infinitum. Even if analogies may be caught between Platonic argumentations and the TMA, they are not able to certificate the aporias of *Parmenides* to be variations of one same structure and issue dependent on the TMA. Plato aims at defending his (really unattackable) theory of ideas, indeed the absolute oneness of an idea, determination essential to its metaphysical condition, through a singular and mostly original (even ironical) procedure with the purpose of declaring implicitly non-receivable and pretentious the critical attacks through the various TMA against his thesis."

79. Romano, Francesco. 2002. "La probabile esegesi pitagorizzante (Accademica, Medioplatonica e Neopitagorica) del *Parmenide* di Platone." In *Il Parmenide di Platone e la sua tradizione*, edited by Barbanti, Maria and Romano, Francesco, 197–248. Catania: CUECM.
80. Ruocco, Ilario. 2003. *Il Platone latino: il Parmenide: Giorgio di Trebisonda e il cardinale Cusano*. Firenze: Olschki.
Contiene la traduzione latina del *Parmenide* curata da Giorgio di Trebisonda.
81. Tóth, Imre. 1994. *I Paradossi di Zenone nel Parmenide di Platone*. Napoli: Istituto italiano per gli studi filosofici.
82. Trabattoni, Franco. 1993. "Una nuova interpretazione del *Parmenide* di Platone." *Elenchos* no. 14:65–82.
83. ———. 2003. "Il dialogo come "portavoce" dell'opinione di Platone. Il caso del *Parmenide*." In *Platone e la tradizione Platonica. Studi di filosofia antica*, edited by Bonazzi, Mauro and Trabattoni, Franco, 151–178. Milano: Cisalpino.
84. ———. 2003. "Sui caratteri distintivi della 'metafisica' di Platone (a partire dal *Parmenide*)." *Méthexis* no. 16:43–63.
85. Untersteiner, Mario. 1956. *Parmenide: interpretazioni filologiche e ricostruzione del pensiero*. Genova: Libreria Mario Bozzi.
86. Vitiello, Vincenzo, ed. 1992. *Il "Parmenide" di Platone. Atti del convegno: Napoli, 27-28 ottobre 1988*. Napoli: Guida.
Indice: Vincenzo Vitiello: Premessa 7; Emanuele Severino: Il problema 11; Francesco Adorno: Platone interprete di Parmenide 15; Árpád Szabó: La filosofia degli Eleati e il *Parmenide* 31; Enrico Berti: Conseguenze inaccettabili e conseguenze accettabili delle ipotesi del *Parmenide* 47; Carlo Sini: Il *Parmenide* di Platone 75; Vincenzo Vitiello: La terza ipotesi 87-112.
87. ———, ed. 1992. *Il Parmenide di Platone*. Napoli: Guida.
Atti del convegno "Il Parmenide di Platone", 27-28 ottobre 1988.