CHAPTER 1

Introduction: Tracing Plato

1 THE SILENT STREAM

At the opening of Lucian's *Hermotimus or On the philosophical schools*, Lycinus, a standard *alter ego* of the author, meets the ageing Hermotimus, a student of Stoic philosophy:

LYCINUS. To judge from the book, Hermotimus, and the speed of your walk, you are likely hurrying to your teacher. As you went along, you were thinking something over and moving your lips and muttering quietly to yourself and waving your hand this way and that, as though you were arranging a speech for yourself, or composing some thorny question or thinking over a sophistic puzzle. Even when you are walking along, you do not take time off, but you are always working away at some serious problem which will advance you on the path of your studies.[1]

HERMOTIMUS. Yes indeed, Lycinus, that sums it up. I was thinking over in my memory the details of yesterday's session and what he said to us. I think that we should not let any opportunity slip, as we know that what the Coan doctor said is true, 'Life is short, art is long.' He was talking about medicine, which is easier to learn. Philosophy cannot be reached even after a long time, unless you are very awake and keep your eyes ever fixed and sharp on her; the struggle is not for trifles – to be a wretched nobody along with the teeming throng of ordinary people (ἐν τῶι πολλῶι τῶν ἰδιωτῶν συρφετῶι)[2] or to practise philosophy and be happy (εὐδαιμονῆσαι).

Lucian, *Hermotimus* 1

The situation is a familiar one; as Graham Anderson put it, 'Lucian often makes his interlocutor discover a friend in the middle of some exotic reverie,

[1] The repetition ὁδῶι βαδίζων . . . πρὸ ὁδοῦ σοι γένοιτο κτλ. need not be significant, but does suggest that Lucian is developing the 'path' as a metaphor for Hermotimus' (fruitless) intellectual journey; Hermotimus in fact is going nowhere fast. At the very end of the work (86), Hermotimus claims that in the future, if he finds a philosopher while he is 'walking on the road', he will avoid him as though he were a rabid dog.

[2] A tag from Plato, cf. *Theaetetus* 152c9; Lycinus picks up the phrase mockingly in chap. 21.

and takes some time to bring him down to earth.'[3] There is, however, something specific here within this general familiarity of situation. A man is studying a book as he hurries along,[4] going over the words of his teacher's lecture from the day before, in the hope that one day he might be like that teacher. We are, of course, listening to or reading a rewriting of one of the most famous of all Platonic passages, Socrates' encounter with Phaedrus at the opening of the *Phaedrus*.[5] The rewriting bears some familiar signs of literary *mimêsis*: in Plato's dialogue, Phaedrus was still (at least) in the prime of life and could certainly later be represented as having been the age to be an *erômenos*,[6] Hermotimus, however, has grown old in the pursuit of wisdom; whereas Phaedrus was coming παρὰ Λυσίου, Hermotimus is hurrying παρὰ τὸν διδάσκαλον, though – as we shall see – change is here not limited just to an elegant variation in the use of a preposition; whereas Phaedrus claims to be taking 'time off' after a very long session (διατριβή) with Lysias, Hermotimus makes no attempt to conceal what he is up to – it is business (σπουδή) as usual, even when he is on his way to further business; both characters, however, appeal to medical knowledge to support their claims, Phaedrus to the advice of Akoumenos, father of Plato's best-known doctor, Eryximachus from the *Symposium*, and Hermotimus to the first and best-known Hippocratic aphorism, 'life is short, and art long', a saying that he interprets as an injunction never to let a moment for concentrated effort slip by,[7] while Phaedrus has his eye currently on exercise which is ἀκοπώτερον; whereas Phaedrus seeks to conceal his book-roll from Socrates and it has, as it were, to be brought out from under cover,

[3] Anderson 1976b: 103; cf. below on the *Nigrinus*. Anderson apparently saw in the opening of the *Hermotimus* 'a reminiscence of Socrates rapt in meditation [in the *Symposium*]', but that seems to me a very remote intertext. Another Lucianic reuse of the very opening of the *Phaedrus* is the opening of the *Lexiphanes*: Lycinus comes across the absurd Atticist carrying a book which turns out to be his recently composed 'Symposium', written in explicit competition with Plato's; cf. Romeri 2002: 28–32.

[4] With Hermotimus' agitated pace contrast the description of Philosophy herself at *The dead come to life* 13 as she strolls in Athens, 'modest in her gestures, gentle of expression, deep in thought as she walks along slowly', with – we might add – not a book in sight. On *The dead come to life, or The fisherman* cf. below pp. 20–4.

[5] The standard works are, however, remarkably silent about this: nothing in Householder 1941, the Indexes in Macleod's OCT, Trapp 1990: 171, Nesselrath 1992 or Möllendorff 2000. Muecke on Hor. *Sat.* 2.4.1, however, directs readers of that poem (cf. below pp. 10–11) to the *Hermotimus*. For the Platonic structure of the *Hermotimus* in general, and for other allusions to Plato, cf. Nesselrath 1992: 3472–4, Möllendorff 2000: 197–201; Tackaberry 1930: 62–85 helpfully surveys Lucian's engagement with Plato.

[6] Cf., e.g., Maximus of Tyre 18.9; for Phaedrus' actual age at the dramatic date of the *Phaedrus* cf. Rowe 1986: 11–12, Nails 2002: 232–4, Yunis 2011: 7–10.

[7] Möllendorff 2000: 149–50 sees irony for those who know how the Hippocratic aphorism continues, '. . . the moment is swift to pass, past experience deceptive, decision difficult'.

in Lucian's work it is the very first thing to which Lycinus draws attention and it becomes a kind of emblem of what Hermotimus does – he is always 'bent over a book and writing out notes from the classes' (chap. 2), just like (some) modern students.

Behind the shift from the subject of rhetoric in the *Phaedrus* to philosophy in the *Hermotimus* lies an important cultural development. One of the explicit purposes of the *Phaedrus* would seem to have been, not just to establish the parameters of a properly philosophical rhetoric, but the replacement of 'logography' by philosophy, as Plato marks out the space of his own intellectual activity.[8] That replacement in one sense, of course, never happened, but in the *Hermotimus* Lucian shows us one version of what did happen to philosophy: it became institutionalized as a set of mutually antagonistic and quarrelsome 'schools' who all claimed to have found the holy grail of wisdom and, concomitantly, denied any value to their opponents, and initiation into this world became a matter of learning off the words of whichever clay-footed guru took one's fancy. Some of Lucian's satirical techniques here may derive from Scepticism, but the satire in this instance is directed more at the institutions than the arguments of philosophy. The theme of the decline of philosophical practice from classical heights to contemporary humbug is a familiar Lucianic one (cf. esp. *Philosophies for sale*), but the rewriting of the *Phaedrus*, that dialogue in which Plato famously deprecated writing as a tool of philosophical instruction, here gives it sharp new point.[9] Was all Plato's effort worth it? Is philosophy now no more than second-rate rhetoric, as Plato had painted it?

Another important development in Greek *paideia* is also traced in this rewriting. The opening of the *Phaedrus* is a brilliantly 'dramatic' piece of writing which encourages us to imagine the gestures, hesitations, tone of voice and physical interplay as Socrates and Phaedrus engage in a cat-and-mouse game, from which of course only one will emerge the winner; these opening exchanges could certainly be successfully staged as 'drama'.[10] At the opening of the *Hermotimus*, Lucian has written the stage-directions for us in Lycinus' opening description of the would-be philosopher's movements; the appeal is still, as in Plato, to our dramatic imagination, but it is now a much more closely 'scripted' encounter. Lucian's detailed stage-directions reflect a different approach from Plato's apparently effortless 'realism' and the overwhelming centrality of reception through reading in the cultural

[8] Nightingale 1995 is particularly important here. [9] Cf. Del Corso 2005: 33–4.
[10] Cf. Charalabopoulos 2011 on the traditions of ancient Platonic performance.

world of the Second Sophistic, but this close scripting of the opening of the *Hermotimus* also reflects the fact that the opening of the *Phaedrus* has become a 'classic', the object of discussion, imaginative recreation, imitation, and indeed drama; it is a text which has gathered around itself a body of metatextual commentary and interpretation, which has almost coalesced with the Platonic text itself. The opening of the *Phaedrus*, like some other iconic Platonic moments, has entered into the bloodstream of educated Greeks and it wells up in many forms and guises, sometimes unnoticed and sometimes gushing out, insisting that we notice it; this book will consider instances of both of these patterns. For the literate world of the later Hellenistic and Roman periods Plato was one of the greatest figures of the classical past, one to be set alongside, or perhaps just below, Homer. If Plato could not quite compete with Homer's unquestioned place as the foundation of Greek education and hence as a kind of referential *lingua franca* for important sections of the population (the trite comparison with the place formerly held by the Bible in western society is not entirely misleading), Plato came to share with Homer a compelling hold over multiple audiences.

While Alexandrian grammarians pored in minute detail over Homer's language and text, other interpreters produced allegorical readings of varying degrees of apparent distance from the 'natural' meaning of the text,[11] and ordinary men of culture contented themselves with that familiarity with the epic poems which allowed seemingly effortless allusion and quotation; as for Plato, the later philosophical tradition sought, through commentary and analysis, to determine his meaning, whereas (again) men of culture displayed that broad familiarity with some, though by no means all, of his texts which marked them as 'educated'.[12] Nevertheless, the nature of our evidence makes it in fact very difficult to sketch, even in outline, the reception of Platonic texts outside philosophical circles in the three centuries or so after Plato's death, and the central place given in this book to the prose literature of the Roman empire is thus a choice imposed by the evidence, though not necessarily one that seriously misrepresents the history of Platonic reception in literature. The Alexandrians certainly knew Plato, even if (inevitably) he attracted nothing like the attention which they devoted to Homer; Eratosthenes, who had studied philosophy in Athens

[11] Cf. below pp. 60–7.

[12] Tarrant 2000: 1–10 offers a helpful introduction to the whole subject. Quintilian's observation that some bits of Plato, most notably in the *Timaeus*, are unintelligible to all but those who have made a serious study of music and mathematics (1.10.13) is as telling as his fondness for citing and alluding to Plato.

before becoming Head of the Alexandrian Library, expounded and used Platonic mathematics and cosmology, particularly that of the *Timaeus*,[13] and his successor Aristophanes of Byzantium was one of those (perhaps the first?) who, according to Diogenes Laertius (3.61–2), arranged fifteen of the dialogues into trilogies,[14] although it remains quite unclear whether there was an Alexandrian 'edition' of Plato.[15] An interesting observation by Aristarchus of a difference of technique with regard to speeches between Homer and Plato is preserved,[16] and some other references to Plato in the Homeric scholia may go back to the high period of scholarship.[17] A few Platonic papyri of the third century BC have survived,[18] and some at least of the surviving epigrams ascribed to Plato, both amatory and on other subjects, will (together with the ascription) go back to the high Hellenistic period.[19]

In the first half of the third century, Callimachus, admittedly no ordinary 'man of culture', reveals in his poetry a familiarity with (at least) the *Phaedo*, *Ion*[20] and *Phaedrus*, all of which may have contributed to the account of his poetic 'investiture' by Apollo in *Aitia* fr. 1; it has, for example, been attractively suggested that this owes something to Socrates' account at *Phaedo* 60d–1b of how, while in prison, he versified fables of Aesop and wrote a hymn to Apollo, just in case this is what a repeated dream commanding him to 'make *mousikê* and work at it' meant.[21] For Callimachus, Plato was without doubt a 'classic', if not one of whom he always approved.[22] At the heart of the *Aitia*-prologue lies not just an appeal for 'judgement' (κρίσις)

[13] Cf. Solmsen 1942, Pfeiffer 1968: 156–7, Fraser 1972: 1 410.
[14] Cf. Chroust 1965: 34–7.
[15] For discussion and bibliography cf. Solmsen 1981; Dickey 2007: 46–9 offers a helpful survey of ancient scholarship on Plato.
[16] A-scholium on *Iliad* 1.219a, cf. Nünlist 2009: 318.
[17] Cf. Nünlist 2009: Index s.v. Plato. Plato's criticism of Homeric passages in the *Republic* is cited four times in the scholia on the *Iliad* (bT-scholia on 14.176, 342–51, 24.527–8, and A-scholia on 18.22–35). A number of important critical ideas which appear in the scholia, such as the poet's shift between μιμητικόν and διηγηματικόν modes, ultimately go back to Plato (cf. b-scholium on *Iliad* 2.494–877), but it is usually very difficult to show that they descend directly from him.
[18] Cf. Pack 1965: 81–2, Alline 1915: 66–78 (papyri of *Phaedo*, *Laches* and *Sophist*).
[19] Cf. Page 1981: 125–7; Meleager's *Garland* included 'an ever golden shoot of divine Plato, everywhere gleaming with virtue' (*AP* 4.1.47–8 = *HE* 3972–3), and Virgil, *Ecl.* 9.51–2 uses 'Plato', *Epigr.* XV Page within a reworking of a Callimachean epigram, cf. Hunter 2006a: 132–4. Some of the 'Platonic' epigrams show familiarity with names important to Plato (Agathon, Phaedrus, Dion, etc.), but no great familiarity with his texts (and cf. further n. 24 below).
[20] Cf. Hunter 1989, below pp. 107–8.
[21] Cf. White 1994: 157, Acosta-Hughes and Scodel 2004: 6–8. For Callimachus and Plato in general see, in addition to White 1994 and Cuypers 2004, Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 2011: Chapter 1, and for links between Callimachean stylistic terms and the Platonic critical tradition cf. below p. 157.
[22] On Callimachus' apparent dismissal of Plato's literary judgement (fr. 589 Pf.) cf. Hunter 2011b: 222.

in the appreciation of poetry, but also the poet's own 'judgement' about which models of literature are to be followed and what style of voice is to be adopted; Callimachus is, however, in this as in so much else, a special case, if not a unique one. His contemporary fellow-poet, Theocritus of Syracuse, seems to have used the *Phaedrus* (again) for the creation of a bucolic world in his poetry, and the 'Thalysia' (*Idyll* 7) in particular, the account of a remarkable meeting in the countryside of a naïve and confident young man with a mysterious figure of notably ironic wisdom, may be read as a large-scale reworking of that dialogue;[23] Longus' pastoral novel from the second century AD, *Daphnis and Chloe*, which draws heavily upon both Theocritus and Plato's *Phaedrus*, may perhaps suggest that the links between the two were already identified in antiquity.[24]

It was, very likely, the growth of formal rhetorical and poetic criticism in the later third and second centuries BC which brought Plato back to centre-stage, offering yet one more reason for the prominence of the *Phaedrus* in the reception of Plato; it is then later texts of rhetorical education, such as the essays of Hermogenes (second century AD), which show not just how easily quotations and allusions to Plato might come to the lips of the educated, but also how integral Plato was to the various rhetorical systems of style which became formalised under the Roman empire.[25] Aelius Theon, describing the basic rhetorical education on offer through *progymnasmata* in (probably) the early empire,[26] notes that the story in *Republic* I of Sophocles' pleasure at no longer being able to have sex was a 'classic' instance of *chreia* (66.2–8 Sp.), just as Plato's myths, including the eschatological myths of *Phaedo*, *Gorgias* and *Republic*, served the same educational purpose for 'narration' (διήγησις, 66. 16–21 Sp.). More surprising today might seem Theon's classification of Socrates' discussions of justice with Glaukon, Adeimantus and Thrasymachus in the early books of the *Republic* as an example of 'contradiction' (ἀντίρρησις), that is accusation and defence or speaking on both sides of a question, on a par with the opposed speeches of the *Phaedrus* (70.15–23 Sp.). It is clear, as the analysis to date has already revealed, that some parts of Plato were better known than others, and the predominance in this book of the *Phaedrus*, the *Symposium* and some parts of the *Republic* tells its own story; nevertheless, we must be cautious about

[23] For bibliography and discussion cf. Hunter 1999: 14, 145–6, Payne 2007: Chapter 4.
[24] Cf. the ascription to Plato of two 'pastoral' epigrams (XVI and XVII Page).
[25] Cf. Walsdorff 1927: 56–74.
[26] For discussion of the date of the treatise on *progymnasmata* cf. Patillon in Patillon and Bolognesi 1997: vii–xvi; Heath 2002/3 proposes a radical re-dating to the fifth century AD. For Theon's use of Plato cf. Walsdorff 1927: 79–80.

just how wide knowledge of the Platonic texts outside strictly philosophical circles actually was – that some texts did not apparently lend themselves to literary reworking or allusion does not necessarily mean that they were barely known. Most works in the Platonic corpus are found on one or more papyri, largely from the first three centuries AD.[27]

The Platonic stream which runs through the culture and literature of the Hellenistic and Roman worlds sometimes flows so 'noiselessly' that its very presence becomes all but imperceptible,[28] whereas at other times it bursts its banks and will not be ignored. In the former case we may say that some Platonic texts and passages had been so internalised by élite culture that they were foundational for the literary forms in which that culture expressed itself, and no strong verbal gestures towards them were either needed or would indeed have been appropriate. For every ancient author who ticks one or more of the *Phaedrus*' overly familiar boxes of 'plane-tree', 'cicadas' and 'Zeus, the great leader in heaven', there is another whose intellectual and rhetorical debt to Plato requires the kind of literary and cultural archaeology to which some of the chapters of this book are devoted. It is tempting to express these, inevitably simplified, differences of relationship to the Platonic model in terms of 'foreground' and 'background', but, as, for example, Lucian's use of the *Phaedrus* from which I began or any number of ancient reworkings of Homeric patterns show, the range of intertextual possibilities here far outstrips any simple categorisation. The Platonic texts themselves are, moreover, matched in the richness of their afterlife by 'the idea of Socrates', an image of a life lived properly and a death with meaning, an image which may be evoked at any time as a protreptic to oneself or others. This Socratic 'idea' was neither tied to nor dependent upon familiarity with specific Platonic texts, but also of course was not entirely independent of them; it is no accident that Plato's *Apology*, in which Socrates himself is made to explain what he does and why he does it, and the *Phaedo* which tells the story of his death and of his final inspiring discussion of the nature and immortality of the soul

[27] A glance at Pack 1965: 81–3 or the Mertens–Pack database (www2.ulg.ac.be/facphl/services/cedopal) will show that, although *Laws*, *Phaedo*, *Phaedrus* and *Republic* predominate, the spread is very wide, with *Gorgias*, *Politicus* and *Theaetetus* also well represented, together with a fair sprinkling of the spurious works. On 8 April 2011 only *Charmides*, *Critias*, *Crito*, *Hippias Minor*, *Ion* and *Menexenus* were not registered on the database.

[28] 'Longinus', *On the sublime* 13.1 refers to the 'noiseless flow' of the Platonic stream, picking up a phrase from Plato himself: at *Theaetetus* 144b5 Theodorus describes the young Theaetetus' quiet and gentle demeanour as he devotes himself to his studies as 'like a stream of oil which flows noiselessly'. The Platonic tag had clearly entered the critical (blood)stream before 'Longinus': Dionysius uses it of Isocrates (*Dem.* 20.5), and cf. Demetrius, *On style* 183 'It is as though [Plato's] clauses slip along . . . (οἷον ὀλίσθωι τινὶ ἔοικε τὰ κῶλα).'

are two texts whose reception history in antiquity runs the full gamut from strongly activated model to 'authorising', but barely perceptible, intertext; Chapter 2 will trace examples of both in the case of the *Apology*. 'Socrates' and/or the Socratic pattern may be evoked – for good or ill – without any direct reference to particular passages of Plato, and yet Plato is never really absent, for it was his works which, more than any of those with which they originally competed, created that pattern.

The Greek literature of the Roman empire reflects a *paideia* based on shared educational curricula and a (broadly) shared view of the Greek past; Plato holds a very central position in both of these. Plutarch's *Amatorius*, the subject of Chapter 5, shows how Platonic texts could be treated as 'classics', available for that overt rewriting, marked by a mixture of allusion, refashioning and nostalgic and/or ironic reverence, which we find throughout the Greek literature of the period. The *Amatorius* is, however, not just 'typical', but also 'special', because Plutarch is himself not just a cultured *littérateur* of rare productivity, but also a serious student and adept both of Platonic philosophy and of complex narrative techniques; as such, he embodies, as also (though in a very different way) does Apuleius, the possibilities which Plato offered to both technicians of *sophia* and to those of more general literate culture. So too, the principal Platonic models for the *Amatorius*, the *Phaedrus* and the *Symposium*, are themselves the Platonic works which most easily straddled the post-Platonic boundaries between 'philosophy', 'rhetoric' and 'literature', or rather were a constant reminder that those boundaries were not essentialist entities, but could rather be constructed (and hence deconstructed) in accordance with the demands of particular cultural situations; probably no extant work shows this as clearly as the 'Apology' of the Platonist Apuleius, which will be considered in greater detail in Chapter 3.[29] It was, as we shall see, Plato himself who showed the way to how much of the later tradition used him, and Plutarch takes up the Platonic challenge to offer a philosophically acceptable account of love. Plato's challenge was, moreover, not just one of form and content, but also of style. Plato offered later critics not just an extraordinary variety of styles on which they could exercise their critical tools (and occasionally, as we shall see in Chapter 4 with Dionysius of Halicarnassus, their sarcasm), but also texts which, in foreshadowing their own critical language, seemed consciously self-referential; Plato was not just the material with which stylistic and rhetorical critics worked, he also appeared as a model for them.

[29] Cf. below pp. 142–7.

For the later literary tradition, however, Plato differed from Homer in at least one decisive way. Plato's writing was itself an engagement with the literature, most notably of course Homer himself, which had preceded him; up through the Platonic stream, and often contesting with it, welled the texts, techniques and figures of early poetry,[30] of pre-Socratic philosophy, and of drama, and so engagement with Plato always entailed also Plato's relationship with other texts. That Plato himself had banned Homer from the ideal state, although he himself was manifestly deep in Homer's debt, merely confirmed that Plato always brought a deep literary, as well as intellectual, texture with him, and this was formative on the way in which texts of different kinds rewrote him. The discussions of Plutarch's *Amatorius* in Chapter 5 and of the ancient novel in Chapter 6 make (I hope) very obvious this intertwining within the ancient literary reception of Plato. One frame within which any consideration of Plato's reception in ancient literature must therefore be set is that of the critical tradition and its explicit concern with the relationship between Plato and the poetic heritage; discussion of Plato within that tradition and reworkings of Plato within literature are not two utterly separate fields of study. Chapter 2 therefore seeks explicitly both to pick away at some aspects of how the critical tradition explored and exploited the apparent fissure at the heart of Plato's writing, and what we might learn from these explorations, and also to point to some of what it was within Plato himself which most prompted the critical and literary tradition to take the turn it did;[31] the two principal case studies are a consideration of Plato's appropriation and reinvention of a central technique of poetry, namely image-making, particularly in the *Republic*, and, secondly, the explicit confrontation with poetry which is staged in the *Ion* and which seems strangely prescient about the directions poetic criticism was to take.

It goes, I hope, without saying that neither the discussion of Plato's engagement with the poetic tradition nor the studies of Platonic reception which follow it make any claims to exhaust these themes; some very important subjects, such for example as how the critical and rhetorical traditions reacted to the strictures of the *Gorgias*[32] and Cicero's Roman recreation of Platonic dialogue, receive here nothing like the space they deserve, and others, such as the *Nachleben* of the *Symposium* in specifically

[30] Plato's engagement with Hesiod has recently begun to attract the attention it deserves, cf. Boys-Stones and Haubold 2010, Hunter 2008b. On the debt of the dialogue form to poetic forms more generally cf. below p. 225.
[31] Despite its title, the concerns of Levin 2001 are very different from those of this book.
[32] Cf., however, below pp. 181–2 on Aelius Aristides 2.

sympotic literature,[33] are perhaps familiar enough not to need another immediate rush of oxygen, however much remains to be done there also. I hope, of course, that these studies will encourage others to pursue the stream wherever it leads. Those of us who profess 'Greek literature' can be accused, I think with some justification (and, of course, with some important and very honourable exceptions), of doing Plato less than justice; both institutionally and in our academic practice he is too often left to 'the philosophers', and it is we who are both the losers in this and who are also in serious danger of misrepresenting not just his importance beyond the schools of philosophy, but also how the ancients understood his work, and how perhaps we should. It can, of course, be argued that we are in fact merely reflecting an ancient trend: at the height of the Second Sophistic, for example, there was for many of the literate élite no reason at all for serious engagement with Platonic philosophy, as that is constructed today, however strong the imperative to appreciate Plato as a classic *writer*.[34] There were, as we have seen, many Platos available. Nevertheless, the longer we allow this situation to continue, the harder the sclerosis which will settle, and the nature of our distinction between 'literature' and 'philosophy' will be seen to have been a self-fulfilling prophecy. Approaching Plato through his ancient reception in literature and criticism is certainly not the only way of redressing the balance, but it may prove productive not just for our understanding of the ancient practice of literature but also for Plato himself.

2 Lucian's Plato

The opening of the *Hermotimus* from which I began is by no means the only, or indeed even the only Lucianic, such reworking of the initial meeting of Socrates and Phaedrus to have survived. The opening of the fourth poem of Horace's second book of *Satires* is probably better known than the opening of the *Hermotimus*:

> 'unde et quo Catius?' 'non est mihi tempus, auenti
> ponere signa nouis praeceptis, qualia uincent
> Pythagoran Anytique reum doctumque Platona.'
> 'peccatum fateor, cum te sic tempore laeuo
> interpellarim: sed des ueniam bonus, oro
> quodsi interciderit tibi nunc aliquid, repetes mox,
> siue est naturae hoc siue artis, mirus utroque.'

[33] Cf. Martin 1931, Relihan 1992, Romeri 2002.

[34] Some helpful remarks in Trapp 2000b: 362–3.