# Plato and Hellenistic Poetics: A Study of Narratological Framing

One of the finest examples of framed narrative in literature is Catullus 64. It possesses such a dazzlingly intricate narrative that a reader is practically compelled to carefully consider its structure. Delicately woven layers of narrative function as a series of frames. With these frames the narrator directs a reader's attention from the voyage of the Argo, to the meeting of Peleus and Thetis and their eventual wedding, and then to the coverlet that adorns their marriage bed. Here the narrator launches into an ekphrasis of the coverlet, which depicts the weeping Ariadne, and includes a lengthy account of the myth of Theseus and the Minotaur, of which the central part Ariadne's lament over Theseus' infidelity. The focus of the narrative then returns to the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, where we hear the epithalamium of the Parcae. The subject of the song is Achilles, the future offspring of the newlywed couple, and thus the song within a song itself frames the myth of the Trojan War.

This brief summary of Catullus 64 serves as an excellent starting point for a discussion of framing as practiced by Hellenistic and later poets, because in many ways the poem represents the full maturation, the zenith, of framing as narrative structure. A brief look at the history of Greek literature reveals that since Homer, framing was virtually a standard and accepted method of presenting a story. One need only consider the *Odyssey*, in which many occurrences of the technique can be noted, the most obvious being in Book IX, when Odysseus recounts his wanderings to Alcinous. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* themselves are presented in a very defined framework, each being an account of a relatively brief span of time set against the understood backdrop of a larger event, the Trojan war. One observes a great deal of framing in lyric poetry as well, particularly in Pindar, whose style, as Gildersleeve noted over a century ago, is marked

by "overlapping parallels" and "the dexterous use of foils,"[1] features that are established almost invariably by framed mythological references. A specific example would be the myth of Pelops that is embedded into *Olympian* I. Later, we encounter Plato, perhaps the supreme example of an author who utilized framing to structure his narrative. The dialogue form is intrinsically a sort of frame, which separates the reader of the narrative from the author by at least one degree (or several, as is the case in the *Symposium*).

This short history demonstrates that framing can be distinguished as a consistent narrative technique in Greek literature, and was utilized consciously from Homer onwards. This may seem like an absurdly obvious assertion to make, however 'conscious' is the operative word. The importance of the conscious aspect of framing cannot be overstated because the maturation of framing as a technique in Greek literature consisted of an advancing degree of consciousness, or rather perhaps self-consciousness, on the part of the authors. For this reason one witnesses in Catullus 64 the poet taking the trope of the frame to such an extreme that it moves beyond being a mere structural edifice and becomes a key feature in determining the meaning of a poem. Framing in earlier Greek poetry, for example in Homer, generally provides nothing more than an occasion for a story.[2] Framing in Catullus and other Latin poets is an intricate and self-reflective process which has the effect of bringing the narrative structure of a poem to the forefront of a reader's consideration. The purpose of this paper is essentially to examine what sort of changes took place in the intervening centuries to effect such an evolution. The answer, I would argue, is surprisingly concise: essentially, the change was the career

[1] Gildersleeve (1885) p. 129
[2] This assertion is admittedly an oversimplification that I must make, as Homeric narrative technique itself falls outside the scope of this paper. There are undoubtedly scores of questions that can and ought to be raised about how frames function in Homer, which will unfortunately not be treated here.

of Plato. Plato the author (as opposed to Plato the philosopher, in which regard he was also very self-conscious) took literary self-consciousness to a level that had never existed, particularly the consciousness of oneself as operating within a defined tradition. This assertion will be examined more thoroughly later in this discussion, but for a starting point one need only consider the dialogue structure Plato used. So many questions about the nature and authority of the narrative, about the intended effect upon the reader, about the author himself, arise inherently from the dialogue as such. Plato's *modus operandi* within the genre of dialogue functioned analogously to monumental scientific advances like the discoveries of gravity and electricity: it gave rise to an explosion of subsequent advances that occurred at an astonishing rate.

One objective of this paper, then, is to examine the monumental literary impact Plato had on subsequent authors in terms of the framed narrative, first on the Alexandrian poets, and later on the Latin poets who were influenced by them. With respect to this, I shall examine how narratological framing operates in the dialogues of Plato, paying specific attention to the *Phaedrus* and the *Symposium*. Thereafter I shall look at the palpable changes Plato's narrative innovations may have effected in the Alexandrian and Latin authors whom he impacted, in particular Theocritus, Callimachus, Catullus, and Virgil. The second objective of this discussion, which really is a natural outgrowth of the above goal, is simply to cultivate a more nuanced understanding of the frame as a device in Alexandrian poetry. Too often it seems as though framing is depicted as a narrow and singular concept, one applicable exclusively to narrative, and employed by authors for primarily gratuitous purposes (i.e. to demonstrate skill or to make a poem *tenuis*). Hopefully the ensuing discussion will help to eliminate some of these presuppositions.

Before launching into the discussion proper, I should discuss briefly my conception of framing as a literary device. If it is not clear by the preceding remarks, it will soon become evident that I perhaps have a broader view of what constitutes a framed narrative than others do. To count as a frame only explicit example of narratives within narratives would severely limit our understanding of the concept. Rather, a degree of open-mindedness is required in our designation of certain techniques as 'frames,' in that we need to better appreciate the framing effects of diverse techniques encompassed in the "highly wrought" Hellenistic poetic ethos, many of which are not specifically designated as "frames" by commentators. Much of this will become clear in later discussions of specific poems, but I should like to point out a general distinction that I draw in methods of framing that many commentators seem to ignore. The accepted and most common formulation of a frame is what I would label a structural frame, where literally a narrative is presented as part of a narrative, as in *Odyssey* IX. However it becomes exceedingly clear to my mind that in the Hellenistic period a method of framing which I will term 'thematic' gained prominence, and that the thematic frame was a fairly common literary device in the Alexandrian-influenced Latin poets. An example is Ariadne in Catullus 64, where Catullus plays upon the distressed heroine motif by echoing Medea in Ariadne's lament, thereby implicitly casting Ariadne within that thematic frame. This topic will be treated at length later, but a brief introductory note was in order.

An unfortunate result of posterity's great fascination with Plato the philosopher is the short shrift that is given to Plato the literary stylist. It seems that only in the recent past that people have give more than cursory attention to questions like 'Why did Plato write dialogues?" Yet this question is of astonishing centrality to any understanding of

Plato, for scholars of literature and philosophy alike. Kenneth Sayre begins his literary study of Plato study with a statement that brings the issue into clear relief: "There were other forms that Plato might have chosen for his philosophic writing. He might have written in verse, like Parmenides, or in the form of speeches, like Isocrates…He might have even chosen the form of essays or treatises, like the author of the *Dissoi Logoi*."[3] Historically, scores of theses have been posited for why Plato chose to write dialogue, and many of them are correct to a degree. The most plausible of these is the most widely held, i.e. that Plato desired for his readers to engage in a philosophical conversation with his interlocutors, and this conversation was best initiated by a dialogue. To support this one need look no further that these famous lines in Letter VII, which, even if they are not actually by Plato, express a genuinely Platonic sentiment:

```
                    Ou1koun e0mo&n ge peri\
                au)tw~n e1stin
su&ggramma ou)de\ mh&pote ge/nhtai: r(hto_n ga_r
ou)damw~j e0stin
w(j a1lla maqh&mata, a)ll' e0k pollh~j sunousi/aj
gignome/nhj
peri\ to_ pra~gma au)to_ kai\ tou~ suzh~n
e0cai/fnhj, oi[on a)po_ puro_j
phdh&santoj e0cafqe\n fw~j, e0n th|~ yuxh|~
geno&menon au)to_ e9auto_
h1dh tre/fei. [4]
```

While perhaps it is most likely that Plato chose the dialogue because of the singular way it can engage a reader in the privileged teacher-pupil exchange, I would argue that the

[3] Sayre (1995) p. 1

[4] "There is no writing of mine about these matters, nor will there ever be one. For this knowledge is not something that can be put into words like other sciences; but after long-continued intercourse between teacher and pupil, in joint pursuit of the subject, suddenly like light flashing forth when a fire is kindled, it is born in the soul and straightway nourishes itself" Plato, Letter VII 341c4-d2. The apparent problem these lines cause for people who would like to think that Plato wrote both his dialogues and Letter VII can be solved by asserting that the dialogues themselves do not house opinions specifically attributable to Plato, as he is not a character in any, nor do they contain actual philosophical knowledge, but rather lead to philosophic understanding. For such an argument cf. Sayre (1988).

inherent framing that occurs within each dialogue was also a major factor in his selection. Each dialogue is framed in the sense that it expresses something of Plato's thought, but through the filter of others' speech. Diskin Clay asserts that this was intended primarily for its 'historicizing' effect:

> In attributing his dialogues to others, Plato is imitating Socrates, who liked to claim (in the words of Euripides' philosophical drama, *Melanippe the Philosopher*), "[T]he tale I tell is not my own." To attribute them to others and to Socrates himself is to create the impression of history rather than artifice.[5]

Essentially, by virtue of framing his narrative, Plato manages to create an almost imperceptible (yet very real) level of readership where he and his reader are engaged in the sort of conversation that leads to philosophic wisdom. In the Platonic scheme, truth cannot be taught, that is communicated via spoken word. The Platonic problem with language is formulated in the words of Socrates in *Phaedrus*:

```
Deino_n ga&r pou, w} Fai=dre, tou~t' e1xei
grafh&, kai\
w(j a)lhqw~j o3moion zwgrafi/a|. kai\ ga_r ta_
e0kei/nhj e1kgona
e3sthke me\n w(j zw~nta, e0a_n d' a)ne/rh| ti,
semnw~j pa&nu siga|~.
tau)to_n de\ kai\ oi9 lo&goi: do&caij me\n a2n
w3j ti fronou~ntaj
au)tou_j le/gein, e0a_n de/ ti e1rh| tw~n
legome/nwn boulo&menoj
maqei=n, e3n ti shmai/nei mo&non tau)to_n a)ei/.[6]
```

Plato would be acting counterproductively if he attempted to forge a teacher-pupil relationship by making himself a character in the dialogue, because in doing so the inert and unintelligent words printed on the page would confine him to the extent that he

[5] Clay (2000) p. 29

[6] "Writing, Phaedrus, has this strange quality, and is very like painting: for the creatures of painting stand like living beings, but if one asks them a question, they preserve a solemn silence. And so it is with written words; you might think they spoke as though they had intelligence, but if you question them, wishing to know their sayings, they always say only one and the same thing." Plato, *Phaedrus* 275d4-9.

would no longer be a real person. Instead, by framing a philosophical lesson between himself and a reader as a dialogue between Socrates and other Athenians, Plato establishes a secondary level in his texts, where true philosophical exchange takes place. Rosemary Desjardins, in an essay on why Plato chose to write dialogues, draws a fine distinction between Plato and Socrates in this regard, pointing out how the dialogues clearly establish Socrates as the "protagonist *within* the dialogues" and Plato as the "author *of* the dialogues."[7] This sophisticated incorporation of the self into one's writing was to become a hallmark feature of the Alexandrian and later Latin poets, as I shall later discuss.

The *Symposium* provides a useful illustration of Plato's attempt to place himself in his writing so as to initiate meaningful dialogue with his reader. An author, by casting his narrative as merely a frame for the speeches of several interlocutors, forgoes a tremendous amount of authority. This authority, when concentrated in a single individual, constitutes a reader's safety-net. With it, the meaning of an author can be discerned simply by making sense of a text. Without it, readers must alternately play the part of each interlocutor, must 'engage in the dialogue' (as first year philosophy professors urge), by reasoning through a set of unendorsed (at least officially) principles. Even in the *Symposium,* a dialogue that departs from the strict Socratic method of argument, one may look at the structure and realize that it demands a heightened awareness of the function of frames. The whole narrative is related by Apollodorus, who learned of the events of the symposium at Agathon's house from Aristodemus, who was actually present. These degrees of separation from the actual event, coupled with the fact that it took place a long time ago, inevitably causes readers to question the veracity of the

[7] Desjardins (1988) p. 112

account. Plato does a little to offset this uneasiness, by having Apollodorus say that he checked certain details with Socrates, and that he has just refreshed his memory by reciting the story to Glaucon. Nonetheless, reliability is an issue ever present in a reader's mind. This has the effect of destabilizing the narrative voice in the dialogue. In fact, the convoluted series of narrations could be seen as a conscious attempt on the part of Plato to eliminate any sort of authority in the discussion. The narrative thus assumes an almost lifelike quality, in which notions of love are posited and refined not on the basis of one man's intellectual authority over another,[8] but rather on the plausibility or implausibility of the argument. The narrative voice is further destabilized when Socrates gives a speech that Diotima spoke to him many years ago. The reader, then, is placed within the framework of the dialogue. In addition, Plato, by absenting his voice from the entire narrative, effectively becomes equal to the reader in the basic scheme of the dialogue, that is, he too becomes a witness and participant. In this light he can be seen as having self-consciously acknowledged the limitation of his art, and as having entered the dialogue in the role of facilitator, as opposed to instructor.

Desjardin also notes in her essay that Plato's use of the dialogue demonstrates his keen awareness of operating within a tradition, and embodies his attempt to function properly within that tradition.[9] Desjardin terms the ideas of interlocutors that are subject to Socrates' refutation "traditional," in that they are formulaic and lack sufficient grounding in understanding to ever move beyond mere opinion. She writes, "[T]he problem [of these traditional formulations] is not that they are false, but rather that they

[8] Although this is a counter-theme whose existence is acknowledged in passing throughout the dialogue, for instance in the deference to the medical knowledge of Eryximachus, the poetic knowledge of Agathon, and even the comedic knowledge of Aristophanes.
[9] The following argument may be found in Desjardins (1988) pp. 116-125.

are inadequate and partial until properly (and differently) understood." A prime example of this is the escalating refinement in the conceptions of love discussed during the *Symposium*. None, not even that of Aristophanes, can be said to not contain some germ of truth, but each needs refinement and rounding out by being grounded in understanding, a process which occurs as the dialogue progresses. From this point Desjardin notes that a tension arises between the two most common modes of dealing with tradition: "uncritical subservience" to it, or "critical independence."[10] Each of these, she argues, leads to the loss of tradition, the former because it does not lead to real understanding, the latter because it empties the tradition of meaning. Plato, by framing traditional arguments as part of a dialectic exchange, adopts the salutary middle ground between the two damaging extremes. Incidentally, Desjardins asserts that this method also functions as a defense of Socrates against the charge that he abandoned tradition. She writes,

> In giving us, therefore, the Socrates of the dialogues, with his persistent demand that the tradition make sense, that it be understood in such a way as to illuminate and nourish, Plato has offered a subtle, yet powerfully eloquent defense of his master.[11]

Plato's nuanced understanding of tradition was partially a product of his own genius, but it also had something to do with the period in which he lived, because there was an ever expanding list of 'canonical' who comprised the philosophical and literary patrimony of Athens. Simon Goldhill writes, in an attempt to describe the innovative nature of Hellenistic poetics,

> After Herodotus' and Thucydides' contributions to the narratives of war, Plato's analysis of desire, Aristotle's investigation of the natural world, the authority of, say, Homer, the lyric poets, Hesiod as privileged expositors

[10] Ibid. p. 122
[11] Ibid. p. 123

> of the world (and the authority of those writing within such a poetic tradition) becomes subject to less certain validation.[12]

I would argue further that Plato himself, having lived after the monumental 5th Century, was also benefited by the broadened Hellenic tradition, philosophically by the Sophists, in literature by the dramatists.

In speaking to the importance of the concept of tradition in the scheme of the Platonic dialogue, I should like to incorporate several points made by David Halperin in his excellent essay, "Plato and the Erotics of Narrativity," which strongly supports the above points regarding the framed dialogue in Plato. A substantial portion of the essay is devoted to Halperin's argument that the narrative process, as formulated by Plato, is analogous to the definition of e1rwv given by Diotima in Socrates' speech at Agathon's during the *Symposium*. According to her words to Socrates, the basic desire of mortal things for immortality manifests itself in the desire to procreate.[13] Procreation is the means by which what is mortal "shares in immortality"[14] Diotima extends this statement to all transient things, including Homer, Hesiod, and their 'children'. Halperin takes the next logical step of applying the same truth to historical events and conversations, such as the one that took place at Agathon's victory celebration. By this he argues for the erotic (in this specific, Platonic sense) nature of the framed narrative:

> In any case, the series of receding narratives has the effect of making present to the reader a number of moments in the past, plucking them from

---

[12] Goldhill (1991) p. 225

[13] Plato, *Symposium*, 207c8-d3: "Ei0 toi/nun, e1fh, pisteu&eij e0kei/nou ei]nai fu&sei to_n e1rwta, ou{ polla&kij w(mologh&kamen, mh_ qau&maze. e0ntau~qa ga_r d.) to_n au)to_n e0kei/nw| lo&gon h( qnhth_ fu&sij zhtei= kata_ to_ dunato_n a)ei/ te ei]nai kai\ a)qa&natoj. du&natai de\ tau&th| mo&non, th|~ gene/sei, o3ti a)ei\ katalei/pei e3teron ne/on a)nti\ tou~ palaiou~..."

[14] Plato, *Symposium*, 208 b3

> the eternal flow of time and preserving them, stabilizing their identity without, however, denying their transience.[15]

Halperin goes on to relate this to the *Symposium* specifically:

> Apollodorus' series of nested narratives exemplifies, then, the procreative labor of *meletē*: only by means of that ongoing oral tradition has the knowledge of what has been said and done at Agathon's victory party been preserved—been captured and held fast in a force field of desire—and thus been saved from dissolution in the endless cycles of becoming.[16]

In Halperin's analysis, then, it is the framework of the *Symposium* which embodies the desire to preserve a tradition of *logoi.* However, in accordance with Socrates' claim that things only desire what they lack,[17] Halperin notes that this same framework of narrative implies a reader's otherness from the actual events:

> For narrative is itself a sign of a gap that has opened up between the "now" of a telling and the "then" of a happening, a gap that demands to be continually crossed and recrossed, if we are to succeed at reconstituting in imagination, however fleetingly, the lost presence of a past that is forever slipping away from us.[18]

Ultimately, then, Halperin's analysis of desire and its relation to narrativity expresses in Platonic terms the two main points enumerated earlier. Plato's use of frame of dialogue in narrative is on the one hand a vehicle for the transmission of tradition, in that we see within the framework of the dialogue the offspring of people and events from the past. On the other hand, there is intrinsically present in this scheme the notion of the individual (which includes the reader and, indeed, Plato himself) whom the frame structure distinguishes from the characters in the actual dialogue.

In summary, Plato accomplished two major objectives by framing his philosophical discourses as dialogues between Socrates and his companions. First, he

[15] Halperin (1992) p. 101-102
[16] Halperin (1992) p. 102
[17] cf. *Symposium* 200-201
[18] Halperin (1992) p. 106

managed to transmit himself, i.e. himself as teacher to the reader as pupil, by framing the philosophical lesson in more or less dramatic dialogues. Second, by writing dialogues, which inherently elicit the critical refinement of traditional formulae, Plato preserved his own tradition, deepened his readers' understanding of it, and contextualized himself at a pivotal point within that tradition. Either directly or by indirect cultural influence, these two objectives of Plato became common concerns for Hellenistic authors, and thus Plato's novel uses of framed narrative are heavily reflected in Alexandrian and Latin poetry. The remainder of this paper will function largely as a survey of narratological framing in Hellenistic and Latin poetry, with a specific eye towards discussing how the different framing techniques in the poetry of Theocritus, Callimachus, Virgil, and Catullus can be seen as the literary descendants of Plato's groundbreaking narrative technique. Each of these poets demonstrates on some level one or both of the two critical Platonic concerns: to genuinely incorporate oneself in one's writing; and, to meaningfully transmit the larger tradition, while implicitly claiming a place within that tradition.

We begin with Theocritus, where one should first note the basic, pre-Platonic structural framework that is conspicuous throughout his poetry. Here we see that frames can still serve simply as pretexts for stories. *Idylls* 11 and 13 of Theocritus are framed as stories told by the narrator to his friend Nicias. What is hinted at is an implied and continuing conversation between the narrator and his one-person audience, which inherently provides a certain *raison d'être* for each poem. A similar effect is seen in other framed *Idylls* of Theocritus, particularly in those pastoral ones involving singing contests. For instance in *Idyll* 7, a random meeting and an impromptu singing contest are given as pretext for the two pastoral songs presented. In these specifically pastoral

poems, this structure has the added effect of framing location. For instance, in *Idyll* 7, the fact that Simichidas, Eucritus, and Amyntas are journeying to a harvest feast when they meet Lycidas on a country road effectually defines the scope and tone of the framed songs, while also dictating to a large extent the scenes where they take place.

The functions noted above constitute the most basic and primary purposes of the frame, namely introduction, pretext, and setting. Such uses of framing were standard and common in Greek literature from the time of Homer. The first word of the *Iliad*, mh=nin, frames the entire poem within the concept of Achilles' rage, which supplies a pretext for the narrative while further framing the poem within the physical context of the Trojan war. These are practical poetic concerns. The trope of the frame occupies the same practical space in Theocritus, as one sees by the examples noted above, and also in the other poets who will be discussed in this essay. However, framing in these Hellenistic works also facilitates a self-conscious, almost meta-poetic vein that is not present in archaic Greek poetry, or at least not in the same fashion. In the essay in his 1991 book *The Poet's Voice* entitled "Framing, Polyphony, and Desire: Theocritus and Hellenistic Poetics," Simon Goldhill comments on the self-conscious dimension of the Alexandrian poets:

> The poet, as Posidippus puts it, has a soul e0n bu/bloiv peponhme/nh, 'worked out in books'. This is seen not only in the fascination with details of earlier writing but also in the search for novelty in narrative and technique through an active response to and manipulation of the texts of the past. The past is in all senses *written through*. Indeed, this constant interplay with the texts of the past is a mark also of self-awareness of position within a poetic tradition, a self-reflexive concern for the composition of poetry, expressed within poetry, that makes the Hellenistic writers fundamental for my discussion of the poet's voice.[19]

[19] Goldhill (1991) p.224

On a related note, Goldhill points out that what comprised "the tradition" was really quite different in the Hellenistic period than it was in the 5th Century:

> After Herodotus' and Thucydides' contributions to the narratives of war, Plato's analysis of desire, Aristotle's investigation of the natural world, the authority of, say, Homer, the lyric poets, Hesiod as privileged expositors of the world (and the authority of those writing within such a poetic tradition) becomes subject to less certain validation.

There is a larger realization present between the lines of this paragraph. Perhaps the "highly wrought" character of Hellenistic poetry is precisely due to a coupling of poets' increased self-consciousness with a cognizance of operating within a varied and evolving tradition. This point may seem obscure, but it is best elucidated by examining the framing that occurs in Theocritus *Idyll* 7, which in turn distinctly aligns Theocritean poetics with the view of Plato's literary style previously outlined.

Structurally, *Idyll* 7 consists of a series of ever narrowing frames. The first frame is from the perspective of the narrator, Simichidas, who tells of his meeting with Lycidas on the road to a festival, and of their settling on friendly singing contest. The second frame is the song of Lycidas in this contest, which he frames as a *propemtikon*[20] for his lover Ageanax. In this song, Lycidas imagines himself in another (framed) scene, sitting by his hearth surrounded with an abundance of food and drink, celebrating the return of Ageanax in the presence of two shepherd-pipers. To their music sings a man named Tityrus, and Lycidas anticipates two of his songs, each about a poet, which comprise the innermost frames of the poem. The first is about the legendary poet-shepherd Daphnis. The second is about the poet Comatas, and what Lycidas says will be sung here is particularly germane to the present discussion:

[20]Cairns (1972) p. 27

a|)sei= d' w3j pok' e1dekto to_n ai0po&lon
eu)re/a la&rnac
zwo_n e0o&nta kakai=sin a)tasqali/aisin a1naktoj,
w3j te/ nin ai9 simai\ leimwno&qe fe/rbon
i0oi=sai
ke/dron e0j a(dei=an malakoi=j a1nqessi
me/lissai,
ou3neka& oi9 gluku_ Moi=sa kata_ sto&matoj xe/e
ne/ktar.
w} makariste\ Koma~ta, tu& qhn ta&de terpna_
pepo&nqeij:
kai\ tu_ katekla|&sqhj e0j la&rnaka, kai\ tu_
melissa~n
khri/a ferbo&menoj e1toj w3rion e0cepo&nasaj.
ai1q' e0p' e0meu~ zwoi=j e0nari/qmioj w1felej
h}men,
w3j toi e0gw_n e0no&meuon a)n' w1rea ta_j kala_j
ai]gaj
fwna~j ei0sai5wn, tu_ d' u(po_ drusi\n h2 u(po_
peu&kaij
a(du_ melisdo&menoj kateke/kliso, qei=e Koma~ta.[21]

Goldhill comments on the scenario, "This Comatas, a singer within the song within the song within the song is within…a box,"[22] and he likens the effect to that of a "Chinese box"[23] the smallest of which contains the image of the poet Comatas trapped within a box. The image certainly grabs the attention, but the meaning is obscure. I would argue that we are to take Comatas, albeit with a healthy degree of uncertainty, as a figure for Theocritus, embedded in his own poem and voiced in it by three levels of the pastoral poetic tradition. It is hard to imagine that each of the poets within the framework of *Idyll* 7 is not meant to evoke Theocritus himself at some point, or perhaps to 'imply' him.

[21] "And he will sing how once a wide chest took in a goatherd, still alive, by the base malice of a king, and how the flat-nosed bees nourished him, coming to the sweet cedar from the meadow, with fresh flowers, because the Muse poured sweet nectar upon his mouth. Oh most happy Comatas, surely then you endured these delights. You were closed into a chest, and feeding on the honeycomb of the bees you toiled away the seasons of a year. If only your were numbered among the living of my time, so that I would have shepherded your fine upon the mountains, hearing your voice, while you beneath an oak or pine were lain, singing sweetly, godlike Comatas. " Theocritus *Idyll* 7, 78-89
[22] Goldhill (1991) p. 234
[23] Ibid. p. 235

Goldhill calls into question the traditional association of Simichidas with Theocritus,[24] however I would reverse the argument assert that Theocritus makes us think twice about *not* conflating him with Simichidas. The reason for this assertion is the delayed revelation of the narrator's identity, a trope which also occurs in Virgil's *Eclogues* to the same effect.[25] Readers spend the first 20 lines of the poem assuming that the narrator's voice is that of Theocritus, and this impression cannot help but linger. By association and more importantly by framing, every poet mentioned in the poem becomes a sort of metaphor for Theocritus. Of course Simichidas could simply be a poet *qua* poet, as would then be Lycidas, Tityrus, Comatas, and of course Theocritus himself. Either way, the poet is in his own poem. The poem is self conscious, then, because the poet is part of his work, indeed he *is* his work. This is especially true from the perspective of a posterity in which biography is often gleaned from an author's corpus, a reality to which the Greek tradition undoubtedly alerted Theocritus. *Idyll* 7 affirms the act of the poetic self-creation that takes place within the framework of a tradition. Moreover, Comatas, i.e. Theocritus, is a poet who is filtered to us through the frames of three other poets, perhaps to recreate in verse the process of *traditio*, etymologically the 'handing down.'

What we have witnessed thus far in these two poems of Theocritus is what was termed structural framing at the outset of this discussion. This sort of frame is the easiest to discern, and the most overtly akin to the framing in Plato's dialogues. However, perhaps due to their efforts to increase the complexity of the poetic voice and build upon the self-conscious branch of the tradition initiated by Plato, the remaining poets in this discussion can be said to practice a different sort of framing, what I termed thematic

[24] Ibid. p 229-230
[25] Professor Jay Reed should be credited for this point.

framing. While all three of these poets provide many instances of structural framing as seen in Theocritus, they best demonstrate their similarity to the Platonic model in their thematic frames. Thematic framing is a difficult concept, because often such a frame does not appear to be a frame as traditionally constructed. Also, one's perception of such a device commonly depends on noting obscure intertextualities, always a tricky proposition. The thematic frame is best understood by example, and a fine one is presented in Catullus 64. We have already been familiarized with the general scheme of the poem in the introduction, and it is perfectly clear that the poem presents a good example of structural framing. However the lament of Ariadne (132-201) in the ekphrasis presents an instance of thematic framing which is not to be ignored, for it is here that Catullus exhibits the Platonic concern for tradition and one's place in it. Specifically, he accomplishes this by a deft allusion to Euripides' Medea. Syndikus notes the clear allusions in this passage to Apollonius' *Argonautica* Book III: "Auch bei Apollonius entscheidet ein langer Liebesblick über Medeas Schiksal, auch bei ihm finden sich die Metaphern des Sturmes im Herzen und des verzehrenden Feuers wie auch das Wechseln der Gesichtsfarbe."[26] In addition to this, I would point out that Catullus consciously reaches back to an earlier stage in the narration of the Medea myth, Euripides' tragedy. The following textual similarities are evident:

> quaenam te genuit sola sub rupe leaena?
> quod mare conceptum spumantibus expuit undis,
> quae Syrtis, quae Scylla rapax, quae vasta Charybdis
> talia qui reddis pro dulci praemia vita?[27]

[26] Syndikus (1990) p. 149

[27] What lioness bore you under a deserted rock? What sea conceived you and spewed you from its foaming waves? What Syrtis, what rapacious Scylla, what horrible Charybdis? You who return such a payment for your sweet life?" Catullus 64, 154-157.

gh~mai se/, kh~doj e0xqro_n o)le/qrio&n t'
e0moi/,
le/ainan, ou) gunai=ka, th~j Turshni/doj
Sku&llhj e1xousan a)griwte/ran fu&sin.[28]

It seems highly probable that the language of Catullus 64 in this passage is intended to echo Euripides' play, even if in Catullus it is the distressed heroine who speaks these words, while Jason is the speaker in Euripides. The inclusion of the words "lioness" and "Scylla" in such close proximity supports this assertion strongly. Here we see an oblique reference, not a quotation or an allusion, whose effect is to roughly align our reading of Ariadne in Catullus 64 with Euripides' *Medea*. Another echoed passage in Catullus 64 is the following:

An patris auxilium sperem? quemne ipsa reliqui,
Respersum iuvenem fraterna caede secuta?[29]

nu~n poi= tra&pwmai; po&tera pro_j patro_j
do&mouj,
ou4j soi\ prodou~sa kai\ pa&tran a)fiko&mhn;[30]

w} pa&ter, w} po&lij, w{n a)pena&sqhn
ai0sxrw~j to_n e0mo_n ktei/nasa ka&sin.[31]

Here we see Catullus repeating the motif voiced twice by Euripides. Both heroines 'burned their bridges' out of love for the treacherous heroes, and thus both are now helpless. In this way, I would argue that Catullus frames his narrative of Ariadne's lament with the Medea story as told by both Euripides and Apollonius. The myth of

[28] "I married you, a hateful and ruinous marriage for me, a lioness, not a woman, having a nature more savage than Tyrrhenian Scylla." Euripides *Medea* 1341-1343
[29] "Can I hope for help from my father? Whom I deserted, following a youth smeared with my brother's blood?" Catullus 64 (180-182)
[30] "Where am I now to turn? To my father's house, which I betrayed along with my country for your sake when I came here?" Euripides. *Medea* 502-503.
[31] "O father, O my native city, from you I departed in shame, having killed my brother." Euripides, *Medea* 167-168.

Medea acts as a frame in that it conditions our perception of and expectations for the scene of Ariadne lamenting.

To establish the Platonic quality of this phenomenon, one should consider how it establishes a traditional grounding for Catullus as a poet. By crafting his narrative in such a way that it echoes both Athenian and Alexandrian literary models, Catullus places himself, and Roman poetry in general, within that tradition. We witness a sharing of myth, of motif, and of language. Most importantly, the Greek frame for the lament of Ariadne that Catullus establishes becomes in a sense the frame of the whole poem. After encountering it, one comes to view Catullus as a successor in the tradition of Euripides and Apollonius. This is very similar to Plato's objective in choosing to write in the dialogue form.

The two selections that remain to be examined in this discussion come from Callimachus (Hymn 5) and Virgil (*Aeneid* 3). In these selections, Callimachus and Virgil demonstrate thematic framing as seen in the above example, but they incorporate a new element into the technique by varying slightly from their source frame. Callimachus' *Hymn* 5, "On the Bath of Pallas," begins as a pious invocation for the religious ceremony of the bathing of a statue of Athena, and from this invocation he embarks on an oblique etiology. Callimachus warns the participants in the ritual, "a0lla/ Pelasge/, fra/zeo mh\ ou0k e0qe/lwn ta\n basi/leian i1dh?v": But beware, Pelasgian, lest you behold unwillingly the Queen."[32] He then frames within the hymn the story of how Tiresias was blinded by Athena for catching sight of her naked while she

[32] Callimachus, *Hymn* 5, 51-52

bathed. Callimachus gives his narrative the tone of grand tragedy,[33] and certain elements of the diction[34] and stock phraseology of epic (e.g. the absolute effect of Zeus bowing his head (kate/neuse) in lines 131-136). These contribute to the poem's general tenor, which is reminiscent of a traditional hymn in the high Homeric style.

The one problem that careful reading reveals is that the poem uses a very non-traditional myth of Athena as the basis for the etiology. Bulloch devotes substantial attention to this fact in his introduction to *Hymn* 5. The standard version of the myth of the blinding of Tiresias is first found in Hesiod, *Melampodia* fr. 275. In this account, Tiresias saw two snakes mating on mount Cithaeron, and when he killed the female he was magically turned into a woman, and when he killed the male, he was turned back into a man. For this reason he was chosen by Zeus and Hera to judge whether it was the man or the woman who received more pleasure from sexual intercourse. Tiresias answered:

> oi1hn me\n moi~ran de/ka moirewn te/rpetai a0nh/r,
> ta\v de/ka d'empi/plhsi gunh\ te/rpousa no/hma.

Hera, because she did not like this answer, blinded Tiresias, but Zeus gave to him the power of prophecy. Bulloch points out that is by far the more common version, citing only one author prior to Callimachus who tells the other version, the 5th Century mythographer Pherecydes. Bulloch concludes that "Callimachus was consciously drawing on the mythographer for an unusual version of a standard story.[35] Further, Bulloch points outs the odd similarity between the myth as told in *Hymn* 5 and the myth

[33] Bulloch notes the essentially tragic character of the phrase "paido\v d'o1mmata nu\c e1laben." Bulloch, p. 26.
[34] cf. Bulloch pp. 25-31.
[35] Bulloch p.19

of Artemis and Actaeon. This similarity prompted Wilamowitz to exclaim, "Passt es sich für Athena im Walde zu spazieren, und in einer Quelle zu baden oder für die Jägerin Artemis? Hat Athena wie jene einen Chor von Gespielen um sich? Und ist der Abklatsch nicht deutlich, wenn Teiresias auf die Jagd gehen muss?." Bulloch points out how these difficulties led Wilamowitz to conclude that Pherecydes "made up his story from that of Artemis and Actaeon." Bulloch rightly suspects this, arguing, "…The bath of Artemis is not mentioned before the Fifth Hymn itself, and some scholars have argued that it is the Artemis story which Callimachus has remodeled on the basis of the Athena myth."[36]

I would argue that this discrepancy between the traditional myth and the one that Callimachus uses in *Hymn* 5 is a complex instance of framing. Callimachus was far too learned to not know what the accepted version of the myth was, and he was far too meticulous to just randomly settle upon an obscure version. Rather, the common myth serves a key purpose in the poem by 'framing' in the mind of the reader the differing version of Callimachus. It is a case of Callimachus bringing what is said into harsh juxtaposition with what is expected. In this sense it is perhaps better to envision the standard myth as the frame *outside of which* Callimachus' poem exists.

Before examining Callimachus' purpose in using this sort of frame, some attention should be paid to the example of thematic framing in Virgil's *Aeneid*, as Virgil and Callimachus seem to be operating in much the same fashion on these two occasions. The passage in Virgil is located in Books II and III, where Aeneas launches into the narrative of his troubles, beginning with the sack of Troy. Clearly we have the frame here in the classic, Homeric sense. An encounter with a curious host prompts the hero to

[36] This quotation and the points preceding it can be found in Bulloch pp. 18-19.

recount his troubles and adventures, thus giving the author the opportunity to include in the frame material that chronologically falls outside of the scope of the epic. What is of interest here is the possibility that Virgil problematizes this convention in his epic. Most likely, a reader of the end of Book I, where Dido says asks Aeneas to tell from the beginning the "insidias Danaum…casusque tuorum erroroesque tuos,"[37] has in mind Odysseus at the hall of Alcinous, in *Odyssey* Book IX. This is a natural assumption, given the similarity in setting. Aeneas, like Odysseus, has just reached safe haven after long and harrowing wanderings. Each is present at a feast, and each is prompted by the ruler of the land to give a history of his wanderings. Virgil seems to be incorporating a standard epic motif. However there is a potential intertext present in the beginning of *Aeneid* II that raises substantial difficulties. Let us compare the following words of Aeneas with the words of Odysseus at another point in the *Odyssey*:

> 'Infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem,
> Troianas ut opes et lamentabile regnum
> eruerint Danai, quaeque ipse miserrima
> et quorum pars magna fui. quis talia fando
> myrmidonum Dolopumve aut duri miles Ulixi
> temperet a lacrimis? Et iam nox umida caelo
> praecipitat suadentque cadentia sidera somnos.
> sed si tantus amor casus cognoscere nostros
> et breviter Troiae supremum audire laborem,
> quamuam animus meminisse horret luctuque refugit,
> incipiam.[38]

```
w} gu&nai ai0doi/h Laertia&dew  0Odush~oj,
ou)ke/t' a)pollh&ceij to_n e0mo_n go&non
e0cere/ousa;
```

[37] Virgil, *Aenied* 754-755

[38] "You bid me to renew an unspeakable grief, O Queen, how the Danaans destroyed Troy's wealth and the piteous kingdom, which were the most miserable things I have seen, and of which I played a large part. Who of the Myrmidons or Dolopians, or what hardened soldier of Ulysses, could hold back tears while speaking such things? And now dewy night descends from the sky and the falling stars persuade sleep. But if your desire to know our misfortunes is so great, and to hear briefly Troy's last ill, though my mind is horrified to remember and flees in pain, I shall begin." Virgil *Aeneid* II.3-13

a)ll' e1k toi e0re/w. h} me/n m' a)xe/essi/ ge dw&seij
plei/osin h2 e1xomai: h( ga_r di/kh, o(ppo&te pa&trhj
h{j a)pe/h|sin a)nh_r to&sson xro&non o3sson e0gw_ nu~n,
polla_ brotw~n e0pi\ a1ste' a)lw&menoj, a1lgea pa&sxwn.
a)lla_ kai\ w{j e0re/w o3 m' a)nei/reai h)de\ metalla|~j. [39]

There seem to be significant echoes between the Virgil text and the scene from Odyssey 19, where Odysseus has a conversation with Penelope while disguised as a beggar. Again, as in the case of Catullus, we are not dealing with quotations, but rather subtle indicators of a distinct relation. First, we have the two very similar phrases, 'infandum dolorem renovare' and "h} me/n m' a)xe/essi/ ge dw&seij plei/osin h2 e1xomai." More importantly, the arguments contained in the two speeches are remarkably alike. Both begin with a feigned refusal (see Odysseus' token refusal at 107-122), both emphasize how painful the process of recounting will be. We are now faced with the possibility that this is an intentional intertext on the part of Virgil, therefore posing the question, to what end? The strongest effect this tactic has is to align the relationship between Dido and Aeneas not with that of Odysseus and Alcinous, but rather with that of Odysseus and Penelope. If one accepts that Virgil is hinting at this on at least some level, a myriad of issues arise. Firstly, how truthful is Aeneas' ensuing narrative? Once Odysseus gave into Penelopes wishes, he "i1ske yeu&dea polla_ le/gwn

[39] "Honored wife of Odysseus, son of Laertes, will thou never cease to ask me of my parentage? Well, I will tell you; though indeed you will give me over to more pains than those by which I am now held; for so it ever is, when a man has been far from his country as long as I have now, wandering through the many cities of men in experiencing ills. Yet even so will I tell you what you ask and enquire. Homer, *Odyssey* XIX.165-171

e0tu&moisin o(moi=a"[40] he launched into an extremely realistic set of lies.[41] Second, one must consider whether this intertext hints at the fact that Aeneas ought to remain with Dido. Odysseus, although in disguise, has reached his home, and is speaking to his wife. Perhaps the similarities in Aeneas' mode of speech indicate that he and Dido are analogous to Odysseus and Penelope? If one accepts that a specific intertextual similarity exists here, one must admit that these issues are at least subtly raised. I suspect this to be the case simply based on Virgil's style; on many occasions in the *Aeneid* he problematizes in very slight ways certain features of the epic tradition, and this seems to be such an instance.

So again, as in Callimachus, we see Virgil using his readers' expectation as a frame for what he actually presents. Now we may ask regarding these two poets, why the subtle variation? Indeed, in each case, it is relatively slight, so as to be almost imperceptible. Is it simply to seem learned by incorporating obscure and subtle references into fairly straightforward narratives? I would tend to argue against describing these as gratuitous displays of erudition. Based on the sophistication of these two authors, it seems safe to assert that nothing is an accident, and that even minute details serve the larger artistic whole in some meaningful way. The English poet Gerard Manly Hopkins speaks of metrical counterpoint, where the actual rhythm in a line varies, but is continuously played against the anticipated rhythm in the listeners mind. I sense a sort of thematic counterpoint in these poems of Callimachus and Virgil. The tradition, embodied in a reader's expectation for the conventional, serves as a sort of drone or (or "pedal point," to use a musical phrase) against which the individual voice of the narrator is

[40] "He made the many falsehoods of his words seem like truth," i.e. in his fabricated account, Homer, *Odyssey*. 19 lines 172-202.

played. In the case of Callimachus, the subtle tension that this contrapuntal feel gives to each poem has the effect of alerting the reader to the poetic territory he is entering. This territory is not separate, but it is divergent from that of earlier poetry, specifically of the Homeric Hymns, and it seems safe to assert that a critical dialogue exists between these earlier hymns and those of Callimachus. We must bear in mind Callimachus advice from Apollo in the prologue to his *Aetia*:

> ta\ mh\ pate/ousin a3macai
> ta\ stei/bein, e(te/rwn d' i1xnia mh\ kaq' o9ma/
> di/fron e0l]a=n mhd' oi[mon a0na\ platu/n, a0lla\
> keleu/qouv
> a0rti/pto]uv, ei0 kai\ steinote/rhn e0laseiv.[42]

In *Hymn* 5 we see Callimachus moving towards the unused path, and using the contrapuntal tension created by a thematic frame to alert his readers to this fact. Falivene expresses a fine summary of this technique, while maintaining the crucial similarity to its musical parallel, noting of the *Hymns* of Callimachus in general, "Callimaco intende i suoi *Inni* come un "contracanto" agli *Inni omerici.*"[43]

Virgil operates in much the same way in relation to the epic tradition. Certainly he inherited the Alexandrian proclivity for the original and to\ lepto\n, and the passage in question illustrates this. There are probably dozens of other instances to be found in the *Aeneid* where Virgil subtly inverts the tropes of his tradition, even while continuing to frame the external structure of the *Aeneid* according to traditional rules. Indeed, in the introduction to Aeneas' narrative he seems to trope the technique of framing as used in Catullus 64. Both Catullus 64 and this section of the *Aeneid* rely on

[42] "Tread paths which carriages do not trample, and do not drive your chariot upon the common tracks of others, nor along a wide road, but on unworn path, even if you drive the more narrow course." Callimachus, Aetia fr. 1 lines 25-28.
[43] Falivene, p. 127

intertexuality to establish a framework of tradition within a frame. Catullus, in the more traditional Platonic sense that we have examined, uses this framework to align himself individually to an established tradition. Virgil in one sense seems to attempt the same effect; however he also takes the evolution of this Platonic concept to its next logical phase by placing more emphasis on his own role as an individual in the tradition. However, in light of what we have already discussed, it ought to be emphasized that neither Virgil nor Callimachus abandons the tradition or even hints at a desire to do so. Callimachus actually includes passing reference to the myth of Artemis and Actaeon that he imitates with his account of the blinding of Tiresias.[44] Virgil, much like Callimachus in *Hymn* 5, evokes his inherited tradition and proceeds to revise and refine it, as opposed to supplanting it, by introducing a contrapuntal and problematic vein to his storyline. Thereby he inherently establishes his own meaningful place within the poetic tradition as an innovator, and perhaps more significantly, as a *Roman* in contrast to his Greek models. In sum we might say that both Virgil and Callimachus cultivate a dialectic[45] effect in these two poems. Each encapsulates a confrontation between the inherited poetic tradition and the desire of the poet to innovate, and from this arises an image of a poet as a unique voice within that tradition.

An unfortunate reality for the sort of argument presented in this discussion is the fact that it will always be susceptible to accusations of twisting the meaning of texts to establish some sort of historic connection where none exists. This is especially the case

[44] Callimachus *Hymn* 5 107-109.
[45] Falivene in fact comments on Callimachus *Hymn* 5: In sostanza, Callimaco adotta lo stesso stratagemma di Platone, il quale, avendo a modello I Mimi di Sofrone, imita in scrittura situazioni eminentemente orali: finge cioè che le sue opera siano null'altro che (trascrizioni di) *Dialoghi*, e con ciò tende a negare la scrittura proprio mentre se ne serve. E ben not oil disorientamento che Platone così induce nei suoi lettori (in quanto tali, interamente presi nella logica della scrittura). La mia ipotesi è che i componimenti mimetici dell'età ellenistica tendano a produrre nei loro lettori un effetto analogo a quello dei *Dialoghi* platonici. Falivene p. 108.

in light of the fact that there is no tangible evidence of a Hellenistic poet appealing to Plato as a specifically stylistic model. So we must now ask, how direct is the stylistic link between Plato and Hellenistic and later poets? Unfortunately this is a question for which there is no satisfactory answer. Certainly these poets knew of and had read Plato. Whether they consciously imitated his methods is an entirely different question that relies primarily on interpretation. The strongest historical evidence for this is essentially an argument from the reverse. Between the 5th Century and the Hellenistic period, there had to have been some major occurrence or occurrences, be they literary, cultural, historical, etc., to have precipitated the significantly innovative poetics of the Hellenistic period. Certainly in this includes the cataclysmic Peloponnesian War, the conquests of Alexander, and the diffusion of Greek culture over a broader geographical space. Still, I would argue that the specifically literary influence must lie primarily with Plato, simply because his synthesis of form and meaning is consistently so powerfully executed, as we have witnessed, and this synthesis is really at the heart of all that we have discussed. In addition, one might conjecture that the poets of the Hellenistic period looked all the more to Plato precisely because he stood on their side of history in relation to the Peloponnesian War, and thus shared with them the reality of being not entirely 'classical.' Regardless, these constitute mere guesses as to possible literary links between Plato and the poets we have looked at. Ultimately, the safest assumption to make is that Platonic thought shaped the Hellenistic intellectual world to such a degree that whether specific authors' styles were directly influenced by him or not, Plato's literary fingerprints are all over nearly everything produced in the era. The similarities between

his use of framing and that of Theocritus, Callimachus, Catullus, Virgil, represent one very important aspect of that influence, and constitute a large part of Plato's legacy.

# Bibliography

Modern Sources:

Bulloch, A.W. "Introduction to the Fifth Hymn of Callimachus" in A.W. Bulloch Ed. *The Fifth Hymn of Callimachus*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Clay, Diskin. Platonic Questions: Dialogues with the Silent Philosopher. University Park, Penn.:The Pennsylvania Stat University Press, 2000.

Cairns, Francis. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh: University Press, 1972.

Desjardins, Rosemary. "Why Dialogues? Plato's Serious Play." In C. Griswold Jr. ed. *Platonic Writings, Platonic Readings.* New York: Routledge, 1988.

Falivene, Maria Rosario. "La Mimesi in Callimaco: *Inni* II, IV, V, e VI." In *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* Vol. 64 No. 2 (1990): 103-128.

Gildersleeve, Basil L.. *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1885.

Goldhill, Simon. *The Poet's Voice : Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature.* Cambridge; New York : Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Halperin, David. "Plato and the Erotics of Narrativity." In R. Hexter and D. Selden eds. *Innovations of Antiquity.* New York; London: Routledge, 1992.

Sayre, Kenneth M. *Plato's Literary Garden: How to read a Platonic dialogue*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.

Syndikus, Hans. *Catull*: *Eine Interpretation, Zweiter Teil*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellshaft, 1990.

----"Plato's dialogues in light of the *Seventh Letter*." In C. Griswold Jr. ed. *Platonic Writings, Platonic Readings.* New York: Routledge, 1988.

Ancient Texts:

Callimachus. *Aetia*. In R. Pfeiffer ed. *Callimachus*. vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

Callimachus. *The Fifth Hymn*. A.W. Bulloch Ed. *The Fifth Hymn of Callimachus*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Catullus. *Carmina*. R.A.B. Mynors ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Euripides. *Medea*. In G. Murray ed. *Euripidis Fabulae Tomus I*. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Homer. *Odyssey*. P. von der Mühll ed. *Homeri Odyssea*. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1962.

Plato. *Phaedrus*. In J. Burnet ed. *Platonis opera*, vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.

----*Symposium*. In J. Burnet ed. *Platonis opera*, vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.

----*Epistula VII*. In J. Burnet ed. *Platonis opera*, vol. 5. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907

Theocritus. *Idylls*. In A.S.F. Gow ed. *Theocritus*, vol. 1, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.

Virgil, *Aeneid*. In R.A.B. Mynors ed. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.