

Plato's Later Metaphysics & Epistemology

PHIL 107B/207B – Syllabus

Instructor: Willie Costello

Autumn Quarter. Prerequisite: PHIL 80. Meetings on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 15:00 to 16:20 in Bldg 380 Rm 381U. Office hours on Mondays from 13:30 to 14:30 in Bldg 100 Rm 102M, or by appointment (email williec@stanford.edu). Course readings available from <http://bit.ly/phil107b>. Course website available through <http://canvas.stanford.edu>.

Course description

This course is dedicated to a slow and close reading of the *Theaetetus* and the *Parmenides*, Plato's mature works on the topics of knowledge and reality, respectively. These two dialogues showcase one of history's great philosophical minds at the peak of his powers, tackling some of the most intractable philosophical questions, engaging with some of his most formidable philosophical opponents, and seeming even to cast a critical eye back on his own earlier thought. Both dialogues are also tightly woven literary masterpieces, suggestive in their dramatic staging and brimming with some of Plato's most memorable images and metaphors. The dialogues are also surprisingly modern in their concerns, seeming to weigh in on such contemporary issues as sense-data theory, the "justified true belief" account of knowledge, and the problem of universals. It is thus no surprise that, in the twentieth century, the *Theaetetus* and the *Parmenides* were, more so than any other of the dialogues, responsible for securing Plato's reputation as a "serious" philosopher in analytically minded philosophical circles of the Anglo-American world.

Perhaps the most notable feature of this pair of dialogues, however, is that in each Plato seems to be starting, philosophically, from scratch, and to end without arriving at any positive conclusions about knowledge or reality. This is puzzling because the dialogues are hardly Plato's first forays into metaphysics and epistemology; indeed, by all accounts, at the time when he was composing these dialogues Plato had already developed his so-called "theory of Forms", which includes among its chief tenets the claims that Forms are the proper objects of knowledge and the realest realities. Yet the *Theaetetus* is completely silent as to the Forms, and the *Parmenides* is openly critical of them. Has Plato then given up his earlier belief in the Forms? Has he realized

that his earlier views must be developed in new ways? Or is the inconclusiveness of these dialogues in fact a sly demonstration of why Forms really are necessary, of why metaphysics and epistemology is futile lest we recognize that Forms exist?

In addition, to further complicate this mess of issues, there's the fact that Plato has chosen to compose both these dialogues in ways which explicitly recall his earlier works. The *Theaetetus*, for example, is plainly a definitional dialogue, with Socrates vigorously pursuing a 'What is X?' question with an interlocutor, invalidating a number of that interlocutor's proposed answers, and ultimately ending in *aporia*. The first part of the *Parmenides* is similarly elenctic, but with a young Socrates playing the part of the dumbfounded interlocutor and the eminent Presocratic philosopher Parmenides taking him to task. Why has Plato chosen to write the dialogues in this way? And what clues about the dialogues' deeper significance can we glean from their dramatic structure and literary form?

The aim of this seminar is to investigate these and other questions, by reading these two dialogues carefully and critically. Through this process we will deepen our understanding, not only of Plato's own thought, but also of the foundational philosophical issues that he's here grappling with.

No particular background in Plato or ancient philosophy is assumed (nor any command of Greek); but reference will be made as appropriate to other ancient works. Students whose background is minimal or rusty would do well to (re)read the *Meno*, *Phaedo*, and *Republic* v–vii. Everyone should read the whole of the *Theaetetus* and the *Parmenides* in English before the start of the course.

Course learning objectives

By the end of this course, you should be able to...

- explain the major features of Plato's later metaphysics and epistemology
- identify these features as they appear in the actual texts of the *Theaetetus* and the *Parmenides*
- relate Plato's views about knowledge and reality to other historical and contemporary views
- analyze and evaluate Plato's arguments about the nature of knowledge and reality, both vis-à-vis his opponents' conceptions and vis-à-vis our own contemporary views
- research and defend an original thesis dealing with the above topics
- read a Platonic dialogue carefully, charitably, and critically
- critique others' work with respect, charity, and encouragement
- cultivate a personally effective approach to academic research and writing

Course contract

This course is a collaboration between me, you, and your classmates. You will be regularly called upon to actively participate in class discussions and other activities, and your contributions will directly influence what we cover in seminar. **It is not necessary that you agree with everything I or anyone else says in this class, but it is necessary that you always listen and respond with respect.** With this in mind, I put forth the following “course contract”, applying to everyone in the class (students and instructor alike):

- we have the responsibility to **contribute** to the collective learning process (which includes asking questions when we’re not understanding something)
- we have the responsibility to **be receptive** to other points of view than our own
- we have the right to **dissent or differ** from the instructor and from others in the class
- we have the responsibility to **welcome challenges** to our own opinions, and be willing to support our claims with further reasons (or be honest when we don’t have any)
- we have the right to **personal dignity**, which at no point should be infringed upon in any way by the conduct of others

Texts

The only texts that are required for this course are translations of Plato’s *Theaetetus* and *Parmenides*. If you don’t already own a translation, I would recommend the following, which are available for purchase at the Stanford Bookstore:

- Plato, *Theaetetus*, trr. M. J. Levett & Myles Burnyeat (Hackett, 9780872201583) – approx. \$13.00
- Plato, *Parmenides*, trr. Mary Louise Gill & Paul Ryan (Hackett, 9780872203280) – approx. \$16.00

It would also be beneficial to have a copy of both Plato’s complete works handy, for various cross-references. The standard edition (which includes the above translations of the *Theaetetus* and the *Parmenides*) is:

- Cooper, J. M. and Hutchinson, D. S. (eds.) 1997. *Plato: Complete Works*. Hackett Publishing Company

All secondary readings can be downloaded from: <http://bit.ly/phil107b>

Evaluation – Undergraduate Students

If you are an undergraduate student, your grade for the course will be determined by the following components: in-class participation (in seminar discussions and activities); twice-weekly micro-reflections (informal brainstorming exercises, done at home before class); two shorter papers (on topics of your choosing); and one longer paper (a revision and expansion of one of your earlier papers, in light of my feedback). The full grade breakdown is as follows:

<i>Component</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Due date</i>
In-class participation	15%	N/A
Micro-reflections	15%	by 1 p.m. before each class
First paper (1000 words)	20%	October 23
Second paper (1000 words)	20%	November 27
Final paper (2000 words)	30%	December 16

- » **In-class participation:** You are expected to be an active participant in our seminar meetings. One (obvious) way to be an active participant is by asking questions and sharing your thoughts with the class; but this is not the only way, nor will it necessarily be the way that works best for you. Other ways to be an active participant include: attentively listening to classroom discussions; participating in break-out discussion groups with your peers; and/or coming to talk to me after class or during office hours. (You will receive a progress report on your in-class participation midway through the term, to let you know how you are doing, and if you could be doing anything any better.)
- » **Micro-reflections:** Before each class you are to submit a very short reflection piece responding to some part of the week’s assigned readings – a “micro-reflection”. The purpose of these micro-reflections is: (a) to deepen your appreciation of the readings; (b) to enhance our classroom discussions of the readings; and (c) to help you come up with and develop ideas and material for your papers.

Each micro-reflection should be approximately 100 words in length (i.e., one paragraph of about five or six sentences), though you are welcome to write more if you feel inspired. More important than length, though, is content: **each micro-reflection should clearly articulate a single, specific question / confusion / reaction / idea** you had in response to the day’s assigned reading. **Micro-reflections should not be mere summaries** of any part of the reading; **you must do some analysis or synthesis of the assigned material**. This can be as simple as pointing out some part of the reading that confused you and explaining why it confused you. Or you may write about how some part of the reading reminded you of this other thing and explain why this connection is interesting. Or you may lay out an argument from the reading and explain why you think it’s faulty. Or you may develop an objection to a claim made in the reading. Basically, just pick something from the day’s assigned reading that struck you and explain why it struck you.

Micro-reflections must be completed and submitted on Canvas by 1:00 P.M. before each class meeting. Micro-reflections submitted after this deadline will receive no credit. **Each micro-reflection counts for 1% of your final grade, up to 15%.** You will have, in total, twenty opportunities to submit micro-reflections over the course of the term. This means that you

can skip five micro-reflections without penalty. (You do not need to tell me when you're choosing not to submit a micro-reflection.) Full credit for micro-reflections is awarded when the student has made a honest attempt to complete the task; determination of this criterion is at the discretion of the instructor.

- » **Papers:** You will submit three papers over the course of the term. Your first paper will be on a topic of your choosing from *Theaetetus* 142a–186e; and your second will be on a different topic of your choosing from either *Theaetetus* 187a–210d or *Parmenides* 126a–137c. Your third paper will be a revision and expansion of either your first or your second paper. (It cannot be simply a combination of the two.) Papers should be fairly narrowly focused on the dialogues themselves, but may within reason relate this material to other historical or contemporary philosophical sources. Further instructions will be provided separately, via the course website.

Papers must be submitted via Canvas by end of day on the day they are due (or, for all you night owls, by 6 A.M. the following morning at the latest), preferably in PDF format. Late papers will be docked 5% for each 24 hour period between the due date and when they are handed in (unless accompanied by valid medical documentation). Late papers may be submitted up to 7 days after the due date; any papers not received by this time will automatically receive a 0. Formatting guidelines will be provided along with assignment prompt.

Evaluation – Graduate Students (three-paper option)

If you are a graduate student, you have a choice between two possible evaluation schemes. This option is designed for graduate students who consider themselves nonspecialists in either ancient philosophy or contemporary metaphysics and epistemology, or who would otherwise prefer to avoid putting all their evaluative eggs in one basket, as it were. On this evaluation scheme, the bulk of your grade will be spread out between three papers: one very short paper and two slightly longer papers. The remainder of your grade will come from participation in seminar meetings.

<i>Component</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Due date</i>
In-class participation	10%	N/A
End-of-class recaps	10%	(to be arranged with student)
Very short paper (1000 words)	20%	October 23
Short paper (2000 words)	30%	November 27
Short paper (2000 words)	30%	December 16

- » **End-of-class recaps:** A few times over the course of the term you will be called upon to provide a short, two to three minute recap of the day's discussion at the end of class. (The precise

number of times you will do this will depend on the total number of graduate students in the class.) The days on which you will do this will be arranged with you in advance. I will model how to do these recaps at the end of our first few meetings, before passing the responsibility off to you and your peers. The purpose of these recaps is: (a) to give you some practice at synthesizing a seminar discussion on the spot, an essential skill for any future professor to have; and (b) to give everyone the benefit of listening to a recap and synthesis of the day’s discussion.

- » **Papers:** You will submit three papers over the course of the term. Your first paper will be on a topic of your choosing from *Theaetetus* 142a–186e; your second will be on a different topic of your choosing from anywhere in the *Theaetetus*; and your third will be on a topic of your choosing from anywhere in the *Parmenides*. Papers should ideally be fairly narrowly focused on the dialogues themselves, but may, if you so desire, respond to a specific issue in the secondary literature, or relate the material in the dialogues to other historical or contemporary philosophical sources.

Papers should be submitted via email by end of day on the day they are due (or, for all you night owls, by 6 A.M. the following morning at the latest), preferably in PDF format.

Evaluation – Graduate Students (term paper option)

This option is designed for graduate students who consider themselves specialists in ancient philosophy or contemporary metaphysics and epistemology, or who would otherwise prefer to use this course as an opportunity to develop a focused piece of scholarly research. On this evaluation scheme, the bulk of your grade will consist in one final term paper. The remainder of your grade will come from participation in seminar meetings and a term paper prospectus.

<i>Component</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Due date</i>
In-class participation	10%	N/A
End-of-class recap(s)	10%	(to be arranged with student)
Term paper prospectus (1000 words)	20%	November 27
Term paper (4000 words)	60%	December 16

- » **End-of-class recaps:** See above.
- » **Term paper prospectus:** Midway through this course, between weeks eight and nine, you are to hand in a prospectus/“think-piece”: a preliminary investigation into the issue you intend to explore further in your term paper. Your prospectus should be at least 1000 words in length. It

should not be merely an outline of your term paper. It should present an original and in-depth analysis of a particular idea, issue, or argument, which will serve as the basis for your eventual term paper. The purpose of this prospectus is: (a) to give you a head-start on your term paper; and (b) to give you some early feedback on your ideas, so that you have some guidance on how to develop them in the weeks to come.

Your prospectus should be emailed to me by end of day November 27 (or, for all you night owls, by 6 A.M. the following morning at the latest), preferably in PDF format.

- » **Term paper:** The major assignment for this course is a term paper. It should be a focused, argumentative essay, defending a specific and original thesis about some aspect of the *Theaetetus* or the *Parmenides*, sensitive to (though not defined by) the existing literature on the topic. It should be approximately 4000 words in length, and not much longer; I've set this word count deliberately low so as to challenge you to be concise and economical in your argumentation, and to leave you with a term paper which can more easily be submitted to conferences for presentation.

Your term paper should be emailed to me by end of day December 16 (or, for all you night owls, by 6 A.M. the following morning at the latest), preferably in PDF format.

Honor Code

One of the aims of this (and really, *any* university-level) course is to develop your ability to express yourself intelligently and responsibly. Part of what expressing yourself intelligently and responsibly involves is situating your own views in relation to others'. Plagiarizing others' views, or failing to acknowledge views you are responding to, runs counter to this aim. Because of this, plagiarism and all other forms of academic dishonesty will be treated with the greatest severity in this course. You should make yourself familiar with the University's Honor Code; see <http://communitystandards.stanford.edu>.

Accessibility

Students with diverse learning styles and needs are welcome in this course. Students who may need an academic accommodation based on the impact of a disability must initiate the request with the Office of Accessible Education (OAE). Professional staff will evaluate the request with required documentation, recommend reasonable accommodations, and prepare an Accommodation Letter for faculty dated in the current quarter in which the request is being made. Students should contact the OAE as soon as possible since timely notice is needed to coordinate

accommodations. The OAE is located at 563 Salvatierra Walk (phone: 723-1066, URL: <http://studentaffairs.stanford.edu/oea>).

Academic Resources

The Hume Center for Writing and Speaking offers support in any and all areas of both writing and speaking. Both scheduled appointments and drop-in tutoring are available and always encouraged. New, residence-based tutoring is also available in dorms.

- Writing Tutors: <http://undergrad.stanford.edu/tutoring-support/hume-center/writing>
- Speaking Tutors: <http://undergrad.stanford.edu/tutoring-support/hume-center/speaking>
- Academic Skills Coaching: <http://adinag.youcanbook.me>

Email

Questions should ideally be brought to me in person, either at lecture or during my office hours. If you would prefer to correspond via email, my email address is williec@stanford.edu. I will respond to emails within two business days.

Detailed Schedule with Suggested Supplemental Readings

Reminder: All the readings listed below can be downloaded from: <http://bit.ly/phil107b>.

On any given day, if you are going to look at just one of the suggested secondary readings listed below, you should choose the first reading listed over the second.

9/27 Introduction | Plato's earlier metaphysics & epistemology

- Plato: *Meno* 80d–87c (on recollection), 96d–100c (on knowledge vs. true opinion); *Phaedo* 72e–77d (on recollection), 95e–103c (on Forms as causes); *Republic* v 475d–480a (on knowledge vs. opinion), vi 504e–511e (on the Form of the Good), vii 514a–519b (the Allegory of the Cave), 523a–525b (on perception)
- Harte, V., 2008. "Plato's Metaphysics." In G. Fine (ed.) "The Oxford Handbook of Plato," 191–216. Oxford University Press
- Silverman, A., 2014. "Plato's Middle Period Metaphysics and Epistemology." In E. N. Zalta (ed.) "The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy," The Metaphysics Research Lab, fall 2014 edn.
<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2014/entries/plato-metaphysics/>

9/29 The *Theaetetus*: Prologue | Definition "o"

start–151d

- Burnyeat, M. F., 1992. "Socratic Midwifery, Platonic Inspiration." In H. H. Benson (ed.) "Essays on the Philosophy of Socrates," 53–65. Oxford University Press
- Sedley, D., 1996. "Three Platonist Interpretations of the *Theaetetus*." In "Form and Argument in Late Plato," 79–103. Clarendon Press

10/4 Definition I: 'Knowledge is perception'

151d–160e

- Lee, M.-K., 2000. "The Secret Doctrine: Plato's Defence of Protagoras in the *Theaetetus*." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 19: 47–86
- Fine, G., 1996. "Conflicting Appearances: *Theaetetus* 153d–154b." In "Form and Argument in Late Plato," 105–133. Clarendon Press

10/6 Definition I: Initial objections | Refutation of Protagoras

160e–171d

- Emilsson, E. K., 1994. "Plato's Self-Refutation Argument in *Theaetetus* 171a–c Revisited." *Phronesis* 39(2): 136–149
- Burnyeat, M. F., 1976b. "Protagoras and Self-Refutation in Plato's *Theaetetus*." *The Philosophical Review* 85(2): 172–195

10/11 The digression | Refutation of Protagoras, cont'd

171d–179c

- Plato: *Apology*; *Gorgias* 484c–486b
- Rue, R., 1993. "The Philosopher in Flight: The Digression (172c–177c) in Plato's *Theaetetus*." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 11: 71–100
- Giannopoulou, Z., 2007. "Socratic Midwifery: A Second *Apology*?" *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 33: 55–87

10/13	Definition I: Refutation of Heraclitus	179c–184b
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plato: <i>Cratylus</i> 438d–440e • Silverman, A., 2000. “Flux and Language in the <i>Theaetetus</i>.” <i>Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy</i> 18: 109–152 • Thaler, N., 2013. “Plato on the Importance of “This” and “That”: The Theory of Flux and its Refutation in the <i>Theaetetus</i>.” <i>Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy</i> 45: 1–42 	
10/18	Definition I: Final refutation	184b–186e
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plato: <i>Republic</i> VII 523a–525b; Aristotle: <i>De Anima</i> III.1 (424b–425b) • Cooper, J. M., 1970. “Plato on Sense-Perception and Knowledge (<i>Theaetetus</i> 184–186).” <i>Phronesis</i> 15(2): 123–146 • Burnyeat, M. F., 1976a. “Plato on the Grammar of Perceiving.” <i>The Classical Quarterly</i> 26(1): 29–51 	
10/20	Definition II: ‘Knowledge is true judgment’ False judgment	187a–191a, 200d–201c
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plato: <i>Euthydemus</i> 285d–288a; <i>Cratylus</i> 429a–435d; <i>Sophist</i> 236e–241d, 254b–264b • Ackrill, J., 1966. “Plato on False Belief: <i>Theaetetus</i> 187–200.” <i>The Monist</i> 50(3): 383–402 • Burnyeat, M. F., 1980. “Socrates and the Jury: Paradoxes in Plato’s Distinction Between Knowledge and True Belief.” <i>Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volumes</i> 54: 173–191 	
10/25	Definition II: The wax block & the aviary	191a–200d
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Woolf, R., 2004. “A Shaggy Soul Story: How Not to Read the Wax Tablet Model in Plato’s <i>Theaetetus</i>.” <i>Philosophy and Phenomenological Research</i> 69(3): 573–604 	
10/27	Definition III: ‘Knowledge is true judgment plus an account’	201c–206b
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aristotle: <i>Metaphysics</i> Z.17 (1041a–1042a) • Burnyeat, M. F., 1970. “The Material and Sources of Plato’s Dream.” <i>Phronesis</i> 15(2): 101–122 • Thaler, N., 2011. “Taking the Syllable Apart: The <i>Theaetetus</i> on Elements and Knowledge.” <i>Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy</i> 41: 201–228 	
11/1	Definition III: The meaning of ‘account’	206c–end
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morrow, G. R., 1970. “Plato and the Mathematicians: An Interpretation of Socrates’ Dream in the <i>Theaetetus</i> (201e–206c).” <i>The Philosophical Review</i> 79(3): 309–333 • Thomas, C. J., 2002. “<i>Theaetetus</i>’ Snubness and the Contents of Plato’s Thoughts.” <i>Ancient Philosophy</i> 22: 53–74 	
11/3	The <i>Theaetetus</i> in retrospect	review
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nehamas, A., 1984. “<i>Episteme</i> and <i>Logos</i> in Plato’s Later Thought.” <i>Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie</i> 66(1): 11–36 • Fine, G., 1979. “Knowledge and <i>Logos</i> in the <i>Theaetetus</i>.” <i>The Philosophical Review</i> 88(3): 366–397 	

11/8	The <i>Parmenides</i> , Part I: The Forms, defended The Whole–Part Dilemma	<i>start–131e</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plato: <i>Phaedo</i> 100b–103c • Harte, V., 2002. <i>Plato on Parts and Wholes: The Metaphysics of Structure</i>. Oxford University Press [Chapter 2] 	
11/10	Part I: The Bigness & Likeness Regresses	<i>131e–133a</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aristotle: <i>Peri Ideōn (On Ideas)</i> 83.32–85.3 [available from http://bit.ly/phil1107b] • Vlastos, G., 1954. “The Third Man Argument in the <i>Parmenides</i>.” <i>The Philosophical Review</i> 63(3): 319–349 • Meinwald, C. C., 1992. “Good-bye to the Third Man.” In R. Kraut (ed.) “The Cambridge Companion to Plato,” 365–396. Cambridge University Press • Schofield, M., 1996. “Likeness and Likenesses in the <i>Parmenides</i>.” In C. Gill and M. M. McCabe (eds.) “Form and Argument in Late Plato,” 61–89. Clarendon Press 	
11/15	Part I: The “Greatest Difficulty” for the theory of Forms	<i>133a–134e</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plato: <i>Republic</i> v 475d–480a • Peterson, S., 1981. “The Greatest Difficulty for Plato’s Theory of Forms: The Unknowability Argument of <i>Parmenides</i> 133c–134c.” <i>Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie</i> 63: 1–16 • Duncombe, M., 2013. “The Greatest Difficulty at <i>Parmenides</i> 133c–134e and Plato’s Relative Terms.” <i>Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy</i> 45: 43–61 	
11/17	Transition to Part II	<i>134e–137c</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peterson, S., 2000. “The Language Game in Plato’s <i>Parmenides</i>.” <i>Ancient Philosophy</i> 20: 19–51 	
11/29	Part II: Mary Margaret McCabe’s view	<i>137c–end*</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • McCabe, M. M., 1996. “Unity in the <i>Parmenides</i>: The Unity of the <i>Parmenides</i>.” In C. Gill and M. M. McCabe (eds.) “Form and Argument in Late Plato,” 5–47. Clarendon Press 	
12/1	Part II: Constance Meinwald’s view	<i>137c–end*</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meinwald, C., 2014. “How Does Plato’s Exercise Work?” <i>Dialogue</i> 53(3): 465–494 • Peterson, S., 1996. “Plato’s <i>Parmenides</i>: A Principle of Interpretation and Seven Arguments.” <i>Journal of the History of Philosophy</i> 34(2): 167–192 	
12/6	Part II: Mary Louise Gill’s view	<i>137c–end*</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gill, M. L., 2014. “Design of the Exercise in Plato’s <i>Parmenides</i>.” <i>Dialogue</i> 53(3): 495–520 	

Commentaries

There are a number of modern commentaries on the *Theaetetus* and the *Parmenides* (as well as one ancient Neoplatonic commentary on the *Parmenides*, which has been translated into English), all of which may be of use and interest throughout the term:

- Burnyeat, M. F. and Levett, M. J., 1990. *The Theaetetus of Plato*. Hackett Publishing Company
- Sedley, D., 2004. *The Midwife of Platonism: Text and Subtext in Plato's Theaetetus*. Oxford University Press
- Chappell, T., 2004. *Reading Plato's Theaetetus*. Academia Verlag
- McDowell, J., 1973. *Plato: Theaetetus*. Oxford University Press
- Cornford, F. M., 1934. *Plato's Theory of Knowledge: The Theaetetus and the Sophist of Plato*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd
- Campbell, L., 1883. *The Theaetetus of Plato*. Oxford University Press, 2nd edn
- Gill, M. L. and Ryan, P., 1996. *Plato: Parmenides*. Hackett Publishing Company
- Sayre, K. M., 1996. *Parmenides' Lesson: Translation and Explication of Plato's Parmenides*. University of Notre Dame Press
- Meinwald, C. C., 1991. *Plato's Parmenides*. Oxford University Press
- Allen, R. E., 1983. *Plato's Parmenides*. University of Minnesota Press
- Cornford, F. M., 1939. *Plato and Parmenides: Parmenides' Way of Truth and Plato's Parmenides*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd
- Morrow, G. R. and Dillon, J. M., 1987. *Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Parmenides*. Princeton University Press

Those planning to read or refer to the dialogue in Greek should be looking at the Oxford Classical Texts edition: the *Theaetetus* is found in *Platonis Opera* tomus I (either Burnet (ed.), or the newer Duke et al. (eds.)); the *Parmenides* is in tomus II (Burnet (ed.)).

Basic Schedule

DATE	TOPIC(S)	READING
9/27	Introduction Plato's earlier metaphysics & epistemology	
9/29	The <i>Theaetetus</i> : Prologue Definition "o"	<i>start–151d</i>
10/4	Definition I: 'Knowledge is perception'	<i>151d–160e</i>
10/6	Definition I: Initial objections Refutation of Protagoras	<i>160e–171d</i>
10/11	The digression Refutation of Protagoras, cont'd	<i>171d–179c</i>
10/13	Definition I: Refutation of Heraclitus	<i>179c–184b</i>
10/18	Definition I: Final refutation	<i>184b–186e</i>
10/20	Definition II: 'Knowledge is true judgment' False judgment	<i>187a–191a, 200d–201c</i>
10/23	FIRST PAPER DUE	
10/25	Definition II: The wax block & the aviary	<i>191a–200d</i>
10/27	Definition III: 'Knowledge is true judgment plus an account'	<i>201c–206b</i>
11/1	Definition III: The meaning of 'account'	<i>206c–end</i>
11/3	The <i>Theaetetus</i> in retrospect	<i>review</i>
11/8	The <i>Parmenides</i> , Part I: The Forms, defended The Whole–Part Dilemma	<i>start–131e</i>
11/10	Part I: The Bigness & Likeness Regresses	<i>131e–133a</i>
11/15	Part I: The "Greatest Difficulty" for the theory of Forms	<i>133a–134e</i>
11/17	Transition to Part II	<i>134e–137c</i>
11/27	SECOND PAPER (OR TERM PAPER PROSPECTUS) DUE	
11/29	Part II: Mary Margaret McCabe's view	<i>137c–end*</i>
12/1	Part II: Constance Meinwald's view	<i>137c–end*</i>
12/6	Part II: Mary Louise Gill's view	<i>137c–end*</i>
12/8	The <i>Parmenides</i> in retrospect	<i>review</i>
12/16	FINAL PAPER (OR TERM PAPER) DUE	

*The primary reading for these classes is the associated piece of secondary literature: McCabe (1996), Meinwald (2014), and Gill (2014), respectively; available from <http://bit.ly/phil107b>