



Εἶδος, ἰδέα, παράδειγμα: osservazioni sulla natura del Santo in *Eutifrone* 6d–10e

Emanuele Maffi

Cultore in Storia della Filosofia Antica, Università degli Studi di Bergamo,

Milan, Italy

emanuele.maffi@gmail.com

Abstract

Plato's *Euthyphro* has been interpreted in two ways. The first one, given by Vlastos, is the so-called “developmentalism” according to which in the *Euthyphro* (and in the early dialogues) we cannot find any ‘theory of Forms’, which belongs only to Plato's middle dialogues, but nothing more than a search for definitions. The second one, supported by Allen, claims instead that in the *Euthyphro* we can find the early (or Socratic) theory of Forms, a theory that has some common items as well as some differences with the later (or Platonic) theory of Forms. Through the detailed analysis of the refutation of Euthyphro second definition of holiness I argue that the ontological status of Holiness and its causal role is already the status and the role played by the Forms in Plato's middle works. So a metaphysical meaning can be assigned to εἶδος, ἰδέα, παράδειγμα already in the *Euthyphro*.

Keywords

Platone – Idee – *Eutifrone* – santo – εἶδος – ἰδέα – παράδειγμα – auto-predicazione – causalità

1 Introduzione

In un suo contributo relativamente recente Francesco Fronterotta ha avuto il merito di riproporre il problema del nesso che, nei dialoghi giovanili (in particolare *Eutifrone* e *Ippia Maggiore*), lega la domanda socratica al tipo di oggetto