

L'ordito e la trama
Il Sofista platonico e la tessitura del λόγος

Walter Cavini

Bildliche Ausdrücke, mit Vorsicht gebraucht, können
immerhin etwas zur Verdeutlichung beitragen.

Frege 1918-1919, p. 157

In Plato's Sophist 261d1-262e3 two main claims are maintained about names, verbs, and sentences: a syntactic claim, according to which a sentence is neither a list of names nor a list of verbs but the 'interweaving' of verbs with names; and a semantic claim, according to which both names and verbs signify something but something radically different: verbs signify actions (πράξεις), i.e. acts or activities, and names signify agents (πράττοντες). In this paper I will briefly discuss and criticize Nicholas Denyer's and Donald Davidson's ambivalent reactions to these main claims. They both agree (within limits as for Denyer) with the syntactic claim and disagree with the semantic one. What I try to prove, through a joint reading of Plato's Sophist and Aristotle's linguistic section of the de Interpretatione, is that their disagreement with Plato's semantic claim is ungrounded. A special attention will be given, in this context, to Plato's weaving metaphor of συμπλοκή ('interweaving') to be compared with Frege's chemical metaphor of 'saturation' as the key to understand the syntactic and semantic unity of sentence.

Keywords: *Davidson, Denyer, Intreccio, Platone, Predicazione*

Nel suo libro postumo *Truth and Predication*, Donald Davidson esalta come «una tesi straordinaria» («a portentous claim») del *Sofista* platonico quella secondo cui una frase (*sentence*) non è né una lista di nomi né una lista di verbi, ma deve contenere sia un nome sostantivo (*noun*) sia un verbo: