The GCAS Review Journal
Vol. II, Issue 1/2025
© Filippo Scafi
Available online at: https://www.gcasreview.com/philosophy-and-social-commitment

Dialogue, Containment, and Planetary Philosophy

Filippo Scafi
Global Center for Advanced Studies (GCAS)
School of Materialist Research (SMR)
filippo@gcas.ie

Abstract: This essay examines Plato's paradoxical choice to write dialogues despite his critique of writing as "inhuman" in the Phaedrus and Seventh Letter. Rather than transmitting doctrines, Plato's dialogues aim to preserve the function of Socratic discourse: a logos of questioning, refutation, and maieutic discovery. Drawing on Michel Serres, Jacques Derrida, and Wilfred Bion, I argue that the dialogues are technologies of transmission that formalize dialogue as the condition of philosophy while dramatizing their own insufficiency. Serres highlights the Platonic dialogue as the intersubjective genesis of abstraction, extracting order from noise, the formal from the empirical; Derrida shows that this abstraction is already a form of writing, haunted by absence and deferral; and Bion's theory of containment illuminates Socratic elenchus as a container-function, metabolizing confusion into thought, though always marked by the structural determinations of its container. The analogy reveals that no pure containment or universal transmission exists: every philosophical form leaks its own borders, shaping what it contains. The Platonic wager thus anticipates the contemporary problem of planetary philosophy: how to transmit thought across crises and cultural differences without reducing the Other to doctrine or abandoning universality to relativism. Philosophy's universality emerges here as a task—the invention of dialogical forms of containment that hold open spaces where truth may appear in relation.

The GCASReview Journal is a Publication of GCAS College Dublin, Ltd.

This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0) license, which permits others to copy or share the article, provided original work is properly cited and that this is not done for commercial purposes. Users may not remix, transform, or build upon the material and may not distribute the modified material (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Introduction

Few issues in the history of philosophy are as enigmatic, and as structurally decisive, as Plato's relation to writing. At once a poet of dialogue and a critic of inscription, Plato gives us texts that refuse to be either doctrinal treatises or mere literary entertainments. His writings stage conversations that put philosophy into motion without ever allowing it to settle into final form. The paradox has been noted since antiquity: Plato (or: his characters), who in the *Phaedrus* condemns writing as "inhuman," composes some of the most artful and enduring works of literature in the Western tradition. This paradox raises a fundamental question that has accompanied philosophy ever since: how can thought be transmitted without betraying itself?

For Plato, the problem was sharpened by the legacy of Socrates. Socrates left no writings, and his philosophy was not a body of doctrine but a way of living, a function of discourse: questioning, refuting, and generating perplexity in others. To inherit Socrates was not to inherit a set of theses but to inherit a practice, a logos that was itself a mode of relation. Plato's wager was that this *logos* could be preserved—if not as doctrine, then as dramatized conversation. Yet this wager always verges on contradiction. To put into writing the function of dialogue is to risk freezing what depends on presence, immediacy, and unpredictability.

This essay pursues that paradox through three theoretical lenses. First, Michel Serres's account of dialogue as the intersubjective genesis of abstraction: the Platonic dialogue formalizes communication, abstracting order from noise, but always at risk of sterilization. Second, Derrida's critique of Plato's hierarchy of speech and writing: the abstraction of dialogue is already a form of writing, haunted by absence and deferral. Third, Wilfred Bion's psychoanalytic theory of containment: the Platonic dialogue can be read as a container-function, metabolizing confusion into thinkable form, though always marked by the determinations of its container.

These frameworks converge on a central thesis: Plato's dialogues are technologies of transmission that dramatize the impossibility of transmitting pure logos. They preserve Socratic philosophy by staging its form rather than by inscribing its content. But in doing so, they also reveal that all transmission is structurally determined, leaking the limits of its container, never pure. The stakes are not merely historical. In a planetary present marked by violence, displacement, and crisis, the problem of transmission returns as the problem of philosophy itself: how to contain, metabolize, and transmit thought across irreducible difference without erasing it.

1. Plato's Dialogues and the Problem of Writing

The Platonic dialogue is one of philosophy's most enigmatic forms. Unlike the treatises of Aristotle or the aphorisms of Heraclitus, Plato's writings take the form of dramatic exchanges in specific contexts—banquets, trials, walks outside the city walls—where Socrates and others engage in inquiry. Scholars have long debated what this form signifies. Nineteenth-century interpreters such as Schleiermacher already stressed the unity of form and content, while more recent studies insist that the dramatic and narrative dimensions of the dialogues are inseparable from their philosophical meaning (Blondell 2002; Fossheim et al. 2020). The dialogue is at once a literary artifact and a philosophical act: it enacts philosophy rather than transmitting a body of doctrines (Hyland 2004). The anonymity of Plato's own voice reinforces this: no character can be simply equated with Plato himself (Press 2000).

Yet this choice of form collides with Plato's own suspicion of writing. In the *Phaedrus* (274b–278b), Socrates recounts the myth of Theuth, the Egyptian inventor of writing, only to have King Thamus reject the gift as a false elixir. Writing, he argues, produces forgetfulness, substituting external marks for inner memory, and offers only the semblance of wisdom. A written text is mute: it cannot answer questions or adapt to the reader. Plato compares it to an orphaned child, wandering without its father's protection, vulnerable to misinterpretation (*Phaedrus* 275e–276a). The *Seventh Letter* (341c–344d) goes further: no serious philosopher, Plato claims, would ever commit ultimate truths to writing, since knowledge emerges only through long dialectical exchange culminating in a sudden flash of insight.

This ambivalence has been interpreted in the wider context of Greece's transition from orality to literacy. Havelock (1963) saw Plato's rejection of poetry and writing as part of a cultural revolution: philosophy sought to replace oral epic with literate abstraction. Ong (1982) framed Plato's suspicion as a reaction of someone steeped in oral culture to the disruptive technology of alphabetic writing. Derrida (1972), however, famously deconstructed the opposition: writing is not simply secondary to speech but the very structure of signification, a *pharmakon*—poison and remedy, cure and contamination. Plato's own dialogues, containing critiques of writing within written form, already betray the impossibility of maintaining a pure boundary.

Why, then, did Plato write at all? Scholars suggest that the dialogue is a deliberate compromise. By avoiding the systematic treatise, Plato distances himself from dogmatism; by writing in dialogue, he simulates the vitality of live exchange. The dialogues thus function as what Derrida calls "self-limiting writing": they inscribe their own insufficiency, not

transmitting truths but provoking thought in the reader (Derrida 1972). In this sense, the dialogue form is both a concession and an invention: a way to preserve the Socratic inheritance while acknowledging that it cannot be captured.

2. Transmission and the Socratic Inheritance

What is at stake, then, is the very possibility of transmitting Socratic philosophy. Plato inherits a master who refused to write, and he must decide how to make that inheritance live beyond the time of Socratic presence. The dialogue form appears as a compromise: not a doctrinal treatise, but a written simulation of live exchange. It is a way of conjuring Socrates while also warding him off, maintaining both presence and absence, memory and difference. What Plato inherits from Socrates is not doctrine but a practice: the logos as questioning, refutation, and maieutic discovery. To transmit Socrates is to transmit a function of discourse, a *logos*: the generative power of dialogue itself. The dialogues thus attempt to capture not what Socrates knew, but what Socrates did.

Catherine Zuckert (2009) has argued that Plato even orders the dialogues to present a pedagogical trajectory of Socratic philosophy, portraying Socrates guiding others to self-discovery in works like the *Meno* and *Theaetetus*. The dialogues dramatize Socratic practice rather than summarizing it. Gerald Press (2000) insists that no character is Plato's mouthpiece; instead, the reader must engage the arguments, becoming a silent interlocutor. Bakhtin (1984) saw in this polyphony an early form of literary dialogism: truth arises not from a single voice but from the interplay of voices, often unresolved.

The stakes of this strategy are clear. To write Socrates is to risk betraying him; to not write is to risk losing him altogether. Plato's solution is to stage Socrates in action, to preserve the function of dialogue while refusing to freeze it into doctrine. This is why the dialogues so often end in aporia: they model the process of philosophizing rather than delivering conclusions. They are invitations to think, not monuments to thought.

This paradox of preservation and betrayal also resonates with Pierre Hadot's notion of philosophy as a *way of life* (Hadot 1995). For Hadot, philosophical texts in antiquity were not primarily theoretical expositions but spiritual exercises, designed to transform the reader's mode of being. The Platonic dialogue can thus be read as a textual exercise that both reenacts and provokes the experience of philosophy, keeping alive a form of life rather than transmitting propositions. Derrida's notion of the *supplement* (Derrida 1976) further clarifies this tension: writing supplements Socrates' presence, both compensating for its absence and exposing the

impossibility of full preservation. The dialogues therefore stand at the hinge between memory and invention: they inherit a vanished master, but in the very act of transmission, they reconfigure philosophy as something that can be staged, re-performed, and perpetually renewed.

3. Serres: Dialogue, Noise, and Abstraction

This is precisely where Michel Serres' analysis becomes illuminating. In *Hermès I*, Serres does not approach the Platonic dialogue as a neutral literary form but as the very scene where abstraction and communication are born together. He begins from graphism—writing as drawing or mark (*graphe*)—to distinguish between the essential traits of a written sign (form, grammar, syntactic regularity) and its accidental traits, the contingent marks of the hand such as hesitation, error, or affect, which he calls cacography (Serres 2015, 30–34). For communication to succeed, interlocutors must share a key (code) for encoding and decoding form, and at the same time suppress the accidental features that obscure it. This technical problem extends directly into epistemology: in mathematics and logic we never reason about *this* particular chalked sign but about the abstract entity recognized across instances; recognition of form is simultaneously an act of intersubjective agreement. Serres thus equates the act of eliminating noise with the dual birth of abstraction and community: formalization is at once the passage from noisy marks to ideal invariants and the constitution of a communicative "we" (Serres 2015, 35–36).

On this reading, the Platonic dialogue is never simply dyadic but structurally triangular, since communication always involves a third element: noise, the "parasite," which must be continually excluded. The deepest problem of dialogue is not simply the Other, which remains a variation of the Same, but this third man, the demon of interference that constantly intrudes (Serres 2015, 33–34). Plato's aporetic dialogues dramatize precisely this difficulty: they end in stalemate not because they fail but because they reveal the persistent intrusion of noise, the impossibility of absolute purification. Against this, mathematics figures as the paradigm of (almost) perfect communication, the space where the third is nearly excluded and recognition becomes universal. Serres therefore situates the Platonic dialogue alongside the emergence of geometry as part of what historiography calls the "Greek miracle": the same labor of excluding noise and stabilizing recognition generates both abstract form and the intersubjective space of philosophical agreement (Serres 2015, 36–37).

The technical hinge of Serres' argument lies in his relocation of the classic "problem of

the symbol" from logic to the intersubjective scene. A symbol's identity is secured not in itself but through recognition across variant inscriptions, and this recognition is inseparable from communal agreement. In Platonic terms, the sand-drawn square or diagonal is never the scribble before us but the form recognized through it. The empirical stroke serves only as a vehicle, subordinated to the process of abstraction that extracts meaning by excluding noise. For Serres, this exclusion is always provisional: empiricity itself—tone, gesture, accident—is the most powerful "demon" of noise, perpetually threatening to overwhelm communication (Serres 2015, 34–36). The Platonic dialectic, like early geometry, is thus a process of purification, a labor of stabilizing form and meaning against the grain of empirical contingency.

Serres' reading has important consequences. First, it clarifies why writing is not simply an enemy to dialogue but a medium that radicalizes the anti-noise labor. Writing multiplies and stores messages, but it also foregrounds the task of filtering out accident and interference. In this sense, the Platonic dialogue does not merely describe philosophy but enacts the anti-noise struggle: it stages the work of recognizing form amidst empirical cacography. Second, it shows why the dialogue is structurally incomplete: every communication must negotiate noise anew, and every aporia is the mark of this ongoing struggle. As Serres notes, mathematics and philosophy are born together as practices of exorcism, endlessly repeating the labor of excluding the third. The Platonic dialogue is thus not a stylistic flourish but the exemplary apparatus where abstraction and community are constituted together (Serres 2015, 37).

Secondary scholarship has reinforced this interpretation. Harari and Bell (1982) situate Serres' Platonic essay within his broader "mytho-scientific" method, which reads literature and mathematics as co-producing forms through processes of translation and mediation. Maria Assad (1999) emphasizes that the *Hermès* series and *The Parasite* share the same problematic—order emerging from disorder—where noise is not only a threat but also the very condition of form. Paul Harris (2015) likewise stresses that Serres' work demonstrates how noise is never eliminated but continually negotiated, making philosophy a recursive handling of interference. David Bell (2010) underscores the same point in his account of Serres for the *History of Continental Philosophy*: communication, not system, is primary, and Plato's dialogues are the privileged scene where philosophy is constituted through circuits of transmission, relay, and exclusion.

From this perspective, Serres' contribution can be condensed in a single claim: Plato's dialogues do not simply transmit doctrines but aim to enact the intersubjective labor of extracting invariants from noisy marks. They show how the very possibility of philosophy depends on the purification of cacography and the continual struggle with the "third man". In

doing so, they *found* rather than presuppose the "we" of philosophy.

4. Derrida: Arche-writing and the Spectral Invitation

Yet Serres' celebration of abstraction confronts a problem that Derrida helps to articulate: what exactly is abstracted in Plato? It is not merely objects or concepts but the very *function* of dialogue itself. Serres still presumes abstraction's purity whereas Derrida insists on its contamination by writing from the outset. To conceptualize the gesture of questioning is already to perform an operation analogous to writing: transforming lived exchanges into symbols, into repeatable structures. Derrida's notion of *arche-écriture*, the structure of difference and spacing underlying all signification, suggests that abstraction is already a form of writing (Derrida 1967). Even before inscription, the gesture of isolating form from instance is an act of writing.

Here lies Plato's paradox. Mathematics can abstract the circle from imperfect drawings, but the abstraction of dialogue remains sketchy, incomplete. It requires presence, embodiment, the immediacy of interlocutors. The Platonic dialogue attempts to stage this presence by effacing the author, refusing omniscient narration, and inviting the reader to become a participant. Yet, as Derrida notes, this invitation is spectral. It is never explicit, always deferred, haunting the text as a demand that can only be fulfilled by the reader's own act of philosophizing. Plato's dialogues thus oscillate between staging presence and exposing absence, between conjuring Socrates and revealing his irretrievable loss.

My argument builds on this paradox. Plato turns to writing not to produce truths but to stage dialogue as the condition of philosophy itself. The dialogues are therefore not repositories of doctrines but technologies of transmission, artifacts with their own agency (*à la* Gell 1998). For Gell, agency does not mean that objects literally possess will, but that they act as indices in networks of social relations, mediating intentions and producing effects beyond the control of their makers. A work of art – or here, a Platonic dialogue – functions as a secondary agent that extends the presence of its author/referents, shaping the responses of readers and interlocutors long after the original situation has passed. The dialogues formalize the Socratic encounter while acknowledging the impossibility of reproducing it in pure form. This gesture raises the broader question: is it worth exposing philosophy to the contagion of writing in order to secure its survival as discourse? Plato's wager suggests that philosophy cannot avoid this risk, for only by accepting the inhuman medium of writing can Socratic truth be preserved as an event of dialogue open to everyone.

5. Socratic Gestures and Psychoanalytic Containment

The Socratic methods of *elenchus* and *maieutics* are paradigmatic of this tension. They require presence, immediacy, and responsiveness. The interlocutor projects opinions, confusions, anxieties; Socrates receives them, holds them, and returns them in transformed form. Many commentators have noted the resemblance to psychoanalysis (Ricoeur 1970; Vlastos 1994; Fink 1997; Lear 1998). Like the analyst, Socrates does not teach doctrines but facilitates the birth of the other's thought.

Here Bion's theory of containment becomes illuminating. In *Learning from Experience* (1962), Bion describes the container–contained relation: the patient projects raw, unassimilable "beta-elements" into the analyst, who metabolizes them through alpha-function and returns them as thinkable symbols. Socrates' dialogue functions similarly: interlocutors expel confused opinions, which Socrates receives and re-presents in clarified, though often aporetic, form. The goal is not indoctrination but the internalization of the capacity to think.

This analogy helps us to see why Socratic dialogue is often frustrating for interlocutors: the process of containment requires the subject to endure the pain of disorientation before meaning can emerge. In psychoanalysis, the analyst must tolerate and hold the patient's projections without prematurely resolving them; likewise, Socrates sustains *aporia* as a necessary moment of transformation (Lear 1998, 28–33). Martha Nussbaum (1986) has argued that the emotional experience of perplexity is not an incidental byproduct but central to Platonic pedagogy, an affective preparation for philosophical conversion. Containment here is not comfort but the capacity to bear anxiety long enough for it to become thinkable. This reframes the *elenchus* not as refutation alone, but as a therapeutic process in which the interlocutor learns to contain his own thought.

Bion himself experimented with dialogical writing in *A Memoir of the Future* (1975–79), staging exchanges between analyst, patient, and a third reflective voice. Like Plato's dialogues, these texts refuse monological authority, dramatizing thought in relation. Both Plato and Bion grasp that thought is born not in solitary reflection but in the space between interlocutors, where projections are contained, transformed, and returned. This is why Bion insisted on the analyst's "negative capability" (after Keats): the capacity to remain in uncertainty without rushing to explanation (Bion 1970). Socratic irony performs the same function: by feigning ignorance, Socrates creates a space where interlocutors must work through their own confusion, metabolizing it into understanding. Both Plato and Bion, then, dramatize not the transmission of knowledge but the conditions for its emergence, showing that

thinking is a relational achievement, dependent on containment, patience, and the willingness to sustain absence of closure.

6. Transfer, Presence, and the Limits of Mediation

For both Socrates and Bion, this process requires a living relation. Truth emerges only in the immediacy of presence. Plato's suspicion of writing reflects this: dialogue loses vitality when severed from interlocutors. Bion likewise insists that transformation occurs only in the analytic situation, through the live transfer of projections into the analyst's containing function. Interpretation is not information but gesture; it becomes effective only in the here-and-now of the session.

This underlines a crucial point: transmission in both Socratic and analytic contexts cannot be fully mediated. Writing can gesture toward the function, but it cannot replace the presence that makes it operative. Plato's dialogues preserve the function of Socratic logos by staging it, but they also acknowledge their own insufficiency. They are records that dramatize their inability to capture the act itself.

Containment, however, is never neutral. For Bion, the analyst's alpha-function transforms beta-elements into symbols, but this transformation is mediated by the analyst's own psychic structure and capacity for *reverie* (Bion 1962; Grotstein 2007). What is returned to the patient is not untouched freedom but material already shaped by the container. Similarly, Socratic maieutics, while professing ignorance, channels interlocutors' thought into certain rational forms, exposing contradictions but privileging dialectical reasoning (Vlastos 1994; Brickhouse and Smith 1994).

This raises a difficult question: is there such a thing as a "pure" containment, a self-containing function that allows absolute freedom of thought? The answer would need a lot more space to be digested, and it is not the point of this article. We can provisionally say, via Bion himself, that every operation of containment leaks its own determinations, inscribing doctrinal borders even as it liberates. The Platonic dialogue reveals this ambivalence: it emancipates by enabling thought, but also frames what counts as philosophy. Derrida's notion of *pharmakon* captures this double bind: containment both cures and poisons, enables and contaminates (Derrida 1972). It is in this sense that we can understand the fact that even Socratic speech is already a form of writing: it produces a *vectorial container*.

The theatrical character of Plato's dialogues underscores this. By fictionalizing Socratic conversations, Plato reduces presence for the sake of preservation, but in doing so he also

demonstrates that even Socratic interrogation itself was already a form of containment, determined by logical form and cultural context. Between Socrates and Plato, the difference is less of kind than of degree: both contain, both shape, both delimit.

Conclusion: Toward a Planetary Philosophy

Plato's problem of transmission thus becomes an early meditation on the limits of philosophy's universality. What is transmitted is not pure logos but a structurally determined function of containment. The container—be it Socrates, Plato, or the analyst—is never absolute but always shaped by inheritance and remodulation. Every abstraction remains tethered to the empirical stratum from which it arises.

Here Serres's analysis of mathematics acquires a broader significance. Just as the pure circle can only be abstracted from imperfect drawings, the pure logos can only be abstracted from noisy dialogues. But the abstraction never escapes entirely; it carries traces of the empirical. Containment, likewise, is always both formal and empirical: it idealizes, but always in relation to the density of speech, gesture, and suffering. There is no pure container, only determinate containers, each leaking its limits into what they contain.

This recognition reframes the claim to universality. Philosophy's universality is not an a priori presupposition but a task: to invent forms of containment that can hold open spaces for truth while acknowledging their own determinations. Universality is always contingent, inherited, remodulated.

Seen in this light, Plato's paradox speaks directly to the planetary problem posed by our present. In a world marked by wars, displacement, and atrocities, philosophy faces the challenge of transmission across radical difference. Should philosophy speak for the Other, or make space for the Other to speak? Should it impose universal truths, or retreat into relativism?

The model of containment suggests a third path. Philosophy cannot avoid shaping what it contains, but it can acknowledge its determinations, resist the illusion of purity, and strive to metabolize rather than to dominate. Its task is not to impose ideal forms on the world, nor to abandon form to chaos, but to hold open a space where truth can emerge in relation. Like Plato's dialogues, philosophy today must invent forms that transmit not doctrines but the function of discourse itself, enabling others to think.

This means reimagining philosophy as planetary containment: a fragile, imperfect, but necessary labor of metabolizing global noise into spaces of dialogue. Just as Plato preserved Socrates without freezing him, philosophy must preserve the possibility of thought across

cultures without erasing their differences. The universality of philosophy is thus not a possession but a possibility: the possibility of sustaining dialogue on a planetary scale.

In this sense, Plato's wager remains ours. Philosophy survives not by purifying itself into absolute truth but by accepting the inhuman medium of writing, the determinations of containment, the inevitability of leakage. It survives by inheriting and remodulating, by returning abstraction to empiricity, by keeping open the space of dialogue. To philosophize today is to accept this ambivalence as the very condition of thought—and to risk, with Plato, that only through such ambivalent containment can philosophy live at all.

This proposal resonates with contemporary efforts to think philosophy on a planetary scale. Enrique Dussel (2013) insists that philosophy must provincialize its Eurocentric heritage and open itself to the epistemic demands of the "South," while Achille Mbembe (2017) frames our condition as one of planetary entanglement in which colonial histories and technological futures converge. For Souleymane Bachir Diagne (2018), translation rather than domination is the paradigm of philosophy today: to philosophize is to translate between idioms, to acknowledge irreducible plurality while seeking mutual intelligibility. Édouard Glissant (1997) speaks of a "poetics of relation" that resists the totalizing impulse of universalism without collapsing into relativism, imagining a planetary community grounded in opacity and reciprocity. All of these perspectives converge with the model of containment: universality is not pre-given but emerges through the fragile labor of metabolizing difference without annihilating it, a labor of relational thinking that accepts its own determinations.

In a different register, Benjamin Bratton (2021) has argued that planetary crises—ecological collapse, computational infrastructures, pandemics—demand that philosophy reckon with the scale of the planet as a technical and political condition. His *Terraforming* project reframes philosophy as part of a design problem: how to create planetary systems of survival that metabolize not only resources but also knowledges and modes of thought. Read alongside Plato and Bion, Bratton's work underscores that containment is never purely intellectual: it is infrastructural, ecological, and systemic. The question is not whether philosophy can articulate a single universal but whether it can sustain the circuits of translation, design, and relation that allow planetary coexistence. In this way, contemporary planetary thought gives flesh to the Platonic wager: philosophy persists only by inventing forms of containment that are porous, remodulated, and oriented toward survival in common.

Bibliography

Assad, Maria. *Reading with Michel Serres: An Encounter with Time*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1999.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Translated by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Bell, David F. "Michel Serres." In *The History of Continental Philosophy*, vol. 6, edited by Peter Gratton and Paul J. Ennis, 267–288. Durham: Acumen, 2010.

Bion, Wilfred R. *A Memoir of the Future*. 3 vols. London: Karnac, 1975–79.

——. *Attention and Interpretation*. London: Tavistock, 1970.

——. *Learning from Experience*. London: Heinemann, 1962.

Blondell, Ruby. *The Play of Character in Plato's Dialogues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Bratton, Benjamin. *The Terraforming*. Strelka Press, 2021.

Brickhouse, Thomas C., and Nicholas D. Smith. *Plato's Socrates*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976 [1967].

——. "La pharmacie de Platon." In *La dissémination*, 69–197. Paris: Seuil, 1972. [Translated as "Plato's Pharmacy" in *Dissemination*, trans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.]

Diagne, Souleymane Bachir. *Postcolonial Bergson*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2018.

Dussel, Enrique. *Ethics of Liberation in the Age of Globalization and Exclusion*. Trans. Nelson Maldonado-Torres et al. Durham: Duke University Press, 2013.

Fossheim, Hallvard J., Vigdis Songe-Møller, and Elinor Mason, eds. *Philosophy as Drama: Plato's Thinking through Dialogue*. London: Routledge, 2020.

Gell, Alfred. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Glissant, Édouard. *Poetics of Relation*. Trans. Betsy Wing. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.

Grotstein, James S. *A Beam of Intense Darkness: Wilfred Bion's Legacy to Psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac, 2007.

Hadot, Pierre. *Philosophy as a Way of Life*. Translated by Michael Chase. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

Harari, Josué V., and David F. Bell, eds. *Michel Serres: Hermes—Literature, Science, Philosophy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.

Havelock, Eric. *Preface to Plato*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Hyland, Drew. *Questioning Platonism: Continental Interpretations of Plato*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2004.

Lear, Jonathan. *Open Minded: Working Out the Logic of the Soul*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard

University Press, 1998.

Mbembe, Achille. *Critique of Black Reason*. Trans. Laurent Dubois. Durham: Duke University Press, 2017.

Nails, Debra. *The People of Plato: A Prosopography of Plato and Other Socratics*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2002.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Methuen, 1982.

Plato. *Phaedrus*. In *Plato: Complete Works*, edited by John M. Cooper. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997.

——. *Seventh Letter*. In *Plato: Complete Works*, edited by John M. Cooper. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997.

Press, Gerald. *Plato: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London: Continuum, 2000.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*. Translated by Denis Savage. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

Serres, Michel. *Hermes: Literature, Science, Philosophy*. Vol. 1. Translated by Lawrence R. Schehr. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015 [1968].

Vlastos, Gregory. *Socratic Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Zuckert, Catherine H. *Plato's Philosophers: The Coherence of the Dialogues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.