(1)

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA RIVERSIDE
the gorgias of plato.

## THE

## GORGIAS <br> of

## PLATO,

CHIEFLY ACCORDING TO STALLBAUM'S TEXT,

WITH

N O TES,

BY

THEODORE D. WOOLSEY.
president of yale college.

Athenis diligentius legi Gorgiam: quo in libro in hoc maxime admirabar Platonem, quod mihi in oratoribus irridendis ipse esse orator summus videbatur.

Cic. de Oeatore, I. 11.

NEW EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS.

BOSTON AND CAMBRIDGE:
JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY.
1856.

# PA 4279 Q 7 1848 

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1848, by James Munhue and Company, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

CAMBRIDGE:
stereotyped and printed by
METCALFAND COMPANY, printers to the university.

## PROFESSOR FELTON

OF IARTARD UNIVERSITY<br>TIIS EDITION OF GORGIAS<br>IS INSCRIBED,<br>AS A MEMORIAT OF LONG FRIENDSEIP,<br>$B Y$

THE EDITOR.
$b^{*}$

## PREFACE.

1. The text of this edition principally follows Stallbaum's, published at Gotha in 1810 . After examining the various readings, as Ast has given them, the editor was led to make about forty changes in the text of Stallbaum's first Gotha edition of 1828. On receiving, not very long since, the same critic's second edition of 1840 , mentioned above, the editor was pleased to find a large part of these alterations, and nearly all the more important ones, made by Stallbaum himself. A number of others have since been 'made, in reliance upon Stallbaum's long study of Plato and ability ; and the text now differs from his last revision chiefly in the following places.

450, D, my ed. inserts ij before dं $\rho \iota \theta \mu \eta \tau \kappa \kappa \eta$. - 451, A, I have given oûv for $\nu \hat{v} \nu$. - $459, A$, тou $\nu \hat{v} \nu ~ \delta i \grave{\eta}$ for toinv $\delta \dot{\eta} \eta$. 460, C, Stallb. has no brackets. - ibid. D, omits the words in brackets. - $461, \mathrm{~B}$, vid. not. - 462, E, Stallb. has äp’ for $\delta^{\circ}$. - 465, B, gives $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \nu$. - 466, A, omits the words in brackets. - 472, A, has rà̉rà for raûta. - ibid. B, has пиधoî. Vid. not. - ibid. ėváós. Vid. not. - 480, D, has тои̂то for тои́тต̨. - 481, A, omits a乞̉ before Өaváтov. - 483, E, puts a colon after $\pi \lambda$ áт $\tau о \nu \tau \epsilon s . ~-~ 491, ~ D, ~ v i d . ~ n o t . ~-~ 492, ~$ B, omits the words in brackets. - 494, E, omits * $\tau o^{*}$. -
 Callicles. Vid. not. - $500, \mathrm{~B}$, brackets кат̀̀ тò $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ after $\mu \pi \gamma є \iota \rho \iota \dot{\eta} \nu$, which I have omitted. - 505 , E, joins oütcs to
 have bracketcd $\dot{\imath} \phi$ '. - $522, \mathrm{C}$, have given oütws. Vid. not. - 525 , D, have onitted тoùs before тov́т $\omega \%$ - 527 , C, Stallb. gives $\delta$ oòs $\lambda$ óyos. Vid. not.

In the text, like other editors of Plato, I have allowed oikoûv, nonne igilur, to be thus accented, and, as I think, for good reasons. In the notes, I have followed what is, I believe, Hermann's practice, in treating a single Greek oxytoned word in an English sentence just as it would be treated in a Greek one. If, for example, $\hat{a} v$ occurs in the middle of a clause, it is not written ${ }^{a} \nu$.
2. I have had access to the following editions of Gorgias, which include all the modern ones of much value. 1. Routh's, Oxford, 1784. 2. Findeisen's, - an edition of indifferent judgment. Gotha and Amsterdam, 1796. 3. Heindorf's second, edited by Buttmann, Berlin, 1829, - excellent, especially for the Commentary. 4. Bekker's. 5. Stallbaum's Leipzig ed. These are concerned only with the text. Bekker's has some Scholia. 6. Coray's, Paris, 1825, together with Xenophon's Memorab. 7. Ast's, in his Plato. The bulky Commentary on Gorgias is in Vol. XI., Leipzig, 1832 ; valuable, but ill-arranged and tedious, and not always judicious. 8. Stallbaum's, in his Gotha ed. of Plato, 1828 and 1840. Both text and interpretation owe much to him, and he has collected most of what is useful in other editions.

From these editions, above all from the last, I have derived great assistance, which is often acknowledged and
often not. In a work like this, it would be plainly impossible to trace everything up to its source, but nothing has been adopted without examination ; much, also, is original ; but I fear that, if any one should pass the severe judgment upon the edition, that much of what is faulty is original, he would not be very far out of the way.

Besides these editions, I have consulted several of those works relating to Plato, to which an editor of his dialogues would naturally think of turning for aid. Of this description are Ast's Lexicon Platonicum (the first three vols.), which is of no great use after all, Ast's, Socher's, and the first vol. of C. F. Hermann's Introduction to Plato, Schleiermacher's and Cousin's translations, and Dobson's translation of Schleiermacher's Prefaces.
3. An introduction is prefixed to the text of the dialogue, with a view to give an explanation and critique of the argument. To this are added, in notes, rather literal translations of a few illustrative passages out of very many from Plato's other writings, most of which I have read with reference to the present edition during its preparation. I had intended to add an index, in which some things omitted in the notes were to find their place, and had made some progress in it, but was tempted by the overpowering tediousness of the task to lay it aside until too late.
4. I have said nothing, thus far, as to the propriety of laying the Gorgias before American students of Greek, rather than some other dialogue of the same great author. To persons familiar with the Platonic dialogues, perhaps nothing need be said on this point. Let me say, however, that while many of the dialogues would not have suited my design, on account of their abstruseness or their length, the

Gorgias deserved to be preferred to others equally finished in style, on account of its positive inculcation of truth and its high moral tone. Something better is to be found in it than the miscrable doctrine of instruction, and the duty of the politician to obey the popular will.

Yale College, New Haven, July, 1842.

A second edition of the Gorgias being called for, the editor has done what he could, amid the pressing cares of a new office, to render it, by the necessary changes and additions, less imperfect than the former. In doing this, he has received kind aid from several friends, and takes this opportunity of making his acknowledgments to Professor Crosby of Dartmouth College, Mr. Sophocles of Harvard University, Mr. Hadley of Yale College, and C. A. Bristed, Esq., of New York.

Yale College, June I, 1848.

## INTRODUCTION.

The times in Greece which just preceded the age of Socrates gave bitth to a class of men denominated the Sophists. This title, which before was honorably applied to such as excelled in wisdom or ingenuity, was then chiefly confined to those who, with mercenary views, professed a vain and shallow kind of wisdom. Such is in substance Aristotle's definition of a Sophist. In the successive sketches of Plato's Sophistes, he is hit off as a mercenary hunter after rich young men; a dealer and huckster in intellectual wares, especially of his own production ; a logomachist ; one who, by his power of taking the opposite on all subjects, gets a reputation for wisdom; one who is employed about that which is false, or merely appearing, instead of the invariable objects of true science, and who conceals his ignorance of true science by artificial and crafty turns of words. This last characteristic is one which gives the relation of the Sophist to philosophy. He denied all objective truth, and stood only on the fluctuating, uncertain ground of subjective opinion. Hence, as to truth, he was an unbeliever. He could accommodate himself to one side or its opposite, contending for or against any point, as interest might dictate. Finding nothing in philosophy to employ himself with, he withdrew from the study of it to the arts of practical life, and aimed, by attract-
ing admiration and educating the young, to gain wealth and honor. Gratification or pleasure was the immediate object in his view, and he could have no higher ; for to instruct in virtue would imply the cxistence of unalterable moral differences, which he denied. Or, if he professed to teach virtue and justice, it was only in accommodation to a vague opinion of those who employed him ; and it was necessary for him to pervert these notions, in order to make his instructions consistent with the rule of gratification by which he was governed.

It would carry us far beyond our bounds, were we to attempt to exhibit at any length the causes to which this class of men owed their origin and their prominence. These causes lay partly in the unsatisfactory results to which the prevailing systems of Greck philosophy had arrived, and partly in the circumstances of the times. On the one hand, many of the philosophers either wholly denied the existence of truth within the reach of man, or so contracted its dimensions as to make it not worth pursuing. Hence arose scepticism, despair, and the fading away of a serious regard for truth, which were succceded by frivolity and by the purpose to gain immediate sclfish ends through pretensions to supcrior knowledge. On the other hand, the decay of religious belief which attends upon increasing civilization in heathen countries, and the disregard of political morality so prevalent in Greece, threw uncertainty into the opinions of men upon the most important subjects. Thus the same disease attacked the roots of philosophy, religion, and morals.

In the schools of the philosophers, the art of reasoning and its instrument had received by degrees some attention. Thus logic had been cultivated by the Eleatic sect, but was turned, in the lands of the Sophists, into an art of disputing, applied to puzzle the unpractised and display their
own dexterity. The right and elegant use of words was employed by other Sophists to procure for themselves admiration and pupils. Many of this class of men exhibited their knowledge in public by answering any question that might be proposed to them, or gave lectures prepared with great care; while in private they imparted such instructions to young men as would give them polish and ability in civil and political life. All of them took money for their instructions, - a practice not regarded as entirely honorable at that time in Greece.

The sophistical principles of the time were brought into closer connection with public affairs by means of the art of rhetoric, which arose at about the same era. Rhetoric began to be taught as a means of gaining a cause in the courts at Syracuse after the year 466, when a popular government, succeeding to the sway of Hiero's family, greatly multiplied judicial proceedings. An art like this was calculated to be popular in free states, and especially in Athens, where the judicial function of the people was the most important one; where the crowds of ignorant judges were easily deceived by sophistry; and where there was an uncommon fondness for displays of skill in the use of words.

The sophistical tendency, which we have represented as one in its origin, affected all branches of truth and every art which can be referred to scientific principles. In metaphysics it may be exemplified by the tenets of Protagoras, that all knowledge consists in sensation, and that whatever appears true to any man is true to him; and by the doctrine of Gorgias, that there is no truth which men can ascertain or communicate to one another. In morals and politics, it appeared in the opinions, that there is no natural justice, or that justice is the interest of the stronger; and that pleasure is the chief good. In the use of rhetoric, it showed its nature when Protagoras offered to teach how to prevail
 when Tisias and Gorgias said that the probable must be held in higher esteem than the true.

The Sophists could not fail to disgust a man like Socrates, who hated show and pretension, and who had a deep veneration for truth. Hence he was sometimes brought into collision with them, and in a degree his doctrines, as well as those of Plato, were shaped by opposition to theirs. And in accordance with this, Plato, especially in his first works, represents Socrates arguing against some false opinion or other maintained by a person imbued witn this spirit.

One of the more prominent Sophists, with whom Socrates was contemporary, was Gorgins, after whom this dialogue is named. Gorgias was a Sicilian Greek of Leontini, a Chalcidian town, which lay some twenty miles to the north of Syracuse, and suffered much from its nearness to that powerful Doric state. The birth of Gorgias is assigned by Foss* to the first year of the 71 st Olympiad, or 496 B. C. But there is good reason, I think, for putting it scveral years later. For the art of rhetoric began to flourish at Syracuse after 466 B. C., and Gorgias learned this art from Tisias, a scholar of Corax, the first preceptor. $\dagger$ And with this it accords, that Gorgias heard Empedocles in philosophy, whose birth even Foss places no earlier than the 71st Olympiad, while the ancients say that he flourished from forty to sixty years afterward.

From this time we know nothing of Gorgias until he was

[^0]sixty years old or upwards. In the interval he may have taught rhetoric in Sicily, for Polus of Agrigentum appears at Athens as his disciple, and he probably stood high in his native state. In the second year of the 88th Olympiad, he came to Athens on the following occasion. "The Leontines (Diodor. 12. 53), who were emigrants from Chalcis, and of the same stock with the Athenians, were invaded by the people of Syracuse. As they were pressed by the war, and in danger of being reduced by the superior might of Syracuse, they sent ambassadors to Athens, begging the people to help them as speedily as possible, and rescue their state from its dangers. The principal ambassador among those who were sent was Gorgias, the orator, a man who excelled all his time in eloquence, and first invented the
 Athens he was introduced into the Assembly, and discoursed before the people concernig the alliance. The Athenians, who were fond of displays of genius and skill in the use of words, were struck with wonler by the novelty of his style, by his various antitheses, his clauses of equal length, his words of similar forms and endings, and the like artifices; which then, being new, met with favor, but now seem to be a waste of labor, and are ridiculous if repeated so often as to produce satiety. At last, having persuaded the Athenians to form an alliance with the Leontines, and gained admiration at Athens for his rhetorical art, be returned to his native town." The sensation which his rhetoric produced at Athens is spoken of by others also. The days on which he made his exhibitions were called festivals, and his discourses themselves torches.t " He won great praise," says

[^1]Socrates in Plato's Hippias Maj. (282, B), " by his speeches in the Assembly, and by his private displays of his eloquence. By the instructions he imparted to the young (ov$\nu \grave{\nu}$ rois véoss) he gained a large amount of money, and carried it with him from Athens." If Plato, who is sometimes careless about precise facts and dates, may here be relied upon, he must have stayed long enough at Athens to act the part of a teacher before he went elsewhere. It is probable that, after discharging his mission, he soon returned to Greece, where the rest of his life seems to have been spent. Thessaly was his principal residence, and that he passed no very long time in Athens may be argued from the fact, that Isocrates, an Athenian, received his instructions in that country. 'There, also, he taught Meno, and Aristippus, one of the nobles of Larissa, and there, or in Bœotia, Proxenus, the comrade of Xenophon. The wealthy families of Thessaly had that rude taste which would make them fond of the glitter and ostentation of Gorgias, and were able to pay him well. He lived in splendor, affecting in his dress the same show and parade which marked his eloquence. (Elian, Var. Hist. 12. 32.) Owing to his habits of temperance, he attained to a very great age, to six or eight years over a century, and acted the rhetorician to the last, by saying, according to Flian (u. s. 2. 35), when invaded by a lethargic sleep, premonitory of his end,- "Sleep is now beginning to lay me in the hands of his brother." His works, in his capacity as a rhetorician, were, - 1. One on the art, or on one branch of it, the art of speaking suitably to the oceasion. 2. A number of orations, declamatory and laudatory. One of these was delivered at the Olympic festival, in which, like Isocrates afterwards, he tried to unite the Greeks against the Persians. Another was a funeral discourse in bonor of Athenians slain in battle, a fragment of which, preserved by a Scholiast on Hermogenes,
supplies us with the longest extant specimen of his style. These works exhibited a stately, uncommon, and poetical diction, together with frequent rhetorical figures, which must have been tedious and frigid in the extreme.* Two declamations still extant, bearing his name, are unlike his fragments in style, and ought probably to be regarded as spurious.

Gorgias was, as we have said, at bottom a Sophist, $\dagger$ but he avoided the title, which was not very popular, " and laughed at the Sophists, who professed to know how to make men better, confining himself to instructions concerning the art of speaking." (Plat. Meno, 95, C.) His literary labors in the more appropriate sphere of the Sophist were confined, so far as we know, to a work entitled $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ фúvews $\hat{\eta}$ toû $\mu \grave{\eta}$ ö̀vтos, which may have been unknown to Plato, but is analyzed in a little treatise among the works of Aristotle. In this work, with such an ominous title, he attempted to prove, first, that nothing exists, then, if any thing exists, that it cannot be known, and, finally, that if known, it cannot be made known to others. Olympiodorus (in Routh's ed. of Gorgias, p. 567) says, that this work was written in the 84th Olympiad, that is, sixteen years or thereabouts before his embassy to Athens. For the sophis-

[^2]tries out of which, with the help of the principles of the Eleatic Sect, he built up this triple wall against truth, I must refer to the treatise of Aristotle,* and to Ritter's history of philosophy.

Such was Gorgias. Of Polus, another speaker in the dialogue, little is known. He was a Sicilian of Agrigentum, a scholar of Gorgias in rhetoric, and perhaps of Empedocles in philosophy. He wrote, together with other works, a treatise, probably on rhetoric, to which Plato refers in the Gorgias. As we learn from the Phædrus and other sources, he gave great prominence to the figures of that artificial rhetoric of which his master was so fond; such as equality of periods and correspondence of adjoining words in sound ; and taught the mode of using maxims and similes under separate hcads, to which he gave pedantic names.

Callicles is an unknown Athenian, not a Sophist, as some have regarded him, but rather a contemner of the Sophists; although he carried out in practical life those principles which they laid down. He is a specimen of a considerable number of Athenians of his time, who, while they courted the people, despised it ; who would have grasped at tyrannical power, without scruple as to the means; who looked down upon the pursuits of philosophy, when compared with the honors of political life; who had no faith in the distinction between right and wrong, and held pleasure to be the supreme good.

Besides these and Socrates, Chærephon bears a small part at the opening of the dialogue. He was an early frieud and a follower of the philosopher, ardent in whatever he undertook, whose variance with his brother is mentioned in Xen. Memorab. 2. 3, and who obtained a response from

[^3]the Pythia commendatory of Socrates, according to the Apologies of Plato and Xenophon. He went into exile in the time of the thirty tyrants, and died soon afterwards, before his friend's condemnation. He injured his health and complexion through his studies, and received the nicknames of voктєpis, $\nu v к т \grave{s}$ пais (Aristoph. Birds, 1564, and Horarum frag.), for never coming abroad during the day, and of
 Aristoph. Wasps, 1413), as well as other ridicule from the comic poets.* When, according to the Scholiast on Plato's Apology, these reckless jesters proceeded further to call him a sycophant, a parasite, and a thief, we may put by the side of these aspersions the testimony of Xenophon, who classes him among those friends of Socrates who sought his company to improve themselves in household and civil relations, and who, at no time of their lives, either did, or were charged with doing, any wrong.

The persons of this dialogue are represented as having met in the year after the sea-fight at Arginusæ. Gorgias, being then on a visit at Athens, was lodging at the house of Callicles, and there, it is generally supposed, the dialogue was spoken. There is, however, good reason, I think, to accede to the opinion of Schleiermacher, who lays the sceue in some public place, tike the Lyccum, where the parties in several other dialogues convened. $\dagger$ At the opening of the

[^4]work, Socrates and his friend find that they have reached the place where Gorgias and others were assembled, too late to witness his exhibitions of rhetorical skill. In the hope, however, of drawing from him his views concerning his art, they approach and begin the conversation. Gorgias being fatigued, the younger rhetorician, Polus, volunteers to take his place, and answer to the inquiries concerning the nature of rhetoric ; but as it is soon apparent that he is unwilling or unable to observe a logical method, Socrates transfers the discourse to Gorgias, from whom he professes to think that more brevity and accuracy of definition may be expected. (447-449.) By a series of questions in his peculiar manner, he gathers from Gorgias that he is a rhetorician, and able to make others such; and that his art is employed about words as instruments of thought. Socrates asks whether the definition is not too general, sinee several arts called by other names are also employed about words. To this Gorgias replies, that other arts ask principally, "What is to be done?" and use words as a secondary thing; but that rhetoric inquires, "What is to be said?" $(-450, B$.$) Socrates objects that there are other arts, such$ as those of calculation and astronomy, which mainly depend on words, and demands to what the words relate which rhetoric employs. The most important of human affairs, says Gorgias. ( -451, B.). But what are the most important? asks Socrates; for other arts might make a similar claim. The good, replies Gorgias, to which rhetoric opens the way, is freedom for the orator and the power of controlling other men, and this it effects by the power of persuading public assemblies. By this power it brings every other art under its control. ( -453 .) Socrates still is not satisfied. For although Gorgias has defined rhetoric to be the art of persuasion, he inquires whether other arts, which have to do with words, do not aim at persuasion also. What, then, is
the province and the nature of rhctorical persuasion? Gorgias is brought to admit that its province is to persuade judicial and other popular assemblies concerning things right and wrong; and that it attains its end rather by plansible arguments than by proofs drawn from absolute truth. (-455.) But Socrates still finds it hard to comprehend what is the peculiar sphere of rhetoric. In all public deliberations, the artificer, the general, or other person acquainted with the point in question, can give the best counsel. Where, then, is the orator's place? In reply, Gorgias refers to matters of fact. It was the advice of the political leaders which led to the building of the Athenian walls and docks, and not that of the artificers. He himself had often persuaded sick persons to comply with the directions of physicians, who had exhausted their arguments in vain. There was no occasion when an orator was opposed to an artificcr, without gaining an easy victory. Such was the power of rhetoric, but, like other arts, it might be abused by those who learned it. Yet that abuse was no good cause of complaint against the teacher. ( -457, C.) Socrates, after offering an apology for his seemingly contentious spirit, now forces Gorgias to allow that the orator may be ignorant of the subject-matter of other arts; all his study being concerned with finding the means of appearing to "those who do not know to know more than those who do." This Gorgias regards as an advantage, since it furnishes the orator with power aequired by small pains.* Socrates, without stopping to examine into the extent of this advantage, inquires whether the case is the same with justice and injustice, good and evil, and the like; whether, without know-

[^5]ing what these are in themselves, the orator can gain a reputation for such knowledge ; and whether, as a master in rhetoric, Gorgias would teach a scholar justice, who should come to him unacquainted with its nature. Gorgias has here to reply, either that there is no need of knowing anything about right and wrong in order to be an orator, and that, too, when he is perpetually employed upon questions involving right and wrong; or that he will teach his students their nature. He chooses the latter alternative, although the preyious conversation shows that, to be consistent, he should have taken the former. Socrates now forces him to admit that he who knows justice is just. The rhetorician, then, under his training, must be a just man. But he had before said, that the art might be used for a good or a bad purpose, - to favor justice or injustice. Socrates brings forward this inconsistency as needing explanation, when this, the first part of the dialogue, is broken off by the impatience of Polus. ( -461, B.)

There are two remarks which this portion of the discussion seems to demand. The first is, that, while it ends with an argumentum ad hominem, and with fastening upon Gorgias an inconsistency of no importance in itself to philosophical truth, it is not without its use. It shows how little the Sophists had reflected upon the nature of their arts, and how little they cared for truth or justice.* The

[^6]art itself, having in its own nature no reference to truth, but merely to the force of arguments upon the minds of others, and, at the same time, being employed in discussions concerning what is good and just, could in its best estate be as easily used against truth as in its behalf. But as it then was, it was based on sophistical principles and opposed to sound philosophy, its aim being something else than the greatest good. It was an art of acting on the ignorant, and of acting on them by pretending to knowledge. It must use such arguments as were suited to persuade the masses, who are not capable of taking the true philosophical view of things. What arguments could a person ignorant of justice use before an audience also ignorant, when the question related to justice, but such as almost necessarily mislead?

[^7]But in the second place, if the art taught or presupposed the teaching of justice, its scholars would be a very different sort of persons from what even Gorgias allows that they were. For he who has learned justice is just. This looks to us like sophistry on the part of Socrates himself, as if the knowledge and practice of virtue could not exist apart. But whatever of untruth there is in the proposition, it was not meant for sophistry ; it is a part of the system of Socrates and Plato. In the view of Socrates, and in that of Plato at first, all virtue could be resolved into science; all vice into ignorance.* Nor was the reason voluntarily ignorant, but merely deceived by the conccit of knowledge, and false opinion. When this was removed, and knowledge took possession of the mind, there was no cause why he who knew should not act in conformity with his knowledge.

In the second part of the dialogue, Polus takes his master's place. He begins by complaining that Socrates had unfairly involved Gorgias in inconsistency. Gorgias had said that he would teach justice to a scholar ignorant of it, only in accommodation to the prejudices of mankind, who regarded instruction upon that point as of high importance. A discussion now arises, in which Socrates explains in part his views of rhetoric. It is not an art, but a knack, or practical observation of rules aiming to produce pleasure. It belongs to a nature which is adroit, courageous, and skilled in mingling with mankind. It is reducible to flattery; like the arts of cookery, cosmetics, and sophistry, being mere routine or practice, not guided by the laws of absolute truth, and

[^8]aiming at gratification. The real arts relating to the soul and body are two, with a twofold division each; of which the one, - the political art, or that which conserves the public good, - when it seeks to secure that good, is called the legislative art, when to restore it, is called justice. To these two arts, two touching the body correspond : gymnastics, aiming to preserve bodily good or health, and medicine, to bring it back. To these four arts four arts of flattery answer, and, acting adroitly without settled principles, slip into their places. These are sophistry, answering to legislation, rhetoric to justice, cosmetics to gymnastics, and cookery to medicine. Aiming at pleasure, and not at the highest'good, these false arts attract and deceive the ignorant and thoughtless. And, being incapable of exact limits from their want of a scientific basis, they run into one another. (-466.) Polus is displeased at this brand of flattery put upon rhetoric, and asks if good orators are so regarded in the states where they live. Socr. "They are not regarded at all." Pol. "How not regarded? Have they not the greatest power in their countries?" To this Socrates replies by admitting that they do what seems good to them, but denies that they do what they wish. In explaining this, he shows that what men wish is not what they do, but that for the sake of which they do it. It is a good in prospect which moves to action. Unless, then, the great power which enables orators to dispose, as Polus says, of the lives and fortunes of others, is a good, it is not what they wish. And if to have great power is a good, orators cannot have it, seeing they use that which they call such as an evil. They may do, then, what seems good to them, without either really having great power, or doing what they wish. (-469.) Polus sneers at these views expressed by Socrates. "Just as though you would not choose the liberty of doing what seemed good to you in the state, and would feel no envy if you saw one killing
whom he liked, or stripping him of his goods, or binding him." Socrates earnestly tlcelares, that he regards such a one, if doing this unjustly, as most wretehed, and to do wrong as the greatest of evils. Polus is surprised that he should think so, and affirms, that to be wronged is a greater evil than to wrong; and that the possession of supreme power in the state - which is won by the orator - is to be desired as enabling him to do what he thinks fit, - to wrong, if he pleases, and to keep others from wronging him. Upon this, Socrates makes his opponent own that uncontrolled power in the state, if it is a good, may also be an evil. It cannot, therefore, be a good in itself, and something beyond it must determine when it is good and when the contrary. This criterion is, that it shall be justly or unjustly exercised. ( -470, C.) Polus responds in a superior tone to this, as gring against the common sense of men, and appeals rhetorically to the prosperity of Archelaus, king of Macedon, which was begun by atrocious crimes. If you wish, says Socrates, to support yourself by examples and by testimony, you will have no want of them. But I shall not consider the matter settled until I force you, with whom I hold the argument, to acknowledge that the unjust man is unhappy, or you compel me to the contrary admission. (-472, D.)

The discussion during the rest of this part of the dialogue embraces two points, arising out of the proposition, that it is better to wrong than to be wronged : - 1. That the unjust man is, in every event, miserable; and, 2. That if he eseapes punishment for his crimes, he is more miserable than if he suffers. And hence no man can prefer doing wrong to being wronged, which Polus says is the choice of all men.

1. Polus acknowledges that it is baser (aitoxov, more ugly) to wrong, but denies that it is more evil (кíkoov). This leads to an analysis of the ideas of the beautiful and the base ( тò ка入óv, тò aïoर $\rho^{\prime} \nu$ ), in which Socrates shows that
a thing is beautiful owing to its utility or pleasure, or both; and base, owing to its evil or pain. But to wrong - which has been owned to be baser than to be wronged - is not more painful ; therefore it must be more evil. Neither Polus, then, nor any other man, as desirous of the highest good, can prefer the more evil and base to the less. ( -476 .)
2. Polus admits, that to be the object of justice (סióóva $\delta i k \eta \nu)$ and to be justly punished for wrong-doing are the same; that a just punisher supposes one who suffers what
 If, then, what is suffered is just, it is кадóv, and if so, either useful or pleasant. But suffering for doing wrong is not pleasant ; therefore, it is useful or good. This goodness consists in removing pravity of soul, which, of all kinds of badness, is the greatest. Justice, the medicine of the soul, effects this removal: hence, to escape from punishment is more miserable than to be punished. It is better to go unhealed of a disease, than not cured of this inward severer malady. And not to seek this cure from justice is like fearing the pain necessary for attaining to health. ( -480 .)

If these things are so, of what use is rhetoric? For if it place a man in a situation where he can wrong more easily than be wronged, it does him so much the more harm; and if he be enabled by it to escape the punishment of his misdeeds, again it does him so much the more harm. If it help him to punish an enemy, it benefits that enemy, - an object at which he is far from aiming. He cannot even defend himself against an enemy without doing the enemy this good.* ( $-481, \mathrm{C}$.

The end reached in this second division of the Gorgias is to set forth in a clear light that a pretended art, like the rhetoric of Gorgias and Polus, which has the gratification

[^9]of others, as well as one's own, in view, fails, by running against the law of right, to attain to anything good or useful, defeats its own objects, and falls into inconsistency with itse!f. It will not be doubted by the reader, that the moral tone of this discussion is worthy of the highest praise, and the conclusion most gratifying, considering it is formed by a heathen. But there are several places in the stream of the argument where we may fancy that we see shallows, or touch upon the ground. In the first place, we may question the accuracy of the comparison of the legislative art and justice with the self-styled arts of sophistry and rhetoric. What is the truth of the distinction, and what sphere must we suppose that Plato assigns to rhetoric ? In reply, it must .be owned, I think, that Plato fluctuates a little,* owing to his analogy between rhetoric and medicine, on the one hand, and between rhetoric and justice, on the other. If we press the resemblance to medicine, rhetoric must be confined to the reparation of injustice, and restoration of the public health. If we follow the parallel with justice, rhetoric must embrace within its limits every case where the question of conformity to the rule of right is involved; the rule of true right being laid down at the outset by the legislative art, and that of seeming right or gratification, in the place of justice, by sophistry. In this part of the dialogue, the narrower notion of rhetoric, determined by comparing it with medicine, seems to prevail in Plato's mind: the art has to do with the courts. And in this Plato was fully justified by the practice of writers on this art, who all, as Aristotle affirms (Rhet. 1. 1. 10), said nothing about the popular assembly, and confined their rules of art to the judicial

[^10] latter division of this work, Plato treats the rhetorician and the political man as the same, which accords with the analogy between rhetoric and justice. This is the truer view of the subject, for otherwise the assembly of the people, where there lay open a wide field for false art, must be unoccupied.* We must recollect that Plato himself speaks of the boundaries of rhetoric as uncertain; and, also, that he is not opposing the bare " art of inventing and arranging arguments," but a sophistical art opposed to truth. $\dagger$

In the second place, we may doubt whether the analysis of the beautiful into the pleasant and the good, that is, the useful, and of the opposite to the beautiful into the painful and the harmful, is correctly made out, and, consequently, whether the principles of the latter part of the discourse be-

* With more justice still, Socrates, in Phædr. 261, A, regards it "as the art of bending men's minds by words withont respect to the oceasion, not only in courts and other public assemblies, but also in private meetings; being the same in nature, whether small or great afiairs are in question." To which, in reply, Phredrus says, that the rules of art are used in speaking and writing when suits at law are brought, and in speaking when addresses are made to the Assembly; but that he has not heard of a wider application of rhetorical precepts.
 rò $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \delta \delta \chi^{\prime} \mu$ \&vov $\pi \iota \rightarrow$ avóv. It is worthy of remark how Aristotle alludes to this dialogue without naming it. He begins with saying, that rhetoric is ávri-
 on the garb ( $\dot{v} \pi 0 \delta \dot{v} \varepsilon \tau \alpha t$ ) of the political art"; and, soon afterwards, " $\% \sigma \tau$
 ricians is ascribed to ignorance, or vanity, or other human reasons (1. 2. 7) ; and donbtless he joined with Plato in condemning the sophistical rhetoric of the preceding age. (Comp. 1.1.3.) But when he says that the judge himself ought to know whether a thing is just or not, and not learn it from the parties, whose only duty is to discuss the fact, he must be regarded not only as opposing Plato's views (454, B), but as condemning the Athenian and every other system where the judges were ignorant,
tween Socrates and Polus, true as we feel them to be, are not built upon the sand. If I am not deceived, Plato does not here intend to enter into a elose dialectical exposition of what is meant by $\tau \grave{o} \kappa a \lambda \dot{\rho} \nu$, the beautiful. But, still, his definition is exact enough for the argument and the purposes of the dialogue. The attempts of others to analyze this idea prove this. Whether the term beautiful is or is not applied on account of pleasure derived from contemplating the object so called, or on account of the perception of a certain fitness, implying a relation of the parts to the whole, and of the whole to some good or pleasant end ; - whatever we may decide to be the primary and essential characteristic of beautiful objects, it is sufficient, I think, for the argument to say, that pleasure or utility, or both, invariably attend on objects so called, and the author was not required to stop and subject this idea to a closer examination. It is also to be remarked, that the good and the useful are treated here as identical.* Upon this point we need only say, that it is assumed that whatever is good tends to promote the perfection or well-being of the person ; in other words, is useful in reaching a good end.

Again, it may be thought that the last argument, concern ing the good or utility of punishment, renders it necessary that punishment should reform the offender, whereas Plato. in this work and elsewhere, speaks of incorrigible criminals. $\dagger$

[^11]If to suffer סiкaia $=$ to suffer калá $=$ to suffer $\dot{\omega} \phi_{\epsilon} \lambda_{\iota} \mu a$ or àađá, can the criminal help being profited? and does not
passages from the Laws give us Plato's views. One is found in Book XI. 934 , A. "Not suffering for the sake of his crime, - for what he has done can never be undone, - but in order that for the future he and they who see him suffering justice ( (orrasóv $\mu$ svoy) may either altogether hate wrong-doing, or, at least, that a considerable part of so great an evil may cease." Another occurs in Book IX. 854, D. "For, perhaps, if he suffer this penalty, he may become better, by being rendered more sober-minded ( $\sigma \omega \not \subset \rho$ ovo 9 sis). For no penalty which is inflicted by law is intlicted for
 improves him who is punished, or, at least, checks the growth of his depravity." He then goes on to speak of incurable offenders doing good as examples. On page 862, E, after remarking on the excellence of legal expedients by which transgressors shall be made "to hate wrong, and to lore or not hate the nature of right," he continues thus : - "When a lawgiver finds men incurable, he will provide some law and penalty for them, being assured that, for such persons themselves, it is not the better part to live, and that, by withdrawing from life, they will confer a twofold benefit on others : they will serve as an example to others to deter from evil, and will rid the state of bad inhabitants. Thus [that is, on these principles], in the case of such persons must the lawgiver establish death as the penalty for crimes, and in no other way."

In Book V. 728, C, he speaks of becoming like the wicked, and being separated from the good, as the greatest penalties for wrong-doing. "Though this is not penalty ( $\delta i \neq n$ ), - since justice and penalty are always beautiful, - but vengeance, which is suffering attendant on iniquity. And as well he who has suffered this rengeance is miserable, as he who avoids suffering it ; the one, because there is no cure for him ; the other, because lie is lost, that many may be saved." In these passages, the end of punishment is to cure and deter, or, at least, such is its result. And with these may be compared such places as Repub. 1. 335, where it is said, that a just man cannot harm even an enemy and a bad man. It is true that the notion of harm is confined there to making such a man worse, but the reasoning appears to include pain if unproductive of good. Cousin, in his Preface to Gorgias, contends very brilliantly, and in some degree justly, that the right to punish in society is derived, not from the good effects of
the argument look like a dead algebraic formula, more than like living moral truth? This difficulty must attend the argument at the first view of it. Nor can it be removed, unless we allow sixaua and кà̀̀ to be what they are, not only in themselves, but also in the apprehension of the sufferer, while $\dot{\omega} \phi \varepsilon \lambda^{\prime} \mu a$ is simply objective. The argument now becomes tenable. Punishment can be a good to none who do not receive it as just; nor can it, in the arrangements of this world, fail of being more or less of a good to him who feclangly owns that it is rightly inflicted. But there may be some who do not own this, and they are the incorrigible.

Polus being reduced to silence, Callicles steps forth as the third champion of the arts of show. He begins with doubting whether Socrates is in earnest in maintaining these principles, which would throw human life and conduct off from their old foundations. To this Socrates answers, that he follows wherever philosophy shows the way, just as implicitly as Callicles obeys the popular will, and that, before he can change his tone, he must hear her strike a different key. In reply, Callicles says that it was not philosophical reasoning, but trick, by which Polus was beaten. He had made the incautious admission, that to do wrong is baser (alo ${ }^{\text {olov }}$ ) than to be wronged. It is so, indeed, by law, but not by nature. This ambiguity it is between the naturally

[^12]and the legally beautiful or right which enables crafty reasoners to gain their points. When Polus spoke of that which is legally base, Socrates shuffled the natural into its room. But by nature nothing is baser which is not more harmful. The natural feelings of men, which, when injured, instantly rise against the aggressor, show, that to be wronged is no property of a man. The legal definitions of base and wrong deeds are introduced by the many and the weak, in order to keep the strong in check. But herein law is opposed to nature, which teaches that the better ought to have more* than the worse, and the more powerful

* $\pi \lambda$ govextiv. $\pi \lambda \operatorname{soveg}$ द́a is substantially selfishness, to which cause in a very striking passage Plato ascrives all the wrong actions of men. Leges, V. $731, \mathrm{D}: \pi \alpha^{\prime} \downarrow \tau \omega \nu \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu^{\prime} \xi$ gurov, etc. "The greatest of all evils is inherent in the souls of the mass of men, for which they excuse themselves and seek no deliverance from it. This is what the vulgar saying implies, that every man by nature loves himself, and that it is right so to do. But in truth the cause of all errors in every case is to be ascribed to too great self-love. For the lover becomes blind in regard to the object beloved, so that he judges wrongly of the beautiful, the good, and the just, thinking that he ought to honor what pertains to himself before the truth. The man who will be truly great ought not to love himself or his own things, but what is just and right, whether pertaining to his own actions or another man's. From this fault it comes, that all think their own igmorance wisdom. Whence, though we know next to nothing, we think we know everything; and, being unwilling to intrust to others that which we are not well skilled to do, we are forced to make mistakes in doing it. Therefore ought every man to avoid undue self-love, and to seek out some one better than himself, allowing no shame to prevent his taking such a course."

In another fine passage of the same work (IX. 875, B), the necessity of law is partly ascribed to the selfishness of man. סeúrȩor $\delta \varepsilon$, etc. "In the second place, should any one in theory properly comprehend that this is so [that is, that the political art ought to care for the community more than for the individual, and that it is for the interests of both to have the community, rather than the individual, well arranged], and then rule a state with irresponsible and autocratical power, yet can he not adhere to this persuasion,
than the less powerful. The "good old plan, that they should get who have the power," is the law of nature ay, and of right - in animals and man, as they slow whenever they can seize the occasion. All this is very erident to the man of the world. But philosophy makes a man blind to these truths of common sense, and, if pursued beyond the requirements of education, is the ruin of a man. It unfits him for civil and political life; it is unbecoming for a full-grown man, who should be practical and mix with his fellows; it makes one slink away to a corner with two or three diseiples; and, if attacked by focs in the courts, he cannot help himself, but falls into their hands, as defenceless prey, to be slain at their pleasure. ( -486, D.)

In this brilliant passage we see described the contempt felt by the vulgar politician for the true philosopher, and the sympathy of such a man with false and sophistical principles. He aims at pleasure rather than good, and the Sophists give their maxims for the prudential attainment of the same end. There is a plain allusion, also, to the behavior of Socrates at his trial, and to the charges against Socrates and Plato, - especially the latter, - of neglecting the service of the state. The ground which Callicles takes is evidently the only one which can be taken against Socrates,*
and through life keep the interests of the community foremost in the state, and his private interests subordinate; but his mortal nature will ever drive
 fiav), since it blindly shuns pain and seeks pleasure. Thus it will give a higher place to jleasure and pain than to the more jnst and good; and, by producing darkness in itself, will at length plunge the man himself and the state into all sorts of evils."

* The philonopher Archelaus, who was, perhaps, an Athenian and a scholar of Anaxagoras, taught (although he may not have meant by his words
 vó $\mu$ \%. This principle is admirably ridiculed in the Clouds, 1421, seq. Pla-
but it is equally the foundation of an attack against all morality. If the idea of right is admitted, it must be supreme; and pleasure, if opposed to it, must bow before it. The only escape is to show that pleasure is never inconsistent with the right and the good. But right, as fixed by law, restrains the individual, and is therefore inconsistent with self-gratification. Hence the advocate for pleasure must yield, unless he can show that natural right - which is really such - is another thing from what the opinions of men, expressed in their laws, call such, and that it authorizes selfish indulgence. But if this be natural right, it contains no moral element, implies no relation of one man to others, and sanctions obedience to every desire which looks towards pleasure.

Socrates first answers with exquisite irony to the maxim of Callicles, that the better ought, by natural right, to have more than the worse. If his opponent means, as he admits that he does, by the better ( $\beta \epsilon \lambda$ riovs), the superior and stronger, then, since the many are stronger than the one, as is shown by their enforcing their laws, they have a natural right to make laws for the one. Now they say, in their laws, that to wrong is baser than to be wronged; and hence, according to Callicles, it must naturally be so. (-489, B.) 2. Callicles now shifts his ground, and makes the better the more intelligent. If so, replies Socrates, and if the more intelligent ought to have more than another of that to which his intelligence relates, then, in a mixed collection of men, a physician ought to have more food and drink than others, while yet the greater portion thus assigned to

[^13]him may do him extreme harm. In short, there is no end to the absurdities which will follow from the princuple, that intelligence should move in an orbit around desire and not around good. ( -491, B.) 3. Callicles forsakes this definition, and the better now become the more intelligent and courageous in-politics, - such as are capable of governing.* Socrates here changes his point of attack, and takes a position nearer to the enemy's inner works. For whatever definition Callicles gives, to have more than others ( $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ evek $\tau \epsilon i v)$, or self-gratification, is the centre of the system, and must be laid bare in all its deformity. Do you mean, says he, by governing, governing one's self? At this the man of the world sneers, and pronounces a man's well-being to consist in having as large desires as possible, with the courage and intelligence to fulfil them. These qualities the many do not possess, whence, to hide their weakness, they praise self-restraint and blame incontinence. But it was not so from the berinning; the great and mighty of old acted by another rule; they regarded justice and selfrestraint as base and evil, and got all they could from their enemies for themselves and their friends. Good and pleasure are the same. $(-492$, C. $)$

Socrates answers this in two ways. He first tries, by selecting some examples of low bodily pleasures, to awaken Callicles to the consciousness of the amazing baseness and evil which may attend a life of eujoyment. $\dagger$ The illustrations which form the long prologue of this part show that a most important topic is begun. $(-495, B$.) In the second place, he searches for some tests of the nature of pleasure,

[^14]which shall show that it differs from good. To do this, he makes Callicles allow that courage, science, and pleasure are not the same; and that $\epsilon \hat{\delta} \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ and какюิs $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$ are opposites, so that one cannot be in both states at once, any more than he can be well and ill at once. The same may be said of weakness and strength, of swiftness and slowness, of good and bad, of happiness and misery. But pleasure and pain can coexist in the same person at the same time; as, for instance, thirst, a pain, exists, until drinking, which is pleasant, slakes it.* Thus pleasure wants an essential characteristic of good, and pain of evil. (-497, E.) Another test follows, grounded on the admission of Callicles, that the manly and intelligent are good. A foolish boy or man may be glad, and so may a wise one. $\dagger$ In war a coward is as glad, if not more so, when the enemy goes away, than the man of courage. 'Then the coward is as good as the courageous man, or even better, and yet bad by the concession of Callicles. ( -499, B.) In other words, if good is relative to desire, as such, then its absolute nature ceases, it is in a perpetual flux, and alters with every change of desire or character. $\ddagger$

Callieles now admits that some pleasures are evil and some good. He thus overthrows his argument, for if pleas-

* Comp. Cic. de Fin. 2. 3. 9.
$\dagger$ Comp. Philebus, 55, B: "And, besides, to be compelled to say that a man who feels grief is bad when he feels it, though he be the best of all men, and that one who is glad, the more he is so, at the time when he is so, is the more virtuous."
$\ddagger$ In a fine passage, Leges, II. 663, Plato teaches that the good and bad judge of ,leasure subjectively, or relatively to their own character. He then inquires whose judgment is io be received, as accordant with the truth, and answers, that of the good. Neither the lawgiver, then, should ever separate the pleasant from the right, the good, and the beautiful, nor any one else engaged in educating the young.
ure is in itsclf a good, evil cannot be affirmed of it. Socrates seizes upon the acknowledgment, and earries him back to a point debated in the first part of the dialogue, that the good being the end of all actions, the pleasant must be sought for its sake, and not vice versû. (-500, A.) Now to know what pleasures are good and what cvil needs an artist, - a man who has studied the invariable absolute principles of true good and right; - whilst the knowledge how to gratify, acquired by observation, and resting on no unchanging truth, has nothing of the nature of true art, and to apply that knowledge calls simply for an excrecise of memory.

If this be so, we have a standard by which we may try the pursuits of men; and, according to this standard, must condemn the music which is in vogue at the public contests, dithyrambic poetry, and even tragedy itself, with all its lofty pretensions. But how is it with rhetoric and the orators or statesmen? Do they negleet their own or the public interests ? Do they scek to benefit or gratify the community? To this Callicles responds, that the question admits of a double answer; the orators of the present day scek to please the people, and follow their will, but he thinks that Miltiades, Themistocles, Cimon, and Pericles were good men, and aimed at the highest public good. ( -503, D.) This Socrates denies, and, to make the matter clearer, goes at some length into the motives which should influence the good orator, - the true political artist. As the physician has health in viev, so has he the health of the community, which consists in justice and temperance* ( $\sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \sigma v v^{*} \eta$, self-

[^15]restraint, soundness of mind in regard to all pleasures and excess). Instead of flattering them and following popular desires, such a politician will restrain and chastise the people. ( -505, C.) This is further enforced in a most important and admirable passage, by pointing out that the idcas of true good, of virtue, of order, of self-restraint or orderliness, of justice and piety (or the observance of the laws of moral order), of courage, of the well-being of the individual and his happiness, are closely and necessarily connected; while the opposites of these are linked together with the pursuit of pleasure. Neither a man, then, nor a state, which would be happy, can have any end in view inconsistent with justice and temperance. If this be admitted, everything will follow which Socrates had maintained, and his three adversaries had controverted. The orator ought to be just, and to know justice ; otherwise he cannot practise or promote it. To be wronged is better than to wrong, for it involves no violation of justice; and to be punished for wrong-doing, than to go unpunished, for it reconciles the soul to justice. The wonder of Callicles, when Socrates defended these latter points, was misplaced. Furthermore, by acting on such principles, he should help himself and his friends, to do which Callicles pronounced him unable. For by living aecording to these principles, he would avoid the basest and the greatest evil. (-509, C.) But cannot a man, it may be asked, gain the advantage arising from not being wronged, as well as that arising from not wronging others? For the latter, an art is needed. As no one does wrong because he prefers it, but because he thinks to gain some good by it, that art must inculcate
is vaguely used by Plato, especially in his early dialogues; and that the definition in the passages of the Repub. which he cites (4.430, u. s., and 3. 389, D) almost reduces its notion to that of סırasootiyn.
the nature of true good; for example, must distinguish it from self-gratification. Is there, also, an art to avoid being wronged? The only way of preventing injuries in all cases 1s, to have supreme power yourself, or to be a friend of the supreme power ; - for instance, if the people is that power, to gain its friendship by catering for its desires and following all its whims. But if this is done, the other and greater good must slip out of your hands. Nor is it of any use to say, that, if you do not thus conciliate the sovereign power in the state, you may lose your life. For it is not a man's business in this world to seek to save his life, nor ought the art of rhetoric to make higher pretensions because it saves life than the art of the pilot or the engineer, by each of which the life of those intrusted to its care is preserved, no matter whether it be better for such persons to live or to die. A man's part is to leave it to God how long he shall live, and to find out on what principles he shall pass the term of life given to him ; whether on those of the flattering politician, which will involve the loss of the greatest good, or on those of the man who sacrifices pleasure to the really good and useful. (-514, A.) And the same will apply to the management of a state. Hence the apprenticeship of political life must be in philosophy, which reveals the good and just to those who search for them; and the true politician, contrary to what Callicles had maintained, must be a philosopher. A man who seeks to play the important part of a leader in the state must first ask himself whether, in his private capacity, he has cultivated justice and temperance, and made men better; for the aim in the public and in the private sphere is one and the same. With this in mind, wo may return to the four great Athenians, and bring their characters to the touchstone. Did Pericles make the Athenians better? or did they not rather become idle, cowardly, talkative, and covetous through the measures of his admin-
istration? And did not those very Athenians, near the close of his long political life, show their degeneracy, by ungratefully bringing against him a charge of peculation!* The other three met with even worse treatment at the hands of those whom, if skilful politicians, they must have wished and known how to make better. Their illsuccess is a proof that they understood not the true art of rhetoric, - that of persuading men to aim at the good, rather than the pleasant; and, indeed, that they were ignorant of the false art, also, if that enables its possessors, as is alleged, to sail in safety amid the storms of politics. ( -517, A.)

In this remarkable attack on four of the greatest men of Athens, - men certainly not inferior, in any point, to hundreds of public characters who have been extolled by Christian historians, - we discover an exasperation of feeling in Plato, produced by the unjust fate of his master, and by the wide difference between his own political views and those of his native land. Nor can his character in general be freed from the charge of fault-finding. To this he was led by that uncommonly high standard which the nature of his mind compelled him to form ; and, dwelling aloof, as he did, from the turmoil of politics, in contemplative retirement, he could not estimate all the practical difficulties which even a perfect statesman must encounter from a spoiled and self-willed people. But if we strike out what is due to these prejudices, we must find sometling of justice left in his blame of "the four." The very fact that he draws a broad line between them and Aristides $(526, B)$ is presumptive proof of a real difference. They were highminded leaders of parties, who humored the people in many of its wishes for the sake of keeping power, and sought the

[^16]greatness, but not the real well-being, of their country. Had they

> "to divinity aspired,
> Not on the breath of popular applause, But through dependence on the sacred laws, Framed in the schools where wisdom dwelt retired, Intent to trace the ideal path of right,"
had they been philosophical statesmen, aiming at justice and the highest good, the allies of Athens would have been less oppressed; the people would not have grown worse so fast ; they themselves would have impressed something of their own virtue upon the state, and been less likely to suffer unjustly from those to whom they had done good.

But is it not strange that Plato should reproach these politicians with their ill-success, as a proof of their want of virtuous statesmanship? This is the point which Aristides, the Sophist, presses most effectively in his long and wearisome defence of "the four." If ill-success is to be the test, what is to be argued from the two reprobate companions of Socrates, Critias and Alcibiades (Aristid. de Quatuorviris, 2. 322, Dindorf., de Rhet. 2. 111)? What from Plato's abortive attempts to make a man out of Dionysius of Syracuse ( $302-301,324$ ) ? Nor is Plato, the Sophist goes on to allege, consistent with himself, since he praises Pericles, in the Phædrus, for his rhetorical skill.* In the Apology (31, E), he makes Socrates affirm that no one can be safe who opposes any populace, or strives to prevent injustice in a state, unless he avoid public life and live as a private citizen. $(343,353,366$.) And, in our dialogue itself, he pronounces safety to arise from being like the sovereign power, or from having supreme power in one's own hands. Again, he says: "I should be a fool not to know

[^17]that at Athens any man may suffer anything." And yet the fact, that these statesmen were not safe from the effects of popular ingratitude, is his proof that they did not oppose the people, or strive to prevent injustice.

How the reasonableness or consistency of Plato, as to this point, can be defended, I do not see. Ill-success could have the force which he gives it only in case the influence of the four men outweighed the opposing influences of all other causes acting at their time upon the opposite side. In general, however, it may be said that politicians who complain of ingratitude are only reaping what they have sown. They have tickled the nice palate of the people until their cookery pleases no longer; and now, by a rotation in office, which was right in their eyes until they came into power, and wrong afterwards, they are driven from the kitchen by new hands, who pay a price for the situation, and have learned some newcr arts of falsehood. It was, perhaps, the sight of such flatterers of the Athenian demus fallen into disgrace, that led Plato beyond the bounds of truth, in imputing all the ill-success of politicians to their want of correct principles, - to their aiming at pleasure rather than good. Being preoccupied by this partial view, and having also in his mind the pretensions of the Sophists, - the teaehers of such politicians, - that they could make men good, he loses sight of the great truth, that, in a corrupt age, a good man must suffer ill from those whom he tries to benefit.

But to return to the dialogue: - When Socrates had expressed such an opinion of these four great statesmen, CaIlicles replied, that no one of his own contemporaries could compare with them in the works they had done for the state. In answer, Socrates admits that they had shown uncommon ability in gratifying the desires of the peoplc. They had created the ships, walls, and docks of Athens, but they dif-
fered in no respect from the politicians of the day in the motives of their administration. If the highest good of the state should be the statesman's aim, they could no more claim this title, than a cook or a writer on cookery could claim to rank with the master of gymnastics in preserving the bodily health. And as such persons, if intrusted with the care of the body, would be blamed when the maladies arising from luxury should come on, so will the politician, who seeks to please rather than to profit, be punished for political evils which he or his predecessors have occasioned. The head of a state may not complain of ingratitude; for it is by his management that the character of those who compose it has grown worse. And the same holds good of the Sophists. They pretend that they can make their disciples better; and yet find fault with these very scholars for keeping back the price of tuition from them, and for other acts of unthankfulness. But what good, demands Callicles, can you say of such worthless men as the Sophists? They are the same with rhetoricians, answers Socrates, or nearly so ; only somewhat above them, because they deal with principles which thetoricians mercly apply. If, now, their pretensions are well founded, they, as well as politicians, ought to fear no ingratitude; they should stipulate for no fees of instruction beforehand, trusting to the generosity of those pupils whom they had purged from vice.* (-521, A.)

Having thus compared the arts which aim at pleasure with those which aim at good, Socrates makes a personal

[^18]appeal to Callicles. "Which mode of serving the state do you now exhort me to follow; that of sceking its best interests, or that of catering for its desires?" Callicles persists in telling over the same story, that fidelity in doing good will make him suffer the loss of all things. Socrates acknowledges, with evident allusion to his trial and condemnation, thiat he is exposed to such dangers from bad men, and that he could say nothing in the court which would win lim the favor of his judges. If he should urge, on his defence, that he had opposed the public will when it was basely clamorous for present gratification, that he had striven to make men goorl, and had their well-being in view, he would fare as a physician might fare before a jury of children with a cook for his accuser. What he called good, they called evil ; what he called hurtful, they called pleasant. It was painful to be perplexed; and yet he must lead them through perplexity to truth. Would he not, then, before such judges, be himself perplexed, and at a loss for a defence ? "And do you think, then," says Callicles again, "that it is well with a man who cannot help, himself?" "Assuredly," replies Socrates, "it would be very ill with me, if I could not give myself that help which has been shown to be truly such, - if I could not observe the rule of right in all my relations. Let a man show me that I am not seeking to help myself thus, and I shall be ashamed of my character, and be grieved if I need punishment. But if I die for want of the flattering art of rhetoric, I shall not be sorry. For no one who is a man, and has reason, fears death in itself, but rather to do wrong. For to go into the other world with a soul full of all manner of iniquity is the worst of evils." (-5®3, A.)

Having thus brought the two principles of action to the confines of the two states of being, he closes very nobly, by presenting them in contrast beyond the grave. His views
are introduced as an explanation of the common mythus concerning a judgment after death; which, however, Plato scruples not to alter for his own purposes. The views are these: - The character formed by disregarding the good and right, and pursuing pleasure, must be lasting, while all the advantages it offers are temporary, being connected with the world and the wrong judgments of men. But, at death, men will come before a judge who will look at the bare soul, and give sentence according to its qualities. Among transgressors, there are some who are not gone too far in evil to be curable. For these, punishment, bitter as it must be, will prove a good. Others, having passed beyond the reach of a cure, will suffer eternally, as an example to all who shall behold them. Of this description, a large part will be tyrants and other men in power, who had on earth the greatest license to do evil. But if one of these, like Aristides, rises above the temptations of his station on earth, his reward will be so much the greater. The larger number, however, of those who receive rewards will be private persons; and, more especially, philosophers who had not mingled in public affairs. With this trial in view, Socrates asserts that he strives to bring his soul, in its most healthy condition, before the judge, and that he secks to lead his fellow-men to do the same. And to this he now urges Callicles, warning him that the trial then will be more serious than all earthly ones, and that, without such a preparation, he will be unable to help himself, but, speechless and perplexed, must submit to worse than earthly indignities. Callicles, he continues, might despise such fables, and the truth they contain, if he could show anything better. But this, neither he, Polus, nor Gorgias had been able to do. They should, therefore, agree with Socrates, that to be, and not to seem to be, a good man is a good thing ; that the next best thing is to become good by submitting to punishment;
that all flattery of one's self or others, of a few or a multitude, must be shunned; and that rhetoric, like everything else, must be used to promote the right, and that only. "Let us, then," he says in closing, " join together to live virtuously on such principles; then can we best apply ourselves to politics, when we are no longer afloat on the most momentous subjects. This is the only way to live well and to die well."

With respect to the close of the Gorgias, which must be counted among the finest passages in Greek, it may be observed that Plato shows elscwhere the same inclination to clothe in a mythical dress those truths which lie beyond the bounds of reason. It scems as if he felt the need of the venerable authority and positive assurances of a revelation upon such points, and resorted to the old traditions of his country as the best substitute which he could find, as having for their foundation real, though distorted, truth.* The mythus is something more than mere drapery, something more than a poctical fiction, which, with a beautifully plastic hand, he shapes into a form and meaning corresponding to his awakened moral sense. And yet the freedom with which he treats the mythus, and the readiness with which he alters its form on several occasions, prove that he accepted it only in its leading outlines as true; it was to him a $\mu \hat{\imath} \theta o s$, and yet a $\mu a ́ \lambda a$ кадòs $\lambda$ óyos. It is found, also, at the close of the Phædo and of the Republic. He who compares the three passages will perceive that they agree in affirming the rewards and punishments of another life, which are used, with all seriousness, as motives for living

[^19]well here below ; and also in teaching that some criminals are healed by punishment, while others must suffer for ever without hope of a cure.* This Platonic view of the reme-

[^20]dial nature of punishment, in certain cases, even in another life, seems to have recommended the doctrine of purgatory to some of the Christian fathers.*

Having thus exhibited the argument of the Gorgias at some length, it will be in order for us to ask, What is the main subject of the dialogue? A question which it is almost as difficult to answer, in regard to some of the Platonic dialogues, as it would be to express the sum total of an evening's conversation among refined and intelligent persons : the delight you have felt, the instruction you have received, you are conscious of, and you carry away much in your memory ; but it is hard to say what was the leading topic of the discourse, or whether there was any. The subject of the Gorgias is more easy to be perceived, and yet all have not been agreed concerning it. Olympiodorus (apud Routh) mentions three opinions besides his own:- Some say that it treats of rhetoric ; others, of justice and injustice, considered especially in their relations to happiness; others still, absurdly enough, make it relate to the demiurgus or divine builder of the world, on account of the mythus at the close. "But we say," continues the Platonic commentator, "that the scope is, to treat of the principles which lead men to political happiness." With the first of these opinions, Cousin and Stallbaum agree. The latter says, however, that " though the principal point of the discussion is to blame the civil and rhetorical art at that day in vogue, and to show that it could not attain to excellence without the knowledge and practice of philosophy," yet several other topics are closely united with this, as the difference of the just and the pleasant, the end of human actions, and the constancy of a good man in bearing evils and injuries. Nearly the same is the view taken by Ast. The Gorgias,

[^21]says he, "has a decidedly political tendency; and all the philosophical inquiries which it contains are intended to show, not only the unmeaning nature, but also the perniciousness, and, in fact, the profligacy, of the political art, when built on sophistry, that is, of the rhetoric there opposed." Another writer on the higher criticism of Plato, Socher, gives this dialogue a wider range. "The whole presents an arena, rising in three gradations. The prize of the contest is the better, happier mode of life; the parties are philosophy and rhetoric ; that contends for righteousness and virtue ; this for the possession of political power ; the champion of the former is Socrates; on behalf of the latter, three step forward, Gorgias, a rhetorician, Polus, a Sophist, and Callicles, an Athenian politician." Finally, Schleiermacher and C. F. Hermann, in the words of the latter, regard "the kernel of the dialogue to be, that the good alone is truly usefirl, and that men harm themselves by wrong-doing; that, accordingly, the rule of pleasure must give way to the higher rule of the gaod." *

[^22]Most of these opinions have something of justice in them, but, with the exception of the last, appear to me to look at a part of the dialogue, rather than at the whole. If rhetoric is the subject, why have the researches into the nature of pleasure, the comparison between suffering injustice and committing it, and the discussion of the efficacy of punishment, so great prominence? Much is said about rhetoric, but it is the vehicle for conveying thought rather than the subject, the starting-point of the dialogue rather than its goal. I should entertain just the opposite opinion to that of Ast above quoted : that the scientific part of the dialogue is the main thing, and rhetoric only an example. Schlciermacher's view, so fur as I understand it, or one very similar to it, appears to me to deserve the preference. The main subject is the worthless nature of pleasure, and of the pursuits founded on pleasure, as opposed to the right and the good. Rhetoric, including politics in its corrupt condition at that time, is selected as the most prominent and most esteemed of the arts which minister to pleasure. This exhibition of the subject being admitted, we see a propricty in the introduction of every topic. The right and the good are inseparably linked to each ather, and, in fact, united with all that pertains to man's excellence and well-being. But to these, pleasure, pursued for its own sake, is opposcrl. It is opposed to true good, for it blindly seeks present gratification, howeyer pernicious or debasing. It is opposed to right or justice, for it tries to avoid suffering wrong by inflicting wrong on others. It is opposed to both, because its impulse is to escape from de-

[^23]served punishment, without regard to the good effects of punishment on virtue and happiness. The arts which minister to pleasure - one of which, and the chicf in its pretensions, is filse rhetoric - fall under the same condemnation. As truth is on the side of good, they have no communion with truth; they are arts of imposition or flattery, calculated to persuade the ignorant, and reared upon no basis of unchanging truth or scientific principles. In the end, as they sacrifice the highest good of those whom they please to their present gratification, they involve in ruin him who practises them, and those who are practised upon. Politics, especially, which, when genuine, aims at the public good, is, when based on these principles, a mischievous trade. And this supreme pursuit of pleasure affects the condition of man, not only in this life, but in the life to come.

Such appears to me to be the subject of the Corgias. But it should be added, that Plato has so handled the subject that the dialogue answers also for a defence of himself and his master. The allusions to the trial of Socrates have been noticed already. He stands before us as the philosopher who suffers reproach and death for seeking men's good rather than their pleasure. But Plato defends himself, also, apparently against friends, who blamed him for not publicly serving the state, as well as against public men, who thought philosophy a uscless pursuit. Politics, he asserts, must be founded on the theory and practice of philosophy. No man is a true politician until he becomes $\tau \epsilon \chi$ totós, - an artist, a philosopher able to distinguish useful from harmful pleasures, - and reduces his science to practice by making men better. That this is a fair defence I do not assert; for, with trne good in view at the outset, the practice perfects a man in the science. He might have said, what he must have felt, that the corruption of the
times, the necessity of using flattering arts, to which he could not resort, wonld have altogether prevented his success. In such an age, - and such an age is a very long one, - the phtlosophical statesman, - let me add, the truly enlightened Christian statesman, - the sound pilot of the state, is thrust from the helm, and ignorant apprentices usurp his place. Plato's part, therefore, was to act on a few, and on future times.

I would gladly now draw the attention of my younger readers to the Gorgias, as a display of the mind and style of Plato; but the limits of an Introduction forbid me to enlarge upon this topic. I must, therefore, omit to speak of the exquisite style of Plato, and the dramatic form in which he clothes his works. I must only glance at the Platonic Socrates, the centre of Plato's writings ; at his admirable irony, now playful and now severe, his unruffled goodnature, his hatred of show and pretence, his attitude as an inquirer rather than as already wise, his unaffected modesty, his propensity to illustrate the great by the small, philosophical truth by common life, his high estimate of moral truth above physical. There are, however, one or two points to be noticed, in which Gorgias differs from many of Plato's works. One is, the earnestness, almost amounting to bitterness, with which the argument is carried on. There is less here of playful irony than elsewhere. Another is, that Socrates expresses his opinion, and lays down his principles, more than in most of the dialogues of an earlier date. Another still is, that, compared with the Platonic works of the first period, it has less of the dramatic about it; we have no embellished preface, like that of Protagoras, but at the beginning, Socrates, without any delay on the part of the writer, enters into the discussion. All these characteristics may be explained by a predominance of moral feeling, which rises cren into indignation, and deprives Plato of part
of his usual tranquillity. With all this, the form is admirable.* The argument grows in interest and importance, until it ends in a strain of highest mood. To mention but a single characteristic, nothing can be finer than the way in which Socrates deals with Callicles in the third part, where he retorts his language upon him, and shows that the indignities which he had described as the rewards of the just man on earth will be heaped upon the unjust in a higher degree hereafter.

The opinion of the greater number of crities assigns the composition of the Gorgias to one of the years not long after the death of Socrates, while that event was still fresh in Plato's mind. Athenæus has a story (11.505, D), that Gorgias read the work, and said, "How well Plato knows how to lampoon!" and another, that Gorgias declared that "he never heard or said such things as Plato reported." If Gorgias died soon after Socrates, as Foss maintains, these aneedotes, which may not be wholly unworthy of eredence, would supply us with the latter term for the composition of the dialogue. But there is no certainty in regard to the dates of the birth of Corgias, and of his age when he came to Athens as ambassador, on which the date of his death depends. A comparison of this dialogue with Plato's other works enables us to come somewhere near the time of its composition in another manner. It occupies a

[^24]middle place, as Schleiermacher teaches us, between the elementary writings of Plato's first years, and the constructive ones of his maturer life. This critic conceives that it was written after Plato's first visit to Sicily, in 389, B. C., when he was forty years of age. Stallbaum brings it much nearer to the death of Socrates, in 399. To this conclusion he is led by a strong resemblance he discovers between the Gorgias and Meno, which latter dialogue he carries back even to a time before the death of Socrates, on account of Plato's mildness there in attacking Anytus, the accuser of his master. But neither of these considerations has much weight ; Plato might and does resemble himself in works written at considerable intervals from one another ; and the more gentle tone of Meno may be owing to a frame of its author's mind which is not to be accounted for. It is safer to say, that the date cannot be ascertained precisely.
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D Cap. XLVII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Óvx $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \varepsilon \nu \nu \omega \tilde{\omega} \gamma \varepsilon, \tilde{\omega}^{\tilde{m}} K \alpha \lambda-$




























 о ั่̃












 Dжai $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau i ́ \theta \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \iota ~ \varepsilon v ่ \delta \alpha \iota \mu о \nu \varepsilon \sigma t \varepsilon ́ g o v s ~ \varepsilon i ̃ v a l ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~$





Cap. XLVIII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Фeg $\rho \varepsilon \delta \eta \eta^{\prime}, \alpha ้ \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \quad \sigma 0 \iota \varepsilon i-$

































幺inv.









































































 $\lambda \alpha ́ \tau \tau \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \dot{o} \varphi p \theta \alpha \lambda \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu \quad \alpha \alpha i \quad \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon v \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \quad{ }_{\alpha} \mu \alpha \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu-$




 xai $\alpha \sigma \theta \varepsilon ́ v \varepsilon \iota \alpha \nu ~ \omega \sigma \alpha v ́ t \omega s ; ~ K A \Lambda . ~ N a i ́ . ~ \Sigma \Omega . ~$ K $\alpha i$ т $\alpha \chi о s$ хаi $\beta \rho \alpha \delta v \tau \eta \tau \tau \alpha ; ~ K A A . ~ \Pi \alpha ́ \nu v ~ \gamma \varepsilon . ~$
















 $\sigma \alpha \nu$ हैv



 Naí. $\quad \Sigma \Omega$. Tò $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \sigma i ́ s ~ \tau \varepsilon ~ \tau \tilde{\eta} s ~ ह ृ \nu-$





























 $\chi \varepsilon \check{\iota}$ oṽt $\omega \varsigma$.






































 $\delta \varepsilon \iota \lambda o i ́ ; ~ K A A$. $\Sigma \varphi o ́ \delta \rho \alpha$ үє. $\Sigma \Omega$. Kai oi






 $\lambda o i \quad x \alpha i$ oi $\alpha \nu \delta \rho \varepsilon \tilde{\imath} o \iota \pi \alpha \varrho \alpha \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i ́ \omega s$, $\omega$ s $\sigma \dot{v} \varphi \eta \eta^{\prime}$,


 KAA. Naí. $\Sigma \Omega . ~ \Pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i ́ \omega s ~ « ̈ \rho \alpha ~ \chi \alpha i \rho o v \sigma \iota ~$ rаi $\lambda v \pi o \tilde{v \nu t \alpha \iota ~ o i ~ a ̉ \gamma \alpha \theta o i ̀ ~ x \alpha i ~ o i ~ x \alpha x o i ́ ; ~ K A A . ~}$ Ф $\eta \mu i$. $\quad \Sigma \Omega .{ }^{5} A \rho$ ' oiv $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i ́ \omega s$ вioì $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha-$



Cap. LIII. KAA. 'A $\lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\alpha} \Delta i '$ ovix oí' D







 $\mathrm{E} \nu o \iota s$ oर̀ $\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \varepsilon \sigma \tau \iota \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \varkappa \alpha \chi \alpha ́, ~ \alpha i ~ \lambda i \tilde{v} \pi \alpha \iota ; ~ K A A . ~$
 бv̀ sĩ̀a九 \％axov̀s tov̀s xaxoús．ì oủxét兀 ゆyís；


 $\tau o v$ ，oi ঠеे $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i ́ \omega s ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i \omega s ; ~ K A A . ~$


 हैं兀 tov̀s $\delta \varepsilon \iota \lambda o v ́ s ; ~ K A A . ~ " E \gamma \omega \gamma \varepsilon . ~ \Sigma \Sigma \Omega . ~ \Sigma u \lambda-~$









 $\mu \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda_{0 \nu}$ тòv кахóv；КАA．Naí．$\Sigma \Omega$ ．Ò̀\％











































 $K A \mathcal{A}$. $\Pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \gamma \varepsilon$. $\Sigma \Omega$. ${ }^{\Sigma} A \rho$ ' oũv $\pi \alpha \nu t o ̀ s ~ \alpha ̉ \nu$ -

 KAA. T'q $\chi$ ขкoũ.

Cap. LV. $\Sigma \Omega$. 'Av $\alpha \mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \omega \mu \mu \nu \delta \eta j{ }_{j} \nu \nu a \hat{v}$


















 Bíov tòv ह̇v pilooopía, zai tí поt' ह̇otiv oṽtos




 тí $\lambda \varepsilon$ ह́ $\gamma \omega . \quad K A \Lambda$. Óv $\delta \tilde{\eta} \tau \alpha . \quad \Sigma \Omega$. ' $A \lambda \lambda$ ' द̇ $\gamma \dot{\prime}$








Cap. LVI. $\Sigma \Omega$. ${ }^{\prime} I \theta \iota ~ \delta \eta$, à $\chi \alpha i ̀ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o v ́ \sigma \delta s ~$


































 KАA. Oĩцац $\check{\iota} \gamma \omega \gamma \varepsilon$.
















































 КАА. Пóvv $\gamma \varepsilon$.

Cap. LVIII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Eĩ̌v. tí dè $\eta$ jugoò tòv 'A0ŋvaíav ס


























 oủx oĩ $\delta \alpha$ tís ह̇бтıv oũtos. KAA. Tí $\delta \varepsilon ́ ; ~ \Theta \varepsilon-C$














Cap. LIX. $\Sigma \Sigma \Omega$. ' $A \lambda \lambda$ ' $\varepsilon$ ' $\alpha \nu \quad \zeta \eta \tau \tilde{\eta} s \quad x \alpha \lambda \omega \tilde{s}$,








 povs, tov̀s oixoסópovs, tov̀s vavaijrou's, tov̀s








 КАА. "Eбть тои̃то ои̃то. $\Sigma \Omega$. Tágescs üga



 Пávv $\gamma \varepsilon . \quad \Sigma \Omega$. Tí $\delta^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \psi v \chi \eta \eta^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha \xi i \alpha s \tau v \chi o \tilde{v}-$


















 " Eбт $\omega$.

Cap. LX. $\Sigma \Omega$. Oủxoũv $\pi \rho_{\rho o ̀ s} \tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha \alpha \tilde{v} \beta \lambda \dot{\varepsilon}-$
 Oós, xai tov̀s hórovs $\pi \varrho \circ \sigma o i ́ \sigma \varepsilon \iota ~ \tau \alpha i ̃ s ~ \psi v \chi \alpha i ̃ s ~ o u ̈ s ~$












 $\tau \alpha ; \quad K A \Lambda$. "Eбтш. $\Sigma \Omega$. Ov̉ $\gamma \alpha$, $\rho$, oí $\mu \alpha, ~ \lambda v$ -






 $\theta \nu \mu \varepsilon \imath ̃ ; ~ \sigma v \gamma \chi \omega \rho \varepsilon i ̃ s ~ \tau о \tilde{\tau}$ ó $\gamma \varepsilon$ каi $\sigma v ́ ; ~ K A \Lambda . ~$

























 زov xaraגєítcousv. KAA. Aùtòs סغ̀ oủx äv





 と̈みะ























 ж $\alpha i$ пध́ $\rho \alpha \iota \nu \varepsilon$.














































 $\tau \alpha \mu \alpha \varkappa \alpha ́ \rho \iota o ́ v ~ \tau \varepsilon ~ \chi \alpha i ~ \varepsilon u ̉ \delta \alpha i ́ \mu o v \alpha ~ \varepsilon і ̃ ँ \alpha \iota, ~ т o ̀ v ~ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \pi o-~$


























 voũv тои́tots, xai т $\alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha$ боњрòs $\omega ้ \nu$, à $\lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon ́ \lambda \eta \theta \varepsilon ́$
















 Cap. LXIV. Tov́t $\omega v$ dè oũt $\omega s$ è $\chi o ́ v \tau \omega \nu, ~ \sigma \chi \varepsilon \psi \omega ́-$






















 xai ảd $\alpha \mu \alpha \nu \tau i ́ v o \iota s ~ \lambda . o ́ \gamma o \iota s, ~ \omega s ~ \gamma o u ̃ \nu ~ a ̈ \nu ~ \delta o ́ g \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$ ovitcoiv, oűs $\sigma u ̀ ~ \varepsilon i ~ \mu i ̀ ~ \lambda v i \sigma \varepsilon \iota s ~ \eta ̈ ~ \sigma o v ̃ ~ \tau \iota s ~ \nu \varepsilon \alpha \nu \iota x \omega ́-~$



















 х $\lambda \varepsilon \iota$; KАА. Ov̉x $\alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \varsigma$.

Cap. LXV. $\Sigma \Omega$. Avoĩv oưv ơvtolv ${ }_{2}$ qoũ ảdt-






















































 $\chi \alpha i \rho \varepsilon \iota \nu$ каi $\alpha \chi \theta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ тஸ̣ $\delta \varepsilon \sigma \pi o ́ t \eta, ~ \varkappa \alpha i ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$
 Е oủz oưtcs; KAA. Naí. $\Sigma \Omega$. Oủzoĩv toú-


$K A A$. Mávv $\gamma \varepsilon$. $\Sigma \Omega .^{5} A \rho^{\prime}$ oưv xai tò $\mu \grave{̀}$




 סíxๆv. ग๋ $\gamma \alpha \mathfrak{\rho}$; KAA. Daivetal. $\Sigma \Omega$. Oủx-

 toṽ סєatótov xai סưvaulv. KAA. Oủx oì'













































































































Cap. LXIX. KAA. Oủx oî ${ }^{\prime}$ övtıvá $\mu$ oı toó-


тò $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi о \lambda \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi \dot{\alpha} \theta o s \cdot$ oủ $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu v$ боє $\pi \varepsilon i ́ \theta o \mu \alpha \iota$.














































р KAA. Пávv $\gamma \varepsilon$.









































































Cap. LXXII. KAA. Tí oũv; qov́zov ย̇vexa


















































Cap. LXXIII. KAA. 'A $\lambda \lambda \alpha^{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon ́ v \tau o \iota ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda o u ̄$














 öv $\delta \iota \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \gamma o ́ \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha$, oúdìv $\pi \alpha v o ́ \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha$ єis tò $\alpha \dot{v} \tau o ̀ ~ \alpha ̀ \varepsilon i ~$







































 ס文 oìvov. Cap. LXXIV. "Iows äv oưv $\eta^{\eta} \gamma \alpha-$


























 хаi $\Pi \varepsilon \rho \iota x \lambda \varepsilon ́ \alpha ~ \varepsilon ̇ \gamma \gamma \omega \mu \iota \alpha ́ \sigma o v \sigma \iota, ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \alpha i ́ t i ́ o v s ~ \tau \tilde{\omega \nu}$


























 ஸ̃ Kaдスix

Cap. LXXV. KAA. $\Sigma v \delta^{\prime}$ oủx äv oĩós $\tau$,



































 үág; KAA. Naí. $\Sigma \Omega$. Oủxoũv $\varepsilon$ í tıs av̉rò

















 KАА. ${ }^{2}$ Eбтıv. $\Sigma \Omega$. 'Eлi тоте́ $\rho \alpha \nu$ oũv $\mu \varepsilon \pi \alpha$ -

















 кахผัs.











 $\tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha$ пৎобঠокต̃; KAA. Móvv $\gamma^{\prime}$. $\Sigma \Omega$. Oĩ-


























Cap. LXXVIII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Toooũtov $\mu$ évzol xai











 тоя $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \nu$ по́






















Cap. LXXIX. $\quad \Sigma \Omega$. 'Axove $\delta \eta \eta^{\prime}, ~ p \alpha \sigma i ́, \mu \alpha \prime \lambda \alpha, 523$



















































 тоৎяías toĩs àv $\theta$ @́́тots.



















 $\tau \alpha \tilde{\tau} \tau \alpha$ है้





















































































 iosiv̀ aủtòv
 x $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma}$.











 x $\alpha i \dot{\eta}$ x



 $\pi \varrho о \pi \eta \lambda \alpha \varkappa \iota \varepsilon \tilde{.}$.

Táx $\alpha \delta^{\prime}$ oũv raṽra $\mu \tilde{v} \theta$ ós бo८ $\delta$ ожะĩ $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$,


















 $\alpha{ }_{\alpha}^{2} \lambda \eta \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \pi \rho \alpha^{2} \xi \varepsilon \iota$.























N OTES.

## N O TES.


#### Abstract

N. B. The references follow the marginal pages and letters of the text, which are those of the Paris edition of 1578 , edited by H. Stephanus. Mt. stands for Matthix's Grammar, second edition; K., for Küher's Middle Grammar, translated by Edwards and Taylor ; Cr., for Crosby's, second edition; and Soph., for that of Sophocles, quoted according to the original sections:-in the new edition (1847) the earlier and present sections are collated at the beginning.


447 A. oüт $\mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda a \gamma \chi^{a ́ v \epsilon \iota \nu, ~ s o ~ t o ~ t a k e ~ p a r t ~ i n ; ~ i . ~ e . ~ i n ~ t h e ~}$ present instance, to take no part in at all. Callicles says, "It were well to have such a share in a battle, as you have had in listening to Gorgias "; i. e. it were well to arrive too late for an unpleasant employment, but not for a feast such as we have had. For the selection of war in this proverbial phrase, comp. Phædr. 242, B, oú пó̀єє ảy $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon t s$, what you tell me is not at all disagreeable; and so
 § 167, N. 2. Cr. § 334. 8. The accusative may be explained by considering it as the object of the general notion of action contained in the verbs, $=$ are we doing то̀ $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon-$
 middle, with an accus. (e. g. $\sigma o \phi i a \nu$ or a neuter adjective) or without, especially denotes that ostentatious display of their art, which the sophists and rhetoricians at this time
 $\mu \epsilon \nu$. As the verbs denote but one act, rovitov might be used equally well, and the plural is not unfrequently used in referring to a single verb. Comp. 492, C.
 clause. No matter: for if I did the harm, I will also find the remedy. According to Olympiod. and a Schol., the words are drawn from the Telephus of Euripides, being spoken by Achilles, who wounded that hero.- $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ סoкєi. The indic. implies belief that such is the view of
 the wish as a mere possible contingency. - '̇ $\sigma a v i \theta ı s$, again, at another time, hereafter. So єírav̂Өıs ảvaßàov̂, Sympos.
 $\delta a i^{\prime}$; usually, where $\delta a i$ is found, $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ is in some MSS. as a various reading. The longer form, it is now admitted, is properly retained after $\tau i$ and $\pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$, where wonder or indignation is expressed. - ov่кô̂̀ . . . íuiv. Stallb., Ast, and others explain the construction by regarding $\eta \pi \kappa \iota \nu$ as used imperatively (Soph. § 219, N. 6 ; Cr. § 625 ; K. § 306, R. 11), àkô̂бaı 「opyiou being understood. I incline to regard $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \delta \epsilon i \xi \epsilon \tau a l \dot{j} \mu i \nu$ as the proper apodosis, which, owing to the intervention of the clause beginning with $\gamma$ áp, deserts its own construction for that of the interposed clause. The sense is, Well, then, whenever you wish to come to my house, Gorgias will exhibit to you, for he lodges with me. So, apparently, Heindorf. Comp. Soph. E.d. R. 227-229, where the clause $\pi \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \tau a l$ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ oviò $\bar{\nu}$ turns the apodosis following it, which would be naturally $\gamma \hat{\eta} s \dot{a} \pi i \tau \omega ~ d \beta \lambda a \beta \eta$ ́s, into
 in inviting us to your house, and quite right in wishing to spare Gorgias further fatigue. But, etc.
C. $\delta a \_\in \chi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a$, here, to discourse by way of question and answer, tacitly contrasted with an $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \delta \epsilon \epsilon \xi(s$, in which Gorgias would be the sole speaker. Hence, to hold a discussion, or search for truth in that way, as Socrates did. Socrates, in Xen. Mem. 4. 5. 12, defines it кoんv̂̂ $\beta o v \lambda \epsilon \cup ́ \epsilon-~$

notion of question and answer faded away from the derivatives of this word; and that of logical reasoning, or that of the science of unchangeable, absolute truth, remained. - $\delta u ́ v a \mu s, ~ e s s e n c e, ~ n a t u r e . ~-~ т o u ̂ ~ a ̀ v \delta o o ̀ s ~ p r o n o m i n i s ~$ fere partes agit, ut exprimi possit pronomine possessivo. Ast. The art of the man = his art, with perhaps something
 in person, or himself. And so 481, B. aùròv is taken with the object of $\dot{\rho} \rho \omega \tau a \hat{\nu}$ not expressed.
D. 'ُ $\rho o \hat{v}$, second aor., not ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \rho o u$. No present is used by the Attics. Soph. § 118 , sub voce; K. § 166 ; Cr.
 "Quorum [sophistarum] e numero primus est ausus Leontinus Gorgias in conventu poscere quæstionem, id est, jubere dicere, qua de re quis vellet audire." This is spoken of at length by Philostr. Vit. Sophist., Procem.
448 A. $\dot{\eta} \pi$ тоv ... àmoкрivє, no donbt, then, you answer with ease, $O$ Gorgias. Ast translates jadics, libenter, but his power to answer, and not his willingness, is in question.
 spoken of a person, comp. $\epsilon i$ ßoúdeı $\lambda a \beta \epsilon i \nu ~ \mu o v ~ \pi \epsilon i ̂ p a \nu, ~ P r o-~$
 difference does that make, if I answer well enough for you? To the common formula, ri roùтo; is sometimes added סua申́िєє, which Stallb. here supplies. But $\tau i$ can well be a nominative. $\tau i$ rov̀тo; what is that? i. e. what of that ?
B. 'Hpódıós, a brother of Gorgias, of whom we know nothing besides his name and calling. He is not to be confounded, as the Scholiast well observes, with another man often mentioned by Plato, Herodicus of Selymbria in Thrace, and originally of Megara ; who first taught gymnastics, but on the failure of his health gave himself up to the attempt to recover it; and was among the earliest to
 predicate-accusative with ка入єì, ỏvo ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\zeta} \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$, may be riva, referring to any one by name or by some appellation taken from his art, business, etc. ; or ri, which is neuter on ac-
 occur together. - $\bar{\eta}$ ì à à $\epsilon \lambda \phi \grave{s}$ aìvov̂. Polygnotus of Thasos, the most celebrated of this family of painters. He painted upon the wall of the Stoa Pœcile at Athens gratuitously, and at Delphi. Of his pictures from epic subjects in a hall near the Delphian temple, Pausanias gives a minute account ( 10.25 . seq.), which has enabled two artists of the present day to reproduce his designs in the spirit of ancient art.
C. $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \pi \pi \varepsilon \iota \delta \eta_{j}^{\prime}$. In this sentence, both the main clause and that which furnishes the reason are interrogative, a usage which would be awkward in English, but is lively and favorable to brevity. A little below, 451, A, we have the interrogative included between the article and participle ( $\dot{\eta}$
 tence. Comp. Cr. § 539. 2.—— $\bar{\omega}$ Xatpeф $\hat{\omega} \nu$. The words which follow are plainly not in the style of conversation. The juxtaposition of words from the same root ( $\epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \omega \hat{\omega}$
 and the antithetical form of the clauses, all show, that either the style of Polus is imitated by Plato, or that words from a treatise of his are hère put into his mouth. They are quoted as his by Syrianus on Hermogenes. (4. 44. Walz.) See 462, B.
D. боі̀ ßоvдодév@ évтiv. Soph. § 196, N. 2; Cr. § 408 ;
 to me, even from what he has said, that Polus has studied the art of rhetoric, so called, rather than how to discourse (logically) by way of question and answer. $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o s$, etc., for $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o ́ v$ $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu,{ }^{\circ} \tau \iota \Pi \bar{\omega} \lambda o s$, by attraction, as it is sometimes called. The
tendency to give prominence to the main word－here the subject－of the second elause caused it to be pushed for－ ward into the leading clause．This made that clause per－ sonal instead of impersonal，and bound the two clauses together more closely．
 on account of moia ris cil $\eta$ ．But this is unnecessary，for the present may be rhetorically for the imperfect，or may in－ clude it．Nobody asks you＝nobody asked you or now asks you．Comp．Xen．Anab．1．1．3，סıaßá入入єt ．．．$\dot{\omega} s \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \iota-$ $\beta o v \lambda \epsilon v i o l$ ，for $\delta \iota \epsilon \in \beta a \lambda \lambda \epsilon$ ．In this sentence，moios and ris，which belong to direct inquiry，are found in company with örcis， by which indirect questions are introduced．Comp．noia and óroía together， 500 ，A．Comp．also oïà for ómoía， $450, \mathrm{C}$ ，ä́a for ómóva， $451, \mathrm{~B}$ ，and other passages．－ $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ тà $\ddot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \rho a \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ ．For the asyndeton，comp．450，B，
 § 478 ，a．The second clause begins at кai vîv oũtcs．
449 A．inoteivectat，est quœstionem ita proponere ut alteri subjicias quid respondendem sit，et in universo proponere quastionem．Ast．－$\dot{\omega} s$ tivos ．．．T＇́ $\chi \nu \eta s$ ．Another form of compound interrogation，when one clause has the particip－
 moratum，as Routh translates it，but plainly egregium certe．


B．oủkoû̀．See Preface．－ä̀入a $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\iota}$ ．See Introd．pp． xiii．，xiv．－a ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\circ} \pi \pi \epsilon \rho$ ，etc．，but be not false to the promise you make．Socrates takes for granted that he consents． Hence ör $\epsilon \rho$ ，which Ast would change into $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho$ ，is justly
 èvias（Heind．），or èv ėviaus motєíधAat．See 448，D．In some of the answers it is necessary to discourse at length．

[^25] \&̀̀̀ $\beta_{\rho a \chi u \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu, ~ j u s t ~ b e l o w . ~-~ W i t h ~ t h i s ~ b o a s t ~ o f ~ G o r g i a s, ~}^{\text {, }}$ comp. the ironical passages in Protag. 329, B, 334, D. The latter runs thus: "O Protagoras, I happen to be an oblivious sort of person, and if I have a long speech made to me, I forget what is the topic of discourse; therefore, as, in case I were somewhat deaf, you would think that you ought to talk in a louder tone with me than with others, to carry on a conversation with me; so, seeing I am so forgetful, abridge your answers, and make them shorter, to enable me to follow you." - $\pi a ́ v v . . . \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \omega \hat{s}$, quite sufficiently, or very well.
E. Toiovs tovirous . . . iytaivotev; what kind of words? are they those which make known by what sort of regimen the sick can get well? Understand $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ with $\pi$ oious roúrous; as in 450 , A, line 4. This is a condensed expression for
 attracted forwards to $\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{v} \sigma \iota$ as its object. ©s is quomodo, not $u t$, and to be taken with סıaıtं $\mu \in \nu=u$. The two words have the same sense as tive otaity. Comp. 453, C. -


 stances of asyndeton which occur in this dialoguc. Some are owing to earnestness of feeling ( $449, \mathrm{~A}, \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \ldots \dot{a} \pi \epsilon-$ к $\rho i \nu \omega)$; some heighten the effect of contrast by bringing

 ä入入ovs), or making a word more emphatic ( $510, \mathrm{C}$ ) ; but in the greater number the second clause is added without a. particle to explain the first, and, like a noun in apposition, would rather be separated than connected by a particle. Comp. K. § 325 .- $\begin{gathered}\text { - } \\ \epsilon \pi \pi o s ~ \epsilon i \pi \epsilon i v . ~ T h i s ~ c o m m o n ~ p h r a s e ~\end{gathered}$ nearly always, in this work, moderates the force of some universal word, as mâs, ovòcis. According to Lobeck (para-
lipom. Gram. Græc. 59), ë̃os єìmeì occurs very often, eineî є̈тоs rarely. It denotes, l. ut ita dicam, as here ; 2. speaking
 $\rho \iota \kappa \bar{\eta} s$. The sense is, But there is no such mamual operation pertaining to rhetoric, but all its activity and efficiency are exercised by means of words. The Seholiast says, that $\chi$ єtpoúpy $\eta \mu a$ and $\kappa \dot{́} \rho \omega \sigma \iota s$ are provincial words brought by Gorgias from his native town, Leontini. This is probably a mere random assertion, and unlikely in itself. But the use of these words, instead of $\chi \epsilon \epsilon \rho o v \rho \gamma i a$ and $\kappa \hat{\imath} \rho o s$, may be intended to show forth the artificial and elaborate style of Gorgias. Thucydides uses кúp $\omega \sigma \iota \iota$ (Lib. 6. 103).
C. Ầp’ oủv . . . калєiv ; Indeed, I perceive what sort of art you wish to call it. So Ast. "Formula âp" oủv eodem modo ut oùk oûv initio per interrogationem cum negatione junctam affirmat." Hermann on Soph. Antig. 628 (632). Or we need only say that $\bar{\alpha} \rho a$, as it often does, requires an affirmative answer. Stallb. retains the interrogative force of $\hat{\alpha} \rho a$, and supposes the question to require a negative answer. Do $I$ understand, etc., i. e. $I$ do not understand. But $\mu a \nu \theta a ́ v \omega$ can denote a perception that is not yet clear. Prof. Crosby remarks on this passage as follows:-"Is there not a species of anacoluthon at the beginning of this chapter ? 'Do I then understand what you would call it? However, I shall soon know.' He seems to me to be first intending to ask Gorgias directly, whether the idea he obtains from his answer is the true one; but then another mode of satisfying himself occurs, and he changes the dis-
 § 142, N. 3.
E. ou่x öть . . . eites, although in the expression which you make use of you so said. ourros refers to the succeeding subordinate clause. oùخ örc is properly elliptical for ov̉ $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$, or oủ火 $\dot{\rho} \rho \hat{\omega}$ ört, and sometimes, followed by $\dot{\mu} \lambda \lambda \dot{c}$, means not
only, or not only not. Comp. Mt. § 624. 4. - $\delta v \sigma \chi$ ¢pai$\nu \epsilon \iota$, to be captious in the discourse or discussion.
B. є єттоц’ à̀ . . . ỏvтa. Complete the sentence by ris 451 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \hat{v} \rho o s{ }^{\epsilon} \chi o v \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu, I$ would say that it is one of those arts that exert their power with regard to (whose efficiency consists in inquiring concerning) the odd and even, how many there can be of each, i. e. that it is an art, which asks how many there are, and whose elements are odd and even numbers. $\gamma^{\nu \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota s}$ is due to a copyist, who thought the structure deficient. - $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ oi $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \delta \delta_{\eta}^{\eta} \mu \varphi$ $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon \nu o t$, as those say who draw up written motions in the meetings of the peo$p l e$, i. e. who offer amendments in the assembly. The clearest light has been thrown upon this phrase recently by Boeckh, in his Inscriptiones Græcæ, Vol. I. No. 84. The allusion is to the formula $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\mu} \nu \dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda a$ ка $A \dot{\lambda} \pi \epsilon \rho \tau \hat{\eta} \beta o v \lambda \hat{\eta}, \mathrm{sc}$. $\epsilon \% 0 \xi \in \nu$, which was used by those who, in the assembly, made amendments to the decrees or probouleumata brought down from the council. They employed the phrase to avoid the trouble of reading over those parts of the decree which they left unaltered. $\sigma \dot{v} \gamma \gamma \rho a \mu \mu a$ is so used of a clause in a decree by Æschines c. Ctes. § 127 Bekker. The Scholiast, with less success, explains these words of cases where two or more bills proposed by the same person followed one another in succession. It was the custom to prefix the names or the citizen, of his father, his demus, and tribe, to his resolution. In such cases the herald, says he, to save time, would say $\tau \grave{\alpha} ~ \mu \grave{̀} \nu$ ä̀ $\lambda \lambda a$ кaтà $\tau a u ̉ \tau a ́$, the same as before. But this explanation is unfortunate for several obvious reasons. Still more so is Coray's, who understands oi ovyүрафо́ $\mu \in \nu=$, of public contractors.
 thus much: that the art of calculating considers how the odd and the even are related to themselves (i. e. odd to odd and even to even) and to each other in respect to number.

For $\pi \bar{\omega} s{ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \chi \epsilon \iota \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta_{\text {ous, }}$, see Soph. § 188, N. ; Cr. § $363, \beta$; K. § 274. 3. This definition of $\lambda_{\text {oyıotıк̀ }}^{\eta}$ is found again in Charmides, 166, A. Arithmetic seems in Plato's definition to be employed with number in general, and $\lambda$ oytorikì to be the vulgar art of reckoning, in which numbers are considered in their relations. A later distinction in the science of number was into Arithmetic, which inquired $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i}$ тov̂ $\pi \sigma \sigma o \hat{v}$
 the relations of numbers. Sometimes, as here, the former term included the whole science of number, but was used
 bers in themselves considered.
D. The second $\tau i$ is added by Stallbaum from a conjecture of Heindorf, and seems necessary to the text. The
 See Eurip. Alcest. 106, and p. 452, E, тi . . . тойто $\lambda$ '́́yєts; also Cr. § 528.
E. тоиิто тò $\sigma к о \lambda \iota o ́ v . ~ T h i s ~ s c o l i u m, ~ o r ~ t a b l e-s o n g, ~ i s ~ a s-~$ cribed by the Scholiast to Simonides or to Epicharmus. It is often quoted, as by Athenæus at the end of his work. Comp. a fine passage, Laws 1.631. The whole song is, -


 кaì тò т́́тартоע $\mathfrak{\eta} \beta a ̂ \nu \mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \phi i \lambda \omega \nu . " ~ " ~$

Plato does not allude to the last line, because no trade or employment is concerned with it.
 order suggested by the scolium. Heindorf wished to read ó iarpós $\tau \epsilon$, but Buttmann observes (the remark does not appear in the second ed. of Heind.), that the article so used would denote that one person had all the attributes mentioned: í $\tau \epsilon$ iatpos кai र $\chi \eta \mu a \tau \iota \sigma \tau \eta$, on the contrary, would
sufficiently discriminate the persons；or，in ambiguous
 ¢ $\xi a \pi a \tau a ̂$ ．For oratio recta after öт $\iota$, comp．Cr．§ 609，a．
 to Stallb．，why there is here an indic．in the protasis with an opt．in the apodosis is，that what the pædotribe says，＂in－ terlocutoris mentem potius quam suam ipsius opinionem re－
 ion，only a possibility，he says $\theta a v \mu a ́ \zeta o \iota \mu \iota a ̈ ้$ ．But per－ haps $\theta a v \mu i \zeta о \iota \mu \iota ~ a ̀ \nu$ may be considered the optative of politeness，which expresses，under the form of a possibility， something real and absolute．Comp．Kühner＇s largest Gr．
 to his art．

C．$\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu v$ катафроү⿳⿵人一 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ is added in satire，to show the higher pretensions of the meanest of the three employ－ ments．Gorgias and the sophists held philosophy in like contempt，compared with the arts of show．One of the comic poets，Anaxandrides（Athenæus，694，F），proposes to comply with these high claims so far as to change the place of the second and third lines of the scolium．He says，＂when the author of it named making money as the third best thing，＂－


——кaì $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ ．．．ö $\delta \epsilon$ ，and yet you see Gorgias here main－ tains on the contrary．

D．кà̀ $\sigma \grave{\epsilon} \ldots$ ．．à̀rov̀．There is here a change not un－ known to our language from the relative to the demonstra－ tive construction．－aùroîs roîs à $\nu \theta$ р $\dot{\pi} \pi \sigma \iota s$, i．e．the cause why the men themselves who are possessed of the art are free．à̀rois is used on account of the contrast with others whom they govern．There is here a certain rhetorical col－
oring, which may be intended as an imitation of the style of Gorgias.
 it, or mean by it the being able to persuade, etc. - $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu} \mathrm{a} \lambda$ $\lambda \omega$ $\sigma v \lambda \lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi$, , facile intelligas $\tau o \grave{s} \sigma v \lambda \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon ́ \varphi \tau a s . ~ S t a l l b . ~-~$ $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \nu \tau a u ́ r \eta ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \nu \nu a ́ \mu \epsilon \epsilon$, i. e. when in or invested with this power. - $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{a}$ $\sigma o \grave{\imath}$ is added as if $a ̀ \lambda \lambda \omega$ had not gone before. Comp. 521, D, oủ $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \chi a ́ p \iota \nu ~ . ~ . ~ a ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \beta e ́ \lambda ~ \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau o \nu, ~ o u ̉ ~$

453 A. тò кєфá̀atov єis $\tau 0 \hat{T} \tau o ~ \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u \tau a ̣, ~ i . ~ e . ~ i t s ~ s u m ~ a n d ~ s u b-~$ stance, its essential quality ends in this or tends to this as its result, тov̂тo referring to $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \theta_{0}$ ûs. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \hat{a} \nu$, meaning to end, takes the preposition $\epsilon$ is and adverbs of motion to a place after it, as including the previous motion, together with the end itself; = to come to an end. So äp $\chi \in \iota \nu$, to be$\operatorname{gin}$, is joined with $\dot{a} \pi \dot{o}, \dot{\epsilon} \kappa$, and adverbs of motion from a
 to be taken with $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \sigma \theta a t$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{c}^{\prime} \nu$ is to a greater ex-



 myself, - if any other person engages in conversation with another, because he wishes to know the very nature of that about which the discourse is held, that I also, I say, - am a person of that description. It is often the case, as here, that an infinitive and its subject are introduced after öть. This happens, for the most part, when a clause intervening between ö $\boldsymbol{\tau} \iota$ and the infinitive renders the change from the grammatical construction to its equivalent one less obvious. But here there is an anacoluthon also. "Owing to the change just mentioned, ${ }_{\epsilon} \gamma \grave{\omega}$ is left by itself, and $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\epsilon}$ takes its place. - ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$. . . oủk oî̀a. Here notice the emphatic position of $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$, the attraction of $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \ldots \pi \epsilon \dot{\omega}$ to the main
sentence, in which oìa is, and the interposition of $\epsilon{ }^{3}{ }^{3} \sigma \theta^{*}$ ö $\tau \iota$ between the adverb and the verb.
 anything further from you), but on account of the discussion, that it may go on in the way in which it can make the subject discussed most clear to us. Some authorities have $\pi o t \hat{\eta}$, which arose from not perceiving that $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ s here is quomodo, and not $u t$. See 449, E.—— $\begin{gathered}\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho ~ a ̈ \nu . ~ a ̂ ~ \\ \nu \\ \text { belongs }\end{gathered}$ to $\eta_{\rho}{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$, and is repeated on account of its distance from the verb, occasioned by the conditional clause. Comp. 447, D. -Z Zev̂cs. As this great painter painted for Archelaus, king of Macedon, who died in the same year with Socrates, there is here no anachronism, and Pliny's date for his entrance on his art (Olymp. 95. 4, after the death of Socrates) must be incorrect.- каì $\pi о \hat{v}$. These words have given no little trouble to the interpreters, because the place where a painter's works are, which is their natural meaning, has nothing to do with the definition of his art. Ast's explanation of mov̀ as meaning where, in what thing, in regard to what (i. e. what animals and what properties of them, etc.), and Cousin's, where, on what, as canvas or stone, are hardly deserving of mention. Others suppose the text corrupt. Heind. conjectures mórov, for how much, and Coray, rov̂, whose son. But how the compensation or the father of Zeuxis had anything more to do with the definition of his art than the place where he painted, they do not inform us. Stallb, after Routh, would read $\pi \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{S}$, which makes good sense, though it departs too much from the letters of the actual text. I conjecture (that I likewise may contribute my mite) that the sentence originally ended at $\gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \omega \nu$; which, indecd, may be argued from the fact, that Plato afterwards only alludes to rà $\zeta \hat{\omega} a$. To this $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\pi o i ̂ a ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \zeta \hat{\omega} \omega \nu$, and ${ }_{a} \lambda \lambda a \pi o \lambda \lambda a ̀ ̀ \zeta \hat{\omega} a$, point ; and no other definition of the art of Zeuxis is hinted at. Next to $\gamma \rho \rho^{\prime} \phi \omega \nu$
came $\hat{\eta}$ ov̉，Hor，which was corrupted into nor；and then kui was added to bring $\pi o \hat{v}$ into grammatical connec－ tion with the sentence．For the confusion of H and $\Pi$ in the MSS．，Bast＇s Epist．Palæograph．in Schæfer＇s Gregory Corinth．，p．716，may be consulted．A similar corruption of $\hat{\eta}$ o र्थ into $\pi o v$ ，in Repub．437，D，is removed in modern editions．

D．кa入̀ิs ä้ $\sigma o \iota$ àmєкє́кpıгo；would your answer have been a good one？This verb，like several other deponents， is used both actively and passively，－a usage almost con－ fined to the perfect，pluperfect，and aorist．Comp．Soph． § 208, N． 2 ；K．§ 252 ；Cr．§ 564 ．－oú $\delta \eta \eta_{\tau a}$ denies the latter part of the alternative，ov $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon$ ．
454 A．тò̀ $\lambda$ е́＇रovta，him who makes this assertion，that rhet－ oric is the art of persuasion．

 sentence changes a little as it proceeds．${ }^{\circ} \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma$ 六 $\rho \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$ is written as if $\mu \dot{\eta} \theta a \dot{\nu} \mu a \xi^{\xi}$ had gone before．The proper apo－
 nection is broken up by $\gamma \dot{d} \rho$ in $\overline{0} \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma$ à̀ $\lambda \lambda^{\prime} \gamma \omega$ ．The sense of ö $\pi \epsilon \rho \ldots \lambda \in \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ is，for as I say（i．e．as I was just saying， $453, \mathrm{C})$ ，I put the inquiry that the discourse may be finished in due order，－not on your account，but that we may not be in the habit of too soon catching up each other＇s words on mere suspicion（of what they mean，and without giving one another time for explanation）．With $\pi \rho \circ a \rho \pi a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu . . . \tau \grave{a}$
入órov．

E．$\beta$ oúntı ．．．$\theta \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ like visne videamus，volo hoc contin－ gat．Soph．§ 219．3，last ed．；Cr．§ 611．3；K．§ 259．1． 6. 455 A．$\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \tau \tau \iota \wedge \hat{\eta} s$, productive of belief．－$\delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa a \lambda \iota \kappa \bar{\eta} s$ ，able to impart instruction or knowledge，i．e．knowledge founded upon absolute，unchangeable principles．－à $\lambda \lambda \grave{a} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \iota k \grave{s}$
$\mu^{\prime} \boldsymbol{v}^{\prime} \nu$, able to cause belief and nothing more (aiming at conviction, and not at truth). This word has been altered into $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ s ~ b y ~ S t e p h e n s, ~ H e i n d o r f, ~ C o r a y, ~ a n d ~ B u t t m a n n ~ ; ~$ and some MSS. favor the change. Bekker, Stallb., and
 at great length, $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ s ~ d e n o t e s ~(h a v i n g ~ r e l a t i o n ~ t o, ~ h a v i n g ~$ to do with, i. e.) able to produce $\pi \epsilon \theta \theta$, and is the more general word, and not necessarily opposed to $\delta \iota \delta a \sigma к а \lambda \iota к o ́ s ; ~$ while $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ s ~ m e a n s ~ a b l e ~ t o ~ p r o d u c e ~ \pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, which has just been contrasted with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \sigma \tau \eta \mu \eta \nu(454, \mathrm{D})$. Again, as to the form of the word, - which, according to Buttmann, cannot analogically be derived from $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota$, - Ast observes that adjectives in -七кós are freely derived, not only from verbals, but also from nouns ( $\dot{\rho} \rho \chi \dot{\eta}, \mathfrak{a} \rho \chi \iota \kappa o ́ s$ ), adjectives ( $\phi i \lambda o s$,
 What objection, then, is there to regarding $\pi \iota \sigma \tau o$ 's, or $\pi i-$ $\sigma \tau \iota s$ (comp. фúaıs, $\phi$ vatkós, $\left.\phi \theta^{\prime} \sigma \iota s, \phi \theta \iota \sigma \iota \kappa o ́ s\right)$, as the source of $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \iota$ ós? However derived, such words may take a genitive. But here there is no necessity of supplying a genitive with $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \iota<o ́ s$.
 a case, before a verb, seems to me to correspond with that of even. Let us see what we are even saying, where an emphasis is thrown on the verb $;=$ what we can mean. A few MSS. have $\lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, which gives the inapposite sense of let us see what we shall say. - $\pi \in \rho \grave{\grave{\imath}}\langle a \tau \rho \bar{\omega} \nu$ aipé $\sigma \in \omega \mathrm{s}$. "The ancient states maintained public physicians at a salary; and Hippocrates is said to have been so employed at Athens. Such physicians had assistants, especially slaves, who practised among the poorer sort of pcople. The famous Democedes of Croton, about Olymp. 60, although as yet little money was in circulation, received the large salary of thirty-six Fginetic minæ or an Attic talent of sitver (\$1,017). When he was called to Athens, he received one hundred minæ
(\$ 1,692), until Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, engaged his services for two talents ( $\$ 2,034$ )." Boeckh's Civil Econ. of Athens, I. § 21.——ä入入o $\tau \iota \ddot{\eta}$ (literally, is there anything else than, is it not true) is a very common formula in Plato, meaning no more than nonne. Very often ä̀ $\lambda \frac{\pi}{} \tau$, , without $\eta$, is found in the same sense at the beginning of a
 cording to Hermann on Viger, note 110, when the latter is used, the interrogation extends to the end of the sentence; but when ä̀ло $\tau \iota$, it stops with those words. -aipeĩधat is in the middle. - After $\hat{\eta} \nu \in \omega \rho^{\prime} \omega \nu$, supply $\sigma v \mu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ $\delta$ p $\eta$ тopıós. And, just below, a similar clause, which is to be supplied in thought before à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oi $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \iota \kappa o i$, , is afterwards in part expressed.—A passage precisely like this occurs in Protag. 319, B.
C. тò $\sigma \grave{\nu} \sigma \pi \epsilon \cup ́ \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$, tuis rebus studere. See 458, B,
 and few, as the more generic word (Wyttenbach on Phædo, p. 116), and therefore $\pi о \lambda \lambda \frac{1}{\prime}$, ó $\lambda_{i}$ oot, and similar words, often follow to define it. Here kai, on account of the position of $\sigma \chi \in \delta o{ }^{2}$, seems to me not to be and, but even. The sense is, some, almost even many, i. e. some, indeed even quite a number.
 rably led the way, i. e. in speaking about the docks, etc., just now you suggested a good answer.
 had preceded : and partly through that of Pericles. $\hat{\epsilon}^{\kappa} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \delta \eta \mu \iota v \rho \gamma \omega \hat{\omega}$, through the advice of thè artificers. Heind. and Buttmann wish to read $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta \eta \mu$ ovp $\gamma \omega \bar{\nu}$. But there is no need of this, because a man effects what his advice effects; and such brevity is common in Greek. Thus, in Alcibiad. I. 135, E, cited by Ast, we have $\pi \epsilon \lambda a \rho-$

from a stork, i. e. from a stork's love; and in Repub. 375,
 $\lambda a \kappa \grave{\nu} \nu$ (in respect to keeping guard) veavícoov єỉgevoûs; Comp. Soph. § 186, N. 1. - тoû סıà $\mu$ écov teíxous. According to Colonel Leake (Topography of Athens, 354 357), this expression denotes both the long walls, which, as he supposes, reached from Athens to Piræeus and Port Phalerum; so named as being between the city and the seaports, and also called $\tau \epsilon i \chi o s$ in the singular, as forming a sort of fortification. Plutarch (Vita Pericl. § 13) alluding to this passage, interprets the words - perhaps carelessly by тò $\mu a \kappa \rho o ̀ \nu ~ \tau \epsilon i \chi o ́ s, ~ a n d ~ t h u s ~ s a n c t i o n s ~ L e a k e ' s ~ v i e w . ~ B u t ~$ Ilarpocration, s. v. סà $\mu$ '́бov teíxovs, explains the phrase of the southern of the two long walls, so styled as being between the northern and the Phaleric wall; and this southern wall it is, says he, which Plato mentions in Gorgias. This is so confirmed by Thucyd. 2. 13, - who speaks of a Phaleric wall reaching to the city, and also of the long walls reaching, both of them, from the city to Piræeus, the outer or northern one of which was guarded, - that it is not casy to see how the opinion of Leake can stand. Sce the commentators on Thucyd. l. c., especially Dr. Arnold. Now this inner or southern leg of the long walls, тò $\mu$ акрò̀ $\tau \epsilon i ̂ \chi o s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \nu o ́ t ı o ̀ ~(Æ s c h i n . ~ d e ~ F a l s . ~ L e g . ~ § ~ 174, ~$ Bekker), was built after the thirty years' peace with Sparta, i. e. after B. C. 445 , when Pericles began to be at the head of aflairs, and when Socrates was over twenty years old.
A. oi $\nu \iota \kappa \omega ิ \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \gamma \nu \dot{\mu} \mu a s$, Soph. § 164, N. 2; K. § 278.456 $2 ; \mathrm{Cr} . \S 433 .-\pi a ́ \lambda a t{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \omega \hat{\omega}$. $\pi a ́ \lambda a t$ is very often found with the present of an action begun in the past and still continued. - Join tò $\mu^{\prime} \hat{\gamma} \epsilon \theta$ os with $\delta a \not \mu o v_{i}^{\prime}$, as the accus. of specification. - єi máva $\gamma \epsilon \epsilon$ ciòcing. The apodosis must be something like סatmovia ầ катафаivoıto, which is pointed at by $\gamma$.
 etc., to put himself into the physician's hands, to be cut or cauterized. A heated iron was applied to the wound for the purpose of stanching blood by the iatpós, who, as Routh observes, cxercised both the medical and the surgical arts. $\pi а \rho a \sigma \chi \epsilon i v$, sc. éavтóv ; comp. 475, D. For $\tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, каū $\sigma a$, see Soph. § 219.2; Cr. § 621. $\beta$. An infinitive so used, if it have the direct object of the leading verb for its subject, is in the passive, but otherwise in the active.
C. ov่סaцoû . . . фavŋ̄̀at, would be of no account. Comp.
 2. 52 , $\mu \eta \delta \alpha \mu \circ \hat{v}$ єival, to be nowhere, in no estimation. єi ßoúdouro is elegantly added, says Stallb., to denote the arrogance and pretension of Gorgias, $=$ if he chose to give himself the trouble.
D. $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu} a \theta \epsilon$, sc. тıs. Soph. § 157, N. 8 ; K. § 238, R. 3 ; Cr. § 546. This omission of the indefinite subject $\tau$ is is common in this dialogue, as is also the transition from a singular verb to a plural, or the contrary, where the subject is
 armis certare discunt. Nam vulgo juventus non veris armis se exercebat sed rudibus, aut pilis præpilatis, quæ dicuntur Græcis ̇̇ $\sigma \phi а \iota \rho \omega \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu a$ àкóvtıa [i. e. with a ball covering the point]. Quæ sunt verba Casauboni ad Theophrast. Charact. p. 79, ed. Fischer. Stallb.
 scholars) for the purpose of using them aright against their foes, and those who wrong them, in defending themselves, not in beginning an assault. toúrois refers to the means of defence used in the arts just named. The subject of $\chi \rho \hat{\eta}-$ $\sigma \theta a t$ is to be gathered from the context, viz. such persons as learn to box, and beat their friends. The forms of $\dot{v \pi a ́ p-}$ $\chi \epsilon \iota \nu$, and those of a a $\mu \dot{v} \nu \mu a \iota$, are often contrasted, in the senses of acting on the offensive and defensive. - $\mu \epsilon \tau a-$
aтpé $\psi a v \tau \epsilon s$, turning round, i. e. on the contrary. Comp. $\mu \epsilon-$ $\tau a \beta a \lambda \dot{\omega} \nu, 480$, E.
A. ${ }_{\epsilon} \mu \beta \rho a \chi \dot{v}$, in short, is taken with $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i}$ öтov àv $\beta$ oú $\eta \tau a t, 457$ to show that that phrase comprises all that can be said, or is used in its widest sense. Its force is like that of omnino.
 ber of the sentence, comp. the note on Electr. 1301, where it is said that кai often stands after words of comparison to show connection, without any force that can be given in English. See also 458, A, at the beginning. kạ? Post participia, каì єīa, каì є̈ єєєта inferuntur, ubi єīa et ё $\pi \epsilon \iota \tau a$ expectes. Stallb. A frequent idiom.
 more exactly, the subject is indefinite, and plural, because the action of conversing requires more than one. - ovito repeats and recalls the participles. Join $\delta \operatorname{ia\lambda } \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ to $\delta \dot{v}-$ раита.
 -каì кarà $\phi$ Oóvov, etc., and they think that they are (i. e. each thinks that the other is) speaking out of envy, or with ill feelings towards each other, having a contentious spirit, and not seeking after that which was proposed in the discussion. For $\dot{\epsilon} a v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu=a ̀ \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$, Soph. § 145 , N. 2; K. § 302. 7; Cr. § 507. 7. - $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon u \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \mathrm{Cr} . § 457 . a ; \mathrm{K}$. § 312, R. 3. - oia kai, etc., so that even the by-standers feel vexed for themselves, because they consented to be listeners to such people. The infinitive follows oîa here, as it so often docs $\omega$ ढ̈ate.
E. $\delta \in \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu$, to go on, or through with a refutation of. $\delta t a ̀$ has the same force in $\delta \iota \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \varphi \dot{\eta} \eta$ below. In the next words, the sense is, Lest you should suppose that I speak with my zeal for debate not directed towards the subject, that it may become plain, but against you. For rov̂ $\gamma \in \nu \in \varepsilon^{-}$ ${ }_{\sigma}$ Өat, comp. Soph. § 187.1 ; K. § 308. 2. (b) ; Cr. § 372.

With genitives in this relation of the motive, $\tilde{E}_{\nu \in \kappa a}$ is often found.

 phro $3, \mathrm{D}$, where Socrates says, that he converses, not only without taking pay for it, à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ каì $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \iota \theta \epsilon i s a ̀ ̀ \nu \dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \omega s$, sc. $\mu \sigma \sigma \theta o ́ v$, but even with a willingness to give pay, if any one is disposed to hear him. Here $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma t \iota \theta$ eis without $\hat{a} \nu$ would mean, that he actually paid his listeners. - Just below,
 or, with the transition to the first person, $\lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma o \mu \mu$, parallel to the succeeding $\lambda$ '́ $\gamma o t$. The reason for using $\lambda^{\prime} \dot{\gamma} \sigma$ seems to be that given by Stallb., which Ast opposes: that Socrates, in speaking of himself, denotes the probability of his being in an error by $\epsilon i$ with an indicative; but only the possibility of error on the part of another by $\epsilon i$ and an optative. -à̀ (the word with which it agrees being omitted), 447, C, oúdév oiov aùròv èpørầ.
B. ö́rov סóga 廿evóńs. Græci in hujusmodi comparationibus modo casus precedenti nomini accommodant, modo nominativum ponunt, intellecto verbo superiore. Stallb.

 have been more common. See Cr. § 655. 4.-- $\tau \grave{\text { ò }} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\pi a \rho o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$, the interests or feelings of the present company. And so тò тoút $\omega \nu$, just below; тò $\sigma \grave{\nu} \sigma \pi \epsilon$ v́סova' ä $\mu a$, кaì тoủ$\mu \grave{\nu}$ aỉnŋ̀s, Soph. Electr. 251. Such formulie are sometimes little more than circumlocutions for the pronoun. Comp. ró $\gamma^{\prime}{ }_{\epsilon} \mu o ́ v, 458$, D. - The Schol. thinks that Gorgias is here finding an excuse to break off. But probably nothing more than polite attention to the wishes of the auditors is intended. Gorgias is uniformly polite to Socrates, and willing to continue the discourse. Comp. 497, B, 506, A.
C. $\pi$ áṕṕ $\omega$ dंтотєvồ $\mu \epsilon \nu$, we shall extend too far, be too prolix. The verb is here used without an object, or, if any-
 - ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{i} \delta^{\prime}$ oỉv, etc., and as for that (oz̉v), may I myself also never have so much business, that leaving a conversation such as this, and so carried on (i. e. on a subject of such importance, and so interesting), it may be of more importance for me to do anything else.
D. тò $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ is the subject of $\kappa \omega \lambda \hat{\nu} \epsilon \iota$. - Tò $\lambda o \iota \pi o ́ v$, after this, i. e since all the others wish that the debate should continue. - кai $\tau a \hat{v} \tau a$, etc., and that too (i. e. and especially) when I myself announced, that whatever questions any one wishes to put he may do so.


 pression ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu}{ }^{\circ} \chi \chi \lambda \omega$. This is the subject of ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \tau \tau \nu$, and the remaining words the predicate. -- $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon}$ roìs $\mu \dot{\eta}$ єiòóoıv. Compare the negative $\mu \dot{\eta}$ here, and in $\delta \mu \dot{\eta}$ latpós, with où in $\dot{\delta}$ oủk єîóss, év roîs oủk єiòórct, just below. In the first two cases, the negation is general and indefinite: "before such as do not know, whoever they are," "he who is no physician, supposing such a person to exist." In the other two cases, the negation being made concerning something definite and particular (the orator and the crowd), ov is properly used.
B. $\hat{e}^{\prime} \nu a \hat{v} \theta a$, i. e. in the case of the art of medicine.
 $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \lambda$ órov $\bar{\eta}$, if it come at all within the scope of our discourse. $\pi \rho$ ós, (literally, ) on the side of, in favor of, to the advantage of.
D. oüт $\omega$ s ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \omega \nu$. This clause is afterwards defined by

A. $\tilde{\omega}^{\sigma} \pi \epsilon \rho$ ä $\rho \tau \iota \epsilon i \pi \epsilon$. See 455, D. - oifaı is paren- 460
thetical : hence $\mu a \theta_{\dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota}$ follows, and not $\mu a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. - $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi} \neq \delta \dot{\delta}$, as Ast says, is a formula of exhorting, like ä ${ }^{\circ} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ $\gamma \eta$; as Heindorf, a "formula subsistendi et inhibendi," $=$
 another to remember something, and perceive its results, $=$ ё $\chi \epsilon$ тои̂то. Its use, here, at least, consists in drawing attention, in causing one to stop and consider something, especially some objection derived from what had been said.
 the same form of speech, after the same analogy. The next words, being explicative of this clause, are without a connecting particle.
C. The words here inclosed in brackets are so injurious to the sense, that there can be little doubt, I think, of their being interpolations. The reasoning is this: He who has learned justice is just. The just does justly. Therefore he wills or prefers to do justly. Therefore he never will prefer to do unjustly. The orator, if taught justice by Gorgias, is just, and therefore will never will or prefer to do unjustly. For this passage, consult the Introduction. éx тô̂ 入óyov, from what has been said ; as follows from the argument. These words show that Socrates begins here to apply what has been conceded to the case of the rhetorician, which is proof that the words in brackets are indefensible.
 low. When the same noun follows two verbs, or a participle and a verb, in different cases, the Greeks content themselves usually with expressing it once. Comp. Mt. § 428. 2. - $\dot{\sigma}$ aúr $\omega$ a aut $\omega$, in the selfsame way. These adverbs answer, as Coray observes, to $\dot{o}$ aủzòs oítos.

 F. A. Wolf, on Demosth. c. Leptin. (p. 468, ed. Reiske),
lays down the rule, that фaivouat with an infin. = videor, but
 always discoursing. For the use of the relative, comp. note on 488 , D. Here $\hat{o}$, which refers to $\dot{\eta}$ ค $\eta \tau o \rho \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$, is put in the gender of the predicate $\pi \rho a \hat{\gamma \mu a}$, by attraction. Comp. 463, E.
 cause the sense is, I said that it was worth while. With $\stackrel{a}{a} \nu$ the sense would be, I said that it would be worth while. The first is a direct assertion, in oratio obliqua ; the second a hypothetical one, in the same form. And so just above,


B. $\mu$ à ròv kíva. A very common oath in the mouth of Socrates, concerning which much has been written. In
 trator Anubis," which is either a comic addition to the original formula, $\mu \grave{\alpha}$ tò̀ кúva, or else shows the oath to be of Egyptian origin. Mr. Mitchell (Aristoph. Wasps, Appendix, Note D) is of the latter opinion. We refer those who wish to pursue this point further to the Commentt. and the Scholl. on that play, v. 83, Solanus on Lucian's Vit. Auct. (Vol. III. p. 520, ed. Lehm.), and Coray on this place. The ancients thought that such oaths were introduced by Rhadamanthus, to avoid swearing by a divinity on a common occasion. Zeno, the Stoic, in imitation of Socrates, swore by the caper-bush. - oủk ỏijqns avvovaias, haud exigui est sermonis. __ каi . . . oogá̧̧ıs. According to Ast, кai affects $\delta o \xi_{i} \zeta_{\epsilon \iota S}$, being a little out of its place. Do you eren or really think? - it oíє . . . '́p $\quad$ тíg passage of considerable difficulty, which scems to be best explained by regarding the sentence, with Schleierm., as a broken one; which is indicated in this edition by a dash after $\delta \iota \delta a \xi \in \iota y$. Polus is so eager, that he cannot end his
sentence grammatically, but must make a rhetorical exhibition of his feelings. The sense is, Or do you think, because Gorgias was ashamed not to admit, both that the orator must understand the just, beautiful, and good; and that he himself would give instruction in these subjects, if one should come to him (to study oratory) ignorant of them; - then, perhaps, from this admission, an inconsistency arose in the discussion, to wit (or) the very thing which you take satisfaction in, though you yourself led the way to such questions (i. e. though you alone, by your artful questions, are to blame for the inconsistency). For the first sentence, Schleierm. supplies a close from roî $\theta^{\prime}$ ô $\delta \grave{\eta}$ ảganâcs, as if Polus had at first meant to say, "Or do you think, because Gorgias," etc. ... "to find your pleasure therein." But perhaps some other close of more emphasis may be gathered from the context, such as, ("do you think, because Gorgias, through shame, made certain admissions,) that therefore his inconsistency is to be charged to rhetoric." The other attempts to explain this sentence which I have seen are, - 1. Ast's, who gives to oite the sense of vopijets, and supplies oüta. Or do you think so because, etc. 2. Stallb., in his first ed., translates thus: an putas Gorgiam pre pudore negasse, etc. But this perverts the sense. Comp. 482 , C, D, where the passage is alluded to and in part explained. He also ends the sentence beginning with $\hat{\eta}$ oitct at $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \tau a, ~-~ a ~ s t r a n g e ~ a n d ~ f l a t ~ c l o s e ~ t o ~ t h e ~ p e r i o d . ~ 3 . ~ I n ~ h i s ~\end{gathered}$ second cdition, where he blames Ast for his "mira commenta," deserting his former view, he continues the sense in an unbroken period, and treats oite as though it did not affect the structure. The sense then becomes, liccause Gorgias was ashamed to deny, ctc. ... did therefore, do you suppose, from this admission an inconsistency arise, cte.? But an inconsistency did arisc, for the very reason contained in the words öre 「opyias, etc. This is evident from

482, D. The words of Polus then become unmeaning. - -
 follows a simply negative expression, $=q u i n$ before a subjunctive. But more usually it follows a verb of negative import, when ou precedes such a verb. Thus ìmapvoì $\mu a \imath$
 oùk émírтa⿱艹at, I do not deny that I know. An analogous formula to this latter is found just below, 461, C, - riva olift
 terrog. implies a negative.
D. '̇mavop $\begin{gathered}\text { itce. Most of the MSS. have the opt. here }\end{gathered}$ in lieu of the subj. after a present in the principal clause. The reasons given for the opt. in the present case by Stallb. and Ast are scarcely sufficient. - oikatos $\delta$ ci, and it is right for you so to do. For diкalos, see Mt. § 297 ; K. § 307, R. 6 ; Cr. § 551. It is for סíkaóv éoti $\sigma \epsilon$, etc., owing to the cause explained in the note on 448 , D. - àva $\theta^{\prime} \sigma \theta a t$, to retract, properly, to put a piece over again, to change a move in playing draughts. Comp. Xen. Memorab. 2. 4. 4. Cicero, in a frag. of his Hortensius, says, "Itaque tibi concedo, quod in duodecim scriptis solemus, ut calculum reducas, si te alicujus dicti pœnitet," borrowing his figure perhaps from Plato. The subject
 non posse manifestum est," says Stallb. But such cases are possible, and we believe Ast to be right. Herc, $\sigma o \iota$ סокеi, just before, and ö $\tau \iota$ à $\nu$ ò̀ $\beta o u ́ \lambda \eta$, , just after, almost forbid us to supply $\mu \epsilon$. A stronger case occurs Theætet. 151, C : "For many feel so towards me, as positively to be ready to bite me, when I strip them of some folly of theirs," - каi oủk oiovtat єivoía toùto $\pi o t \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, i. e. that $I$ do this. (Such is
 one thing. The middle, if you will guard against, might stand here.

E．ov ．．．$\lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota$ ，where of all Greece there is the greatest liberty of speech，＇E入入áoos being a genitive partitive．－ $\dot{a} v \tau i \theta \epsilon s, ~ p u t ~ o v e r ~ a g a i n s t ~ i t, ~ s c . ~ t h i s, ~ v i z . ~ \sigma o v ̂ ~ \mu a \kappa p a ̀ ~ \lambda e ́ \gamma o v t o s, ~$ etc．For this latter passage，compare Aristoph．Acharn．
 rot，though．
 totle（Metaphys．init．）refers to this treatise，or to the words of Polus of like import on 448，C，and approves of his opinion making experience the foundation of art．

C．ои̉коиิข ка入̀̀̀ ．．．àvөрө́тоиs；does not rhetoric，then， namely，to have the faculty of giving pleasure to men，seem to you to be a good thing？The last clause of the sen－ tence explains，and is in apposition with，$\dot{\eta}$ p $\eta \tau o \rho \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ ．oióv $\tau^{\text {＇}}$ єivaı $=$ tıva oióv $\tau^{\text {＇}}$ єival．

D．ßoú入є oủv，etc．，are you willing，then，since you prize giving pleasure，to give me a little pleasure？For the play on $\chi$ дpí̧oaa（which itself playfully alludes to $\chi$ ápıtós tivos кai $\dot{\eta} \delta o \nu \eta ̆ s$, just above），comp．516，B．In this sentence，the present infinitive denotes the habit of Polus；$\chi^{a p i \sigma a \sigma \theta a t,}$ that which Socrates wishes him to do in this instance．

E．tivos $\lambda$ é $\gamma \epsilon \iota s$ raúrns；Comp．449，E，note on moious
 rude．For סéóoıкa omitted，comp．Soph．§ 214，N． 4 ；Cr． § 602．2．The comparative，which here denotes a lower degree of the quality than the positive，is usual in such apologies．
 to be a sort of study，that has not indeed the properties of an art，but which belongs to a mind dexterous in attaining its ends，and manly，and possessed of a natural talent to communicate with men．

B．ís $\delta$ è $\begin{gathered}\text { é } \mu o ̀ s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o s, ~ e t c ., ~ y e t, ~ a s ~ I ~ m a i n t a i n, ~ i s ~ n o t ~ a n ~\end{gathered}$ art but experience，or a routine and practice，i．e．has
nothing to do with absolute truth and reason, but proceeds from accidental discovery that a certain end is gained by certain means. - ко $\mu \mu \omega \tau \kappa \kappa \grave{\eta}$ differt a коб $\mu \eta \tau \kappa \kappa \hat{\eta}$ quâ honestus ornatus quæritur. Stallb.
C. тértapa . . . $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \sigma \iota \nu$, four divisions these (of flattery or the art of show) relating to four matters or subjects. These four subjects, according to Coray and Stallb., are words, food, the ornamenting of the body, and philosophical disquisitions. - àпокєкрцне́vоs. Comp. 453, D, note. — $\pi \rho i \nu$ ầ ... à àoкрivшual. With $\pi \rho i \nu$ "subjunctivum non usurpant tragici, nisi in priore membro adsit negandi aut prohibendi significatio." Elmsley on Medea, 215. In which case $\not a \nu$ accompanics $\pi \rho i \nu$, with some exceptions almost confined to poetry, and the subjunctive aorist has the sense of the exact future of Latin; e. g. here priusquam respondero. For the reason why the subjunctive follows $\pi \rho^{i v}$, see Mt. § 522, C. ; K. § 337. 9. b.
D. à àкрıиаце́vov, sc. $\mu$ ov. Comp. 461, D, note. -
 of the political art, "civilitatis particulæ simulacrum," as translated by Quintil. 2. 15. 25, where this passage is examined.
E. $\Pi \omega \bar{\omega}$ os $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ ö $\delta \bar{\epsilon}$. There is here, probably, an allusion to the meaning of the name colt, as Schleierm. remarks. For another pun on the name of Polus, comp. Aristot. Rhet.
 'Hpóóıкos (of Selymbria, comp. 448, B, note) Өpacúrazov,


 mines the gender of $\quad \nu v$ by attraction, instead of $\dot{\rho} \eta \tau \circ \rho \iota \kappa \grave{\eta}$, to which it refers. Comp. 460, E.
A. oîo totóv $\delta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$, for instance I mean as follows, lit- 464 erally, "cf which sort I mention such a thing as this, viz."

This, with or without the article before rotó $\delta \delta$, is a common formula in Plato, when examples are adduced. —— $\tau$ à $\sigma \dot{\text { o }}$ $\mu a \tau a$ is the accus. of specification.
 supplied by the preceding accusatives, $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ and $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$. But, or, while yet they (soul and body) are none the more in a good condition. Another construction also is possible:

 $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau \iota$, ete., but the art for the body I am not able to name to you off-hand by one name. $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ and $\psi v x \grave{\eta}$ freely take and lose the article (comp. 465, D). 'They lose it, perhaps, as approaching the nature of abstract nouns. In $463, \mathrm{E}$, they could not have it. $\mu i a \nu$ is the predicate-aceusative. ойт $\omega$, thus, in these present circumstances, is often equivalent to illico. Comp. 509, A. - $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \eta े s$, etc. Here $\lambda^{\prime} \hat{\gamma} \omega$ is to be supplied in thought, and $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} s$ depends on $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \nu 0 \mu \circ \theta \epsilon \tau \kappa \kappa \dot{\eta} \nu$, its part. The sense is, And of the political art I mention (one branch) the legislative as the counterpart to the gymnastic art, and (the other) justice as the counterpart to medicine. The political art, or the general art of securing the public good, has two divisions, first, that which consists in securing the moral welfare by law, which preseribes what is right, and according to which the public health will be preserved; and, secondly, that which restores this health when once impaired, or justice, the judge's art. (See Introduction.) Analogous to these arts for the soul are, for the body, gymnasties, or the art of preserving, and medicine, or that of restoring health. Plato elsewhere insists on the analogy between the healing art and justice, e. g. in Repub. 444, C, -a fine passage, where, however, justice is taken in the higher sense of that controlling virtue, which brings all the parts of the soul, like those of a well-regulated state, into their due place and order.
 ——ò̀ $\gamma \nu o v ̂ \sigma a ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \sigma \tau o \chi a \sigma a \mu \epsilon ́ v \eta$. As ai $\sigma \theta o \mu \hat{\prime} \nu \eta$ is a general word denoting mental perceptions, whencesoever derived, it is explained by this clause, not guided by knowledge, I would have you understand, but by guess. Comp. 463, A.- ínoঠ̂̀̄а ímò ëккабтov, having slipped under, or by stealth put on the garb of each of the four divisions.
 norance, or the unwary. - $\tau \hat{\omega} \ldots \dot{\alpha} \in i \dot{\eta} \delta i \sigma \tau \omega$, by that which is at the time the most agreeable.
A. тойто $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \pi \rho$ òs $\sigma \grave{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \omega$ alludes to 463 , D, where Po- 465 lus puts the question concerning the quality of rhetoric.
 $\rho \epsilon$, because it cannot explain what sort of things those are in their nature, which it makes use of. Here we see what Plato thought that a $\tau^{\prime} \chi \chi \eta \eta$ must be. The MSS. give, almost unanimously, $\varphi_{\varphi}^{\hat{j}} \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi \phi_{\epsilon} \rho \varepsilon \iota \hat{a} \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi \hat{\rho} \rho \epsilon t$, and the editors, without MS. authority, $\bar{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \phi \in ́ \rho \epsilon \iota$. I have restored a part of the MS. reading, and have since observed that Stallb., in his second edition, has made the same change. -imooxeiv $\lambda^{\prime}$ yov, to submit the reason, or rationale, to explain and defend a position.
B. inóкeltau, puts itself under, puts on the form or mask
 make men attach to themselves adventitious beauty, and neglect their own, obtained through the gyminastic art.
C. ${ }_{0} \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \dot{\epsilon} \varphi \tau 0 \iota \lambda^{\prime} \gamma \omega$. In the ensuing words, down to ふौотоик $\nu$, the thoughts seem to be only half expressed, as if Socrates, anxious to avoid a long speech, were hastening to an end. Some editors suppose that the text has sustained an injury, but, as I think, without reason. Such, says Socrates, are these arts in their nature ; but in practice the Sophists' art and rhetoric are confounded together ;
and the like would be true of cookery and medicine, if the body judged of them without a presiding mind. The thoughts are not essential to the argument, and are only thrown out en passant. ö öє $\ldots \lambda^{\prime} \gamma \omega$ refers to what has just preceded; but as I say, or was just saying. - סit́$\sigma \tau \eta \kappa \eta$. The subject of this verb, according to Buttmann in Heindorf's edition, is all the arts before mentioned, and öעт $\omega \nu$ has the same subject, which is тaîтa understood, referring to these arts. Stallb. restricts $\delta_{\ell \epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \epsilon$, with reason,
 may be used instead of övтєs, referring to ooфıбтаì каì $\rho \eta^{-}$ropes, next following. A participle is sometimes found in the genitive absolute, when its subject is the same as that of the verb; the cause of which seems to be a desire of the writer to express the thought contained in the participle more distinctly. The grammatical construction is caused by Plato's passing in thought from the arts to those who
 are conterminous arts, sophists and orators are (mixed together in the same place and about the same things, i. e. are) confounded together, and indiscriminately give themselves to the same pursuit, and they know not what to make of themselves, nor their fellow-men of them (i. e. neither they nor others have any exact idea of their so-called arts). For the thought, comp. 520, A : тaủtóv, ¿̄ цакápıє, ধ́бтì бо-
 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \Pi \omega ̂ \lambda o \nu . ~$
 (tô) Anaxagoras said (his tenet) would hold extensively (in regard to these arts). For the uses of the article, see Soph. § 176, and § 139, N. 1; Cr. §§ 477. a, 479. Anaxagoras taught that all things were in a chans at first; then came mind, and arranged them. In other words, he ascribed to an intelligent author, not creation, nor motion and
quality, but only arrangement ; which was, however, a step beyond the earlier Ionic philosophers, who accounted for all phenomena by the physical properties of matter.-_ovi ràp toút $\omega \nu{ }^{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \circ$ s. The Schol. of the Clarke MS. supposes these words to allude to the rhetorical figure called $\pi a \rho i \sigma \omega \sigma \iota s$, which takes place when similar words, as фint $\Pi \omega \lambda \epsilon$ here, are brought together. Another Schol. explains them of the acquaintance of Polus with the philosophy of Anaxagoras, - to which sect, says he, Polus belonged, - a piece of information probably picked out of the text. Perhaps nothing more than ironical praise of Polus for great knowledge is intended. Comp. 462, A.
 The clause might be removed without injury to the sense. àvtiotpoфov here governs a genitive, but a dative, 464, B. Some other compounds of a avii vary in the same way as to their regimen. éккivo, referring to ȯ $\psi o \pi o 九 i a s$, accommodates its gender to that of àriotoopov.
A. Init. If, therefore, I too, when you answer, shall not 466 know what to make (of it), do you likewise prolong your discourse; but if I shall, let me make use of it. The dative, which should follow $\chi$ р $\eta \sigma \omega \mu a z$, is contained in àmокрıvo$\mu^{\prime}$ évov. $^{\text {. }}$
 held in no estimation at all. This verb, which just above has a predicate, фav̂̀oo, is here used absolutely. Our verbs to regard, to consider, and others, are capable of the same twofold usc.
C. The colon, which most editors put after кúva, ought, as it seems to me, to be erased. Comp. $\mu \dot{a}$ тò $\nu \Delta i ́ a \ldots d \lambda \lambda$, $463, \mathrm{D}$, $\nu \grave{\eta}$ toùs $\theta_{\text {foù }} a \grave{\lambda} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}, 481$, C, where the formula of swearing unites in onc clause with what follows. Socrates does not answer Polus by the phrase $\nu \grave{\eta}$ тòv kúva, but only begins his answer in the next chapter.
 " Is not the state that is enslaved and under a tyrant far from doing what it wishes? Very far. And the soul, accordingly, that is governed by a tyrant, will be very far from doing what it may wish (if we speak of the whole soul); and, drawn along forcibly by urgent lust, will be full of agitation and regret." For ©s ëтоs єìтєiv, qualifying oidév,
 The Schol. on Aristoph. Frogs, 1421, thinks that the name of the divinity is omitted out of reverence. But the omission seems intended rather for comic effect, as though the right divinity did not readily occur to the mind. - каi

 declares to be used for the present, has its own force. Polus could come to his conclusion, when he had refuted, or by refuting. The argument may be considered as the preliminary to the conclusion, or as the means of reaching it. In the first case, the aorist is needed ; the present, if used,

 ${ }_{\epsilon} \xi \xi \in \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi \theta \hat{\eta}$. . örı. The verb is here used in sensu pragnan$t i$, unless Socrates be refuted, and it be shown that, thus answering nearly to our verb convince.
B. oūros dà $\dot{\eta} \rho$. An instance of aposiopesis or reticentia, a figure often caused by excited feelings, which cannot find the language to express themselves. "In hac formula recte omittitur articulus, quoniam dicitur $\delta \in \epsilon \kappa \tau \iota \kappa \bar{s}$ de eo qui preesens est." Stallb. oivtos contains a shade of contempt sometimes like iste. Comp. 489, B, 505, C. _- каi $\gamma \dot{\text { ì }} \beta$ non est etenim, sed кai pertinet ad $\nu \hat{v} \nu$. Stallb.; i. e. каì is also. - iva $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon i \pi m$ бє кaтà $\sigma \epsilon$, that I may address you in your own style. This refers to $\lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \Pi \hat{\omega} \lambda \epsilon$, and the artificial juxtaposition of words of equal length, or of similar form or sound. Comp. 448, C, 465, D.
 $\pi a \rho \grave{̀} \tau \omega \bar{\omega}$ lat $\rho \hat{\omega} \nu$, a coustructio pragnans.
D. oi $\pi \lambda$ écotes, i. e. who make voyages for commercial
 pronoun thus prepares the way for the infinitive, the latter
 But, just above, we have not only $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau 0, \pi i \nu \epsilon i \nu$, but also ėkєi-
 not so, then, in all cases ?
E. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta}$ àvá $\gamma \kappa \eta$. The preceding question of Socrates is equivalent to a negative proposition, which is here to be supplied; sc. that there is nothing which is not either good or bad, etc.
A. $\pi \rho$ átтovol, on fait, like $\lambda$ éyovat, on dit. The same 468 indefinite subject appears just before in the first person plural, $\beta a \delta i \delta^{\circ} \rho \epsilon \nu$, etc.
 respect to something further.
E. $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \bar{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau a \dot{\tau} \tau \eta$. Not in this city, Athens, nor does тaúrg denote in this way, but in this just-mentioned city, i. e. in the supposed city. If Athens had been intended, Socrates, living there, would have said, as Stallb. after Boeckh on Pindar (Not. Crit. in Olymp. 6. 102) observes, ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \tau \mathfrak{\eta} \delta \bar{\epsilon}$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi$ ód $\epsilon$. Comp. this formula so used, $469, \mathrm{D}$, fin. ; Leges 932 , A. ö $\delta \varepsilon$ seems to be the strongest, and, so to speak, most objective of the demonstratives, and to point especially at that which has a close outward relation (as that of place) to the speaker. $=$ fieri potest.-i $\dot{s} \delta \dot{\eta}$, as forsooth, just as though. Stallb. translates these words by quasi vero, Ast by nam revera.
A. $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\iota} \stackrel{\AA}{\omega} \nu \ldots \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu$. Comp. Soph. § 151. 3; 469 K. § 332.8 ; Cr. § 522.

tæ (preterea) adjungi solet particula $\gamma \epsilon$. Ast, $=y e s$, and pitiable besides. - $\pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$, cur. - oũ $\omega \mathrm{\omega}$, $\dot{\omega} \mathrm{s}$, for this reason that. And so, in English, we say how is this? nearly in the sense of why is this? the reason of which is, that the manner in which a thing is done often involves the cause why it is done.
C. $\mathfrak{\epsilon \xi \xi \in i v a t . ~ S u p p l y ~} \tau \iota v$, to which aủtệ refers, in the next line.
D. $\tau \hat{\varphi} \lambda \hat{\lambda} \gamma \omega \varphi$ is added to explain the sense in which $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota-$ $\lambda a ß o v$ is used, attack in your discourse, refute by argument. or seems to belong to the imperative, with the usual hortatory sense. ——'̀ ảyopậ $\pi \lambda \eta \theta_{0}$ órg, in the agora, when it is crowded, which it was between early morning and midday. This phrase denotes place, - not time, as Stallb. says, to which $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ is opposed. $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ à $\gamma o \rho a ̀ \nu ~ \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta o v \sigma a \nu$ is a common phrase for time. áropá, even when definitely used, is often without an article, like $\pi$ ó̀ts, $\pi a r i f \rho$, and many other nouns. And this is particularly frequent after prepositions. Comp. 447, A. - $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \xi \epsilon \epsilon$, he shall be dead, the meaning of $\tau \epsilon \in \theta \eta \kappa a$ put into a future. This appears to be the received form in old Attic, and $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{j} \xi \in \tau a t$ came into use afterwards. See Elmsl. on Aristoph. Acharn. 590.

 Aristoph. Peace, 71. But the accusative may also follow this verb, as in 515 , E. Yet the accusative of кє $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{a} \lambda_{\eta}$ was disallowed by the Atticists, although used by Lysias and others of the best writers.
E. тpıńfєt, desidero articulym. Stallb. ai, which may have been absorbed by кaì (KAI for KAIAI), is added by Coray. But the article is unnecessary, being implied or contained in $\tau$,́, as Ast observes. One article often suffices, even for two substantives of different genders, or for two
words separated by disjunctive particles. Comp. Hermann on Eurip. Hec. 593 of his second edition.
A. tò $\mu$ '́ $\quad$ a $\delta \dot{i} y a \sigma \theta a t$, etc. The construction is anaco. 470
 sake of greater emphasis, in the place of кaì єivaı $\mu \dot{́} \gamma \mathrm{\gamma} \delta \dot{i}-$ varAat. The sense is, To have great power appears to you to be a good, if success follows a man while he acts as seems best to him; and this (i. e. the use of great power when accompanied with success), as it seems, is to have great power: but otherwise to have great power is a bad thing, and is to have little power. Socrates shows the absurdities into which Polus, on his own ground, falls.
B. єimè tiva ópov ópíste. tis is here used like örtıs in indirect inquiry. See $447, C, 448, E$, etc.
C. $\chi^{a \lambda e \pi o ́ \nu} \gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \xi a$. These words are obviously spoken in irony.
 pose that by this form of words Socrates conveys ridicule of ópâs, just above, which is used quite rhetorically. This may be so, but áкоv́ш is often thus used for àкŋкоа. Comp. $515, \mathrm{E} ; \mathrm{Cr} . \S 579, \zeta ;$ K. § 255. 1. R.——oùk oỉa. The noble passage down to $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ is freely translated by Cicero, Tusc. Quæst. 5. 12.-aütódev, ex ipsa re. Stallb., from the nature of the case itself.
 кaì үuvaîka. See 469, E, note.
A. Archelaus began his reign by the foul means men- 471 tioned in the text, in 413 B. C., and died by assassination in 399. He seems to have been an able prince, and he made, according to Thucyd. (2. 100), more internal improvements in Macedonia than all his predecessors. His desire of the society of men of letters is well known; besides Euripides, the poet Agathon and others resorted to his court. (Ælian. Var. Hist. 2. 21.) Socrates, also, is said to have been in-

 He said, also, that Archelaus had spent 400 minæ in getting his palace painted by Zeuxis, but had spent nothing on himself. (Ælian. u. s. 14, 17.) Athenæus, in a bitter passage, filled with aspersions of Plato (Lib. 11. sub fin.), says that the philosopher was, according to the testimony of his nephew, Spcusippus, on very good terms with the man whom he here speaks so ill of. But as Plato was scarcely thirty when Archelaus died, and until that time a man of little distinction, the story is probably distorted and exag-
 Heindorf condemns Routh for adopting é $\delta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon v \epsilon \nu$, saying that the latter, with $\hat{a} \nu$, is serviret; the former, servisset. But this is not so. The imperfect indicative with $\hat{a} \nu$, "plerumque refertur ad præsens. Sæpe vero etiam ad præteritum, ejusmodi quidem, quod diuturnitatem aliquam vel repetitionem facti continet." Hermann de partic. äv, II. 10.
B. Aav $\mu a \sigma i \omega s$ ís ä $\theta \lambda \imath o s . ~ S e e ~ 477, D$, note. - $\mu \epsilon \tau a-$ $\pi \epsilon \mu \psi a ́ \mu \epsilon v o s$, etc. "Insignis est hic locus eo, quod plurima participia cumulantur, copula non intercedente." Stallb. In this, the style of rhetoric seems to be imitated. The circumstances are compressed into one sentence, and vibrated, so to speak, one after another with rapidity, for the sake of the greater effect.
C. $\epsilon^{\prime} \mu \beta a \lambda \omega \nu$ єis ф $\rho^{\prime} a \rho$, according to Ast and Stallb., denotes the manner in which the action of $\dot{a} \pi о \pi \nu i \xi a s$ took place, having drowned him by throwing him into a well. Perhaps it may suit the rhetorical style here better, if they are taken side by side, as if kai were in the text, having thrown him into the well (and so) drowned him. For àmo-
 primis, seu interque eos tu primus. Heindorf, who has adduced a number of examples of the phrase.
D. тoù . . $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \kappa \in \dot{\varepsilon} \nu a t$. This clause is brought, by a negligent freedom of style, under the influence of ört, although Socrates of course did not praise Polus for ignorance of the art of conversation. $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ has the force of quanquam ; although you seem to have neglected the art of discussing. - $\pi o ́ \theta \epsilon \nu$. Comp. my note on Eurip. Alcest. 95.
A. Soкoúvtш tivai $\tau \iota$. Cr., § 450 , regards $\tau \iota$ as inde- 472 clinable, eorum qui videntur esse aliquid; not as predic. occus., eorum qui se putant esse aliquid. Aliquis and aliquid are both used by classical Roman writers in the same emphatic way. Cic. Tusc. Quæst. 5. 36. 104: an quidquam stultius, quam quos singulos contemnas, cos esse aliquid putare universos. And so tis, tivés, as in the noted line of
 95 ; and in Demosth. c. Mid. § 213, $\pi \lambda$ ov́oto $\pi o \lambda \lambda o \grave{~ . ~ . ~ . ~ \tau o ̀ ~}$ סoкeì tuvès єivau $\delta i$ єủtopià $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon i \lambda \eta \phi o ́ t \epsilon s$, which favors Crosby's view. -.. j̉írou. Soph. §220 (223. 2); Cr. $\oint 623$. Nixias. This well-known wealthy general perished in the Sicilian disaster, some seven years before the time when this dialogue is feigned to have been held. He is, however, without anachronism, selected as a witness, in the same way that the testimony of Homer might be appealed to. The men here named were not selected on account of their unjust actions, - for they were, perhaps, all of them, among the best Athenian public men, - but probably on account of their wealth, illustrious connections, and ancestry. Socrates means to say, that the spirit of all the great and opulent families in the city led them to prefer prosperous injustice before depressed goodness. -- oi $\tau \rho i$ i$\pi$ oòfs. A favorite kind of votive offering. The tripods here spoken of were set up on the top of small temples in the inclosure of the temple of Bacchus, in commemoration of victories in which the dedicators were the choragi of their tribes. -'Aportokpátクs, son of Scellias. This man,
one of the more moderate aristocrats, after helping, in 411 B. C., to overturn the Athenian constitution, soon again united with Theramenes to put down the more violent revolutionists. His dislike of democracy is punned upon in Aristoph. Birds, 125. We find probably the same person acting as general with Alcibiades, 407 B. C., and one of the commanders in the great sea-fight of Arginusæ, 406 B. C. With five colleagues, he perished, the victim of the popular frenzy which succeeded that event. It would not, then, seem very apposite to cite him the next year as a witness of the tenets of Polus, which his own experience so sadly belied. Either Plato forgot the date of this transaction, or with concealed irony selects the case of this man as really disproving what it is intended to prove. And he may have adduced the others with the same feeling.
B. $\epsilon \nu \Pi \nu \theta i o v$, sc. $i \epsilon \rho \bar{\varphi}$, in the temple of Apollo Pythius at Athens. So I have no hesitation in reading, with Coray, after one MS., for the common חuөồ, Delphi. For тоѝтo points at a votive offering well known and familiar to Athenians, and this temple (i. e. its sacred precinct) was the place where those who conquered in the cyclic choruses at the Thargelia deposited their tripods. Comp. Boeckh's Inscript., no. 213, and Thucyd. 6.54. - $-\hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \in \dot{v} \nu \delta \epsilon$ is for
 which contains the notion of taking from. - $\epsilon \in \beta \dot{\epsilon} \nless \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ . . . ${ }^{\lambda} \lambda \eta \theta_{o u}$. In these words there is an elegant allusion to actions of ejectment. There is, also, according to Stallb., a play upon ovsia, which means not only substance, estate, but reality, truth. 'ध์אä̀ $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, also, may allude to the tyrants before mentioned; as though Socrates had said, "You mean to act the part of one of these tyrants, whom you admire so much, and expel me from my only substance, the truth, by getting a multitude of opinions in your favor.'
 comp. $473, \mathrm{C}, 508, \mathrm{~B}$.
D. $\sigma \dot{v}$ j̀ $\gamma \epsilon i$ oióv $\tau \epsilon \in \mathfrak{i v a l}$. oio is neuter, and cival is to be taken with $\mu$ aкápıò ä̀ò $\rho a$; another єiva being understood, unless we say that the one in the text by brachylogy performs a double part. Comp. Repub. 486, A : oî́v $\tau \in$ olitc
 ठtavó́ $\mu \in \theta a$; shall we not suppose that you think so? For the genitive absolute with $\dot{\omega}$, after a verb of knowing, eomp. Soph. § 192, N. 2 ; Mt. §569. 5 ; K. § 312, R. 12 ; Cr. $\$ 640$. - ipa interrogative is sometimes found out of its usual place at the beginning of the sentenee, like other words of the same class. It is, however, before the most important clause. Comp. 476, A.
 tains a passive idea $=$ кодá̧ŋтта.
B. $\dot{d} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$. . $\grave{\text { ẗ } \sigma \omega s . ~ H o c ~}{ }^{\imath} \sigma \omega \omega$ eum irrisione dictum de

 ironical.

 to see), " ponitur semper in rebus gravioribus, et $\epsilon \pi i \not \tau v \mu$ фopâs ut ait Thomas Magister, p. 335." Wyttenbach on Plut. de sera num. vindiet., p. 17, referred to by Heindorf and others. Not semper, but sape. We have, for instance,
 Plut. Pelopid. § 34, వayópav émıòóvza vioùs $\sigma \tau \epsilon \not \subset a v o \nu \mu \in ́-$ vovs ' $\mathrm{O} \lambda \nu \mu \pi i a \sigma \iota$, and so several times in Plutarch's lives.
 $\nu \dot{\nu} \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \frac{s}{}$ ë́qтal. The compar. here has far less authority in its favor than the superl.; and quite a number of MSS. have $\epsilon \dot{v} \delta a i \mu \omega \nu$. Stallb. inelines to the superl., but no sure example has been adduced of this degree used for the compara-
tive and followed by $\eta$.——кaì $\tau \omega \nu \partial \ddot{\omega} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \xi^{\prime} \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$, and by strangers lesides, or and by the rest of men, viz. strangers. This seemingly pleonastic use of äd $\lambda$ os is quite common.



D. $\mu \circ \rho \mu \circ \lambda \dot{\lambda} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$ â̂, etc., you are this time bringing up bugbears, and not attempting a refutation; and just now you were lringing up witnesses. Socrates is making game of the rhetorical substitutes for philosophical proof used by
 which places there is a reference. - Svoiv yà $\rho$ à $\theta$ iouv. Supply oúdétepos.
 rhetorical precept of Gorgias mentioned by Aristot. Rhet. 3. 18, that the "impression produced by the serious discourse of the adverse party must be destroyed by mirth; and that of his mirth by seriousness." - каi пє́ $\rho v a \iota$ ßov$\lambda \epsilon v ́ \epsilon \iota \nu \lambda a \chi \omega ั \nu . .$. oùk $\eta \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ध̇ $\pi \iota \nLeftarrow \eta \phi i \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$. Socrates, in his ironical way, attributes to ignorance a proceeding which sprang from a conscientious regard to law, and crowned him with the highest honor. It is narrated by Xenophon, in his Hellenics, 1. 7, and mentioned by him (Memorab. 1. 1. 18, and 4. 4. 2) and Plato (Apol. Socr. 32, A), and in the dialogue Axiochus, $\$ 12$. Socrates happened to be the Epistates or president of the Prytanes, and as such the presiding officer in the assembly, on the day when the generals who had conquered at Arginusæ (comp. 4i2, A, note) were brought before the people on a charge of having neglected to pick up the bodies of the citizens that were floating in the water. It was proposed, contrary to the laws, to try them all at once by a summary process. Some of the Prytanes, who declared that they would not put the vote contrary to the laws, were frightened from their pur-
pose by the rage of the people, " and all promised that they would put the vote, except Socrates, the son of Sophroniscus, who only said that he would do everything according to the laws." (Xen. Hellen. u. s.) Whether Socrates was overruled by his colleagues it does not appear. One is tempted to conjecture that they took the affair out of his hands, and pretended that his delay in allowing the assembly to vote proceeded from ignorance; and that to this he playfully alludes. His conduct, however, was viewed by all in its true light. There is some reason to believe, however, that for that day he stayed proceedings upon the proposition. "But on the next day, Theramenes and Callixenus, with their party, by suborning fraudulently chosen proedri, procured the condemnation of the generals without a trial." (Axiochus, u. s.) This passage from a work ascribed to a disciple of Socrates, but commonly regarded as spurious, is important, not only for this item of information, but also for the statement, which may have some historical basis, that the foul plot against the generals was consummated by means of the proedri non-contribules, as they are called, who were drawn according to a pretended lot, on the day of the assembly, by the Epistates for the day, who was the successor of Socrates.

mapádos, as I was saying just now, hand over the proof to me in my turn. He refers to 472 , C.
 some bitterness silently contrast the philosopher with the orator, who aims to persuade the many. -- $\delta i \delta \delta o ́ v a t ~ \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi{ }^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\nu}$, to give an opportunity of refutation, to let (another) take up the argument. - $\pi \circ \lambda \lambda o \hat{v} \gamma \epsilon \delta \epsilon \hat{i}$. In this formula, кai is often added before $\delta \in i$ in the sense of even.
 $\dot{a} \pi \sigma \beta \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega \nu$, etc. Do you call beautiful things in general
（тà кà̀̀ $\pi a ́ \nu \tau a)$ beautiful in each inslance without having reference to anything further？i．e．do you consider beauty a fundamental quality，or resolve it into something else ？ —— $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ o ̂ ~ a ̈ \nu . ~ T h e s e ~ w o r d s ~ d o w n ~ t o ~ \tau o i ̂ t o ~ a r e ~ e p e x e g e t i-~$ cal of the preceding clause．

E．каì $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu \tau a ́ \quad \gamma є \ldots$ ．．à $\mu$ о́тєpa．In this sentence，Ast wishes to write кaдà without the article，thus making it a predicate．тà кa入̀̀ is added by way of explanation．тà катà ．．． гó $\mu$ ous $=$ oi $\boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu$ o七．The sense is，And，moreover， laws and studies－those that are beautiful，that is－arc not removed from（are not without）these properties，viz． the useful or pleasant，or both．
 ка入ิิs．．．орi广єє．This conveys a bitter satire of Polus， who by pleasure and the good meant the same thing．－



B．où каì тоі̀то àvá $\gamma \kappa \eta$ ；frequens apud Plat．dietio pro
 oủ тaûтa ảvá̌кŋ．Stallb．


 $\kappa \in \nu$, my mode of proof when put by the side of your mode of proof is quite unlike it．
476 A．$\sigma \kappa є \psi \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ ，$\sigma к о \pi \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ ．The present imperative， and the subjanctive used for it，seem sometimes to have a closer reference to the present time than the aorist；and therefore to be more urgent．Comp．let us be going，and let us go，in English．It has been remarked（first，I be－ lieve，by Elmsley），that in the present and imperfect the Attics say $\sigma \kappa о \pi \hat{\omega}$ ，＇̇бко́тov»，or $\sigma \kappa о \pi о \hat{\mu} \mu a t$ ，＇̇бкотоv́ $\not \eta \nu$ ，but not бкє́ $т т о \mu a \iota$ ，є่ $\sigma \kappa є \pi т о ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ．There is only one instance of бкє́ттодая in Plato to very many of $\sigma к о \pi \bar{\omega}$ ．On the con－
trary, they never use $\sigma \times 0 \pi \hat{\omega}$ in the future, aorist, or perfect.

 (i. e. $\pi a ́ \sigma \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ ), rov̀ro being the object. The participle is used to continue the form of the preceding discourse.
C. The Attic form кác is justly preferred by all modern editors to kai $\omega$, having, as it does, the support of several MSS.
 in the present, as the clause may be resolved into $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$

 $\omega \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega} \in \epsilon \mathrm{i} \tau a c$, to be taken with its cognate noun, and for the place of $\dot{\omega} \phi \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon a \nu$ in the sentence, comp. Soph. § 151, Rem. 7 ; K. § 332.8 ; Cr. § 522.
B. é̀ $\chi \rho \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ катабкєvท̂ à $\nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi о \nu$, in the condition of a man's property. So Schleierm. Comp. Repub. 544, E,
 $\tau \omega ิ \nu \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s ~ \tau \rho o ́ \pi о \nu ~ к а т а \sigma к є \cup \eta \dot{\eta}$. Ast, in his translation, joins à $\downarrow$ өө́тои with какіау.
C. à $\in \mathfrak{i}$ tò aloxıซтov, etc. In every case, that which is most ugly is most ugly, from what has been admitted before, either as occasioning pain in the greatest degree, or harm, or both. The student will have observed that кa入ós, aioxpós, preserve the same sense throughout the discussion, and there seems to be no fit word except $u g l y$ by which to translate the latter of the two. And yet ugly will not bear to be used in as wide an extent as aíoxpós. àyatós, kakós, denote the relation of anything to our well-being, especially to future and ultimate well-being as opposed to pleasure in the present time.
 most unpleasant, and the ug7iest of them because it exceeds
（them）in unpleasantness，or（it is so because it exceeds them） in hurtfulness，or in both．тovitav refers to the two movp－ piat of soul and body．－inтєрфvєî тıve ．．．ís $\mu \epsilon \gamma \hat{a} \lambda \eta \beta \lambda a ́ \beta \eta$, by some extraordinarily great harm．This may be ex－
 $\mu \epsilon \gamma^{a} \lambda \eta \eta_{!} \beta \alpha_{\beta}!$ ，it is astonishing by how great a harm，and ímєрфvєî тıve $\beta \lambda a ́ \beta \eta \eta$, by some asionishing harm．The com－ mon formula $\dot{\nu} \pi \epsilon \rho \phi \nu \omega \bar{s} \dot{\omega} s$ ，$\theta a \nu \mu a \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} s \dot{\omega}$ ，with an adjective， can be explained in the same way，or by an attraction by
 in their form by the relative adverb．

E．àma入入átтєt．This means no more than＂has a ten－ dency to free．＂Some are beyond the reach of cure by punishment（525，C）．Nor does Socrates teach here that the ultimate object of punishment is to free the bad man from his badness，as that of medicine is to cure the sick． The comparison is not to be pressed in all respects．
 are not prepared to answer．
 трєขó $\mu \in \nu o$, such as are under cure，which，being indefinite， readily gives place to a singular．－iatpєvó $\mu \in \boldsymbol{\nu}$ оs is added to explain oṽт $\omega s$ ．－á $\rho \chi_{n}^{\prime} \nu$ ，omnino，used chiefly with neg－ atives．Comp．Soph．Antig．92．－$\quad \underset{\eta}{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$, the not even possessing it at all．
 imitatione celebratum esse docuit Wyttenbach．ad Plutarch． de sera numinis vindicta，p．23．Stallb．

E．oîtos $\delta^{\prime}{ }^{j} \nu$, but this was，i．e．this is，as we proved， he who，etc．
479 A．ठьатрáそŋтає $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ．This verb and $\grave{\epsilon ̇ \kappa \pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega ~ a r e ~ o f t e n ~}$ followed by $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ before an infinitive．Comp．Soph．Antig．
 like this，an apodosis to which $\dot{a} \nu$ belongs is to be supplied：
here $\delta \iota a \pi \rho a ́ \xi a u t o$ is to be repeated. A little below $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho a-$

 тóv $\tau$ c. aủtoû refers to $\delta i ́ k \eta \nu$ diđóvat, implied in $\delta i ̂ k \eta \nu$, just
 is not uncommon in comparisons, for tov̂ $\sigma v \nu o \iota k \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \mu \grave{\eta}$ ن́ytє̂̀ $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau \iota$, in order to prevent the repetition of $\sigma v p o s \epsilon i v$. Comp. 455, E, note ; Soph. Antig. 75 ; and Soph. § 186, N. $1 ;$ K. § 323, R. $6 ;$ Cr. § 461, R. 2.
C. тарабкєva̧ónєขol. This verb can be followed by an accusative, and by a clause beginning with $\ddot{0} \pi \omega$ s. The two constructions are here united. - ${ }_{0} \pi \omega s$ àv $\bar{\omega} \sigma t \nu$, the means whereby they may be. - $\sigma v \mu \beta a i v \epsilon \iota ~ \mu ' ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau о \nu ~ к а к o ́ v . ~ T h i s ~$ verb may be united with the participle or infinitive of $\epsilon i \mu i$, or with a simple predicate, as here. Comp. Soph. Electr. 261; note in my ed.
 commits the greatest wrongs, suffers no punishment for them. - фаiveтаи, sc. àmoঠєঠєì $\theta a u$.
A. aủròv éautòv. . . фu入áттєıv, etc. For one needs to kecp 480 guard especially over himself, lest he act unjustly, on the ground that (if he so act) he will be possessed of a serious evil. The subject of фu入áттєiv is $\tau \omega \nu$, with which aùvòv is to be joined; and the same omission of the indefinite subject occurs a few lines below. - öँ $\pi \omega s \mu \grave{\eta}$ à̀ıкй $\sigma \eta$. One MS. has $\dot{a} \delta \iota \kappa \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$, and one other $\pi o \iota \eta \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$, just below. 'The old doctrine of Dawes, that ${ }_{o} \pi \omega s \mu \dot{\eta}$ caunot be followed by a first aorist subjunctive, but requires either a second aorist subjunctive or future indicative, is now exploded by all respectable scholars.
B. $\dot{\eta} \pi \hat{\omega} s \lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu$. $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, which Bekker prefers, would be equally good here. Comp. $\tau i \phi \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$, just below. The difference is, that $\pi \hat{\omega} s \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \sigma \mu \boldsymbol{\nu}=$ what is our opinion? $\pi \omega \hat{s} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, what shall we say? what ought to be our opinion! what have we good reason to believe ?
C. $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \epsilon i$. "Sometimes a second $\epsilon i$ follows $\epsilon i \mu \eta$, as in Latin nisi si." Mt. § 617. d; K. § 340, R. 5; Cr. § 667. 2. Stallb., on Sympos. 205, E, says: "Alterum ei rem magis etiam reddit incertan, ut quod exceptioni conditionem adjiciat." ——éni roủvavtiov. According to Stallb., Xpíctuov єivat is here to be supplied, and the clause кatךүo$\rho \epsilon i \nu \delta \epsilon i \nu$, being explanatory of toivavtion, follows without a copula. But this view of the construction overlooks $\delta \in i v$.
 in thought with $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \tau s$, etc., or in other words, Plato, studious of brevity, proceeds as if he had forgotten all of the sentence preceding oủ र $\rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau \mu \mathrm{s}$. For making a defence, etc., . . . rhetoric is of no use at all to us (nor is it of any use), unless one should suppose, on the contrary, that he ought to be an accuser first of all of himself, etc. - ôs ầ
 etc., but to give himself up, with his eyes closed and manfully, as to a plysician, etc. $\mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma a v \tau a$ expresses endurance of calamity with determination, the impressions concerning pain derived from the sense of sight, and their effects in weakening resolution, being thus prevented by the will of him who shuts his eyes. Comp. Soph. Antig. 421.
E. бot ó $\mu$ олоуєirat. Heindorf and Coray would exclude $\sigma_{0}$ from the text. If it be the pleonastic dative, as it is called, the sense is for you, i. e. I am willing to own to you that they agree with what was said before. - rouvavtiov, etc. If, on the other hand, says Socrates, one would do evil to another, he must save him by the use of rhetoric from punishment. Thus the rhetoricians, who place the value of their art in doing good to a friend, and harming an enemy, do just the contrary ; they harm their friends by saving them from justice, and do good to their enemies by the opposite. All this proceeds upon the principles with regard to justice and injustice which Polus has been com-
 as understood by Buttmann, amounts to this: that this method of doing evil to an enemy is only applicable in case the enemy wrongs a third person; for when the enemy wrongs the orator himself, to do evil to him thus, namely, to save him from justice, would be but exposing the orator to fresh injuries from him. By rhetoric, then, he cannot gain the point he desires, namely, to do evil to his adversary without injuring himself. - $\mu \epsilon \tau a \beta a \lambda$ óvгa, mutata ratione, vicissim. Comp. $\mu \epsilon \tau a \sigma \tau \rho \in ́ \psi a s, 456$, E. It agrees with the subject of noteiv. The abundance of words to denote opposition is worthy of notice: roivaviiov, av, and
 subject after a parenthesis. The sense of the first part of this sentence is as follows: But on the other land, again, if, reversing the case, one has need to do harm to any person, whether enemy or any one whomsoever, - provided only one be not himself wronged by his enemy; for that must. be guarded against, -if, I say, an enemy wrong another, he (that other) must procure in every way, by deed and word, that he (the enemy) suffer not punishment nor come before the judge.
A. à $\nu a \lambda i \sigma \kappa \eta \tau a t$. This, according to Coray, is an iso- 481 lated instance of the middle of $\dot{a} \nu a \lambda i \sigma \kappa \omega$ used as the active, and to be altered into àvàiokn. This word and àmoot $\iota \hat{\varrho} \hat{\varrho}$ are in a different tense from the aorists preceding, as containing the signification of continuance, which, however, rather belongs to $\mu \dot{\eta}$ à $\pi o \delta i \delta \omega \hat{\varphi}$ taken together than to the verb in itself.
C. $\nu \grave{\eta}$ тoùs $\theta$ fov̀s ả入入á. Comp. 466, C, note. - $\pi o ́-$ $\tau \epsilon \rho o ́ v \nu \epsilon \phi \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \ldots \sigma \pi$. . $\sigma$ oví̧ovra. For verbs meaning to speak construed with a participle, see Mt. § 555 , Obs. 2.- $\epsilon i$ $u \dot{\eta} \tau \iota{ }_{j} \dot{\prime}$, etc. If men had not the same state of mind, some of them some one, and others some other (i. c. if classes or portions of mankind did not agree in one or another state
of mind），but each of us had a peculiar state of mind dif－ ferent from what the rest of mankind had，it would not be easy to manifest your own state of mind to another．

D．i̊tov $\ddot{\eta}$ ．This construction with $\ddot{\eta}$ ，which belongs to
 account of the notion of difference implied in it．－$\pi \epsilon$－ тоуӨótes．Soph．§ 137, N． 6 ；Cr．§ 337．a；K．§ 241， R．8．Then follows $\epsilon^{\prime} \rho \omega \hat{\nu} \tau \epsilon$ ，because $\delta \dot{v} o$ renders the duality of the persons more striking．－－＇A $\lambda \kappa \iota \beta$ ádov．At the time when Plato would have us suppose this dialogue to be spoken，Alcibiades，then a man of forty and upwards，had retired for the last time from Athens，and long before that the intimacy between him and Socrates had ceased．That intimacy was of the purest kind on the part of Socrates． He saw in the young Alcibiades high natural endowments， and hoped to win him over to the love of wisdom and virtue． But political ambition and his passions were more attractive． －той Пuрı入ápтous，the son of Pyrilampes，whose name was Demus．Pyrilampes was a wealthy Athenian，and a friend of Pericles．He reared peacocks（see Plutarch． Pericl．§ 13 ；Athenæus，p．397，C），as did his son Demus ； and this，being then a new bird in Greece，attracted visitors from so far off as Sparta and Thessaly．On the first day of the month，and at no other time，this living picture－ gallery was open to all．Demus was as much admired for his beauty as one of his peacocks．Hence the parody in Aristoph．Wasps， 97 （acted seventeen years before the date

 ＂K $\kappa \mu$ òs ка入ós，＂i．e．where he finds written $\Delta \bar{\eta} \mu$ оs кп入 ós，＂De－ mus is beautiful，＂he writes close by it，＂K $\eta \mu \mathrm{o} s$＂－the top－ piece of the judge＇s ballot－box－＂is beautiful．＂Pyrilampes also was considered as handsome and as large a man as any in Asia，whither he went on embassics to the great king and
others. (Charmides, 158 , A, if another person of the name be not meant.) We find Demus commanding a galley at Cyprus, before the battle of Cnidus, which happened in 394 B. C. (Lysias de Bonis Aristoph. § 25, Bekker.) The object of Socrates here is to teach Callicles, in a playful way, that he feels constrained to follow his object of attachment, philosophy, wherever it leads him; just as Callicles obeys the whims of the people. I know not why Alcibiades is brought in, unless it be for the reason which Ast has given : that, though aside from his main object, it serves to put Socrates in contrast with the politicians and orators. "I love beauty of mind," he says, " in Alcibiades, truth and justice in philosophy; but you love external beauty in Demus, and an ignorant, unjust Athenian people." -- örı . . . ov̀ סvעa $\mu$ évov. There is here a confusion of two
 strued with oov. ठ̈тı thus becomes idle.
A. $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ ย $\tau \tau \hat{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu \pi a \iota \delta \iota \kappa \bar{\omega} \nu$. The latter word could have an 482 honest sense. - ${ }_{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \eta \kappa \pi o s$, fickle. It has this sense in Lysis, 214, C (where it is joined to ávzád $\mu_{\eta \tau o s) \text {, Soph }}$ Ajax, 1358, and elsewhere.
 show that. See 467, A.
C. ¿ぇ ¿́ккратея. The sense is, O Socrates, you seem to take airs upon yourself in your discourses, being in very truth nothing but an haranguer ; and in the present instance you make this harangue because the same thing has befallen Polus, which, he said, befell Gorgias in respect to you. The first clause relates to the gencral habit of Socrates, which, as Callicles, judging him falsely, says, was that of bringing a man into perplexity by sophistical arguments, and then of crowing over him, as from a loftier moral ground. The second clause asserts this to be true in the instance of Polus. ${ }^{\text {® }} \boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \eta \gamma$ ópos (comp. $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma$ орıкá, 482, E)
means one who, like a popular speaker, gains his ends by sophistry and pretence of honesty. - тù̇̀̀̀v mafóvтos furnishes the ground or else the occasion why Socrates indulged in this spirit.
 be displeased if any one were to refuse. Without ày the sense would be, they were displeased. With äv, the verb, if put into oratio recta, would be in the optative; without ${ }_{a} \nu$, in the indicative. Comp. 461, A.
 while you profess to be in pursuit of the truth, you in reality turn (the conversation) to such vulgar and popular things as these, which are not beautiful by nature, but by law. For фортıќ́, comp. Mitchell on Aristoph. Wasps, 66. It may be translated, also, disagreeable, disgusting. Schol. фортькá ध́ $\sigma \tau \iota \tau \grave{\alpha}$ ßápos $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \mu \pi о \iota o ̂ \nu \tau a$, and so Ast, Stallb. It is joined with $\delta \iota \kappa a v \iota \kappa$ á, in the style of pleadings, in Plat. Apol. Socr. 32, A. ठ$\eta \mu \eta \gamma o \rho \iota \kappa \alpha ́, ~ S c h o l . ~ \tau u ̀ ~ \pi \rho \rho \grave{s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda \omega ̂ \nu ~} \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \sigma \nu \tau a$
 $\delta \epsilon$ is rarely found after the third word of the clause. Here, however, ís $\tau . \pi$. are in a manner one word. See Poppo's note on $\grave{\epsilon} \nu$ тоís $\pi \rho \hat{\omega}$ тoc $\delta$ '́, Thucyd. 1. 6.
483 A. тойто тò $\sigma$ офòv is in apposition with its relative, being added to explain it. - какоирyєís èv roîs hóyots, you deal unfairly in your discussions.- í $\pi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$, asking slyly. He says, that, if a person speaks of anything as according to law, Socrates changes the ground cunningly, and asks about it according to nature, and the contrary. -
 of that which was more ugly according to law, you followed up the law according to nature, i. e. in your argument you followed out law, as if it were nature. Ast, with some reason, wishes to erase тò катà yó $\mu o \nu$ and катà фúбv, which last words are wanting in some books. The sense would then
be, When Polus spoke of that which was more ugly, you urged the law, i. e. you spoke of that which was by law more ugly. For the phrase, $\delta \iota \omega$. катà дó $\boldsymbol{\text { o }}$, comp. Repub. 5. $454, \mathrm{~B}$, катà тò ỏvоца סьต́кєьข, to pursue an inquiry according to the letter, and not the idea. For édькка日es (which EImsley on Mcdea, 186, regards as an aorist, but which here seems to be an imperfect, and its infinitive, Euthyphron 15, D, a present). I beg leave to refer to my note
 though in no MS., is added before rò by several editors, and assists the sense; though without it à̊ıкeĩolat (a part) may be regarded as added in apposition, to explain $\pi a ̂ \nu$ (the general idea). Being pronounced by the scribes like the ending cov of кáк九ov, oiò might easily be absorbed by that word.

C. éкфоßoùvтєs. After this word, $\tau \epsilon$ stands in a few MSS. It seems to have been added to do away with the asyndeton; which, however, is allowable here, as what fol-
 etc. For they are contented if they are put on an equality when they are inferior. - $\dot{\eta} .$. . фvots. Stallb. observes, that oípar is sometimes interposed between a noun and its article or preposition.
D. $\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{1}$. Not $\phi v ́ \sigma t s ~ \delta \eta \lambda o \hat{\text {, }}$, but $\tau a v ̂ \tau a ~ \delta \eta \lambda o \hat{\imath}$, these things show that they are so. But Stallb. and Ast give the verb an intransitive sense here. These things are evident that they are so, i. c. it is evident.
 though in all the MSS., are looked on by several editors as interpolated. Ast retains them, translating фívıv סıкuiov, not the nature of justice, but natural jusiice. He remarks, that a noun governing a genitive may sometimes be resolved into an adjective qualifying that genitive; and cites,
 i. e. golden words; Phædrus, 275, A, $\sigma \propto \phi i a s ~ . ~ . ~ a ̉ \lambda i ̀ ~ \theta \epsilon t a p ~$
 The primary idea, as Heindorf observes, is expressed by the participle. The sense is, Not however, perhaps, according to that law which we enact, (thereby) moulding those among us who have the best gifts and most strength; taking them in their youth, by our incantations and juggleries, we tame them as we would lions, etc. 'The asyndeton at $\epsilon^{\prime} \kappa \nu^{\prime} \epsilon \omega \nu$ is like a number already noticed : the clause is epexegetical of the foregoing. See 450, B. " $\sigma \omega s$ is used sarcastically, the thing being regarded as certain by Callicles.
484 A. àv $\eta \rho$, according to Stallb. and Ast, is here used unemphatically as a man, a person. If contempt were expressed, äv $\theta \rho \omega \pi$ os would have been chosen, as in $518, \mathrm{C}$.
 throwing his rider. - $\gamma$ рá $\mu \mu a \tau a$, written ordinances. ̇̇тavaacàs, etc. He rises upon us and turns out our master, - this slave that was, i.e. this one whose spirit we had
 $\lambda a \mu \psi \epsilon$, denote an action wholly indefinite in regard to time,
 presents or futures. The aorist, in such cases, represents a general truth as a matter of experience; the present, as something oft occurring in the existing state of things; the future, as something sure to happen, as the effect of existing causes.
B. עó $\mu$ os ó $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ßaci入єús. This fragment of an uncertain poem of Pindar's is often referred to, especially by Plato. It is treated of at large by Boeckh, Pind. Vol. III. 640. Boeckh makes it probable that the words катà фט́бıи, or something equivalent, helong to the passage ; $\phi \eta \sigma$ iv, having the same sound, and almost the same letters, as фv́ou,
may have caused that word to be omitted. oitos $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\eta}$ are interposed by Callicles. Something like this followed in

 that Callicles perverted the sense of Pindar, but the same turn is given to the words in Leges, 10. 890, A, and Aristides (2.69, Dindorf) knows no other. The sense of ä $\gamma \epsilon$ $\delta_{\iota \kappa a \iota \omega \nu}^{\text {tò }}$ 及ıatótatov, according to Bocckh, is affert vim maximam, justam cam efficiens; i. e. law (the law of nature) makes use of might, and calls it right. ä $\gamma \epsilon \iota$ and $\delta \iota \times a \omega \bar{\omega}$ have the same object. Socrates interprets äyєt, below (488, B), in the sense of carrying off, plundering, which is suited to the action of Hercules. Hence Ast derives his translation, lex abigit s. rapit, ex suo jure agens, violentissime; where тò $\beta$. is treated as an adverbial phrase. But Aristides, by using the opposite phrase, ä $\gamma \epsilon \iota$ тà $\delta i к \times a \iota a ~ \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon \dot{v} \omega \nu$, shows that tò $\beta$ catótatov is at least the object of $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota \omega \nu$.
—_roútou refers forward to kaì ßoûs . . . civaı.
C. The changes of number here are worthy of notice:


 genitive in two relations. 1. That of the thing from which one is far off ; as, Phædrus, 238, D, oủкє́ть по́ṕpo dıtv-
 dithyrambs. 2. That in respect of which one is far advanced; as Symposium, 217, D, $\delta_{\iota \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma о ́ \mu \eta \nu}^{\pi} \boldsymbol{\tau} \rho \dot{\rho} \rho \dot{\rho} \omega \tau \omega \nu \nu v$ $\kappa \tau \omega \hat{\omega}$, I conversed to a late hour of the night; infra 486, A,
 in philosophy; and in the text the sense can be, to too late a period of his youth.
D. кадòs кảzäòs àvip, in the mouth of Callicles, means quite another thing from what the same words would intend if used by Socrates. In earlier times the optimates were
so called, i. e. the name was given to men of a certain birth. By the standard of Callicles, it would belong to a man of the highest rank in public estimation. The moral character of the individual gave him a right to this title, in the estimation of Socrates. Comp. Welcker, Præf. to The-
 ness transactions in general. The word denotes both private and public contracts, and treaties of commerce. $\grave{\eta} \theta \hat{\omega} \nu$, characters.
E. ' тò tô̂ E. See 465, D. The following lines are from the Antiope, and, as the Schol. says, from a speech of Zethus to Amphion. Valckenaer, in his Diatribe on the frag. of Eurip. (the seventh and eighth chapters of which are devoted to this play), gives these words to Amphion. - in' aùtòs aúrồ, etc., where, i. e. in whatsoever, he happens to do his best, whereinsoever he most excels. One MS. only has ruyxávet, a reading which the editors before Stallb. generally preferred. But it is now admitted on all hands, that in the poets relative words occasionally are joined to the subjunctive without äv. Cousin translates this line, "afin de se surpasser lui-même." It is strange that he did not see that in the very next line Plato interprets the ancient and poetical iva, where (which the Attic prosewriters did not entirely give up), by önov äv. ———For aùzòs aúтoû, see Soph. § 144, N. 4, and § 232 ; and for $\beta_{\epsilon}^{\text {édtıбтos }}$ aúroû, § $177, \mathrm{~N} .5 ; \mathrm{Cr} . § 464$. The comparative with the reflexive pronoun in the genitive denotes the having gone beyond a previous or usual state; the superlative with the same, the possession of the quality in the highest degree to which the person spoken of attains.
485 A. єivoía $\mathfrak{y} \mathfrak{\eta}$ éavtoû, out of regard to himself, through self-love. 'The genitive is objective, as is the possessive


much the same thing. To $\begin{gathered}\mu \\ \mu\end{gathered}$ $\pi \epsilon \rho$ succceds, instead of $\tilde{\pi} \pi \epsilon \rho$ or oiov. Comp. Xen. Sympo-
 $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon ́ \pi o т \epsilon}$ é $\mu \pi i \pi \lambda a \iota \tau$, and 518, B.

E. ikavóv, satisfactory, answerable to his powers, or to the expectations formed of him. - $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon$. Heusdius $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ excidisse suspicabatur. Sed vere monuit Boeckhius (in Plat. Minoem et Leges Comment. p. 112) sæpius ita $\tau$
 friendly.
A. In the Antiope of Euripides, a dialogue between the 486 brothers Zethus and Amphion was contained, in which the former, who was a shepherd, exhorts the other to give up the art of music, to which he had devoted himself. The dialogue, as the remains show, involved a brilliant comparison between the life of the practical man and of one devoted to the arts. See Appendix, No. 3.- $\mu \epsilon \iota \rho a \kappa เ \dot{\omega} \delta \epsilon \iota$ . . . норф'́ $\mu a \tau \iota$, you strive to ornament a soul so nobly endowed by a puerile form, or outside. $\mu о р \phi \dot{\mu} \mu a \pi \iota ~ d e n o t e s$ external decoration; here, the musical and poetical pursuits of Amphion. - oü $\tau^{\prime}$ à̀ $\begin{gathered}\text { dikns, etc., nor in the counsels of }\end{gathered}$ justice couldst thou put forth thy words, nor take hold of anything probable and persuasive; i.e. Zethus denies to his brother the power to defend himself in suits at law, and to use the arts of persuasion. - ajnayazo. The word points at the $\dot{a} \pi a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$ of Attic law, a summary process by which the accused could be dragged before the proper magistrate, and locked in prison, without previous citation. One of the crimes to which this process was applicable was $\dot{a} \sigma \epsilon \in \beta \epsilon a$, the offence for which Socrates, though by another process, was actually tried. There is an allusion below, no doubt, to what actually happened; to the sceming helplessness and unskilfulness of Socrates at his trial ; to his
accusers, who were men of little influence or repute; and especially to the leading one, Meletus, a bad poet and a bad man; as well as to the penalty of death, which they attached to their indictment. - $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon i v, ~ s a y s ~ S t a l l b ., ~ a c-~$ cipiendum pro $\grave{\eta} \delta \iota \kappa \eta \kappa$ évar. Heindorf on Protag. p. 310, D, makes the same remark, and brings a number of examples in proof of it. One is from Lysias, p. 678, Reiske : oi $\delta^{\prime}$
 cording to Ast, the present includes the past, = to have done and to be still doing wrong. This is often true, but it will not explain such a case as this from Lysias, p. 136, Reiske,

 committed is spoken of. The true explanation is, perhaps, that $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \omega \hat{\omega}$ properly means, I am a wrongdoer, as well as $I$ am doing wrong. But he is a wrongdoer who has done wrong.
B. катทүópov . . . $\mu \circ \chi \theta \eta \rho o \hat{v}$, a very common and paltry sort of accuser ; referring to the accuser's standing in general. - Oavárov . . . тциẫ $\begin{gathered}\text { at, to lay his damages against }\end{gathered}$ you at death, which happily is an expression we do not use, because our law, unlike that of Athens, never places human life in the power of a vile or revengeful accuser, and of a throng of unrestricted judges. $\tau \iota \mu \bar{\sigma} \sigma \theta a \iota$, to make his own estimate, set his price, is the usual word for the plaintiff's claim of satisfaction, whether pecuniary or penal. The court were said $\tau \iota \mu \bar{\nu} \nu$. The defendant was said $\dot{a} v \tau \iota-$ ruâotat, to estimate in his turn what ought to be the verdict, or iлтотциã $\theta a t$, to give his reduced estimate, in case he had been voted guilty by the judges. And all this was allowed only in certain suits called äүढิves $\tau \mu \eta \tau o \dot{i}$, or those in which the laws had not settled the penalty, but left it to the judges. One of these was $\dot{a} \sigma \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon a$, for which Socrates was tried. On being found guilty, his $\dot{i \pi o \tau i \mu \eta \mu a}$ was called
for ; and instead of naming some small mulet which might have saved his life, he named support in the Prytaneum. This led the judges, who usually chose between the accuser's estimate and that of the accused, to sentence him to death. - $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \nu \lambda \hat{a} \sigma \theta a u, \zeta \bar{\eta} \nu$. These infinitives, as Stallb. remarks, depend on ${ }^{\epsilon} \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon$, which is followed at first by a participle, $\delta v v a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$, added as a paraphrase of the poet's $\chi \epsilon i \rho o v a$, and then by an infinitive. - à $\tau \epsilon \chi^{\nu \bar{\omega} s . ~ S e e ~}$ 491, A.
 кóppø $\quad \tau \dot{\prime} \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$, to strike a person upon the side of the head or temples, is spoken only of blows with the flat hand, and was the highest insult at Athens. See 527, D. - $\pi \rho a-$ $\gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu . . . \epsilon \dot{j} \mu o v \sigma i a \nu$. This expression is from Eurip., and alludes to Amphion's pursuit. His brother says, No longer practise music, but musicalness of conduct, i. e. that which is in harmony with your nature and powers.
 from фiлобoфia $\gamma^{\prime} \rho, 484, \mathrm{C}$, to this place, but misapprehends its import. - $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\mu} \rho i \sigma \tau \eta \nu$ is in opposition to $\tau \iota \nu a \tau \omega ิ \nu i \theta \omega \nu$. Just above we should expect ais ßagavi\}ova九 for $\hat{\eta}$, referring to roúr $\omega \nu \tau \omega \nu \lambda i \theta \omega \nu$; but $\hat{j}$ comes from Plato's having $\tau \iota \nu a$ $\lambda_{i} \theta_{o \nu}$ in his mind. - $\pi \rho o \sigma a \gamma a \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$, adnoovens, is used with allusion to gold, which was brought to the touchstone to be rubbed upon it, that a judgment might be formed by the
 $\lambda o \nu \epsilon \hat{\dot{v}}$ धíl $\epsilon \sigma \theta a \imath$ єi. Comp. Herodot. 7. 10: "Pure gold we do not distinguish by itself, but when we rub it (viz. on the touchstone) by the side of other gold, then we distinguish the better."
E. $\tilde{a}^{\nu} \nu=\hat{a}{ }^{a} \nu$, -av̉rà $\tau a ̉ \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$, true in themselves, or the very truth.

- A. $\psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \ldots \mu$, as to the soul's living rightly and 487 the opposite.
B. $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ тồ $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon \nu \tau o s .-\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$ is often thus used with a comparative instead of a positive; and in the same way $\pi \epsilon ́ \rho a$, just below, 487, D.
C. Andron is mentioned in Protag. 315, C. He was probably the father of Androtion, an orator and disciple of Isocrates, against whom an oration of Demosthenes was written. - $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\eta} \kappa o v \sigma a$. So Bekker, Ast, and others, with most MSS. Stallb. prefers iníkovaa, I overheard. (This he retracts in his second edition.)
 siastes vii. 16: "Neither make thyself overwise. Why shouldst thou destroy thyself?"
E. $\delta \tilde{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ ör $\iota$ are often interposed in the middle of a sentence, without having an effect on the construction. And so oỉ $\theta^{\prime}$ örtı. - Té $\lambda a s$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ à $\lambda \eta \theta$ cias, de veritate perfecta et consummata accipio. Heindorf. - Tò ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \nu \delta \rho a, ~ i . ~ e . ~ m a n-~$ kind. The article is used because d $\boldsymbol{d} \eta \mathrm{\rho} \rho$ has its widest generic sense, and thus forms a definite whole.

 toni, quod sciam, non item. Heindorf.
 explained by Boeckh, we must suppose that Socrates plays upon the word, without essentially injuring the sense of the passage from Pindar.
 quum de his rebus disputares. Sic tóte passim ponitur. Stallb. - тi $\pi о т \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \iota s$. The present embraces the whole time of the present discussion. Hence it is here for ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \in \gamma \epsilon s$.
D. oi $\delta \dot{\eta}$ кaí, etc. Since, indeed, they even make laws for the one, i. c. to control the one. The relative, as often elsewhere, renders a reason ; i. e. $=$ the demonstrative with रáp. ti $\theta_{\epsilon} \mu a \downarrow$ дó $\mu$ ò is used of a people, or one empowered by them, making laws, the maker being one of the party
to be governed; $\tau i \theta \eta \mu$ vó $\mu \boldsymbol{\nu}$, of a sovereign or a divine lawgiver.
 $3 ;$ K. § 330, R. 4. - air $\chi$ vvó $\mu \in \nu o s$. Socrates refers with admirable irony to 482, C, D. -iva . . . $\beta \in \beta a t \omega \dot{\sigma} \omega \mu a u$, ete., that I may get confirmation (for it) from you, seeing that a man who is competent to decide has admitted it.
 not speaking the truth; for $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \omega$ is the infinitive of the imperfect. - $\hat{a}$...какоир $\bar{\omega}$.. He quotes what Callicles said, 483, A. - ỏуо́дата Өךрє́́凶v, verba aucupans. Comp. 490, A. The same metaphor is seen in our word captious. - ó $\dot{\eta} \mu a \tau \iota \dot{\alpha} \mu a p \tau \epsilon i v$, to use a wrong expression.
C. $\hat{\eta}$ olt $\epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, etc. Or do you think my opinion to be, that if a rabble should be collected of slaves and of all sorts of men, of no account except by reason of their bodily strength, and these persons should say anything, that these very things which they say ought to have the force of law. Join $\tau \hat{̣}$ i ${ }^{\boldsymbol{i} \sigma \chi \nu \rho i \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota}$ together. This verb can mean pollere, contendere, fidere. For the first meaning, which is less common, but seems to belong to it here, comp. Dio

 animo prudenti. $\phi \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ must be taken absolutely, without an object, in the sense of decrecing, determining, but with contemptuous disparagement; unless we read, with Heindorf, äтta for aùtá. And aủtà $\tau a \hat{\imath} \tau a$ refers to the edicts implied in $\phi \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$.
D. тoùs $\delta$ ivo . . . тô ê évós. As the numerals are opposed to one another, they have a certain definiteness. Hence the article. So $\tau \grave{a}$ dío $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \eta$, sc. out of three, two thirds.
 mate an expression as tivas $\pi 0 \tau \epsilon$, which Routh wished to put into its place.
 believe that in $\pi \rho \circ \delta \iota \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu, \pi \rho \circ \mu a \nu \theta \dot{\nu} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ (Aristoph. Clouds, 476,966 ), $\pi \rho \dot{o}$ means forwards, and that it is prefixed without adding much to the meaning of the verbs, because the idea of advance is involved in learning and teaching. This word alludes to a school, as is shown by $\dot{\pi} \pi о ф о \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma$. ——oủ $\mu \grave{a}$ rò̀ Z $\mathrm{y} \theta \theta_{o \nu}$. Comp. 485, E. Most MSS. want où, which, however, is necessary here, for although $\mu \dot{a}$ is almost confined to oaths expressly or impliedly negative, it is in itself merely affirmative, being connected, perhaps, in
 you used of me just now with much raillery.——o òópaтa $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$, you utter mere words.
490 B. $\pi$ oג入ò̀ à $\theta_{\rho} o ́ \iota$, multi simul. Sæpenumero sic junguntur. Stallb.
C. $\boldsymbol{J}^{\mathfrak{Z}}$ ouv roúr $\omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \iota \tau i \omega \nu$, etc. Must he then have more of these provisions than we, because he is better ; or ought he, in virtue of his authority, to distribute them all, etc.
 penalty (by making himself ill). —— $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ èáxtoтov тஸ̣

 used in questions conveying wonder, indignation, or contempt. Aristoph. Clouds, 366, ‘O Zeìs . . . où $\theta$ eós éctiv; 1

 nonsense about? ${ }^{\prime} \chi \omega \nu$ here takes an accusative, unless we
 explanations, not quite satisfactory, are given by Hermann on Viger, note 228 ; Mt. § 567 ; Cr. § 632 ; K. § 668 , R. 1 (largest Gr.). Comp. 497, A.




A. à $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu \hat{\omega}$, absolutely, positively. You never stop talk-491 ing always about cobblers and fullers and cooks, and positively nothing else. In the sense without art, the penult
 joined thus redundantly with oùסèv nav́ouat again, 517, C, and in Leges, 2. 662, E. Socrates was often thus reproached or derided for drawing his illustrations from homely sources. He was led to it by love of simplicity, contempt for pretension, the desire to find a general truth by means of familiar instances, and frequent conversations with artisans. See a fine passage in Sympos. 221, E. - $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau i \nu \omega \nu$. . . $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ е́o ${ }^{\prime} \chi \chi \omega \nu$. Heind. remarks that $\pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \tau \iota$, not $\pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \tau \omega v o s$, is the
 by the better, namely, by who they are I do not mean, etc. oi єi๘ぃь dictum est cum abundantia quadam qualem Callicles in hac oratione sectatur passim. Poterat enim omitti. Stallb.
B. For karnyopeiv with the genitive of the person, see Soph. § 183. 2 (§ 194, N. 3).
 here are quite uncertain. The passage in brackets is omitted by Bekker, after one MS. It has the look of an explanation of $\pi i \delta_{\epsilon} . \quad$ Nor does Socrates afterwards do
 with aúverv. The sense without this passage is, But what? Does justice consist in this, that those who rule themselves should have more than others. Stallbaum's reading in his
 where $\tau i$ is quatenns, qua in parte. But how can àpхон́'pous be the subject of miéov ' $\epsilon \in \epsilon \omega$ ? or how could he say quatenus sibimet ipsis imperantes unless he had already spoken of governing one's self. - $\hat{\eta}$ тойтo $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ où oí̀ $\delta \in \hat{i}$. $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ sometimes takes an accusative of the thing, when that is a pronoun.

E．ís $\eta \dot{\delta} \dot{u} s \in i$ answers nearly to the French comme vous êtes plaisant！how ridiculous or foolish you are！$\gamma \lambda u \kappa u ̈$ us
 фpovas，you mean those fools the temperate．The one accu－ sative is in apposition with the other ；unless，with Stallb．， we make rous $\dot{\eta} \lambda_{1} \theta_{i o v s}$ the predicate－accusative；in which case the sense is，by the temperate you mean the silly．The sophists struck a disastrous blow against morality by giving it this title．Comp．Repub．348，D．＂What！＇＂says Soc－ rates to the sophist Thrasymachus；＂do you call justice （какiav）badness？＂＂No，＂said he，＂but（đávv $\gamma \in \nu \nu a i a \nu$
入е́ $\gamma \epsilon \iota$ ．
 fivat belongs to both clauses．For the transition from the dat．dependent on the verb to the accus．construed with the infinitive，comp．510，E，fin．，and Soph．Electra， 962.
 тáóơ，Soph．Antig． 605 ；Mt．§ 515，Obs．ầ may have dropped out here，as $\tau i$ itself is wanting in ten MSS．，both being absorbed，so to speak，by the last two syllables of סvva⿱亠乂tiav．－ois $\mathfrak{\xi} \xi \partial \nu$ ，etc．A contracted expression for

 ．．．they were themselves to introduce．Comp．Repub．465， fin．：＂Do you remember that some one reproved us，be－ cause we，in his opinion，made（ $\pi o \iota o \hat{\mu} \epsilon \nu$ ）our guards not
 when they could posscss everything belonging to the citi－ zens，were to have nothing．＂

C．тoût＇＇өォтiv à $\rho \in \tau \dot{\eta}$ ，etc．тồтo refers，not to the three
 the condition of things when $\tau \rho u \phi \dot{\eta}$ ，etc．are able to supply
 où $\delta \in \nu o ̀ s ~ a ̈ \xi ̆ z a . ~$
D. ${ }^{\text {a }} \boldsymbol{\rho}^{\prime} \theta_{\epsilon \nu} \gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \pi \circ \theta \epsilon \nu$, undecunque, from obsol. ả $\mu o ́ s$, Attic $\dot{a} \mu o ́ s,=\tau \iota s$, whence $\mu \eta \delta a \mu o v$. . This is Bekker's emendation of ä $\lambda \lambda o \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \pi 0 \theta \epsilon \nu$, which is evidently a false reading.
 the first clause would require. With this infin. supply $\delta$ eiv involved in кода⿱тє́ov.
 ——The lines here quoted are probably from the Polyidus of Eurip., and very similar to another fragment from his Phrixus. The second trimeter is completed by кáte доиі帠та. The passage is parodied by Aristoph. in the Frogs, 1477.
A. The singular passage next following is introduced 493 by the way, and perhaps half in sport. At the beginning of an argument concerning the good and the pleasant, Socrates takes breath a moment, and changes reasoning for playful illustration. He first mentions an opinion concerning the true life, which was expressed by the Orphic and Pythagorean theologists; - that the body is the tomb of the soul, release from which will admit it into real existence. To this dogma Plato alludes in Cratylus, 400, C. He says (ironically throughout), upon the derivation of $\sigma \bar{\omega} \mu a^{\prime}$, that it may come from $\sigma \hat{\eta} \mu a$, because some call the body the $\sigma \hat{\eta} \mu a$ of the soul, as being that in which in this present it is buried; or because the soul $\sigma \eta \mu a i \nu \epsilon \iota$ by means of the body its thoughts and wishes. But he thinks that the name is due to the followers of Orpheus especially, who taught that the soul was inclosed and kept ( $\sigma \dot{\omega} \zeta \epsilon \omega \nu$ ) in it to atone for its crimes in an earlier state. This derivation, he says, would require no change of letter. The Pythagorean Philolaus (Boeekh's Philolaus 181, Clem. Alex. Strom. 3. 3, p. 518, Potter) says, that "the old theologers and diviners testify, that the soul is joined to the body to suffer a certain penalty, and is buried in it каӨáтєр $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ ба́цат.." To this, and to tho
comparison of the body to a prison, there is frequent allusion. Socrates now passes on to an allegorical explanation of the fable of the Danaides, which illustrates the unsatisfactory nature of devotion to animal desire. It was the doctrine of some Mysteries (the Orphic or Bacchic especially), that the initiated fared better in the world below than the uninitiated, and use was made of this fable to show the difference in their condition. The fable was afterwards spiritualized, as we see in the text, and applied to the soul and its parts. It may be doubted who is the author of this punning allegory. Boeckh contends that it was Philolaus, who was a native of Croton or Tarentum. But there is no evidence that this allegory, and the dogma first spoken of, are to be attributed to the same person. The Schol. refers it to Empedocles, and Olympiod. (apud Stallb.) does the same. But their assertions may be mere guesses. Ast regards it as Plato's own invention, playfully ascribed to an Italian or Sicilian, for the purpose of laughing at the countrymen of Polus and Gorgias. - $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta_{\hat{\varepsilon}} \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$, etc. And that that part of the soul in which the desires lodge is capable of being persuaded, and of changing from one side to the other. There may be a side-thrust at rhetoric, the object of which is $\pi \in i \theta_{\varepsilon L \nu}$, when it is said that the part of the soul which contains the desires is moved this way and that by persuasion. - $\mu v \theta_{0} \lambda o \gamma \omega \bar{\omega}$, expressing in the form of a fable. -The ensuing words, as Buttmann, in Heindorf's ed., observes, seem to be taken from a song of Timocreon of Rhodes, a lyric poet contemporary with the Persian war ; of which song a few words in Ionic a minore dimeters preserved by Hephæstion (p. 71, Gaisford) are as follows :
 this word, Ruhnken (Timæus s. v.) says : кон $\psi$ ò dicitur quicquid scitum et venustum est. Plerisque autem locis, apud Platonem vox habet aliquid ironiæ Socraticæ, ut non
tam de vera et naturali, quam de nimia et adscititia venustate capienda videtur. Gorg. 521, E. Pro splendidis nugis sumendum est Gorg. 486, C. Neque tamen desunt loci ubi simpliciter et sine ironia ad laudem referatur: which he considers to be the case here. It answers to nice, fine, refined, and witty. I cannot help thinking that it here
 ing a change in the word, altering its sound a little.
B. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\text {a }} \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \nu$, etc., and that that part of the soul of the uninitiated, whore the desires reside, - its incontinent and irretentive part, 一 he said that this was a cask with holes in it ; making the comparison on account of its $\dot{a} \pi \lambda \eta{ }^{-}$ oria. ả $\mu \nu \eta$ ๆ́rous, besides its similarity to àvońrous, seems to have a double sense, uninitiated ( $\dot{a}, \mu v \in i v$ ) and not closing, unable to contain, as if from $\dot{d}, \mu \dot{v} \epsilon \nu \nu$. The construction is completed by supplying $\epsilon \not \phi \eta$, suggested by $\grave{\omega} \delta \dot{\mu} \mu \sigma \epsilon$. aùтov̂ seems to refer to $\psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$, although no reason appears why the neuter should here be chosen. Heindorf wished to read סoà tò àxó入agтov, in which case aùtov̂ would refer to тoûto $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\psi v \chi \bar{\eta} s$. - qovvavtion and $\sigma o i$ are to be joined, the opposite of what you have expressed. - тò àtiòes $\delta \grave{\eta} \lambda \hat{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu$, meaning of course the invisible, i. e. the intellectual, as opposed to

 that these uninitiated persons are, as it would seem (Eiev ${ }^{a} \nu$ ), the most wretched, and carry water into the cask with holes in a sieve likewise perforated. The early mysteries seem to have consisted of purifications, the effect of which was to remove guilt. Hence the initiated escaped the punishment in the future world which was to fall on others. This was denoted by making use of certain fables of the poets, which exhibited the popular view of the punishment of great offenders, and applying them to the uninitiated.
C. ätc ov̉ $\delta v \nu a \mu \in ́ \nu \eta \nu$, etc., on account, namely, of its inability to retain, through unbelief and forgetfulness. àmıoti$a \nu$ alludes to $\pi i \theta o \nu$. - $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \epsilon \epsilon \omega \bar{\omega} s$. Non explicucrim cum Heindorfio satis, admodum, sed habet vim affirmandi atque concedendi, ut Latinorum utique, sane quidem. Stallb. Ut candide loquar. Routh. -isó $\tau$, aliquatenus, quodammodo. Stallb. - $\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{\imath} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$, etc. Yet they make that clear, by the exhibition of which I wish to persuade you if in any wise I can - to change your mind. - $\mu \in \tau a \theta_{\epsilon}-$ $\sigma \theta a t$, sc. $\gamma \nu \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \nu$ or $\psi \eta \eta \phi \nu$. The next words explain $\mu \epsilon \tau a-$ $\theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \sigma \theta a l$, and therefore have no need of каi, which is in some editions. Just below, $\mu \epsilon \tau a \tau i \theta \epsilon \sigma a \iota$ is used in what is called the constructio pragnans like $\epsilon_{\xi} \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \gamma \chi \omega$, p. 482, B. The sense is, And do you change your opinion, and say that, etc.
 with that just now, from some allegorizing sophist. For ${ }_{o}$ aủròs followed by the dative, in brief phrases, sec Soph. § 195, N. 3. - After oioo supply $\lambda$ ézoıs äv.
 put into, each of these tubs.
494 B. रapaópoov. A bird, so called from the ravines and beds of torrents where it lives, of a yellowish color, and
 The Schol. on this place, and many others, mention that these birds were reputed to cure the jaundice by being looked at ; whence those who brought them into town for sale kept them covered, lest they should effect a cure for nothing. More about the bird will be found in Schneider on Aristot. Hist. Animal., Vol. IV. 80, seq. He thinks it to be the Charadrius œdicnemus or C. hiaticula of Linnæus.
 thing as.
C. $\lambda^{\prime} \gamma \omega$, кaì, etc. $\lambda^{\epsilon} \dot{\gamma} \omega$, to be repeated after кaì in the
sense of speaking of, takes a personal object with which the participles agree. The sense is, Ics, and I speak of (allow that there is such a thing as) a man having all the other desires, and able to live happily by taking pleasure in
 $\dot{a} \pi a \iota \sigma \chi \nu \nu \hat{\imath}$ is used with allusion to what Callicles has said of the modesty of Gorgias and Polus, as in 489, A.
 Hence the asyndeton. - $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma$ ópos, coarse, vulgar.


E. iò . . кєфá入atov, id quod rerum hujus generis (i. e. turpissimarum) caput est. Ast. кєфá入atov is in apposition with $\dot{\delta} \beta$ ios. - à $\nu$ é $\delta \eta \nu$, frecly or openly.

 . . . तórovs, you make what we have said before good for nothing.
B. kaì yà $\rho$ ov. Well, what of that? For you do too, i. е. $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \delta o к o u ̀ v \tau a ~ \sigma a v \tau ̣ ̂ ̣ ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \epsilon s . ~$
 something probably by єं $\pi \iota \sigma \pi \dot{\eta} \mu \eta$ (certain knowledge), do you not? —— ä $\lambda \lambda \frac{\tau}{} \tau$ ovzv, etc. Did you not accordingly, on the ground that knowledge was a different thing from manliness, speak of these as tion? The allusion in this and the prior question is to $491, \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}$. With $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ à $\nu \delta \delta \in i a \nu$, ovzan is to be supplied. The accus. absol. is often found without the participle of $\epsilon i \mu i$ expressed. Bekker, without MS. authority, adds $\dot{\partial} \nu$ after $\tilde{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$, which is a very probable conjecture, as ô may easily have been swallowed up by $\tilde{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$. The participle $\dot{\partial} \nu$ would be attracted in gender to the predicate.
D. $\dot{o}^{\text {'A }}$ дapveís. Socrates playfully but severely imitates the solemn style of covenants, in which the demus of the
parties was mentioned．Some of the demi，as that to which Socrates belonged，had no corresponding adjective forms． The want was in most cases supplied by an adverb in $\theta \in \nu$ taken with the article．
 any part of the body you please，taking it by itself，or sep－ arately．－${ }_{\mathrm{Q}} \mathrm{i}$ ，which disease，refers to voreiv implied in $\nu \circ \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ ．

C．$\dot{\text { intep } \phi и \omega ิ s ~} \dot{\omega}$ ．Comp．447，D．
D．ои̇кои̂̀ тои́тov oủ $\lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon \iota$ ，etc．In that of which you are speaking，the one part，viz．ס七千光va，being thirsty，is then feeling pain，is it not？He was speaking of $\delta \iota \psi \omega \bar{\omega} \tau a$ $\pi i \nu \in \epsilon$ ．

E．катà tò тiveıv xaípetv $\lambda$ é $\gamma \epsilon \epsilon$ ；do you speak of taking pleasure so far forth as the act of drinking is concerned？ i．e．does the pleasure go with the drinking？—— $\lambda ч \pi о ч ́ \mu \epsilon-~$ vov；at the same time that the person feels pain？－єïт $\psi v \chi \bar{\eta} s$ єїтє $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau o s$ ．Stallb．would read $\psi v \chi \bar{\eta} s \pi \epsilon \in \rho$ ．But there can be no objection to taking тónov with the genitives； and $\chi$ póvov is excused by being in its company．
497 A．riүvєта．See 525，E，note．－àккі乡єь．Olymp． apud Stallb．пробто九ŋ̂ $\mu \omega \rho i a \nu$ кaì тò $\mu \grave{\eta}$ єiôéval．Mœeris de－ fines àккıбдòs as the Attic expression for $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \pi o i \eta \sigma \iota s$ ． From examples of the use of the word，its meaning evi－ dently is，to pretend that you do not，particularly to decline taking a thing（as food at table）when you want it．Comp． Coray on Heliodor．2．64．Өрúrtoдa has sometimes much the same sense，e．g．in Plut．Anton．§ 12，where it is used of the feigned reluctance of Cesar to wear the crown．
 Ast suppose this to be a gloss．Stallb．（second ed．），after Winckelmann on Euthydem．295，C（quite a parallel pas－


vovéteis to Callicles, and oủ ${ }^{\prime} \mu \mu a \ldots \pi i v e \iota$ to Socrates.
 a choice Attic expression, has not the look of a gloss, and it is not easy to say what it is a gloss upon. 2. The phrase is not in dramatic keeping with the politeness of the Platonic Socrates. But then, 3. As Callicles wishes to break off the discourse, $\pi \rho o i ̈ \theta \iota$ єis тоӥ $\mu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ is not what he would say. 4. vovéteis can only point at the advice given by Callicles to Socrates, on pp. 484-486, and not to any-
 $\tau \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \mu$, referring to Callicles. 5. There is no mark of a change of person at ov̉X ä́a, and little at каі̀ $\pi \mu o ́ t \theta \imath$. These last considerations induce me to reject Winckelmann's view, and to regard it even more probable that öт ${ }^{\text {en }} \chi^{\prime}{ }^{\omega \nu}$ $\lambda \eta \rho \epsilon i s$ are words spoken by Socrates. But I can arrive at no sure affirmative conclusion respecting the passage.
B. oủ oウ̀ aũ̃ך $\dot{\eta}$ $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta}$, this damage or cost is not yours, i. c. this does you no harm.
C. ötı $\tau \grave{a} \mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{a} \lambda a \quad \mu \epsilon \mu \dot{\prime} \eta \sigma a \iota$. There is an elegant allusion to the mysteries of Ceres; which were divided into the small, held in the city, and the great, held chiefly at Elcusis. The latter could not be witnessed until a year or more after initiation into the other. The sentiment is something like that in Artegall's words to the Giant : -

> "For how canst thou those greater secrets know, That dost not know the least thing of them all? Ill can he rule the great, that cannot reach the small."
 left off. The usual construction of $u p x \omega$ with an adverb of motion is here adopted by aंтoкрivoдat. - $\pi \epsilon \nu \omega \bar{\nu}$ is a par-

 being the ethical dative, and tò̀ 入óyov or tav̂ra understood the subject. But $\dot{\rho} \mu \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. oot may also denote to be consistent with your previous admissions. Comp. 487, D.
 article is here used as a demonstrative, - a usage not uncommon before a relative sentence introduced by ôs, ö öos, or oios.
 is said in contempt, as if Socrates were not deserving of a sensible answer.
C. $\hat{\eta}$ каі̀ $\neq \tau \iota \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$, etc. If cowards, who, according to Callicles, are the bad, feel more pleasure and pain than brave men when enemies retire and advance, and if pleasure and pain are the same as good and evil, then the bad are both bad and grood in a higher degree than the good, which is absurd. After $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ á $\gamma a \theta o i$, the MSS. have oi a $\gamma a \theta o i$, which Routh and succeeding editors have justly left out, as wholly perverting the sense.
E. $\delta i s \gamma$ áp rot, etc. A proverb, imputed by the Schol. to Empedocles, a part of one of whose hexameters v. 164
 rot, you know, is often used in making familiar remarks or citing well-known passages. A little below, in 499, B, пá入aı тot, it has, according to Stallb., "vim confirmandi cum quadam admiratione vel indignatione," $=$ really, or don't you know.
B. is $\delta \dot{\eta}$, see 468 , E.- ioù sometimes expresses grief, sometimes joy, or, as here, wonder. It is oxytoned by all the editors of Plato. Others would write iov, either always, or when it does not denote grief.
C. av̉, again, refers to 491, C. He is again inconsistent with himself. - Éरóvtos єivat, if you could help it, if you had your way about it. See Soph. § 221, N. 3 ; Cr. $§ 623$, N. ; K. § 306, R. 8. According to Hermann (Append. to Viger, de pleonasmo), it is not simply sponte, but quantum quis sponte quid faciat, and is used " de eo potissimum quod quis facere detrectat." Dr. Arnold (on Thu-
cyd. 2. 89), after Hermann, says that éxì eivaz " is used generally in negative sentences where the speaker wishes to qualify his denial or refusal, by saying that he wif not do it if he ean heip it, but that very possibly he may not be able to help it." He adds, that in Prometheus, 266 ( $\in \kappa \grave{\omega} \nu$
 $\epsilon \mathcal{B} \pi$ กociv, to do well what is in one's power, to make the best of what you have. This proverb again occurs in Leges,
 stant use of $\delta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu, \delta \delta \epsilon$, in antitheses, seems to be the reason why (by a kind of apposition, perhaps) they follow $\tau \nu \nu \in s$
 we have, as if the contrast needed to be made stronger, some, these I say . . those. Comp. Eurip. Hec. 1185, $\pi$, $\lambda$ -
 Ctes. (§ 11, Bekk.), of $\mu$ èv follows tives, and the second oi $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ is suppressed, as is often the case with of $\mu^{\prime} \nu$, of $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ alone. The formula often occurs as in Plat. Repub. 8. 560, A.
D. єi «̣̈ра тои́тшv. Græeci frequenter relativam orationis structuram permutant eum conditionali. Stallb. The relative strueture would be â̂ $\mu \grave{\iota} \nu$ äpa тoúт $\omega \nu$, etc.
E. t'́ $\lambda o s$, ete. Comp. Cic. de Fin. 2. 2. 5: Hunc ipsum sive finem sive extremum sive ultimum definiebas, id esse, quo omnia, quæ recte fierent, referrentur, neque id ipsum usquam referretur.


 ——Cap. 55. $\quad \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \nu a \hat{v}$ for $a \hat{v} \hat{\omega} \nu$. a $a \hat{v}$ is out of its clause for the sake of rhythm.
B. See 464, B, seq.- $\quad$ serves, is a middle term, standing for $\tau \in \notin \nu a \iota$ and $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \iota \frac{1 a t}{}$
 pleasure. This is explained by the next words, where
 and among those pursuits which relate to the pleasures, $I$ set down cookery as a knack, and not an art ; but of those which have to do with good (I set down) medicine as an art. —— $\pi \rho$ òs фi入iov, supply $\Delta$ tós. - - $\mu \neq \boldsymbol{T} \epsilon$ aủròs oolov, etc. In this sentence, the two main clauses begin with $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$; and the clause beginning with $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ is the sccond part of the first clause. Comp. K. largest Gr. $\oint 713$, R. $4 . \longrightarrow \mu \eta \delta^{\prime}$ ö $\tau \iota$ àv túגns, etc., and do not, contrary.to your opinion, answer whatever comes into your head, nor take what $I$ say as though I were in sport.
C. oî $\tau \hat{i}$ âv $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \frac{\nu}{\ldots} . . . \hat{\eta}$ тоѝто. The last words are added to recall of to mind, and rov̂то takes the construction of $\tau i$ rather than of $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i}$ тои́тои ov̇. It often happens that $\hat{\eta}$ and quam are so inserted after a genitive depending on a
 סpòs ò̀ raûta прítrovta, whether I ought to spend my life in doing those deeds of the real man, forsooth, that you spoke of. The reference is to $485, \mathrm{~A}-\mathrm{D} . \delta i \bar{i}$ is ironical. -
 $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$; but Plato forms this clause as though he had written

D. $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \epsilon \not \epsilon \sigma \tau \ldots \tau \grave{\omega} \beta i \omega$. A rare instance of a dual agreeing with a singular verb. As is usual in similar examples in Attic writers, where plurals not neuter are joined with a singular verb, the verb is $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i$, and it precedes the noun.
E. Socrates breaks off in the middle of the sentence, to know whether Callicles is so far of the same opinion.


 єррхєтat. There is a striking change of construction here. The sentence begins with $\dot{\eta} \delta o \nu \eta \hat{s}$, as if Plato had in his mind the form of the preceding sentence, and were going
 But this thought, which afterwards appears in the participial form, is postponed, and the intervening clause, $\pi \rho o ̀ s$
 ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \rho \chi_{\chi} \epsilon \tau a l$, accommodated to $\pi \rho \dot{s} \bar{\eta} \nu$, and to leave $\dot{\eta} \delta o \nu \eta \hat{\eta} s$ in the lurch, so to speak. It may be asked, why, when he read it over, he did not dismiss $\dot{\eta} \delta o \nu \eta \hat{g}$ from its irregular position. The answer is, that the Greeks were governed in their style by nature, - a higher rule than grammar, - and did not object to such irregularities of structure as arise from the nature of the mind, and are heard in good conversation.
 $\tau \in \pi$ талти́тагьv, in a mamner altogether irrational, making, $I$ may say (i. e. almost), no estimates (or discriminations), a mere practice and experience.

 oot єivai $\tau \iota v \epsilon$. It might have been said equally well, civai тıvas, etc. - $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \hat{l}, \mathrm{i}$. e. as in the case of the body. ——oüтє $\mu^{\prime} \hat{\epsilon}^{\prime} o \nu$ aủraîs, etc., nor having any concern about aught else but gratificalion merely, no matter whether it be for the better or the worsc. Here the structure changes to the impersonal participle, and the subject of the prior clause becomes aùraîs.
 such, or they seem to me to exist. The words refer to eivai $\tau t v \in s \quad \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} u u$, etc. It is strange that Stallb. and Ast, overlooking this plain sense, understand кoдaкeia as the predicate. - $\sigma v \gamma к a \tau a \tau i \theta$ вба. The word means, properly, to drop one's vote in the same vessel with another person, as a judge in the court. $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ is ironical, as he had compelled Gorgias and Polus to agrce with him.
D. oűk, à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\imath}$ кaí. oủk denies the previous sentence taken

E. тоavít tis . . . $\delta$ ©́ккєเv. The infinitive explains the demonstrative, and depends on $\delta о к є i ̂$ repeated. -- $\hat{a}_{\lambda} \lambda_{o}$ oủסèv фpovtícıl. This rerb, in the sense of caring about, usually takes a genitive, or a genitive with $\pi \epsilon \rho i$, but sometimes a neuter accusative. Soph. § 182, N. 1. - $\dot{\eta}$ кı $\theta a-$
 flute, as tending to render the young unmanly and fond of pleasure. He was, however, for retaining the lyre and harp in education, but disapproved of some of the occasions where they were used, such as the public contests of choruses, dramatic or dithyrambic, thinking that pleasure and not good was their object, and that they tended to agitate and not to calm the soul. Comp. Repub. 3. 398-403. - $\dot{\eta} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ хор $\bar{\nu} \nu \delta_{\iota} \delta a \sigma \kappa а \lambda i a$, the exhibition of choruses, so called because the instruction of the chorus was the principal preparative. The chorus in dithyrambic poetry is especially intended. - Kı $\nu \eta \sigma i a s$ of Thebes, so called, it is
 much laughed at for his poetry by the comedians (Aristoph. Birds, 1377, and Schol.), and attacked by the orators on account of his character (Lysias in Athenæus, 551, 552).

 $\tau i \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \grave{\eta}$, etc., the construction is different, namely,
 said here is a mere passing fling at Meles on account of the badness of his odes.
B. $\dot{\eta}$. . . өav $\mu a \sigma \tau \grave{\eta} \dot{\eta} \tau \hat{\eta} s$ т $\rho a \gamma \omega \delta i a s ~ \pi o i \eta \sigma \iota s$. The ordinary collocation, as Stallb. remarks, would be $\dot{\eta}$ Өavaacтì


 $\mu a ́ \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \ldots$. . ö̃ $\pi \omega s \mu \eta$ ̀̀ $\rho \in \hat{\imath}$. Is its aim . . . to insist upon it
 For ö̀ omitted，comp．Soph．Electr．313．－$\pi$－ $\pi а р \epsilon \sigma \kappa \in v a ́ \sigma \theta a v$ ，utro modo tibi videtur comparata esse．For Plato＇s view of tragedy，comp．Repub．8．568，C，2．378， seq．，and a noble passage，Leges，7．81\％．Another admira－ ble passage treats of the corruption of tragedy by popular influence．Leges，2． 659.

C．єï tis $\pi \epsilon \rho$ кє́ $\lambda o \iota \tau$ ．Aristides，in opposing this passage， and the Schol．，have $\pi \epsilon \rho t \in \epsilon^{\prime}$ oc，which Coray and Stallb． prefer．Ast，in defending the text，says that $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho \operatorname{ce}^{\prime} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{o}}$ de－ notes if one were to strip off，ei $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \in \lambda o \iota t o$ ，if one were to strip off for himsclf，i．e．in his own mind to conceive of it as stripped off．－$\mu^{\prime}$＇̀os，musical accompaniment ；$\hat{\rho} v \theta_{\mu}{ }^{\prime} \nu$ ， definite succcssion of arses and theses；$\mu$＇́тpov，definite suc－
 yvovta．The verb is attracted in number to the predicate入órot．

D．oủкồv ．．．àv є̉̉ $\eta$ ，It（tragedy）would be then a rhe－
 $\pi a i \delta \omega \nu$, i．e．to a people（or audience）composed of boys， etc．The grammatical construction，which would be oiós $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota(\delta \bar{\eta} \mu \sigma s) \pi a i \delta \omega \nu$ ，is forsaken through a singular kind of attraction，by which oios，öros，$\dot{\eta} \lambda i k o s$, with the noun or ad－ jective they accompany，adopt the case of the antecedent． It has been inferred from this，and a few other passages of Plato，that women attended the theatre at Athens，at least in tragic exhibitions．Comp．Leges，2．658，D，7．817，C， and Becker＇s Charicles，excursus to Scene 10.
 i．e．does not admit of a simple answer．－Sıaцáxєの日at

 ter $\tau i$ ov an aorist often fullows，where we should have looked for a present．＂A degree of urgency is contained
in this mode of speaking. It may be explained by the practice of expressing a wish by means of an interrogative sentence. "Why did you not tell me ?" $=$ "I wish you had already told me," and by implication, "Tell me at once." - aitià éXovoı, have it ascribed to them, is here used in a good sensc.
C. oủk àkoúєıs. Præsens hujus verbi de durante fama, - perpetuo ponitur. Stallb. ; i. c. it is used of something which is said and may be heard until now. Comp. the editor's note on Prometh. 683 (ed. sec.).- $\nu \epsilon \omega \sigma \tau i$, i. e. about twenty-three years before. - ở каì ȧкŋ́коаs. See 455, E. For Plato's opinion of Pericles, see the Introduction.
 á $\epsilon \in \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$, Soph. § 151, Rem. 6. The apodosis of this sentence, which might be "they are good men," is omitted. "When a proposition with $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon ́ v$, or $\hat{\eta} \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu$, has another with $\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ opposed to it, the apodosis is often suppressed in one of the two." Mt. § 617. In the ensuing clause, the
 tive is redundant. Examples are given by Heindorf, on Phædo, 63, C. Comp. 453, B, above. ïtı was used as though $\delta \in \hat{i}$ àmoteגєiv was to follow; but when Plato came to that part of the sentence, he accommodated dimote $\lambda \epsilon i v$ to $\epsilon i$ $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\eta}$ тои̂то: " if this, viz. àmomıлт入ávat, is not virtue, but this, viz. àmoтє $\lambda \epsilon \bar{L}$, etc., is so."


 quite calmly, or pretty calmly. oűtos, like sic in Latin, throws into the adverb before which it stands a certain modification of its meaning, which cannot be easily expressed. Comp. Eurip. Alcest. 680, for an analogous use of oũ $\tau \omega s$ with rerbs.
E. $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ кaì oi $\begin{gathered} \\ \lambda\end{gathered} \lambda o \iota$, etc. $\tilde{a} \lambda \lambda o \iota$ is used here as in 473 ,

C．The verb $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi$＇$\rho \epsilon \iota$ leaves the number required by
 tion to that noun．Comp．Mt．§ 302 ，Obs．－oiov $\epsilon i$ ßoúdet ideiv．In this sentence the apodosis is omitted．One can supply in thought $\dot{\rho}{ }^{\circ} \delta i \omega s$ тoìтo ö $\psi \epsilon$ ．But the true ac－ count of the sentence is，that the apodosis should have be－ gun at $\dot{\omega} s$ cis $\tau \dot{\xi} \xi \iota \nu$（＂if you wish to look at painters，ete．，－ you will see that，etc．＂）；but by a change of style the clause $\dot{\omega} s$ eis $\tau \dot{a} \xi \iota \nu$ is made to depend on $i \delta \epsilon i v$ ，and the apodosis loses its proper form under the impression that an impera－
 the sentence．
 $\sigma$ тà єivau．
 $i t$ ，as you did for that．In the MSS．，ėкeivo stands，which， if genuine，is put briefly for ėкєivov тò övода．

E．シ̈ ä入入’ ótเồv，etc．，or anything else which sometimes will not be of more use to it（the body）than the contrary （i．e．abstinence from such gratifications will be）according to a right view of the case；－nay，even of less．So this clause must be rendered as it stands．But I am persuaded， notwithstanding what Stallb．says，that $\eta$ ought to be insert－ ed before кaтá，as Heindorf proposes，or $\gamma \epsilon$ turned into $\delta \epsilon$ ． For since $\gamma \epsilon$ shows that the clause кazá ．．．$\lambda$ ózov relates to the foregoing，кai é ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ גartov stands quite by itself；and the asyndeton（ $\kappa a i$ being etiam）is intolerable．

 46， 48.

C．oîtos àvíp．See 467，B．－код＾క̌ó $\mu \in \nu=s$ is obvious－ ly in apposition with $\pi$ á $\sigma \chi \omega \nu$ ；but we might have also had кодá̧єб Aa in apposition with тov̂тo．According to Aristotle on Rhet．1．10．17，cited by Stallb．，кo入á̧́ıu（to chastise，
correct, lit. to cut off, prune) differs from $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota$ (to take satisfaction from, punish) in this ; that the former takes place for the sake of the suffercr, the latter for that of the
 discourse in the middle? Some inferior MSS. have katà u - $^{-}$ $\sigma о \mu \epsilon \nu$, are we going to end, and some катадí $\omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, which (or rather катад $\dot{\sigma} \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, as the action is momentary) would be shall we end. The present denotes that they are doing that which is equivalent to stopping, that they are beginning to stop. -aù - à̀s $\gamma \nu \omega \dot{\sigma \epsilon \iota}$, you yourself must judge, i. e. I wish to stop, but leave it to you.
D. $\theta^{\prime} \mu$ s. This word, being here an accusative, must be indeclinable. Of this use few will doubt, after reading what Elmsley and Hermann (Soph. Edd. Col. 1191), and Buttmann (largest Gram. 1. §58, and 2. p. 405) have written. The other examples occur in (Ed. Col. u. s., Xen. Econ. 11. 11, and Esch. Suppl. 331. In Esch. Choeph. 632 , it is a neuter nominative. No phrases are found besides $\theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \mu \iota s$ évi', $\theta^{\prime} \dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{s}$ cival. This is a strange, but not a solitary anomaly. Comp. $\chi \rho \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu, \delta \epsilon i v a$ sometimes indeclinable, крâта in Sophocles nominative and accusative.- - $\epsilon \kappa \rho \cdot i ́ n$, sc. $\delta \mu \hat{\nu} \theta$ os. The style changes from the plural to the singular. Comp. for the expression, Leges, 6. 752, A, oüкouv


 $362, \mathrm{D})$ gives his words in a trochaic tetrameter, $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho \grave{o}$ тov̂

 terpretor: in hoc rerum statu, quum tu nolis amplius mecum colloqui. Stallb. outtos seems to me to be looscly used for


506 A. où $8 \grave{\epsilon}$ yàp . . . ciò̀ss $\lambda$ '́ $\gamma \omega$. Socrates often places him-
self in the attitude of a searcher after truth，unable of him－ self to find it，and hoping that others know where it is．

B．$\tilde{\epsilon} \omega$ ．．．Zingov，till．I had given him back the speech of Amphion for that of Zethus，i．e．until I had defended philosophy from his attack．See 485，E．E゙ $\omega$ s with an im－ perfect or aorist indicative accompanies another clause con－ taining the same tenses with ${ }^{a} \nu$ ，when a res non facta is spoken of．

C．${ }^{2} \chi \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu a t$ ．This form is condemned by Mœris as un－Attic，but is found several times in Attic writers， where，however，it may have come from the scribes．ả $\chi \theta^{\prime}$－
 An allusion to the honorary votes recorded on marbles，in favor of foreigners who had rendered Athens a service． －－$\lambda$＇́ $\gamma \epsilon$ aủrós．aủ̇òs is by yourself，without another speaker，and so in oov̂ aùtov̂ סuóvtos above．

D．ov̉ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \epsilon i \kappa k \hat{\eta}$ ．An clegant and certain emendation of
 тat．One would expect ka入入ívin．Coray wishes to strike out the word ；Heindorf，to read $\mu$ ádıoтa．The sense is， attends upon it，or is present most bcautifully，i．e．is pres－ ent in its greatest beauty，or highest perfection．

A． $\bar{\eta} \nu \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ aṽ $\tau \eta$ ，i．e．now this we found to be．$\eta_{\eta} \nu$ points 507 to the time when such a soul was（subjectively to them， i．e．appeared to be）ä $\phi \rho \omega$ ，etc．Comp． 478 ，E，note．
 the $\sigma \dot{\omega} \phi \rho \omega \nu$ à $\nu \dot{\eta} \rho$ here given，Routh compares Aristotle＇s in
 $\delta \in i ̂$ каĭ öтє．
 in this same way from $\epsilon \dot{\cup} \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ to $\epsilon \dot{v} \delta a i ́ \mu o \nu a \operatorname{\epsilon i\nu a\iota }$ in Re－ pub．1．353，E，Charmides 172，$\Lambda$ ，Alcibiad．1．116，B． As $\epsilon \dot{v} \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ has the two senses of acting well，and being prosperous，Plato may seem to have unfairly used this am－
biguity in his argument. So Heindorf and Stallb. view the passage. Routh, on the contrary, says: "Vult philosophus consequens esse necessario ex antecedentilus cum qui recte agit felicem esse. Vix enim potest credi ut Plato duplici sensu verborum $\epsilon \mathcal{\imath} \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$ ad argumentum probandum abuti vellet." Finally, Ast, after Schleierm., correctly, as I think, observes, that Plato "in his conclusionem non ducit ex ambiguo, - sed usum loquendi cogitandus est in rem suan convertere, eumque quodammodo corrigere voluisse, ex ea enim quam posuit ratione, - nisi bonum quod est, nihil est prosperum ac beatum." With this Stallb., in his second edition, agrees.
 of the action of a verbal may be in the accusative or in the
 $=\dot{\omega}$ т тáरıซтa. Comp. Soph. § 188, N. ; Cr. § 363, B. - парабкєvaбtéo is the verbal of the middle voice here,
 opposed to the state), an individual. - In the next sen-
 to overeivovta and what follows it.
E. à áquvtov какóv, an endless or cureless evil, is in apposition with the participial clause preceding it, and in the accusative. Soph. § 167, N. 4 ; Cr. § 334.8 ; K. § 266 , R. 2 _- фaci $\delta^{\prime}$ oi $\sigma o \phi o i$, etc. The allusion is more particularly to Empedocles, who made $\phi \lambda \lambda i a$ and $\nu$ eikos fundamental causes in his world of phenomena; the former, or the attracting principle, the cause of union among things unlike, of organization and of motion when one is made out of many, and the latter, or the dissolving principle, the cause of separation. He is the Agrigentine who taught in verse, that "quer in rerum natura constarent, queque moverentu", ea contrahere amicitian, dissipare discordiam." Cic. de Amicit. 7. His causes for the phenomena of the world
were physical; and Socrates here gives playfully a moral turn to his doctrine.
 the name кór $\mu$ os, order, system, to Pythagoras. Comp.
 which shows that even then the appellation had not become very current. - $\dot{\eta}$ i $\boldsymbol{\sigma} o ́ \tau \eta s \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \tau \rho \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$. Geometrical equality is that of ratios, arithmetical, of numbers. It exists figuratively in morals and politics, when the receipts of one are to his claims as those of another to his, i. e. when justice prevails and assigns to each according to his due, and not according to his power of receiving. But $\pi \lambda \epsilon o v \epsilon \xi i a$ or selfishness disturbs and destroys this kind of equality. In the state, this equality takes power from the bad, i. e. from the unjust and ignorant, and gives it to the wise and virtuous, because it is right that only they should govern who can govern well. There is a noble passage on the two equalities in the Leges, 6.757, B, cited by Routl.
 oi ä $\theta \lambda \iota o$. The predicate $a \theta \theta \lambda$ toc is omitted. See K. § 852. 2 , largest Gr. This is the more natural, because the preceding words, ev̇aímoves oi evidaíuoves, clearly indicate the construction. Stallb. has added $\ddot{a} \theta \lambda \lambda o c$, without authority
 in the predicate with a plural subject is not uncommon.



 power of any one who has the will, as those punished by civil infamy are in any one's hand who wishes it (lit. belong to any one). There were three kinds of civil infamy at Athens, and they are particularly described by Andocides (p. 35, Reiske). The lowest consisted in a deprivation of
certain particular rights, as that of bringing an action as a public accuser. The next involved the taking away of all civil rights ; and to this the highest added confiscation. As, in the two latter kinds, the person affected with aंтuia could not appear in court as a prosccutor or a witness, or complain of his wrongs before the people, he was plainly in the power of his enemies. - $\nu \epsilon a \nu \kappa \kappa \dot{\nu} \nu$ denotes high-spirit$e d$, or rather overbearing. The clause is in apposition with $\tau \dot{\pi} \pi \tau \epsilon \ell \nu$ ènì kópíps. Comp. 507, E. The same is true
 486, A - C.
E. т $\epsilon \mu \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, when taken with $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, is in frusta dissecari.
 to excuse the confidence and want of deference to others which Socrates here displays. Comp. 462, E, 486, C. In the latter passage, we have $\epsilon i$ kaì d., and here kaì fi d. According to Herm. (on Viger, note 307), referred to by Stallb., kai ti, etiam si, is used concerning that which we only assume as true; $\epsilon i$ кai, quamquam, concerning that which we declare to be true. Socrates, then, does not here admit that his expression is impolite ; but in $486, \mathrm{C}$, Callicles acknowledges by $\epsilon i$ кai his trespass against the rules of good-breeding. - oit oriv ut Latinorum sic est primo aspectu. Ast.
B. tiva àv $\beta$ oin $\theta_{\epsilon} a v$, etc. By his inability to afford what kind of aid to himself would a man be in truth ridic-


 $\beta o \eta \theta \epsilon i v$, that it is most disgraceful not to be able to render this assistance, etc. (viz. this assistance which will avert the greatest evil). With this very strange instance of attraction, if it be such, we may compare the expression in
our own language which Routh adduces, this is the most shameful thing to be without, for it is most shameful to be without this thing.
 given to prevent the evil next in magnitude is second (second in shame if inadequate, and in honor if adequate; for this latter is implied). $\beta_{0}{ }^{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota a$ как $\hat{\nu} \nu$ is like $\bar{\pi} \lambda \kappa \dot{\eta}$ как $\hat{\nu} \nu$ in
 Stallb: supplies.

 about doing wrong? This genitive without a preposition may be compared with that which accompanies verbs of speaking. Comp. Soph. Electr. 317.
 perfect $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa$ pivov is in most MSS. ; but in this formula that
 C , and the Introduction, p. xxiv.
A. $\quad \ddot{o} \pi \omega s \mu \grave{\eta} \grave{\partial} \delta \kappa \kappa \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$. See 480, A, note.
B. фìos $\mu$ оь סoкєі̂, etc. Here $̈ v \pi \epsilon \rho$ refers forward to
入auoi tє кaì бофоi alludes especially to Hom. Odys. 17. 218,


 that the bad, being unlike themselves, that is, variable and unstable, cannot be friends. Comp. also Leges, 716, C,


 says Stallb., i. e. тov́тe, refers to ó túpadvos, and the subject of סúvalto is $\dot{o}$ тoû túpavyov $\beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i \omega \nu$. This appears most probable, as Plato might easily return in his mind to the earlier subject of the clause, cil Tis ... eil ; and as ovi $\delta^{\circ}$ à $\nu$
outos shows that the same subject was still in his mind．It is not，however，necessary，because either this person or the tyrant might be called a friend to the other．－${ }_{\epsilon} \nu$ таúr刀 $\frac{1}{n} \pi$ о́八єє．See 468 ，E，note．

D．$\chi^{a i} \rho \omega \nu$ ，impune，the opposite of $\kappa \lambda a i \omega \nu$ ，passim apud dramaticos．And so gaudens is used in Latin．－aïr
 but is attracted，as often happens，in gender，to the predi－ cate ódós．
 tend to his being able．Here the construction of the dative with the infinitive is followed by that of the accusative． Sce 492，B．
 the thing to rouse indignation？

D．$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \sigma \tau a \lambda \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta$ ，simple，properly spoken of garments， drawn close to the body，in contrast to a garment which spreads out with numerous folds and plaits．－a à $\lambda \lambda \grave{a}$ raùrà $\delta \iota a \pi \rho a \xi a \mu \epsilon \varphi \eta$ ，etc．But when it has effected the same things with the forensic arl，it charges，I presume，but two obols if it has brought a man safe from Egina hither；and if from
 when it has conveyed in safety what I just now spoke of，the man himself，and his children，and property，and women； having landed them in the port，it demands but two drachms． Ast and Coray wish to change the order in this sentence． I see not why；for it is not more broken than often hap－ pens in earnest conversation．＇̇трáधaтo is the aorist of indefinite time．See 484，A．With ẻàv $\pi a ́ \mu \pi o \lambda \nu$ ，supply тра́ттךта．
512 A．入oyíseta oû̀ ôtı oủk，etc．Here oủk belongs to $\beta \iota \omega$－
 sentence assumes an antithetical structure，the clauses $\epsilon i$

against one another. On this form of sentences, Mt. § 622. 4, remarks, that "clauses are put in contrast with one another by means of $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ and $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$, of which only the second clause suits the connection, while the first in other languages would be treated as a parenthesis." Preserving the Greek order and form nearly, we may translate, "He reflects that it cannot be (ovк), if a man afflicted with great and incurable diseases, whom he has saved from drowning, is mis erable because he lost not his life, that he on the other hand ought to live, who has many incurable maladies in that which is more precious than the body, the sout, and that he (the person so reflecting) will do him good if he deliver him from the dangers of the sea, or the tribunal, or any other place. Nay, he knows," etc. The use of the optative ò $\dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ is to me at least perplexing. Stallb. renders it, with its attendant words, neque a se ullo modo juvari posse, and then in defence of it refers to Mt. $\$ 529$, on the oratio obliqua. But if I am not deceived, such a form as $\lambda$ orí̧єrat (being a present not equivalent to a historical tense, and not reducible to the form of oratio obliqua, as cases like $\lambda$ é $\gamma \in \tau a \iota$
 and if it were, must mean, not can lenefit, but probably benefits. Heindorf conjectured $\dot{\delta \nu} \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu \quad a ̈ \nu$, can (not) do him good, which in some degree removes the difficulty. I beg leave to offer an opposite conjecture, obvj $\sigma \epsilon$, on the supposition that the final syllable $\epsilon \nu$ may owe its birth to $a \nu$ wrongly repeated.
 $\nu \dot{\eta} \tau o v$, i. e. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ $\epsilon i \pi \eta \mathrm{~g}$ ört, not to say, or to pass by the pilot, who is not mentioned in order to select a stronger case, that


 on a level with (and not rather above) the forcnsic man?
 Biov; does it seem to you to rank with the shoemaker's kind of life?

 the ground that everything else is of no ralue (in compari-
 of $\kappa а \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$, as Stallb. remarks, is often used when a name is given in anger or contempt,$=$ to call by a nickname, to call contemptuously, or with a scornful air. Examples may be found in Æschin. c. Ctes., and in Reiske's Index to De-


 that something is true, or mild expression of opinion, may be joined with an indicative; and the like may be said of ${ }_{\text {öpa }} \mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ also. Comp. Soph. Electr. 581, 584 (where riӨضs, and not $\tau \iota \theta \bar{n} s$, is supported by the MSS.) ; Alcibiad. 2. 139,
 lated by perhaps, or $I$ suspect. The sense is, I suspect that a man deserving the name ought to throw away the idea of living as long as ever he can, and not love his life too well; and yielding the disposal of all such things to the Deity, as well as believing what the women say, that no one, whosoever he be, can escape his destiny, that he ought to consider thereupon how he can best live during the life which he is probably about to live, etc. A fine parallel passage occurs in Leges, 2. 661 ; C. ${ }^{\prime} \pi \iota \tau \rho \epsilon \pi \pi \epsilon \iota$, in the sense of committing or referring to, and of giving up to, takes a dative of a person, often with a genitive with $\pi \epsilon \rho i$. Eschin. c. Ctes. § $83, \epsilon i{ }^{\prime} \pi \pi \iota \tau \rho \epsilon \varepsilon_{-}^{-}$
 wished to refer the grounds of complaint to some impartial and disinterested state. Alcibiad. 1. 117, D, т $\uparrow \underset{\varphi}{\kappa} \kappa \beta \epsilon \rho \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \eta$

own way, and be quiet? For ovio fis, more emphatic than oủdeis, comp. Eurip. Alcest. 671 (note in my ed.).
 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \sigma \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \nu$ кaOatoov́бas. The Thessalian sorceresses, who drew down the moon by their incantations, drew down mischief also upon themselves. They lost, it was thought, their eyes or their children, to which last toîs фı八tátoos alludes. Even an astrologer, in predicting an celipse of the moon, which was akin, in the minds of the vulgar, to magical arts, was supposed to incur calamity. Hence $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i$ oav-
 those who draw down calamities upon themselves by their conduct. The next words, $\sigma \grave{v} \nu$ toîs $\phi i \lambda t a ́ t o r s, ~ m u s t ~ m e a n ~$ with the loss of what we hold most dear, i. e., as Soerates estimates things, of virtue and truth. $\sigma \dot{v} \nu$ here properly denotes the means, and it is only by inference from the connection that the phrase can imply the loss of. The preposition, as Stallb. observes, seems to be chosen with allusion
 $\sigma \iota$ रvvaıక̂́ $\tau \epsilon \kappa a i ̀ \tau \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \in \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$.
B. दُ $\downarrow \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \pi^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau \eta ̂ \delta \epsilon$, i. e. in Athens. See 469, D, and 468 , E, note. - àvó $\neq \circ$. . . хєípov, so long as you are unlike the political institutions either on the better side or on the worse, i. e. so long as you are not assimilated exactly to the democracy of Athens, but are either like the true philosopher, in favor of better institutions, under which knowledge and virtue, and not the popular will, shall govern, and resemble such institutions in your character; or, on the other hand, have the selfish spirit in the extreme, like the tyrant who first corrupts, and then destroys, popular liberty. Thus, I suppose, the polities of Plato, as set forth in the Republic and Laws, require us to understand
 genuine or real result in regard to obtaining the friendship
of the Athenian people, i. e. to be on terms of true friendship with Athens. ठ $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega$ depends on $\phi i \lambda i a \nu$. For $\tau \hat{̣}$. $\Pi v-$
 Ast, after one MS., omits $\pi$ òıctıós, but Stallb. justly says of it, iteratur non sine vi et gravitate. There is, as it seems to me, even something of scorn in the emphatical repetition of the word. $\dot{\omega}$ is since, seeing that; not as, i. e. according to (your wishes).
 $\psi \nu \chi \hat{\eta} \dot{\delta} \mu i \lambda \epsilon i v$. With the indefinite subject of the infinitive agree the two subsequent participles.
 understood just above with $\dot{\eta} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \dot{\eta} \delta o \nu \dot{\eta} \nu .-\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \tau \tau \in$ ... $\theta \epsilon \rho a \pi \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \nu$. The infinitive is added epexegetically, and the datives depend on the verbal. Comp. Soph. Electr. 543, 127\%. For the construction of $\pi$ ooov̀zas, see 492, B, note. It is without a copula as explaining ouv $\omega s$, and $\dot{\omega}$ is taken with $\beta \epsilon \lambda$ riotous only.
514 A. єiрíqкодєу. The Atticists and MSS. vary in regard to the augment of verbs beginning with $\epsilon v$. The earlier practice scems to have been, to leave the diphthong unchanged. Mt. § 167. 6. Below, 514, E, two of the best MSS. give $\eta \dot{\cup} \rho i \sigma \kappa о \mu \epsilon \nu$, and $\eta \dot{\delta} \delta o \kappa i \mu \epsilon \epsilon, 515$, E. —— $\epsilon$ 'à $\nu \mu \dot{\eta}$ $\ldots$.. $\dot{\eta}$ tıvov̂̀ explains and defines ävev roúrov. Comp. a similar apposition of a clause beginning with $\begin{gathered}\text { cì } \nu\end{gathered} \mu \eta$ in
 $\gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, after we had engaged in a public capacity in any transactions of the state. The genitive is taken partitively.
 the statc's service, as that of an épyodáßos, or contractor, like Phidias, and of an ápxtéктьv, like Ictinus, the builder of the Parthenon.
 After would it be incumbent on us to examine, we should add
 and not $\epsilon i \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \pi i \mu \epsilon \theta a$, which is absolute: and so whether we had builded (in the pluperiect), not whether we have builded. But the Greeks, in many kinds of dependent clauses, preferred the absolute to the relative form, as here. The cause of this lay in that liveliness of mind which made the past present and the possible real, and often led them to the use of oratio recta for oratio obliqua.
C. i̊ía ... $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. According to Ast, $\hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ depends on $i \delta i a$, which would alone express the idea, were not $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$ wanted for the contrast with $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{a} \tau \hat{\tau} \nu \nu \delta \delta a \sigma \kappa \tilde{\lambda} \lambda \omega \nu$. Those who would reject such an expression as ioita $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$, which is destitute of the support of parallel examples, must read
 aкєє $\mu^{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \nu \omega$, ete. It would be the part of prudent men, if so situated, to engage in public works. Here $\bar{j}_{\nu}$ has äv, but just below is without it. I think, with Ast, that although ${ }_{j} \nu \nu$ is often used without ${ }^{\circ} \nu$, (see Mt. § 508 , Obs. 2, ) yet here the influence of à can extend to the second $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{j}}$.
D. A very similar passage may be found in Laches, 186, $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$. In the first sentence, $\vec{a} \nu$ belongs to $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \sigma \kappa \in \psi \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \theta a$, which verb is taken with $\pi a ́ \nu \tau a \ldots a ̉ \lambda \lambda a$, as well as with $\epsilon i$ $\pi а \rho \epsilon к а \lambda о \hat{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu$. The aorist, with $\hat{a} \nu$ following the imperfect, here denotes transitory action referable to present time (if we were urging ... we would examine: see Hermann de partic. ä̀, l. 10), or possibly (since we have '̇́ккótovo just below) there may be an inaccuracy of style, like that of using our potential pluperfect for the imperfect, - would have for would. Comp. 447, D, for the opposite use of the
 something continuing in past time. Some would read $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota^{-}$ $\sigma \kappa є \pi \tau \delta \mu \epsilon \theta a$ here, but it is seareely Attic. Sec 476, A, note.
E. à $\nu \theta \rho \dot{\rho} \pi$ ous . . . $̇ \tau \cup ́ \chi o \mu \in \nu$. The style passes frecly from
the first person plural, as a representative of a general truth, to the third, and then back again. There is no reason why we should suspeet $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\rho} \pi \pi o v s$, or read ${ }^{\epsilon} \tau v \chi^{\circ} \nu . \quad \tilde{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ goes with
 could, utcunque. -тò $\lambda_{\epsilon \gamma \text { о́ } \mu \epsilon \nu о \nu ~}^{\text {ò̀ }}$ тои̃тo. See 447, A. $\delta \dot{\eta}$ is just or even. - $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \bar{\varphi} \pi i \theta \varphi$, , etc., to try to learn the potter's art by beginning with the jar, - the largest vessel, and therefore the hardest to make. This proverb occurs again in Laches, $187, B$, in eompany with its opposite, $\dot{\epsilon} v$ Tஸ̣̂ Kapi $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu \nu$ ó kivסvvos, i. e. to risk what you value least, attempt what you can best afford to fail in; which refers to the Carian mercenaries in war, whose blood was less precious than their employer's.
E15 B. бòv iòıんтєúvotos. Soph. § 174 ; Cr. § 454 ; K. § 266. 2.
D. For what is here said of "the four," see the Intro-duetion.-adyafoi moditat here is much the same as a $\boldsymbol{a}^{-}$ Aoì rà $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \dot{a}$, which is used as an equivalent, $516, \mathrm{C}$, 517, A.
E. áкov́ш. See 503, C. - tis $\mu \iota \sigma$ Oофорià . . . катаotíaava, by being the first to bring them into the practice of taking pay for performing their political dutics. Pericles introduced the practice of paying the judges. The pay was one obolus per diem at first, and then three. After the death of Pericles, the people also drew pay for attending in the assembly. All this is explained at large in that admirable book, Boeekh's Civil Economy of Athens,
 D. This phrase is explained fully by Protag. 312, B. "The Lacedæmonians," Socrates there says, "conceal their philosophy, and thus deceive those in other states who affect Spartan manners, and who, in imitation of them, have their ears bruised by blows received in boxing, (ஸิтa ка-

hands and study gymnastics, and wear short tunics, just as though the Lacedæmonians surpassed the rest of Greece by such means." The phrase, then, denotes the partisans of Sparta, those who admire Spartan institutions, and are illaffected towards Athens.
A. $\gamma є \gamma$ óvєбav. Comp. Soph. § 79 (91. 6, N. 4); Cr. 516

 mentions an accusation and a fine (Vit. Pericl. § 35), as does Diodorus also (12.45); but the charge was no doubt
 mony of the most impartial of historians. See Appendix,

 1.2.32, for a similar passage. - àméóєıधॄ . . . $\pi$ ooov̀vzas, if he had caused them to do. This verb and amoфaive are often used in the sense of causing something to appear, of effecting, rendering, and, like фaiva, $\delta \in i \kappa \nu v \mu$, take their complement in the form of a participle.
B. каì тóó . . . $\chi^{\text {ápıoat. There is a similar play upon }}$


 tum in eo quem hodie habemus Homero, nisi quis huc trahere velit quod Routhius fecit Odyss. 6. 120, 9. 175, $\eta^{\circ} \dot{\rho}$
 puts the $\dot{a} \gamma a \theta_{0}$ and $\eta^{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho о \iota$ together, in Repub. 5. 470, E, and makes $\tau \dot{\prime} \ddot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \frac{\nu}{}$ a part of the philosophic nature in Re-

D. What is here said of Cimon and Themistocles is well known. What is said of Miltiades rests on the authority of Plato, and of the Scholiast on Aristides 3.67\%, Dindorf, whom Valck. on Herodot. 6. 136 first cited from

on account of his fruitless attack upon the island of Paros soon after the battle of Marathon), $\dot{\eta} \theta^{\prime} \lambda \eta \sigma a \nu$ av̀ròv катак $\eta \eta$ -
 haps exaggerates a little in saying é $\psi \eta \phi i \sigma a \nu \tau o . ~ T h e ~ P r y-~$ tanis, being president of the assembly of the people which tried the case, was probably one of those friends of Miltiades of whose advocacy Herodot. speaks, and by his intercessions led the judges to lower the penalty from death to a heavy fine. But for that, death, by being thrown into the pit, would have been his portion. See Grote's Greece, Vol. IV. p. 491. - ròv év Mapaө̂̀v, him who was at Marathon, the general there. $\epsilon \nu$ is used because the action was "in Marathonio agro." See Soph. Electr. 1. Thucyd. 2. 85,
 fined by Timæus (Lex. Platon. s. v.), "a place like a well, where the condemned were thrown," and in Bekker's Anecdot. 1. 219, is said to be "an excavation in Kciriadæ, a demus of the CEneid tribe, where they threw down the capitally condemned, as the Lacedæmonians did into Kæadas." Herodot. 7. 133, says that the heralds of Darius were thrown by the Athenians into this place. Comp. Aristoph. Clouds, 1450, and the Schol. on Aristoph. Plut. 431.
E. $\epsilon i \mu \grave{j} \delta a ́$, but for. This not unfrequent formula has always the same sense as if some part of $\kappa \omega \lambda \dot{v} \omega$ were understood. The origin of the phrase is not clear. Ast accounts for it as a confusion or union of two forms of speak-


 is formed like that explained in the note on 512, A. The sense is, It is not true that good drivers are not at first. thrown from their chariots, but when they have improved their horses by care, and have become better drivers themselves, that they are then thrown out. Zeîyos is often used of the vehicle, as well as of the yoke or pair of animals drawing it.
A. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \tau o \iota{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$. Here, by a kind of zeugma, ${ }^{\ell} \lambda \epsilon-517$ $\gamma \epsilon s$, readily suggested by $\dot{\omega} \mu \circ \lambda \dot{o} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon s$, is to be supplied, together with ruvás, which is contained in ouvóva. Comp. Soph. Antig. 29.——où $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \vec{a} \nu \vec{\xi} \xi \in \pi \epsilon \sigma o \nu$. The metaphor is borrowed from chariotcers, and is the more natural, as persons who lost their rank or authority were said $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i v$. Comp. Soph. Antig. 679. - ойтє $\tau \hat{\eta}$ кодакєкй. If they had used the true art of rhetoric, that is, had been good politicians, they would have made the people better, and not have had to rue its ingratitude : if the flattering art of rhetoric, they would have escaped from dangers, because that art, accord-
 $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ éavtóv. Aristides triumphs in a supposed inconsistency of Plato, who had before called "the four" кódaкus, and now says that they did not use $\tau \hat{\eta}$ кодаккк $\hat{\rho} \rho \eta \tau о р \kappa \kappa \hat{\eta}$. But he does not see into the meaning. The words contain a sneer at the rhetoricians. They were кódaкєs, inasmuch as they studied to gratify, not to benefit; and carrying such a motive into their public addresses, they imbued all their words with it. But if the false art of rhetoric can rescue from dangers, and makes that its first aim, they fell short of it. In other words, the art cannot gain its own dearest ends. They had the principles of the fulse rhetoric, but could not gain that for which the art was esteemed.
 usually followed by an infinitive, and Stallb. says that he knows of no example like this. The reason for the construction seems to be, that $\pi o \lambda \lambda o \hat{\nu} \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, being in sense a negative, adopts the construction appropriate to où. où $\mu \dot{\eta}$ '́pyáoŋrat would be a familiar formula. - ôs $\beta$ oúd $\epsilon$, a singular expression for ( $\tau \iota s$ ) $\hat{\nu} \nu \beta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$, to be referred to the rule of attraction of the relative. Comp. Cr. $\$ 526$. $\gamma$. The verb must be regarded as coalescing with ìs to form one notion,

their being servants of the state, or considering them merely as ( $\omega$ s $\gamma \epsilon$ ) being servants of the state. Stallb. thinks that the phrase arises, by a confusio duarum locutionum, out of ©s . . . סtakóvovs, and סıakóvous cival. But the infinitive with $\dot{\omega}$ can be used in this relation to the main verb, as well as
 them have their own way. The infinitives limit $\delta$ t'́ $\phi$ epov. ——ovitav, politicians of the present day.

 $\mu a v \theta a \dot{\nu} \omega$ and other verbs of learning or understanding. Soph. § 182 ; Cr. § 375. $\beta$; K. § 273.5 , f.

 - $\dot{\rho} \iota \gamma \hat{\varphi}$ is for $\dot{\rho} \iota \gamma o \hat{\imath}$, subjunctive of $\dot{\rho} \iota \gamma^{\prime} \omega$; and so $\dot{\rho} \iota \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu$ for $\dot{\rho}$ と $\gamma o u v$ infinitive, in Aristoph. Clouds, 442. This is quite analogous to the contraction of $\pi \epsilon \iota$ vá $\omega$, and a few others in $a \omega$, by $\eta$ instead of $a$, but is usual with no other verb except i̊fów. Buttmann (largest Gr. 1. 506, and note in Heindorf) thinks that both contractions are relics of a general method prevailing in old Ionic. - тоít $\omega$ үàp $\pi 0^{-}$ pıoтıкò̀ єivat, etc. This sentence changes its structure, and proceeds as if övta, and not eival, had stood here. The anacoluthon is caused by the explanatory clause $\hat{\eta}$ кá $\pi \eta \lambda_{o \nu}$
 the original construction.
518 A. סiò $\delta \grave{\eta}$ кaì tav́ras . . eiviva. The construction changes from ö̃t and a finite verb, ciòórı öть єั $\sigma \tau \iota \tau \iota s$, etc., to an infinitive with its subject accus. - Tav̀vâ oủv raû̃a, etc. Now at one time you seem to be aware that I say that the selfsame thing holds good of the soul also, and you agrce to it, as if understanding what I mean. тотѐ $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ answers to

B. тротєь'є́ $\theta a u$, to hold forward as a sample of what 19*
one has got，hence to take，or select as a specimen．－＿
 been the fashionable baker at Athens．He is thus spoken of in a fragment of the Gerytades of Aristophancs（Athe－
 к $\rho \iota \beta a ́ \nu \omega \nu$＇$\dot{\delta} \dot{\omega} \delta t a$, －which is a parody of the beginning of the Hecuba．And a longer fragment from the Omphale of An－ tiphanes，preserved in the same place，asks，（by way of parody on Soph．Electr．257，perhaps，）how a man of noble birth could ever go out of the house where he saw the
 àpтoкótos．In a number of MSS．，dартoтooòs appears．Still another word for the same thing is дјтото́таs，which has most commendation from the Atticists，and which has prob－ ably been without reason thrust out of its place by the other words in a number of instances．Sce Lobeck on Phryni－ chus，222．MiӨaukas，etc．Mithacus，who wrote the treatise called＂La Cuisine Sicilienne．＂The Sicilians were in the gastronomic art to the Greeks what the French are now to the world，and Mithæcus was a Syracusan cook． Repub．3．404，D，乏иракабià тра́тє弓ад каі̀ इıкє入ıкो̀ поккь－

 Cicero de Fin．2．28．According to Maximus Tyrius（23． 1），cited by Routh，Mithæcus went to Sparta，but they， thinking that too many cooks would spoil their broth，drove him away．－To Sarambus（or Sarabus，as Meineke， Com．Græc．frag．4． 525 ，would write the name）many later writers allude，but they seem to have derived their knowl－ edge of him from this passage．Sce the commentators on Suidas，sub voce．
 contempt，having something of the force of our fellow． àvip is used，on the contrary，with an honorable sense．This
is shown at large in Valckenaer＇s Opusc．2．243，ed．Lips． －－oĩ，à $\begin{gathered}\text { oüt } \omega ~ r u ́ \chi \omega \sigma \omega \nu, ~ e t c . ~ W h o, ~ i t ~ m a y ~ b e, ~ a f t e r ~ t h e y ~\end{gathered}$ have filled and fattened the bodies of the men，and while they are praised by them，will cause the loss（not only of this increase of flesh，but）of their old flesh besides．
 shall have brought on disease a good while afterwards． $\eta ँ \kappa \omega \phi \hat{\phi} \rho \omega \nu$ is often nearly the same as $\phi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \omega$ ，and ean only be figuratively explained here of the repletion acting as a cause bringing in its train disease as the effect．

E．Nothing is truer than these remarks．The seeds of present national evil are sown in the past，and yet we blame the men of the present for what we suffer，and praise the men of the past，who are the true source of our calamities． It is thus that some，who look with alarm on the turn our affairs are taking，worship Jefferson as a political saint．－＿ кaí фađ九 ．．．aùroùs is for kaì oũs фaơ，by a change of style from the relative to the demonstrative．
519 A．катаßо入ウ́．$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota o \delta \iota \kappa \eta ̀ \lambda \eta \hat{\eta} \psi \iota s \pi v \rho \epsilon \tau о \hat{v}$ ，interprete Timæo Lex．p． 154 ubi v．Ruhnkèn．Heindorf．－－＇А $\lambda \kappa \iota \beta$ áóov． As he had some time before left Athens for the last time， Plato is here forgetful of dates．See 481，D，note，and Appendix，No．I．

C．Comp．460，C，and Xen．Memorab．1．2．7．－$\kappa \iota \nu$
 hold good of those who，etc．But Mt．§632，has a different explanation of the form of the sentence．

D．каì тứrou тои̂ $\lambda$ óyou．For кaí，Heindorf，without authority，writes кaito．But kai，in the beginning of im－ perative and interrogative sentences，marks liveliness of transition（Mt．§ 620），like our and in animated questions， particularly in those where objections are refuted．－$\delta \eta{ }^{-}$ $\mu \eta \gamma \quad \rho \epsilon i \nu \mu є$ ク̀дáүкабая．See 482，C，494，D．

 things which I have to say I dwell largely upon. But if $\lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu$ depends on $\sigma v \chi \nu o u ̀ s$, as it well can (comp. Soph. § 177. 1), the sense must be, I think, a good many of my discourses I extend in length. - - $\pi \rho$ òs $\phi i \lambda i o v$. See 500, B.
A. öray тúx $\sigma \sigma$. Comp. 514, E, 518, C. - What is 520 said here refers to Protagoras, Prodicus, and other professed teachers of virtue, as Heindorf remarks; and it is amusing to see the contempt felt by the friend of Gorgias, a more
 C), for the Sophists, whose pretensions were as much higher as wisdom is higher than eloquence.

 517, A.
C. $\pi \rho \circ$ о́ $\sigma A a$, to bestow freely, and in the first instance, without knowing what return the party receiving the favor will make. Comp. Thucyd. 2. 43, кá̀入ıaтov Ëpavov aủtท̂ $\pi \rho o i \notin \mu \epsilon \nu o t$, bestowing upon their country a most precious
 47, where Schneider adverts to this sense. - ävev $\mu \tau \sigma \theta o v$. Protagoras, who first openly called himself a Sophist and took pay (Protag. 349, A), says (328, B) that he had a price, which his student might give if he pleased; but if not, that the student went to a temple, and paid so much as he (the student) pronounced on oath the instructions to be worth. For the opinions of Socrates on this point, see, among the rest, Xen. Memorab. 1.6. 13. - ' $\nu \in \neq \chi^{\dot{\omega}} \rho \epsilon \iota$. The absolute form without a $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is here used for the hypothetical with it. See Mt. § 508, Obs. 2; K. § 260, R. 3. -_ rìv $\chi$ ápıv, the favor due, the compensation, as a mark of a
 should not take the money in consequence of a bargain made
with him (i.e. should not take it as the payment which was stipulated) at the very time when he was imparting to him the power of swiftness. öть $\mu$ á入ıoтa is joined with ä $\mu a$ to increase its preciseness.

 doubt that Stallb. is right in separating these words, in opposition to Buttmann (2. 361, largest Gr.), who writes in one word $\dot{a} \nu \tau \epsilon \nu \pi o t \epsilon i v . ~ \epsilon \mathcal{u}$ and $\delta u s$ are united only to derivative forms, except in the instance of the strange word $\delta v \sigma$ $\theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega \nu$, used by Euripides. - $\epsilon i \epsilon \dot{\mathcal{B}} \pi \sigma \neq \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma a s$. Heindorf
 lum non recte explicato." Hermann on Eurip. Hecuba, $485,2 \mathrm{~d}$ ed. The indefinite subject is understood, and $\epsilon \hat{\cup}$ тoinoas denotes after conferring a facor.
 т $\grave{\eta} \nu$ toû סlakoveì kuì ó $\mu \lambda \lambda \epsilon i \nu$, Plato deserts the construction of the nearest words, through the influence of is iatoóv, and accommodates the participles to таракадєis. See Mt. §555, Obs. 2. Just below, Heindorf, Coray, and Stallb. think that $\begin{gathered}\text { s } \\ \text { has fallen out before кодакеย́vovta. }\end{gathered}$
 vexed passage seems to be that which Stallb. and Olympiod., whom he cites from the MSS., give to it, if you like better to call (such a man) a Mysian, call him so; i. e. "You may give the political man the most contemptible name that you can find. Do as you like about that, since if you will not act so as to gratify the Athenians ( $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta}$ . . . $\pi \circ$ oí $\sigma \epsilon \epsilon$ ) you will ——." The apodosis to $\epsilon i \ldots \kappa a \lambda \epsilon i \nu$ is omitted, being readily suggested by the sense of the pas-
 alent. The apodosis which $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \ldots \pi o \imath \eta \sigma \epsilon$. . $\begin{gathered}\text { would have }\end{gathered}$ had, if Socrates had not cut the sentence short, is to be found in his words. With кa入eî must be understood tov̂-
rov, this political man, whom in fact, though not in so many words, Socrates calls a кóдака. But the connection with the foregoing must be owned to be rather loose. The Mysians stood low among the people of Asia Minor. Mvō̄v ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \sigma \chi a \tau o s$ (Theætet. $209, \mathrm{~B}$ ) is a proverb for the vilest of the vile. Cicero, in lis Or. pro Flacco, $\$ 27$, says: "Quid parro in Greco sermone, tam tritum atque celebratum est, quam, si quis despicatui ducitur, ut Mysorum ultimus esse dicatur?"
 before spoken of in ${ }^{\prime} \dot{a} \nu \nu \tau \iota \epsilon^{\prime \prime} \chi \omega$. In $465, \mathrm{C}$, the indicative, but in many places the subjunctive, follows ${ }_{\epsilon} \neq \omega$ in this formula. The distinction seems to be, that with the future the action is viewed as simply future; with the subjunctive, as connected with and dependent on some contemplated cause

 $\tau a t$, about his rational future action. - - ̈̈s $\mu о$ סoкєís. is
 though you were living aloof, and conld not be brought (on trial) into court. For єíalर $\theta$ cis à̀ comp. 458, A, note.
 gentem. Nam optativus post relativa in obliqua oratione haudquaquam infrequens est. Addito ä̀ hoe loco scribendum erat rixp. Stallb. - The dissatisfaction with the political institutions of Athens, which is here clearly implied, was felt by Socrates to some degree, but far more by Plato, whose ideal turn of mind was not fitted to find satisfaction in the present under any system, particularly under one where demagogues reigned, and philosophers had to drink poison. - тovppós. An allusion, no doubt, to the

E. тà коцчì̀ тav̂ra. An allusion to what Callicles says,

used of a person who is present and pointed at, has no arti-cle.- каì aùroùs, кà̀ roùs vєштárous. aùroùs is taken with í $\mu a ̂ s$ єipyactal, and serves to contrast the whole i $\mu$ âs with the part $\nu \epsilon \omega \tau$ árous. $\kappa a i=$ and especially.—— $\nu \epsilon \omega \tau$ dáavs $\delta a \phi \theta$ eipct. An allusion to the actual charge against Socrates. Comp. 522, B.
522 A. For $\epsilon \dot{j} \omega \chi \epsilon i ้$ governing two accusatives, see Mt. § 421 , Obs. 1; Cr. § 430. This construction (which $\gamma \in \dot{v} \omega$ also sometimes takes) scems to be owing to this; that the verb means substantially to make to eat, and needs an object for each of these notions. - The sentiment conveyed by this comparison of the cook and the physician is expressed in another way by Crates of Thebes, a Cynic philosopher who flourished at Athens in Alexander's time (Diog. Laert.



 firmative and a negative proposition are often thus bound together by ov̈тє and $\tau \epsilon$; but ov้тє must come first. av̉rois the judges implied in סıкабтйpıov. - oйтє ois mopíseтat,
 ——àmopeì noovèva. This was a frequent charge against Socrates. The doubt he threw upon their former opinions, and the unsettled state of mind which he produced, may have been unwelcome to a few, and regarded as dangerous by a few more; but probably nothing made him more unpopular than his provoking way of bringing men who argued with him to a stand, so that they did not know what to say. Meno.says (79, D, cited by Heindorf), "O Socrates, I used to hear it said of you, before I became acquainted with you, that you do nothing else except av̇rós $\tau \in \dot{a} \pi o^{-}$ $\rho \epsilon i ̄ s$, кaì тoùs ä̀ $\lambda$ dous $\pi$ oteîs à àopeiv."

just ( $\delta \grave{\eta}$ ) what is for your interest. Ast takes návra , raûta
 added in apposition. - oüt detur oüros, etiam sequente consona litera, usurpatum esse
 $\dot{i \pi a} \rho \chi o$. Heindorf wishes to erase $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$, or write $\tilde{\epsilon} \nu$, with some reason, as $i \pi \alpha \dot{\rho} \chi^{\omega}$ takes with it a simple dative.
D. $\beta$ onj $\theta \in \iota a$ éavṭ̂. This noun with the dative denotes help afforded to ; with the genitive, against (comp. $\beta a \eta \theta \in \iota a$ какой, 509, C, ßapßáp $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, Plat. Epist. 7. 332, E), or to any one. - There is an allusion here to $486, \mathrm{~B}$ :
 to's Apol. $28, \mathrm{~B}$, et seq. - фoßeitat, sc. mâs $\tau \iota s$, by brachylogy supplied from oviotis, just above. See my note on


A. $\phi a \sigma i$, i. e. as story-tellers say, when they begin a 523 story. — $\lambda$ óyov opposed to $\mu \hat{\nu} \theta_{o \nu}$ is a historical narrative, a true story, as opposed to a fictitious narrative. - " $\mathrm{O} \mu \eta$ -
 et nunc etiam. Ast. $\begin{gathered}\sigma \\ \tau \\ \nu \\ \text { includes a past tense. }\end{gathered}$
B. $\nu \epsilon \omega \sigma \tau i$, in modern times, used relatively to the days of Saturn. - oi $\epsilon_{\kappa} \kappa \ldots \nu_{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma \omega \nu$. The preposition is accommodated to ióvres (see Soph. Electr. 137), because the officers set over the blessed islands came from thence. Comp. $\mathrm{Cr} . § 659$; K. $\$ 300.4$; and $472, \mathrm{~B}$, note.
C. ékaté $\rho \omega \sigma \epsilon$, in each dircction, to the blessed islands, and to the prison of punishment.
 Æsch. Prometh. 362 ; Soph. Electr. 54. •The sense is, having eyes and ears, and the whole body, spread as a veil
 their way. - тoù' av่ $\omega \hat{\nu}$, this property of theirs, this in them.
 ment he is dead. Soph. § 222, N. 4. ——By a constructio ad sensum, ${ }^{\prime} \rho \eta \mu о \nu$. . . ката入ıтóvтa are in the masculine, because $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \psi v \chi \grave{̀ \nu} \nu$ Éкáctov is the same as each person.-— $\delta$ óo 'ंк ז $\overline{\text { s }}$ 'A $A$ 'us. Routh explains this by their being born of Europa, a Phœnician, and adds, that Minos was regarded by some as a stranger in Crete. "Sed Cretam insulam Asiæ assignasse videntur veteres sicut Libyam modo Europæ modo Asiæ contribuerunt ; ut duas orbis terrarum partes posuerint, Asiam et Europam." Ast. But no proof has been found elsewhere, that Crete was assigned to Asia.
524 A. '̇̀ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon \mu} \omega \nu$, etc. Virgil, Æneid, 6. 540 : —
" Hic locus est, partes ubi se via findit in ambas: Dextera, quæ Ditis magni sub mœenia tendit, Hac iter Elysium nobis: at leva malorum Exercet pœnas, et ad impia T'artara mittit."

 $\xi \zeta \eta$. $\begin{aligned} & \eta \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \\ & \text { is brought in through the influence of } \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \bar{\epsilon} \xi(\nu)\end{aligned}$ Tìv ávoov, and alters the ensuing words to suit itself.
D. oios єivaı $\pi$ apєбкєن́aoto, etc., such as he had prepared himself to be while living in regard to his body, i. e. such as were his ways of using his body. Just below, ëvò $\eta \lambda a$ rav̂̃a refer to the qualities of body implied in oios tivat $\pi a^{-}$

 time (484, A, note): $\psi u \chi \hat{\eta} s$ depends on oúdév ; nothing belonging to, or in, the soul. Comp. Repub. 376, A, ô кai
 Tacit. Annal. 6. 6, "Neque frustra prestantissimus sapientiæ firmare solitus est, si recludantur tyrannorum mentes, posse adspici laniatus et ictus; quando, ut corpora verberibus, ita sævitia, libidine, malis consultis animus dilaceretur."
B. oi $\grave{\text { ф }} \in \lambda$ дои́ $\mu \epsilon \nu$ о . . . каì סıóóvтєs, i. e. those who, while 525 they suffer, are made better . . . are such as, etc.
C. тoîs à́é. See 464, D; Prometh. 937.
 sensum, $\pi a \rho a \delta ̊ \epsilon \succ \mu a \dot{\tau} \omega \nu$ used of the persons who serve as examples, is joined to $\pi$ o $\lambda \lambda$ ous, as if it were masculine. "O$\mu \eta \rho o s . ~ O d y s . ~ 11.575, ~ s e q . ~$
 Ap $\omega \pi$ ot, the men who prove to be even very wicked are of the class of the powerful. Here, 497, A, 526, B, and elsewhere, rívje夭 $\theta a$ means to become subjectively, i. e. to become in the view of the mind, to be found out to be.
 him to show whether he thinks him curable or not. Comp. Repub. 10.614, which I will give in English. "When, therefore, his soul went out of his body, he began a journey, with a number of others, and they came to a wonderful place, where there were two openings in the ground close by one another, and others opposite to them above in the sky. Between these judges sat, who, whenever they finished judging, bade the just take the road on the right and upwards through the sky, having first attached certificates ( $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i a)$ to those who had been judged, in front; and ordered the unjust to take the road to the left and leading downward, with marks behind indicating all their conduct."
 in other men's matters," who has not gone out of his own sphere of duties, to perform a part belonging to another. In Repub. 4. 433, A, it is made a definition of justice, that
 words especially point at taking an active part in politics, which, for a man who is not yet qualified for political life, is undertaking another's duty to the neglect of his own.

C, D. éкítєpos . . . véкиббгv. This passage is considered to be spurious by Heindorf and Ast, for reasons which, as far as I can see, are altogether insufficient. The passage from Homer is in Odys. 11. 568.
E. àvтıтарака入ิ. àvгi denotes in my turn, in reply to the exhortations which you gave mc to engage in politics. Just below, àvì . . a áต $\boldsymbol{\omega} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ denotes worth all the trials here, i. e. to be set against or equal in importance to all the trials before human tribunals, where rhetoric, as its advocates alleged, would save a man from condemnation. $\vec{\epsilon} \nu-$
 or a future state; the context of course suggesting the explanation. Comp. Soph. Antig. 76 ; Electr. 356 ; Eurip. Alcest. 363.
527 A. đò̀ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ Aizivns vióv. Æacus (son of Jupiter and Egina), as being the judge for all from Europe. Olympiod. apud Stallb. says, "He adds Egina because Callicles was from Egina." But as that Platonic Scholiast can have known nothing about Callicles, I suspect that the last word, Aiyivns, is an error in transcribing for Eipónjŋs, occasioned by the similar word preceding it. — $\chi n \sigma \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$, etc. This noble passage alludes to 486, B. - $\tau v \pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$. The Attic form of the future of $\tau \dot{\pi} \pi \tau \omega$, according to Thomas Magister and Mæris sub voce. Comp. Aristoph. Clouds, 1379, 1443. The later writers used all the forms from $\tau v \pi \tau \epsilon \epsilon$, unless it be the present and imperfect.
 E. The adverb of motion is used, because the journey from this world is thought of. It is the same as when we go thither. Comp. the opposite in Eschin. c. Ctes. § 97, Bekker: "He said that he wished to report to you $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ ' $\kappa$
 ponnesus, strictly the cmbassy into $P$. from which he had returned. - خंp $\epsilon \mu \hat{\epsilon}$, remains quiet, unskaken, i. e. unre-
 the noble words in Repub. 2. 361, A, ধ̇єХátך àòıкia סокєì
 pression, Sept. c. Theb. 574, oủ $\gamma$ àp סокєìv äpıotos à $\lambda \lambda$ ’ єìvaı $\theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \iota$, upon which words all the theatre turned and looked at Aristides, according to Plutarch in his life.

 came perhaps to be used with a verb of motion, because with the motion its end, rest in the place, is often thought of. - is $\dot{o}$ dóyos $\sigma \eta \mu a i v \epsilon t$, as the discourse shows. Stallb. gives $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\delta}$ o $\sigma$ òs $\lambda$ óros, with the best of the MSS., to which Ast very justly objects. The same false reading appears 511, B, $460, \mathrm{C}$, and Socrates could not call the argument, so far as it proved this point, the argument of Callicles, to whom he here speaks.
D. $\pi a \pi a ́ \xi a \iota$. The interpreters are divided between $\pi a$ тágau, with which ধ̈aбóv $\tau \iota \nu a$ and $\sigma \epsilon$, from $\sigma o v$, just above, are to be supplied, and máragat sine te verlerari. Buttmann even denies that the middle can have this sense, and, I incline to think, with reason. It may denote strike yourself, or get yourself struck (i. e. do something which shall cause the action of striking to come back upon yourself), but not allow yourself to be struck, i. e., in this place, "bear such an infliction without thinking it the greatest evil in the world." Stallb., in defence of the middle so used, cites
 where Strepsiades replies, тúnтодat: this word Stallb. takes
 ти́ттодaь is in the passive. "What do you do," says Socrates, " if a person beats you?" "I am beaten," is the reply; i. e. I do nothing but suffer, I get beaten. We need not be troubled by $\sigma \dot{v} \gamma \epsilon \theta a \rho \rho \bar{\rho} \nu$; for $\sigma \grave{v}$ is occasionally repeated with $\gamma \epsilon$ in the second clause, with a certain increase of
force in the exhortation. Comp. Herodot. 7. 10, "I shall hear of you as being torn to pieces by dogs and birds, $\eta^{\eta}$ kov


 Nor do I see how $\theta a \rho \dot{\rho} \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ opposes this construction any more than $\theta a \rho \dot{p}$ pourrews would. The sense, then, is, Yes, indeed, and do you calmly let him give you this dishonorable blow. - Stallb., I find, has given up his defence of $\pi$ ára乡at, imperative middle, in his second edition.
E. oîs oùठétrote taủrà סoкє̂̂. Comp. 491, B. He includes himself in the censure, to give it a milder form.

## A P P E N D I X.

No. I.

## Where and when does Plato represent this Dialogue to have taken place?

1. Where? In the house of Callicles, say all with whose opinion I am acquainted, except Schleiermacher. He decides in favor of some public place, such as the Lyceum, where other conversations of Socrates were held. His reasons, given in a note on his translation of Gorgias (Vol. III. 473 , of his Plato), are principally these. 1. Socrates (447, B) seems to be going into the place where Gorgias is. He meets Callicles without, who says, "Whenever you wish to come to my house, Gorgias will exhibit to you, for he lodges with me." (See the note on that place.) The words, whenever you wish to come, must relate to some future time. What does Callicles do, then, if they are at his house, (Schl. leaves to be implied,) but shut the door in his visitors' faces. To tell a stranger just entering your house to call at any time, without asking him in, is to turn him away. 2. Schl. finds it strange, and not consistent with Athenian politeness, that Callicles should have deserted his guests, and be going away from his own house. To these reasons of Schleiermacher's may be added two others. 3. If Socrates and his friend were at the door of Callicles's house to hear Gorgias display his rhetorical powers, and if Chærephon knew Gorgias well, why should they nced the information that Gorgias lodged there? 4. Perhaps it may be
regarded as a slight argument, that Socrates says ( $506, \mathrm{~A}$ ),

 var must have the same subject as the preceding $\dot{\alpha} \pi i \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$. Here, then, Socrates expects that the other parties to the conversation will go away from the place when the discourse is broken off; and Gorgias repeats what Socrates had said, including himself among those who would leave the place. But this could not bc, if they were where Gorgias was staying.

No one within my knowledge has examined what Schleiermacher says on this point, or given reasons for choosing the house of Callicles as the scene of the Dialogue, except Cousin. His reasons, I must think, have little weight. 1. There would have been some allusion, direct or indirect, to the place, if a public one. The same might be said, with equal reason, I think, on the other side. 2. It was mainly in private houses, as Plato affirms in Hippias Major, that Gorgias spokc. Plato's expression is ioía é $\pi$ to $\delta i \xi \xi \in \iota s$ mot-
 means nothing more than in other places besides the assembly. 3. Of Callicles leaving his guests, and going out to talk with Socrates, he says, "Nothing is more natural than to go to meet persons who are visiting you, and whom you are to receive, at the entrance of your house." If I mistake not, the porter would have admitted the strangers, and the master of the house have been in a distant part of the building. 4. To Schleiermacher's main remark, he replies, that, as Gorgias was fatigued, Callicles could not ask him to repeat his cxhibition, and therefore begged the visitors to call at another time. But need they be turned away? Might they not be invited in, without the recessity of a new exhibition on the part of Gorgias ?
2. When? The passage $473, \mathrm{E}$, which is treated of at
large in the note, has been usually supposed to determine the time. But several scholars, as Bockh (which I learn from C. F. Hermann's work, I. 634) and Foss, have ascribed an earlier date to the Dialogue, and one so early even as the first visit of Gorgias to Athens. The arguments, so far as I know them, with a single exception, are of little importance. They are, - 1. Pericles is spoken of as $\nu \epsilon \omega \sigma \tau i\rangle \tau-$ $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \eta \kappa \omega \dot{s}, 503$, C. But $\nu \epsilon \omega \sigma \tau \grave{\imath}$ may be widely used. Comp. 523, B. "Nuper, id est paucis ante sæculis." Cic. de Nat. Deor. 2. 50. It was twenty-four years before 405 B. C. And Pericles in this passage is contrasted tacitly with Themistocles, Cimon, and Miltiades, whose deaths were considerably earlier. 2. Archelaus is said to have committed the crimes by which he gained the throne "yesterday and the day before." But this is very plainly a rhetorical contrast with the $\pi a \lambda a \iota o i s ~ \pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \sigma \iota \nu$, just bcfore spoken of. See 470, D. 3. Demus, son of Pyrilampes, was a youth when the Wasps was written, seventeen years before 405 B. C. See 481, D. Suppose him thirty-two in 405, Plato, I imagine, if he had been aware, at the time of writing, of his exact age, would not have scrupled to say what he does. 4. The passage, 473 , E, where Socrates speaks of his ignorance of the way to put the qucstion when he was a presiding officer, is inconsistent with Apology 32, B, which refers to the famous occasion in 406 B. C. Socrates, therefore, must allude to something else. I can scarcely conceive how any one, used to the style of the Platonic Socrates, can take what he says $473, \mathrm{E}$, as sober earnest. 5. In 481, D, and 519, A, Alcibiades is spoken of as beloved by Socrates after their intimacy must long have ceased, and as likely to be punished by the Athenians, after his last departure from Athens, and a little before his death. This appears to me the most scrious objection to the year 405. But I apprehend that this is by
no means the only instance in which Plato assigns the relations of one time to another, changing the more immaterial circumstances, as the tragic poets did those of the fables, to suit his design.

## No. II.

## On what is said of Pericles, 516, A, and on the Character given to him in this Dialogue.

An eminent historian (Thirlwall, Hist. of Greece, Vol. III., chap. 18, and Appendix, 2) has examined the passage above quoted, and thinks that Plato's charge of peculation at this time arose out of a confusion of dates and circumstances. This may be so, but there are two things which ought to be said on behalf of Plato, before we fully condemn him for injustice towards his great countryman. The first is, that he expresses no opinion as to the justice of the charge. If it is admitted to be unjust, his argument is so much the stronger, for it turns upon the ingratitude of a people towards its public servants. Indeed, taken in connection with the charges against Themistocles, Cimon, and Miltiades, it wears the appearance of an unfounded accusation. The other is, that the fact may have been as Plato represents it: the people, in a sudden outburst of displeasure, may have at this time fined him, upon a charge of peculation so frivolous, that Thucydides docs not think it worthy of mention. The circumstances were these. Perieles was deposed from his office of general (Plut. Pericl. $\$ .35$, Diodor. 12.45), - it may be at one of the epicheirotonice, or in consequence of a special process, an eisangelia. A suit was brought against him, - probably a ypaфń, though Plutarch calls it a $\delta i k \eta$. Cleon, Simmias, or Lacratidas
was his accuser, and he was fined in a sum variously estimated at fifteen, fifty (Plut.), and eighty (Diodor.) talents. The nature of the suit is not stated, but it certainly may have been клотŋ̀ $\delta \eta \mu \sigma \sigma i ́ \omega \nu ~ \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ t \omega \nu$, based upon some trifling circumstance, occurring at a time when moneys would be under his control, as commander of the forces. The general Timotheus, with no more reason, perhaps, was accused of treason, and then, at the rendering of his accounts (euthync), charged with bribery, and fined one hundred talents. To this it may be added, that Aristides, in his vindication of Pericles, nowhere, so far as I have observed, taxes Plato with inaccuracy, but follows his statement, as if he thought it true. And this he does in a work where he accuses Plato of anachronisms and misquotations. (Aristid. 2. 319, 327, de Quatuorv. ed. Dindorf. In the latter place the Sophist says:-" lf one should ask Plato whether, supposing he had been one of Pericles's judges when he was tried for peculation, he would have been onc to condemn him, and would have given more weight to the words of Cleon than to those of Pericles, or," etc.)

Plato, then, in this very scrious and not at all ironical passage (see Thirlwall, III. 91), may have given no credit to the charge against Pericles, and, notwithstanding the silence of historians as to the nature of the suit, may be right in calling it one for peculation.

Upon another point, - Plato's consistency in the character which he gives to Pericles, - I will say but a word. There are three passages which concern us here; Gorg. 515, C-517; Meno, 99, B-100, B, compared with 94, B; and Phædrus, $269, A-270, B$. In Meno, єiסogia, or correct opinion, is ascribed to Pericles, without wisdom, and in Phædrus he has the credit of possessing consummate eloquence, derived from the discipline of Anaxagoras. In

Gorgias, he is denied to be a true orator, but in Phredrus is declared to be $\pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \dot{\sigma} a \tau o s ~ \epsilon i s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \rho \emptyset \eta \tau o \rho ı к \dot{\eta} \nu$. The seeming inconsistency can be explained by taking into consideration, that Plato judges of the orator in Gorgias by a moral standard, and in Phædrus looks at him as capable of producing a work of art; and perhaps by this consideration also, that while he would grant to Pericles all that knowledge of the mind which the physical instructions of Anaxagoras could furnish, he might still refuse to him the attributes of a truly philosophical artist.

## No. III.

## Sce 486, A, note.

The verses yet extant of this dialogue between the brothers have been collected and emended by Valckenaer, Matthix, and others. We here add the passage adjacent to the lines cited or alluded to by Plato, according to Hartung's arrangement in his Euripides Restitutus (Hamburg, 1843). Zethus invites his brother Amphion to go a hunting, and, on his refusal, reproaches him with effeminacy of mind, as giving himself up to the musical art and to indolence, while he neglects useful pursuits! To this scene Horace alludes (Epist. 1. 18. 39) : -
" Nee tua laudabis studia, aut aliena reprêndes, Nec, cum venari volet ille, poemata panges.
Gratia sic fratrum geminorum, Amphionis atque
Zethi, dissiluit, donee suspecta severo
Conticuit lyra; frateruis cessisse putatur Moribus Amphion."
Zethus first speaks:-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& { }^{*} \Lambda \mu \phi \iota o \nu, \text { à } \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} s \bar{\omega} \nu \dot{e} \pi \mu \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \theta \theta a i \quad \sigma \in \delta \in \hat{i} \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$
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Whately's Logic. Elements of Logic. Comprising the Substance of the Article in the Encyclopredia Metropolitana; with Additions, \&c. By Richard Whately, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. 12 mo pp. 360.
'In an age marked for the fertility of its novel theories and doctrines, in science as well as religion, the subject treated of in this volume would scem to recummend itself to every person who desires to reason forcibly or correctly. This elementary theatise holds a very ligh rank among the ellucational works of the day, having been introduced into many of the liest managed and popular seminaries of learning, both in England and the Cinited States. It is got $u p$ in the usually correct and beantiful stylo of nust buston books.- Mercluant's Magazine.

Questions for Examination in Whately's Elements of Logic. Prepared by a Teacher.

Whately's Rhetoric. Elements of Rhetoric. Comprising the Substance of the Article in the Encyclopardia Metropolitana; with Additions, \&c. By Pichard Whately, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. 12mo. pp. 360. - Both have been well received, and that which we are now to speak of [the Phetoric] is adopted as a text-book in our higher seminaries.'-Amcrican Monthly Review.

Questions for Examination in Whately's Elements of Rhetoric. Prepared by a Teacher.

Whately's Lessons on Reasoning. Easy Lessons on Reasoning, in Seventeen Lessons, by Richard Whately, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. 1 vol. 1\%mo. рр. 164.
In offering to the consideration of teachers and others the sterentype editions of the above works, the publishers would say, that both works have been earefully revised by a practical teacher. the questions were made by one who has long felt the need of a text-book with questions for examination, and it is believed that these will meet the desired object in all respeets.

## T0 PROFESSORS, TEACHERS, AND OTHERS

## INTERESTED IN

## CLASSICAL EDUCATION.

The Publishers of the Classical Works announced in the annexed Catalogue, would ask the attention of Professors, and those interested in Teaching, to the following extract from the London Examiner, edited by Mr. Taylor. In writing of the Boston editions of the Classics, by Felton, Wheeler, Woolsey, and others, he says:
'It-must be distinctly miderstood that the object of these several editions is to furnish students with readable editions of the Greek Classics, editions that shall form a happy medium between the text without comment, which is so often unwisely put in the hands of the learner, and those ponderous annotations, which can only serve to perplex him. Hence, the notes are explanatory and ilhustrative rather than critieal, and their conciseness camot be too much praised. Their texts are those of the highest European scholars; they are all fully yet briefly illustrated by English notes; and all are preceded by such introductions as render them complete in themselves, and furnish the student with that amount of historical and other information which enables him to pursue his journey in a region not altogether strange. ALL ARE EXCEEDLNGLY WELL l'RINTED IN A GOOD CLEAR TYPE, and are volumes as well fitted for the library of a private gentleman as for the school-room or the university.'

As the most of these works are stereotyped and consequently do not get 'out of print,'and are not 'out of the market,' they can alu'ays be had, if upplicu for directly to the publishers,

> J.AMES MUNROE \& CO., Boston.
*** Instructors and others will be furmshed with copies of our publications for examination with a view to their introduction.

Introduction to the Study of the Greek Classic Poets. Designed principally for the Use of Young Persons at School and College. By Henry Nelson Colcridge, Esq., A. M., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Containing, 1. Gencral Introduction. 2. Homer. 12 mo .
'The subject of the Homeric poctry, to which the greater part of the volume is devoted, is admirably discussed. There is ample learning without pedantry or ostentation; and good sense, good taste, and scholarlike elegance of style. The various theories on the origin of the Homeric poems are stated with eleamess and distinctness. The manifold beauties of the lliad and Odyssey, are developed with critical sagacity, and with a warmth of sensibility which nèver becomes overstrained or extravagant.' -North American Review.
[ $\underset{7}{ }$ It is intended to continue these Introductions through the whole body of Greek Classic P'oetry.

## WOOLSEY'S GREEK TRAGEDIES.

Fhe Alcestis of Euripides, with Notes, for the Use of Colleges in the United States. By T. D. Woolsey, Professor of Greek in Yale College. 12mo. 3d edition.

## The Antigone of Sophocles, with Notes, \&c. 12 mo.

'The form in which Mr. Woolsey has given these works to the public is neat and convenient ; and they are printed with Mr. Folsom's well-kwown accuracy. The text of the Alcestis, selected by Mr. Woolsey, is that of William Dindorf, contained in the Poetæ Scenici Græci, published at Leipzig and London in 1530. This text has received the approbation of Hermatm, from whose judgment in such matters there lies no appeal. A well written preface contains a clear statement of the subject-matter of the play, with a critique on the several characters brought out in the development of the plot. A brief, but comprehensive view of the poetical genius of Euripides in which his beanties are pointed out and his faults touched upon With a discriminating hand, gives additional interest to the volmne. The boly of notes at the end are remarkable for a union of deep learning, acute julliment, and fine taste.

- The preface and commentary to the Antigone are even more creditable to Mr. Wool-ey's ability than those to the Alcestis. The sketch of the pocm, in the preface, is written with clearness and brevity. The difliculties in this play, that call for a commentator's explanation, are far more numerous than in the Aicestis. In Mr. Woolsey's commentaries on these numberless knotty passages, he puts them together in a more intelligible form, and shows a sharper perception of delicate shades of meaning, than we have ever met with in the explanations of any other edition whatever.
'We conclude this notice by again expressing our satisfaction at the appearance of these works. They are not only honorable to the taste and talent of Mr. Woolsey, but will bring reputation to the classical scholarship of nur country. Anong all the bonks of this kind, prepared either at home or in England, for students and private readers, we are not acquainted with any which are equal to these in variety of merit. Trollope's Pentalogit does not bear the slightest enmparison with them, in the copionsness, elegauce, or value of the commentary. We are glad to iearn that l'rotessor Wonley is at work on two more tragedies, the Prometlieus ilound and the Electra. When these shall have been nublished, the lovers of classical literature will be provided with a series of the master-pieces of the Attic drama, illustrated by the blemled lights of grammatical, philological, and historical learning, ninder the guidance of a discriminating jndgment, and a ready sympathy with all that is beautiful in poetical inspiration and sublime in moral sentiment.'-North American Review.


## The Prometheus of Aeschylus, with Notes, \&c.

 12 mo .
## The Electra of Sophocles, with Notes, scc. 12 mo

' l'rofessor Woolsey has now completed his proposed course of Greek Tragedies. We hope the reception of these adnirable works among the teachers and scholars of our country will induce Mr. Woolsey to fillow up the carcer he has so brilliantly entered upon. It is an uncominon thing in any country, for a mind of nice poetical sensibiiities to be engaged in critical iabors, or to have the necessary patience in the acquisition of exact knowledge, to qualify it for such a task; lout so fortunate a conjunetion between profond anil accurate learning and delicate taste, when it does take place, brings out something which men will not willingly let die.' -North American Review.

This Course has been introduced into Harvard, Y̌ale, Dartmouth, Borr doin, ana many other Collegcs.

## JUST PUBLISHED.

Wheeler's Herodotus. Herodotus, from the text of Schweighaeuser; with English Notes. Edited by C. S. Wheeler, A. M., Tutor in Greek in Harvard Univer, sity. Stereotype edition. In 2 vols., thick 12mo., with a Map.

## extracts from the preface.

'Schweighaeuser's text was, after some deliberation, selected for reprinting, as on the whole the best. But such commendations of Gaisford, Bekker, Bohir, and others, as approved themselves to the judgment of the editor have been introduced; and many of Long's valuable suggestions as to the punctuation adopted. The greatest care has been taken to prevent any typographical errors. The accompanying Life of Herodotus is taken from K. U. Nohler's History of Greek Literature ; the Map from Behr's edition.
'In the preparation of the Notes such constructions have been selected for comment, as the editor, from some years experience in the recitationroom, has fonnd to present the greatest difficulty to the student. His plan has been to prepare a useful body of Notes.'

## NOTICES OF THE WORK.

'The Clarenden Press could hardly send forth a better specimen of Greek than the Herodotus of Mr. Wheeler.'-London Examiner.
'The publishers of these volumes of the father of history deserve great credit for the beauty of execntion which appears in them; and the labors of the ellitor will call forth that tribute of praise which is his due, for the care manifested in presenting to scholars so beautiful and correct an edition of the great work of Ilerodotus.
'The Notes we think highly valnable, and generally just such as are needed in a text-book for Colleges.'-American Eclectic.

A Professor at one of our Universities, writes: 'I have made a special ex amination of different parts of the work, and I hasten to communicate to vou my judgment of its merits. It is eight years or more since I introduced Herodotus, in the German edition of Tanelmitz, into my classes, and I have had some experience of the difficulties students have to contend with in an edition without Notes. The American editor has supplied this want with great credit to himself. Sufficient aid, it seems to me, is rendered to the pupil, while the notes invite him to thorough habits of study. So far as I have examined the work, I have been struck with the accuracy of the press, which merits the highest praise. Both the editor on his part and the publishers on theirs, deserve well of their country in issuing so fine an edition of one of the most charming authors of antiquity.'

Plato's Gorgias. The Gorgias of Plato, chiefly according to Stallbaum's Text. With Notes by Theodore D. Woolsey, Prof. of Greck in Yale College. 1 vol. 12 m .

## A Professor at Bowdoin College, writes: 'The Gorgias I have read

 with great satisfaction, and an much gratified with this first effort to present one of Plato's Dialogues to American Students in an attractive form. The beauty of the type and the thorough worl of the editor leave nothing to desire. The reputation of Prof. Woolsey is too well established, to render it necessary for me to saymore. I will only add, that good taste and judgment, sound scholarship and accurate discrimination, characterize this in connection with his previous labors. In the Introduction and the Notes, students will find all that is necessary to enable them to enter into the intricacies of this fine specimen of the Soeratic method.'This work has been adopted as a text-book in some of our Universities, and is extensively used in Private Classes.
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[^0]:    * De Gorgia Yeontino Commentatio. Malle. 1828.
    $\dagger$ This is asserted by the author of the Prolegomena to the Rhetoric of Hermogenes (in Walz's Collection, Vol. IV. p. 14). The passage is inserted by Spengel into his valuable book entitled Arlium Scriptores. Stuttgardt. 1828. Foss denies it without authority, "tum propter alius testimonii inopiam, tum propter Tisix attatem."

[^1]:    * See Spengel, u. s., p. 81.
    $\dagger$ This is said by the commentator on Hermog. u. s., p. 15, by Olym. piodor. apud Routh, p. 562, and other late writers.

[^2]:    * The fragments, which are few, are collected by Foss, but not completely. Thus, Clem. Alex. Strom. 1. 11, § 51, cites some words of Gorgias, apparently from his Olympian oration. The following words are a good sample of the style of Gorgias, and show some just thought. They are
    
    
    
    $\dagger$ And so the men of that time regarded those who displayed their talents after the manner of Gorgias. Thucyd. 3. 38, aंxoñs nं $\delta o v \tilde{n} \tilde{n} \sigma \sigma \omega \mu \mu v o s$
     Sophists were held, comp. Protag. 316, seq.

[^3]:    * It is edited by Foss, in his Commentatio before mentioned, and by Mollach (Berlin, 1845).

[^4]:    * In the proœmium to Philostrat. Vitæ Sophist., another Cherephon, as we are there expressly told, is brought into comection with Gorgias. He
    
    
     ¢ús!. I have seen the opinion somewhere expressed, that the story was first told of this Chxrephon, the declaration of Philostrat. notwithstanding.
    $\dagger$ For some observations on the time and place of the dialoguc, see Appendix, No. I.

[^5]:    * Philebus. 58, A. "I heard Gorgias say, on a variety of occasions, that the art of persuasion far surpassed all the other arts, since it brought all things under its sway, not by force, but by their own will."

[^6]:    * Several passages of Phædrus, a work which treats of the worthlessness of rhetoric when not dependent on philosophy, may be adduced in illustration of what is here said. On 260, A, Phedrus tells Socrates that he hears the remark made, "that one who wishes to be an orator has no need to learn true jnstiec, but only what may seem to be such to the multitude, who will exercise the office of jurymen ; nor the truly good or beautiful, but only the sceming ; for from these sources, and not from the truth, persuasion is derived." Aud, again, 272, D: "They say that there is no need of making so much of this, or of taking such a long, round-about

[^7]:    course to reach it. For the orator, who would be well versed in his art, (they maintain,) has no occasion to possess true views in regard to just or true actions, or in regard to men that are such either by nature or education. In fact, they assert that no one in the courts cares for the truth about these things, but only for that which is adapted to persuade. And this is the probable," etc. Plato goes on to illustrate this by an example drawn from Tisias, one of the rhctoricians. If a brave man of weak body should have beaten and stripped of his garment a strong but cowardly man, and the case be brought before a court, neither ought to tell the truth; the coward ought to deny that the weak but courageous man was alone in beating him ; while the other should ask, "how he, being so deficient in bodily strength, could have attempted it." He then shows how weak, at its very forndation, that unphilosophical rhetoric is which is built on merely empiric rules ; since he who knows what is true must know, also, what is like truth, and he who studies the classes of human minds with phitosophy for his guide will know by what arguments each class of minds is most influenced. "But," he adds, very nobly, "the virtuous man will not study this art of rhetoric for the sake of speaking and acting before men, but that he may be able to speak in a manner acceptable to the divinities, and to act so as to please them to the extent of his power."

    Plato's opinion of advocates, which was none of the highest, may be found in Buok XI. of the Laws, at the end.

[^8]:    * Comp. Aristot. Ethic. Eudem. 1. 5, iтл
     סírciov. See, also, Xen. Memorab. 3. 9. 5. Plato appears at first to have entertainel the same opinion, but afterwards made virtue to consist in this: that the faculties of the soul respeetively perform their parts, and are all obedient to the reason.

[^9]:    * See Buttmann's view, in the note on 480, E.

[^10]:    
     intogixñs xaì ס،a 甲'gerv. See 517, A, note.

[^11]:    * Comp. Repub. 2. 379, B. "Is not God truly good, and ought he not to be spoken of as such ? Certainly. But nothing good is harmful. Is it? I think not. Can what is not harmful, then, do harm? By no means. Does that which does no harm do any evil (xaxóv $\sigma_{1}$ )? No, no more this than the other. But whatever does no evil can be the cause of no evil. Is it so? Assuredly. But what? is the good useful (dं $p^{\prime}$ $\left.\lambda_{1} \mu \mathrm{ov}\right)$ ? Yes. Is it, then, the cause of well-being (siarৎarias)? Yes." Etc.
    $\dagger$ On the design and effieacy of punishments in society, a number of

[^12]:    punishment upon the criminal or others, but from the duty of punishing, which is based on the instinetive feeliug of desert of evil for doing wrong. He adds, "This theory is, without doubt, only indicated in Plato, but it occurs in a number of places, briefly but positively expressed." I could wish that the learned translator had proved this assertion, which his familiar acquaintance with Plato must have rendered easy. Doubtless Plato could not get rid of the conviction written on the heart, that the sinner ought to siiffer, or of the tendency to riew suffering as a debt owed to justice. But cid not Plato try to go further back than this conviction, and search into - meason of the right which it admits?

[^13]:    to refers to it in a striking passage, Leges, X. 890. The discussion with Thrasymachus, in the first part of the Republic, attacks a kindred principle, and may be read here to advantage. Ilobbes went to the length of any of the ancient Sophists on this point. See Mr. Ifallam's Critique, Hist. of Lit., Vol. III. 365-382, especially the close of the ehapter.

[^14]:    * This may be regarded as the notion of the $\dot{*}$ ra 9 ni, the optimates, which was somewhat in vogue at the time, only a little altered.
    $\dagger$ Comp. Philebus (an important dialogue, in which the nature of the good and the pleasant is elosely examined), 46, A, B.

[^15]:    * For $\sigma \omega \emptyset$ go oivn, comp. Repub. 4. 430, D. It is there compared to a
    
     soul to the better. Litter observes (2, 47.4) that the expression awpeooivn

[^16]:    * See Appendix, No. II. $d^{*}$

[^17]:    * Comp. Appendix, No. II.

[^18]:    * Schleiermacher thinks that this is aimed at Aristippus, who, by taking pay for his instructions, brought reproach upon the Socratic philosophers. The best account of the remunerations given to the Sophists which I have met with is contained in Weleker's Essay on Prodicus, his Life and Writings, in Welcker and Näkc's Khcinischcs Museum, 1. 22, seq., and since reprinted in his "Kleine Schriften," Part 2, p. 393, seq.

[^19]:    * This remark does not include those mythi which are of Plato's own invention. He was led to use them by his poetical temperament, and felt, perhaps, that the view suggested by a beautiful fable was as true as any which could be gircn ; more true, because more beautiful, than if put into abstract propositions.

[^20]:    * Phædo, 113, E. "Those who àre judged to be incurable on account of the enormity of their crimes, who have committed many and heinous sacrileges, or numerous unjust and lawless murders, or the like, these their appropriate destiny hurls into Tartarus, whence they never come forth." He then speaks of the punishment of those who have committed curable sins, in a passage too long to be inserted here, and then adds: "With respect to the mythus, to affirm positively that these things are as I have narrated them, is not the part of a reasonable man "; and then uses the truth taught in the mythus as a motive for virtuous action. In the Repuolic, the narrator of the mythus is represented as near a chasm (see Gorg. $526, \mathrm{~B}$, note) in the ground, by the side of a person who asked another where Ardiæus was. "Now this Ardiæus was a tyrant in a Pamphylian city a thousand years before, and had slain his aged father and his elder brother, besides doing, as was said, many other unhallowed deeds. The person so asked replied, said the informant, 'He is not come, nor can he hereafter come hither.' Among the frightful spectacles that we saw, this was one, continued he: - When we were near the month of the chasm, and were expecting to go upwards, after enduring all the other things appointed, on a sudden we saw this Ardiæus and others, nearly all of them tyrants; although some enormous transgressors among private persons were there also. When they thought that they should now go upwards (out of the chasm), the mouth would not let them pass, but attered a bellowing sound whenever any such incurably wicked person, or any one who had not paid a sufficient penalty, endearored to ascend. Thereupon, wild men, said he, all fiery to look upon, who stood by, when they heard the bellow, picked ont and carried off a part of the transgressors; but Ardiæus and others they bomd hand and foot, and threw them down, and beat them hard, and dragged then along on one side of the road, scraping them upon thorns, white to the by-standers they told the reasons why these simers suffered these things, and that they were drawn along to be plunged into Tartarus. There, said he, of all the fears many and various which fell upon us, this was the greatest, - lest, when each one was going upwards, the month should ntter that bellow, and most gladly did each one hear no sound as he ascended." A conception worthy of the highest flights of Dante!

[^21]:    * Comp. Muenscher, Dogmengeschichte, Vol. II. § 298.

[^22]:    * All these opinions may be found in the works of their respective advocates, viz. Cousin's in his transl. 3. 130, seq., Stallbaum's in Vol. 2, sec. 1, p. 38, of his second ed., Ast's in his work on Plato's life and writings, p. 133, Socher's in his similar work (Munich, 1820), p. 237, in which he is polemical towards Ast. C. F. Hermann's is contained in his Introd. to Plato (Heidelberg, 1838-39, the second rol. has not appeared), p. 476, and Schleiermacher's - the critic to whom the thorongh understanding of Plato owes most - in Dobson's translation of his prefaces. While I am upon this subject, let me say, that Schleiermacher hardly receives justice from the hands of this translator. His style, indeed, offers serious difficulties, for his mind was not, "though deep, yet clear." It may be forgiven therefore, to a translator, that sometimes he constructs, ont of Schleiermacher's formidable German sentences, something not exactly English, as though lie were only half conscions of the meaning. But when such things as the turning of André Dacier, the Freuch translator of parts of

[^23]:    Plato, into Madame Dacier occur, notwithstanding Schleiermacher's "dem Dacier," and "Seiner eiuleitung," it mazy be suspected that the translation was made before sufficient knowledge of German was acquired, - a suspicion from which only the plea of gross carelessness can free the translatur.

[^24]:    * Stallbaum, in his Introd. to the Repub., says: " Hoc monere juvat disserendi quoque elegantiam in Pulitia tantam regnare ut paucissimi sermones preter Gorgiam, Protagoram, Phedonem, Phedrum, et Symposium, hoc in genere at eam comparandi sint." Ritter, 2. 192. "In regard to Plato's imitative art in dialogue dialogisch-mimische kunst), we consider as his most finished works l'rotagoras, Gorgias, and Symposium, next to which, thongh at some distance, come Plradrus and Phedo." Here, however, style, rather than form, is spoken of. As a work of art, I should place Phadrus first among all the l'latonic dialognes.

[^25]:    ＊Stallb．has é $\rho \omega \tau \underset{a}{a}$ in his second edition．

