



THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA RIVERSIDE









THE GORGIAS OF PLATO.

+

•

.

.

THE

GORGIAS

0 F

PLATO,

CHIEFLY ACCORDING TO STALLBAUM'S TEXT,

WITH

NOTES,

ВҮ

THEODORE D. WOOLSEY.

PRESIDENT OF VALE 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 OBATORE, I. 11.

NEW EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS.

BOSTON AND CAMBRIDGE:

JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY.

1856.

PA4279 G7 1848

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1848, by JAMES MUNKOE AND COMPANY, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

> CAMBRIDGE: STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY METCALF AND COMPANY, PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

70

PROFESSOR FELTON

OF MARVARD UNIVERSITY

THIS EDITION OF GORGIAS

IS INSCRIBED,

AS A MEMORIAL OF LONG FRIENDSHIP,

BY

THE EDITOR.

6*



.

1. The text of this edition principally follows Stallbaum's, published at Gotha in 1840. 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 $\dot{\eta}$ before $d\rho\iota\theta\mu\eta\tau\iota\kappa\dot{\eta}$. — 451, A, I have given $o\dot{v}v$ for $v\dot{v}v$. — 459, A, $\tau o\iota v\dot{v}v \delta\dot{\eta}$ for $\tau o\dot{v}vv \delta\dot{\eta}$. — 460, C, Stallb. has no brackets. — ibid. D, omits the words in brackets. — 461, B, vid. not. — 462, E, Stallb. has $d\rho'$ for δ' . — 465, B, gives $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta\sigma w$. — 466, A, omits the words in brackets. — 472, A, has $\tau a\dot{v}\tau\dot{a}$ for $\tau a\dot{v}\tau a$. — ibid. B, has Huboî. Vid. not. — ibid. $\dot{\epsilon}v\theta\dot{a}\delta\epsilon$. Vid. not. — 480, D, has $\tau o\tilde{v}\tau o$ for $\tau o\dot{v}\tau \varphi$. — 481, A, omits $a\dot{v}$ before $\theta av\dot{a}\tau ov$. — 483, E, puts a colon after $\pi\lambda\dot{a}\tau\tau ov\tau\epsilon s$. — 491, D, vid. not. — 492, B, omits the words in brackets. — 494, E, omits $*\tau o^*$. —

496, A, reads $\exists\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma s.$ — 497, A, gives kai ... $\nu\sigma\nu\theta\epsilon\tau\epsilon is$ to Callicles. Vid. not. — 500, B, brackets katà tò $\sigma\hat{\omega}\mu a$ after $\mu\alpha\gamma\epsilon\epsilon\rho\kappa\eta\nu$, which I have omitted. — 505, E, joins outors to the next sentence. — 508, B, inserts * $d\partial\iota\omega t^*$. — 514, C, I have bracketed $i\phi$ '. — 522, C, have given outors. Vid. not. — 525, D, have omitted tobs before $\tau o i \tau \omega \nu$. — 527, C, Stallb. gives $\delta \sigma \delta s \lambda \delta \gamma \sigma s$. Vid. not.

In the text, like other editors of Plato, I have allowed $o\dot{v}\kappa o\hat{v}v$, nonne igitur, 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, $\dot{u}v$ occurs in the middle of a clause, it is not written $\ddot{u}v$.

I have had access to the following editions of Gorgias, which include all the modern ones of much value.
Routh's, Oxford, 1784.
Findeisen's, — an edition of indifferent judgment. Gotha and Amsterdam, 1796.
Heindorf's second, edited by Buttmann, Berlin, 1829, — excellent, especially for the Commentary.
Bekker's.
Stallbaum's Leipzig ed. These are concerned only with the text. Bekker's has some Scholia.
Coray's, Paris, 1825, together with Xenophon's Memorab.
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.
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

viii

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 1, 1848.

INTRODUCTION.

THE times in Greece which just preceded the age of Socrates gave birth 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 attracting 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 existence 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 succeeded by frivolity and by the purpose to gain immediate selfish ends through pretensions to superior 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 hands of the Sophists, into an art of disputing, applied to puzzle the unpractised and display their

xii

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 b by the worse argument ($\tau \partial \nu \eta \tau \tau \omega \lambda \delta \gamma o \nu \kappa \rho \epsilon i \tau \tau \omega \pi o \iota \epsilon i \nu$), and 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 with this spirit.

One of the more prominent Sophists, with whom Socrates was contemporary, was Gorgias, 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 71st Olympiad, or 496 B. C. But there is good reason, I think, for putting it several 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.† And with this it accords, that Gorgias heard Empedoeles 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

[†] 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 Artium Scriptores. Stuttgardt. 1828. Foss denies it without authority, "tum propter alius testimonii inopiam, tum propter Tisiæ ætatem."

^{*} De Gorgia Lcontino Commentatio. Halle. 1828.

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 S8th 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 artifices of rhetoric * (τέχνας ρητορικάς). - On his arrival at 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 wonder 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, he 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

^{*} See Spengel, u. s., p. 81.

[†] This is said by the commentator on Hermog. u. s., p. 15, by Olympiodor. apud Routh, p. 562, and other late writers.

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 (ovvwv rois vious) 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 Bcotia, 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. (Ælian, Var. Hist. 12. 32.) Owing to his habits of temperanee, he attained to a very great age, to six or eight years over a century, and acted the rhetorician to the last, by saving, according to Ælian (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 Isoerates afterwards, he tried to unite the Greeks against the Persians. Another was a funeral discourse in honor of Athenians slain in battle, a fragment of which, preserved by a Scholiast on Hermogenes,

xvi

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,† 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 $\pi\epsilon\rho i$ φύσεως η τοῦ μη ὄντος, 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-

^{*} 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 cited by Foss from Plutarch. Γ_{ogy} (as the τ_{ogy}) dias interval atains in the oration of the style of Γ_{ogy} (as the τ_{ogy}) of the style of Γ_{ogy} (as the style of Γ_{ogy}) of the style of Γ_{ogy} (by foss from Plutarch. Γ_{ogy} (as the τ_{ogy}) of the style of Γ_{ogy} (by Γ_{ogy}) of Γ_{ogy}) of Γ_{ogy} (by Γ_{ogy}) of Γ_{ogy} (b) of Γ_{ogy}) of Γ_{ogy} (c) of Γ_{ogy} (c) of Γ_{ogy}) of Γ_{ogy} (c) of Γ_{ogy} (c) of Γ_{ogy}) of Γ_{ogy} (c) of Γ_{o

[†] And so the men of that time regarded those who displayed their talents after the manner of Gorgias. Thucyd. 3. 38, ἀχοῆς ἡδονῆ ἡστώμινοι καὶ σοφιστῶν Θιαταῖς ἰοικότις καθημίνοις. For the estimation in which the Sophists were held, comp. Protag. 316, seq.

INTRODUCTION.

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 heads, 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 friend 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

xviii

^{*} It is edited by Foss, in his Commentatio before mentioned, and by Mullach (Berlin, 1845).

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 vuktepis, vuktos mais (Aristoph. Birds, 1564, and Horarum frag.), for never coming abroad during the day, and of πύξινος θάψινος, for his sallow hue (Eupolis Πόλεων frag., 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 scene in some public place, like the Lyceum, where the parties in several other dialogues convened.[†] At the opening of the

* In the procenium to Philostrat. Vitæ Sophist., another Chærephon, as we are there expressly told, is brought into connection with Gorgias. He asked the Sophist a foolish question, $\Delta_{ik} \tau_{i} \circ_{i} \tau_{i} \circ_{i} \tau_{i} \sigma_{i} \sigma$

† For some observations on the time and place of the dialogue, see Appendix, No. I.

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, since 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 rhetorical 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 plausible 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 artificer, 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 acquired 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-

^{*} 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."

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 previous 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

* 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, Phædrus tells Socrates that he hears the remark made, "that one who wishes to be an orator has no need to learn true justice, 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 seeming; for from these sources, and not from the truth, persuasion is derived." And, again, 272, D: "They say that there is no need of making so much of this, or of taking such a long, round-about 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?

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 foundation, 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 philosophy 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 Book XI. of the Laws, at the end.

INTRODUCTION.

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 conceit 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 praetical 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

xxiv

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

С

whom he liked, or stripping him of his goods, or binding him." Socrates earnestly declares, that he regards such a one, if doing this unjustly, as most wretched, 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 going 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 escapes 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 ($ai\sigma\chi\iota\sigma\nu$, more ugly) to wrong, but denies that it is more evil ($\kappa a\kappa\iota\sigma\nu$). This leads to an analysis of the ideas of the beautiful and the base ($\tau \delta \kappa a \lambda \delta \nu$, $\tau \delta a i \sigma \chi \rho \delta \nu$), 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 ($\delta i \delta \delta \nu a i \delta i \kappa \eta \nu$) and to be justly punished for wrong-doing are the same; that a just punisher supposes one who suffers what is just, and that everything just is $\kappa a \lambda \delta \nu$ as far as it is just. If, then, what is suffered is just, it is $\kappa a \lambda \delta \nu$, 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, 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

^{*} See Buttmann's view, in the note on 480, E.

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 itself. 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

xxviii

^{*} Comp. Aristides (2. 377, Dindorf.), τοτε μέν γέ, φησι, ταυτόν εστιν, δ μακάριε, βήτωρ και σοφιστήε, τοτε δ' αδ την σοφιστικήν κρείττον είναι της όητορικής και διαφέρειν. See 517, A, note.

INTRODUCTION.

($\pi\epsilon\rho$) τοῦ δικάζεσθαι πάντες πειρῶνται τεχνολογεῖν). But in the 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.†

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 without respect to the occasion, not only in courts and other public assemblies, but also in private meetings; being the same in nature, whether small or great affairs are in question." To which, in reply, Phædrus 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.

† Whately's definition. Aristotle's is, $\delta i \sqrt{\alpha} \mu is \pi i \epsilon_i^2 \frac{\pi}{2} \pi i \epsilon_i^2 \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{\alpha} \epsilon_i \sqrt$

xxix

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 close dialectical exposition of what is meant by ro kalov, 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.†

* 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 $(\varkappa \alpha \varkappa' \delta \nu \tau_i)$? 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 $(\omega' \phi_i - \lambda_i \mu \sigma \nu)$? Yes. Is it, then, the cause of well-being $(\imath \delta \pi \rho \alpha \gamma i \alpha z)$? Yes." Etc.

† On the design and efficacy of punishments in society, a number of
If to suffer $\delta i \kappa a \iota a =$ to suffer $\kappa a \lambda \dot{a} =$ to suffer $\dot{a} \phi \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \iota \mu a$ or $\dot{a} \gamma a \theta \dot{a}$, 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 (diracouperor) 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 (ouppono Seis). For no penalty which is inflicted by law is inflicted for evil (γίγνεται έπὶ κακῷ), but has, for the most part, one of two effects : it 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 love 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 $(\delta i \times n)$, — since justice and penalty are always beautiful, — but vengeance, which is suffering attendant on iniquity. And as well he who has suffered this vengeance is miserable, as he who avoids suffering it; the one, because there is no cure for him; the other, because he 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 $\delta i \kappa a \iota a$ and $\kappa a \lambda \dot{a}$ to be what they are, not only in themselves, but also in the apprehension of the sufferer, while $\omega \phi \epsilon \lambda \iota \mu a$ 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 feelingly 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 ($a''\sigma\chi_{10}r$) than to be wronged. It is so, indeed, by law, but not by nature. This ambiguity it is between the naturally

punishment upon the criminal or others, but from the duty of punishing, which is based on the instinctive feeling 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 suffer, or of the tendency to view suffering as a debt owed to justice. But $\dot{c}^2 4$ not Plato try to go further back than this conviction, and search into

, reason of the right which it admits?

xxxii

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

* πλεογεπτείν. πλεογεξία is substantially selfishness, to which cause in a very striking passage Plato ascribes all the wrong actions of men. Leges, V. 731, D: πάντων δι μέγιστον, 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 ignorance 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. $\delta_i \dot{\omega} \tau_{i \not c v} \delta_i$, 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 show whenever they can seize the occasion. All this is very evident 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 disciples; and, if attacked by foes 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 him into selfishness and the pursuit of his own ends $(\pi\lambda \iotaovi\xi(\alpha\nu \times \alpha) i \partial \iotaovi\alpha \times \gamma'(\alpha\nu))$, since it blindly shuns pain and seeks pleasure. Thus it will give a higher place to pleasure and pain than to the more just and good; and, by producing darkness in itself, will at length plunge the man himself and the state into all sorts of evils."

* The philosopher Archelaus, who was, perhaps, an Athenian and a scholar of Anaxagoras, taught (although he may not have meant by his words what the Sophists taught) $\tau \delta \delta i \varkappa \sigma \iota \sigma \varkappa \iota \tau \delta \alpha i \sigma \chi c \delta v o \delta \phi \delta \sigma \iota \delta \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ véµq. This principle is admirably ridiculed in the Clouds, 1421, seq. Pla-

xxxiv

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 $(\beta\epsilon\lambda\tau iovs)$, 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

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. Hobbes went to the length of any of the ancient Sophists on this point. See Mr. Hallam's Critique, Hist. of Lit., Vol. III. 365 - 382, especially the close of the chapter.

him may do him extreme harm. In short, there is no end to the absurdities which will follow from the principle, 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 $(\pi\lambda\epsilon_{ov\epsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon\iota\nu})$, 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 beginning; 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 enjoyment.[†] 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,

xxxvi

^{*} This may be regarded as the notion of the $d\gamma \alpha S n'$, the optimates, which was somewhat in vogue at the time, only a little altered.

[†] Comp. Philebus (an important dialogue, in which the nature of the good and the pleasant is closely examined), 46, A, B.

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 in mpatter and kakes mpatter 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.† 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.1

Callicles 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.

[†] 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."

[‡] In a fine passage, Leges, II. 663, Plato teaches that the good and bad judge of pleasure subjectively, or relatively to their own character. He then inquires whose judgment is to 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 itself a good, evil cannot be affirmed of it. Socrates seizes upon the acknowledgment, and carries 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 versâ. (-500, A.)Now to know what pleasures are good and what evil 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 exercise 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 neglect their own or the public interests ? Do they seek to benefit or gratify the community ? To this Callicles responds, that the question admits of a double answer; the orators of the present day seek 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 view, so has he the health of the community, which consists in justice and temperance* (σωφροσύνη, self-

^{*} For σωφροσύνη, comp. Repub. 4. 430, D. It is there compared to a concord and harmony, and called χόσμος τις χαὶ ἡδοιῶν τινων χαὶ ἰτιθυμιῶν ἰγχεμάτεια. This χόσμος consists in the subjugation of the worse part of the soul to the better. Ritter observes (2. 474) that the expression σωφροσύνη

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 ideas 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 according 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 $\delta_{12\,\alpha_{10}\sigma\,\delta_{27}n}$.

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 is, 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, we 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-

xl

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 ill-success 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 something 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

^{*} See Appendix, No. II. d *

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 (302-304, 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

* Comp. Appendix, No. II.

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 sec. 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 teachers 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, Callicles 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 people. 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 rhetoricians merely 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

* Schleiermacher thinks that this is aimed at Aristippus, who, by taking ρ ay 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 Welcker's Essay on Prodicus, his Life and Writings, in Welcker and Näkc's Rheinisches Museum, 1. 22, seq., and since reprinted in his "Kleine Schriften," Part 2, p. 393, seq.

xliv

appeal to Callicles. "Which mode of serving the state do you now exhort me to follow; that of seeking 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, that he is exposed to such dangers from bad men, and that he could say nothing in the court which would win him 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 good, 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." (-523, 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 seeks 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;

xlvi

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 elsewhere the same inclination to clothe in a mythical dress those truths which lie beyond the bounds of reason. It seems 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 poetical 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 $\mu \hat{\upsilon} \theta_{0s}$, and yet a $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda a \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\upsilon} s \lambda \hat{\upsilon} \gamma \sigma s$. 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

^{*} 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 given ; more true, because more beautiful, than if put into abstract propositions.

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-

* Phædo, 113, E. "Those who are 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 Republic, the narrator of the mythus is represented as near a chasm (see Gorg. 526, B, note) in the ground, by the side of a person who asked another where Ardiaus was. "Now this Ardiaus 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 mouth 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 uttered a bellowing sound whenever any such incurably wicked person, or any one who had not paid a sufficient penalty, endeavored 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 Ardians and others they bound hand and foot, and threw them down, and beat them hard, and dragged them along on one side of the road, scraping them upon thorns, while to the by-standers they told the reasons why these sinners 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 utter that bellow, and most gladly did each one hear no sound as he ascended." A conception worthy of the highest flights of Dante!

xlviii

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,

^{*} Comp. Muenscher, Dogmengeschichte, Vol. II. § 298.

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 useful, and that men harm themselves by wrong-doing; that, accordingly, the rule of pleasure must give way to the higher rule of the good." *

^{*} 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, see. 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 vol. has not appeared), p. 476, and Schleiermacher's — the critic to whom the thorough understanding of Plato owes most — in Dobsoa'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, out of Schleiermacher's formidable German sentences, something not exactly English, as though he were only half conscious of the meaning. But when such things as the turning of André Dacier, the Freuch translator of parts of

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. Schleiermacher's view, so far 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 propriety in the introduction of every topic. The right and the good are inseparably linked to each other, 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 opposed. It is opposed to true good, for it blindly seeks present gratification, however 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-

Plato, into Madame Dacier occur, notwithstanding Schleiermacher's "dem Dacier," and "Seiner einleitung," it may 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 translator.

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 chief in its pretensions, is false 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 Gorgias. 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 τεχνικός, - 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 true 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

lii [†]

times, the necessity of using flattering arts, to which he could not resort, would have altogether prevented his success. In such an age, — and such an age is a very long one, — the philosophical 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 even 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 critics 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. Athenœus 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 anecdotes, which may not be wholly unworthy of credence, 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 Gorgias, 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

* Stallbaum, in his Introd. to the Repub., says: "Hoc monere juvat disserendi quoque elegantiam in Politia tantam regnare ut paucissimi sermones præter Gorgiam, Protagoram, Phædonem, Phædrum, et Symposium, hoc in genere ad 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 Protagoras, Gorgias, and Symposium, next to which, though at some distance, come Phædrus and Phædo." Here, however, style, rather than form, is spoken of. As a work of art, I should place Phædrus first among all the Platonic dialogues.

liv

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.



ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΙΑΛΟΓΟΥ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ

ΚΑΛΛΙΚΛΗΣ, ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ, ΧΑΙΡΕΦΩΝ,

ΓΟΡΓΙΑΣ, ΠΩΛΟΣ.

- 447 САР. І. КАЛ. Πολέμου και μάχης φασί γρήναι, Β Σώχρατες, ούτω μεταλαγγάνειν. ΣΩ. Αλλ' ή, το λεγόμενον, κατόπιν έορτης ήκομεν καί ύστερουμεν ; ΚΑΛ. Και μάλα γε αστείας έορτης· πολλά γάρ και καλά Γοργίας ήμιν όλίγον πρότερον έπεδείζατο. ΣΩ. Τούτων μέντοι, Β ὦ Καλλίκλεις, αἴτιος Χαιρεφῶν ὅδε, ἐν ἀγορά άναγχάσας ήμας διατρίψαι. ΧΑΙ. Ούδεν πραγμα, ὦ Σώχρατες· ἐγώ γὰρ καὶ ἰάσομαι. φίλος γάς μοι Γοργίας, ώστ' έπιδείξεται ήμιν, εί μέν δοχεί, νῦν, ἐάν δὲ βούλη, ἐσαῦθις. ΚΑΛ. Τι δαί, ѽ Χαιζεφῶν; ἐπιθυμεῖ Σωκζάτης ἀκοῦσαι Γοργίου; ΧΑΙ. Έπ' αὐτό γέ τοι τοῦτο πάοεσμεν. Κ.Α.Α. Ούχοῦν ὅταν βούλησθε παο' έμε ήκειν οἴκαδε, πας' έμοι γάς Γοργίας καταλύει και έπιδείξεται ύμιτ. ΣΩ. Εῦ λέγεις, C & Kallízleis. άλλ' άρα έθελήσειεν αν ήμιν δια-
- λεχθηναι; βούλομαι γάς πυθέσθαι πας' αὐτοῦ, τίς ή δύναμις της τέχνης τοῦ ἀνδοός, καὶ τί ἐστιν ὕ ἐπαγγέλλεταί τε καὶ διδάσκει. την δὲ

άλλην ἐπίδειξιν ἐσαῦθις, ὥσπες σὺ λέγεις, ποιησάσθω. ΚΑΑ. Οὐδὲν οἶον τὸ αὐτὸν ἐςωτῶν, ঊ Σώ×ςατες. καὶ γὰς αὐτῷ ἕν τοῦτ' ἦν τῆς ἐπιδείξεως· ἐκέλευε γοῦν νῦν δὴ ἐςωτῶν ὅ τι τις βούλοιτο τῶν ἔνδον ὄντων, καὶ πρὸς ἅπαντα ἔφη ἀπο×ςινεῖσθαι. ΣΩ. Ἡ καλῶς λέγεις. ἹΩ Χαιςεφῶν, ἐςοῦ αὐτόν. ΧΑΙ. Τί ἔςωμαι ; ΣΩ. D "Οστις ἐστί. ΧΑΙ. Πῶς λέγεις ; ΣΩ. "Ωσπες ἂν εἰ ἐτύγχανεν ῶν ὑποδημάτων δημιουςγός, ἀπεκςίνατο ἂν δήπου σοι, ὅτι σκυτοτόμος. ἢ οὐ μανθάνεις ὡς λέγω ;

CAP. II. XAI. Μανθάνω και έρήσομαι. -Είπέ μοι, ω Γοργία, αληθη λέγει Καλλικλής όδε, διι έπαγγέλλει αποχρίνεσθαι ό τι αν τίς σε έρωτα; ΓΟΡ. 'Αληθή, δ Χαιρεφών και γάρ 148 νῦν δη αὐτὰ ταῦτα ἐπηγγελλόμην, καὶ λέγω, ὅτι ούδείς μέ πω ήρώτηκε καινόν ούδεν πολλών έτών. ΧΑΙ. 1 που άρα δαδίως αποχρίνει, ω Γοργία. ΓΟΡ. Πάρεστι τούτου πείραν, ῶ Χαιρεφῶν, λαμβάνειν. ΠΩΛ. Νή Δία αν δέ γε βούλη, ῶ Χαιρεφῶν, ἐμοῦ. Γοργίας μέν γάρ καὶ ἀπειοηπέναι μοι δοπεί· πολλά γάρ άρτι διελήλυθε. Χ.1Ι. Τί δαί, ὦ Πώλε; οἴει σὺ κάλλιον ἂν Γοργίου αποκρίνασθαι; ΠΩΛ. Τί δὲ τοῦτο, έαν σοί γε ίκανώς; ΧΑΙ. Οὐδέν · άλλ' ἐπειδή Β ού βούλει, αποχρίνου. ΠΩΛ. Έρώτα. ΧΑΙ. Έρωτῶ δή. εἰ ἐτύγχανε Γοργίας ἐπιστήμων ῶν της τέχνης ήσπεο ό άδελφος αύτου 'Ηρόδικος, τίνα αν αύιον ώνομάζομεν δικαίως; ούχ δπερ έκεινον; ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΧΑΙ. Ίατρον

ἀρα φάσχοντες αὐτὸν εἶναι χαλῶς ἂν ἐλέγομεν.
ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΧΑΙ. Εἰ δέ γε ἦσπες ᾿Αριστοφῶν ὁ ᾿Αγλαοφῶντος ἢ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ἔμπειρος ἦν τέχνης, τίνα ἂν αὐτὸν ὀρθῶς ἐχαλοῦμεν ;
ΠΩΛ. Δῆλον, ὅτι ζωγράφον. ΧΑΙ. Νῦν δ' ἐπειδὴ τίνος τέχνης ἐπιστήμων ἐστί, τίνα ἂν χα-C λοῦντες αὐτὸν ὀρθῶς χαλοῦμεν ;
ΠΩΛ. ὅΩ
χαιρεφῶν, πολλαὶ τέχναι ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἰσὶν ἐχ τῶν ἐμπειριῶν ἐμπείρως εὐρημέναι· ἐμπειρία

- μέν γάς ποιεῖ τὸν αἰῶνα ἡμῶν ποςεύεσθαι κατὰ τέχνην, ἀπειςία δὲ κατὰ τύχην. ἐκάστων δὲ τούτων μεταλαμβάνουσιν ἀλλοι ἀλλων ἀλλως, τῶν δὲ ἀςίστων οἱ ἄςιστοι· ῶν καὶ Γοςγίας ἐστὶν ὅδε, καὶ μετέχει τῆς καλλίστης τῶν τεγνῶν.
- D CAP. III. $\Sigma \Omega$. Kalõs $\gamma \varepsilon$, $\tilde{\omega}$ $\Gamma o \rho \gamma i a$, $\phi a i$ νεται Πώλος παρεσχευάσθαι είς λόγους · άλλά γάρ ΰ ύπέσγετο Χαιρεφώντι οὐ ποιεί. ΓΟΡ. Τί μάλιστα, ὦ Σώπρατες; ΣΩ. Τὸ ἐρωτώμενον ού πάνυ μοι φαίνεται αποχρίνεσθαι. ΓΟΡ. ² Αλλά σύ, εἰ βούλει, ἐροῦ αὐτόν. ΣΩ. Οὔκ, εί αὐτῷ γε σοὶ βουλομένῷ ἐστίν ἀποκρίνεσθαι, άλλά πολύ άν ήδιον σέ. δήλος γάο μοι Πώλος και έξ ών είσηκεν, ότι την καλουμένην δητορικήν Ε μάλλον μεμελέτηχεν ή διαλέγεσθαι. ΠΩΛ. Τί δή, ὦ Σώχρατες ; ΣΩ. "Οτι, ὦ Πῶλε, ἐρομένου Χαιρεφώντος τίνος Γοργίας επιστήμων τέγνης, έγχωμιάζεις μέν αύτοῦ την τέχνην, ωσπερ τινός ψέγοντος, ήτις δέ έστιν, ουχ απεκρίνω. ΠΩΛ. Ού γάρ απεκρινάμην, ότι είη ή καλλίστη; ΣΩ. Καὶ μάλα γε. ἀλλ' οὐδεὶς ἐρωτῷ

PLATONIS

ποία τις είη ή Γοργίου τέχνη, άλλα τίς, και όντινα δέοι καλείν τον Γοργίαν. ωσπερ τα έμπροσθέν σοι ύπετείνατο Χαιρεφών και αυτώ449 καλώς και δια βραχέων απεκρίνω, και νῦν ουτως είπε τίς ή τέχνη και τίνα Γοργίαν καλειν χρή ήμας. μαλλον δέ, ω Γοργία, αύτος ήμιν είπε τίνα σε χρή καλειν ώς τίνος επιστήμονα τέχνης. ΓΟΡ. Τῆς δητορικῆς, ὦ Σώκρατες. ΣΩ. 'Ρήτορα άρα γρή σε καλείν; ΓΟΡ. Αγαθόν γε, ὦ Σώχρατες, εί δή ὄ γε εὔχομαι είναι, ώς ἔφη "Ομηρος, βούλει με καλείν. ΣΩ. ² Αλλά βούλομαι. ΓΟΡ. Κάλει δή. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν χαὶ ἀλλους σε φῶμεν δυνατόν είναι Β ποιείν ; ΓΟΡ. Ἐπαγγέλλομαί γε δή ταῦτα οὐ μόνον ένθάδε, άλλα και άλλοθι. ΣΩ. Αρ' οῦν έθελήσαις αν, ῶ Γοργία, ὥσπερ νῦν διαλεγόμεθα, διατελέσαι το μέν έρωτῶν, το δ' ἀποκρινόμενος, το δε μηχος των λόγων τούτο, οίον και Πώλος ήρξατο, έσαῦθις ἀποθέσθαι; ἀλλ' ὅπερ ὑπισγνεῖ, μή ψεύση, άλλα έθέλησον κατά βραγύ το έρωτώμενον αποχρίνεσθαι. ΓΟΡ. Είσι μέν, δ Σώχρατες, ένιαι των αποχρίσεων αναγχαΐαι δια C μαχρών τους λόγους ποιείσθαι · ού μήν άλλά πειράσομαί γε ώς δια βραχυτάτων. και γαρ αθ χαί τοῦτο ἕν ἐστιν ὦν φημι, μηδένα αν ἐν βραχυτέροις έμοῦ τὰ αὐτὰ εἰπεῖν. ΣΩ. Τούτου μήν δεΐ, ω Γοργία · καί μοι επίδειξιν αύτοῦ τούτου ποίησαι, της βραχυλογίας, μαχοολογίας δε έσανθις. ΓΟΡ. 'Αλλά ποιήσω, και ούδενός φήσεις βραχυλογωτέρου ἀχοῦσαι.

CAP. IV. $\Sigma \Omega$. Φ éque $\delta \eta \cdot - \delta \eta \tau o \rho \iota \pi \eta s \gamma d \rho$ D φής επιστήμων τέχνης είναι και ποιησαι άν καί άλλον δήτορα. --- ή δητορική περί τί των όντων τυγγάνει ούσα; ωσπερ ή ύφαντική περί τήν τών ίματίων έργασίαν η γάρ; ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Ουχούν και ή μουσική περί την των μελών ποίησιν; ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Νή τήν "Ηραν, ὦ Γοργία, ἄγαμαί γε τὰς ἀποκρίσεις, δτι αποκρίνει ώς οδόν τε δια βραχυτάτων. ΓΟΡ. Πάνυ γαο οίμαι, ω Σωχρατες, επιειχώς τούτο ποιείν. ΣΩ. Εθ λέγεις. ίθι δή μοι από-Ε χριναι ούτω χαὶ περὶ τῆς ἑητοριχῆς, περὶ τί τῶν όντων έστιν έπιστήμη; ΓΟΡ. Περί λόγους. ΣΩ. Ποίους τούτους, ὦ Γοργία ; ἆρα οι δηλοῦσι τούς χάμνοντας, ώς αν διαιτώμενοι ύγιαίνοιεν; ΓΟΡ. Ού. ΣΩ. Ούχ άρα περί πάντας γε τούς λόγους ή δητορική έστιν. ΓΟΡ. Ού δητα. ΣΩ. 'Λλλά μην λέγειν γε ποιεί δυνατούς. ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν περὶ ὧνπερ λέγειν, кай форчети; ГОР. Поб удо ой; $\Sigma \Omega$. A_0 450 οῦν χαὶ ήν νῦν δή ἐλέγομεν, ή ἰατρική περὶ τῶν χαμνόντων ποιεί δυνατούς είναι φρονείν χαί λέγειν; ΓΟΡ. Ανάγκη. ΣΩ. Και ή ιατρική άρα, ώς ἔοικε, περί λόγους ἐστί. ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Τούς γε περί τα νοσήματα; ΓΟΡ. Μάλιστα. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν χαὶ ἡ γυμναστιχή περί λόγους έστι τους περί ενεξίαν τε των σωμάτων καί καγεξίαν; ΓΟΡ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Καί Β μήν καί αι άλλαι τέγναι, δ Γοργία, ούτως έγουσιν έχάστη αύτῶν περί λόγους έστι τούτους, οί

PLATONIS

τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα οὖ ἑκάστη ἐστὶν ἡ τέχνη. ΓΟΡ. Φαίνεται. ΣΩ. Τί οὖν δή ποτε τὰς ἀλλας τέχνας οὐ ἡητορικὰς καλεῖς, οὖσας περὶ λόγους, εἴπερ ταύτην ἡητορικὴν καλεῖς, ἡ ἀν ἦ περὶ λόγους; ΓΟΡ. ὍΤι, ὅ Σώκρατες, τῶν μὲν ἀλλων τεχνῶν περὶ χειρουργίας τε καὶ τοιαύτας πράξεις, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, πᾶσά ἐστιν ἡ ἐπιστήμη, τῆς δὲ ἡητορικῆς οὐδέν ἐστι τοιοῦτον χειρούργημα, ἀλλὰ πᾶσα ἡ πρᾶξις καὶ ἡ κύρωσις διὰ λόγων ἐστί. διὰ ταῦτ' ἐγὼ τὴν C ἡητορικὴν τέχνην ἀξιῶ εἶναι περὶ λόγους, ὀρθῶς λέγων, ὡς ἐγώ φημι.

CAP. V. $\Sigma \Omega$. $A \rho' \circ \delta \nu \mu \alpha \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \circ \delta \alpha \nu \alpha \dot{\nu}$ τήν βούλει καλείν; τάχα δὲ εἴσομαι σαφέστερον. άλλ' ἀπόχοιναι. εἰσιν ήμιν τέχναι. ή γάο; ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Πασών δέ, οἶμαι, τών τεγνών τών μέν έργασία το πολύ έστι και λόγου βραγέος δέονται, ένιαι δε ούδενός, άλλα το της τέγνης περαίνοιτο αν και δια σιγής, οίον γραφι- D χή χαι ανδριαντοποιία χαι άλλαι πολλαί. ταs τοιαύτας μοι δοχείς λέγειν, περί ως ού φης την ξητοριχήν είναι. ∀η ου ; ΓΟΡ. Πάνυ μεν ουν
 χαλώς ύπολαμβάνεις, & Σώχρατες. ΣΩ. "Ετεραι δέ γέ είσι τῶν τεχνῶν, αί δια λόγου πῶν περαίνουσι, και έργου, ώς έπος είπεῖν, ή οὐδενος προσδέονται ή βραχέος πάνυ, οἶον ή ἀριθμητική καί λογιστική καί γεωμετρική καί πεττευτική γε και άλλαι πολλαί τέχναι, ών ἕνιαι σχεδόν τι ίσους τούς λόγους έχουσι ταις πράξεσιν, αί δέ πολλαί πλείους και το παράπαν πασα ή πραξις Ε

καί τὸ κῦρος αὐταῖς διὰ λόγων ἐστί. τῶν τοιούτων τινά μοι δοκεῖς λέγειν τὴν ἡητορικήν. ΓΟΡ. ᾿Αληθῆ λέγεις. ΣΩ. ᾿Αλλ' οὐτοι τούτων γε οὐδεμίαν οἶμαί σε βούλεσθαι ἡητορικὴν καλεῖν, οὐχ ὅτι τῷ ἡήματι οὕτως εἶπες, ὅτι ἡ διὰ λόγου τὸ κῦρος ἔχουσα ἡητορική ἐστι, καὶ ὑπολάβοι ἀν τις, εἰ βούλοιτο δυσχεραίνειν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, Τὴν ἀριθμητικὴν ἀρα ἡητορικήν, ὦ Γοργία, λέγεις ; ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶμαί σε οὔτε τὴν ⁴⁵¹ ἀριθμητικὴν οὔτε τὴν γεωμετρίαν ἡητορικὴν λέγειν. ΓΟΡ. ᾿Ορθῶς γὰρ οἴει, ὦ Σώκρατες, καὶ δικαίως ὑπολαμβάνεις.

CAP. VI. ΣΩ. "Ιθι οὖν καὶ σừ τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ήν ήρόμην διαπέρανον. έπει γαρ ή όητορική τυγγάνει μέν οὖσα τούτων τις τῶν τεχνῶν τῶν τό πολύ λόγω χοωμένων, τυγχάνουσι δε χαι άλλαι τοιαυται ούσαι, πειρώ είπεῖν, ή περί τί έν λόγοις το χύρος έχουσα όητορική έστιν. ωσπερ αν εί τίς με έροιτο ών νῦν δή έλεγον περί ήστινοσοῦν τῶν τεχνῶν, 3Ω Σώχρατες, τίς ἐστιν ή Β ἀριθμητική τέχνη ; εἴποιμ' ἂν αὐτῷ, ὥσπερ σῦ άρτι, ότι των διά λόγου τις το χύρος έγουσων. καί εί με έπανέροιτο. Των περί τί; είποιμ' αν, ότι τῶν περί τὸ ἀρτιόντε καὶ περιττὸν [γνῶσιs], όσα αν έκάτερα τυγγάνοι όντα. εί δ' αθ ξροιτο. Τήν δε λογιστικήν τίνα καλεῖς τέχνην; εἴποιμ' αν, ότι και αυτη έστι των λόγω το παν κυρουμένων. καί εί έπανέροιτο, 'Η περί τί ; εἴποιμ' ἂν ώσπες οἱ ἐν τῷ δήμω συγγραφόμενοι, ὅτι τὰ μὲν C άλλα καθάπερ ή άριθμητική ή λογιστική έχει

PLATONIS

περί το αύτο γάρ έστι, τό τε άρτιον και το περιττόν · διαφέρει δε τοσούτον, ότι και πρός αύτα χαι πρός άλληλα πως έχει πλήθους έπισχοπεί το περιττόν καί το άρτιον ή λογιστική. καί ει τις τήν άστοονομίαν άνέροιτο, έμου λέγοντος, ότι χαὶ αῦτη λόγῷ χυροῦται τὰ πάντα, Οἱ δὲ λόγοι οί της αστρονομίας, εί φαίη, περί τι είσιν, ώ Σώχρατες; είποιμ' αν, ότι περί την των άστρων φοράν και ήλίου και σελήνης, πως πρός άλληλα D τάχους έχει. ΓΟΡ. Ορθῶς γε λέγων σύ, δ Σώπρατες. ΣΩ. "Ιθι δή καὶ σύ, ὦ Γοργία. τυγχάνει μέν γαο δη ή δητορική ούσα των λόγω τα πάντα διαπραττομένων τε και κυρουμένων τις. ή γάρ; ΓΟΡ. "Εστι ταῦτα. ΣΩ. Λέγε δή τῶν περί τί; * τί * ἐστι τοῦτο τῶν ὄντων, περί ου ουτοι οί λόγοι είσίν, οίς ή όητορική χρηται; ΓΟΡ. Τα μέγιστα των ανθρωπείων πραγμάτων, Β Σώχρατες, και άριστα.

CAP. VII. $\Sigma\Omega$. 'Αλλ', δ Γοςγία, ἀμφισ6ητήσιμον καὶ τοῦτο λέγεις καὶ οὐδέν πω σαφές. Ε οἴομαι γάο σε ἀκηκοίναι ἐν τοῖς συμποσίοις ἀδόντων ἀνθρώπων τοῦτο τὸ σκολιόν, ἐν ῷ καταριθμοῦνται ἀδοντες, ὅτι ὑγιαίνειν μὲν ἄριστόν ἐστι, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον καλὸν γενέσθαι, τρίτον δέ, ὅς φησιν ὁ ποιητὴς τοῦ σκολιοῦ, τὸ πλουτεῖν ἀδόλως. ΓΟΡ. 'Ακήκοα γάρ · ἀλλὰ προς τί τοῦτο λέγεις; $\Sigma\Omega$. Ότι σοι αὐτίκα ἂν παρα-452 σταῖεν οἱ δημιουργοὶ τούτων ῶν ἐπήνεσεν ὁ τὸ σκολιὸν ποιήσας, ἰατρός τε καὶ παιδοτρίδης καὶ χρηματιστής, καὶ εἴποι πρῶτον μὲν ὁ ἰατρός, ὅτι,

3Ω Σώκρατες, έξαπατῷ σε Γοργίας · οὐ γάρ έστιν ή τούτου τέχνη περί το μέγιστον άγαθον τοις ανθρώποις, αλλ' ή έμή. εί ουν αυτόν έγω έροίμην. Σύ δέ τίς ών ταῦτα λέγεις; εἴποι ἀν ίσως, ὅτι Ἰατρός. Τι οῦν λέγεις; η τὸ τῆς σῆς τέχνης ἔργον μέγιστόν ἐστιν ἀγαθόν; Πῶς γὰρ Β ού, φαίη αν ισως, ω Σωχρατες, ύγίεια; τί δ' έστι μείζον άγαθον άνθρώποις ύγιείας; Εί δ' αῦ μετά τοῦτον ὁ παιδοτρίβης εἴποι, ὅτι Θαυμάζοιμί γ' άν, ὦ Σώχρατες, και αὐτός, εἴ σοι έγει Γοργίας μείζον άγαθον επιδείξαι της αύτοῦ τέχνης ή έγω της έμης. εἴποιμ' άν αθ καί πρός τοῦτον. Σύ δὲ δή τίς εἶ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε; καὶ τί το σον ἔργον; Παιδοτρίβης, φαίη ἄν, το δ' ἔργον μού ἐστι χαλούς τε χαὶ ἰσχυρούς ποιεῖν τούς άνθρώπους τα σώματα. Μετά δε τον παιδοτρίβην είποι αν ό χρηματιστής, ώς εγώμαι, C πάνυ καταφοονών άπάντων, Σκόπει δητα, δ Σώχρατες, ἐάν σοι πλούτου φανή τι μείζον άγαθον όν ή παρά Γοργία ή παρ' άλλω ότωουν. φαίμεν αν ούν πρός αυτόν · Τί δε δή; ή συ τούτου δημιουργός; Φαίη αν. Τίς ών; Χρηματιστής. Τι οῦν; κρίνεις σừ μέγιστον ἀνθρώποις άγαθον είναι πλούτον; φήσομεν. Πως γάο ούκ; έρει. Και μήν αμφισθητεί γε Γοργίας όδε την πας' αύτῷ τέχνην μείζονος ἀγαθοῦ αιτίαν είναι ή την σήν, φαίμεν αν ήμεις. δηλον D οῦν, ὅτι τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο ἔροιτ' ἀν· Καὶ τί ἐστι τοῦτο τὸ ἀγαθόν ; ἀποχρινάσθω Γοργίας. "Ιθι ούν νομίσας, ῶ Γοργία, ἐρωτασθαι καὶ ὑπ' ἐκεί-

PLATONIS

νων καί ύπ' έμου, απόκοιναι τι έστι τουτο, ΰ φής σύ μέγιστον άγαθον είναι τοις άνθρώποις καί σε δημιουργόν είναι αύτοῦ. ΓΟΡ. Οπερ έστίν, δ Σώχρατες, τη άληθεία μέγιστον άγαθον καί αίτιον άμα μέν έλευθερίας αύτοις τοις άνθρώποις, αμα δε τοῦ άλλων ἀρχειν ἐν τῷ αύτοῦ πόλει έχάστω. ΣΩ. Τί οῦν δή τοῦτο λέγεις; Ε ΓΟΡ. Το πείθειν έγωγ' οἶόν τ' είναι τοις λόγοις καί έν δικαστηρίω δικαστάς και έν βουλευτηρίω βουλευτάς και έν έκκλησία έκκλησιαστάς καί έν άλλω ξυλλόγω παντί, δοτις αν πολιτικός ξύλλογος γίγνηται. χαίτοι έν ταύτη τη δυνάμει δούλον μέν έξεις τον ιατρόν, δούλον δέ τον παιδοτρίβην · ό δε χρηματιστής ούτος άλλω άναφανήσεται χρηματιζόμενος και ούχ αύτῶ, άλλά σοι τῶ δυναμένω λέγειν και πείθειν τα πλήθη.

CAP. VIII. ΣΩ. Νῦν μοι δοχεῖς δηλῶσαι, ῶ Γοργία, ἐγγύτατα τὴν ἑητοριχὴν ἥντινα τέ-453 χνην ἡγεῖ εἶναι, καί, εἴ τι ἐγῶ συνίημι, λέγεις, ὅτι πειθοῦς δημιουργός ἐστιν ἡ ἑητοριχή, καὶ ἡ πραγματεία αὐτῆς ἅπασα καὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον εἰς τοῦτο τελευτῷ. ἢ ἔχεις τι λέγειν ἐπὶ πλέον τὴν ἑητοριχὴν δύνασθαι ἢ πειθῶ τοῖς ἀχούουσιν ἐν τῆ ψυχῷ ποιεῖν; ΓΟΡ. Οὐδαμῶς, ῶ Σώκρατες, ἀλλά μοι δοχεῖς ἱχανῶς ὁρίζεσθαι · ἔστι γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτῆς. ΣΩ. ^{*}Αχουσον δή, ῶ Γοργία. ἐγῶ γὰρ εὖ ἴσθ' ὅτι, ὡς ἐμαυτὸν Β πείθω, εἴπερ τις ἀλλος ἀλλῷ διαλέγεται βουλόμενος εἰδέναι αὐτὸ τοῦτο, περὶ ὅτου ὁ λόγος ἐστί, καὶ ἐμὲ εἶναι τούτων ἕνα · ἀξιῶ δὲ καὶ σέ.
ΓΟΡ. Τι οῦν δή, ὦ Σώχρατες; ΣΩ. Ἐγώ έρῶ νῦν. ἐγώ την ἀπὸ τῆς ἑητορικῆς πειθώ, ήτις ποτ' έστιν ην σύ λέγεις και περί ώντινων πραγμάτων έστι πειθώ, σαφῶς μέν εῦ ἴσθ' ὅτι οὐκ οίδα, ού μην άλλ' ύποπτεύω γε ην οίμαί σε λέγειν καί περί ών ούδεν μέντοι ήττον έρήσο-C μαί σε τίνα ποτε λέγεις την πειθώ την από της δητορικής και περί τίνων αυτήν είναι. του ουν ένεχα δη αύτος ύποπτεύων σε ερήσομαι, άλλ' ούκ αύτὸς λέγω; οὐ σοῦ ἕνεκα, ἀλλὰ τοῦ λόγου, ίνα ούτω προίη, ώς μάλιστ' αν ήμιν καταφανές ποιοί περί ότου λέγεται. σχύπει γάρ, εί σοι δοχώ διχαίως ανερωτάν σε. ωσπερ αν εί ετύγχανόν σε έρωτών τίς έστι τών ζωγράφων Ζεύξις, εί μοι είπες, ὅτι ὁ τὰ ζῶα γράφων, ἀρ' οὐκ ἀν δικαίως D σε ήρόμην ό τα ποΐα τῶν ζώων γράφων καὶ ποῦ; ΓΟΡ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. 3Αρα δια τοῦτο, ὅτι και άλλοι είσι ζωγράφοι γράφοντες άλλα πολλά ζῶα; ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Εἰ δέ γε μηδεὶς ἀλλος ή Ζεύξις έγραφε, καλώς άν σοι άπεκέκριτο; ΓΟΡ. Πῶς γάρ οὕ; ΣΩ. "Ιθι δή καὶ περὶ της δητορικής είπέ, πότερόν σοι δοκεί πειθώ ποιειν ή δητορική μόνη, ή και άλλαι τέγναι; λέγω δε το τοιόνδε · όστις διδάσκει ότιουν πραγμα, πότερον ΰ διδάσχει πείθει, ή ού ; ΓΟΡ. Ου δήτα, ѽ Σώχρατες, άλλα πάντων μάλιστα πείθει. Ε ΣΩ. Πάλιν δ' εί έπι των αυτων τεγνων λέγομεν ώνπεο νῦν δή, ή ἀριθμητική οὐ διδάσκει ήμας δσα έστι τα τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ και ὁ ἀριθμητικὸς ἀνθρωπος; ΓΟΡ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν χαὶ

πείθει; ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Πειθοῦς ἄρα δημιουργός ἐστι καὶ ἡ ἀριθμητική. ΓΟΡ. Φαίνεται. ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν ἐάν τις ἐρωτῷ ἡμῶς ποίας πειθοῦς καὶ περὶ τί, ἀποκρινούμεθά που αὐτῷ, ὅτι τῆς διδασκαλικῆς τῆς περὶ τὸ ἀρτιόν τε καὶ 454 τὸ περιττὸν ὅσον ἐστί. καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ὡς νῦν δὴ ἐλέγομεν τέχνας ἁπάσας ἕξομεν ἀποδεῖξαι πειθοῦς δημιουργοὺς οὕσας καὶ ῆστινος καὶ περὶ ὅ τι. ἡ οὕ; ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Οὐκ ἄρα ὅητορικὴ μόνη πειθοῦς ἐστι δημιουργός. ΓΟΡ. ᾿Αληθῆ λέγεις.

CAP. IX. ΣΩ. Ἐπειδή τοίνυν οὐ μόνη ἀπεργάζεται τούτο το έργον, αλλα και άλλαι, διχαίως, ώσπερ περί τοῦ ζωγράφου, μετά τοῦτο έπανεροίμεθ' αν τον λέγοντα, ποίας δή πειθούς και της περί τι πειθούς ή βητορική έστι Β τέχνη; ή ού δοκεί σοι δίκαιον είναι έπανερέσθαι; ΓΟΡ. "Εμοιγε. ΣΩ. 'Απόχριναι δή, ῶ Γοργία, ἐπειδή γε καὶ σοὶ δοκεῖ ούτω. ΓΟΡ. Ταύτης τοίνυν της πειθούς λέγω, & Σώχρατες, της έν δικαστηρίοις και έν τοις άλλοις όγλοις, ώσπερ και άρτι έλεγον, και περί τούτων, ά έστι δίκαιά τε καί άδικα. ΣΩ. Καὶ ἐγώ τοι ὑπώπιευον ταύτην σε λέγειν την πειθώ και περί τούτων, ω Γοργία · άλλ' ίνα μή θαυμάζης, έαν C όλίγον υστερον τοιουτόν τί σε ανέρωμαι, ΰ δοκεί μέν δηλον είναι, έγω δ' έπανερωτω. ύπερ γάρ λέγω, τοῦ έξῆς ἕνεχα περαίνεσθαι τὸν λόγον έρωτῶ, οὐ σοῦ ἕνεκα, ἀλλ' ἕνα μη ἐθιζώμεθα ύπονοούντες προαρπάζειν άλλήλων τα λεγόμενα,

άλλα σύ τα σαυτού κατα την ύπόθεσιν όπως αν βούλη περαίνης. ΓΟΡ. Και ορθώς γέ μοι δοχεῖς ποιεῖν, ὦ Σώχρατες. ΣΩ. "Ιθι δή χαὶ τόδε έπισχεψώμεθα. χαλεῖς τι μεμαθηχέναι; D ΓΟΡ: Καλώ. ΣΩ. Τί δέ ; πεπιστευκέναι ; ΓΟΡ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. Πότερον οῦν ταὐτόν δοχεῖ σοι εἶναι μεμαθηχέναι χαὶ πεπιστευχέναι, χαὶ μάθησις και πίστις, ή άλλο τι; ΓΟΡ. Οιομαι μέν έγωγε, ὦ Σώκρατες, άλλο. ΣΩ. Καλῶς γάο οίει γνώσει δε ενθένδε. ει γάο τίς σε έροιτο 'Αρ' έστι τις, ῶ Γοργία, πίστις ψευδής καὶ ἀληθής; φαίης ἄν, ὡς ἐγώ οἶμαι. ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Τί δέ ; ἐπιστήμη ἐστὶ ψευδής καὶ άληθής ; ΓΟΡ. Ούδαμῶς. ΣΩ. Δήλον γάο Ε αὖ, ὅτι οὐ ταὐτόν ἐστιν. ΓΟΡ. ᾿Αληθη λέγεις. ΣΩ. 'Αλλά μήν οί τέ γε μεμαθηκότες πεπεισμένοι είσι χαι οι πεπιστευχότες. ΓΟΡ. "Εστι ταῦτα. ΣΩ. Βούλει οῦν δύο εἴδη θῶμεν πειθοῦς, τὸ μέν πίστιν παρεγόμενον άνευ τοῦ είδέναι, το δ' έπιστήμην; ΓΟΡ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Ποτέραν οῦν ἡ ἡητορικὴ πειθώ ποιεῖ ἐν δικαστηρίοις τε καί τοις άλλοις όγλοις περί των δικαίων τε καί αδίκων; έξ ής το πιστεύειν γίγνεται άνευ τοῦ εἰδέναι, η έξ ης το εἰδέναι; ΓΟΡ. ~ Δήλον δήπου, ώ Σώχρατες, ότι έξ ής το πιστεύ-455 ειν. ΣΩ. Η φητορική άρα, ώς ἔοικε, πειθοῦς δημιουργός έστι πιστευτικής, άλλ' ού διδασκαλιχῆς περί το δίχαιόν τε χαὶ ἀδιχον. ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Ούδ' άρα διδασχαλιχός ό φήτωρ έστι διχαστηρίων τε και των άλλων όχλων δικαίων τε

πέοι καὶ ἀδίκων, ἀλλὰ πιστικὸς μόνον. οὐ γὰο δήπου ὅχλον γ' ἂν δύναιτο τοσοῦτον ἐν ὀλίγῷ χοόνῷ διδάξαι οὕτω μεγάλα ποἀγματα. ΓΟΡ. Οὐ δῆτα.

CAP. X. ΣΩ. Φέρε δή, ίδωμεν τί ποτε καί B λέγομεν περί της όητορικης. έγω μέν γάρ τοι ούδ' αύτός πω δύναμαι χατανοήσαι ό τι λέγω. όταν περί ιατρών αίρέσεως ή τη πόλει σύλλογος, ή περί ναυπηγών, ή περί άλλου τινός δημιουργιχοῦ ἔθνους, ἀλλο τι ή τότε ὁ ἑητοριχὸς οὐ συμβουλεύσει; δηλον γάρ, ότι έν έχάστη αίρέσει τον τεγνικώτατον δει αίρεισθαι. ούδ' όταν τειγών περί οίκοδομήσεως, ή λιμένων κατασκευής, ή νεωρίων, άλλ' οί άρχιτέχτονες · ούδ' αθ όταν στρατηγῶν αίρέσεως πέρι, ή τάξεώς τινος προς πολεμίους, η χωρίων καταλήψεως συμβουλη η, C άλλ' οί στρατηγιχοί τότε συμβουλεύσουσιν, οί όητοριχοί δε ού. ή πως λέγεις, δ Γοργία, τα τοιαυτα; έπειδή γάρ αυτός τε φής ψήτωρ είναι και άλλους ποιείν δητορικούς, εδ έχει τα της σῆς τέχνης παρά σοῦ πυνθάνεσθαι. καὶ ἐμὲ νῦν νόμισον καὶ τὸ σὸν σπεύδειν. ἴσως γὰρ χαί τυγγάνει τις των ένδον όντων μαθητής σου βουλόμενος γενέσθαι, ώς έγώ τινας σχεδόν χαί συχνούς αίσθάνομαι, οί ίσως αίσχύνοιντ' άν σε άνερέσθαι. ύπ' έμου ούν άνερωτώμενος νόμισον D και ύπ' έκείνων άνερωτασθαι, Τι ήμιν, ω Γοργία, ἕσται, ἐάν σοι συνῶμεν; περὶ τίνων τῆ πόλει συμβουλεύειν οἶοί τε ἐσόμεθα; πότερον περί δικαίου μόνον και αδίκου, ή και περί ων νυν δή

Σωχράτης έλεγε; πειρώ οὖν αὐτοῖς ἀποχρίνεσθαι. ΓΟΡ. 'Αλλ' έγώ σοι πειράσομαι, Ε Σώχρατες, σαφῶς ἀποχαλύψαι τὴν τῆς ἑητοριχῆς δύναμιν άπασαν αὐτὸς γὰρ καλῶς ὑφηγήσω. Ε οἶσθα γὰρ δήπου, ὅτι τὰ νεώρια ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τείχη τα 'Αθηναίων και ή των λιμένων κατασκευή έκ της Θεμιστοκλέους συμβουλής γέγονε, τα δ' έκ της Περικλέους, αλλ' ούκ έκ τῶν δημιουργών. ΣΩ. Λέγεται ταῦτα, ῶ Γοργία, πεοι Θεμιστοχλέους · Περίχλέους δε και αύτος ήχουον, ότε συνεβούλευεν ήμιν περί του δια μέ-456 σου τείχους. ΓΟΡ. Και όταν γέ τις αίρεσις ή ών δή συ έλεγες, ώ Σώχρατες, όρας, ότι οί δήτορές είσιν οί συμβουλεύοντες και οί νικῶντες τάς γνώμας περί τούτων. ΣΩ. Ταῦτα καί θαυμάζων, ῶ Γοργία, πάλαι ἐρωτῶ τίς ποτε ή δύναμίς έστι της δητορικής. δαιμονία γάρ τις έμοιγε καταφαίνεται το μέγεθος ούτω σκοπούντι. CAP. XI. ΓΟΡ. Εί πάντα γε είδείης, ω Σώχρατες, ύτι, ώς έπος είπεῖν, άπάσας τὰς δυ-Β νάμεις συλλαβούσα ύρ' αύτη έχει· μέγα δέ σοι τεχμήριον έρω · πολλάχις γάρ ήδη έγωγε μετὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἰατρῶν είσελθών παρά τινα των χαμνόντων ούχι έθέλοντα ή φάρμαχον πιείν ή τεμείν ή χαύσαι παρασχείν τῷ ἰατοῷ, οὐ δυναμένου τοῦ ἰατοοῦ πείσαι, έγω έπεισα, ούχ άλλη τέχνη ή τη όητορική. φημί δε και είς πόλιν όποι βούλει έλθόντα όητοριχόν άνδρα χαὶ ἰατρόν, εἰ δέοι λόγφ διαγωνίζεσθαι έν έχχλησία ή έν άλλφ

τινί συλλόγω, δπότερον δεῖ αίρεθηναι, δήτορα C ή ζατρόν, ούδαμου άν φανήναι τον ζατρόν, άλλ' αίρεθηναι αν τον είπειν δυνατόν, εί βούλοιτο. καί εἰ πρός άλλον γε δημιουργόν όντιναοῦν άγωνίζοιτο, πείσειεν αν αύτον έλέσθαι ό όητοριχός μαλλον ή άλλος όστισουν · ου γαρ έστι περί ότου ούχ αν πιθανώτερον είποι ό όητοριχός η άλλος όστισοῦν τῶν δημιουργῶν ἐν πλήθει. Η μέν ούν δύναμις τοσαύτη έστι και τοιαύτη της τέγνης. δει μέντοι, ω Σώχρατες, τη όητορικη χρησθαι ωσπερ και τη άλλη πάση άγωνία. και D γάρ τη άλλη άγωνία ού τούτου ένεκα δεί πρός άπαντας γρησθαι άνθρώπους, ότι έμαθε πυχτεύειν τε καί παγκρατιάζειν καί έν ὅπλοις μάχεσθαι, ώστε χρείττων είναι χαὶ φίλων χαὶ ἐχθρῶν· ού τούτου ένεχα τους φίλους δει τύπτειν ούδε χεντείν τε και αποκτιννύναι. ούδέ γε μα Δία έάν τις είς παλαίστραν φοιτήσας, εθ έγων το σῶμα καὶ πυκτικὸς γενόμενος, ἔπειτα τὸν πατέρα τύπτη και την μητέρα ή άλλον τινά των οικείων η τών φίλων, ού τούτου ένεχα δει τούς παιδο- Ε τρίβας και τους έν τοις όπλοις διδάσκοντας μάγεσθαι μισείν τε καί έκβάλλειν έκ των πόλεων. έχεινοι μέν γάο παρέδοσαν έπι τω διχαίως γοησθαι τούτοις πρός τούς πολεμίους και τούς άδιχούντας, αμυνομένους, μή ύπαρχοντας · οί δέ 457 μεταστρέψαντες γρώνται τη ζογύι και τη τέγνη ούχ όρθῶς. ούχουν οί διδάξαντες πονηροί, ούδέ ή τέχνη ούτε αιτία ούτε πονηρά τούτου ένεκά έστιν, άλλ' οί μη χρώμενοι, οίμαι, όρθως. ό

αὐτὸς δὴ λόγος καὶ περὶ τῆς ἡητορικῆς. δυνατὸς μὲν γὰρ πρὸς ἅπαντάς ἐστιν ὁ ἡήτωρ καὶ περὶ παντὸς λέγειν, ὥστε πιθανώτερος εἶναι ἐν τοῖς πλήθεσιν ἐμβραχῦ περὶ ὅτου ἂν βούληται· Β ἀλλ' οὐδέν τι μᾶλλον τούτου ἕνεκα δεῖ οὔτε τοὺς ἰατροὺς τὴν δόξαν ἀφαιρεῖσθαι, ὅτι δύναιτο αν τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, οὔτε τοὺς ἄλλους δημιουργούς, ἀλλὰ δικαίως καὶ τῆ ὑητορικῆ χρῆσθαι, ὥσπερ καὶ τῆ ἀγωνία. ἐὰν δέ, οἶμαι, ὑητορικὸς γενόμενός τις κặτα ταύτῃ τῆ δυνάμει καὶ τῆ τέχνῃ ἀδικῆ, οὐ τὸν διδάξαντα δεῖ μισεῖν τε καὶ ἐκβάλλειν ἐκ τῶν πόλεων. ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ δικαία C χρεία παρέδωκεν, ὁ δ' ἐναντίως χρῆται. τὸν οὖν οὐκ ὀρθῶς χρώμενον μισεῖν δίκαιον καὶ ἐκβάλλειν καὶ ἀποκτιννύναι, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸν διδάξαντα.

CAP. XII. ΣΩ. Οίμαι, ῶ Γοργία, καὶ σὲ ἔμπειρον είναι πολλῶν λόγων καὶ καθεωρακέναι ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ τοιόνδε, ὅτι οὐ ἑφδίως δύνανται περὶ ῶν ἂν ἐπιχειρήσωσι διαλέγεσθαι διορισάμενοι προς ἀλλήλους καὶ μαθόντες καὶ διδάξαντες D ἑαυτοὺς οὕτω διαλύεσθαι τὰς συνουσίας, ἀλλ' ἐὰν περί του ἀμφισ6ητήσωσι καὶ μὴ φῆ ὁ ἕτερος τὸν ἕιερον ὀρθῶς λέγειν ῆ μὴ σαφῶς, χαλεπαίνουσί τε καὶ κατὰ φθόνον οἴονται τὸν ἑαυτῶν λέγειν, φιλονεικοῦντας, ἀλλ' οὐ ζητοῦντας τὸ προκείμενον ἐν τῷ λόγῳ. καὶ ἔνιοί γε τελευτῶντες αἴσχιστα ἀπαλλάττονται, λοιδορηθέντες τε καὶ εἰπόντες καὶ ἀκούσαντες περὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν τοιαῦτα, οἶα καὶ τοὺς παρόντας ἀχθεσθαι ὑπὲρ σφῶν αὐτῶν, ὅτι τοιούτων ἀνθρώπων ἠξίωσαν

<

άχροαταί γενέσθαι. Τοῦ δη ἕνεχα λέγω ταῦτα ; Ε ότι νῦν ἐμοί δοχεῖς σὐ οὐ πάνυ ἀχόλουθα λέγειν ούδε σύμφωνα οίς το πρώτον έλεγες περί της δητορικής. φοβούμαι ουν διελέγγειν σε, μή με ύπολάβης οὐ πρός τὸ πραγμα φιλονειχοῦντα λέγειν τοῦ καταφανές γενέσθαι, άλλά πρός σέ. έγω ούν, εί μέν και συ εί των ανθρώπων ώνπερ 458 και έγώ, ήδέως άν σε διερωτώην εί δε μή, εώην άν. έγω δε τίνων είμί; των ήδέως μεν αν έλεγγθέντων, εί τι μή άληθες λέγω, ήδέως δ' αν έλεγξάντων, εί τίς τι μη αληθές λέγοι, ουχ αηδέστερον μέντ' αν έλεγγθέντων ή έλεγξάντων · μείζον γάρ αὐτὸ ἀγαθὸν ἡγοῦμαι, ὅσωπερ μεζον άγαθόν έστιν αὐτὸν ἀπαλλαγηναι κακοῦ τοῦ μεγίστου ή άλλον άπαλλάξαι. ούδεν γαο οίμαι τοσούτον κακόν είναι άνθρώπω, όσον δόξα ψευδής Β περί ών τυγχάνει νῦν ήμιν ὁ λόγος ὤν. εἰ μέν ουν καί σύ φής τοιούτος είναι, διαλεγώμεθα εί δέ καί δοκεί χρηναι έαν, έωμεν ήδη χαίρειν καί διαλύωμεν τον λόγον. ΓΟΡ. 'Αλλά φημί μέν έγωγε, ω Σώχρατες, καί αυτός τοιούτος είναι, οίον συ ύφηγει · ἴσως μέντοι χρην έννοειν καί το τῶν παρόντων. πάλαι γάρ τοι, πρίν καί ύμας έλθειν, έγώ τοις παρούσι πολλά έπεδειξά- C μην, καί νῦν ἴσως πόδοω ἀποτενοῦμεν, ήν διαλεγώμεθα. σκοπείν ούν χρή και το τούτων, μή τινας αὐτῶν κατέγωμεν βουλομένους τι καὶ ἄλλο πράττειν.

CAP. XIII. XAI. Τοῦ μὲν θορύβου, ὦ Γοςγία τε καὶ Σώκρατες, αὐτοὶ ἀκούετε τούτων τῶν

άνδρών, βουλομένων άχούειν, έάν τι λέγητε. έμοι δ' ούν και αυτώ μη γένοιτο τοσαύτη άσχολία, ώστε τοιούτων λόγων και ούτω λεγομένων D ἀφεμένω ποούογιαίτερόν τι γενέσθαι άλλο πράττειν. ΚΑΛ. Νή τούς θεούς, ῶ Χαιρεφῶν. και μέν δή και αυτός πολλοις ήδη λόγοις παραγενόμενος ούκ οίδ' εί πώποτε ήσθην ούτως, ώσπεο νυνί, ωστ' έμοιγε, κάν την ήμέραν όλην έθέλητε διαλέγεσθαι, χαριεΐσθε. ΣΩ. 'Αλλά μήν, ῶ Καλλίχλεις, τό γ' ἐμον οὐδὲν χωλύει, εἴπεο έθέλει Γοργίας. ΓΟΡ. Αἰσχρον δή το λοιπόν, ῶ Σώχρατες, γίγνεται ἐμέ γε μή ἐθέλειν, καὶ Εταύτα αὐτὸν ἐπαγγειλάμενον ἐρωτῶν ὅ τι τις βούλεται. άλλ' εί δοκεί τουτοισί, διαλέγου τε καὶ ἐρώτα ὅ τι βούλει. ΣΩ. ᾿Ακουε δή, ῶ Γοργία, ά θαυμάζω έν τοις λεγομένοις ύπο σου. ίσως γάρ τοι σοῦ ὀρθῶς λέγοντος ἐγώ οὐκ ὀρθῶς ύπολαμβάνω. δητορικόν φής ποιείν οίός τ' είναι, ἐάν τις βούληται παρά σοῦ μανθάνειν; ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν περὶ πάντων ώστ' 459 έν ὔχλφ πιθανόν είναι, οὐ διδάσχοντα, ἀλλὰ πείη θοντα ; / ΓΟΡ. Πάνυ μέν ουν. ΣΩ. "Ελεγες τοι νῦν δή ὅτι καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὑγιεινοῦ τοῦ ἰατροῦ πιθανώτεςος έσται ό ξήτως. ΓΟΡ. Καὶ γὰς έλεγον, έν γε όχλω. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν τὸ ἐν ὄχλω τοῦιό ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς μη εἰδόσιν ; οὐ γὰο δήπου ἔν γε τοις είδύσι του ζατρού πιθανώτερος έσται. ΓΟΡ. ' Αληθή λέγεις. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν εἴπες τοῦ ζατρού πιθανώτερος έσται, του είδότος πιθανώ-Βτερος γίγνεται; ΓΟΡ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Ούχ

ἰατρός γε ών · η γάς; ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. 'Ο δὲ μη ἰατρός γε δήπου ἀνεπιστήμων ῶν ὁ ἰατρὸς ἐπιστήμων. ΓΟΡ. Δήλον ὅτι. ΣΩ. 'Ο οὐχ εἰδώς ἀρα τοῦ εἰδότος ἐν οὐχ εἰδόσι πιθανώτερος ἔσται, ὅταν ὁ ἑήτωρ τοῦ ἰατροῦ πιθανώτερος ἦ. τοῦτο συμβαίνει, η ἀλλο τι; ΓΟΡ. Τοῦτο ἐνταῦθά γε συμβαίνει. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν χαὶ περὶ τὰς ἀλλας ἀπάσας τέχνας ὡσαύτως ἔχει ὁ ἑηίτως χαὶ ἡ ἑητοριχή · αὐτὰ μὲν τὰ πράγματα οὐδὲν δεῖ αὐτην εἰδέναι ὅπως ἔχει, μηχανην δέ C τινα πειθοῦς εύρηχέναι, ὥστε φαίνεσθαι τοῖς οὐχ εἰδόσι μᾶλλον εἰδέναι τῶν εἰδότων.

CAP. XIV. ΓΟΡ. Ούκοῦν πολλή δαστώνη, ὦ Σώχρατες, γίγνεται, μή μαθόντα τὰς ἄλλας τέχνας, άλλα μίαν ταύτην, μηδεν ελατιοῦσθαι τῶν δημιουογῶν; ΣΩ. Εἰ μὲν ἐλαττοῦται ή μη ελαττουται ό φήτως των άλλων δια το ουτως έχειν, αὐτίκα ἐπισκεψόμεθα, ἐάν τι ἡμῖν πρός λόγου η · νῦν δὲ τόδε πρότερον σκειμώμεθα, δρα τυγχάνει περί το δίκαιον και το άδι- D χον χαί τὸ αἰσχοὸν χαὶ τὸ χαλὸν χαὶ ἀγαθὸν και κακόν ούτως έχων ό όητορικός ώς περί τό ύγιεινον καί περί τα άλλα ών αι άλλαι τέγναι, αύτα μέν ούχ είδώς, τί αγαθόν ή τί χαχόν έστιν, ή τι καλόν η τι αλοχούν, η δίκαιον η άδικον, ζη πειθώ δε περί αὐτῶν μεμηχανημένος, ώστε δοκείν είδέναι ούκ είδως έν ούκ είδόσι μαλλον του Ε είδότος; ή άνάγχη είδέναι, χαί δεῖ ποοεπιστάμενον ταῦτα ἀφικέσθαι παρὰ σὲ τὸν μέλλοντα μαθήσεσθαι την δητορικήν; εί δε μή, σύ ό της

όητορικής διδάσκαλος τούτων μέν ούδεν διδάξεις τον αφιχνούμενον - ου γάρ σον έργον - ποιήσεις δ' έν τοις πολλοις δοχειν είδέναι αύτον τα τοιαύτα ούχ είδότα χαί δοχεῖν ἀγαθόν εἶναι ούχ όντα; η το παράπαν ούγ οίός τε ἔσει αὐτὸν διδάξαι την δητορικήν, έαν μη προειδη περί τούτων την αλήθειαν; η πως τα τοιαυτα έχει, ω 460 Γοργία; και πρός Διός, ώσπερ ἄρτι είπες, άποχαλύψας της δητοριχης είπε τίς ποθ' ή δύναμίς έστιν. ΓΟΡ. 'Αλλ' έγώ μέν οίμαι, ὦ Σώκοατες, ἐἀν τύχη μὴ εἰδώς, καὶ ταῦτα πας' ἐμοῦ μαθήσεται. ΣΩ. "Εχε δή· καλώς γάς λέγεις. έάνπες δητοςικόν σύ τινα ποιήσης, άνάγκη αύτον είδέναι τα δίχαια χαι τα άδιχα ήτοι πρότεούν γε ή υστερον μαθόντα παρά σοῦ. ΓΟΡ. B Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Τί οὖν; ό τὰ τεκτονικὰ μεμαθηχώς τεχτονιχός, ή ου ; ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν χαὶ ὁ τὰ μουσιχὰ μουσιχός; ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Καὶ ὁ τὰ ἰατρικὰ ἰατρικός; καὶ τάλλα ούτω κατά τον αύτον λόγον, ό μεμαθηκώς έχαστα τοιουτός έστιν, οίον ή έπιστήμη έχαστον άπεργάζεται; ΓΟΡ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν κατά τουτον τον λόγον και ό τα δίκαια μεμαθηκώς δίκαιος; ΓΟΡ. Πάντως δήπου. ΣΩ. ⁶Ο C δὲ δίχαιος δίχαιά που πράττει. ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν ἀνάγχη Γτὸν ἡητοριχὸν δίχαιον είναι], τον [δέ] δίχαιον δίχαια βούλεσθαι πράττειν ; ΓΟΡ. Φαίνεταί γε. ΣΩ. Οὐδέποτε άρα βουλήσεται ό γε δίκαιος άδικειν. ΓΟΡ. 'Ανάγχη. ΣΩ. Τον δε όητοριχον ανάγχη έχ

τοῦ λόγου δίχαιον εἶναι. ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Οὐδέποτε ἄρα βουλήσεται ὁ ἑητοριχὸς ἀδιχεῖν. ΓΟΡ. Οὐ φαίνεταί γε.

CAP. XV. ΣΩ. Μέμνησαι οῦν λέγων όλίγω D πρότερον, ότι ού δει τοις παιδοτρίβαις έγχαλειν ούδ' έχβάλλειν έχ τῶν πόλεων, ἐάν ὁ πύχτης τỹ πυχτική [μή χαλώς] χρήται τε και άδική; ώσαύτως δε ούτω και έαν ό φήτως τη φητορική άδίκως γρηται, μή τω διδάξαντι έγκαλειν μηδέ έξελαύνειν έχ τῆς πόλεως, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἀδιχοῦντι χαὶ ούκ όρθῶς χρωμένο τῆ ἑητορικῆ; ἐἰἑήθη ταῦτα, ή ου; ΓΟΡ. Ἐἰξήθη. ΣΩ. Νῦν δέ γε ό αύτος ούτος φαίνεται, ό όητορικός, ούκ αν ποτε Ε άδικήσας. ή ού; ΓΟΡ. Φαίνεται. ΣΩ. Καί έν τοις πρώτοις γε, ῶ Γοργία, λόγοις ἐλέγετο, ὅτι ή ήητορική περί λόγους είη ού τούς τοῦ ἀρτίου χαί περιττοῦ, ἀλλὰ τοὺς τοῦ διχαίου χαὶ ἀδίχου. ή γάς; ΓΟΡ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Έγω τοίνυν σου τότε ταῦια λέγοντος ὑπέλαβον, ὡς οὐδέποτ' ἀν είη ή όητορική άδικον πράγμα, ό γ' άει περί δικαιοσύνης τούς λόγους ποιειται · ἐπειδή δὲ ὀλίγον υστερον έλεγες, υτι ό δήτωρ τη δητορικη κάν άδίχως χρώτο, ούτω θαυμάσας χαι ήγησάμενος 461 ού συνάδειν τα λεγόμενα έχείνους είπον τούς λόγους, ότι, εί μεν κέρδος ήγοιο είναι το ελέγχεσθαι, ώσπερ έγώ, άξιον είη διαλέγεσθαι, εί δε μή, έαν χαίρειν. υστερον δε ήμων έπισχοπουμένων, όρας δή και αυτός, ότι αθ όμολογειται τον όητοριχόν αδύναιον είναι αδίχως γρησθαι τη όητορική και έθέλειν άδικειν. ταυτα ουν όπη ποτέ

Β ίχει, μὰ τὸν κύνα, ὦ Γοργία, οὐκ ὀλίγης συνουσίας ἐστίν, ὥστε ἑκανῶς διασκέψασθαι. 2~

CAP. XVI. ПΩA. Ti δαί, δ Σώχρατες; ούτω καί σύ περί της δητορικής δοξάζεις, ώσπερ νῦν λέγεις; ή οἴει, ὅτι Γοργίας ήσχύνθη σοι μή προσομολογήσαι τον έητορικόν άνδρα μη ούχι אמו דע אואמוע בואציעו אמו דע אמאע אמו דע עיעθά, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ταῦτα εἰδώς παρ' αὐτόν, C αύτος διδάξειν — ἔπειτα ἐχ ταύτης ἴσως τῆς όμολογίας έναντίον τι συνέβη έν τοῖς λόγοις, τοῦθ' ΰ δι) ἀγαπῶς, αὐτὸς ἀγαγών ἐπὶ τοιαῦτα έρωτήματα. έπει τίνα οι ει απαρνήσεσθαι μή ούχι και αύτον επίστασθαι τα δίκαια και άλλους διδάξειν ; άλλ' είς τα τοιαύτα άγειν πολλή άγροικία έστι τούς λόγους. ΣΩ. 3Ω κάλλιστε Πώλε, αλλά τοι έξεπίτηδες πτώμεθα έταίρους παί υίεις, ίνα, έπειδαν αύτοι πρεσβύτεροι γιγνόμενοι σφαλλώμεθα, παρόντες ύμεις οι νεώτεροι έπα-D νορθοιιε ήμων τών βίον και έν ἔργοις και έν λόγοις. και νῦν εἴ τι ἐγώ και Γοργίας ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σφαλλόμεθα, σύ παρών ἐπανόρθου · δίχαιος δ' εί. χαι έγω εθέλω των ωμολογημένων ει τί σοι δοχεί μη χαλώς ώμολογησθαι, άναθέσθαι δ τι άν συ βούλη, έάν μοι εν μόνον φυλάττης. ΠΩΑ. Τί τοῦτο λέγεις; ΣΩ. Την μαχρολογίαν, & Πωλε, ήν χαθείρξης, ή το πρώτον έπεγείρησας χρήσθαι. ΠΩΛ. Τί δαί; ουκ έξέ-Εσται μοι λέγειν όπόσα αν βούλωμαι; ΣΩ. Δεινα μέντ' αν πάθοις, ω βέλτιστε, ει 'Αθήναζε άφικύμενος, ου της Έλλάδος πλείστη έστιν έξου-

σία τοῦ λέγειν, ἔπειτα σῦ ἐνταῦθα τούτου μόνος άτυχήσαις. άλλα άντίθες τοι · " Σου μαχρά λέγοντος καί μή έθέλοντος το έρωτώμενον αποκρίνεσθαι, ού δεινά αν αῦ έγω πάθοιμι, εἰ μη έξέσται μοι απιέναι και μή ακούειν σου; " αλλ' εί 462 τι πήδει του λόγου του είρημένου και έπανορθώσασθαι αὐτον βούλει, ώσπερ νῦν δή ἔλεγον, άναθέμενος ό τι σοι δοχεί, έν τῷ μέρει έρωτῶν τε καί έρωτώμενος, ώσπερ έγώ τε καί Γοργίας, έλεγχέ τε και έλέγχου. φής γαο δήπου και σύ έπίστασθαι άπερ Γοργίας. η ου; ΠΩΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. Ούχουν καί σύ κελεύεις σαυτόν έρωταν έχάστοτε ο τι άν τις βούληται, ώς επιστάμενος αποχρίνεσθαι; ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ μέν οὖν. Β ΣΩ. Και νῦν δή τούτων ὑπότερον βούλει ποίει. έρώτα, ή αποκρίνου.

CAP. XVII. ΠΩΛ. 'Λλλὰ ποιήσω ταῦτα. καί μοι ἀπόκριναι, ὡ Σώκρατες. ἐπειδὴ Γοġγίας ἀπορεῖν σοι δοκεῖ περὶ τῆς ἡητορικῆς, σὐ αὐτὴν τίνα φὴς εἶναι; ΣΩ. ᾿Αρα ἐρωτῷς ἥντινα τέχνην φημὶ εἶναι; ΠΩΛ. Ἔγωγε. ΣΩ. Οὐδεμία ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ, ὡ Πῶλε, ὡς γε προς σὲ τὰληθῆ εἰρῆσθαι. ΠΩΛ. 'Αλλὰ τί σοι δοκεῖ ἡ ģητορικὴ εἶναι; ΣΩ. Πρᾶγμα, ὑ φὴς σὺ ποιῆσαι τέχνην ἐν τῷ συγγράμματι, ὑ ἐγῶ ἔναγχος ἀνέγνων. ΠΩΛ. Τί τοῦτο λέγεις; ΣΩ. Ἐμ- C πειρίαν ἔγωγέ τινα. ΠΩΛ. Ἐμπειρία ἄρα σοι δοκεῖ ἡ ἑητορικὴ εἶναι; ΣΩ. ͳμοιγε, εἰ μή τι σῦ ἀλλο λέγεις. ΠΩΛ. Τίνος ἐμπειρία; ΣΩ. Χάριτός τινος καὶ ἡδονῆς ἀπεργασίας.

ΠΩΛ. Ούχοῦν χαλόν σοι δοχεῖ ή ξητοριχή είναι, χαρίζεσθαι οίόν τ' είναι άνθρώποις; ΣΩ. Τί δέ, ὦ Πῶλε; ἤδη πέπυσαι παρ' ἐμοῦ ὅ τι D φημί αὐτην είναι, ώστε το μετά τοῦτο ἐρωτῷς, εί ού καλή μοι δοκεί είναι; ΠΩΛ. Ού γάρ πέπυσμαι, ὅτι ἐμπειρίαν τινὰ αὐτὴν φής είναι; ΣΩ. Βούλει οῦν, ἐπειδή τιμῶς τὸ χαρίζεσθαι, σμιχρόν τί μοι χαρίσασθαι; ΠΩΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. 'Ερού νύν με, όψοποιία ήτις μοι δοκεί τέχνη είναι. ΠΩΛ. Έρωτῶ δή, τίς τέχνη όψοποιία; ΣΩ. Οὐδεμία, ὦ Πῶλε. ΠΩΛ. 'Αλλα τί; φάθι. ΣΩ. Φημὶ δή, ἐμπειρία τις. Ε ΠΩΛ. Τίνος ; φάθι. ΣΩ. Φημι δή, χάριτος καὶ ήδονῆς ἀπεργασίας, ὦ Πῶλε. ΠΩΛ. Ταὐτον δ' έστιν όψοποιία και όητορική; ΣΩ. Ούδαμώς γε, άλλα της αυτης έπιτηδεύσεως μόοιον. ΠΩΛ. Τίνος λέγεις ταύτης; ΣΩ. Μή άγροικότερον η το άληθες είπεῖν · όκνῶ γάρ Γοργίου ένεκα λέγειν, μη οἴηταί με διακωμωδεῖν 463 το έαυτου έπιτήδευμα. έγω δέ εἰ μέν τουτό έστιν ή όητορική ήν Γοργίας επιτηδεύει ούκ οίδα · καί γαο άρτι έκ του λόγου ούδεν ήμιν χαταφανές έγένετο τί ποτε ούτος ήγειται · δδ' έγώ καλώ την όητορικήν, πράγματός τινός έστι μόριον ούδενός των καλών. ΓΟΡ. Τίνος, δ Σώχρατες ; είπέ, μηδεν έμε αλογυνθείς.

CAP. XVIII. ΣΩ. Δοχεῖ τοίνυν μοι, ѽ Γοςγία, εἶναί τι ἐπιτήδευμα τεχνικον μεν οὖ, ψυχῆς δὲ στοχαστικῆς καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ φύσει δεινῆς Β προσομιλεῖν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις · καλῶ δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐγῶ

το κεφάλαιον χολαχείαν. ταύτης μοι δοχεί της έπιτηδεύσεως πολλά μέν και άλλα μόρια είναι, έν δε και ή όψοποιική. Ο δοκεί μεν είναι τέχνη, ώς δε ό εμός λόγος, ούχ εστι τέγνη, άλλ' εμπειρία καί τριβή. ταύτης μόριον καί την δητορικήν έγώ καλώ και τήν γε κομμωτικήν και τήν σοφιστικήν, τέτταρα ταῦτα μόρια ἐπὶ τέτταρσι πρά- C γμασιν. εί οὖν βούλεται Πῶλος πυνθάνεσθαι, πυνθανέσθω · ου γάο πω πέπυσται όποϊόν φημι έγω της χολαχείας μόριον είναι την όητοριχην άλλ' αύτον λέληθα ούπω άποκεκριμένος, ό δέ έπανερωτά, εί ού καλόν ήγουμαι είναι. έγω δέ αὐτῶ οὐκ ἀποκρινοῦμαι πρότερον εἴτε καλον εἴτε αίσχρον ήγουμαι είναι την όητορικήν, πρίν αν πρώτον αποχρίνωμαι ό τι έστίν. ου γαρ δίχαιον, ῶ Πῶλε · ἀλλ' εἴπερ βούλει πυθέσθαι, ἐρώτα όποΐον μόριον της χολαχείας φημί είναι την όητορικήν. ΠΩΛ. Έρωτῶ δή, και ἀπόκριναι, D όποῖον μόριον. ΣΩ. Αρ' οῦν ἀν μάθοις ἀποχριναμένου; ἔστι γάρ ή δητοριχή χατά τον έμον λόγον πολιτικής μορίου είδωλον. ΠΩΛ. Τί ούν ; καλόν ή αίσχοόν λέγεις αὐτήν είναι ; ΣΩ. Αίσχοὸν ἔγωγε· τὰ γὰρ κακὰ αἰσχρὰ καλῶ· έπειδή δεί σοι άποχρίνασθαι, ώς ήδη είδότι ά έγώ λέγω. ΓΟΡ. Μα τον Δία, δ Σώπρατες, άλλ' έγω ούδε αύτος συνίημι δ τι λέγεις. ΣΩ. Είκό-Ε τως γε, ὦ Γοργία · οὐδὲν γάρ πω σαφὲς λέγω, Πώλος δε όδε νέος έστι και όξύς. ΓΟΡ. 'Αλλά τούτον μέν έα, έμοι δ' είπε πως λέγεις πολιτικής μορίου είδωλον είναι την όητορικήν. ΣΩ.

Αλλ' έγῶ πειράσομαι φράσαι ὅ γέ μοι φαίνεται είναι ἡ ἡητοριχή· εἰ δὲ μὴ τυγχάνει ὅν τοῦτο,
464 Πῶλος ὅδε ἐλέγξει. σῶμά που καλεῖς τι καὶ ψυχήν; ΓΟΡ. Πῶς γὰρ οὖ; ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν καὶ τούτων οἴει τινὰ είναι ἐκατέρου εὐεξίαν;
ΓΟΡ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. Τί δέ; δοκοῦσαν μὲν εὐεξίαν, οὖσαν δ' οὖ; οἶον τοιόνδε λέγω· πολλοὶ δοκοῦσιν εὖ ἔχειν τὰ σώματα, οῦς οὐχ ἀν ἡ ἀατρός τε καὶ τῶν γυμναστικῶν τις. ΓΟΡ.
᾿Αληθῆ λέγεις. ΣΩ. Τὸ τοιοῦτον λέγω καὶ ἐν ψυχῆ, ὅ τι ποιεῖ δοκεῖν μὲν σώματι εἶναι καὶ ἐν ψυχῆ, ὅ τι ποιεῖ δοκεῖν μὲν

CAP. XIX. ΣΩ. Φέρε δή σοι, έαν δύνωμαι, σαφέστερον ἐπιδείξω ὃ λέγω. Δυοῖν ὄντοιν τοῖν πραγμάτοιν δύο λέγω τέγνας την μέν έπι τη ψυχη πολιτικήν καλώ, την δε επί σώματι μίαν μέν ούτως όνομάσαι ούκ έχω σοι, μιας δέ ούσης τῆς τοῦ σώματος θεραπείας δύο μόρια λέγω, τὴν μέν γυμναστικήν, την δε ιατρικήν. της δε πολιτικής αντίστοοφον μέν τη γυμναστική την νομοθετικήν, αντίστροφον δε τη ιατρική την δικαιο-C σύνην. ἐπιχοινωνοῦσι μέν δή ἀλλήλαις, ἅτε περί το αύτο ούσαι, έχατεραι τούτων, ή τε ιατριχή τη γυμναστική και ή δικαιοσύνη τη νομοθετική. όμως δε διαφέρουσί τι αλλήλων. τεττάρων δή τούτων ούσῶν, χαὶ ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ βέλτιστον θερα-. πευουσών, τών μέν το σώμα, τών δε την ψυχήν, ή πολακευτική αίσθομένη, ού γνούσα λέγω άλλά

στοχασαμένη, τέτραχα έαυτην διανείμασα, ύποδύσα ύπο έχαστον των μορίων, προσποιειται εί- D ναι τοῦτο, ὅπερ ὑπέδυ, καὶ τοῦ μέν βελτίστου ούδεν φοοντίζει, τῷ δε ἀεὶ ήδίστω θηρεύεται τὴν άνοιαν καί έξαπατα, ώστε δυκεί πλείστου άξία είναι. ύπο μέν ούν την ιατρικην ή όψοποιική ύποδέδυκε, καί προσποιείται τα βέλτιστα σιτία τῷ σώματι είδέναι, ώστ', εί δέοι έν παισί διαγωνίζεσθαι διμοποιόν τε και ιατρόν ή έν ανδράσιν ούτως άνοήτοις ώσπερ οί παίδες, πότερος έπαίει περί τῶν γρηστῶν σιτίων καὶ πονηρῶν, ὁ ἰατρος η ό όψοποιός, λιμῷ αν ἀποθανεῖν τὸν ἰατρόν. Ε χολαχείαν μέν ούν αύτο χαλώ, χαι αίσχοόν φημι είναι το τοιούτον, ω Πωλε, - τούτο γαο προς σέ 465 λέγω, - ύτι τοῦ ήδέος στοχάζεται άνευ τοῦ βελτίστου · τέχνην δε αὐτην ού φημι είναι, ἀλλ' έμπειρίαν, ότι ούχ έχει λόγον ούδένα ά προσφέρει όποι' άττα την φύσιν έστίν, ώστε την αίτίαν έχάστου μή έγειν είπεῖν. έγω δε τέγνην ού χαλώ ο αν η άλογον πράγμα. τούτων δέ πέρι εί αμφισβητεῖς, ἐθέλω ὑποσγεῖν λόγον.

CAP. XX. Τῆ μέν οὖν ἰατοικῆ, ὥσπεο λέγω, ἡ ὀψοποιικὴ κολακεία ὑπόκειται· τῆ δὲ γυμνα- Β στικῆ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τοᡠπον τοῦτον ἡ κομμωτική, κακοῦογός τε οὖσα καὶ ἀπατηλὴ καὶ ἀγεννὴς καὶ ἀνελεύθεοος, σχήμασι καὶ χοώμασι καὶ λειότησι καὶ ἐσθήσει ἀπατῶσα, ὥστε ποιεῖν ἀλλότοιον κάλλος ἐφελκομένους τοῦ οἰκείου τοῦ διὰ τῆς γυμναστικῆς ἀμελεῖν. ὕν' οὖν μὴ μακοολογῶ, ἐθέλω σοι εἰπεῖν ὥσπεο οἱ γεωμέτοαι — ήδη

γάρ αν ίσως άχολουθήσαις — ότι δ χομμωτιχή C πρός γυμναστικήν, τοῦτο ὀψοποιική πρός ἰατρικήν. μαλλον δε ώδε, ότι ο κομμωτική πρός γυμναστικήν, τούτο σοφιστική πρός νομοθετικήν, καί ότι ΰ όψοποιική πρός ίατρικήν, τουτο έητοοική πρός δικαιοσύνην. ⁵πεο μέντοι λέγω, διέστηκε μέν ούτω φύσει άτε δ' έγγυς ύντων φύρονται έν τῷ αὐτῷ χαὶ περὶ ταὐτὰ σοφισταὶ χαὶ δήτορες, και ούκ έχουσιν ό τι χρήσονται ούτε αύτοι έαυτοις ούτε οι άλλοι άνθρωποι τούτοις. D καὶ γὰς är, εἰ μὴ ἡ ψυχὴ τῷ σώματι ἐπεστάτει, άλλ' αύτο αύτῷ, καὶ μὴ ὑπὸ ταύτης κατεθεωςεῖτο καί διεκρίνετο ή τε όψοποιική και ή ίατρική, όλλ' αύτο το σωμα έχρινε σταθμώμενον ταις γάρισι ταις πρός αύτό, τὸ τοῦ 'Αναξαγόρου ἂν πολύ ήν, ω φίλε Πωλε - σύ γαο τούτων έμπει-005 · — όμοῦ ἂν πάντα χρήματα ἐφύρετο ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, ἀχρίτων ὄντων τῶν τε ἰατριχῶν χαὶ ὑγιεινῶν καὶ ὀψοποιικῶν. ὑ μὲν οὖν ἐγώ φημι τὴν δητορικήν είναι, ακήκοας · αντίστροφον όψοποι-Είας έν ψυγη, ώς έχεινο έν σώματι. "Ισως μέν οῦν ἀτοπον πεποίηκα, ὅτι σε οὐκ ἐῶν μακρούς λόγους λέγειν αὐτὸς συχνὸν λόγον ἀποτέταχα. άξιον μέν οῦν ἐμοί συγγνώμην ἔγειν ἐστί · λέγοντος γάρ μου βραχέα ούκ εμάνθανες, ούδε γρησθαι τη αποκρίσει ην σοι απεκρινάμην υύδεν 466 οίός τ' ήσθα, άλλ' έδέου διηγήσεως. έων μεν οῦν καὶ ἐγώ, σοῦ ἀποκρινομένου, μὴ ἔχω ὅ τι χρήσωμαι, απότεινε καί σύ λόγον, έαν δε έχω,

3*

ἔα με χοῆσθαι· δίχαιον γάο. καὶ νῦν ταύτῃ τῆ ἀποκοίσει εἴ τι ἔχεις χοῆσθαι, χοῶ.

CAP. XXI. ΠΩΛ. Τί οῦν φής ; κολακεία δοκεί σοι είναι ή φητορική; ΣΩ. Κολακείας μέν ουν έγωγε είπον μόριον. άλλ' ού μνημονεύεις τηλιχοῦτος ὤν, ὦ Πῶλε ; τί τάχα δράσεις [ποεσβύτης γενόμενος]; ΠΩΛ. Ας' οῦν δοχοῦσί σοι ώς χόλαχες έν ταῖς πόλεσι φαῦλοι νομίζε-Β σθαι οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ἑήτορες; ΣΩ. Ἐρώτημα τοῦτ' έρωτῷς, ή λόγου τινός ἀρχήν λέγεις; ΠΩΛ. Έρωτῶ ἔγωγε. ΣΩ. Οὐδὲ νομίζεσθαι ἔμοιγε δοχούσι. ΠΩ Λ. Πῶς οὐ νομίζεσθαι; οὐ μέγιστον δύνανται έν ταῖς πόλεσιν; ΣΩ. Οΰκ, εἰ το δύνασθαί γε λέγεις άγαθόν τι είναι τῷ δυναμένω. ΠΩΛ. 'Αλλά μεν δή λέγω γε. ΣΩ. Έλάχιστον τοίνυν μοι δοχούσι των έν τη πόλει C δύνασθαι οί δήτορες. ΠΩΛ. Τί δέ; ούγ, ώσπερ οί τύραννοι, αποχτιννύασί τε ων αν βούλωνται, καί ἀφαιροῦνται χρήματα καὶ ἐκβάλλουσιν έκ των πόλεων ων άν δοκή αυτοίς; ΣΩ. Νή τόν κύνα, αμφιγνοώ μέντοι, ω Πωλε, έφ' έκαστου ών λέγεις, πότερον αυτός ταυτα λέγεις καί γνώμην σαυτοῦ ἀποφαίνει, ή ἐμὲ ἐρωτῷς. ΠΩΛ. 'Αλλ' έγωγε σε έρωτῶ. ΣΩ. Εἶεν, ἇ φίλε· ἔπειτα δύο άμα με ἐρωτῷς; ΠΩΛ. Πῶς δύο; ΣΩ. Ούχ άρτι ούτω πως έλεγες, δτι άποκτιν- D νύασιν οί δήτορες ούς αν βούλωνται, ωσπερ οί τύραννοι, καὶ χρήματα ἀφαιροῦνται καὶ ἐξελαύνουσιν έχ τῶν πόλεων ῶν ἀν δοκῃ αὐτοῖς; ΠΩΛ. "Εγωγε.

CAP. XXII. ΣΩ. Λέγω τοίνυν σοι, ὅτι δύο ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τὰ ἐρωτήματα, καὶ ἀποκρινοῦμαί γέ σοι πρός αμφότερα. φημί γάρ, ῶ Πῶλε, ἐγῶ καί τους δήτορας και τους τυράννους δύνασθαι Εμέν έν ταις πόλεσι σμιχρότατον, ώσπερ νῦν δή έλεγον · ούδεν γαο ποιείν ών βούλονται, ώς έπος είπειν · ποιειν μέντοι ό τι αν αύτοις δόξη βέλτιστον είναι. ΠΩΛ. Ούχοῦν τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ μέγα δύνασθαι; ΣΩ. Ούχ, ως γέ φησι Πωλος. ΠΩΛ. Έγω ου φημι; φημί μέν ουν έγωγε. ΣΩ. Μα τον - ού σύ γε, ἐπεὶ τὸ μέγα δύνασθαι ἔφης ἀγαθόν είναι τῷ δυναμένω. ΠΩΛ. Φημί γάο οῦν. ΣΩ. Άγαθον οῦν οἴει εἶναι, ἐάν τις ποιη ταυτα, & αν δοχη αύτω βέλτιστα είναι, νοῦν μη ἔγων ; καὶ τοῦτο καλεῖς μέγα δύνασθαι; ΠΩΑ. Ούκ έγωγε. ΣΩ. Ούκοῦν ἀποδείξεις τους δήτορας νοῦν ἔχοντας και τέχνην ιστήν δητορικήν, άλλα μή κολακείαν, έμε έξελέγξας ; εί δέ με έάσεις άνέλεγκτον, οί φήτορες οί ποιουντες έν ταις πόλεσιν & δοχει αύτοις χαι οί τύραννοι ούδεν άγαθόν τοῦτο κεκτήσονται, εἰ δή δύναμίς έστιν, ώς συ φής, άγαθόν, το δε ποιείν άνευ νοῦ ῶ δοχεῖ χαὶ σῦ ὁμολογεῖς χαχὸν εἶναι. ή ου; ΠΩΛ. Έγωγε. ΣΩ. Πῶς ῶν οῦν οἱ δήτορες μέγα δύναιντο ή οί τύραννοι έν ταις πόλεσιν, έαν μη Σωπράτης έξελεγχθη ύπο Πώ-Βλου, ὅτι ποιοῦσιν & βούλονται; ΠΩΛ. Οὖτος άνής — ΣΩ. Ού φημι ποιεῖν αὐτοὺς ἅ βούλονται · άλλά μ' έλεγγε. ΠΩΛ. Ούχ άρτι ώμολόγεις ποιείν & δοχεί αύτοις βέλτιστα είναι,

ιούτου πρόσθεν ; ΣΩ. Καὶ γὰρ νῦν ὁμολογῶ. ΠΩΛ. Οὐχοῦν ποιοῦσιν & βούλονται. ΣΩ. Οὕ φημι. ΠΩΛ. Ποιοῦντες δὲ & δοχεῖ αὐτοῖς ; ΣΩ. Φημί. ΠΩΛ. Σχέτλια λέγεις καὶ ὑπερφυῆ, ὦ Σώχρατες. ΣΩ. Μὴ κατηγόρει, ὦ λῷστε Πῶλε, ἵνα προσείπω σε κατὰ σέ · ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν C ἔχεις ἐμὲ ἐρωτῶν, ἐπίδειξον, ὅτι ψεύδομαι, εἰ δὲ μή, αὐτὸς ἀποκρίνου. ΠΩΛ. ᾿Αλλ' ἐθέλω ἀποκρίνεσθαι, ἕνα καὶ εἰδῶ ὅ τι λέγεις.

CAP. XXIII. ΣΩ. Πότερον οῦν σοι δοχοῦσιν οι άνθρωποι τοῦτο βούλεσθαι, ΰ άν πράττωσιν έχάστοτε, η έχεινο, οδ ένεχα πράττουσι τοῦθ', δ πράττουσιν; οίον οί τὰ φάρμακα πίνοντες παρά των ίατρων πότερόν σοι δοχούσι τούτο βούλεσθαι, όπερ ποιοῦσι, πίνειν τὸ φάρμαχον D χαι άλγεῖν, ή έχεῖνο, το ύγιαίνειν, οῦ ἕνεχα πίνουσι ; ΠΩΛ. Δηλον, ὅτι τὸ ὑγιαίνειν, οῦ ἕνεχα πίνουσιν. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν χαὶ οἱ πλέοντές τε καί τον άλλον χρηματισμόν χρηματιζόμενοι ού τοῦτό ἐστιν ὕ βούλονται, ὕ ποιοῦσιν ἑχάστοτε. τίς γαο·βούλεται πλεῖν τε καὶ κινδυνεύειν καὶ πράγματ' έγειν; άλλ' έχεινο, οίμαι, ου ένεχα πλέουσι, πλουτείν · πλούτου γαο ένεκα πλέουσι. ΠΩΑ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. "Αλλο τι οῦν ούτω καί περί πάντων; ἐάν τίς τι πράττη ἕνεκά του, ού τοῦτο βούλεται, ὕ πράττει, ἀλλ' ἐχεῖνο, οῦ ένεχα πράιτει. ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. ⁵Αρ' οῦν Ε έστι τι των ύντων, δ ούχι ήτοι άγαθύν γ' έστιν η κακόν η μεταξύ τούτων, ούτε άγαθόν ούτε κακόν; ΠΩΛ. Πολλή ανάγκη, δ Σώκρατες.

GORGIAS.

ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν λέγεις εἶναι ἀγαθόν μέν σοφίαν τε καί ύγίειαν και πλούτον και τάλλα τα τοιαῦτα, κακὰ δὲ τἀναντία τούτων; ΠΩΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. Τὰ δὲ μήτε ἀγαθὰ μήτε κακὰ ἆρα 468τοιάδε λέγεις, α ένίοτε μέν μετέχει του άγαθου, ένίοτε δέ τοῦ χαχοῦ, ἐνίστε δὲ σὐδετέρου, οἶον χαθήσθαι χαὶ βαδίζειν χαὶ τρέγειν χαὶ πλεῖν, χαι οίον αθ λίθους χαι ξύλα χαι τάλλα τα τοιαῦτα ; οὐ ταῦτα λέγεις ; ἢ ἀλλ' ἀττα χαλεῖς τὰ μήτε ἀγαθὰ μήτε κακά; ΠΩΛ. Οὔκ, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα. ΣΩ. Πότερον οὖν τὰ μεταξύ ταῦτα ένεκεν των άγαθων πράττουσιν, όταν πράττωσιν, η τάγαθα των μεταξύ; ΠΩΛ. Τα μεταξύ δή-Β που τῶν ἀγαθῶν. ΣΩ. Τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἀρα διώχοντες χαί βαδίζομεν, δταν βαδίζωμεν, οἰόμενοι βέλτιον είναι, καί το έναντίον έσταμεν, όταν έστωμεν, τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἕνεκα, τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. ἡ οῦ; ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν χαὶ ἀποχτίννυμεν, εί τιν' ἀποχτίννυμεν, και ἐχβάλλομεν και ἀφαιοούμεθα χρήματα, οιόμενοι άμεινον είναι ήμιν ταῦτα ποιεῖν η μή; ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ γε. · ΣΩ. "Ενεκ' ἄρα τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἅπαντα ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν οί ποιούντες. ΠΩΛ. Φημί.

CAP. XXIV. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν ὡμολογήσαμεν, ἁ C ἕνεκά του ποιοῦμεν, μὴ ἐκεῖνα βούλεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο, οὖ ἕνεκα ταῦτα ποιοῦμεν; ΠΩΛ. Μάλιστα. ΣΩ. Οὐκ ἀρα σφάττειν βουλόμεθα οὐδ' ἐκβάλλειν ἐκ τῶν πόλεων οὐδὲ χρήματα ἀφαιgεῖσθαι ἁπλῶς οὕτως, ἀλλ' ἐὰν μὲν ὡφέλιμα ἦ ταῦτα, βουλόμεθα πράττειν αὐτά, βλαβερὰ δὲ

όντα ού βουλόμεθα. τα γαρ αγαθά βουλόμεθα, ώς φής σύ, τα δε μήτε άγαθα μήτε κακά ού βουλόμεθα, ούδε τα κακά. η γάρ; άληθη σοι δοκώ λέγειν, ὦ Πῶλε, η ού ; Τί ουκ ἀποκρίνει ; D ΠΩΛ. 'Αληθή. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν εἴπερ ταῦτα ὁμολογούμεν, εί τις αποκτείνει τινα ή εκβάλλει έκ πόλεως η άφαιοειται χρήματα, είτε τύραννος ών είτε βήτωρ, οιόμενος άμεινον είναι αύτῶ, τυγγάνει δε ον κάκιον, ούτος δήπου ποιεί α δοκεί αὐτῷ. η γάρ; ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. ³Αρ' οῦν καί α βούλεται, είπερ τυγχάνει ταῦτα κακά όντα; Τί οὐχ ἀποχοίνει; ΠΩΛ. ᾿Αλλ' οὐ μοι δοχεῖ ποιεῖν ἅ βούλεται. ΣΩ. Ἔστιν οὖν δπως ό τοιοῦτος μέγα δύναται ἐν τῆ πόλει ταύ- Ε τη, είπερ έστι το μέγα δύνασθαι άγαθόν τι χατά την σην όμολογίαν; ΠΩΛ. Ούχ ἔστιν. ΣΩ. Αληθή άρα έγώ έλεγον, λέγων, ότι έστιν άνθρωπον ποιούντα έν πόλει ά δοκεί αύτῷ μή μέγα δύνασθαι μηδέ ποιείν ά βούλεται. ΠΩΛ. Ως δη σύ, δ Σώχρατες, ούχ αν δέξαιο έξειναί σοι ποιείν ο τι δοχεί σοι έν τη πόλει μαλλον η μή, ούδε ζηλοις, όταν ίδης τινά ή αποχτείναντα όν έδοξεν αύτῷ ή ἀφελόμενον χρήματα ή δήσαντα. ΣΩ. Δικαίως, λέγεις, η αδίκως; ΠΩΛ. Όπότερ' αν ποιή, ούκ αμφοτέρως ζηλωτόν έστιν ; 469 $\Sigma \Omega$. $E \dot{v} \varphi \dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \iota$, $\tilde{\omega} \Pi \tilde{\omega} \lambda \varepsilon$. $\Pi \Omega \Lambda$. $T \dot{\iota} \delta \dot{\eta}$; $\Sigma \Omega$. "Οτι ού χρή ούτε τους άζηλώτους ζηλούν ούτε τούς αθλίους, αλλ' έλεεῖν. ΠΩΑ. Τί δαί; ούτω σοι δοκεί έχειν περί ών έγω λέγω των άνθρώπων; ΣΩ. Πῶς γὰρ οΰ; ΠΩΛ. Οστις

οὖν ἀποκτίννυσιν ὃν ἀν δόξῃ αὐτῷ, δικαίως ἀπο**χτιννύς, ἄθλιος δοχεῖ σοι εἶναι χαὶ ἐλεεινός**; ΣΩ. Ούχ έμοιγε, ούδε μέντοι ζηλωτός. ΠΩΛ. B Ούκ ἄρτι ἄθλιον ἔφησθα είναι; ΣΩ. Τον ἀδίχως γε, ὦ έταῖρε, ἀποχτείναντα, χαὶ ἐλεεινόν γε πρός · τον δε δικαίως άζήλωτον. Π $\Omega \Lambda$. ${}^{3}H$ που ο γε αποθνήσχων αδίχως έλεεινός τε χαί άθλιός έστιν. ΣΩ. Ηττον η ό αποχτιννύς, ῶ Πῶλε, καὶ ήττον η ὁ δικαίως ἀποθνήσκων. ΠΩΛ. Πῶς δῆτα, ὦ Σώχρατες; ΣΩ. Ούτως, ώς μέγιστον των κακών τυγχάνει όν το άδικειν. ΠΩΛ. ³Η γάρ τοῦτο μέγιστον; οὐ τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι μείζον; ΣΩ. "Ηχιστά γε. ΠΩΛ. Σύ άρα βούλοιο αν άδικεισθαι μαλλον ή άδικειν; C Z Ω. Βουλοίμην μέν αν έγωγε ούδέτερα · εί δ' άναγκαΐον είη άδικειν ή άδικεισθαι, έλοίμην αν μαλλον άδικεισθαι ή άδικειν. ΠΩΛ. Σύ άρα τυραννείν ούκ αν δέξαιο; ΣΩ. Ούκ, εἰ τὸ τυραννείν γε λέγεις ὅπερ ἐγώ. ΠΩΛ. 'Αλλ' έγωγε τοῦτο λέγω, ὅπερ ἄρτι, ἐξεῖναι ἐν τῷ πόλει, δ αν δοκή αύτῷ, ποιείν τοῦτο, καὶ ἀποκτιννύντι χαι έχβάλλοντι χαι πάντα πράττοντι χατά την αύτοῦ δόξαν.

CAP. XXV. ΣΩ. ³Ω μακάριε, έμοῦ δη λέ-D γοντος τῷ λόγῷ ἐπιλαβοῦ. εἰ γὰς ἐγὼ ἐν ἀγοgῷ πληθούση λαβών ὑπὸ μάλης ἐγχειρίδιον λέγοιμι πρὸς σὲ, ὅτι ³Ω Πῶλε, ἐμοὶ δύναμίς τις καὶ τυραννὶς θαυμασία ἄρτι προσγέγονεν · ἐἀν γὰς ἄςα ἐμοὶ δόξη τινὰ τουτωνὶ τῶν ἀνθςώπων ὧν σὺ ὁςῷς αὐτίκα μάλα δεῖν τεθνάναι, τεθνήξει

ούτος, ων αν δόξη · κάν τινα δόξη μοι της κεφαλης αύτῶν κατεαγέναι δεῖν, κατεαγώς ἔσται αὐτίχα μάλα, καν θοιμάτιον διεσγίσθαι, διεσχισμένον ἔσται · ούτω μέγα έγω δύναμαι έν τηδε τη Έ πόλει · εί οῦν ἀπιστοῦντί σοι δείξαι ιι το ἐγγειρίδιον, ίσως αν είποις ίδων, ότι 3Ω Σωπρατες, ούτω μέν πάντες αν μέγα δύναιντο, έπει κάν έμπρησθείη οικία τούτω τω τρόπω ήντιν' άν σοι δοκή, και τά γε 'Αθηναίων νεώρια και τριήρεις χαὶ τὰ πλοῖα πάντα χαὶ τὰ δημόσια χαὶ τὰ ἴδια. άλλ' ούχ άρα τοῦι' ἔστι τὸ μέγα δύνασθαι, τὸ ποιείν ά δοχεί αὐτῷ. ή δοχεί σοι; ΠΩΛ. Οὐ470 δήτα ούτω γε. ΣΩ. "Εχεις οῦν εἰπεῖν, διότι μέμφει την τοιαύτην δύναμιν ; ΠΩΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. Τί δή; λέγε. ΠΩΛ. Οτι άναγκαῖον τον ούτω πράττοντα ζημιοῦσθαί ἐστι. ΣΩ. Τὸ δὲ ζημιοῦσθαι οὐ κακόν; ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν, ὦ θαυμάσιε, τὸ μέγα δύνασθαι πάλιν αὖ σοι φαίνεται, ἐἀν μέν πράττοντι ά δοχεῖ ἕπηται το ώφελίμως πράττειν, άγαθόν τε είναι, καί τούτο, ώς ἔοιχεν, ἐστὶ τὸ μέγα δύνασθαι· εἰ δὲ Β μή, κακόν καί σμικρόν δύνασθαι. Σκεψώμεθα δε και τόδε. άλλο τι δμολογούμεν ενίστε μεν άμεινον είναι ταυτα ποιείν, ά νυν δή έλέγομεν, αποκτιννύναι τε καί έξελαύνειν ανθρώπους καί άφαιρείσθαι χρήματα, ένίστε δε ού; ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Τοῦτο μέν δή, ὡς ἔοικε, καὶ παρά σοῦ καὶ παρ' ἐμοῦ ὁμολογεῖται. ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Πότε οὖν σῦ φῃς ἀμεινον εἶναι ταῦτα ποιείν; είπε τίνα δρον δρίζει. ΠΩΛ. Σύ

μέν οὖν, ῶ Σώχρατες, ἀπόχριναι ταὐτὸ τοῦτο. Ο ΣΩ. Ἐγῶ μέν τοίνυν φημί, ῶ Πῶλε, εἴ σοι πας' ἐμοῦ ἦδιόν ἐστιν ἀχούειν, ὅταν μὲν διχαίως τις ταῦτα ποιῷ, ἀμεινον εἶναι, ὅταν δὲ ἀδίχως, χάχιον.

CAP. XXVI. ΠΩΛ. Χαλεπόν γέ σε έλέγξαι, ῶ Σώπρατες · άλλ' οὐχὶ κάν παῖς σε ἐλέγξειεν, ότι ούκ άληθη λέγεις; ΣΩ. Πολλήν άρα έγώ τῷ παιδὶ χάριν έξω, ἴσην δὲ καὶ σοί, ἐάν με ἐλέγξης χαί απαλλάξης φλυαρίας. αλλα μη χάμης φίλον ανδοα εύεργετών, αλλ' έλεγχε. ΠΩΛ. D' Αλλά μήν, ὦ Σώχρατες, οὐδέν γέ σε δεῖ παλαιοίς πράγμασιν έλέγχειν τα γαρ έχθες καί πρώην γεγονότα ταῦτα ίχανά σε ἐξελέγξαι ἐστὶ και αποδείξαι, ώς πολλοι αδικούντες ανθρωποι εύδαίμονές είσι. ΣΩ. Τὰ ποῖα ταῦτα; ΠΩΛ. Αργέλαον δήπου τουτον τον Περδίκκου όρας άργοντα Μαχεδονίας; Σ.Ω. Εἰ δὲ μή, ἀλλ' άκούω γε. ΠΩΛ. Εὐδαίμων οὖν σοι δοκεῖ εἶναι ή άθλιος; ΣΩ. Ούχ οίδα, ὦ Πωλε ού γάο πω συγγέγονα τῷ ἀνδρί. ΠΩΛ. Τί δαί; Ε συγγενόμενος αν γνοίης, άλλως δε αύτόθεν ου γιγνώσκεις ότι εύδαιμονεί; ΣΩ. Μα Δί' ου δήτα. ΠΩΑ. Δήλον δή, Ξ Σώχρατες, ότι ούδε τόν μέγαν βασιλέα γιγνώσκειν φήσεις εύδαίμονα όντα. ΣΩ. Καὶ ἀληθῆ γε ἐρῶ· οὐ γὰρ οἶδα παιδείας ὅπως ἔγει καὶ δικαιοσύνης. ΠΩΛ. Τί δέ; ἐν τούτω ή πάσα εύδαιμονία ἐστίν; ΣΩ. ⁹Ως γε έγω λέγω, ὦ Πῶλε· τὸν μὲν γὰο χαλὸν χάγαθον άνδρα χαί γυναϊχα εύδαίμονα είναί

φημι, τον δε άδιχον χαι πονηρον άθλιον. ΠΩΛ. 471 . "Αθλιος άρα οὖτός ἐστιν ὁ Αργέλαος κατὰ τὸν σον λόγον; ΣΩ. Είπεο γε, ω φίλε, άδικος. ΠΩΛ. 'Αλλά μέν δη πως ούκ άδικος; ῷ γε προσήκε μέν της άρχης ούδέν, ήν νῦν ἔχει, ὄντι έκ γυναικός, η ην δούλη 'Αλκέτου, του Περδίκχου άδελφοῦ, χαὶ χατὰ μέν τὸ δίχαιον δοῦλος ην 'Αλκέτου, και ει έβούλετο τα δίκαια ποιείν, έδούλευεν αν 'Αλκέτη και ήν ευδαίμων κατά τον σον λόγον · νῦν δὲ θαυμασίως ὡς ἄθλιος γέγονεν, Β έπει τα μέγιστα ήδίχηχεν. δε γε πρωτον μέν τούτον αὐτὸν τὸν δεσπότην καὶ θεῖον μεταπεμψάμενος ώς αποδώσων την αργήν, ήν Περδίκκας αύτον αφείλετο, ξενίσας και καταμεθύσας αὐτόν τε καί τον υίον αύτοῦ 'Αλέξανδρον, ἀνειμιον αύτοῦ, σχεδον ήλιχιώτην, ἐμβαλών εἰς άμαξαν, νύχτως έξαγαγών απέσφαξέ τε χαὶ ήφάνισεν άμφοτέρους, και ταῦτα ἀδικήσας ἔλαθεν ἑαυτόν άθλιώτατος γενόμενος χαί ου μετεμέλησεν αυτώ, άλλ' όλίγον υστερον τον άδελφον τον γνήσιον, C τον Περδίκκου υίόν, παιδα ώς έπταετη, ου ή άργη έγίγνετο κατά το δίκαιον, ούκ έβουλήθη εύδαίμων γενέσθαι δικαίως έκθρέψας και άποδούς την ἀρχην ἐκείνω, ἀλλ' εἰς φρέαρ ἐμβαλών άποπνίξας πρός την μητέρα αύτοῦ Κλεοπάτραν χηνα έφη διώχοντα έμπεσειν και αποθανειν. τοιγάρτοι νῦν, άτε μέγιστα ήδικηκῶς τῶν ἐν Μακεδονία, αθλιώτατός έστι πάντων Μακεδόνων, άλλ' ούχ εύδαιμονέστατος, χαί ίσως ἔστιν ὅστις 'Αθηναίων από σοῦ ἀρξάμενος δέξαιτ' αν ἀλλος

D όστισοῦν Μακεδόνων γενέσθαι μαλλον η ἀΑςχέλαος.

CAP. XXVII. ΣΩ. Καί κατ' ἀρχάς τῶν λόγων, ὦ Πῶλε, ἔγωγέ σε ἐπήνεσα, ὅτι μοι δοκεῖς εὖ προς την δητορικήν πεπαιδεῦσθαι, τοῦ δὲ διαλέγεσθαι ήμεληκέναι · και νυν άλλο τι ουτός έστιν ό λόγος, δ με καί αν παις έξελέγξειε, καί έγω ύπο σου νυν, ώς συ οίει, έξελήλεγμαι τούτω τῷ λόγω, φάσχων τὸν ἀδιχοῦντα οὐχ εὐδαίμονα είναι; πόθεν, ω 'γαθέ; και μήν ουδέν γέ σοι τούτων όμολογῶ ῶν σῦ φής. ΠΩΛ. Οὐ γὰρ ἐθέ-Ελεις, έπει δοχεί γέ σοι ώς έγω λέγω. ΣΩ. 3Ω μαχάριε, δητοριχώς γάρ με έπιχειρεις έλέγχειν, ώσπερ οί έν τοις δικαστηρίοις ήγούμενοι έλέγγειν. καί γάρ έκει οι έτεροι τους έτέρους δοκούσιν έλέγγειν, έπειδαν των λόγων ών αν λέγωσι μάρτυρας πολλούς παρέχωνται και εύδοκίμους, ό δε τάναντία λέγων ένα τινά παρέχηται, η μηδένα. ούτος δε ό έλεγχος ούδενος άξιός έστι πρός την 472 αλήθειαν · ένίοτε γάρ αν και καταψευδομαρτυοηθείη τις ύπο πολλών και δοκούντων είναι τι. και νῦν περί ῶν σύ λέγεις όλίγου σοι πάντες συμφήσουσι ταῦτα Αθηναῖοι καὶ ξένοι · ἐάν βούλη κατ' έμου μάρτυρας παρασχέσθαι ώς ούκ άληθη λέγω, μαρτυρήσουσί σοι, έαν μέν βούλη, Νικίας ό Νικηράτου και οι άδελφοι μετ' αύτου, ών οί τρίποδες οι έφεξης έστωτές είσιν έν τῷ Λιονυσίω, ἐάν δὲ βούλη, ᾿Αριστοχράτης ό Β Σχελλίου, οδ αδ έστιν έν Πυθίου τοῦτο τὸ χαλον ανάθημα, έαν δε βούλη, ή Περικλέους όλη

οίκία, η άλλη συγγένεια, ηντινα αν βούλη των ένθένδε έκλέξασθαι. άλλ' έγώ σοι είς ών ούχ όμολογω. ού γάρ με σύ αναγκάζεις, αλλα ψευδομάρτυρας κατ' έμου πολλούς παρασχόμενος έπιχειρείς έχβάλλειν με έχ της ούσίας χαί του αληθοῦς. ἐγώ δὲ ἂν μή σὲ αὐτὸν ἕνα ὄντα μάρτυρα παράσχωμαι όμολογούντα περί ων λέγω, ούδεν οίμαι άξιον λόγου μοι πεπεράνθαι περί ών αν ήμιν ό λόγος η · οίμαι δε ούδε σοί, εαν μη C έγώ σοι μαρτυρώ είς ών μόνος, τούς δ' άλλους πάντας τούτους χαίρειν έφς. Εστι μέν ουν ούτός τις τρόπος έλέγχου, ώς σύ τε οἴει καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί · ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἀλλος, ὑν ἐγώ αὖ οἶμαι. παραβαλόντες οὖν παρ' ἀλλήλους σχεψώμεθα ει τι διοίσουσιν άλλήλων. και γαο τυγχάνει περί ών αμφισβητούμεν ού πάνυ σμικρα όντα, άλλα σγεδόν τι ταυτα, περί ων είδεναι τε χάλλιστον, μή είδέναι τε αισγιστον · το γάο πεφάλαιον αύτῶν ἐστιν η γιγνώσχειν η άγνοεῖν ὅστις τε εὐδαίμων έστι και όστις μή. αυτίκα πρώτον, περί D ού νῦν ὁ λόγος ἐστί, σὐ ήγεῖ οἶόν τε είναι μαχάριον άνδρα άδιχοῦντά τε χαὶ ἀδιχον ὄντα, εἴπερ ² Αρχέλαον άδικον μέν ήγει είναι, εύδαίμονα δέ. άλλο τι ώς ούτω σου νομίζοντος διανοώμεθα: ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ γε.

CAP. XXVIII. ΣΩ. Ἐγὼ δέ φημι ἀδύνατον. ἕν μὲν τουτὶ ἀμφισβητοῦμεν. εἶεν ἀδικῶν δὲ δὴ εὐδαίμων ἔσται ἀρ', ἂν τυγχάνῃ δίκης τε καὶ τιμωρίας; ΠΩΛ. Ἡκιστά γε, ἐπεὶ οὕτω γ' ἂν ἀθλιώτατος εἶη. ΣΩ. ᾿Αλλ' ἐὰν ἄρα μὴ τυγ-Ε

χάνη δίχης ό άδιχῶν, χατά τὸν σὸν λόγον εὐδαίμων έσται. ΠΩΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ. Κατά δέ γε την έμην δόξαν, ὦ Πῶλε, ὁ ἀδιχῶν τε χαὶ ἐ άδικος πάντως μέν άθλιος, άθλιώτερος μέντοι, έαν μή διδῷ δίκην μηδε τυγχάνη τιμωρίας άδιχών, ήττον δε άθλιος, έαν διδώ δίκην και τυγ-473χάνη δίκης ύπο θεών τε και άνθρώπων. ΠΩΛ. "Ατοπά γε, & Σώχρατες, ἐπιχειρεῖς λέγειν. ΣΩ. Πειράσομαι δέ γε καί σε ποιήσαι, δ έταζοε, ταύτα έμοι λέγειν φίλον γάρ σε ήγουμαι. νυν μέν οῦν & διαφερόμεθα ταῦτ' ἐστί σκόπει δὲ και σύ. είπον έγώ που έν τοις έμπροσθεν το άδιχεῖν τοῦ ἀδιχεῖσθαι χάχιον εἶναι. $Π\Omega \Lambda$. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Σύ δὲ τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι. ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Καὶ τοὺς ἀδιχοῦντας ἀθλίους ἔφην είναι έγώ, και έξηλέγχθην ύπο σου. ΠΩΛ. B Nai µà Aía. $\Sigma \Omega$. Ω s où ye olei, $\tilde{\omega}$ Höle. ΠΩΛ. 'Αληθή γε οἰόμενος ἴσως. ΣΩ. Σύ δέ γε εύδαίμονας αθ τους άδιχουντας, έαν μη διδωσι δίχην. ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ μέν οὖν. $\Sigma \Omega$. Έγω δέ αύτους άθλιωτάτους φημί, τους δε διδόντας δίχην ήττον. βούλει και τουτο έλέγγειν ; ΠΩΛ. 'Αλλ' έτι τουτ' έκείνου χαλεπώτερόν έστιν, δ Σώπρατες, έξελέγξαι. ΣΩ. Ού δητα, ὦ Πῶλε, άλλ' άδύνατον · το γάρ άληθες ουδέποτε έλέγχεται. ΠΩΛ. Πῶς λέγεις ; ἐάν ἀδικῶν ἀνθρω-C πος ληφθή τυραννίδι επιβουλεύων, και ληφθείς στοεβλώται και έκτέμνηται και τους όφθαλμους έκκάηται, και άλλας πολλάς και μεγάλας και παντοδαπάς λώβας αὐτός τε λωβηθείς χαὶ τοὺς 4*

αύτοῦ ἐπιδών παῖδας τε χαὶ γυναῖχα τὸ ἔσχατον ἀνασταυφωθῷ ἢ χαταπιττωθῷ, οὖτος εὐδαιμονέστεφος ἔσται ἢ ἐἀν διαφυγών τύφαννος καταστῷ καὶ ἄφχων ἐν τῷ πόλει διαβιῷ ποιῶν ὅ τι ἀν βούληται, ζηλωτὸς ἂν καὶ εὐδαιμονιζόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀλλων ξένων; ταῦτα λέ- D γεις ἀδύνατον εἶναι ἐξελέγχειν;

CAP. XXIX. ΣΩ. Μορμολύττει αδ, δ γενναῖε Πῶλε, καὶ οὐκ ἐλέγχεις · ἄρτι δὲ ἐμαρτύρου. όμως δε ύπόμνησόν με σμικρόν · εαν αδίκως επιβουλεύων τυραννίδι, είπες; ΠΩΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. Εὐδαιμονέστερος μέν τοίνυν οὐδέποτε ἔσται ούδέτερος αὐτῶν, οὔτε ὁ κατειργασμένος τὴν τυραννίδα άδίχως ούτε ό δίχην διδούς · δυοίν γάρ άθλίοιν εύδαιμονέστερος μέν ούκ αν είη · άθλιώτερος μέντοι ό διαφυγών και τυραννεύσας. Τί Ε τουτο, ῶ Πῶλε; γελάς; ἀλλο αῦ τοῦτο είδος έλέγχου έστίν, έπειδάν τίς τι είπη, καταγελάν, έλέγγειν δε μή; ΠΩΛ. Ούχ οἴει έξεληλέγγθαι, δ Σώπρατες, διαν τοιαύτα λέγης & ούδεις άν φήσειεν ανθρώπων; έπει έρου τινα τουτωνί. ΣΩ. Ω Πωλε, ούχ είμι των πολιτιχών, χαι πέουσι βουλεύειν λαγών, έπειδή ή φυλή έπουτάνευε και έδει με έπιψηφίζειν, γέλωτα παρείχον και ούχ ήπιστάμην επιψηφίζειν. μή ούν μηδε νύν 474 με κέλευε έπιψηφίζειν τους παρόντας, άλλ' εί μή έχεις τούτων βελτίω έλεγχον, όπες νῦν δή έγώ έλεγον, έμοι έν τῷ μέρει παράδος, και πείρασαι τοῦ ἐλέγχου οίον ἐγώ οίμαι δεῖν είναι. ἐγώ γάο ών αν λέγω ένα μέν παρασχέσθαι μόρτυρα έπί-

σταμαι, αὐτὸν πρὸς ὃν ἀν μοι ὁ λόγος ἦ, τοὺς δε πολλούς έω χαίρειν, και ένα επιψηφίζειν επί-Β σταμαι, τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς οὐδὲ διαλέγομαι. ὕρα οῦν, εἰ ἐθελήσεις ἐν τῷ μέρει διδόναι ἔλεγγον άποχρινόμενος τα έρωτώμενα. έγω γάρ δή οίμαι και έμε και σε και τούς άλλους άνθρώπους το άδιχειν του άδιχεισθαι χάχιον ήγεισθαι χαί τό μη διδόναι δίκην του διδόναι. ΠΩΛ. Έγω δέ γε ουτ' έμε ουτ' άλλον άνθρώπων ούδένα. έπει συ δέξαι' αν μαλλον άδικεῖσθαι η άδικεῖν; $\Sigma \Omega$. Καὶ σύ γ' αν και οι άλλοι πάντες. ΠΩΛ. Πολλοῦ γε δεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐτ' ἐγώ οὐτε σύ οὐτ' ἀλλος οὐδείς. c ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν ἀποκρινεῖ; ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ μέν οῦν · καί γὰς ἐπιθυμῶ εἰδέναι ὕ τι ποτ' ἐρεῖς. ΣΩ. Λέγε δή μοι, ϊν' είδης, ώσπες αν εί έξ άρχης σε ήρώτων πότερον δοχεί σοι, ὦ Πῶλε, χάχιον είναι το άδιχειν ή το άδιχεισθαι; ΠΩΑ. Το άδιπείσθαι έμοιγε. ΣΩ. Τί δε δή αίσγιον; πότερον το άδιχεῖν ή το άδιχεῖσθαι ; ³Αποχρίνου. $\Pi \Omega \Lambda$. To adureiv.

CAP. XXX. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν καὶ κάκιον, εἴπες αἴσχιον. ΠΩΛ. ⁶Ηκιστά γε. ΣΩ. Μανθάνω[•] Dοὐ ταὐτὸν ἡγεῖ σύ, ὡς ἔοικας, καλόν τε καὶ ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακὸν καὶ αἰσχοόν. ΠΩΛ. Οὐ δῆτα ΣΩ. Τί δὲ τόδε ; τὰ καλὰ πάντα, οἶον καὶ σώματα καὶ χοώματα καὶ σχήματα καὶ φωνὰς καὶ ἐπιτηδεύματα, εἰς οὐδὲν ἀποβλέπων καλεῖς ἑκάστοτε καλά; οἶον πρῶτον τὰ σώματα τὰ καλὰ οὐχὶ ἤτοι κατὰ τὴν χοείαν λέγεις καλὰ εἶναι, πρὸς ὅ ἂν ἕκαστον χοήσιμον ἦ, πρὸς τοῦτο, ἢ

κατά ήδονήν τινα, έαν έν τῷ θεωρεῖσθαι χαίρειν ποιή τους θεωρούντας; έχεις τι έχτος τούτων λέγειν περί σώματος κάλλους ; ΠΩΛ. Ούκ Ε έγω. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν χαὶ τἆλλα πάντα οὕτω χαὶ σχήματα καί χρώματα ή δια ήδονήν τινα, ή δια ώφέλειαν, η δι' άμφότερα καλά προσαγορεύεις; ΠΩΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. Οὐ καὶ τὰς φωνὰς καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν μουσικὴν πάντα ὡσαύτως; ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Καὶ μὴν τά γε κατὰ τοὺς νόμους και τα έπιτηδεύματα ου δήπου έκτος τούτων έστι τα καλά, τοῦ η ἀφέλιμα είναι, η ήδέα, η άμφότερα. ΠΩΑ. Ούκ έμοιγε δοκεί. ΣΩ. 475 Ούχοῦν χαὶ τὸ τῶν μαθημάτων χάλλος ὡσαύτως; ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ γε · καί καλῶς γε νῦν ὑρίζει, ὦ Σώχρατες, ήδονη τε καὶ ἀγαθῷ ὁριζόμενος τὸ καλόν. ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν τὸ αἰσχοὸν τῷ ἐναντίῳ, λύπη τε καί κακώ; ΠΩΛ. 'Ανάγκη. ΣΩ. Οταν άρα δυοίν χαλοίν θάτερον χάλλιον ή, ή τῷ ἑτέρω τούτοιν ή ἀμφοτέροις ὑπερβάλλον κάλλιόν έστιν, ήτοι ήδονη ή ώφελεία ή αμφοτέροις. ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Καὶ ὅταν δὲ δή δυοῖν αίσχοοῖν τὸ ἕτερον αἴσχιον η, ήτοι λύπη ή κα- Β χῷ ὑπερβάλλον αἴσχιον ἔσται. η οὐχ ἀνάγχη; ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Φέρε δή, πῶς ἐλέγετο νῦν δή περί του άδικεῖν και άδικεῖσθαι; οὐκ ἔλεγες το μέν άδιχεισθαι χάχιον είναι, το δε άδιχειν αίσγιον; ΠΩΑ. "Ελεγον. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν εἴπεο αἴσγιον το ἀδικεῖν τοῦ ἀδικεῖσθαι, ἤτοι λυπηρότερόν έστι και λύπη ύπερβάλλον αἴσχιον αν εἴη, ή κακῷ, ή ἀμφοτέροις; οὐ καὶ τοῦτο ἀνάγκη; ΠΩΛ. Πῶς γάρ ού;

c CAP. XXXI. ΣΩ. Ποῶτον μέν δη σκειψώμεθα · άρα λύπη ύπερβάλλει το άδιχειν του άδιχεισθαι, και άλγοῦσι μάλλον οι ἀδικοῦνιες ἢ οί άδικούμενοι; ΠΩΛ. Ούδαμῶς, ὦ Σώκρατες, τοῦτό γε. ΣΩ. Οὐκ ἀρα λύπη γε ὑπερέχει. ΠΩΑ. Οὐ δῆτα. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν εἰ μὴ λύπη, άμφοτέροις μέν ούκ αν έτι ύπερβάλλοι. ΠΩΛ. Οὐ φαίνεται. ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν τῷ ἑτέρῳ λείπεται. ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Τῷ κακῶ. ΠΩΛ. "Εοικεν. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν χαχῷ ὑπερβάλλον τὸ ἀδιχεῖν χά-D κιον αν είη τοῦ άδικεῖσθαι. ΠΩΛ. Δηλον δή ότι. ΣΩ. "Αλλο τι οὖν ὑπὸ μέν τῶν πολλῶν άνθρώπων και ύπο σου ώμολογειτο ήμιν έν τῷ ἔμποοσθεν χοόνω αἴσχιον εἶναι το ἀδικεῖν τοῦ ἀδικείσθαι; ΠΩΑ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Νῦν δέ γε κάκιον έφάνη. ΠΩΛ. "Εοιχε. ΣΩ. Δέξαιο ἂν οὖν σύ μάλλον το κάκιον και το αισχιον άντι τοῦ ήττον; Μή ὄχνει ἀποχρίνασθαι, ὦ Πῶλε ούδεν γαο βλαβήσει —, άλλα γενναίως τῷ λόγω, Ε ώσπες ίατοώ, παρέχων αποκρίνου, και η φάθι η μη α έςωτῶ. ΠΩΛ. 'Αλλ' οὐκ ἂν δεξαίμην, ὦ Σώκρατες. ΣΩ. "Αλλος δέ τις ἀνθρώπων ; ΠΩΛ. Ού μοι δοχεῖ χατά γε τοῦτον τὸν λόγον. ΣΩ. 'Αληθή άρα έγω έλεγον, ότι ούτ' αν έγω ούτ' άν σύ ούτ' άλλος ούδεις άνθρώπων δέξαιτ' άν μαλλον άδιχεῖν ή άδιχεῖσθαι· χάχιον γάρ τυγχάνει ον. ΠΩΛ. Φαίνεται. ΣΩ. Ορῶς ουν, & Πωλε, ό έλεγχος παρά τον έλεγχον παραβαλλόμενος ότι ούδεν έσικεν, άλλα σοι μεν οί άλλοι πάντες όμολογοῦσι πλην ἐμοῦ, ἐμοὶ δὲ σῦ

ἐξαρχεῖς εἶς ῶν μόνος καὶ ὁμολογῶν καὶ μαρτυ-476 gῶν, καὶ ἐγῶ σὲ μόνον ἐπιψηφίζων τοὺς ἀλλους ἐῶ χαίρειν. Καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἡμῖν οὕτως ἐχέτω · μετὰ τοῦτο δὲ περὶ οὖ τὸ δεύτερον ἠμφεσβητήσαμεν, σκεψώμεθα, τὸ ἀδικοῦντα διδόναι δίκην ἀρα μέγιστον τῶν κακῶν ἐστιν, ὡς σὺ ῷου, ἡ μεῖζον τὸ μὴ διδόναι, ὡς αὖ ἐγῶ ῷμην. σκοπώμεθα δὲ τῆδε · τὸ διδόναι δίκην καὶ τὸ κολάζεσθαι δικαίως ἀδικοῦντα ἀρα τὸ αὐτὸ καλεῖς ; ΠΩΛ. Ἐκρωγε. ΣΩ. Ἐκεις οὖν λέγειν, ὡς οὐχὶ τά γε δίκαια Β πάντα καλά ἐστι, καθ' ὅσον δίκαια ; καὶ διασκεψάμενος εἰπέ. ΠΩΛ. ᾿Αλλά μοι δοκεῖ, ὦ Σώκρατες.

CAP. XXXII. ΣΩ. Σχόπει δη χαὶ τόδε · ἆρα εί τίς τι ποιεῖ, ἀνάγκη τι εἶναι καὶ πάσχον ὑπὸ τούτου τοῦ ποιοῦντος; ΠΩΑ. "Εμοιγε δοχεῖ. ΣΩ. 3Αρα τοῦτο πάσχον ὕ τὸ ποιοῦν ποιεῖ, καὶ τοιούτον οίον ποιεί τὸ ποιούν; λέγω δὲ τὸ τοιόνδε · εί τις τύπτει, ανάγκη τι τύπτεσθαι; ΠΩΛ. 'Ανάγκη. ΣΩ. Καὶ εἰ σφόδρα τύπτει η C ταχύ ὁ τύπτων, ούτω καὶ τὸ τυπτόμενον τύπτεσθαι; ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Τοιοῦτον ἀρα πάθος τῷ τυπτομένφ ἐστίν οἶον αν τὸ τύπτον ποιη; ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν χαὶ εἰ χάει τις, άνάγχη τι κάεσθαι; ΠΩΛ. Πῶς γάρ οΰ; ΣΩ. Καί εί σφόδρα γε κάει η άλγεινως, ούτω κάεσθαι τό καόμενον ώς αν τό καον κάη; ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν χαὶ εἰ τέμνει τις, ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος ; τέμνεται γάρ τι. ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Καὶ εἰ μέγα γε ή βαθύ τὸ τμημα ή ἀλγεινόν.
- D τοιούτον τμήμα τέμνεται τό τεμνόμενον οίον τό τέμνον τέμνει; ΠΩΛ. Φαίνεται. ΣΩ. Συλλήβδην δή όρα, εί όμολογεις ο άρτι έλεγον περί πάντων · οίον αν ποιη το ποιούν, τοιούτον το πάσχον πάσχειν. ΠΩΛ. 'Αλλ' όμολογω. ΣΩ. Τούτων δή όμολογουμένων, το δίκην διδόναι πότερον πάσχειν τί έστιν η ποιείν; ΠΩΛ. Ανάγκη, ^δ Σώκρατες, πάσχειν. ΣΩ. Ούκοῦν ὑπό τινος ποιούντος; ΠΩΛ. Πῶς γὰο οΫ; ὑπό γε τοῦ Ε χολάζοντος. ΣΩ. Ο δε όρθῶς χολάζων διχαίως κολάζει; ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Δίκαια ποιών, η ού; ΠΩΑ. Δίχαια. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν ὁ χολαζόμενος δίχην διδούς δίχαια πάσχει; ΠΩΛ. Φαίνεται. ΣΩ. Τὰ δὲ δίχαιά που χαλὰ ώμολόγηται; ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Τούτων άρα ό μεν ποιεί καλά, ό δε πάσχει, ό κολαζόμενος. ΠΩA. Naí.
- CAP. XXXIII. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν εἴπες χαλά, 4πἀγαθά; ἢ γὰς ἡδέα ἢ ἀφέλιμα. ΠΩΛ. ᾿Ανάγχη. ΣΩ. ᾿Αγαθὰ ἀςα πάσχει ὁ δίχην διδούς; ΠΩΛ. Ἐοικεν. ΣΩ. ˁΩφελεῖται ἀςα; ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. ᾿Αςα ἥνπες ἐγὼ ὑπολαμβάνω τὴν ἀφέλειαν; βελτίων τὴν ψυχὴν γίγνεται, εἴπες διχαίως χολάζεται; ΠΩΛ. Εἰχός γε. ΣΩ. Καχίας ἄςα ψυχῆς ἀπαλλάττεται ὁ δίχην διδούς; ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. ᾿Ας' οὖν τοῦ μεγίστου Β ἀπαλλάττεται καχοῦ; ˁΩδε δὲ σχόπει. ἐν χοημάτων χατασχευῆ ἀνθςώπου χαχίαν ἀλλὴν τινὰ ἐνοςᾶς ἢ πενίαν; ΠΩΛ. Οὕχ, ἀλλὰ πενίαν. ΣΩ. Τί δ' ἐν σώματος χατασχευῦ; χαχίαν ἂν

φήσαις ασθένειαν είναι και νόσον και αίσχος και τά τοιαῦτα; ΠΩΑ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν καί ἐν ψυχη πονηρίαν ήγει τινα είναι; ΠΩΛ. Πῶς γὰρ ού; ΣΩ. Ταύτην οῦν οὐκ ἀδικίαν καλεῖς καὶ ἀμαθίαν καὶ δειλίαν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα; ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ μέν οῦν. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν γοημάτων καί σώματος καί ψυχης, τριών όντων, τριττάς C είοηκας πονηρίας, πενίαν, νόσον, άδικίαν; ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Τίς οῦν τούτων τῶν πονηοιών αἰσχίστη; οὐχ ἡ ἀδικία καὶ συλλήβδην ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς πονηρία; ΠΩΛ. Πολύ γε. ΣΩ. Εί δή αἰσχίστη, καὶ κακίστη; ΠΩΛ. Πῶς, ὦ Σώχρατες, λέγεις; ΣΩ. Ωδί · αεί το αἴσχιστον, ήτοι λύπην μεγίστην παρέχον ή βλάβην ή αμφότερα, αἴσχιστόν ἐστιν ἐχ τῶν ὡμολογημένων έν τῷ ἔμπροσθεν. ΠΩΛ. Μάλιστα. ΣΩ. Αἴσχιστον δε άδικία και σύμπασα ψυχης πονηγία νῦν δή ώμολόγηται ήμιν; ΠΩΑ. 'Ωμολόγηται D γάρ. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν ή ἀνιαρότατόν ἐστιν καὶ ανία ύπερβάλλον αζοχιστον τούτων έστίν, ή βλάβη, η ἀμφότερα; ΠΩΛ. ἀΛνάγκη. ΣΩ. 3 Αρ' οὖν ἀλγεινότερόν ἐστι τοῦ πένεσθαι καὶ χάμνειν το άδιχον είναι χαι άχόλαστον χαι δειλόν καί αμαθή; ΠΩΛ. Ούκ ἕμοιγε δοκεί, α Σώχρατες, από τούτων γε. ΣΩ. Υπερφυεί τινι άρα ώς μεγάλη βλάβη και κακῷ θαυμασίω ύπερβάλλουσα τἆλλα ή της ψυγής πονηρία αἴσχιστόν Ε έστι πάντων, έπειδή ούκ άλγηδόνι γε, ώς ό σὸς λόγος. ΠΩΛ. Φαίνεται. ΣΩ. 'Αλλά μήν που τό γε μεγίστη βλάβη ύπερβάλλον μέγιστον αν

κακὸν εἶη τῶν ὄντων. ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. 'Η ἀδικία ἄοα καὶ ἡ ἀκολασία καὶ ἡ ἄλλη ψυχῆς πονηοία μέγιστον τῶν ὄντων κακόν ἐστι; ΠΩΛ. Φαίνεται.

CAP. XXXIV. $\Sigma\Omega$. Tis our téxun πενίας άπαλλάττει; ού χρηματιστική; ΠΩΑ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Τίς δὲ νόσου; οὐχ ἰατριχή; ΠΩΛ. 478 Ανάγκη. ΣΩ. Τίς δὲ πονηρίας καὶ ἀδικίας; Εί μή ούτως εύπορεῖς, ὦδε σχόπει · ποῖ ἄγομεν καί παρά τίνας τους κάμνοντας τα σώματα; ΠΩΛ. Παρά τούς ἰατρούς, ὦ Σώχρατες. ΣΩ. Ποϊ δέ τους άδιχοῦντας χαὶ τους άχολασταίνοντας; ΠΩΛ. Παρά τούς δικαστάς λέγεις; ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν δίχην δώσοντας ; ΠΩΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ. Αρ' οὖν οὐ δικαιοσύνη τινὶ χρώμενοι κολάζουσιν οἱ ὀρθῶς χολάζοντες; ΠΩΛ. Δῆλον Β δή. ΣΩ. Χοηματιστική μέν άρα πενίας άπαλλάττει, ἰατρική δὲ νόσου, δίκη δὲ ἀχολασίας καὶ άδικίας. ΠΩΛ. Φαίνεται. ΣΩ. Τί οῦν τούτων χάλλιστόν έστιν [ών λέγεις]; ΠΩΑ. Τίνων λέγεις; ΣΩ. Χοηματιστικής, ιατοικής, δίκης. ΠΩΛ. Πολύ διαφέρει, ὦ Σώκρατες, ή δίκη. ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν αῦ ἤτοι ἡδονὴν πλείστην ποιεῖ, ἢ ὦφέλειαν, ἡ ἀμφότερα, εἴπερ κάλλιστόν έστι; ΠΩΑ. Ναί. ΣΩ. ⁵Αρ' οὖν τὸ ἰατρεύεσθαι ήδύ έστι, και χαίρουσιν οι ιατρευόμενοι; ΠΩΛ. Ούχ έμοιγε δοχεί. ΣΩ. 'Αλλ' ωφέλι-C μόν γε. η γάρ; ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Μεγάλου γάρ χαχοῦ ἀπαλλάττεται, ὥστε λυσιτελεῖ ὑπομεϊναι την άλγηδόνα και ύγιει είναι. ΠΩΛ

Πῶς γὰρ οὐ; ΣΩ. ᾿Αρ' οὖν οὕτως ἂν περί σῶμα εύδαιμονέστατος άνθρωπος είη, ιατρευόμενος, η μηδέ κάμνων άρχήν; ΠΩΛ. Δηλον, ὅτι μηδέ κάμνων. ΣΩ. Οὐ γὰς τοῦτ' ἦν εὐδαιμονία, ὡς έοιχε, χαχοῦ ἀπαλλαγή, ἀλλὰ την ἀρχην μηδὲ κτήσις. ΠΩΛ. "Εστι ταυτα. ΣΩ. Τί δέ; άθλιώτερος πότερος δυοίν έχόντοιν χαχόν είτ' έν D σώματι είτ' έν ψυχη; ό ἰατοευόμενος και άπαλλαττόμενος τοῦ κακοῦ, ἡ ὁ μὴ ἰατοευόμενος, ἔχων δέ; ΠΩΛ. Φαίνεταί μοι ό μη λατρευόμενος. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν τὸ δίχην διδόναι μεγίστου χαχοῦ απαλλαγή ην, πονηρίας; ΠΩΛ. ³Ην γάρ. ΣΩ. Σωφρονίζει γάρ που και δικαιοτέρους ποιεί καί ἰατρική γίγνεται πονηρίας ή δίκη. ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Εὐδαιμονέστατος μέν ἄρα ὁ μὴ ἔχων Ε κακίαν έν ψυχη, έπειδή τοῦτο μέγιστον τῶν καχών έφάνη. ΠΩΛ. Δήλον δή. ΣΩ. Δεύτερος δήπου ό απαλλαττόμενος. ΠΩΛ. "Εοικεν. ΣΩ. Ούτος δ' ην ό νουθετούμενός τε καί έπιπληττόμενος και δίκην διδούς. ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Κάχιστα άρα ζη ό έχων άδιχίαν χαὶ μή απαλλαττόμενος. ΠΩΛ. Φαίνεται. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν οῦτος τυγχάνει ὤν, ΰς ἂν τὰ μέγιστα ἀδικῶν καί γρώμενος μεγίστη άδικία διαπράξηται ώστε 479 μήτε νουθετείσθαι μήτε χολάζεσθαι μήτε δίχην διδόναι, ώσπες σύ φής 'Αρχέλαον παρεσκευάσθαι χαί τους άλλους τυράννους χαι φήτορας χαι δυνάστας; ΠΩΛ. "Εοιχε.

CAP. XXXV. ΣΩ. Σχεδον γάς που ούτοι, δ ἄριστε, το αὐτο διαπεπραγμένοι εἰσί, ὥσπες ἂν

εί τις τοις μεγίστοις νοσήμασι συνισχόμενος διαπράξαιτο μή διδόναι δίχην των περί το σωμα άμαρτημάτων τοῖς ἰατροῖς μηδὲ ἰατρεύεσθαι, φο-Β βούμενος, ώσπερανεί παῖς, τὸ κάεσθαι καὶ τὸ τέμνεσθαι, ότι άλγεινόν. η ού δοχεῖ χαὶ σοὶ ούτως ; ΠΩΛ. "Εμοιγε. ΣΩ. 'Αγνοών γε, ώς έοικεν, οίόν έστιν ή ύγίεια και άρετη σώματος. χινδυνεύουσι γάρ έχ τῶν νῦν ἡμῖν ὡμολογημένων τοιουτόν τι ποιείν και οι την δίκην φεύγοντες, ῶ Πῶλε, τὸ ἀλγεινὸν αὐτοῦ καθορᾶν, πρὸς δὲ τὸ ώφέλιμον τυφλώς έχειν και άγνοειν ύσω άθλιώτερόν έστι μη ύγιοῦς σώματος μη ύγιεῖ ψυγη C συνοικεῖν, ἀλλὰ σαθρῷ καὶ ἀδίκῷ καὶ ἀνοσίῷ. δθεν καί παν ποιούσιν, ώστε δίκην μη διδόναι μηδ' απαλλάττεσθαι τοῦ μεγίστου κακοῦ, καὶ γρήματα παρασκευαζόμενοι και φίλους και όπως άν ώσιν ώς πιθανώτατοι λέγειν. εί δε ήμεις άληθη ώμολογήχαμεν, ὦ Πῶλε, ἀρ' αἰσθάνει τὰ συμβαίνοντα έχ τοῦ λόγου; η βούλει συλλογισώμεθα αὐτά; ΠΩΛ. Εἰ μη σοί γε. ἀλλως δοκεί. ΣΩ. Αρ' ουν συμβαίνει μέγιστον καχον ή αδικία και το αδικείν; ΠΩΛ. Φαίνεταί Dyε. ΣΩ. Καὶ μην ἀπαλλαγή γε ἐφάνη τούτου τοῦ κακοῦ τὸ δίκην διδόναι; ΠΩΛ. Κινδυνεύει. ΣΩ. Τὸ δέ γε μη διδόναι ἐμμονή τοῦ χαχοῦ; ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Δεύτερον ἀρα ἐστὶ τῶν κακῶν μεγέθει τὸ ἀδικεῖν · τὸ δὲ ἀδικοῦντα μή διδόναι δίχην πάντων μέγιστόν τε χαι πρώτον κακῶν πέφυκεν. ΠΩΛ. "Εοικεν. ΣΩ. 3Ας' ούν ού περί τούτου, ὦ φίλε, ἡμφεσβητήσαμεν, σύ

μέν τον 'Αοχέλαον εὐδαιμονίζων τον τὰ μέγιστα ἀδικοῦντα δίκην οὐδεμίαν διδόντα, ἐγῶ δὲ τοὐ- Ε ναντίον οἰόμενος, εἴτ' 'Αοχέλαος εἴτ' ἀλλος ἀνθρώπων ὑστισοῦν μὴ δίδωσι δίκην ἀδικῶν, τούτῷ προσήκειν ἀθλίῷ εἶναι διαφερόντως τῶν ἀλλων ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀεὶ τον ἀδικοῦντα τοῦ ἀδικουμένου ἀθλιώτερον εἶναι καὶ τον μὴ διδόντα δίκην τοῦ διδόντος; οὐ ταῦτ' ἦν τὰ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ λεγόμενα; ΠΩΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν ἀποδέδεικται, ὅτι ἀληθῆ ἐλέγετο; ΠΩΛ. Φαίνεται.

CAP. XXXVI. $\Sigma \Omega$. Eiev. ei oùv dù tav-480 τα αληθη, ω Πωλε, τίς ή μεγάλη χρεία έστι της όητορικής; δει μέν γάρ δή έκ των νυν ώμολογημένων αύτον ξαυτόν μάλιστα φυλάττειν, όπως μή άδικήση, ώς ίκανον κακόν έξοντα. ού γάρ; ΠΩΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Ἐὰν δέ γε ἀδικήσῃ ή αύτός, η άλλος τις ών αν χήδηται, αυτόν έχόντα ίέναι έχεισε όπου ώς τάχιστα δώσει δίχην, παρά τόν δικαστήν ώσπερ παρά τον ίατρόν, σπεύδοντα ὅπως μή ἐγχρονισθέν το νόσημα τῆς ἀδικίας Β υπουλον την ψυχην ποιήση και άνίατον · ή πως λέγομεν, ὦ Πῶλε, εἴπεο τὰ πρότερον μένει ήμιν όμολογήματα; ούχ άνάγχη ταυτα έχείνοις ούτω μέν συμφωνείν, άλλως δε μή; ΠΩΛ. Τί γαο δή φωμεν, ὦ Σώχρατες; ΣΩ. Ἐπὶ μὲν ἀρα το απολογείσθαι ύπεο της αδικίας της αύτου, ή γονέων, η έταίοων, η παίδων, η πατρίδος άδικούσης ού χρήσιμος ούδεν ή όητορική ήμιν, α Πώλε, εἰ μή εἴ τις ὑπολάβοι ἐπὶ τοὐναντίον, C κατηγορείν δείν μάλιστα μέν έαυτου, έπειτα δέ

και των οικείων και των άλλων δς αν άει των φίλων τυγχάνη άδικῶν, καὶ μὴ ἀποκρύπτεσθαι, άλλ' είς το φανερον άγειν το άδίχημα, ίνα δώ δίχην και ύγιης γένηται, άναγκάζειν τε και αύτόν καί τους άλλους μη άποδειλιαν, άλλα παρέχειν μύσαντα και άνδοείως, ώσπεο τέμνειν και χάειν ἰατοῷ, τὸ ἀγαθὸν χαὶ χαλὸν διώχοντα, μὴ D ύπολογιζόμενον το άλγεινόν · ἐάν μέν γε πληγῶν άξια ήδικηκώς ή, τύπτειν παρέχοντα, έαν δε δεσμού, δείν, έαν δε ζημίας, αποτίνοντα, έαν δε φυγῆς, φεύγοντα, ἐάν δὲ θανάτου, ἀποθνήσκοντα, αύτον πρώτον όντα χατήγορον χαί αύτου χαί τών άλλων οίχείων χαι έπι τουτο χρώμενον τη όητορικῆ, ὅπως ἂν καταδήλων τῶν ἀδικημάτων γιγνομένων απαλλάττωνται του μεγίστου χαχού, αδιχίας. Ε φώμεν ούτως, η μη φώμεν, ὦ Πώλε; ΠΩΛ. "Ατοπα μέν, ὦ Σώχρατες, ἔμοιγε δοχεῖ, τοῖς μέντοι ἔμπροσθεν ἴσως σοι ὁμολογεῖται. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν ή κάκεινα λυτέον, ή τάδε άνάγκη συμβαίνειν ; ΠΩΛ. Ναί, τοῦτό γε οῦτως ἔχει. ΣΩ. Τοὐναντίον δέ γε αὖ μεταβαλόντα εἰ ἀρα δεῖ τινα κακώς ποιείν, είτ' έγθρον είτε όντινουν, έαν μόνον μη αύτος άδικηται ύπο του έχθρου, --- τουτο μέν γάρ εύλαβητέον - έάν δε άλλον άδικη ό 181 έχθρός, παντί τρόπω παρασχευαστέον χαὶ πράιτοντα χαὶ λέγοντα, ὅπως μὴ δῷ δίχην μηδὲ ἔλθῃ παρά τον δικαστήν έαν δε έλθη, μηχανητέον δπως αν διαφύγη και μη δω δίκην ό έχθοός, άλλ' έάν τε χουσίον ήρπαχώς ή πολύ, μη άποδιδώ τούτο, άλλ' έχων άναλίσκηται καί εἰς ἑαυτόν

καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ ἀδίκως καὶ ἀθέως, ἐάν τε αὖ Φανάτου ἀξια ἡδικηκώς ἦ, ὅπως μὴ ἀποθανεῖται, μάλιστα μὲν μηδέποτε, ἀλλ' ἀθάνατος ἔσται πο- Β νηǫος ὥν, εἰ δὲ μή, ὅπως ὡς πλεῖστον χοόνον βιώσεται τοιοῦτος ὥν. ἐπὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ, ὦ Πῶλε, ἡ ἡητοοικὴ χοήσιμος εἶναι, ἐπεὶ τῷ γε μὴ μέλλοντι ἀδικεῖν οὐ μεγάλη τίς μοι δοκεῖ ἡ χοεία αὐτῆς εἶναι, εἰ δὴ καὶ ἔστι τις χοεία· ὡς ἔν γε τοῖς ποόσθεν οὐδαμῆ ἐφάνη οὖσα.

CAP. XXXVII. KAA. Einé µoi, & Xaigeφῶν, σπουδάζει ταῦτα Σωχράτης, η παίζει; ΧΑΙ. 'Εμοί μέν δοχεί, & Καλλίχλεις, ύπερφυῶς σπουδάζειν · ούδεν μέντοι οίον το αύτον ερωταν. C ΚΑΛ. Νή τους θεους αλλ' ἐπιθυμώ. Εἰπέ μοι, ω Σώχρατες, πότερόν σε φωμεν νυνί σπουδάζοντα, η παίζοντα; εί μεν γαρ σπουδάζεις τε καί τυγχάνει ταῦτα ἀληθη ὄντα, ὰ λέγεις, ἄλλο τι η ήμων ό βίος ανατετραμμένος αν είη των άνθρώπων και πάντα τα εναντία πράττομεν, ώς ἔοικεν, η ά δεῖ; ΣΩ. 3Ω Καλλίκλεις, εἰ μή τι ην τοις ανθρώποις πάθος, τοις μέν άλλο τι, τοις δε άλλο τι, τὸ αὐτό, ἀλλά τις ἡμῶν ἴδιόν τι ἔπα- D σχε πάθος ή οί άλλοι, ούκ αν ήν δάδιον ένδείξασθαι τῷ έτέρω τὸ ἑαυτοῦ πάθημα. λέγω δ' έννοήσας, ὅτι ἐγώ τε χαὶ σὐ νῦν τυγχάνομεν ταὐτόν τι πεπονθότες, έρωντε δύο όντε δυείν έχάτεços, έγώ μέν 'Αλκιβιάδου τε τοῦ Κλεινίου καὶ φιλοσοφίας, σύ δέ του τε 'Αθηναίων δήμου καί τοῦ Πυριλάμπους. αἰσθάνομαι οὖν σου ἑχάστοτε, χαίπεο όντος δεινου, ότι όπόσ' αν φη σου

τα παιδικά και όπως αν φη έχειν, ού δυναμένου Ε άντιλέγειν, άλλ' άνω και κάτω μεταβαλλομένου. έν τε τη έκκλησία, έάν τι σοῦ λέγοντος ὁ δημος ό Αθηναίων μη φη ούτως έχειν, μεταβαλλόμενος λέγεις & έχεινος βούλεται, και πρός τον Πυριλάμπους νεανίαν τον καλόν τουτον τοιαυτα έτερα πέπονθας. τοις γάρ των παιδιχών βουλεύμασί τε και λόγοις ούγ οϊός τ' εί έναντιοῦσθαι, ώστε, ει τίς σου λέγοντος έχάστοτε & δια τούτους λέγεις θαυμάζοι ώς ἄτοπά έστιν, ίσως είποις αν 482 αύτῷ, εἰ βούλοιο τάληθη λέγειν, ὅτι, εἰ μή τις παύσει τα σα παιδικά τούτων των λόγων, ούδε σύ παύσει ποτέ ταῦτα λέγων. νόμιζε τοίνυν καὶ παρ' έμου χρηναι έτερα τοιαυτα άχούειν, χαί μή θαύμαζε, ότι έγω ταῦτα λέγω, ἀλλὰ τήν φιλοσοφίαν, τὰ ἐμὰ παιδικά, παῦσον ταῦτα λέγουσαν. λέγει γάρ, ὦ φίλε έταῖρε, ἀεὶ & νῦν ἐμοῦ άχούεις, χαί μοί έστι τῶν ἑτέρων παιδιχῶν πολύ ήττον έμπληχτος · ό μέν γάο Κλεινίειος ούτος άλλοτε άλλων έστι λόγων, ή δε φιλοσοφία αεί Β τῶν αὐτῶν. λέγει δὲ ἅ σῦ νῦν θαυμάζεις · παοήσθα δε καί αύτος λεγομένοις. ή ουν εκείνην έξέλεγξον, ὅπερ ἀρτι ἔλεγον, ὡς οὐ τὸ ἀδικεῖν έστι και άδικούντα δίκην μη διδόναι άπάντων ἔσχατον κακῶν· ή εἰ τοῦτο ἐάσεις ἀνέλεγκτον, μα τον κύνα, τον Αίγυπτίων θεόν, ού σοι όμολογήσει Καλλικλής, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, ἀλλὰ διαφωνήσει έν απαντι τῷ βίω. καίτοι ἔγωγε οἶμαι, ὦ βέλτιστε, καί την λύραν μοι κρειττον είναι άναρ-C μοστείν τε καί διαφωνείν, και γορόν & γορηγοίην.

καὶ πλείστους ἀνθοώπους μὴ ὁμολογεῖν μοι ἀλλ' ἐναντία λέγειν, μᾶλλον ἢ ἕνα ὄντα ἐμὲ ἐμαυτῷ ἀσύμφωνον εἶναι καὶ ἐναντία λέγειν.

CAP. XXXVIII. KAA. 3 D. Zwzgates, Soκεῖς νεανιεύεσθαι ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ὡς ἀληθῶς δημηγόρος ών και νῦν ταῦτα δημηγορεῖς ταὐτον παθόντος Πώλου πάθος, ὅπες Γοργίου κατηγόρει πρός σε παθεῖν. ἔφη γάς που Γοργίαν έρωτώμενον ύπο σοῦ, ἐάν ἀφίκηται πας' αὐτὸν μή έπιστάμενος τα δίχαια ό την δητοριχην βουλό- D μενος μαθείν, εί διδάξει αὐτὸν ὁ Γοργίας, αίσχυνθηναι αὐτὸν καὶ φάναι διδάξειν διὰ τὸ ἔθος τών ανθρώπων, ότι αγανακτοιεν αν, εί τις μή φαίη · δια δή ταύτην την όμολογίαν αναγκασθηναι έναντία αὐτὸν αύτῷ εἰπεῖν, σὲ δὲ αὐτὸ τοῦτο άγαπάν. καί σου κατεγέλα, ως γέ μοι δοκεῖν, όρθῶς τότε. νῦν δὲ πάλιν αὐτὸς ταὐτὸν τοῦτο ἔπαθε, καὶ ἔγωγε κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀγαμαι Πώλον, ότι σοι συνεχώρησε το άδικεῖν αἴσχιον Ε είναι τοῦ ἀδικεῖσθαι· ἐκ ταύτης γάρ αὖ τῆς όμολογίας αύτος ύπο σου συμποδισθείς έν τοις λόγοις έπεστομίσθη, αἰσγυνθεὶς & ἐνόει εἰπεῖν. σύ γάρ τῷ όντι, ὦ Σώχρατες, εἰς τοιαῦτα ἀγεις φορτικά καί δημηγορικά, φάσκων την άλήθειαν διώχειν, α φύσει μέν ούχ έστι χαλά, νόμω δέ. ώς τα πολλα δε ταυτα έναντία αλλήλοις έστίν. ή τε φύσις και ό νόμος. Εάν οῦν τις αἰσχύνηται χαὶ μὴ τολμῷ λέγειν ἅπερ νοεῖ, ἀναγχάζεται 483 έναντία λέγειν. ΰ δή και σύ τοῦτο τὸ σοφόν κατανενοηχώς χαχουργείς έν τοις λόγοις, έαν μέν

GORGIAS.

τις κατά νόμον λέγῃ, κατά φύσιν ὑπερωτῶν, ἐἀν δε τα της φύσεως, τα τοῦ νόμου. ῶσπες αὐτίχα έν τούτοις, τῷ ἀδικεῖν τε καὶ τῷ ἀδικεῖσθαι, Πώλου το κατά νόμον αἴσχιον λέγοντος, σῦ τον νόμον έδιώκαθες κατά φύσιν. φύσει μέν γάο παν αἴσχιόν ἐστιν ὅπερ καὶ κάκιον, * οἶον * τὸ ἀδι-Β κεῖσθαι, νόμω δὲ τὸ ἀδικεῖν. οὐδὲ γὰο ἀνδοὸς τοῦτό γ' ἐστὶ τὸ πάθημα, τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' άνδραπόδου τινός, ῷ χρεῖττόν ἐστι τεθνάναι ή ζην, όστις άδιχούμενος χαί προπηλαχιζόμενος μή οίόστε έστιν αύτος αύτῷ βοηθεῖν μηδε άλλω οῦ άν κήδηται. άλλ', οίμαι, οί τιθέμενοι τούς νόμους οί ασθενείς ανθρωποί είσι και οί πολλοί. προς αύτους οὖν και τὸ αύτοῖς συμφέρον τούς τε νόμους τίθενται χαὶ τοὺς ἐπαίνους ἐπαινοῦσι χαὶ C τούς ψόγους ψέγουσιν· — έχφοβοῦντές τούς έζόωμενεστέρους των άνθρώπων και δυνατούς όντας πλέον ἔχειν, ἵνα μή αὐτῶν πλέον ἔχωσι, λέγουσιν, ώς αἰσχοὸν καὶ ἄδικον τὸ πλεονεκτεῖν, καί τοῦτο ἔστι τὸ ἀδικεῖν, τὸ πλέον τῶν ἀλλων ζητείν έχειν · άγαπωσι γάρ, οίμαι, αύτοι άν το ίσον ἔγωσι φαυλότεροι ὄντες. CAP. XXXIX. διά ταυτα δή νόμω μέν τουτο άδιχον χαι αισχοόν λέγεται, τὸ πλέον ζητεῖν ἔχειν τῶν πολλῶν, καὶ άδιχειν αύτο χαλούσιν ή δέ γε, οίμαι, φύσις D αύτή ἀποφαίνει αὐτὸ, ὅτι δίχαιόν ἐστι τὸν ἀμείνω τοῦ χείοονος πλέον ἔχειν και τόν δυνατώτερον τοῦ ἀδυνατωτέρου. δηλοῖ δὲ ταῦτα πολλαχοῦ ὅτι οὕτως ἔχει, χαὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀλλοις ζώοις χαὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν ὅλαις ταῖς πόλεσι καὶ τοῖς γέ-

PLATONIS

νεσιν, ότι ούτω το δίχαιον χέχριται, τον χρείττω τοῦ ήττονος ἀρχειν καὶ πλέον ἔχειν. ἐπεὶ ποίφ δικαίω χρώμενος Ξέρξης ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐστρά-Ε τευσεν, ή ό πατής αύτοῦ ἐπὶ Σχύθας; ή άλλα μυρία άν τις έχοι τοιαύτα λέγειν. άλλ' οίμαι, ούτοι κατα φύσιν [την του δικαίου] ταυτα πράττουσι, καί ναι μα Δία κατά νόμον γε τον της φύσεως, ού μέντοι ίσως χατά τοῦτον, ΰν ήμεῖς τιθέμεθα πλάττοντες τούς βελτίστους και έφωμενεστάτους ήμων αύιων έχ νέων λαμβάνοντες, ώσπερ λέοντας χατεπάδοντές τε χαι γοητεύοντες 484 χαταδουλούμεθα, λέγοντες, ώς το ίσον χοή έχειν καί τουτό έστι το καλόν καί το δίκαιον. έαν δέ γε, οίμαι, φύσιν ίχανην γένηται έχων άνής, πάντα ταυτα αποσεισάμενος και διαδόήξας και διαφυγών, καταπατήσας τα ήμέτερα γράμματα καί μαγγανεύματα καί έπωδας και νόμους τους παρά φύσιν άπαντας, ἐπαναστάς άνεφάνη δεσπότης ήμέτερος ό δούλος, και ένταῦθα ἐξέλαμψε το Β της φύσεως δίχαιον. δοχεί δέ μοι χαι Πίνδαρος άπερ έγω λέγω ένδείχνυσθαι έν τῷ ἀσματι, έν ῷ λέγει, ὅτι Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς θνατών τε χαὶ ἀθανάτων οῦτος δὲ δή, φησίν, άγει δικαιών το βιαιότατον ύπερτάτα χερί· τεχμαίρομαι ἔργοισιν 'Ηραχλέος, έπει απριάτας - λέγει ούτω πως το γάρ δσμα ούκ επίσταμαι. λέγει δ', ότι ούτε ποιάμενος ούτε δόντος του Γηρυόνου ήλάσατο τας βούς, ώς τούτου όντος του δικαίου φύσει, καί C βοῦς καὶ τἆλλα κτήματα εἶναι πάντα τοῦ βελ-

58

GORGIAS.

τίονός τε και κρείττονος τα των χειρόνων τε και ήττόνων. CAP. XL. το μέν ουν αληθές ουτως έχει, γνώσει δέ, αν επί τα μείζω έλθης εάσας ήδη φιλοσοφίαν. φιλοσοφία γάο τοί έστιν, ὦ Σώχρατες, γαρίεν, αν τις αύτοῦ μετρίως αψηται έν τη ήλικία · έαν δε περαιτέρω του δέοντος ένδιατρίψη, διαφθορά των άνθρώπων. έάν γάρ καὶ πάνυ εὐφυὴς ἦ καὶ πόἰξω τῆς ἡλικίας φιλο-D σοφή, ανάγκη πάντων απειρον γεγονέναι έστίν, ών χρή έμπειρον είναι τον μέλλοντα χαλόν χάγαθόν καί εὐδόκιμον ἔσεσθαι ἀνδρα. καὶ γὰρ τῶν νόμων ἀπειροι γίγνονται τῶν κατα την πόλιν, καί τῶν λόγων, οἶς δεῖ γρώμενον όμιλεῖν ἐν τοις συμβολαίοις τοις άνθρώποις και ίδία και δημοσία, και των ήδονων τε και επιθυμιών των άνθρωπείων, και συλλήβδην των ήθων παντάπασιν άπειροι γίγνονται. ἐπειδάν οὖν ἔλθωσιν εἴς τινα Ε ίδίαν ή πολιτικήν πράξιν, καταγέλαστοι γίγνονται, ωσπεφ γε, οίμαι, οί πολιτικοί, έπειδάν αθ είς τας ύμετέρας διατριβάς έλθωσι και τους λόγους, καταγέλαστοί είσι. συμβαίνει γαο το τοῦ Εὐοιπίδου · λαμπρός τ' ἐστίν ἕχαστος ἐν τούτω,

χάπὶ τοῦτ' ἐπείγεται,

νέμων τὸ πλεῖστον ἡμέρας τούτῷ μέρος, ἕν' αὐτὸς αὑτοῦ τυγχάνῃ βέλτιστος ὤν.

495 ὅπου δ' ἂν φαῦλος ἢ, ἐντεῦθεν φεύγει καὶ λοιδορεῖ τοῦτο, τὸ δ' ἕτερον ἐπαινεῖ, εὐνοία τῆ ἑαυτοῦ, ἡγούμενος οὕτως αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐπαινεῖν. ἀλλ', οἶμαι, τὸ ὀρθότατόν ἐστιν ἀμφοτέρων μετα-

σχεῖν. φιλοσοφίας μέν, ὅσον παιδείας χάοιν, καλόν μετέχειν, καί ούκ αίσχρον μειρακίω όντι φιλοσοφείν · έπειδάν δε ήδη πρεσθύτερος ών άνθρωπος έτι φιλοσοφή, καταγέλαστον, ὦ Σώκρατες, το χρημα γίγνεται, και έγωγε δμοιότατον πάσγω προς τους φιλοσοφούντας ώσπερ προς τους Β ψελλιζομένους και παίζοντας. όταν μεν γαο παιδίον ίδω, ῷ ἔτι προσήχει διαλέγεσθαι οὕτω, ψελλιζόμενον καί παίζον, χαίρω τε καί χαρίεν μοι φαίνεται και έλευθέριον και πρέπον τη του παιδίου ήλικία · όταν δε σαφώς διαλεγομένου παιδαρίου απούσω, πιπρόν τί μοι δοπεῖ χρημα είναι και άνια μου τα ώτα καί μοι δοκεί δουλο-Ο πρεπές τι είναι · όταν δε άνδρος άκούση τις ψελλιζομένου ή παίζοντα όρα, καταγέλαστον φαίνεται και άνανδρον και πληγών άξιον. ταυτόν οῦν ἔγωγε τοῦτο πάσχω καὶ πρός τοὺς φιλοσοφούντας. παρά νέω μέν γάρ μειραχίω όρων φιλοσοφίαν άγαμαι, και πρέπειν μοι δοκεί, και ήγουμαι έλεύθερόν τινα είναι τουτον τόν άνθρωπον, τόν δε μή φιλοσοφούντα ανελεύθερον χαί ούδέποτε ούδενος άξιώσοντα έαυτον οὔτε χαλοῦ D ούτε γενναίου πράγματος · όταν δε δή πρεσθύτεοον ίδω έτι φιλοσοφούντα και μή απαλλαττόμενον, πληγών μοι δοκεί ήδη δείσθαι, ω Σώκρατες, ούτος ό ανήρ. ΰ γαρ νυν δή έλεγον, ύπάρχει τούτω τῶ ἀνθρώπω, κάν πάνυ εὐφυής ἦ, ἀνάνδρω γενέσθαι φεύγοντι τα μέσα της πόλεως και τας άγοράς, έν αίς έφη ό ποιητής τούς άνδρας άριπρεπείς γίγνεσθαι, καταδεδυκότι δε τον λοιπόν

GORGIAS.

βίον βιώναι μετά μειρακίων έν γωνία τριών η Ε τεττάρων ψιθυρίζοντα, έλεύθερον δε και μέγα και ίχανον μηδέποτε φθέγξασθαι. CAP. XLI. έγω δέ, ὦ Σώκρατες, προς σε επιεικῶς ἔχω φιλικῶς. χινδυνεύω οὖν πεπονθέναι νῦν ὅπεο ὁ Ζηθος πρός τόν 'Αμφίονα ό Εύριπίδου, οδπερ έμνήσθην. καί γάρ έμοι τοιαυτ' άττα έπέρχεται πρός σε λέγειν, οξάπερ έχεινος πρός τον άδελφόν, ότι άμελεῖς, ὦ Σώκρατες, ὧν δεῖ σε ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, καί φύσιν ψυχης ώδε γενναίαν μειρα-436χιώδει τινί διαπρέπεις μορφώματι, χαί οὔτ' ἂν δίχης βουλαῖσι προθεῖ' ἂν ὀρθῶς λόγον, ούτ' είχος αν χαὶ πιθανὸν λάβοις, ούθ' ύπέρ άλλου νεανιχόν βούλευμα βουλεύσαιο. καίτοι, δ φίλε Σώκρατες - καί μοι μηδέν άγθεσθης. εύνοία γάρ έρω τη ση ούχ αίσχρον δοχεί σοι είναι ούτως έχειν, ώς έγώ σε οίμαι έγειν και τούς άλλους τούς πόδρω αεί φιλοσοφίας έλαύνοντας; νῦν γὰρ εἴ τις σοῦ λα**βόμενος** ή άλλου ότουοῦν τῶν τοιούτων εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον απαγάγοι, φάσχων αδιχείν μηδέν Β άδιχοῦντα, οἶσθ' ὅτι οὐχ ἀν ἔγοις ὅ τι χρήσαιο σαυτώ, άλλ' ίλιγγιώης αν καί γασμώο ούκ έγων δ τι είποις, καί είς το δικαστήριον αναβάς, κατηγόρου τυγών πάνυ φαύλου χαὶ μογθηροῦ, ἀποθάνοις άν, εί βούλοιτο θανάτου σοι τιμασθαι. καίτοι πῶς σοφόν τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὦ Σώκρατες, εἴ τις εύφυα λαβούσα τέχνη φώτα ἔθηχε χείοονα, μήτε αὐτὸν αύτῷ δυνάμενον βοηθεῖν μηδ' έχσῶσαι έχ τῶν μεγίστων χινδύνων μήτε ξαυτόν 6

PLATONIS

μήτε άλλον μηδένα, ύπο δὲ τῶν ἐχθοῶν πεοισυλά- C σθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οὐσίαν, ἀτεχνῶς δὲ ἀτιμον ζῆν ἐν τῆ πόλει; τον δὲ τοιοῦτον, εἴ τι καὶ ἀγοοικότεοον εἰοῆσθαι, ἔξεστιν ἐπὶ κόἰδῃς τύπτοντα μὴ διδόναι δίκην. ἀλλ' ὡ 'γαθέ, ἐμοὶ πείθου, παῦσαι δ' ἐλέγχων, πραγμάτων δ' εὐμουσίαν ἀσκει, καὶ ἀσκει ὁπόθεν δόξεις φοονεῖν, ἀλλοις τὰ κομψὰ ταῦτ' ἀφείς, εἴτε ληοήματα χοὴ φάναι εἶναι εἴτε φλυαρίας, ἐξ ὡν κενοῖσιν ἐγκατοικήσεις δόμοις · ζηλῶν οὐκ ἐλέγχοντας ἄνδοας τὰ μικρὰ ταῦτα, ἀλλ' D οῖς ἐστι καὶ βίος καὶ δόξα καὶ ἀλλα πολλὰ ἀγαθά.

CAP. XLII. ΣΩ. Εί χουσην έχων ἐτύγχανον την ψυχήν, & Καλλίκλεις, ούκ αν οἴει με άσμενον εύρειν τούτων τινά των λίθων, ή βα-. σανίζουσι τον γουσόν, την αρίστην, προς ήντινα ἔμελλον προσαγαγών αὐτήν, εἴ μοι ὑμολογήσειεν έχείνη χαλώς τεθεραπεύσθαι την ψυχήν, εδ είσεσθαι, ὅτι ἱκανῶς ἔχω καὶ οὐδέν μοι δεῖ ἀλλης Ε βασάνου; ΚΑΛ. Προς τί δη τοῦτ' ἐρωτῷς, ὦ Σώχρατες; ΣΩ. Έγώ σοι έρω νῦν. οἶμαι έγώ σοι έντετυχηχώς τοιούτω έρμαίω έντετυχηχέναι. ΚΑΛ. Τί δή; ΣΩ. Εῦ οἶδ', ὅτι, άν μοι σύ δμολογήσης περί ῶν ή ἐμὴ ψυχὴ δοξάζει, ταῦτ' ἦδη ἐστίν αὐτὰ τάληθῆ. ἐννοῶ γὰρ, ὅτι 187 τον μέλλοντα βασανιείν ίχανῶς ψυχῆς πέρι όρθῶς τε ζώσης καὶ μὴ τρία ἄρα δεῖ ἔχειν, ά σὐ πάντα ἔχεις, ἐπιστήμην τε καὶ εὖνοιαν καὶ παδδησίαν. έγω γάρ πολλοῖς έντυγχάνω, οί

έμε ούγ οίοί τε είσι βασανίζειν δια το μή σοφοί είναι ωσπες σύ · έτεςοι δέ σοφοί μέν είσιν, ούκ έθέλουσι δέ μοι λέγειν την αλήθειαν δια το μή κήδεσθαί μου ώσπερ σύ·τω δε ξένω τώδε, Γορ-Βγίας τε καὶ Πῶλος, σοφώ μὲν καὶ φίλω ἐστόν έμώ, ένδεεστέρω δε παφόησίας και αισχυντηροτέρω μαλλον του δέοντος · πῶς γὰο ού; ὥ γε εἰς τοσουτον αίσχύνης έληλύθατον, ώστε δια το αίσχύνεσθαι τολμά έχάτερος αὐτῶν αὐτὸς αύτῷ έναντία λέγειν έναντίον πολλών άνθρώπων, καί ταῦτα περί τῶν μεγίστων. σὐ δὲ ταῦτα πάντα έχεις, & οί άλλοι ούκ έχουσι · πεπαίδευσαί τε γάρ ίχανῶς, ὡς πολλοὶ ἂν φήσαιεν 'Αθηναίων, καὶ C ἐμοί γ' εἶ εὐνους. τίνι τεχμηρίω χοῶμαι; ἐγώ σοι έρω. οίδα ύμας έγώ, ὦ Καλλίχλεις, τέτταρας όντας, ποινωνούς γεγονότας σοφίας, σέ τε παί Τίσανδρον, τόν 'Αφιδναΐον, και "Ανδρωνα, τόν Ανδροτίωνος, και Ναυσικύδην, τον Χολαργέα. καί ποτε ύμῶν ἐγώ ἐπήκουσα βουλευομένων μέχρι όποι την σοφίαν άσχητέον εἴη, χαὶ οἶδα, ὅτι ένίκα έν ύμιν τοιάδε τις δόξα, μή προθυμεισθαι D είς την αχρίβειαν φιλοσοφεῖν, αλλα εὐλαβεῖσθαι παρεχελεύεσθε άλλήλοις, ὅπως μή πέρα τοῦ δέοντος σοφώτεροι γενόμενοι λήσετε διαφθαρέντες. έπειδή ούν σου άχούω ταῦτα ἐμοί συμβουλεύοντος, άπερ τοῖς σεαυτοῦ ἑταιροτάτοις, ἱχανόν μοι τεχμήριόν έστιν, ότι ώς άληθως μοι εύνους εί. καί μήν, ότι γε οίος παδόησιάζεσθαι καί μή αίσχύνεσθαι, αὐτός τε φής καὶ ὁ λόγος, ὃν ὀλίγον πρότερον έλεγες, όμολογεί σοι. έχει δή ούτωσί

δήλον δτι τούτων πέρι νυνί · ἐάν τι συ ἐν τοῖs Ε λόγοις όμολογήσης μοι, βεβασανισμένον τοῦτ' ήδη ἔσται ίκανῶς ὑπ' ἐμοῦ τε καὶ σοῦ, καὶ οὐκέτι αύτο δεήσει έπ' άλλην βάσανον άναφέρειν. ού γάρ άν ποτε αύτό συνεγώρησας σύ ούτε σοφίας ένδεία ούτ' αίσχύνης περιουσία · ούδ' αῦ άπατῶν ἐμὲ συγγωρήσαις ἀν · φίλος γάρ μοι εἶ, ὡς καί αύτος φής. τῷ ὄντι οῦν ή ἐμη καὶ ση ὁμολογία τέλος ήδη έξει της άληθείας. πάντων δέ καλλίστη έστιν ή σκέψις, & Καλλίκλεις, περί τούτων ών συ δή μοι έπετίμησας, ποϊόν τινα χρη είναι τον άνδρα και τί επιτηδεύειν και μέγρι του, 488 και πρεσθύτερον και νεώτερον ὄντα. έγω γάρ εί τι μή δοθώς πράτιω κατά τον βίον τον έμαυτου, εῦ ἴσθι τοῦτο ὅτι οὐχ ἑκών ἐξαμαρτάνω, ἀλλ' άμαθία τη έμη. σύ ούν, ώσπερ ήρξω νουθετείν με, μή αποστής, αλλ' έχανως μοι ενδειζαι τί έστι τούτο, δ έπιτηδευτέον μοι, και τίνα τρόπον κτησαίμην αν αύτό. και έάν με λάβης νῦν μέν σοι όμολογήσαντα, έν δε τῷ ύστέρω χρόνω μή ταῦτα πράιτοντα, άπερ ώμολόγησα, πάνυ με ήγοῦ βλακα είναι και μηκέτι ποτέ με νουθετήσης ύστερον, Β ώς μηδενός άξιον όντα. έξ άρχης δέ μοι έπανάλαβε, πῶς φής τὸ δίχαιον ἔγειν χαὶ σừ χαὶ Πίνδαρος το κατά φύσιν; άγειν βία τον κρείττω τά τών ήττόνων και άρχειν τον βελτίω τών γειρόνων και πλέον έγειν τον αμείνω του φαυλοτέρου; μή τι άλλο λέγεις το δίκαιον είναι, η όρθως μέμνημαι;

CAP. XLIII. ΚΑΛ. 'Αλλά ταῦτα έλεγον

χαὶ τότε, χαὶ νῦν λέγω. ΣΩ. Πότερον δὲ τὸν C αὐτὸν βελτίω καλεῖς σῦ καὶ κρείττω; οὐδὲ γάρ τοι τότε οἶός τ' ή μαθεῖν σου τί ποτε λέγεις. πότερον τους ίσχυροτέρους χρείττους χαλείς χαί δεῖ ἀχοοᾶσθαι τοῦ ἰσχυροτέρου τοὺς ἀσθενεστέρους, οίόν μοι δοχείς χαι τότε ένδείχνυσθαι, ώς αί μεγάλαι πόλεις έπι τας σμικράς κατά το φύσει δίχαιον ἔρχονται, ὅτι χρείττους εἰσὶ χαὶ ἰσχυρότεραι, ώς το χρεϊττον χαι ίσχυρότερον χαι βέλτιον ταύτον όν, ή έστι βελτίω μέν είναι, ήττω δέ καί άσθενέστερον, και κρείττω μέν είναι, μοχθηρότε-D ουν δέ· η ό αὐτὸς ὄςος ἐστὶ τοῦ βελτίονος χαὶ τοῦ χρείττονος; τοῦτό μοι αὐτὸ σαφῶς διόρισον, ταύτον, ή έτερόν έστι το χρείττον χαί το βέλτιον καί το ἰσχυρότερον; ΚΑΛ. 'Αλλ' ἐγώ σοι σαφῶς λέγω, ὅτι ταὐτόν ἐστιν. ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν οἱ πολλοί τοῦ ένὸς χρείττους εἰσὶ χατὰ φύσιν; οί δή και τους νόμους τίθενται ἐπὶ τῷ ἑνί, ὥσπερ καὶ σῦ ἀρτι ἔλεγες. ΚΑΛ. Πῶς γὰρ οὕ; ΣΩ. Τὰ τῶν πολλῶν ἀρα νόμιμα τὰ τῶν κρειττόνων Ε ἐστί. ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν τὰ τῶν βελτιόνων; οί γαο χρείττους βελτίους πολύ κατά τον σόν λόγον. ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν τὰ τούτων νόμιμα κατὰ φύσιν καλά, κρειττόνων γε όντων; ΚΑΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ. Αρ' ουν οί πολλοί νομίζουσιν ούτως, ώς άρτι αὖ σὺ ἔλεγες, 489 δίκαιον είναι τὸ ἴσον ἔχειν καὶ αἴσχιον τὸ ἀδικεῖν τοῦ ἀδικεῖσθαι; ἔστι ταῦτα, ἢ οὖ; καὶ ὅπως μὴ άλώσει ένταῦθα σὺ αἰσχυνόμενος. νομίζουσιν, η ού, οί πολλοί το ίσον έχειν άλλ' ού το πλέον 6*

65

PLATONIS

δίκαιον είναι, καὶ αἴσχιον τὸ ἀδικεῖν τοῦ ἀδικεῖσθαι; Μὴ φθόνει μοι ἀποκρίνασθαι τοῦτο, Καλλίκλεις, ἵν', ἐάν μοι ὑμολογήσῃς, βεβαιώσωμαι ἤδη παρὰ σοῦ, ἅτε ἱκανοῦ ἀνδρὸς διαγνῶναι ὑμολογηκότος. ΚΑΑ. ᾿Αλλ' οῦ γε πολλοὶ νομίζουσιν οὕτως. ΣΩ. Οὐ νόμιῷ ἀρα μόνον ἐστὶν αἴσχιον τὸ ἀδικεῖν τοῦ ἀδικεῖσθαι, οὐδὲ δίκαιον τὸ ἴσον ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ φύσει · ὥστε κινδυνεύεις Β οὐκ ἀληθῆ λέγειν ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν οὐδὲ ὀρθῶς ἐμοῦ κατηγορεῖν λέγων ὅτι ἐναντίον ἐστὶν ὁ νόμος καὶ ἡ φύσις, ὣ δὴ καὶ ἐγῶ γνοὺς κακουργῶ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, ἐὰν μέν τις κατὰ φύσιν λέγῃ, ἐπὶ τὸν νόμον ἄγων, ἐὰν δἑ τις κατὰ τὸν νόμον, ἐπὶ τὴν φύσιν.

CAP. XLIV. ΚΑΛ. Θύτοσὶ ἀνήο οὐ παύσεται φλυαρών. Είπέ μοι, δ Σώχρατες, ούχ αίσγύνει, τηλικούτος ών, όνόματα θηρεύων, και έάν τις δήματι άμάρτη, έρμαιον τουτο ποιούμενος; C έμε γάρ οι ει άλλο τι λέγειν το χρείττους είναι ή τό βελτίους; ού πάλαι σοι λέγω, ότι ταὐτόν φημι είναι το βέλτιον και το κρείττον; η οίει με λέγειν, έαν συρφετός συλλεγή δούλων και παντοδαπῶν ἀνθρώπων μηδενός ἀξίων πλην ἴσως τῶ σώματι ἰσχυρίσασθαι, καὶ οὖτοι φῶσιν, αὐτὰ ταῦτα είναι νόμιμα ; ΣΩ. Είεν, δ σοφώτατε Καλλίχλεις · ούτω λέγεις; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ μέν ουν. D ΣΩ. 'Αλλ' έγώ μέν, ὦ δαιμόνιε, και αὐτος πάλαι τοπάζω τοιοῦτόν τί σε λέγειν τὸ χρεῖιτον, χαὶ άνερωτώ γλιγόμενος σαφώς είδέναι ό τι λέγεις. ού γαο δήπου σύ γε τούς δύο βελτίους ήγει του

ένός, ούδε τους σούς δούλους βελτίους σου, ότι ίσχυρότεροί είσιν η σύ. άλλα πάλιν έξ άρχης είπέ, τί ποτε λέγεις τους βελτίους, έπειδη ου τους ίσγυροτέρους ; καί, ὦ θαυμάσιε, πραότερόν με Επροδίδασκε, ίνα μή αποφοιτήσω παρά σου. KAA. Eigenvevel, $\tilde{\omega}$ Zwagates. $\Sigma\Omega$. Où µd τον Ζηθον, & Καλλίκλεις, & συ χρώμενος πολλά νῦν δή εἰρωνεύου πρός με. ἀλλ' ἴθι εἰπέ, τίνας λέγεις τους βελτίους είναι; ΚΑΛ. Τους αμείvous έγωγε. $\Sigma\Omega$. Όρας άρα, ότι σύ αύτος όνόματα λέγεις, δηλοϊς δε ούδεν. ούχ έρεις τους βελτίους και κρείττους πότερον τους φρονιμωτέοους λέγεις, η άλλους τινάς ; ΚΑΛ. 'Αλλά ναί μα Δία τούτους λέγω, και σφόδοα γε. ΣΩ. Πολλάκις άρα είς φρονών μυρίων μή φρονούν-190 των κρείττων έστι κατά τόν σόν λόγον, και τουτον ἄρχειν δει, τούς δ' ἄρχεσθαι, και πλέον έχειν τόν ἄρχοντα τῶν ἀρχομένων. τοῦτο γάρ μοι δοκείς βούλεσθαι λέγειν - και ου δήματα θηρεύω -, εί ό είς των μυρίων χρείττων. ΚΑΛ. Αλλά ταῦτ' ἔστιν & λέγω. τοῦτο γάο οἶμαι έγώ το δίχαιον είναι φύσει, το βελτίω όντα χαί φρονιμώτερον και άρχειν και πλέον έχειν των φαυλοτέρων.

B CAP. XLV. ΣΩ. ^{*}Εχε δη αὐτοῦ. τί ποτε αὖ νῦν λέγεις; ἐἀν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ὦμεν, ὥσπεο νῦν, πολλοὶ ἀθοόοι ἄνθοωποι, καὶ ἡμῖν ἢ ἐν κοινῷ πολλὰ σιτία καὶ ποτά, ὦμεν δὲ παντοδαποί, οἱ μὲν ἰσχυροί, οἱ δὲ ἀσθενεῖς, εἶς δὲ ἡμῶν ἢ φονιμώτερος περὶ ταῦτα ἰατρὸς ὦν, ἢ δέ, οἶον εἰκός,

τῶν μέν ἰσχυρότερος, τῶν δὲ ἀσθενέστερος, ἄλλο τι η ούτος φοονιμώτερος ήμων ων βελτίων και κρείττων έσται είς ταῦτα; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. ³Η οὖν τούτων τῶν σιτίων πλέον ήμῶν ἑχτέον C αὐτῷ, ὅτι βελτίων ἐστίν, ἢ τῷ μὲν ἀοχειν πάντα έχεινον δει νέμειν, έν δε τῷ ἀναλίσχειν τε αὐτὰ καί καταγρησθαι είς το έαυτου σώμα ού πλεονεχτητέον, εί μη μέλλει ζημιούσθαι, άλλα των μέν πλέον, τῶν δ' ἔλαττον ἑχτέον · ἐάν δὲ τύγη πάντων ἀσθενέστατος ῶν, πάντων ἐλάγιστον τῷ βελτίστω, ῶ Καλλίχλεις; οὐγ οὕτως, ῶ 'γαθέ; ΚΑΛ. Περί σιτία λέγεις χαί ποτα χαί ίατρους χαί φλυαρίας · έγω δε ού ταῦτα λέγω. ΣΩ. Πότερον D ούν τον φρονιμώτερον βελτίω λέγεις; Φάθι η μή. ΚΑΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. 'Αλλ' ου τον βελτίω πλέον δεῖν ἔγειν; ΚΑΛ. Οὐ σιτίων γε οὐδὲ ποτῶν. ΣΩ. Μανθάνω, ἀλλ' ἴσως ἱματίων, καὶ δεί τον ύφαντικώτατον μέγιστον εμάτιον έχειν καί πλεΐστα καί κάλλιστα άμπεγόμενον περιιέναι. ΚΑΛ. Ποίων ίματίων; ΣΩ. 'Αλλ' είς ύποδήματα δηλον ύτι δει πλεονεκτειν τον φοονιμώτερον είς ταῦτα καὶ βέλτιστον. τον σκυτοτό-Ε μον ίσως μέγιστα δει ύποδήματα και πλειστα ύποδεδεμένον περιπατείν. ΚΑΛ. Ποία ύποδήματα φλυαρεῖς - ἔχων; ΣΩ. 'Αλλ' εἰ μη τα τοιαῦτα λέγεις, ἴσως τὰ τοιάδε · οἶον γεωργικόν άνδρα περί γην φρόνιμόν τε καί καλόν και άγαθόν, τοῦτον δή ἴσως δεῖ πλεονεκτεῖν τῶν σπεομάτων καί ώς πλείστω σπέρματι χρησθαι είς την αύτοῦ γῆν. ΚΑΛ. Ώς ἀεὶ ταὐτὰ λέγεις, ὦ

Σώπρατες. ΣΩ. Οὐ μόνον γε, ὦ Καλλίπλεις, 491 άλλά και περί των αύτων. ΚΑΛ. Νή τους θεούς, άτεγνῶς γε ἀεὶ σκυτέας τε καὶ κναφέας καί μαγείρους λέγων και ιατρούς ούδεν παύει, ώς περί τούτων ήμιν ὄντα τον λόγον. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν σύ έρεῖς περί τίνων ὁ χρείττων τε χαί φρονιμώτερος πλέον έχων δικαίως πλεονεκτεί; ή ούτε έμου ύποβάλλοντος ανέξει ούτ' αύτος έρεῖς; ΚΑΛ. 'Αλλ' ἔγωγε καὶ πάλαι λέγω. πρώτον μέν τούς χρείττους οί είσιν, ού σχυτοτό-Β μους λέγω οὐδὲ μαγείρους, ἀλλ' οῦ ἀν εἰς τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματα φρόνιμοι ὦσιν, ὄντινα ἂν τρόπον εθ οίκοιτο, και μη μόνον φρόνιμοι, άλλα και ανδρείοι, ίκανοι όντες α αν νοήσωσιν έπιτελεῖν, καὶ μὴ ἀποκάμνωσι διὰ μαλακίαν บบททีร.

CAP. XLVI. ΣΩ. 'Οράς, δ βέλτιστε Καλλίκλεις, ώς οὐ ταὐτὰ σύ τ' ἐμοῦ κατηγορεῖς καὶ ἐγῶ σοῦ ; σὺ μὲν γὰρ ἐμὲ φὴς ἀεὶ ταὐτὰ λέγειν, καὶ μέμφει μοι · ἐγῶ δε σοῦ τοὐναντίον, ὅτι οὐ-C δέποτε ταὐτὰ λέγεις περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ τοτὲ μὲν τοὺς βελτίους τε καὶ κρείττους τοὺς ἰσχυgoτέgous ὡgίζου, αὖθις δὲ τοὺς φρονιμωτέgous, νῦν δ' αὖ ἕτερόν τι ἥκεις ἔχων · ἀνδρειότεροί τινες ὑπὸ σοῦ λέγονται οἱ κρείττους καὶ οἱ βελτίους. ἀλλ' ὦ 'γαθέ, εἰπῶν ἀπαλλάγηθι τίνας ποτὲ λέγεις τοὺς βελτίους τε καὶ κρείττους καὶ εἰς ὅ τι. ΚΑΛ. 'Αλλ' εἴgηκά γε ἔγωγε τοὺς φρονίμους D εἰς τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματα καὶ ἀνδρείους.

το δίχαιον τοῦτ' ἐστί, πλέον ἔχειν τούτους τῶν άλλων, τους άργοντας των άργομένων. ΣΩ. Τί δέ; αύτῶν, ὦ έταῖρε; [η τί ἄρχοντας ή ἀργομένους ;] KAA. Πῶς λέγεις ; $\Sigma \Omega$. ^eEva έχαστον λέγω αὐτὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἀργοντα. ή τοῦτο μέν ούδεν δεῖ, αὐτὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἄρχειν, τῶν δὲ ἀλλων ; ΚΑΛ. Πῶς ἑαυτοῦ ἄοχοντα λέγεις ; ΣΩ. Οὐδέν ποιχίλον, ἀλλ' ώσπες οἱ πολλοί, σώφρονα όντα καί έγκρατη αύτον έαυτου, των ήδονῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμιῶν ἀρχοντα τῶν ἐν ἑαυτῷ. Ε ΚΑΛ. 'Ως ήδυς εί! τους ήλιθίους λέγεις τους σώφοονας. ΣΩ. Πῶς γὰρ οὕ; οὐδεὶς ὅστις ούκ άν γνοίη, ότι ούτω λέγω. ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε σφόδρα, ῶ Σώχρατες· ἐπεί πῶς ἂν εὐδαίμων γέ~ νοιτο άνθρωπος δουλεύων ότωοῦν; άλλά τοῦτ' έστι το κατά φύσιν καλόν και δίκαιον, ΰ έγώ σοι νῦν παζόησιαζόμενος λέγω, ὅτι δεῖ τον ὀρθῶς βιωσόμενον τας μέν επιθυμίας τας ξαυτού εαν ώς μεγίστας είναι και μή κολάζειν, ταύταις δέ ώς μεγίσταις ούσαις ίχανον είναι ύπηρετείν δι' 492 άνδρείαν και φρόνησιν και άποπιμπλάναι ών άν άει ή ἐπιθυμία γίγνηται. ἀλλὰ τοῦτ', οἶμαι, τοις πολλοις ού δυνατόν · δθεν ψέγουσι τούς τοιούτους δι' αίσγύνην αποκουπτόμενοι την αύτῶν ἀδυναμίαν, καὶ αἰσχρὸν δή φασιν εἶναι τήν άχολασίαν · ὅπερ ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν ἐγώ ἔλεγον, δουλούμενοι τους βελτίους την φύσιν ανθρώπους, καί αύτοι ού δυνάμενοι έκπορίζεσθαι ταις ήδοναις πλήρωσιν έπαινοῦσι τὴν σωφροσύνην Β καί την δικαιοσύνην διά την αύτων άνανδρίαν.

GORGIAS.

έπεί γε οίς έξ άρχης ύπηρξεν η βασιλέων υίέσιν είναι η αύτούς τη φύσει ίχανούς έχπορίσασθαι άρχήν τινα ή τυραννίδα ή δυναστείαν, τί τη άληθεία αισχιον και κάκιον είη σωφοοσύνης [xai διxαιοσύνης] τούτοις τοις ανθρώποις; οίς έξον απολαύειν των αγαθών και μηδενός έμποδών όντος, αύτοι έαυτοις δεσπότην επαγάγοιντο τόν των πολλών άνθρώπων νόμον τε και λόγον C καί ψόγον; η πως ούκ αν αθλιοι γεγονότες είησαν ύπὸ τοῦ χαλοῦ τοῦ τῆς διχαιοσύνης χαὶ τῆς σωφροσύνης, μηδέν πλέον νέμοντες τοις φίλοις τοις αύτῶν ή τοις έχθροις, και ταυτα ἄρχοντες έν τη ξαυτών πόλει; αλλα τη αληθεία, ω Σώχρατες, ήν φής σύ διώχειν, ωδ' έχει τουφή χαί άχολασία χαὶ ἐλευθερία, ἐάν ἐπιχουρίαν ἔχη, τουτ' έστιν άρετή τε και εύδαιμονία · τα δε άλλα ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τὰ χαλλωπίσματα, τὰ παρὰ φύσιν συνθήματα, άνθρώπων φλυαρία και ούδενός äzia.

D CAP. XLVII. ΣΩ. Οὐχ ἀγεννῶς γε, ὡ Καλλίχλεις, ἐπεξέοχει τῷ λόγῷ παἰộησιαζόμενος · σαφῶς γὰο σừ νῦν λέγεις ὡ οἱ ἀλλοι διανοοῦνται μέν, λέγειν δὲ οὐχ ἐθέλουσι. δέομαι οῦν ἐγώ σου μηδενὶ τοόπῷ ἀνεῖναι, ἵνα τῷ ὄντι κατάδηλον γένηται πῶς βιωτέον. καί μοι λέγε · τὰς μὲν ἐπιθυμίας φὴς οὐ κολαστέον, εἰ μέλλει τις οἶον δεῖ εἶναι, ἐῶντα δὲ αὐτὰς ὡς μεγίστας πλήοωσιν αὐταῖς ἁμόθεν γέ ποθεν ἑτοιμάζειν, καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι τὴν ἀοετήν ; ΚΑΛ. Φημὶ Εταῦτα ἐγώ. ΣΩ. Οὐχ ἀρα ὀρθῶς λέγονται οἱ

PLATONIS

μηδενός δεόμενοι εὐδαίμονες εἶναι. ΚΑΛ. Οἱ λίθοι γὰς ἂν οὕτω γε καὶ οἱ νεκςοὶ εὐδαιμονέστατοι εἶεν. ΣΩ. 'Αλλὰ μὲν δὴ καὶ ຜς γε σῦ λέγεις δεινὸς ὁ βίος. οὐ γάς τοι θαυμάζοιμ', ἀν, εἰ Εὐςιπίδης ἀληθῆ ἐν τοῖσδε λέγει, λέγων

τίς δ' οἶδεν, εἰ τὸ ζῆν μέν ἐστι κατθανεῖν,

το κατθανείν δε ζην;

και ήμεις τῷ όντι ίσως τέθναμεν · όπερ ήδη του 493 ἔγωγε καὶ ἤκουσα τῶν σοφῶν, ὡς νῦν ἡμεῖς τέθναμεν, καί το μέν σωμά έστιν ήμιν σήμα, της δέ ψυχής τουτο, έν ῷ ἐπιθυμίαι εἰσί, τυγχάνει ὂν οίον άναπείθεσθαι και μεταπίπτειν άνω κάτω, χαί τοῦτο ἄρα τις μυθολογῶν χομιγός ἀνήρ, ἴσως Σικελός τις ή 'Ιταλικός, παράγων τω ονόματι δια τό πιθανόν τε και πιστικόν ώνόμασε πίθον, τούς δε ανοήτους αμυήτους · των δ' αμυήτων τουτο Β της ψυχης, οδ αί επιθυμίαι είσι, το απόλαστον αύτοῦ καὶ οὐ στεγανόν, ὡς τετρημένος εἴη πίθος, διά την απληστίαν απεικάσας. τουναντίον δή ούτος σοί, ὦ Καλλίχλεις, ἐνδείχνυται, ὡς τῶν ἐν "Αιδου - το αειδές δη λέγων - ουτοι αθλιώτατοι αν είεν οί αμύητοι, και φοροίεν είς τον τετρημένον πίθον ύδωο έτέοω τοιούτω τετοημένω χοσχίνω • το δε χόσχινον άρα λέγει, ώς έφη ό προς έμε λέγων, την ψυχην είναι · την δε ψυχην χο- C σκίνω ἀπείκασε την τῶν ἀνοήτων ὡς τετρημένην, άτε ού δυναμένην στέγειν δι' απιστίαν τε καί λήθην. ταῦτ' ἐπιειχῶς μέν ἐστιν ὑπό τι ἄτοπα, δηλοί μήν δ έγω βούλομαί σοι ένδειξάμενος, έάν πως οἶός τε ώ, πείσαι μεταθέσθαι, άντι τοῦ ἀπλή-

GORGIAS.

στως καὶ ἀχολάστως ἔχοντος βίου τὸν κοσμίως καὶ τοῖς ἀεὶ παροῦσιν ἱκανῶς καὶ ἐξαρκούντως ἔχοντα βίον ἑλέσθαι. ἀλλὰ πότερον πείθω τί σε D καὶ μετατίθεσαι εὐδαιμονεστέρους εἶναι τοὺς κοσμίους τῶν ἀκολάστων, ἢ οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἂν καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα μυθολογῶ, οὐδέν τι μᾶλλον μεταθήσει ; ΚΑΛ. Τοῦτ' ἀληθέστερον εἴοηκας, ὦ Σώχρατες.

CAP. XLVIII. ΣΩ. Φέρε δή, αλλην σοι είκόνα λέγω έκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γυμνασίου τῷ νῦν. σκόπει γάρ, εί τοιόνδε λέγεις περί του βίου έχατέρου τοῦ τε σώφρονος χαὶ τοῦ ἀχολάστου, οἶον εἰ δυειν άνδροιν έχατέρω πίθοι πολλοί εἶεν, χαι τῷ Ε μέν έτέρω ύγιεις και πλήρεις, ό μέν οίνου, ό δέ μέλιτος, ό δε γάλαχτος χαι άλλοι πολλοί πολλών, νάματα δε σπάνια και γαλεπά εκάστου τούτων είη και μετά πολλών πόνων και χαλεπών έκποοιζόμενα · ό μέν ουν έτερος πληρωσάμενος μήτ' έποχετεύοι μήτε τι φροντίζοι, άλλ' ένεχα τούτων ήσυχίαν ἔχοι · τῷ δ' ἑτέρῳ τὰ μὲν νάματα, ὥσπερ και έκείνω, δυνατά μεν πορίζεσθαι, χαλεπά δέ, τα δ' άγγεῖα τετρημένα καὶ σαθρά, καὶ ἀναγκά-494 ζοιτο ἀεὶ καὶ νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν πιμπλάναι αὐτά, η τας έσχάτας λυποίτο λύπας άρα τοιούτου έχατέρω όντος τοῦ βίου, λέγεις τον τοῦ ἀχολάστου εύδαιμονέστερον είναι ή τον του χοσμίου; πείθω τί σε ταῦτα λέγων συγχωρῆσαι τὸν κόσμιον βίον τοῦ ἀχολάστου ἀμείνω εἶναι, ἢ οὐ πείθω; ΚΑΛ. Ού πείθεις, ὦ Σώχρατες. τῷ μέν γάρ πληρωσαμένω έχείνω ούχέτ' έστιν ήδονή ούδεμία,

73

PLATONIS

άλλα τοῦτ' ἔστιν, Ὁ νῦν δὴ ἐγῶ ἔλεγον, τὸ ὥσπεο λίθον ζῆν, ἐπειδαν πληρώσῃ, μήτε χαίgοντα ἔτι Ρ μήτε λυπούμενον. ἀλλ' ἐν τούτῷ ἐστὶ τὸ ἡδέως ζῆν, ἐν τῷ ὡς πλεῖστον ἐπιφၲρεῖν. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν ἀνάγχη γ', ἀν πολὺ ἐπιφόρεῖν. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν ἐναι καὶ μεγάλ' ἄττα τὰ τρήματα εἶναι ταῖς ἐχοοαῖς; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ μὲν οὖν. ΣΩ. Χαβαδριοῦ τινα αὖ σὺ βίον λέγεις, ἀλλ' οὐ νεχοοῦ οὐδὲ λίθου. καί μοι λέγε, τὸ τοιόνδε λέγεις, οἶον πεινῆν καὶ πεινῶντα ἐσθίειν ; ΚΑΛ. Ἐγωγε. ΣΩ. Καὶ διψῆν γε καὶ διψῶντα πίνειν ; ΚΑΛ. Ċ Λέγω, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἐπιθυμίας ἁπάσας ἔχοντα καὶ δυνάμενον πληροῦντα χαίροντα εὐδαιμόνως ζῆν.

CAP. XLIX. ΣΩ. Εὖγε, ὦ βέλτιστε · διατέλει γάο ωσπεο ήοξω, και όπως μη άπαισχυνέι. δει δέ, ώς έσικε, μηδ' έμε απαισχυνθηναι. καί πρώτον μέν είπέ, εί και ψωρώντα και κνησιώντα, άφθόνως έχοντα τοῦ χνησθαι, χνώμενον διατελούντα τον βίον εύδαιμόνως έστι ζην. ΚΑΛ. D Ως άτοπος εί, ὦ Σώχρατες, και άτεχνῶς δημηγόρος. ΣΩ. Τοιγάρτοι, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, Πῶλον μέν καί Γοργίαν και έξέπληξα και αισχύνεσθαι έποίησα, σύ δε ού μή έχπλαγής ούδε μη αίσχυνθής. άνδρεῖος γάρ εἶ. άλλ' ἀποκρίνου μόνον. ΚΑΛ. Φημί τοίνυν και τον κνώμενον ήδέως αν βιώναι. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν εἴπερ ήδέως, χαὶ εὐδαιμόνως; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Πότερον εἰ την κεφα-Ε λήν μόνον χνησιώ, ή έτι τί σε έρωτω; όρα, ω Καλλίκλεις, τί αποκρινεῖ, ἐάν τίς σε τὰ ἐχόμενα

τούτοις έφεξης απαντα έρωτα. χαί, *τὸ* τούτων τοιούτων όντων χεφάλαιον, ό τῶν χιναίδων βίος ούτος ού δεινός χαι αίσχοός χαι άθλιος; η τούτους τολμήσεις λέγειν εύδαίμονας είναι, έαν άφθόνως ἔχωσιν ῶν δέονται; ΚΑΛ. Οὐχ αίσχύνει είς τοιαῦτα ἀγων, ὦ Σώχρατες, τοὺς λόγους; ΣΩ. ³Η γαο έγω άγω ένταῦθα, ὦ γενναίε, ή έχεινος, ος αν φη ανέδην ούτω τους 495 γαίροντας, όπως αν χαίρωσιν, εύδαίμονας είναι, καί μή διορίζηται τῶν ήδονῶν ὁποῖαι ἀγαθαὶ καὶ κακαί ; άλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν λέγε, πότερον φὴς εἶναι το αύτο ήδυ χαι άγαθόν, η είναι τι των ήδέων, ο ούκ έστιν άγαθόν; ΚΑΛ. Ίνα δή μοι μή άνομολογούμενος ή ό λόγος, έαν έτερον φήσω είναι, το αύτό φημι είναι. ΣΩ. Διαφθείρεις, ω Καλλίκλεις, τους πρώτους λόγους, και ούκ αν έτι μετ' έμου έχανῶς τὰ ὄντα έξετάζοις, εἴπερ παρά τὰ Β δοχούντα σαυτῷ έρεῖς. ΚΑΛ. Καὶ γὰρ σύ, ὦ Σώχρατες. ΣΩ. Οὐ τοίνυν ὀρθῶς ποιῶ οὐτ' έγώ, εἴπεο ποιῶ τοῦτο, οὐτε σύ. ἀλλ', ὦ μαχάριε, ἄθρει μή ού τοῦτο ἦ τὸ ἀγαθόν, τὸ πάντως γαίρειν · ταυτά τε γάρ τα νυν δή αίνιγθέντα πολλά και αίσχρα φαίνεται συμβαίνοντα, εί τοῦτο ούτως έχει, και άλλα πολλά. ΚΑΛ. Ως σύ γε οἴει, ὦ Σώκρατες. ΣΩ. Σύ δὲ τῶ ὄντι, ῶ Καλλίκλεις, ταῦτα ἰσχυρίζει; ΚΑΛ. "Εγωγε. c CAP. L. ΣΩ. Ἐπιχειοῶμεν ἀρα τῷ λόγφ, ώς σοῦ σπουδάζοντος; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε σφόδρα. ΣΩ. "Ιθι δή μοι, ἐπειδή ούτω δοχεῖ, διελοῦ τάδε. έπιστήμην που καλεῖς τι; ΚΑΛ. "Εγωγε.

PLATONIS

 $\Sigma \Omega$. Οὐ καὶ ἀνδρείαν νῦν δὴ ἔλεγές τινα εἶναι μετά ἐπιστήμης; ΚΑΛ. "Ελεγον γάο. ΣΩ. " Αλλο τι οὖν ώς ἕτερον την ἀνδρείαν της ἐπιστήμης δύο ταῦτα ἔλεγες; ΚΑΛ. Σφόδρα γε. ΣΩ. Τί δέ; ήδονην και επιστήμην ταυτόν, ή D έτερον ; ΚΑΛ. "Ετερον δήπου, ω σοφώτατε σύ. ΣΩ. ³Η καὶ ἀνδρείαν ἑτέραν ἡδονῆς; ΚΑΛ. Πῶς γὰο οὕ; ΣΩ. Φέρε δη ὅπως μεμνησόμεθα ταῦτα, ὅτι Καλλικλῆς ἔφη ὁ ᾿Αχαονεὺς ἡδὺ μὲν χαί ἀγαθόν ταὐτόν εἶναι, ἐπιστήμην δὲ χαί ἀνδρείαν χαὶ ἀλλήλων χαὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἕτερον. ΚΑΛ. Σωχράτης δέ γε ήμιν ό 'Αλωπεχηθεν ούχ όμολογεῖ ταῦτα · ἡ ὁμολογεῖ; ΣΩ. Οὐχ ὁμολο- Ε γει · οίμαι δέ γε οὐδὲ Καλλικλης, ὅταν αὐτὸς αύτον θεάσηται όρθῶς. εἰπὲ γάρ μοι, τοὺς εὖ πράιτοντας τοις χαχῶς πράτιουσιν οὐ τοὐναντίον ήγεῖ πάθος πεπονθέναι; ΚΑΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ.. * Αρ' οῦν, εἴπερ ἐναντία ἐστὶ ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις, άνάγχη περί αὐτῶν ἔχειν ὥσπερ περί ὑγιείας ἔχει χαι νόσου; ου γαο άμα δήπου ύγιαίνει τε χαί νοσει ό άνθρωπος, ούδε άμα απαλλάττεται ύγιείας τε καί νόσου. ΚΑΛ. Πῶς λέγεις; ΣΩ. Οἶον περί ότου βούλει τοῦ σώματος ἀπολαβών σκόπει. 496 νοσεί που άνθρωπος όφθαλμούς, δ όνομα όφθαλμία; ΚΑΛ. Πῶς γὰρ οΰ; ΣΩ. Οὐ δήπου καὶ ὑγιαίνει γε ἅμα τοὺς αὐτούς; ΚΑΛ. Οὐδ' όπωστιοῦν. ΣΩ. Τί δέ; ὅταν τῆς ὀφθαλμίας απαλλάττηται, αξοα τότε και της ύγιείας απαλλάττεται τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ τελευτῶν άμα ἀμφοτέρων απήλλαχται ; ΚΑΛ. "Ηχιστά γε.

76

Β ΣΩ. Θαυμάσιον γάς, οἶμαι, καὶ ἄλογον γίγνεται. ἦ γάς; ΚΑΛ. Σφόδςα γε. ΣΩ. ᾿Αλλ' ἐν μέρει, οἶμαι, ἑκάτερον καὶ λαμβάνει καὶ ἀπολλύει; ΚΑΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν καὶ ἰσχὺν καὶ ἀσθένειαν ὡσαύτως; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Καὶ τάχος καὶ βςαδυτῆτα; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. ὅΗ καὶ τἀγαθὰ καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν καὶ τἀναντία τούτων, κακά τε καὶ ἀθλιότητα, ἐν μέςει λαμβάνει, καὶ ἐν μέςει ἀπαλλάττεται ἑκατέgoυ; ΚΑΛ. Πάντως δήπου. ΣΩ. Ἐαἰν εὕ- C σωμεν ἄςα ἄττα, ῶν ἅμα τε ἀπαλλάττεται ἄνθςωπος καὶ ἕμα ἔχει, δῆλον ὅτι ταῦτά γε οὐκ ἂν εἴη τό τε ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ κακόν. ὁμολογοῦμεν ταῦτα; ΚΑΛ. ᾿Αλλ' ὑπεςφυῶς ὡς ὁμολογῶ.

CAP. LI. ΣΩ. "Ιθι δή ἐπὶ τὰ ἔμπροσθεν ώμολογημένα. το πεινην έλεγες πότερον ήδύ, η άνιαρόν είναι; αύτό λέγω το πεινην. ΚΑΛ. D' Ανιαρόν έγωγε · τό μέντοι πεινώντα έσθίειν ήδύ. ΣΩ. Μανθάνω · άλλ' οὖν τό γε πεινην αὐτὸ άνιαρόν. η οὐχί; ΚΑΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν χαὶ τὸ διψῆν; ΚΑΛ. Σφόδοα γε. ΣΩ. Πότερον οῦν ἔτι πλείω ἐρωτῶ, ἡ ὁμολογεῖς ἅπασαν ἕνδειαν καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν ἀνιαρον είναι; ΚΑΛ. Ομολογῶ, ἀλλὰ μή ἐρώτα. ΣΩ. Είεν. διψῶντα δὲ δη πίνειν άλλο τι η ήδυ φής είναι; ΚΑΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν τούτου οῦ λέγεις Ε το μέν διψώντα λυπούμενον δήπου έστί; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Τὸ δὲ πίνειν πλήρωσίς τε τῆς ἐνδείας καὶ ήδονή; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν 7*

κατά τὸ πίνειν χαίρειν λέγεις; ΚΑΛ. Μάλιστα. ΣΩ. Διψώντά γε; ΚΑΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ. Αυπούμενον; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Λίσθάνει ουν το συμβαίνον, ότι λυπούμενον γαίρειν λέγεις άμα, δταν διψώντα πίνειν λέγης; η ούχ άμα τοῦτο γίγνεται κατά τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον καὶ χρόνον εἴτε ψυχης εἴτε σώματος βούλει; οὐδέν γάρ, οίμαι, διαφέρει. έστι ταῦτα, η ου; ΚΑΛ. "Εστιν. ΣΩ. 'Αλλά μήν εὖ γε πράττοντα καχῶς πράττειν άμα ἀδύνατον ἔφης εἶναι. ΚΑΛ. Φημί γάο. ΣΩ. Ανιώμενον δέ γε χαίρειν δυ-497 νατόν ώμολόγηχας. ΚΑΛ. Φαίνεται. ΣΩ. Ούχ άρα το γαίρειν έστιν εῦ πράττειν οὐδε το άνιασθαι χαχώς, ώστε έτερον γίγνεται το ήδυ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. ΚΑΛ. Οὐχ οἶδ' ἄττα σοφίζει, ὦ Σώχρατες. ΣΩ. Οἶσθα, ἀλλὰ ἀχχίζει, ὦ Καλλίχλεις. χαι πρόϊθί γε έτι είς τουμπροσθεν, ότι έχων ληρεῖς, ίνα είδῆς ὡς σοφὸς ὡν με νουθε-Β τεις. ούχ άμα διψών τε έχαστος ήμών πέπαυται καὶ ἅμα ἡδόμενος διὰ τοῦ πίνειν ; ΚΑΛ. Οὐκ οίδα ο τι λέγεις. ΓΟΡ. Μηδαμώς, δ Καλλίκλεις, αλλ' αποκρίνου και ήμων ένεκα, ίνα πεοανθώσιν οι λόγοι. ΚΑΛ. 'Αλλ' αεί τοιουτός έστι Σωχράτης, δ Γοργία · σμιχρά χαι όλίγου άξια άνερωτῷ καὶ ἐξελέγχει. ΓΟΡ. 'Αλλά τί σοι διαφέρει; πάντως ού ση αυτη ή τιμή, α Καλλίκλεις · άλλ' ύπόσγες Σωκράτει έξελέγξαι όπως αν βούληται. ΚΑΛ. Έρώτα δη ου τα C σμιχοά τε καί στενά ταῦτα, ἐπείπεο Γοργία δοχεί ούτως.

78

CAP. LII. ΣΩ. Εύδαίμων εί, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, ότι τα μεγάλα μεμύησαι πρίν τα σμικρά · έγω δ' ούκ ώμην θεμιτόν είναι. όθεν ούν απέλιπες, άποχρίνου, εί ούχ άμα παύεται διιψών έχαστος ήμων και ήδόμενος. ΚΑΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ. Ούκοῦν καὶ πεινῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιθυμιῶν καὶ ήδονων αμα παύεται; ΚΑΛ. "Εστι ταυτα. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν χαὶ τῶν λυπῶν χαὶ τῶν ήδονῶν Dάμα παύεται; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. 'Αλλά μην τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν οὐχ ἅμα παύεται, ὡς συ ώμολόγεις · νῦν δὲ ούχ ὁμολογεῖς ; ΚΑΛ. "Εγωγε. τί οῦν δή; ΣΩ. "Οτι οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ γίγνεται, ὦ φίλε, τάγαθὰ τοῖς ἡδέσιν οὐδὲ τὰ καχὰ τοῖς ἀνιαροῖς. τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἅμα παύεται, τῶν δε ού, ώς ετέρων όντων. πως ούν ταύτα αν είη τὰ ήδέα τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἢ τὰ ἀνιαρὰ τοῖς Χαχοῖς ; 'Εάν δε βούλη, και τηδ' επίσκεψαι · οίμαι γάρ Ε σοι οὐδὲ ταύτῃ ὁμολογεῖσθαι. ἀθρει δέ · τοὺς άγαθούς ούχι άγαθών παρουσία άγαθούς χαλεῖς, ὥσπεο τοὺς οἶς ἂν κάλλος παοῦ; ΚΑΛ. Έγωγε. ΣΩ. Τί δέ; ἀγαθοὺς ἀνδρας χαλεῖς τούς ἄφρονας καί δειλούς; ού γαρ άρτι γε, άλλά τούς ανδρείους και φρονίμους έλεγες. η ού τούτους άγαθούς καλείς; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ μέν ουν. ΣΩ. Τί δέ; παῖδα ἀνόητον χαίροντα ἤδη είδες; ΚΑΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. "Ανδοα δέ ουπω είδες άνόητον χαίροντα; ΚΑΛ. Οίμαι έγωγε. άλ-198λα τί τοῦτο; ΣΩ. Οὐδέν · ἀλλ' ἀποχρίνου. ΚΑΛ. Είδον. ΣΩ. Τί δέ; νοῦν ἔχοντα λυπούμενον και χαίροντα; ΚΑΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ.

Πότεροι δε μαλλον χαίρουσι και λυπουνται, οί φρόνιμοι, η οί αφρονες; ΚΑΛ. Οίμαι έγωγε ού πολύ τι διαφέρειν. ΣΩ. 'Αλλ' άρχεῖ χαί τοῦτο. ἐν πολέμῷ δὲ ἤδη εἶδες ἄνδοα δειλόν; ΚΑΛ. Πῶς γὰς οὔ ; ΣΩ. Τί οῦν ; ἀπιόντων τῶν πολεμίων πότεροί σοι ἐδόχουν μαλλον χαίοειν, οί δειλοί, η οί ανδοεΐοι; ΚΑΛ. 'Αμφότεοοι έμοιγε μαλλον εί δε μή, παραπλησίως γε. Β ΣΩ. Ούδεν διαφέρει. χαίρουσι δ' οῦν καὶ οί δειλοί; ΚΑΛ. Σφόδοα γε. ΣΩ. Και οί άφρονες, ώς ἔοικε. ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Προσιόντων δε οί δειλοί μόνον λυπουνται, ή και οί άνδρεΐοι; ΚΑΛ. 'Αμφότεροι. ΣΩ. 'Αρα όμοίως ; ΚΑΛ. Μάλλον ἴσως οἱ δειλοί. ΣΩ. 'Απιόντων δ' ου μαλλον γαίρουσιν ; ΚΑΛ. "Ισως. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν λυποῦνται μὲν χαὶ γαίρουσι και οι άφρονες και οι φρόνιμοι και οι δειλοί και οί ανδρεΐοι παραπλησίως, ώς σύ φής, μαλλον δε οί δειλοί των ανδρείων; ΚΑΛ. C Φημί. ΣΩ. 'Αλλά μήν οί γε φρόνιμοι και άνδοεῖοι ἀγαθοί, οἱ δὲ δειλοὶ καὶ ἄφοονες κακοί; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Παραπλησίως άρα χαίρουσι καί λυποῦνται οἱ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ οἱ κακοί; ΚΑΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ. 3Αρ' οῦν παραπλησίως εἰσιν ἀγαθοί και κακοί οί άγαθοί τε και οί κακοί; ή και έτι μάλλον άγαθοί και κακοί είσιν οι κακοί;

CAP. LIII. ΚΑΛ. ᾿Αλλὰ μὰ Δί' οὐκ οἶδ' D ὅ τι λέγεις. ΣΩ. Οὐκ οἶσθ', ὅτι τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀγαθῶν φὴς παρουσία εἶναι ἀγαθούς, κακοὺς δὲ κακῶν; τὰ δὲ ἀγαθὰ εἶναι τὰς ἡδονάς, κακὰ δὲ

τας ανίας; ΚΑΛ. Έγωγε. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν τοις γαίρουσι πάρεστι τάγαθά, αι ήδοναί, είπερ χαίρουσι; ΚΑΛ. Πῶς γὰρ οΰ; ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν ἀγαθῶν παρόντων ἀγαθοί εἰσιν οἱ χαίροντες; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Τί δέ; τοις ανιωμέ-Ενοις ού πάρεστι τα κακά, αί λυπαι; ΚΑΛ. Πάρεστι. ΣΩ. Καχῶν δέ γε παρουσία φής σύ είναι κακούς τούς κακούς. η ούκέτι φής ; ΚΑΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. 'Αγαθοί άρα οι άν χαίρωσι, χαχοί δέ οι άν άνιῶνται; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Οί μέν γε μαλλον μαλλον, οί δ' ήττον ήττον, οί δέ παραπλησίως παραπλησίως; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν φῃς παραπλησίως χαίρειν χαὶ λυπεΐσθαι τούς φρονίμους και τούς ἄφρονας και τούς δειλούς χαι τούς άνδρείους, ή χαι μαλλον έτι τούς δειλούς ; ΚΑΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. Συλλόγισαι δη κοινή μετ' έμου, τι ήμιν συμβαίνει έχ τῶν ὡμολογημένων · καὶ δὶς γάο τοι καὶ τρίς 499 φασι καλόν είναι τα καλά λέγειν τε και έπισκοπεῖσθαι. 'Αγαθόν μὲν εἶναι τόν φοόνιμον χαὶ άνδοεϊόν φαμεν. ή γάς; ΚΑΑ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Καχόν δὲ τὸν ἀφοονα χαὶ δειλόν; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. 'Αγαθόν δὲ αὖ τὸν χαίοοντα; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Κακόν δὲ τὸν ἀνιώμενον ; ΚΑΛ. 'Ανάγκη. ΣΩ. 'Ανιάσθαι δε και γαίρειν τον άγαθον και κακόν όμοίως, ίσως δε καί μάλλον τον κακόν; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν ὁμοίως γίγνεται κακὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς τῷ ἀγα-Β θῷ ή καὶ μᾶλλον ἀγαθὸς ὁ κακός; οὐ ταῦτα συμβαίνει, καί τα πρότερα έκεινα, έάν τις ταύτὰ φῆ ἡδέα τε καὶ ἀγαθὰ εἶναι ; οὐ ταῦτα ἀνάγκη, ὦ Καλλίκλεις ;

CAP. LIV. ΚΑΛ. Πάλαι τοί σου άχροωμαι, δ Σώχρατες, χαθομολογών, ένθυμούμενος, ότι, χαν παίζων τίς σοι ένδῷ ότιοῦν, τούτου ἀσμενος ἔχει ώσπες τα μειράχια. ώς δή σύ οἴει ἐμὲ ή και άλλον όντινοῦν ἀνθρώπων οὐχ ἡγεῖσθαι τὰς μέν βελτίους ήδονάς, τας δε γείρους. ΣΩ. 'Ιού ίού, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, ὡς πανοῦργος εἶ, καί μοι C ώσπες παιδί χοῦ, τοτὲ μέν αὖ φάσκων οὕτως έχειν, τοτε δε ετέρως, έξαπατών με. καίτοι ούκ ὤμην γε κατ' ἀργὰς ὑπὸ σοῦ ἑκόντος εἶναι ἐξαπατηθήσεσθαι, ώς όντος φίλου · νῦν δὲ ἐψεύσθην, καί ώς ἔοικεν, ἀνάγκη μοι κατὰ τὸν παλαιὸν λόγον τὸ παρὸν εὖ ποιεῖν καὶ τοῦτο δέχεσθαι τὸ διδόμενον παρά σου. έστι δε δή, ώς έσικεν, δ νῦν λέγεις, ὅτι ἡδοναί τινές εἰσιν αί μὲν ἀγαθαί, αί δὲ κακαί. η γάρ; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. ³Αρ' D οῦν ἀγαθαὶ μέν αἱ ὡφέλιμοι, κακαὶ δὲ αἱ βλαβεραί; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. 'Ωφέλιμοι δέ γε αί ἀγαθόν τι ποιοῦσαι, χαχαὶ δὲ αί χαχόν τι; ΚΑΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ. Ας' οὖν τὰς τοιάσδε λέγεις, οίον κατά το σωμα ώς νυν δή ελέγομεν έν τῷ ἐσθίειν χαὶ πίνειν ήδονάς · εἰ ἄρα τούτων αί μέν ύγίειαν ποιούσιν έν τῷ σώματι ή ἰσχύν ή άλλην τινα άρετην του σώματος, αδται μέν άγαθαί, αί δὲ τἀναντία τούτων κακαί ; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν χαὶ λῦπαι ὡσαύτως αί Ε μέν χρησταί είσιν, αί δὲ πονηραί; ΚΑΛ. Πῶς γάρ ού; ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν τὰς μέν χρηστάς χαί
ήδονας καὶ λύπας καὶ αίρετέον ἐστὶ καὶ πραπτέον; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Τας δὲ πονηρας οῦ; ΚΛΛ. Δῆλον δή. ΣΩ. "Ενεκα γάρ που τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἅπαντα ἡμῖν ἔδοξε πρακτέον εἶναι, εἰ μνημονεύεις, ἐμοί τε καὶ Πώλῳ. ἀρα καὶ σοὶ συνδοκεῖ οῦτω, τέλος εἶναι ἀπασῶν τῶν πράξεων τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ ἐκείνου ἕνεκεν δεῖν πάντα ταλλα 500 πράττεσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκεῖνο τῶν ἀλλων; σύμψηφος ἡμῖν εἶ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τρίτων; ΚΑΛ. "Εγωγε. ΣΩ. Τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀρα ἕνεκα δεῖ καὶ ταλλα καὶ τὰ ἡδέα πράττειν, ἀλλ' οὐ τἀγαθὰ τῶν ἡδέων. ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. ^{*}Αρ' οὖν παντὸς ἀνδρός ἐστιν ἐκλέξασθαι ποῖα ἀγαθὰ τῶν ἡδέων ἐστὶ καὶ ὁποῖα κακά, ἢ τεχνικοῦ δεῖ εἰς ἕκαστον; ΚΑΛ. Τεχνικοῦ.

CAP. LV. ΣΩ. 'Αναμνησθώμεν δη ών αὐ έγὼ προς Πῶλον καὶ Γοργίαν ἐιύγχανον λέγων. Β ἕλεγον γάρ, εἰ μνημονεύεις, ὅτι εἶεν παρασκευαὶ αἱ μὲν μέχρι ήδονῆς, αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον παρασκευάζουσαι, ἀγνοοῦσαι δὲ τὸ βέλτιον καὶ τὸ χεῖρον, αἱ δὲ γιγνώσκουσαι ὅ τι τε ἀγαθὸν καὶ ὅ τι κακόν · καὶ ἐτίθην τῶν μὲν περὶ τὰς ήδονὰς τὴν μαγειρικὴν ἐμπειρίαν, ἀλλ' οὐ τέχνην, τῶν δὲ περὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τὴν ἰατρικὴν τέχνην. καὶ πρὸς φιλίου, ῶ Καλλίκλεις, μήτε αὐτὸς οἴου δεῖν πρὸς ἐμὲ παίζειν μηδ' ὅ τι ἂν τύχης πα-C ρὰ τὰ δοκοῦντα ἀποκρίνου, μήτ' αῦ τὰ παρ' ἐμοῦ οὕτως ἀποδέχου ὡς παίζοντος. ὡρῷς γὰρ, ὅτι περὶ τούτου εἰσὶν ἡμῖν οἱ λόγοι, οὖ τί ἂν μᾶλλον σπουδάσειἑ τις καὶ σμικρὸν νοῦν ἔχων

άνθρωπος, η τούτο, δντινα γρη τρόπον ζην πότερον ἐπὶ ὃν σῦ παραχαλεῖς ἐμέ, τὰ τοῦ ἀνδρος δή ταῦτα πράττοντα, λέγοντά τε ἐν τῷ δήμφ καὶ ὅητορικήν ασκούντα και πολιτευόμενον τούτον τόν τρόπον, ων ύμεις νῦν πολιτεύεσθε, η ἐπὶ τόνδε τον βίον τον έν φιλοσοφία, και τί ποτ' έστιν ούτος έχείνου διαφέρων; ίσως οῦν βέλτιστόν ἐστιν, ώς άρτι έγω έπεγείρησα, διαιρείσθαι, διελομένους δέ D και όμολογήσαντας άλλήλοις, εί έστι τούτω διττώ τώ βίω, σχέψασθαι τί τε διαφέρετον άλλήλοιν χαί όπότερον βιωτέον αύτοιν. ἴσως οὖν οὖπω οἶσθα τί λέγω. ΚΑΛ. Οὐ δῆτα. ΣΩ. 'Αλλ' ἐγώ σοι σαφέστερον έρω. επειδή ωμολογήχαμεν εγώ τε καί σύ είναι μέν τι άγαθόν, είναι δέ τι ήδύ, ἕτερον δὲ τὸ ἡδὺ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, ἑκατέρου δὲ αὐτοῖν μελέτην τινά είναι και παρασκευήν της κτήσεως, τήν μέν τοῦ ήδέος θήραν, τήν δὲ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ — Ε αύτο δέ μοι τοῦτο πρῶτον η σύμφαθι, η μή. σύμφης; ΚΑΛ. Ούτω φημί.

CAP. LVI. ΣΩ. "Ιθι δή, à καὶ ποὸς τούσδε ἐγὰ ἐλεγον διομολόγησαί μοι, εἰ ἀρα σοι ἔδοξα τότε ἀληθῆ λέγειν. ἔλεγον δέ που, ὅτι ἡ μὲν ὀψοποιικὴ οὖ μοι δοκεῖ τέχνη εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἐμπειρία, ἡ501 δ' ἰατρική, λέγων, ὅτι ἡ μὲν τούτου οῦ θεραπεύει καὶ τὴν φύσιν ἔσκεπται καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν ῶν πράττει, καὶ λόγον ἔχει τούτων ἑκάστου δοῦναι, ἡ ἰατρική · ἡ δ' ἑτέρα τῆς ἡδονῆς, πρὸς ἡν ἡ θεραπεία αὐτῆ ἐστιν ἅπασα, κομιδῆ ἀτέχνως ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἔρχεται, οὐτε τι τὴν φύσιν σκεψαμένη τῆς ἡδονῆς οὖτε τὴν αἰτίαν, ἀλόγως τε παντάπασιν,

ώς έπος είπειν ούδεν διαριθμησαμένη, τριβή καί εμπειρία, μνήμην μόνον σωζομένη τοῦ εἰωθότος Β γίγνεσθαι, ῷ δη καὶ πορίζεται τὰς ήδονάς. ταῦτ' ούν πρώτον σχόπει εί δοχεί σοι ίχανῶς λέγεσθαι, καί είναί τινες καί περί ψυχήν τοιαῦται άλλαι πραγματεΐαι, αί μέν τεχνιχαί, προμήθειάν τινα έγουσαι τοῦ βελτίστου περί την ψυγήν, αί δὲ τούτου μέν όλιγωροῦσαι, ἐσχεμμέναι δ' αὖ, ὥσπερ έχει, την ήδονην μόνον της ψυχης, τίνα αν αύτη τρόπον γίγνοιτο, ήτις δε ή βελτίων ή χείρων των ήδονών ούτε σχοπούμεναι, ούτε μέλον αύταις C άλλο η χαρίζεσθαι μόνον, είτε βέλτιον είτε γείρον. έμοι μεν γάρ, ῶ Καλλίκλεις, δοκοῦσί τε είναι, καὶ ἔγωγέ φημι τὸ τοιοῦτον κολακείαν είναι καί περί σώμα καί περί ψυχήν καί περί άλλο, ότου αν τις την ήδονην θεραπεύη ασκέπτως έχων τοῦ ἀμείνονός τε καὶ τοῦ χείρονος · σῦ δὲ δὴ πό~ τερον συγκατατίθεσαι ήμιν περί τούτων την αύτήν δόξαν ή αντίφης; ΚΑΛ. Ούκ ἔγωγε, αλλα συγγωρώ, ίνα σοι και περανθή ό λόγος και Γορ-D γία τῷδε χαρίσωμαι. ΣΩ. Πότερον δὲ περὶ μὲν μίαν ψυχήν έστι τοῦτο, περί δὲ δύο χαὶ πολλάς ούχ ἔστιν; ΚΑΛ. Ούχ, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ δύο καὶ περί πολλάς. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν χαὶ ἀθρόαις ἅμα χαρίζεσθαι έστι μηδέν σχοπούμενον το βέλτιστον; ΚΑΛ. Οίμαι έγωγε.

CAP. LVII. ΣΩ. "Εχεις οὖν εἰπεῖν αίτινές εἰσιν αί ἐπιτηδεύσεις αί τοῦτο ποιοῦσαι; Μᾶλλον δέ, εἰ βούλει, ἐμοῦ ἐφωτῶντος, ἡ μὲν ἄν σοι δοχῆ τούτων εἶναι, φάθι, ἡ δ' ἂν μή, μὴ φάθι. πρῶ-

85

τον δε σκεψώμεθα την αύλητικήν. ού δοκεί σοι Ε τοιαύτη τις είναι, ὦ Καλλίχλεις, την ήδονην ήμῶν . μόνον διώχειν, άλλο δ' ούδεν φροντίζειν; ΚΑΛ. "Εμοιγε δοχεί. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν χαὶ αἱ τοιαίδε άπασαι, οίον ή κιθαριστική ή έν τοις άγωσι; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Τί δὲ ή τῶν χορῶν διδασκαλία και ή τῶν διθυράμβων ποίησις; οὐ τοιαύτη τίς σοι καταφαίνεται ; η ήγει τι φροντίζειν Κινησίαν τὸν Μέλητος, ὅπως ἐρεῖ τι τοιοῦτον, ὅθεν αν οί αχούοντες βελτίους γίγνοιντο, η ο τι μέλ-502 λει χαριείσθαι τῷ όχλω τῶν θεατῶν; ΚΑΛ. Δήλον δή τοῦτό γε, ὦ Σώχρατες, Κινησίου γε πέρι. ΣΩ. Τί δὲ ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ Μέλης; ή πρός το βέλτιστον βλέπων έδόχει σοι χιθαρωδείν; ή έχεινος μέν ούδε πρός το ήδιστον; ήνία γάρ άδων τούς θεατάς. άλλα δή σχόπει · ούχι ή τε χιθαρωδική δοχεί σοι πάσα και ή των διθυράμβων ποίησις ήδονης χάριν εύρησθαι; ΚΑΛ. "Εμοιγε. ΣΩ. Τί δὲ δη ή σεμνή αὕτη καὶ θαυμαστή Β ή της τραγωδίας ποίησις έφ' δ έσπούδακε; πότεούν έστιν αὐτῆς τὸ ἐπιχείοημα καὶ ή σπουδή, ὡς σοί δοχεί, γαρίζεσθαι τοις θεαταίς μόνον, ή χαί διαμάγεσθαι, έάν τι αύτοις ήδύ μέν ή και κεγαρισμένον, πονηρον δέ, όπως τουτο μέν μη έρει, εί δέ τι τυγγάνει αηδές και ωφέλιμον, τουτο δέ και λέξει και άσεται, έάν τε χαίρωσιν έάν τε μή; ποτέρως σοι δοχεί παρεσχευάσθαι ή των τραγωδιών ποίησις; ΚΑΛ. Δήλον δή τουτό γε, ὦ Σώ- C χρατες, ότι προς την ήδονην μαλλον ωρμηται καί το χαρίζεσθαι τοις θεαταις. ΣΩ. Ούχουν το

τοιούτον, & Καλλίκλεις, έφαμεν νῦν δη κολακείαν είναι; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Φέρε δή, εί τις περιέλοιτο της ποιήσεως πάσης τό τε μέλος και τον δυθμον και το μέτρον, άλλο τι ή λόγοι γίγνονται το λειπόμενον; ΚΑΛ. Ανάγκη. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν πρὸς πολὺν ὄχλον καὶ δῆμον D ούτοι λέγονται οι λόγοι. ΚΑΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ. Δημηγορία άρα τίς έστιν ή ποιητική. ΚΑΛ. Φαίνεται. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν ξητοριχή δημηγορία άν είη. ή ου φητορεύειν δοκουσί σοι οί ποιηταί έν τοις θεάτροις ; ΚΑΛ. "Εμοιγε. ΣΩ. Νύν άρα ήμεις εύρήκαμεν δητορικήν τινα πρός δημον τοιούτον, οίον παίδων τε όμου και γυναικών και άνδοῶν, καί δούλων και έλευθέρων, ήν ου πάνυ · ἀγάμεθα · κολακικήν γὰρ αὐτήν φαμεν εἶναι. ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε.

CAP. LVIII. ΣΩ. Εἶεν. τί δὲ ή ποὸς τὸν ² Αθηναίων δημον ξητορικη καὶ τοὺς ἀλλους
Ε τοὺς ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι δήμους τοὺς τῶν ἐλευθέφων ἀνδφῶν, τί ποτε ἡμῖν αὕτη ἐστί ; πότεφόν σοι δο-κοῦσι πρὸς τὸ βέλτιστον ἀεὶ λέγειν οἱ ἑήτοφες, τούτου στοχαζόμενοι, ὅπως οἱ πολῖται ὡς βέλτιστοι ἔσονται διὰ τοὺς αὐτῶν λόγους, ἢ καὶ οὖτοι πρὸς τὸ χαφίζεσθαι τοῖς πολίταις ὡφμημένοι, καὶ ἕνεκα τοῦ ἰδίου τοῦ αὑτῶν ὀλιγωφοῦντες τοῦ κοινοῦ, ὥσπες παισὶ προσομιλοῦσι τοῖς δήμοις, χαφίζεσθαι αὐτοῖς πειφώμενοι μόνον, εἰ δέ γε βελτίους ἔσονται ἢ χείφους διὰ ταῦτα, οὐδὲν φροντίζουσιν ;
503 ΚΑΛ. Οὐχ ἁπλοῦν ἔτι τοῦτο ἐφωτῷς · εἰσὶ μὲν γὰς οῦ κηδόμενοι τῶν πολιτῶν λέγουσιν ὡ λέγου

σιν, είσι δε και οίους σύ λέγεις. ΣΩ. Έξαρκει. εί γαο και τουτό έστι διπλούν, το μεν έτερόν που τούτου πολαπεία αν είη παι αισχρά δημηγορία, το δ' έτερον καλόν, το παρασκευάζειν, ύπως ώς βέλτισται ἔσονται τῶν πολιτῶν αί ψυχαί, χαὶ διαμάχεσθαι λέγοντα τα βέλτιστα, είτε ήδίω είτε άηδέστερα ἔσται τοῖς ἀχούουσιν. ἀλλ' οὐ πώποτε Β σύ ταύτην είδες την δητορικήν · η εί τινα έχεις τῶν δητόρων τοιοῦτον εἰπεῖν, τί οὐγὶ καὶ ἐμοὶ αὐτὸν ἔφρασας τίς ἐστιν ; ΚΑΛ. ᾿Αλλὰ μὰ Δι' ούκ έχω έγωγέ σοι είπειν των γε νῦν ἡητόρων οὐδένα. ΣΩ. Τί δέ; τῶν παλαιῶν ἔγεις τινὰ εἰπείν, δι' όντινα αιτίαν έχουσιν 'Αθηναΐοι βελτίους γεγονέναι, έπειδή έχεινος ήρξατο δημηγορείν, έν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνφ χείρους όντες ; έγὼ μέν γὰρ ούκ οίδα τίς έστιν ούτος. ΚΑΛ. Τί δέ; Θε- C μιστοκλέα ούκ ακούεις ανδρα αγαθόν γεγονότα καί Κίμωνα καί Μιλτιάδην καί Περικλέα τουτονί τον νεωστί τετελευτηχότα, ού χαί συ άχήχοας; ΣΩ. Εί ἔστι γε, ὦ Καλλίχλεις, ην πρότερον σύ έλεγες άρετήν, άληθής, τὸ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας άποπιμπλάναι και τας αύτοῦ και τας τῶν ἄλλων. εί δε μή τουτο, άλλ' ύπερ έν τῷ ύστέρω λόγω ήναγκάσθημεν ήμεις όμολογειν, ότι αι μέν των έπιθυμιών πληρούμεναι βελτίω ποιούσι τόν άν- D θρωπον, ταύτας μέν αποτελεῖν, αί δὲ χείρω, μή· τούτο δε τέγνη τις είναι · τοιούτον άνδρα τούτων τινά γεγονέναι έγεις είπεῖν; ΚΑΛ. Ούχ έχω ἔγωγε πῶς εἴπω.

CAP. LIX. ΣΩ. 'Αλλ' έαν ζητης καλώς,

εύρήσεις. ίδωμεν δη ούτωσιν ατρέμα σχοπούμενοι, εί τις τούτων τοιούτος γέγονε. φέρε γάρ, Ε ό άγαθός άνης και έπι το βέλτιστον λέγων & αν λέγη άλλο τι ούχ είχη έρει, άλλ' άποβλέπων πρός τι; ώσπεο και οι άλλοι πάντες δημιουργοι βλέποντες πρός το αύτων έργον έχαστος ούχ είκη έχλεγόμενος προσφέρει & προσφέρει πρός το έργον τὸ αύτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅπως ἀν εἶδός τι αὐτῷ σχῆ τοῦτο, δ έργάζεται. οίον εί βούλει ίδειν τους ζωγράφους, τούς οίχοδόμους, τούς ναυπηγούς, τούς άλλους πάντας δημιουργούς, δντινα βούλει αυτῶν, ὡς εἰς τάξιν τινὰ ἕχαστος ἕχαστον τίθησιν δ ἂν τιθη, καὶ προσαναγκάζει τὸ ἕτερον τῷ ἑτέρω 504πρέπον τε είναι χαι άρμόττειν, έως αν το απαν συστήσηται τεταγμένον τε καί κεκοσμημένον πράγμα, καί οί τε δή άλλοι δημιουργοί και ούς νῦν δη ἐλέγομεν, οί περί τὸ σῶμα παιδοτρίβαι τε καὶ ἰατροί, κοσμοῦσί που τὸ σῶμα καὶ σύντάττουσιν. δμολογούμεν ούτω τούτ' έγειν, ή ού; ΚΑΛ. "Εστω τοῦτο ούτω. ΣΩ. Τάξεως ἀρα καὶ κόσμου τυχοῦσα οἰκία χρηστὴ ἂν εἴη, ἀταξίας Βδέ μοχθηρά; ΚΑΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ. Ούκοῦν καὶ πλοΐον ώσαύτως; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Καὶ μὴν καί τα σώματά φαμεν τα ήμέτερα; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Τίδ' ή ψυχή; αταξίας τυχοῦσα έσται χρηστή, η τάξεώς τε και κόσμου τινός ; ΚΑΛ. 'Ανάγχη έχ τῶν πρόσθεν χαὶ τοῦτο συνομολογείν. ΣΩ. Τί οὖν ὄνομά ἐστιν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῷ ἐχ τῆς τάξεώς τε χαὶ τοῦ χόσμου γιγνομένω; ΚΑΛ. Υγίειαν και ζσχύν ζσως λέγεις. 8*

ΣΩ. "Εγωγε. τί δὲ αὖ τῷ ἐν τῷ ψυχῷ ἐγγιγνο- C μένῷ ἐκ τῆς τάξεως καὶ τοῦ κόσμου; πειῷῶ εὑġεῖν καὶ εἰπεῖν ὥσπεῷ ἐκείνῷ τὸ ὄνομα. ΚΑΛ. Τί δὲ οὐκ αὐτὸς λέγεις, ὦ Σώκῷατες; ΣΩ. ²Αλλ' εἴ σοι ἥδιόν ἐστιν, ἐγὼ ἐῷῶ. σὺ δέ, ἂν μέν σοι δοκῶ ἐγὼ καλῶς λέγειν, φάθι· εἰ δὲ μή, ἔλεγχε καὶ μὴ ἐπίτῷεπε. ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ ταῖς μὲν τοῦ σώματος τάξεσιν ὄνομα εἶναι ὑγιεινόν, ἐξ οῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἡ ὑγίεια γίγνεται καὶ ἡ ἀλλη ἀφετὴ τοῦ σώματος. ἔστι ταῦτα ἢ οὐκ ἔστιν; ΚΑΛ. D "Εστι. ΣΩ. Ταῖς δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς τάξεσί τε καὶ κοσμήσεσι νόμιμόν τε καὶ νόμος, ὅθεν καὶ νόμιμοι γίγνονται καὶ κόσμιοι· ταῦτα δ' ἔστι δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ σωφῷοσύνη. φής, ἢ οὒ; ΚΑΛ.

CAP. LX. $\Sigma\Omega$. Οὐχοῦν πορὸς ταῦτα αῦ βλέπων ὁ ἡἰτωρ ἐχεῖνος, ὁ τεχνιχός τε καὶ ἀγαθός, καὶ τοὺς λόγους προσοίσει ταῖς ψυχαῖς οῦς ἂν λέγῃ καὶ τὰς πράξεις ἁπάσας, καὶ δῶρον ἐἀν τι διδῷ, δώσει, καὶ ἐἀν τι ἀφαιοῆται, ἀφαιgήσεται, πρὸς τοῦτο ἀεὶ τὸν νοῦν ἔχων, ὅπως Ε ἂν αὐτοῦ τοῖς πολίταις διχαιοσύνη μὲν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς γίγνηται, ἀδιχία δὲ ἀπαλλάττηται, καὶ σωφροσύνη μὲν ἐγγίγνηται, ἀχολασία δὲ ἀπαλλάτιηται, καὶ ἡ ἀλλη ἀρετὴ ἐγγίγνηται, καχία δὲ ἀπίῃ; συγχωρεῖς, ἢ οὕ; ΚΑΛ. Συγχωρῶ. ΣΩ. Τί γὰρ ὄφελος, ὡ Καλλίκλεις, σώματί γε κάμνοντι καὶ μοχθηρῶς διαχειμένῷ σιτία πολλὰ διδόναι καὶ τὰ ἦδιστα ἢ ποτὰ ἢ ἀλλ' ὁτιοῦν, ὅ uὴ ὀνήσει αὐτὸ ἔσθ' ὅτε πλέον ἢ τοὐναντίον, κα505 τά γε τον δίχαιον λόγον, χαὶ ἔλαττον; ἔστι ταῦτα; ΚΑΛ. "Εστω. ΣΩ. Ού γάρ, οίμαι, λυσιτελεί μετά μοχθηρίας σώματος ζην άνθρώπω. άνάγκη γάς ούτω και ζην μοχθηςῶς. ή ούχ ούτω; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν καὶ τὰς έπιθυμίας ἀποπιμπλάναι, οίον πεινώντα φαγείν ύσον βούλεται η διψώντα πιειν, ύγιαίνοντα μέν έωσιν οί ἰατροὶ ὡς τὰ πολλά, χάμνοντα δέ, ὡς έπος είπειν ούδέποι' έωσιν έμπίπλασθαι ών έπιθυμεῖ; συγχωρεῖς τοῦτό γε καὶ σύ; ΚΑΛ. Β' Εγωγε. ΣΩ. Περί δε ψυχήν, δ άριστε, ούχ ό αὐτος τρόπος; έως μεν αν πονηρα ή, ανόητός τε ουσα καὶ ἀχόλαστος καὶ ἄδικος καὶ ἀνόσιος, εἴογειν αύτην δεί των έπιθυμιών και μη έπιτρέπειν άλλ' άττα ποιείν η άφ' ών βελτίων ἔσται ; φής, η ού; ΚΑΛ. Φημί. ΣΩ. Ούτω γάρ που αὐτη ἄμεινον τη ψυχη. ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν το είργειν έστιν άφ' ών επιθυμεί πολάζειν; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Το κολάζεσθαι άρα τη ψυγη άμεινόν έστιν η ή άχολασία, ωσπερ σύ νῦν δή ι ώου. ΚΑΛ. Ούχ οίδ' άττα λέγεις, ω Σώχρατες, άλλ' άλλον τινά έρώτα. ΣΩ. Ούτος άνήρ ούχ ύπομένει ώφελούμενος και αύτος τουτο πάσχων, περί οδ ό λόγος έστί, χολαζόμενος. ΚΑΛ. Ούδέ γέ μοι μέλει ούδεν ών συ λέγεις, και ταυτά σοι Γοργίου χάριν απεχρινάμην. ΣΩ. Είεν. τί οὖν δη ποιήσομεν; μεταξύ τὸν λόγον καταλύομεν; ΚΑΛ. Αὐτὸς γνώσει. ΣΩ. 'Αλλ' D οὐδὲ τοὺς μύθους φασὶ μεταξὺ θέμις εἶναι χαταλείπειν, άλλ' ἐπιθέντας κεφαλήν, ίνα μη άνευ

χεφαλης πεοιίη. ἀπόχοιναι οὖν καὶ τὰ λοιπά, ἵνα ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος χεφαλην λάβη.

CAP. LXI. ΚΑΛ. 'Ως βίαιος εί, ὦ Σώκρατες. ἐάν δὲ ἐμοὶ πείθῃ, ἐάσεις χαίρειν τοῦτον τον λόγον, η και άλλω τω διαλέξει. ΣΩ. Τίς οῦν ἀλλος ἐθέλει; μη γάρ τοι ἀτελη γε τον λόγον καταλείπωμεν. ΚΑΛ. Αὐτὸς δὲ οὐκ άν δύναιο διελθεῖν τὸν λόγον, ή λέγων κατά σαυτὸν Ε η αποχρινόμενος σαυτώ; ΣΩ. "Ινα μοι το τοῦ ² Επιγάρμου γένηται, & πρό τοῦ δύο ἀνδρες ἔλεγον, είς ων ίχανος γένωμαι. άταο χινδυνεύει άναγχαιότατον είναι ούτως. εί μέντοι ποιήσομεν, οίμαι έγωγε γρηναι πάντας ήμας φιλονείχως έχειν πρός το είδέναι το άληθες τί έστι περί ών λέγομεν και τί ψεύδος · κοινόν γαο άγαθόν άπασι φανερόν γενέσθαι αὐτό. δίειμι μεν οῦν τῶ λόγφ έγω ώς άν μοι δοκή έγειν έαν δέ τφ 506 ύμῶν μη τὰ όντα δοχῶ ύμολογεῖν έμαυτῷ, χρη άντιλαμβάνεσθαι και έλέγχειν. ούδε γάο τοι ἔγωγε είδως λέγω & λέγω, ἀλλά ζητῶ χοινη μεθ' ύμῶν, ώστε, ἀν τι φαίνηται λέγων ὁ ἀμφισβητῶν έμοί, έγώ πρώτος συγχωρήσομαι. λέγω μέντοι ταύτα, εί δοχεί χρηναι διαπερανθηναι τον λόγον · εί δε μή βούλεσθε, εώμεν δή χαίρειν καί άπίωμεν. ΓΟΡ. 'Αλλ' έμοι μέν ού δοκεϊ, δ Σώπρατες, χρηναί πω απιέναι, αλλα διεξελθείν Β σε τον λόγον · φαίνεται δέ μοι και τοις άλλοις δοκείν. βούλομαι γαο έγωγε και αυτός ακούσαί σου αύτοῦ διιόντος τὰ ἐπίλοιπα. ΣΩ. 'Αλλά μέν δή, δ Γοργία, και αυτός ήδέως μέν αν Καλλικλεί τούτω έτι διελεγόμην, έως αὐτῷ τὴν τοῦ ²Αμφίονος ἀπέδωκα ὅῆσιν ἀντὶ τῆς τοῦ Ζήθου ἐπειδὴ δὲ σύ, ὡ Καλλίκλεις, οὐκ ἐθέλεις συνδιαπερᾶναι τὸν λόγον, ἀλλ' οὖν ἐμοῦ γε ἀκούων C ἐπιλαμβάνου, ἐάν τί σοι δοκῶ μὴ καλῶς λέγειν. καί με ἐἀν ἐξελέγξῃς, οὐκ ἀχθεσθήσομαί σοι, ὥσπερ σῦ ἐμοί, ἀλλὰ μέγιστος εὐεργέτης παρ' ἐμοὶ ἀναγεγράψει. ΚΑΛ. Λέγε, ὡ 'γαθέ, αὐτὸς καὶ πέραινε.

CAP. LXII. ΣΩ. "Αχουε δή έξ ἀρχης έμου άναλαβόντος τον λόγον. 3 Αρα το ήδυ και το άγαθον το αύτό έστιν; Ού ταύτόν, ώς έγω καί Καλλικλής ώμολογήσαμεν. Πότερον δε το ήδυ ένεχα τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ πραχτέον, ἢ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἕνεχα τοῦ ήδέος; Τὸ ήδὺ ἕνεκα τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. 'Ηδὺ D δέ έστι τοῦτο, οὖ παραγενομένου ἡδόμεθα; ἀγαθον δέ, οῦ παρόντος ἀγαθοί ἐσμεν; Πάνυ γε. 'Αλλά μήν άγαθοί γέ έσμεν και ήμεις και τάλλα πάντα δσα άγαθά έστιν, άρετης τινος παραγενομένης; "Εμοιγε δοχεί αναγχαίον είναι, ω Καλλίκλεις. 'Αλλά μέν δή ή γε άρετή έκάστου, καί σκεύους καί σώματος καί ψυγης αὖ και ζώου παντός, οὐ τῶ εἰχῆ χάλλιστα παραγίγνεται, άλλα τάξει και δοθότητι και τέχνη, ήτις έκάστω άποδέδοται αύτῶν. ἆρα ἔστι ταῦτα; Ἐγώ μὲν Εγάρ φημι. Τάξει άρα τεταγμένον και κεκοσμημένον έστιν ή αρετή έχάστου; Φαίην αν έγωγε. Κόσμος τις άρα έγγενόμενος έν εκάστω ό εκάστου οίχεῖος ἀγαθόν παρέχει ἕχαστον τῶν ὄντων; "Εμοιγε δοχεί. Και ψυχή άρα χόσμον έχουσα

τόν έαυτης άμείνων της άχοσμήτου; 'Ανάγχη. ' Αλλά μήν ή γε κόσμον έχουσα κοσμία; Πῶς γάο ού μέλλει; Η δέ γε ποσμία σώφοων; 507 Πολλή ανάγκη. Η άρα σώφρων ψυχή αγαθή. Έγω μέν ούκ έχω παρά ταῦτα άλλα φάναι, ὦ φίλε Καλλίκλεις • σύ δ' εἰ ἔχεις, δίδασκε. ΚΑΛ. · Λέγ', ω 'γαθέ. ΣΩ. Λέγω δή, ὅτι, εἰ ή σώφοων άγαθή έστιν, ή τούναντίον τη σώφρονι πεπονθυία צמצון בֿסדוע. אין אב מטורון א מקסטע דב אמן מאטλαστος: Πάνυ γε. Καὶ μὴν ὅ γε σώφοων τὰ προσήχοντα πράττοι αν και περί θεούς και περί άνθρώπους; ού γάρ άν σωφρονοί τα μή προσήχοντα πράττων. 'Ανάγχη ταῦτ' εἶναι οὕτω. Καὶ μὴν περὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπους τὰ προσήχοντα Β πράττων δίκαι' αν πράττοι, περί δε θεούς όσια. τόν δε τα δίχαια χαι όσια πράττοντα ανάγχη δίκαιον καί όσιον είναι; "Εστι ταῦτα. Καὶ μέν δή και άνδρεϊόν γε άνάγκη; ού γαρ δή σώφρονος άνδρός έστιν ούτε διώχειν ούτε φεύγειν ά μη προσήχει, άλλ' ά δει χαι πράγματα χαι άνθρώπους και ήδονας και λύπας φεύγειν και διώκειν, και ύπομένοντα καρτερείν όπου δεί · ώστε πολλή C άνάγκη, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, τὸν σώφρονα ὥσπερ διήλθομεν, δίχαιον όντα χαι άνδρεῖον χαι όσιον άγαθόν άνδρα είναι τελέως, τόν δε άγαθόν εῦ τε καί χαλώς πράττειν & άν πράττη, τον δ' εῦ πράττοντα μαχάριόν τε χαί εύδαίμονα είναι, τον δε πονηρόν και κακώς πράττοντα άθλιον. ούτος δ' άν είη ό εναντίως έχων τῷ σώφρονι, ό ἀχόλαστος, ὃν σύ ἐπήνεις. CAP. LXIII. 'Εγώ μέν οὖν ταῦτα

ούτω τίθεμαι χαί φημι ταυτα άληθη είναι. εί δε D ἔστιν ἀληθη, τον βουλόμενον, ὡς ἔοικεν, εὐδαίμονα είναι σωφροσύνην μέν διωχτέον χαι άσχητέον, απολασίαν δε φευπτέον ώς έχει ποδών έπαστος ήμων, καί παρασκευαστέον μάλιστα μέν μηδέν δεισθαι του χολάζεσθαι, έαν δε δεηθη η αύτος η άλλος τις των οικείων, η ιδιώτης η πόλις, έπιθετέον δίκην και κολαστέον, ει μέλλει εύδαίμων είναι. ούτος έμοιγε δοχεί ό σχοπός είναι, πρός ὃν βλέποντα δεῖ ζῆν, καὶ πάντα εἰς τοῦτο τὰ αύτοῦ συντείνοντα χαὶ τὰ τῆς πόλεως, ὅπως Ε διχαιοσύνη παρέσται χαὶ σωφροσύνη τῷ μαχαρίω μέλλοντι έσεσθαι, ούτω πράττειν, ούκ έπιθυμίας έῶντα ἀχολάστους εἶναι χαὶ ταύτας ἐπιγειροῦντα πληρούν, ανήνυτον κακόν, ληστού βίον ζώντα. ούτε γαο αν άλλω ανθρώπω προσφιλής αν είη δ τοιούτος ούτε θεώ · κοινωνείν γαο άδύνατος · ότω δε μη ένι κοινωνία, φιλία ούκ αν είη. φασί δ' οί σοφοί, ὦ Καλλίχλεις, χαὶ οὐρανὸν χαὶ γῆν 508 καί θεούς καί άνθρώπους την κοινωνίαν συνέχειν καί φιλίαν και κοσμιότητα και σωφροσύνην και διχαιότητα, — χαί τὸ ὅλον τοῦτο διὰ ταῦτα χόσμον καλούσιν, ὦ έταῖςε, — οὐκ ἀκοσμίαν οὐδὲ άχολασίαν. σύ δέ μοι δοχεῖς οὐ προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν τούτοις, χαὶ ταῦτα σοφὸς ὤν, ἀλλὰ λέληθέ σε, ότι ή ίσότης ή γεωμετρική και έν θεοις και έν άνθρώποις μέγα δύναται. συ δε πλεονεξίαν οίει δείν άσχείν · γεωμετρίας γάρ άμελείς. Είεν. ή Β έξελεγκτέος δή ούτος ό λόγος ήμιν έστιν, ώς ού δικαιοσύνης καί σωφροσύνης κτήσει εύδαίμονες

οί εύδαίμονες, κακίας δε οι άθλιοι η εί ούτος άληθής έστι, σχεπτέον τί τα συμβαίνοντα. τα πρόσθεν έχεινα, ὦ Καλλίχλεις, συμβαίνει πάντα, έφ' οίς σύ με ήρου, εί σπουδάζων λέγοιμι, λέγοντα, ότι χατηγορητέον είη και αύτου και υίέος καί έταίρου, ἐάν τι άδικῆ, καὶ τῆ ἑητορικῆ ἐπὶ τοῦτο γρηστέον. καὶ ἅ Πῶλον αἰσγύνη ὤου συγχωρείν, άληθη άρα ήν, το είναι το άδικειν του C άδιχεῖσθαι, ὅσωπερ αἴσχιον, τοσούτω χάχιον · χαὶ τόν μέλλοντα όρθῶς δητορικόν ἔσεσθαι δίκαιον άρα δει είναι και έπιστήμονα των δικαίων, ΰ αθ Γοργίαν έφη Πωλος δι' αἰσγύνην δμολογήσαι. CAP. LXIV. Τούτων δε ούτως εγόντων, σκεψώμεθα τί ποτ' έστιν & συ έμοι όνειδίζεις, δοα καλώς λέγεται, η ού, ώς άρα έγω ούχ οίός τ' είμι βοηθήσαι ούτε έμαυτῷ ούτε τῶν φίλων οὐδενὶ οὐδὲ τῶν οἰχείων, οὐδ' ἐχσῶσαι ἐχ τῶν μεγίστων χινδύνων, είμι δε έπι τῷ βουλομένο ωσπες οι άτιμοι D τοῦ ἐθέλοντος, ἄν τε τύπτειν βούληται, τὸ νεανικόν δή τούτο του σου λόγου, επί κόζωης, εάν τε χρήματα άφαιρεΐσθαι, ἐάν τε ἐκδάλλειν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ἐάν τε, τὸ ἔσχατον, ἀποχτεῖναι· καὶ οὕτω διακείσθαι πάντων δή αἴσχιστόν ἐστιν, ώς ὁ σὸς λόγος. ό δε δή εμός, ύστις πολλάχις μεν ήδη είοηται, ούδεν δε χωλύει χαι έτι λέγεσθαι · ού φημι, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, τὸ τύπτεσθαι ἐπὶ κύὀῥης ἀδίκως Ε αισχιστον είναι, ούδέ γε το τέμνεσθαι ούτε το σῶμα τὸ ἐμὸν οὔτε τὸ βαλάντιον, ἀλλὰ τὸ τύπτειν καί έμε καί τα έμα άδίκως και τέμνειν και αίσχιον και κάκιον, και κλέπτειν γε άμα και άνδρα-

96

ποδίζεσθαι και τοιχωρυχεῖν και συλλήβδην ότιοῦν άδιχειν χαι έμε χαι τα έμα τῷ άδιχοῦντι χαι αίσχιον καὶ κάκιον εἶναι ή ἐμοὶ τῷ ἀδικουμένῳ. ταῦτα ἡμῖν ἀνω ἐχεῖ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν λόγοις 509 ούτω φανέντα, ώς έγω λέγω, χατέγεται χαὶ δέδεται, καί εί άγροικότερόν τι είπειν έστι, σιδηροις και άδαμαντίνοις λόγοις, ώς γοῦν ἂν δόξειεν ούτωσίν, ούς συ εί μη λύσεις ή σου τις νεανιχώτερος, ούχ οίόν τε, άλλως λέγοντα ή ώς έγώ νῦν λέγω, καλῶς λέγειν · ἐπεὶ ἔμοιγε ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος έστιν αεί, ὕτι έγώ ταῦτα οὐχ οἶδα ὅπως ἔχει, ὅτι μέντοι ών έγω έντετύχηχα, ωσπερ νῦν, οὐδεὶς οἶός Β τ' έστιν άλλως λέγων μή ού καταγέλαστος είναι. έγώ μέν οὖν αὖ τίθημι ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχειν. εἰ δὲ ούτως έχει, και μέγιστον των κακών έστιν ή άδικία τῷ ἀδικοῦντι, καὶ ἔτι τούτου μεῖζον μεγίστου όντος, εί οἰόν τε, τὸ ἀδιχοῦντα μὴ διδόναι δίχην, τίνα αν βοήθειαν μη δυνάμενος άνθρωπος βοηθείν έαυτῷ χαταγέλαστος ἂν τῆ ἀληθεία εἴη; δο' ού ταύτην, ήτις αποτρέψει την μεγίστην ήμῶν βλάβην; ἀλλὰ πολλή ἀνάγκη ταύτην είναι τήν αίσχίστην βοήθειαν, μή δύνασθαι βοηθείν μήτε έαυτῷ μήτε τοις αύτοῦ φίλοις τε και οικεί-C οις, δευτέραν δὲ τὴν τοῦ δευτέρου χαχοῦ χαὶ τρίτην την του τρίτου, και τάλλα ούτως · ώς έκάστου κακού μέγεθος πέφυκεν, ούτω και κάλλος τοῦ δυνατόν είναι ἐφ' ἕχαστα βοηθεῖν χαὶ αἰσγύνη τοῦ μή. ឨοα άλλως, η ούτως ἔγει, ὦ Καλλί**κλεις**; ΚΑΛ. Ούχ άλλως.

CAP. LXV. ΣΩ. Δυοίν οὐν ὄντοιν, τοῦ ἀδι-9

κείν τε καί άδικείσθαι, μείζον μέν φαμεν κακόν το άδιχειν, έλαττον δε το άδιχεισθαι. τι ουν αν παρασκευασάμενος άνθρωπος βοηθήσειεν αύτώ, ώστε αμφοτέρας τας ωφελείας ταύτας έχειν, τήν D τε από τοῦ μη αδιχεῖν χαι την από τοῦ μη αδιχεῖσθαι ; πότερα δύναμιν, η βούλησιν ; ῶδε δὲ λέγω • πότερον ἐάν μη βούληται άδιχεῖσθαι, οὐχ άδικήσεται, ή έαν δύναμιν παρασκευάσηται τοῦ μή άδικεῖσθαι, οὐκ άδικήσεται; ΚΑΛ. Δήλον δή τοῦτό γε, ὅτι ἐἀν δύναμιν. ΣΩ. Τί δὲ δή τοῦ ἀδικεῖν; πότερον ἐἀν μή βούληται ἀδικεῖν, ίκανὸν τοῦτ' ἐστίν — οὐ γὰρ ἀδικήσει —, ἢ καὶ Ε έπι τούτο δει δύναμίν τινα και τέγνην παρασχευάσασθαι, ώς, έαν μη μάθη αυτά και άσκήση, άδικήσει; Τί ούκ αὐτό γέ μοι τοῦτο ἀπεκρίνω, ῶ Καλλίπλεις; πότερόν σοι δοπουμεν ὀρθῶς άναγκασθηναι όμολογειν έν τοις έμπροσθεν λόγοις έγώ τε καί Πῶλος, ή ου, ήνίκα ωμολογήσαμεν μηδένα βουλόμενον άδιχεῖν, άλλ' άχοντας τούς άδιχοῦντας πάντας ἀδιχεῖν ; ΚΑΛ. "Εστω σοι τούτο, ω Σώχρατες, ούτως, ίνα διαπεράνης 510 τόν λόγον. ΣΩ. Καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἄρα, ὡς ἔοικε, παρασχευαστέον έστι δύναμίν τινα χαι τέχνην, οπως μη άδικήσωμεν. ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Τίς οῦν ποτ' ἐστὶ τέχνη τῆς παρασκευῆς τοῦ μηδέν άδικεισθαι ή ώς όλίγιστα; σκέιμαι, εί σοί δοχει ήπεο έμοι. έμοι μέν γάο δοχει ήδε ή αύτον ἄρχειν δείν έν τη πόλει ή και τυραννείν, η της ύπαρχούσης πολιτείας εταίρον είναι. ΚΑΛ. Οςας, ω Σώχρατες, ώς έγω έτοιμός είμι

Β ἐπαινεῖν, ἀν τι καλῶς λέγῃς; τοῦτό μοι δοκεῖς πάνυ καλῶς εἰρηκέναι.

CAP. LXVI. ΣΩ. Σκόπει δη και τόδε ἐάν σοι δοχώ εῦ λέγειν. φίλος μοι δοχεῖ ἕχαστος ἑχάστω είναι ώς οίόν τε μάλιστα, δνπερ οί παλαιοί τε καί σοφοί λέγουσιν, ό δμοιος τῷ όμοίφ. οὐ καί σοί; ΚΑΛ. "Εμοιγε. ΣΩ. Ούκοῦν ὅπου τύραννός έστιν άρχων άγριος και άπαίδευτος, εί τις τούτου έν τη πόλει πολύ βελτίων είη, φο**βοίτο δήπου αν αύτον ό τύραννος και τούτ**ω έξ C απαντος τοῦ νοῦ οὐχ ἀν ποτε δύναιτο φίλος γενέσθαι; ΚΑΛ. "Εστι ταῦτα. ΣΩ. Οὐδέ γε εί τις πολύ φαυλότερος είη, ούδ' αν ούτος. καταφρονοϊ γάρ ἂν αὐτοῦ ὁ τύραννος καὶ οὐκ άν ποτε ώς πρός φίλον σπουδάσειε. ΚΑΛ. Καί ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ. ΣΩ. Λείπεται δη ἐχεῖνος μόνος άξιος λόγου φίλος τῷ τοιούτω, ὃς ἄν, ὁμοήθης ών, ταύτα ψέγων και έπαινων έθέλη άρχεσθαι και ύποκεισθαι τῷ ἀρχοντι. οὖτος μέγα ἐν ταύ-D τη τη πόλει δυνήσεται· τουτον ούδείς χαίοων άδικήσει. ούχ ούτως έχει; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Εἰ ἀρα τις ἐννοήσειεν ἐν ταύτη τη πόλει τῶν νέων, Τίνα αν τρόπον έγω μέγα δυναίμην καί μηδείς με άδικοίη, αύτη, ώς ξοικεν, αύτω όδός έστιν, εύθύς έχ νέου έθίζειν αύτον τοις αύτοις γαίρειν και άγθεσθαι τω δεσπότη, και παρασκευάζειν, ὅπως ὅτι μάλιστα ὅμοιος ἔσται ἐκείνω. Ε ούγ ούτως; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν τούτω το μέν μη άδιχεῖσθαι χαὶ μέγα δύνασθαι, ώς

ό ύμέτερος λόγος, έν τη πόλει διαπεπράξεται.

KAA. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. ⁵Aq' οὖν καὶ τὸ μὴ άδιχεῖν; ή πολλοῦ δεῖ, εἴπερ ὅμοιος ἔσται τῷ άρχοντι, όντι άδίχω, χαὶ παρὰ τούτω μέγα δυνήσεται; άλλ' οίμαι ἔγωγε, πῶν τοὐναντίον ούτωσί ή παρασκευή έσται αύτῷ ἐπὶ τὸ οίῷ τε είναι ώς πλεΐστα άδιχειν χαι άδιχουντα μη διδόναι 511 δίκην. η γάρ; ΚΑΛ. Φαίνεται. ΣΩ. Ούχούν το μέγιστον αύτω κακόν ύπάρξει, μοχθηρώ όντι την ψυχην και λελωβημένω δια την μίμησιν τοῦ δεσπότου καὶ δύναμιν. ΚΑΛ. Οὐκ οἶδ' ύπη στρέφεις έκάστοτε τους λόγους άνω και κάτω, ὦ Σώχρατες. ἢ οὐχ οἶσθα, ὅτι οὖτος ὑ μιμούμενος τον μή μιμούμενον έκεινον αποκτενει, έαν βούληται, καὶ ἀφαιρήσεται τὰ ὄντα ; ΣΩ. Οἶδα, Β ῶ 'γαθὲ Καλλίκλεις, εἰ μὴ κωφός γ' εἰμί, καὶ σοῦ άχούων χαὶ Πώλου ἄρτι πολλάχις χαὶ τῶν ἀλλων όλίγου πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ πόλει. ἀλλὰ καὶ σῦ έμοῦ ἄχουε, ὅτι ἀποχτενεῖ μέν, ἀν βούληται, ἀλλὰ πονηρός ών χαλόν χάγαθόν όντα. ΚΑΛ. Ούχοῦν τοῦτο δή καὶ τὸ ἀγανακτητόν ; ΣΩ. Οὐ νοῦν γε έχοντι, ώς ό λόγος σημαίνει. η οίει δειν τουτο παρασκευάζεσθαι άνθρωπον, ώς πλεΐστον χρόνον ζην, και μελετάν τας τέχνας ταύτας, αι ήμας αεί έχ τῶν χινδύνων σώζουσιν, ὥσπερ χαὶ ήν συ χε- C λεύεις έμε μελεταν την δητορικήν, την έν τοις διχαστηρίοις διασώζουσαν; ΚΑΛ. Ναὶ μα Λι' όρθῶς γέ σοι συμβουλεύων.

CAP. LXVII. $\Sigma\Omega$. Τ΄ δέ, $\tilde{\omega}$ βέλτιστε; $\tilde{\eta}$ καὶ $\tilde{\eta}$ τοῦ νεῖν ἐπιστήμη σεμνή τίς σοι δοκεῖ εἶναι; ΚΑΛ. Μὰ Δί' οὐκ ἔμοιγε. $\Sigma\Omega$. Καὶ

μήν σώζει γε καί αύτη έκ θανάτου τούς άνθρώπους, όταν είς τοιούτον έμπέσωσιν, οὗ δεῖ ταύτης D τῆς ἐπιστήμης. εί δ' αύτη σοι δοχεῖ σμιχρά είναι, έγώ σοι μείζονα ταύτης έρω, την χυβερνητιχήν, ή ου μόνον τας ψυχας σώζει, αλλα και τα σώματα καί τα χρήματα έκ τῶν ἐσχάτων κινδύνων, ωσπερ ή όητορική. και αύτη μέν προσεσταλμένη έστι και κοσμία, και ού σεμνύνεται έσχηματισμένη ώς ύπερήφανόν τι διαπραττομένη, άλλα ταύτα διαποαξαμένη τη δικανική, έαν μέν έξ Αιγίνης δεύρο σώση, οίμαι, δύ' όβολούς έπρά-Εξατο, έαν δε έξ Αιγύπτου ή έκ του Πόντου, έαν πάμπολυ ταύτης τῆς μεγάλης εὐεργεσίας, σώσασ' ά νῦν δη ἔλεγον, και αὐτὸν και παίδας και χρήματα καί γυναϊκας, αποβιβάσασ' είς τον λιμένα δύο δραχμας έπράξατο, και αύτος ό έχων την τέχνην καί ταῦτα διαπραξάμενος ἐκβὰς παρὰ τὴν θάλατταν χαί την ναῦν περιπατεῖ ἐν μετρίφ σχήματι. λογίζεσθαι γάρ, οίμαι, επίσταται, ότι άδηλόν έστιν ούστινάς τε ώφέληκε των συμπλεόντων ούχ έάσας χαταποντωθήναι χαί ούστινας έβλαψεν, είδώς, ότι ούδεν αύτούς βελτίους έξεβί-512 βασεν ή οίοι ένέβησαν, ούτε τα σώματα ούτε τας ψυχάς. λογίζεται οὖν, ὅτι οὖκ, εἰ μέν τις μεγάλοις και άνιάτοις νοσήμασι κατά το σώμα συνεχόμενος μη απεπνίγη, ούτος μεν αθλιός έστιν, ότι ούκ απέθανε, και ούδεν ύπ' αύτοῦ ἀφέληται εί δέ τις άρα έν τῷ τοῦ σώματος τιμιωτέρω, τῆ ψυχη, πολλά νοσήματα έχει και άνίατα, τούτω δε βιωτέον έστι και τούτον όνήσειεν, άν τε έκ 9*

θαλάττης αν τε έχ διχαστηρίου αν τε άλλοθεν όποθενούν σώση, άλλ' οίδεν, ότι ούκ άμεινόν έστι Β ζην τῷ μοχθηρῷ ἀνθρώπῷ · κακῶς γὰρ ἀνάγκη έστι ζην. CAP. LXVIII. Δια ταυτα ου νόμος έστι σεμνύνεσθαι τον χυβερνήτην, χαίπερ σώζοντα ήμας. ούδέ γε, & θαυμάσιε, τον μηχανοποιόν, ΰς ούτε στρατηγού, μή ότι κυβερνήτου, ούτε άλλου ούδενός έλάττω ένίστε δύναται σώζειν πόλεις γάρ ἔστιν ὅτε ὅλας σώζει. μή σοι δοχεῖ χατά τὸν διχανιχόν είναι; χαίτοι εί βούλοιτο λέγειν, & Καλλίχλεις, άπεο ύμεις, σεμνύνων το ποαγμα, καταχώσειεν αν ύμας τοις λόγοις, λέγων και πα- C ρακαλών έπι το δείν γίγνεσθαι μηχανοποιούς, ώς ούδεν τάλλά έστιν · ίκανός γάρ αύτῷ ό λόγος. άλλά σύ ούδεν ήττον αύτου καταφρονεις και της τέχνης τῆς ἐκείνου, καὶ ὡς ἐν ὀνείδει ἀποκαλέσαις άν μηχανοποιόν, και τῷ υίεῖ αὐτοῦ οὕτ' άν δοῦναι θυγατέρα έθέλοις, οὔτ' ἂν αὐτὸς τῷ σαυτοῦ λαβείν την έχείνου. χαίτοι έξ ών τα σαυτού έπαινεῖς, τίνι διχαίω λόγω τοῦ μηχανοποιοῦ χαταφοονεῖς χαὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὦν νῦν δη ἔλεγον; οἶδ' ὅτι D φαίης αν βελτίων είναι και έκ βελτιόνων. το δέ βέλτιον εί μή ἔστιν ΰ ἐγώ λέγω, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τοῦτ' έστιν άρετή, το σώζειν αύτον και τα έαυτου όντα όποιός τις έιυχε, καταγέλαστός σοι ό ψόγος γίγνεται καὶ μηχανοποιοῦ καὶ ἰατροῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τεγνών, δσαι τοῦ σώζειν ἕνεκα πεποίηνται. άλλ', ῶ μαχάριε, ὅρα μή ἀλλο τι τὸ γενναῖον χαὶ τὸ άγαθον ή του σώζειν τε καί σώζεσθαι. μη γαο τοῦτο μέν, τὸ ζην ὁποσονδή χρόνον, τόν γε ὡς Ε

άληθῶς ἄνδοα ἐατέον ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ φιλοψυχητέον, άλλα έπιτρέψαντα περί τούτων τῷ θεῷ καί πιστεύσαντα ταις γυναιξίν, ότι την είμαρμένην ούδ' αν είς έχφύγοι, το έπι τούτω σχεπτέον, τίν' αν τρόπον τουτον ων μέλλει χρόνον βιώναι ώς άριστα βιώη, άρα έξομοιῶν αύτὸν τῆ πολιτεία 513ταύτη, έν ή άν οἰκη, καὶ νῦν δὲ ἀρα δεῖ σὲ ὡς όμοιότατον γίγνεσθαι τῷ δήμω τῷ 'Αθηναίων, εἰ μέλλεις τούτω προσφιλής είναι και μέγα δύνασθαι έν τη πόλει ; τοῦθ' ὅςα εἰ σοὶ λυσιτελεῖ χαὶ έμοί, όπως μή, δ δαιμόνιε, πεισόμεθα όπες φασί τας την σελήνην χαθαιρούσας, τας Θετταλίδας. σύν τοις φιλτάτοις ή αίρεσις ήμιν έσται ταύτης τῆς δυνάμεως τῆς ἐν τῆ πόλει. εἰ δέ σοι οἴει ὑντινούν ανθρώπων παραδώσειν τέχνην τινα τοιαύ-Β την, ήτις σε ποιήσει μέγα δύνασθαι έν τη πόλει τῆδε ἀνόμοιον ὄντα τῷ πολιτεία εἴτ' ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον είτ' έπι το χείρον, ώς έμοι δοχεί, ούχ όρθως βουλεύει, & Καλλίχλεις · ού γαο μιμητήν δεί είναι, άλλ' αύτοφυῶς δμοιον τούτοις, εἰ μέλλεις τι γνήσιον απεργάζεσθαι είς φιλίαν τῶ Αθηναίων δήμω και ναι μα Δία τῷ Πυριλάμπους γε πρός. δστις ούν σε τούτοις όμοιότατον απεργάσεται, ούτός σε ποιήσει, ώς έπιθυμεῖς πολιτιχος είναι, πο-C λιτικόν και δητορικόν · τω αύτων γαρ ήθει λεγομένων των λόγων έχαστοι χαίρουσι, τῷ δὲ ἀλλοτρίω ἄχθονται. εί μή τι συ άλλο λέγεις, ω φίλη κεφαλή. Λέγομέν τι πρός ταῦτα, ὦ Καλλίκλεις; CAP. LXIX. ΚΑΛ. Ούχ οίδ' υντινά μοι τρόπον δοχεῖς εὖ λέγειν, ὦ Σώχρατες. πέπονθα δὲ τό τῶν πολλῶν πάθος • οὐ πάνυ σοι πείθομαι. ΣΩ. Ο δήμου γαο έρως, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, ἐνών ἐν τῆ ψυγῆ τῆ σῆ ἀντιστατεῖ μοι · ἀλλ' ἐἀν πολλά- D κις ἴσως καὶ βέλτιον ταὐτὰ ταῦτα διασκοπώμεθα, πεισθήσει. αναμνήσθητι δ' ουν, ότι δύ' έφαμεν είναι τας παρασκευας έπι το έκαστον θεραπεύειν καί σωμα καί ψυχήν, μίαν μέν προς ήδονην όμιλείν, την έτέραν δε προς το βέλτιστον, μη καταχαριζόμενον, άλλα διαμαχόμενον. ού ταῦτα ἦν ά τότε ώριζόμεθα; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν ή μεν ετέρα, ή προς ήδονήν, άγεννής και ούδεν άλλο ή πολαπεία τυγχάνει οὖσα. ή γάο; Ε ΚΑΛ. "Εστω, εί βούλει, σοι ούτως. ΣΩ. Η δέ γε έτέρα, ὅπως ὡς βέλτιστον ἔσται τοῦτο, εἴτε σώμα τυγγάνει ὂν εἴτε ψυχή, ὃ θεραπεύομεν; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. 3Ας' οῦν οῦτως ἡμῖν έπιχειοητέον έστι τη πόλει και τοις πολίταις θεραπεύειν ώς βελτίστους αύτους τους πολίτας ποιουντας; άνευ γάο δή τούτου, ώς έν τοις έμπροςθεν εύρίσχομεν, ούδεν ὄφελος άλλην εύεργεσίαν 514 ούδεμίαν προσφέρειν, έαν μή καλή κάγαθή ή διάνοια η τῶν μελλόντων ή χρήματα πολλα λαμβάνειν ή ἀρχήν τινων ή ἀλλην δύναμιν ήντινοῦν. θωμεν ούτως έχειν; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε, εί σοι ήδιον. ΣΩ. Εἰ οὖν παρεκαλοῦμεν ἀλλήλους, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, δημοσία πράξαντες των πολιτικών πραγμάτων, έπι τα οιχοδομικά, ή τειχών ή νεωρίων ή ίερῶν ἐπὶ τὰ μέγιστα οἰκοδομήματα, πότεοον έδει αν ήμας σκέψασθαι ήμας αύτους καί Β έξετάσαι, πρῶτον μέν εἰ ἐπιστάμεθα τὴν τέχνην, ἢ

ούχ ἐπιστάμεθα, την οίχοδομικήν, και παρά τοῦ έμάθομεν; έδει άν, ή ού; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν δεύτερον αὖ τόδε, εἴ τι πώποτε οίχοδόμημα ώχοδομήχαμεν ίδία ή τῶν φίλων τινὶ ή ήμέτερον αύτῶν, και τοῦτο τὸ οἰκοδόμημα καλόν η αίσχούν έστι. και εί μεν εύρίσκομεν σκο-C πούμενοι διδασχάλους τε ήμῶν ἀγαθους χαὶ ἐλλογίμους γεγονότας και οικοδομήματα πολλά μεν χαί χαλά μετά τῶν διδασχάλων ϣχοδομημένα ήμιν, πολλα δε και ιδία ύφ' ήμων, επειδή των διδασχάλων άπηλλάγημεν, ούτω μέν διαχειμένων, νοῦν ἐχόντων ἦν ἂν ἰέναι ἐπὶ τὰ δημόσια ἔργα. εί δε μήτε διδάσκαλον είχομεν ήμων αύτων έπιδείξαι οἰχοδομήματά τε ή μηδεν ή πολλα και μηδενός άξια, ούτω δε ανόητον ήν δήπου επιχειρείν τοις δημοσίοις έργοις και παρακαλειν αλλήλους έπ' αὐτά. φῶμεν ταῦτα ὀρθῶς λέγεσθαι, ἢ οὐ; D ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε.

CAF. LXX. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν οὕτω πάντα, τά τε άλλα, κῶν εἰ ἐπιχειοήσαντες δημοσιεύειν παρεκαλοῦμεν ἀλλήλους ὡς ἱκανοὶ ἰατροὶ ὄντες, ἐπεσκεψάμεθα δήπου ἂν ἐγώ τε σὲ καὶ σὺ ἐμέ, Φέρε προς θεῶν, αὐτος δὲ ὁ Σωκράτης πῶς ἔχει το σῶμα προς ὑγίειαν ; ἢ ἤδη τίς ἀλλος διὰ Σωκράτην ἀπηλλάγη νόσου, ἢ δοῦλος ἢ ἐλεύθερος ; Κῶν Ε ἐγώ, οἶμαι, περὶ σοῦ ἕτερα τοιαῦτα ἐσκόπουν. καὶ εἰ μὴ ηὑρίσκομεν δι' ἡμῶς μηδένα βελτίω γε-

γονότα τὸ σῶμα, μήτε τῶν ξένων μήτε τῶν ἀστῶν, μήτε ἀνδοα μήτε γυναῖχα, ποὸs Διόs, ὦ Καλλίχλεις, οὐ χαταγέλαστον ἂν ἦν τῆ ἀληθεία εἰς το-

σούτον άνοίας έλθειν άνθρώπους, ώστε, πρίν ίδιωτεύοντας πολλά μέν όπως ετύχομεν ποιήσαι, πολλα δέ κατορθώσαι και γυμνάσασθαι ίκανώς την τέχνην, το λεγόμενον δή τουτο, έν τῶ πίθω τήν κεραμείαν έπιχειρεῖν μανθάνειν, καὶ αὐτούς τε δημοσιεύειν επιχειοείν και άλλους τοιούτους παραχαλείν; ούχ ἀνόητόν σοι δοχεί αν είναι ούτω πράττειν ; ΚΑΛ. Εμοιγε. ΣΩ. Νῦν δέ, 3515 βέλτιστε ανδρών, έπειδή σύ μεν αύτος άρτι άρχει πράττειν τα τῆς πόλεως πράγματα, ἐμὲ δὲ παραχαλεῖς χαὶ ὀνειδίζεις, ὅιι οὐ πράττω, οὐχ ἐπισκεψόμεθα άλλήλους, Φέρε, Καλλικλης ήδη τινά βελτίω πεποίηχε τῶν πολιτῶν; ἔστιν ὅστις πρότερον πονηρός ών άδικός τε και ακόλαστος και ἄφρων δια Καλλικλέα καλός τε κάγαθος γέγονεν, ή ξένος ή αστός, ή δούλος ή έλεύθερος ; Λέγε Β μοι, ἐάν τίς σε ταῦτα ἐξετάζῃ, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, τί έζεῖς; τίνα φήσεις βελτίω πεποιηχέναι ἀνθρωπον τῆ συνουσία τῆ σῆ; - 'Οκνεῖς ἀποκρίνασθαι, εἴπες έστι τοιόνδε τι έργον σόν έτι ίδιωτεύοντος, πρίν δημοσιεύειν έπιχειρεῖν ; ΚΑΛ. Φιλόνειχος εί, ῶ Σώχρατες.

CAP. LXXI. ΣΩ. ' Αλλ' οὐ φιλονεικία γε έςωτῶ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀληθῶς βουλόμενος εἰδέναι ὅντινά ποτε τςόπον οἴει δεῖν πολιτεύεσθαι ἐν ἡμῖν, εἰ ἀλλου του ἀςα ἐπιμελήσει ἡμῖν ἐλθῶν ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς C πόλεως πςάγματα ἢ ὅπως ὅτι βέλτιστοι οἱ πολῖται ῶμεν. ἡ οὐ πολλάκις ἡδη ὡμολογήκαμεν τοῦτο δεῖν πςάιτειν τὸν πολιτικὸν ἀνδςα; ὡμολογήκαμεν, ἢ οὖ; ἀποκςίνου. ΄ Ωμολογήκαμεν · ἐγῶ

106

ύπεο σοῦ ἀποχοινοῦμαι. Εἰ τοίνυν τοῦτο δεῖ τον άγαθον άνδρα παρασκευάζειν τη έαυτου πόλει, νῦν μοι ἀναμνησθείς εἰπὲ περί ἐκείνων τῶν άνδρων ών όλίγω πρότερον έλεγες, εί έτι σοι δο-D χοῦσιν ἀγαθοὶ πολῖται γεγονέναι, Περιχλῆς χαὶ Κίμων και Μιλτιάδης και Θεμιστοκλής. ΚΑΛ. Έμοιγε. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν εἴπεο ἀγαθοί, δηλον ὅτι έχαστος αὐτῶν βελτίους ἐποίει τοὺς πολίτας ἀντὶ χειρόνων. ἐποίει, η ού ; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Ούκοῦν ὅτε Περικλής ήρχετο λέγειν ἐν τῷ δήμω, χείφους ήσαν οί 'Αθηναΐοι ή ότε τα τελευταΐα έλεγεν; ΚΑΛ. "Ισως. ΣΩ. Ούχ ἴσως δή, ὦ βέλτιστε, αλλ' ανάγχη έχ των ωμολογημένων, Ε είπεο άγαθός γ' ήν έκεινος πολίτης. ΚΑΛ. Τί ουν δή; ΣΩ. Ουδέν. αλλα τόδε μοι είπε έπι τούτω, εί λέγονται 'Αθηναΐοι διά Περικλέα βελτίους γεγονέναι, η παν τουναντίον διαφθαρηναι ύπ' έχείνου. ταυτί γαο έγωγε αχούω, Περιχλέα πεποιηχέναι 'Αθηναίους ἀργούς χαὶ δειλούς χαὶ λάλους καί φιλαργύρους, είς μισθοφορίαν πρώτον καταστήσαντα. ΚΑΛ. Τῶν τὰ ὦια κατεαγότων αχούεις ταύτα, & Σώχρατες. ΣΩ. 'Αλλα τάδε οὐκέτι ἀκούω, ἀλλ' οἶδα σαφῶς καὶ ἐγώ καὶ σύ, ὅτι τὸ μέν πρῶτον ηὐδοχίμει Περιχλῆς χαὶ ούδεμίαν αίσχοάν δίχην χατεψηφίσαντο αύτοῦ ' Αθηναΐοι, ήνίχα χείρους ήσαν · ἐπειδή δε καλοί 516 χάγαθοί γεγόνεσαν ύπ' αύτοῦ, ἐπὶ τελευτῆ τοῦ βίου τοῦ Περικλέους, κλοπήν αὐτοῦ κατεψηφίσαντο, όλίγου δε και θανάτου ετίμησαν, δηλον ότι ώς πονηρού όντος.

CAP. LXXII. KAA. Tí o $\tilde{v}v$; τούτου ένεκα κακὸς ἦν Περικλῆς ; ΣΩ. "Ονων γοῦν ἂν ἐπι μελητής και ίππων και βοών τοιούτος ών κακός άν έδόχει είναι, εί παραλαβών μή λαχτίζοντας μηδε χυρίττοντας μηδε δάχνοντας απέδειξε ταῦτα άπαντα ποιοῦντας δι' ἀγριότητα. ή οὐ δοκεῖ σοι κακός είναι έπιμελητής όστισοῦν ότουοῦν ζώου, ὃς Β ἂν παραλαβών ήμερώτερα ἀποδείξη ἀγριώτερα η παρέλαβε; Δοχεϊ, ή ου; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε, ίνα σοι χαρίσωμαι. ΣΩ. Και τόδε τοίνυν μοι χάρισαι αποχρινάμενος, πότερον χαι ό ανθρωπος έν τῶν ζώων ἐστίν, η οΰ; ΚΑΛ. Πῶς γὰρ οΰ; ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν ἀνθρώπων Περιχλης ἐπεμέλετο; KAA. Naí. ΣΩ. Τί οὖν; οὐχ ἔδει αὐτούς, ὡς άρτι ωμολογούμεν, δικαιοτέρους γεγονέναι άντί άδικωτέρων ύπ' έκείνου, είπερ έκεινος έπεμελειτο C αὐτῶν ἀγαθος ῶν τὰ πολιτικά; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Ούχοῦν οί γε δίχαιοι ήμεροι, ώς ἔφη Ομηρος. σύ δε τί φής; ούχ ούτως; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. 'Αλλά μην άγριωτέρους γε-αύτούς απέφηνεν ή οίους παρέλαβε, και ταῦτ' εἰς αὐτόν, ύν ήπιστ' αν έβούλετο. ΚΑΛ. Βούλει σοι όμολογήσω; ΣΩ. Εί δοχῶ γέ σοι ἀληθη λέγειν. ΚΑΛ. "Εστω δή ταῦτα. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν εἴπερ άγριωτέρους, άδιχωτέρους τε χαί χείρους ; ΚΑΛ. "Εστω. ΣΩ. Οὐχ ἄρ' ἀγαθὸς τὰ πολιτιχὰ Πε- D οικλής ην έκ τούτου τοῦ λόγου. ΚΑΛ. Οὐ σύ γε φής. ΣΩ. Μα Δί' οὐδέ γε σῦ ἐξ ῶν ὁμολογεῖς. Πάλιν δὲ λέγε μοι περὶ Κίμωνος · οὐκ έξωστράχισαν αύτον ούτοι, ούς έθεράπευεν, ίνα

108

αύτοῦ δέχα ἐτῶν μη ἀχούσειαν τῆς φωνῆς ; καὶ Θεμιστοχλέα ταὐτὰ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν χαὶ φυγῆ προσεζημίωσαν; Μιλτιάδην δε τον έν Μαραθώνι Ε είς το βάραθρον έμβαλεῖν έψηφίσαντο, χαὶ εἰ μὴ διά τον πούτανιν, ένέπεσεν άν; Καίτοι ούτοι, εί ήσαν άνδρες άγαθοί, ώς σύ φής, ούχ άν ποτε ταῦτα ἔπασχον. οὐ χουν οί γε ἀγαθοὶ ἡνίοχοι κατ' ἀρχὰς μέν οὐκ ἐκπίπτουσιν ἐκ τῶν ζευγῶν, έπειδαν δε θεραπεύσωσι τούς ίππους χαι αύτοι άμείνους γένωνται ήνίοχοι, τότ' ἐκπίπτουσιν. οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτ' οὐτ' ἐν ἡνιογεία οὐτ' ἐν ἄλλω ἔργω ούδενί. ή δοχεί σοι; ΚΑΛ. Ούχ έμοιγε. ΣΩ. Αληθείς αοα, ώς ξοικεν, οι ξμπροσθεν λόγοι 517 ήσαν, ότι ούδένα ήμεις ίσμεν άνδρα άγαθον γεγονότα τα πολιτιχα έν τηδε τη πόλει. σύ δε ώμολόγεις τῶν γε νῦν οὐδένα, τῶν μέντοι ἔμπροσθεν, καί προείλου τούτους τους άνδρας. ουτοι δέ άνεφάνησαν έξ ίσου τοις νῦν ὄντες, ὥστε, εἰ οὖτοι δήτορες ήσαν, ούτε τη αληθινη δητορικη έχρωντο . — οὐ γὰο ἂν ἐξέπεσον — οὔτε τῷ χολαχιχῷ.

CAP. LXXIII. ΚΑΛ. 'Αλλά μέντοι πολλοῦ Βγε δεῖ, ὦ Σώχρατες, μή ποτέ τις τῶν νῦν ἔργα τοιαῦτα ἐργάσηται, οἶα τούτων ὓς βούλει εἰργασται. ΣΩ. 3Ω δαιμόνις, οὐδ' ἐγὼ ψέγω τούτους, ὡς γε διαχόνους εἶναι πόλεως, ἀλλά μοι δοχοῦσι τῶν γε νῦν διαχονιχώτεροι γεγονέναι καὶ μᾶλλον οἶοί τε ἐκπορίζειν τῆ πόλει ῶν ἐπεθύμει. ἀλλὰ γὰρ μεταβιβάζειν τὰς ἐπιθυμίας καὶ μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν, πείθοντες καὶ βιαζόμενοι ἐπὶ τοῦτο, ὅθεν ἔμελλον ἀμείνους ἔσεσθαι οἱ πολῖται, ὡς ἔπος

είπειν ούδεν τούτων διέφερον έχεινοι. όπερ μόνον C ἔργον ἐστίν ἀγαθοῦ πολίτου. ναῦς δὲ χαὶ τείχη χαι νεώρια χαι άλλα πολλά τοιαντα χαι έγώ σοι ύμολογῶ δεινοτέρους είναι ἐχείνους τούτων ἐχπορίζειν. Πράγμα οὖν γελοῖον ποιοῦμεν ἐγώ τε καί σύ έν τοῖς λόγοις. ἐν παντὶ γὰρ τῷ χρόνω, ^{ΰν} διαλεγόμεθα, οὐδὲν παυόμεθα εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ ἀεὶ περιφερόμενοι και άγνοουντες άλλήλων ό τι λέγομεν. έγω γουν σε πολλάκις οίμαι ώμολογηκέναι καὶ ἐγνωκέναι, ὡς ἄρα διττὴ αύτη τις ἡ πραγμα- D τεία έστι και περί το σωμα και περί την ψυχήν, και ή μεν ετέρα διακονική εστιν, ή δυνατόν είναι έκπορίζειν, έαν μέν πεινη τα σώματα ήμῶν, σιτία, έαν δε διψη, ποτά, έαν δε φιγώ, ιμάτια, στοώματα, ύποδήματα, άλλα ών ἔρχεται σώματα εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν. και έξεπίτηδές σοι δια των αυτών είκόνων λέγω, ίνα δάον καταμάθης. τούτων γαο ποριστιχόν είναι η χάπηλον όντα η έμπορον η δημιουργόν του αὐτῶν τούτων, σιτοποιον ή όψο- Ε ποιον ή ύφάντην ή σχυτοτόμον ή σχυτοδεψόν, ουδέν θαυμαστόν έστιν, όντα τοιούτον δόξαι καί αύτῷ καί τοῖς άλλοις θεραπευτήν είναι σώματος, παντί τῷ μή είδότι, ότι ἔστι τις παρά ταύτας άπάσας τέχνη γυμναστική τε και ιατρική, ή δή τῷ ὄντι ἐστὶ σώματος θεραπεία, ήνπερ χαὶ προσήχει τούτων ἀρχειν πασών τών τεχνών χαι γρησθαι τοις τούτων έργοις διά τὸ εἰδέναι ὅ τι τὸ χρηστόν καί πονηρόν τῶν σιτίων η ποτῶν ἐστιν 518 είς ἀρετήν σώματος, τὰς δ' ἄλλας πάσας ταύτας 🔀 άγνοειν · διό δή και ταύτας μέν δουλοπρεπείς τε

110

καί διακονικάς και άνελευθέρους είναι περί σώματος πραγματείαν, τας άλλας τέχνας. την δέ γυμναστικήν και ιατρικήν κατά το δίκαιον δεσποίνας είναι τούτων. ταὐτά οὖν ταῦτα ὅτι ἔστι καί περί ψυγήν, τοτέ μέν μοι δοκεῖς μανθάνειν ότι λέγω, και δμολογεις ώς είδως, ό τι έγω λέγω. ήκεις δε όλίγον ύστερον λέγων, ότι [άνθρωποι] Β καλοί κάγαθοί γεγόνασι πολιται έν τη πόλει, καί έπειδαν έγω έρωτω οίτινες, δοχεῖς μοι ομοιοτάτους προτείνεσθαι άνθρώπους περί τα πολιτικά, ώσπερ άν εί περί τα γυμναστικά έμου έρωτωντος οίτινες άγαθοι γεγόνασιν η είσι σωμάτων θεραπευταί, έλεγές μοι πάνυ σπουδάζων, Θεαρίων ό άρτοχόπος και Μίθαικος ό την όψοποιίαν συγγεγραφώς την Σικελικήν και Σάραμβος ο κάπηλος, ότι ούτοι θαυμάσιοι γεγόνασι σωμάτων θεραπευταί, δ μέν C ἄρτους θαυμαστούς παρασκευάζων, ό δὲ ὄψον, ό δέ οίνον. CAP. LXXIV. "Ισως αν ούν ήγανάχτεις, εί σοι έλεγον έγω, ότι, "Ανθρωπε, έπαίτεις ούδεν περί γυμναστικής · διακόνους μοι λέγεις και ἐπιθυμιῶν παρασκευαστὰς ἀνθρώπους, οὐκ έπαΐοντας χαλόν χάγαθόν ούδεν περί αύτων, οί, αν ούτω τύχωσιν, έμπλήσαντες και παχύναντες τα σώματα των ανθρώπων επαινούμενοι ύπ' αυ-D τῶν, προσαπολοῦσιν αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς ἀρχαίας σάρκας. οί δ' αὖ δι' ἀπειρίαν οὐ τοὺς ἑστιῶντας αίτιάσονται τῶν νόσων αἰτίους εἶναι χαὶ τῆς ἀποβολης των ἀρχαίων σαρχών, ἀλλ' οι αν αὐτοῖς τύγωσι τότε παρόντες χαὶ συμβουλεύοντές τι, ὅταν δη αύτοις ήχη ή τότε πλησμονή νόσον φέρουσα

συχνώ υστερον χρόνω, άτε άνευ του ύγιεινου γεγονυΐα, τούτους αλιιάσονται και ψέξουσι και κακόν τι ποιήσουσιν, αν οξοί τ' ωσι, τους δε προτέρους έχείνους χαὶ αἰτίους τῶν χαχῶν ἐγχωμιά-Ε σουσι. καί σύ νῦν, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, ὁμοιότατον τούτω έργάζει · έγχωμιάζεις άνθρώπους, οί τούτους είστιάχασιν εύωγοῦντες ὧν ἐπεθύμουν, χαί φασι μεγάλην την πόλιν πεποιηκέναι αύτούς. ότι δε οίδει και υπουλός έστι δι' εκείνους τους παλαιούς, ούχ αἰσθάνονται. άνευ γὰρ σωφροσύ-519 νης καί δικαιοσύνης λιμένων καί νεωρίων καί τειχών καί φόρων και τοιούτων φλυαριών έμπεπλήχασι την πόλιν. δταν ουν έλθη ή χαταβολή αύτη της ασθενείας, τους τότε παρόντας αιτιάσονται συμβούλους, Θεμιστοχλέα δε χαι Κίμωνα καὶ Περικλέα ἐγκωμιάσουσι, τοὺς αἰτίους τῶν κακῶν · σοῦ δὲ ἴσως ἐπιλήψονται, ἐἀν μὴ εὐλαβῆ, χαὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ ἑταίρου ᾿Αλχιβιάδου, ὅταν χαὶ τὰ άρχαῖα προσαπολλύωσι προς οἶς ἐκτήσαντο, οὐκ Β αίτίων ὄντων τῶν κακῶν, ἀλλ' ἴσως συναιτίων. καίτοι έγωγε ανόητον πραγμα και νυν όρω γιγνόμενον καί ακούω των παλαιών ανδρών πέρι. αἰσθάνομαι γάρ, ὅταν ἡ πόλις τινὰ τῶν πολιτικῶν άνδρών μεταγειρίζηται ώς άδιχουντα, άγαναχτούντων χαὶ σχετλιαζόντων, ὡς δεινὰ πάσχουσι · πολλά χαὶ ἀγαθὰ τὴν πόλιν πεποιηχότες ἄρα άδίχως ύπ' αὐτῆς ἀπόλλυνται, ὡς ὁ τούτων λόγος. το δε όλον ψευδός έστι. προστάτης γαρ πόλεως C ούδ' αν είς ποτε αδίχως απόλοιτο ύπ' αύτης της πόλεως, ής προστατεί. χινδυνεύει γάρ ταύτον

είναι, δσοι τε πολιτικοὶ προσποιοῦνται είναι καὶ δσοι σοφισταί. καὶ γὰρ οἱ σοφισταί, τἆλλα σοφοὶ ὄντες, τοῦτο ἀτοπον ἐργάζονται πρᾶγμα · φάσκοντες γὰρ ἀρετῆς διδάσκαλοι εἶναι πολλάκις κατηγοροῦσι τῶν μαθητῶν, ὡς ἀδικοῦσι σφᾶς αὐτούς, τούς τε μισθοὺς ἀποστεροῦντες καὶ ἀλλην χάριν οὐκ ἀποδιδόντες, εὖ πάθόντες ὑπ' αὐτῶν. D καὶ τούτου τοῦ λόγου τί ἂν ἀλογώτερον εἰη

- πράγμα, ἀνθρώπους ἀγαθούς καὶ δικαίους γενομένους, ἐξαιρεθέντας μεν ἀδικίαν ὑπο τοῦ διδασκάλου, σχόντας δε δικαιοσύνην, ἀδικεῖν τούτῷ ῷ οὐκ ἔχουσιν; οὐ δοκεῖ σοι τοῦτο ἀτοπον εἶναι, ὦ ἑταῖρε; ʿΩς ἀληθῶς δημηγορεῖν με ἡνάγκασας, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, οὐκ ἐθέλων ἀποκρίνεσθαι.
- CAP. LXXV. ΚΑΛ. Σύ δ' ούκ αν οίός τ' Ε είης λέγειν, εἰ μή τίς σοι ἀποχοίνοιτο; ΣΩ. "Εοιχά γε · νῦν γοῦν συχνοὺς τείνω τῶν λόγων, έπειδή μοι ούκ έθέλεις αποκρίνεσθαι. αλλ', ώ γαθέ, είπε πρός φιλίου, ού δοχεί σοι άλογον είναι άγαθόν φάσχοντα πεποιηχέναι τινά μέμφεσθαι τούτω, ὅτι ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἀγαθὸς γεγονώς τε καί ών ἔπειτα πονηρός ἐστιν; ΚΑΛ. "Εμοιγε δοκεί. ΣΩ. Ούκουν ακούεις τοιαυτα λεγόντων 520 τῶν φασκόντων παιδεύειν ἀνθρώπους εἰς ἀρετήν; ΚΑΛ. "Εγωγε. άλλα τί αν λέγοις άνθρώπων πέρι ούδενός άξίων; ΣΩ. Τί δ' αν περί εκείνων λέγοις, οι φάσχοντες προεστάναι της πόλεως χαί έπιμελεῖσθαι, ὅπως ὡς βελτίστη ἔσται, πάλιν αὐτῆς κατηγοροῦσιν, ὅταν τύχωσιν, ὡς πονηροτάτης; οίει τι διαφέρειν τούτους έχείνων; ταυτόν, & μα-10*

χάρι', ἐστὶ σοφιστής χαὶ δήτωρ, ή ἐγγύς τι χαὶ παραπλήσιον, ώσπερ έγω έλεγον προς Πωλον. συ δε δι' άγνοιαν το μεν πάγχαλόν τι οίει είναι, Β την βητορικήν, του δε καταφρονείς. τη δε άληθεία κάλλιόν έστι σοφιστική δητορικής δσωπερ νομοθετική δικαστικής και γυμναστική ιατρικής. μόνοις δ' έγωγε και ώμην τοις δημηγόροις τε καί σοφισταις ούχ έγχωρειν μέμφεσθαι τούτω τῶ πράγματι, δ αύτοι παιδεύουσιν, ώς πονηρόν έστιν είς σφας, ή τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῷ τούτῷ άμα χαὶ ἑαυτῶν κατηγορείν, δτι ούδεν ώφελήκασιν ούς φασιν ώφελείν. ούχ ούτως έχει; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. C Καὶ προέσθαι γε δήπου την εὐεργεσίαν ἀνευ μισθού, ώς το είχός, μόνοις τούτοις ένεχώρει, είπερ άληθη έλεγον. άλλην μέν γάρ εύεργεσίαν τις εύεργετηθείς, οίον ταχύς γενόμενος δια παιδοτρίβην, ίσως αν αποστερήσειε την χάριν, εί προοίτο αὐτῷ ὁ παιδοτρίβης χαὶ μὴ συνθέμενος αὐτῷ μισθον ότι μάλιστα άμα μεταδιδούς του τάχους D λαμβάνοι το ἀργύριον οὐ γάρ τη βραδυτήτι, οίμαι, άδιχοῦσιν οἱ ἀνθρωποι, ἀλλ' ἀδιχία. ή γάρ ; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Οὐχοῦν εἴ τις αὐτὸ τούτο άφαιρεί, την άδικίαν, ούδεν δεινόν αυτώ μήποτε άδικηθη, άλλα μόνο άσφαλές ταύτην την εύεργεσίαν προέσθαι, εἴπερ τῷ ὄντι δύναιτό τις άγαθούς ποιείν. ούχ ούτως; ΚΑΛ. Φημί.

CAP. LXXVI. ΣΩ. Λιὰ ταῦτ' ἄοα, ὡς ἔοικε, τὰς μὲν ἀλλας συμβουλὰς συμβουλεύειν λαμβάνοντα ἀογύοιον, οἶον οἰκοδομίας πέοι ἡ τῶν ἀλλων τεχνῶν, οὐδὲν αἰσχοόν. ΚΑΛ. "Εοικέ Ε

γε. ΣΩ. Περί δέ γε ταύτης της πράξεως, όντιν' άν τις τρόπον ώς βέλτιστος είη και άριστα την αύτοῦ οἰχίαν διοιχοῖ ή πόλιν, αἰσχοὸν νενόμισται μή φάναι συμβουλεύειν, έαν μή τις αὐτῷ ἀργύοιον διδώ. ή γάο ; ΚΑΛ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Δήλον γάρ, δτι τουτο αιτιόν έστιν, δτι μόνη αυτη των εύεργεσιών τον εὖ παθόντα ἐπιθυμεῖν ποιεῖ ἀντ, εῦ ποιεῖν, ώστε χαλόν δοχεῖ τὸ σημεῖον εἶναι, εἰ εῦ ποιήσας ταύτην την εὐεργεσίαν ἀντ' εὖ πείσε-521ται εί δε μή, ού. Εστί ταῦτα ούτως ἔχοντα; ΚΑΛ. "Εστιν. ΣΩ. 'Επί ποτέραν οῦν με παραχαλεῖς την θεραπείαν της πόλεως; διόρισόν μοι · την του διαμάχεσθαι 'Αθηναίοις, όπως ώς βέλτιστοι έσονται, ώς ιατρόν, η ώς διαχονήσοντα καί πρός χάριν όμιλήσοντα; Τάληθη μοι είπέ, ῶ Καλλίκλεις · δίκαιος γαο εἶ, ῶσπεο ἤοξω παδόησιάζεσθαι πρός έμέ, διατελεῖν & νοεῖς λέ-Β γων. καί νῦν εὖ και γενναίως εἰπέ. ΚΑΛ. Λέγω τοίνυν, ότι ώς διαχονήσοντα. ΣΩ. Κολακεύσοντα άρα με, ῶ γενναιότατε, παρακαλεῖς. ΚΑΛ. Εί σοι Μυσόν γε ήδιον καλείν, 3 Σώχρατες·ώς εἰ μη ταῦτά γε ποιήσεις — ΣΩ. Μη είπης δ πολλάκις είζηκας, ότι αποκτενεί με ό βουλόμενος, ίνα μη αθ και έγω είπω, ότι πονηρός γε ων άγαθον όντα · μηδ' ότι άφαιρήσεται, έάν C τι έχω, ίνα μη αθ έγω είπω, ότι 'Αλλ' άφελόμενος ούχ έξει ό τι χρήσεται αύτοις, άλλ' ώσπεο με άδίχως άφείλετο, ούτω χαι λαβών άδίχως χρήσεται· εί δε αδίχως, αίσγρως· εί δε αίσγρως, χαχώς.

CAP. LXXVII. KAA. "De nou doneis, & Zoχρατες, πιστεύειν μηδ' αν έν τούτων παθεῖν, ώς οίχῶν ἐχποδών χαὶ οὐχ ἂν εἰσαχθεὶς εἰς διχαστήοιον ύπο πάνυ ίσως μογθηρού άνθρώπου καί φαύλου! ΣΩ. 'Ανόητος ἄρα εἰμί, ὅ Καλλίκλεις, ώς άληθως, εί μη οἴομαι ἐν τῆδε τη πόλει όντινοῦν ἀν, ὅ τι τύχοι, τοῦτο παθεῖν. τόδε μέν- D τοι εὖ οἶδ', ὅτι, ἐάνπερ εἰσίω εἰς δικαστήριον περί τούτων τινός κινδυνεύων ών σύ λέγεις, πονηρός τίς με έσται ό είσάγων ούδεις γαρ αν χρηστός μή άδιχοῦντ' άνθρωπον είσαγάγοι. χαι οὐδέν γε άτοπον, εί αποθάνοιμι. βούλει σοι είπω, διότι ταῦτα ποοσδοχῶ; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Οἶμαι μετ' όλίγων 'Αθηναίων, ίνα μή είπω μόνος, έπιχειρείν τη ώς άληθως πολιτική τέχνη καί πράττειν τα πολιτιχα μόνος των νυν. άτε ουν ού πρός χάριν λέγων τούς λόγους ούς λέγω έχάστοτε, αλλα πρός το βέλιιστον, ου πρός το ήδι-Ε στον, καί ούκ έθέλων ποιείν α σύ παραινείς, τα κομιψά ταῦτα, οὐχ ἕξω ὅ τι λέγω ἐν τῷ δικαστηοίω. ὁ αὐτὸς δέ μοι ήχει λόγος, ὅνπεο ποὸς Πῶλον έλεγον · κρινούμαι γάρ ώς έν παιδίοις ίατρός άν χρίνοιτο χατηγορούντος όψοποιού. σχόπει γάζ, τί αν απολογοιτο ό τοιούτος ανθρωπος έν τούτοις ληφθείς, εί αὐτοῦ κατηγοροῖ τις λέγων, ότι 🖓 παίδες, πολλά ύμας και κακά όδε είργασται άνης και αύτούς, και τους νεωτάτους ύμῶν διαφθείρει, τέμνων τε και κάων και ίσχναίνων 522 και πνίγων άπορειν ποιεί, πικρότατα πώματα διδούς καί πεινην καί διψην άναγκάζων, ούχ ώσπεο

116

έγω πολλά και ήδέα και παντοδαπά εύώχουν ύμας. τί αν οἴει ἐν τούτῷ τῷ κακῷ ἀποληφθέντα τὸν ἰατοὸν ἔχειν εἰπεῖν; ἢ εἰ εἴποι τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὅτι Ταῦτα πάντα ἐγῶ ἐποίουν, ῶ παῖδες, ὑγιεινῶς, ὅπόσον οἴει αν ἀναβοῆσαι τοὺς τοιούτους δικαστάς; οὐ μέγα; ΚΑΛ. ὅτως οἴεσθαί γε χρή. ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν οἴει ἐν πάσῃ ἀπορία ἂν αὐ-Β τὸν ἔγεσθαι ὅ τι χρὴ εἰπεῖν; ΚΑΛ. Πάνυ γε.

CAP. LXXVIII. ΣΩ. Τοιοῦτον μέντοι καί έγω οίδ' ότι πάθος πάθοιμι αν είσελθων είς δικαστήριον. ούτε γαρ ήδονας ως έκπεπόρικα έξω αύτοις λέγειν, ως ούτοι εύεργεσίας και ώφελείας νομίζουσιν, έγώ δε ούτε τους πορίζοντας ζηλώ ούτε οίς πορίζεται · έάν τέ τίς με ή νεωτέρους φή διαφθείρειν απορείν ποιούντα, ή τους πρεσβυτέοους κακηγορείν λέγοντα πικρούς λόγους η ίδία ή δημοσία, ούτε το άληθες έξω είπειν, ότι Δικαίως C πάντα ταῦτα ἐγὼ λέγω, καὶ πράττω τὸ ὑμέτερον δή τούτο, & άνδρες διχασταί, ούτε άλλο ούδέν. ώστε ίσως, ό τι αν τύχω, τοῦτο πείσομαι. ΚΑΛ. Δοχεί οὖν σοι, ὦ Σώχρατες, χαλῶς ἔχειν ἀνθρωπος έν πόλει ούτως διαχείμενος χαι αδύνατος ων έαυτῶ βοηθεῖν ; ΣΩ. Εἰ ἐχεῖνό γε ἐν αὐτῷ ύπάργοι, ὦ Καλλίχλεις, ὃ σὺ πολλάχις ὡμολόγησας · εί βεβοηθηχώς είη αύτῷ, μήτε περί ἀνθρώ-D πους μήτε περί θεούς άδικον μηδέν μήτε είρηκώς μήτε είργασμένος. αύτη γάρ τις βοήθεια έαυτώ πολλάχις ήμιν ώμολόγηται χρατίστη είναι. εί μέν ουν έμέ τις έξελέγχοι ταύτην την βοήθειαν άδύνατον όντα έμαυτῷ καὶ ἀλλφ βοηθεῖν, αἰσχυ-

νοίμην ἂν καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς καὶ ἐν ὀλίγοις ἐξελεγχόμενος καὶ μόνος ὑπὸ μόνου, καὶ εἰ διὰ ταὐτην τὴν ἀδυναμίαν ἀποθνήσκοιμι, ἀγανακτοίην ἀν· εἰ δὲ κολακικῆς ἡητοςικῆς ἐνδεία τελευτώην ἔγωγε, εῦ οἶδα, ὅτι ἡαδίως ἴδοις ἀν με φέςοντα τον θάνα- Ε τον. αὐτὸ μὲν γὰς τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν οὐδεὶς φοδεῖται, ὅστις μὴ παντάπασιν ἀλόγιστός τε καὶ ἀνανδgός ἐστι, τὸ δὲ ἀδικεῖν φοδεῖται· πολλῶν γὰς ἀδικημάτων γέμοντα τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς "Λιδου ἀφικέσθαι πάντων ἔσχατον κακῶν ἐστιν. εἰ δὲ βούλει, σοὶ ἐγώ, ὡς τοῦτο οὕτως ἔχει, ἐθέλω λόγον λέξαι. ΚΑΛ. ᾿Αλλ' ἐπείπες γε καὶ τἇλλα ἐπέgavaς, καὶ τοῦτο πέςανον.

CAP. LXXIX. ΣΩ. "Ακουε δή, φασί, μάλα 523 χαλου λόγου, ών σύ μεν ήγήσει μυθον, ώς έγω οίμαι, έγω δε λόγον · ώς αληθή γαο όντα σοι λέξω ά μέλλω λέγειν. "Ωσπεο γάο "Ομηρος λέγει, διενείμαντο την ἀρχην ὁ Ζευς καὶ ὁ Ποσειδῶν και ό Πλούτων, επειδή παρά τοῦ πατρός παρέλα-60ν. ³ην οθν νόμος όδε περί ανθρώπων έπι Κρό-עסט, אמן מצו אמן עטע צדו צדוע לי טצסוג, דשע מעθρώπων τον μέν δικαίως τον βίον διελθόντα καί όσίως, ἐπειδάν τελευτήση, ἐς μακάρων νήσους ἀπι- Β όντα οίχειν έν πάση εύδαιμονία έχτος χαχών, τόν δε αδίχως χαι αθέως εις το της τίσεώς τε χαι δίχης δεσμωτήριον, δ δή τάρταρον καλουσιν, ιέναι. τούτων δε δικασταί επί Κρόνου και έτι νεωστί τοῦ Διός την ἀρχην ἔχοντος ζῶντες ἦσαν ζώντων, ἐχείνη τη ήμέρα δικάζοντες, ή μέλλοιεν τελευτάν. χαχῶς οὖν αἱ δίχαι ἐχρίνοντο. ὅ τε οὖν Πλούτων
καί οι επιμεληταί οι εκ μακάφων νήσων ιόντες C έλεγον πρός τόν Δία, ότι φοιτῷέν σφιν άνθρωποι έχατέρωσε ανάξιοι. εἶπεν οὖν ό Ζεύς, 'Αλλ' έγώ, ἕφη, παύσω τοῦτο γιγνόμενον. νῦν μὲν γὰρ χαχῶς αί δίχαι διχάζονται. ἀμπεχόμενοι γάρ, έφη, οί χρινόμενοι χρίνονται · ζώντες γάρ χρίνονται. πολλοί οὖν, ἦ δ' ὅς, ψυχὰς πονηρὰς ἔχοντες ήμφιεσμένοι είσι σώματά τε χαλά χαι γένη χαί πλούτους, καί, ἐπειδαν ή κρίσις ή, ἔρχονται αὐτοῖς πολλοὶ μάρτυρες, μαρτυρήσοντες, ὡς διχαίως D βεβιώχασιν. οί οὖν διχασταὶ ὑπό τε τούτων ἐχπλήττονται, καί άμα και αύτοι άμπεχόμενοι διχάζουσι, πρό τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς αύτῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς χαὶ ώτα και όλον το σώμα προκεκαλυμμένοι. ταῦτα δή αύτοις πάντα ἐπίπροσθεν γίγνεται, και τα αύτῶν ἀμφιέσματα καὶ τὰ τῶν κρινομένων. πρῶτον μέν οῦν, ἔφη, παυστέον ἐστὶ προειδότας αὐτοὺς τον θάνατον · νῦν μὲν γὰρ προίσασι. τοῦτο μὲν οῦν καὶ δὴ εἴοῃται τῷ Ποομηθεῖ ὅπώς ἀν παύσῃ Ε αὐτῶν. ἔπειτα γυμνοὺς χριτέον ἁπάντων τούτων · τεθνεώτας γάρ δει χρίνεσθαι. χαι τόν χριτήν δει γυμνόν είναι, τεθνεωτα, αύτη τη ψυγή αὐτήν τήν ψυχήν θεωροῦντα ἐξαίφνης ἀποθανόντος έχάστου, ἔρημον πάντων τῶν συγγενῶν χαὶ καταλιπόντα έπι της γης πάντα έκεινον τον χόσμον, ίνα δικαία ή χρίσις η. έγω μεν ούν ταυτα έγνωχώς πρότερος η ύμεις εποιησάμην διχαστας υίεῖς ἐμαυτοῦ, δύο μὲν ἐχ τῆς ᾿Ασίας, Μίνω 521τε καί 'Ραδάμανθυν, ένα δὲ ἐκ τῆς Εὐοώπης, Αἰακόν. ούτοι οὖν ἐπειδάν τελευτήσωσι, δικάσουσιν έν τῷ λειμῶνι, ἐν τῆ τριόδῷ ἐξ ἦς φερετον τὰ ὁδά, ἡ μὲν εἰς μαχάρων νήσους, ἡ δ' εἰς τάρταρον. χαὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐχ τῆς ᾿Ασίας ˁΡαδάμανθυς κρινεῖ, τοὺς δὲ ἐχ τῆς Εὐρώπης Αἰαχός · Μίνῷ δὲ πρεσβεῖα δώσω, ἐπιδιαχρίνειν, ἐἀν ἀπορῆτόν τι τὰ ἑτέρω, ἵνα ὡς διχαιοτάτη ἡ χρίσις ἦ περὶ τῆς πορείας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

CAP. LXXX. Ταῦτ' ἔστιν, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, ἁ έγω άκηκοως πιστεύω άληθη είναι · και έκ τού- Β των των λόγων τοιόνδε τι λογίζομαι συμβαίνειν. Ο θάνατος τυγχάνει ών, ώς έμοι δοκεί, ούδεν άλλο ή δυοίν πραγμάτοιν διάλυσις, της ψυγής καί του σώματος, απ' αλλήλοιν. ἐπειδαν δέ διαλυθητον άρα απ' αλλήλοιν, ού πολύ ήττον έχάτερον αύτοιν έχει την έξιν την αύτου ήνπερ καί ότε έζη ό άνθρωπος, τό τε σωμα την φύσιν την αύτοῦ καὶ τὰ θεραπεύματα καὶ τὰ παθήματα, ένδηλα πάντα. οίον εί τινος μέγα ην το σωμα C φύσει η τροφή η αμφότερα ζώντος, τούτου καί έπειδαν αποθάνη ό νεχρός μέγας · καί εί παχύς, παγύς καί αποθανόντος, και τάλλα ούτως. καί εί αῦ ἐπετήδευε χομάν, χομήτης τούτου χαὶ ὁ νεχρός. μαστιγίας αὖ εἴ τις ην χαὶ ἴχνη εἶχε τῶν πληγῶν οὐλὰς ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡ ὑπὸ μαστίγων ἡ άλλων τραυμάτων ζών, και τεθνεώτος το σώμα έστιν ίδεῖν ταῦτα ἔχον. κατεαγότα τε εἴ του ἦν μέλη η διεστραμμένα ζώντος, και τεθνεώτος ταυτά D ταῦτα ἔνδηλα. ἑνὶ δὲ λόγφ, οἶος εἶναι παρεσκεύαστο το σωμα ζών, ένδηλα ταῦτα και τελευτήσαντος ή πάντα ή τα πολλα επί τινα χρόνον.

ταύτον δή μοι δοχεί τουτ' άρα χαί περί την ψυχήν είναι, ὦ Καλλίχλεις · ἕνδηλα πάντα ἐστίν ἐν τη ψυχη, έπειδάν γυμνωθη του σώματος, τά τε τῆς φύσεως και τα παθήματα α δια την έπιτήδευσιν έχάστου πράγματος ἔσχεν ἐν τῆ ψυχῆ ὁ Ε άνθρωπος. Έπειδαν ουν αφίχωνται παρά τον δικαστήν, οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῆς ᾿Ασίας παρὰ τὸν Ῥαδάμανθυν, ό 'Ραδάμανθυς έχείνους έπιστήσας θεαται έχάστου την ψυχήν, ούχ είδως ότου έστίν, άλλά πολλάχις τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως ἐπιλαβόμενος η άλλου ότουοῦν βασιλέως η δυνάστου χατεῖδεν ούδεν ύγιες ον της ψυχης, άλλα διαμεμαστι-525 γωμένην και ούλων μεστήν ύπο επιορκιών και άδικίας, & έκάστω ή πραξις αύτου έξωμόρξατο είς τήν ψυχήν, και πάντα σχολιά ύπο ψεύδους και άλαζονείας χαὶ οὐδὲν εὐθῦ διὰ τὸ ἀνευ ἀληθείας τεθράφθαι · και ύπο έξουσίας και τρυφής και ύβρεως καί ακρατίας τῶν πράξεων ασυμμετρίας τε καί αἰσχοότητος γέμουσαν την ψυχην είδεν. ίδών δε ατίμως ταύτην απέπεμψεν εύθυ της φοουρας, οί μέλλει έλθοῦσα ἀνατλῆναι τὰ προσήχοντα πάθη. CAP. LXXXI. Προσήκει δὲ παντὶ τῷ Β έν τιμωρία όντι, ύπ' άλλου όρθῶς τιμωρουμένω, η βελτίονι γίγνεσθαι και όνίνασθαι η παραδείγματι τοις άλλοις γίγνεσθαι, ίν' άλλοι δρώντες πάσχοντα & αν πάσχη φοβούμενοι βελτίους γίγνωνται. είσι δε οί μεν ωφελούμενοί τε και δίκην διδόντες ύπο θεών τε και άνθρώπων ούτοι, οι άν ίάσιμα άμαρτήματα άμάρτωσιν · όμως δε δι' άλγηδόνων και όδυνῶν γίγνεται αὐτοῖς ή ἀφέλεια καὶ

PLATONIS

ένθάδε και έν Αιδου ού γαο οίόν τε άλλως άδικίας ἀπαλλάττεσθαι. οί δ' ἀν τὰ ἔσχατα ἀδική- C σωσι καί δια τα τοιαύτα αδικήματα ανίατοι γένωνται, έκ τούτων τα παραδείγματα γίγνεται, καί ούτοι αύτοι μέν ούκέτι όνίνανται ούδέν, άτε άνίατοι ὄντες, άλλοι δε όνίνανται οί τούτους όρωντες δια τας άμαρτίας τα μέγιστα και όδυνηρότατα καί φοβερώτατα πάθη πάσγοντας τον ἀεὶ γρόνον, άτεχνῶς παραδείγματα άνηρτημένους ἐχεῖ ἐν "Αιδου έν τῷ δεσμωτηρίω, τοῖς ἀεὶ τῶν ἀδίχων ἀφιχνουμένοις θεάματα καί νουθετήματα. ὧν ἐγώ D φημι ένα και 'Αρχέλαον έσεσθαι, ει άληθη λέγει Πώλος, και άλλον όστις αν τοιούτος τύραννος ή. οίμαι δε καί τούς πολλούς είναι τούτων τών παραδειγμάτων έκ τυράννων και βασιλέων και δυναστών και τα τών πόλεων πραξάντων γεγονότας. ούτοι γάρ δια την έξουσίαν μέγιστα και άνοσιώτατα άμαοτήματα άμαρτάνουσι. μαρτυρεί δε τούτοις καί "Ομηρος · βασιλέας γάρ και δυνάστας έχεινος πεποίηχε τους έν Αιδου τον άει Ε γρόνον τιμωρουμένους, Τάνταλον και Σίσυφον και Τιτυόν. Θεοσίτην δέ, και εί τις άλλος πονηούς ην ίδιώτης, ούδεις πεποίηκε μεγάλαις τιμωρίαις συνεχόμενον ώς ανίατον · ού γάρ, οίμαι, έξην αύτῷ · διο και εύδαιμονέστερος ην η οίς έξην. άλλα γάρ, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, ἐκ τῶν δυναμένων εἰσὶ χαί οί σφόδρα πονηροί γιγνόμενοι άνθρωποι · 526 ούδεν μην χωλύει χαι έν τούτοις άγαθους άνδρας έγγίγνεσθαι, καί σφόδρα γε άξιον άγασθαι των γιγνομένων · χαλεπόν γάρ, ѽ Καλλίκλεις, καί

122

πολλού ἐπαίνου ἀξιον ἐν μεγάλη ἐξουσία τοῦ άδικειν γενόμενον δικαίως διαβιώναι. όλίγοι δέ γίγνονται οί τοιοῦτοι· ἐπεὶ χαὶ ἐνθάδε χαὶ ἄλλοθι γεγόνασιν, οίμαι δε καί ἔσονται καλοί κάγαθοί Β ταύτην την άρετην την του δικαίως διαχειρίζειν ά άν τις έπιτρέπη · είς δε και πάνυ ελλόγιμος γέγονε καί εἰς τοὺς ἀλλους Ελληνας, ᾿Αριστείδης ό Αυσιμάγου. οί δε πολλοί, δ άριστε, χαχοί γίγνονται τῶν δυναστῶν. CAP. LXXXII. Οπερ οῦν ἕλεγον, ἐπειδάν ὁ Ῥαδάμανθυς ἐχεῖνος τοιοῦτόν τινα λάβῃ, ἄλλο μὲν περὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχ οἶδεν ούδέν, ούθ' όστις ούθ' ώντινων, ότι δε πονηρός τις · καί τουτο κατιδών απέπεμψεν είς τάρταρον, C ἐπισημηνάμενος, ἐάν τε ἰάσιμος ἐάν τε ἀνίατος δοκή είναι · ό δε εκείσε αφικόμενος τα προσήκοντα πάσχει. ένίοτε δ' άλλην εἰσιδών ὁσίως βεδιωχυΐαν χαὶ μετ' ἀληθείας, ἀνδρος ἰδιώτου ἢ άλλου τινός, μάλιστα μέν, ἔγωγέ φημι, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, φιλοσόφου τὰ αύτοῦ πράξαντος καὶ οὐ πολυπραγμονήσαντος έν τῷ βίω, ήγάσθη τε καὶ ἐς μαχάρων νήσους απέπεμψε. ταυτά ταυτα χαι ό Αἰαχός. ἑχάτερος δὲ τούτων ἑάβδον ἔχων διχάζει. D ό δε Μίνως επισκοπών κάθηται μόνος, έχων χουσουν σχηπτρον, ως φησιν 'Οδυσσεύς ό 'Ομήρου ίδειν αυτόν

> χούσεον σχηπτοον ἔχοντα, θεμιστεύοντα νέχυσσιν.

Έγω μέν οὖν, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, ὑπὸ τούτων τῶν λόγων πέπεισμαι, καὶ σκοπῶ, ὅπως ἀποφανοῦμαι τῷ κοιτῷ ὡς ὑγιεστάτην τὴν ψυχήν. χαίοειν οὖν

PLATONIS

ἐάσας τὰς τιμὰς τὰς τῶν πολλῶν ἀνθοώπων, τὴν ἀλήθειαν σχοπῶν πειοάσομαι τῷ ὄντι ὡς ἀν δύνωμαι βέλτιστος ὢν καὶ ζῆν καί, ἐπειδὰν ἀποθνή- Ε σχω, ἀποθνήσκειν. παοαχαλῶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀλλους πάντας ἀνθοώπους, καθ' ὅσον δύναμαι, καὶ δὴ καὶ σὲ ἀντιπαοαχαλῶ ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν βίον χαὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα τοῦτον, ῦν ἐγώ φημι ἀντὶ πάντων τῶν ἐνθάδε ἀγώνων εἶναι, καὶ ὀνειδίζω σοι, ὅτι οὐχ οἶός τ' ἔσει σαυτῷ βοηθῆσαι, ὅταν ἡ δίχη σοι ἦ καὶ ἡ κρίσις ῆν νῦν δὴ ἐγὼ ἔλεγον, ἀλλὰ ἐλθών παρὰ τὸν διχαστὴν τὸν τῆς Λἰγίνης νίόν, ἐπειδάν 527 σου ἐπιλαδόμενος ἀγῃ, χασμήσει καὶ ἰλιγγιάσεις οὐδὲν ἦττον ἢ ἐγὼ ἐνθάδε σὺ ἐχεῖ, καὶ σε ἴσως τυπτήσει τις καὶ ἐπὶ κόἰξῆς ἀτίμως, καὶ πάντως προπηλαχιεῖ.

Τάχα δ' οὖν ταῦτα μῦθός σοι δοχεῖ λέγεσθαι, ѽσπες γραός, καὶ καταφοονεῖς αὐτῶν. καὶ οὐδέν γ' ἂν ἦν θαυμαστὸν καταφοονεῖν τούτων, εἴ πῃ ζητοῦντες εἰχομεν αὐτῶν βελτίω καὶ ἀληθέστερα εὑρεῖν · νῦν δὲ ὁρῷς, ὅτι τρεῖς ὄντες ὑμεῖς, οἵπερ σοφώτατοί ἐστε τῶν νῦν Ἐλλήνων, σύ τε καὶ Β Πῶλος καὶ Γοργίας, οὐκ ἔχετε ἀποδεῖξαι, ὡς δεῖ ἀλλον τινὰ βίον ζῆν ἢ τοῦτον, ὅσπερ καὶ ἐκεῖσε φαίνεται συμφέρων, ἀλλ' ἐν τοσούτοις λόγοις τῶν ἄλλων ἐλεγχομένων μόνος οὖτος ἦρεμεῖ ὁ λόγος, ὡς εὐλαβητέον ἐστὶ τὸ ἀδικεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι, καὶ παντὸς μᾶλλον ἀνδςὶ μελετητέον οὐ τὸ δοκεῖν εἶναι ἀγαθόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἰδία καὶ δημοσία· ἐαν δέ τις κατά τι κακὸς γίγνηται, κολαστέος ἐστί, καὶ τοῦτο δεύτερον ἀγαθὸν μετὰ C

124

τὸ εἶναι δίκαιον, τὸ γίγνεσθαι καὶ κολαζόμενον διδόναι δίκην · καὶ πᾶσαν κολακείαν καὶ τὴν περὶ ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὴν περὶ τοὺς ἀλλους, καὶ περὶ ὀλίγους καὶ περὶ πολλούς, φευκτέον · καὶ τῆ ὅητορικῆ οῦτω χρηστέον, ἐπὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἀεί, καὶ τῆ ἀλλη πάση πράξει.

CAP. LXXXIII. 'Εμοί οὖν πειθόμενος ἀχολούθησον ένταῦθα, οἶ ἀφιχόμενος εὐδαιμονήσεις καὶ ζῶν καὶ τελευτήσας, ὡς ὁ λόγος σημαίνει. καὶ ἔασόν τινά σου καταφρονῆσαι ὡς ἀνοήτου D καὶ προπηλακίσαι, ἐἀν βούληται, καὶ ναὶ μὰ Δία σύ γε θαζόῶν πατάξαι τὴν ἄτιμον ταύτην πληγήν · ούδεν γάρ δεινόν πείσει, εάν τῷ όντι ής καλός χάγαθός, άσχῶν ἀρετήν. χάπειτα οὕτω χοινή άσκήσαντες, τότε ήδη, έαν δοκή χρηναι, έπιθησόμεθα τοις πολιτικοις, η όποιον άν τι ήμιν δοκή, τότε βουλευσόμεθα, βελτίους όντες βουλεύεσθαι ή νῦν. αἰσχοὸν γὰς ἔχοντάς γε ὡς νῦν φαινόμεθα έχειν, έπειτα νεανιεύεσθαι ώς τι όντας, οίς Ε ούδέποτε ταύτα δοχεῖ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν, χαὶ ταῦτα περί τῶν μεγίστων · εἰς τοσοῦτον ῆκομεν ἀπαιδευσίας! ώσπες οῦν ήγεμόνι τῷ λόγω χοησώμεθα τῷ νῦν παραφανέντι, ὃς ἡμῖν σημαίνει, ὅτι οὖτος ό τρόπος άριστος τοῦ βίου, καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην καί την άλλην άρετην άσχουντας και ζην καί τεθνάναι. τούτω οὖν ἑπώμεθα, και τους ἄλλους παρακαλώμεν, μή έκείνω, ῷ σύ πιστεύων ἐμὲ παραχαλεῖς · ἔστι γὰρ οὐδενος ἄξιος, ὦ Καλλίχλεις.

1.0

.

. -

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 Matthiæ's Grammar, second edition; K., for Kühner'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. outo μεταλαγχάνειν, so to take part in; i. e. in the 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, οὐ πόλεμον ayyealaes, what you tell me is not at all disagreeable; and so Laws, 702, D. - to *heyóµevov*, as the saying is. Soph. § 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 $\tau \delta \lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu \epsilon$ vov, i. e. are we too late. —— $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \delta \epsilon i \xi a \tau o$. This verb in the middle, with an accus. (e. g. oodíar or a neuter adjective) or without, especially denotes that ostentatious display of their art, which the sophists and rhetoricians at this time were wont to make. --- τούτων refers to ήκομεν και ύστεροῦμεν. As the verbs denote but one act, τούτου might be used equally well, and the plural is not unfrequently used in referring to a single verb. Comp. 492, C.

B. έγω γαρ και ιάσομαι. και, also, refers to a suppressed 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. ---- el µèv δοκεί. The indic. implies belief that such is the view of Socrates; while in tav de Bouly the subjunctive expresses the wish as a mere possible contingency. ---- ¿σαῦθις, again, at another time, hereafter. So eloavous avabadov, Sympos. 174, E; eloavous anobéoda, Euthydem. 275, A. ---- ti dai; usually, where dai is found, de is in some MSS. as a various reading. The longer form, it is now admitted, is properly retained after τi and $\pi \hat{\omega} s$, where wonder or indignation is expressed. - oùkoûv . . . vµîv. Stallb., Ast, and others explain the construction by regarding $\eta_{\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu}$ as used imperatively (Soph. § 219, N. 6; Cr. § 625; K. § 306, R. 11), akovoa Fopylov being understood. I incline to regard enidelferal upiv as the proper apodosis, which, owing to the intervention of the clause beginning with yáp, 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. Ed. R. 227-229, where the clause πείσεται γàp οὐδέν turns the apodosis following it, which would be naturally $\gamma \hat{\eta} s \ d\pi i \tau \omega \ d\beta \lambda \alpha \beta \dot{\eta} s$, into γης δ' ἄπεισιν ἀβλαβής. — εἶ λέγεις, i. e. you are very civil in inviting us to your house, and quite right in wishing to spare Gorgias further fatigue. But, etc.

C. $\delta\iotaa\lambda\epsilon\chi\theta\eta\nua\iota$, here, to discourse by way of question and answer, tacitly contrasted with an $\epsilon\pi i\delta\epsilon\iota\xi\iotas$, 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 $\kappa ouv\eta$ $\beta ou\lambda\epsilon' ver \sigma\theta a \delta\iotaa\lambda\epsilon' youras \kappaarà yévη rà πράγματα. In the end, the$

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. $----\delta \dot{\nu} \delta \nu a \mu \iota s, essence, nature. ----- \tau o \hat{\nu} d \nu \delta \rho \delta s$ pronominis fere partes agit, ut exprimi possit pronomine possessivo. Ast. The art of the man == his art, with perhaps something of contempt in $\tau o \hat{\nu} d \nu \delta \rho \delta s$. $----- \tau \delta d \nu \tau \delta \nu \epsilon^2 \rho \omega \tau \hat{a} \nu$, to ask him in person, or himself. And so 481, B. $a \dot{\nu} \tau \delta \nu$ is taken with the object of $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \hat{a} \nu$ not expressed.

D. $\epsilon \rho o \hat{v}$, second aor., not $\tilde{\epsilon} \rho o v$. No present is used by the Attics. Soph. § 118, sub voce; K. § 166; Cr. § 298. — $\delta \tau \iota \epsilon \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \delta \pi o \kappa \rho i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. Cic. de Fin. 2, init.: "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.

A. η που ... ἀποκρίνει, no doubt, then, you answer with ease, O Gorgias. Ast translates ῥαδίως, libenter, but his power to answer, and not his willingness, is in question.
--- ἀν δέ γε βούλη, ἐμοῦ, sc. λάμβανε πεῖραν. For λ. πεῖραν spoken of a person, comp. εἰ βούλει λαβεῖν μου πεῖραν, Protag. 341, E, cited by Ast. --- τί δε ... ἰκανῶς; but what difference does that make, if I answer well enough for you? To the common formula, τί τοῦτο; is sometimes added διαφέρει, which Stallb. here supplies. But τί can well be a nominative. τί τοῦτο; what is that? i. e. what of that ?

B. 'H $\rho \delta \delta \mu \kappa \sigma s$, 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

cure diseases by exercise. $---\tau i va \ \delta v \dots \delta vo\mu \delta \zeta o \mu e v$. The predicate-accusative with $\kappa a \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} v$, $\delta vo\mu \delta \zeta \epsilon v v$, may be $\tau i va$, referring to any one by name or by some appellation taken from his art, business, etc.; or τi , which is neuter on account of $\delta vo\mu a$. Here in $\tau i va \ \delta v \dots o \delta \chi \ \delta \pi \epsilon \rho$ both forms occur together. $---\frac{\eta}{\eta} \delta \ \delta \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \delta s \ a \dot{v} \tau o \hat{v}$. 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. $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \delta' \epsilon \pi \epsilon_i \delta'_j$. 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 ($\dot{\eta}$ $\pi\epsilon\rho i \tau i \dots \epsilon'_{\chi \circ \nu \sigma a}$), as it often is found within a relative sentence. Comp. Cr. § 539. 2. — $\delta X a \iota \rho \epsilon \phi \delta \nu$. The words which follow are plainly not in the style of conversation. The juxtaposition of words from the same root ($\epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \iota \delta \nu$, 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 here put into his mouth. They are quoted as his by Syrianus on Hermogenes. (4. 44. Walz.) See 462, B.

D. $\sigma oi \beta ov \lambda o\mu \epsilon v \varphi \epsilon \sigma \tau i v$. Soph. § 196, N. 2; Cr. § 408; K. 284. 10. c. — $\delta \eta \lambda os \gamma \delta \rho \ldots \delta u \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a u, for it is plain$ to me, even from what he has said, that Polus has studied theart of rhetoric, so called, rather than how to discourse (logi $cally) by way of question and answer. <math>\delta \eta \lambda os$, etc., for $\delta \eta \lambda \delta v$ $\epsilon \sigma \tau u r, \delta \tau u f u \lambda \delta s$, by attraction, as it is sometimes called. The tendency to give prominence to the main word — here the subject — of the second clause caused it to be pushed forward into the leading clause. This made that clause personal instead of impersonal, and bound the two clauses together more closely.

E. $\epsilon\rho\omega\tau\hat{q}$. So all the MSS., but the editors give $\dot{\eta}\rho\omega\tau a$,* on account of $\pi oia \tau is \epsilon \tilde{i}\eta$. But this is unnecessary, for the present may be rhetorically for the imperfect, or may include it. Nobody asks you = nobody asked you or now asks you. Comp. Xen. Anab. 1. 1. 3, $\delta ia\beta a\lambda \epsilon_i \dots \dot{\omega}s \dot{\epsilon}\pi i$ - $\beta ov\lambda\epsilon \dot{v}oi$, for $\delta i\epsilon \beta a\lambda \lambda \epsilon$. In this sentence, $\pi o \hat{i} os$ and $\tau i s$, which belong to direct inquiry, are found in company with $\delta \sigma \tau i s$, by which indirect questions are introduced. Comp. $\pi o \hat{i} a$ and $\delta \pi o \hat{i} a$ together, 500, A. Comp. also $o \tilde{i} a \nu$ for $\delta \pi o (a \nu,$ 450, C, $\tilde{\sigma}\sigma a$ for $\delta \pi \delta \sigma a$, 451, B, and other passages. $\tilde{\sigma} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \tau \tilde{a} \tilde{\epsilon} \mu \pi \rho o \sigma \delta \epsilon \nu$, comp. Soph. § 141, N. 1; Cr. § 478, a. The second clause begins at $\kappa a \hat{i} \nu \hat{\nu} \nu o \tilde{v} \tau \omega s$.

449 A. ὑποτείνεσθαι, est quæstionem ita proponere ut alteri subjicias quid respondendem sit, et in universo proponere quæstionem. Ast. — ὡς τίνος ... τέχνης. Another form of compound interrogation, when one clause has the participial structure (ἐπιστήμονα, sc. ὄντα). — ἀγαθών γε, not bene moratum, as Routh translates it, but plainly egregium certe.
— ὡς ἔφη "Ομηρος. Il. 6. 211, and elsewhere.

B. $oi\kappa oiv$. See Preface. — $i\lambda\lambda a\theta\iota$. See Introd. pp. xiii., xiv. — $i\lambda\lambda$ $ö\pi\epsilon\rho$, etc., but be not false to the promise you make. Socrates takes for granted that he consents. Hence $\delta\pi\epsilon\rho$, which Ast would change into $\epsilon i\pi\epsilon\rho$, is justly defended by Stallb. — $\epsilon ioi \ldots \pi o \iota \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota$, $= ava \gamma \kappa a i \delta v \epsilon \sigma \tau u$ $<math>\epsilon v i a s$ (Heind.), or $\epsilon v \epsilon v i a s \pi o \iota \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota$. See 448, D. In some of the answers it is necessary to discourse at length.

^{*} Stallb. has έρωτậ in his second edition.

C, D. $\delta s \, \delta i \delta \, \beta \rho a \chi v \tau \delta \tau \omega v = \delta s \, \beta \rho a \chi v \tau \delta \tau a$, or $\delta s \, \delta i \delta v \tau \epsilon$ $\delta i \delta \, \beta \rho a \chi v \tau \delta \tau \omega v$, just below. — With this boast of Gorgias, 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." — $\pi \delta v v \ldots \epsilon \pi \iota \epsilon \omega \delta s$, quite sufficiently, or very well.

E. ποίους τούτους ... ύγιαίνοιεν; what kind of words? are they those which make known by what sort of regimen the sick can get well? Understand περì with ποίους τούτους; as in 450, A, line 4. This is a condensed expression for ποῖοί εἰσιν οὖτοι περì οὕς ἐστιν; The subject of ὑγιαίνοιεν is attracted forwards to δηλοῦσι as its object. ὡς is quomodo, not ut, and to be taken with διαιτώμενοι. The two words have the same sense as τίνι διαίτη. Comp. 453, C. οὐκοῦν περì ὧνπερ, etc. = οὐκοῦν ποιεῖ δυνατοὺς καὶ φρονεῖν περì τούτων περì ὧνπερ λέγειν δυνατοὺς ποιεῖ.

B. $ov{\tau}\omega s ~ i\chi ov \sigma \iota v \cdot i\kappa \dot{\alpha}\sigma \tau \eta$. One of a number of the in-450 stances of asyndeton which occur in this dialogue. Some are owing to earnestness of feeling (449, A, $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \ldots \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \cdot \kappa \rho i r \omega$); some heighten the effect of contrast by bringing clauses closely together (503, E, $\tau ov s ~ \zeta \omega \gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi ov s \ldots \tau ov s ~ i\lambda \lambda ov s$), or making a word more emphatic (510, 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. $\omega s ~ i\pi s c i\pi \epsilon i r \omega$. This common phrase nearly always, in this work, moderates the force of some universal word, as $\pi \tilde{a}s$, $ov \delta \epsilon i s$. According to Lobeck (para-

450, B.]

NOTES.

lipom. Gram. Græc. 59), έπος εἰπεῖν occurs very often, εἰπεῖν έπος rarely. It denotes, 1. ut ita dicam, as here; 2. speaking inaccurately, the opposite of ἀκριβεῖ λόγφ. — τῆς δὲ ῥητορικῆς. The sense is, But there is no such manual operation pertaining to rhetoric, but all its activity and efficiency are exercised by means of words. The Scholiast says, that χειρούργημα and κύρωσις 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 χειρουργία and κύρος, may be intended to show forth the artificial and elaborate style of Gorgias. Thucydides uses κύρωσις (Lib. 6. 103).

C. àp' our ... Kaleiv; Indeed, I perceive what sort of art you wish to call it. So Ast. "Formula åp' our eodem modo ut oùr oùr initio per interrogationem cum negatione junctam affirmat." Hermann on Soph. Antig. 628 (632). Or we need only say that $\delta \rho a$, as it often does, requires an affirmative answer. Stallb. retains the interrogative force of apa, and supposes the question to require a negative answer. Do I understand, etc., i. e. I do not understand. But μανθάνω 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 discourse abruptly." ---- For tŵv μέν . . . čviai δέ, comp. Soph. § 142, N. 3.

E. où χ $\delta \tau \iota$. . . $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon s$, although in the expression which you make use of you so said. our so refers to the succeeding subordinate clause. où χ $\delta \tau \iota$ is properly elliptical for où $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$, or où $\kappa \epsilon \rho \omega$ $\delta \tau \iota$, and sometimes, followed by $d\lambda \lambda d$, means not

3

only, or not only not. Comp. Mt. § 624. 4. --- $\delta v \sigma \chi \epsilon \rho a i$ vev, to be captious in the discourse or discussion.

«ιποιμ' αν ... οντα. Complete the sentence by τις 451 В. Tŵr Kupos exouow, 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. yrwors is due to a copyist, who thought the structure deficient. — ωσπερ οι έν τῷ δήμω συγγραφόμενοι, as those say who draw up written motions in the meetings of the people, 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 $\tau \dot{a} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \vec{a} \lambda \lambda a \kappa a \theta \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \rho \tau \hat{\eta} \beta o \nu \lambda \hat{\eta}$, sc. έδοξεν, 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. $\sigma' \gamma \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu a$ 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 of the citizen, of his father, his demus, and tribe, to his resolution. In such cases the herald, says he, to save time, would say tà μέν άλλα κατά ταὐτά, the same as before. But this explanation is unfortunate for several obvious reasons. Still more so is Coray's, who understands of συγγραφόμενοι of public contractors.

C. $\delta\iota a\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota \ \delta\epsilon \ \tau o\sigma o \hat{v}\tau ov$, etc., but it differs ($\dot{\eta} \ \lambda o\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\dot{\eta}$) 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 $\pi \hat{\omega}s \, \tilde{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon i \, \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \beta \delta \upsilon s$, see Soph. § 188, N.; Cr. § 363, β ; K. § 274. 3. This definition of $\lambda \delta \gamma \iota \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ is found again in Charmides, 166, A. Arithmetic seems in Plato's definition to be employed with number in general, and $\lambda \delta \gamma \iota \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ 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 $\pi \epsilon \rho i \tau \sigma \tilde{\upsilon} \pi \sigma \sigma \sigma \tilde{\upsilon}$ $\kappa a \theta' \dot{\epsilon} a \upsilon \tau \delta$, and Music $\pi \epsilon \rho i \tau \sigma \tilde{\upsilon} \pi \rho \delta s \, \tilde{a} \lambda \delta \delta$; i. e. concerning the relations of numbers. Sometimes, as here, the former term included the whole science of number, but was used $i \delta \iota a \iota \tau \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \sigma \tilde{\upsilon} \tau \sigma \sigma \sigma \tilde{\upsilon} \kappa a \theta' a \dot{\upsilon} \tau \delta$, more especially of numbers in themselves considered.

D. The second τi is added by Stallbaum from a conjecture of Heindorf, and seems necessary to the text. The stars denote insertion. $---- d\mu\phi\iota\sigma\beta\eta\tau\eta\sigma\mu\sigma\nu$ καὶ τοῦτο λέγεις. See Eurip. Alcest. 106, and p. 452, E, $\tau i \ldots \tau$ οῦτο λέγεις; also Cr. § 528.

E. τοῦτο τὸ σκολιών. This scolium, or table-song, is ascribed 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,—

> " ύγιαίνειν μὲν ἄριστον ἀνδρὶ θνατῷ, δεύτερον δὲ καλὸν φυὰν γενέσθαι, τὸ τρίτον δὲ πλουτεῖν ἀδόλως, καὶ τὸ τέταρτον ἡβâν μετὰ τῶν φίλων."

Plato does not allude to the last line, because no trade or employment is concerned with it.

452 A. laτρόs τε... χρηματιστής. They are named in the order suggested by the scolium. Heindorf wished to read δ laτρός τε, 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: ὅ τε laτρòs καὶ χρηματιστής, on the contrary, would 12*

sufficiently discriminate the persons; or, in ambiguous cases, ὅ τε ἰατρὸς καὶ ὁ χρηματιστής. —— εἶποι ... ὅτι ... ἐξαπατậ. For oratio recta after ὅτι, comp. Cr. § 609, α.

B. $\theta av\mu a'_{\zeta o \mu i} \gamma' a^{\mu} \dots \epsilon^{i} \sigma o i \epsilon^{i} \chi \epsilon \iota$. The reason, according to Stallb., why there is here an indic. in the protasis with an opt. in the apodosis is, that what the pædotribe says, "interlocutoris mentem potius quam suam ipsius opinionem respiciat." As, however, $\epsilon^{i} \chi \epsilon \iota \epsilon^{i} \pi \iota \delta \epsilon i \xi a \iota$ is, in his own opinion, only a possibility, he says $\theta av\mu a'_{\zeta o \iota \mu \iota} a^{\nu}$. But perhaps $\theta av\mu a'_{\zeta o \iota \mu \iota} a^{\nu}$ may be considered the optative of politeness, which expresses, under the form of a possibility, something real and absolute. Comp. Kühner's largest Gr. § 817. 6. — $\tau \epsilon'_{\chi v \eta s}$ depends on $a'_{\gamma a} \theta \delta v$, good pertaining to his art.

C. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \kappa \alpha \tau a \phi \rho o \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ is added in satire, to show the higher pretensions of the meanest of the three employments. 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,"—

> ''τοῦθ', ὁρậs, ἐμαίνετο, μετὰ τὴν ὑγίειαν γὰρ τὸ πλουτεῖν διαφέρει · καλὸs δὲ πεινῶν ἐστιν αἰσχρὸν θηρίον.''

—— καὶ μὴν ... ὅδε, and yet you see Gorgias here maintains on the contrary.

D. $\kappa a \dot{a} \sigma \dot{\epsilon} \dots a \dot{v} \tau o \ddot{v}$. There is here a change not unknown to our language from the relative to the demonstrative construction. — $a \dot{v} \tau o \hat{s} \tau o \hat{s} \dot{a} v \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi o i s$, i. e. the cause why the men themselves who are possessed of the art are free. $a \dot{v} \tau o \hat{s} \dot{s}$ is used on account of the contrast with others whom they govern. There is here a certain rhetorical col-

452, D.]

NOTES.

oring, which may be intended as an imitation of the style of Gorgias.

453 A. τὸ κεφάλαιον εἶς τοῦτο τελευτậ, i. e. its sum and substance, its essential quality ends in this or tends to this as its result, τοῦτο referring to πειθοῦς. τελευτâν, meaning to end, takes the preposition εἰς 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 ἄρχειν, to begin, is joined with ἀπὸ, ἐκ, and adverbs of motion from a place, = to start. — ἡ ἕχεις ... δύνασθαι. Here τι seems to be taken with δύνασθαι, and ἐπὶ πλέον is to a greater extent, plus. Comp. ταῦτα ἐπὶ πλέον εἰπεῦν, Laws, 697, C; ἐπὶ πλέον τι δύναται, Politicus 305, B. So also ἐπ᾽ ἕλαττον, ἐπὶ πολὺ, ἐπὶ σμικρὸν (Soph. Electr. 414), are used.

B. $i\gamma\omega\gamma a\rho\ldots\tau o\nu\tau\omega\nu$ $i\nu\alpha$, be assured that I, as I flatter 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 $5\pi\iota$. This happens, for the most part, when a clause intervening between $\delta\tau\iota$ 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, $i\gamma\omega$ is left by itself, and $i\mu\dot{\epsilon}$ takes its place. — $i\gamma\omega\ldots o\dot{\epsilon}\kappa$ oida. Here notice the emphatic position of $i\gamma\omega$, the attraction of $\tau\eta\nu\ldots\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\omega$ to the main

sentence, in which olda is, and the interposition of $\epsilon \tilde{v}$ $l\sigma\theta'$ $\tilde{v}\tau b$ between the adverb and the verb.

C. où σοῦ ἕνεκα . . . λέγεται, not on your account (to draw 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 πo_{ij} , which arose from not perceiving that ω_s here is quomodo, and not ut. See 449, E. --- ωσπερ αν. αν belongs to neounv, and is repeated on account of its distance from the verb, occasioned by the conditional clause. Comp. 447, D. ---- ZevEis. 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. —— Kai nov. 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 $\pi \circ \hat{v}$ 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 $\pi \acute{o}\sigma ov$, for how much, . and Coray, Tov, 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 $\pi \hat{\omega}s$, 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 ypápov; which, indeed, may be argued from the fact, that Plato afterwards only alludes to rà júa. To this rà ποία των ζώων, and άλλα πολλά ζωα, point ; and no other definition of the art of Zeuxis is hinted at. Next to ypádow

came $\hat{\eta}$ ov, HOY, which was corrupted into ΠOY ; and then kai was added to bring $\pi o \hat{v}$ into grammatical connection with the sentence. For the confusion of H and Π in the MSS., Bast's Epist. Palæograph. in Schæfer's Gregory Corinth., p. 716, may be consulted. A similar corruption of $\hat{\eta}$ ov into $\pi o v$, in Repub. 437, D, is removed in modern editions.

D. $\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} s$ äv σοι ἀπεκέκριτο; would your answer have been a good one? This verb, like several other deponents, is used both actively and passively, — a usage almost confined to the perfect, pluperfect, and aorist. Comp. Soph. § 208, N. 2; K. § 252; Cr. § 564. — où δητα denies the latter part of the alternative, où πείθει.

454 A. τον λέγοντα, him who makes this assertion, that rhetoric is the art of persuasion.

B, C. $\tau a \dot{v} \tau \eta s \ldots \tau \eta s \pi \epsilon \iota \partial o \hat{v} s \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$, sc. $\tau \eta \nu \dot{\rho} \eta \tau o \rho \iota \kappa \eta \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon}$ $\chi \eta \nu \epsilon \dot{\iota} \nu a \ldots \dot{d} \lambda \dot{\prime} \dot{\iota} \nu a \mu \dot{\eta} \, \partial a \nu \mu \dot{a} \dot{\zeta} \eta s$, etc. The form of this sentence changes a little as it proceeds. $\delta \pi \epsilon \rho \, \gamma \dot{a} \rho \, \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ is written as if $\mu \eta \, \partial a \dot{\iota} \mu a \dot{\zeta} \epsilon$ had gone before. The proper apodosis of $\ddot{\iota} \nu a \ldots \partial a \nu \mu a \dot{\zeta} \eta s$ is $\tau o \hat{\iota} \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \ldots \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \hat{\omega}$, but the connection is broken up by $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ in $\delta \pi \epsilon \rho \, \gamma \dot{a} \rho \, \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$. The sense of $\delta \pi \epsilon \rho \ldots \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ is, for as I say (i. e. as I was just saying, 453, 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 $\pi \rho o a \rho \pi \dot{a} \dot{\zeta} \epsilon \nu \ldots \tau \dot{a} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \dot{o} \mu \epsilon \nu$, comp. Herodot. 9. 91, $\delta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \, \dot{\upsilon} \pi a \rho \pi \dot{a} \sigma a s \tau \dot{\upsilon} \nu \, \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \lambda o \iota \tau \omega$

E. βούλει... θώμεν like visne videamus, volo hoc contingat. Soph. § 219. 3, last ed.; Cr. § 611. 3; K. § 259. 1. 6.
455 A. πιστευτικῆς, productive of belief. διδασκαλικῆς, able to impart instruction or knowledge, i. e. knowledge founded upon absolute, unchangeable principles. dλλά πιστικός

μόνον, able to cause belief and nothing more (aiming at conviction, and not at truth). This word has been altered into πειστικόs by Stephens, Heindorf, Coray, and Buttmann; and some MSS. favor the change. Bekker, Stallb., and Ast, with reason, retain $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \delta s$. For, as is shown by Ast at great length, πειστικόs denotes (having relation to, having to do with, i. e.) able to produce $\pi \epsilon \iota \theta \omega$, and is the more general word, and not necessarily opposed to διδασκαλικόs; while $\pi i \sigma \tau i \kappa \delta s$ means able to produce $\pi i \sigma \tau i \nu$, which has just been contrasted with ἐπιστήμην (454, D). Again, as to the form of the word, - which, according to Buttmann, cannot analogically be derived from $\pi i \sigma \tau i s$, — Ast observes that adjectives in -ikós are freely derived, not only from verbals, but also from nouns $(d\rho_X \eta, d\rho_X \iota \kappa \delta s)$, adjectives $(\phi i \lambda \delta s,$ φιλικόs), and imaginary forms (νουθετικόs from νουθέτης). What objection, then, is there to regarding $\pi_{i\sigma\tau\delta}$, or $\pi_{i\tau}$ στις (comp. φύσις, φυσικός, φθίσις, φθισικός), as the source of πιστικός? However derived, such words may take a genitive. But here there is no necessity of supplying a genitive with πιστικός.

B. $i\delta\omega\mu\epsilon\nu \tau i \pi\sigma\tau\epsilon \kappa a \lambda \dot{\epsilon}\gamma \omega\mu\epsilon\nu$. The force of κa in such 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 $\lambda \dot{\epsilon}\gamma \omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, which gives the inapposite sense of let us see what we shall say. — $\pi\epsilon\rho\lambda$ $\lfloor a\tau\rho\omega\nu$ alpé $\sigma\epsilon\omegas$. "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 people. The famous Democedes of Croton, about Olymp. 60, although as yet little money was in circulation, received the large salary of thirty-six Æginetic minæ or an Attic talent of silver (\$ 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. — $\tilde{a}\lambda\lambda \sigma \tau \tilde{\eta}$ (literally, is there anything else than, is it not true) is a very common formula in Plato, meaning no more than nonne. Very often $\tilde{a}\lambda\lambda\sigma \tau \eta$, without $\tilde{\eta}$, is found in the same sense at the beginning of a sentence; and Bekker always prefers it to $\tilde{a}\lambda\lambda\sigma \tau \eta \tilde{\eta}$. According to Hermann on Viger, note 110, when the latter is used, the interrogation extends to the end of the sentence; but when $\tilde{a}\lambda\lambda\sigma \tau\iota$, it stops with those words. — $al\rho\epsilon \tilde{l}\sigma\theta a\iota$ is in the middle. — After $\tilde{\eta} \nu\epsilon\omega\rho l\omega\nu$, supply $\sigma\nu\mu\beta\sigma\nu\lambda\epsilon \dot{\sigma}\epsilon\iota$ $\delta \dot{\rho}\eta\tau\sigma\rho\iota\kappa\delta s$. And, just below, a similar clause, which is to be supplied in thought before $d\lambda\lambda'$ of $\sigma\tau\rho a\tau\eta\gamma\iota\kappa\delta i$, is afterwards in part expressed. — A passage precisely like this occurs in Protag. 319, B.

C. $\tau \delta \sigma \delta \nu \sigma \pi \epsilon \delta \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$, tuis rebus studere. See 458, B, note. $---\tau \iota \nu as \sigma \chi \epsilon \delta \delta \nu \kappa a \delta \sigma \iota \chi \nu o \delta s$. $\tau \iota \nu \delta s$ includes many and few, as the more generic word (Wyttenbach on Phædo, p. 116), and therefore $\pi o \lambda \lambda o i$, $\delta \lambda i \gamma o \iota$, and similar words, often follow to define it. Here $\kappa a i$, on account of the position of $\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta \delta \nu$, seems to me not to be and, but even. The sense is, some, almost even many, i. c. some, indeed even quite a number.

D. abròs . . . $\kappa a \lambda \hat{\omega} s \dot{\upsilon} \phi \eta \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, for you yourself have admirably led the way, i. e. in speaking about the docks, etc., just now you suggested a good answer.

E. $\tau \lambda \delta' \epsilon \kappa \tau \eta s \Pi \epsilon \rho \kappa \lambda \epsilon \delta v s$. $\tau \lambda \delta \delta t$ is used as if $\tau \lambda \mu \delta v$ had preceded: and partly through that of Pericles. $\epsilon \kappa \tau \delta v \delta \eta \mu \omega v \rho \gamma \delta v$, through the advice of the artificers. Heind. and Buttmann wish to read $\tau \eta s \delta \eta \mu \omega v \rho \gamma \delta v$. 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 $\pi \epsilon \lambda a \rho$ - $\gamma o \tilde{v} \delta \epsilon \mu \delta s \tilde{\epsilon} \rho \omega s o \delta \delta \tilde{\epsilon} v \delta \omega \delta \sigma \epsilon t$, my love then will not differ

from a stork, i. e. from a stork's love; and in Repub. 375, A, we have οίει τι διαφέρειν φύσιν γενναίου σκύλακος είς φυλακήν (in respect to keeping guard) νεανίσκου εὐγενοῦς; Comp. Soph. § 186, N. 1. --- τοῦ διὰ μέσου τείχους. 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 $\tau \epsilon i \chi os$ in the singular, as forming a sort of fortification. Plutarch (Vita Pericl. § 13) alluding to this passage, interprets the words - perhaps carelessly by to μακρόν τείχος, and thus sanctions Leake's view. But Harpocration, s. v. διά μέσου τείχους, 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, το μακρου τείχος το νότιον (Æschin. de Fals. Leg. § 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 affairs, and when Socrates was over twenty years old.

A. of vikiovies ta's $\gamma \nu \omega \mu as$, Soph. § 164, N. 2; K. § 278. 456 2; Cr. § 433. — $\pi a'\lambda ai \epsilon' \rho \omega \tau \hat{\omega}$. $\pi a'\lambda ai$ is very often found with the present of an action begun in the past and still continued. — Join $\tau \partial \mu \epsilon' \gamma \epsilon \theta os$ with $\delta a \mu \rho \nu i a$, as the accus. of specification. — $\epsilon i \pi a' \nu \tau a \gamma \epsilon \epsilon i \delta \epsilon i \eta s$. The apodosis must be something like $\delta a \mu \rho \nu i a \delta \nu \kappa a \tau a \phi a' \nu \rho \iota \tau o$, which is pointed at by $\gamma \epsilon$.

456, B.]

B. $\mu\epsilon\tau\dot{a}\ \tau\sigma\hat{v}\ d\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\sigma\hat{v}$. See 448, B. — $\dot{\eta}\ \tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\hat{i}v\ \dot{\eta}\ \kappa a\hat{v}\sigma ai$, 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 $ia\tau\rho\delta s$, who, as Routh observes, exercised both the medical and the surgical arts. $\pi a \rho a \sigma \chi\epsilon \hat{i}v$, sc. $\epsilon a v \tau \delta v$; comp. 475, D. For $\tau\epsilon \mu\epsilon \hat{i}v$, $\kappa a \hat{v} \sigma a i$, see Soph. § 219.2; Cr. § 621. β . 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. $o\dot{v}\delta a\mu o\hat{v} \dots \phi av \eta vai$, would be of no account. Comp. Soph. Antig. 183, $\tau o \tilde{v} \tau o v o\dot{v}\delta a\mu o\hat{v} \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$; Xen. Memorab. 1. 2. 52, $\mu \eta \delta a\mu o\hat{v} \epsilon \dot{v} vai$, to be nowhere, in no estimation. — $\epsilon i \beta o \dot{v} \lambda o \tau o$ is elegantly added, says Stallb., to denote the arrogance and pretension of Gorgias, \equiv if he chose to give himself the trouble.

D. $\tilde{\epsilon}\mu a\theta\epsilon$, sc. $\tau\iota s$. Soph. § 157, N. 8; K. § 238, R. 3; Cr. § 546. This omission of the indefinite subject τis is common in this dialogue, as is also the transition from a singular verb to a plural, or the contrary, where the subject is an indefinite one. $---\tilde{\epsilon}\nu \ \delta\pi\lambda o\iota s \ \mu\dot{\alpha}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\iota\iota$ dicuntur qui veris armis certare discunt. Nam vulgo juventus non veris armis se exercebat sed rudibus, aut pilis præpilatis, quæ dicuntur Græcis $\epsilon\sigma\phi\mu\rho\mu\mu\epsilon\nu a \ d\kappa\delta\nu\tau\iota a$ [i. e. with a ball covering the point]. Quæ sunt verba Casauboni ad Theophrast. Charact. p. 79, ed. Fischer. Stallb.

E. $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \nu \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \gamma \delta \rho$, etc., for they intrusted (them to their scholars) for the purpose of using them aright against their foes, and those who wrong them, in defending themselves, not in beginning an assault. $\tau o \dot{\tau} \sigma \sigma \sigma$ refers to the means of defence used in the arts just named. The subject of $\chi \rho \eta - \sigma \theta \omega$ is to be gathered from the context, viz. such persons as learn to box, and beat their friends. The forms of $\dot{\sigma} \pi \dot{\alpha} \rho - \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$, and those of $d\mu \dot{\nu} \nu \rho \mu \omega \alpha$, are often contrasted, in the senses of acting on the offensive and defensive. $\mu \epsilon \tau a$ -

στρέψαντες, turning round, i. e. on the contrary. Comp. μεταβαλών, 480, E.

A. $\epsilon_{\mu\beta\rho\alpha\chi\dot{\nu}}$, in short, is taken with $\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{\nu}$ örov $\dot{a}\nu$ $\beta o\dot{\nu}\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, 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.

B. $\kappa ai \tau \hat{\eta} \ \hat{\rho} \eta \tau o \rho \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} \ ... \ \delta \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \kappa a i$. For $\kappa a i$, in each member of the sentence, comp. the note on Electr. 1301, where it is said that $\kappa a i$ 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. — $\kappa \hat{q} \tau a$. Post participia, $\kappa a i \ \epsilon i \tau a$, $\kappa a i \ \epsilon i \tau a$ inferuntur, ubi $\epsilon i \tau a$ et $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \tau a$ expectes. Stallb. A frequent idiom.

C. δύνανται, sc. of λέγοντες, implied in τῶν λόγων; or, more exactly, the subject is indefinite, and plural, because the action of conversing requires more than one. —— οὕτω repeats and recalls the participles. Join διαλύεσθαι to δύνανται.

D. $\mu \eta$ $\sigma a \phi \hat{\omega}_s$, i. e. $\mu \eta \phi \hat{\eta}$ (deny) $\tau \delta \nu$ $\tilde{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \nu$ $\sigma a \phi \hat{\omega}_s \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$. $---- \kappa a \iota \kappa a \tau \dot{a} \phi \theta \dot{\delta} \nu o \nu$, 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 $\dot{\epsilon} a \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu = \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$, Soph. § 145, N. 2; K. § 302. 7; Cr. § 507. 7. --- $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s$, Cr. § 457. a; K. § 312, R. 3. --- ola $\kappa a \iota$, etc., so that even the by-standers feel vexed for themselves, because they consented to be listeners to such people. The infinitive follows ola here, as it so often does $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$.

E. $\delta\iota\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$, to go on, or through with a refutation of. $\delta\iota\dot{a}$ has the same force in $\delta\iota\epsilon\rho\omega\tau\phi\eta\nu$ 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 $\tau\circ\hat{\nu}$ y $\epsilon\nu\dot{\epsilon}$ - $\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, comp. Soph. § 187. 1; K. § 308. 2. (b); Cr. § 372. With genitives in this relation of the motive, $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\kappa a$ is often found.

458 Α. των ήδέως ... αν έλεγχθέντων = τούτων οι ήδέως αν έλεγχθείεν. K. § 260. 2. (5); Cr. § 615. 2. Comp. Euthyphro 3, D, where Socrates says, that he converses, not only without taking pay for it, and kai προστιθείs av ήδέως, sc. $\mu \iota \sigma \theta \delta \nu$, but even with a willingness to give pay, if any one is disposed to hear him. Here $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau \iota \theta \epsilon is$ without $a\nu$ would mean, that he actually paid his listeners. ---- Just below, for εί τι μή άληθες λέγω, we should expect εί τι . . . λέγοιεν, or, with the transition to the first person, *\langle \gamma out*, parallel to the succeeding $\lambda \epsilon_{\gamma \alpha}$. The reason for using $\lambda \epsilon_{\gamma \omega}$ 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 ϵ with an indicative; but only the possibility of error on the part of another by el and an optative. — $a\dot{v}\tau\dot{o}v$ $\dot{a}\pi a\lambda\lambda a\gamma\eta\nu a\iota$. Comp. for $a\dot{v}\tau\dot{o}v$ emphatic (the word with which it agrees being omitted), 447, C, ouder οίον αύτον έρωταν.

B. orov doža yevdýs. Græci in hujusmodi comparationibus modo casus præcedenti nomini accommodant, modo nominativum ponunt, intellecto verbo superiore. Stallb. Comp. Repub. 334, B, τοῦτο μέντοι ἔμοιγε δοκεί ἔτι, ἀφελείν μέν τούς φίλους ή δικαιοσύνη, where την δικαιοσύνην would have been more common. See Cr. § 655. 4. ---- τό τών $\pi a \rho \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$, the interests or feelings of the present company. And so τὸ τούτων, just below; τὸ σὸν σπεύδουσ' äμa, καὶ τοὐμον αὐτηs, Soph. Electr. 251. Such formulæ are sometimes little more than circumlocutions for the pronoun. Comp. τό γ' ἐμόν, 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.

D. $\tau \delta \ \epsilon \mu \delta \nu$ is the subject of $\kappa \omega \lambda \dot{\nu} \epsilon \iota$. $--- \tau \delta \lambda \omega \pi \delta \nu$, after this, i. e since all the others wish that the debate should continue. $--- \kappa \alpha \dot{\iota} \tau a \hat{\upsilon} \tau a$, etc., and that too (i. e. and especially) when I myself announced, that whatever questions any one wishes to put he may do so.

A. $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\varsigma$ τοι νῦν δή, you were saying certainly just now. 459 I have written τοι νῦν δή for τοίνυν δή, at Bekker's suggestion, on account of the sense. — τὸ ἐν ὅχλῷ τοῦτο, this expression ἐν ὅχλῷ. This is the subject of ἐστιν, and the remaining words the predicate. — ἐν τοῖs μὴ εἰδόσιν. Compare the negative μὴ here, and in ὁ μὴ ἰατρόs, with οὐ in δ οὐκ εἰδώs, ἐν τοῖs οὐκ εἰδόσιν, 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), οὐ is properly used.

B. $\epsilon \nu \tau a \hat{\nu} \theta a$, i. e. in the case of the art of medicine.

C. $\beta q \sigma \tau \delta \nu \eta$, saving of trouble, convenience. $\rightarrow \dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \tau \iota$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \pi \rho \delta s \lambda \delta \gamma \delta \nu \eta$, if it come at all within the scope of our discourse. $\pi \rho \delta s$, (literally,) on the side of, in favor of, to the advantage of.

D. o $\ddot{\upsilon}\tau\omega s$ $\ddot{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu$. This clause is afterwards defined by a $\dot{\upsilon}\tau\dot{a}$ $\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ o $\dot{\upsilon}\kappa$ $\epsilon\dot{\ell}\delta\dot{\omega}s$.

Α. ωσπερ άρτι είπες. See 455, D. --- οίμαι is paren- 460

thetical: hence $\mu a \theta h \sigma \epsilon \tau a t$ follows, and not $\mu a \theta h \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$. $----- \tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi \epsilon} \delta h$, as Ast says, is a formula of exhorting, like $\tilde{a}_{\gamma \epsilon}$ γh ; as Heindorf, a "formula subsistendi et inhibendi," = $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi \epsilon} \sigma \epsilon a v \tau \delta v$; as Stallb., after Hermann, one of admonishing another to remember something, and perceive its results, = $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi \epsilon} \tau \sigma v \tau \sigma v \tau \sigma$. 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.

B. $\tau \delta \lambda a$ $\delta v \tau \omega$, sc. $\xi \chi \epsilon \iota$. — $\kappa a \tau \delta \tau \delta v a v \tau \delta v \lambda \delta \gamma o v$, after 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. ---- is $\tau \sigma \delta \lambda \delta \gamma \sigma v$, 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.

D. $\epsilon \kappa \beta \delta \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$, sc. $a \vartheta \tau \sigma \vartheta s$, and so with $\epsilon \xi \epsilon \lambda a \vartheta \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$, just below. 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. — $\delta \sigma a \vartheta \tau \sigma s$ and $\sigma \vartheta \tau \sigma s$ and $\sigma \vartheta \tau \sigma s$ and δs an

Ε. φαίνεται ... οὐκ ἄν ποτε ἀδικήσας, appears incapable of ever doing injustice, = φαίνεται ὅτι σὐκ ἄν ποτε ἀδικήσειε.
F. A. Wolf, on Demosth. c. Leptin. (p. 468, ed. Reiske),

lays down the rule, that $\phi a i \nu o \mu a \iota$ with an infin. = videor, but with a particip. palam sum. -- $\ddot{o} \gamma' \ldots \pi o \iota \dot{\iota} \tau a \iota$, since it is always discoursing. For the use of the relative, comp. note on 488, D. Here \dot{o} , which refers to $\dot{\eta} \dot{\rho} \eta \tau o \rho \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$, is put in the gender of the predicate $\pi \rho \tilde{a} \gamma \mu a$, by attraction. Comp. 463, E.

A. $\epsilon i \pi \sigma \nu \dots \sigma \tau \dots \delta \xi \iota \sigma \nu \epsilon \sigma \eta$. Here $\delta \nu$ is not used, be-461 cause the sense is, I said that it was worth while. With $\delta \nu$ 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, 460, E, $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \tau \sigma \delta \tau \eta$, $\delta \eta \tau \sigma \rho \iota \kappa \eta$, $\ldots \epsilon \delta \eta$, that rhetoric was, but $\nu \pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha \beta \sigma \nu \delta s$ où $\delta \epsilon \pi \sigma \tau \delta \eta \epsilon \eta$, that it never could be.

B. µà τòν κύνα. A very common oath in the mouth of Socrates, concerning which much has been written. In 482, B, we have $\mu \dot{a} \tau \dot{o} \nu \kappa \dot{\nu} v a$, $\tau \dot{o} \nu A \dot{i} \gamma \upsilon \pi \tau \dot{i} \omega \nu \theta \epsilon \dot{o} \nu$, i. e. " latrator Anubis," which is either a comic addition to the original formula, µà τὸν κύνα, 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. --- our ohr on vourias, haud exigui est sermonis. — Kai . . . Sozáčers. According to Ast, kai affects dogaters, being a little out of its place. Do you even or really think ? — η ofter . . . $\epsilon \rho \omega \tau \eta \mu a \tau a$. A passage of considerable difficulty, which seems to be best explained by regarding the sentence, with Schleierm., as a broken one; which is indicated in this edition by a dash after διδάξειν. 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 $(\delta \hat{\eta})$ 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 $\tau o \hat{\upsilon} \theta'$ δ δη ayaπas, 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 offer the sense of voulgers, and supplies ouro. Or do you think so because, etc. 2. Stallb., in his first ed., translates thus: an putas Gorgiam præ 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 h oter at $\epsilon_{\pi\epsilon\iota\tau a}$, — a strange and flat close to the period. 3. In his second edition, where he blames Ast for his "mira commenta," deserting his former view, he continues the sense in an unbroken period, and treats offer as though it did not The sense then becomes, because affect the structure. Gorgias was ashamed to deny, etc.,... did therefore, do you suppose, from this admission an inconsistency arise, etc.? But an inconsistency did arise, for the very reason contained in the words or ropylas, etc. This is evident from 482, D. The words of Polus then become unmeaning. — $\mu\dot{\eta} \pi\rho\sigma\sigma\rho\mu\partial\lambda\gamma\eta\sigma\alpha\ldots\mu\dot{\eta} \ o\dot{\chi}\dot{\chi}i.\ \mu\dot{\eta} \ o\dot{v} \ sometimes, as here,$ follows a simply negative expression, = quin before a subjunctive. But more usually it follows a verb of negative $import, when où precedes such a verb. Thus <math>\dot{a}\pi a\rho\nuo\hat{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$ $\mu\dot{\eta} \ \dot{\epsilon}\pi i\sigma\tau a\sigma\theta a\iota$, I deny that I know, but oùk $\dot{a}\pi a\rho\nuo\hat{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ oùk $\dot{\epsilon}\pi i\sigma\tau a\sigma\theta a\iota$, I do not deny that I know. An analogous formula to this latter is found just below, 461, C, — $\tau i\nu a \ oie t$ $\dot{a}\pi a\rho\nu\eta\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta a\iota$ $\mu\dot{\eta} \ o\dot{\chi}i \ \kappa ai \ a\dot{\nu}\tau oir \ \dot{\epsilon}\pi i\sigma\tau a\sigma\theta a\iota$, — where the interrog. implies a negative.

D. $\epsilon \pi a \nu o \rho \theta o \hat{i} \tau \epsilon$. Most of the MSS. have the opt. here 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. --- dikatos d' ei, and it is right for you so to do. For dikalos, see Mt. § 297; K. § 307, R. 6; Cr. § 551. It is for δίκαιόν ἐστί $\sigma\epsilon$, etc., owing to the cause explained in the note on 448, D. --- $d\nu a\theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, 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 of avaléobal Ast takes to be of understood. "Quod fieri non posse manifestum est," says Stallb. But such cases are possible, and we believe Ast to be right. Here, ou dokei, just before, and $\ddot{o} \tau \iota \, \dot{a} \nu \, \sigma \dot{\nu} \, \beta o \dot{\nu} \lambda \eta$, 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," - Kai οὐκ οἴονται εὐνοία τοῦτο ποιεῖν, i. e. that I do this. (Such is the MS. reading.) — $\phi \nu \lambda \dot{a} \tau \tau \eta s$, if you will only observe one thing. The middle, if you will guard against, might stand here.

461, E.]

NOTES.

E. οδ... λέγειν, where of all Greece there is the greatest liberty of speech, Έλλάδοs being a genitive partitive. ἀντίθες, put over against it, sc. this, viz. σοῦ μακρὰ λέγοντος, etc. For this latter passage, compare Aristoph. Acharn. 303, σοῦ δ' ἐγὼ λόγους λέγοντος οὐκ ἀκούσομαι μακρούς. τοι, though.

462 B. νῦν δή, nunc igitur. — ἐν τῷ συγγράμματι. Aristotle (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. οἰκοῦν καλὸν... ἀνθρώποις; 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 sentence explains, and is in apposition with, ή ῥητορική. οἶόν τ' εἶναι = τινα οἶόν τ' εἶναι.

D. $\beta o i \lambda \epsilon_i o i \nu$, etc., are you willing, then, since you prize giving pleasure, to give me a little pleasure? For the play on $\chi a \rho i \zeta o \mu a i$ (which itself playfully alludes to $\chi a \rho i \tau i \nu \sigma s$ $\kappa a i \hbar \delta o \nu \eta s$, just above), comp. 516, B. In this sentence, the present infinitive denotes the habit of Polus; $\chi a \rho i \sigma \sigma \sigma a a$, that which Socrates wishes him to do in this instance.

E. $\tau i \nu \sigma s \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota s \tau a \upsilon \tau \eta s$; Comp. 449, E, note on $\pi \sigma i \sigma \sigma s$ $\tau \sigma \upsilon \tau \sigma s$. $\mu \eta \ \epsilon \gamma \rho \sigma \kappa \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \eta$, I fear that it may seem too rude. For $\delta \epsilon \delta \sigma \kappa a$ 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.

463 A. δοκεί τοίνυν μοι... ἀνθρώποις, it seems to me, then, 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. $\omega s \ \delta \epsilon \ \delta \ \epsilon \mu \delta s \ \lambda \delta \gamma o s$, etc., yet, as I maintain, is not an 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. —— $\kappa o \mu \mu \omega \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ differt a $\kappa o \sigma \mu \eta \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ quâ honestus ornatus quæritur. Stallb.

C. $\tau\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\rho a \ldots \pi\rho\dot{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha\sigma\nu$, 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. — $d\pi\sigma\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ s. Comp. 453, D, note. — $\pi\rho\lambda\nu \ \dot{\alpha}\nu \ldots d\pi\sigma\kappa\rho\dot{\mu}\nu\omega\mu\alpha$. With $\pi\rho\lambda\nu$ "subjunctivum non usurpant tragici, nisi in priore membro adsit negandi aut prohibendi significatio." Elmsley on Medea, 215. In which case $d\nu$ accompanies $\pi\rhoi\nu$, 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 $\pi\rhoi\nu$, see Mt. § 522, C.; K. § 337. 9. b.

D. $d\pi o \kappa \rho \iota \nu a \mu \acute{e} \nu o \nu$, sc. $\mu o \nu$. Comp. 461, D, note. -- $\pi o \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} s \mu o \rho \acute{o} \nu \epsilon'' d \omega \lambda o \nu$, a shadow or semblance of a division of the political art, "civilitatis particulæ simulacrum," as translated by Quintil. 2. 15. 25, where this passage is examined.

Ε. Πώλος δὲ ὅδε. 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. 2. 23: ὡς Κόνων Θρασύβουλον "θρασύβουλον" ἐκάλει, καὶ 'Ηρόδικος (of Selymbria, comp. 448, B, note) Θρασύμαχον, "alεἰ θρασύμαχος εἶ," καὶ Πώλον, "alεἰ σὺ πῶλος εἶ," καὶ Δράκοντα τὸν νομοθέτην, ὅτι οἰκ ἀνθρώπου οἱ νόμοι ἀλλὰ δράκοντος. — In τυγχάνει Ἐν τοῦτο, the predicate τοῦτο determines the gender of ὅν by attraction, instead of ῥητορικὴ, to which it refers. Comp. 460, E.

A. olov τοιώνδε λέγω, for instance I mean as follows, lit-464 erally, "cf which sort I mention such a thing as this, viz."
a.

NOTES.

This, with or without the article before $\tau \sigma \iota \delta \tau \delta \epsilon$, is a common formula in Plato, when examples are adduced. $---\tau \dot{a} \sigma \dot{\omega} - \mu a \tau a$ is the accus. of specification.

B. «xel de ouder pallor, i. e. ev. The subject of «xel is supplied by the preceding accusatives, $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu a$ and $\psi v \chi \eta v$. But, or, while yet they (soul and body) are none the more in a good condition. Another construction also is possible : ότι ποιεί (τινα) δοκείν μέν εδ έχειν (κατά) το σώμα ... έχει δέ, while he is none the more in a good condition. $--- \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\iota}$ σώματι, etc., 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 $\psi v \chi \hat{\eta}$ freely take and lose the article (comp. 465, D). They lose it, perhaps, as approaching the nature of abstract nouns. In 463, E, they could not have it. $\mu i a \nu$ is the predicate-accusative. ουτω, thus, in these present circumstances, is often equivalent to illico. Comp. 509, A. - τη̂s δέ πολιτικη̂s, etc. Here $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ is to be supplied in thought, and $\tau \eta s$ molutikings depends on the vouoletikhv, 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 prescribes 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, gymnastics, 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.

C. $\pi\rho\delta_{3}$ τὸ βέλτιστον, with a view to the greatest good. — οὐ γνοῦσα λέγω ἀλλὰ στοχασαμένη. As aἰσθομένη 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. — ὑποδῦσα ὑπὸ ἕκαστον, having slipped under, or by stealth put on the garb of each of the four divisions.

D. $\theta\eta\rho\epsilon\dot{\nu}\epsilon\tau a\iota \ \tau\dot{\eta}\nu\ \ddot{a}\nu o \iota a\nu$, hunts for, seeks to captivate ignorance, or the unwary. $--\tau \hat{\varphi} \ldots d\epsilon \dot{\iota} \dot{\eta} \delta \iota \sigma \tau \varphi$, by that which is at the time the most agreeable.

A. $\tau \circ \tilde{\upsilon} \tau \circ \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \rho \dot{\delta} s \sigma \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ alludes to 463, D, where Po-465 lus puts the question concerning the quality of rhetoric. Comp. 448, C – E. —— $\tilde{\sigma} \tau \iota \ o \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tilde{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota \lambda \dot{\delta} \gamma o \nu \circ \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \nu a \dot{a} \pi \rho o \sigma \phi \dot{\epsilon} - \rho \epsilon \iota, because it cannot explain what sort of things those are$ in their nature, which it makes use of. Here we see what $Plato thought that a <math>\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$ must be. The MSS. give, almost unanimously, $\ddot{\omega} \pi \rho o \sigma \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \iota$, and the editors, without MS. authority, $\tilde{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \iota$. I have restored a part of the MS. reading, and have since observed that Stallb., in his second edition, has made the same change. —— $\dot{\iota} \pi o \sigma \chi \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu \lambda \dot{\delta} \gamma o \nu$, to submit the reason, or rationale, to explain and defend a position.

B. $\dot{\upsilon}\pi \delta \kappa \epsilon_{i\tau a\iota}$, puts itself under, puts on the form or mask of, $= \dot{\upsilon}\pi \sigma \delta \dot{\upsilon} \nu \epsilon_{i}$ above. $- \delta \sigma \tau \epsilon \pi \sigma_{i} \epsilon \dot{\upsilon} \nu \ldots \dot{d} \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{\upsilon} \nu$, so as to make men attach to themselves adventitious beauty, and neglect their own, obtained through the gymnastic art.

C. $\delta\pi\epsilon\rho \ \mu\epsilon'\nu\tau\sigma\iota \ \lambda\epsilon'\gamma\omega$. In the ensuing words, down to $\delta\psi\sigma\pi\sigma\iota\iota\kappa\delta\nu$, 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. $\ddot{o}_{\pi\epsilon\rho}$... $\lambda \dot{\epsilon}_{\gamma\omega}$ refers to what has just preceded; but as I say, or was just saying. ---- Siéστηκη. The subject of this verb, according to Buttmann in Heindorf's edition, is all the arts before mentioned, and όντων has the same subject, which is ταῦτα understood, referring to these arts. Stallb. restricts diegrake, with reason, I think, in his first edition, to σοφιστική και ρητορική. όντων may be used instead of ovres, referring to oodiorai kai bhropes, 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 pursue them. — äτε δ' έγγὺs ὄντων, but, inasmuch as they 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 : rairóv, & µaκáριε, έστὶ σοφιστής και ρήτωρ, ή έγγύς τι και παραπλήσιον, ωσπερ έγω έλεγον πρός Πώλον.

D. $\tau \delta \tau \sigma \tilde{v}$ 'Avaξayópov åν πολύ ην, what the well-known ($\tau \sigma \tilde{v}$) 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 chaos 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. $---\sigma \dot{\nu} \gamma \dot{\rho} \tau \sigma \dot{\nu} \tau \omega \nu \ \tilde{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \sigma s$. The Schol. of the Clarke MS. supposes these words to allude to the rhetorical figure called $\pi a \rho (\sigma \omega \sigma \iota s)$, which takes place when similar words, as $\phi i \lambda \epsilon$ $\Pi \hat{\omega} \lambda \epsilon$ 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.

E. $\omega_s \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon i \nu \sigma \epsilon \omega \mu a \tau \iota$, sc. $d \nu \tau i \sigma \tau \rho \sigma \phi \delta \nu \epsilon \epsilon \tau \tau \eta s \rho \eta \tau \sigma \rho \iota \kappa \eta s$. The clause might be removed without injury to the sense. $d \nu \tau i \sigma \tau \rho \sigma \phi \sigma \nu$ here governs a genitive, but a dative, 464, B. Some other compounds of $d \nu \tau i$ vary in the same way as to their regimen. $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \nu \sigma$, referring to $\delta \psi \sigma \pi \sigma \iota i \sigma s$, accommodates its gender to that of $d \nu \tau i \sigma \tau \rho \sigma \phi \sigma \nu$.

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 $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \mu$, is contained in $d \pi \sigma \kappa \rho \mu \nu \sigma - \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \nu$.

B. oùbê voµiζeo θ au, not even to be thought of, i. e. to be held in no estimation at all. This verb, which just above has a predicate, $\phi a \hat{\imath} \lambda \omega$, is here used absolutely. Our verbs to regard, to consider, and others, are capable of the same twofold use.

C. The colon, which most editors put after $\kappa i \nu a$, ought, as it seems to me, to be erased. Comp. $\mu \dot{a} \tau \partial \nu \Delta i a \dots d \lambda \lambda'$, 463, D, $\nu \dot{\eta} \tau \partial \dot{\nu} s \theta \epsilon \partial \dot{s} d \lambda \lambda'$, 481, C, where the formula of swearing unites in one clause with what follows. Socrates does not answer Polus by the phrase $\nu \dot{\eta} \tau \partial \nu \kappa i \nu a$, but only begins his answer in the next chapter.

E. $o\dot{v}\delta\dot{v} \gamma\dot{a}\rho \pi \sigma\iota\hat{\iota}v$, etc. Comp. Repub. 9. 577, E. "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 $\dot{\omega}s \ \tilde{\epsilon}\pi\sigma s \ \epsilon l\pi\epsilon\hat{\iota}v$, qualifying $o\dot{\upsilon}\delta\dot{\epsilon}v$, see 450, B. — $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\omega} \ o\breve{\upsilon} \ \phi\eta\mu\iota$; egone nego? — $\mu\dot{a} \ \tau \acute{o}v$. 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. — $\kappa a\dot{a}$ $\tau\dot{\epsilon}\chi\nu\eta\nu \ \tau\dot{\eta}\nu \ \dot{\rho}\eta\tau o\rho\iota\kappa\dot{\eta}\nu$. Supply $o\dot{\upsilon}\sigma a\nu$. Comp. 495, C.

467 A. ἐμὲ ἐξελέγξας. The aorist participle, which Heindorf 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, would have the second sense. — οὐδὲν ἀγαθὸν τοῦτο κεκτήσονται. By τοῦτο, he means τὸ ποιεῖν à δοκεῖ αὐτοῖς. —
ἐξελεγχθη...ὅτι. The verb is here used in sensu prægnanti, unless Socrates be refuted, and it be shown that, thus answering nearly to our verb convince.

B. obros $dv\eta\rho$. 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 $\delta\epsilon\iota\kappa\tau\iota\kappa\omegas$ de eo qui præsens est." Stallb. obros contains a shade of contempt sometimes like iste. Comp. 489, B, 505, C. — καὶ γàρ non est etenim, sed καὶ pertinet ad vũv. Stallb.; i. e. καὶ is also. — ĩνα προσείπω σε κατὰ σέ, that I may address you in your own style. This refers to λῷστε Πῶλε, and the artificial juxtaposition of words of equal length, or of similar form or sound. Comp. 448, C, 465, D.

D. of $\pi\lambda\dot{\epsilon}_{0\nu\tau\epsilon s}$, i. e. who make voyages for commercial purposes. $d\lambda\lambda'\dot{\epsilon}_{\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu\sigma}\ldots\pi\lambda_{0\nu\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu}$, when a demonstrative pronoun thus prepares the way for the infinitive, the latter often loses its article. Comp. $\tau o\hat{\upsilon}\tau \sigma \ldots \dot{\epsilon}_{\delta} \dot{\epsilon}_{\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota}$, 469, C. But, just above, we have not only $\tau o\hat{\upsilon}\tau \sigma$. $\pi\dot{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$, but also $\dot{\epsilon}_{\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}}$ - $\nu\sigma$, $\tau\dot{\sigma}$ $\dot{\upsilon}_{\nu}\iota\iota\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$. - $d\lambda\lambda\sigma$ $\tau \ldots o\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omega$. Supply $\dot{\epsilon}_{\chi\epsilon\iota}$. Is it not so, then, in all cases ?

E. $\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \, d\nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$. 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. $\pi \rho \acute{a} \tau \tau \sigma v \sigma \iota$, on fait, like $\lambda \acute{e} \gamma \sigma v \sigma \iota$, on dit. The same 468 indefinite subject appears just before in the first person plural, $\beta a \delta i \zeta \sigma \mu \epsilon v$, etc.

C. $d\pi\lambda \hat{\omega}s$ obtains, thus in themselves considered, without respect to something further.

E. $i\nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon_i \tau a \delta \tau \eta$. Not in this city, Athens, nor does $\tau a \delta \tau \eta$ 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, $i\nu \tau \eta \delta \epsilon_i$. Comp. this formula so used, 469, D, fin.; Leges 932, A. $\delta \delta \epsilon$ 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. $---\delta \epsilon \sigma \tau \nu \dots \delta \delta \tau a \sigma t \delta \nu a \sigma t \delta \eta$. Stallb. translates these words by quasi vero, Ast by nam revera.

A. $\pi \epsilon \rho i \ \delta \nu \dots \tau \delta \nu \ d\nu \theta \rho \delta \pi \omega \nu$. Comp. Soph. § 151. 3;469 K. § 332. 8; Cr. § 522.

B. και ελεεινόν γε πρός · præpositioni πρός absolute posi-

tæ (præterea) adjungi solet particula $\gamma \epsilon$. Ast, = yes, and pitiable besides. $---\pi \tilde{\omega}s$, cur. $---\omega \tilde{\tau}\omega s$, $\tilde{\omega}s$, 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. ¿ξείναι. Supply τινι, to which αὐτῷ refers, in the next line.

D. $\tau \hat{\varphi} \lambda \delta \gamma \varphi$ is added to explain the sense in which $\epsilon \pi t$ λaβoù is used, attack in your discourse, refute by argument. by seems to belong to the imperative, with the usual hortatory sense. —— $\epsilon \nu$ àyopậ $\pi \lambda \eta \theta o \dot{\nu} \sigma \eta$, 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. $\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{\iota}$ a yopar $\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\theta\sigma\nu\sigma\alpha\nu$ is a common phrase for time. ayopá, even when definitely used, is often without an article, like πόλις, πατήρ, and many other nouns. And this is particularly frequent after prepositions. Comp. 447, A. --- τεθνήξει, he shall be dead, the meaning of $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa a$ put into a future. This appears to be the received form in old Attic, and redvijferal came into use afterwards. See Elmsl. on Aristoph. Acharn. 590. ---- τινα ... της κεφαλης αὐτῶν κατεαγέναι, that any of them shall have his head broken, like συντριβήναι τής κεφαλής, Aristoph. Peace, 71. But the accusative may also follow this verb, as in 515, E. Yet the accusative of $\kappa\epsilon\phi a\lambda\eta$ was disallowed by the Atticists, although used by Lysias and others of the best writers.

E. τ_{plipeus} , desidero articulum. Stallb. *ai*, which may have been absorbed by κai (KAI for KAIAI), is added by Coray. But the article is unnecessary, being implied or contained in τa , as Ast observes. One article often suffices, even for two substantives of different genders, or for two

14*

words separated by disjunctive particles. Comp. Hermann on Eurip. Hec. 593 of his second edition.

A. $\tau \delta \mu \epsilon \gamma a \ \delta \delta \nu a \sigma \theta a$, etc. The construction is anaco-470 luthous; $\kappa a i \tau \sigma \delta \tau \sigma i \tau \delta \mu \epsilon \gamma a \ \delta \delta \nu a \sigma \theta a$ being, for the sake of greater emphasis, in the place of $\kappa a i \epsilon \delta \nu a \mu \epsilon \gamma a \ \delta \delta \nu \nu a \sigma \theta a$. 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. εἰπὲ τίνα ὅρον ὁρίζει. τίς is here used like ὅστις in indirect inquiry. See 447, C, 448, E, etc.

C. $\chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi \delta \nu \gamma \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \xi \alpha \iota$. These words are obviously spoken in irony.

D. $d\lambda\lambda' d\kappa o i\omega \gamma \epsilon$. Routh and other editors since suppose that by this form of words Socrates conveys ridicule of $\delta\rho\hat{\rho}s$, just above, which is used quite rhetorically. This may be so, but $d\kappa o i\omega$ is often thus used for $d\kappa \eta \kappa o a$. Comp. 515, E; Cr. § 579, ζ ; K. § 255. 1. R. — oix oida. The noble passage down to $d\lambda\lambda\dot{a} \mu \epsilon \nu \delta\eta$ is freely translated by Cicero, Tusc. Quæst. 5. 12. — $a\dot{v}\tau \delta\theta\epsilon\nu$, ex ipsa re. Stallb., from the nature of the case itself.

E. παιδείας ὅπως ἔχει. See 451, C. — τὸν . . . ἄνδρα καὶ γυναῖκα. 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-

vited, and to have replied, JApir cival un divardal autorardal όμοίως εἶ παθόντα ώσπερ καὶ κακῶς. (Aristot. Rhet. 2. 23.) 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, Speusippus, 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 exaggerated. ---- ¿δούλευεν άν. Some few MSS. give ¿δούλευσεν. Heindorf condemns Routh for adopting έδούλευεν, saying that the latter, with av, is serviret; the former, servisset. But this is not so. The imperfect indicative with av, "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. $\theta av\mu a \sigma i \omega s$ is $\tilde{a} \theta \lambda \omega s$. See 477, D, note. — $\mu \epsilon r a \pi \epsilon \mu \psi \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon v o s$, 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. $\epsilon \mu \beta a \lambda \delta \nu \epsilon is \phi \rho \epsilon a \rho$, according to Ast and Stallb., denotes the manner in which the action of $d\pi \sigma \pi \nu i \xi a s$ 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 $\kappa a \lambda$ were in the text, having thrown him into the well (and so) drowned him. For $d\pi o \pi \nu i \xi a s$, comp. 512, A. — $d\rho \xi d \mu \epsilon \nu o s \ d\pi d \sigma o \tilde{\nu}$, tuque imprimis, seu interque eos tu primus. Heindorf, who has adduced a number of examples of the phrase.

D. $\tau \circ \tilde{\upsilon} \ldots \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu a \iota$. This clause is brought, by a negligent freedom of style, under the influence of $\ddot{\sigma} \tau \iota$, 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. $-\pi \delta \theta \epsilon \nu$. Comp. my note on Eurip. Alcest. 95.

A. δοκούντων είναι τι. Cr., § 450, regards τι as inde- 472 clinable, eorum qui videntur esse aliquid ; not as predic. accus., 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 guidguam stultius, quam quos singulos contemnas, cos esse aliquid putare universos. And so ris, rivés, as in the noted line of Pindar, τί δέ τις; τί δ' οῦ τις; σκιᾶς ὄναρ ἄνθρωπος, Pyth. 8. 95; and in Demosth. c. Mid. § 213, πλούσιοι πολλοί ... τό δοκείν τινές είναι δι' ευπορίαν προσειληφότες, which favors Crosby's view. — όλίγου. Soph. § 220 (223. 2); Cr. § 623. ---- Nikias. 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 Tpi- $\pi o \delta \epsilon s$. 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. ---- 'Apiotokpátns, 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. έν Πυθίου, sc. ίερφ, in the temple of Apollo Pythius at Athens. So I have no hesitation in reading, with Coray, after one MS., for the common IIvooi, Delphi. For rouro 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. --- Tŵr erberde is for $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \theta \hat{a} \delta \epsilon$, by attraction or accommodation to $\epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon \epsilon a \sigma \theta a \iota$. which contains the notion of taking from. - έκβάλλειν ... $d\lambda\eta\theta_{ovs}$. In these words there is an elegant allusion to actions of ejectment. There is, also, according to Stallb., a play upon ovoia, which means not only substance, estate, but reality, truth. ¿κβάλλειν, 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."

C. δν έγω αὐ οἶμαι. Supply τρόπον έλέγχου εἶναι, and comp. 473, C, 508, B.

D. $\sigma \dot{v} \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \hat{i} \delta \dot{v} \tau \epsilon \epsilon \dot{v} a.$ olov is neuter, and $\epsilon \dot{v} a i$ is to be taken with $\mu a \kappa \dot{a} \rho \iota o \nu$ $\ddot{a} \nu \delta \rho a$; another $\epsilon \dot{v} a \iota$ being understood, unless we say that the one in the text by brachylogy performs a double part. Comp. Repub. 486, A: olov $\tau \epsilon$ of $\epsilon \iota$ $\tau o \dot{\tau} \sigma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma a \tau \iota \delta \sigma \kappa \epsilon \hat{v} \epsilon \dot{i} \nu a \iota \tau \delta \nu \dot{a} \nu \rho \dot{\rho} \omega \pi \iota \nu \sigma \rho \delta (\sigma \iota - - - - \vec{a} \lambda \lambda \sigma \tau \iota . . . \delta \iota a \nu \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma a; shall we not suppose that you think so? For$ $the genitive absolute with <math>\dot{\omega} s$, after a verb of knowing, comp. Soph. § 192, N. 2; Mt. § 569. 5; K. § 312, R. 12; Cr. § 640. — $\dot{a} \rho a$ interrogative is sometimes found out of its usual place at the beginning of the sentence, like other words of the same class. It is, however, before the most important clause. Comp. 476, A.

A. $\dot{\upsilon}_{\pi\dot{\upsilon}} \partial \epsilon_{\hat{\omega}\nu}$. $\dot{\upsilon}_{\pi\dot{\upsilon}}$ is used because τυγχάνη δίκης con-473 tains a passive idea = κολάζηται.

B. $d\lambda\eta\theta\eta$... ĭσωs. Hoc ĭσωs eum irrisione dictum de re certa ut Lat. fortasse. Stallb. — $d\lambda\lambda$ ' ἔτι τοῦτ'... χαλεπώτερον alludes to 470, C, χαλεπών γέ σε ἐλέγξαι, and is ironical.

C. $\epsilon \kappa \tau \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \tau a \iota$, exscetur. Ast. — $\tau o \delta s a \delta \tau o \delta \epsilon \pi \iota \delta \delta \nu \pi a \delta \delta a s$. Supply $\lambda \omega \beta \eta \theta \epsilon \nu \tau a s$. $\epsilon \pi \iota \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$ (to look upon, to live to see), "ponitur semper in rebus gravioribus, et $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \nu \mu \phi o \rho a s$ ut ait Thomas Magister, p. 335." Wyttenbach on Plut. de sera num. vindict., p. 17, referred to by Heindorf and others. Not semper, but sape. We have, for instance, Eurip. Med. 1025, $\pi \rho \iota \nu \sigma \phi \phi \nu \delta \nu \sigma \sigma \theta a \iota \kappa \delta \pi \iota \delta \delta \iota \nu \epsilon \upsilon \delta a \iota \mu \rho \nu a s$; Plut. Pelopid. § 34, $\Delta \iota a \gamma \delta \rho a \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \delta \delta \nu \tau a \nu \iota \delta \nu s$ or $\epsilon \epsilon \delta \delta a \mu \rho \nu \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho s \epsilon \sigma \tau a .$ The compar. here has far less authority in its favor than the superl.; and quite a number of MSS. have $\epsilon \upsilon \delta a \iota \mu \omega \nu$. Stallb. inclines to the superl., but no sure example has been adduced of this degree used for the compara-

473, C.]

tive and followed by $\tilde{\eta}$. — $\kappa a \tilde{\iota} \tau \tilde{\omega} v \tilde{a} \lambda \omega v \xi \tilde{\epsilon} v \omega v$, and by strangers besides, or and by the rest of men, viz. strangers. This seemingly pleonastic use of $\tilde{a} \lambda \lambda os$ is quite common. Comp. 480, D; Phædo, 110, E, $\gamma \hat{\eta}$ κa $\tau \sigma \tilde{s} \tilde{a} \lambda \lambda \sigma s \tilde{s} \tilde{\omega} \sigma s$; Leg. 7. 789, D, $\kappa a \lambda \lambda \sigma s \kappa a \tau \tau n v \tilde{a} \lambda \lambda \eta v \rho \omega \eta v$; Xen. Cyrop. 7. 3, $\beta \sigma \tilde{v} s \kappa a \tilde{i} \pi \sigma \sigma s \ldots \kappa a \tilde{a} \lambda \lambda a \pi \rho \delta \beta \sigma \pi a \sigma \lambda \lambda \delta a$.

D. $\mu \rho \rho \mu \rho \lambda \dot{\nu} \tau \tau \epsilon a \dot{v}$, etc., you are this time bringing up bugbears, and not attempting a refutation; and just now you were bringing up witnesses. Socrates is making game of the rhetorical substitutes for philosophical proof used by Polus. For $a\rho\tau i \delta \dot{\epsilon} \, \dot{\epsilon} \, \mu a \rho \tau \dot{\nu} \rho o \nu$, comp. 470, D, 472, A, to which places there is a reference. — $\delta \nu o \hat{\nu} \, \gamma \dot{a} \rho \, \dot{a} \partial \lambda i o \nu$. Supply obdérepos.

E. άλλο αὐ τοῦτο είδος ελέγχου. This may allude to a 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." ---- Kai πέρυσι βουλεύειν λαχών ... οὐκ ἠπιστάμην ἐπιψηφίζειν. 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. 472, 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.

A. $\delta\pi\epsilon\rho \ \nu\bar{\nu}\nu \ \delta\eta \ \epsilon\gamma\omega \ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\sigma\nu$ is to be taken with $\epsilon\mu\sigma$...474 $\pi\alpha\rho\Delta\sigma$, as I was saying just now, hand over the proof to me in my turn. He refers to 472, C.

D. $\tau i \ \delta \epsilon \ \tau \delta \delta \epsilon$; intellige $\lambda \epsilon' \gamma \epsilon \iota s$. Stallb. —— $\epsilon \iota s \ o \iota \delta \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ $a \pi \sigma \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega \nu$, etc. Do you call beautiful things in general 474, D.]

NOTES.

($\tau \lambda \kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha$) beautiful in each instance without having reference to anything further? i. e. do you consider beauty a fundamental quality, or resolve it into something else? $----\pi \rho \delta s \delta \alpha \nu$. These words down to $\tau o \tilde{v} \tau o$ are epexegetical of the preceding clause.

E. $\kappa a i \mu j \nu \tau a \gamma \epsilon \ldots a \mu \phi \delta \tau \epsilon \rho a$. In this sentence, Ast wishes to write $\kappa a \lambda a$ without the article, thus making it a predicate. $\tau a \kappa a \lambda a$ is added by way of explanation. $\tau a \kappa a \tau a \ldots \nu \delta \mu o v s = o i \nu \delta \mu o u$. 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.

475 A. τὸ τῶν μαθημάτων κάλλος ὡσαύτως. Supply ἔχει. καλῶς... ὁρίζει. This conveys a bitter satire of Polus, who by pleasure and the good meant the same thing. οὐκοῦν τὸ αἰσχρὸν τῷ ἐναντίῳ, i. e. οὐκοῦν καλῶς ὁρίζομαι, τῷ ἐναντίῷ ὁριζόμενος τὸ αἰσχρόν.

B. οὐ καὶ τοῦτο ἀνάγκη; frequens apud Plat. dictio pro quâ quis expectet οὐ καὶ τοῦτο ἀναγκαῖον; infra, p. 499, B, οὐ ταῦτα ἀνάγκη. Stallb.

- C. οὐκοῦν τῷ ἐτέρῷ λείπεται, sc. ὑπερβάλλειν αὐτό.
- D. ἀντὶ τοῦ ἦττον, sc. κακοῦ καὶ αἰσχροῦ.

E. For $\pi a \rho \epsilon \chi \omega \nu$, see 456, B. — $\delta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi o s \dots \delta \delta \delta \nu \epsilon \delta \epsilon \nu$, my mode of proof when put by the side of your mode of proof is quite unlike it.

476 A. σκεψώμεθα, σκοπώμεθα. The present imperative, and the subjunctive 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 believe, by Elmsley), that in the present and imperfect the Attics say σκοπῶ, ἐσκόπουν, or σκοποῦμαι, ἐσκοπούμην, but not σκέπτομαι, ἐσκεπτόμην. There is only one instance of σκέπτομαι in Plato to very many of σκοπῶ. On the con-

trary, they never use $\sigma \kappa o \pi \hat{\omega}$ in the future, aorist, or perfect.

B. διασκεψάμενος, after careful consideration. — δρα τοῦτο πάσχον, sc. ἐστί, or better, ἀνάγκη τοῦτο πάσχον εἶναι (i. e. πάσχειν), τοῦτο being the object. The participle is used to continue the form of the preceding discourse.

C. The Attic form $\kappa \dot{a}\omega$ is justly preferred by all modern editors to $\kappa \dot{a}\omega$, having, as it does, the support of several MSS.

D. $\tau \circ \dot{\tau} \omega \nu \delta \dot{\eta} \delta \mu \circ \lambda \circ \gamma \circ \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu$. The participle is properly in the present, as the clause may be resolved into $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta} \tau a \hat{\iota} \theta' \delta \mu \circ \lambda \circ \gamma \circ \hat{\iota} \mu \epsilon \nu$.

A. $\delta \rho a \quad \vec{\eta} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \quad \epsilon \gamma \omega \quad \upsilon \pi \circ \lambda a \mu \beta \dot{a} \nu \omega \quad \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \dot{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \pi a \iota$, to be taken with its cognate noun, and for the place of $\omega \phi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon a \nu$ in the sentence, comp. Soph. § 151, Rem. 7; K. § 332.8; Cr. § 522.

B. ἐν χρημάτων κατασκευῆ ἀνθρώπου, in the condition of a man's property. So Schleierm. Comp. Repub. 544, E, ai τῶν ἰδιωτῶν κατασκευαὶ τῆς ψυχῆς, and 449, A, περὶ ἰδιωτῶν ψυχῆς τρόπου κατασκευήν. Ast, in his translation, joins ἀνθρώπου with κακίαν.

C. $d\epsilon i \tau \delta a i\sigma \chi \iota \sigma \tau \sigma v$, 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 καλός, ai- $\sigma \chi \rho \delta s$, preserve the same sense throughout the discussion, and there seems to be no fit word except ugly by which to translate the latter of the two. And yet ugly will not bear to be used in as wide an extent as $a i \sigma \chi \rho \delta s$. $d \gamma a \theta \delta s$, κακόs, denote the relation of anything to our well-being, especially to future and ultimate well-being as opposed to pleasure in the present time.

D. οὐκοῦν η ἀνιαρότατόν, etc. Therefore it is either most unpleasant, and the ugliest of them because it exceeds

(them) in unpleasantness, or (it is so because it exceeds them) in hurtfulness, or in both. $\tau \circ i \tau \omega \nu$ refers to the two $\pi \circ \nu \eta$ plai of soul and body. $\longrightarrow i \pi \epsilon \rho \phi \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \tau \iota \nu \ldots \dot{\omega} s \mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \beta \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \eta$, by some extraordinarily great harm. This may be explained as a confusio duarum locutionum, $i \pi \epsilon \rho \phi \nu \epsilon \hat{s} \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu \dot{\omega} s$ $\mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \beta \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \eta$, it is astonishing by how great a harm, and $i \pi \epsilon \rho \phi \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \tau \iota \nu \iota \beta \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \eta$, by some astonishing harm. The common formula $i \pi \epsilon \rho \phi \nu \omega \hat{s}$, $\theta a \nu \mu a \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \hat{s}$, with an adjective, can be explained in the same way, or by an attraction by which the adjectives $i \pi \epsilon \rho \phi \nu \epsilon \hat{s}$, $\theta a \nu \mu a \sigma \tau \delta \nu (\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu)$ are changed in their form by the relative adverb.

E. $d\pi a\lambda\lambda \dot{a}\tau\tau\epsilon\iota$. This means no more than "has a tendency 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.

478 A. εἰ μὴ οῦτως εὐπορεῖς, if on this view of the subject you are not prepared to answer.

C. $d\pi a\lambda\lambda \dot{a}\tau\tau\epsilon\tau a$. The subject is to be found in of ia- $\tau\rho\epsilon v \dot{a}\mu\epsilon v o \iota$, such as are under cure, which, being indefinite, readily gives place to a singular. — $ia\tau\rho\epsilon v \dot{a}\mu\epsilon v o s$ is added to explain $o \tilde{v}\tau \omega s$. — $d\rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$, omnino, used chiefly with negatives. Comp. Soph. Antig. 92. — $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu d\rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$, the not even possessing it at all.

D. *λατρική γίγνεται πονηρίας ή δίκη*. Hoc dictum multorum imitatione celebratum esse docuit Wyttenbach. ad Plutarch. de sera numinis vindicta, p. 23. Stallb.

E. obros d' $\eta \nu$, but this was, i. e. this is, as we proved, he who, etc.

479 A. διαπράξηται ώστε. This verb and ἐκπράσσω are often followed by ὥστε before an infinitive. Comp. Soph. Antig. 303. Eurip. Alcest. 298. — ὥσπερ ἁν εἴ τις. In phrases like this, an apodosis to which åν belongs is to be supplied:

here διαπράξαιτο is to be repeated. A little below ώσπερανεί παῖς == ὥσπερ φοβοῖτο ἂν εἰ παῖς εἴη.

B. $\tau \delta d\lambda \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \nu$ $a \delta \tau \sigma \tilde{\nu} \kappa a \delta \rho \rho \tilde{\mu} \nu$ is added to explain $\tau \sigma \iota \sigma \tilde{\nu} \tau \tau \iota$. $\tau \delta \nu \tau \iota$. $a \delta \tau \sigma \tilde{\nu}$ refers to $\delta (\kappa \eta \nu \delta \iota \delta \delta \nu a \iota$, implied in $\delta (\kappa \eta \nu$, just above. — $\mu \eta$ $\delta \gamma \iota \sigma \tilde{\nu}$ $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau \sigma s$ stands, with a brevity which is not uncommon in comparisons, for $\tau \sigma \tilde{\nu} \sigma \sigma \nu \nu \sigma \iota \kappa \tilde{\epsilon} \nu$ $\mu \eta$ $\delta \gamma \iota \epsilon \tilde{\iota}$ $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau \iota$, in order to prevent the repetition of $\sigma \nu \nu \sigma \iota \kappa \tilde{\epsilon} \nu$. Comp. 455, E, note; Soph. Antig. 75; and Soph. § 186, N. 1; K. § 323, R. 6; Cr. § 461, R. 2.

C. $\pi a \rho a \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu a \zeta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \iota$. This verb can be followed by an accusative, and by a clause beginning with $\delta \pi \omega s$. The two constructions are here united. --- $\delta \pi \omega s ~ \delta \nu ~ \delta \sigma \iota \nu$, the means whereby they may be. --- $\sigma \nu \mu \beta a \ell \nu \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon \gamma \iota \sigma \tau \sigma \nu \kappa a \kappa \delta \nu$. This verb may be united with the participle or infinitive of $\epsilon \iota \mu \iota$, or with a simple predicate, as here. Comp. Soph. Electr. **261**; note in my ed.

E. $\tau \delta \nu$ $\delta \delta \kappa \delta \delta \nu \tau a$... $\delta \delta \delta \delta \nu \tau a$, the one who, though he commits the greatest wrongs, suffers no punishment for them. — $\phi a \delta \nu \epsilon \tau a$, sc. $\delta \pi a \delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon$

A. $a\dot{v}\tau\dot{\delta}\nu$ is $i\omega\tau\dot{\delta}\nu\ldots\phi\nu\dot{\delta}\tau\tau\epsilon\iota\nu$, etc. For one needs to keep 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 $\phi\nu\lambda\dot{\alpha}\tau\tau\epsilon\iota\nu$ is $\tau\iota\nu\dot{\alpha}$, with which $a\dot{\nu}\tau\dot{\delta}\nu$ is to be joined; and the same omission of the indefinite subject occurs a few lines below. -- $\delta\tau\omega\rho$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ doix $\dot{\eta}\sigma\mu$. One MS. has $d\partial_{i\kappa}\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota$, and one other $\pi\sigma\iota\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota$, just below. The old doctrine of Dawes, that $\delta\pi\omega\rho\mu\dot{\eta}$ 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. $\hat{\eta} \pi \hat{\omega}_s \lambda_{\epsilon \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu}$. $\lambda_{\epsilon \gamma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu}$, which Bekker prefers, would be equally good here. Comp. $\tau i \ \phi \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$, just below. The difference is, that $\pi \hat{\omega}_s \ \lambda_{\epsilon \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu} = what$ is our opinion? $\pi \hat{\omega}_s \lambda_{\epsilon \gamma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu}$, what shall we say? what ought to be our opinion? what have we good reason to believe?

C. ei µì ei. "Sometimes a second ei follows ei µí, as in Latin nisi si." Mt. § 617. d; K. § 340, R. 5; Cr. § 667. 2. Stallb., on Sympos. 205, E, says : "Alterum el rem magis etiam reddit incertam, ut quod exceptioni conditionem adjiciat." --- ent rouvavriov. According to Stallb., χρήσιμον είναι is here to be supplied, and the clause κατηγοpeir deir, being explanatory of roirartion, follows without a copula. But this view of the construction overlooks $\delta \epsilon i v$. It may explained by supplying ou xphothos ... huiv again in thought with el µή τις, etc., or in other words, Plato, studious of brevity, proceeds as if he had forgotten all of the sentence preceding où xpήσιμos. 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. ---- os av àcí. Here dci = at any time. — $d\lambda\lambda a$ παρέχειν μύσαντα, etc., but to give himself up, with his eyes closed and manfully, as to a physician, etc. μύσαντα 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. $\sigma ot \, \delta \mu o \lambda o \gamma \epsilon i r a u$. Heindorf and Coray would exclude σot 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. — roivarriov, 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-

pelled to admit. The parenthesis day μώνον ... εὐλαβητέον, 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. ---- μεταβαλόντα, mutata ratione, vicissim. Comp. μεταστρέψας, 456, E. It agrees with the subject of $\pi_{0i\epsilon i\nu}$. The abundance of words to denote opposition is worthy of notice : rodvartion, av, and this participle. ---- έαν δέ άλλον, etc. δέ often resumes the subject after a parenthesis. The sense of the first part of this sentence is as follows: But on the other hand, 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. $d\nu\alpha\lambda i\sigma\kappa\eta\tau\alpha\iota$. This, according to Coray, is an iso-481 lated instance of the middle of $d\nu\alpha\lambda i\sigma\kappa\omega$ used as the active, and to be altered into $d\nu\alpha\lambda i\sigma\kappa\eta$. This word and $d\pi\sigma\delta\iota\delta\varphi$ are in a different tense from the aorists preceding, as containing the signification of continuance, which, however, rather belongs to $\mu\eta$ $d\pi\sigma\delta\iota\delta\varphi$ taken together than to the verb in itself.

C. $\nu\eta$ τούς θεούς άλλά. Comp. 466, C, note. — πότερόν σε φώμεν... σπουδάζοντα. For verbs meaning to speak construed with a participle, see Mt. § 555, Obs. 2. — εἰ uή τι ην, 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

481, C.]

NOTES.

of mind), but each of us had a peculiar state of mind different from what the rest of mankind had, it would not be easy to manifest your own state of mind to another.

D. "διον η. This construction with η, which belongs to άλλος, evartios, and similar words, is adopted here by ίδιος, on account of the notion of difference implied in it. $---\pi\epsilon$ πουθότες. Soph. § 137, N. 6; Cr. § 337. a; K. § 241, R. 8. Then follows ipavre, because dio renders the duality of the persons more striking. ---- 'Αλκιβιάδου. 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. ---- τοῦ Πυριλάμπουs, 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 picturegallery 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 of this dialogue): καὶ νη Δί ην ίδη γέ που γεγραμμένον τον Πυριλάμπους έν θύρα Δημον καλόν, ίων παρέγραψε πλησίον, "Kyµòs καλός," i. e. where he finds written $\Delta \bar{\eta} \mu os$ καλός, "Demus is beautiful," he writes close by it, "Kyµds" - the toppiece 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 embassies 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." ---- ὅτι...οὐ δυναμένου. There is here a confusion of two expressions, or ... Súvada, and Suvapévou, without or, construed with oov. or thus becomes idle.

A. $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \, \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu \, \pi a \iota \delta \iota \kappa \tilde{\omega} \nu$. The latter word could have an 482 honest sense. --- $\epsilon \mu \pi \lambda \eta \kappa \tau \sigma s$, fickle. It has this sense in Lysis, 214, C (where it is joined to $d\sigma \tau a \theta \mu \eta \tau \sigma s$), Soph. Ajax, 1358, and elsewhere.

B. $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \nu \eta \nu \epsilon \xi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \xi \circ \nu \ldots \omega s$, refute her (philosophy) and show that. See 467, A.

C. $\delta \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon s$. 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 general 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. $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma \delta \rho os$ (comp. $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma \delta \rho \kappa \delta$, 482, E)

means one who, like a popular speaker, gains his ends by sophistry and pretence of honesty. —— $\tau a \vartheta \tau \delta \nu \pi a \theta \delta \nu \tau os$ furnishes the ground or else the occasion why Socrates indulged in this spirit.

D. $\delta \tau \iota$ dyavaktoiev $\delta \nu$, $\epsilon \iota$ $\tau \iota s \mu \dot{\eta} \phi a \iota \eta$, because they would be displeased if any one were to refuse. Without $\delta \nu$ the sense would be, they were displeased. With $\delta \nu$, the verb, if put into oratio recta, would be in the optative; without $\delta \nu$, in the indicative. Comp. 461, A.

E. $\sigma \vartheta \gamma \partial \rho \tau \varphi \ \tilde{\sigma} \nu \tau \iota$, $\tilde{\omega} \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon s$, etc. For, O Socrates, 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 $\phi o \rho \tau \iota \kappa \dot{a}$, comp. Mitchell on Aristoph. Wasps, 66. It may be translated, also, disagreeable, disgusting. Schol. $\phi o \rho \tau \iota \kappa \dot{a} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \tau \dot{a} \beta \dot{a} \rho o s \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi o \iota \partial \nu \tau \sigma \dot{a}$, and so Ast, Stallb. It is joined with $\delta \iota \kappa a \nu \iota \kappa \dot{a}$, in the style of pleadings, in Plat. Apol. Socr. 32, A. $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma o \rho \iota \kappa \dot{a}$, Schol. $\tau \dot{a} \pi \rho \dot{\delta} s \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \omega \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu \beta \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \pi o \nu \tau a$ $<math>\delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon}$ is rarely found after the third word of the clause. Here, however, $\dot{\omega} s \tau$. π . are in a manner one word. See Poppo's note on $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \sigma \tilde{i} s \pi \rho \tilde{\omega} \tau o \dot{\epsilon}$, Thucyd. 1. 6.

483 A. τοῦτο τὸ σοφὸν is in apposition with its relative, being added to explain it. — κακουργεῖs ἐν τοῖs λόγοιs, you deal unfairly in your discussions. — ὑπερωτῶν, 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. — Πώλου τὸ κατὰ νόμον αἴσχιον, etc., literally, when Polus spoke 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 τὸ κατὰ νόμον and κατὰ φύσιν, 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, $\delta\iota\omega\kappa$. $\kappa\alpha\tau\dot{a}\ \nu\dot{o}\mu\sigma\nu$, comp. Repub. 5. 454, B, $\kappa\alpha\tau\dot{a}\ \tau\dot{o}\ \delta\nu\sigma\mu\alpha\ \delta\iota\dot{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$, to pursue an inquiry according to the letter, and not the idea. For $i\delta\iota\dot{\omega}\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilons$ (which Elmsley on Medea, 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 on Antigone, 1096, second edition. -- $\tau\dot{o}\ d\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. $o\information$, though in no MS., is added before $\tau\dot{o}$ by several editors, and assists the sense; though without it $d\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (a part) may be regarded as added in apposition, to explain $\pi\hat{a}\nu$ (the general idea). Being pronounced by the scribes like the ending $\iotao\nu$ of $\kappa\dot{\alpha}\kappa\iotao\nu$, oliov might easily be absorbed by that word.

B. οί τιθέμενοι τούς νόμους. See 488, D.

C. $\epsilon_{\kappa\phi\rho\beta\sigma\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma}$. 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 follows is an illustration of the foregoing. — $d\gamma a\pi\omega\sigma\iota \gamma d\rho$, etc. For they are contented if they are put on an equality when they are inferior. — $\dot{\eta} \dots \dot{\eta} \omega \sigma\iota$. Stallb. observes, that $\delta_{\mu}a\iota$ is sometimes interposed between a noun and its article or preposition.

D. $\delta\eta\lambda o\hat{i}$. Not $\phi i\sigma is \delta\eta\lambda o\hat{i}$, but $\tau a \partial \tau a \delta\eta\lambda o\hat{i}$, 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.

E. κατὰ φύσιν τὴν τοῦ δικαίου. The three last words, though in all the MSS., are looked on by several editors as interpolated. Ast retains them, translating φύσιν δικαίου, not the nature of justice, but natural justice. He remarks, that a noun governing a genitive may sometimes be resolved into an adjective qualifying that genitive; and cites,

in his support, Aristoph. Plut. 268, $\& \chi\rho\nu\sigma\delta\nu \ d\gamma\gamma\epsiloni\lambda as \ ender$ $i. e. golden words; Phædrus, 275, A, <math>\sigma\sigma\phiias \ldots d\lambda i\beta\epsilon_{iar}$ $\pi\sigma\rhoi\zeta\epsilon_{is}$, true wisdom. — $\delta\nu \ i\mu\epsilon_{is} \tau_{i}\theta\epsilon_{\mu}\epsilon_{\theta}a \ \pi\lambda i\tau\tau\sigma\nu\tau\epsilon_{s}$, etc. 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 $\epsilon\kappa \ \nu\epsilon\omega\nu$ is like a number already noticed : the clause is epexegetical of the foregoing. See 450, B. $i\sigma\omega_s$ is used sarcastically, the thing being regarded as certain by Callicles.

484 A. $d\nu\eta\rho$, according to Stallb. and Ast, is here used unemphatically as a man, a person. If contempt were expressed, $d\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma\sigma$ would have been chosen, as in 518, C. —— $d\pi\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\dot{a}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\sigma$ contains a figure drawn from a horse throwing his rider. —— $\gamma\rho\dot{a}\mu\mu\alpha\tau a$, written ordinances. — $i\pi\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\dot{a}s$, etc. He rises upon us and turns out our master, —— this slave that was, i.e. this one whose spirit we had curbed by laws against nature. The aorists $d\nu\epsilon\phi\dot{a}\nu\eta$, $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\dot{\epsilon}$ $\lambda a\mu\psi\epsilon$, denote an action wholly indefinite in regard to time, and thus answer to $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{a}\nu \ \gamma\dot{\epsilon}\eta\tau a\iota$ in the protasis, instead of 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. $\nu \delta \mu \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{\nu} s$. 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 $\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \phi \dot{\nu} \sigma \iota \nu$, or something equivalent, belong to the passage ; $\phi \eta \sigma \iota \nu$, having the same sound, and almost the same letters, as $\phi \dot{\nu} \sigma \iota \nu$,

may have caused that word to be omitted. obros de di are interposed by Callicles. Something like this followed in Pindar: έπει Γηρυόνα βόας Κυκλωπίων έπι προθύρων Εύρυσθέος αναιτήτας (?) τε και απριάτας ήλασεν. Coray supposes 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 ayer δικαιών το βιαιότατον, according to Boeckh, is affert vim maximam, justam cam efficiens; i.e. law (the law of nature) makes use of might, and calls it right. "ayer and Sikarŵv have the same object. Socrates interprets äyer, 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 $\tau \delta \beta$. is treated as an adverbial phrase. But Aristides, by using the opposite phrase, ayer rà dikara πρεσβεύων, shows that to Biaiótatov is at least the object of Sikaiw. ---- τούτου refers forward to καὶ βοῦς . . . εἶναι.

C. The changes of number here are worthy of notice: $\tau_{15} \ldots \tilde{a}\psi\eta\tau a\iota, \ldots \tau \tilde{\omega}\nu \dot{a}\nu\theta\rho\dot{\omega}\pi\omega\nu, \ldots \epsilon\dot{c}\dot{d}\psi\eta\dot{s}\, \overset{2}{y}, \ldots \gamma\dot{i}\gamma\nu\rho\nu\tau a\iota.$ $-----\dot{\eta}\lambda\iota\kappa\dot{i}a$ de ætate juvenili intelligendum. Itaque $\pi \delta\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\omega$ $\tau\eta\dot{s}\,\dot{\eta}\lambda\iota\kappa\dot{i}as$ est ultra juventutem. Stallb. $\pi\delta\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\omega$ can take a genitive in two relations. 1. That of the thing from which one is far off; as, Phædrus, 238, D, $o\dot{c}\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\tau\iota \ \pi\delta\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\omega \ \delta\iota\theta\nu \rho\dot{a}\mu\beta\omega\nu \ \phi\theta\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\rho\mu a\iota, my words are not far from the style of$ dithyrambs. 2. That in respect of which one is far ad $vanced; as Symposium, 217, D, <math>\delta\iota\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\delta\mu\eta\nu \ \pi\delta\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\omega \ \tau \tilde{\omega}\nu \ \nu\nu \kappa\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$, I conversed to a late hour of the night; infra 486, A, $\pi\delta\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\omega \ d\dot{\epsilon}\iota \ \tau\eta s \ \phi\iota\lambda\sigma\sigma\phi\dot{\mu}as \ \epsilon\lambdaa\dot{\nu}\nu\nu\tau as, always pushing forwards$ in philosophy; and in the text the sense can be, to too latea period of his youth.

D. $\kappa a \lambda \delta s \kappa d \gamma a \theta \delta s d u \eta \rho$, 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 Theognis, p. 25. \cdots is $\sigma v \mu \beta o \lambda a loss, in stipulations, or busi$ ness transactions in general. The word denotes both private and public contracts, and treatics of commerce. $<math>\dot{\eta} \theta \hat{\omega} v$, characters.

E. To Toù 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. - iv avros avros, etc., where, i. e. in whatsoever, he happens to do his best, whereinsoever he most excels. One MS. only has *ruyxáve*, 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 av. 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 onou av. ---- For avros aύτοῦ, see Soph. § 144, N. 4, and § 232; and for βέλτιστος aύτοῦ, § 177, N. 5; 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. εἰνοία τŷ έαυτοῦ, out of regard to himself, through self-love. The genitive is objective, as is the possessive pronoun, 486, A, εἰνοία τŷ σŷ. — ὅσον παιδείας χάριν, just for the sake of education. — ὁμοιότατον πάσχω, I feel very

much the same thing. Το ὅμοιος, in the second clause, ὥσπερ succeeds, instead of ὅπερ or οἶον. Comp. Xen. Symposium, 4. 37, ὅμοιά μοι δοκοῦσι πάσχειν ὥσπερ εἶ τις πολλὰ ἐσθίων μηδέποτε ἐμπίπλαιτο, and 518, B.

D. έφη ό ποιητής, in Iliad, 9. 441.

E. iκανών, satisfactory, answerable to his powers, or to the expectations formed of him. $---\mu\eta\delta\epsilon'_{\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon}$. Heusdius $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon'_{\nu}$ excidisse suspicabatur. Sed vere monuit Boeckhius (in Plat. Minoem et Leges Comment. p. 112) sæpius ita τ_{ι} et $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon'_{\nu}$ omitti. Stallb. $----\epsilon'_{\pi\iota\epsilon\iota\kappa\omega}$ $\epsilon'_{\chi\omega}$ $\phi\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\omega$ s, am quite 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. --- μειρακιώδει ... μορφώματι, you strive to ornament a soul so nobly endowed by a puerile form, or outside. μορφώματι denotes external decoration; here, the musical and poetical pursuits of Amphion. - over av dikys, etc., nor in the counsels of 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. --- amayayou. The word points at the $d\pi a \gamma \omega \gamma \eta$ 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 $d\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon_{ia}$, 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

[485, A.

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. ---- addikeiv, says Stallb., accipiendum pro noing van. 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 : of 8' ήδικηκότες έκπριάμενοι τούς κατηγόρους ούδεν έδοξαν άδικείν. Αςcording 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, cited by Heindorf: άξιῶ δέ, ὡ βουλή, εἰ μὲν ἀδικῶ, μηδεμιῶs συγγνώμης τυγχάνειν, where one crime some time before committed is spoken of. The true explanation is, perhaps, that doix properly means, I am a wrongdoer, as well as I am doing wrong. But he is a wrongdoer who has done wrong.

B. κατηγόρου ... μοχθηροῦ, a very common and paltry sort of accuser ; referring to the accuser's standing in general. --- θανάτου . . . τιμασθαι, to lay his damages against 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. rupasdau, 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 Tupar. The defendant was said avTiτιμάσθαι, to estimate in his turn what ought to be the verdict, or inormandan, 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 ayoves runnoi, or those in which the laws had not settled the penalty, but left it to the judges. One of these was docfeea, for which Socrates was tried. On being found guilty, his inotiunua 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. $----\pi\epsilon\rho_{1\sigma\nu\lambda}\hat{a}\sigma\theta_{a\iota}, \zeta_{\eta\nu}^{2}$. These infinitives, as Stallb. remarks, depend on $\tilde{\epsilon}\theta_{\eta\kappa\epsilon}$, which is followed at first by a participle, $\delta_{\nu\nu\dot{a}\mu\epsilon\nu\nu\nu}$, added as a paraphrase of the poet's $\chi\epsilon_{i\rho\nu\nu\alpha}$, and then by an infinitive. $----d\tau\epsilon_{\chi\nu\omega\delta}$. See 491, A.

C. $\epsilon i \tau \kappa \alpha i d \gamma \rho o \kappa \delta \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$. See 509, A, note. — $\epsilon n i \kappa \delta \rho \delta \rho s \tau v \pi \tau \epsilon u \nu$, 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. — $\pi \rho a - \gamma \mu \delta \tau \omega \nu \cdot \cdot \cdot \epsilon \delta \mu o \nu \sigma \delta a \nu$. 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.

D. $d\gamma u \theta d$. A. Gellius (10. 22) has quoted the passage from $\phi \iota \lambda o \sigma o \phi \iota a \gamma d \rho$, 484, C, to this place, but misapprehends its import. $---- \tau \eta \nu d \rho \iota \sigma \tau \eta \nu$ is in opposition to $\tau \iota \nu a \tau \partial \nu \lambda \iota \theta \omega \nu$. Just above we should expect a is $\beta a \sigma a \nu \iota \zeta \sigma \upsilon \sigma$ for η , referring to $\tau \circ \upsilon \tau \sigma \nu \tau \partial \nu \lambda \iota \theta \omega \nu$; but η comes from Plato's having $\tau \iota \nu a$ $\lambda \iota \theta \sigma \nu$ in his mind. $---- \pi \rho \sigma \sigma a \gamma a \gamma \omega \nu$, admovens, 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 color. The order here is, $\pi \rho \delta s \eta \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma a \gamma a \gamma \delta \nu a \delta \tau \eta \nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \rho \nu \epsilon \tilde{\upsilon} \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \sigma \sigma \theta a \epsilon \tilde{\iota}$. 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. $a\nu = a$ $a\nu$. $---- a\nu\tau a$ $\tau a\lambda\eta\theta\eta$, true in themselves, or the very truth.

A. $\psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s \pi \epsilon \rho \ldots \mu \eta$, as to the soul's living rightly and 487 the opposite.

B. $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \tau \hat{o} \hat{v} \delta \hat{\epsilon} o \tau \hat{o} \hat{s} - \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \hat{v}$ is often thus used with a comparative instead of a positive; and in the same way $\pi \hat{\epsilon} \rho a$, 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. —— $i\pi\eta\kappa\sigma\sigma\sigma a$. So Bekker, Ast, and others, with most MSS. Stallb. prefers $i\pi\eta\kappa\sigma\sigma\sigma a$, I overheard. (This he retracts in his second edition.)

D. εὐλαβεῖσθαι ... διαφθαρέντες. Strikingly like Ecclesiastes vii. 16: "Neither make thyself overwise. Why shouldst thou destroy thyself?"

E. $\delta\eta\lambda\rho\nu$ $\delta\tau\iota$ are often interposed in the middle of a sentence, without having an effect on the construction. And so $\delta^{i}\sigma\theta'$ $\delta\tau\iota$. — $\tau\epsilon\lambda\rhos$ $\tau\eta s$ $d\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota as$, de veritate perfecta et consummata accipio. Heindorf. — $\tau\delta\nu$ $d\nu\delta\rhoa$, i. e. mankind. The article is used because $d\nu\eta\rho$ has its widest generic sense, and thus forms a definite whole.

488 A. εὖ ἴσθι τοῦτο ὅτι. τοῦτο traxerim ad ἐξαμαρτάνω. Nam Demostheni familiaris formula εὖ ἴσθι τοῦθ' ὅτι, Platoni, quod sciam, non item. Heindorf.

B. $a_{\gamma\epsilon\nu}$. See 484, B, note. If $a_{\gamma\epsilon\nu}$ is there correctly explained by Boeckh, we must suppose that Socrates plays upon the word, without essentially injuring the sense of the passage from Pindar.

C. $d\kappa\rhoo\hat{a}\sigma\theta u$, obedire, like $d\kappao\dot{\epsilon}uv$. — $\tau \dot{\sigma}\tau\epsilon$, i. e. antea, quum de his rebus disputares. Sic $\tau \dot{\sigma}\tau\epsilon$ passim ponitur. Stallb. — $\tau i \pi \sigma \tau\epsilon \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota s$. The present embraces the whole time of the present discussion. Hence it is here for $\ddot{\epsilon}\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon s$.

D. of $\delta\eta$ κai , 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 $\gamma d\rho$. $\tau i \theta \epsilon \mu ai$ $\nu \delta \mu o \nu$ is used of a people, or one empowered by them, making laws, the maker being one of the party

to be governed; $\tau l \theta \eta \mu \iota \nu \delta \mu \rho \nu$, of a sovereign or a divine law giver.

B. κινδυνεύεις οὐκ ἀληθῆ λέγειν, it seems that you were not speaking the truth; for λέγειν is the infinitive of the imperfect. <u>â...</u> ά... κακουργῶ. He quotes what Callieles said, 483, A. <u>bνόματα θηρεύων</u>, verba aucupans. Comp. 490, A. The same metaphor is seen in our word captious. <u>bήματι άμαρτεῖν</u>, to use a wrong expression.

C. $\hat{\eta}$ of $\epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon' \gamma \epsilon \nu$, 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 $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ log $\chi v \rho (\sigma a \sigma \theta a)$ 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 Cass. 44, p. 406, Reimar : $\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \delta \nu i \sigma \chi v \rho i \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \lambda \beta \eta \nu a$, difficile est corpore esse valido, et animo prudenti. $\phi \tilde{\omega} \sigma \nu$ must be taken absolutely, without an object, in the sense of decreeing, determining, but with contemptuous disparagement; unless we read, with Heindorf, ärra for avrá. And avrà $\tau a \tilde{v} \tau a$ refers to the edicts implied in $\phi \tilde{\omega} \sigma \nu$.

D. $\tau \circ i s \delta i \circ \ldots \tau \circ i i s \delta s$. As the numerals are opposed to one another, they have a certain definiteness. Hence the article. So $\tau a \delta i \circ \mu \epsilon \rho \eta$, sc. out of three, two thirds. Comp. Cr. § 483. $\tau i \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota s \tau \circ i s \beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i \circ v s$ is as legitimate an expression as $\tau i v a s \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon$, which Routh wished to put into its place.

E. προδίδασκε. Schol. περιττεύει ή πρόθεσιs 'Αττικώs. I believe that in προδίδασκειν, προμανθάνειν (Aristoph. Clouds, 476, 966), πρὸ 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 ἀποφοιτήσω. — οὐ μὰ τὸν Ζῆθον. Comp. 485, E. Most MSS. want οἰ, which, however, is necessary here, for although μà is almost confined to oaths expressly or impliedly negative, it is in itself merely affirmative, being connected, perhaps, in origin with μήν, μέν. — ῷ σὺ χρώμενος, etc., whose words you used of me just now with much raillery. — ὀνόματα λέγεις, you utter mere words.

490 B. πολλοι άθρόοι, multi simul. Sæpenumero sic junguntur. Stallb.

C. $\hat{\eta}$ οἶν τούτων τῶν σιτίων, 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. $---\epsilon i \mu \hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i (\eta \mu ι ο \hat{\upsilon} \sigma \theta \alpha i, unless he intends to pay the$ $penalty (by making himself ill). <math>---- \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \chi_{i} \sigma \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega}$ $\beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i \sigma \tau \omega$. Supply $\epsilon \kappa \tau \epsilon \sigma \nu$.

D. $\pi o i \omega v i \mu a \tau i \omega v$; sc. $\delta \epsilon i a \dot{v} \tau \delta v \pi \lambda \dot{\epsilon} o v \, \xi \chi \epsilon \iota v$. $\pi o \hat{\epsilon} o s$ is often used in questions conveying wonder, indignation, or contempt. Aristoph. Clouds, 366, 'O Ze $\dot{v}s$. . . $o\dot{v} \, \theta \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} s \, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota v$; | $\pi o \hat{\epsilon} o s Z \epsilon \dot{v}s$; $o\dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta} \, \lambda \eta \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$; $o\dot{v} \delta' \, \ddot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota Z \epsilon \dot{v}s$. Just below we have $\pi o \hat{\epsilon} a \, \dot{v} \pi o \delta \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a$. . $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \omega v$; what shoes are you talking nonsense about? $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \omega v$ here takes an accusative, unless we write $\pi o \hat{\epsilon} a \, \dot{v} \pi o \delta \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a$; $\phi \lambda v a \rho \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} s \, \dot{\epsilon} \chi \omega v$. Of this last phrase 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.

E. ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν. Comp. Xen. Mem. 4. 4. 6, ἑ δέ γε ταύτου δεινότερον, ἔψη, ὡ Ἱππία, οὐ μόνον ἀεὶ τὰ αὐτὰ λέγω, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν · σῦ δ' ἴσως, διὰ τὸ πολυμαθής εἶναι, περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν οὐδέποτε τὰ αὐτὰ λέγεις.

A. arexvŵs, 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 has the acute accent. —— $\dot{a}\epsilon \dot{i} \dots \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \nu \dots o \dot{v} \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi a \dot{v} \epsilon \iota$. $\dot{a}\epsilon \dot{i}$ is joined thus redundantly with oùder παύομαι 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, Ε. --- περί τίνων . . . πλέον έχων. Heind. remarks that περί τι, not περί τινος, is the usual formula with $\pi\lambda$ iov $\xi\chi\epsilon_{i\nu}$. — To's $\kappa_{\rho\epsilon}$ it to us of ϵ iou, etc., by the better, namely, by who they are I do not mean, etc. of elow dictum est cum abundantia quadam qualem Callicles in hac oratione sectatur passim. Poterat enim omitti. Stallb.

B. For $\kappa \alpha \tau \eta \gamma o \rho \epsilon \tilde{\nu}$ with the genitive of the person, see Soph. § 183. 2 (§ 194, N. 3).

D. $\tau i \ \delta \epsilon_j \ldots \delta \rho \chi o \mu \epsilon \nu o v s$; The reading and pointing here are quite uncertain. The passage in brackets is omitted by Bekker, after one MS. It has the look of an explanation of $\tau i \ \delta \epsilon$. Nor does Socrates afterwards do anything with $\delta \rho \chi o \mu \epsilon \nu o v s$, while $\delta \rho \chi o \nu \tau a s$ is easily supplied with $a \delta \tau \delta \nu$. 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 second ed. is $a \delta \tau \delta \nu \ldots \tau i \ [\dagger \tau i] \ \delta \rho \chi o \nu \tau a s \ \dagger \ \delta \rho \chi o \mu \epsilon \nu o v s$; where τi is quaternus, qua in parte. But how can $\delta \rho \chi o \mu \epsilon \nu o v s$; where τi is quaternus, qua in parte. But how could he say quaternus sibimet ipsis imperantes unless he had already spoken of governing one's self. --- $\dagger \tau \sigma \delta \tau \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu o v \delta \epsilon v \delta \epsilon i$. $\delta \epsilon i$ sometimes takes an accusative of the thing, when that is a pronoun. 491, E.]

NOTES.

E. $\delta s \dot{\eta} \delta \dot{v} \epsilon \dot{i}$ answers nearly to the French comme vous $\hat{v} tes \ plaisant !$ how ridiculous or foolish you are ! $\gamma \lambda v \kappa \dot{v} s$ is used in the same way. $\longrightarrow \tau \sigma \dot{v} s \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \theta \dot{i} \sigma v s \dot{v} \dot{\tau} \sigma \dot{v} s$ $\phi \rho \sigma v as, you mean those fools the temperate.$ The one accusative is in apposition with the other; unless, with Stallb., we make $\tau \sigma \dot{v} s \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \theta \dot{i} \sigma v s$ 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 Socrates to the sophist Thrasymachus; "do you call justice (κακίαν) badness ?" "No," said he, "but (πάνυ γενναίαν εἰήθειαν) very noble folly." — πάνυ γε σφόδρα, sc. τοῦτο λέγειs.

492 Β. οίς ... ύπηρξεν ... υίέσιν είναι ή αυτούς ... ίκανούς. eivat 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. τί ... κάκιον είη, for τί αν ... κάκιον είη. Comp. τίς ... κατάσχοι, Soph. Antig. 605; Mt. § 515, Obs. aν may have dropped out here, as τi itself is wanting in ten MSS., both being absorbed, so to speak, by the last two syllables of δυναστείαν. ---- ois έξον, etc. A contracted expression for οί, έξον αὐτοῖς . . . aὐτοὶ ἐπαγάγοιντο, which is much the same as el, ¿Eòv autois, etc., if, when they had it in their power, ... they were themselves to introduce. Comp. Repub. 465, fin.: " Do you remember that some one reproved us, because we, in his opinion, made $(\pi o \iota o \tilde{\iota} \mu \epsilon \nu)$ our guards not happy, οίς έξον πάντα έχειν τα των πολιτων ούδεν έχοιεν, who, when they could possess everything belonging to the citizens, were to have nothing."

D. $\delta\mu\delta\theta\epsilon\nu \ \gamma\epsilon \ \pi\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$, undecunque, from obsol. $d\mu\deltas$, Attic $\delta\mu\deltas$, $= \tau \iota s$, whence $\mu\eta\delta a\mu\deltav$. This is Bekker's emendation of $\delta\lambda\lambda\delta\theta\epsilon\nu \ \pi\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$, which is evidently a false reading. $----\epsilon \ \epsilon \tau \iota \iota \mu \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$ is for $\epsilon \tau \iota \iota \mu a\sigma \tau \ \epsilon \sigma \iota$, which the construction of the first clause would require. With this infin. supply $\delta\epsilon \ i \nu$ involved in $\kappa\delta\lambda a\sigma \tau \ \epsilon \nu$.

E. $\delta s \gamma \epsilon \sigma \vartheta \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon s \ldots \delta \beta i os, such a life as you mention.$ — 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 $\kappa \dot{a} \tau \omega$ $\nu o \mu i \langle \epsilon \tau a \iota$. 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 $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, 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 $\sigma\eta\mu ai\nu\epsilon by$ 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 $(\sigma \omega \zeta \epsilon w)$ in it to atome for its crimes in an earlier state. This derivation, he says, would require no change of letter. The Pythagorean Philolaus (Boeckh'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 $\kappa a \theta a \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \nu \sigma a \mu a \tau \iota$." To this, and to the
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. — $\tau \hat{\eta} s \ \delta \hat{\epsilon} \ \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$, 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 $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$, when it is said that the part of the soul which contains the desires is moved this way and that by persuasion. — μυθολογῶν, 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 : Σικελός κομψός ἀνήρ ποτὶ τὰν ματέρ" ἔφα. — κομψός. On this word, Ruhnken (Timæus s. v.) says : κομψόν 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 contains something of irony. $---\pi a \rho \dot{a} \gamma \omega \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \dot{o} \nu \dot{o} \mu a \pi \iota$, making a change in the word, altering its sound a little.

B. των δ' ἀμυήτων, etc., and that that part of the soul of the uninitiated, where the desires reside, -- its incontinent and irretentive part, - he said that this was a cask with holes in it; making the comparison on account of its $d\pi\lambda\eta$ στία. ἀμυήτους, besides its similarity to ἀνοήτους, seems to have a double sense, uninitiated $(a, \mu v \epsilon i \nu)$ and not closing, unable to contain, as if from \dot{a} , $\mu \dot{v} \epsilon w$. The construction is completed by supplying ¿φη, suggested by ωνόμασε. αὐτοῦ 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 διà τὸ ἀκόλαστον, in which case αὐτοῦ would refer to τοῦτο τῆς yuxis. --- Touvartion and goi are to be joined, the opposite of what you have expressed. ---- to deedes by Neywy, meaning of course the invisible, i. e. the intellectual, as opposed to the material. Comp. Phædo 80, D, ý δέ ψυχή αρα, τὸ ἀειδές, τό είς τοιούτον έτερον τόπον οἰχόμενον. --- οῦτοι . . . κοσκίνω, 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.

192

C. $\tilde{a}\tau\epsilon$ où duvaµévnv, etc., on account, namely, of its inability to retain, through unbelief and forgetfulness. $d\pi\iota\sigma\tau i$ av alludes to $\pi i \theta ov. \longrightarrow \epsilon \pi\iota\epsilon \iota \kappa \hat{o}s$. Non explicaterim cum Heindorfio satis, admodum, sed habet vim affirmandi atque concedendi, ut Latinorum utique, sane quidem. Stallb. Ut candide loquar. Routh. $\longrightarrow \delta \pi \delta \tau \iota$, aliquatenus, quodammodo. Stallb. $\longrightarrow \delta \eta \lambda o \tilde{\iota} \mu \eta v$, 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. $\longrightarrow \mu \epsilon \tau a \delta \epsilon \sigma \theta a\iota$, sc. $\gamma v \omega \mu \eta v$ or $\psi \eta \phi o v$. The next words explain $\mu \epsilon \tau a - \delta \epsilon \sigma \theta a\iota$, and therefore have no need of $\kappa a \ell$, which is in some editions. Just below, $\mu \epsilon \tau a \tau i \delta \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi \omega$, p. 482, B. The sense is, And do you change your opinion, and say that, etc.

D. $\epsilon_{\kappa} \tau_0 \tilde{v}$ airoù yuµvaoiou $\tau_{\hat{\eta}}$ viv, from the same school with that just now, from some allegorizing sophist. For δ airòs followed by the dative, in brief phrases, see Soph. § 195, N. 3. — After olov supply $\lambda \epsilon_{\gamma o s}$ äv.

E. νάματα ... έκάστου τούτων, liquors belonging to, or put into, each of these tubs.

494 B. χαραδριοῦ. A bird, so called from the ravines and beds of torrents where it lives, of a yellowish color, and very voracious. äμα τῷ ἐσθίειν ἐκκρίνει, says the Schol. 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 ædicnemus or C. hiaticula of Linnæus. — τὸ τοιώνδε λέγεις, οἶον, do you allow that there is such a thing as.

C. λέγω, καὶ, etc. λέγω, to be repeated after καὶ in the

sense of speaking of, takes a personal object with which the participles agree. The sense is, Yes, 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 feeding them. - $\sigma_{\pi\omega\varsigma} \mu_{\eta}$, i. e. $\sigma_{\kappa\delta\pi\epsilon\iota} \sigma_{\pi\omega\varsigma} \mu_{\eta}$, as usual. $a\pi_{a\alpha\sigma\chi\nu\nu\epsilon\hat{\iota}}$ is used with allusion to what Callicles has said of the modesty of Gorgias and Polus, as in 489, A. - $\kappa\nu\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\nu\nu\delta_{\alpha\alpha\epsilon\lambda\sigma\hat{\nu}\nu\tau\alpha} \tau \delta\nu \beta_{i\sigma\nu}$ explains the preceding clause. Hence the asyndeton. - $\delta\eta\mu\eta\gamma\delta\rho\sigma$, coarse, vulgar.

D. $d \nu \delta \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota} s$ $\gamma a \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota}$. This alludes ironically to his definition of the $\beta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \lambda \tau_{1} \sigma \tau_{0} \iota$ as being the $d \nu \delta \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota} o \iota$ (491, C).

E. $\tau \dot{o} \dots \kappa \epsilon \phi \dot{a} \lambda a \iota ov$, id quod rerum hujus generis (i. e. turpissimarum) caput est. Ast. $\kappa \epsilon \phi \dot{a} \lambda a \iota ov$ is in apposition with $\delta \beta \iota os$. — $\dot{a} \iota \delta \eta v$, freely or openly.

A. ἀνομολογούμενος, inconsistent, disagreeing; from όμο-495
 λογούμενος, used as an adjective, and ἀ priv. — διαφθείρεις
 ... λόγους, you make what we have said before good for nothing.

B. καὶ γὰρ σύ. Well, what of that? For you do too,
i. e. παρὰ τὰ δοκοῦντα σαυτῷ λέγεις.

C. $\delta\iota\epsilon\lambda\delta\vartheta$ $\tau d\delta\epsilon$, etc. Explain the following. You mean something probably by $\epsilon \pi\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu\eta$ (certain knowledge), do you not? — $d\lambda\lambda\sigma\tau\iota$ $\delta^{2}\nu$, etc. Did you not accordingly, on the ground that knowledge was a different thing from manliness, speak of these as two? The allusion in this and the prior question is to 491, A, B. With $\tau\eta\nu$ $d\nu\delta\rho\epsilon da\nu$, $o\delta\sigma a\nu$ is to be supplied. The accus. absol. is often found without the participle of $\epsilon^{2}\mu\lambda$ expressed. Bekker, without . MS. authority, adds $\delta\nu$ after $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma\nu$, which is a very probable conjecture, as $\delta\nu$ may easily have been swallowed up by $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma\nu$. The participle $\delta\nu$ would be attracted in gender to the predicate.

D. $\delta' A \chi a \rho \nu \epsilon \nu s$. 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 $\theta \epsilon_{\nu}$ taken with the article.

496 A. περὶ ὅτου... ἀπολαβών, look at this with regard to any part of the body you please, taking it by itself, or separately. ---- ϕ , which disease, refers to νοσεῖν implied in νοσεῖ.

C. ύπερφυώς ώς. Comp. 447, D.

D. οἰκοῦν τούτου οῦ λέγεις, etc. In that of which you are speaking, the one part, viz. διψῶντα, being thirsty, is then feeling pain, is it not? He was speaking of διψῶντα πίνειν.

E. κατὰ τὸ πίνειν χαίρειν λέγεις; 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? — λυπούμενον; at the same time that the person feels pain? — εἶτε ψυχῆς εἶτε σώματος. Stallb. would read ψυχῆς πέρι. But there can be no objection to taking τόπον with the genitives; and χρόνον is excused by being in its company.

497 A. γίγνεται. See 525, E, note. — ἀκκίζει. Olymp. apud Stallb. προσποιῆ μωρίαν καὶ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι. Mœris defines ἀκκισμὸs as the Attic expression for προσποίησιs. From examples of the use of the word, its meaning evidently 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. θρύπτομαι has sometimes much the same sense, e. g. in Plut. Anton. § 12, where it is used of the feigned reluctance of Cæsar to wear the crown. — ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖs. Comp. 490, E, note. Stallb. (first ed.) and Ast suppose this to be a gloss. Stallb. (second ed.), after Winckelmann on Euthydem. 295, C (quite a parallel passage, οὐκ ἀποκρίνει, ἔψη, πρὸs ǜ ὖν ὑπολαμβάνῃs, ὅτι ἑχων ψλυαρεῖs καὶ ἀρχαιότεροs εἶ τοῦ δέοντοs), gives καὶ προῦθί γε...

νουθετείs to Callicles, and oux aµa ... πίνειν to Socrates. On this passage we may remark, - 1. That or Exw Appeirs, 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, $\pi \rho \delta \partial \theta_{\epsilon} \epsilon is \tau \delta \nu \mu \pi \rho \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ is not what he would say. 4. vov θετείs can only point at the advice given by Callicles to Socrates, on pp. 484-486, and not to anything said by Socrates. Comp. 488, A, ωσπερ ήρξω νουθε- $\tau \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu \mu \epsilon$, referring to Callicles. 5. There is no mark of a change of person at $o\dot{v}_{\chi}$ $\ddot{a}\mu a$, and little at $\kappa a\dot{\iota} \pi \rho \delta i \theta \iota$. These last considerations induce me to reject Winckelmann's view, and to regard it even more probable that or Exw $\lambda \eta \rho \epsilon i s$ are words spoken by Socrates. But I can arrive at no sure affirmative conclusion respecting the passage.

B. οὐ σὴ αὕτη ἡ τιμή, this damage or cost is not yours,
i. e. this does you no harm.

C. $\delta \tau \iota \tau \lambda \mu \epsilon \gamma \delta \lambda a \mu \epsilon \mu \delta \eta \sigma a \iota$. 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 Eleusis. 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."

— ὅθεν ἀπέλιπες ἀποκρίνου, answer beginning where you left off. The usual construction of $\"{a}_{\rho\chi\omega}$ with an adverb of motion is here adopted by ἀποκρίνομαι. — πεινῶν is a participle; παύεται here adopts two constructions.

D. $\delta\mu\sigma\lambda\sigma\gamma\epsilon\tilde{i}\sigma\thetaa$ seems to mean to agree with itself; $\sigma\sigma$ being the ethical dative, and $\tau\delta\nu\lambda\delta\gamma\sigma\nu$ or $\taua\tilde{i}\tau a$ understood the subject. But $\delta\mu\sigma\lambda$. $\sigma\sigma\sigma$ may also denote to be consistent with your previous admissions. Comp. 487, D.

497, E.]

NOTES.

E. $\tau o \dot{v} s o \dot{s} \dot{s} v \kappa \dot{a} \lambda \partial s \pi a \rho \hat{g}$. Supply $\kappa a \lambda o \dot{v} s \kappa a \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} s$. The article is here used as a demonstrative, — a usage not uncommon before a relative sentence introduced by δs , $\delta \sigma o s$, or o δs .

498 A. ἀμφότεροι ἕμοιγε μαλλον, i. e. χαίρειν δοκοῦσι. This is said in contempt, as if Socrates were not deserving of a sensible answer.

C. $\hat{\eta}$ κai $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ $\mu\hat{a}\lambda\lambda\rho\nu$, 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 good in a higher degree than the good, which is absurd. After $\mu\hat{a}\lambda\lambda\rho\nu$ $d\gamma a\theta oi$, the MSS. have oi $d\gamma a\theta oi$, which Routh and succeeding editors have justly left out, as wholly perverting the sense.

E. $\delta is \gamma a \rho \tau o \iota$, etc. A proverb, imputed by the Schol. to Empedocles, a part of one of whose hexameters v. 164 in Sturz's Emped.) is kal $\delta is \gamma a \rho \delta \delta \epsilon i kal \delta \sigma' e \sigma \tau \sigma' e \nu \sigma \pi \epsilon i \nu$. $\tau o \iota$, you know, is often used in making familiar remarks or citing well-known passages. A little below, in 499, B, $\pi a \lambda a \iota \tau o \iota$, it has, according to Stallb., "vim confirmandi cum quadam admiratione vel indignatione," = really, or don't you know.

499 B. ώs δή, see 468, E. —— loù sometimes expresses grief, sometimes joy, or, as here, wonder. It is oxytoned by all the editors of Plato. Others would write loû, either always, or when it does not denote grief.

C. as, again, refers to 491, C. He is again inconsistent with himself. --- έκόντος είναι, 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 ikav eival " is used generally in negative sentences where the speaker wishes to qualify his denial or refusal, by saying that he will not do it if he can help it, but that very possibly he may not be able to help it." He adds, that in Prometheus, 266 (ikav έκων ημαρτον), έκων είναι would make nonsense. --- το παρον ευ ποιείν, to do well what is in one's power, to make the best of what you have. This proverb again occurs in Leges, 12. 959, C. --- ήδοναί τινές . . . ai μέν . . . ai δέ. The constant 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 Tives here. Instead of rives µèv ... andau dé, some, ... others, we have, as if the contrast needed to be made stronger, some, these I say ... those. Comp. Eurip. Hec. 1185, nolλαὶ γὰρ ἡμῶν, ai μὲν εἴσ' ἐπίφθονοι | ui δ', etc. In Æschin. c. Ctes. (§ 11, Bekk.), of µèv follows Tives, and the second of $\mu \epsilon \nu$ is suppressed, as is often the case with $\delta \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta \delta \epsilon$ alone. The formula often occurs as in Plat. Repub. 8. 560, A.

D. $\epsilon i \, \ddot{a} \rho a \, \tau o \dot{v} \tau \omega v$. Græci frequenter relativam orationis structuram permutant eum conditionali. Stallb. The relative structure would be $a\hat{i} \, \mu \hat{\epsilon} v \, \ddot{a} \rho a \, \tau o \dot{v} \tau \omega v$, etc.

E. $\tau \epsilon \lambda os$, etc. 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.

A. ἐκ τρίτων, and ἐκ τρίτου, in the third place, third. 500
Eurip. Orest. 1173, σωτηρίαν σοι, τῷδέ τ', ἐκ τρίτου τ' ἐμοί.
Sympos. 213, B. ὑπολύετε ᾿Αλκιβιάδην, ΐνα ἐκ τρίτων κατακέηται.
— Cap. 55. ὧν að for að ῶν. að is out of its clause for the sake of rhythm.

B. See 464, B, seq. — $\pi a \rho a \sigma \kappa \epsilon v a i$, the Schol. observes, is a middle term, standing for $\tau \epsilon \chi v a \iota$ and $\epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \iota \rho i a \iota$ both, like $\epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \epsilon \dot{\upsilon} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$. — $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota$ $\dot{\eta} \delta o \nu \eta s$, terminating in pleasure. This is explained by the next words, where

aờrò rovro refers to $\eta \delta o n' \eta v$, i. e. $\tau \delta \eta \delta \delta d \delta t$, $t = \kappa a i \epsilon t (\delta \eta v)$, etc., 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. $----\pi \rho \delta \phi \iota \lambda (ov, \text{ supply } \Delta \iota \delta s. ------ \mu \eta \tau \epsilon a v \tau \delta s o \delta ov,$ etc. In this sentence, the two main clauses begin with $\mu \eta \tau \epsilon$; and the clause beginning with $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon$ is the second part of the first clause. Comp. K. largest Gr. § 743, R. 4. $------\mu \eta \delta$ $\delta \tau \iota$ $\delta \nu \tau \tau \nu \chi \eta s$, 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. $o\tilde{v} \tau i ~ a\tilde{v} \mu a\lambda\lambda ov \ldots \hat{\eta} \tau o\tilde{v}\tau o$. The last words are added to recall $o\tilde{v}$ to mind, and $\tau o\tilde{v}\tau o$ takes the construction of τi rather than of $\pi\epsilon\rho i$ $\tau o\tilde{v}\tau o$ $o\tilde{s}$. It often happens that $\hat{\eta}$ and quam are so inserted after a genitive depending on a comparative. —— $i\pi i$ δv , i. e. $\tau o\tilde{v}\tau ov$ $i\phi$, δv . —— τa $\tau o\tilde{v}$ dv- $\delta\rho \deltas$ $\delta\eta$ $\tau a\tilde{v}\tau a \pi\rho i \tau \tau ov \tau a$, 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, A – D. $\delta\eta$ is ironical. — $\hat{\eta}$ $i\pi i \tau ov \delta\epsilon \tau \delta v$ βiov . We should expect $\tau ov \delta\epsilon \tau \delta v \beta iov$, sc. $\xi \hat{\eta} v$; but Plato forms this clause as though he had written $\pi \delta \tau \epsilon \rho ov \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \rho a \kappa a \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \tilde{s} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau o \tilde{v} \tau ov$.

D. $\epsilon i \ \epsilon \sigma \tau i \dots \tau \omega \beta \omega$. 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 $\epsilon \sigma \tau i$, 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.

501 A. $\dot{\eta}$ δ' *latpini*, i. e. δοκεί μοι τέχνη είναι. Just below, $\dot{\eta}$ *latpini* is added to explain $\dot{\eta}$ μέν. Comp. $\dot{\delta}$ μέν... $\dot{\delta}$ κολαζόμενος, 476, E. — $\dot{\eta}$ δ' έτέρα της ήδονης... έπ' αὐτην έρχεται. There is a striking change of construction here. The sentence begins with ήδονης, as if Plato had in his mind the form of the preceding sentence, and were going

to say, $\tau \hat{\eta} s \hat{\eta} \delta v \hat{\eta} s o v \tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} v \dot{\phi} \dot{v} o v \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \pi \tau a v o v \tau \dot{\eta} v a \dot{\tau} t a v$. But this thought, which afterwards appears in the participial form, is postponed, and the intervening clause, $\pi \rho \dot{\delta} s \hat{\eta} v \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \rho a \pi \epsilon \dot{a} \ldots \ddot{a} \pi a \sigma a$, determined him to say, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi^{2} a \dot{v} \tau \dot{\eta} v \dot{\epsilon} \rho \lambda \epsilon \tau a$, accommodated to $\pi \rho \dot{\delta} s \ddot{\eta} v$, and to leave $\dot{\eta} \delta o v \dot{\eta} s$ in the lurch, so to speak. It may be asked, why, when he read it over, he did not dismiss $\dot{\eta} \delta o v \dot{\eta} s$ 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. — $d \tau \epsilon \chi \nu \omega s$, and not $d \tau \epsilon \chi \nu \omega s$. Comp. 491, A. — $d \lambda \delta \gamma \omega s$ $\tau \epsilon \pi a v \tau \dot{a} \pi a \sigma u$, in a manner altogether irrational, making, I may say (i. e. almost), no estimates (or discriminations), a mere practice and experience.

B. $\tilde{\psi}$ $\delta \eta$ καὶ πορίζεται. $\tilde{\psi}$ refers to $\tau \tilde{\psi}$ μνήμην σώζεσθαι τοῦ εἰωθότος γίγνεσθαι. — καὶ εἶναί τινες, i. e. καὶ εἰ δοκοῦσί σοι εἶναί τινες. It might have been said equally well, εἶναί τινας, etc. — ὥσπερ ἐκεῖ, i. e. as in the case of the body. — οῦτε μέλον αἰταῖς, etc., nor having any concern about aught else but gratification merely, no matter whether it be for the better or the worse. Here the structure changes to the impersonal participle, and the subject of the prior clause becomes αἰταῖς.

C. $\epsilon_{\mu o i} \dots \delta o \kappa o i \sigma i} \epsilon_{i \nu a i}$, it seems to me that there are such, or they seem to me to exist. The words refer to $\epsilon_{i \nu a i}$ $\tau_{i \nu \epsilon s}$ $\pi_{\rho a \gamma \mu a \tau} \epsilon_{i a i}$, etc. It is strange that Stallb. and Ast, overlooking this plain sense, understand $\kappa o \lambda a \kappa \epsilon_i a$ as the predicate. --- $\sigma_{\nu \gamma \kappa a \tau a \tau} i \delta \epsilon \sigma a a$. The word means, properly, to drop one's vote in the same vessel with another person, as a judge in the court. $i_{\mu i \nu}$ is ironical, as he had compelled Gorgias and Polus to agree with him.

D. $o\breve{v}\kappa$, $d\lambda\lambda\dot{u}\kappa a\iota$. $o\breve{v}\kappa$ denies the previous sentence taken as a whole. — $\chi a\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta a\iota\,\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota$, i. c. $\tilde{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$.

E. τοιαύτη τις ... διώκειν. The infinitive explains the demonstrative, and depends on Sokei repeated. ---- and ovδέν φροντίζειν. This verb, 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. ---- ή κιθαριστική ή έν τοις άγωσι. Plato condemned all music on the 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. called because the instruction of the chorus was the principal preparative. The chorus in dithyrambic poetry is especially intended. - Kumpias of Thebes, so called, it is said, because έν τοις χοροίς έχρητο πολλή κινήσει. He was 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).

502 A. τί δέ... Μέλης; i. e. ἐδόκει σοι, as above τί ή διδασκαλία καὶ ποίησις; i. e. καταφαίνεταί σοι. A little below, τί δὲ δὴ ή σεμνὴ, etc., the construction is different, namely, τί δὲ δἡ ἐστι τοῦτο ἐφ' ὡ ἐσπούδακε ἡ σεμνὴ, etc. What is said here is a mere passing fling at Meles on account of the badness of his odes.

B. ή...θαυμαστὴ ή τῆς τραγῷδίας ποίησις. The ordinary collocation, as Stallb. remarks, would be ή θαυμαστὴ ποίησις, ή τῆς τραγῷδίας. He cites Herodot. 7. 196, ό ναυτικὸς ὁ τῶν βαρβάρων στρατός; Repub. 565, D, τὸ ἐν Ἀρκαδία τὸ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Λυκαίου ἰερόν, and other examples. — διαμάχεσθαι... ὅπως μὴ ἐρεῖ. Is its aim ... to insist upon it

... that it will not say, etc. — $\epsilon i \ \delta \epsilon \ \tau \iota \ \tau \upsilon \gamma \chi \acute{a} \nu \epsilon \iota \ \acute{a} \eta \delta \acute{e}s.$ For $\delta \nu$ omitted, comp. Soph. Electr. 313. — $\pi \sigma \tau \acute{e} \rho \omega s \ldots \pi a \rho \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \upsilon \acute{a} \sigma \theta a \iota, utro modo tibi videtur comparata esse. For$ Plato's view of tragedy, comp. Repub. 8. 568, C, 2. 378, seq., and a noble passage, Leges, 7. 817. Another admirable passage treats of the corruption of tragedy by popular influence. Leges, 2. 659.

C. $\epsilon i \tau \iota s \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \lambda o \iota \tau o$. Aristides, in opposing this passage, and the Schol., have $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \lambda o \iota$, which Coray and Stallb. prefer. Ast, in defending the text, says that $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \lambda o \iota$ denotes if one were to strip off, $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \lambda o \iota \tau o$, if one were to strip off for himself, i. e. in his own mind to conceive of it as stripped off. $\mu \epsilon \lambda o s$, musical accompaniment; $\delta \nu \theta \mu \delta \nu$, definite succession of arses and theses; $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho \nu \nu$, definite succession of long and short syllables. $\mu \epsilon \eta \lambda \delta \nu \nu \iota \eta \lambda \delta \nu \nu \iota \eta$ $\nu \nu \nu \nu \tau a \iota$. The verb is attracted in number to the predicate $\lambda \delta \nu \iota$.

D. $o\dot{v}\kappa o\dot{v} \dots \dot{a}\nu \epsilon \tilde{u}\eta$, It (tragedy) would be then a rhetorical species of popular speaking. — $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu o \nu \tau o \iota o \hat{v} \tau o \nu$, $o\dot{l} o \nu$ $\pi a i \delta \omega \nu$, i. e. to a people (or audience) composed of boys, etc. The grammatical construction, which would be $o\dot{i} \delta s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota (\delta \hat{\eta} \mu o s) \pi a i \delta \omega \nu$, is forsaken through a singular kind of attraction, by which $o\dot{i} o s$, $\ddot{\sigma} \sigma o s$, $\dot{\eta} \lambda i \kappa o s$, with the noun or adjective 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.

Α. οὐχ ἀπλοῦν, etc. = τοῦτο ὑ ἐρωτậs οὐκέτι ἐστιν ἀπλοῦν, 503
 i. e. does not admit of a simple answer. — διαμάχεσθαι
 λέγοντα, to persist in saying, or steadily to say.

B. $\tau i \ o \vartheta \chi i \dots a \vartheta \tau i \vartheta \psi \delta \rho a \sigma a s$. Mt. § 503, c, says : "After $\tau i \ o \vartheta$ an aorist often follows, 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." — alriav $\xi_{\chi ovouv}$, have it ascribed to them, is here used in a good sense.

C. oùr arovers. Præsens hujus verbi de durante fama, - perpetuo ponitur. Stallb.; i. e. it is used of something which is said and may be heard until now. Comp. the editor's note on Prometh. 683 (ed. scc.).---νεωστί, i. e. about twenty-three years before. ---- of Kai akhkoas. See 455, E. For Plato's opinion of Pericles, see the Introduction. ----- εί έστι γε ... ην σύ έλεγες αρετήν, αληθής. Comp. for άρετήν, Soph. § 151, Rem. 6. The apodosis of this sentence, which might be "they are good men," is omitted. "When a proposition with $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu$, or $\eta \nu \mu \epsilon \nu$, has another with el de opposed to it, the apodosis is often suppressed in one of the two." Mt. § 617. In the ensuing clause, the predicate, coriv and both solution and both before the infinitive is redundant. Examples are given by Heindorf, on Phædo, 63, C. Comp. 453, B, above. or was used as though dei anoredeiv was to follow; but when Plato came to that part of the sentence, he accommodated amoreheiv to ei δε μή τοῦτο: " if this, viz. ἀποπιμπλάναι, is not virtue, but this, viz. anoreleiv, etc., is so."

D. $\tau \circ \tilde{v} \tau \circ \delta \epsilon \tau \epsilon_{\chi v \eta} \tau \iota s \epsilon_{\iota v a \iota}$. The nominative here is used by anacoluthon, as if, instead of $\eta \nu a \gamma \kappa \delta \sigma \theta \eta \iota \epsilon v \delta \mu o \lambda o \gamma \epsilon_{\iota v}$, Plato had written $\omega \mu o \lambda o \gamma \eta \theta \eta$. — $o \dot{v} \tau \omega \sigma \dot{v} \nu d \tau \rho \epsilon \mu a$, quite calmly, or pretty calmly. $o \ddot{v} \tau \omega s$, 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 $o \ddot{v} \tau \omega s$ with verbs.

E. $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ και οι άλλοι, etc. άλλοι is used here as in 473,

C. The verb $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota$ leaves the number required by $\delta\eta\mu\iota\sigma\nu\rho\gamma\sigma\iota$, through the influence of $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\sigma\sigma$, added in apposition to that noun. Comp. Mt. § 302, Obs. — ofor ϵl $\beta\sigma\delta\iota\epsilon\iota$ ide $i\nu$. In this sentence the apodosis is omitted. One can supply in thought $\dot{\rho}a\dot{\sigma}\iota\sigma\sigma$ $\dot{\sigma}\psi\epsilon\iota$. But the true account of the sentence is, that the apodosis should have begun at $\dot{\omega}s \epsilon ls \tau \dot{\alpha}\xi\iota\nu$ (" if you wish to look at painters, etc., — you will see that, etc."); but by a change of style the clause $\dot{\omega}s \epsilon ls \tau \dot{\alpha}\xi\iota\nu$ is made to depend on $l\delta\epsilon\iota\nu$, and the apodosis loses its proper form under the impression that an imperative, $l\delta\epsilon \epsilon l \beta\sigma\delta\iota\epsilon\iota$, instead of $\epsilon l \beta\sigma\delta\iota\epsilon\iota$ $l\delta\epsilon\iota\nu$, had commenced the sentence.

B. καὶ μὴν καὶ τὰ σώματά φαμεν, i. e. τάξεως τυχόντα χρη- 504 στὰ είναι.

C. $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon i \nu \, \omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \, \epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \nu \omega \, \tau \delta \, \sigma \nu \rho a$, to mention the name for it, as you did for that. In the MSS., $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \nu \sigma$ stands, which, if genuine, is put briefly for $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \nu \sigma \nu \sigma \delta \, \sigma \nu \rho a$.

E. $\hbar \, d\lambda \lambda' \, \delta \tau \omega \delta \nu$, 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 \hbar ought to be inserted before $\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha}$, as Heindorf proposes, or $\gamma \epsilon$ turned into $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$. For since $\gamma \epsilon$ shows that the clause $\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \ldots \lambda \dot{\delta} \gamma \sigma \nu$ relates to the foregoing, $\kappa \alpha \dot{\epsilon} \, \lambda \alpha \tau \tau \sigma \nu$ stands quite by itself; and the asyndeton ($\kappa \alpha \dot{\epsilon}$ being etiam) is intolerable.

Β. οὐκοῦν...κολάζειν; ἀφ' ὡν ἐπιθυμεῖ belongs to εἴρ-505
 γειν. — ὥσπερ...ῷου relates to ἀκολασία. See Chap.
 46, 48.

C. oùros dvýp. See 467, B. — κολ ιζόμενοs is obviously in apposition with $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \omega \nu$; but we might have also had κολάζεσθαι in apposition with τοῦτο. According to Aristotle on Rhet. 1. 10. 17, cited by Stallb., κολάζειν (to chastise,

correct, lit. to cut off, prune) differs from $\tau\iota\mu\omega\rho\epsilon\tilde{i}\sigma\thetaa\iota$ (to take satisfaction from, punish) in this; that the former takes place for the sake of the sufferer, the latter for that of the doer. — $\mu\epsilon\tau a\xi \tilde{v} \tau \delta \nu \lambda \delta \gamma o \nu \kappa a \tau a \lambda \delta o \mu \epsilon \nu$; are we ending the discourse in the middle? Some inferior MSS. have $\kappa a \tau a \lambda \delta \sigma \sigma \rho \epsilon \nu$, are we going to end, and some $\kappa a \tau a \lambda \delta \omega \rho \epsilon \nu$, which (or rather $\kappa a \tau a \lambda \delta \sigma \omega \rho \epsilon \nu$, 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. — $a \delta \tau \delta s \gamma \nu \delta \sigma \epsilon \iota$, you yourself must judge, i. e. I wish to stop, but leave it to you.

D. $\theta \epsilon \mu \iota s$. This word, being here an accusative, must be indeclinable. Of this use few will doubt, after reading what Elmsley and Hermann (Soph. Œd. Col. 1191), and Buttmann (largest Gram. 1. § 58, and 2. p. 405) have written. The other examples occur in Œd. Col. u. s., Xen. Œcon. 11. 11, and Æsch. Suppl. 331. In Æsch. Choeph. 632, it is a neuter nominative. No phrases are found besides $\theta \epsilon \mu \iota s \epsilon \circ \tau \iota$, $\theta \epsilon \iota \iota s \iota$. This is a strange, but not a solitary anomaly. Comp. $\chi \rho \epsilon \iota \iota s$ sometimes indeclinable, $\kappa \rho \tilde{a} \tau a$ in Sophocles nominative and accusative. $---\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \iota g$, se. $\delta \mu \tilde{\iota} \theta \sigma s$. The style changes from the plural to the singular. Comp. for the expression, Leges, 6. 752, A, $\circ \iota \kappa \sigma \iota \tau \sigma$ $\cdot \cdot \cdot \delta \tau \mu \tilde{\upsilon} \theta \sigma \nu \delta \kappa \epsilon \delta \mu \delta \sigma \nu \kappa a \tau a \lambda (\pi \sigma \iota \mu \iota, \pi \lambda a \nu \omega \mu \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \gamma a \rho \delta \tau \delta \tau \sigma \tau$.

E. $\tau \delta \tau \sigma \tilde{v}$ 'Eπιχάρμου. Athenæus (7. 308, C, and 8. 362, D) gives his words in a trochaic tetrameter, $\tau \lambda \pi \rho \delta \tau \sigma \tilde{v}$ $\delta \dot{v}$ ' $\ddot{a} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ $\ddot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \sigma \nu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \pi \sigma \chi \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega$. $---- \dot{a} \nu a \gamma \kappa a i \delta \tau a \tau \sigma \nu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu a a \sigma \delta \tau \omega s$. Supplent ποιε \hat{v} ellipsi inaudita. Equidem $\sigma \tilde{v} \tau \omega s$ interpretor: in hoc rerum statu, quum tu nolis amplius mecum colloqui. Stallb. $\sigma \tilde{v} \tau \omega s$ seems to me to be loosely used for $\tau \sigma \tilde{v} \tau \sigma$. Comp. Soph. Antig. 706, $\omega s \phi \eta s \sigma v -- \tau \sigma \tilde{v} \tau' \delta \rho \theta \omega s$ $\tilde{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \omega$, for $\delta \phi \eta s \sigma v$.

506 A. οἰδὲ γàρ . . . εἰδώς λέγω. Socrates often places him-18

self in the attitude of a searcher after truth, unable of himself to find it, and hoping that others know where it is.

B. $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\omega s} \ldots Z_{\eta} \ell_{\omega v}$, 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. $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\omega s}$ with an imperfect or a orist indicative accompanies another clause containing the same tenses with \tilde{a}_{ν} , when a res non facta is spoken of.

C. $d\chi \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \sigma \rho \mu a \iota$. This form is condemned by Mæris as un-Attic, but is found several times in Attic writers, where, however, it may have come from the scribes. $d\chi \theta \epsilon' \sigma \sigma \rho \mu a \iota$ is the approved form. $----\epsilon \iota \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \tau \eta s \ldots \iota a \nu a \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \eta \epsilon \iota$. An allusion to the honorary votes recorded on marbles, in favor of foreigners who had rendered Athens a service. $-------\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \ a \iota \tau \delta s$ is by yourself, without another speaker, and so in $\sigma \circ \iota$ a \iota \tau \delta \iota \delta \iota \delta \iota \delta \iota \delta \sigma \delta.

A. $\tilde{\eta}\nu$ $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ $a\tilde{v}\tau\eta$, i. e. now this we found to be. $\tilde{\eta}\nu$ points 507 to the time when such a soul was (subjectively to them, i. e. appeared to be) $\tilde{a}\phi\rho\omega\nu$, etc. Comp. 478, E, note.

B. $\hat{a} \delta \epsilon \hat{i} \dots \phi \epsilon \hat{v} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa a \hat{\delta} \iota \hat{\omega} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$. With the definition of the $\sigma \hat{\omega} \phi \rho \omega \nu \dot{a} \nu \dot{\eta} \rho$ here given, Routh compares Aristotle's in the Eth. Nicom. 3, sub fin. : $\hat{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta \upsilon \mu \epsilon \hat{\iota} \delta \sigma \omega \phi \rho \omega \nu \delta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \kappa a \hat{\iota} \delta s \delta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \kappa a \hat{\delta} \sigma \epsilon$.

C. $\tau \delta \nu \delta' \epsilon \delta' \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \sigma \nu \tau a \dots \epsilon \dot{\nu} \delta a \dot{\mu} \rho \nu a \epsilon \dot{\nu} a \iota$. Plato passes in this same way from $\epsilon \delta' \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ to $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \delta a \dot{\mu} \rho \nu a \epsilon \dot{\nu} a \iota$ in Repub. 1. 353, E, Charmides 172, A, Aleibiad. 1. 116, B. As $\epsilon \delta' \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ 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 antecedentibus eum qui recte agit felicem esse. Vix enim potest credi ut Plato duplici sensu verborum $\epsilon v \pi p \acute{a} \tau \tau \epsilon v$ 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 suam 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.

D. β ουλόμενον εἰδαίμονα εἶναι ... διωκτέον. The subject of the action of a verbal may be in the accusative or in the dative. — ώς ἔχει ποδῶν = ὡς ἔχει τάχους, Thueyd. 2. 92, = ὡς τάχιστα. Comp. Soph. § 188, N.; Cr. § 363, B. — παρασκευαστέον is the verbal of the middle voice here, = δεῖ παρασκευάσασθαι. Mt. § 447. 2. — ἰδιώτης (when opposed to the state), an individual. — In the next sentence, εἰς τοῦτο refers to ὅπως ... ἔσεσθαι, and οὕτω πράττειν to συντείνοντα and what follows it.

E. $d\nu \eta \nu \nu \tau \sigma \nu \kappa \kappa \kappa \sigma'$, 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. $---\phi a\sigma \delta$ of $\sigma \sigma \phi \sigma \delta$, etc. The allusion is more particularly to Empedocles, who made $\phi \iota \lambda i a$ and $\nu \epsilon i \kappa \sigma s$ 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 "que in rerum natura constarent, queque moverentur, ea contrahere amicitiarn, 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.

Α. τὸ ὅλον τοῦτο...κόσμον καλοῦσιν. The universe owed 508 the name Kóomos, order, system, to Pythagoras. Comp. Xen. Mem. 1. 1. 11, ό καλούμενος ύπο των σοφιστων κόσμος, which shows that even then the appellation had not become very current. — ή ἰσότης ή γεωμετρική. 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 $\pi\lambda\epsilon_{0}\nu\epsilon\xi\iota_{\alpha}$ 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 Routh.

B. ἐξελεγκτέος ... ώς. See 467, A, note. — κακίας δὲ οἱ ἄθλιοι. The predicate ἄθλιοι is omitted. See K. § 852. 2, largest Gr. This is the more natural, because the preceding words, εὐδαίμονες οἱ εὐδαίμονες, clearly indicate the construction. Stallb. has added ἄθλιοι, without authority or sufficient reason. — τί τὰ συμβαίνοντα. This use of τί in the predicate with a plural subject is not uncommon. Comp. Æschin. c. Ctes., ἀπόδειξιν ποίησαι τί ποτ' ἦν å ἕπραξας, καὶ τί ποτ' ἦν ἁ ἕλεγες. (§ 165, Bekker.) The same formula is repeated just below, τί ποτ' ἐστὶν ἁ ... ὀνειδίζεις.

D. $\epsilon_{i\mu}$ $\delta \epsilon' \epsilon \pi i \tau \hat{\varphi} \beta \omega \lambda \delta \mu \epsilon' \psi_{\varphi}$, etc. And that I am in the 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 arunia could not appear in court as a prosecutor or a witness, or complain of his wrongs before the people, he was plainly in the power of his enemies. --- veavikov denotes high-spirited, or rather overbearing. The clause is in apposition with τύπτειν έπι κόρρης. Comp. 507, E. The same is true of to egyator, as it respects anorteiral. Socrates refers to 486, A - C.

τέμνεσθαι, when taken with σώμα, is in frusta disse-E. cari.

509 A. καὶ εἰ ἀγροικότερόν ... ἐστι. These words are used 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 ei kai d., and here kai ei d. According to Herm. (on Viger, note 307), referred to by Stallb., Kai el, etiam si, is used concerning that which we only assume as true; el kai, quamquam, concerning that which we declare to be true. Socrates, then, does not here admit that his expression is impolite; but in 486, C, Callicles acknowledges by *i* kai his trespass against the rules of good-breeding. - outwoiv ut Latinorum sic est primo aspectu. Ast.

B. τίνα αν βοήθειαν, etc. By his inability to afford what kind of aid to himself would a man be in truth ridiculous? This alludes to 486, B, μήτε αὐτὸν αὐτῶ δυνάμενον βοηθείν. --- ταύτην είναι την αισχίστην βοήθειαν, μη δύνασθαι βοηθείν is for αἴσχιστον είναι ταύτην την βοήθειαν μη δύνασθαι $\beta_{on}\theta_{\hat{\epsilon}i\nu}$, 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.

C. $\tau \eta \nu \tau \sigma \hat{\nu} \delta \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \nu \kappa \alpha \kappa \sigma \hat{\nu}$, sc. $\beta \sigma \eta \theta \epsilon \iota a \nu$, and that the aid 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). $\beta \sigma \eta \theta \epsilon \iota a \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ is like $d\lambda \kappa \eta \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ in Euripides. $----\kappa a \lambda \tau \tilde{a} \lambda \lambda a \sigma \tilde{\nu} \tau \omega s$, sc. $\tilde{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$, not $\tilde{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota$, which Stallb. supplies.

D. $d\delta\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau a\iota$. See Soph. § 207, N. 6; Cr. § 554, a; K. § 251, R. 1. — $\tau i \ \delta \epsilon \ \delta \eta \ \tau o \hat{\nu} \ d\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon i\nu$; well, but what about doing wrong? This genitive without a preposition may be compared with that which accompanies verbs of speaking. Comp. Soph. Electr. 317.

E. $\tau i \ o \dot{\nu} \kappa \ldots \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa \rho \dot{i} \nu \omega$. See 503, B, note. The imperfect $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa \rho \dot{i} \nu o \nu$ is in most MSS.; but in this formula that tense is not used. $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu a \ \beta o \nu \lambda \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu \ \dot{a} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon \dot{\iota} \nu$. See 468, C, and the Introduction, p. xxiv.

A. ὅπως μή ἀδικήσωμεν. See 480, A, note.

B. φίλος μοι δοκεῖ, etc. Here ὅνπερ refers forward to δ ὅμοιος, and ὡς οἶόν τε μάλιστα is taken with φίλος. οἱ παλαιοί τε καὶ σοφοὶ alludes especially to Hom. Odys. 17. 218, ὡς aἰεὶ τὸν ὅμοιον ἄγει θεὸς ὡς τὸν ὅμοιον. The thought is found also in Sympos. 195, B, ὁ γὰρ παλαιὸς λόγος εὖ ἔχει, ὡς ὅμοιος ὁμοίψ ἀεὶ πελάζει, and in Lysis, 214, where it is said that the bad, being unlike themselves, that is, variable and unstable, cannot be friends. Comp. also Leges, 716, C, τῷ ὁμοίψ τὸ ὅμοιον ὅντι μετρίφ φίλον ἁν εἴη, τὰ δ' ἅμετρα οὐτ' ἀλλήλοις οὕτε τοῖς ἐμμέτροις.

C. δύναιτο φίλος γενέσθαι. Repentina subjecti mutatio, says Stallb., i. e. τούτφ refers to δ τύραννος, and the subject of δύναιτο is δ τοῦ τύραννου βελτίων. This appears most probable, as Plato might easily return in his mind to the earlier subject of the clause, εἴ τις ... εἶη; and as οὐδ' ἀν

510

510, c.]

NOTES.

obros 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. $---- \dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau a \dot{\nu} \tau \eta \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \iota$. 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. — $a \ddot{\nu} \tau \eta$, ... $\delta \delta \dot{\delta} s \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \nu$. $a \ddot{\nu} \tau \eta$, the subject of $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota$, refers to $\dot{\epsilon} \partial \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \iota \nu$, but is attracted, as often happens, in gender, to the predicate $\delta \delta \delta s$.

511 B. οὐκοῦν ... ἀγανακτητόν; Well, then, is not this just the thing to rouse indignation?

D. $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\mu\epsilon\nu\eta$, simple, properly spoken of garments, drawn close to the body, in contrast to a garment which spreads out with numerous folds and plaits. —— $d\lambda\lambda\dot{a} \tau a\dot{a}\tau\dot{a}$ $\delta\iota\alpha\pi\rho\alpha\xi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\eta$, etc. But when it has effected the same things with the forensic art, it charges, I presume, but two obols if it has brought a man safe from Ægina hither; and if from Egypt or the Pontus, — at the highest rate ($\dot{\epsilon}a\nu \pi \alpha\mu\pi\sigma\lambda\nu$), 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 happens in earnest conversation. $\epsilon\pi\rho\dot{a}\xi\alpha\tau\sigma$ is the aorist of indefinite time. See 484, A. With $\epsilon\dot{a}\nu \pi\dot{a}\mu\pi\sigma\lambda\nu$, supply $\pi\rho\dot{a}\tau\tau\eta\taua$.

512 A. λογίζεται οὖν ὅτι οὐκ, etc. Here οὐκ belongs to $β_{iω}$ τέον ἐστὶ καὶ ὀνήσειεν, which is the primary clause. But the sentence assumes an antithetical structure, the clauses εἰ μέν τις, ε... εἰ δέ τις, and οὖτος μέν, τούτῷ δὲ being paired off

against one another. On this form of sentences, Mt. § 622. 4, remarks, that "clauses are put in contrast with one another by means of $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ and $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$, 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 (ov_{κ}) , if a man afflicted with great and incurable diseases, whom he has saved from drowning, is miserable 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 soul, 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 ονήσειεν 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 $\lambda_{0\gamma}i\xi\epsilon\tau_{a\epsilon}$ (being a present not equivalent to a historical tense, and not reducible to the form of oratio obligua, as cases like *\lefteria* ώς τινά τις δέξαιτο are) ότι οὐκ ὀνήσειεν would not be Greek. and if it were, must mean, not can benefit, but probably Heindorf conjectured dungener av, can (not) do benefits. him good, which in some degree removes the difficulty. I beg leave to offer an opposite conjecture, dringer, on the supposition that the final syllable $\epsilon \nu$ may owe its birth to $a\nu$ wrongly repeated.

B. où vóµos ἐστί, it is not the custom. — µὴ ὅτι κυβερνήτου, i. e. µὴ εἴπης ὅτι, not to say, or to pass by the pilot, who is not mentioned in order to select a stronger case, that of the general. Comp. où χ ὅτι, 450, E, note. — ελάττω σώζειν = ελάττονα σωτηρίαν πορίζειν, or ἀπεργάζεσθαι. µή σοι δοκεῖ κατὰ τὸν δικανικὸν εἶναι; docs he seem to you to be on a level with (and not rather above) the forensic man?

512, B.]

NOTES.

Comp. Repub. 466, B, $\mu \eta \pi \eta \kappa a \tau a \tau \partial \nu \tau \omega \nu \sigma \kappa \upsilon \tau o \tau \delta \mu \omega \nu \phi a (\nu \epsilon \tau a \iota \beta) or; does it seem to you to rank with the shoemaker's kind of life?$

C. $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \nu \kappa a \lambda \pi a \rho a \kappa a \lambda \dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \partial \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu$. Briefly for $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \nu$ $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\nu}, \kappa a \lambda \pi a \rho a \kappa a \lambda \dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \partial \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\nu}$. \dots $\dot{\omega} s o \dot{\nu} \partial \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{a} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \nu$, on the ground that everything else is of no value (in comparison with engineering). \dots $\dot{a} \pi \sigma \kappa a \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \sigma a u s$. This compound of $\kappa a \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, 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 Demosth. \dots $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \delta \nu \tau \dot{a} \sigma a \upsilon \tau o \hat{\nu} \dot{\epsilon} \pi a u \nu \hat{\epsilon} s = \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \dot{\iota} \tau \omega \nu o \hat{\nu} s \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ $\sigma a \upsilon \tau o \hat{\nu} \tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi a u \nu \hat{\epsilon} s.$

D. μή γάρ τοῦτο ... ἐατέον ἐστί. μή denoting suspicion that something is true, or mild expression of opinion, may be joined with an indicative; and the like may be said of όρα μή also. Comp. Soph. Electr. 581, 584 (where $\tau i \theta \eta s$, and not $\tau \iota \theta \eta s$, is supported by the MSS.); Alcibiad. 2. 139, D, άλλ' ὅρα μὴ οὐχ οῦτω ταῦτα ἔχει. μὴ may here be translated 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. ¿πιτρέπειν, in the sense of committing or referring to, and of giving up to, takes a dative of a person, often with a genitive with περί. Æschin. c. Ctes. § 83, εἰ ἐπιτρέπειν έθέλοι πόλει τινί ίση και όμοία περί των έγκλημάτων, if he wished to refer the grounds of complaint to some impartial and disinterested state. Alcibiad. 1. 117, D, τφ κυβερνήτη έπιτρέψas av houxiav έχοις; would you let the pilot have his

213

own way, and be quiet? For oùo' ϵ is, more emphatic than où $\delta\epsilon$ is, comp. Eurip. Alcest. 671 (note in my ed.).

Α. καὶ νῦν δὲ ἄρα δεῖ depends on σκεπτέον ἶρα. ---- τὰς 513 την σελήνην καθαιρούσας. 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 tois pilttátois alludes. Even an astrologer, in predicting an eclipse of the moon, which was akin, in the minds of the vulgar, to magical arts, was supposed to incur calamity. Hence $i\pi i \sigma av$ τώ σελήνην καθαιρείς, or καθέλκεις, is used proverbially of those who draw down calamities upon themselves by their conduct. The next words, συν τοις φιλτάτοις, must mean with the loss of what we hold most dear, i. e., as Socrates estimates things, of virtue and truth. oùr 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 to Iliad, 4. 161, σύν τε μεγάλω απέτισαν | σύν σφήσιν κεφαλήσι γυναιξί τε και τεκέεσσι.

B. $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon_{\ell} \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \epsilon_{\ell}$, i. e. in Athens. See 469, D, and 468, E, note. $- \frac{\partial \nu \delta \mu \omega \omega \nu}{\partial \nu \omega \omega \nu} \dots \chi \epsilon \hat{\iota} \rho \omega \nu$, 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 these words. $- \tau_{\iota} \gamma \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \iota \omega \ \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \partial \alpha$, etc., to effect any 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. $\delta \eta \mu \varphi$ depends on $\varphi \iota \lambda (a\nu)$. For $\tau \varphi$ $\Pi \nu - \rho \iota \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \sigma \nu s$, see 481, D. — $\dot{\omega} s \epsilon i \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu \epsilon i s \pi \sigma \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\delta} s$ eival. Ast, after one MS., omits $\pi \sigma \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\delta} s$, 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. $\dot{\omega} s$ is since, seeing that; not as, i. e. according to (your wishes).

D. $\pi\rho\delta s$ $\eta\delta\delta\sigma\eta\nu$ $\delta\mu\lambda\epsilon i\nu$, i. e. $\tau\delta$ $\tau\nu a$ $\pi\rho\delta s$ $\eta\delta$. $\sigma\delta\mu a \tau\iota$ $\kappa a \iota$ $\psi\nu\chi\eta$ $\delta\mu\iota\lambda\epsilon i\nu$. With the indefinite subject of the infinitive agree the two subsequent participles.

E. $\dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho a$, $\ddot{\sigma} \pi \omega s$. Supply $\dot{\delta} \mu i \lambda \epsilon \hat{i}$, as $\dot{\delta} \mu i \lambda \delta \ddot{\sigma} \sigma a$ is understood just above with $\dot{\eta} \pi \rho \dot{\delta} s \dot{\eta} \delta \nu \eta \nu$. $----\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \chi \epsilon i \rho \eta \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu$. The infinitive is added epexegetically, and the datives depend on the verbal. Comp. Soph. Electr. 543, 1277. For the construction of $\pi \omega \delta \nu \tau \sigma s$, see 492, B, note. It is without a copula as explaining $\delta \ddot{\nu} \tau \omega s$, and $\dot{\omega} s$ is taken with $\beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i \sigma \tau \sigma \upsilon s$ only.

514 A. εἰρίσκομεν. The Atticists and MSS. vary in regard to the augment of verbs beginning with ϵv . The earlier practice seems to have been, to leave the diphthong unchanged. Mt. § 167. 6. Below, 514, E, two of the best MSS. give ηὑρίσκομεν, and ηὐδοκίμει, 515, E. — ἐἀν μὴ ... ἡντινοῦν explains and defines ἄνευ τούτου. Comp. a similar apposition of a clause beginning with ἐἀν μὴ in Soph. Antig. 87. — δημοσία πράξαντες τῶν πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων, after we had engaged in a public capacity in any transactions of the state. The genitive is taken partitively. The words πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων denote any employment in the state's service, as that of an ἐργολάβος, or contractor, like Phidias, and of an ἀρχιτέκτων, like Ictinus, the builder of the Parthenon.

B. εἰ ἐπιστάμεθα, and a little below, εἰ ϣκοδομήκαμεν. After would it be incumbent on us to examine, we should add

in English, whether we knew, $\epsilon i \eta \pi \iota \sigma \tau \Delta \mu \epsilon \theta a$, relative to $\delta \epsilon \iota \, \delta \nu$, and not $\epsilon i \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \Delta \mu \epsilon \theta a$, 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. $i\delta i q \ldots j \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. According to Ast, $j \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ depends on $i\delta i q$, which would alone express the idea, were not $j \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ wanted for the contrast with $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta i \delta a \sigma \kappa \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \nu$. Those who would reject such an expression as $i\delta i q j \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, which is destitute of the support of parallel examples, must read with Stallb., after one MS., $i\delta i q \dot{\nu} \dot{\sigma} j \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. $\cdots \sigma \tilde{\upsilon} \tau \omega \mu \dot{\nu} \delta i - a \kappa \epsilon \iota \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu$, etc. It would be the part of prudent men, if so situated, to engage in public works. Here $j \nu$ has $\tilde{a} \nu$, but just below is without it. I think, with Ast, that although $j \nu$ is often used without $\tilde{a} \nu$, (see Mt. § 508, Obs. 2,) yet here the influence of $\tilde{a} \nu$ can extend to the second $j \nu$.

D. A very similar passage may be found in Laches, 186, B, C. In the first sentence, $a\nu$ belongs to $i\pi\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\psi\dot{a}\mu\epsilon\thetaa$, which verb is taken with $\pi\dot{a}\nu\tau a$... $\ddot{a}\lambda\lambda a$, as well as with ϵi $\pi a\rho\epsilon\kappa a\lambda o \tilde{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu$. The aorist, with $a\nu$ following the imperfect, here denotes transitory action referable to present time (*if* we were urging ... we would examine: see Hermann de partic. $\ddot{a}\nu$, 1. 10), or possibly (since we have $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\dot{\sigma}\sigma\nu\nu$ 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 imperfect ($\epsilon i \dot{\epsilon}r\dot{\nu}\gamma\chi\dot{a}\nu\epsilon\nu$ $\dot{a}\nu$... $d\pi\epsilon\kappa\rho\dot{\nu}a\tau\sigma$), in speaking of something continuing in past time. Some would read $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ - $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\pi\tau\dot{\sigma}\mu\epsilon\theta a$ here, but it is scarcely Attic. See 476, A, note.

E. aνθρώπουs ... ετύχομεν. The style passes freely from

515 Β. σὸν ἰδιωτεύοντος. Soph. § 174; Cr. § 454; K. § 266.2.

D. For what is here said of "the four," see the Introduction. — $d\gamma a\theta o\lambda \pi o\lambda \lambda \tau a\iota$ here is much the same as $d\gamma a$ - $\theta o\lambda \tau a \pi o\lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa d$, which is used as an equivalent, 516, C, 517, A.

E. $dxoi\omega$. See 503, C. — $\epsilon is \mu\sigma\theta\phi\rho\rho iav$... karaorifoavra, 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, Book II. §§ 14, 15. — $\tau \hat{\omega}v \tau \hat{a} \delta \tau a \kappa a \tau \epsilon a \gamma \delta \tau \omega v$. See 469, D. This phrase- is explained fully by Protag. 342, 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, ($\delta \tau a \kappa a \tau \dot{a} \gamma v v v \tau a \mu \mu \omega \dot{\nu} \mu v \omega \dot{\mu} \dot{\nu} v \dot{\nu} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\nu}$), and bind the cæstus round their

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. $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \delta \nu \epsilon \sigma a \nu$. Comp. Soph. § 79 (91. 6, N. 4); Cr. 516 § 194. 1; K. § 120, R. 2. — $\epsilon \lambda \sigma \pi h \nu a \nu \tau \sigma \tilde{\nu} \kappa a \tau \epsilon \psi \eta \phi i \sigma a \nu \tau \sigma$. Thucyd. merely says (2. 65) $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \sigma \iota \nu \epsilon \xi \eta \mu i \omega \sigma a \nu$. Plutarch mentions an accusation and a fine (Vit. Periel. § 35), as does Diodorus also (12. 45); but the charge was no doubt false: he was $\chi \rho \eta \mu \dot{a} \tau \omega \nu \delta \iota a \phi a \nu \dot{\omega} s d \delta \omega \rho \dot{\sigma} \tau \tau \sigma s$ by the testimony of the most impartial of historians. See Appendix, No. II. — $\theta a \nu \dot{a} \tau \omega \nu \epsilon \dot{\pi} \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \tau \dot{\eta} s$. Comp. Xen. Memorab. 1. 2. 32, for a similar passage. — $d \pi \epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota \xi \epsilon \ldots \pi \sigma \iota \sigma \tilde{\nu} \nu \tau a s$ *if he had caused them to do*. This verb and $d \pi \sigma \phi a \dot{\nu} \omega$ are often used in the sense of causing something to appear, of *effecting*, *rendering*, and, like $\phi a \dot{\nu} \omega$, $\delta \epsilon i \kappa \nu \nu \mu$, take their complement in the form of a participle.

B. καὶ τόδε ... χάρισαι. There is a similar play upon χαρίζομαι in Repub. 1. 351, C, σοὶ γάρ, ἔφη, χαρίζομαι. Εὖ γε σὺ ποιῶν· ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τόδε μοι χάρισαι καὶ λέγε.

C. $\delta s \ \tilde{\epsilon} \phi \eta \ \tilde{\epsilon} O \mu \eta \rho \rho s$. Nusquam disertis verbis hoc dictum in eo quem hodie habemus Homero, nisi quis hue trahere velit quod Routhius fecit Odyss. 6. 120, 9. 175, $\tilde{\eta} \ \rho'$ $o \tilde{\iota} \gamma' \dot{\iota} \beta \rho \iota \sigma \tau a \iota \tau \epsilon \kappa a \tilde{\iota} \ \tilde{a} \gamma \rho \iota o \iota , o \delta \delta \tilde{\epsilon} \delta \iota \kappa a \iota o \iota$. Heindorf. Plato puts the $d\gamma a \theta o \tilde{\iota}$ and $\tilde{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho o \iota$ together, in Repub. 5. 470, E, and makes $\tau \delta \ \tilde{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho o \nu$ a part of the philosophic nature in Repub. 3. 410, E. — $\delta \nu \ \tilde{\eta} \kappa \iota \sigma \tau' \ \tilde{a} \nu \ \tilde{\epsilon} \beta o \tilde{\iota} \lambda \epsilon \tau o$, i. e. $\epsilon \tilde{\iota} s \ \tilde{\upsilon} \nu$.

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. 677, Dindorf, whom Valck. on Herodot. 6. 136 first cited from a MS. The Scholiast says $\ddot{\sigma}\tau\epsilon \ \epsilon \ \kappa \rho (\nu \epsilon \tau \sigma \ \epsilon \tau \eta) \ \Pi \ d\rho \phi$ (i. e.

on account of his fruitless attack upon the island of Paros soon after the battle of Marathon), ήθέλησαν αὐτὸν κατακρημνήσαι, ό δε πρύτανις είσελθών έξητήσατο αὐτών. Plato perhaps exaggerates a little in saying inphioanto. The Prytanis, 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. - τον έν Μαραθώνι, him who was at Marathon, the general there. ϵv is used because the action was "in Marathonio agro." See Soph. Electr. 1. Thucyd. 2. 85, της έν Στράτω μάχης, at, near Stratus. --- το βάραθρον is defined 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 Keiriadæ, a demus of the Œneid 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. $\epsilon i \ \mu \eta$ diá, but for. This not unfrequent formula has always the same sense as if some part of $\kappa \omega \lambda \dot{\omega} \omega$ were understood. The origin of the phrase is not clear. Ast accounts for it as a confusion or union of two forms of speaking; e. g., in this case, $\epsilon i \ \mu \eta$ do $\Pi \rho \dot{\nu} \tau a \nu \iota s \ \eta \nu$, if the Prytanis had not existed, ... $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu \ \ddot{a} \nu$, and dia $\tau \partial \nu \Pi \ldots o \dot{\nu} \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$. This sentence 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. $Z \epsilon \tilde{\nu} \gamma \sigma$ is often used of the vehicle, as well as of the yoke or pair of animals drawing it.

A. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \tau o \iota \epsilon \mu \pi \rho o \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$. Here, by a kind of zeugma, $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon - 517$ yes, readily suggested by ωμολόγειs, is to be supplied, together with rivás, which is contained in oùdéva. Comp. Soph. Antig. 29. - où yàp av ¿ξέπεσον. The metaphor is borrowed from charioteers, and is the more natural, as persons who lost their rank or authority were said exmessiv. Comp. Soph. Antig. 679. — over $\tau \hat{\eta}$ κολακική. 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, according to the Sophists, σώζει έκ των μεγίστων κινδύνων μάλιστα $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon_{avró\nu}$. Aristides triumphs in a supposed inconsistency of Plato, who had before called "the four" κόλακας, and now says that they did not use $\tau \hat{\eta}$ κολακικ $\hat{\eta}$ $\hat{\rho}\eta \tau o \rho \iota \kappa \hat{\eta}$. But he does not see into the meaning. The words contain a sneer at the rhetoricians. They were κόλακες, inasinuch 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 false rhetoric, but could not gain that for which the art was esteemed.

B. $\pi \circ \lambda \circ \hat{v} \ \epsilon \ \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \dots \ \mu \hat{\gamma} \dots \ \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \acute{a} \sigma \eta \tau a \iota$. $\pi \circ \lambda \wedge \hat{v} \ \delta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$ is 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 $\pi \circ \lambda \wedge \hat{v} \ \delta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$, being in sense a negative, adopts the construction appropriate to $\circ \hat{\iota}$. $\circ \hat{\iota} \ \mu \hat{\eta} \ \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \hat{a} \cdot$ $\sigma \eta \tau a \iota$ would be a familiar formula. $- \hat{v}_S \ \beta \circ \hat{\iota} \lambda \epsilon \iota$, a singular expression for $(\tau \iota_S) \ \delta \nu \ \beta \circ \hat{\iota} \lambda \epsilon \iota$, to be referred to the rule of attraction of the relative. Comp. Cr. § 526. γ . The verb must be regarded as coalescing with \hat{v}_S to form one notion, like quivis in Latin. $- \hat{w}_S \ \gamma \epsilon \ \delta \iota a \kappa \acute{o} \nu \circ s \ \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu a \iota \ \pi \circ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$, as to

their being servants of the state, or considering them merely as ($\delta s \gamma \epsilon$) being servants of the state. Stallb. thinks that the phrase arises, by a confusio duarum locutionum, out of $\delta s \ldots \delta \iota a \kappa \delta \nu o v s$, and $\delta \iota a \kappa \delta \nu o v s \epsilon \delta \nu a \iota$. But the infinitive with δs can be used in this relation to the main verb, as well as in others. — $\kappa a \iota \mu \eta \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \rho \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$, and in regard to not letting them have their own way. The infinitives limit $\delta \iota \epsilon \phi \epsilon \rho o \nu$. — $\tau o \iota \tau \sigma \nu$, politicians of the present day.

C. οὐδὲν παυόμεθα... ἀεί. Comp. 491, A. — ἀγνοοῦντες ἀλλήλων ὅ τι λέγομεν. ἀγνοέω takes a genitive, like μανθάνω and other verbs of learning or understanding. Soph. § 182; Cr. § 375. β ; K. § 273. 5, f.

518 A. διὸ δὴ καὶ ταύτας... εἶναι. The construction changes from ὅτι and a finite verb, εἰδότι ὅτι ἕστι τις, etc., to an infinitive with its subject accus. — ταὐτὰ οὖν ταῦτα, 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 agree to it, as if understanding what I mean. τοτὲ μὲν answers to ολίγον δὲ ὕστερον, and δὲ is, in a sense, out of its place.

B. $\pi \rho \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \epsilon$, to hold forward as a sample of what 19 *

one has got, hence to take, or select as a specimen. όμοιοτάτους . . . ωσπερ. See 485, A. --- Θεαρίων must have been the fashionable baker at Athens. He is thus spoken of in a fragment of the Gerytades of Aristophanes (Athenæus, 3. 112, E): ήκω Θεαρίωνος άρτοπώλιον | λιπών, ίν έστι κριβάνων έδώδια, — which is a parody of the beginning of the Hecuba. And a longer fragment from the Omphale of Antiphanes, 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 white loaves of bread . . . oùs $\delta \eta \mu \delta \tau \alpha is | \Theta \epsilon \alpha \rho i \omega \nu \, \epsilon \delta \epsilon i \xi \epsilon \nu$. άρτοκόπος. In a number of MSS., άρτοποιος appears. Still another word for the same thing is apromónos, which has most commendation from the Atticists, and which has probably been without reason thrust out of its place by the other words in a number of instances. See Lobeck on Phrynichus, 222. — Midaikos, etc. Mithæcus, 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, Συρακοσίαν τράπεζαν και Σικελικήν ποικιλίαν όψων, ώς έοικας, ούκ αίνεις. Athenæus, 12. 518, C, διαβόητοί είσιν έπι τρυφή και αι Σικελών τράπεζαι. Comp. also 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 knowledge of him from this passage. See the commentators on Suidas, sub voce.

C. $\pi a \rho a \sigma \kappa \epsilon v a \sigma \tau \dot{a} s d v \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \sigma v s$. $\tilde{a} v \theta \rho \omega \pi \sigma s$ is often added in contempt, having something of the force of our *fellow*. $\dot{a} v \dot{\eta} \rho$ is used, on the contrary, with an honorable sense. This

D. $\delta\tau_{\alpha\nu}$ $\delta\eta$ advois $\eta\kappa_{\eta}$, when now their former repletion shall have brought on disease a good while afterwards. $\eta\kappa_{\omega}$ $\phi\epsilon_{\rho\omega\nu}$ is often nearly the same as $\phi\epsilon_{\rho\omega}$, and can 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 calamitics. It is thus that some, who look with alarm on the turn our affairs are taking, worship Jefferson as a political saint. --- $\kappa ai \phi a \sigma i \dots a v \tau o v s$ is for $\kappa ai o v s \phi a \sigma i$, by a change of style from the relative to the demonstrative.

519 A. καταβολή. περιοδική λήψις πυρετοῦ, interprete Timæo Lex. p. 154 ubi v. Ruhnkén. Heindorf. —— ᾿Αλκιβιάδου. 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.

B. αγανακτούντων, sc. αὐτῶν, these politicians.

C. Comp. 460, C, and Xen. Memorab. 1. 2. 7. $--\kappa_{\ell\nu}$ δυνεύει ταὐτὸν εἶναι, (τούτοις,) ὅσοι, the same thing seems to hold good of those who, etc. But Mt. § 632, has a different explanation of the form of the sentence.

D. καὶ τσώτου τοῦ λόγου. For καί, Heindorf, without authority, writes καίτοι. But καί, in the beginning of imperative and interrogative sentences, marks liveliness of transition (Mt. § 620), like our and in animated questions, particularly in those where objections are refuted. — $\delta\eta$ μηγορείν με ἡνάγκασας. See 482, C, 494, D.

E. $\sigma v \chi v o \dot{v} s \tau \epsilon i v \omega \tau \dot{\omega} v \lambda \dot{o} \gamma \omega v$. The construction seems to be $\tau i v a s \tau \dot{\omega} v \lambda \dot{o} \gamma \omega v \sigma v \chi v o \dot{v} s \tau \epsilon i v \omega$, i. e. $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon \sigma v \chi v o \dot{v} s \epsilon i v a i, some$ things which I have to say I dwell largely upon. But if $\lambda \dot{o} \gamma \omega v$ depends on $\sigma v \chi v o \dot{v} s$, as it well can (comp. Soph. § 177. 1), the sense must be, I think, a good many of my discourses I extend in length. $--- \pi \rho \dot{o} s \phi i \lambda i o v$. See 500, B.

A. $\ddot{\sigma}\tau a\nu \tau \dot{\nu}\chi \omega \sigma a\nu$. 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 mere teacher of words ($\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \sigma i \epsilon \tau a \delta \epsilon \hat{i} \nu \pi \sigma \iota \epsilon \hat{i} \nu \delta \epsilon \iota \nu \sigma \sigma \delta$, Meno, 95, C), for the Sophists, whose pretensions were as much higher as wisdom is higher than eloquence.

B. $\hat{\eta} \dots \hat{a}_{\mu a} \kappa a \hat{\epsilon}_{a \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu} \kappa a \tau \eta \gamma o \rho \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\nu}$. Here supply $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\nu}$ or $\hat{a}_{\nu} \dot{a}_{\gamma} \kappa \eta \nu \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu a \iota$, which is readily suggested by $\hat{\epsilon}_{\gamma} \chi \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$. Comp. 517, A.

C. $\pi po \acute{\sigma} \theta a_{i}$, to bestow freely, and in the first instance, without knowing what return the party receiving the favor will make. Comp. Thucyd. 2. 43, κάλλιστον έρανον αὐτη προϊέμενοι, bestowing upon their country a most precious contribution. So προεμένους εὐεργεσίαν, Xen. Anab. 7. 7. 47, where Schneider adverts to this sense. --- ανευ μισθού. 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. - ένεχώρει. The absolute form without $a\nu$ is here used for the hypothetical with it. See Mt. § 508, Obs. 2; K. § 260, R. 3. ---- $\tau_{\eta\nu}$ xápiv, the favor due, the compensation, as a mark of a grateful mind. ---- καὶ μὴ συνθέμενος ... τό ἀργύριον, and 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. $\ddot{\sigma}\tau \mu \dot{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau \alpha$ is joined with $\ddot{\alpha}\mu \alpha$ to increase its preciseness.

E. $\epsilon a \nu \mu \eta \tau s a \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \delta t \delta \hat{\varphi}$. $a \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$ refers to the indefinite subject of $\phi \dot{a} \nu a \cdot \tau$ $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \pi o \iota \epsilon i \nu$. There can be little doubt that Stallb. is right in separating these words, in opposition to Buttmann (2. 361, largest Gr.), who writes in one word $\dot{a} \nu \tau \epsilon \nu \pi o \iota \epsilon i \nu$. $\epsilon \dot{\nu}$ and $\delta \nu s$ are united only to derivative forms, except in the instance of the strange word $\delta \nu \sigma$ - $\theta \nu \eta \sigma \kappa \omega \nu$, used by Euripides. — $\epsilon i \epsilon v \pi o \iota \eta \sigma a s$. Heindorf writes $\delta \epsilon v \pi o \iota \eta \sigma a s$, "sed fallitur, loco qui repudiat articulum non recte explicato." Hermann on Eurip. Hecuba, 485, 2d ed. The indefinite subject is understood, and ϵv $\pi o \iota \eta \sigma a s$ denotes after conferring a favor.

521 A. ώς διακονήσοντα καὶ όμιλήσοντα. Instead of writing τὴν τοῦ διακονεῖν καὶ όμιλεῖν, Plato deserts the construction of the nearest words, through the influence of ὡς ἰατρόν, and accommodates the participles to παρακαλεῖς. See Mt. § 555, Obs. 2. Just below, Heindorf, Coray, and Stallb. think that ὡς has fallen out before κολακεύσοντα.

B. ϵ_i^{\prime} σοι Μυσών γε ήδιον καλείν. The sense of this 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 ($\epsilon_i \mu \eta$... ποιήσειs) you will —..." The apodosis to $\epsilon_i \ldots \kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon_i \nu$ is omitted, being readily suggested by the sense of the passage. It is οῦτως κάλει, or οὐδèν κωλύει, or something equivalent. The apodosis which $\epsilon_i \mu \eta$... ποιήσειs would have had, if Socrates had not cut the sentence short, is to be found in his words. With καλείν must be understood τοῦ-

τον, this political man, whom in fact, though not in so many words, Socrates calls a κόλακα. But the connection with the foregoing must be owned to be rather loose. The Mysians stood low among the people of Asia Minor. Μυσῶν $čσ\chi ατos$ (Theætet. 209, B) is a proverb for the vilest of the vile. Cicero, in his Or. pro Flacco, § 27, says : "Quid porro in Græco sermone, tam tritum atque celebratum est, quam, si quis despicatui ducitur, ut Mysorum ultimus esse dicatur?"

C. $o \dot{v}\chi \ \tilde{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \iota \ \delta \tau \iota \ \chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \ a \dot{v} \tau o \hat{s}$. $a \dot{v} \tau o \hat{s}$ is his property, before spoken of in $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \tau \iota \ \tilde{\epsilon} \chi \omega$. In 465, C, the indicative, but in many places the subjunctive, follows $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \omega$ 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 and ground of action. Thus, in $o \dot{\nu} \kappa \ \tilde{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota \ \delta \tau \iota \ \chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$, the subject is in doubt about his future action; in $o \dot{\nu} \kappa \ \tilde{\epsilon} . \delta . \ \chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta - \tau a \iota$, about his rational future action. $---\delta s \mu o \iota \delta \delta \kappa \epsilon \hat{s}$. $\dot{\omega} s$ is exclamatory. $---\delta s \ o \iota \kappa \delta \nu \ \ldots \ \kappa a \iota \ o \dot{\nu} \kappa \ \dot{\iota} \nu \ \epsilon \ell \sigma a \chi \theta \epsilon \dot{\iota} s, as$ though you were living aloof, and could not be brought (on $trial) into court. For <math>\epsilon \ell \sigma a \chi \theta \epsilon \dot{\iota} s \ \dot{\iota} \nu \ \epsilon \delta s$, Λ , note.

D. $\delta \tau \iota \tau \dot{\nu} \chi o \iota$. Mireris Heindorfium $\delta \tau \iota \dot{a}\nu \tau \dot{\nu} \chi o \iota$ corrigentem. Nam optativus post relativa in obliqua oratione haudquaquam infrequens est. Addito $\dot{a}\nu$ hoc loco scribendum erat $\tau \dot{\nu} \chi y$. 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. — $\pi o \nu \eta \rho \delta s$. An allusion, no doubt, to the actual accusers. — $o \dot{\delta} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \ddot{a} \tau \sigma \sigma \nu$, sc. $\epsilon \ddot{u} p$.

E. $\tau \dot{a} \kappa o \mu \psi \dot{a} \tau a \hat{v} \tau a$. An allusion to what Callicles says, 486, C. — $\delta \delta \epsilon \epsilon i \rho \gamma a \sigma \tau a \dot{a} \nu \eta \rho$. $\delta \delta \epsilon$, like $o \delta \tau o s$, 489, B,
NOTES.

used of a person who is present and pointed at, has no article. $---\kappa a\lambda a \dot{v} \tau \sigma \dot{v} s$, $\kappa a\lambda \tau \sigma \dot{v} s$ $\nu \epsilon \omega \tau \dot{\sigma} \tau \sigma v s$. $a \dot{v} \tau \sigma \dot{v} s$ is taken with $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{a} s$ $\epsilon \dot{\ell} \rho \gamma a \sigma \tau a \iota$, and serves to contrast the whole $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{a} s$ with the part $\nu \epsilon \omega \tau \dot{\sigma} \tau \sigma v s$. $\kappa a\lambda = and especially. ---- \nu \epsilon \omega \tau \dot{\sigma} \tau \sigma v s$. $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon \dot{\iota} \rho \epsilon \iota$. An allusion to the actual charge against Socrates. Comp. 522, B.

522 A. For εἰωχεῖν governing two accusatives, see Mt. § 421, Obs. 1; Cr. § 430. This construction (which γείω also sometimes takes) seems 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. 6.86): τίθει μαγείρω μνῶς δέκ', ἰατρῶ δραχμήν· | κόλακι τάλανται πέντε, συμβούλω καπνόν· | πόρνη τάλαντον, φιλοσόφω τριώβολον.

B. οὔτε γὰρ ήδονάς. Το οὕτε, ἐάν τε answers. An affirmative and a negative proposition are often thus bound together by out and te; but out must come first. autois i. e. ούτε τούτους, οίς ταῦτα (referring to ήδοναί) πορίζεται. ---- anopeiv noiovra. 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 avrós re anoρείς, και τους άλλους ποιείς απορείν."

C. πράττω τὸ ὑμέτερον δὴ τοῦτο, and herein I am doing

D. $\beta o \eta \theta \epsilon i a \epsilon a \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$. This noun with the dative denotes help afforded to; with the genitive, against (comp. $\beta o \eta \theta \epsilon i a \kappa a \kappa o \hat{\nu}$, 509, C, $\beta a \rho \beta \dot{a} \rho \omega \nu$, Plat. Epist. 7. 332, E), or to any one. — There is an allusion here to 486, B.

E. avrò rò $d\pi o \theta \nu \eta \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$. Comp. for the sentiment Plato's Apol. 28, B, et seq. — $\phi \circ \beta \epsilon i \tau a \iota$, sc. $\pi a s \tau \iota s$, by brachylogy supplied from $o v \delta \epsilon i s$, just above. See my note on Soph. Antig. 29. — $\delta s \tau o v \tau o v \tau \omega s \tilde{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota$ depends on $\lambda \delta \gamma o \nu$ $\lambda \epsilon \xi a \iota$, as if it were $\lambda \delta \gamma \omega \delta \epsilon i \xi a \iota \delta s \ldots \tilde{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota$.

A. $\phi_{\alpha\sigma'_{1}}$, i. e. as story-tellers say, when they begin a 523 story. $\longrightarrow \lambda \delta_{\gamma \sigma \nu}$ opposed to $\mu \hat{\nu} \theta_{\sigma \nu}$ is a historical narrative, a true story, as opposed to a fictitious narrative. \longrightarrow "Oµ¬- $\rho_{\sigma \sigma} \lambda \dot{\epsilon}_{\gamma \epsilon \iota}$. Iliad. 15. 187. $\longrightarrow \kappa a \dot{\iota} \dot{\epsilon}_{\alpha} \kappa a \dot{\iota} \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \, \tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau \iota}$, et semper et nunc etiam. Ast. $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\sigma \tau \iota \nu}$ includes a past tense.

C. $\epsilon_{\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\omega\sigma\epsilon}$, in each direction, to the blessed islands, and to the prison of punishment.

D. $\pi \rho \circ \kappa \epsilon \kappa a \lambda \upsilon \mu \mu \ell \upsilon \omega = \ell \chi \circ \upsilon \tau \epsilon s \pi \rho \circ \kappa \epsilon \kappa a \lambda \upsilon \mu \mu \ell \upsilon \upsilon v$. See Æsch. Prometh. 362; Soph. Electr. 54. 'The sense is, having eyes and ears, and the whole body, spread as a veil before the soul. — a voîs . . · $\ell \pi i \pi \rho \circ \sigma \theta \epsilon \upsilon \gamma i \gamma \upsilon \epsilon \tau a$, are in their way. — $\tau \circ \tilde{\upsilon} \tau' a \vartheta \tau \tilde{\omega} \upsilon$, this property of theirs, this in them.

523, E.]

NOTES.

E. $\dot{\epsilon}\xi a i \phi \nu \eta s \ d\pi \sigma \theta a \nu \delta \nu \tau \sigma s = \epsilon \dot{\upsilon} \theta \dot{\upsilon} s \ d\pi \sigma \theta a \nu \delta \nu \tau \sigma s$, the moment he is dead. Soph. § 222, N. 4. — By a construction ad sensum, $\tilde{\epsilon} \rho \eta \mu \sigma \nu \ldots \kappa \alpha \tau a \lambda \iota \pi \delta \nu \tau \sigma$ are in the masculine, because $\tau \eta \nu \psi \nu \chi \eta \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \sigma \nu$ is the same as each person. — $\delta \dot{\iota} \sigma \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \eta s$ 'A $\sigma \dot{\iota} a s$. 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. έν τῷ λειμῶνι, etc. Virgil, Æneid, 6. 540 :-

"Hie locus est, partes ubi se via findit in ambas: Dextera, quæ Ditis magni sub mænia tendit, Hac iter Elysium nobis: at læva malorum "Exercet pænas, et ad impia Tartara mittit."

B. οὐ πολὺ ἦττον ... ἦνπερ καὶ ὅτε ἔζη. A free and rather irregular construction, instead of οὐ πολὺ ἦττον ... ἢ ὅτε ἔζη. ἦνπερ is brought in through the influence of τὴν ἕξιν τὴν αὐτοῦ, and alters the ensuing words to suit itself.

D. olos είναι παρεσκεύαστο, 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, ἕνδηλα ταῦτα refer to the qualities of body implied in olos εἶναι παρεσκεύαστο, as if ola ἕσχεν ἐν τῷ σώματι had been written.

E. $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \hat{i} \delta \epsilon \nu \ldots \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$. The aorist marks indefinite time (484, A, note): $\psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$ depends on $o \delta \delta \epsilon \nu$; nothing belonging to, or in, the soul. Comp. Repub. 376, A, $\delta \kappa a \lambda$ $\tilde{a} \xi_{io\nu} \quad \theta a \dot{v} \mu a \sigma a \iota \tau o \tilde{v} \quad \theta \eta \rho i o \upsilon = - \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{a} \quad \delta i a \mu \epsilon \mu a \sigma \tau i \gamma \omega \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta \nu$, etc. Tacit. Annal. 6. 6, "Neque frustra præstantissimus sapientiæ firmare solitus est, si recludantur tyrannorum mentes, posse adspici laniatus et ictus; quando, ut corpora verberibus, ita sævitia, libidine, malis consultis animus dilaceretur."

C. rois dei. See 464, D; Prometh. 937.

D. τούς πολλούς ... παραδειγμάτων. By a constructio ad sensum, παραδειγμάτων used of the persons who serve as examples, is joined to πολλούς, as if it were masculine. — "Ομηρος. Odys. 11. 575, seq.

E. où yàp $\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\xi}\hat{\eta}\nu$ aù $\hat{\eta}\hat{\varphi}$, sc. $\sigma\nu\nu\hat{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta a.$ — $\hat{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$... $\hat{u}\nu$ - $\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma o.$, the men who prove to be even very wicked are of the class of the powerful. Here, 497, A, 526, B, and elsewhere, $\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta a$ means to become subjectively, i. e. to become in the view of the mind, to be found out to be.

C. enonphyvauevos, eav re, etc., putting his mark upon 526 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 $(\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon ia)$ 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." - ou πολυπραγμονήσαντος, who has not been " a busybody 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 a man τὰ αύτοῦ πράττει καὶ οὐ πολυπραγμονεῖ. Here the 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. $\epsilon \kappa \acute{a} \tau \epsilon \rho o s \dots \nu \acute{\epsilon} \kappa v \sigma \sigma \iota \nu$. 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. $d\nu\tau\iota\pi\alpha\rho\kappa\alpha\lambda\hat{\omega}$. $d\nu\tau\hat{\iota}$ denotes in my turn, in reply to the exhortations which you gave me to engage in politics. Just below, $d\nu\tau\hat{\iota}$... $d\gamma\omega\nu\omega\nu$ 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. $d\nu \theta d\delta\epsilon$, $d\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}$, and $d\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\sigma\epsilon$ are often used of this life, and of death or a future state; the context of course suggesting the explanation. Comp. Soph. Antig. 76; Electr. 356; Eurip. Alcest. 363.

527 A. $\tau \partial \nu \tau \eta s$ Algiung vión. Æacus (son of Jupiter and Ægina), as being the judge for all from Europe. Olympiod. apud Stallb. says, "He adds Ægina because Callicles was from Ægina." But as that Platonic Scholiast can have known nothing about Callicles, I suspect that the last word, Algiungs, is an error in transcribing for Edpánns, occasioned by the similar word preceding it. — $\chi u \sigma \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$, etc. This noble passage alludes to 486, B. — $\tau \nu \pi \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$. The Attic form of the future of $\tau \nu \pi \tau \omega$, according to Thomas Magister and Mæris sub voce. Comp. Aristoph. Clouds, 1379, 1443. The later writers used all the forms from $\tau \nu \pi \tau \epsilon \omega$, unless it be the present and imperfect.

B. $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \dots \sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$, advantageous there. See 526, 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 Æschin. c. Ctes. § 97, Bekker: "He said that he wished to report to you $\tau h \nu \epsilon \kappa$ $\Pi \epsilon \lambda \sigma \sigma \rho \nu \tau \eta \sigma \sigma \sigma \beta \epsilon i a \nu \eta \nu \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon$, his embassy into Peloponnesus, strictly the embassy into P. from which he had returned. $\eta \rho \epsilon \mu \epsilon i$, remains quiet, unskaken, i.e. unre-

futed. — où tò δοκεῖν εἶναι ἀγαθόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶναι. Comp. the noble words in Repub. 2. 361, A, ἐσχάτη ἀδικία δοκεῖν δίκαιον εἶναι, μὴ ὅντα. Æschylus was the source of the expression, Sept. c. Theb. 574, οὐ γὰρ δοκεῖν ἄριστος ἀλλ' εἶναι θέλει, upon which words all the theatre turned and looked at Aristides, according to Plutarch in his life.

C. $\delta \tilde{v} \tau \omega \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon \delta v$. $\delta \tilde{v} \tau \omega$ is immediately explained by $\epsilon \pi i \tau \delta \delta i \kappa a \iota \omega \tau a \epsilon \ell v \tau a \tilde{v} \theta a$, to that kind of life. $\epsilon v \tau a \tilde{v} \theta a$ came perhaps to be used with a verb of motion, because with the motion its end, rest in the place, is often thought of. — $\delta s \delta \delta \gamma \sigma s \sigma \eta \mu a \ell v \epsilon \iota$, as the discourse shows. Stallb. gives $\delta s \delta \sigma \delta s \lambda \delta \gamma \sigma s$, with the best of the MSS., to which Ast very justly objects. The same false reading appears 511, B, 460, 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. $\pi a \tau \dot{a} \xi a \iota$. The interpreters are divided between πa τάξαι, with which «ασόν τινα and σε, from σου, just above, are to be supplied, and $\pi \dot{a} \tau a \xi a sine te verberari$. 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 from Aristoph. Clouds, 494, φέρ' ίδω τί δρậs, ήν τίς σε τύπτη; where Strepsiades replies, τύπτομαι: this word Stallb. takes in the sense of έω έμαυτον τύπτεσθαι. I apprehend that τύπτομαι 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 $\sigma \dot{\nu} \gamma \epsilon \theta a \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \dot{\omega} \nu$; for $\sigma \dot{\nu}$ is occasionally repeated with $\gamma \epsilon$ in the second clause, with a certain increase of

NOTES.

force in the exhortation. Comp. Herodot. 7. 10, "I shall hear of you as being torn to pieces by dogs and birds, $\eta' \kappa ov$ $\epsilon \nu \gamma \eta \tau \eta' \lambda \theta \eta \nu a(\omega \nu \eta' \sigma \epsilon' \gamma \epsilon \ \epsilon \nu \ \tau \eta' \Lambda a \kappa \epsilon \delta a: \mu ov(\omega \nu;)"$ Soph. Ed. Tyr. 1101, $\tau is \ \sigma \epsilon \dots \epsilon \tau i \kappa \tau \epsilon \dots$ Havos $\dots \pi po \sigma \pi \epsilon \lambda a \sigma \theta \epsilon i \sigma', \eta'$ $\sigma \epsilon' \gamma \epsilon \dots \Lambda o \xi i ov;$ The sense is true of $\delta' \gamma \epsilon$, and tu in Latin. Nor do I see how $\theta a \rho h \omega \nu$ opposes this construction any more than $\theta a \rho h \omega \nu \sigma \omega$ 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 $\pi a \tau \sigma \tau a \tau a \tau a$, imperative middle, in his second edition.

E. οις οὐδέποτε ταὐτὰ δοκεί. Comp. 491, B. He includes himself in the censure, to give it a milder form.

20*



APPENDIX.

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 need the information that Gorgias lodged there? 4. Perhaps it may be regarded as a slight argument, that Socrates says (506, A), $\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\omega}_{\mu\epsilon\nu} \chi_{\alpha}\hat{i}_{\rho\epsilon\iota\nu} \kappa_{\alpha}\hat{i}_{\alpha}\hat{i}_{\omega\mu\epsilon\nu}$: to which Gorgias replies, "It does not seem to me that we ought yet $\hat{a}\pi_i\hat{\epsilon}\nu_{\alpha i}$." For $\hat{a}\pi_i\hat{\epsilon}\nu_{\alpha i}$ must have the same subject as the preceding $\hat{a}\pi_i\hat{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu$. 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 be, if they were where Gorgias was staying.

No one within my knowledge has examined what Schleicrmacher 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 spoke. Plato's expression is idia inideifers notούμενος, and idia, contrasted with έν τῷ δήμω, just preceding, 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 exhibition, and therefore begged the visitors to call at another time. But need they be turned away? Might they not be invited in, without the necessity of a new exhibition on the part of Gorgias ?

2. When? The passage 473, E, which is treated of at

 $\mathbf{236}$

large in the note, has been usually supposed to determine the time. But several scholars, as Boeckh (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 $\nu \epsilon \omega \sigma \tau i \tau \epsilon$ τελευτηκώς, 503, C. But νεωστί 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 παλαιοίς πράγμασιν, just before 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 question 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, 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 serious 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 Themistoeles, Cimon, and Miltiades, it wears the appearance of an unfounded accusa-The other is, that the fact may have been as Plato tion. 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 does 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 epicheirotoniæ, or in consequence of a special process, an eisangelia. A suit was brought against him, — probably a $\gamma \rho a \phi \eta$, though Plutarch calls it a disp. Cleon, Simmias, or Lacratidas

APPENDIX.

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 κλοπή δημοσίων πραγμάτων, 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 (euthyna), 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 : -- " If one should ask Plato whether, supposing he had been one of Pericles's judges when he was tried for peculation, he would have been one 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 serious 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, $\epsilon i \delta \delta \xi i a$, 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 Phædrus is declared to be $\pi \acute{a}\nu\tau\omega\nu \tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\omega}\tau a\tau os \epsilon \acute{ls} \tau \grave{\eta}\nu \acute{\rho}\eta\tau\rho\mu\kappa\acute{\eta}\nu$. 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.

See 486, A, note.

The verses yet extant of this dialogue between the brothers have been collected and emended by Valckenaer, Matthiæ, 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): —

> "Nec tua laudabis studia, aut aliena reprêndes, Nec, cum venari volet ille, poemata panges. Gratia sic fratrum geminorum, Amphionis atque Zethi, dissiluit, donec suspecta severo Conticuit lyra; frateruis cessisse putatur Moribus Amphion."

Zethus first speaks:---

^{*}Λμφιον, ἀμελεῖς ὡν ἐπιμελεῖσθαί σε δεῖ • ψυχῆς δὲ . . . ὡδε γενναίαν φύσιν

APPENDIX.

γυναικομίμω διαπρέπεις μορφώματι ουτ' έν δίκης βουλαΐσιν ὀρθώς ἀν λόγον προθείο πιθανόν, ουτ' ἀν ἀσπίδος κύτει όμιλήσειας, ουτ' ἀλλων ῦπερ νεανικόν βούλευμα βουλεύσαιο. . . κακῶν κατάρχεις τῆνδε Μοῦσαν εἰσάγων ἀσύμφοοόν τιν' ἄτοπον ἀργὸν φίλοινον χρημάτων ἀτημελῆ.

πολλοί δὲ θνητῶν τοῦτο πάσχουσιν κακόν. γνώμη φρονοῦντες οὐ θέλουσ' ὑπηρετείν ψυχῆ, τὰ πολλὰ πρὸς φίλων νικώμενοι.

άνὴρ γὰρ ὅστις εῦ βίον κεκτημένος τὰ μὲν κατ' οἴκους ἀμελία παρεὶς ἐậ, μολπαῖσι δ' ἡσθεὶς τοῦτ' ἀεὶ θηρεύεται, ἀργὸς μὲν οἴκοις καὶ πόλει γενήσεται, φίλοισι δ' οὐδείς · ἡ φύσις γὰρ οἴχεται ὅταν γλυκείας ἡδονῆς ἦνσων τις ἦ · καὶ πῶς σοφὰν τοῦτ' ἐστίν, εἶ τις εὐφυῆ λαβοῦσα τέχνη ψῶτ' ἔθηκε χείρονα μήτ' αὐτὰν αὐτῷ δυνάμενον προσάρκεσαι;

μισῶ
μισῶ
σοφὸν λόγοισι, ἐς δ' ὕνησιν οὐ σοφόν.
ἀλλ' ἐμοῖ πιθοῦ,
παῦσαι δ' ἀοιδῶν, πολεμίων δ' εὐμουσίαν
ἄσκει, τοιαῦτ' ἄειδ' ἀφ' ῶν δόξεις φρονεῖν,
σκάπτων, ἀρῶν γῆν, ποιμνίοις ἐπιστατῶν,
ἄλλοις τὰ κομψὰ ταῦτ' ἀφεὶς σοφίσματα
ἐξ ῶν κενοῦσιν ἐγκατοικήσεις δόμοις.

ΑΜΦΙΩΝ.

έκ παντός ών τις πρώγματος δισσών λόγων 21 241

.

.

αγώνα θείτ' αν, εί λέγειν είη σοφός

.

.

.

.

. . . . δς δ' εὐγλωσσία νικᾶ, σοφὸς μέν, ἀλλά τοι τὰ πράγματα κρείσσω νομίζω τῶν λόγων ἀεί ποτε.

. .

λαμπρός δ' έκιστος κάπι τοῦτ' ἐπείγεται, νέμων τὸ πλεῖστον ἡμέρας τούτφ μέρος εν' αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ τυγχάνη κράτιστος ὤν.

.

κ. τ. λ.

THE END.

*

.

.

.

.

.

.... Score S. Vole. Claje 1'59-Bal Lolly C. - Onator -



BY

JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY,

134 Washington, opposite School St., Boston.

PUBLISHED ANNUALLY.

NO. 2. 25711

Whately's Logic. Elements of Logic. Comprising the Substance of the Article in the Encyclopædia Metropolitana; with Additions, &c. By Richard Whately, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. 12mo. 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 scent to recommend itself to every person who desires to reason forcibly or correctly. This elementary treatise holds a very high rank among the educational works of the day, having been introduced into many of the best managed and popular seminaries of learning, both in England and the United States. It is got up in the usually correct and beautiful style of most Boston books.'—Merchant'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 Encyclopædia Metropolitana; with Additions, &c. By Richard Whately, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. 12mo. pp. 360.

Both have been well received, and that which we are now to speak of [the Rhetoric] is adopted as a text-book in our higher seminaries.'-American 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. 12mo. pp. 164.

In offering to the consideration of teachers and others the stereotype and other share the publishers would say, that both works have been earcfully 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 respects.

TO 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:

⁴It-must be distinctly understood that the object of these several editions is to furnish students with *readulle* 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 illustrative rather than critical, and their conciseness eannot 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 EXCEEDINGLY WELL PRINTED 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.²

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 always be had, if applied for directly to the publishers,

JAMES 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 Coleridge, Esq., A. M., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Containing, 1. General Introduction. 2. Homer. 12mo.

⁴ The subject of the Homeric poetry, 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 elearness and distinctness. The manifold beauties of the lliad and Odyssey, are developed with critical sagacity, and with a warmth of sensibility which never becomes overstrained or extravagant.' *—North American Review.*

 $\square \square$ It is intended to continue these Introductions through the whole body of Greek Classic Poetry.

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. 12mo.

'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-known 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 1830. This text has received the approbation of Hermann, 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 Euripi des, in which his beauties are pointed out and his faults touched upon with a discriminating hand, gives additional interest to the voluine. The body of notes at the end are remarkable for a union of deep learning, acute judgment, and fine taste.

indement, and fine taste. 'The preface and commentary to the Antigone are even more creditable to Mr. Woolsey's ability than those to the Alcestis. The sketch of the poem, in the preface, is written with clearness and brevity. The difficulties in this play, that call for a commentator's explanation, are far more numerous than in the Alcestis. 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.

numerous than in the Alcestis. 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 our country. Among all the books of this kind, prepared either at home or in England, for students and private renders, we are not acquainted with any which are equal to these in variety of merit. Trollope's Pentalogia does not bear the slightest comparison with them, in the copioanness, elegance, or value of the commentary. We are glad to learn that Professor Woolsey is at work on two more tragedies, the Prometheus Bound and the Electra. When these shall have been published, the lovers of classical literature will be provided with a series of the master-pieces of the Attic drama, illustrated by the blended lights of grammatical, philological, and historical learning, inder the guidance of a discriminating judgment, and a ready sympathy with all that is beautiful in poetical inspiration and subline in moral sentiment.'--North American Review.

The Prometheus of Aeschylus, with Notes, &c. 12mo.

The Electra of Sophocles, with Notes, &c. 12mo

⁴Professor Woolsey has now completed his proposed course of Greek Tragedies. We hope the reception of these admirable works among the teachers and scholars of our country will induce Mr. Woolsey to follow up the carcer he has so brilliantly entered upon. It is an uncommon thing in any country, for a mind of nice poetical sensibilities to be engaged in critical labors, or to have the necessary patience in the acquisition of exact knowledge, to qualify it for such a task; but so fortunate a conjunction between profound and 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, Yale, Dartmouth, Bow doin, and many other Colleges.

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 University. Stercotype edition. In 2 vols., thick 12mo., with a Map.

EXTRACTS FROM THE PREFACE.

⁴Schweighaeuser's text was, after some deliberation, selected for reprinting, as on the whole the best. But such commendations of Gaisford, Bekker, Boehr, 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. O. Müller's History of Greek Literature: the Map from Behr's edition.

K. O. Miller'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 found 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.

⁴ The publishers of these volumes of the father of history deserve great credit for the beauty of execution which appears in them; and the labors of the editor 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 Herodotus.

'The Notes we think highly valuable, 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 term you my judgment of its merits. It is eight years or more since I introduced Herodotus, in the German edition of Tanelnitz, 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 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 Greek in Yale College. 1 vol. 12mo.

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 work of the editor leave nothing to desire. The reputation of Prof. Woolsey is too well established, to render it necessary for me to say more. 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 Socratic method.'

This work has been adopted as a text-book in some of our Universities, and is extensively used in Private Classes.



•



| DATE DUE | |
|----------------|-------------------|
| J | NOV (1:86 |
| a. 1963 8 | SEP : 197 |
| NOV 2 6 1955 | @ NOV 1 5 1987 |
| NOV 2 8 966 5 | JAN 21 1994 |
| DEC 4 1967 | MAY C 1 1994 |
| OCT 2 6 1968 | |
| OCT 25 1958 1 | |
| JAN 3 1 1969 | |
| JAN 2 2 1969 7 | |
| NOV 3 0 1314 | |
| DEC 31974 4 | |
| UGT 2 9 1976 | |
| NOV 1 2 1910 0 | |
| DEC 7 13/9 | |
| 056111972 | |
| | |
| HOV 25 JOB | PRINTED IN U.S.A. |

3 1210 00215 7145

