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## PREFACE.

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 numbet 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.
 A. I have given oüv for vũv. - 459. A. too vul in for toivvy $\delta \dot{\eta} .-460$. C. Stall. has no brackets. - ibid. D. omits the words in brackets. - ibid. reads oütu, vid. 522. C. not. - 461. B. vid. not. - 462. E. Stallb. has $\ddot{\alpha}_{\varrho} \rho^{\prime}$ for $\delta^{\prime}$. -465 . B. gives $\hat{\varepsilon} \sigma \vartheta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \iota v$. -466 . A. omits the words in brackets. - 472. A. has $\tau \alpha u ̈ \tau \alpha ̀$ for $\tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha$. -
 for $\tau$ ov́tu. - 481. A. omits $\alpha v ̄$ before $\vartheta \alpha y$ cútov. - 483. E.
puts a colon after $\pi \lambda$ ćritovies. - 491. D. vid. not. 492. B. omits the words in brackets. - 494. E. ormits * $\tau 0$ *. - 496. A. reads ${ }_{\alpha}^{\circ} \nu \vartheta \rho \omega \pi \sigma$. - 497. A. gives $x \alpha \grave{\iota}$ - vov9ยtモis to Callicles; a good change. - 500. B. brackets $\kappa \alpha \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \dot{o} \sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$ after $\mu \alpha \gamma \varepsilon \iota \varrho \iota x \eta^{\nu}$, which I have omitted. - 505. E. joins oütws to the next sentence. 508. B. inserts * ${ }^{*} \vartheta \lambda \iota \circ \iota$ *. -514 . C. I have bracketed
 have omitted $\tau o v_{s}$ before $\tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu .-527$. C. Stallb. gives ó oòs $\lambda$ ógos. vid. not.

In the text, like other editors of Plato, I have allowed ov̉zoũv, 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, $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu$ occurs in the middle of a clause it is not written $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$.
2. I have had access to the following editions of Gorgias, which include all the modern ones of much value. 1. Routh's, Oxford. 1784. 2. Findeisen's,an edition of indifferent judgment. Gotha and Amsterdam. 1796. 3. Heindorf's second, edited by Buttmann. Berlin. 1829, excellent, especially for the Commentary. 4. Bekker's. 5. Stallbaum's Leipzig ed. These are concerned only with the text. Bekker's has some Scholia. 6. Coray's, Paris, 1825, together with Xenophon's Memorab. 7. Ast's, in his Plato. The bulky Commentary on Gorgias is in vol. 11. Leipzig. 1832 ; valuable, but ill-arranged and tedious, and not always judicious. 8. Stallbaum's in his Gotha ed. of Plato. 1828 and 1840. Both text and interpretation owe much to
him, and he has collected most of what is useful in other editions.

From these editions, above all from the last, I have derived great assistance, which is often acknowledged and often not. In a work like this, it would be plainly impossible to trace every thing 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 most of what is good in it is borrowed, and 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 three first 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, translations, - rude, it must be confessed, - 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. If a second
edition should chance to be called for, it may be appended.
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 miserable doctrine of instruction, and the duty of the politician to obey the popular will.

Yale College, New Haven,
July, 1840.

## 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 Greek 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 skepticism, 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 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 connexion 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 by the worse
 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 hy Foss* to the first year of the 71 st 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. $\dagger$ And with this it accords,

[^0]that Gorgias heard Empedocles in philosophy, whose birth even Foss places no earlier than the 71st Olympiad, while the ancients say, that he flourished from forty to sixty years afterward.

From this time we know nothing of Gorgias until he was 60 years old or upwards. In the interval he may have taught rhetoric in Sicily, for Polus of Agrigentum appears at Athens as his disciple, and he probably stood high in his native state. In the second year of the 88th Olympiad, he came to Athens on the following occasion. " The Leontines (Diodor. 12. 53) who were emigrants from Chalcis, and of the same stock with the Athenians, were invaded by the people of Syracuse. As they were pressed by the war, and in danger of being reduced by the superior might of Syracuse, they sent ambassadors to Athens, begging the people to help them as speedily as possible, and rescue their state from its dangers. The principal ambassador among those who were sent was Gorgias, the orator, a man who excelled all of his time in eloquence, and first invented the artifices of rhetoric*
 introduced into the assernbly, and discoursed before the people concerning 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,

[^1]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.* "He won great praise," says 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 (ovvஸiv rois véoç) he gained a large amount of money, and carried it with him from Athens." If Plato, who is sometimes careless about precise facts and dates, may here be relied upon, he must have stayed long enough at Athens to act the part of a teacher before he went elsewhere. It is probable, that, after discharging his mission, he soon returned to Greece, where the rest of his life seems to have been spent. Thessaly was his principal residence, and that he passed no very long time in Athens may be argued from the fact, that Isocrates, an Athenian, received his instructions in that country. There, also, he taught Meno, and Aristippus, one of the nobles of Larissa, and there, or in Bœotia, Proxenus, the comrade of Xenophon. The wealthy families of Thessaly had that rude taste, which would make them fond of the glitter and ostentation of Gorgias, and were able to pay him well. He lived in splendor, affecting in his dress the same show and parade which marked his eloquence. (Ælian Var. Hist. 12. 32.) Owing to his habits of temperances he attained to a very great age, to six or eight years over a century, and acted the rhetorician to the last by saying, according to Elian (u. s. 2. 35), when invaded by a lethargic sleep, premonitory of his end, "sleep is

[^2]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 occasion ; 2. A number of orations, declamatory and laudatory. One of these was delivered at the Olympic festival, in which, like Isocrates afterwards, he tried to unite the Greeks against the Persians. Another was a funeral discourse in honor of Athenians slain in battle, a fragment of which, preserved by a scholiast on Hermogenes, supplies us with the longest extant specinen of his style. These works exhibited a stately, uncommon, and poetical diction, together with frequent rhetorical figures, which must have been tedious and frigid in the extreme.* Two declamations still extant, bearing his name, are unlike his fragments in style, and ought probably to be regarded as spurious.

Gorgias was, as we have said, at bottom a Sophist, $\dagger$ but he avoided the title, which was not very popular, " and laughed at the Sophists, who professed to know how to make men better, confining himself to instructions concerning the art of teaching." (Plat. Meno. 95, C.) His literary labors in the more appropriate sphere of the Sophist, were confined, so far as we know,

* 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



$\dagger$ And so the men of that time regarded those, who displayed their

 which the Sophists were held, comp. Protag. 316, seq.
 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 attempts 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 sophistries 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 Einpedocles 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

[^3]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 appears in the dialogue, though he says but little. 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 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 nick-names of vuxtggis, vurios $\pi \alpha \pi \bar{s}$ (Aristoph. Birds, 1564, and Horarum frag.) for never
 for his sallow hue, (Eupolis in a 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 bis company to improve themselves in household and

[^4]civil relations, and who, at no time of their lives either did, or were charged with doing any wrong.
The persons of the dialogue are represented as having met in the year after the sea-fight at Arginusw. 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 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

[^5]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 liberty for men in general, and sway over others for the orator, 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 ars 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 knowing 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,

[^6]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

[^7]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 was, is this just or not, but such as almost necessarily mislead?

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 was resolvable into science ; all vice into ignorance.* Nor was the reason voluntarily ignorant, but

[^8]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 with 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 men, who regarded instruction upon that point as of high importance. A discussion now arises in which Socrates explains in part his views of rhetoric. It is not an art but a knack or practical observation of rules aiming to produce pleasure. It belongs to a nature which is adroit, courageous, and skilled in mingling with mankind. It is reducible to flattery; like cookery, the cosmetic and the sophistic art, being mere routine or practice, not guided by the laws of absolute truth, and aiming at gratification. The real arts relating to the soul and body are two, with a twofold division each : 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,

Sixarov. See, also, Xen. Memorab. 3. 9. 5. Plato appears at first to have entertained the same opinion, but afterwards made virtue to consist in this: that the faculties of the soul respectively perform their parts, and are all obedient to the reason.
and cookery to medicine. Aiming at pleasure, and not at the highest good, these false arts address and deceive the ignorant and thoughtless. And, being incapable of exact limits from their want of a scientific basis, they run into one another. ( -466 .) Polus is displeased at this brand of flattery put upon rhetoric, and asks if good orators are so regarded in the states where they live. Socr. They are not regarded at all. Pol. How not regarded ? Have they not the greatest power in their countries? To this Socrates replies by admitting, that they do what seems good to them, but denies that they do what they wish. In explaining this he shows, that what men wish is not what they do, but that for the sake of which they do it. It is a good in prospect which moves to action. Unless, then, the great power which enables orators to dispose, as Polus says, of the lives and fortunes of others is a good, it is not what they wish. And if to have great power is a good, orators cannot have it, seeing they use that which they call such as an evil. They may do, then, what seems good to them, without either really having great power, or doing what they wish. ( -469 .) Polus sneers at these views expressed by Socrates. "Just as though you would not choose the liberty of doing what seemed good to you in the state, and would feel no envy if you saw one killing whom he liked, or stripping him of his goods, or binding him." [Socrates earnestly 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 excrcised. ( -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 ( $\alpha_{i}^{i} 0 \chi \iota 0 v$, more ugly) to wrong, but denies that it is more evil ( $\kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha} \times \iota \circ$ ). This leads to an analysis of the ideas of the beautiful and the base (tò x $\alpha 0^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$, to $\alpha i \sigma \chi \rho^{\prime} y^{\prime}$ ), 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 ( $\delta, \delta_{o}{ }^{\prime} \alpha \iota$ Si $\quad$. $\eta v$ ), and to be justly punished for wrong doing are the same ; that a just punisher supposes one who suffers what is just, and that every thing just is nulo ${ }^{\circ}$ as far as it is just. If, then, what is suffered is just it is rodo ${ }^{\prime}$, 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 is 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 airning. 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 of others, as well as one's own in view, fails, by running against the law of right, to attain to any thing 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

[^9]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 ; ( $\pi \varepsilon \varrho \grave{\imath} \tau 0 \tilde{v} \delta \iota-$
 division of this work, Plato treats the rhetorician and the political man as the same, which accords with the an-



alogy between rhetoric and justice. This is the truer view of the subject, for otherwise the assembly of the people, where there lay open a wide field for false art, must be unoccupied.* We must recollect, that Plato himself speaks of the boundaries of rhetoric as uncertain; and, also, that he is not opposing "the bare art of inventing and arranging arguments," but a sophistical art opposed to truth. $\dagger$

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

[^10]the discourse between 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 $x \alpha \lambda .0^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$, 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 concerning the good or utility of punishment, renders it necessary, that punishment should reform the offender,

[^11]whereas, Plato, in this work and elsewhere, speaks of incorrigible criminals.* If to suffer $\delta i x \alpha c \alpha,=$ to suffer

* On the design and efficacy of punishments in society, a number of 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 ( ( $\delta_{\text {uassú } \mu s \nu o \nu \text { ) may either altogether hate }}$ wrong-doing, or, at least, that a considerable part of so great an evil may cease." Another occurs in Book IX. 854, D. "For, perhaps, if he suffer this penalty, he may become better, by being rendered more sober-minded ( $\sigma \omega \varphi \varrho$
 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 $862, \mathrm{E}$., 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 ( $\delta i \not \approx n$ ), - 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 reason appears to include pain if unproductive of good. Cousin, in his
$x \not \alpha \lambda\left(x,=\right.$ to suffer $\omega^{\prime} \varphi \varepsilon^{\prime} \lambda \iota \mu \alpha$ or ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \vartheta \vartheta^{\prime}$, can the criminal help being profited? and does not 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 Sixucto and $x \alpha \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ to be what they are, not only in themselves, but also in the apprehension of the sufferer, while $\omega \dot{\omega} \varphi \dot{\lambda} h \mu \alpha$ 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

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 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 did not Plato try to go farther back than this conviction, and search into the reason of the right which it admits?
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 (orivxov) than to be wronged. It is so, indeed, by law, but not by nature. This ambiguity it is between the naturally 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

[^12]worse, and the more powerful than the less powerful. The "good old plan, that they should get who have the power," is the law of nature, - aye, 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 even 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
one better than himself, allowing no shame to prevent his taking such a course."

In another fine passage of the same work, $(9.875$,$) the necessity of law$ is partly ascribed to the selfishness of man. $\delta \varepsilon u ́ \tau \varepsilon \rho o v ~ \delta \varepsilon ́, ~ e t c . ~ " I n ~ t h e ~$ 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, 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 ( $\pi \lambda$ हоу\& $\xi_{i}^{\prime} \alpha y$ xai idiođ $\left.\rho^{\alpha} \gamma^{i} \alpha y\right)$, 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."

$$
d^{*}
$$

principles. He aims at pleasure rather than good, and the Sophists suit their maxims to the prudential attainment of the same end. There is a plain allusion, also, to the behaviour of Socrates at his trial, and to the charges against Socrates and Platn, - 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,* 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

[^13]means, as he admits that he does, by the better, ( $\beta \varepsilon \lambda \tau i-$ ovs,) 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 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 ( $\pi \lambda \varepsilon o v \varepsilon \% \tau \varepsilon i v)$, or self-gratification, is the centre of the system, and must be laid bare in all its deformity. Do you mean, says he, by governing, governing one's self ? At this the man of the world sneers, and pronounces a man's well-being to consist in having as large desires as possible, with the courage and intelligence to fulfil them. These qualities the many do not possess, whence, to hide their weakness, they praise self-restraint and blame incontinence. But it was not so

[^14]from the beginning ; the great and mighty of old acted by another rule, regarding justice and self-restraint as base and evil, and getting 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, which shall show, that it differs from good. To do this he makes Callicles allow, that courage, science, and pleasure, are not the
 sites, so that one cannot be in both states at once, any more than be sick and well 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 coëxist in the same person at the same time ; as, for instance, thirst, a pain, exists, until drinking, which is pleasant, slakes it. Thus pleasure wants an essential characteristic of good, and pain of evil. ( -497 , E.) Another test follows, grounded on the admission of Callicles, that the manly and intelligent are good. A foolish boy or man may be glad, and so may a wise one. $\dagger$ In war a coward is as glad, if not more

[^15]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.*

Callicles now admits, that some pleasures are evil and some good. He thus overthrows his argument, for if pleasure is, in itself, a good, evil cannot be predicated of it. Socrates seizes upon the acknowledgment, and carries him back to a point debated in the first part of the dialogue, for 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

[^16]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 its 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.* ( $\sigma \omega \varphi \varrho \sigma \sigma v ́ \nu \eta$, self-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, every thing will follow which Socra-

[^17]tes 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. ( $-509, \mathrm{C}$. 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 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 touch-stone. Did Pericles make the Athenians better ? or did they not rather become idle, cowardly, talkative, and covetous through the measures of his administration ? 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.)

[^18]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 blarne of "the four." The very fact, that he draws a broad line between them and Aristides ( $526, \mathrm{~B}$.) is presumptive proof of a real difference. They were high-minded leaders of parties, who humored the people in many of its wishes for the sake of keeping power, and sought the 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 (302-4, 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, that at Athens any man may suffer any thing." And yet the fact, that these statesmen were not safe from the effects of popular ingratitude, is his proof that they did not oppose the people, or strive to prevent injustice.

How the reasonableness or consistency of Plato, as to this point, can be defended, I do not see. Ill-success could have the force which he gives it, only in case the influence of the four men outweighed the opposing influences of all other causes acting at their time upon the opposite side. In general, however, it may be said, that politicians, who complain of ingratitude, are only reaping what they have sown. They have tickled the nice palate

[^19]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 newer 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 differed 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 wellfounded, they, as well as politicians, ought to fear no ingratitude ; they should stipulate for no fees of instruction beforehand, trusting to the generosity of thase pupils, whom they had purged from vice.* ( -521, A.)

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

[^20]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 any thing better. But this, neither he, Polus, nor Gorgias, had been able to do. They should, therefore, agree with Socrates, that to be, and not to seem to be, a good man is a good thing, that the next best thing is, to become good by submitting to punishment ; that all flattery of one's self or others, of a few or a multitude, must be shunned, and that rhetoric, like every thing 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 poli-
tics, 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 pnetical fiction, which, with a beautifully plastic hand, he shapes into a form and meaning corresponding to his awakened moral sense. And $y^{4}$ 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;
 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 well here below ; and also in teaching, that some criminals are healed by punishment, while others must suffer for ever without

[^21]hope of a cure.* This Platonic view of the remedial nature of punishment, in certain cases, even in another

[^22]life, seems to have recominended 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

[^23]the view taken by Ast. The Gorgias, 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." *

[^24]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

[^25]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 deserved 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, against friends, apparently, who blamed him for not publicly serving the state, and against public men, who thought philosophy a useless pursuit. Politics, he asserts, must be founded on the theory and practice of philosophy. No man is a true politician until he becomes $\tau \star \chi r x \alpha_{o}^{\prime}$, - an artist, a phi-
losopher 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 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 dráw 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 good-nature, 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 embellishéd 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 him 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. Athenæus has a story (11. 505, D.), that Gorgias read the work, and said, "How well Plato knows how to lampoon "; and another, that Gorgias declared, that " he never heard or said such things as Plato reported." If Gorgias died soon after Socrates,

[^26]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 middle place as Schleiermacher teaches us, between the elementary writings of Plato's first years, and the constructive ones of his maturer life. This critic conceives that it was written after Plato's first visit to Sicily, in 389, B. C., when he was forty years of age. Stallbaum brings it much nearer to the death of Socrates, in 399. To this conclusion he is led by a strong resemblance he discovers between the Gorgias and Meno, which latter dialogue he carries back even to a time before the death of Socrates, on account of Plato's mildness there in attacking Anytus, the accuser of his master. But neither of these considerations has much weight ; Plato might and does resemble himself in works written at considerable intervals from one another, and the more gentle tone of Meno may be owing to a frame of its author's mind which is not to be accounted for. It is safer to say, that the date cannot be ascertained precisely.
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Сap. XXIII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Пótegov oũv бo兀 סoxoũ$\sigma \iota \nu$ oi $\nprec ้ \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi о \iota ~ \tau о \tilde{\tau} \tau о ~ \beta o v ́ \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, ô $\alpha \not ้ \nu \pi \varrho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega-$
 ő $\pi \rho \alpha ́ t \tau 0 v \sigma \iota \nu$; oĩov oì tà pá $\rho \mu \alpha \chi \alpha$ тípovtes




 жаi тòv $\alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda о \nu ~ \chi \varrho \eta \mu \alpha \tau \iota \sigma \mu o ̀ v ~ \chi \varrho \eta \mu \alpha \tau \iota \zeta о ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu о \iota ~ o 兀 ̉ ~$



 $\Pi \Omega$. Пávv $\gamma \varepsilon$. $\Sigma \Omega$. "A $A \lambda o$ тו ov̉v oṽt $\omega$













































 xаi à $\beta$ оv́ $\lambda \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota, ~ \varepsilon і ̈ \pi \varepsilon \rho ~ \tau v \gamma \chi \alpha ́ \nu \varepsilon \iota ~ \tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha ~ x \alpha \varkappa \alpha ̀$



 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \sigma \eta ̀ \nu ~ o ́ \mu о \lambda o \gamma i ́ \alpha \nu ; ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda . ~ O v ่ \chi ~ \varepsilon ̈ \sigma \tau \iota \nu . ~ \Sigma ~ \Sigma \Omega$.




 ov̉סغे Чท


 $\Sigma \Omega$. Ev̉甲 $\eta^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \iota, ~ \omega ̃ ~ \Pi \tilde{\omega} \lambda \varepsilon . ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda . ~ T i ́ ~ \delta \eta ́ ; ~ \Sigma \Omega$.





 $\Sigma \Omega$. Ov̉x $\varepsilon^{\prime} \mu о \iota \gamma \varepsilon$, оv่ठร̀ $\mu \varepsilon ́ \nu \tau o \iota ~ \zeta \eta \lambda \omega \tau o ́ s . ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda$.

 $\pi \varrho о ́ s \cdot \tau o ̀ v ~ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \delta \iota \alpha \alpha i ́ \omega s ~ \alpha^{3} \eta^{\prime} \lambda \omega \tau о \nu . ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda . ~{ }^{5} H$















 тท̀̀ $\alpha \dot{v} \tau 0 \tilde{v}$ סóšuv.

Cap. XXV. $\Sigma \Omega .{ }^{5} \Omega \mu \alpha \times \alpha ́ \rho \iota \varepsilon, ~ द ُ \mu o v ̃ ~ \delta \eta ̀ ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́-~$







































 xáxıov.




甲ỉ

























 ท้̃ $\nu$ ' $A \lambda x \varepsilon ́ \tau o v, ~ x \alpha i ̀ ~ \varepsilon i ~ \varepsilon ُ b o u ́ \lambda \varepsilon \tau о ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \delta i ́ x \alpha \iota \alpha ~ \pi о เ \varepsilon i ̃ \nu, ~$




 $\alpha v ̉ \tau o ̀ v ~ \alpha ̉ \varphi \varepsilon i ́ \lambda \varepsilon \tau о, ~ \xi ॄ \varepsilon v i ́ \sigma \alpha s ~ x \alpha i ~ x \alpha \tau \alpha \mu \varepsilon \theta v i \sigma \alpha s ~ \alpha v ̉ ่ o ́ v ~$
















 $\chi^{\prime} \lambda$ дos.



















 бขцч









 бо $\mu \alpha ́ \rho \tau v \rho \alpha s ~ \varkappa \alpha \tau ' ~ द ُ \mu о \tilde{v}$ тоддоv̀s $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \chi o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s$


 ov̉dèv oĩ $\mu \alpha \iota ~ \alpha ้ \xi \iota o v ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o v ~ \mu o \iota ~ \pi \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon \rho \alpha ́ \nu \theta \alpha \iota ~ \pi \varepsilon \rho i ~$




 $\pi \alpha \varrho \alpha 6 \alpha \lambda o ́ v t \varepsilon s$ оขึ้ $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime} \alpha^{3} \lambda \lambda \eta^{\prime} \lambda$ ovs $\sigma \varkappa \varepsilon \psi \omega ́ \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha$ $\varepsilon \grave{\prime} \tau \iota \delta \iota o i ́ \sigma o v \sigma \iota \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta \eta^{\lambda} \omega \nu$. каi $\gamma \grave{\varrho} \tau v \gamma \chi \alpha ́ \nu \varepsilon \iota$








 $\Pi \Omega \Lambda$. Пávv $\gamma \varepsilon$.

Cap. XXVIII. $\Sigma \Omega$. ' $E \gamma \omega$ ' $\delta \varepsilon ́ ~ \varphi \eta \mu \iota ~ \alpha ̉ \delta ข ́ v \alpha \tau o v . ~$























 $\alpha v ̉ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \alpha ̉ \theta \lambda \iota \omega \tau \alpha ́ \tau o v s ~ \varphi \eta \mu i ́, ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \delta \iota \delta o ́ v \tau \alpha s ~ \delta i ́ x \eta \nu$ ทั้ттоข. $\beta$ ои́ $\lambda \varepsilon \iota$ xai тоข̃то $\varepsilon ่ \lambda \varepsilon ่ \gamma \chi \varepsilon \iota \nu ; ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda . ~$






 $\pi \alpha \nu \tau o \delta \alpha \pi \alpha ̀ s ~ \lambda \dot{\omega} b \alpha s$ av̉tós tє $\lambda \omega b \eta \theta \varepsilon i s$ xai тov̀s
 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha v \varrho \omega \theta \tilde{\eta} \eta$ クे $x \alpha \tau \alpha \pi \iota \tau \tau \omega \theta \tilde{\eta}$, oṽtos $\varepsilon v ̉ \delta \alpha \iota \mu \circ \nu \varepsilon ์-$






Cap. XXIX. $\quad \Sigma \Omega$. Moguodútteє $\alpha \tilde{v}, \tilde{\omega}^{\tilde{m}} \gamma \varepsilon v$ -






 тє@os $\mu$ ย́vto८ ò $\delta \iota \alpha \varphi v \gamma \omega ̀ \nu ~ 火 \alpha i ~ \tau v \varrho \alpha \nu \nu \varepsilon v ́ \sigma \alpha s . ~ T i ́ ~ E ~$
































 $\Pi \Omega \Lambda$. Tò $\dot{\alpha} \delta \kappa \varepsilon \tau \nu$.



 $\Sigma \Omega$. Tí $\delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \tau o ́ \delta \varepsilon ; ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \varkappa \alpha \lambda \alpha ̀ ~ \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha, ~ o i ̃ o \nu ~ \varkappa \alpha i ̀ ~$










 $\Pi \Omega . .^{\prime \prime} E_{\gamma \omega \gamma \varepsilon .} \quad \Sigma \Omega$. Ov̉ xaì tàs pшvàs xaì
 Naí. $\Sigma \Sigma \Omega$. K $\alpha i \mu \eta ̀ \nu \tau \alpha ́ \gamma \varepsilon$ кат $\alpha$ тov̀s vó $\mu о v s$




















 Пیム. Пஸ̃s $\gamma \dot{\varrho}$ ov̉;

C Cap. XXXI. $\Sigma \Omega$. Пৎஸ̃тov $\mu \varepsilon ̀ \nu \delta \eta ̀ ~ \sigma \chi \varepsilon \psi \omega ́ \mu \varepsilon-$



 $\Pi \Omega \Lambda$. Ov̉ $\delta \tilde{\eta} \tau \alpha . \quad \Sigma \Omega$. Ov̉жоṽv $\varepsilon i ̉ \mu \eta ̀ ~ \lambda u ́ \pi \eta$,
 Oỉ paivєtal. $\Sigma \Sigma$. Ov̉




























 тò $\delta \iota \delta o ́ v \alpha \iota ~ \delta i ́ x \eta \nu ~ x \alpha i ~ \tau o ̀ ~ x о \lambda \alpha ́ \xi \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \delta \iota x \alpha i ́ \omega s ~ \alpha ̀ \delta \iota-~$



 Б'́кцатєs.

Cap. XXXII. $\Sigma \Omega$. $\Sigma$ хóтєє ঠ̀̀ xai tó $\delta \varepsilon \cdot \tilde{\alpha} \varrho \alpha$ غï $\tau i ́ s ~ \tau \iota ~ \pi o \iota \varepsilon i ̃, ~ \alpha ̉ \nu \alpha ́ \gamma x \eta ~ \tau \iota ~ \varepsilon i ̃ \nu \alpha \iota ~ x \alpha i ~ \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \chi o \nu ~ i ́ \pi o ̀ ~$





 $\sigma \theta \alpha \iota$; $\Pi \Omega \Lambda$. Naí. $\Sigma \Omega$. Toьovitov ä $\rho \alpha \pi \alpha$ т
 $\Pi \Omega \Lambda$. Пávv $\gamma \varepsilon$. $\Sigma \Omega$. Oủxоข̃v xai $\varepsilon i$ xávı tıs,



 $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ; \tau \varepsilon ́ \mu \nu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota ~ \gamma \alpha ́ \rho ~ \tau \iota . ~ \Pi \Omega \Omega$. Noí. $\Sigma \Omega$. K $\alpha i$ عi $\mu \varepsilon ́ \gamma \alpha$ $\gamma \varepsilon \ddot{\eta} \beta \alpha \theta \grave{v}$ тò $\tau \mu \tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha$ $\eta^{\alpha} \alpha \lambda \gamma \varepsilon \iota \nu o ́ v$,
 тє́ $\mu \nu 0 \nu$ тє́ $\mu \nu \varepsilon \iota ; ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda$. Фаívєtal. $\Sigma \Omega . \Sigma v \lambda$ -








 ov̉; $\Pi \Omega \Lambda$. Дíxaıа. $\Sigma \Omega$. Ov̉xoũv ò xo入a̧ó-

 $\lambda о ́ \gamma \eta \tau \alpha \iota ; ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda$. Пávv үє. $\Sigma \Omega$. Tov́t $\boldsymbol{\tau} \nu \stackrel{\alpha}{\rho} \propto$
 $\Pi \Omega \Lambda$. Ná.

Cap. XXXIII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Ov̉xoṽv عi̋meg xaiá,

 $\Pi \Omega \Lambda .{ }^{2}$ Eоькєv. $\Sigma \Omega$. ${ }^{~} \Omega \varphi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon і ̃ \tau \alpha \iota ~ \alpha ้ \rho \alpha ; ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda$.



 $\Pi \Omega \Lambda$. Naí. $\Sigma \Omega$. ${ }^{5} A \varrho$ ' оข̃ข тоข̃ $\mu \varepsilon \gamma i ́ \sigma \tau о \nu$











 $\Pi \Omega \Lambda$. Naí. $\Sigma \Omega$. Tís oũv tov́t $\omega \nu$ т $\omega \nu \nu$ тоขท-























































 $\varkappa \tau \tilde{\eta} \sigma \iota \varsigma . ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda$. "Eбть таṽта. $\Sigma \Omega$. Tí $\delta \varepsilon$;


 $\delta \varepsilon ́ ; ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda$. Фаívєtaí $\mu$ оє ó $\mu \eta ̀ ~ i \alpha \tau \rho \varepsilon v o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s . ~$
 $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \gamma \eta \tilde{\eta}^{\nu} \nu, \pi о \nu \eta \varrho i ́ \alpha s ; ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda .{ }^{5} H \nu \gamma \alpha \rho$. $\Sigma \Omega$. $\Sigma \omega \varphi \varrho о \nu i ́ \zeta \varepsilon \iota ~ \gamma \alpha ́ \varrho ~ \pi о v ~ x \alpha i ́ ~ \delta \iota x \alpha \iota о \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho o v s ~ \pi о \iota \varepsilon \tilde{\imath}$




 $\Sigma \Omega$. Oũtos $\delta$ ' $\tilde{\eta} \nu$ o o vov $\theta \varepsilon \tau о ข ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o ́ s ~ \tau \varepsilon ~ \varkappa \alpha i ~ \varepsilon ̇ \pi \tau-~$







 $\nu \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \alpha s ; ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda . ~ " E о \iota \varepsilon . ~$

Cap. XXXV. $\Sigma \Omega . \Sigma \chi \varepsilon \delta o ̀ v ~ \gamma \alpha ́ \rho ~ \pi o v ~ o v ̃ \tau o \iota, ~$























 tov toṽ $\varkappa \alpha \varkappa o \tilde{v}$ tò $\delta i ́ x \eta \nu$ ঠı $\delta o ́ v \alpha \iota ; ~ I I \Omega \Lambda$. Kıv-


















































 $\mathrm{E} \varphi \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ oṽ $\tau \omega s, \ddot{\eta}^{\mu} \mu \dot{\eta} \varphi \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu, \omega_{\tilde{\prime}} \Pi \tilde{\omega} \lambda \varepsilon ; ~ \Pi \Omega \Lambda$. ${ }^{\prime \prime} A$ -


















































 $\mu \alpha \sigma i ́ \tau \varepsilon$ жai 久óүoıs ov̉\% oîós $\tau$ ' $\varepsilon i ̃ ~ \varepsilon ̇ \nu \alpha \nu \tau \iota o \tilde{\sigma} \theta \theta \iota$,


























Cap. XXXVIII. KAA. ${ }^{5} \Omega$ इ'́x $\rho \alpha \tau \varepsilon$, до-












 हैं $\pi \alpha \theta \varepsilon$, x $\alpha i$ ' $\begin{gathered} \\ \\ \\ \end{gathered}$















 $\mu \circ \nu$ द̇ठเต́x $\alpha \theta \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \chi \alpha \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \varphi v ́ \sigma \iota \nu . ~ р v ́ \sigma \varepsilon \iota ~ \mu \varepsilon ̀ \nu ~ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho ~ \pi \tilde{\alpha} \nu$














































 $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \varepsilon x \alpha i{ }_{\alpha}{ }^{3} \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \alpha^{\tau} \tau \nu \cdot$ oṽtos $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \eta \eta^{\prime}, \varphi \eta \sigma i v$,





















 $\alpha^{2} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \varepsilon i ́ \omega \nu, \chi \alpha i \quad \sigma v \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \delta \delta \eta \nu \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \eta^{3} \theta \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha \nu \alpha ́ \pi \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$





 тоข์тต,





 $\alpha ̉ \lambda \lambda$ ’, оїน $\mu \iota$, то̀ ỏ $\varrho \theta$ о́т $\alpha \tau o ́ \nu ~ \varepsilon ̉ \sigma \tau \iota \nu ~ \alpha ̉ \mu \varphi о \tau \varepsilon ́ \varrho \omega \nu ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha-~$
$\sigma \chi \varepsilon i v . ~ \varphi i \lambda о \sigma о р i ́ \alpha s ~ \mu \varepsilon ́ v$, ő́оо $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \varepsilon i \alpha s ~ \chi \alpha ́ \rho \iota \nu$, र $\alpha \lambda o ̀ \nu$ $\mu \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon ́ \chi \varepsilon \iota \nu$, xai oủx $\alpha i \sigma \chi \rho o ̀ \nu ~ \mu \varepsilon \iota \rho \alpha x i ́ \omega ~ o ้ \nu \tau \iota$








 $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \alpha \varrho i ́ o v ~ \alpha ̉ x о v ́ \sigma \omega, ~ \pi \iota x \varrho o ́ v ~ \tau i ́ ~ \mu о \iota ~ \delta о ж \varepsilon i ̃ ~ \chi \varrho \eta ̃ \mu \alpha ~$


























 «ai 甲v́бıv $\psi v \chi \tilde{\eta} s$ ต̃ठє $\gamma \varepsilon \nu \nu \alpha i ́ a \nu \mu \varepsilon \iota \varrho \alpha-$ $486 x \iota \omega ́ \delta \varepsilon \iota$ тıvi $\delta \iota \alpha \pi \rho \varepsilon ́ \pi \varepsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \mu о \varrho \varphi \omega ́ \mu \alpha \tau \iota$, жаi













 $\theta \alpha ́ v o \iota s ~ u ̈ \nu, ~ \varepsilon i ~ \beta o v ́ l o \iota \tau о ~ \vartheta \alpha v \alpha ́ r o v ~ \sigma о \iota ~ \tau \iota \mu \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$.
 $\varepsilon u ̉ \varphi v \tilde{\alpha} \lambda \alpha b o \tilde{v} \sigma \alpha \tau \varepsilon ์ \chi \nu \eta \quad \varphi \tilde{\omega} \tau \alpha \stackrel{้}{\varepsilon} \theta \eta x \varepsilon \quad \chi \varepsilon i ́-$













 $\alpha^{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \dot{\alpha}$.


















 देध $\varepsilon$ ह่.












 Tíवavסŋov, tòv 'A








































 мข миає;

Cap. XLIII. KAA. 'Aidà $\tau \alpha \tilde{\tau} \tau \alpha$ है̀ $\lambda \varepsilon \neq \nu$

жаi тótє, xai $\nu \tilde{v} \nu ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega . ~ \Sigma \Omega$. Пórє@ov $\delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~$ С аข̉tòv $\beta \varepsilon \lambda \tau i ́ \omega ~ x \alpha \lambda \varepsilon i ̃ s ~ \sigma u ̀ ~ x \alpha i ~ x \rho \varepsilon i ́ t \tau \omega ~ ; ~ o v ̉ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \gamma \alpha ́ \rho ~$



















 ката̀ tòv oòv hózov. KAA. Naí. $\Sigma \Omega$. Ov̉-






















Cap. XLIV. KAA. Ovitoai ảvท̀ ov̉ тav́бغ-
















Evvós, oủdè tov̀s oov̀s dov́hovs $\beta$ हitious ooṽ, ötィ





















 ¢aviotégov.














 $\tau \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \tau o s ~ \omega ٌ \nu, \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ है่ $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \chi \iota \sigma \tau о \nu \tau \omega ̃ ~ \beta \varepsilon \lambda \tau i ́-$




 $\pi \lambda \varepsilon ์ o \nu ~ \delta \varepsilon і ̃ \nu ~ \varepsilon ้ \chi \varepsilon \iota \nu ; ~ K A A . ~ O v ̉ ~ \sigma \iota \tau i ́ \omega \nu ~ \gamma \varepsilon ~ o v ̉ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~$ $\pi о \tau \omega \nu \nu . \quad \Sigma \Omega$. M $\alpha \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega, \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \omega s$ í $\mu \alpha \tau i ́ \omega \nu, \chi \alpha i$

 $\nu \alpha \iota$. КАА. Поíшv iцатíшv; $\Sigma \Omega$. ' $A \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ вis







 $\mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$ жаi $\omega$ ต่s $\pi \lambda \varepsilon i ́ \sigma \tau \omega ~ \sigma \pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \mu \alpha \tau \iota ~ \chi \varrho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \varepsilon i s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu$















 $\psi ข \nsim \tilde{\eta}$.
















 रouย́vovs ; ] KAA. Пஸ̃s $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \iota s ; ~ \Sigma \Omega$. ${ }^{0} E v \alpha$


 $\Sigma \Omega$. Oidack तुण

















 סovioúusvo兀 tov̀s $\beta \varepsilon \lambda \tau i ́ o v s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \varphi v ́ \sigma \iota \nu ~ \alpha ̉ \nu \theta \rho \omega ́-~$


















 $\lambda \alpha \tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau$ ' ह̇бтi $\tau \alpha ̀ ~ \varkappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \pi i \sigma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha, \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ̀ ~ \varphi u ́-$
 «̈ $\xi \iota \alpha$.
D Cap. XLVII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Ovंx $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \varepsilon \nu \nu \tilde{\omega} s \gamma \varepsilon$, $\tilde{\omega} K \alpha \lambda-$










$\mu \eta \delta \varepsilon \nu o ̀ s ~ \delta \varepsilon o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o \iota ~ \varepsilon v i \delta \alpha i ́ \mu o v \varepsilon s ~ \varepsilon i ̃ \nu \alpha \iota . ~ K A A . ~ O i ~$




 тò x $\alpha \tau \theta \alpha \nu \varepsilon і ̃ \nu ~ \delta \check{~ ¢ ~ \zeta \tilde{\eta} \nu ; ~}$



 о $̃ \nu \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \pi \varepsilon i ́ \theta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \chi \alpha i ̀ ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \pi i ́ \pi \tau \varepsilon \iota \nu ~ a ̈ \nu \omega ~ \chi \alpha ́ \tau \omega, ~$

 тò $\pi \iota \theta \alpha \nu o ́ v$ тє $\varkappa \alpha i ̀ \pi \iota \sigma \tau \iota x o ̀ \nu ~ \omega ้ \nu o ́ \mu \alpha \sigma \varepsilon ~ \pi i ́ \theta o v, ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ s$

 $\alpha v ̉ \tau o \tilde{v}$ «ai ov̉ бтєү $\alpha \nu o ́ v, ~ ต ̀ s ~ \tau \varepsilon \tau \varrho \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v o s ~ \varepsilon i ̉ \eta ~ \pi i ́ \theta o s, ~$














 D*ai $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau i \theta \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \iota ~ \varepsilon v ่ \delta \alpha \mu о \nu \varepsilon \sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ g o v s ~ \varepsilon i ̃ \nu \alpha \iota ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~$


 $\Sigma \omega ́ \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \varepsilon$.



























 ह̇x


 $\Sigma \Omega$. Kai $\delta \iota \psi \tilde{\eta \nu} \gamma \varepsilon$ х $\alpha i \delta \iota \psi \tilde{\omega \nu \tau \alpha} \pi i \nu \varepsilon \iota \nu ;$ K.A. С

 ఢัท
$\mathrm{Cap}_{\text {ap. XLIX. }} \quad \Sigma \Omega . E \tilde{v} \gamma \varepsilon, \tilde{\omega}^{\tilde{\omega}} \beta \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau \varepsilon \cdot \delta \iota \alpha \tau \varepsilon ́-$





































 то ov゙т


























 $\tau \varepsilon$ rai vóбov. KAA. Пต̃s $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \iota s ; ~ \Sigma \Omega$. Oĩov








 $\tau \alpha \iota$. $\bar{\eta} \gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho ; ~ K A A . \Sigma \varphi o ́ \delta \rho \alpha ~ \gamma \varepsilon . ~ \Sigma \Sigma \Omega$. ' 'A $\lambda \lambda$ '









 тó $\tau \varepsilon \alpha \nprec \alpha \theta o ̀ v$ xai тò xaxóv. ó $\mu о \lambda о \gamma о \tilde{\mu} \mu \varepsilon \nu \tau \alpha \tilde{v}$ -















 סєías xai ท̂jovท'; KAA. Naí. $\Sigma \Omega$. Oủxoũv





















 ৎ $\alpha \nu \theta \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ oi $\lambda o ́ \gamma o \iota . ~ K A A . ~ ' A \lambda \lambda ’$ 'á $\varepsilon i$ to七oũtós








Cap. LII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Ev̉ $\delta \alpha i ́ \mu \omega \nu \varepsilon i ̃, \omega^{\tilde{\prime}} K \alpha \lambda \lambda i x \lambda \varepsilon t s$,




















 tov̀s $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \varrho \varepsilon i ́ o v s ~ \chi \alpha i ~ \varphi \varrho о \nu i ́ \mu o v s ~ ह ै ं \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon s . ~ そ ้ ~ o v ̉ ~ \tau o v ́-~$ tovs ả $\gamma \alpha \theta$ ov̀s x $\alpha \lambda \varepsilon i ̃ s ; ~ К А \Lambda . ~ П \alpha ́ \nu ข ~ \mu \varepsilon ̀ v ~ o v ̃ \nu . ~$



 KAA. Eĩסov. $\Sigma \Omega$. Tí ১є́; voũv हैzovta $\lambda v$ -











七óvt $\omega \nu$ dè oi $\delta \varepsilon \iota \lambda o i ̀ \mu o ́ v o v ~ \lambda v \pi o \tilde{v} \nu \tau \alpha \iota, \eta$ そ xai oi





 $\mu \tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ dè oi $\delta \varepsilon \iota \lambda o i \quad \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \quad \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \varepsilon i ́ \omega \nu ; \quad K A \Lambda$ ．с




 Өoì xaì xaxoì oi à $\gamma \alpha \theta$ oí te xai oi xaxoí ；そ̀ x $\alpha i$


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







 Еvoıs où $\pi \alpha ́ \rho \varepsilon \sigma \tau \iota ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \varkappa \alpha x \alpha ́, ~ \alpha i ~ \lambda \tilde{v} \pi \alpha \iota \iota ~ K A \Lambda$.



 $\Sigma \Omega$. Oi $\mu \varepsilon ́ v \gamma \varepsilon \mu \tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ov $\mu \tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$, oi $\delta$ ' $\eta_{\imath}^{\tau} \tau \tau о \nu \tilde{\eta} \tau-$ tov, oi $\delta \check{̀} \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i ́ \omega s ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i \omega s ; ~ K A A$.

 tov̀s $\delta \varepsilon 1 \lambda o v ̀ s ~ x \alpha i ~ t o v ̀ s ~ \alpha ̉ \nu \delta \rho \varepsilon i ́ o v s, ~ \eta ̀ ~ x \alpha i ~ \mu a ̃ \lambda \lambda o \nu ~$






 $\nu v \quad \gamma \varepsilon . \quad \Sigma \Omega$. 'Aүa日òv סغ̀ $\alpha \tilde{v}$ тòv $\chi \alpha i ́ \rho o v \tau \alpha ;$


 $\mu \tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ тòv жажóv ; KAA. Naí. $\Sigma \Omega$. Ov̀ж-









 $\mu \varepsilon ̀ v \beta \varepsilon \lambda \tau i ́ o v s ~ \hat{\eta} \delta o v \alpha ́ s, \tau \alpha \grave{s} \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \chi \varepsilon i ́ \varrho o v s . ~ \Sigma \Sigma \Omega$. 'Iov'





 $\lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \alpha \varrho o ̀ \nu ~ \varepsilon v ̃ ~ \pi о \iota \varepsilon i ̃ \nu ~ \chi \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau о \tilde{t o ~ \delta \varepsilon ́ \chi \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~}$



 beœaí; KA.A. Пávv $\gamma \varepsilon$. $\Sigma \Omega$. ' $\Omega \varphi$ ' $\lambda \iota \mu о \iota ~ \delta \varepsilon ́$







 $\mu \varepsilon ̀ v ~ \chi \varrho \eta \sigma \tau \alpha i ́ ~ \varepsilon i \sigma \iota \nu, ~ \alpha i ~ \delta \grave{\varepsilon ̀ ~ \pi o \nu \eta \varrho \alpha i ́ ; ~ К A A . ~ П \omega ̃ s ~}$














 KАА. Tє $\chi \nu \iota \varkappa о \tilde{v}$.

Cap. LV. $\Sigma \Omega$. ' $A v \alpha \mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \omega \tilde{\omega} \mu \nu \nu \eta \eta^{\omega} \nu \alpha{ }^{\tau}$


















 $\beta i ́ o \nu \tau o ̀ \nu$ év pı




























 $\pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \varepsilon i \alpha \alpha \iota$, $\alpha i \quad \mu \varepsilon ̀ \nu$ т $\varepsilon \chi \nu \iota \chi \alpha i ́, \pi \varrho о \mu \eta^{\prime} \theta \varepsilon \iota \alpha \prime \nu \quad \tau \iota \nu \alpha$





 ๑оข. द̇นoi $\mu \varepsilon ̀ \nu ~ \gamma \alpha ́ \rho, ~ \omega ̃ ~ K \alpha \lambda \lambda i ́ x \lambda \varepsilon \iota \varsigma, ~ \delta о x о ข ̃ \sigma i ́ ~ \tau \varepsilon ~$
 жаi $\pi \varepsilon \rho i ~ \sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$ каi $\pi \varepsilon \rho i ~ \psi v \chi \eta ̀ \nu ~ \chi \alpha i ~ \pi \varepsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \alpha ̈ \lambda \lambda о, ~$



















 K.A. Naí. $\quad \Sigma \Omega$. Tí $\delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \hat{\eta} \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \chi о \rho \tilde{\nu} \nu \delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma \chi \alpha-$





 $\pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \iota . \quad \Sigma \Omega$. Tí ठє̀ ó $\pi \alpha \tau \eta ̀ \varrho ~ \alpha v ̌ \tau o \tilde{v} ~ M \varepsilon ́ \lambda \eta \varsigma ; ~ \eta ̃ ~$















 тò $\chi \alpha \varrho i ́ \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ тoĩs $\vartheta \varepsilon \alpha \tau \alpha \tilde{s}$. $\Sigma \Omega$. Oủxoũv тò





 D กข̃̃o८ $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma о \nu \tau \alpha \iota ~ o i ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o \iota . ~ K A \Lambda . ~ \Phi \eta \mu i ́ . ~ \Sigma \Sigma \Omega$.







 КАА. Па́vv $\gamma \varepsilon$.

Cap. LVIII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Eĩ $\varepsilon v . \quad \tau i ́ ~ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \eta ̀ ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ v ~$





 $\pi \varrho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \chi \alpha \rho i ́ \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \tau о і ̃ s ~ \pi о \lambda i ́ \tau \alpha \iota s ~ \omega \varrho ̧ \mu \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v o \iota, ~ x \alpha i ~$




















 оủx oĩठa тís द̇бтıv oṽtos. KAA. Tí $\delta \varepsilon ́ ; ~ \Theta \varepsilon-\mathrm{c}$











 है $\gamma \omega \gamma \varepsilon \pi \tilde{\omega} s \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \pi \omega$.









 povs, tov̀s oixoסónous, tov̀s vavாฑүoús, tov̀s





 $\nu \tilde{v} \nu \delta \eta ̀$ है $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu$, oi $\pi \varepsilon \rho i ̀ \tau o ̀ ~ \sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha \pi \alpha \iota \delta o \tau \rho i ́ b \alpha \iota ~ \tau \varepsilon$



 в $\delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \mu о \chi \theta \eta \varrho \alpha ́ ; ~ K A A . ~ Ф \eta \mu i ́ . ~ \Sigma \Sigma \Omega . ~ O u ̉ x о \tilde{v} \nu ~ \chi \alpha i ~$ $\pi \lambda o i ̂ o \nu$ ต̀б $\alpha$ v́tcs; KAA. Naí. $\quad \Sigma \Omega$. Kai $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ каi т $\alpha ~ \sigma \omega ́ \mu \alpha \tau \alpha ́ ~ \varphi \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \grave{\eta \mu \varepsilon ́ \tau \varepsilon \rho \alpha ; ~ К А А . ~}$

















 $\mu \circ \iota$ र'я
 "Eбт $\omega$.

Cap. LX. $\Sigma \Omega$. Ov̉xoũv $\pi \varrho o ̀ s \tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha \alpha \tilde{v} \beta \lambda \varepsilon$ -










 жа́ $\mu \nu о \nu \tau \iota ~ х \alpha i ~ \mu о \chi \theta \eta \varrho \omega \tilde{s} \delta \iota \alpha ж \varepsilon ц \mu \varepsilon ́ v ต ~ \sigma \iota \tau i ́ \alpha ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha ~$


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

 оข̃ँ七 ; KAA. Naí. $\quad \Sigma \Omega$. Ov̉xoũv xai тàs



 $\theta v \mu \varepsilon \tau ̃ ; ~ \sigma v \gamma \omega \omega \varrho \varepsilon i ̃ s ~ \tau o \tilde{\tau} \tau o ́ ~ \gamma \varepsilon ~ ะ \alpha i ~ \sigma v ́ ; ~ K A \Lambda . ~$







 KAA. Naí. $\quad \Sigma \Omega$. Tò жо入á $\varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \alpha ้ \rho \alpha ~ \tau \tilde{\eta} \psi v-$







 $\lambda$ v́ouєv ; KAA. Av̀ıòs $\gamma \nu \omega$ ต́бє. $\Sigma \Omega$. ' $A \lambda \lambda$ '





Cap. LXI. KAA. ' $\Omega s \beta i ́ \alpha l o s ~ \varepsilon i ̃, ~ \omega ̃ ~ \Sigma ' \omega ́ x \rho \alpha-~$







 ふ่ข $\alpha \gamma \chi \alpha \iota o ́ \tau \alpha \tau о \nu ~ \varepsilon i ̃ \nu \alpha \iota ~ o v ̃ \tau \omega s . ~ \varepsilon i ~ \mu \varepsilon ́ v \tau о \iota ~ \pi о \iota \eta ่ \sigma o-~$

 $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma o \mu \varepsilon \nu$ xai тí $\psi \varepsilon \tilde{v} \delta o s \cdot ~ x o \iota \nu o ̀ v ~ \gamma \alpha \grave{~} \alpha^{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta o ̀ v$ ๙̈ $\pi \alpha \sigma \iota ~ \varphi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \varrho o ̀ \nu ~ \gamma \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \alpha v ̉ t o ́ . ~ \delta i ́ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota ~ \mu \varepsilon ̀ \nu ~ o v ̃ \nu ~$





 $\tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha, \varepsilon i$ ठохєĩ $\chi \varrho \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota ~ \delta \iota \alpha \pi \varepsilon \varrho \alpha \nu \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$ тòv $\lambda o ́-$


 бє тòv $\lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu \cdot ~ р \alpha i ́ v \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota ~ \delta \varepsilon ́ ~ \mu o \iota ~ x \alpha i ~ \tau о i ̃ s ~ \alpha ̉ \lambda \lambda о \iota s ~$










 « $\alpha i \pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \alpha \iota \nu \varepsilon$.
 ảvaiabóvtos tòv hóyov. ${ }^{3} A \rho \alpha$ tò $\hat{\eta} \delta \dot{v}$ \% $\alpha i$ tò

































 tòv $\delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \delta i ́ x \alpha \iota \alpha ~ x \alpha i ̀ ~ o ̋ \sigma \iota \alpha ~ \pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau t o v \tau \alpha ~ \alpha ̉ \nu \alpha ́ \gamma x \eta ~ \delta i ́-~$









 $\tau \alpha \mu \alpha x \alpha ́ \rho \iota o ́ v ~ \tau \varepsilon ~ x \alpha i ~ \varepsilon v ̉ \delta \alpha i ́ \mu о v \alpha ~ \varepsilon i ̃ v \alpha \iota, ~ т o ̀ v ~ \delta \grave{~} \pi 0-$



























































 $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$ тò दे $\mu o ̀ \nu$ оข้тє $\tau o ̀ ~ \beta \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \nu \tau \iota o \nu, \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau o ̀ ~ \tau \cup ́ \pi \tau \tau \varepsilon \iota \nu$
































Cap. LXV. $\Sigma \Omega$. Avoĩv oûv ỏvtouv, toṽ ảdı-






























 $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu v \nsim \alpha \lambda \omega ั s ~ \varepsilon i \varrho \eta \chi \varepsilon ์ v \alpha$.






 Goĩтo סท่̂
















 E oủ oṽtcs; KAA. Naí. $\Sigma \Omega$. Ov̉zoũv тov́-


$K A A$. Пávv үє. $\Sigma \Omega$. ${ }^{\text {T}} A \rho ’$ oũv xai tò $\mu \grave{\eta}$







 тои̃ ठєбто́тov xai $\delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \mu \nu$. КАА. Ov̉x oĩठ'




















































 ह̇б兀i ఢŋ̃v. Cap. LXVIII. $\Delta \iota \alpha ̀ \tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha$ ov̉ vó $\mu$ os













































 $\gamma \nu \eta \eta^{\sigma} \iota o \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \rho \gamma \alpha^{\prime} \xi \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ єis $\varphi \iota \lambda i \alpha \alpha \nu \tau \tilde{\omega}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} A \theta \eta \nu \alpha i ́ \omega \nu$








Cap. LXIX. KAA. Ov̉x oĩ́ ' övtıvá $\mu$ oı tgó-


тò $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha ́ \theta o s \cdot ~ o u ̀ ~ \pi \alpha ́ v v ~ \sigma o \iota ~ \pi \varepsilon i ́ \theta o \mu \alpha \iota . ~$
 $\tau \tilde{\eta} \psi v \chi \tilde{\eta} \tau \tilde{\eta} \sigma \tilde{\eta} \alpha \alpha^{\alpha} \tau \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \tau \varepsilon \tilde{\imath} \mu \circ \iota \cdot \alpha^{2} \lambda \lambda{ }^{\prime} \varepsilon^{\circ} \alpha \nu \quad \pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime}-\mathrm{D}$












































D KАА. Пávv үย.
Cap. LXX. $\Sigma \Omega$. Ovं $\neq \hat{\nu} \nu$ ovit $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha, \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \varepsilon$


































Cap. LXXI. $\Sigma \Omega$. 'A $A \lambda$ ' ov̉ pi













 ย'x























Cap. LXXII. KAA. Tí oũv ; tov́tov ย̇vexo







 боє $\chi \alpha \rho i ́ \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \iota$. $\Sigma \Omega$. Kai tód́ тоívvข $\mu$ оє $\chi \alpha ́ \rho \iota-$


 KAA. Naí. $\Sigma \Omega$. Tí oṽv ; oủx ع̌'ঠsı av̇tov́s, ต่s

 $\alpha v ๋ \tau \omega ̃ \nu$ à $\gamma \alpha \theta$ òs ตัv $\tau \alpha ̀ \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \alpha \alpha ́ ; ~ K A \Lambda . ~ \Pi \alpha ́ \nu v ~$










 $\gamma \varepsilon i ̃ s . ~ \Pi \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \iota \nu ~ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ~ \mu о \iota ~ \pi \varepsilon \varrho і$ Kí $\mu \omega \nu 0 s \cdot$ oủx






















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















 $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varphi \varepsilon \rho о ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu о \iota ~ \chi \alpha i ~ \alpha ̉ \gamma \nu о о \tilde{v} \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon \mathfrak{\alpha}^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu$ ó тє $\lambda \varepsilon ́-$




































 Э $\alpha \nu \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \iota \circ \iota ~ \gamma \varepsilon \gamma o ́ v \alpha \sigma \iota ~ \sigma \omega \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ Э \varepsilon \rho \alpha \pi \varepsilon \nu \tau \alpha i ́, ~ \delta ~ \mu \varepsilon ̀ v ~$
















 govs ėxยívovs xai aitíovs t $\tilde{\omega} \nu$ x $\alpha x \tilde{\nu} \nu$ द̇ $\gamma x \omega \mu \iota \alpha$ - E


甲 $\alpha \sigma \iota ~ \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \eta \nu$ тท̀̀v $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu \pi \varepsilon \pi о \iota \eta \varkappa \varepsilon ́ v \alpha \iota ~ \alpha v ̉ \tau о v ́ s . ~$





































Cap. LXXV. KAA. $\Sigma \dot{v}^{\prime} \delta^{\prime}$ oử äv oîós $\tau$,



































 үág; KAA. Naí. $\Sigma \Omega$. Oủxoṽv \&í tıs av̉tò

















 KAA. "Eбтוv. $\quad \Sigma \Omega$. 'Eлi тотє́ $\alpha \nu$ оข̃v $\mu \varepsilon \pi \alpha-$

















 ж $\alpha \omega \tilde{\omega}$.

Cap. LXXVII. KAA. " $\Omega_{s} \mu \circ \iota$ бокві̃s, $\tilde{\omega}^{\Sigma} \Sigma^{\prime} \omega$ -














 ov̉ $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \chi \alpha ́ \rho \iota v ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu ~ v o v ̀ s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o v s ~ o v ゙ s ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ ~ \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega ~ \varepsilon ́ x \alpha ́-~$










 थ $\alpha i$ тvíүตv $\alpha \pi о \rho \varepsilon i ̃ \nu ~ \pi о \iota \varepsilon i ̃, ~ \pi \iota \varkappa \varrho о ́ \tau \alpha \tau \alpha ~ \pi \omega ́ \mu \alpha \tau \alpha ~ \delta \iota-~$










Cap. LXXVIII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Toıoũtov $\mu$ évtoı xai









 ต̈бтє i̋б
























Cap. LXXIX. $\Sigma \Omega$. ${ }^{2} A \chi o v \varepsilon \delta \eta \prime, \varphi \alpha \sigma i ́, \mu \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha 523$

 а" $\mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \iota \nu$. " $\Omega \sigma \pi \varepsilon \varrho \gamma \alpha \varrho{ }^{\circ} O \mu \eta \varrho о \varsigma ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \iota$,



 $\theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \epsilon \omega \nu$ тòv $\mu \varepsilon ̀ \nu ~ \delta \iota x \alpha i ́ \omega s ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ \beta i ́ o v ~ \delta \iota \varepsilon \lambda \theta o ́ v \tau \alpha ~ x \alpha i ̀ ~$




























 $\tau \tilde{\eta} \nu$ ठ $\varepsilon \tilde{\imath} \gamma \nu \mu \nu \grave{\nu} \nu$ घĩ $\alpha \iota, \tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \varepsilon \omega \tilde{\tau} \alpha$, $\alpha \dot{v} \tau \tilde{\eta} \tau \tilde{\eta} \psi v \chi \tilde{\eta}$
















































































 oĩ $\mu \alpha \iota \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \chi \alpha i ~ t o v ̀ s ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda o v ̀ s ~ \varepsilon i ̃ \nu \alpha \iota ~ \tau o v ́ t \omega \nu ~ t \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha-$ $\varrho \alpha \delta \varepsilon \iota \gamma \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ę̉ $\tau v \varrho \alpha ́ \nu \nu \omega \nu$ x $\alpha i \quad \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \varepsilon ́ ต \nu \nu$ xai $\delta v$ -










 каi oi бро́дৎа торпৎоi $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu о ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu о \iota ~ \alpha ̈ \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi о \iota \cdot 526$


























 i̊ะĩv av̉тòv
 ※ขठбしע.
















 пৎотทлах८єг.



















 $\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \eta \pi \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \eta \pi \rho^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime} \varepsilon \varepsilon$.
























NOTES.

## NOTES.

N. B. The references follow the marginal pages and letters of the text. Soph. or Soph. Gr. stands for Sophocles' Grammar : Mt. for Matthiæ's.

447 A. ov゙ $\tau \omega \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \gamma \chi \alpha \dot{\nu} \varepsilon \iota$, 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 phrase, comp. Phædr. 242, B., ov̉ лó $\lambda \varepsilon \mu o \nu \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \gamma \gamma^{\dot{\varepsilon}} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \iota$, what you tell me is not at all disagreeable ; and so Laws 702, D. - ió $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 \nu$, as the saying is. Soph. Gr. § 167. N.2. This epexegetical or appositional accus. may be regarded as a sort of object of the main idea. - $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon i \xi \alpha \tau 0$. This verb in the middle, with an accus. (e. g. $\sigma o \varphi i \alpha \nu$ 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.
 denote but one act, rov́rov might be used equally well.
B. $\dot{\varepsilon \gamma \dot{\omega} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \varrho \varkappa \alpha i ̀ ~ i \alpha \alpha \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota . ~} x \alpha i$, 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. - $\tau i \delta \alpha i$; usually, where $\delta \alpha \grave{\imath}$ is found, $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ is in some MSS. as a various reading. The longer form, it is now admitted, is
properly retained after $x \alpha i$ and $\pi \tilde{\omega} s$ ，where wonder or in－ dignation iṣ＇expressed．－oủィoũv．．．víuiv．Stallb．，Ast and others，explain the construction by regarding ${ }_{j}^{\circ} x \varepsilon \iota \nu$ as used imperatively（Soph．Gr．§219．N．6），גँ $x<\bar{v} \sigma \alpha \iota$ Togyiou being understood．I incline to regard $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \delta \varepsilon i \stackrel{\xi}{\varepsilon} \tau \alpha \iota$ $\dot{v} \mu i v$ as the proper apodosis，which，owing to the inter－ vention of the clause beginning with $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ，deserts its own construction for that of the interposed clause．The sense is，well，then，whenever you wish to come to my house，Gor－ gias will exhibit to you，for he lodges with me．So，appar－ ently，Heindorf．Comp．Soph．CEd．R．227－229，where the clause $\pi \varepsilon i \sigma \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ovj $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ turns the apodosis following it，which would be naturally $\gamma \tilde{\eta}_{S} \dot{\alpha} \pi i \tau \omega \omega \dot{\alpha} \beta \lambda \alpha \beta \beta \eta_{S}$ ，into $\gamma \tilde{\eta}_{S} \delta^{\prime}$ $\ddot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \iota \sigma \iota \nu{ }_{\alpha} \beta \lambda \alpha \beta \eta_{\zeta}^{\prime}$ ．－$\varepsilon v \tilde{̃} \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \iota \varsigma$ ，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．$\delta \iota \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \chi \vartheta \eta \eta_{\nu} \alpha \iota$ ，here to discourse by way of question and answer，tacitly contrasted with an $\dot{\varepsilon \pi i \delta} \varepsilon \varepsilon \xi \iota$ ，in which Gor－ gias would be the sole speaker．Hence，to hold a dis－ cussion，or search for truth in that way，as Socrates did． Socrates in Xen．Mem．4．5．12，defines it xouvin $\beta$ ovdzv́ध－ $\sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota \delta \iota \alpha \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \sigma \nu \tau \alpha \varsigma \quad \chi \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\varepsilon} v \eta \quad \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \varrho \dot{\gamma} \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ ．In the end，the notion of question and answer faded away from the deriv－ atives of this word ；and that of logical reasoning，or that of the science of unchangeable，absolute truth remained． －$\delta \dot{v} v \alpha \mu \iota$ ，essence，nature．－$\tau o \tilde{v} ~ \dot{\alpha} v \delta \varrho \dot{\rho}$ pronominis fere partes agit，ut exprimi possit pronomine possessivo． Ast．－ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{o} \alpha \dot{v} \dot{\partial} \dot{\nu}$ ह́ $\varrho \omega \tau \tilde{\alpha} \nu$ ，ipsum interrogare，the accus． with which $\alpha \dot{v} \dot{\partial} \dot{o} v$ is taken not being expressed．

D．そœoũ，second aor．，not そœov．No present is used by the Attics．Soph．Gr．§ 118，sub voce．
 ease， 0 Gorgias．Ast translates $\varrho \propto \alpha i \omega \varsigma$ libenter，but his power to answer，and not his willingness，is in question．

- $x i \delta_{\varepsilon} . .$. ixavõs; but what difference does that make, if I answer well enough for you? To the common formula ui toṽ̃o; is sometimes added $\delta_{\iota \alpha \varphi \varepsilon}^{\rho} \rho \varepsilon$, which Stallb. here supplies. But $\tau i$ can well be a nominative, ti $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{v} \tilde{\tau} 0$, what is that, i. e. of what importance is it.
B. 'İóóixos, 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 gymuastics, but on the failure of his health gave himself up to the attempt to recover it ; and was among the ear-
 The predicate-accusative with $\gamma \alpha \lambda \varepsilon i v$, , oेvo $\mu \alpha \dot{\prime} \xi \varepsilon \nu$, may be tiva, referring to any one by name or by some appellation taken from his art, business, etc.; or $\tau i$, which is neuter
 forms occur together. - $\vec{\eta}^{\eta} \dot{\delta} \dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi \dot{\rho} s \alpha \hat{v} \tau o v ̃ . ~ P o l y g n o t u s$ of Thasos, the most celebrated of this family of painters. He painted upon the walls 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. $v \tilde{v} v \delta^{\prime}$ हл $\pi \delta \delta \tilde{\eta}^{\prime}$. In this sentence both the main clause and that which furnishes the reason are interrogative, a usage which sounds awkwardly in English. - $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ Xate६甲 $\tilde{y}$. The words which follow are plainly not in the style of conversation. The juxtaposition of words from
 $\sigma \tau \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma t o l)$, $\alpha i \omega \nu \nu \alpha$ for $\beta i o v$, 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. бoì $\beta_{0} \lambda_{0} \boldsymbol{\mu} \dot{\varepsilon} \nu($ éciv. Soph. Gr. § 196. N. 2. -
 what he has said, that Polus has studied the art of rhetoric, so called, rather than how to discourse (logically,) by way of
 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. $\ell \varrho \omega \tau \tilde{\tilde{\alpha}}$. So all the MSS. but the editor's give $\grave{\eta} \rho \omega$ ' $\tau \alpha$, * on account of $\pi$ oio $\tau \iota s$ zin. 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. In this sentence $\pi$ roios and $\tau i s$, which belong to direct inquiry, are found in company with öctus, by which indirect questions are introduced. Comp. roĩ $\alpha$ and $\dot{\delta} \pi \frac{i}{\alpha}$ together $500, \mathrm{~A}$.


 cias quid respondendum sit, et in universo proponere questionem. Ast. - ws tivos . . vix ixys. Another form of compound interrogation, when one clause has the parti-
 bene moratum, as Routh translates it, but plainly egregium certe.
B. $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha}^{\alpha} \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ ö $\pi \varrho$, etc., but be not false to the promise you make. Socrates takes for granted that he will consent.

[^27]Hence ö ö $\varepsilon$, which Ast would change into $\varepsilon \ddot{\prime \prime} \pi \varepsilon$, is justly

 some of the answers it is necessary to discourse at length.
 Sı凶̀ $\beta \varrho \alpha \chi \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$, 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." —— $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \frac{\varepsilon \pi}{} \pi \varepsilon \iota \omega_{s}$, quite sufficiently, or very well.
E. roiovs roúrovg . . . viacivoısv ; What kind of words ? Are they those which make known by what sort of regimen the
 as in 450 , A. line 4. This is a condensed expression for
 attracted forwards to $\delta \eta \lambda_{0} \tilde{v} \sigma \iota$ as its object. $\omega \varsigma$ is quomodo, not $u t$, and to be taken with $\delta \iota \alpha \iota \tau \omega^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 \iota$. The two words are the same as rivı $\delta \iota \alpha i r\urcorner ̣ . ~ C o m p . ~ 453, ~ C . ~-~ o u ̀ x o u ̃ v ~$


B. ovitas ${ }^{\varepsilon} \chi \chi o v \sigma \iota \nu \cdot$ غx $\alpha \sigma \tau \eta$. One of a number of the instances of asyndeton which occur in this dialogue. Some are owing to earnestness of feeling (449, A. ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \pi \varepsilon \varrho$. . $\vec{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \% \rho i v \omega)$; some heighten the effect of contrast by bringing
 ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha}$. $\lambda$. .ovec , 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 appo-
sition，would rather be separated than connected by a
 always，in this work，moderates the force of some uni－ versal word，as $\pi \tilde{\alpha}_{\varsigma}$ ，ov $\delta \varepsilon i \varsigma$ ．According to Lobeck，（para－
 ย̈лоя perraro．It denotes，1．prope dixerim，as here； 2.
 $\tau \tilde{\eta}_{S} \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\varrho} \eta t o \varrho \iota x \tilde{\eta}_{s}$ ．The sense is，but there is no such manual operation pertaining to rhetoric，but all its activity and ef－ ficiency are exercised by means of words．The Scholiast says，that $\chi \varepsilon \varrho \circ \dot{\jmath} \varrho \gamma \eta \mu \alpha$ and $\chi \dot{\varrho} \varrho \omega \sigma \iota s$ are provincial words brought by Gorgias from his native town，Leontini． This is probably a mere random assertion，unlikely in it－ self，and resting on so much truth as this ：that these words are of Gorgias＇own coining，affectedly used for the


C． $\bar{\alpha}^{\alpha} \rho^{\prime}$ oūv ．．．ка入દiv ；Indeed I perceive what sort of art you wish to call it．So Ast．＂Formula $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \varrho$＇ov̉ $\nu$ eodem modo ut oủx oũv initio per interrogationem cum negatione junc－ tam affirmaret．＂Hermann on Soph．Antig．628，（632．） Or，we need only say that $\stackrel{\tilde{\alpha} \rho \alpha, \text { as it often does，requires an }}{ }$ affirmative answer．Stallb．retains the interrogative force of $\tilde{\alpha} \rho \alpha$ ，and supposes the question to require a negative answer．Do $I$ understand，etc．，i．e．$I$ do not understand． But $\mu \alpha \nu \vartheta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ can denote a perception that is not yet clear． ——For $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ ．．． $\begin{gathered}\prime \prime \\ \nu \alpha \alpha \iota \\ \delta \varepsilon \\ \text { comp．Soph．Gr．§ 142．N．} 3 .\end{gathered}$

E．ov̉ð ö兀九 ．．．$\varepsilon$ ĩ̃ $\varepsilon \xi$ ，although in the expression which you make use of you so said．ởð öø七 is properly elliptical for
 means not only，or not only not．Comp．Mt．§ 624．4．－ $\delta \nu \sigma \chi \varepsilon \rho \alpha i v \varepsilon \iota \nu$ ，to be captious in the discourse or discussion．

 that exert their power with regard to（whose efficiency con－
sists 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. $\quad: 0 \% \alpha$, a relative, is sometimes, as here, put for its correlative $\delta \pi \sigma^{\prime} \sigma \alpha$ in indirect inquiry. $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \sigma \iota$ is due to a copyist, who thought the structure deficient. - 由ัぁ
 written motions in the meetings of the people, i. e. who offer amendments in the assembly. The Scholiast explains this 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 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \mu \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ \%atć $\tau \alpha v \tau \alpha \dot{\prime}$, the same as before. But this explanation is unfortunate for several obvious reasons. Still more so is
 tractors. The clearest light, however, has been thrown upon the phrase recently by Boeckh in his Inscriptiones Græcæ, Vol. I. No. 84. The allusion is to the formula
 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. $\sigma v ं \gamma \gamma \circ \alpha \mu \mu \alpha$ is so used of a clause in a decree by Eschines c. Ctes. § 127 Bekker.
C. Sıaøépย $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ roбoṽtov, etc., but they differ 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 $\pi \tilde{\omega} s{ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} / \varepsilon \iota \pi \lambda \eta^{\prime}-$ $\vartheta 0 v$, see Soph. Gr. § 188, N. This definition of hoyıotıx $\dot{\eta}$ is found again in Charmides, 166, A. Arithmetic seems in Plato's definition to be employed with number
in general, and $\lambda o y \iota \sigma \tau \iota x \dot{\eta}$ 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 $\pi \varepsilon \varrho \grave{\iota}$ тoṽ $\pi \sigma \sigma o \tilde{v} ~ \psi \alpha \vartheta^{\prime}$ غ $\alpha v \tau o ́$, and
 numbers. Sometimes, as here, the former term included
 $\tau o \tilde{v} x \alpha \vartheta^{\prime} \alpha v^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$, more especially of numbers in themselves considered.
E. toũto tò oxoдıóv. 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

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { §ะv́т }
\end{aligned}
$$

Plato does not allude to the last line, because ro trade or employment is concerned with it.
 order suggested by the scolium. Heindorf wished to read ó iar@ós $\tau \varepsilon$, 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: : ${ }_{o} \tau \varepsilon$ iatgos $\chi \alpha \grave{\imath}$, on the contrary, would sufficiently discriminate the persons; (the article being omitted often where there is no ambiguity before all but the first.)
 to Stallb., why there is here an indic. in the protasis with an opt. in the apodosis is, that the words of the pædotribe "interlocutoris mentem potius quam suam ipsius opinionem respiciat." As, however, 'z' $\chi \varepsilon \iota ~ \varepsilon ̇ \pi \iota \delta \varepsilon i \xi \kappa \iota$ is, in his own
opinion, only a possibility, he says $\vartheta \alpha \nu \mu \alpha ́\} o \iota \mu \iota$. - $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \chi \nu \eta s$ depends on ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \alpha \vartheta{ }_{o}{ }^{\prime}$, good pertaining to his art.
C. $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \alpha^{\alpha \alpha \tau \alpha \varphi \varrho o v \tilde{\omega} \nu} \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ 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,"


D. $x \alpha \grave{\imath} \sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \ldots \alpha \vec{v} \tau o \tilde{v}$. There is here a change not unknown to our language from the relative to the demonstra-
 selves considered, to the mass of men contrasted by $\alpha \dot{\imath} \tau o \imath_{s}$ with $\varepsilon x \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$, each individual ruler. There is here a certain rhetorical coloring, which may be intended as an imitation of the style of Gorgias.

 $\sigma v \lambda \lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi$, , facile intelligas $\tau o \dot{v}_{S} \sigma v \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \alpha c$. Stallb. ह̇v $\tau \alpha u u^{\tau} \eta \tau \tilde{\eta} \delta \nu v \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu \varepsilon$, i. e. when in or invested with this power. - ${ }_{\alpha}^{3} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma o \grave{~ i s ~ a d d e d ~ a s ~ i f ~}{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ had not gone be-


453 A. тò $\varkappa \varepsilon \varphi \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \propto \iota \nu v$ घị̧ тoṽ̃o $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon v \tau \tilde{\alpha}$, i. e. its sum and substance, its essential quality ends in this or tends to this as its result. to $\tilde{v} \tau o$ is used on account of $\pi \varepsilon i \vartheta \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$, suggested by and contained in $\pi \varepsilon \iota \vartheta \circ \tilde{v}_{S}$ just above. $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon v \tau \tilde{\alpha} \nu$, meaning to end, takes the preposition $\varepsilon i s$ and adverbs of motion to a place after it, as including the previous rest, together
with the end itself; = to come to an end. So ${ }_{\alpha} \varphi \chi \varepsilon เ \nu$, to begin, is joined with $\dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{o}, \vec{\varepsilon} x$, and adverbs of motion from a place, $=$ to start. —— $\ddot{\eta}^{\prime} \not \bar{z} \chi \iota \varsigma . . \delta \delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$. Here $\tau \iota$ seems to be taken with $\delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$, and $\varepsilon \pi \grave{\imath} \pi \lambda \varepsilon \dot{c} \nu$ is to a greater ex-



 myself, - if any other person engages in conversation with another, because he wishes to know the very nature of that about which the discourse is held, that I also, I say, am a person of that description. It is often the case, as here, that an infinitive and its subject are introduced after ${ }_{o}^{\circ} \tau t$. This happens, for the most part, when a clause intervening between ő ő $\iota$ 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, $\dot{\xi} \gamma \dot{\omega}$ is left by itself, and $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \dot{\varepsilon}$ takes its place.
C. ov̉ бoṽ $\ell^{\prime \prime} \varepsilon \varepsilon \alpha$. . . $\lambda \varepsilon$ ' $\gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota$, not on your account (to draw any thing further from you), but on account of the discussion, that it may go on in the way in which it can make the subject discussed most clear to us. Some authorities have $\pi о \iota \tilde{\eta}$, which arose from not perceiving that $\omega s$ here is quomodo, and not $u t$. See 449, E. - ${ }_{\omega}^{\omega} \sigma \pi \varepsilon \rho \ddot{\mu} \nu$. $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu$ belongs to ${ }_{\eta}, \dot{\circ} \mu \eta \nu$, and is repeated on account of its distance from the verb, occasioned by the conditional clause. Comp. 447, D. - Z $\varepsilon \tilde{v} \stackrel{y}{s} \iota \varsigma$. 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. - $\quad \alpha \grave{\iota}$ лой. 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 rov 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 canvass or stone, are hardly deserving of mention. Others suppose the text corrupt. Heind. conjectures róoov, for how much, and Coray, ioũ, whose son. But how the compensation or the father of Zeuxis had any thing 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 $\pi \tilde{\omega}$, which makes good sense, though it departs too much from the letters of the actual text. I conjecture, (that I likewise may contribute my mite), that the sentence originally ended at $\gamma \varrho$ cú $\omega \nu$; which, indeed, may be argued from the fact, that Plato afterwards only alludes to $\tau \dot{\alpha} \zeta \tilde{\zeta} \alpha$. To this $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ лоĩ $\alpha$ $\tau \tilde{\nu} \zeta \omega \dot{\omega} \omega \nu$, and $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \pi \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega \tilde{\omega}$ point ; and no other definition of the art of Zeuxis is hinted at. Next to roćqpev came $\hat{\eta}$ oथ̉; HOT; which was corrupted into $\Pi O T$; and then rai was added to bring $\pi 0 \tilde{v}$ into grammatical connexion with the sentence. For the confusion of $I I$ and $I I$ in the MSS., Bast's Epist. Palæograph. in Schæfer's Gregory Corinth., p. 716, may be consulted. A similar corruption of $\ddot{\eta} \circ \tilde{\tilde{v}}$; into $\pi o v$, in Repub. 437, D., is removed in modern editions.
 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. Gr. § 208. N. 2. - ov̉ $\delta \tilde{\eta} \tau \alpha$ denies the latter part of the alternative, $0 \mathcal{v} \pi \varepsilon i \vartheta \varepsilon$.
454 A. iò $\lambda \varepsilon^{\prime} y_{0} \boldsymbol{\tau} \alpha$, him who makes this assertion, that rhetoric is the art of persuasion.
B., C. $\alpha^{3} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \nu \alpha \mu \mu \dot{\eta} \vartheta \alpha v \mu \alpha^{\prime} \xi, \eta$, , etc. The form of this sen-
tence changes a little as it proceeds. ${ }_{o}^{\circ} \pi \varepsilon \rho$ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$ is written as if $\mu \grave{\eta} \vartheta \alpha \dot{v} \mu \alpha \zeta \varepsilon$ had gone before. The proper apodosis of $i \nu \alpha-\vartheta \alpha v \mu \alpha \zeta_{\eta} \eta_{\varsigma}$ is $\dot{\varepsilon} \varrho \omega \tau \tilde{\omega}$ etc., but the connexion is broken up by $\gamma \dot{\circ} \rho$. The sense of $\circ \pi \pi \varrho \ldots . . \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \omega$ is, for as I say (i. e. as I was just saying, 453, C.), I put the inquiry for the purpose of finishing the discourse 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 $\pi \varrho \circ \alpha \varrho \pi \alpha \dot{\zeta} \varepsilon \iota \nu \tau \grave{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \gamma o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha$,

A. $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \varepsilon v \tau \iota x \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$, productive of belief. $\delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma \alpha \alpha \lambda_{\iota x} \tilde{\eta}_{S}$, able to 455 impart instruction or knowledge, i. e. knowledge founded upon absolute unchangeable principles. - ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \boldsymbol{\pi} \tau \sigma \tau \iota$ о̀s $\mu^{\prime}$ vov, able to cause belief and nothing more (aiming at conviction, and not at truth). This word has been altered into $\pi \varepsilon \iota \sigma \tau \iota x \dot{s}_{s}$ by Stephens, Heindorf, Coray, and Buttmann ; and some MSS. favor the change. Bekker, Stallb., and Ast, with reason, retain лıбtıxós. For, as is shown by Ast at great length, $\pi \varepsilon \iota \sigma \tau \iota \dot{c}_{\varsigma}$ denotes able to produce $\pi \varepsilon \iota \vartheta \omega^{\prime}$, and is the more general word, and not necessarily opposed to $\delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma x \alpha \lambda \iota x o ́ s ;$ while $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \iota x o s$ means able to produce riotıv, which has just been contrasted with $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\prime} \mu \nu \quad$ (454, D.). Again, as to the form of the word, - which, according to Buttmann, cannot analogically be derived from $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$, - Ast observes, that adjectives in $-\iota x o ́ s$ are freely derived, not only from verbals, but also
 imaginary forms ( $\operatorname{\nu ov\vartheta \varepsilon \tau \iota xọs~from~vov\vartheta ย̇ı\eta s).~What~objec-~}$ tion, then, is there to regarding $\pi \iota \sigma \pi o{ }_{s}$, or $\pi i \sigma \pi \iota s$ (comp.
 However derived, such words may take a genitive. But here there is no necessity of supplying a genitive with лıбтıжós.
B. ${ }^{i} \delta \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu \tau i \pi \not \pi \tau \varepsilon \alpha \alpha i \lambda \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu$. The force of $x \alpha i$ 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 $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$, which gives the inapposite sense of let us see what we shall say. - $\pi \varepsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ ì $\alpha \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu ~ \alpha i-$
 cians 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 Crotona, about Olymp. 60, when as yet little money was in circulation, got the large salary of thirty-six ※ginetic 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. — $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda_{0} \tau \iota \ddot{\eta}$ (literally, is there any thing else than, is it not true, ) is a very common formula in Plato, meaning no more than nonne. Very often $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda . \lambda_{0} \tau \iota$, without $\vec{\eta}$, is found in the same sense at the beginning of a sentence; and Bekker always prefers it to $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \tau \iota \geqslant \Rightarrow$. According to Hermann on Viger, note 110, when the latter is used, the interrogation extends to the end of the sentence; but when $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda_{0} \tau \iota$, it stops with those words. - $\alpha i \rho \varepsilon \pi \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$ is in the middle. - A passage precisely like this occurs in Protag. 319, B.
C. tò $\sigma o ̀ \nu ~ \sigma \pi \varepsilon v ́ \delta \varepsilon \iota v, ~ t u i s ~ r e b u s ~ s t u d e r e . ~ C o m p . ~ S o p h . ~$
 many, and few, as the more generic word (Wyttenbach on Phædo, p. 116), and therefore $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda . i$, ỏ̀i $i$ oot, and similar words, often follow to define it. Here xai, on account of the position of $\sigma \not \& \delta \circ \nu$, seems to me not to be and, but even.

The sense is, some, almost even many, i. e. some, indeed even quite a number.
D. $\alpha u ̉ \tau o s ̧ ~ \alpha \alpha \lambda \tilde{\omega} \varsigma ~ \dot{v \varphi \eta \gamma \eta ं \sigma \omega, ~ y o u ~ l e d ~(t h e ~ w a y) ~ r i g h t ~ y o u r-~}$ self, i. e. in speaking about the docks, etc., just now you suggested a good answer.
 had preceded : and partly through that of Pericles. - - 'x
 and Buttmann wish to read $\tau \tilde{\eta}_{s} \delta \eta \mu \omega 0 v \rho \gamma \omega \tilde{\nu}$. But there is no need of this, because a man effects what his advice effects ; and such brevity is common in Greek. Thus in
 ${ }_{\xi \ell \rho}^{\ell}, \mathrm{s}$ oủdèv sioioit, my love then will not differ from a stork, i. e. from a stork's love. Comp. Soph. Gr. § 186. N. 1. - toṽ Siá $\mu \dot{z} \sigma o v ~ \tau \varepsilon i x \chi o u s . ~ A c c o r d i n g ~ t o ~ C o l o n e l ~ L e a k e, ~$ (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 $\tau \varepsilon i \chi o s$ in the singular, as forming a sort of fortification. Plutarch (Vita Pericl. § 13), alluding to this passage, interprets the words, - perhaps carelessly, - by iò $\mu \alpha-$
 pocration, s. v. $\delta_{i \alpha} \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma o v ~ \tau \varepsilon i \chi \chi o v s$, 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 easy to see how the opinion of Leake can stand. See the commentators on Thucyd. l. c., especially Dr. Arnold. Now this inner or southern leg of the long walls,
tó $\mu \alpha \times$ ģò teìyos tȯ vótuov (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.
 $\pi \dot{u} v z a$ yย $\varepsilon i \delta \varepsilon i i_{\zeta}$. The apodosis must be something like סutuovía âv zatuquivoito, which is pointed at by $\gamma \varepsilon$.
B. $\hat{\eta}_{\eta}^{\kappa} \tau \mu \varepsilon \check{v} \tilde{\eta}_{i}$ सaĩoul, 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 íaroós, who, as Routh observes, exercised both the

 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. oỉ̊auoṽ qurirvat, vould be of no account. Comp. Soph. Antig. 183, toũ̃ov oỉdauoṽ $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\gamma} \omega$; Xen. Memorab. 1. 2. 52 , $\mu r_{i} \delta a \mu o \tilde{v}$ हivval, to be nowhere, in no estimation. \&i $\beta$ oci.outo is elegantly added, says Stallb., to denote the arrogance and pretension of Gorgias, $=$ if he chose to give himself the trouble.
D. $\xi^{\prime} u a \vartheta \varepsilon$, sc. $\tau \iota \xi$. Soph. Gr. § 157. N. 8. This omission of the indefinite subject $\tau \iota s$ 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.
 discunt. Nam vulgo juventus non veris armis se exercebat sed rudibus, aut pilis præpilatis, quæ dicuntur Græcis
 Quæ sunt verba Casauboni ad Theophrast. Charact. p. 79, ed. Fischer. Stallb.
 scholars) for the purpose of using them aright against those
foes, and those who wrong them, in defending themselves, not in beginning an assault. cov́voıs refers to ö $\pi \lambda o \iota s$. The subject of $\chi \varrho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$ is to be gathered from the context, viz. such persons as learn to box, and beat their friends. The
 trasted, in the senses of acting on the offensive and defensive. —— $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \varrho \varepsilon \dot{\epsilon} \alpha \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$, turning round, i. e. on the contrary. Comp. $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \omega \prime$, 480, E.
 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; and prope, by which Stallb. renders it, seems incorrect.
 ubi $\varepsilon i ँ \tau \alpha$ et $\begin{gathered}\xi \prime \pi \\ \varepsilon \iota \tau \alpha \\ \text { expectes. Stallb. A frequent idiom. }\end{gathered}$
C. $\delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \iota$, sc. oi $\lambda . \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma 0 \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$, implied in $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \lambda \frac{1}{\gamma} \gamma \omega \nu$; or, more exactly, the subject is indefinite, and plural, because the action of conversing requires more than one. ovit repeats and recalls the participles.
 - $\% \alpha \grave{\imath} \% \alpha \tau \alpha$ $\varphi \vartheta$ óvov, 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 $\varepsilon \alpha v \tau \omega \nu \nu=\dot{\alpha}^{3} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \lambda o l v$, Soph. Gr. § 145. N. 2. oĩa $x \alpha i$, etc., so that even the bystanders feel vexed for themselves, because they consented to be listeners to such people. The infinitive follows oïa, here, as it so often does $\omega \sigma \tau \varepsilon$.
E. $\delta \iota \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \chi \varepsilon \iota v$, to go on, or through with a refutation of. $\delta_{\iota} \dot{\circ}$ has the same force in $\delta \iota \varepsilon \varrho \omega \epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \eta \boldsymbol{y}$ 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
 comp. Soph. Gr. §18\%. 1. With genitives in this relation, $\varepsilon^{\prime \prime} v \varepsilon r \alpha \alpha$ is often found.
 $\chi \vartheta \varepsilon$ ธisv. Soph. §222. 6. Comp. Euthyphro 3, D., where Socrates says, that he converses not only without taking
 with a willingness to give pay, if any one is disposed to hear him. Here $\pi \varrho \circ \sigma \tau \iota \vartheta \varepsilon i \varsigma$ without $\stackrel{\ddot{\alpha} \nu}{\nu}$ would mean, that he actually paid his listeners. - Just below, for $\varepsilon i^{\prime \prime} \tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta}$
 the succeeding $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma o \iota$. The reason for using $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$ 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 $\varepsilon i$ with an indicative; but only the possibility of error on the part of another by $\varepsilon i$ and an optative.
B. öซov $\delta_{o}^{\prime} \xi \alpha \propto \varepsilon v \delta \dot{\eta} \xi$. Græci in hujusmodi comparationibus modo casus præcedenti nomini accommodant, modo nominativum ponunt, intellecto verbo superiore. Stallb.

 been more common. - $\boldsymbol{i} \tau \omega \tilde{\omega} \pi \alpha \varrho o ́ \nu \tau \omega y^{\prime}$, the interests or feelings of the present company. - 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. 506, A.
 prolix. The verb is here used without an object, or, if any thing is understood, it is $\varepsilon \alpha v \tau o v{ }_{\varsigma}$ rather than to $\nu$ hóyov. $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu o i ̀ \delta^{\prime}$ oṽv, etc., and as for that (ov̀v), may I myself also never have so much business, that it may be of more importance for me to do any thing else, being obliged to leave ( $\left.\alpha^{\prime} \varphi \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \nu\right)$ a conversation such as this, and so carried on (i. e. on a subject of such importance, and so interesting).
D. $\tau \dot{\partial} \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \dot{o} \nu$ is the subject of $x \omega \lambda \dot{\nu} \varepsilon \iota$. - $\alpha \alpha \grave{\imath} \tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha$, etc., and that too (i. e. and especially) when I myself announced, that whatever questions any one wishes to put he may do so.

I have written rol vivy $\delta \dot{\eta}$ for roivvy $\delta \dot{\eta}$, at Bekker's sugges-

 negative $\mu \eta$ h here, and in $\delta \mu \dot{\eta}$ iax $\rho$ ós, with oủ in $\delta$ oủx-
 cases, the negation is general and indefinite : "before such as do not know, whoever they are," "he who is no physician, supposing such a person to exist." In the other two cases, the negation being made concerning something definite and particular, (the orator and the crowd,) ov is properly used.
 ท̂uiv noòs hóyov $\mathfrak{\eta}$, if it come at all within the scope of our discourse. $\pi$ oos, (literally, ) on the side of, in favor of, to the advantage of.
D. oũ $\omega \mathrm{c}{ }^{e}$ è $\chi \omega 1$. This clause is afterwards defined by

 thetical : hence $\mu \alpha \vartheta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ follows, and not $\mu \alpha \vartheta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$. -— $\varepsilon_{\chi}^{\prime} \varepsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$, as Ast says, is a formula of exhorting, like ${ }_{\alpha} \neq \varepsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$; as Heindorf, "a formula subsistendi et inhibendi"; as Stallb., after Hermann, one of admonishing another to remember something, and perceive its results. Its use, here at least, consists in drawing attention, in causing one to stop and consider something, especially some objection derived from what had been said.
 the same form of speech, after the same analogy. The next words, being explicative of this clause, are without a connecting particle.
C. The words here enclosed 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. - ह̇x toṽ hóyov, from what has been said; as follows from the argument. These words show that Socrates begins here to apply what has been conceded by the rhetorician, which is proof that the words in brackets are indefensible.
D. $\dot{\varepsilon} x \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \iota v$, sc. $\alpha v ่ \tau o v ́ s$, and so with $\varepsilon \xi_{\xi} \varepsilon \lambda \alpha v ่ \nu \varepsilon \iota \nu$, 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.
 adverbs answer, as Coray observes, to ó aủzòs ov̌̃og.

 F. A. Wolf, on Demosth. c. Leptin. (p. 468, ed. Reiske), lays down the rule that $\varphi \alpha i v o \mu \alpha \iota$ with an infin. $=$ videor, but with a particip. palam sum. But this distinction is now, I believe, regarded as untenable. - ö $\gamma^{\varepsilon} \pi о \iota \varepsilon i \tau \alpha \iota$. Here $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$, which refers to $\dot{\eta} \varrho \eta \eta \tau o \varrho \iota x \eta^{\prime}$, is put in the gender of the predicate $\pi \varrho \tilde{\alpha} \gamma \mu \alpha$, by attraction. Comp. 463, E.
 because the sense is, $I$ said that it was worth while. With $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ the sense would be, I said that it vould be worth while. The first is a direct assertion, in oratio obliqua; the second a hypothetical one, in the same form.
B. $\mu \dot{\alpha}$ còv $x \dot{v} \nu \alpha$. A very common oath in the mouth of Socrates, concerning which much has been written. In
 tor Anubis," which is either a comic addition to the original formula, $\mu \dot{\alpha}$ đò $\nu x \dot{v} \nu \alpha$, 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 Comment. and the Schol. 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. -

 a little out of its place. Do you even or really think.
 must first notice some of the attempts to explain it. 1. Ast gives to $o \not \geqslant \varepsilon \iota$ the sense of $\nu 0 \mu i \zeta \varepsilon \iota \zeta$, and supplies ovitc. Or do you think so because, etc. 2. Stallb. in his first ed. translates thus: an putas Gorgiam prae pudore negasse, etc. But this perverts the whole sense. Comp. 482, C., D., where the passage is in part explained. He
 a strange and flat close to the period. 3. In his second ed., - where he blames Ast for his "mira commenta," forgetting, of course, his own greater ones relating to this passage, - deserting his former view, he continues the
 ois as though it did not affect the structure. The sense then becomes, because Gorgias, etc. . . . did therefore, do you suppose, - an inconsistency arise, etc. But an inconsistency did arise, for the very reason contained in the words ö ö $\tau \downarrow$ Togyias, etc. The words of Polus then become unmeaning. 4. Schleierm. seems to regard the sentence
as a broken one, in which I think he is right; and only wrong when he supplies a close from $\tau o \tilde{v} \vartheta^{\prime}$ ó $\delta \dot{\eta}{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \tilde{\alpha} s$. His version in English is, "Or do you think, because Gorgias, etc. . . . to find your pleasure therein." I have put a dash after $\delta \iota \delta \alpha_{s} \xi_{\varepsilon \imath v}$, to show that the sentence is incomplete. Polus is so eager, that he cannot end his words grammatically. He 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 ( $\delta \dot{\eta}$ ) 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). The first sentence might perhaps have run thus: "Do you think, because Gorgias through shame made certain admissions, that therefore his inconsistency is to be charged to
 times follows a simply negative expression, = quin before a subjunctive. But more usually it follows a verb of negative import, when ovं precedes such a verb. Thus
 $\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$, which occurs just below 461, C.
D. $\dot{\pi} \alpha \nu \circ \rho \vartheta 0 i \tau \varepsilon$. Optativus post particulas finales in hujusmodi ennutiatis usurpatur, si vel ex aliena mente et cogitatione loquimur, vel nihil nisi finem et consilium significamus, adjuncta notione optandi. Stallb. - dizolos $\delta^{\prime}$ हĩ, and it is right for you so to do. For jixolog, see Mt. § 297. It is for $\delta i \varkappa \alpha 1$ óv $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau i \quad \sigma \varepsilon$, etc., owing to the cause explained in the note on 448, D. - $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \vartheta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$, 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. - quháctuq̧s, if you will only observe one thing. The middle, if you will guard against, would be equally appropriate.
E. oṽ . . . $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \nu$, where of all Greece there is the greatest liberty of speech. - < $\boldsymbol{\alpha} v i \vartheta \varepsilon \xi$, put over against it, sc. that which I can say. - rot, though.
 (Metaphys. init.) refers to this treatise, or to the words of Polus of like import on 448, C., and approves of his opinion ascribing art to experience.
 namely, to have the faculty of giving pleasure to men, seem to you to be a good thing? The last clause of the sentence
 $=\tau \iota \gamma \alpha$ oîóv $\tau^{\prime}$ हìrva.
D. ßoưvis oũv, etc., are you willing, then, since you prize giving pleasure, to give me a little pleasure. For the play on $\chi \alpha$ oi'So $\mu \alpha \iota$, comp. $516, \mathrm{~B}$. In this sentence, the present infinitive denotes the habit of Polus; $\chi \propto \rho i \sigma \alpha \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$, that which Socrates wishes him to do in this instance.
E. tivos hìjeıs raúrı̧. Comp. 449, E., note on toiovs
 rude. For $\delta \dot{\delta} \delta o t \% \alpha$ omitted, comp. Soph. Gr. § 214. N. 4. The comparative, which here denotes a lower degree of the quality than the positive, is usual in such apologies.
 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.
 but experience, or a routine and practice, i. e. has nothing
to do with absolute truth, and the reason, but proceeds from accidental discovery, that a certain end is gained by certain means. - $о \mu \mu \omega \tau \iota x \grave{\eta}$ differt a коб $\mu \eta \tau \iota x \tilde{\eta}$ quâ honestus ornatus quæritur. Stallb.
C. тétт tery 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 philo-
 note. - $\pi \varrho i v ~ \not ̈ \nu ~ \dot{\alpha} \pi о х \rho i \nu \omega \mu \alpha \iota$. With $\pi \rho i \nu$ " subjunctivum non usurpant tragici, nisi in priore membro adsit negandi aut prohibendi significatio." Elmsley on Medea, 215. In which case $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ accompanies $\pi \rho i \nu$, with some exceptions almost confined to poetry, and the subjunctive has the sense of the exact future of Latin ; e. g. here priusquam respondero. For the reason why the subjunctive follows $\pi \rho i v$, see Mt. § 522, C.
 division of the political art, "civilitatis particulæ simulacrum," as translated by Quintil. 2.15. 25, where this passage is examined.
E. $\Pi \tilde{\omega} \chi_{o s} \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ö $\delta \varepsilon$. There is here probably an allusion to the meaning of the name, colt, as Schleierm. remarks. Comp. Aristot. Rhet. 2. 23, which no one, I believe, has
 Sıxos (comp. 448, B., note,) Є९,

 ${ }_{o ้ \nu}^{\nu} \tau o \tilde{\tau} \tau o$, the predicate $\tau 0 \tilde{v} \tau 0$ determines the gender of ${ }_{\circ}^{\circ} \nu$ by attraction, instead of $\varrho \eta \tau o \varrho \iota x \eta$ to which it refers. Comp. 460, E.
464 A. oテ̃ov toเóy $\delta \varepsilon$ र'́ $\gamma \omega$, for instance I mean as follows, literally, " of which sort I mention such a thing as this, viz." This, with or without the article before rooóv $\delta$, is a common formula in Plato, when examples are adduced.
 supplied by the preceding accusatives, $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$ and $\psi v \nsim \dot{\eta} \nu$.
 not able to name to you off-hand by one name. owَuc and $\psi v x \eta$ freely have 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. $\mu i \alpha \nu$ is the predicate-accusative. ovitw, thus, in these present circumstances, often is equivalent to illico. Comp. 509, A. - $\tau \tilde{\eta}_{S} \delta_{\dot{\varepsilon}} \pi_{\alpha} \lambda \iota \tau \iota x \tilde{\eta}_{s}$, etc. Here $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$ is to be supplied in thought, and $\tau \tilde{\eta} s \pi \sigma \lambda \tau \tau x \tilde{\eta}_{S}$ depends on $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \nu \circ \mu \circ \vartheta \varepsilon \tau \tau x \eta \eta_{\nu}$ its part. The sense is, and of the political art $I$ mention (one branch) the legislative as the counterpart to the gymnastic art, and (the other) justice as the counterpart to medicine. The political art, or the general art of securing the public good, has two divisions, first, that which consists in securing the moral welfare by law which 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 body are 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, - 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.

 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. See

slipped under, or by stealth put on the garb of each of the four divisions.
D. $\vartheta \eta \rho \varepsilon v ่ \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota ~ i \dot{\eta} \nu \alpha ้ \nu o \iota \alpha \nu$, hunts for, seeks to captivate ignorance, or the unwary. - $\tau \tilde{\omega} \dot{\omega} \varepsilon \grave{\eta} \dot{\eta} \delta i \sigma \tau \omega$, by that which is at the time most agreeable.
465 A. тoũro $\gamma \dot{\varrho} \varrho \pi \varrho o ̀ s ~ \sigma \dot{~} \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$ alludes to 463, D., where Polus puts the question concerning the quality of rhetoric.
 gยt, because it cannot explain what sort of things those are in their nature, which it makes use of. Here we see what Plato thought a $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \chi^{\prime} \eta$ must be. The MSS. give, almost
 without MS. authority, $\tilde{\sim} \nu \pi \varrho \circ \sigma \varphi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \varepsilon$. I have restored a part of the MS. reading, and have since observed that Stallb. in his second ed. has made the same change. vinooxeiv $\lambda$ ió $\gamma o v$, to submit the reason, or rationale, to explain and defend a position.
B. íло́жвı兀 $\alpha$, puts itself under, puts on the form or mask
 make men attach to themselves adventitious beauty, and neglect their own, obtained through the gymnastic art.
C. ${ }_{\circ}^{\prime \prime \pi} \varepsilon \varrho \quad \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau 0 \iota ~ \lambda \varepsilon ่ \gamma \omega$. In the ensuing words down to óчолоихшข , 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. örغg . . . $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \omega \omega$, refers to what has just preceded ; but as $I$ sày, or was just saying. - $\delta \iota$ ' $\sigma \tau \eta x \varepsilon$. The subject of this verb, according to Buttmann
in Heindorf's ed., is all the arts before mentioned, and ${ }_{o}^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ has the same subject, which is $\tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha$ understood, referring to these arts. Stallb. restricts $\delta \iota \varepsilon \sigma \tau \eta x \varepsilon$, with rea-
 ${ }_{o}^{\circ} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ may be used instead of ${ }_{o}{ }^{\prime} \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon$, referring to $\sigma o \varphi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \grave{\imath}$ x $\alpha \grave{\varrho}$ @ $\eta$ to@६s, 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
 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).
 ( $七 o v ̃)$ 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. 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. - $\sigma \dot{v} \gamma \dot{\varrho} \rho$ $\tau о v ं \tau \omega \nu$ है $\mu \pi \varepsilon \iota \varrho o g$. The Schol. of the Clarke MS. supposes these words to allude to the rhetorical figure called $\pi \alpha \rho i-$ $\sigma \omega \sigma t s$, which takes place when similar words, as pi $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \Pi \tilde{\omega} \lambda \varepsilon$ here, are brought together. Another Schol. explains them of the acquaintance of Polus with the philosophy of

Anaxagoras, - to which sect, says he, Polus belonged, - a piece of information probably picked out of the text. Perhaps nothing more than ironical praise of Polus for great knowledge is intended. Comp. 462, A.
 The clause might be removed without injury to the sense. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i \sigma \tau \varrho o \varphi o v ~ h e r e ~ g o v e r n s ~ a ~ g e n i t i v e, ~ b u t ~ a ~ d a t i v e ~ 464, ~ B . ~ . ~$ Some other compounds of $\dot{\alpha \nu \tau \iota}$ vary in the same way as to
 nouns often do to nouns of another gender, = that thing.
A. Init. If, therefore, I too, when you answer, shall not know what to make (of it), do you likewise prolong your discourse; but if $I$ shall, let me make use of $i t$. The dative, which should follow $\chi \rho_{\rho}^{\prime}, \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \iota$, is contained in $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \times \rho \iota \nu 0-$ $\mu \varepsilon ่ \nu o v$.
B. ovidغ voui乡єбЭal, not even to be thought of, i. e. to be held in no estimation at all. This verb, which just above has a predicate $\varphi \alpha \tilde{v} \lambda_{o l}$, 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 $\varkappa v \dot{v} \alpha$, ought, as it seems to me, to be erased. Comp. $\mu \dot{\alpha}$ tòv $\Delta i \alpha \alpha \ldots \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$,
 swearing unites in one clause with what follows.
 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 repentance." For $\omega s$ हैंाos $\varepsilon i \pi \varepsilon \tau \nu$ qualifying ov̉ $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} v$, see $450, \mathrm{~B}$. - $\mu \grave{\alpha}$ tóv. 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. - $\alpha \alpha \grave{\imath} \tau \varepsilon \chi \nu \eta \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ § $\eta \tau o \varrho \iota-$

A. $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \xi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \xi \bar{\xi} \alpha \varsigma$. The aorist participle, which Heindorf 467 declares to be used for the present, has its own force. He could prove what he wished, when he had refuted, or by refuling. In the first case, the aorist is needed; the present, if used, would have the second sense. - $\xi \xi \varepsilon$ -
 unless Socrates be refuted, and it be shown that, thus answering nearly to our verb convince.
B. oữos $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \rho$. An instance of aposiopesis or reticentia, a figure often caused by excited feelings, which cannot find the language to express themselves. "In hac formula recte omittitur articulus, quoniam dicitur $\delta \varepsilon \iota x \tau 1 x \omega ̃ s$ de eo qui præsens est." Stallb. oũ̃os contains a shade of contempt sometimes like iste. Comp. 489, B., 505, C. ка̀े $\gamma \grave{\varrho} \rho$ non est ctenim, sed $\% \alpha \grave{\imath}$ pertinet ad $\nu \tilde{v} \nu$. Stallb.;
 address you in your own style. This refers to $\lambda \tilde{\omega} \sigma \tau \varepsilon ~ \Pi \tilde{\omega} \lambda \varepsilon$, and the artificial juxtaposition of words of equal length, or of similar form or sound. Comp. 465, D.
 $\pi \alpha \varrho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ì兀@ผั, a constructio prcegnans.
D. oi $\pi \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \circ \nu \tau \varepsilon \xi$, i. e. who make voyages for commercial
 pronoun thus prepares the way for the infinitive, the latter
 But just above we have not only roṽro, $\pi i v \varepsilon \iota v$, but also
 it not so, then, in all cases?
E. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \grave{\eta}{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime} \gamma \eta$. 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.

468 A. пৎळ́тtovat, on fait, like $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma o v \sigma \iota$, on dit. The same indefinite subject appears just before in the first person plural $\beta \alpha \delta i \zeta 0 \mu \varepsilon \nu$, etc.
C. «́лえผ̄s ovit $\omega \mathrm{s}$, thus in themselves considered, without respect to something further.
E. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \tilde{\eta} \tilde{\eta}^{\pi} \pi^{\prime} \lambda \varepsilon \iota \tau \alpha \underset{\tau}{\tau} \tau \eta$. Not in this city, Athens, as Heindorf understood it, 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 (Notæ Crit. in Olymp. 6. 102) observes, $\varepsilon \nu \tau \tilde{y} \delta \varepsilon$ $\tau \tilde{\eta} \pi o ́ l \varepsilon \varepsilon$. Comp. this formula so used, 469, D., fin. Leges 932, A. "̈ $\delta \varepsilon$ seems to be the strongest, and, so to speak, most objective of the demonstratives, and to point especially at that which has a close outward relation, (as that
 $=$ fieri potest. - $\omega s$ ' $\eta$, as forsooth, just as though. Stallb. translates these words by quasi vero, Ast by nam revera.
469 A. $\pi \varepsilon \varrho \grave{\omega} \tilde{\omega} \nu \ldots \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu \varrho \omega \dot{\sigma} \pi \omega \nu$. Comp. Soph. § 151. 3.
 tæ (prceterea) adjungi solet particula $\gamma \varepsilon$. Ast. = yes, and pitiable besides. - $\pi \omega ̃ s$, cur. ovitws $\omega \varsigma$, 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.
 हॄรivat, supply tıvı.
D. $\tau \tilde{\oplus} \lambda \frac{0}{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ is added to explain the sense in which $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \pi \iota-$ $\lambda \alpha \beta o \tilde{v}$ is used, attack in your discourse, refute by argument. $\delta \dot{\eta}$ seems to belong to the imperative, with the usual hortatory sense. - $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \circ \rho \tilde{\alpha} \pi \lambda \eta \vartheta \circ v \dot{v} \sigma$, in the agora, when it is crowded, which it was between morning and mid-day. This phrase denotes place, - not time, as Stallb. says, to
which $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ is opposed. $\pi \varepsilon \varrho \grave{\iota} \dot{\alpha} \gamma o \varrho \dot{\alpha} \nu \quad \pi \lambda \eta \vartheta \vartheta o v \sigma \alpha \nu$ is a common phrase for time. ảyoó́, even when definitely used, is often without an article, like $\pi \sigma^{\prime} \lambda \iota \varsigma, \pi \alpha \tau \eta \dot{\eta}$, and many other nouns. And this is particularly frequent after prepositions. Comp. 447, A. - $\tau \varepsilon \vartheta \nu \eta^{\prime} \xi \varepsilon \varepsilon$, he shall be dead, the meaning of $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \vartheta \nu \eta \chi \alpha$ put into a future. This appears to be the received form in old Attic, and $\tau \varepsilon \vartheta \nu \eta \eta_{\xi \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota}$ came into use afterwards. See Elmsl. on Aristoph. Acharn.

 $\lambda_{\bar{\eta}}$, Aristoph. Peace, 71. But the accusative may also follow this verb, as in 515 , E. Yet the accusative of \% $\varepsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda \dot{\eta}$ was disallowed by the Atticists, although used by Lysias and others of the best writers.
E. toıngesı, desidero articulum. Stallb. oi, which may have been absorbed by $\chi \alpha \grave{\imath}$ ( $K A I$ for KAIAI), is added by Coray. But the article is unnecessary, being implied or contained in tó, as Ast observes. One article often suffices, even for two substantives of different genders, or for two words separated by disjunctive particles. Comp. Hermann on Eurip. Hec. 593 of his second ed.
A. iò $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \alpha \delta \dot{v} v^{\prime} \alpha \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$, etc. In this passage, the words 470 just written must be supplied, as the predicate of paiveral, and return again after $\varepsilon i \delta_{\dot{\varepsilon}} \mu \dot{\eta}$. It sometimes happens, in Greek, that when the same word belongs to the subject and predicate, it is omitted in the latter. Comp.
 good cannot be good naturally. We in like cases use so, such, in the predicate. The sense is, to have great power appears to you to be such, if a man is attended with success while he does what seems to him best, and (it then appears) to be a good; and this, 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 falls upon his ground. The words $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \vartheta \vartheta{ }^{\circ} \nu$ $\tau \varepsilon$ \&ivaı are singularly enough joined by $\tau \varepsilon$ to the omitted predicate of paivetol.
 indirect inquiry.
 spoken in irony.
D. $\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \alpha \alpha^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} v^{\prime} \omega \gamma$. Routh and other editors since suppose, that by this form of words Socrates conveys ridicule of $\delta \varrho \tilde{\varphi} \varsigma$ just above, which is used quite rhetorically. This may be so, but ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} x o v v^{\prime} \omega$ is often thus used for ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \eta^{\prime} x o \alpha$. Comp. 515, E. - oủx oì $\alpha$. The noble passage down to $\alpha \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ is freely translated by Cicero, Tusc. Quæst. 5. 12. - $\alpha$ v่tó $\vartheta \varepsilon v$, ex ipsa re. Stallb., from the nature of the case itself.


471 A. Archelaus began his reign by the foul means mentioned 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 invited, and to have replied $\dot{v} \beta \rho \iota v$
 xaxшัs. (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. (Elian. 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. - $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \delta o v i d \varepsilon v \varepsilon \nu \ddot{\alpha} \nu$. Some few MSS. give $\bar{\delta} \delta o u ̛ \ell \varepsilon v \sigma \varepsilon \nu$. Heindorf condemns Routh for adopting édoúkevev, saying that the latter with $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ is serviret; the former servisset. But this is not so. The imperfect indicative with $\alpha \nu$, "plerumque refertur ad præsens. Sæpe vero etiam ad præteritum, ejusmodi quidem, quod diuturnitatem aliquam vel repetitionem facti continet." Hermann de partic. $\ddot{\mu} \nu$. II. 10.
B. $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \pi \varepsilon \mu ч \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \nu{ }^{\circ}$, etc. "Insignis est hic locus eo, quod plurima participia cumulantur, copula non intercedente." Stallb. In this, the style of rhetoric is, I think, 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. $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \alpha \lambda \dot{\omega} \nu \varepsilon$ zis $\varphi_{\varrho} \dot{\varepsilon} \alpha \rho$, according to Ast and Stallb., denotes the manner in which the action of $\dot{\mu} \pi o \pi v i \xi \alpha$, took place, having drowned him by throwing him into the well. I know not whether it may not suit the rhetorical style here better, if they are taken side by side, as if $x \alpha \iota$ were in the text, having thrown him into the well (and so) drowned
 бoṽ, tuque imprimis, seu interque eos tu primus. Heindorf, who has adduced a number of examples of the phrase.
D. $\tau о \tilde{v} . . . \eta \eta_{\mu} \mu \lambda \eta x \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \alpha c$. This clause is brought, by a negligent freedom of style, under the influence of ö ot $t$, although Socrates of course did not praise Polus for ignorance of the art of conversation. $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ has the force of quanquam; although you seem to have neglected the art of discussing. - $\pi \dot{\prime} \vartheta \varepsilon \nu$; comp. my note on Eurip. Alcest. 95.
A. Nixics. This well known wealthy general perished 472 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 connexions, 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 toitrofs.. A favorite kind of votive offering. The tripods here spoken of were set up on the top of small temples in the enclosure of the temple of Bacchus in commemoration of victories in which the dedicators were the choragi of their tribes. -iptotozoútrя, 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. Plato, writing this dialogue perhaps some time after the death of Socrates, may have forgotten dates or neglected them. But perhaps a view of the text deserves mention, which no one seems to have taken. It is suggested by the fact, that all the individuals and families mentioned here were singularly unfortunate at the end. The decline of that to which Nicias belonged, had already begun. See Boeckh's
Civ. EEcon. of Athens, B. 4, § 3. The surviving son of Pericles, of the same name, perished in company with Aristocrates, and this illustrious race soon disappears from history. Now it is not unlikely, that Plato sarcastically introduces these examples as at once disproving the point for which they might be quoted. Perhaps Archelaus himself, who died miserably by assassination, is selected for the same reason.
B. '̀v $\Pi v \vartheta i o v, ~ s c . ~ i \varepsilon \varrho ஸ ̃, ~ i n ~ t h e ~ t e m p l e ~ o f ~ A p o l l o ~ P y t h i u s ~$ at Athens. So I have no hesitation in reading with Coray, after one MS., for the common $\Pi \vee \vartheta о \imath ̃, ~ D e l p h i . ~ F o r ~$ toũto 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. —— $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \vartheta \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \varepsilon$ is for $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu-$ $\vartheta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta$, by attraction or accommodation to $\dot{\varepsilon} x \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \xi \alpha \sigma \vartheta \alpha l$, which contains the notion of taking from. - $\dot{\varepsilon} \times \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \iota \nu \ldots \dot{\alpha}^{3} \lambda \eta-$ $\vartheta o \tilde{v}_{s}$. In these words, there is an elegant allusion to actions of ejectment: There is, also, according to Stallb., a play upon ovevia, which means not only substance, estate, but reality, truth. $\dot{\varepsilon} x \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota \nu$ also may allude to the tyrants before mentioned; as though Socrates had said, "You mean to act the part of one of these tyrants, whom you admire so much, and expel me from my only substance, the truth, by getting a multitude of opinions in your favor."
 comp. what is said in the note on 470, A.
D. $̈ \not ้ \lambda \lambda_{0} \tau \iota \ldots \delta \iota \alpha \nu 0 \omega \omega_{\mu} \xi \vartheta \alpha$, shall we not suppose that you think so. For the genitive absolute with $\omega$, after a verb of knowing, comp. Soph. § 192. N. 2, Mt. § 569. 5. $\dot{\dot{\alpha}} \rho \alpha$ 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.
 tains a passive idea, $=$ ходи́̈́ritcu.
 re certa ut Lat. fortasse. Stallb. —— ç̉hl हُtı тои̃


 to see,) " ponitur semper in rebus gravioribus, et $\varepsilon$ ह̇ì $\sigma v \mu-$ qooũs ut ait Thomas Magister, p. 335.". Wyttenbach de Sera Num. Vindict. referred to by Heindorf and others. Not semper but scepe. We have, for instance, Eurip.

 @os ${ }^{\text {Évtata }}$. The compar. here has far less MS. authority in its favor, than either the superl. or the positive preceded by ovitws. Stallb. inclines to the superl., but no sure example has been adduced of this degree used for the
 and by strangers besides, or and by the rest of men, viz. strangers. This seemingly pleonastic use of $\% \lambda .2 .0$ is quite


 $\mu r_{1} \nu$.
D. $\mu \circ \rho \mu о \lambda \dot{\tau} \tau \tau \varepsilon \iota$ aṽ, etc., you are this time bringing up bugbears, and not attempting a refutaiion ; and just nov you were bringing up witnesses. Socrates is making game of the rhetorical substitutes for philosophical proof used by Polus. - Svoĩv $\dot{\mu} \varrho(\dot{\alpha} \vartheta \lambda i o t v . ~ S u p p l y ~ o v ̉ \delta \varepsilon ̇ \tau \varepsilon \varrho o s . ~$
 rhetorical precept of Gorgias mentioned by Aristot. Rhet. 3. 18, that the "impression produced by the serious dis-
course of the adverse party must be destroyed by mirth;

 ironical way, attributes to ignorance a proceeding which sprang from a conscientious regard to law, and crowned him with the lighest 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 purpose 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 every thing 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 dis-
ciples of Socrates, Mr. Thirlwall (4.126, seq.) disregards as spurious, or has forgotten, for he ends the trial in one day. It is an important passage, not only for this item of information, but also for making known to us 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.
 $\pi \alpha \varrho \alpha \dot{\alpha}{ }^{\circ}$, as $I$ was saying just now, hand over the proof to me in my turn. He refers to 472, C.
 some bitterness silently contrast the philosopher with the orator, who aims to persuade the many. - $\delta_{1} \delta_{o}$ vol Ėdz\%ðov, to give an opportunity of refutation, to let (another) take up the argument. - $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \frac{1}{} \tilde{v} \gamma \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon i$. In this formula, woì is often added before $\delta \varepsilon i ̃$ in the sense of even.
D. $\tau i \delta \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \tau o ́ \delta \varepsilon ;$ intellige $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \iota \varsigma$. Stallb. - عis oủdìv $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \beta \lambda \varepsilon ̇ \pi \omega v$, etc. Do you call beautiful things in general ( $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ккג̀ $\pi \dot{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha$ ) beautiful in each instance wilhout having reference to any thing further? i. e. do you consider beauty a fundamental quality or resolve it into something
 epexegetical of the preceding clause.
 wishes to write $x \alpha \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ without the article, thus making it a predicate. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ is added by way of explanation. $\tau \alpha ̀$ кагі̀ . . . rópous $=$ oi vó $\mu$ ol. The sense is, and moreover laws and studies, - those that are beautiful that is, - are not removed from (are not without) these properties, viz. the useful or pleasant, or both.


 This conveys a bitter satire of Polus, who by pleasure and the good, meant the same thing.
B. ov̉ $\alpha \alpha \grave{\imath}$ toṽ̃o ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \not \eta$; frequens apud Plat. dictio pro
 B., ov̉ $\tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$. Stallb.


 Eootxev, my mode of proof when put by the side of your mode of proof is quite unlike it.
A. $\sigma x \varepsilon \psi \omega \mu \mu \vartheta \vartheta \alpha, \sigma \varkappa о \pi \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \vartheta \alpha$. The present imperative, 476 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
 not $\sigma x \dot{\varepsilon} \pi t o \mu \alpha \iota$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma x \varepsilon \pi t o ́ \mu \eta \nu$. There is only one instance of $\sigma$ бє่лтоца兀 in Plato to very many of $\sigma о л \tilde{\omega}$. On the contrary, they never use $\sigma \% \sigma \pi \tilde{\omega}$ in the future, aorist, or perfect.
B. $\delta \iota \alpha \sigma x \varepsilon \psi \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu \circ$, afler careful consideration.
C. The Attic form $x \dot{\alpha} \omega$ is justly preferred by all modern editors to $\% \alpha i \omega$, having, as it does, the support of several MSS.
 $\omega \varphi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \alpha<$, to be taken with its cognate noun, and for the place of $\omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \varphi \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon_{\varepsilon \iota \alpha \nu}$ in the sentence, comp. Soph. § 151. Rem. 7.
 a man's property. So Schleierm. Ast, in his translation, joins ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \vartheta \varrho \omega \dot{\jmath} \pi \sigma v$ with $x \alpha x i \alpha \nu$.
C. $\dot{\alpha} \varepsilon \grave{\imath}$ to aỉšiotoy, etc. In every case that which is most ugly is most ugly, from whal has been admitted before, either as occasioning pain in the grealest degree, or harm, or both. The student will have observed, that $\alpha \alpha i o s, ~ a i-$ oxoós, 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 cioxoós. ふّزaधós, $x \alpha \alpha_{s}$, denote the relation of any thing to our well being, especially to future and ultimate well being as opposed to pleasure in the present time.
D. oủoũv $\eta_{\eta}^{n}$ ảvooótatov, etc. Therefore it is either most unpleasant, and the ugliest of them because it exceeds (them) in unpleasanlness, or (it is so because it exceeds them) in hurlfulness, or in both. $\tau 0$ ítwy refers to the two rovn-
 by some extraordinarily great harm. This may be ex-
 $\mu \varepsilon \gamma^{\alpha} \lambda \eta \quad \beta \lambda \alpha_{1}^{\prime} \quad \eta$, it is aslonishing by how great a harm, and

 can be explained in the same way, or by an attraction by
 changed in their form by the relative adverb.
E. únakhártє. This means no more, than "has a tendency to free." Some are beyond the reach of cure by punishment ( $525, \mathrm{C}$.). 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.
 you are not prepared to answer.
 ó $\mu \varepsilon v o l$, such as are cured, which being indefinite readily
gives place to a singular. -iar@evó $\mu$ _vos is added to ex-
 tives. Comp. Soph. Antig. 92.—— $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi_{\grave{\eta} \nu} \mu \eta \delta \dot{\delta} \varkappa \tau \tilde{\eta} \sigma \iota \varsigma$, the not even possessing it at all.
 torum imitatione celebratum esse docuit Wyttenbach. ad Plutarch. de sera numinis vindicta, p. 23. Stallb.
E. oṽ̃os $\delta^{\prime} \bar{v}_{i} \nu$, but this was, i. e. this is, as we proved, he who, etc.
 often followed by ต̈ote before an infinitive. Comp. Soph.
 phrases like this, an apodosis to which $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ belongs is to be supplied: here $\delta \iota \alpha \pi \varrho \alpha^{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \alpha \tau 0$ is to be repeated. A little

 тóv $\tau \iota$. $\alpha \cup \cup \imath o v ̃ ~ r e f e r s ~ t o ~ \delta i x \eta \nu ~ \delta i \delta o ́ v \alpha t, ~ i m p l i e d ~ i n ~ \delta i x \eta \nu ~ j u s t ~$
 is not uncommon in comparisons, for to $\tilde{v}$ ovvolx\&ĩ $\mu \dot{\eta}$ íyı\& oajusitı, in order to prevent the repetition of ovrooxeiv. Comp. 455, E. note, Soph. Antig. 75, and Soph. § 186. N. 1.
C. $\pi \propto \varrho \alpha \sigma \kappa \varepsilon v \alpha \zeta^{\circ} \mu \varepsilon r^{\prime} o$. This verb can be followed by an accusative, and by a clause beginning with ö $\pi \omega \varsigma$. 'The two constructions are here united. - $\sigma v \mu \beta \alpha i \nu \varepsilon \iota \mu \varepsilon ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau o \nu$ uaxóv. This verb may be united with the participle or infinitive of $\varepsilon i \mu i$, or with a simple predicate as here. Soph. Electr. 261, note in my ed.
 commits the greatest wrongs suffers no punishment for them. —— $\varphi \alpha i \nu \varepsilon \tau \alpha t$, sc. $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \pi o \delta \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon i \chi \vartheta \alpha \iota$.
A. aủiòv Exviò̀ quhátiztv, 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 $\varphi u \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \varepsilon \nu$ is $\tau \iota \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha}$, with which $\alpha v v^{3} \dot{\nu} \nu$ is to be joined; and the same omission of the indefinite subject occurs a few lines below. ön $\boldsymbol{\circ} \boldsymbol{s} \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota x \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta$. One MS. has $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \iota x \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon \iota$, and one other $\pi \circ \iota \eta \quad \sigma \varepsilon \iota$ just below. The old doctrine of Dawes, that ${ }_{\circ}^{\circ \prime} \pi \omega \varsigma \mu \dot{\eta}$ cannot 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. $\geqslant \pi \tilde{\eta} \varsigma \lambda^{\varepsilon} \gamma 0 \mu \varepsilon \nu$. $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$, which Bekker prefers, would be equally good here. Comp. $i \boldsymbol{i} \varphi \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ just below. The difference is, that $\pi \tilde{\omega} s ~ \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \gamma \mu \varepsilon \nu=$ what is our opinion? $\pi \tilde{\omega} \lambda^{\prime} \dot{\gamma} \omega \mu \varepsilon \prime$, what shall we say? what ought to be our opinion? what have we good reason to believe?
C. $\varepsilon i \mu \eta ̀ \varepsilon i$ ". "Sometimes a second $\varepsilon i$ follows $\varepsilon i \mu \eta$, as in Latin nisi si." Mt. § 617, d. - दौлì qov̀vavioov. Accord-
 clause $\kappa \alpha \tau \eta \gamma o \varrho \varepsilon \tau \nu ~ \delta \varepsilon i v$, being explanatory of $\tau 0 \dot{\nu} \nu \alpha \nu \tau i o v$, follows without a copula. But this view of the construction
 тov̀vaviiov, unless one can suppose that it is useful for a contrary purpose; viz. that a person ought first of all to accuse himself (i. e. by means of rhetoric). - ös ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \varepsilon i$. Here $\alpha^{\prime} \varepsilon \grave{\imath}=$ at any time. - $\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \chi \varepsilon เ \nu \mu v \prime \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \alpha$, etc., but to give himself up, with his eyes closed and manfully, as to a physician, etc. $\mu v v_{\sigma} \nu \tau \alpha$ expressed 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. $\sigma o \iota$ ó $\mu$ o久oyeitcı. Heindorf and Coray would exclude $\sigma o c$ 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. rov̉vavtioy, 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 is said in the character of the rhetoricians, but upon the principles with regard to justice and injustice which Polus has admitted. The parenthesis, also, $\varepsilon^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu \mu^{\prime} \nu 0 \nu \ldots \varepsilon^{3} \lambda \alpha \beta \eta \tau \varepsilon^{\prime} \% \nu$ is so understood by Buttmann. It is as much as to say, 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 wronging himself. - $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \kappa \lambda o ́ v \tau \alpha, m u-$ tata ratione, vicissim. Comp. $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \varepsilon^{\prime} \psi \alpha \varsigma, 456, \mathrm{E}$. It agrees with the subject of roเ\&iv. The abundance of words to denote opposition is worthy of notice, roủvaviov, $\alpha \tilde{v}$, and this participle. - $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$, etc. $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ often resumes the subject after a parenthesis.
A. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \lambda i \sigma x \eta \tau \alpha \iota$. This, according to Coray, is an iso-481 lated instance of the middle of $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha i \sigma x \omega$ used as the active, and to be altered into $\alpha^{\dot{\alpha}} \cdot \alpha \lambda i \sigma x \eta$. This word and $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0-$ $\delta \iota \delta \tilde{j}$ are in a different tense from the aorists preceding, as containing the signification of continuance, which, however, rather belongs to $\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \delta \iota \delta \omega \omega_{\omega}$ taken together than to the verb in itself.
C. Ivì tov̀s $\vartheta \varepsilon o \grave{v} \varsigma ~ \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\mu}$. Comp. 466, C., note. $\left.\pi о ́ т \varepsilon \rho o ́ v ~ \sigma \varepsilon ~ \varphi \omega \tilde{\mu \varepsilon \nu} \sigma \pi о v \delta \alpha^{\prime}\right\} о \nu \tau \alpha$. For verbs meaning to speak construed with a participle, see Mt. § 555 , Obs. $\AA^{2}$ $\varepsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \tau_{\iota} \stackrel{\grave{\eta}}{\eta}$, etc. If men had not the same state of mind, some of them some one, and others some other, (i. e. if
classes or portions of mankind did not agree in one or another state of mind,) but each of us had a peculiar state of mind different from what the rest of mankind had, it would not be easy to manifest your own state of mind to another.
D. iSiov $\eta$. This construction with $\eta$, which belongs to ${ }_{\alpha}^{u} \lambda \lambda o s, \dot{z} v \alpha r \tau i o \varrho$, and similar words, is adopted here by ${ }^{\prime} \delta \iota o s$, on account of the notion of difference implied in it. -
 because $\delta$ vo renders the duality of the persons more striking. - ${ }^{-} A \lambda x ı \beta \iota \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \delta o v$. 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.
 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 visiters from so far off as Sparta and Thessaly. On the first day of the month, and at no other time, this living picture-gallery was open to all. Demus was as much admired for his beauty as one of his peacocks. Hence the pun in Aristoph. Wasps 97, (acted seventeen years before the date of this dialogue, ) \% $\alpha i \geqslant \grave{\eta} \Delta i^{\prime}{ }_{i}{ }^{\prime} \nu i \delta j \eta$

 people, is beautiful. Pyrilampes himself, also, was considered as handsome and as large a man as any in Asia, whither he went on embassies to the great king and oth-
ers. (Charmides 158, A., if another person of the name be not intended.) 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."
A. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\xi} \mu \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \iota \delta \iota x \dot{\alpha}$. The latter word could have an 482 honest sense. - $\xi^{\prime \prime} \mu \pi \lambda \eta \kappa \tau 0$, fickle. It has this sense in Lysis. 214, C., (where it is joined to $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \mu \eta \tau o s$, ) Soph. Ajax 1358, and elsewhere.
 show that. See 467, A.
C. $ข \varepsilon \alpha \nu \iota \varepsilon v ่ \varepsilon \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$ denotes the tone of superiority in which Socrates carried on the discussion with Polus, and to which Callicles gives a somewhat harsh name. The word is paid back at the end of the dialogue. - $\omega_{s}{ }^{3} \lambda \eta-$ $\vartheta \omega ̃ s ~ \delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma o ́ \rho o s ~ \ddot{v} \nu$, being in very truth a haranguer. ס $\eta \mu \eta-$ yó@os denotes speaking in the style of a mob-orator; that is, talking at large and verbosely for effect without reasoning fairly. Comp. 519, D., where Socrates alludes to this title.
 be displeased if any one were to refuse. Without $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu$ the sense would be, they were displeased. With $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu$, the verb, if put into oratio recta, would be in the oplative; without $\stackrel{\circ}{\alpha} \nu$, in the indicative.
 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 qootıxá, comp. Mitchell on Aristoph. Wasps 66. It may be translated also disagreeable, disgusting. Schol. qоютько́
 with $\delta$ เxavixí, in the style of pleadings, in Plat. Apol. Socr.
 $\delta_{0}^{\prime} \xi \alpha \prime$, i. e. in the style of a $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma \dot{\rho} \varrho o g$. - $\omega \varsigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi o \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \delta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$. $\delta_{\delta}$ is rarely found after the third word of the clause. Here, however, $\omega s \tau$. $\pi$. are in a manner one word. See

483 A. coũ̃o tó $\sigma 0 ¢ \dot{\partial} \nu$ is in apposition with its relative, being added to explain it. - xaxovg殳єĩs हैv roĩs hó deal unfairly in the discussion.— ins@由twiv, asking slyly. He says, that, if a person speaks of any thing as according to law, Socrates changes the ground cunningly, and asks about it according to nature, and the contrary. -
 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 $\tau \dot{o} \gamma \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu o ́ \mu o \nu$, and $\chi \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha}$ qúviv, 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, $\delta t \omega x . x \alpha \dot{\alpha}$
 pursue an inquiry according to the letter, and not the idea. For $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \iota \omega \not \omega \alpha \vartheta \varepsilon \xi$, (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 ed. - io
$\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota x \varepsilon \check{\iota} \vartheta \vartheta \alpha \iota$. oĩov, though in no MS., is added before $\tau \grave{a}$ by several editors, and assists the sense ; though without it ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \delta \iota x \varepsilon \tau \sigma \vartheta \alpha t$, (a part,) may be regarded as added in apposition, to explain $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \nu$ (the general idea). Being pronounced by the scribes like the ending $\iota 0 \nu$ of $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \varkappa \iota \nu$, oio $\nu$ might easily be absorbed by that word.
C. $\dot{\varepsilon} x \varphi о \beta$ oüvtध . After this word, $\tau \varepsilon$ 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. - $\dot{\alpha}^{\gamma} \gamma \alpha \pi \omega \tilde{\omega} \sigma$ रóg, etc. For they are contented if they are put on an equality when they are inferior. - $\boldsymbol{\eta} .$. . qúols. Stallb. observes, that oì $\mu<l$ is sometimes interposed between a noun and its article or preposition.
D. $\delta \eta \lambda o i ̃ . ~ N o t ~ q u ́ v \iota s ~ \delta \eta \lambda o \tilde{r}$, but $\tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha ~ \delta \eta \lambda o \tilde{\imath}$, these things show that they are so. But Stallb. and Ast give the verb an intransitive sense here. These things are evident that they are so, i. e. it is evident.
E. xax<̀ qúoıv tì̀ roṽ $\delta ı x \alpha i o v$. The three last words, though in all the MSS., are looked on by several editors as interpolated. Ast retains them, translating $\varphi \dot{v} \sigma \iota \nu \delta \iota-$ waiov 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, ${ }^{\bar{\omega}}$ रœvoòv

 $\pi \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \tau \boldsymbol{c} o v \tau \varepsilon$, 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 $\dot{\varepsilon} x \mathcal{\nu} \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \nu$ is like a number already noticed:
the clause is epexegetical of the foregoing. iows is used sarcastically, the thing being regarded as certain by Callicles.
484 A. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \rho$ is here used unemphatically as a man, a person. If contempt were expressed, ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \vartheta \rho \omega \pi o s$ would have
 from a horse throwing his rider. - yó́uцид $\alpha$, written ordinances. - दोл $\alpha \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \grave{s}_{5}$, 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 aorist $\dot{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon \varphi^{\prime} \alpha v \eta$ denotes an action wholly indefinite in regard to time.
 certain 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 xat̀ qúviv, or something equivalent, belong to the passage : $\varphi$ roiv, having the same sound, and almost the same letters, as qúбiv, may have caused that word to be omitted. oūtos $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\eta}$ are interposed by Callicles. Something like

 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.
 Boeckh, is afferl vim maximam, justam eam efficiens; i. e. law (the law of nature) makes use of might, and calls it
 interprets ü $\gamma \varepsilon \iota$ 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 tò $\beta$. is treated as an adverbial phrase. But Aristides, by using the opposite
 at least the object of $\delta \iota x \alpha \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu$. - covitov refers forward to

C. The changes of number here are worthy of notice:


 genitive in two relations. 1. That of the thing from which

 dithyrambs. 2. That in respect of which one is far ad-
 $\varkappa \tau \omega \nu, I$ conversed to a late hour of the night, infra 486, A.
 in philosophy, and in the text the sense can be, to too late a period of his youth.
D. It must be remembered, that $x \alpha \lambda \dot{o}_{s} x \alpha \gamma \alpha \vartheta \dot{o}_{s} \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta$ 'g, 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. -_
 in general. The word denotes both private and public contracts, bargains, and treaties of commerce. - $\eta^{3} \vartheta \tilde{\omega} \nu$, characters.
E. tó toũ 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 Am-
phion. - ivo aútós avitoui, etc., where, i. e. in whatsoever, he happers to do his best, whereinsoever he most excels. One MS. only has $\tau v \gamma \nsim u y \varepsilon$, 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 $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$. 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
 ——For av̉iós avitoũ., see Soph. § 144. N. 4, and § 232 ; and for $\beta \dot{k} \lambda t / \sigma \tau e s$ aitoũ, § 177. N. 5. 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. عưvoíg tịi Eavtoũ, out of regard to himself, through self-love. The genitive is objective, as is the possessive
 for the sake of education. - ípoiót $\alpha \tau \boldsymbol{\nu} \pi \alpha \sigma \% \omega, I$ feel very much the same thing. To öuoos in the second clause, ws succeeds, instead of öляя or oioy. Comp. Xen. Sympo-


 Heusdius $\mu r_{1} \delta \varepsilon ̇ \nu$ excidisse suspicabatur. Sed vere monuit Boeckhius (in Plat. Minonem et Leges comment. p. 112) sæpius ita $\tau \iota$ et $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ omitti. Stallb.
E. ixaróv, satisfaclory, arswerable to his powers, or to
 am quile friendly.
486 A. In the Antiope of Euripides, a dialogue between the 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. - $\mu \varepsilon \iota \rho \alpha \nleftarrow \omega ́ \delta \varepsilon \iota \ldots \mu \rho \rho \varphi \omega \dot{\rho} \mu \tau \iota$, you strive to ornament a soul so nobly endowed by a puerile form, or outside. $\mu о \wp \varphi \varphi_{\mu} \boldsymbol{\tau} \iota \iota$ denotes external decoration; here the musical and poetical pursuits of Amphion. ov'r' ' $\alpha \nu$ sixŋ, etc., nor in the counsels of justice canst thou put forth thy words, nor take hold of any thing 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. - $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \gamma^{\alpha} \gamma o \iota$. The word points at the $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha-$ $\gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$ of Attic law, a summary process by which the accused could be dragged before the proper magistrate, and locked in prison, without previous citation. One of the crimes to which this process was applicable was $\alpha_{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \beta \varepsilon \iota \alpha$, 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 seeming helplessness and unskilfulness of Socrates at his trial ; to his accusers, who were men of little influence or repute; and especially to the leading one, Meletus, a bad poet and a bad man ; as well as to the penalty of death, which they attached to their indictment. - $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota x \varepsilon i v$, says Stallb., accipiendum pro $\dot{j}_{\iota \iota \varkappa \eta \mu \varepsilon ่ \nu \alpha \iota . ~ H e i n d o r f ~ o n ~ P r o t a g . ~ p . ~ 310, ~}^{\text {, }}$ D., makes the same remark, and brings a number of examples in proof of it. One is from Lysias, p. 678,
 ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{z} \delta 0 \xi_{\alpha \nu}^{\xi}{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \delta \iota x \varepsilon i \nu . ~ A c c o r d i n g ~ t o ~ A s t, ~ t h e ~ p r e s e n t ~ i n c l u d e s ~$ 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; ${ }^{\alpha} \xi \stackrel{\omega}{\imath}$
 one crime some time before committed is spoken of. The true explanation is, perhaps, that $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota x \tilde{\omega}$ properly means

I am a verong doer, as well as $I$ am doing verong. But he is a verong doer who has done vorong.
B. ヶатi;ópov . . . $\mu 0 \% \vartheta$ ŗoũ, a very common and pallry sort of accuser; referring to the accuser's standing in
 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. $\tau \iota \mu \tilde{\alpha}-$ $\sigma \vartheta \alpha l$, to make his own estimate, set his price, is the usual word for the plaintiff's claim of satisfaction, whether pecuniary or penal. The court were said $\tau \iota \mu \tilde{\imath} \nu$. The defendant was said ${ }_{\dot{\alpha}}{ }^{2} \tau \iota \tau \iota u \tilde{u} \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$, to estimate in his turn vhat ought to be the verdict, or $\dot{v} \pi о \tau \iota \mu \tilde{\sigma} \vartheta \vartheta a$, 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 $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \tilde{\omega}-$ $\nu \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\text {e }} \tau \iota u r_{1} \tau o i$, or those in which the laws had not settled the penalty, but left it to the judges. One of these was $\vec{\mu} \sigma \dot{\varepsilon}-$ $\beta_{\varepsilon \iota \alpha}$, for which Socrates was tried. On being found guilty, his itогiu ${ }^{2} \mu \alpha$ was called for ; and instead of naming some small mulct 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.
 the head or temples, is spoken only of blows with the flat hand, and was the highest insult at Athens. See 527, D. - $\pi \varrho \alpha \neq \mu \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \nu$ घ $\imath^{\prime} \mu \circ v \sigma i \alpha \nu$. 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. $\vec{c}_{\dot{c} \gamma \alpha \vartheta \dot{c} \text {. A. Gellius ( } 10.22, \text { ) has quoted the passage }}$



Just above we should expect ois $\beta \alpha \sigma \alpha v i j o v o \iota ~ f o r ~ i, ~ r i, ~ r e f e r r i n g ~$ to $\tau 0 v v^{\tau} \omega \nu \tau \omega ̃ \nu \lambda i \vartheta \omega \nu$; but $\tilde{j}$ comes from Plato's having $\tau \tau \nu \alpha$ $\left\langle\uparrow \vartheta_{0}\right.$ in his mind. - $\pi \varrho о \sigma \alpha \gamma \alpha \gamma \sigma^{\prime} \nu$, 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

 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."
 the very truth.
B. $\mu \tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda .0 \nu$ toṽ $\delta \dot{o} o v i o g$. These words are redundant, 487 i. e. the comparative alone would convey the same sense. $\mu \tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda_{0}$ is often thus used after a comparative ; and in the same way $\pi \varepsilon \rho \alpha$ 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. - $\quad \bar{\pi} \pi \dot{\eta} x o v \sigma \alpha$. So Bekker, Ast, and others, with most MSS. Stallb. prefers $\boldsymbol{i} \pi \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{x} \alpha \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma, I$ overheard. (This he retracts in his second edition.)
D. $\varepsilon \mathfrak{\nu} \alpha \alpha \beta \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota \ldots \delta \iota \alpha \varphi \vartheta \alpha \rho \varepsilon \dot{v} \tau \varepsilon \xi$. Strikingly like Ecclesiastes vii. 16, "neither make thyself overwise. Why shouldst thou destroy thyself?"
E. $\delta \tilde{\eta}$ Rov ö ö $\iota$ are often interposed in the middle of a sentence, without having an effect on the construction.
 et consummata accipio. Heindorf. - tò̀ ürvọ, i. e. mankind. The article is used because $\dot{\alpha} v \dot{\eta} \rho$ has its widest generic sense, and thus forms a definite whole.

 toni, quod sciam, non item. Heindorf.
B. $\ddot{«} \% \varepsilon \iota v$. See 484, B., note. If $\ddot{\mu} y \varepsilon \iota$ 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.
 tea, quum de his rebus disputares. Sic tóre passim ponitur. Stallb.
D. oi $\delta \grave{\eta} x a i$, etc. Since, indeed, they even make laws for the one, i. e. to control the one. The relative, as often elsewhere, renders a reason; i. e. = the demonstrative
 powered by them, making laws : $\tau i \vartheta r_{j} u$ vóuov of a sovereign or a divine lawgiver.
 ozuvóu\&vos. Socrates refers with admirable irony to 482, C., D. - iva $\beta$ \& $\beta$ cucóowucl, etc,, that I may get confirmation (for it) from you, seeing that a man who is competent to decide has admitted it.
B. \%u not speaking the truth, for $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \varepsilon \iota \nu$ is the infinitive of the imperfect. - . . . кажоขๆүш. He quotes what Callicles said, p. 483, A. - ỏvóцита Эroॄvív, verba aucupans. Comp. 490, A. The same metaphor is seen in our word

 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 any thing, that these very things which they say, ought to have the force of lav. Join $\tau \tilde{\omega} \dot{\imath} \sigma \nsim \nu i \sigma \alpha \sigma \vartheta a \iota$ together. This verb can mean pollere, contendere, fidere. For the first meaning, which is less common but seems to belong to it here, comp. Dio


animo prudenti．ゆw̃o $\begin{gathered}\text { must be＇taken absolutely without }\end{gathered}$ an object in the sense of decreeing，determining，but with contemptuous disparagement ；unless we read with Hein－ dorf $\alpha \boldsymbol{\alpha} \tau \alpha$ for $\alpha \dot{v} \tau \alpha \dot{\prime}$ ．And $\alpha v ่ \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha$ refers to the edicts implied in 甲命栲．

D．toùs $\delta$ v́o ．．．toṽ évós．As the numerals are opposed to one another，they have a certain definiteness．Hence

 tivas $\pi о \tau \varepsilon$ ，which Routh wished to put into its place．
 believe that in $\pi \varrho \circ \delta \iota \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu, \pi \rho \circ \mu \alpha \nu \vartheta \alpha^{\prime} \nu \varepsilon \iota \nu$ ，（Aristoph．Clouds 476，966，）тৎо means forwards，and that it is prefixed without adding much to the meaning of the verbs，because the idea of advance is involved in learning and teaching． This word alludes to a school，as is shown by $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \varphi o \iota t 讠 j \sigma \omega$ ．
 want $o v$, which，however，is necessary here，for although $\mu \alpha$ is almost confined to oaths expressly or impliedly neg－ ative，it is in itself merely affirmative，being connected，
 whose words you used of me just now with mueh raillery． －ỏvó $\mu \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon ⿺ 𠃊$, you utter mere words．
 guntur．Stallb．
 more of these provisions than we，because he is better；or ought he，in virtue of his authority，to distribute them all，

 often used in questions conveying wonder，indignation，



are you talking nonsense about ? $\% \omega \boldsymbol{v}$ here has an accusative, but is sometimes used in such phrases as qivu@̨is $\% \% \omega \nu, \lambda r_{-}$ $\rho \varepsilon i s \% \omega v$; which are explained, but not perhaps quite satisfactorily, by Hermann on Viger, Note 228, and Mt. § $56 \%$.
491 A. üts\%rás, absolulely. In the sense withoul art, the

 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.

 toi's «ositiovs oi qiviv, etc., by the beller, namely, by who they are I do not mean, etc. oí siou dictum est cum abundantia quadam qualem Callicles in hac oratione sectatur passim. Poterat enim omitti. Stallb.
B. For \%arrizoogir with the genitive of the person, see Soph. § 184. 2.
 here are quite uncertain. The passage in brackets is omitted by Bekker, after one MS. It has the look of an explanation of $\tau i \delta^{\prime} \varepsilon^{\prime}$. Nor does Socrates afterwards do
 with $\alpha i \cdot \tau \omega \nu$. 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
 where $\tau i$ is quatemus, qua in parte. But how can $\dot{\alpha}$ g\%ouś$\nu$ vous be the subject of $\pi \lambda \varepsilon_{0} \nu \varepsilon^{\prime \prime} / \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$ ? or how could he say quatenus sibimet ipsis imperantes unless he had already spoken of governing one's self. —— $\eta_{\eta}^{\text {r }} \tau 0 \check{\tau} \tau 0 ~ \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu ~ o u ̉ \delta \dot{\varepsilon} v \quad \delta \varepsilon i ̃$.
$\delta \varepsilon i$ sometimes takes an accusative of the thing, when that is a pronoun.
 êtes plaisant! how ridiculous or foolish you are! रдvxìs
 goovas, you mean those fools the temperate. The one accusative is in apposition with the other ; unless, with Stallb., we make rov̀s ${ }^{3} \ell \iota \vartheta$ iovs 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 ( $\alpha \alpha x i \alpha v$ ) badness ?" "No," said he, "but ( $\pi \alpha \prime \nu v$
 sc. тoṽтo $\lambda \varepsilon$ ย̇モıs.
 sivol. For this union in one sentence of the dative dependent on the verb, and the accusative construed with the infinitive, comp. 510, E. fin., and Soph. Electra 962.
 ж $\alpha \alpha \alpha ́ \sigma \chi o \iota$, Soph. Antig. 605, Mt. § 515, Obs. $\stackrel{\alpha}{\prime} \nu$ may have dropped out here, as $\tau i$ itself is wanting in ten MSS., both being absorbed so to speak by the two last syllables of $\delta v \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \varepsilon i \alpha \nu$. - oĩ̧ है૬óv, etc. A contracted expression for

 power, . . . they were themselves to introduce. Comp. Repub. 465 , fin. "Do you remember that some one reproved us, because we, in his opinion, made ( $\pi o \circ o \check{\mu} \mu \varepsilon$ ) our guards
 who, when they could possess every thing belonging to the citizens, were to have nothing."
C. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$. The predicate is phvo@í x $\alpha \grave{\imath}$ ov̉סzvós ${ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\alpha} \xi \iota \alpha$.
D. $\dot{\alpha} \mu o ́ \vartheta \varepsilon v \gamma \varepsilon^{\prime} \pi o \vartheta \varepsilon v$, undecunque, from obsol. áuós, Attic $\dot{\alpha} \mu o ́ s,=\tau \iota \varsigma$, whence $\mu \eta \delta \not \mu_{\rho} \tilde{v}$. This is Bekker's emendation of $火 火 \lambda .0 \vartheta \vartheta \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \pi о \vartheta \varepsilon \nu$, which is evidently a false reading.
 _- 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 «óta $\nu o \mu i \xi \varepsilon r \alpha \iota$. The passage is parodied by Aristoph. in the Frogs 1477.
493 A. The singular passage next following is introduced 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 $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$, that it may come from $\sigma \tilde{\eta}, \mu \alpha$, because some call the body the $\sigma \tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha$ of the soul, as being that in which in this present it is buried; or because the soul onuaive 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 ( $\sigma \omega \omega^{\prime} \xi \varepsilon / \nu$ ) in it to atone for its crimes in an earlier state. This derivation, he says, would require no change of letter. The Pythagorean Philolaus (Boeckh's Philolaus 181, Clem. Alex. 3. 3, p. 518, Potter,) says, that "the old theologists and diviners testify, that the soul is joined to the body to suffer a certain retribution, and
 comparison of the body to a prison, there is frequent allusion. Socrates now passes on to an allegorical expla-
nation 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 Crotona 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. - $v \tilde{\eta}_{S} \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \psi v \chi \tilde{\eta}_{s}$, 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. $\mu v \vartheta \frac{1}{\circ} \frac{\alpha}{\omega} \nu$, 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 $\mathrm{He}-$

 ken (Timæus s. v.) says : xо $\mu \nless \grave{\nu}$ 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 adscititica 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, wise, and polished. I cannot help thinking, that it here contains something of irony. - $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \nu$ т $\tilde{\mu}$ ỏvó $\mu \alpha \tau \iota$, making a change in the word, altering its sound a little.
B. $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \nu$, 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 tub full of holes; making the comparison on account of its $\stackrel{\alpha}{\pi} \lambda \eta \sigma \pi i \alpha$. There may be a side-thrust at rhetoric, the object of which is $\pi \varepsilon i \vartheta \varepsilon \iota \nu$, when it is said that the part of the soul which contains the desires is moved this way and that by persuasion.
 double sense, uninitiated ( $\alpha, \mu v \varepsilon \tilde{\nu} \nu$ ) and not closing, unable to contain, as if from $\alpha, \mu v \in \iota v$. The construction is com-
 ${ }_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{\alpha}} \varepsilon v \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \zeta \delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega \nu$, meaning of course the invisible, i. e. the intellectual, as opposed to the material. Comp. Phædo 80,

 are, as it would seem ( $\varepsilon i \varepsilon v{ }_{u} \dot{\nu} \nu$ ), the most wretched, and carry water into the leaky tub in a similar leaky sieve. The early mysteries seem to have consisted of purifications, the effect of which was to remove guilt. Hence the initiated escaped the punishment in the future world, which was to fall on others. This was denoted by making use of certain fables of the poets, which exhibited the popular view of the punishment of great offenders, and applying them to the uninitiated.
C. ${ }_{\alpha}^{\circ} \tau \varepsilon$ ov $\delta v \nu \alpha \mu \varepsilon ่ v \eta \nu$, etc., on account, namely, of its inability to retain, through unbelief and forgetfulness. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \iota \sigma \pi i \alpha \nu$ alludes to $\pi i \vartheta \circ v_{0}$ - $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \varepsilon \iota x \tilde{\omega}$. Non explicuerim cum Heindorfio satis, admodum, sed habet vim affirmandi atque concedendi, ut Latinorum utique, sane quidem. Stallb. Ut candide loquar. Routh. - vinó $\tau \iota$, aliquatenus, quo-
dammodo. Stallb. - $\delta \eta \lambda_{0 i} \mu \eta_{i v}$, etc. Yet they make that clear, by the exhibition of which I uish to persuade you, if I in any wise can, - lo change your mind. - $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \vartheta \varepsilon$ '$\sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$, sc. $\gamma \nu \omega^{\prime} \mu \gamma^{\nu}$ or $\psi \tilde{\eta} \varphi o \nu$. The next words explain $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha-$ $\vartheta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$, and therefore have no need of $\varkappa \alpha i$, which is in some editions. Just below, $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau i 9 \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \iota$ is used in what is called the constructio pragnans like $\xi_{\xi} \xi \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \gamma \omega$, p. 482, B. The sense is, and do you change your opinion, and say that, etc.
 with that just now, from some allegorizing sophist. For ${ }_{o}$ avéós followed by the dative, in brief phrases, see Soph. § 195. N. 3.
E. vópoxto éxúotov toúr $\omega v$, liquors belonging to, or put into each of these tubs.
B. $\chi \propto \varrho \alpha \delta \varrho \iota o \tilde{v}$. A bird so called from the ravines and 494 beds of torrents where it lives, of a yellowish color, and
 The Schol. on this place and many others mention, that these birds were reputed to cure the jaundice by being looked at ; whence those who brought them into town for sale kept them covered, lest they should effect a cure for nothing. More about the bird will be found in Schneider on Aristot. Hist. Animal. Vol. IV. 80 seq. He thinks it to be the charadrius œdicnemus or c. hiaticula of Linnæus. ——cò tooóve $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota$ oiov, do you allow that there is such a thing as.
C. $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega, \kappa \alpha i$, etc. The construction here changes from the infinitive to the participle after $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$. The sense is, yes, and $I$ speale 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. - ítws $\mu \dot{\prime}$, i. e.
 to what Callicles has said of the modesty of Gorgias and
 plains the preceding clause. - $\delta \eta_{\mu} \eta_{\eta}$ о́ооs, coarse, vulgar.
D. $\alpha^{3} \cdot \delta \rho \varepsilon i ̃ o s \gamma^{\alpha} \varrho$ हĩ. This alludes ironically to his defi-

E. to . . . थєф́'ìacov, id quod revum hujus generis (i. e. turpissimarum) caput est. Ast. \%\&чáخ. $\alpha \iota o v$ is in apposition with ó pios. - aंvéd $\eta \nu$, freely or openly.

 . . . .o'jovs, you make uchat we have said before good for nothing.
B. \%à زào ov́. Well, what of that? For you do too,

C. $\delta \iota \varepsilon$.oṽ $\tau u \dot{\delta} \varepsilon$, etc. Explain the following. You meansomething probably by ह̇тıotriuך (certain knowledge), do you not? —äk. $\quad \tau \iota$ oĩv, etc. Did you not accordingly, on the ground that knowledge was a different thing from manliness, speak of these as two. The allusion is to 491, A., B , in this and the prior question. With $\tau \grave{r}_{1} \nu{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \cdot \delta \rho \varepsilon i \alpha \nu$, ${ }^{\tilde{v}} \sigma \alpha \nu$ is to be supplied. The accus. absol. is often found without the participle of $\varepsilon i \mu i$ expressed. Bekker, without MS. authority, adds ${ }_{o \nu}^{\circ} \nu$ after $\varepsilon^{\prime} \tau \varepsilon o o v$, which is a very probable conjecture, as oiv may easily have been swallowed up by $\xi^{\prime \prime} \varepsilon \varepsilon \varrho \circ \nu$. The participle $\circ_{\circ}^{\prime \prime} \nu$ would be attracted in gender to the predicate.
 tates the solemn style of covenants in which the demus of the parties was mentioned. Some of the demi, as that to which Callicles belonged, had no corresponding adjective forms. The want was supplied by an adverb in $\vartheta \varepsilon \nu$ taken with the article.
496 A. $\pi \varepsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ ötov . . . $\dot{\alpha} \pi \frac{\alpha \alpha \beta \omega v, ~ l o o k ~ a t ~ t h i s ~ w i t h ~ r e g a r d ~ t o ~}{c}$ any part of the body you please, taking it by itself, or separately.
C. ขin๕@quต̃s ตร. Comp. 477, D.
D. oủหoũv roúrov oũ héysıs, etc. In that of which we are speaking, the one part, viz. סıчüvta, being thirsty, is then feeling pain, is it not? They were speaking of $\delta \iota \psi \omega \bar{\nu} \tau \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ nivelv.
E. $\chi \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha}$ tò $\pi i v \varepsilon \iota \nu \chi \alpha i \rho \varepsilon \iota \nu \lambda$ hévध६; 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? - גขлоข́ $\mu$ гоv;

 denti tónov xà đ@óvov pendeant." And he would read
 with the genitives ; and $\chi \rho_{o}{ }^{\prime} o v$ is excused by being in its company.

 pression for iœootoinois. 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. - ötu è $\chi \omega v$ ג $\begin{aligned} & \text { nosics. These words are }\end{aligned}$ either a gloss on ${ }^{\circ} \tau \tau \alpha$ ooyis $\varepsilon \varepsilon$, or, what is more probable,火ò̀ . . . vov9धtẽ̌ must be given to Callicles. So Stallb., in his second ed., after the conjecture of a recent writer. Comp. for the phrase, 490, E. note.
B. ovं o $\dot{\eta} \alpha \dot{v} \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta}$, this damage or cost is not yours, i. e. this does you no harm.
C. ö $\tau \iota \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \gamma^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \mu \varepsilon \mu \dot{\eta} \eta \sigma \alpha \iota$. 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 doest not know the least thing of them all ? Ill can he rule the great, that cannot reach the small."
 left off. The usual construction of $\ddot{q}_{\mathrm{Q}}^{\mathrm{z}} \mathrm{\omega}$ with an adverb of motion is here adopted by cizoxpirouce.
 is said in contempt, as if Socrates were not deserving of a sensible answer.
 to Callicles, are the bad, feel more pleasure and pain than brave men when enemies retire and advance; and if pleasure aud pain are the same as good and evil, then the bad are both bad and good in a bigher degree than the good, which is absurd. After uïhiov čyuけoi, the MSS. have of "yaधoi, which Routh and succeeding editors have justly left out, as wholly perverting the sense.
E. Sis yép tor, etc. A proverb, imputed by the Schol. to Empedocles, a part of one of whose hexameters ( v .
 o.tior. tos, you know, is often used in making familiar remarks or citing well known passages. A little below, in 499, B., тu'iku tor, it has, according to Stallb., " vim confirmandi cum quadam admiratione vel indignatione," $=$ really, or don't you knove.
499 B. $\omega_{s} \delta \dot{\gamma}_{i}$, see 468 , E. - ioi sometimes expresses grief, sometimes, as here, uonder, or joy. It is oxytoned by all the editors of Plato. Others would write ioi, either always, or when it does not denote grief.
C. av̌, again, refers to $491, \mathrm{C}$. He is again inconsistent with himself. - Exóvtos eiver, if you could help it, if you had your way about it. See Soph. § 221 . N. 3. 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 Thucyd. 2. 89), after Hermann, says that غx由iv घiral " 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,
 would make nonsense. - tò $\pi<\rho \dot{o} v \varepsilon \frac{\tilde{v}}{} \pi o t \varepsilon i v$, 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. -
 $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu, \delta_{\delta} \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, in antitheses, seems to be the reason why, (by a kind of apposition, perhaps,) they follow $\tau \iota \nu \varepsilon$, here. Instead of $\tau \iota \nu \varepsilon \varsigma \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \ldots \not{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \iota \iota \dot{\varepsilon}$, some, . . . others, we have, as if the contrast needed to be made stronger, some, these $I$

 ( $\oint 11$, Bekk.), oi $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ follows $\tau \iota \nu \varepsilon \varsigma$, and the second oi $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ is suppressed, as is often the case with ${ }^{\circ} \mu \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} v$, $\delta$ 㬵 alone. The formula is found also in Plat. Repub. 8. 560, A.
 nis structuram permutant cum conditionali. Stallb. The relative structure would be $\alpha \ddot{i} \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \ddot{\alpha} \rho \alpha \tau o v i \tau \omega v$, etc.
A. '̇x tøitav, and दُx t@itov, in the third place, third. 500

 $\chi \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \eta \tau \alpha \iota$.
B. See 464 , B. seq. - $\pi \alpha \varrho \alpha \sigma \kappa \varepsilon v \alpha i$, the Schol. observes, is a middle term, standing for $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \chi \nu \alpha \iota$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi \varepsilon \iota \rho i \alpha \iota$ both, like zंग८tท $\delta \varepsilon \dot{v} \sigma \varepsilon \iota \varsigma .-\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \chi \varrho \iota \dot{\eta} \delta o v \tilde{\eta} s$, terminating in pleasure. This is explained by the next words, where
 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.
 and do not, contrary to your opinion, answer whatever comes
into your head, nor take what I say as though I were in sport. For $\mu r_{i} \delta \varepsilon$ after $\mu \gamma_{i}^{\prime} \varepsilon$, see Mt. § 609.
 added to recall ove to mind, and toũтo takes the construction of $\tau i$ rather than of $\pi$ r@ì tovívov oiv. It often happens, that $\tilde{r}_{j}$ and quam are so inserted after a genitive depend-

 my life in doing those deeds of the real man, forsooth, that you spoke of. The reference is to $485, \mathrm{~A} .-\mathrm{D}$. $\delta_{r_{i}}$ is iron-
 Biov, sc. 乌ั̌v; but Plato forms this clause as though he

E. Socrates breaks off in the middle of the sentence, to know whether Callicles is so far of the same opinion.
 $\dot{\eta} \dot{i} \propto \tau \rho \iota \dot{\eta}$ is added to explain $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\gamma}$. Comp. of $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \ldots$. . $\delta$

 The sentence begins with $r_{i} \delta o v \tilde{j}_{s}$, as if Plato had in his mind the form of the preceding sentence, and were going
 But this thought, which afterwards appears in the participial form, is postponed, and the intervening clause, $\pi$ oòs

 the lurch, so to speak. It may be asked, why, when he read it over, he did not dismiss $i_{i} \delta o r \tilde{r}_{i}$ 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
 A. -ả̉ójos $\tau \varepsilon \pi \alpha r \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \omega \nu$, in a manner altogether irra-
tional, making I may say (i. e. almost) no estimates (or discriminations), a mere practice and experience.

 xoṽoi $\sigma o \iota$ हivai $\tau \imath v \varepsilon$. It might have been said equally

 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 (Soph. § 168. N. 2), and the subject of the prior clause becomes «v̇toũs.
 such, or they seem to me to exist. The words refer to zivai $\tau \tau v \varepsilon \varepsilon_{~}^{\pi} \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \varepsilon i \alpha u$, etc. It is strange that Stallb. and Ast, overlooking this plain sense, understand wohaxsius as the predicate. - $\quad$ vүдגт $\alpha \tau i 9 \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \iota$. The word means properly, to drop one's vote in the same vessel with another person, as a judge in the court. $\eta \mu i v$ is ironical, as he had compelled Gorgias and Polus to agree with him.
D. ouvx, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \alpha \alpha i$. ov̉z denies the previous negative

 demonstrative, and depends on $\delta o x \varepsilon \tilde{\imath}$ repeated. - $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda .0$ oư $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \varphi \rho o v i t \delta s u$. This verb sometimes takes a genitive, and sometimes an accusative. Soph. § 182. N. 1. -
 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, p. 3.98-403.
 exhibition of choruses, so called because the instruction of the chorus was the principal preparative. The chorus in dithyrambic poetry is especially intended. - Kır ${ }^{2} \sigma i \alpha{ }_{s}$
 то то $\lambda \lambda \tilde{\eta}$ xurijoधl. 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).

 $\tau i \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \mu v \dot{r}$, etc., the construction is different, namely,
 said here is a mere passing fling at Meles on account of the badness of his odes.
 nary collocation, as Stallb. remarks, would be, $\dot{\eta} \vartheta u v \mu a \sigma t \dot{\eta}$

 धृ๐ะั. Is its aim . . . to insist upon it . . . that it will not say,
 Soph. Electr. 313. - $\pi о \tau \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \varsigma ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ \pi \alpha \varrho \varepsilon \sigma ж \varepsilon v \alpha ́ \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota, ~ u t r o ~$ modo tibi videtur comparata esse. For Plato's view of tragedy, comp. Repub. 8, p. 568, C., 2. 378, seq., and a noble passage, Leges. 7. 817. Another admirable passage treats of the corruption of tragedy by popular influ= ence. Leges. 2. 650.

 Stallb. prefer. Ast, in defending the text, says, that $\varepsilon \hat{\imath} \pi \varepsilon-$
 were to strip off for himself, i. e. in his own mind to con-
 The verb is attracted in number to the predicate dóyol.
D. oủxoũv. . . «้̈ દỉn, lt (tragedy) would be then a rhetorical species of popular speaking. - $\delta \tilde{\eta} \mu o \nu$ voooũtov oĩuv $\pi \alpha i \delta \omega v$, i. e. to a people (or audience) composed of boys, etc. The grammatical construction, which would be oiós ह̇б兀 ( $\delta \tilde{\eta} \mu 0 \varsigma$ ) $\pi \alpha i \delta \omega \nu$, is forsaken through a singular kind of attraction, by which oios, öcos, $\mathfrak{\eta} \lambda i x o s$, 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. Comp. Leges 2. 658, D., 7. 817, C.

i. e. does not admit of a simple answer. - $\delta \iota \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \not \varepsilon \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$ líyovta, to persist in saying, or steadily to say.
 "after $\tau i$ ov 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." - aitiov हैंरovov, have it ascribed to them that, here in a good sense.
C. oủx «̉xoúsıs. 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. sec.). - $\nu \varepsilon \omega \sigma \tau i$, about
 For Plato's opinion of Pericles, see the Introduction.
 Soph. § 151. Rem. 6. The apodosis of this sentence, which might be "they are good men," is omitted. "When a proposition with $\varepsilon i \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$, or $\ddot{\eta} \nu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$, has another with $\varepsilon i \delta_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon}$ opposed to it, the apodosis is often suppressed in one of the two." Mt. § 617. In the ensuing clause,
the predicate, $\varepsilon^{\prime} \cup \tau i \nu{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \lambda \eta \vartheta^{\dot{\varepsilon}} \dot{\xi}$, is left out, and ${ }_{o}^{\circ} \tau \iota$ before the infinitive is redundant. Examples are given by Heindorf,
 was to follow; but when Plato came to that part of the sentence, he accommodated $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i \nu \quad$ to $\varepsilon i \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \dot{\eta}$ тoũto: "if this, viz. $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda \dot{c} \nu \alpha \iota$, is not virtue, but this, viz.

 used by anacoluthon, as if, instead of $\eta_{\nu \alpha \gamma \varkappa \dot{x} \sigma} \vartheta \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu \quad{ }_{\rho} \mu \circ-$
 quite calmly, or prelly calmly. ov̋t $\omega$, 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 outucs with verbs.
 473, C. The verb пৎорѓ $\varrho \varepsilon$ leaves the number of $\delta \eta$ -
 in apposition to that noun. Comp. Mt. § 302, Obs. -

 the true account of the sentence is, that the apodosis should have begun at $\omega s$ sis $\tau \alpha \dot{s} \varsigma \nu$ (" if you wish to look at painters, etc., - you will see that, etc.'"), but by a change of style the clause $\omega_{\varsigma} \varepsilon i \varsigma \tau \alpha_{s}^{\prime} \xi \nu$ is made to depend on $i \delta \varepsilon \tau \nu$; and the apodosis is forgotien, under the impression that an imperative, $i d \varepsilon$ instead of $\varepsilon i \beta_{0} \mathcal{u}^{\prime} \ell \iota i \delta \varepsilon i \nu$, had commenced the sentence.
 $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha}$ عìvน兀.
 it, as you did for that. In the MSS. ह̇x if genuine, is put briefly for हैxsivov tò óvouc.
E. $\eta^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \frac{0}{}$ òto $\tilde{v} \prime$, etc., or any thing 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 $\ddot{\eta}$ ought to be inserted before $x a t u ́$, as Heindorf proposes, or $\gamma \varepsilon$ turned into $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$. For since $\gamma \varepsilon$ shows that the clause $\gamma \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \ldots$ hórov relates to the foregoing, xaì ènuxtov stands quite by itself; and the asyndeton ( $\alpha \alpha i ̀ i ̀ i n g ~ e t i a m$ ) is intolerable.


 ously in apposition with $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \omega \nu$; but we might have also had $\varkappa 02 \alpha \dot{\jmath} \delta \delta \vartheta \alpha \iota$ in apposition with toṽ̃o. According to Aristotle on Rhet. 1. 10. 17, cited by Stallb., xohás siv (to chastise, correct, lit. to cut off, prune) differs from $\tau \mu \omega \omega-$ $\rho \varepsilon \tilde{i} \vartheta \vartheta \alpha \iota$ (to take satisfaction from, punish,) in this ; that the former takes place for the sake of the sufferer, the
 are we ending the discourse in the middle. Some inferior MSS. have $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \dot{v} \sigma o \mu \varepsilon \nu$, are we going to end, and some $\varkappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \dot{v} \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$, which (or rather $\varkappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$, as the action is momentary) would be shall we end. The present denotes that they are doing that which is equivalent to stopping, or that they are beginning to stop. - aủros $\gamma \nu \omega^{\prime} \dot{s} s$, you yourself must judge, i. e. I wish to stop, but leave it to you.
D. $\vartheta \dot{\delta} \mu \varsigma$. This word, being here an accusative, must be indeclinable. Of this use few will doubt, after reading what Elmsley and Hermann (Soph. (Ed. Col. 1191), and Buttmann (largest Gram. 1. §58, and 2. p. 405) have written. The other examples occur in CEd. Col. u. s., Xen. EEcon. 11. 11, and Æsch. Suppl. 331. In Æsch. Choeph. 632, it is a neuter nominative. No phrases are
 but not a solitary anomaly. Comp. $\chi \varrho \varepsilon \omega^{\prime} \nu, \delta \varepsilon i v \alpha$ sometimes indeclinable, x $\check{\tilde{\alpha} \tau \alpha}$ in Sophocles nominative and accusative. - $\pi \varepsilon \rho i \frac{i}{\eta}$, sc. $\frac{\text { o }}{} \mu \tilde{v} \vartheta o \varsigma$. The style changes from the plural to the singular. Comp. for the expression, Leges


E. tò toũ 'Eлıх̛́́guov. Athenæus (7. 308, C., and 8. 362 , D.) gives his words in a trochaic tetrameter, $\tau \dot{\alpha}$

 ovitws interpretor : in hoc rerum slatu, quum tu nolis amplius mecum colloqui. Stallb. ovitws seems to me to be loosely used for toũ̃o. Comp. Soph. Antig. 706, ws $\varphi \dot{1} s$

 self in the attitude of a searcher after truth, unable of himself to find it, and hoping that others know where it is.
B. E'ms . . . Zn' ${ }^{\prime}$ ov, 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. '́ws with an imperfect or aorist indicative accompanies another clause containing the same tenses with ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu$, when a $r \epsilon s$ non facta is spoken of.
C. $\dot{\alpha} \chi \vartheta \varepsilon \sigma \vartheta \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$. This form is condemned by Mœris as un-Attic, but is found several times in Attic writers, where, however, it may have come from the scribes. $\dot{\alpha}_{\alpha} \vartheta^{\dot{\varepsilon}} \dot{\prime} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ is the approved form. $\gamma \varrho \propto ́ \psi \varepsilon \iota$, an allusion to the honorary votes recorded on marbles, in favor of foreigners who had rendered Athens a service. - $\lambda \varepsilon$ ' $\gamma \varepsilon$ avitós. aviós is by yourself, without another speaker, and so in ooṽ aủtoĩ Suóvios above.
D. ov̉ tequ $\varepsilon i x \tilde{\eta}$. An elegant and certain emendation of

Stallb. (ed. sec.) for ov̉ ouivos six $\mathfrak{\eta}$. For the latter, see
 \% $\alpha \lambda \lambda i \sigma \tau \eta$. Coray wishes to strike out the word; Heindorf to read $\mu$ व́ $⿲ 丿 \sigma \tau \alpha$. The sense is, attends upon $i t$, or is present most beautifully, i. e. is present in its greatest beauty, or highest perfection.
A. $\bar{\eta}^{\eta} \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \alpha \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \eta$, i. e. now this we found to be. $\bar{\eta}^{\eta}$ points 507 to the time when such a soul was (subjectively to them, i. e. appeared to be) $\ddot{\alpha}^{\prime} \varphi \rho \omega v$, etc.
 of the $\sigma \dot{\varphi} \varphi \rho(\omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \rho$ here given, Routh compares Aristo-



 in Repub. 1. 353, E., Charmides 172, A., Alcibiad. 1.
 and being prosperous, Plato may seem to have unfairly used this ambiguity 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
 gumentum 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."
 ject of the action of a verbal may be in the accusative or
 Soph. § 188. N. - $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma x \varepsilon v \alpha \sigma t \varepsilon^{\prime} \%$ is the verbal of the
middle voice here, $=\delta \varepsilon \check{~} \pi \alpha \varrho \alpha \sigma \% \varepsilon v \alpha ́ \sigma \alpha \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota . ~ M t . § 447.2$. -idowitrs (when opposed to the state), an individual. —— In the next sentence, हis тoи̃тo refers to $\ddot{\theta}^{\circ} \pi \omega s$. . .

 position with the participial clause preceding it, and in the accusative. Soph. § 167. N. 4. - प $\alpha \sigma \grave{ } \delta^{\prime}$ oi voqoì, etc. The allusion is more particularly to Empedocles, who made $\varphi$ chia and $v \varepsilon i x o s$ 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 "quæ in rerum natura constarent, quæque moverentur, ea contrahere amicitiam, dissipare concordiam." 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.
 owed the name róouos, order, system, to Pythagoras.
火ó $\sigma \mu \circ \varsigma$, which shows that even then the appellation had
 ometrical 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 $\pi \lambda \varepsilon 0$ resiu $^{\xi}$ 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, p. 757, B., cited by Routh.

 A. It is the more easily omitted here, because the preceding words, $\varepsilon v \dot{v} \delta \alpha i \mu 0 \nu \varepsilon \varsigma$ oi $\varepsilon v v^{\prime} \delta u i \mu o \nu \varepsilon s$, clearly indicate the construction. Stallb. has added $\alpha \nsim \vartheta \lambda \iota o \iota$, without authority or sufficient reason. - $\tau i \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma v \mu \beta \alpha i \nu o \nu \tau \alpha$. This use of $\tau i$ in the predicate with a plural subject is not uncommon.

 same formula is repeated just below, $\tau i$ not' żoxiv ü... ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{3}{ }^{2} \varepsilon \varepsilon \delta i \zeta \varepsilon \iota \zeta$.
 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 $\dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \mu i \alpha$ 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. $\nu \varepsilon \alpha \nu \iota x o ̀ \nu$ denotes high-spirited, or rather overbearing. The

 $\dot{\alpha} \pi о ж \tau \varepsilon \tilde{\nu} \alpha \iota$. Socrates refers to 486, A. - C.
E. $\tau \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$, when taken with $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$, is in frusta dissecari.
 to excuse the confidence and want of deference to others,
which Socrates here displays. Comp. 462, E., 486, C.
 According to Herm. (on Viger, note 307), referred to by Stallb., rà $\varepsilon i$, etiam si, is used concerning that which we only assume as true ; $\varepsilon i$ xai, 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 $\varepsilon i$ xai his trespass against the rules of good breeding. - oúrooiv ut Latinorum sic est primo aspectu. Ast.
B. тiva ٌ̛ $\nu \beta \circ \eta \dot{\vartheta} \vartheta \varepsilon \iota \nu$, etc. By his inability to afford what kind of aid to himself would a man be in truth ridiculous.


 $\vartheta \varepsilon ะ \nu$, 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.
 given to prevent the evil next in magnitude is second (second in shame if inadequate, and in honor if adequate; for this

 supplies.
D. $\hat{\alpha} \delta \iota » \eta \dot{\eta} \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota$. See Soph. § 207. N. 6. - $\tau i \dot{i} \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \grave{\eta}$ toṽ $\alpha \dot{\delta}$ ıxモiv, 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.

perfect ${ }^{3} \pi \varepsilon x \varrho i v o v$ is in most MSS. ; but in this formula the
 468, C., and the Introduction.
A. ${ }_{o} \pi \omega \varsigma \mu \grave{\eta} \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \delta \iota x \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu$. See 480, A., note. 510
B. фi
 $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha \iota o i ~ \tau \varepsilon ~ \varkappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \sigma o \varphi o i ̀ ~ a l l u d e s ~ e s p e c i a l l y ~ t o ~ H o m . ~ O d y s . ~ 17 . ~$
 is found also in Sympos. 195, B., ò y凶̀@ $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha i o s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ \varepsilon \dot{v}$
 is said that the bad, being unlike themselves, that is, variable and unstable, cannot be friends. Comp. also Laws


 tio, says Stallb. This may be, but it is possible also that pilos may be used here actively (fond of, friendly to), and with oư $\delta^{\prime} \leadsto \stackrel{\alpha}{\nu} \nu$ oũ̃os just below passively (beloved by, dear to), in which case there would be no change of person

D. $\chi \alpha i \rho \omega \nu$, impune, the opposite of $x \lambda \alpha i \omega \nu$, passim apud dramaticos. And so gaudens is used in Latin. - avit
 but is attracted, as often happens, in gender, to the predicate ofós.
 tend to his being able. Here the construction of the dative with the infinitive is followed by that of the accusative. See 492, B.
 the thing to rouse indignation?
 drawn close to the body, in contrast to a garment which spreads out with numerous folds/ and plaits. - ${ }_{\alpha}^{2} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$
$\tau \alpha v\rangle \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \alpha \pi \varrho \alpha \dot{s} \alpha \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \eta$, 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 ЉEgina hither; and if from Egypt or the Pontus, - though it should ask very high for this great benefit, 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. '̇п@ $\alpha \dot{\prime} \alpha \tau \%$ is the aorist of indefinite time. With $\dot{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu \pi \alpha^{\prime} \mu \pi \sigma \lambda$, , supply $\pi \varrho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \eta \tau \alpha \iota$.

 the sentence assumes an antithetical structure, the clauses
 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 $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ and $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, of which only the second clause suits the connexion, 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 (ov̉x), if a man afflicted with great and incurable diseases, and saved from drowning by him, 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 ${ }^{\circ} \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \iota \varepsilon \nu$ is to me at least perplexing. Stallb. renders it, with its attendant words, neque a se ullo modo juvari posse, and then in defence of it refers to Mt. §529, on the oralio obliqua. But if I am not deceived,
such a form as $\lambda 0 \gamma i j^{\prime} \xi \tau \alpha \iota$ (being a present not equivalent to a historical tense) ötı ov̉x ỏv $\dot{j} \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$ would not be Greek, and if it were, must mean, not can benefit, but probably benefits. Heindorf conjectured ỏvそ̈osıv üv, can (not) do him good, which in some degree removes the difficulty. I beg leave to offer an opposite conjecture, obvíos, on the supposition that the final syllable $\varepsilon \nu$ may owe its birth to ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \nu$ wrongly repeated.
 $\nu \dot{\eta} \eta o v$, i. e. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ हiँnhs ött, 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. oix ötu, 450, E., note. -

 you to be on a level with (and not rather above) the foren-
 totó $\mu \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ qaivetal piov; does it seem to you to rank with the shoemaker's kind of life ?

 the ground that every thing else is of no value (in compari-
 of $\chi \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega$, as Stallb. remarks, is often used when a name is given in anger or contempt, $=$ to call by a niclname, to call contemptuously, or with a scornful air. Examples may be found in Æschin. c. Ctes., and in Reiske's index


D. $\mu \grave{\eta} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ тoũto . . éaczéov ह́vti. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ denoting suspicion that something is true, or mild expression of opinion may be joined with an indicative; and the like may be said of $0_{\rho} \rho \alpha \mu \eta$ also. Comp. Soph. Electr. 581, 584, (where $\tau i \vartheta \eta s$, and not $\tau \vartheta \vartheta \eta_{s}$, is supported by the MSS.), Alcibiad.

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. हौ兀ıgध่лєıv, in the sense of committing or referring to, and of giving up to, takes a dative of a person often with a genitive with $\pi$ gopi.

 grounds of complaint to some impartial and disinterested
 xiav と́zoss; would you let the pilot have his own way, and be quiet? For oư ${ }^{\prime}$ हís, more emphatic than oủ $\delta \varepsilon i \xi$, comp. Eurip. Alcest. 671 (note in my ed.).

 es, 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 toĭs qìtátols 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 calam-
 used proverbially of those who draw down calamities upon themselves by their conduct. The next words, oìv toiss pìtútols, must mean with the loss of what we hold most dear, i. e. as Socrates estimates things, of virtue and truth. oùv here properly denotes the means, and it is only by inference from the connexion, that the phrase can imply the loss of. 'The preposition, as Stallb. observes, seems
to be chosen with allusion to Iliad 4. 161, oúv $\tau \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega$

B. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \tilde{\eta} \pi o ́ l \varepsilon \iota \tau \tilde{\eta} \delta \varepsilon$, i. e. in Athens. See 469, D., and
 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 politics of Plato, as set forth in the Republic and Laws, require us to under-
 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. $\delta \dot{\eta} \mu \omega$ depends on $\varphi / \lambda i \alpha r$.
 xòs عīvo九. Ast, after one MS., omits roдıtıxós, 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. $\omega_{s}$ is since, seeing that; not as, i. e. according to (your wishes).

 $\tau \varepsilon ่ \circ \nu . . . \vartheta \varepsilon \varrho \alpha \pi \varepsilon v^{\prime} \varepsilon \nu$. The infinitive is added epexegetically, and the datives depend on the verbal. Comp. Soph. Electr. 543, 127\%. For the construction of roooṽvucs, see 492, B., note. It is without a copula as explaining oütcos, and $\omega s$ is taken with $\beta \varepsilon \lambda \tau i \sigma t o v s$ only.
A. $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \ldots \hat{\eta} \nu \tau \iota \nu o v ̃ \nu$, explains and defines $\ddot{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon v \tau \tau u ́-514$ rov. Comp. a similar apposition of a clause beginning

 pacity in any transactions of the state. The genitive is
 $\pi \varrho \alpha \gamma \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ denote any employment in the state's service, as that of an eqoodápos, or contractor, like Phidias, and of

B. $\varepsilon i \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \vartheta \alpha$, and a little below, $\varepsilon i \varphi_{\varphi} \times о \delta о \mu \eta_{\gamma}^{\prime} \alpha \mu \varepsilon v$. After would it be incumbent on us to examine, we should

 so whether we had builded (in the pluperfect), 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 their liveliness of mind, which made the past present and the possible real, and led them to the use of oratio recta. - For evgiozo$\mu \varepsilon \nu$ (imperfect), see Soph. § 80. N. 4. The Atticists and MSS. vary in regard to the augment of verbs beginning with $\varepsilon v$. The earlier practice seems to have been, to leave the diphthong unchanged. Mt. $\$ 167.6$. Below, 514, E., two of the best MSS. give núoioxousv.
 on $i \delta i \alpha$, which would alone express the idea, were not $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \check{\omega} \nu$ wanted for the contrast with $\mu \varepsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega ँ \nu \delta_{i} \delta \alpha \sigma x \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \%$. Those who would reject such an expression as $i \delta i x \not \approx \eta \mu \omega ँ \nu$, which needs the support of parallel examples, must read
 Star\&ццivor, etc. It would be the part of prudent men, if so situated, to engage in public works. Here $\bar{\eta}^{\nu} \nu$ has $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$, but just below is without it. I think, with Ast, that although $\tilde{\eta}_{\nu} \nu$ is often used without $\ddot{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu($ see Mt. § 508, Obs. 2), yet here the influence of $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu$ can extend to the second $\tilde{\eta}^{\dot{\nu}} \nu$.
D. A very similar passage may be found in Laches 186, B., C. In the first sentence, $\hat{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu$ belongs to $\varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \sigma \varkappa \varepsilon ч \dot{\alpha}-$
$\mu \varepsilon \geqslant \alpha$, which verb is taken with $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \alpha \ldots \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$, as well as with $\varepsilon i \pi \alpha \varrho \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \lambda .0 \tilde{v} \mu \varepsilon v$. The aorist, with ${ }_{\alpha} \nu$ following the imperfect, here denotes transitory action referrible to present time (if we were urging ... we would examine: see Hermann de partic. $\ddot{u}, 1.10$ ), or possibly, (since we have éवxónovv just below,) there may be an inaccuracy of style, like that of using the potential pluperfect for the imperfect, -would have for would. Comp. 447, D., for
 roivato), in speaking of something continuing in past time. Some would read $\dot{\varepsilon \pi \iota \sigma \varkappa \varepsilon \pi t o ́ \mu \varepsilon \vartheta \alpha ~ h e r e, ~ b u t ~ i t ~ i s ~ s c a r c e l y ~}$ Attic. See 476, A., note.
 from the first person plural, as a representative of a general truth, to the third, and then back again. There is

 utcunque. - iò $\lambda$ şónsvov ס̀̀ toṽzo. See 447, A. ठ̀̀ is just or even. - $\dot{\varepsilon} v \underset{\sim}{\tilde{L}} \pi i \vartheta \omega$, etc., to try to learn the potter's art by beginning with the tub, - the largest vessel, and therefore the hardest to make. This proverb occurs again in Laches 187, B., in company with its opposite, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon v} \tau \tilde{\omega}$ Ka@ì $\mathfrak{\text { huiv }}$ o xiv tempt what you can best afford to fail in; which refers to the Carian mercenaries in war, whose blood was less precious than their employer's.
B. $\sigma$ òv idı $\omega \tau$ tv́ovios. Soph. § 174.
D. For what is here said of "the four," see the Introduction.
 orjoavta, by being the first to bring them into the practice of taking pay for performing their political duties. 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, Boeckh's Civil Economy of Ath-
 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 vho, in imitation of them, have their ears bruised by blows rectived in boxing,
 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 ill-affected towards Athens.
516 A. кiotì̀ av̉toũ «utะ乡rciourto. Thucyd. merely says
 tion and a fine (Vit. Pericl. § 35), as does Diodorus also (12. 45) ; but it was no doubt false: he was zøๆүútov $\delta$ ouqurws $\dot{\text { ä }} \delta \omega \rho$ ótutos by the testimony of the most impartial
 Xen. Memorab. I. 2. 32, for a similar passage. - üré$\delta_{\varepsilon \iota, \varepsilon}$. . . तotovivas, if he had caused them to do. This verb and ciroquivo are often used in the sense of causing something to appear, of effecting, rendering, and, like quive, $\delta_{\varepsilon i z v} \mathrm{y}, \mu$, take their complement in the form of a participle.
B. xaì тódr ... גćóvat. There is a similar play upon


C. $\omega_{\xi}$ हैq ${ }^{\circ} \eta{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \mu \mathrm{r}, \mathrm{g}, \mathrm{o}$. Nusquam disertis verbis hoc dictum in eo quem hodie habemus Homero, nisi quis huc trahere velit quod Routhius fecit Odyss. 6. 120, 9. 175,



470, E., and makes tò $\ddot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \rho o \nu$ a part of the philosophic
 zis ơp.
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
 on account of his fruitless attack upon the island of Paros soon after the battle of Marathon), $\hat{\eta} \vartheta \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \alpha \dot{v} i o \nu ~ x \alpha \tau \alpha-$
 information, we are enabled to reconcile Plato with Herodot. u. s. It was on the day of the trial, that the prytanis, or the epistates, came into court as one of the 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. - iò
 $i v$ is used because the action was "in Marathonio agro." See Soph. Electr. 1. - to $\beta$ ќó $\alpha \vartheta \rho o v$ 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 CEneid tribe, where they threw down the capitally condemned, as the Lacedæmonians did into Kæadas." Herodot. 7. 133, says, that the heralds of Darius were thrown by the Athenians into this place. Comp. Aristoph. Clouds 1450, and the Schol. on Aristoph. Plut. 431.
E. oüxovv oì $\gamma \varepsilon \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha 9$ oì $\dot{\eta} v i o x o t$, etc. 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 tended their horses, and have become betier drivers themselves, that they
are then thrown out. Zeüyos is often used of the vehicle, as well as of the yoke or pair of animals drawing it.
 हैไ $\lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \varsigma$, readily suggested by $\omega \mu 0 \lambda o^{\prime} \gamma \varepsilon \iota \varsigma$, is to be supplied, together with $\tau \omega v a s$, which is contained in ov̉ $\delta \dot{s} v u$. See
 is borrowed from charioteers, and is the more natural, as persons who lost their rank or authority were said $\varepsilon \mu \pi \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \varepsilon i \nu$.
 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, $\sigma \omega^{\prime \prime} \leqslant t$ हैx $\tau \omega \check{\nu} \mu \varepsilon-$
 a supposed inconsistency of Plato, who had before called "the four" xó $\lambda \alpha \times \alpha$, and now says that they did not use
 ing. The words contain a sneer at the rhetoricians. They were xóla\%\&s, inasmuch as they studied to gratify, not to benefit; and carrying such a motive into their public addresses, they imbued all their words with it. But if the false art of rhetoric can rescue from dangers, and makes that its first aim, they fell short of it. In other words, the art cannot gain its own dearest ends. They had the principles of the false rhetoric, but could not gain that for which the art was esteemed.
 usually followed by an infinitive, and Stallb. says that he knows of no example like this. The reason for the construction seems to be, that roh. $\quad 0 \tilde{v} \delta \varepsilon \tilde{\text {, }}$, being in sense a negative, adopts the construction appropriate to ou. ou
 singular expression for ( $\tau \iota \varsigma$ ) ô $\gamma \beta$ oúl $\varepsilon \varepsilon$. The verb must be
regarded as coalescing with ös to form one notion, like
 being servants of the state, or considering them merely as ( ${ }^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime} \gamma \varepsilon$ ) being servants of the state. Stallb. thinks, that the phrase arises, by a confusio duarum locutionum, out of $\omega s$ ... $\delta \iota \alpha$ zóvovs, and $\delta \iota \alpha$ кóvovs عìvol. But the infinitive with ws can be used in this relation to the main verb, as well
 their own way. The infinitives limit $\delta \iota \varepsilon \varphi \varepsilon \varrho \circ \nu$.
C. ov̉ $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \pi \alpha v o ́ \mu \varepsilon \vartheta \alpha \ldots$. . $\alpha \varepsilon i . \quad$ Comp. 491, A. - ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \nu 0-$
 $\mu \alpha \vartheta^{\vartheta} \vartheta^{\prime} \nu \omega$ and other verbs of learning or understanding. Soph. § 182. - $\tilde{\eta} \delta v \nu \alpha \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \varepsilon \tilde{i} \nu \alpha \iota$ is for $\tilde{\eta} \delta$. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \iota$, by a change of style from direct to suspended discourse. Supply $\boldsymbol{\omega} \mu \mathbf{-}$ 2оү ${ }^{\prime} \varkappa \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu$.
D. $\varrho \iota y \tilde{\varrho}$ is for $\varrho \iota \gamma$ õ, subjunctive of $\varrho \iota \gamma$ ów ; and so $\varrho \iota \gamma \omega ̃ \nu$ for $\varrho(\gamma) \tilde{v} \nu$ infinitive, in Aristoph. Clouds 442. This is quite analogous to the contraction of $\pi \varepsilon \iota \nu \alpha, \omega$, and a few others in $\alpha \omega$, by $\eta$ instead of $\alpha$, but is used with no other verb in Attic except iojów. Buttmann (largest Gr. 1. 506, and note in Heindorf,) thinks that both contractions are relics of a general method prevailing in old Ionic.
 its structure, and proceeds as if ${ }_{o}^{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha$, and not $\varepsilon \hat{i} \gamma \alpha l$, had stood here. The anacoluthon is caused, no doubt, by
 which suggested another construction.
A. $\tau \alpha \dot{v} \tau \dot{\alpha}$ oṽv $\tau \alpha \tilde{v} r \alpha$, etc. Now at one time you seem to 518 be aware, that I say that the self-same thing holds good of the soul also, and you agree to it, as if understanding what $I$ mean. тotè $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ answers to obliyov $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{v} \sigma \tau \varepsilon g o v$, and $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ is, in a sense, out of its place.
B. $\pi$ ootsiveç $\vartheta$, to hold forward, as a sample of what one has got, hence to take, or select as a specimen. -
 have been the fashionable baker at Athens. He is thus spoken of in a fragment of the Gerytades of Aristophanes
 'iv' '̇utiv xolficurwv $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \omega^{\prime} \delta \iota \alpha$, 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... ovis $\delta \eta \mu о ́ \tau \alpha \iota \varsigma \mid \Theta \varepsilon \alpha \rho i \omega \nu$ द้ย $\delta \varepsilon \iota \xi \varepsilon \nu$. - йотожо́лоэ. In a number of
 thing is $\dot{\alpha} \tau о \pi о$ о́лоя, which has most commendation from the Atticists. I think it likely that this has been unlawfully thrust out of its place by the other words in some instan-
 Mithcecus, 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., $\Sigma v-$
 $\alpha i \nu \varepsilon i s . ~ A t h e n æ u s ~ 12 . ~ 518, ~ C ., ~ \delta \iota \alpha \beta o ́ \eta \tau o i ~ \varepsilon i \sigma \iota \nu ~ ह ̇ \pi i ̀ ~ \tau \rho v \varphi \tilde{n}$
 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.
C. $\pi \alpha \varrho \alpha \sigma x \varepsilon v \alpha \sigma t \dot{\alpha} \varsigma \dot{\alpha} \nu \vartheta \rho \omega^{\prime} \pi \sigma v \varsigma . \quad u ̈ \nu \vartheta \rho \omega \pi \sigma$ is often added in contempt, having something of the force of our fellow. $\dot{u} v \dot{\eta} \rho$ is used on the contrary with an honorable sense. This is shown at large in Valckenaer's Opusc. 2. 243, ed. Lips. - oí, $̈ \nu \nu$ ou゙t $\omega$ tí $\omega \omega \sigma \iota$, etc. Who, it may be, after they have filled and fattened the bodies of the men, and while they are praised by them, will cause the loss (not only of this increase of flesh but) of their old flesh besides.
 shall have brought on disease a good while afterwards. $\dot{\eta} \times \omega \boldsymbol{\varphi} \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \omega \nu$ is often nearly the same as $\varphi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \omega$, 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 calamities. It is thus that some, who look with alarm on the turn our affairs are taking, worship Jefferson as a
 by a change of style from the relative to the demonstrative.
A. $\quad \alpha \alpha \tau \beta 0 \lambda \dot{\eta}$. $\quad \pi \varepsilon \varrho \varrho \iota \delta \iota x \dot{\eta} \lambda \tilde{\eta} \psi \iota \varsigma \pi v \varrho \varepsilon \tau 0 \tilde{v}$ interprete Timæo 519

Lex. p. 154 ubi v. Ruhnken. Heindorf. -' 'A ${ }^{\prime}$ 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.
 which Stallb. supplies.
C. Comp. p. 460, C., and Xen. Memorab. 1. 2. 7. -
 to hold good of those who, etc. But Mt. §632, has a different explanation of the form of the sentence.
D. waì toútov toũ hórov. For zai, Heindorf, without authority, writes $\varkappa \alpha i \tau o t$. But $\% \alpha i$, in the beginning of imperative and interrogative sentences, mark liveliness of transition (Mt. §620), like our and in animated questions, particularly in those where objections are refuted.

 some things which I have to say I dwell largely upon. But if hóo ${ }^{\prime} \omega \nu$ depends on ovzvòs, as it well can (comp.

Soph. § 177. 1), the sense must be, I think, a good many of my discourses $I$ extend in length. - $\quad$ п̣òs quitov. See 500, B.
20 A. öт $\tau \nu$ ríx $\omega \sigma \iota$. Comp. 514, E., 518, C. -What is 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
 $\delta_{\varepsilon ı v o u ́ s, ~ M e n o ~ 95, ~ C .), ~ f o r ~ t h e ~ S o p h i s t s ~ w h o s e ~ p r e t e n s i o n s ~}^{\text {a }}$ were as much higher, as wisdom is higher than eloquence.

 Comp. 517, A.
C. $\pi \varrho \circ \dot{\delta} \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota$, to bestow freely, and in the first instance, without knowing what return the parly receiving the favor
 $\pi \varrho o ̈ ̈ \dot{\beta} \mu v 0 \iota$, bestowing upon their country a most precious con-
 where Schneider adverts to this sense. -ǜzv $\mu \sigma \vartheta \circ$ our. 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. $\dot{\varepsilon} v \varepsilon \notin \omega \rho \rho \varepsilon$. The absolute form without ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu$ is here used for the hypothetical with it. See Mt. § 508, Obs. 2. - $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ $\chi$ र́ $\rho v$, the favor due, the compensation, as a mark of a
 should not take the money in consequence of a bargain made with him (i.e. should not take it as the payment which was stipulated), at the very time when he was imparting to
him the power of swiftness. ö $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ is joined with $\ddot{\alpha} \mu \alpha$ to increase its preciseness.
 Stallb. is right in separating these words, in opposition to Buttmann (2. 361, largest Gr.), who writes in one word
 except in the instance of the strange word $\delta \dot{\sigma} \vartheta \vartheta \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha$,
 $\delta_{o}$ \&ṽ $\pi o \neq \eta \eta_{\sigma \alpha \varsigma}$, "sed fallitur loco qui repudiat articulum non recte explicato." Hermann on Eurip. Hecuba, 485,
 oas denotes after conferring a favor.
 $\nu \varepsilon i v$, Plato deserts the construction of the nearest words, and accommodates the participles to $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \% \alpha \lambda \varepsilon i \nu . ~ S e e ~ M t . ~$ §555. Obs. 2. Just below, Heindorf, Coray, and Stallb.

 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 ( $\varepsilon i \mu \dot{\eta}$ ... $\pi 01 \eta{ }^{\prime} \delta \varepsilon!$ ) you will -." The apodosis to $\varepsilon i$... \%al. $\varepsilon i \nu \nu$ is omitted, being readily suggested by the sense
 thing equivalent. The apodosis which $\varepsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \ldots \pi o \eta^{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon \iota$ would have had, if Socrates had not cut the sentence short, is to be found in his words. With waleiv must be understood roṽov, this political man, whom in fact, though not in so many words, Socrates calls a xó $2 \alpha \alpha \alpha$. But the connexion with the foregoing must be owned to be rather loose. The Mysians stood low among the people of Asia

Minor. Mvoã̃ žozatos (Theætet. 209, B.), is a proverb for the vilest of the vile. Cicero, in his Or. pro Flacco, § 27 , says, "Quid porro in sermone Græco, tam tritum atque celebratum est, quam, si quis despicatui ducitur, ut Mysorum ultimus esse dicatur ?"

 the indicative, but in many places the subjunctive follows ${ }^{2} \chi \chi \omega$ in this formula. The distinction is, according to Stallb. on Euthydem. 287, C., that the subj. deliberates on that "quod pro præsenti rerum conditione fieri debeat." If the action is continued, the present subj. is used ; otherwise the aorist. Comp. 521, E. just below. When the future occurs, on the contrary, "non de una aliqua aut præsenti dubitatione sermo est, sed res in universum significatur ideoque de futuri temporis perpetuitate cogitan-

 brought (upon trial) into court. The participle, as $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ indicates (Soph. § 222. 6), is equivalent to the optative ;
 to give an optative force to oixw also ; but that is unne-
 aloof: as if you were isolated, (the consequence of which would be, that he could not be accused,) not as though you could live isolated.
 gentem. Nam optativus post relativa in obliqua oratione haudquaquam infrequens est. Addito $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ hoc loco scribendum erat $\tau i \not x \eta$. 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 Plaio, whose ideal turn of m nd was not fitted to find satisfaction in the present under any system, particularly
under one where demagogues reigned, and philosophers had to drink poison. - лovŋ९ós. An allusion, no doubt, to the actual accusers. - ovi $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \bar{\gamma} \dot{\alpha} \tau о \pi о \nu$, sc. $\varepsilon i \eta \eta$.
E. $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ конч $\dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha$. An allusion to what Callicles
 B., used of a person who is present and pointed at, has


 $\nu \varepsilon \omega \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau o v s \delta \delta \iota \propto \vartheta \varepsilon i \rho \varepsilon \iota$. An allusion to the actual charge against Socrates. Comp. 522, B.
A. For $\varepsilon \dot{v} \omega \chi \varepsilon \check{\varepsilon} v$ governing two accusatives, see Mt. 522 § 421. Obs. 1. This construction, (which $\gamma \varepsilon \dot{v} \omega$ 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.



 firmative and a negative proposition are often thus bound together by oư $\tau \varepsilon$ and $\tau \varepsilon$; but oùv $\varepsilon$ must come first. $\alpha \hat{v} \tau o \tilde{c}_{\varsigma}$


 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, E., cited by Heindorf,) "O Socrates, I used to hear it said of you, before I became acquainted with you, that you do nothing

 just ( $\delta \dot{\eta}$ ) what is for your interest. Ast takes $\pi \alpha \dot{\prime} \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha$
 added in apposition. - ovit etiam sequente consona litera usurpatum esse ubi vi et
 Heindorf wishes to erase $\dot{\varepsilon} v$, or write $\varepsilon \ddot{\varepsilon} \eta$, with some reason, as $\dot{v} \pi \alpha \dot{\varrho} \varrho \chi \omega$ takes with it a simple dative.
D. $\beta \circ \eta \dot{\eta} \vartheta \varepsilon \iota \alpha$ ह $\alpha v \tau \tilde{\omega}$. This noun with the dative denotes help afforded to ; with the genitive, against (comp. $\beta$ o $\eta$ Э $\varepsilon \iota \alpha$ ß $\kappa \rho \beta \alpha \dot{\rho} \rho \nu$, Plat. Epist. 7.332, E.), or to any one. There is an allusion here to $486, \mathrm{~B}$.
E. $\alpha \dot{v} \tau \dot{o} \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \vartheta \nu \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$. Comp. for the sentiment


523 A. paбi, i. e. as story-tellers say, when they begin a story. - $\lambda$ ógov opposed to $\mu \tilde{v} \vartheta \begin{aligned} & \text { ov } \\ & \text { is a historical narrative, a }\end{aligned}$ true story, as opposed to a fictitious narrative. ——"O $\mu \eta$ ŋos
 nunc etiam. Ast. दौध̃兀っ includes a past tense.
B. vewoti, in modern times, used relatively to the days of Saturn. - o $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\varepsilon}$. . . $\nu \eta^{\prime} \sigma \omega \nu$. The preposition is accommodated to ioviধs (see Soph. Electr. 137), because the officers set over the blessed islands came from thence.
C. غxurévous, in each direction, to the blessed islands, and to the prison of punishment.
 Esch. Prometh. 362, Soph. Electr. 54. The sense is, having eyes and cars, and the whole body, spread as a veil

their way. - тoṽzo av̉züv, this property of theirs, this in them.

 Routh explains this by their being born of Europa, a Phœenician, and adds, that Minos was regarded by some as a stranger in Crete. "Sed Cretam insulam Asiæ assignasse videntur 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.
A, żे $\tau \tilde{\sim} \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$, etc. Virgil, Æneid 6. 540,
"Hic locus est, partes ubi se via findit in ambos: Dextera, quæ Ditis magni sub mœnia tendit, Hac iter Elysium nobis : at læva malorum Exercet pœnas, et ad impia Tartara mittit."
 rather irregular construction, instead of ở $\pi$ ohv̀ $\bar{\eta} \tau \tau o \nu .$. $\eta$ 品 ö $\varepsilon$ 解 $\eta \eta$. $\ddot{\eta}^{\eta} \nu \pi \varepsilon \rho$ is brought in through the influence of $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\xi}{ }^{\circ} \nu \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \alpha \dot{v} \tau o \tilde{v}$, and alters the ensuing words to suit itself.
 himself to be while living in regard to his body, i. e. such as were his ways of using his body. Just below, $\varepsilon_{v}^{\prime 2} \delta \eta \lambda \alpha$
 ceded, and $\tau \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha$ refers to the qualities implied in oios, etc.
 time ; $\psi v x \tilde{\eta}_{s}$ depends on ov $\delta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} v$; nothing belonging to, or in
 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."
 they suffer, are made better . . . are such as, etc.
C. toĩs č่\&i. See 464, D., Prometh. 937.
D. тov̀s $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ viş $_{\varsigma} . . \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \gamma \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega v$. By a constructio ad sensum, $\pi \alpha \varrho \alpha \delta \varepsilon \iota \gamma \mu \alpha \tau_{\tau} \epsilon \nu$ used of the persons who serve as examples, is joined to $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda_{0} v_{s}$, as if it were masculine. -"Oипŋos. Odys. 11.575, seq.
E. $\dot{\varepsilon} x \tau \tau \tilde{y} \ldots \dot{\alpha} \nu \vartheta \rho \omega \pi \sigma$, the men who prove to be even very wicked are of the class of the powerful. Here, and in 526, A., yiyvso $\vartheta \alpha \iota$ means to become subjectively, i. e. to become in the view of others, to be found out to be.
 him to show whether he thinks him curable or not. Comp. Repub. 10. 614, which I will give in English. "When, therefore, his soul went out of his body, he began a journey, with a number of others, and they came to a wonderful place, where there were two openings in the ground close by one annther, 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 (опицї) 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 indi-
 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, B., it

 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.
 ered to be spurious by Heindorf and Ast, for reasons, which, as far as I can see, are altogether insufficient.
E. $\dot{\alpha}^{\vec{\nu}} \nu \tau \iota \pi \alpha \varrho \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda \omega . \quad \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i{ }_{\imath}$ denotes in my turn, in reply to the exhortations which you gave me to engage in politics. Just below, $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \grave{\imath} . . . \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \dot{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$ 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. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \vartheta \dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \not \varepsilon \varepsilon \check{\prime}$, and $\dot{\varepsilon} x \varepsilon i \sigma \varepsilon$ 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.
A. cìv t $\eta_{s}$ Aivivทs vióv. Facus (son of Jupiter and 527 Ægina), as being the judge for all from Europe. Olympiod. apud Stallb. says, "he adds Egina because Callicles was from Ægina." But as the Platonic Scholiast can have known nothing about Callicles, I suspect that Aiyi$\nu \eta_{\mathrm{s}}$ is an error in transcribing for $E \hat{v} \varrho \omega \dot{\mu} \pi \eta$ s, occasioned by the similar word preceding it. — $\chi \circlearrowleft \sigma \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \iota$, etc. This noble passage alludes to 486, B. - $\tau v \pi \tau \eta \sigma \varepsilon$. The Attic form of the future of $\tau v i \pi t \omega$, according to Thomas Magister and Mœris sub voce. Comp. Aristoph. Clouds 1443, 1379. The later writers used all the forms from гขлะ' $(\omega$, unless it be the present and imperfect.
 E. The adverb of motion is used, because the journey from this world is thought of. It is the same as when we go thither. Comp. the opposite in Fischin. c. Ctes. § 97, Bekker, " he said that he wished to report to you $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \vec{\varepsilon} x$
 loponnesus, strictly the embassy into $\boldsymbol{P}$. from which he had returned. - خं $\varrho \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon}$, remains quiet, unshaken, i. e. unve-

 Sixalov عïvol, $\mu \grave{\eta}$ oैv $\nu \alpha$. Eschylus was the source of the

 looked at Aristides, according to Plutarch in his life.

 came perhaps to be used with a verb of motion, because with the motion its end, rest in the place, is often thought of. - ${ }^{s}$ s $\begin{gathered}\text { dójos onuciveı, as the discourse shows. Stallb. }\end{gathered}$ gives $\omega_{s} \dot{o}$ oos hóogos, 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. $\pi \alpha \tau \alpha ́ s \alpha i$. The interpreters are divided between $\pi \alpha \tau \alpha^{\prime} \xi \alpha l$, with which ${ }^{\prime \prime} \alpha \sigma o ́ \nu \tau i \nu \alpha$ and $\sigma \varepsilon$, from $\sigma o v$, just above, are to be supplied, and $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \tau{ }_{5}^{\xi} \alpha \iota$ 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, $\varphi^{\dot{\varepsilon}} \rho^{\prime} \dot{i} \delta \omega \tau i$
 this word Stallb. takes in the sense of $\dot{\varepsilon} \omega \tilde{\varepsilon} \dot{\mu} \mu \nu \tau \dot{\nu} \tau \tau \dot{\pi} \pi \tau \varepsilon \vartheta \alpha \iota$. I apprehend, that $\tau v$ viл兀oucı is in the passive. "What do you do," says Socrates, "if a person beats you?" "I am beaten," is the reply, i. e. I do nothing but suffer, I get beaten. We need not be troubled by $\sigma \dot{v} \gamma \varepsilon \vartheta \mu \varrho \rho(̧ \tilde{\omega} \nu$; for $\sigma v$ is occasionally repeated with $\gamma^{\varepsilon}$ in the second clause, with a certain increase of force in the exhortation. Comp. Herodot. 7. 10, "I shall hear of you as being torn to pieces by dogs and birds, $\ddot{\eta}$ xov $\vec{\varepsilon} \nu \quad \gamma \tilde{\eta} \tau \tau \tilde{\eta}^{3} A \vartheta \eta v a i \omega \nu \quad \ddot{\eta}$

 The same is true of ${ }_{o}^{\circ} \gamma \varepsilon$, and $t u$ in Latin. Nor do I see how $\vartheta \alpha \varrho \varrho \delta \omega \nu \nu$ opposes this construction any more than $\vartheta \alpha \rho$ §ov่vtas 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 $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha \alpha_{5}^{\xi} \alpha \iota$, imperative middle, in his second edition.
 cludes himself in the censure to give it a milder form.

## 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' 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
 gias replies, "it does not seem to me that we ought yet $\dot{\alpha} \pi \iota \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \alpha \iota . "$ For $\dot{\alpha} \pi \iota \varepsilon \dot{\prime} \nu \alpha \iota$ must have the same subject as the preceding $\dot{\alpha} \pi i \omega \mu s \nu$. 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 Schleiermacher says on this point, or given reasons for choosing the house of Callicles as the scene of the Dialogue, except Cousin. His reasons, I must think, have little weight. 1. There would have been some allusion, direct or indirect, to the place, if a public one. The same might be said, with equal reason, I think, on the other side. 2. It was mainly in private houses, as Plato affirms in Hippias Major, that Gorgias spoke. Plato's expression is $i \delta i \neq \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \delta \varepsilon i \xi \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \pi o \iota o v j \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$, and $i \delta i \alpha$, , contrasted with $\tilde{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \tilde{\omega} \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \varphi$ 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 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, 1.634,) 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 $\nu \varepsilon \omega \sigma \tau \grave{\imath} \tau \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon v \tau \eta x \omega \dot{\prime}, 503$, C. But $\nu \varepsilon \omega \sigma \tau \grave{m}$ may be widely used. Comp. 523. "Nuper, id est paucis ante sæculis." Cic. de Nat. Deor. 2. 50. It was twenty-four years before 405, B. C. And Pericles in this passage is contrasted tacitly with Themistocles, Cimon, and Miltiades, whose deaths were considerably earlier. 2. Archelaus is said to have committed the crimes by which he gained the throne, "yesterday and the day before." But this is very plainly a rhetorical contrast with the $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha \iota o i ̃$ $\pi \varrho \propto \dot{\gamma} \mu \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$, 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, E. 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 how 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, p. 516, A., and on the chapacter given to him in this Dialogue.

An eminent historian, ThirIwall, 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 connexion with the charges against Themistocles, Cimon, and Miltiades, it wears the appearance of an unfounded accusation. The other is, that the fact may have been as Plato represents it : the people, in a sudden outburst of displeasure, may have at this time fined him, upon a charge of peculation so frivolous, that Thucydides does not think it worthy of mention. The circumstances were these: Pericles was deposed from his office of general (Plut. Pericl. § 35, Diodor. 12. 45), - it may be at one of the epicheirotonia, or in consequence of a special process, an eisangelia. A
suit was brought against him, - probably a y $\wp \alpha \varphi \eta^{\prime}$, though Plutarch calls it a $\delta i x \eta$. Cleon, Simmias, or Lacratidas, was his accuser, and he was fined in a sum variously estimated at fifteen, fifty (Plut.), and eighty talents (Diodor.). The nature of the suit is not stated, but it certainly may have been $x \lambda о \pi \dot{\eta} \delta \eta \mu \sigma \sigma i \omega \nu \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$, based upon some trifling circumstance, occurring at a time when moneys would be under his control, as commander of the forces. The general Timotheus, with no more reason, perhaps, was accused of treason, and then, at the rendering of his accounts (euthynæ), 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 Perieles' 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, 3. 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, $\varepsilon v^{3} \delta o s i \alpha$, or correct opinion, is ascribed to Pericles, without wis-
dom, 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 $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ redéntatos $\varepsilon i \varsigma \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ ¢ $\eta-$ rogıx $\eta^{\prime} \nu$. 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.
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"Greek, - the shrine of the genius of the old world; as universal as our race, as individual as ourselves; of infinite flexibility, of indefatigable strength, with the complication and the distinctness of nature herself; to which nothing was vulgar, from which nothing was excluded; speaking to the ear like Italian, speaking to the mind like English; with words like pictures, with words like the gossamer film of the summer; at once the variety and picturesqueness of Homer, the gloom and the intensity of たschylus; not compressed to the closest by Thucydides, not fathomed to the bottom by Plato, not sounding with all its thunders, nor lit up with all its ardors even under the Promethean touch of Demosthenẹs ! " - Coleridge's Study of the Greels Classic Pocts, Gen. Introd.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1841, by Crocker and Bhewster, in the Clerk's office of the District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

## PREFACE TO THE TABLES.

The following tables have been prepared as part of a Greek Grammar. They are published separately in two forms; in duodecimo, for the convenience and economy of beginners in learning the Greek paradigms, and in large quarto, for the convenience of more advanced students in consulting and comparing them. To avoid confusion, and the disturbance of those local associations which are so important in learning the grammar of a language, every duodecimo page of the tables, whether in the dundecimo or in the quarto edition, presents, with a single exception, precisely the same appearance as in the larger work to which it belongs. Even the numbers denoting the book, chapter, section, and page, are throughout the same; and, indeed, in the duodecimo edition of the tables, every opening, with a single exception, is simply an opening in the grammar.

The principles upon which these tables have been constructed, are the following;
I. To avoid needless repetition. There is a certain ellipsis in grammatical tables, as well as in discourse, which relieves not only the material instruments of the mind, but the mind itself, and which assists alike the understanding and the memory. When the student has learned that, in the neuter gender, the nominative, accusative, and rocative are always the same, why, in each neuter paradigm that he studies, must his eye and mind be taxed with the examination of nine forms instead of three? why, in his daily exercises in declension, must his tongue triple its labor, and more than triple the weariness of the teacher's ear? To relieve, so far as possible, both instructor and pupil of that mechanical drudgery, which wastes, with-
out profit, the time, strength, and spirit, which should be devoted to higher effort, these tables have been constructed with the following ellipses, which the student will supply at once from general rules.

1. In the paradigms of declension, the vocative singular is omitted whenever it has the same form with the nominative, and the following cases are omitted throughout;
a. The vocative plural, because it is always the same with the nominative.
f. The dative dual, because it is always the same with the genitive.
$\gamma$. The accusative and vocative dual, because they are always the same with the nominative.

ס. The neuter accusative and vocative, in all the numbers, because they are always the same with the nominative.
2. In the paradigms of ADJECTives, and of words similarly inflected, the columns of the masculine and neuter genders are united in the genitive and dative of all the numbers, and in the nominative dual; because in these cases the two genders never differ.
3. In the paradigms of conjugation, the first person dual is omitted throughout, as having the same form with the first person plural, and the third person dual is omitted; whenever it has the same form with the second person dual, that is, in the primary tenses of the indicative, and in the subjunctive. The form in $\mu_{\varepsilon}$ gov, though perhaps too hastily pronounced by Elmsley an invention of the Alexandrine grammarians, is yet, at most, only an exceedingly rare variety of the first person dual. The teacher who meets with it in his recitation room, may pretty safely call his class, as the crier called the Roman people upon the celebration of the Secular games, "to gaze upon that which they had never seen before, and would never see again." In the secondary tenses of the indicative, and in the optative, this form does not occur at all; and, in the remaining tenses, there have been found only five examples, two of which are quoted by Athenæus from a word-hunter (ovoperờnges), whose affectation he is ridiculing, while the three classical examples are all poetic, occurring, one in Homer (Il. $\psi^{\prime}, 485$ ), and the other two in Sophocles (El. 950 and Phil. 1079). And yet, in the single paradigm of $\tau u ́ \tau \tau \omega$, as I learned it in my boyhood, this " needless Alexandrine,"

[^28]occurs no fewer than twenty-six times, that is, almost nine times as often as in the whole range of the Greek classies.
4. The compound forms of the perfect passive subjutctive and optative are omitted, as belonging rather to Syntax than to inflection.
II. To give the forms just as they appear upon the Greek page, that is, without abbreviation and without hyphens. A dissected and abbreviated mode of printing the paradigms exposes the young student to mistake, and familiarizes the eye, and of course the mind, with fragments, instead of complete forms. If these fragments were separated upon analytical principles, the evil would be less; but they are usually cut off just where convenience in printing may direct, so that they contain, sometimes a part of the termination, sometimes the whole termination, and sometimes the termination with a part of the root. Hyphens are useful in the analysis of forms, but a table of paradigms seems not to be the most appropriate place for them. In the following tables, the terminations are given by themselves, and the paradigms are so arranged in columns, that the eye of the student will usually separate, at a glance, the root from the termination.
III. To represent the language according to its actual use, and not according to the theories or fancies of the Alexandrine and Byzantine grammarians. Hence, for example,

1. The purely imaginary first perfect active imperative has been discarded.
 have been substituted the actual forms ${ }_{i \sigma \tau \eta}, \tau_{i} 9 \varepsilon, \delta_{i} \hat{\delta}_{00}, \delta_{\varepsilon i x y v}$.
2. Together with analogical but rare forms, have been given the usual forms, which in many grammars are noticed only as exceptions

 and Bovisuíq9

3. The second future active and middle, which, except as a euphonic form of the first future, is purely imaginary, has been wholly rejected.
IV. To distinguish between regular and irregular usage. What student, from the common paradigms, does not receive the impression, sometimes never corrected, that the second perfect and pluperfect, the second aorist and future, and the third future belong as regularly to the Greek verb, as the first tenses bearing the same name; when,
in point of fact, the Attic dialect, even including poetic usage, presents only about fify verbs which have the second perfect and pluperfect ; eighty-five, which have the second aorist active; fifty, which have the second aorist and future passive; and forty, which have the second aorist middle? The gleanings of all the other dialects will not double these numbers. Carmichael, who has given us most fully the statistics of the Greek verb, and whose labors deserve all praise, has gathered, from all the dialects, a list of only eighty-eight verbs which have the second perfect, one hundred and forty-five which have the second aorist active, eighty-four which have the second aorist passive, and fifty-eight which have the second aorist middle. And, of his catalogue of nearly eight hundred verbs, embracing the most common verbs of the language, only fifty-five have the third future, and, in the Attic dialect, only twenty-eight.
To sorne there may appear to be an impiety in attacking the venerable shade of $\tau \dot{u} \pi \tau \omega$. but alas! it is little more than a shade, and, with all my early and long cherished attachment to it, I am forced, after examination, to exclaim, in the language of Electra,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 'Аvгi фi } \lambda \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau n s
\end{aligned}
$$

and to ask why, in an age characterized by its devotion to truth, a false representation of an irregular verb should be still set forth as the paradigm of regular conjugation, and made the Procrustes' bed, to which all other verbs must be stretched or pruned. The actual future of $\tau \dot{u} \pi \tau \omega$ is not $\tau \dot{v} \psi \omega$, but $\tau v \pi \tau n \dot{\sigma} \sigma$, the perfect passive is both
 the first and second perfect and pluperfect active are not found in classic Greek, if, indeed, found at all, and the second future active and middle are the mere figments of grammatical fancy. And yet all the regular verbs in the language must be gravely pronounced defective, because they do not conform to this imaginary model.

In the following tables, the example of the learned Kühner has been followed, in selecting $\beta$ oùsúw as the paradigm of regular conjugation. This verb is strictly regular, it glides smoothly over the tongue, is not liable to be mispronounced, and presents, to the eye, the prefixes, root, and terminations, with entire distinctness throughout. This is followed by shorter paradigms, in part merely synoptical, which exhibit the different classes of verbs, with their varieties of formation. It is scarcely necessary to remark, that, in the table of translation ( $\$ 283$ ), the form of the verb must be adapted to the number and person of the pronoun; thus, I am planning, thou art
planning, \&c.; or that, in the translation of the middle voice, the forms of "plan" are to be changed into the corresponding forms of "deliberate"; and, in that of the passive voice, into the corresponding forms of "be planned."
V. To arrange the whole in the most convenient manner for study and reference. The inflection of each word is exhibited upon a single page, or, if this is not possible, except in the case of $\beta$ ounsúv, at a single opening. Words which the student may wish to compare, are presented, as far as possible, at the same opening. Thus a single opening exhibits all the nouns of the first and second declension, another, the declension of the numerals, article, and pronouns, another, the verbs inut, si $\mu i$, and $\boldsymbol{i} i \mu \mu$, \&c. In the quarto edition, a single opening presents all the tables of declension; another, the whole regular conjugation of the verb, including its terminations, paradigm, and translation; a third, all the verbs in $\mu$, \& $c$.

With respect to the manner in which these tables sloould be used, so much depends upon the age and attainments of the student, that no directions could be given which might not require to be greatly modified in particular cases. I would, however, recommend,

1. That the paradigms should not be learned en masse, but gradually, in connexion with the study of the principles and rules of the grammar, and with other exercises.
2. That some of the paradigms should rather be used for reference, than formally committed to memory. It will be seen at once, that some of them have been inserted merely for the sake of exhibiting differences of accent, or individual peculiarities.
3. That in adjectives and words similarly inflected, each gender should be repeated by itself. The association of forms which is fixed in learning the nouns, will not then be broken up in passing to the adjectives. The order in which the genders are repeated, seems to be indifferent. In the tables, the neuter is placed next to the masculine, because it is of the same declension, and has, in part, the same forms.
4. That in the first learning, and common repetition of the paradigms, the dual should be omitted. It is little more than a mere variety of the plural, of comparatively rare occurrence, and, from its regular simplicity of structure; may always be supplied with perfect ease from the tables of terminations, or from general rules. That it may be omitted or repeated at pleasure, it is placed last in the following tables. If any should object to this arrangement, as interfering with old associations, let them remember, that the book is de-
signed for those whose only grammatical associations connect the plural immediately with the singular. I have no desire to change the habits of those who have already learned the Greek paradigms, but to discover, if possible, the best method for those who are yet to learn them.
5. 'That, in learning and consulting the paradigms, the student should constantly compare them with each other, with the tables of terminations, and with the rules of the grammar.
6. That the humble volume should not be dismissed from service, till the paradigms are impressed upon the tablets of the memory as legibly as upon the printed page, - till they have become so familiar to the student, that whenever he has occasion to repeat them, " the words," in the expressive language of Milton, " like so many nimble and airy servitors, shall trip about him at command, and in wellordered files, as he would wish, fall aptly into their own places."

Hanover, N. H., Aug. 10th, 1841.

## CONTENTS OF THE TABLES．

## INTRODUCTORY TABLES．

Page． Page．
7 Consonants， ..... 32
27．Greek Inflection， ..... 72Alphabet，Vowels，
TABLES OF DECLENSION．
I．Terminations of the Three Declensions， ..... 80
II．Paradigms of Nouns．
First Declension．
A．Masculine，$\tau \propto \mu i \alpha s, ~ \tau ৎ о \emptyset \dot{n} \tau ท$ ，
＇Aтৎsídns，ßop＇sas， ..... 80
B．Feminine，oixia， $\mathfrak{\imath} \rho\left(\alpha, \gamma^{\lambda} \tilde{\omega} \sigma\right.$－ $\sigma \alpha, \tau \iota \mu \dot{n}, \mu \nu \alpha ́ \alpha$, ..... 81
Second Decrension．
A．Masculine and Feminine，$\delta \tilde{\eta}-$
B．Neuter，$\sigma \tilde{u} x \circ y, ~ i \mu \alpha ́ \tau \iota \tau \nu, \dot{\partial} \sigma \tau \varepsilon \circ \nu$,  ..... 81
Third Declension．
A．Mute．
1．Labial，rú $\psi,{ }^{\text {A }} \mathrm{A} ৭ \downarrow \psi$ ，． ..... 82
 ruyń， ..... 82
3．Lingual．
a．Masculine and Feminine，$\pi \alpha i \xi, \pi о v_{5}, x \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon_{5}^{\prime}$ ，ó ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu / 5$ ，
ß．Neuter，$\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha, \phi \tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\eta}-$ $\pi x \rho, x!\rho \propto \alpha$, ..... 82
B．Liquid，
 $\chi$ ₹í， ..... 83
 áévós， ..... 83
C．Double Consonant，
$\lambda \varepsilon \omega \nu$ ，ỏdoús，$\gamma^{\prime} \gamma \alpha \xi, \phi_{\alpha}^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \gamma \xi$ ， ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \propto \xi, \pi v i \xi$, ..... 83
D．Pure．
$\alpha$ ．Maseuline and Feminine，ńpŋs，乃oũs，reaũs，vaũs， 84
хৎव́тทร，${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{H}_{\varrho} \alpha x \lambda$ ह́n ${ }^{\prime}$ ，85
 $\rho^{\alpha}{ }^{s},$. ..... 85
Miscrllaneous Examples．
viós，Oi̊ítous，Zsús，Гגoũs，үóve，
ע̀ $\delta \omega \varrho, \mu^{\prime} \lambda_{1}$ ，$\gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha$ ， ..... 85
III．Paradigms of Anjectives．
Of Two Terminations．
A．Second Declension，ädıxos，  ..... 86
B．Third Declension，äpppny，\＆ジ－  $\zeta_{\omega \nu}$, ..... 86
Of Three Terminations．A．Second and First Declensions，фí 105, оофós，87
 ..... 87
B．Third and First Declensions， ..... 88
C．The Three Declensions，$\mu^{\prime}$－ ras，rodús， ..... 88

## IV．Paradigms of Participles．

 ..... 89
2．Present Active Contracted，$\lambda \nu \pi \tilde{\omega} \nu, 89$ 5．Perfect Active，zioẃs， ..... 89
3．Aorist Active，«̋ $\rho \alpha$ ，． 89，6．From Verbs in $\mu$ ，$\delta_{i \delta o v_{s},}$ ..... 89

## V．Numerals．



## VI．The Article and its Compounds．



## VII．Pronouns．


Emphatic，aủrós，．．． 90 Interrogative，rís，．．． 91

roũ，．．．． 91 Relative Indefinite，ö örus，．． 91
Reciprocal，$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{n} \lambda \omega \nu$ ，． 91 Indefinite，ris，．．． 91

## TABLE OF NUMERALS．

| I．Adjectives． | 4．Multiple，．．． 121 |
| :--- | :--- |

1．Cardinal，．．．120 5．Proportional，．． 121
2．Ordinal，．．． 120 II．Adverbs，．．． 121
3．Temporal，• ．121 III．Substantives，．． 121

## TABLES OF CONJUGATION．

I．Formation of the Tenses， ..... 136
XII．D．Pure Terba
II．Flexible Endings， ..... 136
III．Terminations of Verbs IN $\mu$ ， ..... 137
I．Contract，
1．$\tau \iota \mu a ́ \omega$ ， ..... 158
2．$\varphi \cdot \lambda$ 臽 $\omega$ ， ..... 160
IV．Regular Terminations of the Active Voice， ..... 138
V．Regular Terminations ofthe Middle and PassiveVoices，．．． 140
VI．Active Voice of ßoudsj́㇒Translated，．． 142
VII．Active Voice of ßou入zún， ..... 144
VIII．Middle and Passive Voices of Bou入をú㇒， ..... 146
IX．A．Mute Verbs．
1．Labial，1．久 $\rho^{\prime} \varphi \omega$ ， ..... 149
2．$\lambda \varepsilon i \pi \omega$ ， ..... 150
iI．Palatal，$\pi \varrho^{\alpha} \alpha \sigma \omega$ ， ..... 151
ix．Lingual，1．$\pi \varepsilon i \rightarrow \omega$ ， ..... 152
2．ropíb， 153 XIII．E．Preteritive Verbs，
X．B．Liquid Verbs，
1．ả $\gamma \gamma^{\prime} غ \lambda \lambda \omega$ ， ..... 154
2．Qaivo， ..... 156
XI．C．Double Consonant Verbs，157
 ..... 157
§ 51. Table of the Vowels.

Simple Vowels. $\left\{\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Short, } & \text { 1. } \breve{\alpha} & \varepsilon & 0 & \breve{v} & \breve{\imath} \\ \text { Long, } & \text { 2. } \bar{\alpha} & \eta & \omega & \bar{v} & \bar{\iota}\end{array}\right.$

Diphthongs in $\iota$. $\left\{\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Proper, 3. } & \breve{\alpha} \iota & \varepsilon \iota & o \iota & \breve{v} \iota \\ \text { Improper, 4. } & \bar{\alpha} & \eta & \varphi & \bar{v} \iota\end{array}\right.$

Diphthongs in $v .\left\{\right.$| Proper, 5. | $v$ | $\varepsilon v$ | $o v$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Improper, 6. | $\bar{\alpha} v$ | $\eta v$ | $\omega v$ |

§ 60. The Consonants. (Table I.)
A. Associated Consonants.

Orders.

1. Smooth Mutes,
2. Middle Mutes,
3. Rough Mutes,
4. Nasals,
5. Double Consonants,

Class I. Labials.
$\boldsymbol{\pi}$
$\varphi$
$\mu$
$\psi$

Class II. Palatals.

Class III. Linguals.
$\tau$
$\delta$
$\theta$
$\nu$
$\zeta$
B. Unassociated Consonants. $\lambda \quad \rho \quad \sigma$

The Consonants. (Table II.)

§174．NOUNS OF THE THIRD DECLENSION． A．Mute．

## 1．Lablal．

¿，vulture．©，Arcub．

D．$\gamma v \pi i \quad$＂$A \rho \alpha \beta l$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { D．} \gamma v \pi i & \\ \text { A．} \gamma \tilde{\pi} \pi \alpha \beta & { }^{3} A \rho \alpha \beta \alpha\end{array}$
V．
P．N．$\gamma \tilde{v} \pi \tau \varepsilon_{\xi} \quad$＂A $1 \rho \beta \varepsilon_{\varsigma}$
G．$\gamma v \pi \tilde{\omega} \nu{ }^{3} A \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \beta \omega \nu$
D．$\gamma v \psi i \quad$＂Ао $\alpha \psi \iota$
A．$\gamma \tilde{v \pi} \pi{ }_{\varsigma} \quad " A \varrho \alpha \beta \alpha \varsigma$
D．N．$\gamma \tilde{v} \pi \varepsilon \quad$＂$A \rho \alpha \beta \varepsilon$


## 2．Palatal

$\dot{\delta}$, raven．$\dot{\delta}, \dot{\eta}$, ，goat．$\dot{\eta}$, hair．$\stackrel{i}{\eta}$, woman．
S．N． $\boldsymbol{y}^{\prime} \psi \quad{ }^{\quad \prime} A \rho \alpha \psi$

みóposxos xógaxi diyi т＠ıi juvalxi
 yưvaı







## 3．Lingual．

a．Masculine and Feminine．
$\dot{\delta}, \dot{\eta}$, child．$\delta$, foot．
S．N．$\pi \alpha \tilde{\iota} \varsigma$
G．$\pi \alpha \iota \delta{ }^{\prime}{ }_{5}$
D．$\pi \alpha, \iota \delta i$
A．$\pi \alpha \tilde{\iota} \delta \alpha$
V．$\pi \alpha \tilde{\imath}$
P．N．$\pi \alpha \tilde{i} \delta \varepsilon \varsigma$
G．$\pi \alpha i \delta \omega \nu$
D．$\pi \alpha \iota \sigma i$
A．$\pi \alpha \tilde{\iota} \delta \alpha_{\varsigma}$
D．N．$\pi \alpha i ̃ \delta \varepsilon$
G．$\pi \kappa \kappa i \delta o \iota \nu$

тov́s xגeis

$\pi o \delta i \quad x \lambda \varepsilon i \delta i$

$\dot{\delta}, \stackrel{i}{\eta}$, bird．
ö $\rho$ vıs
opvitos

$\ddot{\circ} \nu \nu \iota \vartheta \alpha, \stackrel{\circ}{\rho} \rho \nu \nu$
ло́ס६؟
$\pi o \delta \tilde{\omega} \nu$
$\pi о \sigma i$
$\pi o ́ \delta \alpha_{s}$




őøンıбь



óvivour

B．Neuter．
rò，body．tò，light．rò，liver．rò，horn．
S．N．$\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$

D．$\sigma \omega ́ \mu \alpha \tau \iota \quad \varphi \omega \tau i \quad \stackrel{\ddot{\eta}}{\pi \alpha \pi \iota}$
P．N．$\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ 甲 $\tilde{\tau} \tau \alpha \quad \ddot{\eta} \pi \alpha \tau \alpha$

D．$\sigma \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \sigma \iota \quad \varphi \omega \sigma \iota \quad \ddot{\eta} \pi \alpha \sigma \iota$


§ 278. I. Formation of the Tenses.

| Prefixes. | Tenses. | Terminations. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Present, | $\omega, \mu \iota$ |  | о $\mu \alpha \iota, \mu \alpha \iota$ |  |
|  | Imperfect, | $0 \nu, \nu$ |  | ó $\mu \eta \nu, \mu \eta \nu$ |  |
|  | Future, 2 Future | $\sigma \omega$ | бороя |  | $\vartheta \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$ ท'боиоц |
| Augm. | Aorist, | $\sigma^{\alpha}$ | $\sigma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ |  | $\vartheta \eta \nu$ |
| Augm. | 2 Aorist, | ${ }^{0} \boldsymbol{\nu}, \nu$ | ${ }^{\circ} \mu \eta \nu \nu, \mu \eta \nu$ |  | $\eta \nu$ |
| Redupl. | Perfect, | $\boldsymbol{\sim} \alpha$ |  | $\mu \alpha$, |  |
| Redupl. | 2 Perfect, | $\alpha$ |  |  |  |
| Augm. Redupl. | Pluperfect, | $\chi \varepsilon \iota \nu$ |  | $\mu \eta \nu$ |  |
| Augm. Redupl. | 2 Pluperfect, | $\varepsilon \iota \nu$ |  |  |  |
| Redupl. | 3 Future, |  |  | оораь |  |

## § ¥y9. II. Flexible Endings.

Class I. Subjective.

| Orders. | 1. Prim. | 2. Second. | 3. Imp. | 4. Inf. | 5. Part. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S. 1 | $\mu$ | $\nu, \mu \iota$ |  | $\nu \alpha \iota, \nu, \iota$ | N. $\nu \tau{ }_{\boldsymbol{s}}$ |
| 2 | $s$ | $s$ | $\vartheta \downarrow$ |  | $\nu \tau \sigma \alpha$ |
| 3 | $\sigma \iota$ | * | $\tau \omega$ |  | $\nu \tau$ |
| P. 1 | $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ | $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ |  |  | G. $\nu$ tog |
| 2 | $\tau \varepsilon$ | $\tau \varepsilon$ | $\tau \varepsilon$ |  | $\nu \tau \sigma \eta$ ¢ |
| 3 | $\nu \sigma \iota$ | $\sigma \alpha \nu, \nu, \varepsilon \nu$ | $\tau \omega \sigma \alpha \nu, \nu \tau \omega \nu$ |  |  |


| D. 1 | $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ | $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\tau \nu \nu$ | $\tau \nu \nu$ | $\tau 0 \nu$ |
| 3 | $\tau o \nu$ | $\tau \eta \nu$ | $\tau \omega \nu$ |

Class II. Objective.

| Orders. <br> S. 1 | 1. Prim. $\mu \alpha \iota$ | 2. Seco $\mu \eta \nu$ | 3. Imp. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4. Inf. } \\ & \sigma \vartheta \alpha \iota \end{aligned}$ | 5. Part. <br> N. $\mu \varepsilon \nu \circ$ s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | ${ }_{\sigma} \alpha \iota, \alpha, \iota$ | oo, o | -0, 0 |  | $\mu \dot{\prime} \dot{\prime} \eta$ |
| 3 | $\tau \alpha \iota$ | \% | $\sigma \vartheta \omega$ |  | $\mu \varepsilon \nu 0 \nu$ |
| $\text { P. } \begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mu \varepsilon \vartheta \alpha, \mu \varepsilon \sigma \vartheta \alpha \\ & \sigma \vartheta \varepsilon \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mu \varepsilon \vartheta \alpha \\ & \sigma \vartheta \varepsilon \end{aligned}$ | $\sigma \vartheta \varepsilon$ |  | G. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \circ v$ $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \eta \eta{ }^{\prime}$ |
| 3 | $\nu \tau \alpha \iota$ | $\nu \tau 0$ | $\sigma \vartheta \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$ |  |  |

D. $1 \mu \varepsilon \vartheta \alpha, \mu \varepsilon \vartheta \circ \rho \nu \quad \mu \varepsilon \vartheta \alpha$
$2 \sigma \vartheta \circ \nu \quad \sigma \vartheta \circ \nu \sigma \vartheta 0 \nu$
$3 \sigma \vartheta \begin{gathered} \\ \sigma\end{gathered} \sigma \eta \nu \quad \sigma \vartheta \omega \nu$

# § 284．VII．Active Voice of the 

| Present． | Imperfect． | Future． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ind．S． 1 ßoulzúm | éßoúlıvov | $\beta u v \lambda \varepsilon v ́ \sigma \omega$ |
| 2 ßoulをúzıs | हßßoúdzvะ¢ | Boulzúceıs |
| 3 ßou入をข์์ı |  |  |
|  |  | ßоиไ\＆v́боиєข |
|  |  |  |
| 3 ßoulsviovaı | Eßoúlevov | $\beta$ ®ovizv́aovaı |
| D． $2 \beta$ ßovגをv́ยrov 3 | दُßovגะย́ยтov <br>  | $\beta$ ¢ovגrv́бsтov |
| Subj．S． 1 ßoulvvím |  |  |
| 2 ßoulvéns |  |  |
| 3 Boulcuin |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| $2 \beta$ ¢оид\＆únt\＆ |  |  |
| 3 ßovlevmou |  |  |
| D． 2 ßou入をúpiov |  |  |
| Opt．S． 1 ßovגをv́oıцı |  | ßovarv́voцut |
| 2 ßovגzvoos |  | ßovlıv́ools |
| 3 ßovhrvúo |  | $\beta$ ®ovivv́бoi |
|  |  |  |
| 2 ßoulvéoute |  | Boulvévoute |
| 3 ßovגrvoızv |  |  |
| D． 2 ßoukzv́outov |  | $\beta$ ¢oudzúqoutov |
| 3 ßoulevoít ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |

Imp．S． 2 ßov́ $\lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon$
3 ßovגをvét
P． 2 ßоu入\＆v́ยtє
3 ßovไรvย่ $\tau \omega \sigma \alpha$ ， ßovגをvóvтшข
D． 2 ßoulzv́ยrov
3 ßovגをvغ́zav
Infin．$\quad \beta o v a \varepsilon v \varepsilon \iota \nu$
Part．$\quad$ ouvizv́فv



Regular Verb $\beta$ oudev́v，to plan，to counsel．

| Aorist． | Perfect． | Pluperfect． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \＆̇ßov́dzuca | $\beta$ ¢ßоv́дยvxa |  |
| ＇̇ßovidzvoas | $\beta \varepsilon \beta 0$ v́dzux ${ }_{\text {c }}$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\beta \varepsilon \beta 0 v \lambda \varepsilon$ v́x $\alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu$ |  |
|  | $\beta \varepsilon \beta$ оиไzúx $\alpha \tau$ |  |
|  |  |  $\varepsilon \beta \varepsilon \beta$ oudzúx $\varepsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$ |
| $\varepsilon$ हßov $\lambda$ sv́acctov <br> ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\beta} \beta \circ v \lambda \varepsilon v \sigma \alpha ́ \tau \eta \nu$ |  |  <br> $\varepsilon \beta \varepsilon \beta$ ои $\frac{1}{} \varepsilon v x \varepsilon i \tau \eta \nu$ |

ßovдをúvo
ßovגとv́ans
ßovגะv́ợ



ßovizv́aŋtov
$\beta$ ov $2 \varepsilon$ v́б $\alpha \iota \mu \iota$





ßov2\＆v́б人utov
ßovגとvaxitๆข
$\beta$ oúdzvoov
ßovגєvoót $\omega$

$\beta$ ßovגعvбót $\omega \sigma \sigma \alpha$ ，

ßovגをv́б人tov
$\beta$ ßuдعuбútuv
$\beta$ रudzṽб $\alpha \iota$
$\beta$ ßuldvúбūs
$\beta \varepsilon \beta o v \lambda \varepsilon v x \varepsilon \varepsilon^{2} \alpha \downarrow$
$\beta \varepsilon \beta 0 v \lambda \varepsilon v x \omega$ ต́s
§ 28\％．Labial．2．Aeític，to leave．

## Active Voice．

| Ind． | Present． | Imperfect． <br>  | Future． | 2 Perfect． <br> $\lambda$ ह́ $\lambda 0 \iota \pi \alpha$ | 2 Pluperfect． <br> ह่ं $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda о i ́ \pi \varepsilon \iota \nu$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\lambda \varepsilon i \pi \omega \omega$ |  | $\lambda \varepsilon i \psi \omega$ |  |  |
| Subj． | 1． $8 i \pi \omega$ |  |  |  |  |
| Opt． | $\lambda \varepsilon і \pi о \iota \mu \iota$ | $\lambda \varepsilon i \psi o \iota \mu \iota$ |  |  |  |
| Imp． | $\lambda \varepsilon і \pi \overline{ }$ |  |  |  |  |
| Inf． | $\lambda \varepsilon i \pi \varepsilon \iota \nu$ | $\lambda \varepsilon i \psi \varepsilon \iota \nu$ <br> $\lambda \varepsilon i \psi \omega \nu$ |  |  |  |
| Part． | $\lambda \varepsilon i \pi \omega \nu$ |  |  |  |  |
| Aorist II． |  |  |  |  |  |
| S． 1 | Ind． | Subj． | Opt． | Imp． | Inf． |
|  | ${ }_{\text {E }}$ ？ 2 ıTov | $\lambda i \pi \omega$ | $\lambda i \pi о \iota \mu \iota$ |  | $\lambda \iota \pi \varepsilon$ ยัข |
|  | ${ }^{\text {che }}$ ¢ $\downarrow \pi \varepsilon ¢$ | גimits | גíлoıs | $\lambda i \pi \varepsilon$ |  |
| P． $\begin{array}{r}3 \\ 1 \\ 2\end{array}$ |  | $\lambda i \pi \eta$ | ділоь | $\lambda_{\iota \pi \varepsilon \text { ċ }}$ | Part． |
|  |  | $\lambda i \pi \omega \mu$ ¢ |  |  | дıла́v |
|  | हो $\lambda i \pi \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ | $\lambda i \pi \eta \tau \varepsilon$ |  | גіл | $\lambda \iota \pi<\tilde{v} \sigma \alpha$ |
| D． $\begin{array}{r}2 \\ 3 \\ 3\end{array}$ |  | $\lambda i \pi \omega \sigma \iota$ | $\lambda i \pi<\iota \varepsilon \nu$ |  | $\tau \omega \nu$ גıлóv |
|  | $\varepsilon$ ¢าinetov | גiлท | גітоьтоv <br> лıлоі́тท | 入iлєтоу | גıtóvios |
|  | ย̇ไル | $\lambda \iota \pi$ оitף |  | $\lambda \iota \pi \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \nu$ |  |

Middle and Passive Voices．

| Ind． | Present． | Future Mid． |  | Perfect． | Aorist Pass． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\lambda \varepsilon і т о \mu<\iota$ | $\lambda \varepsilon і \psi о \mu \propto \iota$ |  | $\lambda \varepsilon$＇$\varepsilon є \iota \mu \mu \iota$ | $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\varphi} \vartheta \eta \eta \nu$ |
| Subj． | $\lambda \varepsilon i \pi \omega \mu \mu \iota$ | $\lambda \varepsilon \iota \psi \circ i \mu \eta \nu$ |  |  |  |
| Opt． | $\lambda \varepsilon \iota \pi o i \mu \eta \nu$ |  |  |  | $\lambda \varepsilon \iota \varphi \vartheta \varepsilon i \eta \nu$ |
| Imp． | $\lambda \varepsilon i \pi<u$ |  |  | $\lambda \dot{\text { che }}$ ¢ıu\％ | $\lambda \varepsilon i \varphi \vartheta \eta \eta \tau$ |
| Inf． | $\lambda \varepsilon i \pi \varepsilon \sigma \vartheta \uparrow \downarrow$ |  <br> $\lambda \varepsilon \iota \nprec о ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 \varsigma$ |  |  | $\lambda \varepsilon \iota \varphi \vartheta$ 的 $\nu \alpha \iota$ |
| Part． | $\lambda \varepsilon \iota \pi o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu о$ ¢ |  |  | $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \iota \mu \mu \dot{v}$ ขоs | $\lambda \varepsilon \iota \varphi \vartheta \varepsilon i^{\prime}$ |
| Ind． | Imperfect． | 3 Future． <br> $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i \psi о \mu \alpha \iota$ |  | Pluperfect． | Future Pass． |
|  | Aorist II．Middle． |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ind． | Subj． | Opt． | Imp． | Inf． |
| S． 1 |  | $\lambda i \pi \omega \mu \alpha \iota$ | $\lambda \iota \pi о і \dot{\mu} \eta \nu$ |  | $\lambda \iota \pi \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \vartheta \vartheta \propto \iota$ |
|  | ¢иitov | $\lambda i \pi \eta$ | діло | 入ıлой |  |
| 3 | हौiл | $\lambda i \pi \eta \tau \alpha \iota$ | $\lambda i \pi \%$ | $\lambda \iota \pi \varepsilon ์ \sigma \vartheta \omega$ | Part． |
| P． 1 |  | $\lambda \iota \pi \omega \mu_{\mu \varepsilon \vartheta \%}$ | रııло |  | גıло́ив ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |
| 2 |  | $\lambda i \pi \eta \sigma \vartheta \varepsilon$ | 2íno | \％$\lambda i \pi \varepsilon \sigma \vartheta \varepsilon$ |  |
| 3 |  | $\lambda i \pi \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ | діло | －$\lambda \iota \pi \varepsilon ์ \sigma \vartheta \omega \sigma$ | $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \vartheta \omega \nu$ |
| D． 2 |  | $\lambda i \pi \eta \sigma \vartheta$ ov | $\lambda i \pi \%$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\lambda \iota \pi о$ | $\eta \nu \lambda ı \pi \varepsilon ์ \sigma \vartheta \omega \nu$ |  |

(ans




[^0]:    * De Gorgia Leontino Commentatio. Halle. 1828.
    $\dagger$ This is asserted by the author of the prolegomena to the Rhetoric of Hermogenes, (in Walz's Collection, Vol. 4, 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."

[^1]:    * See Spengel, u. s. p. 81.

[^2]:    * This is said by the commentator on Hermog. u. s., by Olympiodor. apud Routh, p. 562, and other late writers.

[^3]:    * It is edited by Foss, in his Commentatio before mentioned.

[^4]:    * In the proœmium to Philostrat. vitæ Sophist. another Chærephon, as we are there expressly told, is brought into connexion with Gorgias. He
    
    
     rooov́rovs фúsı. I have seen the opinion somewhere expressed, that the story was first told of this Chærephon ; the declaration of Philostrat not= withstanding.

[^5]:    * For some observations on the time and place of the dialogue, see Appendix I.

[^6]:    * 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."

[^7]:    * 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 bas 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 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 rhetoricians. If a brave man of weak body should have beaten and stripped of his garment a strong but cowardly man, add the case be brought before a court, neither ought to tell the truth ; the bofitrd 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

[^8]:    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.

    * Comp. Aristot. Ethic. Eudem. 1, 5, '̇สл।
    

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

[^10]:    * 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.
    
     dialogue without naming it. He begins with saying, that rhetoric is $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i-$ $\sigma \tau \varrho \circ \emptyset 0 s \tau \tilde{\eta} \delta_{1} \alpha \lambda_{\varepsilon \kappa \tau \iota r \tilde{q}}$. In speaking of its abuse he says, "it tries to put
    
     rhetoricians is ascribed to ignorance, or vanity, or other human reasons (1.2.7) ; and doubtless he joined with Plato in condemning the sophistical rhetoric of the preceding age. (Comp. 1. 1.3.) But when he says, that the judge himself ought to know, whether a thing is just or not, and not learn it from the parties, whose only duty is to discuss the fact, it must be regarded, not only as opposing Plato's views (454, B.), but as a condemnation of the Athenian and every other system, where the judges were ignorant.

[^11]:    * Comp. Repub. 2. 379, B. "Is not God truly good, and ought he not to be spoken of as such ? Certainly. But nothing good is harmful. Is it? I think not. Can what is not harmful, then, do harm? By no means. Does that which does no harm do any evil ( naxóv $\pi_{\imath}$ )? 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 (wं@!' $\left.\lambda_{(\mu 0 \nu}\right)$ ? Yes. Is it, then, the cause of well-being ( $\varepsilon \dot{i} \pi \rho_{\alpha} \gamma^{\prime}\left(\alpha_{s}\right)$ ? Yes." etc.

[^12]:     a very striking passage Plato ascribes all the wrong actions of men. Leges
     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 every thing; and, being unwilling to commit 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

[^13]:    * The philosopher Archelaus, who was, perhaps, an Athenian and a scholar of Anaxagoras, taught rò סírany Eĩvaı xaì rò aíax ̧̀̀ où púres $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ уó $\mu \omega$. This principle is admirably ridiculed in the Clouds, 1421 , seq. Plato refers to it in a striking passage, Leges 10. 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.

[^14]:    * This may be regarded as the notion of the $\dot{\alpha}$; aió, the optimates, which was somewhat in vogue at the time, only a little altered.

[^15]:    * Comp. Philebus, (an important dialogue, in which the nature of the good and the pleasant is closely examined,) 46, A., B.
    $\dagger$ Comp. Philebus, 55, B., " and, besides, to be compelled to say, that a man who feels grief is bad when he feels it, though he be the best of all men, and that one who is glad, the more he is so, at the time when he is so, is the more virtuous."

[^16]:    * In a fine passage, Leges, 2.663, 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 according 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.

[^17]:    * For $\sigma \omega \emptyset \varrho o \sigma$ ún , comp. Repub. 4.430, D. It is there compared to a
    
     the soul to the better. Ritter observes, (2.474,) that the expression $\sigma \omega \varrho \varrho o \sigma$ úvn 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 סirasooúvy.

[^18]:    * See Appendix, No. II.

[^19]:    * Comp. Appendix, II.

[^20]:    * Schleiermacher thinks, that this is aimed at Aristippus, who, by taking pay for his instructions, brought reproach upon the Socratic philosophers. The best account of the remunerations given to the Sophists, which I have met with, is contained in Welcker's Essay on Prodicus, his Life and Writings, in Welcker and Näke's Rheinisches Museum, 1. 22 seq.

[^21]:    * 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.

[^22]:    * 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 Ardiæus was. "Now this Ardiæus was a tyrant in a Pamphylian city a thousand years before, and had slain his aged father and his elder brother, besides doing, as was said, many other unhallowed deeds. The person so asked replied, said the informant, ' He is not come, nor can he hereafter come hither.' Among the frightful spectacles that we saw, this was one, continued he: When we were near the 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, endeavoured to ascend. Thereupon, wild men, said he, all fiery to look upon, who stood by, when they heard the bellow, picked out and carried off a part of the transgressors ; but Ardiæus 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 mouth 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!

[^23]:    * Comp. Muenscher, Dogmengeschichte, Vol. II. § 298.

[^24]:    * 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. II. Sec. 1. p. 38 of his second ed., Ast's in his work on Plato's life and writings, p. 133, Socher's in his similar work, (Munich, 1820,) p. 237, in which he is polemical towards Ast. C. F. Hermann's is contained in his Introd. to Plato, (Heidelberg, 1838-9, the second vol. I have not seen, p. 476 , and Schleiermacher's - the critic to whom the thorough understanding of Plato owes most - in Dobson's translation of his prefaces. While I am upon this subject, let me say, that, in this translation, Schleiermacher is too often traduced (traduire), and too seldom done into English. His style, indeed, offers serious difficulties to a translator; 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

[^25]:    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 French translator of parts of 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 gross carelessness can free the translator.

[^26]:    * 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.

[^27]:    * Stallb. has ${ }^{2} \rho(\underset{c}{\tilde{c}}$ in his second edition.

[^28]:    "Which, like a wounded snake, drags its slow length along,"

