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## - PREFACE.

This edition of the Apology of Socrates and the Crito is based upon Dr. Christian Cron's eighth edition, Leipzig, 1882. The Notes and Introduction here given have in the main been confined within the limits intelligently drawn by Dr. Cron, whose commentaries upon various dialogues of Plato have done and still do so much in Germany to make the study of our author more profitable as well as pleasanter. No scruple has been felt, however, in making changes. I trust there are few if any of these which Dr. Cron might not himself make if he were preparing his work for an English-thinking and English-speaking public.

No editor of Plato in England or America can escape the influence of Dr. Jowett's labors upon Plato; certainly not one who owes so much to Dr. Jowett's teaching and friendship as I do. This is a debt which, because it is contracted unconsciously for the most part, can hardly be adequately acknowledged. Riddell's valuable edition has suggested many changes and additions in the Notes, and Stallbaum has been assiduously consulted.

The Appendix to the Introduction differs very materially from the corresponding portion of Dr. Cron's book. There as elsewhere I have been constantly advised and as constantly enlightened by my kind friend and former teacher, Professor W. W. Goodwin. But this list of my creditors must necessarily remain incomplete, for I cannot mention those who have helped me most; nor can I record here the names of all my pupils, past and present, whose needs have been my guide and my impulse in preparing this book.

The Text is substantially that of Dr. Cron's edition; where there is alteration, reasons are given in the Critical Appendix. In no case have the illustrative citations of the German commentary been inconsiderately omitted; so far as possible, indeed, further citations have been made. The dramatists, especially Euripides, have been constantly drawn upon for new citations. It is easy to underrate the importance of Euripides to the reader of Plato; it is impossible to overstate in the interests of higher scholarship the desirability of having even the youngest students of Greek letters discipline themselves in the reading and heeding of citations offered to illustrate their author.

LOUIS DYER.
Harvard University,
July, 1885.

## INTRODUCTION.

The endowment of philosophical thought with a beautiful form 1 of its own was the last literary triumph of Greece. Guided by a wonderful law of growth, the Greeks, before dealing with philosophy, had already displayed in the elaboration of various kinds of literature their singular susceptibility to beauty. Epic and lyric composition first ran their full course and then the drama succeeded them. Indeed not poetry only but also history and oratory preceded philosophy, for when the drama was perfect they were nearly so. Philosophy, meanwhile, still lacked an outward form for the expression of what she was bound to say. This lack involves more than a question of clothing: the body itself of Greek thought was as yet but imperfectly developed. Since thought (ratio) is the soul of which the body is utterance (oratio), we cannot wonder at finding a single Greek word ( $\lambda$ óyos) for both, nor can we fail to see that the soul of philosophy was not full-grown until it had fashioned for itself a body in which to stand forth free and independent.

The merest glance at the history of philosophy ${ }^{1}$ justifies this 2 statement. Greek philosophy first gave signs of life in the cosmogonies and theogonies of early poets who were anything but

[^0]five volumes, i. and ii. "The Pre-Socratic Philosophy," iii. "Socrates and the Socratic Schools," iv. "Plato and the Older Academy," v. "The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics." (4) F. Ueberweg, Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie des Alterthums, History of Philosophy from Thales to the present time, Vol. I. "Ancient Philosophy." (5) G. H. Lewes's Biographical History of Philosophy. (6) J. F. Ferrier's Lectures. (7) The best book for young students is $J$. B.
philosophers; and even those famous worthies, the seven wise men, belong rather to the history of politics and civilization in general, than to the special history of philosophy. The name of Thales, one of the wise seven, stands at the beginning in Greek philosophy. He, and with him his fellow-townsmen and successors, Anaximander and Anaximenes, asked this question: What is that something out of which everything in Nature grows and is made? At Miletus, a town whose political and intellectual rigor gave it preëminence among the Ionian colonies in Asia Minor, these three men lived and sought for something omnipresent and unchanging, for the real substance which underlies the unceasing surface-changes offered to man's senses in the world. They all found this in elementary matter of some description. Thales described it as water, Anaximander as tò änetpov, the cnlimited. ${ }^{1}$ Anaximenes called it arr. But this elementary matter no one of the three opposed to Spirit; for the opposition of "spiritual" and " material," or of "matter" and " mind" came much later. 'Io the Milesian philosophers matter was a something which, if not divine, was instinct with divine energy.
3 Yet a far less material notion of this permanent something underlying all change was undoubtedly arrived at by the Pythagoreans. Born at Samos, Pythagoras emigrated to Croton, where about 530 в.c. he founded the half religious and half political society which bore his namë. These Pythagoreans believed that number was the essence of things, the permanent and real part of the world, or, to give their second way of putting the doctrine, that the elements of numbers are the elements of things. This doctrine admits of application not only to the physical world, but also to

Mayor's Sketch of Ancient Philosophy from Thales to Cicero. Cambridge, 1881. Pitt Press Scries. Special works on Plato are: (1) K. F. Hermann, Geschichte und System der Platonischen Philosophie. (2) Steinhart, Einleitung zu Platon's Sämmtlichen Werken, uibersetzt von $H$. Müller, und Platons Leben. (3) Susemihl, die genetische Entwickelung der Platonischen Philo-
sophie, 2 Theile. (4) The Dialogues of I'lato translated into English by B. Jowett. (5) Grote, Plato and the other companions of Sokrates.

1 Matter stripped of limits or boun-dary-lines; a something which, being everything and anything, is, according as it is limited in one way or another, "everything by turns and nothing long."
the moral world, - to the whole field of human action. ${ }^{1}$ But the Pythagoreans framed no philosophy of right and wrong. They contented themselves with a few practical maxims which were useful in the work of their society. Among the various doctrines attributed to Pythagoras and his school, we can with certainty connect only one with Pythagoras himself. He certainly maintained the theory of the Transmigration of Souls. ${ }^{2}$ Philolaus, probably an elder contemporary of Socrates and Democritus, first stated the tenets of this school in writing. He came to Thebes, where he taught, nearly at the same time with Lysis, his wellknown brother-Pythagorean. Of the book by Philolaus entitled חifpl $\Phi$ v́r $\epsilon \omega$, such fragments as have been preserved are collected by Boeckh, ${ }^{3}$ and supply an invaluable source for the history of the old-school Pythagoreanism. Of the later Pythagoreans Archytas of Tarentum, who lived in the fourth century b.c., is the most noteworthy. He distinguished himsslf in politics and in mathematics.

The Pythagoreans approached a comparatively spiritual conception of nature, but the Eleatics went further in the same direction. Xenophanes of Colophon, the reputed originator of this new doctrine, was probably a contemporary of Pythagoras. Looking upon the world as a whole, he maintained that the All is the One, and that the One is God. This utterance implies a deep-seated moral conviction that God is perfection. Parmenides, who was born about 515 в.c. ${ }^{4}$ at Elea, a Phocaean colony in Italy, first devel-

1 Number is the law and the bond that holds the world together; everything, if we are to know it, must be numbered, i.e. odd or even. Odd numbers are limited, even numbers are unlimited, and all cases of opposition are, as it were, cases of the opposition of odd to even so that the following list of opposites may be made кaтà ouavot久iav, under two heads:-

| (A) (B) | (A) | (B) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Limited. Unlimited. | Rest | Motion. |
| Odd . . . Eren. | Straigh | Crooked. |
| One . . . Many. | Light | Darkness. |
| Right . . Left. | Good | Bad. |
| Male . . . Female. | Square | Oblong |

${ }^{2}$ Cf. The Merchant of Venice, Act IV. Scene I. 130 ff . ; also Ovid, Metam. XV. 165 ff.
${ }^{3}$ Philolaos des Pythagoreers Lehren nebst den Bruchstiicken seines Werkes, von August Bocckh. Berlin, 1810. The authenticity of these fragments has recently been called in question.
${ }^{4}$ To fix this date $c f$. Plato's Theaetetus, p. 183 e , and Parmenides, p. 127 b , where it is said that Socrates, in early youth, saw both Zeno and Parmenides, and that the latter was a very old man. The age of Parmenides was sixty-five, while Zeno's is placed at
oped the doctrines of Xenophanes, saying that what has not Being but is many does not exist. He maintained the Oneness of all that is, calling it Being, pure and simple. Following Xenophanes, Parmenides set forth his doctrine in a long didactic poem in epic verse. Zeno supported this theory by indirect-demonstration, pointing out the contradictions in which we are involved by maintaining the opposite view, that what is many has Being or exists. ${ }^{1}$ Finally, Melissus of Samos, well known as a Samian general in the revolt of that island from Athens, about 440 в.c., accepted the views of Parmenides, and, unlike Zeno, argued directly ${ }^{2}$ that Being is eternal, infinite, one and unchangeable. ${ }^{3}$

The physical first cause of Pythagoreanism suggests the possibility of a systematic theory of right and wrong, that is of Ethics. ${ }^{4}$ The Eleatic first cause gives promise of a coming system of philosophic reasoning, of Dialectic. For all this we must not call Zeno the originator of Dialectic. Any inclination to do so ought to disappear after a consideration of his method in controversial reasoning and proof. He argues, not to win truth from the heart of his facts, but to defend a ready-made doctrine and to thrust it upon those whose attention he gains. At its best this is rhetoric, at its worst it is sophistry.
5 Conflicting authorities leave us uncertain whether it was before or after the completer statement of the Eleatic doctrines by Parmenides, that Heraclitus of Ephesus flatly contradicted the saying
forty. This is not history, but it gives a chronological clue.
1 Assert that the many things seen in the world really exist, and you must admit that they are at the same time limited and limitless. For if these things are real there must be a definite sum of them, not more and not less. Hence they are limited. But they are also limitless; because, taking their definite sum and subdividing it as often as we please, we still can go on with the subdivision indefinitely and without limit.
${ }^{2}$ If there is no Being, why do we
talk of anything as being? If there is Being, either it always existed or it came into existence at some time. If it came into existence it must have grown out of something of which we could have said it is or it is not. Out of that which is not nothing can grow, therefore Being can only have grown out of Being.
${ }^{3}$ Fragmenta philosophorum Graecorum collegit recensuit vertit F. G. A. Mullachius. Parisiis, 1860.

* Cf. the placing of "good" and "bad" on the Pythagorean list of pairs, p. 3, note 1 above.
of his older contemporary Xenophanes that the One admits neither motion nor change. Heraclitus is said to have flourished about the sixty-ninth Olympiad, 500 b.c. The elaborate superstructure of his teaching rested upon the following statement: "Everything is moving like a stream, and nothing stands still; all things are forever coming into existence and ceaselessly flowing away. The world was from the beginning, and always will be, ever-living fire, kindling by fixed degrees and by fixed degrees dying down. Everything has its price in terms of Fire, and Fire pays for the world as gold buys goods and goods are sold for gold." 'The phraseology here used abundantly shows that Heraclitus, in speaking of fire as he does, is not following the older Ionic philosophers by taking his turn at describing anew a permanent substratum in their sense. Under the veil of his. oracular words the meaning is given as it were in a parable. Ever-living Fire stands for the restless impulse which underlies the process of becoming or transformation. This process he also calls the upward and the downward way, meaning the constant shifting of things growing up and dying down. This he thought was the common life in all Nature. Such was the picture which he drew of the world. In the same vein Heraclitus said, "The father of all things is war," meaning by war the united play of opposites or things contradictory. "Concord," he said, "is the daughter of strife."

By making his system account for the world of sensible things 6 Heraclitus undoubtedly improves upon the Eleatics. And this, too, in spite of his substantial agreement with them in certain leading conclusions. In the first place, both schools agree in rejecting all sensible impressions as wholly untrustworthy ; reaching this conclusion, however, from points of view diametrically opposed. This agreement is most obvious in their respective accounts of particular (sensible) things. Heraclitus's stream of ceaseless transformation or Becoming allows to no single thing an instant of real and permanent existence, and thus practically relegates all things that we see in the world to a state of non-existence. Parmenides regards the sensible world as non-existent, opposing to it pure existence one and indivisible. But the Eleatics provide no means
for connecting pure Being on the one hand with Not-being on the other, and, unlike Heraclitus, they cleave the world in twain and find no way of uniting the two parts. In the second place, Parmenides teaches that outside of the thought of the One there is no true thinking but only deceptive 'opining,' while Heraclitus urges
 alone has understanding. This understanding the 'individual' shares only in proportion to the degree of its submission to and submersion in the 'universal.' Here is substantial agreement, but here again Heraclitus takes a wider view than Parmenides, and accordingly makes a fuller provision for the facts.
7 Though Heraclitus did not follow the example of Xenophanes and Parmenides, but wrote his work ${ }^{1}$ in prose, he expressed himself most obscurely. It was on this account that the ancients themselves nicknamed him of okotevós, the man of durkness. We hear that Socrates, when asked by Euripides for his opinion of Heraclitus's book, gare this answer: "All that I could fathom was excellent: what I could not fathom is no doubt the same, only we had better send to Delos for a man to do the diving." Aristotle says that Heraclitus is obscure because it is impossible to decide how his words are to be combined, and of the parts of his book that are preserved not a few justify this statement. For instance, a passage

 satisfactorily answered. Shall we put a comma before or after kal e $\theta \in \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon$ ? How are the various words in the sentence to be construed?
8 Empedocles of Agrigentum stated his doctrines in a didactic poem after the manner of Xenophanes and Parmenides. He chose the epic form, and his work was the model after which Lucretius wrote his De rerum natura. Empedocles flourished in the eightyfourth Olympiad, near the middle of the fifth century b.c. This date is confirmed by the report that he visited the newly founded

[^1]tempted restoration of the original sequence of the fragments, Heraklit von Ephesus, by Dr. P. Schuster, Leipzig, 1873. See also Heracliti Ephesii reliquae, ed. I. Bywater, London, 1877.
colony of Thurii. His system is closely connected with the Eleatic as well as with the Heraclitan scheme of things, and also shows traces of Pythagorean influence. Starting from the first principle, that Not-being can no more come to be than Being can decay and cease to be, he concludes that what men call growth and decay are respectively cases of the combination and of the disintegration of primal elements. His four elements are the familiar ones, to each of which his imaginative genius gives a mythological name. Fire, described as flaming Aether, he names Zeus; Air, Hera; Earth, Aidoneus; Water, Nestis. These four elements were at the beginning inseparably united within the eternal Globe ( $\Sigma$ daîpos), which in all its parts was of like consistency. But outside of this globe ruled Strife (Neîos), who finally invaded it, causing complete disintegration. The resisting impulse of Love ( $\Phi \downarrow \lambda(a)$ reacted from within and brought about a partial reintegration. This reaction and reintegration gave rise to the frame of the world (Kó $\sigma \mu \mathrm{os}$ ) with all the particular things which it comprises. In his detailed account of sensible perception, feeling, and intellectual apprehension of the good and the bad, Empedocles applies his fundamental principle with an unsteady hand, and is often involved in contradictions. His religious theories are set forth in a separate work called Käappol.

Neither the date nor the place of the birth of Leucippus can 9 be determined, but we know that he founded the school of the Atomists. Democritus of Abdera, born in the eightieth Olympiad, about 460 b.c., was certainly his younger contemporary, and probably his disciple. Upon Democritus devolved the task of developing this new system of thought. ${ }^{1}$ The Atomists were unwilling to say either with Heraclitus (1) Being is a process of constant change, or with Parmenides (2) Being immovable and unchangeable exists apart from all particular things, but like Empedocles they said (3) A number of original elements exists. Instead, however, of four elements, they supposed an unlimited number of atons (ai äтouoı, sc. oưolaı or toéar). These indivisible Atoms were in-

[^2]menta," Berol. 1843. Also his work referred to above, p. 4, note 3 .
wardly alike in essence, and so small as to be indistinguishable; they differed in shape, arrangement, and position. Their combination means growth ; their separation means decay and destruction; the difference in their situation and arrangement is at the bottom of such variety and change as we see in the world. But why, we may ask, should these Atoms combine or separate? Because, says the Atomist, necessity forces them to move. This necessary motion comes, not from any source or cause beyond and above them, but is derived partly from an original rotary motion, a twist which they take at the start, and partly from their constant collision one with another and the consequent reaction. But to move at all they need room to move in. This room is a vacuum which offers no resistance; it is free and empty space or void, while the atoms are space compacted and filled full, or fulness. Reality consists solely of these Atoms, and hence they are Being, while the Void is Not-being. And yet Not-being in this sense has a relative existence. Therefore the Atomists did not hesitate to say: Being no more is than Not-being. By Atoms not the physical world of the senses only, but also the soul, is explained. The body is the cabin, oкrivos, of the soul, and on this basis an attempt is made to explain mental activity and the life of the soul. Here the shortcomings of the Atomistic explanation of the world show themselves. Still, against the Atomists the point is not well taken that, by necessity, an Atomist must mean chance or what is arbitrary, and all praise is due to the determined logic with which they apply their principle consistently to every detail. Democritus is credited with a number of admirable moral maxims; they express, however, the plain common-sense of a man who means to make the most of life, rather than a matured philosophy of conduct.
10 Anaxagoras of Clazomenae was born in the seventieth Olympiad. about 500 в.c., and thus his birth preceded that of Empedocles and Democritus; but he must be counted as belonging to a maturer phase of thought." When Anaxagoras said: "Order is introduced
${ }^{1}$ Aristotle, Metaphysics A, 3: 'A $\nu \alpha-$ $\xi a \gamma \delta \rho a s . . . \tau \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota k i \alpha \pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho o s ~ \varpi \nu \tau o v-$

 his book $\Pi \epsilon \rho l$ Фú $\sigma \in \omega \bar{s}$ a number of fragments are preserved. Schaubach has
into the All by mind," there was no further use either for the half-mythological forces of Empedocles, or for the blind necessity of the Atomists. And yet, there was much upon which all the three schools would have agreed; Democritus and Empedocles would have welcomed Anaxagoras's dictum, "The Greeks are wrong in believing that there is such a thing as growing to be out of nothing or perishing away into nothing; nothing grows to be and nothing perishes, but all things are the mingling together and the falling apart of elements that really exist. So, therefore, to grow into being is properly to-be-compounded, and to perish is to-fall-apart." These elements that really exist Anaxagoras did not define as Empedocles defined his elements or as the Atomists defined their atoms. He often calls his elements seeds, orípuara, and they have certain determinate qualities which make them the seeds of this, that, or the other particular kind of thing, e.g. gold, wood, bone. Flesh, blood, and bone are respectively combinations of parts, each one of which parts has the peculiar properties of the whole of which it is one part, and the whole has the properties of each of its parts. In speaking of such a whole, as well as of
 part) ; therefore, the whole theory has often been called номоюmeric. In the beginning, the sum of things infinitesimally small and infinite in number, no one of which could be perceived on account of its smallness, lay in a mass together. Finally mind intervened, separating like from unlike and introducing order. The most delicate and purest of essences, mind enters into combination with nothing else ; it understands all things for and by itself, and over all it rules supreme. In such unmistakable terms as these did Anaxagoras set forth the idea of an all-wise and all-powerful essence completely distinct from matter. The words which he chose are no doubt inadequate because borrowed from the domain of the senses, but their import is clear. The fact that he reached this conception of mind gives to Anaxagoras a conspicuous place in the history of Greek philosophy, and yet he hardly knew the
published them: Anaxagorae Clazomenii fragmenta collecta et illustrata, Lips. 1827. Mullach has also put
them into his book. See on Apology, p. 26 d .
full bearing of his discovery. Mind, he says, when in the begin-- ning all things lay in a motionless mass, gave them their first impulse and lent the motion which brought order into all. In other respects Anaxagoras's explanation of nature is materialistic, the same in kind with those of his predecessors and contemporaries. This is what Plato and Aristotle say, and it is of this that they both complain. In order that the conception of mind reached by Anaxagoras might be made fruitful, there was need that it be completely worked out, and for this the foundations of philosophy had to be laid anew. For this necessary work of reconstruction no more favorable place could have been found than Athens. Indeed, it was at Athens, and in the society of its most noteworthy men, especially of Pericles and Euripides, that Anaxagoras himself lived. He was, however, finally accused of atheism and exiled by the enemies of his great friend Pericles. Leaving Athens, he retired to Lampsacus, and there ended his days.
11 After numerous attempts to account for the world of sensible things on a physical basis, the very school of thinkers who sought to explain matter by matter began to feel the need of some first cause which should lie outside of matter and above it. Henceforward the one thing indispensable for the full recognition of such a first cause was a vigorous impulse which, arousing and uplifting the moral energy of national thought, should re-shape Philosophy by the help of this new conception. This required impulse was found in the practical demand, now for the first time made upon philosophers, that they abandon the retirement in which, with little or no reference to what was going on about them, they had up to this time carried on their speculations. ${ }^{1}$ Now the time had come when the world demanded a new departure in education, and now was the opportunity for Philosophy to try her strength. At first this trial seemed to lead rather to destruction than to reconstruction; the wear and tear of practice threatened completely to swallow up all theory. Various tendencies, indeed, the obvious

1 They show no little impatience and disdain of every-day men like ourselves. It matters little to them whether we keep pace with their dis-
cussions or fall behind, - every man of them steadily goes on his chosen way. Plato, Sophist, p. 243 a.
results not a few of them of doctrines previously taught, accomplished nothing but their own destruction. But this very destruction served to point a moral, since it showed that the engrossing aim of sound philosophy must not be to adorn its devotees with irresponsible cleverness and to train their faculties in that kind of intellectual dexterity whose chief reward is success. For it became evident that a moral ideal was required which, in the teaching of the Sophists, was absent. This lack of a freshly grasped and high moral standard, coupled with the effort to turn their disciples into dextrous performers on the stage of life, characterized many different teachers at this time. These teachers were the Sophists, and their teaching is usually called not Sophistry but Sophistic. ${ }^{1}$ This term is accordingly applied to the teaching of men who, in the details of their theories, often had little or nothing in common. Men who appeared as public professors of wisdom called themselves Sophists, and were so called by the public. They gathered about them old and young, and, for a stated fee, gave lectures to hearers fresh from the heat of a keen and active political strife in such branches of knowledge as were likely to interest men so pre-occupied. In short, the practical needs of political life led them to annex the widening territory of rhetoric to the traditional domain of philosophy. They devoted much energy to the art of vigorous speech-writing and of finished speech-making. These were the outward graces which a Sophist used in order to make his teachings and lectures attractive. Rhetoric and Sophistic were sister arts, inseparable from the outset, and for every man who was anxious to find the best market for his proficiency in
${ }^{1}$ Grote, in his History of Greece (ch. 67), is certainly right in rejecting this designation, if it must mean that the teachings and principles of all Sophists were the same or that all of them taught in the same way. The word Sophistic may, however, be said to imply such similarity in methods of teaching and in doctrine as would (i) fairly distinguish the Sophists from Socrates, and (2) lead us to class the

Sophists together. Three negative statements apply to all the Sophists which do not apply to Socrates: first the Sophists did not teach free of charge, second they did not in any strict sense lay foundations for the future development of philosophy, third they did not cast their lot either with their own or with any adopted country.
these arts, Athens, at that time the centre of all the intellectual activity of the day, was a natural place of abode.
12 Among the representatives of the new turn which thought had taken, Protagoras and Gorgias are especially prominent. 'Accordingly, more than all the rest, these two have earned a place in the history of philosophy. Protagoras of Abdera was the first who claimed as his distinguishing title the name of Sophist. ${ }^{1}$ When he was born and when he died ${ }^{2}$ cannot be satisfactorily determined. At all events, he was a contemporary of Socrates, though considerably his elder. ${ }^{3}$ Protagoras, during his long life of seventy jears more or less, made repeated and protracted visits to Athens. He was, however, forced to discontinue them on account of a vote of the Athenian assembly condemning him as an atheist. His philosophical theory was based upo... the dictum of Heraclitus that all things are constantly in a state of flux. But, in applying this principle to human thought and human action, he reached conclusions which were not infrequently opposed to those of the great Ephesian. In place of Heraclitus's छvvòs $\lambda$ óyos he maintained that Man is the measure of all things; of things that are that they are, of things that are not that they are not. ${ }^{4}$ By man he understood man as this or that

[^3]only by the right man; by an ideally perfect man endowed with ideally perfect knowledge. In saying that Protagoras did not mean this ideal man Cron agrees with the following account, translated ( freely) from Plato's Theaetetus, p. 161 c: "In other respects I am charmed with the doctrine of Protagoras that what seems to each man is, but I can never swallow his beginning. Why did he not commence by saying the measure of all things was a hog or a dog-faced baboon or some still worse monster, and that so far as wisdom went he himself was no whit wiser than a tadpole? If each man is his own best judge and all that he decides upon is right and true, how then is Protagoras wise enough to teach the rest of us, and to charge us roundly for it?"
individual. This amounted to cutting away all footing for knowledge, after reducing knowledge to the sensation or sensible perception of a given individual.

Gorgias of Leontini ${ }^{1}$ in Sicily appeared at Athens in 427 b.c., on 13 an embassy from his native town. ${ }^{2}$ His mission was successful, and his brilliant oratory won such golden opinions that large numbers crowded to listen to his show speeches and paid him handsomely for his trouble. Later he revisited Athens and travelled to various places in Greece (Xen. Anab. ii. .6. 16 ff.), always with the same success. It is said that he was a hundred years old when he died. ${ }^{3}$ His philosophical views and method of reasoning were based upon the Eleatic system, and are summed up in the
 or that which is not): "Nothing is; if anything is, it cannot be known; if anything can be known, it cannot be communicated." But the chief concern of Gorgias was the teaching of rhetoric; here he sought to win fame. Still, his instruction seems to have been confined to practical hints in regard to details and he objected to being called a Sophist.

Among the other distinguished Sophists, Hippias of Elis and 14 Prodicus of Ceos were especially famous. Hippias was chiefly noted for his extensive knowledge of genealogy and of mathematical astronomy, ${ }^{4}$ but he also plumed himself upon his miscellaneous accomplishments in various practical directions. Prodicus is best known for his nice discriminations between words of similar meaning, and for his moral lectures. Xenophon (Mem. ii. 1.21) has preserved one of these, the very clever story of the Choice of Heracles.

The bustling activity of these and of other Sophists who had no 15 fixed abiding-place, produced no marked effect upon philosophy beyond making clear the insufficiency of all previous speculation. After a hundred years and more, Greek thought had reached the conclusion that to talk of real truth was idle, and that all knowl-

[^4][^5]edge depends solely upon sensible perception and sensation. So, therefore, knowledge could at most change worse sensations into better ones, - more profitable and pleasanter ones.
16 This doctrine virtually involved the destruction of all philosophy. Therefore Socrates, who won the day against it, is rightly called the deliverer and the new founder of philosophy.
17 Socrates, the son of a sculptor Sophroniscus, ${ }^{1}$ was born at Athens, and as a boy followed his father's occupation. Soon, however, he abandoned sculpture and devoted himself to the profession to which he thought God called him ; this was a continuous warfare carried on against the conceit of sham knowledge in all its forms. Wherever and whenever he met it he was bound to expose sham knowledge as real ignorance. ${ }^{2}$ As for himself, he claimed no knowledge beyond the capital fact that he knew nothing. By this, however, he did not mean that real knowledge was as the Sophists maintained impossible. For though Socrates said that God alone was really wise, his meaning was that the whole duty of man was comprised in the struggle toward that real knowledge which alone gives the power to do right. And just here Socrates declared that all virtues, d.perai, were essentially forms of knowledge, and were based upon the understanding of some class of things. This involved the final identification of virtue in general with understanding. If virtue ${ }^{3}$ is understanding, it follows that no one does wrong knowingly; men sin only in so far as they are in ignorance of what is right. A man who knows the right, who has real knowledge, will do the right, for then that knowledge will be stronger within him than any desire. Naturally the standard of this genuine knowledge is not arbitrary, nor is it borrowed from anything outside of the soul. Socrates based all knowledge upon necessary obedience to the commandment inscribed upon the temple at

[^6]Socrates' conception of $\grave{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta}$, the old notion so manifest in Homer ( $c f$. Doederlein, Hom. Gloss., p. 536) of 'skill' or cleverness was still very strong. The German word 'Tugend' and its corresponding idea are similarly connected with 'Tauglichkeit' and 'Tüchtigkeit.'
 of Socrates's explanation of this. ${ }^{1}$

Two questions arise concerning Socrates's idea of knowledge 18 as the foundation of righteousness. (r) What constitutes this knowledge? (2) What is the field in which it works? Xenophon, Plato, and Aristotle vie with one another in declaring that Socrates would always ask about everything under discussion: What is the general idea of which this, that, or the other is a particular instance?
 and then he is a fit guide for his friends; otherwise it is a case of 'the blind leading the blind.' Hence, when Socrates found a man who claimed the possession of knowledge, his test question was, Can you define the thing which you say you know? And he usually found his man incapable of giving the required definition, and accordingly showed up the boasted knowledge as ignorance.

In applying this test, and in taking the steps by which he led up to and determined the definition required, consisted the peculiar method of Socrates. He always began with everyday facts, and then proceeded by the method of question and answer, either (i) to the definition and general idea required, or (2) to the irresistible conclusion that some definition in vogue which he had taken up was wrong. The steps taken in going from a given class of particulars to their universal, which is the general idea including them all, are called $\epsilon_{\pi} \pi a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$, induction. Hence, Aristotle ascribes to Socrates the discovery of the epagogic or inductive method ( $\boldsymbol{\text { ovis }}$ émakrı-
 - hence ópos = definitio).

By the dialectic ( dia $^{2}$ entikí) of Socrates is meant simply his 19 acuteness in so guiding a series of questions and answers that something was finally done toward determining a general conception and reaching some measure of truth. This process required a living issue raised between a man skilled in questioning and some one willing to answer him. But, soon after the day of Socrates,

[^7]Gorgias said: We cannot have real knowledge ; Socrates met this by saying: Before we give up knowledge let us seriously try to know ourselves.
'dialectic' became a philosophical term applied particularly to the more developed and many-sided method of Plato ; indeed, it finally became identified with Plato's logic or theory of ideas. Quite apart from Socrates's dialectic is the controversial art of certain Sophists (àvi入oүккй), for, whereas this controversial art only sought perpetual controversy, the essential peculiarity of the dialectic of Socrates was that it aimed at the understanding of truth.
20 The discussions of Socrates were almost always ethical. Nearly all questions which up to his day had engrossed philosophers he summarily excluded from the field of his investigation. He asked : What is virtue? what is holiness? what is justice? what is courage? And his answer, in every case, was understanding, - the understanding of what is good in reference now to one and now to another class of facts. Courage, for instance, is the understanding of what is good in relation to things terrible and dangerous; and he has courage whose conduct is right in cases of terror and danger. Yet Socrates recognized that the original bent with which the individual is born here disclused itself ; since he saw that, just as one man's body is born stronger than his neighbor's, so one man's soul was born more courageous than his neighbor's. Yet he maintained that every man, be the qualities born in him what they might, could advance in excellence ( $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ́ p \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} v)$ by learning and practice.
21 Such is Socrates's doctrine in its outlines, as Xenophon, Plato, and Aristotle have represented it in their writings. Socrates himself, as is well known, was the author of no books. We have, therefore, no direct statement of his views at first hand. 'The most important authority for his teachings is Xenophon, especially
 ment(arii, Memorabilia). In this work the writer undertakes to defend the memory of his friend and master against the accusations and slanders of all enemies. With this in view, he sets forth all that he can remember of the conversations of socrates. All must be ready to allow that Xenophon, who was nothing if not a man of action, failed to understand Socrates's position in

[^8]The poct's allusion, however, is probably more vague.
the history of Greek philosophy ; he could not adequately appreciate him as a philosopher. But of the man his portrait is invaluable, in spite of this or perhaps on account of this. Writing from a popular point of view, he corrects Plato's ideal representation of the master Socrates, and helps us to the facts about Socrates as he lived and taught. Further, in the judicious remarks scattered here and there through Aristotle's writings, we have always a most welcome supplement, and often a most wholesome corrective; by drawing from all these sources we are enabled to bring our ideal Socrates within the limits of historical fact.

An account of Socrates's theory gives no adequate knowledge 22 of his historical significance. A necessary aid must be sought in some description of his personality, of Socrates during life and Socrates facing death. ${ }^{1}$

It has already been said that Socrates thought his life consecrated 23 to the service of a higher power and his every act the fulfilment of a task laid on him by God. This it was that forbade his following any of the pursuits which engross the majority of men. He was poor, ${ }^{2}$ but his poverty was not so complete as his frugality. The fulfilment of God's command imposed upon him abstention from politics, except in cases where to abstain would be to neglect the plain duties of a citizen. He served as a hoplite in three campaigns, ${ }^{3}$ and showed in battle that he was no mere talker about courage. This same temper, this unterrified obedience to duty, unswerving in the way of right and law, he displayed as one of the senators ${ }^{4}$ and prytanes on the occasion of the memorable popular assembly which illegally condemned the generals victorious at Arginusae. Here he faced the arbitrary caprice of the people with the same strength of mind which made him

1 When Xenophon is used as our authority, it should be remembered that the subtler qualities of such a man as Socrates were likely, either to escape so unimaginative a mind, or, if felt, to be represented inadequately by a writer comparatively destitute of dramatic power. These are just the qualities which distinguish Socrates from all other teachers, and these
are given by Plato alone. Cf. 'Socrates,' a translation of the Apology, Crito, and parts of the Phaedo. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
${ }^{2}$ Apology, p. 23 c and note; also Xen. Mem. I. vi.
${ }^{3}$ Apology, p. 28 e and note; also Laches, pp. $181 \mathbf{a b}, 188 \mathbf{e}$, and Symposium, pp. 219e-221c.
${ }^{4}$ A pology, p. $32 \mathbf{b}$ with note
afterwards ${ }^{1}$ prefer death to a cowardly and unrighteous submission to the thirty tyrants.

## 24

Critias, like Alcibiades, was for a time a disciple of Socrates chiefly for the reason that he expected in that capacity to learn certain useful accomplishments. Later, as the leading spirit among the Thirty, this same Critias undertook to make the habitual occupation of Socrates uncomfortable for him. The conversation between the two is preserved by Xenophon (Mem. i. 2. 31 ff .). The passage is characteristic of both speakers, and should certainly be read by all, for it familiarizes us with the plan of active operations to which Socrates devoted all of his life and energy.

Xenophon tells us that Critias, and with him Charicles who was also an influential member of the Thirty, had been irritated by Socrates's freedom of speech. They pointedly reminded him of the terms of a law which they had promulgated to meet his particular case, and threateningly bade him obey its behests: $\lambda o ́ \gamma \omega v \tau$ téx $\eta \eta v$ $\mu \eta \mathbf{~} \delta \delta \delta a \sigma k \epsilon \nu$, no one shall teach the art of words. It is no matter for surprise that this law should have been aimed at Socrates, for two reasons: first, because of the tendency to classify Socrates as one of the Sophists. Indeed, he seems to have been looked upon simply as the most popular and effective of Sophists, and hence he became for the comic poets the representative Sophist. ${ }^{2}$ The second reasou is, that the words $\lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \omega \omega v \tau^{\prime} \mathrm{X} v \eta$, taken in their widest sense, do apply to Socrates's characteristic way of question and answer, as well as to rhetoric; and yet there were really many outer and palpable marks which distinguished Socrates and his teaching from the Sophists and their art. A Sophist charged for his instruction, and hence would usually teach in some place of private resort; Socrates, since he was the servant

[^9]compares himself with the statues of Silenus (Xenophon, Symposium, ch. 5 ; Plato, Symposium, ch. 33). How then could we expect the comic poets to abstain from caricaturing one so easy to caricature? Anybody could recognize a mask which was meant for Socrates.
of God, would take no man's pay. Hence, he naturally preferred the most public places, such as the market, the gymnasium, a public porch, or some workshop. Being no respecter of persons he was ready to discuss with every man, and eager to share the search for truth with any new comer. The genuineness of this desire for coöperation was undoubted, for he declared himself unable alone to get at any knowledge. 'To exemplify this his homely description of his art as intellectual midwifery ( $\mu \mathrm{\mu} เ ย \cup \tau เ к ท$ ) and his comparison of it with the profession of his mother, the midwife Phaenarete, may be mentioned. ${ }^{1}$ This idea made him protest against being called any man's teacher, indeed he stoutly denied that he had any pupils. As substitutes for these names of teacher and pupil, Xenophon and Plato use words which all of them describe the pursuit of truth on equal and friendly terms.

The chief delight of Socrates was to gather about him young 26 men of good parts who were eager for knowledge. This led him to frequent places where they habitually assembled, such as the palaestra or the gymnasium. No doubt the Thirty bore this in mind when they bade him not to consort with any one under thirty years of age. But Socrates was ready to talk with men of all ages and all stations, no matter where he found them. He was often seen conversing eagerly with workmen, and this led him to draw freely upon their familiar surroundings and occupations for topics and for illustrations. And hence we hear the frequent complaint that he was continually harping upon cobbling, cobblers, carpenters, smiths, and the like. He was considered a bore who repeated the same thing about the same subject ad nauseam; whereas, the Sophists were at infinite pains never to use the same phraseology twice in discussing the same thing. Of course this implied that their attention was riveted upon the way of putting things: they dazzled their hearers and drew from them tumultuous applause, little caring if the enthusiasm lasted but for a moment. But the whole energy of Socrates was absorbed by the central purpose of rousing a right understanding and of implanting a firm and fruitful conviction. That the knowledge itself which Socrates strove for was far other

[^10]than that which the Sophists so glibly taught, is best shown by a contrast between one characteristic attribute of his discourse and theirs. The Sophists made a great flourish of trumpets ( $\dot{e} \pi i \delta \in \epsilon \xi \mathrm{~s})$; they began with a perfectly rounded self-complacency. Socrates began by protesting that he was sure of one thing only, - his own ignorance. Wisdom, he declared, is of God; and this, said he, was the meaning intended by the oracle at Delphi by the words: No man is wiser than Socrates. This self-knowledge is nothing more than a purified form of the genuinely Greek idea of temperance, $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \sigma v i v$. It is based upon the immemorial belief that the gods are jealous and refuse to tolerate men who put themselves upon a pedestal. ${ }^{1}$ The conceit of self-knowledge with which the Sophists were puffed up, Socrates undoubtedly considered a case in point. Against this conceit he waged war with his incomparable irony, ${ }^{2}$ before which all their wisdom became as nothing. He made it plain to them, and to whomsoever it might concern, that all their general notions were confused and worthless. A tempered form of his irony is seen in his treatment of young and enthusiastic votaries of learning. First of all, he helps them to an understanding of their ignorance, but yet he leaves in their souls such a sting as stirs them to an earnest struggle for real insight. Indeed, we have seen that the humility of Socrates's selfmeasurement was by no means incompatible with a fixed determination to win the truth which leads to righteousuess. Socrates said, in short: Let no man call himself a voфьoris, owner of wisdom, but let every man be a фı入óroфos, lorer of wisdom.

There is, indeed, no uncertain ring in the religious tone of Socrates's philosophy. By his conversations ${ }^{3}$ he strove to rouse in 27 others the religious sense, and at the same time he exhibited in his own life a heartfelt piety, rooted in the purest gratitude for the goodness of God, and manifested in the most scrupulous conformity to all the outward rites and observances of public worship. Even the popular practice of consulting oracles and interpreting omens, he did not, according to Xenophon, ${ }^{4}$ reject. He merely sought to confine it

[^11]${ }^{3}$ See Xen. Mem. i. 4 and iv. 3.
${ }^{4}$ Cf. particularly Mem. I. i. 2 sqq., especially 6-9; see also Anabasis iii. 1. 5-7.
to difficulties for dealing with which God had given to man neither the knowledge nor the capacity. In all these cases, Socrates himself was singularly favored in that he possessed a gift sent of God, - a heavenly voice of warning. Whenever this voice spoke within him he knew that what he was about to do would result in harm and that therefore he must abstain from it; when the voice was silent he was the stronger in his purpose and strengthened others in theirs. ${ }^{1}$ Socrates most certainly did not conceive of this voice as an emanation from a special and independent divinity, but as a revelation of the love and the wisdom of God. Such a revelation, he thought, ${ }^{2}$ might well come to any man, though perhaps not in the same way. Still Socrates may have been uncommonly sensitive to this influence, and more conscientious than most men in doing what it prompted. Be this as it may, what we know about the matter serves to prove that his trust in God was exceptional; indeed this is nowhere made clearer than in cases where Socrates did not hear the voice, and yet, without its warning to direct him, was deaf to the clamors of selfish fears which greatly disturb other men, - cases where he did what he knew was right without petty anxiety as to the end.

Intimately connected with this remarkable strength of moral 28 character is the absolute control in which his body was held by his mind. The capital manifestation of this is to be found in the accounts which have been preserved of his 'staying power' while he was engaged in following up a train of thought. The best instance of this Plato gives in the following story of Socrates at the siege of Potidaea. ${ }^{3}$ Early one day a subject of thought occurred to Socrates while he was walking, and he stopped; for twenty-four hours he stood stock-still, because he could not come to any conclusion until
> ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Apol., pp. $31 \mathbf{c d}$ d, 40 ab ; Xen. Mem. i. 2, 1-5. In the Appendix to his edition of the Memorabilia, Breitenbach enters into this whole question. See also Susemihl in Bursian's Jahresbericht I. 5, p. 546, and Zeller II., pp. 69-8.3 of the third edition. Cf. Riddell's Apology, Appendix A, and Cardinal Manning's The Daemon
of Socrates, Longmans and Green, 1872.
${ }^{2}$ Schleiermacher proves this in his note on Apology, p. 27 b , by showing that Plato and Xenophon alike use $\delta a \mu \mu \delta \nu t o \nu$ as an adjective. $C f$. on Apol., p. 31 d.
${ }^{3}$ Sympos.,p. 220 cd; see also, on the credibility of the story, Zeller II.,p.69.
the next morning. In other respects as well his endurance was remarkable: he was hardened to every privation. Winter and summer alike he went barefoot, and always wore clothes of the same texture and thickness. This, in fact, made the rigours of a winter in Thrace tell upon him far less than upon his comrades in arms. ${ }^{1}$ Apart from his soldiering, hardly anything could induce Socrates to leave Athens, as he is made to say himself in the Crito. ${ }^{2}$ As for temperance aud frugality, we have seen that he was remarkable for both.

The outline given above may be regarded as an historically trustworthy account of the character of Socrates. And now we need hesitate no longer in agreeing with the enthusiastic estimate of Socrates given at the end of the Memorabilia. But all this certainly leaves us but ill-prepared for the manner of the great man's 'taking off.' Prosecuted in his declining years, on a most serious charge, he was, after a legal trial, sentenced to death. And all this happened, not during any oligarchical or democratic reign of terror, but at the very time when everybody was admiring the moderate spirit of the newly-restored Athenian democracy. It was shortly after the archonship of Euclides and the deposition of the thirty tyrants by Thrasybulus. As far as history has determined them, the facts about this trial are as follows:-
In the first year of the ninety-fifth Olympiad, whle Laches was archon, and when Socrates had already passed the limit of threescore years and ten, ${ }^{3}$ Meletus, seconded by Anytus and Lyco, came forward with his accusation. In Plato's Euthyphro Meletus is described as an insignificant youth, and in the Apology he is treated with a measure of contempt. Some identify him with the poet Meletus, ${ }^{4}$ others say he was the poet's son, ${ }^{5}$ though ' a chip


[^12]named Meletus, (1) the accuser of Socrates, (2) the poet referred to in the Frogs, (3) the Meletus, cf. Apol., p. 32 cd , who obeyed the thirty, and arrested the unoffending Leon of Salamis, (4) the Meletus of Xen. Hell. ii. 4.36. Frohberger argues against this in the Philol. Anzeiger II. 7.
ax日órevos imply that he was poetically inclined. He led the prosecution, the other two being technically his ovvryopol. It is plain, however; that the substantial man of the three was Anytus, since it was the influence of Anytus which chiefly secured the verdict. ${ }^{1}$ Anytus, who had inherited a handsome property and had filled the highest offices in the commonwealth, was at this particular time one of the most popular men in public life. He had worked with all his might to help Thrasybulus expel the Thirty and to restore the democracy. Not only did he condemn Socrates as being one of the Sophists against all of whom his bitterness was uncompromising, but in addition he owed him an especial grudge. For Socrates, it appears, had made certain indiscreet and irritating comments upon his private affairs. ${ }^{2}$ Lyco is absolutely unknown beyond what is said in the Apology (22 e). There he is represented as a professional speech-maker, and it is reasonable to infer that as such he contributed far more than Meletus toward the success of the prosecution.

The indictment was submitted by Meletus to the äpx ${ }^{\boldsymbol{v}}$ ßacideús, 31 whose jurisdiction covered all cases involving religion. Its formal terms were ${ }^{3}$ Socrates is guilty of not believing in the gods believed in by the state, and also of introducing other new divinities. Moreover, he is further guilty of corrupting the young. The penalty proposed is death. This was an indictment for an offence againstthe state ${ }^{4}$; accordingly it was technically a үpaфท' (public suit), and, as further qualified by the specific charges, a ypaфض d $\sigma \in \beta \in l a s$ (a public suit on the count of impiety).
 $\theta$ ©ovs ov่ $v o \mu{ }^{\prime}(\omega \omega)$ ), it certainly is difficult to see any fact to justify such an accusation, inasmuch as Socrates expressly recognized the
 cerned the worship of the gods ; and, indeed, himself scrupulously

[^13] $\delta a!\mu \delta \nu ı a$ єiбך $\eta o v{ }^{\prime} \mu \in \nu 0 s$ (or $\epsilon i \sigma \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu$ with Xen. Mem. i. 1.1). àठıкє̂̂ $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ кal toùs $\nu$ ย́ous $\delta<a \phi \theta \in i ́ \rho \omega \nu$.
${ }^{4}$ See infra, § 67, and Apol., p. 19 b.
${ }^{5}$ Apol., p. 26 d.
observed all its requirements. ${ }^{5}$ The terms of the second (affirma-
 the much mooted $\delta a u \mu^{\prime} v o v$, - the mysterious communication from God to Socrates. This allegation was a slander, but had it been true could hardly have had much weight at Athens, where the introduction of new divinities was not a crime.
It is, however, probable that the first count was introduced as a foil to the second, and was primarily intended as a means for giving a legal foothold to the suit. For among all known provisions of Athenian law there is not one under which Socrates could have been prosecuted on the second count (díukei dè kai rovis $\nu$ veos $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon(\rho \omega v)$. This view is confirmed by the difficulty which even the thirty tyrants had in interfering officially with Socrates's dealings with young men. They had to pass a special law for the purpose, and that law was doubtless abolished when the democracy was restored. At all events it is certain that in the accuser's mind the second count was the most important. We have only to remember the prejudices of Anytus, and to recall the fact that he was still smarting under Socrates's sharp criticism of the way in which he educated his son. We can understand his indignation, though we do not share it. Now Anytus was a citizen in excellent standing, and naturally felt sure of success against such heresies in any appeal to the law. What, then, is easier to understand than his eagerness to take advantage of any pretext that offered itself against Socrates? He was eager to save his country by redressing his own grievance. Nor is it difficult to see why many of the judges should have been inclined to sympathize with him. They were enthusiastic for the democracy, and looked with disfavour upon any man like Socrates who had so often and so sharply criticized institutions dear to the democrat's heart. Still, it is more than questionable whether such criticisms were amenable to the law of a commonwealth whose shibboleth was free speech ( $\pi$ app $\eta \sigma i a$ ). A connection, on Socrates's part, with overt or covert attempts at revolution cannot be thought of ; any suggestion of the kind falls by its own weight, for it is pure and unadulterated slander. But still it was urged that Alcibiades and Critias. notorious scourges of the body politic, were for some time
the companions of Socrates. And, though Xenophon has abundantly shown the injustice of remembering this against Socrates, the judges could not forget it. The memory of these men's crimes was still so fresh that every one was inclined to mistrust the man to whose teaching many attributed the misdeeds which had so lately made life unbearable. This teaching they were therefore determined to stop, and nothing could better have served their purpose than the first count of the indictment, an accusation of atheism, for at Athens it had often gone hard in the courts with those who had to meet this charge.

This whole accusation was from the first met calmly and collect- 34 edly by Socrates, and he showed the same temper at the bar of the court. There is a story, told twice of Socrates, ${ }^{1}$ which brings this unruffled spirit vividly before us, and Plato's Theaetetus does the same more subtly. Plato represents that intricate and abstruse philosophical discussion, carried on by Socrates with phenomenal fair-mindedness and consummate ease, as taking place immediately before the great teacher was compelled by the summons of Meletus to appear for preliminary examination before the morystrate ${ }^{2}$
 rates to appear, both at this time and afterwards, at the trial. It was his duty, he thought, to appear in his own case and to make his own plea, ${ }^{3}$ though he made it without real hope or serious

[^14]the story is almost verbally repeated. ${ }^{2}$ Theaetet., p. 210 c d.
${ }^{3}$ Cicero (De oratore I. 54) is our chief authority for the following tale about Socrates's defence. The celebrated orator Lysias, out of the fulness of his friendship for Socrates, wrote him a speech for his defence. Socrates declined it when offered, because he thought it would be undignified for him to use it, and in spite of the fact that it was a marvel of pleading. The story is probably founded on the fact that upwards of six years after Socrates's execution Lysias wrote a rhetorical exercise (declamatio) on the theme of Socrates's defence, as an answer to
desire of escaping the death-penalty proposed by his accuser. His defence was made without previous preparation, ${ }^{1}$ and there breathed in it such noble pride and such uncompromising independence that its effect must rather have irritated than conciliated his judges. In the court-room as on the battle-field Socrates was always the same fearless champion of his own and his country's honour. Where other men consulted their own safety, God required Socrates to be faithful and to obey orders.
35 And so it came to pass that the judges brought in the verdict of 'guilty,' but by no large majority. ${ }^{2}$ In cases of this nature the law did not fix the penalty beforehand, ${ }^{3}$ and Socrates had still the
 cuser having proposed, $\tau \mu \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta a \iota$, the penalty of death. After the defendant had named his counter-penalty, the court was bound to choose one of the two. ${ }^{4}$. Just as in his plea Socrates had disdained the ordinary means of working upon the feelings of the court by tears and supplications, so now he scorned the-obvious way of safety still open to any man whose guilt had been affirmed by verdict. We absolutely refused to suggest any real counter-penalty, and hence an increased majority ${ }^{5}$ sentenced him to death.
The same courage which had animated him while speaking his I defence, the same rooted conviction that they who love God need fear no evil, supported him now when his execution had become a question of days and hours, and prevented him from countenancing any plan for disobeying the laws of the state. Exceptional circumstances ${ }^{6}$ delayed the execution of his sentence for thirty days after
a speech on the other side of the case by the rhetorician Polycrates. For a discussion of the matter, see Spengel ( $\Sigma \nu \nu \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \grave{\eta} \tau \epsilon \chi \nu \omega \bar{\omega} \nu, \mathrm{p} .141)$ and Rauchenstein (Philol. XVI. 1).

1 "But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak." Matthew x., v. 19.
${ }^{2}$ Apol., p. 36 a and ibid. note on $\epsilon l$ тра́̈кодта ктє.
${ }^{3}$ Ibid., p. 35 d and infra, § 73.
${ }^{4} 873$.
${ }^{5}$ It is said that the adverse majority was increased by eighty votes which had previously been cast for a verdict of ' not guilty.'
${ }^{6}$ Crito, p. 43 c with note on tò $\pi \lambda o i ̂ o \nu . C f$. Xen. Mem. iv. 8. 2: " He was constrained to live for thirty days after his case was decided because it was the month of the yearly festival and embassy to Delos, and the law prohibited all public executions until the return of the sacred envoys
it was rendered, and his friends, perhaps with the connivance of the authorities, offered him means of escape and also opportunity to use them. But he was firm in refusing these, just as while on trial he had been firm in rejecting every opportunity to secure either a favourable verdict or a lighter penalty. The tale that shortly after his death the Atheniaus repented and actually called the accusers to account rests on such slender authority that it must not be taken as history.

Of all the companions of Socrates none more deeply revered the 37 master's noble life than Plato, and no heart was more deeply stirred by the pathos of his death. At the time Plato was still young, barely thirty years of age. ${ }^{1}$ Aristo his father and his mother Perictione were both of good old Athenian stock. Codrus was one of his ancestors on his father's side, and by his mother he was descended from Solon. At the age of twenty he became a disciple of Socrates, having until that time devoted his energies to poetry. It is said that he was already so much of a poet that he was on the eve of bringing out a tetralogy; but when he became a disciple of Socrates he gave himself entirely to philosophy. At last he had found a field which was to be all his own, a field where his genius was soon to work wonders; for his philosophy was to guide the spiritual and intellectual life of his countrymen to a new and splendid consummation. Before this he had not been unacquainted
from Delos. During this time not one of his familiar friends could detect in his case any change in the manner of his life from what it had always been. And as for his previous carcer, he certainly always commanded unparalleled admiration for living a cheerful and contented life." The amual festival and embassy to Delos - another festival, also called $\Delta \dot{\eta} \lambda, a$, was celebrated every four years came in the tenth or eleventh month of the Athenian year (Mouvoरı $\omega$, or Oap $\eta \lambda \iota \omega \nu)$, hence the death of Socrates probably occurred in Thargelion (our May and June); the year was 309 в.c.
${ }^{1}$ Various dates are given for Plato's birth (I) The usually accepted one depends on Athenaeus, and is the archonship of Apollodorus, Ol. 87, 3 $=430 / 29$ в.с. (2) Diogenes Laertius gives Ol. $87,4=429 / 28$ b.c., Epameinon's year as archon, and the year of Pericles's death. (3) Zeller follows Hermodorus, a pupil of Plato, and fixes upon $428 / 27$ b.c. The birthday is said to have been the seventh day of Thargelion, a day sacred to Apollo. In the year $428 / 27$ b.c. this came on May 26/27, or, as others claim, May 29/30. Cf. Steinhart.
with philosophy, and we are told that Cratylus had initiated him into the mysteries of Heraclitus; but not until he met Socrates had he found the guide and friend who was to lead him in all his speculations toward the goal of truth.
38 It is not possible to decide whether some of Plato's earliest writings (e.g. the Lysis) were produced during Socrates's life, or all of them after the master's death. The bias of opinion now-a-days inclines to the latter view, and insists upon the unhistorical and ideal picture of Socrates which Plato everywhere alike has drawn. At all events, the questions dealt with by Plato's earliest works were just the ones constantly discussed by Socrates, though even here and at the outset Plato displays originality. His vocation was to connect together the definitions insisted upon by Socrates and to reduce them to an ordered system by the application of a single law or principle. At the very outset he took up the same lines which his whole life was devoted to following out, and he ended by estahlishing dialectic as a science. Yet he never lost sight of Socrates, who always moved before him as the perfect philosopher. He valued philosophical writing only so far as it mirrored the ways, the wisdom, and the words of the ideal philosopher, and his works are pictures of the marvellous personality of Socrates. Hence it is that Plato, when he wrote, could not dispense with the peculiarly Socratic form of question and answer, but in his hands the dialogue is fashioned and developed into a new form of literature. His early interest in art and his familiarity with all the forms of poetry naturally stood him in good stead here, and we need not wonder that the poetic fire and dramatic vividness of his dialogues are universally admired.
39 Among the dialogues which he first wrote the Protagoras is perhaps the one which most conspicuously exemplifies these great qualities. Both in the subject dealt with, and in the conclusions arrived at, the Protagoras belougs to the school of Socrates. Virtue is there defined as knowledge of what is good, and in this are contained and summed up all particular virtues. Therefore, (i) virtue can be taught, and (2) no man is wicked freely and of his own proper choice. Wickedness is ignorance of what is good, and perfect goodness belongs only to God. Man's virtue is incomplete
and tentative only, - it is a constant struggle ; God alone is invariably and forever good. There is nothing discussed here which was not an every-day topic with Socrates and his friends.

In the Gongias Plato discusses the relation of goodness to 40 pleasure, a matter barely touched upon in the Protagoras. The opposition between rhetoric and dialectic is most effectively drawn by contrasting the sophist and his scheme of morals with the true philosopher. Rhetoric is a sham art of living, the beau-ideal of which is the unbridled indulgence by each individual of every passing whim, a fool's paradise where the bodily appetites are gorged. The true art of living, on the other hand, seeks and finds everywhere law, order, and righteousness ( (\&ka.oovivn), even though in so doing all temporal happiness and life itsolf be sacrificed. Higher than this earthly life is life eterual and the hereafter, where he only is blessed who has walked upon earth in the paths of righteousness. Therefore, it is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong. The former does harm that lasts but a day, the latter brings enduring contamination.

This bare outline is enough to suggest that the fate of Socrates 41 was in the mind of the writer of the Gorgias. This is confirmed by the merciless directness of its arguments, and by the tone of severity and almost bitterness which pervades the whole work. The Gorgias contains the moral teachings of Socrates and a great deal more, for there we find them as it were transfigured. Moreover, we get a glimpse of Plato's political creed. An aristocrat by birth, he could hardly have learned the love of democracy from Socrates, though even without this master there was enough in contemporary political events to incline him to the views which he held. It has been supposed that Pericles died in the course of the same year which saw the birth of Plato. ${ }^{1}$ Plato's earliest impressions about politics may therefore best be understood by reading in Thucydides the history of that time. It was the era of decay in Athenian morals both public and private, an era which Thucydides described with a heavy heart. If Plato went a step further and, in seeking for the cause of so much harm, attributed this

[^15]degeneration to Pericles, it surely can be urged that such a view of the great statesman's leadership is not absolutely untenable even when judged by the strictest standard of historical impartiality. ${ }^{1}$ But though Plato loved democracy less, it was not because he loved the thirty tyrants more. Two of his mother's kin, his uncle Charmides and also Critias, were conspicuous among the Thirty, but Plato was neither of them nor with them. What Socrates had to endure revealed to his disciple the infamy of the Thirty and their lust for power, while any dawning hopes from the moderate temper shown by the newly restored democracy which supplanted them was more than obscured by Socrates's trial and condemnation. He found in these events new reasons for adopting the plan of life which of old had been congenial to him, and he was thus confirmed in his inclination to serve his country by shunning all active participation in his country's affairs. It would surely be rashness to urge that, in deciding upon the manner of his life, Plato lacked either patriotism or common sense.
42 To avoid political entanglements, and at the same time to add to his intellectual attainments, Plato left Athens shortly after Socrates's death, and retired to Megara, the home of a group of his philosophical friends. Euclides of Megara, a warm friend of Socrates, was the central figure among them. Like many other disciples of Sccrates, Antisthenes for example, Euclides was at great pains to reconcile the Socratic definitions or general ideas with the Eleatic doctrine of the oneness of pure being. Plato who, in the Euthyphro, early foreshadows a more abstruse account of these general ideas than Socrates had given, naturally sought to profit, while thinking out his own views, by those of Euclides. But the Eleatic motionless Being worked apparently like a palsy upon the Megarians, for Plato gained no new light from his friends at Megara. However he certainly was impelled by his sojourn
> ${ }^{1}$ The opinion of Pericles expressed by Thucydides (ii. 65) is very favourable. Grote warmly defends the reputation of Pericles against the less favourable comments of Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, and a certain number
of modern writers. Recently Büchsenschütz in his 'Besitz und Erwerb im griechischen Alterthume' has again accentuated the other side, and Herzberg in turn argues, Jahrbücher für Ph. u. P. 100, 5 , in favour of Pericles
there to supplement what he knew of the Eleatic doctrine by more thorough studies. If the Socratic philosophy may be called the ground in which the tree of Plato's knowledge took firm root, what he gained at Megara, and the familiarity with the Eleatic doctrines which he soon acquired, may be compared to the showers which watered that ground, and enabled the roots of the tree to strike deeper, and helped its branches to a fuller growth.

This same end was subserved by his further travels. He first 43 went to Cyrene, - perhaps by way of Ephesus, where he may have wished to become acquainted with the living representatives of Heraclitus's school, - and there spent some time with Theodorus the mathematician. Though Theodorus was the reputed exponent of Protagoras's philosophy, Plato was chiefly drawn to him as a great mathematician and geometer. The Athenians certainly were not likely to forget the learning which he had exhibited when he visited their city. ${ }^{1}$ The importance attached by Plato to mathematics as a necessary part of right education ${ }^{2}$ is notorious, as is also his own proficiency in that branch of learning. ${ }^{3}$ After a visit to Egypt, he proceeded to Magna Graecia that he might there consort with the Pythagoreans, from whose learning he obviously expected to derive great benefit. The chief man among them was Archytas of Tarentum. Distinguished alike for statesmanship and as a general, Archytas had originated the analytic method in mathematics, and had solved many problems in geometry and mechanics, besides achieving a great name in philosophy. The society of Archytas and his school revived Plato's interest in practical government, which had died with Socrates. As a sight-seer Plato extended his tour to Sicily, and was there introduced by Dio to the court of the elder Dionysius. But his Athenian visitor was too outspoken for that tyrant, and finally incurred his ungovernable resentment. At the time, just before the peace of Antalcidas, there was war between Athens and the Peloponnesians, - and so it

[^16][^17]occurred to Dionysius that his guest should become Sparta's prisoner of war. He was sold and carried as a slave to Aegina, whence he was finally ransomed by the generous zeal of Anniceris of Cyrenc. ${ }^{1}$
44 It the age of forty Plato was again in Athens, and he brought with him great treasures of knowledge and of experience. During his absence, moreover, he had been busy writing, and the Theaetetus serves as a reminder of his sojourn at Megara and at Cyrene. It is a dialogue within a dialogue; the introductory conversation may be called Plato's dedication of the whole work to his friends at Megara. The question, What is knowledge? is asked, and every typical answer to it, beginning with the most obvious one, Knowledge is sensation (aíoض $\sigma$ os), and ending with the most abstruse one, is first stated with fairness and then with equal fairness refuted. In this dialogue we find Socrates and Theaetetus represented more effectively than anywhere else in Plato's writings, while in the companion pictures, so eloquently drawn by Socrates, of the philosopher and the practical man or lawyer, Plato seems to be vindicating himself against fault-finders. ${ }^{2}$

[^18]define true opinion we must distinguish, and to distinguish we must have already a true opinion of the characteristic differences between one notion and another. Plato's way out of the difficulty, which closes in on all sides and seems to leave no avenue of escape, is a recourse to his theory of ideas, and for a statement of this theory we have to go to his other dialogues. He did not reject Socrates's definitions, but rather erected them into a symmetrically organized scheme of thought, of reality. These ideas are the realities dimly suggested by the world around us; but neither they nor anything else would ever be suggested to us or known by us if we had not lived in another and a better world where these ideas exist. We know things in this world because, before coming here, we have seen

In the Sophist, the Politicus, and the Parmenides, we have 45 works more or less obviously connected with the Theaetetus. These are the dialectical dialogues, so called because they are devoted to a connected account of dialectic. At the same time they contain a searching criticism of Heraclitus and of the Eleatics. One characteristic of the three works last named is that in them ${ }^{1}$ it is not Socrates who leads the discussion.

As soon as Plato returned to his native land he gathered pupils 46 about him in the Academy, a suburban gymnasium close to his own house and garden. Here he taught with but few interruptions throughout the remaining forty years of his life. About the matter or manner of his teaching in the Academy we know nothing, unless we find it in those of his writings which were written while he was engaged in teaching.

There are weighty reasons for surmising that the Phandrus was 47 written at the beginning of this period, ${ }^{2}$ and accordingly it is prefaced, appropriately enough, by a graceful sketch of the scenery near Athens. Here dialectic is treated as something more than the science of that which really is (ideas); it is that and also the genuine art of putting things or oratory, and as such it is as far superior to ordinary rhetoric as reality is to sham or instruction to persuasion. Both teaching and learning are based upon the history of the human soul, and consist in a revival of memories (divajv $\quad$ ors) which are stored away in every soul while it is yet living in the divine world of ideas and before it comes to dwell on earth in a mortal frame. The relation of teacher and learner is spoken of as under the control of the pure and heaven-sent passion of love. The two become as one in order to bring forth knowledge from
those original shapes of which things here are poor copies. Dialectic is the means of education and the perfected activity of thought by which we learn to neglect the bad copies and fix our minds upon the originals, which are in heaven. There they are all in their right place, and there goodness and truth shine upon them, enabling us to see them aright.
${ }^{1}$ Lately there has been a revival of the doubt as to whether Plato wrote these three dialogues.
${ }^{2}$ Schleiermacher considers the Phaedrus as Plato's maiden discourse; with this view other writers of eminence either wholly agree, or at least place it among Plato's earliest works.
the learner's soul. The Symposium (ounróatov, banquet) and the Phaedo like the Phaedrus are masterpieces of style and may be called companion pictures: the Symposium represents the philosopher in his moments of conviviality; the Phaedo portrays him face to face with death. The Philebus contains an inquiry into the idea of the good and is not so conspicuous for the charm of its style, since it deals with most abstruse ethical and dialectical (metaphysical) points. In the course of the dialogue a great deal is said of the Pythagorean philosophy as stated by Philolaus. ${ }^{1}$
43 In the Philebus, more than in any of his previous works, Plato strives to throw the light of philosophy upon the facts of life, and this he does to a still greater extent in those of his works which usually are considered his latest: the Republic (mo八ıteia), the Timaeus and the Critias, all three of which are closely connected, and the Laws. These discourses, because they are attempts to mould facts into harmony with ideal principles, to construct the world as it should be, are called his constructive works. The most celebrated of these, and indeed the most admirable of all Plato's works, is the Republic. Beginning with the question, "What is justice?" the writer soon develops the fact that justice, belonging as it does to the state as much as to any individual citizen, can most easily be seen in the former, where it is ' writ large.' Recognizing three classes of citizens as natural and necessary in the state, he connects them with his tripartite division of the soul. ${ }^{2}$ His class of rulers correspond to the reason

 These three classes in combination work out the happiness of the whole state, and it is the happiness of all which determines the teaching and training of each. The rulers follow wisdom (rodia) ; the warriors, courage (arspeia) ; rulers, warriors, workers in unison

[^19]( $\theta v \mu \hat{\sigma}_{s}$ ) and (b) an ignoble part ( ${ }^{2} \pi t-$ $\theta v \mu i a)$. These three divisions are explained as faculties of the soul by Wildauer, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Psychologie, in the Philosophische Monatschrift, 1873.
 virtues, works toward the determining ideal for the sake of which the limbs of the body politic cöoperate; and while the collective happiness of all citizens depends on justice, justice is gained by having each of the three classes pursue its characteristic perfection or virtue. This certainly is not the Socratic doctrine of the unity of all virtues, but a modification of it. ${ }^{1}$ With this great work are connected the Timaeus and the (unfinished) Critias. The Timaeus describes the universe as an organic and rational creation, just as the state is described in the Republic. The Critias represents the ideal state as having existed in Attica before the deluge. There is also the story of their wars with the Atlantids. The dates and the facts thus given are of course purely mythical, and purport to be derived from foreign traditions. In what relation the twelve books of Plato's Laws stand to the ten books of the Republic is a question still under discussion, as is also the question whether Plato himself put the finishing touches upon his Laws as they have come down to us. Whether he wrote it as it actually stands or not, the work, in spite of the many eccentric views and odd turns of speech which it contains, is broadly conceived and of very great interest.

The general drift of these last works prepares us for Plato's last 49 two visits to Sicily, where the younger Dionysius showed such promise both intellectual and moral that Plato hoped with his help to realize his new theories of government and of education. At the instance of Dio he accepted an invitation from the younger Dionysius, and again went to Syracuse in spite of the harsh treatment which had so precipitately terminated his former sojourn in that city. The too irascible elder Dionysius had died Ol. 103, $1=368-7$ b.c. On his arrival Plato carried everything before him and it became the court fashion to imitate young Dionysius's enthusiasm for the new philosophy ; but back-stairs intrigues soon turned the tables upon the reformer. His friend Dio was incau-

[^20]in boldly executing the ruler's commands is the warrior's virtue, (3) wisdom in obedient service to his betters is the workman's virtue.
tious, and his indiscretion was promptly punished with banishment by the same clique of flattering courtiers which soon after brought about, against the wishes of Dionysius, the dismissal of Plato. But the repentant king again urged Plato to come back, promising that Dio should be recalled. The Pythagorean circle at Tarentum urged acceptance, and finally, still hoping to carry his pet theories into effect at Syracuse, ${ }^{1}$ Plato made his third visit to Syracuse. It was not long, however, before all the influence of Archytas was required to get our philosopher back to Athens alive. How little Plato's high hopes of the younger Dionysius were realized, is but too plain from the character of that tyrant as afterwards exhibited.
50 The remainder of Plato's life was engrossed by teaching and writing. Of his pupils many were from foreign parts, and among his numerous Athenian hearers there were not a few marked men, statesmen and generals such as Chabrias Timotheus and Phocion, orators such as Lycurgus and Demosthenes. Though hard to prove, it is casy to believe that Demosthenes's keenness and irresistible readiness in argument was stimulated and perfected by a training in the dialectic of Plato. Plato lived to a green old age, ${ }^{2}$ and death finally surprised him in the full possession of all his faculties when upwards of eighty (Ol. $108,1=348-7$ в.c.). The vigor of his mind at the time is brought home to us by the tale that after death they found under his pillow a draft of the opening passage of the Republic, which he had covered with erasures and corrections. Pausanias, who made his 'grand tour' in the second century after Christ, saw the tomb of Plato in the Ceramicus (Kєрaبєєкós), not far from the Academy. The post left vacant by Plato, the charge of his school which became known as the older Academy, was undertaken by Speusippus, a son

[^21]died on his birthday, just as he had completed his eighty-first year. A similarly unauthenticated tale is repeated by Cicero, who says (Cato major 5.13): "uno et octogesimo ano scribens est mortuus." Perhaps his word "scribens" is simply a version of the story of the tablet discovered under the philosopher's pillow.
of Plato's sister. The Chalcedonian Xenocrates succeeded Speusippus.

We may well call it a lucky chance that has preserved for us all 51 of Plato's works. ${ }^{1}$ They are an exhaustless treasurehouse filled to overflowing with thoughts which have been the inspiration and the delight of successive generations of men, for they appeal alike to the philosopher and to the poet; to the former by the fulness of their wisdom, to the latter by the beauty of their style. Plato chose the form of question and answer, and in presenting philosophical truth dramatised the process by which such truth is reached. Once chosen, that form became, in the hands of so great a master both of thought and of style, something new under the sun, and took its place among the other exemplars of literary art created by the Greeks as the Greek method of presenting philosophy. The various forms in which previous philosophical speculations had appeared were but the imperfect statements of unperfected theories. The one thing which these forms perfectly represented was the lack of completeness which characterized the early systems of philosophy. ${ }^{2}$ Socrates brought down Philosophy from the clouds of heaven to the needs of life upon earth, ${ }^{3}$ and, the uncompromising ordeal of his cross-questioning once passed, her worth and strength became manifest. 'Then at last, transfigured as it were by Plato's genius, she appeared in all the beauty of a form of literature quite worthy of her message. This is the moment which at the opening of this sketch was anticipated. In Plato's dialogues


#### Abstract

${ }^{1}$ Besides the works already enumerated and the Apology and Crito, there are quite a number of others. Some of these Plato has been supposed not to have written. Those whose authenticity has been questioned connect themselves with the Protagoras; they are: the Ion, Hippias Maior and Minor, the first and second Alcibiades, Lysis, Charmides, Laches Euthyphro. Then there are dialogues connected with the so-called dialectical discourses : the Meno, the Euthydemus, the Cratylus. The Menexenus


remains, and the only dialogues with which it can be in any way compared are the Apology and the Phaedrus. Of course no mention is here made of such other short discourses as have been falsely attributed to Plato but are now admitted by all to be spurious.
${ }^{2}$ The best account of the comparative inefficiency of these early philosophers is Plato's own. $C f$. the passage from the Sophist quoted supra, p. 10 , note 1.
${ }^{3}$ Cicero, Tusc. v. 4, 10, and Academ. I. 4, 15.
the central purpose and the crowning result is to stimulate in every reader a self-reliant vigor of understanding which shall grapple boldly with the self-imposed task of seeking after the fundamental idea, and achieve in the end a clear insight into the whole subject discussed. Without this effort of mind no man can ever emerge from darkness into light. That Plato did not overestinate the value of his own or of any writings is clearly shown in the Phaedrus. The views there expounded probably influenced him to choose the dialogue-form, which is a reproduction, a mirror, as it were, of the words of living truth spoken by the living teacher. That he did not however underestimate the value of philosophical writing he shows rather in deed than in word. For how, otherwise, can we account for the long series of writings produced by him from the age of thirty until the time of his death, - a period of fifty years? By writing he increased the number of those who felt his influence, and this he might well seek to do while still believing that, compared with the spoken word, the written word was dead.
52 The many resources of Plato's artistic imagination are apparent in the varied settings of his dialogues. The simplest form (1) has no introduction or preamble, but is a dialogue, with occasional interruptions from interested bystanders, in which one of the parts is taken throughout by the same speaker, usually Socrates, while the other may be successively assumed by various persons. Instances of this form of dialogue are the Gorgias and the Phaedrus, which best exemplify the dramatic power of Plato even in this simplest form of dialogue. More intricately dramatic and effective are the narrated dialogues, to which the second and third classes belong. These are (2) without preface and with no account of the persons to whom the narration or reading, as the case may be, is made, -e.g., the Republic; or (3) introduced by a short dialogue between the narrator and his friends, who soon become his attentive listeners. In (3) sometimes, though rarely, the narrated dialogue is momentarily interrupted before the close, and at the close a few words are commonly exchanged between the narrator and his auditors. Dialogues of this kind are the Symposium and the Phaedo. Just as these various forms are used accord-
ing to the demands of the subject discussed or the artistic plan of the author, so in certain of Plato's later writings, in fact very commonly where very abstruse points are considered, the dramatic form is subordinated and all but disappears.

Something must now be said of the two works before us. They 53 are both of them closely connected with the trial and death-sentence of Socrates. Of the two the first is

## THE APOLOGY OF SOCRATES.

If we heeded our first impressions on reading the Apology, we should pronounce it a report of what Socrates actually said in court, since it is given as a speech made by Socrates and we feel convinced that Socrates would naturally have made just such a speech. But there is nothing in this fact alone that necessarily bears such a construction, for Plato's dialogues are all of them conversations more or less fictitious, and yet are represented as carried on in the most life-like manner by historical personages. To reach any trustworthy conclusion as to the historic accuracy of the Apology would require more information than that supplied by Plato himself, and yet Plato is the only witness whom we can trust. ${ }^{1}$ We have, therefore, to depend chiefly upou internal evidence. ${ }^{2}$ There is no doubt that, not Plato only, but any disciple and friend of Socrates who had been present on such a momentous occasion would have been more than eager to spare no pains in accurately reproducing the words of his master, - of the father of his soul's new-birth. He would have left no stone unturned in striving to reach and to write, 'the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the

1 We are not warranted in pinning our faith to Xenophon's (?) 'Amoдoria $\Sigma$ wapátous, a production whose origin end value are equally doubtful. Xenophon's Memorabilia, on the other hand, is inadequate for our purpose.
${ }^{2}$ Schleiermacher and Zeller uphold the accuracy of Plato's report. The former argues that the speech suits
all the circumstances too well to allow of its not being an exact report, while the latter strives to deal with the arguments used to prove his untrustworthiness. Ueberweg lately has taken this same point of view with great decision. In the admirable introduction of Steinhart is to be found the best presentation of the opposite view.
truth,' that it might live as a monument of the great man's moral and intellectual worth forever. And individually Plato must have regarded such an undertaking as his opportunity to appeal to the supreme court of intelligent and unprejudiced mankind from the death-sentence pronounced by an unjust court upon the incomparable master. In such an enterprise Plato's memory would undoubtedly do good service. Yet it is hard to see how a mind like his, distinguished rather for its devotion to speculative truth and for its obedience to the laws of artistic and poetical symmetry than for its submission to the inelastic canons of history, could, even in such a case as this, have endured the straight-jacket of stenographic accuracy. Plato doubtless heard with attentive ears and held with retentive memory all that was spoken before the court by the man he loved best. And indeed no hand was better trained than his in presenting faithfully the peculiar conversational genius of Socrates. But for all that, and by means of it all, he has gained and used the second sight of a sympathetic and creative imagination; he has given us more than the actual defence of Socrates in court. In Plato's Apology, Socrates on trial for his life stands before us in clear outline, sharply contrasted with any typical presentation of the drift of contemporary public opinion ; for public opinion, so far as it opposed him and his ways, is personified by his named and unnamed accusers. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{He}$ is condemned in court, but before the tribunal of the eternal fitness of things he and his life-work stand acquitted.
54 However, we have no right to assume that this could not all be accomplished without unduly sacrificing historical accuracy. The nobler, the more appropriate we suppose Socrates's actual words to have been, -and no one will incline to say they were not appropriate and noble, - the less would Plato feel called upon to depart from a simple report of what he had actually heard. In the absence of anything like convincing proofs of the contrary, it is reasonable, with due allowance for Plato's artistic bent and after taking into consideration the circumstances under which he wrote, to conclude that his Apology of Socrates resembled very closely

[^22]the speech actually made in court by Socrates. The circumstances under which Plato wrote lead however to the following qualification of this statement of substantial identity. Any speech reported in writing necessarily differs from the speech as originally made, and no orator even can write down from memory the words he has used, - as for Socrates he spoke on the spur of the moment without previous notes or preparation of any kind. ${ }^{1}$ Plato heard him just as Thucydides heard Pericles, and as Thucydides, with the most earnest desire to reproduce as a part of history Pericles's speeches, ${ }^{2}$ could not avoid making them by his manner of statement to some extent his own, so it was with Plato and the speech of Socrates. He could not, in spite of the accuracy which he observed in reproducing the situation at the trial and the words to which he had so attentively listened, avoid giving the Apology of Socrates in a way which makes it a work of his own, though at the same time it is the genuine defence of Socrates. ${ }^{3}$ The success with which Plato brings before us the living persons concerned in Socrates's trial is the best proof that he allowed himself a certain freedom of expression in presenting the matter and manner of Socrates himself. Among Plato's many works distinguished for vividness of dramatic characterization, the Apology is one of the most noteworthy. In the Apology we have the most life-like of Plato's many portraits of Socrates.

We find many inequalities in the speech of the Apology, and 55
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Apology, p. 17 c. Those unconvinced by the genuine ring of this passage may still doubt. We know Socrates chiefly from Plato, hence discussions of Plato's trustworthiness are apt to beg the question.

2 For the best account of this whole matter, $c f$. Professor R. C. Jebb's article on the speeches of Thucydides, published in a volume of Oxford Essays called Hellenica, edited by E. Abbott, Rivingtons, 1871.
${ }^{8}$ There is an important difference between the relation of Thucydides to Pericles and that of Plato to Socra-
tes. The intimacy of ten years' standing between the two latter made their case one of ideal friendship, where, at least in intellectual matters, what belonged to Socrates was Plato's, and vice versa. Therefore Plato, if he made the defence of Socrates characteristically his own, could be sure that it was also and for that reason characteristically Socrates's. Was not Plato, therefore, better prepared to deal with Socrates, the friend of his youth, than was Thucydides to deal with Pericles, who certainly was not one of his intimates?
indeed a tendency here and there to repetition and circumlocution. ${ }^{1}$ This is not only characteristic of Socrates in general, but particularly characteristic of him or of any one when speaking .off-hand. Equally characteristic of Socrates is the cross-examination ${ }^{2}$ and the frequent recourse which is had to the dialogue form; ${ }^{3}$ for Socrates undoubtedly went as far in this direction as the rules of Athenian pleading would allow.
56 No matter whether we take the speech as a verbal report or as, in the main, an invention of Plato, if we once admit that its aim was to vindicate Socrates before the whole world no less than to influence the particular men who were his judges, it is easy to understand the line of defence taken in the Apology. The counts in the indictment against him are summarily dealt with, for Socrates is chiefly anxious to show that the sole cause of his accusation is the wide-spread prejudice against him. This prejudice he grapples with, and seeks by analyzing to remove it, appealing in justification of all that he had habitually said and done to his commission from God. The careless way in which he quotes ${ }^{4}$ the terms of the indictment, - he reverses the order of the counts against him and deals with them in that order, - would prove the speaker's indifference to the opinion of his judges, if such laxities were not known to be very common in the Athenian courts. Far more important, therefore, or rather all important, is the fact that he does not meet the accusation of disbelief in the gods of Athens. We have seen that nothing would have been easier than a triumphant refutation of this charge ; yet the matter is passed over, and Socrates prefers to merge the narrower question in a consideration of the more sweeping charge of downright atheism, of disbelief in all gods. Evidently Socrates cared little for winning his case, but much for the opportunity afforded him to enlighten his fellowcitizens as to the wider and deeper import of the point at issure. The device by which the terms of the accusation to be met were enlarged ${ }^{5}$ was one sanctioned by the traditional procedure in

[^23]courts ${ }^{1}$ at Athens. Under cross-examination on the meaning of his bill of indictment, the accuser himself gave to Socrates the wider interpretation best suited for the answer with which it was to be met.

The manner in which Socrates talks of death and of the here- 57 after is very striking. There is more than a conviction that compared with wickedness death is no evil, for that conviction is made the firmer by the comforting hope that death is but the door which leads to everlasting life and happiness. If this be considered not Plato's addition but Socrates's literal statement, then the moral steadfastness and the joy with which Socrates hailed death's deliverance was the best re-enforcement for Plato's own doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which is stated in the Phaedo and elsewhere.

The closing words on immortality play an important part in 53 the tragic development of the situation; for the first part and the verdict of guilty which succeeds it awaken a sense of cruel injustice, which, by the second part and the ensuing sentence of death, is soon brought to a second climax but is finally mitigated by the closing words of Socrates. This third part bears we may say to the two parts that precede it a relation similar to that borne by the Eumenides of Aeschylus to the preceding plays of the Oresteian trilogy, and solves a tragic situation by merging a narrowed view of justice in a broader one by which it is superseded.

The first of these three subdivisions, which is the defence 59 proper, is complete in itself. Though all the laws of oratorical art are here carefully observed, the usual practices of oratory are sharply criticised. The five natural heads of the argument certainly are unmistakable, since, by carefully following the connection of thought, we can easily mark the words in which the speaker dismisses one point and takes up another.

[^24]Analysis of the First Part, or tife Defence Proper, cc. I-XXIV.
( 1 ) c. i. Introduction ( $\pi \rho \circ \circ i_{\mu} \quad$ ov, exordium)

(b) c. ii. Statement ( $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \sigma t s$, propositio) of the case and of the plan in the plea.
(c) cc. iii-xv. Refutation ( $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ v́бเs, confutatio)
$=\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { of former accusers, cc. iii-x. } \\ \text { of Meletus, cc. xi-xv. }\end{array}\right.$
(d) cc. xri-xxii. Digression (тарє́кßaбıs, digressio) on Socrates's life.
 upon the usual form of peroration, and ends with a confession of trust in God.

An introduction (a) is always intended to prepare the hearers for listening to the speaker's plea. This is especially hard in the face of prejudice against the speaker's person or against his case. The rules of speech-writing here prescribe recourse to insinuation ' $\ddagger$ oסos, a subtle process by which the speaker wins over the sympathics of his audience. He may do this (1) by attacking his opponent, (2) by conciliating his audience, (3) by strongly stating his personal hardship in the case, or (4) by putting concisely the difficulties involved in dealing with the facts. After the introduction follows (b) the statement $\pi \rho^{\prime} \theta \in \sigma$ ts. This is commonly a plain unvarnished tale covering the matters of fact involved. If such an account be unnecessary the statement sets forth simply the plan of the plea. This plan is not unfrequently accompanied by a subdivision (partitio), which is sometimes simply a summary of heads (enumeratio), ${ }^{1}$ and sometimes a detailed account of topics (expositio). ${ }^{2}$ Here, again, Socrates's defence follows the rules of oratory. Next comes the most important part, the proof ( $\pi$ iotis, probatio), represented by (c) the refutation which naturally: falls, as indicated above, under two heads. In the manner

[^25][^26]of refutation here given, the genuine Socrates is in his element, and here he is pictured to the life. After proof or refutation, as the case may be, comes, in the programme of oratorical orthodoxy, (d) a digression. This was the orator's opportunity to try his wings. The theme chosen in a digression needed no more than an indirect bearing upon the argument of the case, and the ornamental part which the digression often played has led to the use of another term for it, i.e. exornatio or embellishment. ${ }^{1}$ 'This, too, can be found in Socrates's speech, and so perfect is its beauty that the laws of school-oratory are more than satisfied. Yet, embellishment though it be called, this part of the speech has nothing that is far-fetched or beside the point; in the Apology it is the complement of the preceding negative refutation, its positive and required reinforcement (confirmatio). The transition to (e) the peroration is plainly marked. At this point the orator, and more than ever if he were on trial for his life, made a desperate appeal to the feelings of his hearers. No means of moving the judges were left untried. Recourse to such methods Socrates condemned as equally dishonest and dishonorable. ${ }^{2}$ This part of

[^27]the soul have nothing to do with facts, but affect only the judge himself. Hence, if all legal proceedings were regulated as in certain states distinguished for particularly good laws, these emotions would play no part whatever. Indeed, all agree on this point, some urging that the law should prescribe this course, while others enforce the principle, and rule out any plea which is off the point. This is the rule of procedure before the Areopagus, and a very good rule it is. A judge should certainly never have his mind warped by the influence of anger, of jealousy, or of pity brought to bear upon him. To have recourse to these is exactly the same as for a carpenter to give a twist to his rule before using it." To the procedure of the Areopagus we may perhaps apply Quintilian's words (VI. 1, 7) : "Athe-
the Apology is an attack upon the ordinary practice of pleaders in court. Not unmanly subserviency to men, but manly submission to God's will are heard in the closing words of this defence.
00 Such was the temper of the Apology written for Socrates by Plato, and as such, whether intentionally or unintentionally, it must have been in striking contrast with the drift of the plea which Lysias is said to have elaborated for the same case. ${ }^{1}$ The tradition that Plato undertook to plead in the capacity of Socrates's adrocate (ovvíyopos) but was not allowed to do so rests on very slight authority. It is therefore ridiculous to suggest that this plea, which Plato did not prepare, was the first outline afterwards worked up in the Apology.
61 The second and third parts, which come respectively after the first and the second verdict, can hardly be expected to answer all the requirements of a set speech. And yet these are symmetrically arranged, and their topics skilfully set before us. The second part naturally opens with an allusion to the verdict of 'guilty' just rendered ; any regular peroration would have been out

- of place before the third, which is the suitable conclusion both for the first part and the second. And where, indeed, is there a more eloquent and nobly impressive ending than this? That part of it addressed to the judges who voted for Socrates's acquittal is certainly made most prominent and very appropriately so. For these judges, they who alone are worthy of that title, are his chosen friends; to their kindred souls he confides the unspeakable hopes of happiness after death that are stirring within him, and invites them to be of good cheer and not to fear death. In so doing, even while death stares him in the face, he does not blench, but obeys his captain and works as the servant of God.
62 Closely connected with the Apology is the clialogue called the


## CRITO.

This dialogue belongs to the first class ${ }^{2}$ of Plato's dialogues ; it is a conversation pure and simple, neither narrated nor read to an
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { nis affectus movere ctiam per prae- } & { }^{1} \text { Cf. supra, } \S 34 \text { and note. } \\ \text { conem prohibebatur orator." } & { }^{2} \text { Cf. supra, } \S 52 .\end{array}$
audience introduced at the beginning. There are two speakers only, Socrates and Crito. Their close friendship has been mentioned in the Apology (p. 33 d). This intimacy was unbroken, and though Crito was much absorbed by the care of his extensive property, yet, in all the fortunes of Socrates's life, Crito had been his firm friend. And now that a sentence which he could not but regard as unjust had been pronounced upon his friend, Crito rebelled against its execution and against the shame of seeing Socrates die a criminal's death. To prevent this he was willing to risk his fortune and his civil rights. The lucky combination of circumstances which furthered the plans made for this end has already been explained. ${ }^{1}$ Apparently, nothing prevented Socrates's escape from prison but Socrates. At this juncture Socrates stands before us as the ideally loyal citizen. Though opposed to the principles of the democracy at Athens, he submits without reservation to its laws and exhorts all others to do the like. This, he declares, is the first and the most imperative duty of every citizen. Such is the historical groundwork of the dialogue. The dramatic picture given of this situation admits of the application of various terms used to designate the development of the plot in a Greek tragedy.

Analysis of the Crito.
(a) cc. I, II. Prologue ( $\pi$ pódoyos) ; the characters and their mental


r. c. iii. The threats of the multitude.
2. c. iv. The prayers of friends.
3. c.v. The jeers of enemies.
r. cc. vi, vii. The threats are many but duty is one.
2. c. viii. Nothing should warp our idea of duty.
3. cc. ix, $x$. It is wrong to run away from prison, and wrong should not be done, even in retaliation.

[^28](c) cc. xi-xv. Clearing up ( $\lambda \dot{v} \sigma$ rs). ${ }^{1}$ The laws of Athens require his submission and his death.
I. cc. xi, xii. Socrates owes them life liberty and happiness.
2. cc. xiii, xiv. They require and he has promised obedience.
3. c. xv. He will gain nothing by disobedience.
(d) cc. xvi, xvir. Epilogue (ė $\pi$ i $\lambda$ oyos). There are laws in Hades which can reach him who disobeys law upon earth.

64 Like the Apology, this work bears memorable witness to the nobility of Plato's mind, and it reveals especially his lofty patriotism. As for Socrates, we see in both these works that not words only but deeds prove him a more law-abiding citizen than scores of men whose spurious good-citizenship is well portrayed on many pages of the Crito (e.g. p. $45 \mathbf{e}$ ). The very laws of the land, as well as the example of Socrates submitting to his unjust sentence of death, declare in no uncertain tones to every Athenian what true patriotism is and how it is preserved.
65 The Crito is by no means simply the chronicle of a conversation actually held; though it is based upon facts, it must still be recognized as Plato's work. This is proved by the finished skill both of plan and execution displayed in this dialogue, short and simple though it is. Moreover, in the Crito we see that Plato has made a step forward in his notion of duty. For here is the earliest statement of Plato's 'golden rule': Injustice always is wrong ; it is wrong to retaliate injustice by injustice. ${ }^{2}$ In the Gorgias (see supra, § 40) this rule is applied more universally and put upon its rational basis. Indeed, from a philosophical point of view we may regard the Crito and the Apology as a suitable preface to the Gorgias, if we do not forget that both are primarily pictures of the one great master whom Plato in all his works most delighted to honor.

[^29]
## APPENDIX

## ON ATHENIAN COURTS OF LAW．${ }^{1}$

Six thousand Athenian citizens were entrusted with the power 60 to decide law－suits．Choice was made by lot every year of six hundred men from each of the ten tribes（фunai），and any citizen over thirty years of age was eligible．Every one thus chosen was liable，after taking the prescribed oath ${ }^{2}$ of office，to be called upon to act as a $\delta$ ıкaotท＇s；$\delta$ ıкaбтai，jurymen，${ }^{3}$ was the official name ${ }^{4}$ by
${ }^{1}$ The chicf authority is Meier and Schömann，Der Attische Process，Cal－ vary（Berlin，1884）．See also K．Fr． Hermann，Lehrbuch der griechischen Staatsalterthümer，and G．F．Schö－ mann，Griechische Alterthümer， 2 vol－ umes，of which the first has been translated into English，and published under the title Antiquities of Greece by Rivingtons（London，1880）．
${ }_{2}$ The oath，which is cited in the speech of Demosthenes against Timo－ crates（149－151），is of doubtful authen－ ticity．Schömann and Lipsius（p．153， note 17），by omissions and bracketed additions change the formula there given into the following，which，ex－ cepting the last bracketed clause，－－a conjecture of Frïnkel＇s，－is not far from the real form：$\psi \eta \phi ı o ̄ \mu a \iota ~ к a \tau \alpha ̀ ~$









 accordance with the laws and enactments of the 4 thenian people and of the Senate
of Five IIundred，［and where there is no law，in accordance with my best knowl－ edge of what is just，unmoved alike by faror and by enmity］，．．and I will give impartial hearing both to the accuser and to the defendant，and vote on the question at issue in the suit．［If I keep this oath let blessings be my portion；if I break it let ruin seize on me and all my kindred．］

${ }^{3}$ The use，in other connexions，of $\delta_{\text {ıка }} \tau$ 亿́s with the meaning of judge leads many to translate $\delta$ ıka⿱宀⿻三丨口 and not jurymen．Neither of these words is satisfactory，but to describe a body of citizens without any techni－ cal knowledge of the law as judges is certainly more misleading from a modern point of view than to call them jurymen．It must be remem－ bered，however，that the presiding magistrate did not perform the duties of a modern judge in any important
 substantial powers both of judge and jury in all cases brought before them．
${ }^{4}$ The customary form in addressing them was $\overline{\bar{\omega}}$ ä $\nu \delta \rho \in s$ סıкaotal，but this could be varied．We have sometimes
 and once and again $\bar{\omega}$＇A $\begin{aligned} & \text { nvaioc．} C f \text { ．} \\ & \text { ．}\end{aligned}$ Apol．，pp． $17 \mathrm{a}, 22 \mathrm{e}, 20 \mathrm{~d}, 30 \mathrm{~b}$.
which they were addressed. These six thousand were divided into a reserve of one thousand, to be used as substitutes ctc., and a main body of five thousand for regular service. A subdivision of the five thousand was then made into ten courts, of five hundred each, called סıкaбт judicial body as well as the place where such a body sits in judgment. Sometimes a court was composed of less than five hundred jurymen, e.g. of two or four hundred; sometimes we find two or more courts of five hundred sitting as one, but it is doubtful whether the whole six thousand ever sat as one court. The even numbers, $200,500,1000$, etc., were habitually increased by one, and for that purpose a $\delta$ ıкaбт ${ }^{\prime}$ s was drawn from the 1000 supernumeraries. This precaution was taken to avoid a tie vote.

On days appointed for holding court each of the subdivisious above mentioned was assigned by lot to one of the places used as court-rooms, and there tried the suit appointed for that time and place. Each juryman received as the badge of his office a staff (Baктпpia) corresponding in color to a sign over the door of his court. He also received a ticket ( $\sigma v_{\mu} \mu \circ \lambda_{o v}$ ), by showing which he secured his fee after his day's service. Cf. Dem. De Cor. 210. A fee of one obol (about three cents) for every day's session was introduced by Pericles, and afterwards trebled by Cleon.
67 Almost all cases except those of homicide were tried in these Heliastic courts, and the jurymen were called also $\dot{\eta}^{\lambda} \iota a \sigma$ tal from the name $\boldsymbol{\eta} \lambda \iota a l a$, given to the largest court-room in Athens. The most general term to designate a law-suit is $\delta<\kappa \eta$, though the same word also has the narrower meaning of a private suit. According as the complaint preferred involves the rights of individuals or of the whole state, $\delta i_{\text {cat }}$ in the wider sense were subdivided into (1) Sikat in the narrower sense, private suits, and (2) ypaфal, public suits. Since the state was the real plaintiff in public suits, any fine which in such suits might be imposed upon the defendant went to the state ; accordingly in public suits, the accuser, as a rule, was entitled to no part of the penalty.
68 In the ordinary course of procedure, every plaintiff was required to present his indictment ( $\gamma \rho a \phi \eta^{\prime}$ ), or complaint ( $\lambda \hat{\eta} \xi$ is), in writing to the particular magistrate whose department included the matters
involved. Most suits thus came before the nine archons, commonly before one of the first three or before all of the remaining six. The first archon, - called ó äpx $\omega \mathrm{v}$ par excellence, - dealt especially with charges involving family rights and inheritance; the second archon, called $\beta a \sigma \iota \epsilon \in$ ús, with those involving the regulations and requirements of religion and public worship; the third archon,
 ( $\mu$ '́тoккo) and forcigners; the remaining six, - called the Thesmothetae, - dealt with almost all cases not especially assigned to the first three. There were, however, cases which were disposed of by other magistrates, or otherwise especially provided for.

The accusation had to be made in the presence of the accused, 69 who had previously been served with due notice to appear. Legal notice required the presence of two witnesses to the summons ( $\kappa \lambda \eta \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon \mathrm{s}$ ). If the magistrate allowed proceedings in the case, the terms of accusation were copied and posted in some public place, and at the time of this publication a day was fixed, upon which both parties were bound to appear before the magistrate for the preliminary investigation (ávákpıas). There the plaintiff's charges and the Lifendant's answer, ${ }^{1}$ both of them already written down and handed in, were reaffirmed under oath, and both parties submitted to the magistrate such evidence as they intended to use. The reaffirmation or confirmation under oath was called $\delta$ ownoota, sometimes àvтตнoria. ${ }^{2}$ The evidence submitted consisted in citations from the laws, documentary evidence of various kinds, the depositions of witnesses, and particularly any testimony given under torture ( $\beta$ áravos) by slaves, which had been taken and written down in the presence of witnesses. The magistrate fixed his official seal
${ }^{1} C f$. (Dem. xur. 46) the written charge ( $\lambda \bar{\eta} \xi \stackrel{s}{ }$ ) in a private suit: ' $A \pi=\lambda$ -入óowpos пa
 $\mu \eta \mu \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \nu \tau o \nu . \quad \tau \grave{\alpha} \psi \in \nu \delta \hat{\eta} \mu о \nu \kappa a \tau \epsilon \mu \alpha \rho-$
 रрациатєіч $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho а \mu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \alpha$, Apollodorus the Acharnian, son of Pasion, accuses Stephanus the Acharnian, son of Menecles, for giving false testimony; the damages named are fixed at one talent. Stephanus
testified falsely against me in the statements recorded in the evidence submitted.


 the testimony which $I \ldots$ gave is true as recorded in the evidence submitted.
${ }^{2} \delta \iota \omega \mu o \sigma i \alpha$ refers strictly to the double oath of the two parties ; $\dot{a} \nu \tau \omega-$ $\mu o \sigma i \alpha$ to the defendant's oath. But both are used for each singly.
upon all the documents thus submitted, and took charge of them against the day when the case was to be tried.
70 On the day ( $\dot{\eta}$ кvpia) when a court was to sit upon any case, the magistrate who had presided over the preliminary investigation proceeded to the appointed court-room, where he met the sixartal
 suit, having been previously notified, were required to put in an appearance. Proceedings in court were opened by some religions ceremony; then the clerk (үранцатє ${ }^{\prime}$ ) read aloud the written accusation and the reply, and finally the parties to the suit were successively called forward to state their case. This was the opening of
 toph. Vesp. 860 ff ., Antipho, vi. 42.
71 The law required that every man should conduct his own case in person, and hence those who were not themselves skilful pleaders generally recited speeches which had been written for them by others. Still, the law permitted a man to appear in court accompanied by advocates (ovvíyopor), who came as his friends, and therefore were not supposed to be paid for their trouble; not infrequently, after a short speech from the principal, the most important part of his plea was made by one of his advocates. E.g. Demosthenes's speech on the Crown was made as Ctesipon's advo-
 used to measure the time allotted to each for pleading before the court. When called for, the written documents offered in evidence were read by the clerk, and meanwhile the clock was stopped. By way of precaution, the witnesses whose depositions were read had to be present in court and acknowledge their testimony. While making his plea a man was protected by law from interruption by his opponent, and the law required his opponent to answer his questions. ${ }^{2}$ The jurymen had a right to interrupt the speaker

[^30]stantially the same thing. Hence the presiding magistrate, $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \grave{\omega} \nu$ тồ $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha-$

${ }^{2}$ According to the terms of the



(1) if in their opinion he was off the point, (2) if they required fuller explanation on any point whatsocver. Of course, there were frequent attempts to prejudice the jurymen instead of enlightening them, and nothing was commoner than to make appeal to their sympathics. It was by no means an unusual occurrence for a defendant to appear in court with his wife and children, or with infirm and helpless parents, and sometimes with friends of great popularity or of high character; he depended upon these to act as his intercessors with the court. Such practices, though manifestly tending to disarm the severity of the law and to defeat the ends of justice for which the court was organized, seem never definitely to have been prohibited in any court except the Areopagus.

When the pleas had been made, the jurymen proceeded without 72 preliminary consultation to decision by a secret rote. In public suits, only one speech was allowed to the plaintiff, and one to the defendant. In private suits, two were allowed to each. The jurors generally voted with bronze balls or discs, either solid (to denote acquittal) or perforated (to denote condemnation). These were called $\psi \dot{\eta} \phi o$. If the vote was a tie, the case went in favor of the defeytant; and, in a public suit, if less than one-fifth of the votes were for the plaintiff, he was fined, and also debarred from ever again acting as plaintiff in a similar suit. This fine was fixed at 1000 drachmas, about $\$ 170$. The plaintiff in such a suit also incurred both these penalties if, without good and sufficient excuse, he failed to appear in court, and thus by his own act allowed that his case was bad. If the defendant failed to appear, the case went against him by default (see on є́ $\bar{\eta} \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ калๆүоройขтєs, Apol. 18 c), and he was pronounced guilty in contumaciam. In most private suits, the plaintiff, under similar circumstances, forfeited one-sixth of the sum which he claimed ; this forfeiture was called $\overline{\epsilon \pi \omega \beta \in \lambda a}$, one obol for every drachma.

Suits, both public and private, were divided into (1) áyŵes 73 ти $\eta$ ๆrol, in which, if it decided against the defendant, the court had still to determine the degree of punishment to be inflicted
( $\tau \uparrow \mu \eta \mu$ ), because no penalty was fixed by law ; and (2) diyw ves $\dot{\alpha} \tau(\mu \eta \tau 0$, in which, after deciding against the defendant, the court had no further decision to make, because the penalty was fixed by law. In cases of the former kind, if they were public suits, - like the ypaфウ̀ $\dot{\sigma} \epsilon \beta \in \mathfrak{i}$ as brought against Socrates, - the accuser proposed the penalty which he considered adequate, ${ }^{1}$ and the accused, if convicted, had the right to make a counter-proposition ; then followed the decision of the court. ${ }^{2}$ It is still a moot point whether the judges were confined to a choice between these two propositions or could, if they saw fit, inflict a third penalty midway between the two.
74 The ordinary penalties for crimes against the state were death, banishment, loss of rights of citizenship ( $\mathbf{\alpha} \tau \mu(\alpha)$, confiscation of property, and fines. All these are summed up in the formula
 must suffer or pay for his offence. In case the convicted defendant was not an Athenian by birth, he might be sold into slavery, and thus additionally punished by the loss of his freedom.
75 The magistrates who had to oversee the execution of the punishment of death were called the Eleven (oiévocka). Ten men on this board were chosen by lot every year, one from each of the ten tribes; the eleventh was a scribe, үpapнarev́s. They had general charge of all prisons, and they issued the order requiring their subordinates ${ }^{4}$ to execute the penalty of death.
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 as wholes，not $\dot{v} \mu \in i \in s$ and $\epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \dot{\omega}$ ，are contrasted．
 more usual and technical $\bar{\omega}$ á $\nu \delta \rho \in s$ $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha$ ，which Socrates reserves for his closing words（ 40 a to the end） addressed to those who voted for his acquittal．See on $\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { ă } \\ \nu \\ \delta \\ \hline\end{array}\right) \kappa \tau \mathcal{\epsilon} ., 26 \mathrm{~d}$ ， and Introd．p．49，note 4．－$\pi \epsilon \pi$ óv $\theta a \tau \epsilon$ ： have been affected，though act．in form is pass．in meaning，and therefore takes $\dot{v} \pi \delta$ with the gen．

2．$\delta^{\prime}$ ou์v：introduces an asserted fact，which is contrasted with the preceding statement of uncertainty， but at any rate，Lat．certe．$C f$ ．Xen．

 $I$ shall be doing what is right $I$ do not know，but at any rate $I$ will choose you．

 and arguments were urged which to some Greeks seem apocryphal，but at any rate they were urged．
kal aủcós：even myself，sc．＂How then may not you have been affected！＂

3．ỏ入lyou：sc．$\delta \epsilon i v$, used abs．G．${ }^{1}$ 1534 ；H． 956 and 743 b．Cf． 22 a．－ $\pi \iota \theta a v \omega \bar{s}, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime}$ ：these words state and contrast the respective aims of rhetoric and of dialectic（philoso－ phy）．

4．ws è $\ddagger$ oos cimeiv：qualifies the sweeping denial in où $\delta \in(\nu$ ，hardly any－ thing．G．1534；H． 956 ．For an equiv． idiom in Herodotus，cf．Hdt．ii．I $5, \tau \delta$
 $\lambda \dot{\sigma} \gamma \omega \in i \pi \in \hat{i} \nu, \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \pi \epsilon \phi \eta \nu \delta s$ ，has only re－ cently，so to speak，come to light．
 connect both gens．with $\epsilon \nu \nu$ ．$\alpha \dot{\nu} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ， about them，designates the persons who are responsible for the $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \nu$（ $c f$ ．below $\mathbf{b}$ ，
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$ gives the sum of which év is part．See also on tov̀s rod入oús
 in appos．with it．－ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{v} \hat{\varphi}$ ：refers to the passage where the statement is made．

6．XP自：the original warning was $\chi \rho \grave{\eta} \epsilon \dot{\jmath} \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a t$ ．$\chi \rho \epsilon i ́ \eta$ ，but not $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \nu$ ， would be grammatically possible． G．1487；H．932．For the use of $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$ ， cf． $33 \mathrm{~d}, 34 \mathrm{a}$ ，and Lach． 181 c ．G． 1400 ；H． 897.









10．єl $\mu \mathfrak{\eta}$ ăpa：unless perchance， Lat．nisi forte．In order to sug－ gest that the one safest way out of the difficulty is to beg the whole question at issue，á $\rho x$ introduces a definition of good speaking，and ironically con－ nects with it the assertion that Soc－ rates is a good speaker．

11． $\operatorname{\text {cl}} \mu$ év ：if indeed．This use of $\mu^{\prime} \nu$ ，like many others，shows its con－ nexion with $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ ．The supposition is merely restated．

12．ov̉ кarà тov́rous：but not after their pattern．A parenthetical state－ ment，which he proceeds to explain （see on $\mu$ ó $\iota \iota$ s， 21 b ，and $c f .27 \mathrm{c}$ ）．The explanation begins with où $\mu$ évtoc and ends with the chapter．Pending this explanation，these words mean a bet－ ter or a worse speaker than they，i．e． one not on their level．

13．yoûv：at all events．－ $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ тし $\eta$ oùठ＇́v：little or nothing．Cf．Hdt．iii． 140，à $\nu a \beta \epsilon \beta \eta \kappa \epsilon$ グ $\tau \iota s$ خ̀ ò̀ $\delta \epsilon$ ls к $\omega$ $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \alpha a \dot{\tau} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，hardly a single one of them has ever been here．Xen．Cyr．vii．

 standers I know next to no one at all．
 of $\epsilon^{\prime} \mu о \hat{v} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \kappa о \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ．The position of $\dot{v} \mu \in \hat{i} s$ suggests a contrast with ô̂to $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu$ ；the sense calls for $\bar{\epsilon} \mu o \hat{v} \delta \hat{\epsilon}(\dot{\delta} \mu \epsilon \hat{i} s)$ àкои́ $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ．This collocation leaves op－
portunity for bringing out $\pi \hat{\iota} \sigma a \nu \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\grave{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \iota a \nu$ with great prominence．For a similar shifting of emphasis，$c f$ ．



 iो入ıklav，now I for one，if you are minded to bestir yourselves to accom－ plish this，am ready to follow your lead； if you however appoint me to lead you I make no excuse on the score of my age． See App．

15．кєка入入ıє $\boldsymbol{\pi} \eta \mu$ évous $\kappa \tau \epsilon \in$. ：in Crat． 309 a b $\Delta l$ фi $\lambda o s$ is quoted as a $\rho \bar{\eta} \mu a$ ； when changed to $\Delta$（ $\phi i \lambda o s$ it becomes an úvo $\mu \alpha$ ．Here ó ó $\delta \mu a \tau \alpha$ means words， р $\eta \mu a \tau \alpha$ means phrases．In grammar
 The кó $\sigma \mu o s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \lambda \delta \gamma \omega \nu$（ornatus） means specifically the use of tropes and figures of speech．Orators took great pains in the choice of single words，and in the collocation and suitable arrangement of their words in phrases．Accordingly，in Symp． 108 b ，Socrates is made to bestow un－ stinted praise upon Agathon＇s speech： то̂̀ кá入入ovs $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ỏvo $\mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ каl
 who would not have been beside himself on hearing words and phrases of such marvellous beauty？Then he contrasts his own fashion of speaking with Aga－
$\qquad$
$\square$

$\qquad$










${ }^{17}$ thon＇s as follows：ö $\rho \alpha$ о $\hat{\nu} \nu$ єl $\tau \iota$ каl
 $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha$ àsov́є $\ell$, ỏ $\nu \delta \mu a \sigma \iota$ б̀̀ каl

 yout feel the need of such a speech as this，of hearing the truth told about love in words and phrases arranged just in the way they sugyest themselves（cf．єiкฑ̂ $\lambda \in \gamma \dot{\prime} \mu \in \nu \alpha)$ ．Sce Introd． 55.
c 17．єiкị̂，тoîs émıгuXov̂бıv ỏvó $\mu a \sigma$ ： the same fact stated under two differ－ ent but parallel aspects，$\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$ è $\kappa \pi \alpha-$ $\rho a \lambda \lambda$ भ́八 $^{\prime} \dot{u}$ ．Sce on $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \iota \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} ., 18 \mathbf{b}$ ，and on kal à̀тol $k \tau \epsilon \in .$, Crit． 48 d ，and for the facts Introd．34．Also for freq．sneers at the unrefined illustrations and home－ ly vocabulary of Socrates，cf．Gorg． $480 \mathrm{~b}-491$ c．Cf．also Xen．Mem．i． 2. 37，$\delta$ ठè K Kıтías，＂ả入入à $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon ́ \not \tau o i ́ ~ \sigma \epsilon$
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \kappa \nu \tau \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$ каl $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ тєктóv $\omega \nu$ каl $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$



18．á $\lambda \epsilon \prime \gamma \omega$ ：referring to the speech which follows，my plea．－$\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \epsilon_{\mathrm{s}} \pi \rho o \sigma-$ סокŋбátc：for the aor．imv．third pers．in prohibitions，see GMT．260； G． 1347 ；H． 874 b．
 as $1 . \pi \lambda a ́ \tau \tau o \nu \tau \iota$ agrees in gender with $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \sigma^{\prime}$ ，i．e．the person involved in $\pi \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \tau-$

тoviı and suggested，though not ex－ plicitly，by $\tau \hat{\eta} \delta \epsilon$（equiv．to $\tau \hat{\eta} \epsilon \mu \hat{\eta})$ ． The comparison is attracted into the dat．，i．e．$\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho ~ \mu \epsilon є \rho a \kappa i ́ \varphi ~ s t a n d s ~ f o r ~$ $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \leqslant \iota \rho a ́ c t o \nu$ à $\nu \pi \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \tau o \iota$.

21．єis tipâs ：before you，sc．тoùs
 similar use of $\epsilon \nu$ ．－кal $\mu$ ќvtol кai $\pi a ́ v v: ~ y e s, ~ a n d ~ m o s t ~ f e r v e n t l y ~ t o o . ~ к a . l ~$ $\mu^{\epsilon} \nu \tau o \iota=$ a rhetorical＇yes，＇the second кai adds a specification of the inten－ sity with which the request is made， ＂and indeed I beg of you，and I beg you most fervently too．＂

22．$\delta є ́ о \mu a \iota ~ к а і ~ \pi а р і є \mu a ı: ~ c f . ~ 27 ~ b, ~$
 ＂this has respect primarily to the conversation with Mcletus，which is prefaced by the request， $27 \mathrm{~b}, \mu_{i}{ }_{7}$ oopu－
 $\pi о \iota \omega \hat{\omega} \alpha$. ．But，as something like this was recognized under the name of $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \eta \sigma t s$（see Introd．71），the reference here prob．extends to the conversa－ tions rehearsed（20a），alluded to （ 21 c sqq．， 23 c ），and imagined（ 28 b ， 29 c ），in the course of the defence； perhaps also to the castigation inter－ mingled with it $(30 \mathrm{~d}, 31 \mathrm{c}, 35 \mathrm{~b}$ ， c）．＂R．

23．кal év áyopấ кal ä à $\lambda 0 \theta_{\iota}$ ：see Introd． 25.






 well as shops, esp. those near the market place, were favorite lounging places at Athens. Cf. Lys. ix. 5,

 recited I gathered from a conversation at Philius's bank. $C f$. also $I d$. xxiv. 19-20, where, to meet the charge that his shop is the resort of evil minded persons without visible means of support, the defendant says: $\tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu$
 $\lambda \omega \nu$ öбoı тє́ $\chi \nu a s$ ढ̆ $\chi$ ovaı (who follow

入ous $\delta \eta \mu$ ouvpoús (tradesmen). ধ̈ккатоs $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{v} \mu \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$ є $\ell \theta \iota \sigma \tau \alpha!\pi \rho o \sigma \phi o \iota \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$ (frequent, lounge in) $\delta \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu \pi \rho \partial s$ $\mu \nu \rho o \pi o \lambda \epsilon i o \nu(p e r-$


 тoùs Є่ $\gamma \gamma v \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega ~ \tau \hat{\jmath} s$ à $\gamma о \rho \hat{\rho} s$ катабкєva-
 тoùs $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \tau o \nu ~ a ̀ \pi \epsilon ́ \chi o \nu \tau \alpha s ~ a u ̀ \tau \eta ̂ s . ~ O n ~$ the last point, $c f$. Xen. Mem. iv. 2. 1, where Socrates ai $\sigma \theta a \nu \delta \dot{\mu} \in \nu 0 s$ à̀ $\tau \delta \nu$ (sc. $\tau \grave{\nu} \mathrm{E} \dot{u} \theta \dot{v} \delta \eta \mu o \nu) \delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \nu \in \delta \tau \eta \tau a$ (because he was so young) ö̈ $\pi \omega \in$ is $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \gamma o-$

 $\tau \iota$ (a harness-maker's) $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon^{2} \gamma \gamma \dot{\imath} s$
 $\kappa \tau \epsilon$.
d 25. Oopußєiv: $0_{0}$. describe noisy demonstrations whether of approval or disapproval, and are
used esp. of large assemblies. Cf. $\mathbf{d}$ Rep. vi. 492 b, ö $\tau \alpha \nu ~^{\sigma} v \gamma \kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon \zeta \delta \mu \in \nu o \iota$


 $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi}$ $\theta o \rho v ́ \beta \varphi$ тà $\mu \in ̀ \nu \psi \in ́ \gamma \omega \sigma \iota ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

 $\kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} .$, whenever the multitude gathers and crowds the seats of assemblies, courts, theatres, or camps, or collects in any place where crowds commonly resort, and there makes a great uproar with shouting and clapping of hands meting out praise to this and blame to that in a speech or a play, etc.
 the notion of presenting one's self to the court. Cf. Isae. Frg. (Dion H. de
 à $\alpha \beta \epsilon \in \beta \eta \kappa \alpha$ refers to the $\beta \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$." R.
 App. Cf. also Lys. xıx. 55, Єे $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ र̀̀ $\rho$
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi a \tau \rho!$ où $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu \quad \pi \omega \dot{\pi} \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon$ à $\nu \tau \epsilon \grave{\iota} \pi o \nu$, oй $\tau \epsilon$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ où $\delta \in i ́ s ~ \mu o \iota ~ \epsilon ̀ \nu \in \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \in \sigma \in \nu$ (brought accusation), द่ $\gamma \gamma \dot{\prime} \dot{s} \tau \in$ oik $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu} \tau \hat{\eta} s$

 $\pi о \tau \epsilon, \pi \rho l \nu \tau \alpha v ́ \tau \eta \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\sigma} \nu \mu \varphi о \rho \alpha ̀ \nu \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta \alpha L$.
 gen. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \lambda^{\prime} \dot{\xi} \epsilon \omega s$ depends upon $\xi \in \nu \omega s$ (G. 1147; H. 757 a ), the adv. of $\xi^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} 0 s$, -used almost in the sense of atetpos, - which in this sense takes the gen., but is rare in Att. prose.
$\omega^{*} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ov̉v $\mathfrak{\alpha} \nu \kappa \tau \mathcal{\epsilon} .:$ for the position











17 and repetition of $\alpha \nu$, see GMT. 223; G. 1312; H. 864.
30. $\phi \omega \nu \mathrm{n}$ : dialect, with esp. reference to pronunciation, while $\tau \rho \delta \pi \omega$, style of speech, describes more generally any unusual choice and combination of words.
18 éтєӨра́ццทท: had been brought up, a belongs to the supposed case. See on $\delta \bar{s}{ }_{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu, 20$ a. Foreigners were allowed to appear in court only in exceptional cases. Ordinarily their $\xi \in \mathcal{\nu} 0 s$, guest-friend, or their $\pi \rho \sigma \xi \in \nu=5$, resident consul, represented them in court and was surety for them.
31. кal $\delta \dot{\eta}$ кal: takes the place of ov̈rc кal after $̈ \sigma \pi \pi \epsilon \rho$; $\delta \dot{\text { ýn calls atten- }}$ tion to the case in point here cited. $\nu \hat{v}$ : not now in contrast to then, but as it is contrasted with as it would have been. "Now that I am not a stranger in Athens, but only a stranger in courts." Lat. nunc is used in the same way. $C f$. Liv. ii. 12.
 $\gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu \mathrm{mol}$, the reading of inferior Mss. adopted by many editt. The important word is $\dot{\omega} s$, not $\mu o$, which is the least emphatic form in which the pron. could be introduced. Here the pers. pron. is used instead of the
refl. H. 684. For the analogous use of the oblique cases of aùvós instead of the ind. refl., see G. 992 ; H. 684 a.
32. io $\omega \mathrm{s}$, lo $\sigma$, : the reason urged is a general one. The influence of style, if felt at all, will be felt just in those cases where the style of the plea is better or worse than the case deserves, - just where it interferes with true judgment. For similar phraseology, cf. Xen. Cyr. iv. 3.

 (for their own satisfaction). Two Gen. of Ver. i. 1,
If haply won perhaps a hapless gain; If lost, why then a grievous labor won.
35. aṽtท: in place of rov̂̃o, by assimilation to the gender of the pred. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \eta$. . It refers to the preceding clause à̀ $\boldsymbol{r} \quad \ldots \mu \dot{\eta}$.
 adjs. used pers. with the inf., see GMT. 762; G. 1527; H. 952.
 because in the act. the idiom is кaтnropeì $u i$ tivos.
4. द̇भov̂ үàp ктé.: introducing the $\mathbf{b}$ reason why Socrates is to speak first









18
which is equiv. to катŋүорŋ́кхбь. $\quad C f$.
 $\pi \rho \partial{ }_{s} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$, where $\pi \rho \sigma_{s}$ relates to those to whom the accusation is addressed.
5. каi, каi: the first каi emphasizes $\pi \dot{x} \lambda a=$, the second requires no com-
 $\epsilon i \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \dot{\epsilon} ., 17 \mathrm{c}$. $\pi \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda a l$ goes back to the beginning of the accusations while $\pi л \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$. follows out their long continuance. This has been going on more than twenty years at the very least, for the Clouds was first put upon the stage in 423, and Socrates was tried in 399.
6. coves átфl"Avviov: when followed by the ace. of a person's name, oi $\pi \in \rho^{\prime}$ and oi $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi^{\prime}$ mean the person and those connected with him (subjects, followers, companions, adherdents). G. 952,$2 ;$ H. 791, 3 fin. Anytus was the most influential accauser. See Intro. 30.
8. roves $\pi \mathrm{o} \lambda \lambda \mathrm{hou}$ : : most of you. The art. is not used here (as in 17 a above, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ ) to call up something familiar; it contrasts most of them, who were caught young and taught to abhor Socrates, with the few, implied in the part. gen. $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, to whom this may not have happened. G. 965, 967 ; H. 665 and 673 b .

таралацßávovтєs: this word often is used of one who takes charge of a child and educates it. $C f$. . Al. I.

 Bact $\lambda$ pious $\pi \alpha \iota \delta a \gamma \omega \gamma o \grave{s}$ oj $\nu о \mu a ́\} o v \sigma \iota \nu$. But this sense is too narrow for the present context. More to the point is Gory. 483 e , where $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha, \nu \epsilon \nu$ is used in a wider sense, which is analogous to that of $\pi \alpha \rho a \lambda \alpha \mu Q \alpha, \nu \in \iota \nu$ here, $\tau o u ̀ s$ $\beta \in \lambda \tau i ́ \sigma \tau o u s$ каl द̀ $\rho \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \in \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau o v s ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$
 $\lambda$ 'оутаs катєт best and most vigorous of our number in our earliest youth, and by incantations subduing us as if we were young lions.
 diced you against me by unceasing accusations. Strictly speaking кuтๆ-
 ordination here idiomatically takes the place of subordination. - Tets
 conveys an indefiniteness and undertaint which are always uncomplimentory and which in this case amount to scorn, an individual (somebody or other) named Socrates. Cf. what d' you call him? used colloquially in Eng.
10. ooфòs div ip: these words are practically intended to mean a Sophist. "The title $\sigma o \phi \partial s \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \dot{p}$ would at once be understood as a class-appellation, $c f .23 \mathrm{a}, 34 \mathrm{c}$; in it the meaning and associations of Philosopher are uppermost, yet not so distinctly as to exclude those of Sophist." R. -
 uar prejudice coined this phrase, or something like it, to stigmatize all

 $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \delta \alpha ́ \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ oi $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu o i ́ ~ \epsilon i \sigma i ́ ~ \mu o v ~ к а \tau \eta ́ \gamma о \rho o \iota . ~ o i ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ a ̀ к о v ́-~$
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b scientific investigation into nature. With such investigation began and ended the earliest Greek philosophy (Introd. 2-12), and even Socrates' contemporaries, the Sophists, - notably Hippias, - were much addicted to it. See Introd. 14. Cf. Prot. 315 c,

 $\pi \delta \nu$ ' $1 \pi \pi i ́ a \nu$, and they (Eryximachus, Phaedrus, and Andron) appeared to be plying Hippias with astronomical questions about nature and the heavenly bodies. The phrase $\tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{v} \pi \delta \gamma \hat{\eta} s$ (where $\dot{v} \pi \delta^{\prime}$ has the very unusual sense of beneath and covered by) does not refer to definite matters searched into, but is part and parcel of a sweeping assertion that nothing either high or low, nothing "in heaven above or in the earth beneath or in the waters under the earth" is safe from their fatuous and futile curiosity. This popular view is amusingly exaggerated and dramatized by Aristophanes in the Clouds, 184-234. Here the word ä $\pi a \nu \tau \alpha$ adds a final touch of exaggeration. - фpovrıбтท's: used trans. here like фроутi$\zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ with acc., For a dat. similarly governed, $c f . \tau \grave{\eta} \nu{ }^{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \tau \hat{\varphi} \quad \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \quad \dot{v} \pi \eta \rho \epsilon-$ oiav, 30 a , where see note. See also App. - "This 'accusation,' $\sigma o \phi \partial s . .$. $\pi о \iota \omega \bar{\omega}$, both as given here, and as repeated with mock formality in 19 b , is nothing more than a vivid way of representing, for a rhetorical purpose, the popular prejudice, in which the court shared. The charges it contains are two-edged, being borrowed partly from the vulgar representation
of the Philosopher, partly from that of the Sophist; the $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \epsilon \omega \rho a$ фродтı $\sigma \tau \eta$ 's points to the Philosopher, the $\tau \delta \nu .$. $\pi o \iota \omega \bar{\nu}$ to the Sophist." R.
 ing of rhe ${ }^{+\sim}$ ric, as such, must contain hints as to $\overrightarrow{0}$ e most effective means for making $\vec{t}$, best of a bad case by presenting it skilfully. How far this must be condemned should not be decided without reference to circumstances and facts. To-day it is equally impossible to assert that a lawyer in all cases is bound not to defend a client whose cause he knows to be unjust. Popular opinion at Athens seems to have been convinced that the Sophist's single aim in teaching rhetoric was to communicate the art of proving that black was white. Cf. the Clouds, 889-1104, where Aristophanes introduces the fíkalos $\lambda$ óros and the ¿סıкos $\lambda$ ó ${ }^{\prime}$ os respectively. They have an argument in which the ádiкos $\lambda$ dóos wins. Cf. Cic. Brut. 8, where the excellent Claudius says of the Sophists: docerese profitebantur quemadmodum causa inferior (ita enim loquebantur) dicendo fierisuperior posset. His opposuit sese Socrates, qui subtilitate quadam disputandi refellere eorum instituta solebat verbis.
13. of $\delta$ elvoi: in the pred. The c accusers just mentioned as кат' $\begin{gathered} \\ \xi\end{gathered} \boldsymbol{o}_{-}$

 tions alluded to above were, it was charged, not only a foolish waste of
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d main statement of the preceding sent. about the anonymous accusers, $\delta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ ... $\epsilon i \pi \in i \nu$. On the loose conversational structure of such sents., see Introd. 55.
 used here to connect, not two different ideas, but two different ways of putting the same idea. Socrates would be sure always to use his favorite method of question and answer, and therefore $\sigma \kappa เ \alpha \mu \alpha \chi \in \hat{\imath} \nu \quad \dot{a} \pi о \lambda o \gamma \delta \nu \mu \in \nu o \nu$ for him would be practically ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \in \in ́ \gamma \chi \in เ \nu$
 ing one and the same thing twice over, the speaker expresses his idea all the more effectively.
27. ást $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma a r \epsilon: ~ t h e ~ t w o ~ n o t i o n s ~ o f ~}$ kiov, worth (price) and right, are as usual blended in this word, duly grant. Notice the persistent recurrence in various forms of the idea conveyed by $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ є́ $\gamma \dot{\omega} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$. See Introd. 55.
e 29. ou์s $\lambda \in$ '่ $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ : refers to $\mathbf{b}$ above. -olท'Өทтє $\kappa \tau \mathcal{\epsilon} .:$ it was common for a speaker to ask the court to approve
of some order of topics which he proposed to follow. For a fuller description of ékívous, see $\mathbf{b}$ above; notice that it refers to é $\tau \in ́ \rho o u s ~ \delta \grave{e ̀ ~} \tau o u ̀ s ~ \pi \alpha ́ \lambda a l . ~$ These old-time accusers, though the last-mentioned, were the most remote in thought, for Anytus and his crew were actually present as $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon$ shows. H. 696 b.
32. eifv: well, pointing to what has just been said, and implying that the whole must be accepted by his hearers as a matter of course. It is like "So far, so good!" $\neq \sigma \tau \omega$ often has the same force. Grammatical arguments are used to prove that this $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu$ is nothing more nor less than the alternative form used not infrequently in place of the opt. єin $\eta \sigma a \nu$. The force of $\delta \dot{\eta}$ is very much that of $\epsilon \bar{l} \in \nu$, for it indicates that the duty of making some plea must be taken for granted.
 duced by the slanders just described.
34. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \chi \in \tau \epsilon$ : acquired. See on $\left.\begin{array}{c} \\ \sigma \\ \\ \\ \eta\end{array}\right)$ 20 d , and $c f$. Hdt. i. 14, $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau v \rho a \nu \nu \ell(\delta$,







 $\delta \iota \epsilon ́ \beta a \lambda \lambda o \nu$ oi $\delta \iota a \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau \epsilon S$ ；$\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ov̂v катך $\sigma o ́ \rho \omega \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$

 means，be in possession，光 $\sigma \chi o \nu$ means， came into possession．G．1260；H． 841．－тav́тŋข：resumptively after the interrupting clause of explanation introduced by $\eta \nu$ ．
 without an expressed standard of comparison because the opposite in－ evitably suggests itself，＂better in any way than that I should not ac－ complish anything．＂

38．ov̉ $\pi$ ávv：not at all．Here cer－ tainly hardly would not be adequate． Cf．$\mu$ ó $\boldsymbol{\iota}$ s $\pi \alpha ́ \nu v, 21 \mathbf{b}$ ．

39．$\tau \underset{\hat{\omega}}{ } \theta \in \omega \hat{\varphi}$ ：the divine will or God． The art．is used not because any par－ ticular god is referred to，but with a generic or collective force．$C f$ ．Crit． 43 d ，and see on $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}, 35 \mathrm{~d}$ and 42 a ， and $\delta \theta \epsilon \delta s$ ，Crit． 54 e．

III．2．тเซтєvं由v：not as above， 18 c ，fdem habens，but rather con－ fidens or fretus．Cf．Alc．I． 123 c，$\tau i$
 páкเov；Come now，on what does the youth rely？－Mé ${ }^{\prime} \eta$ тos：see Introd． 30，and for $\gamma \rho a \phi \eta{ }^{2}$, ibid． 67.

4．$\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ oův katๆүóp $\omega v$ ：a freq．
idiom in comparisons；the leading and dependent clauses are briefly blended in one；à $\nu \alpha \gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \nu a \iota$ as well as $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \mu o \sigma i a \nu$ are involved in this con－ solidation．The reference is to the formal reading of the documents in a suit before the full court．On à $\nu \tau \omega \mu \circ \sigma_{i}^{\prime} a$ ，see Introd． 69.

5．dंठık氏i：very commonly，as here， adockeiv has almost the force of a pf． One of its obvious meanings is àdıóss －time，which practically signifies，$I$ ，．ave done wrong or I am guilty．GMT．27； H． 827.

6．$\pi \in \rho เ \epsilon \rho \gamma{ }^{\prime} \xi \in \tau a l:$ is a busybody．A busybody either minds other people＇s business or makes too much of his own．Socrates is accused of the first ； for a good case of the second，$c f$ ．Nep． Arst． 1.4 ，sibi non placere quod tam cupide elaborasset，ut praeter ceteros Iustus appel－ laretur．$C f .20 \mathrm{c}, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau \delta \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \nu \pi \rho a \gamma-$ $\mu a \tau \epsilon v o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o v$ ，and see on $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \omega \rho a$ in 18 b ．－ovipávia：the art．is omitted
 conception．Cf．Xen．Mem．i．ı．19，
 $\tau \alpha \tau \in \lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu \in \nu a \kappa a l \pi \rho a \tau \tau \delta \mu \in \nu a$








 Plans in man's thought). In Pro. 315 e of Hippias.
7. ä $\lambda \lambda$ nous. . . $\delta \iota \delta \delta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega \nu$ : see Intro. 11 and 25.
8. тolavín is: Socrates alone is responsible for the exact words; the accusation itself is vague.- тav̂ra - $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ et $\omega \rho \hat{\rho} \tau \epsilon$ : in the Clouds, Aristophans put before the Athenians their own feelings against Socrates, he dramatized a prejudice already existing.
9. $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho$ it $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \downarrow \mathbf{\alpha}$ ктé.: in appos. with $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$. For the force of $\tau \iota \nu \alpha$, see on $\tau \iota \Sigma \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \eta s, 18 \mathbf{b}$; it implies that Socrates in the Clouds bears no close resemblance to the real Socrates. Cf. Clouds, 218-225, where Strepsiades on entering Socrates's thinkingshop says: Who is this man up there in the basket? Hearing it is Sorates, he asks him what he's about. Socrates answers $\dot{\alpha} \epsilon \rho o \beta \alpha \tau \hat{\omega}$ каl $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota-$ $\phi \rho o \nu \hat{\omega} \tau \delta \nu \nu \ddot{\eta} \lambda t o \nu$, on air $I$ tread and oversee the sun.
10. фáбкоvтa ктє.: subordinated to $\pi \in \rho เ \phi \in \rho \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$.
11. $\hat{\omega v}$ : referring to all statements of the sort above mentioned. - oüт $\mu \in ́ \gamma a$ oṽтє $\mu<\kappa$ ро́v: a reënforcement of the oui $\delta \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime}$ stated disjunctively. Cf. 21 b and 24 a ; also for a similar locu-





 "Such knowledge is a fine thing, if any one has it." Socrates ironically hints that no one has it. $C f$. Ken, Mem. i. I. 11, out $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \in \rho l \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta} s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu \quad \phi \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}, \hat{\}} \pi \epsilon \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ oi $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{i}-$ $\sigma \tau o \iota, \delta \iota \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \tau \sigma, \sigma \kappa о \pi \omega ิ \nu$ ठ̈ $\pi \omega s$ б калоv́ $\mu \epsilon-$



 ias $\dot{\alpha} \pi \in \delta \epsilon i \kappa \nu v \in \nu$. Those who pursued these studies were crazy, he thought, because man ought first to know him-



 $\phi \rho o \nu \tau\{\zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$, and 38 a below), and because these physicists looked into questions which were really beyond the sphere of man (ibid., to $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$
 $\pi 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon$, $\mathfrak{\eta} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \hat{v} \nu \tau \alpha \iota \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \hbar \kappa o \nu \tau \alpha$ $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \epsilon(\nu)$ and therefore arrived at impotent conclusions (cf.id.iv. 7.6-7). See on $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\eta} s \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} ., 26$ e, and Intro. 10.
 et these words: "qua sanam interpretationem spernunt." Stallbaum punctuates " $\mu \grave{\eta}$...ф́́रoı $\mu$ !"






 $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \epsilon ̇ \mu o v ̂ ~ a ̀ ~ o i ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda o i ̀ ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o v \sigma \iota \nu . ~$







19 The meaning certainly appears to be, may I never by any chance have to defend myself against Meletus on so serious a charge! $\delta i \kappa \alpha$ is often best represented in translation by the sing. For $\dot{v} \pi \delta$ with $\phi \epsilon \dot{v} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$, see on $\pi \epsilon \pi \delta \partial \nu \theta a \tau \epsilon$, 17 a. If Socrates despised the wisdom of the natural philosophers, he would be pretending to know what he did not know. Meletus then would have a strong case against him, for the charge would be so serious that Socrates could not attempt to defend himself. Socrates ironically attributes to Meletus and the courts his own strong disapproval of pretended knowledge.
15. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha{ }_{\alpha}$ yáp: but the truth is, the truth, namely, which contradicts the notion that Socrates pretends to know what he is ignorant of, and also gives the reason why Aristophanes's attack does not touch him, but the physicists only.
case, sc. the one just mentioned; hence the art. is used.
22. $\pi \epsilon \rho \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{v}$ : the colloquial tone is marked in the position of these words. Instead of "the other stories which people tell about me," Socrates says, "the other stories about me, which people tell." The rel. clause is appended as an apparent afterthought.
IV. 1. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{a} p:$ in turning to a new topic, a glance is thrown backward (oư $\epsilon \ldots$... そ̌ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ), and the new departure begins with the emphatic
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime}(\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu)$.
3. ' $\in \pi \epsilon i$ : although. Strictly a con- $\mathbf{e}$ necting thought must be supplied.
4. $\epsilon$ tis $\epsilon i \eta$ : the regular apod.
 equiv. in sense, $\delta о \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ калдд $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ єival. GMT. 502, and compare 555.
5. $\ddot{\omega}^{\circ} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ Гopylas: on Gorgias, see Introd. 12-14. Protagoras was not living at this time. See Introd. 12.










 $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \eta \nu \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon i \nu$ каì $\mu \tau \sigma \theta \omega \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, òs ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu \alpha u ̈ \tau \grave{\omega} \kappa \alpha \lambda \omega$
 $\stackrel{a}{a} \nu$ ov̂̃os $\hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad i \pi \pi \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \iota \varsigma \quad \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \cdot \nu \hat{v} \nu \delta^{\prime}$

 ironical surprise of Socrates is reproduced by the anacoluthon in this sent. With oî́s $\tau^{\prime}$ évoì the speaker apparently leads up to $\pi \epsilon^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, but the emphatic roúzous (in which the clause roùs $\nu$ '́ous oîs . . . Bov̀ $\lambda \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ is summed up) is followed by $\pi \epsilon$ ( Oovat instead. (The pl. after ধ́кабтоs is not uncommon. H. 609 a .) Then comes the statement of a fact which is surprising, they pay these men, and finally the climax is capped by their giving them thanks to boot. To give this last point $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \in \delta \in(\nu a t$, which should be a partic. like $\delta i \delta \delta \nu \tau \alpha s$, is put on a par with छuveival. For a fuller account of these teachers, see Prot. 316 cff. named are not the only ones, for also, etc."
12. ท่ $\sigma \theta$ ó $\mu \eta \nu$ : see on $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma \theta \delta \mu \eta \nu$ oio $\mu \epsilon$ $\nu \omega \nu, 22$ c.
14. Ka入入fq: at Callias's house foreigners, and particularly foreign

Sophists, were welcomed. Callias's fondness for Sophists is humorously brought out in the Protagoras, where he is almost crowded out of house and home by them. The indulgence of this and of other tastes exhausted his resources, and he died in poverty. His father Hipponicus fell in the battle at Delium ( 424 в.c.).
17. ôs ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu$ : for $\nLeftarrow \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu$ and the inf., without $\alpha \nu$, expressing a past likelihood which was not realized, see GMT. 428 a. Here is a present likelihood (see ib. a for an analogous use of $\left.\begin{array}{c} \\ \delta \epsilon t\end{array}\right)$ which is not realized, who would, in the case supposed $(\epsilon i \ldots \mu / \sigma \theta \omega-$ $\sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a$ ), proceed to make them, etc.
21. $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \mathcal{L} \eta \mathrm{s} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \tau \mathcal{\varepsilon} .:$ sc. the $\mathbf{b}$ boys must be civilized and humanized. Civilization involves the existence of the family and the state, and these require education. $C f$. Arist. Pol.
 man is by nature a political animal.








 тò $\sigma o ̀ \nu \tau i ́ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \iota \pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a ; \pi o ́ \theta \epsilon \nu$ ai $\delta \iota a \beta o \lambda a i ́ ~ \sigma o \iota ~ a \tilde{v} \tau \alpha \iota ~ \gamma \epsilon-$
 in this answer, upon the brevity of which largely depends the humor of the story. Evenus is elsewhere mentioned as a teacher of oratory and a writer of elegiacs. A few such poems attributed to him still exist. Here he is introduced as a Sophist anü a teacher of virtue. The smallness of his charge for instruction prob. measures accurately the value attached to it by his contemporaries, and places him and his teaching in the second rank. Protagoras charged 100 minas. There have beerf attempts to distinguish between a younger and an elder Evenus, both of whom came from Paros and wrote elegiacs. If there were two, allusion is here made to the elder.
 original statement which Socrates may be supposed to have in mind, both of these were in the indic. Both might change to the opt. (GMT. 696; H. 937) after $\epsilon \not \mu \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ \rho \iota \sigma a$. The change to the opt. from $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \chi \in \ell$ throws $\epsilon i \notin \chi o \iota$, as it were, into the background, leaving oü $\omega \omega \bar{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} s \delta เ \delta \alpha \dot{\sigma} \kappa \in \iota$, which contains a very pointed insinuation, in the more vivid indic. Sce App.
27. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon \lambda \omega \bar{s}:$ synonymous with o $\rho \theta \hat{\omega} s$. Its opposite is $\pi \lambda \eta \mu \mu \in \lambda \hat{\omega} s$ (discordantly or falsely, of a false note). The word also conveys by innuendo the notion that the teaching of Evenus is cheap, and this is the point here made. In Criti. $106 \mathrm{~b}, \mu \in \tau \rho i \omega s$ and $\pi a \rho \alpha ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda o s, \pi \lambda \eta \mu \mu \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} s$ and $\epsilon \in \mu \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta$ 's are used as contradictories.
V. All error is distorted truth; until a man sees the truth which a particular error caricatures, he will not renounce his error; to denounce error as such is therefore not enough. Thus far Socrates has argued against the grossly erroneous popular opinion of himself; now he proceeds to exhibit the truth. His upright conduct has been exasperating, for obedience to God has led him to defy men.
 dramatized and put in the form of questions. The argument is: "there must be some cause." Hence the $\gamma$ ap in oủ $\gamma$ à $\rho$ र́ńtov.
2. тò $\sigma \dot{\text { ò }} \pi \rho \hat{\gamma} \mu a$ : What is that you have been about? or better, What is this about you? Accordingly $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu \alpha$ is used cither in the sense of pursuit, study, or plan of life ; or it has no independent meaning, but is joined with the art.






 $10 \tau \iota \sigma i \nu \quad \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha i \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu, \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \tau \sigma \iota \stackrel{\imath}{\iota} \sigma \tau \epsilon, \pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta^{\eta}-$



and $\sigma \delta \nu$ ，the whole being a paraphrase for $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \eta s$ ．See on $\tau \grave{\partial} \tau o \hat{v} \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau o u s$ $\pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a$, Crit． 53 d ．

3．тєрıтто́тєроv：what overpasses the limit restraining common men， and hence provokes suspicion．See on $\pi \epsilon \rho t \epsilon \rho \gamma \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota, 19 \mathrm{~b}$ ，and $c f$ ．Soph．


 $\rho \iota \sigma \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \grave{\alpha} \phi \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \cdot \tau \delta \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta o s$
 （whate＇er the multitude of lowlier men puts faith in and practises）$\tau \delta \delta \delta^{\circ}$ a $\nu$ $\delta \epsilon \chi o i \mu \alpha \nu$ ．That $\sigma o \hat{v} . . . \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon v o \mu \epsilon \in-$ vou（although as you say you have been doing nothing）conveys a statement of fact，not a supposition，is shown by
 trast between two statements of fact， （1）$\sigma o \hat{v}$（gen．after $\phi \eta \dot{\eta} \eta$ ）$\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon v o-$ $\mu \epsilon ́ v o v$ ，and（2）тoбaúтך фŋ́ $\mu \eta \gamma^{\prime} \gamma \sigma \nu \in \nu$ ． The words $\epsilon i \mu \eta$＇$\tau \iota \ldots$ oi $\pi o \lambda \lambda o l$（see App．）re－state（1）more mildly and as a supposition．＂The evil report did not arise about you while you were doing nothing out of the way，unless your behaviour was eccentric．＂A man may be eccentric and yet keep
within bounds；$c f$ ．below $d$ and e，also 23 a．

8．тò övoцa кal тท̀v $\delta \iota a \beta \circ \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} v: ~ s c . ~ d$ $\sigma o \phi o ́ s$. To be distinguished from $\phi \eta^{\prime} \mu \eta$ $\tau \in \kappa a l$ גó $\begin{array}{r}\text { os } \\ \text { only as bringing out the }\end{array}$ bad repute which was their result．$C f$ ． the Lat．nomen．The words $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \alpha-$ Bo入ńv show that óvoua is not to be taken in its usual sense of good name or fame，but closely with $\delta \iota a \beta o \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$ ， both the name and the blame．

11．${ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \eta$＂：this collocation with ou $\delta \dot{\prime} \epsilon$ indicates that $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \eta$ arose from the use of $\alpha \lambda \lambda o s$ ．For a case where a $\lambda \lambda \lambda$ os precedes it，$c f .34 \mathbf{b}$ ．

12．＇̈＇ХПка：I have become pos－ sessed of and still have．See on ${ }_{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ， 19 a，and Phaedr． 241 b，$\nu 0 \hat{v} \nu$ 万̄ $\eta \eta$ Ė $\sigma \chi \eta-$ $\kappa \grave{s}$ кal $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \omega \phi \rho о \nu \eta \kappa \omega$ s，after he had come to full understanding and gained self－control．
$\pi o l a v . .$. rav́rqv：this question treads upon the heels of the preced－ ing sent．so closely that $\delta \alpha^{\prime}$ is not repeated．$\pi \pi^{\prime} a \nu$ is in the pred．；we











 wisdom is one of two things，either superhuman or no wisdom at all．

18．$\mu \eta \dot{\eta}^{\theta} \theta_{0} \rho \beta \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ ：do not interrupt me with noise，strictly referring to the
 21 a ，and 30 c ，the pres．is used（ $\mu \eta$ $\theta o \rho \cup \beta \epsilon i \tau \epsilon)$ because the request is less precise，make no disturbance．GMT． 259 ；H． 874 a．
 the sense of speaking out loud（cf．Rep．
 beginning to speak above his brealh），but in that of $\mu \in \gamma a \lambda \eta \gamma \circ \rho \epsilon i v$ ，as $\mu \epsilon \prime \gamma \alpha \phi \rho o-$ $\nu \in i \nu$ is used in the sense of $\mu \in \gamma a \lambda o-$ фооуєiv．Cf．Rich．II．iii．2，

Boys with women＇s voices
Strive to speak lig，and clap their female joints
In stiff unwieldy arms against thy crown．
— ov̉ үàp $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\nu} v \kappa \tau \epsilon \in .: ~ a ~ c o m p r e s s e d ~$ form of statement，made effective with the audience by the allusion to certain Euripidean strains．（ $C f$ ．Eur．
 $\mu \eta \tau \rho \dot{\Delta} s \pi \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho a$ ，not mine the word，I heard it from my mother．This line is paro－ died in Symp． 177 a，$\dot{\eta} \mu_{\epsilon ́ \nu} \mu o \iota ~ \grave{a} \rho \chi \grave{\eta}$ тov̂ $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \iota ~ к а \tau \grave{\alpha} ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ Eủpıníoov $\mathrm{M} \in \lambda \alpha \nu i ́ \pi \pi \eta \nu \cdot$ ò $\quad \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \in \mu \delta s \delta \mu \hat{v}$－ $\theta$ os $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ Фaı $\delta \rho o \hat{u}$ rov̂ $\delta \in$ ．The same sentiment is found in Eur．Hel．513，
 not mine the word；by clerkly men＇twas
spoken．Hor．Sat．ii．2，2，nec meus hic sermo est sed quae prae． cepit Ofellus．）For a similarly compressed statement，cf．iка⿱亠䒑⿱亠乂 $\tau \partial \nu$ $\mu a ́ \rho \tau v \rho a, 31$ c．＂A pred．adj．or subst． is often a brief equiv．for one clause of a compound sent．＂H．618．$\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu \delta \nu$ and $\grave{\alpha} \xi \sigma \chi \rho \epsilon \omega \nu$ are both preds．，and special point is given them by their position．This sent．is far more tell－ ing than what might be spun out of


 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$. －ôv âv $\lambda \lambda^{\prime} \gamma \omega$ ：equiv．to $\delta \nu \nu \epsilon \in \lambda-$ $\lambda \omega \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu$ ，though it is formally a hypothetical rel．clause with indef． antec．，＂the word I shall utter，whatev ${ }^{\text {r }}$ the word may be，that I say，will not be mine，etc．＂Cf．Crit． 44 c．

20．ávoíw ：in the sense of shifting responsibility．For àvaфopá in that sense，cf．Eur．Orest． $414 \mathrm{ff} ., \mathfrak{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ モ̌ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$
 Bos $\kappa \in \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \alpha s \mu \eta \tau \rho \partial s$ éк $\kappa \rho a ̂ \xi a \iota ~ \phi o ́ \nu o \nu . ~$
 skill as well as modesty to avoid blurting out here with $\tau \hat{\eta} s \epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\eta} s$ ooф＇as． The $\epsilon i$ i $\delta \dot{\eta} \tau i s$ द̇ $\sigma \tau i$ interrupts just in time．$C f$ ．Isocr．xv．50，$\pi \in \rho l$ l $\mu \in ̀ \nu$ oủv
 $\mu \epsilon \omega s$ ，єїтє фı入oбoфías，єЇтє $\delta \iota \alpha \tau \rho \iota \beta \hat{\eta} s$ ， àкทко́aтє $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma a \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota a \nu$ ，now you have heard all the truth about my talent or methodical study or pursuit，which－ ever you like to call it．









21．oia：goes back to $\pi$ oía ${ }^{2}$ in $d$ above．
22．Xaıpєфйvтa：certainly，if the Athenians did not know Chaerephon， many a joke of Aristophanes at Chaerephon＇s expense was lost on them；see below on line 25 ．He is mentioned by Xen．（Mem．i．2．48）as one of those friends of Socrates oì éceí－


 $\pi о \lambda i ́ \tau \alpha \iota s \delta^{\prime} \nu \alpha, \nu \tau o ~ к а \lambda \omega \bar{s} \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a$. ．
23．$\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \in \mathrm{t}$ ：the $\hat{\eta} \lambda \iota a \sigma \tau \alpha \mathfrak{l}$ are here taken as representing the whole people；and here，as often，$\pi \lambda \hat{\eta}-$ $\theta o s$ is equiv．to $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu o s$, and means dem－ ocratic party．Cf．Lys．passim．－غ่тai－ pos：partisan．Cf．Gorg． 510 a，$\tau \hat{\eta} s$
 a partisan of the government in power．

24．тウ̀v фvүฑ̀v тaúт $\eta v$ ：an allusion， which no one present could fail of understanding，to the exile from which all conspicuous democrats had only four years before returned（in 403 в．c．）．The Thirty Tyrants were the authors of this banishment；cf． Xen．Hell．ii．4．1，троєìтод $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ тoîs є $\xi \omega$ то̂̀ ката入ob their catalogue of 3000 oligarchical sym－ pathizers）$\mu \grave{\eta}$ єiซıє́vaı єis $\tau \grave{\partial}$ ă $\sigma \tau v . \quad \phi \in \cup-$



$\tau \omega \nu$ ．All these allusions had the ef－${ }^{2}$ fect of influencing the court in favor of what they were about to hear．
25．бфoठpós：Chaerephon was a born enthusiast．Cf．Charm． $153 \mathbf{b}$ ，

 anes calls Chaerephon＂a bat＂（Birds， 1554）；Chaerephon and Socrates be－ long to the jaundiced barefoot brother－ hood（Clouds，104）．Browning，Aris－ tophanes＇s Apology，
In me＇twas equal balanced flesh rebuked Excess alike in stuff－guts Glauketes Or starveling Chaerephon；I challenge both．

26．кal $\delta \eta^{\prime} \pi о т є$ кal $\kappa \tau \epsilon \in .:$ well then really once．$C f$ ． 18 a．The regular way of introducing a particular instance of what has been stated generally．What Chaerephon did at Delphi was an instance of his $\sigma \phi o \delta \rho \delta \tau \eta s$ ．

тoûro：a cognate acc．after $\mu \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \dot{\prime}-$
 For $\tau о \bar{\tau} \tau o$ referring forward，see H ． 696 a．For a similar acc．after $\mu \alpha \nu-$ $\tau \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a l, c f$ ．Eur．Ion． 346 f．， $1 \Omega . \delta \delta^{\prime}$ ${ }_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \in \theta \epsilon i s$（exposed）$\pi \alpha i ̂ s ~ \pi o \hat{v}$＇$\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ；єí $\sigma o p \hat{\alpha}$ фáos（alive）？KP．oủk oî $\delta \in \nu$ où $\delta \in i ́ s$ ． таиิта каl $\mu \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon$ ย́o $\mu \alpha 九$ ．
27．ӧтєр $\lambda \epsilon$＇$\gamma \omega: I$ repeat，lit．just what 1 am saying．$\quad C f .17 \mathrm{c}$ and 20 e ．
 an explanatory digression and leads back to $\mu \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau v \rho \alpha$ ט́ $\mu i \nu \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon ́ \xi о \mu \alpha \iota$ ．The

 $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \tau \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$ ．





## 5



 $\tau \omega \nu$（or $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu) \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \eta s ~ \sigma о ф \omega ́ \tau \alpha \tau о s . ~$ See the Schol．on Arist．Clouds， 144.

29．ó ad $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi$ ós：sc．Chaerecrates． We are told that once，when the two were at variance，Socrates intervened as peacemaker．Cf．Yen．Mem．ii．3． 1.
b
VI．3．$\tau i \pi \% \tau \epsilon$ alvin $\tau \epsilon \tau a l:$ through modesty Socrates takes it for granted that this is＂a dark saying．＂For a genuinely enigmatical oracle，$c f$ ．Paus．
 （Temenus and Cresphontes）aùv $\omega \bar{\nu}$
 $\pi о \iota \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \alpha \mathrm{\tau} \tau \nu \quad \tau \rho \iota \delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu о \nu$ ，that they should make＂the three－eyed＂leader of their home return．The＂three－eyed＂ turned out to be Oxylus，son of An－ draemon，whom they met riding on a one－eyed mule；acc．to Apollodorus， Oxylus was one－eyed and bestrode a two－eyed horse．See an essay on Greek Oracles by F．W．H．Myers，in his volume entitled Essays Classical（Lon－ don，1883）．

5．$\sigma$ oфòs $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu\end{gathered}$ ：see on $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \varphi, 22$ c．
 the meaning and $\phi \alpha \sigma \kappa \omega \nu$ to the words in which it was conveyed．

6．ova $\delta \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{i}$ tow：of course $I$ do not sup－ pose．move adds a shade of uncer－
taints to the stress of $\delta \dot{\eta}$ ．Notice that Socrates＇s long struggle（ $\mu$ of $\gamma$ ts $\pi \alpha ́ \nu v)$ is dramatized in these short， quick sents．，which suggest a man talking to himself．－oui үàp $\theta^{\theta}$＇$\mu$ Is：it would be against his nature．God， being by nature truthful，could not lie；$c f$. Rep．ii． 382 e，$\pi a ́ \nu \tau \eta ~ \gamma \grave{a} \rho$
 the nature of divinity and of God is absolutely void of falsehood．The in－ plicit faith of pious Greeks in oracles， esp．in those of Apollo，is proved directly by such words as Pindar＇s $\psi \epsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \in \omega \nu$ où $\chi$ ä $\pi \tau \epsilon \tau \alpha l$ ，he（Apollo）sets not his hand to falsehood（Pith．iii．G），
 full for him to have part in a lie（Pyth． ix．42）．It is also shown indirectly by the horror，expressed so often by the tragedians，at finding Phoebus＇s speech untrue．Against all blasphe－ mous attribution of falsehood to the gods，Plato defends the faith in Rep． ii． $383 \mathbf{b}$ ，where he reprobates the fol－ lowing lines of Aeschylus（spoken by Thetis in a lost play），кảү⿳亠丷厂犬 id фoíßov
 $\tau \iota \kappa \hat{\eta}$ Bpúò $\tau \epsilon \in \chi \nu \eta$（with skill prophetic
 $\pi \alpha \rho \grave{\omega} \nu$（marriage－feast）$\alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \delta s \tau_{\alpha} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon i \pi \omega \nu$,
 ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \mu \nu \nu$ ．The hesitating tone adopted by










Socrates in mentioning this oracle (21 a), and his interpretation here, suggest that he himself would never have asked Chaerephon's question; the question could be settled by haman means and in such cases Sorates's practice agreed with the sentimont in Eur. Hel. 753 ff .,

The gods why question? Nay, we rather should
With sacrifice approach them, and a prayer For what is good, disdaining prophecy, . . .
What prophecy will lead the sluggard man to thrift?
Of prophets best good counsel is and sense.
Cf. Yen. Mem. i. 1. 9, $\delta a_{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ (were crazed) そ̈ $\phi \eta$ ס̀̀ каl тoùs $\mu \alpha \nu \tau \in v o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o u s$
 סakpivelv (to learn and know thoroughly).
8. $\mu$ of $\mathbf{y}$ es mávv: after a long trugglee, a qualification of $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \tau \alpha$ '่̇ $\tau \rho a \pi \delta-$ $\mu \eta \nu$ which repeats parenthetically the idea of $\pi \delta \delta \lambda \nu \nu \quad \chi \rho \delta \partial o \nu$. For a similar parenthetical qualification, see on ob кáà toúzous, 17 b . For the position of $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu v$, see on ov̀ $\pi \dot{a} \nu v, 19$ a. - rolav́$\tau \eta \nu \tau เ v a$ : sc. Sク̇ $\tau \eta \sigma \iota \nu$, purposely vague, " which I began in some such way as this." See on rotaúvŋ xis, 19 c .
is. This whole clause was spoken $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & \mathbf{c}\end{aligned}$ with special emphasis.

 $\tau \alpha s \quad \Xi \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \pi \rho \partial s$ тò̀s $\psi \in \lambda \lambda \iota \zeta о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o u s ~ \kappa a l$ $\pi a!$ foveas, in the case of philosophers $I$ feel just as I do about people who lisp and are childish. Contrast the use of $\pi \rho \partial \delta_{s}$ in such expressions as $\pi \rho \partial s{ }^{\epsilon} \mu a \nu-$ $\tau \delta \nu \sigma \kappa o \pi \hat{\omega} \nu$, pondering in my mind ; $\pi \rho \partial s$ $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda o u s$ бкотov̂ $\mu \in \nu$, we consider among
 in d below).
 speaking, this covers the same ground as $\delta \iota a \sigma \kappa о \pi \hat{\omega} \nu$ тov̂тov. Socrates has no test except by conversing with his man.
 toted before $\delta$ окєiv (to seem) to avoid ধ̌ooga in the unusual but possible sense, I came to the opinion. The same anacoluthon occurs both when the nom. part. precedes (cf. Yen. An. iii. 2. 12,

 $\chi \iota \mu \alpha!\rho a s ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \theta \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \quad \theta \in \hat{\varphi}, \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon l$ oùк

 when it follows (cf. Th. iii. 36, cal
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$21 \kappa \alpha \lambda o \hat{v} \nu \tau \epsilon s \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \pi \delta o ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$, taxing them with their revolt).
 see on line 13 above.
20. о̀ть . . . є $\epsilon \mu$ í: not really dependent like ót ơoıтo in line 17, but
 above.
23. $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ oûv: the $o \bar{u} \nu$ leads back
 contains a reaffirmation of є่ $\gamma \grave{\omega} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \ldots$ $\sigma o \neq \partial ̀ s ~ \check{\omega} \nu, \mathbf{b}$ above. Here oùk, not où $\delta \in ́ \nu$, is used, because the antithesis is between not-knowing and false assumption of knowledge. - éouka $\gamma^{\prime}$ oûv : now it seems at least that, etc. $\gamma^{\prime}$ oûv is a better reading than $\gamma$ रov̀ $\nu$, since єoнка and тov́тourequire precisely the same stress in the connexion of thought. One of the many examples of $\gamma \epsilon$ repeated in Hom. is Il. v. 258, тoú $\tau \omega \delta^{\circ}$ où $\pi \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \nu$


24. au่тஸ̂ тоט́тч: serves to prepare the way for the clause with örı, which
gives a detailed specification of what $\underset{d}{21}$ is indefinitely stated in $\sigma \mu \kappa \rho \hat{\varphi} \tau \iota \nu \iota$.
VII. 1. oviv: pointing back to the e end of 21 b . - ${ }^{\prime} \delta \eta$ : straightway or im mediately, vividly bringing up the moment of past time alluded to.
2. ö $\tau \iota \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \chi \theta^{\theta}$ vó $\eta \eta v$ : this gives the fact of which Socrates says he was always conscious ( $\alpha i \sigma \theta \alpha \nu \delta \mu \in \nu o s$ ), so that he was constantly tormented ( $\lambda \nu \pi o u$ $\mu \in \nu o s$ ) and terrified ( $\delta \in \delta i \omega s$ ). With $\lambda \nu \pi o u ́ \mu \in \nu o s$ and $\delta \epsilon \delta \iota \omega s$, ö́ $\tau \iota$ would mean because ; these two parts. should therefore be attached to $\alpha i \sigma \theta \alpha \nu \delta \mu \in \nu o s$. Notice, however, that aiodavo $\mu \in \nu 0 s$ followed by $\delta \dot{\prime} \tau \iota(t h a t)$ is a very uncommon const. Cf. $\grave{a} \pi \eta \chi \theta \delta \mu \eta \nu$ in $\mathbf{d}$ above with $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \chi \theta \alpha \nu \delta \mu \eta \nu$, here in something like the sense of the colloquial "was getting myself disliked."
 $\mu \in \nu o s{ }_{\mu}{ }^{\prime} \nu$, breaks out of the partic. const. Socrates, in stating his determination to do his duty, adopts a con-








c above, and on $\alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon i \mu \epsilon \prime \nu$ in 34 e below. Cf. also Lach. 196 e, тоиิто $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$
 say this not by way of a joke, but I think it absolutely unavoidable, etc.
3. то̀ то̂ $\theta \in 0 \hat{v}$ : the interest of the god, which required of Socrates that he should refute or confirm the oracle.
4. ไréov ov์v: a change to the dir. discourse strikingly introduced by the narrator. Such a transition is often resorted to for the sake of vividness. $C f$. Xen. An. v. 5. 24, $\pi \alpha \rho \in \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime} \alpha \dot{u}-$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ à $\lambda \lambda o s \in โ \pi \in \nu$ ö $\tau t$ ov̉ $\pi \delta \lambda \in \mu o \nu \pi o \iota \eta-$

 $I d$. vii. 1. 39, where the transition is the reverse, $\mu \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \mu \delta \lambda \iota s$, ${ }^{\ell} \phi \eta, \delta \iota \alpha \pi \rho a \xi^{\prime} \alpha^{-}$
 ó $\tau \iota \kappa \tau \in \in . \quad$ Still more striking is Id. Hell. i. 1. 27, $\pi \alpha \rho \eta!\nu \in \sigma \alpha \nu ~ a ̈ \nu \delta \rho a s ~ a ̀ \gamma \alpha \theta o u ̀ s ~$

 charged them to be brave men and not to forget in how many sea-fights, " with only your own forces, you have been victorious." - бкопоиิvть: not $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \psi о \mu \epsilon \in \nu \psi$, for Socrates simply proceeds as he began. Hence the subj. of $\sigma \kappa o \pi o \hat{v} \nu \tau i$ is not expressed. See on $\delta \iota a \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega \mu \epsilon ้ \nu \varphi, 27$ a.
5. vì тòv кúva: this form of asseveration is a whim of Socrates, upon which the Schol. says, 'Paסa ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \nu \theta$ vos



 $\chi \dot{\eta} \nu \cdot \theta \in o \dot{v} s \delta^{\prime} \in \sigma\{\gamma \omega \nu$ (they named no god), K $\rho a \tau \hat{\imath} \nu o s \mathrm{X} \epsilon i \rho \omega \sigma \iota$ (i.e. in the
 l $\nu \alpha \mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ oi ő окоь үír $\gamma \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota, \tau о \iota o \hat{v}-$
 ous turn is given to this oath in Gorg. $482 \mathrm{~b}, \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \kappa \dot{\nu} \alpha \boldsymbol{\tau} \delta \nu \mathrm{~A} \dot{\gamma} \gamma v \pi \tau i ́ \omega \nu \quad \theta \epsilon \delta \nu$. Socrates would swear by the Egyptian god, but not by any of the gods whom he worshipped. His objection to doing this may be illustrated by the reasons for "An act to restrain the abuses of players," 3 James I. c. 21. "For the preventing and avoiding of the great abuse of the holy name of God in Stage-plays, Enterludes, May-games, shews, and the like." Sce Clarke and Wright on Merch. of Ven. i. 3 .
6. ทீ $\mu \eta \eta^{v}$ : expresses solemn asseveration, and is introduced to corroborate the preceding oath. The Schol. explains it as meaning ǒ $\nu \tau \omega s \quad \delta \eta$, in very truth. It is, however, the usual formula for beginning any affirmation prefaced by a solemn oath.
9. кatà тòv $\theta$ éov: under the god's command. The inquiry was commanded of God, because it was possible to understand the meaning of the oracle only by experience, and Socrates's experience had not yet justified







11. $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ móvovs tivàs movoûvtos: my Herculean labors, as I may call them; the gen. agrees with $\epsilon^{\prime} \mu o \hat{v}$ inplied in its equiv. $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu . \quad$ G. 1001; H. 691. The words aóvous novov̂dzos were sure to remind his hearers of several passages in the tragedians, where Heracles, a character endeared to them chiefly by his heroic struggles, recounts his labors. Socrates compares his own intellectual encounters with the physical ones endured by Heracles, and recounts in a halftragic vein these "labors" imposed of God. Cf. Soph. Track. 1046 f. and 1089 ff.,

In many a heat, by fearful odds hard pressed,
With arms and straining back ere now I strove . . .
Hands, hands, my back, my breast, 0 arms of mine,
Still, still, ye are the same whose sometime strength
In haunts Nemean smote the shepherd's bane, And tamed the lion whom none dared apbroach,
Or look on, etc.
Cf. Eur. H. F. 1255-1280, and esp. the chorus, 348-455; Browning in Aristophanes's Apology translates the whole of this play. - iva $\mu$ ot kail $\kappa \tau \in$. : Socrates, assuming for the sake of his point an attitude of opposition, says that he thought he was refuting
the oracle (cf. 22 c) while really he was proving it to be irrefutable. This achievement is ironically stated as his real purpose. $C f$. iva used by Homs. in indignant or ironical queslions, e.g. Il. xiv. 364 f., 'A $\rho \gamma \in \hat{\imath} \circ \iota$, каl

 and must we to Priam's son Hector again yield the day, that he on our ships may lay hands and be sure of renown? Socrates was, he here implies, guided to just the result which he least expected. This might easily suggest the irony of fate, so tragically exemplified in Sophocles's Oedipus the King, which was first performed about 429 B.c. and presumably was familiar to the court. In clauses with iva ( $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta}$ ), каl is freq. used simply for greater stress. Cf. Gory. $501 \mathrm{c}, \sigma v \gamma \chi \omega \rho \hat{\omega}$, $\grave{y} \alpha$ ot каl $\pi \in \rho \alpha \nu \theta \hat{\eta}$ $\delta \lambda$ bros, just to help your argument on to its close. This is not like sal $\mu \alpha \nu \theta \alpha^{\prime}-$ $\nu o \iota \mu$ below, b, where cai means also. The opt. clause iva $\gamma^{\prime}$ boito depends upon movov̀zos, which represents the impf. G. 1289 ; H. 856 a.
14. kail тov̀s ar $\lambda$ nous: see the pas- $b$ sage from the Ion quoted in the note on c below. The $\kappa \omega \mu \varphi \delta$ otototoi are hardly included here. The idea that the genuine poet was a being endowed with exceptional wisdom was common in ancient times. $C f$. Arist. Poet. 9. 3,
$\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \pi \epsilon \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \alpha u ̉ \tau o i ̂ s, \delta \iota \eta \rho \omega ́ \tau \omega \nu \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{a} \nu \alpha v \dot{v} \tau o v ̀ s \tau^{i} 22$





 $\theta \epsilon о \mu \alpha ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ к \alpha i$ oi $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \omega \delta$ оí. каì $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$ ov̂тоı $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \sigma v \sigma \iota \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$

 філобофढ́тєроу (more philosophical) каl
 pias (prose narrative of facts) ėqтiv.
17. $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \not \mu a \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \theta a l: ~ u s e d ~ h e r e ~$ as a pass., as is made evident by aúrois, the dat. of the agent. G. 1186 and 1238,1 ; H. 769. See also App. - $\delta \iota \eta \rho \omega \dot{r} \omega \nu$ ảv: see on 20 below.
18. " $v^{\prime}$ " ä $\mu a$ к $\kappa \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$.: mentioned as a subordinate end to be reached by the way. For каl, see on 11 above. aloxv́vouat: this discovery was discreditable to the poets, and Socrates hesitates to mention it. For this same borrowing of shame from another's actions, see Crit. 45 d and e. When ai $\sigma \chi{ }^{\dot{\nu} \nu \in \sigma \ell a \iota}$ means feel shame at the thought of an action, it takes the inf., as here, instead of the partic. Socrates feels shame at the idea of telling what neverthcless must be told, because it is the truth.
20. of mapóvtes: those who were present, i.e. the bystanders. Hence a $\nu$
 force as $\delta \iota \eta \rho \omega ́ \tau \omega \nu$ д̆ $\nu$ above. GMT. 162; G. 1296 ; H. 835.
c 23. фv́бєє $\tau \iota \nu$ кal évӨovaıágovtes: the dat. $\phi$ v́reı and nom. partic. characterize the same subj. in two parallel
ways. Hence they are appropriately coupled by means of каí. Cf. $18 \mathbf{b}$. фv́бєt: by (grace of) nature. Here used to express what Plato elsewhere means by $\theta$ eía $\mu$ oípa, by the grace of heaven. Acts done $\phi \dot{\prime} \sigma \in \iota$ are done unconsciously, are inspired by something below the surface of our every-day selves, whereas conscious acts are, if right, guided by $\tau \epsilon \in \chi \nu \eta$ and $\sigma o \phi^{\prime} \alpha$, art and wisdom. Cf. Ion, 533 e-534 c, $\pi \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \nu-$

 of knowledge of their art) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \underset{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ (inspired) ó $\nu \tau \in s \kappa \alpha l \kappa a \tau \epsilon \chi \not\langle\mu \in \nu 0 \iota$ (possessed) $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha ~ \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ тà ка入à 入є́ $\gamma o v \sigma \iota$ $\pi o เ \eta \mu a \tau \alpha$, каl oi $\mu \in \lambda o \pi o t o l(l y r i c ~ p o e t s) ~$
 motồvtes (writing poetry) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \theta \in l a$

 $\varpi_{\rho} \rho \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu, \delta \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu \delta_{\imath} \theta \nu \rho a ́ \mu \beta o u s$ (one can write dithyrambs), $\delta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ є่ $\gamma \kappa \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{a}$ (hymns
 songs, accompanied by a lively dance), $\delta \delta^{\prime} \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \pi \eta$ (epics), $\delta \delta^{\prime}$ iá $\mu \beta$ Bous (iambics)
 $\tau 0 \cup \dot{\tau} \omega \nu \tau \delta \nu \nu 0 \hat{\nu} \nu$ (taking all reason
 каl тoîs $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \psi \delta o i ̂ s ~ \kappa a l ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \mu a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \sigma t ~$ roîs $\theta \in$ locs.


 $30 \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \omega ิ \nu$ ．










27．ท่ $\sigma \theta$ ó $\mu \eta \nu$ olo $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega \nu$ ：like àкоv́o $\nu-$
 curs in 20 a，$\delta \nu \geqslant \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \delta \mu \eta \nu$ ढ่ $\pi \iota \delta \eta \mu \rho \hat{v} \nu \tau a$. $C f$ ．Xen．Mem．ii．2．1，$\alpha \mathfrak{i} \sigma \theta \delta \mu \in \nu \delta s$ $\pi о \tau \epsilon \Lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho о к \lambda \epsilon \in \alpha \quad \tau\rangle \nu \pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \dot{\prime} \tau \alpha \tau о \nu$
 vovia（in a passion with his mother）．

28．$\sigma 0 \phi \omega \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \omega v$ ：pred．agreeing with
 єìval．－ảv $\theta$ рórt $\omega v$ ：part．gen．G．1088； H．650．－å ov̉к そ̉ $\sigma a v: s c$ ．$\sigma o \phi o l$ ．Cff．
 тоиิто каl $\sigma 0 \phi$ б́s $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ．On the acc．of specification，see G． 1058 ；H． 718.

VIII．1．$\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \cup \tau \omega \hat{v}$ ：finally．For participles used adverbially，see GM＇T． 834 ；G． 926 ；H． 968 a and 619 a．
 $\gamma^{\prime}$ gives stress to roúzous，but yields the first place to $\delta \epsilon^{\prime}\left(c f .24 \mathbf{c}\right.$ ，${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \gamma \dot{\omega}{ }^{\omega} \delta_{\epsilon}$ $\gamma \epsilon) ; \mu \epsilon \in$ also takes the same prece－ dence．As a rule，$\gamma \in ́$ comes imme－ diately after the word which it empha－ sizes，or else between the noun and its art．

4．ท่ $\boldsymbol{\prime} \boldsymbol{l} \sigma \tau a v \tau 0$ ：they knew，without any implication that they have ceased to know at the time when he speaks．

6．ö $\pi \in \rho$ кal，kal oi $\kappa \tau \in \in$ ：this repe－ tition of каl is idiomatic in correl． sents．，and may be represented by one Eng．word，also．With oi moın is easy to supply ${ }_{\epsilon} \chi \chi$ ．$v \sigma \iota \nu$ from the ${ }_{\epsilon} \chi \in \iota \nu$ of the leading clause；similar cases are very frequent in Greek．

7．Sıà тò $\kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$ ．：here begins the ex－ planation which the preceding clause demands．$\gamma \alpha \rho$ might have been added，
 $\gamma$ à $\rho \tau \epsilon ́ \chi \nu \eta \nu$ є̇ $\xi \in \rho \gamma \alpha \zeta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s \kappa \tau \epsilon$ ．

8．т $\mathfrak{d} \lambda \lambda a$ тà $\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau a: ~ a d j s . ~ u s e d ~$ subst．take the art．after $\delta$ ă $\lambda \lambda$ os quite as commonly as substs．do．$\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ refers to affairs of state and of the common weal，as in Rep．iv． 420 c， $\sigma o \phi \partial s$ тà $\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau a$ and Gorg． $484 \mathbf{c}$ ，
万ुठ $\eta$ фi入oбoфíav，you shall linow if once you proceed to affairs of larger concern and give up philosophy once for all． $C f$ ．also Xen．An．ii．6．16，and in




 $15{ }^{\epsilon}$ Єै $\chi \iota \nu$.
 $\pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha i ̀ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ a ̉ \pi \epsilon ́ \chi \theta \epsilon \iota \alpha i ́ ~ \mu o \iota ~ \gamma \epsilon \gamma o ́ \nu \alpha \sigma \iota ~ к а i ̀ ~ o i ̂ a \iota ~ \chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega ́ \tau \alpha \tau \alpha \iota ~ 23 ~$ каì $\beta a \rho v ́ \tau \alpha \tau \alpha \iota, ~ \check{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \pi о \lambda \lambda a ̀ s ~ \delta \iota a \beta o \lambda a ̀ s ~ a ̉ \pi ’ ~ a u ̉ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma \epsilon \gamma о \nu \epsilon ́-$


22 Menex. 234 a, ̇̇ $\pi\} \tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon\{\zeta \omega$ er $\pi \iota \nu 0 \in i ̂ s ~ \tau \rho \epsilon ́-$

9. $\pi \lambda \eta \mu \mu \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \epsilon เ \alpha$ : see on $\epsilon \mu \mu \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} s$, 20 c.
 would be too emphatic. It repre-

e Cf. e below, and see App.- vi $\pi$ è $\rho$ тoû Xt $\eta \sigma \mu \circ \hat{v}$ : in the name of and, as it were, on behalf of the oracle.
11. $\delta \in \xi a i \mu \eta v$ adv : that is "if it were
 $\sigma t s$ is implied. Notice the idioms
 ${ }_{€} \chi \in \iota \nu$. In both the order is just the reverse of the natural Eng. one. In Lat., the corresponding idioms follow the same order with the Greek.
12. $\mu \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \epsilon \tau: \tau$ strengthens the negation $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$. Cf. oй $\tau, \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \iota$.
IX. 1. $\delta \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime}$ : here used by way of closing and summing up the previous line of argument. On $\bar{\omega} \not \approx \nu \delta \rho \in s$ ' $A \theta \eta-$ vaîo, see Introd. p. 49, n. 4.
2. oil $\mathrm{X} a \lambda \epsilon \pi \dot{\sigma} \tau \alpha \tau a l: ~ s c$. $\epsilon i \sigma \ell$, explanned by places where the same idiom is expanded, e.g. Sen. Mem. iv.

 $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta \alpha \iota \mu о \nu \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \tau о$.

 $\delta \epsilon$ coordinates the whole with $\pi o \lambda \lambda a l$ $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa \tau \mathcal{\epsilon}$. and the two form the leading clause, yet the inf. $\lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \in \sigma \theta a l$ half incorporate these words with the $\dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ clause. This irregular constr. is perfectly clear in a conversational style like that of Socrates. It has the effect of stating more distinctly the fact that this epithet robs, as applied to Socrates, is the capital instance of $\pi o \lambda \lambda a l$ $\delta \iota a \beta o \lambda a l$ and results from them. - $\sigma 0 \phi$ os: introduced to explain precisely what is meant by
 back to the main statement modal $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon ́ \chi \theta \epsilon \iota a l$ not $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \delta \nu \alpha \sigma \iota$, which, however, dwells in the speaker's mind as $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon ́ \chi \theta \eta \mu \alpha$. $\quad$ oo фós agrees acc. to rule with the nom. subj. of this $\alpha_{\pi} \epsilon \chi \chi \eta \eta \mu a$. G. 927 ; H. 940 . If $\epsilon \mu \epsilon^{\prime}$, the acc. subj. of $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$, had been expressed instead of understood, this nom. would not have been possible. - $\epsilon$ iva: the
 pred. nouns or adjs. after $\dot{o} \nu \rho \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$, ob $\nu o \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$, and the like. Cf. Rep. iv. 428 e, on $\nu \circ \mu a ́ S o \nu \tau a l$ to $\tau \in s \in i ̄ \nu a \iota$, are called by certain names. Prot. 311 e, $\sigma o \phi i \sigma \tau \eta \nu$




 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \nu \eta$ бофía ỏ $\lambda i ́ \gamma o v ~ \tau \iota \nu o ̀ s ~ a ̉ \xi i ́ a ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau i ~ к \alpha i ~ o v ̉ \delta \epsilon \nu o ́ s . ~ к а i ~$





 rates, what do you mean by (how do you define) this common quality which in all these expressions you call quickness?
5. тaîta: see on \&̀ oùк $\bar{\phi} \sigma a \nu, 22 \mathbf{c}$.
 $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \in \lambda \in \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \chi^{\prime} \mu a t, I$ am most pleased to be self-convicted of this. Change $\bar{\xi} \xi \in \lambda \in \gamma$ $\chi^{\circ} \mu a, ~ f r o m ~ p a s s . ~ t o ~ a c t ., ~ a n d ~ t h e ~ a c c . ~$ of the person reappears; $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ in the quoted passage, like $\ddot{a}$ in the text, is a cognate acc., which, in such collocations, is almost invariably a pron. of some sort. G. 1051, 1076; H. 725 c.
 is adv., meaning practically the same as toùvautiov, for it introduces an assertion which, being true, necessarily contradicts the previous false statement. Plato is particularly fond of this use of $\tau \delta \delta \epsilon^{\prime}$. See, for the adv. use of the art. in Attic, G. 982; H. 054 b . $-\tau \hat{\omega}$ övct: serves to point the contrast between this true statement and the false one which people believe (otovzal).
8. kal oưסevós: brought in as a climax after ò̀ízou. Cf. Theaet. $173 \mathbf{e}$,
 $\sigma \mu \iota \kappa \rho \grave{\alpha} \kappa \alpha l$ oì $\delta \epsilon \in$, , but his (the philosopher's) mind regarding all this as little or nothing at all. The Lat. idiom is much the same as the Greek. Cic.

Or. 16. 52 , rem difficilem, di im- ${ }^{23}$ mortales, atque omnium difficillimam, a thing which, heaven knows, is hard; or rather, hardness can no farther go.
9. то仑̂тo $\lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu: s c$. öтı $\dot{\eta}$ à $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \nu \eta$ бopía $\kappa \tau \epsilon$. The argument runs as follows: "People credit me with knowing all the things which I convict my neighbors of not knowing. The truth is far otherwise, for God alone has real knowledge. The meaning of his dark saying about my being the wisest of men is simply that 'human wisdom is vanity:' He does not mean that Socrates has any other than human wisdom. He only uses the name 'Socrates' because he needs a particular instance." The double acc. with $\lambda^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ closely resembles the idiom какà $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \tau \nu \alpha ́ . \quad$ Cf. Crit. 48 a. See App.
10. $̈$ ©̈ $\pi \epsilon \rho$ âv $\epsilon$ l: in this compressed idiom ă $\nu$ alone represents a whole clause, which the context readily suggests. GMT. 483 f.; H. 905, 3. For a case where the ellipsis is a simpler one, cf. Xen. Cyr. i. 3. 2, ضो $\sigma \pi \alpha ́ S \epsilon \tau \delta$



13. тaût' oũv: ccf. Prot. $310 \mathbf{e}$, à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ b



 $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{d} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi o \lambda i ́ a s ~ o v ̈ \tau \epsilon \tau \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s \pi \rho a ̂ \xi a i \quad \mu o \iota ~ \sigma \chi o \lambda \grave{\eta}$
 єípi $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \theta \epsilon o v ̂ ~ \lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon i ́ a \nu . ~$
 $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ~ \sigma \chi o \lambda \eta \eta^{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, oi $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \lambda o v \sigma \iota \omega \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$, av̀тó $\mu a \tau o \iota$ H. 719 c . The object is omitted as in Gorg. 503 d , द̀à $\langle\eta \tau \hat{p} \mathrm{~s} \kappa \kappa \lambda \bar{\omega} s$, єuph宁єIs, if you search in the right way, you shall find. Cf. eidévau below in d.
14. кal $\xi^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \omega v$ : notice the not unusual grouping under one art. of two words connected by $\kappa$ ai.
 $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu 0 \hat{v}, 22 \mathrm{e}$.


 Oecon. ii. 1-4, where Critobulus and Socrates converse substantially as follows: "C. I have gained reasonable self-control ; therefore, Socrates, give me any hints you can: tell me the best way to manage my property. But perhaps you think me already quite rich enough. S. That is my own case, not yours. I am sure that I am a rich man, but I consider you pov-erty-stricken, and sometimes I am quite worried about you. C. I like that, Socrates! For heaven's sake do be good enough to tell me what price you imagine that your property would fetch, if sold, and what mine would sell for. S. I am sure a fair buyer would be glad of the chance of getting my house and all my property for five minas (about eighty-five dollars). I am sure you are worth
more than a hundred times that sum. C. How comes it then that you are so rich and I so poor? S. My income provides amply for all my wants, but for your wants you need three times as much as you have." The possession of five minas must have placed Socrates in the lowest of the four classes established by Solon, that of the $\theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \mathrm{s}$. Originally this lowest class had few political duties and no political rights; later on, a law proposed by Aristides gave them the same rights as the others.



入arpeias, madness intervened and by prophesying to those who were in straits found relief by recourse to prayer unto the gods and the observance of their rites. The dat. (less freq. the gen.) with verbal nouns occurs chiefly after nouns such as $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon i a$ and ej̀ $\dot{\eta}$, which express the abstract idea of the act denoted by the verb; but Plato uses both the gen. and dat. with $\dot{u} \pi \eta \rho \in \dot{\epsilon} \eta \eta$ s, and the gen. with $k \pi t$ trovpos; while the dat. with Bondos is familiar in many Greek authors. In the const. with $\dot{v} \pi \eta \rho \epsilon \sigma$ ia below, 30 a, the dat. $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$ takes the place of the gen. here.
X. 2. aư่о́цатоь: of their own motion,









 रov $\sigma \iota \nu$, o̊ ơ $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \omega \rho a$ каì $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ vinò $\gamma \hat{\eta} s$ каì $\theta \epsilon o v ̀ s \mu \grave{\eta} \nu о \mu i ́-$
3. Xalpovøเv к $\tau \epsilon$.: Plato compares the disconcerting effect of Socrates's homely method with the charm exercised by the smooth discourse of men like Protagoras and Gorgias. Compare the ironical account of the persuasive charms of Gorgias, Prodicus, and Hippias in 19 e above, where especially the implication of rov́rous $\pi \epsilon_{i}^{\prime} \theta o v a \iota$ should be noticed. Cf. Prot. 317 e-319a, where Protagoras is represented as giving a very taking account of his own teaching for the benefit of young Hippocrates.
 they are for imitating me, and then they undertake, etc. No strict sequence in time is here marked by $\epsilon i \tau \alpha$, although their readiness to imitate must logically have preceded the acts in which their imitation consisted. For a most lively description of the early symptoms of such imitators, cf. Rep. vii. 539 b . In other editt. $\mu \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{v}_{\mu} \mu \nu o c$ is substituted for $\mu<\mu о \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha l$, needlessly, since this use of $\epsilon \bar{l} \tau a$, where $\kappa \bar{d} \tau \alpha$ would seem more natural, is quite common. $C f .31$ a, and also Xen. Mem. ii. 2, 14,

$\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \gamma \sigma \nu \epsilon ́ \omega \nu$ à $\mu \epsilon \lambda o \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ à $\tau \iota \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \omega-$

 17 b , and on ò $\lambda i ́ \gamma o v ~ к а l ~ o ̀ ̀ \delta \epsilon \nu d ́ s, ~ 23 a . ~ . ~$
8. a $\lambda \lambda$ ' ov̉x : instead of. $C f$. Xen. An. ii. I. 10, where кal ov is used with the same meaning. See App. $-\Sigma \omega$ - d

11. ${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ áyvoovotv: see App.
 means the familiar well-worn commonplaces. T.lese may be found in the Clouds of Aristophanes. Xenophon, referring specifically to the $\lambda \delta \gamma \omega \nu$ $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu \eta$, which is not lost sight of here, uses almost the words of our text in
 $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\delta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \iota \mu \omega \mu \mu \nu 0 \nu$ दे $\pi \iota \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu$ à̀ $\tau \hat{\omega}$, (Critias) making against him the charge made by the many against philosophers in general. $C f .18 \mathbf{b} \mathbf{c}, 19 \mathbf{b}$, and see on єi $\gamma$ à $\omega \emptyset \phi \in \lambda o \nu$, Crito, 44 d .
13. ö'ть тà $\mu \in \tau \in ́ \omega \rho a \kappa \tau \in \in$.: the sense requires that from line $10 \delta$ $\delta \delta \delta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega \nu$ should be understood, or rather $\delta_{t-}$
 implied $\delta \iota \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega \nu$ depend (1) the two accs. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \omega \rho \alpha$, $\tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{v} \pi \delta \partial \gamma \hat{\eta} s$, and (2) the two infs. $\nu o \mu l \zeta \epsilon i \nu$ and $\pi o \epsilon \epsilon i \nu . \quad C f$. 26 b and 19 b .




 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \grave{\alpha} \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha i ̀ \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \iota ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ \nu v ̂ \nu \sigma \phi о \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \varsigma \delta \iota \alpha \beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$. '̇є

 vimè $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \eta \mu \iota o v \rho \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu$ каi $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \hat{\omega} \nu$, $\Lambda v ́ \kappa \omega \nu \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ vi $\pi \grave{\rho} \rho 24$
 $\kappa a \tau \alpha \dot{\delta} \eta \lambda o t \kappa \tau \hat{\epsilon}$. Eng. idiom requires a sing. or an abstract noun more ferequently than the Greek, egg. Tav̂тa often means this. H. 635. Cf. Phaed.,

 тov̂ $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \delta \tau o v$, but a fool might perhaps think this, that he ought to run away from his master.
16. єlóval: one man claims knowledge of this, and another, knowledge of that; the absurdity is in all cases the same, ie. their claiming knowsedge at all.
 phrases well combined, or (2) with their
 aa $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime}$ edo, ie. according to a concerted plan. (2) and (3) make it refer to the united efforts of those represented by the three accusers. छ $\boldsymbol{\xi \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \ell \nu \omega s , ~}$ the reading adopted by Schanz, means about the same as $\sigma \phi 0 \delta \rho \bar{\omega}$ s below, ie. content, with might and main. This would really amount to the same as (2), and suits the context far better than (1) or (3).
19. 'ix тovit $\omega v$ : "it is upon this footing, - namely that of an old general prejudice, aggravated by supervening
personal animosity, - that I am now ${ }^{23}$ attacked by, etc." R. In spite of
 states the fact here alluded to, "in consequence of" would here be an inappropriate translation for $k \kappa$. On the accusers, see Introd. 30.
21. vt $\pi \grave{\rho} \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \pi о \imath \eta \tau \omega \bar{\omega}, \delta \eta \mu \iota o v \rho \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu$,
 the word inf. The accusers merely represented the feelings of their respecfive classes. The $\bar{\beta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ topes have not been explicitly mentioned before. For the топтаи, cf. $22 \mathbf{a}$; for the полıтькоl, of. 21 c ; for the $\delta \eta \mu$ ovproo, cf. 22 d . Prob. the fítopes were thought of under the general designation of montтוкol. This is the more likely because the line between men who habitually spoke on public questions, and what we may call professional speakers, was not yet clearly drawn at Athens. All this lends weight to the surgestimon that the words $\kappa$ к al $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \bar{\omega} \nu$ are a later addition, for which Plato is not responsible. See App. In favor of keeping the words, however, is the fact that Anytus, who, like Cleon, was a Bupoodé $\psi \eta s$, tanner, came into collision with the views of Socratoes rather as a moitrikos than as a









XI．Пєрì $\mu \grave{\varepsilon} \nu$ oû̀ $\oplus ̂ \nu$ oi $\pi \rho \omega ิ \tau o i ́ ~ \mu о v ~ к а \tau \eta ́ \gamma о р о \iota ~ к а \tau \eta \gamma o ́-~$

 $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o v s ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau a v ̂ \tau \alpha \quad \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a ́ \sigma o \mu a \iota ~ \grave{a} \pi о \lambda о \gamma \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ．a乞̂Өıs

$\delta \eta \mu$ oovoros．It may be that Socrates had aristocratic views about the de－ basing effect of manual labor similar to those of Plato and Aristotle．Cf． Xen．Oecon．iv． 2 and 3，where Socra－ tes is represented as saying that the mechanical arts encrvate men＇s bodies and womanize their souls．Also（ibid． vi．7）where Socrates again is made to say that in case of an invasion the $\tau \in \chi \nu \hat{i} \tau a \iota$ will prove cowards．
 etc．，＂just what I promised to tell you at the beginning of my speech．＂
 here is illustrated by many places in Dem．，e．g．，xxxvir．48，каl $\tau \hat{\varphi} \mu \eta \delta \grave{\ell} \nu$

 to resort to absolutely undisguised and shameless wailing and lamentation．See also xix．237，à $\nu \alpha ́ \gamma \kappa \eta ~ \delta \epsilon ́, ~ \bar{\alpha} \not{ }^{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \in s$＇A $\theta \eta$－
 ข่тоб $\tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$ ．

28．тoîs aủtoîs：$s c$ ．by just such un－ disguised and unmitigated statements．

29．aüтך，тaûta：both pred．
 The finite verb is also left out in such cases，cf．Rep．ii． 360 d，$\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ ồv $\delta \grave{\eta}$ ou゙ $\tau \omega s, s c$ ． $\begin{gathered} \\ \chi\end{gathered} \in$ ．
 $c f .18 \mathbf{a}$, à $\pi о \lambda o \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a l \pi \rho \delta s$ $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ v̈ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho a$ （ $s c . \kappa a \tau \eta \gamma o \rho \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu a$ ）каl тò̀s v̀ $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o u s ~(s c$. $\kappa а \tau \eta \gamma \delta \rho o u s)$ ；the Greek idiom is $\dot{a} \pi о \lambda о-$ $\gamma \in i ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota \quad \pi \rightarrow \partial s$（1）qoùs $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{s},(2)$ тoùs
 Eng．the idiom is to plead（1）before the court，（2）against the accusers， （3）against（to）the accusations．

3．тòv áyaOóv $\tau \epsilon$ каl фıло́то入เv： that upright and patriotic man．The addition of $\ddot{\omega} \phi \eta \sigma_{\iota}$ suggests that few or none encourage Meletus in＂laying this flattering unction to his soul．＂．

4．aviols ．．．avi：once more ．．．in turn．A strong distinction is made between the serious accusation of the first accusers，those who have preju－ diced the public mind，and that of Meletus．

5．$\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ध́ $\tau \in \mathfrak{\rho} \rho \omega \nu$ тоv́т $\omega \nu$ ővт $\omega \nu$ ка－ т $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ оо́раv：as if these were a second set

 $\phi \eta \sigma i ̀ \nu \dot{a} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ тоv́s $\tau \epsilon$ ขє́ovs $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon i \rho о \nu \tau a$ каi $\theta \epsilon o v ̀ s ~ o v ̂ s ~ \dot{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \iota s ~ \nu o \mu i \zeta \epsilon \iota ~ o ̛ ̉ ~ \nu o \mu i \zeta o \nu \tau \alpha, ~ \epsilon ̈ \tau \epsilon \rho a ~$



 $\rho \iota \epsilon \nu \tau i \zeta \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota \dot{\rho} \alpha \delta_{i} i \omega s \in i s$ ar $\gamma \hat{\omega} \nu \alpha$ ка $\theta \iota \sigma \tau \grave{\alpha} \varsigma \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi о v s, \pi \epsilon \rho i$

 $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha ́ \sigma о \mu a \iota ~ к \alpha i ~ ن ீ \mu \imath ̂ \nu ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi \iota \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \xi \alpha \iota$ ．X

 Socrates distinguishes between two sets of accusers，but maintains that the charges preferred by his actual accusers（Anytus，Meletus，and Ky－ con）are based upon those of his real accusers（public prejudice and mas－ representation）．
 tally，implies that the quotation is not literal．See Introd． 31 and 56．Cf． Xen．Mem．ii．1，21，Прódıos ．．．$\pi \in \rho$ l


7．$\phi \eta \sigma i v:$ Meletus，already named as the chief accuser．

9．тò er ${ }^{\prime} \kappa \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ ：see Untrod． 68.
11．є́ $\gamma \omega$ ढ́ $\delta$＇$\gamma \epsilon$ ：see on 22 d ．
 an $\dot{o} \xi \dot{v} \mu \omega \rho o \nu$ ；for $\chi a \rho \iota \epsilon \nu \tau \ell \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ is akin to $\pi a l \zeta \in \iota \nu$ ，the subst．to which，$\pi a \iota \delta \iota a$, is the contradictory of $\sigma \pi o v \delta \dot{\eta}$ ．＂Me－ cetus treats a serious business（an accusation involving life and death） as playfully as though the whole mat－ ter were a joke．＂Cf． 27 a ．
 usual word for a suit at law；hence
the phrase $a \gamma \omega \nu\{\zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \quad \delta i \kappa \eta \nu$ ，contend in a lawsuit．．The sing．is used dis－ tributively，involving men in a lawsuit． Cf．Yen．Rep．Lac．8．4，ěфоро ．．．кúpıo

 the ephors had power both to supersede and to imprison the magistrates and to bring them to trial for their lives．
 which is an adv．acc．See on $\tau o v ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ， 26 b．

15．тoút $\omega$ ：gives greater vividness than à̀tê would give．

16．sal $讠 \mu \hat{\mu} v:$＂so that you can see it as plainly as I can．＂

XII．1．$\delta \epsilon \hat{v} \rho o$, єimé：come and tell me．$C f$ ．below，$\imath \theta \iota \delta \grave{\eta} \nu \hat{v} \nu \in i \pi \epsilon \in . \quad \delta \in \hat{\rho} \rho \circ$ is freq．found instead of ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \chi o v,{ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \theta \in$ ． Cf．Theaet． 144 d，$\Theta \in a i \tau \eta \tau \epsilon, \delta \epsilon \hat{\rho} \rho o \pi \alpha \rho d$ $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \eta$ ，come here，Theaetetus，and sit by Socrates．Homer has a similar idiom．Cf．Od．xvii． $529, ~ \leftrightarrows \rho \chi \chi \in 0, \delta \in \hat{\nu} \rho o$
 summon him hither，that face to face he may tell me himself．On the cross－ex－ amination，see Untrod．71．－ $\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \lambda \lambda_{0} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ：









 $\kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, oi $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha i ́$. Пิ̂s $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \varsigma$, $\widehat{\omega}$ M ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \eta \tau \epsilon$; oi̋ $\delta \epsilon \tau o u ̀ s$

 $\tau \epsilon \varsigma$. $\mathrm{E} \hat{v} \gamma \epsilon \nu \grave{\eta} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{H} \rho a \nu \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \varsigma \kappa \alpha a ̀ ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \phi \theta o \nu i ́ a \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

 this idiom, in Plato generally without the $\eta$, is an abbreviated form of question, is it otherwise than, etc., which always leads up to the answer " assuredly" or " most undoubtedly." H. 1015 b . Here the answer is implied by ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon$.
 ered their corrupter in me, you bring me before this court and make your accusation. In Eng. clearness requires a repetition of the ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime}$, which in Greek goes only with eioá $\gamma \in t s$.
5. єloáyєเs: you summon into court, commonly with eis $\delta$ ıкaбtńptov or tis roùs סıкaбтás, instead of which rou$\tau o \iota \sigma l$ is used. Sometimes also єi$\sigma \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ is found. with the gen. of the charge. $C f .26 \mathrm{a}$. The word, strictly speaking, should be used only of the magistrates (Introd. 70), but not infrequently it is said of the plaintiff, whose charge
occasions the magistrate ciod́ $\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$, to ${ }_{d}^{24}$ bring into court, the suit.
 for the acc. after $\mu \eta \nu \dot{\in} \in i v, c f$. Andoc. i.

7. $\tau$ is $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \tau \iota v: ~ c f . ~ K i n g ~ L e a r, ~ i . ~ 1, ~}$ where Cordelia says to her sisters: I know you what you are.
9. $\lambda$ '́ $\gamma \omega$ : the pres. because Socrates is only maintaining what he has just asserted. The ellipsis with $\mu \in \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \eta \kappa \in \nu$ is readily supplied from the context.
12. ov̂tol, oi Sıкaनtal: these men, the judges. The oúrot is isolated by the e voc. from oi $\delta \varkappa \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha$ l. The o\% $\delta \epsilon$ which follows includes, strictly speaking, only the $\hat{\eta} \lambda \iota a \sigma \tau a l$ who were present at the trial; but they are evidently taken as representing all $\delta$ ıк $\alpha \sigma \tau \alpha$.
17. of axpoaral: the audience, all except the סıкaбтal, who have been mentioned. See on 27 b.



 ठє̀ $\mu$ óvos $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon i ́ \rho \omega$. ov̋ $\omega \omega$ $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota s ; ~ \Pi a ́ \nu v ~ \sigma \phi o ́ \delta \rho a ~ \tau \alpha v ̂ \tau a ~$



 ó $\beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i ́ o v s$ oîós $\tau \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \iota \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ $\hat{\eta} \pi a ́ \nu \nu$ ỏ $\lambda i ́ \gamma o \iota$, oi $i \pi \pi \iota \kappa o i ́$ oi $\delta \epsilon ̀ \pi о \lambda \lambda o i ́, \epsilon \in \alpha ́ \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \quad \xi \nu \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \kappa \alpha i ̀ \chi \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha \iota ~ i ̈ \pi \pi о \iota s, \delta \iota \alpha \phi \theta \epsilon i \rho o v-$ $30 \sigma \iota \nu$; oủ $\chi$ oưт $\omega \mathrm{s}$ є้ $\chi \epsilon \iota$, 今̂ Мє́ $\lambda \eta \tau \epsilon$, каi $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ ì $\pi \pi \omega \nu \kappa \alpha i ̀ \tau \hat{\omega \nu}$


19. à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ äpa $\kappa \tau \in \mathfrak{\varepsilon} .:$ cf. Euthyd. 290 e ,


 gracious! have I forgotten, and was it Ctesippus who said it? C. Ctesippus? rubbish! Questions with $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ take a negative answer for granted. The use of ¿oa here marks the last stage in Socrates's exhaustive enumeration. Only the $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\kappa} \kappa \lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \eta \sigma \iota a \sigma \tau \alpha$ are left. "Somebody in Athens is corrupting the youth. We have seen that it is nobody else, hence possibly it is these gentlemen." But this is absurd, hence $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ápa
 has probably crept into the text, and was originally a marginal note, put in by way of giving a word parallel to àкроатаl and $\beta$ ounєutal. There was good reason for varying the sameness of discourse by saying oi $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{n}$ दे $\kappa \kappa \lambda \eta$ oía. There seems less reason for putting this last idea in two ways. All Athenians twenty years of age in full
standing ( $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \iota \mu \circ \iota$ ) were members of the public assembly ( $\epsilon_{\kappa \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i \alpha)}$ at Athens.
27. тov่vavtiov mâv: quite the re- $\mathbf{b}$ verse, an adv. acc. perhaps of measure or content. Cf. Gorg. $516 \mathbf{e}, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha_{\alpha} \tau \delta \delta \epsilon$
 ठıà Пєрıклє́a $\beta \in \lambda \tau$ lous $\gamma \in \gamma o \nu \in ́ \nu \alpha \iota, \hat{\eta} \pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$
 In Crit. 47 bc d, Socrates appeals from the many and ignorant to the few, or to the one who has special knowledge.
29. $\delta<a \phi \theta_{\epsilon}$ ipourtv: by its emancipation from the government of $\delta о к \in \boldsymbol{i}$ this statement is made especially vigorous. The transition has already been half made by ets $\mu \in ́ v$ tis, where instinctively we supply $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \ell$ in spite of бокєі.
31. $\pi \alpha^{\prime} v \tau \omega \mathrm{~s} \delta \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \pi \mathrm{mov}$ : before this Socrates waits a moment, to give Meletus opportunity to answer.
32. ov่ $\phi \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ : the answer no is made prominent by the order of clauses. $\epsilon \mathfrak{\alpha} \nu$ où $\phi \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, if you say no, द́à $\nu \mu \grave{\eta} \phi \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$,








 if you do not say yes. ov̉ фŋ̂тє must be taken closely together as equiv. to a verb of denying. See GMT. 384.

 ov̉ $\phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \eta,{ }^{\prime} \rho \in \sigma \theta \in \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon}$. For the use of $\mu \dot{\eta}, c f$. Dem. xxi. 205, ă $\nu \tau^{\prime}$ '̇ं $\gamma \dot{\omega} \phi \hat{\omega}, \iota_{\nu} \nu$
 here tis applied to an abstraction particularizes it. Thus the $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta a \iota \mu o \nu i ́ a$ is represented as of some sort; this makes the form of statement more specific though still vague.
 pres. indic. here is not used in the prot. that immediately belongs to the apod. $\pi o \lambda \lambda \grave{\eta}$. . a ${ }^{2} \nu \epsilon \ell \eta$. See GMT. 503. The connexion of thought requires an intervening prot., or some qualifying adv. like єiкóт $\omega$ s: This implied prot., with its apod., goes with $\epsilon_{i}^{i} \delta t a \phi \theta \in\{\rho \in t$, $\dot{\omega} \phi \in \lambda o \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu . \quad C f .30 \mathrm{~b}$ and, for a case where $\delta \iota \kappa a i \omega s$ represents the prot. required by the sense, Xen. An. vii. 6.

 (most at variance) $\epsilon i \mu \iota, \pi \hat{\omega} s \not \hbar \nu$ ย $\tau \iota$

 implies criticism of Meletus's bearing,
 used of pretentious performances. Here, however, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \pi} \pi \delta \epsilon i \kappa \nu v \sigma a l ~ m e a n s$
primarily $\epsilon \pi \iota \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \nu \iota_{s} \sigma a \nu \tau \delta \nu$. G. 1242; ${ }^{25}$ H. 812. For the added ótı clause, see the next note, and on $\tau i s \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i v, 24 \mathrm{~d}$.
 explain $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \sigma \alpha u \tau o \hat{u}$ à $\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota a \nu$. Here at last is the pun upon Meletus's name (cf. also 26 b ), for which the constant recurrence of the idea of $\mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \kappa \epsilon$ (variously expressed, $\tilde{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \in \lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ and
 and $\mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$ in 24 d) has already paved the way. For similar plays upon words, cf. Soph. O. T. 395, $\delta$ $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ єiठ̀̀s Oiठítovs, Symp. 185 c, Паи$\sigma a \nu i v v \delta e ̀ ~ \pi a v \sigma a \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o v$, and the obvious play upon Agathon's name, ib. 174 b; Rich. II. ii. 1,
Old Gaunt indeed, and gaunt in being old, ... Within me grief bath kept a tedious fast; Gaunt am I for the grave; gaunt as a grave.
 the same order, $c f . M \underset{f}{ } .71 \mathbf{d}$, $\sigma \grave{v} \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ aù $\tau \delta s, \bar{\omega} \pi \rho \delta s \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{M} \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega \nu \kappa \tau \epsilon \in$. For a different order, see 26 b , Crit. 46 a. In 26 e the voc. is not expressed.
3. ※ taiv: my friend, or my good friend. $\quad C f$. Dem. 1. 26, à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ढे $\tau \alpha \nu$, où $\chi$ l Bou入h$\sigma \in \tau a l$. The orthography is much disputed, and we find $\bar{\omega} \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$, $\bar{\omega} \tau \alpha \nu$, and $\bar{\omega}{ }^{\prime} \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$.
4. тov̀s é $\gamma \gamma \cup \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega ~ \in ́ a u \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ o ̋ v \tau a s: ~$ i.e. those who were most unavoidably influenced by them.










 $\mu о \chi \theta \eta \rho o ̀ \nu \pi о \iota \eta=\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \xi v \nu o ́ v \tau \omega \nu, \kappa \iota \nu \delta v \nu \in v ́ \sigma \omega$ какóv $\tau \iota \lambda a-$





7. а́токрічои: after a pause. - © ขópos кте́.: see Introd. 71 with note 2.
 and $\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa \delta \sigma \delta \epsilon$, acc. to the context, mean indifferently so young or so old. See Introd. 30. Notice the chiastic order:-

Cf. below, 26 e fin., and Euthyph. 2b,




 rputov $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$, a young person who, $I$ conceive, is not much known: his name is Meletus and Pitthis is his deme,-perhaps you remember a Meletus of Pitthis, who has rather a beak, a scrubbed beard, and lank long hair.
15. áyvow: for the indic. with $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon, \stackrel{25}{e}$ see GMT. 582 ; H. 927.
 the case supposed the какó is the natural result. It is stated, however ( $c f$. the equiv. idiom á $\gamma \alpha \theta \delta \nu \quad \tau \iota \lambda a \beta \in i \nu$
 victim goes out of his way to obtain. 18. oโนa亡 oủठ'́va: cf. Lach. 180 a,


19. $\eta \geqslant$, äк $\omega \nu$ : the verb is supplied from its subordinate clause, $\epsilon i$ ica$\phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \omega$. More usually the verb of the subord. clause is implied and that of the leading clause expressed. Socrates believed that all sin was involuntary, oùdels ék $\kappa \grave{\omega}$ á $\mu a \rho \tau \alpha ́ \nu \epsilon 1$. See Introd. 17.
21. kal akovoi $\omega v$ : strictly speaking this is superfluous, since $\tau o l o v \tau \omega \nu$ takes
 26 a




 $\mu a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega$ s.





 tion Socrates's homely fashion of repeating himself. See Introd. 55. - For the gen. of the charge after $\epsilon i \sigma d \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$, see on $\epsilon i \sigma \alpha ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu, 24 \mathrm{~d}$.
 must supply $\pi o \iota \omega \hat{\nu}$ with $\pi a v ́ \sigma o \mu a t$. Such an ellipsis as this is obvious, and therefore not uncommon. See App.
25. є̈фиүєs $\kappa \tau \epsilon \in .:$ you declined. Socrates offered Meletus every opportunity for such an effort. See Introd. 25. The compound $\delta<a \phi \in \dot{\prime} \gamma \in L \nu$ in this sense is more common, but $c f$. Eur. Heracl. 595 f., aùzol $\delta$ è $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \iota-$
 $\rho \delta \nu \sigma \epsilon \sigma \hat{\omega} \sigma \theta a \iota$ (when they might be wholly
 From this quotation it appears that $\mu \eta$ might have been used before $\xi v \gamma-$ $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ and $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \xi a \iota$. See Arnold's edit. of Madvig's Syntax, 156, Rem. 3. For cases of $\varepsilon_{\kappa} \kappa \phi \epsilon \dot{v} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ qualified by a neg. and followed by $\tau \boldsymbol{\partial} \mu \grave{\eta}$ ov and $\mu \dot{\eta}$
 (sc. $\delta$ $\sigma o \phi \iota \sigma \tau \eta s) ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ \tau \delta ~ \mu \grave{\eta} ~ o \grave{v} \tau o \hat{v}$

$\pi<\iota \hat{\omega} \nu$ тเs єts. GMT. 811. Phaedr. ${ }^{26}$

 GMT. 807. For an entirely different case, cf. 39 a , where $\tau \dot{\partial} \dot{\alpha} \pi о \theta \alpha \nu \epsilon i \nu$ represents $\theta$ ávatov.
XIV. 2. точ่т $\omega \nu$ : see on $\bar{\omega} \nu, 24 \mathbf{c}$. b - ov̈тє $\mu \in ́ \gamma \alpha$ oűтє $\mu$ ккро́v: a stronger way of saying où $\delta \epsilon \nu$. The whole is acir., and therefore in the cognate acc. rather than in the gen. See G. 1060 and 1054 ; H. 719 b .
3. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \mu \omega \mathrm{s} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\eta}$ : all the carelessness of Meletus is accumulated in $\delta \mu \omega s$, and thus the adversative force of $\delta \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is enhanced, while $\delta \dot{\eta}$ brings the statement of contradiction to a point; that is, $\delta \dot{\eta}$ marks transition from a general to a special account of $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau 0 \hat{v} \mathrm{M} \in \lambda \dot{\eta}-$ тov $\dot{a} \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \nu$.
4. $\eta \geqslant \delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o v$ : appends a more precise and pressing question to the first, and anticipates the answer. In Lat. an is used in this way. The ellipsis in $8 \% \tau \iota \kappa a \tau \grave{\alpha} \kappa \tau \dot{\varepsilon}$. is to be supplied from

6. тav̂̃a: does not go with $\lambda \epsilon$ '́ $\gamma \in$ เs but with $\delta \iota \delta \alpha \dot{\sigma} \kappa \omega \nu$.











 and asserts with all his might and main，$I$ assure you exactly that is what $I$ do mean．$\pi \alpha ́ \nu v$ and $\sigma \phi \delta \delta \rho \alpha$ give strength to the assertion $\tau a \hat{v} \tau \alpha \lambda^{\prime} \gamma \omega$ （cf． 25 a），os $\nu$ signifies agreement with Socrates，and $\mu \epsilon \cdot \nu$（a weakened $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ ） gives him the assurance of it．
 A prep．is more usual，but compare

 $\phi \iota \sigma \mu$ ．There are many cases where the gen．is used without a prep．（esp． where $\pi \epsilon \rho$ l would seem appropriate）． Kr．Spr．47，7，6．Stallbaum，however， insists that $\pi \in \rho!$ is not implied here， and distinguishes between $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ $\hat{\omega} \nu \delta$ $\lambda \delta$ jos and $\tilde{\omega} \nu \delta \lambda \sigma$ jos，just as between $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$（have in mind）$\tau \iota \nu \alpha$ and $\lambda \epsilon$＇ $\gamma \in ⿺ 辶 \pi \in \rho^{\prime}$ rives．That such a distinc－ ton sometimes holds good is plain from other passages in Plato．$C f$ ． Stalls．in bloc．and Soph． 260 a，$\sigma \delta \nu$
 （sc．$\left.\delta \lambda \frac{\sigma}{\gamma} \sigma \mathrm{s}\right)$ ．
c 10 ff ．то́тєроv $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \in เ s \kappa \tau \in \in$ ．：the two horns of this dilemma are，I．$\pi \delta \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ ．．．öтı є́ $\tau \epsilon ́ \rho o u s$, and II．\＃．．．$\delta \iota \delta a ́ \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \%$ ． In I．there are two subdivisions：
（a）$\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu . . . \tau \iota \nu a s \quad \theta \epsilon o u ́ s$ and（b）cal
 described as the inevitable result of （a）．In II．there are two subdivisions： （c）oйтє．．．$\theta \in o$ ย́s，－which contradicts （b），— and（d）тoús $\tau \epsilon \ldots$ ．．$\delta \delta \delta \alpha ́ \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$, — which contradicts（a），but is not stated as the result of（c）．After making his first point（a），Socrates，carried away by the minute zeal of explana－ ton，states $(b)$ independently of $\lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon s$ ． Therefore it would be clearer to print
 thesis if it were not for $\begin{gathered}\text { Ex } \\ \kappa \kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon i s, ~ w h i c h ~\end{gathered}$ in sense reënforces $\lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon s$ ．каl aù $\boldsymbol{\partial} \partial s$ kappa，being strongly affirmative，is fol－ lowed by cal оѝк（rather than où $\delta$＇́） ci $\mu$ it．This，in turn，being strongly neg．，is followed by out $\delta \epsilon$（rather than $\kappa a l$ oùк）da $\delta \iota \kappa \omega \hat{\omega}$ ．Although the sense connects out $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \tau o 九 .$. et $\tau$＇́fous with vo－ $\mu\left\{\zeta_{\epsilon \iota \nu} .\right.$. ．$\theta \in o$＇vs preceding，the syntax connects it with poult $\omega$ final $\theta$ eaves． From this we supply the ellipsis with öтı є́ $\tau \in ́ \rho o u s, s c . \nu 0 \mu i \zeta \omega$ $\theta$ єoús．
 є $\gamma \kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon$ is are not correl．See on $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau^{2}$ \＆$\nu \in!\eta, 27 \mathrm{~d}$ ．

17．iva $\tau i, \kappa \tau \epsilon$ ．：sc． $\boldsymbol{\gamma \epsilon} \nu \eta \tau \tau a \iota$ ，what makes






yet. - ápa: the insinuation of Meletus was both startling and unwelcome to Socrates, who nevertheless meets it in a tone of playful irony. Every re-ligious-minded Greek reverenced the sun. No appeal was more solemn and sincere than that to $\eta \lambda \lambda \iota o s \pi a \nu \delta-$ $\pi \tau \eta s$. Accordingly this appeal is constantly met with in the most moving situations created by tragedy. Ajax, when in despair he falls upon his sword, and outraged Prometheus from his rock, both cry out to the sun. Ion, before entering upon his peaceful duties in the temple, looks first with gladness toward the sun. Both Heracles and Agave are saved from madness when they once more can clearly recognize the sun. That Socrates habitually paid reverence with exemplary punctiliousness to this divinity not made by human hands is here suggested and is still more plainly shown in Symp. 220 d , where, after some account of a brown study into which Socrates had fallen, we read: $\delta \delta \frac{1}{\epsilon}$

 $\pi \rho o \sigma \in \nu \xi \alpha \dot{\beta} \mu \in \nu$ os $\tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{\eta} \lambda i \not \varphi$, then, after a prayer to the sun, he took his departure. On Socrates's religion, see Introd. 32.
19. $\bar{\omega}$ äv $\delta \rho \in s$ Sıкaбtal: Meletus uses this form of address, which Plato is careful not to put into the mouth of Socrates. See on $\check{\omega}$ ă $\nu \delta \rho \in s ~ \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$, , 17 a .
20. 'Avakayópov: see Introd. 10. Diog. Laert. ii. 3. 4, reports that An-
 єîval סıáaupov (a red hot mass of stone

 каl фа́paryas (ravines). From this last apparently the public inferred that Anaxagoras held the belief which Meletus attributes so wrongfully to Socrates, i.e. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \nu \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu$. The real view of Socrates in regard to such an account of the "all-seeing sun," as was attributed to Anaxagoras, is perhaps represented by the parenthetical refutation introduced by Xenophon in Mem. iv. 7.7. For a criticism of Anaxagoras which is more worthy of Socrates himself, see the one attributed to him in the Phaedo, $97 \mathrm{c}-99 \mathrm{~d}$. The capital objection there made to Anaxagoras is that he unfolds his dogmatic views $\grave{\alpha} \mu \in \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma a s$ тàs $\dot{\omega}$ à $\lambda \eta \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$ airías $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$. The argument here is: "apparently you take me for Anaxagoras, and forget that it is Socrates whom you are prosecuting." Diogenes Laertius, ii. 3. 5, gives a startling story about Anaxagoras: $\phi \alpha \sigma l \delta^{\prime}$ aùrd̀ $\pi \rho o є i \pi \epsilon i \nu(p r o p h e-$ sied) $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho$ l Airds $\pi о \tau a \mu \partial \nu($ Aegospotami) $\tau 0 \hat{v} \lambda^{\prime}$ '⿴ov $\pi \tau \hat{\omega} \sigma เ \nu$ (the fall of the

21. oṽт : qualifying à $\pi \epsilon$ ípous below as well as каraфpoveis.
22. $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu$ : in literature. $\gamma \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu-$ $\mu_{\alpha \tau \alpha}$ stand in the same relation to $\mu \alpha \theta \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ as litterae to disciplinae. Plato meant to be outspoken in dealing with the stupidity which led the court to pronounce Socrates guilty.





－oủk єiféval：ȯ̉ because Socrates wishes to suggest the most positive form of statement：oú $\tau \omega \mathrm{s}$ ă $\pi \in \iota \rho o \iota$
 $\boldsymbol{\kappa \tau \epsilon}$ ．This vivid use of ov̀ for $\mu \dot{\eta}$ in inf．clauses after $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ is not uncom－ mon where it is indifferent whether the indic．or infin．is used；thus here
 would be equally regular and $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ oùk eidéval is a mixture of the two． See GMT． 594 ；H． 1023 b．

23．$\beta \iota \beta \lambda i a$ ：cf．Diog．Laert．ii． 3. 8，$\pi \rho \omega \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{\tau}$（sc．of the philosophers）$\delta \dot{\epsilon}$
 lished）$\sigma v \gamma \gamma \rho a \phi \hat{\eta} s$.

24．кal סทे kal：and now you expect people to believe that it is from me，etc．
 $\mu \dot{\prime}$＇vors：sc．the doctrines，not the books．
 might，they chanced to see a play in which these doctrines were promul－ gated，as in Eur．Orest．982，
Where hangs a centre－stone of heaven and earth
With linked chains of gold aloft suspended， Where whirls the clod erst from Olympus flung， There I would go．
It is said that，in the lost play of Phaethon，Euripides called the sun $\chi \rho v \sigma \epsilon ́ a \nu$ ß $\hat{\alpha} \lambda o \nu, a$ clod of gold．Such utterances could be heard by any who paid the price of admission and listened to this poet＇s choral odes， which were sung $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\partial} \rho \chi \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \tau \rho a s$. The price of admission to the theatre of Dionysus thus appears to have been at most（ $\epsilon i \pi \alpha ́ \nu \nu ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda o \hat{v}$ ）one drachma．

Ordinary spectators paid two obols， one－third of a drachma，or about six
cents．Pericles passed a law provid－ one－third of a drachma，or about six
cents．Pericles passed a law provid－ ing that Athenians who asked for it should receive two obols for this pur－ pose from the public treasury．The mention here of a maximum admis－ sion price of one drachma suggests that the better places may have been reserved by the manager（called $\theta \in c$－ $\tau \rho \omega \nu \eta s$ or $\theta \in \alpha \tau \rho \sigma \pi \bar{\omega} \lambda \eta s$ ，sometimes even áp义ıテє́к $\tau \omega \nu$ ）for those who could pay more than six cents．In the account rendered（sce Rangabé，Antiquités IIel－ rendered（see Rangabé，Antiquite＇s Hel－
léniques，the inscription numbered 57 ， lines $30-33$ ，also C．I．A．I．324，pp． 171，175）for building the Erechtheum （ 407 в．c．）is found the following item：

 $\psi a \mu \epsilon \nu \vdash \vdash|l| l$ ，expenditures：purchases： $\psi \alpha \mu \in \nu+1$ buil，expenditures：purchases：
［item］bought two sheets of paper upon which we wrote our accounts， 2 drachmas which we wrote our accounts， 2 drachmas
and 4 obols．It is accordingly absurd to suggest that a volume of Anax－ agoras at this time could have cost as little as one drachma，even if it as little as one drachma，even if it
could be proved that books were sold in the orchestra of the theatre of Dionysus ；or if，that failing， we were content with the notion of we were content with the notion of
a book－market close to the Agora． The part of the a oopa where the statues of Harmodius and Aristogei－ ton stood bore the name íp $\chi \dot{\eta} \sigma \tau \rho a$ ， but nothing goes to show that books were sold there．

27．ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \mathrm{s} \tau \epsilon$ каl．．．äто $\pi \alpha$ ：the more
so because of their singularity．＂With－



 $\dot{v} \beta \rho \iota \sigma \tau \grave{\jmath}$ каі̀ ảкó入абтоs，каì à $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu \hat{\omega} \varsigma \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta \nu$




26 out taking even that into account，the youths must know well enough that these are not my doctrines．＂Etymo－ logically ä $\tau о \pi \alpha$ suggests not absurd， but uncommon，eccentric．See the pre－ ceding note．
 $\kappa \tau \epsilon \in, 25 \mathrm{c}$ ，and $c f$ ．Dem．ix．15，ג̀ $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$

 sition to a second argument against the charge of atheism，and hence Meletus repeats the charge．Socrates has already shown the absurdity of the charge viewed as a statement of fact．Now he considers it as a state－ ment of opinion（oít $\omega \sigma \boldsymbol{i} \sigma o \iota \quad \delta o \kappa \bar{\omega} ;$ ）， and－urges that Mcletus is not entitled to hold such an opinion because it conflicts with another of Meletus＇s own views．See App．
 discrediting．．．your own（proper）self． $C f$ ．the use of $\pi t \theta a \nu o{ }^{\prime} s$ in the contrary sense，e．g．Phaed． 67 e，$\epsilon \check{l} \tau \iota$ o $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu \\ \dot{u} \mu i \nu \\ \nu\end{gathered}$


 $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ єóт $\boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \mathrm{t}$ ：in a spirit of mere wantonness and youthful bravado．－є̈оккє $\xi$ чить－ 0 évtl：there are three possible consts． with＇̇osк＇́va：：（1）it may be followed by the dat．part．as here，（2）it may take the nom．part．，（3）it may take
the inf．With the partic．nom．or ${ }^{2}$ dat．ėoเкévaı means to offer the appear－ ance of（to scem like unto one）being； with the infinitive it means to seem，on consideration，to be．For the inf．const． $c f$ ． 21 d above；for the rarer nom． partic．cf．Cratyl． 408 b ，另 $\gamma \epsilon^{\top} \mathrm{I} \rho \iota s$ à $\pi \boldsymbol{\delta}$ $\tau o \hat{v} \epsilon \check{\rho} \epsilon \iota \nu$（an old－fashioned word mean－ ing tell）$\epsilon \circ \iota \kappa \in \kappa \in \kappa \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu} \eta$ ，and Xen．



34．Sıaтєцршんє́vఱ：＂one participial 2 clause（ $\omega \sigma \pi \pi \epsilon \rho$ $\xi v \nu \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \in \nu \tau \iota)$ within an－ other（ $\delta \iota \alpha \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \omega)$ ；as Rep．viii．
 pıov $\tau \iota \tau \rho \omega \sigma \kappa o \nu \tau \in s$ ，they（the busi－ ness men）inserting their sting，that is， their money，into any who yields them opportunity，keep inflicting wounds．No－ tice that it is $\underset{\omega}{\sigma} \pi \epsilon \rho$ ăvi $\gamma \mu a$ ，a＇mock－ riddle，＇one which has no answer．＂ R ． $C f$ ．for the use of the pres．partic． Phaed． 116 c d，ol $\sigma \theta \alpha$ $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \hat{\alpha} \bar{\gamma} \lambda \theta o \nu$ à $\gamma-$ $\gamma_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \omega \nu$ ．Xen．Hell．ii．4．37，Є゙ $\pi \epsilon \mu \pi о \nu$ ．．．$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma о \nu \tau \alpha s$ ö $\tau \iota$ ктє́．An．ii．4．24，$\delta$
 סıaßalvolєข тд̀ потанóv．Id．iv．5．8，
 $\delta \iota \delta \delta \nu \tau a s \kappa \tau \epsilon \in$ ．See on $\sigma \kappa о \pi о \hat{\nu} \nu \tau, 21 \mathrm{e}$ ． Usually $\delta \iota a \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$ takes the gen．， but here the question which foliows explains the nature of the $\delta$ tánetpa．

35．o ooфòs $\delta \eta$＇：that enlightened man，spoken with irony．－غ่ $\mu \hat{\sim}$ Xapt－

 $\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ aủ $\tau$
 40 тои̂тó є̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \pi \alpha i \zeta$ ортоs.









 and partic. with $\gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \tau a$, , see examples cited in note on $\mathfrak{j} \sigma \theta \delta \mu \eta \nu, 22 \mathbf{c}$.
36. тov̀s ä $\lambda \lambda$ ous: see on $\tau o i ̂ s \not a \lambda \lambda o t s$, b below.
 $\kappa \tau \mathcal{\epsilon}$.: to contradict himself in so many words. A more positive phrase than



b 4. тovs $\lambda$ óyous: the art. has nearly the force of a poss. here. See G. 949 ; H. 658. In many such cases as here the art., strictly speaking, points out something which the context has already suggested. To all such suggestions a Greek audience was very sensitive. Hence the freq. and delicate use of the dem. art. in Greek. G. 981 f.; H. 654. On the method of Socrates, see Introd. 18, 21, 25, 26.

ways trying to get up a disturbance; more lit., disturbing in one way and another. Cf. Xen. An. i. 5. 12, kal oìvos $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ (Menon's soldier) à̀тoù h̆ $\mu a p \tau \epsilon \nu$



 See also Euthyd. 273 b, ठั $\tau \in \Delta$ sovuab-


 $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̀ s$ (now and then glancing at us). The acc. is after the analogy of $\theta 6 \rho \mathrm{pu}$ Bov $\theta_{0} \rho \nu \beta \in i v$, i.e. a cognate acc. G. 1051;H.715. Here Meletus (cf. 25 d) gives no answer apart from such demonstrations of disgust as Socrates complains of. The words in $\mathbf{c}$
 gest that the court was finally forced to interpose. Of course many "waits" of one kind or another may have oc-
$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$ каì $\tau 0 i ̂ s ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda o \iota s ~ \tau o v \tau o \iota \sigma i ́ . ~ a ̀ ~ \lambda \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi i ̀ ~ \tau o u ́ \tau \omega ~ \gamma \epsilon ~ a ̉ \pi o ́-~$



 єїтє $\pi a \lambda a \iota a ́ \cdot a ̉ \lambda \lambda ’$ oôv $\delta a \iota \mu o ́ v \iota a ́ ~ \gamma \epsilon ~ \nu о \mu i ́ \zeta \omega ~ к а \tau a ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \sigma o ̀ \nu ~$




cored during such a cross-examinadion as is here given.
11. Toîs äd $\lambda$ orts: all except the accauser and the accused; the audience (a above) and more esp. the $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau a i$.
 to answer the next question. "This will go to the bottom of the whole matter." $\overline{\varepsilon \pi l}$ rovíc is almost the same as $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ дov̀zo. $\quad \epsilon \pi l$ with the dat. easily passes from the meaning of nearness to the kindred sense of immediate succession in time. The acc. is like
 asked) or $\tau \delta$ Er $\rho \omega \tau \omega \mu \not \mu \nu 0 \nu$, the question which is being asked, freq. used with а̀токрірє $\sigma \theta a$.
c 13. is ẅrnoas: Oh! thank you! Used absolutely, like iuvare in Lat.

16. đג入’ oũv: not essentially differant from $\delta^{\prime}$ o ${ }^{\circ} \nu$. See on 17 a. - $\delta a-$ $\mu$ о́vá $\gamma \epsilon$ : "To make the reasoning
 $\mu a \tau a$ above ought to mean the same; which it must be acknowledged they do not. It must be observed, however, that the original perversion lay with Miletus, whose charge of $\delta \alpha \mu \delta^{-}$ via kaıvá was based simply on Socrates's to $\delta a \mu \mu$ nov. Now by this

Socrates meant a divine agency, but Miletus had wrested it into the sense of a divine being. So that here the equivocation of Meletus is simply returned upon himself. Contrast, where Socrates is speaking uncontroversially of his monitor, the distinctly adj. use, $\theta \in i ̂ o ̛ ̀ ~ \tau \iota ~ к а l ~ \delta a ц \mu \delta \nu ı o \nu, ~ 31 ~ c . " ~ R . ~$
17. $\tau \hat{n}$ àrç $\rho a \phi \hat{n}$ : elsewhere and in its stricter use this means the written affidavit put in as a rejoinder by the accused; rarely as here, the accusation or the written affidavit of the accuser. So in Hyper. Eur. §§ 4, 33 (Col. 20, 40). Harpocration on the word ar $\nu \tau \tau \rho \rho a \phi$ '́ says, evidently referring to this passage: $\Pi \lambda \alpha{ }^{2} \omega \nu \bar{\delta} \delta \dot{c}$

 69 and N .1 and 2.
19. ${ }^{\text {ex }}$ ¢ $\epsilon$ : repeated by way of an-
 carly the simple verb is often repeated after a compound form. See on Crit. 44 d.- $\delta_{\eta}$ : certainly. Such an affirmation is not only self-evident (justified by common sense), but also follows from the admission which Meletus already has made.
20. roves $\delta a(\mu$ vas $\kappa \tau \mathcal{\epsilon}$.: the defination here given is consistent with










Greek usage from Homer to Plato. In Homer $\theta \epsilon \delta \delta^{\prime}$ and $\delta a i \mu \omega \nu$, applied to any divinity in particular or to divinity in general, are all but interchangeable terms. The distinction between them, if distinction there is, suggests itself rather in the adjs. derived from them than in the two nouns themselves. Hesiod, Op. 108125 , calls the guardian spirits that watch over men $\delta a i \mu o \nu \in s$; to the rank of $\delta$ aluoves he says those were raised who lived on earth during the golden age. He distinguishes between $\theta \in o i ́$, daípoves, and thpets, and this same distinction is attributed to Thales. On this Plato based the fancy expressed in the Symposium

 ... $\hat{\epsilon} \rho \mu \eta \nu \epsilon \hat{v} о \nu$ каl $\delta \iota a \pi о \rho \theta \mu \epsilon \hat{v} о \nu$ (interpreting and convoying) $\theta \in o i ̂ s ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \rho^{\prime}$ $\dot{a} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu$ кal à $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \pi o ı s ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \rho a ̀ ~ \theta \epsilon \omega ̂ \nu$,

 and rewards) $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \theta \nu \sigma เ \omega ิ \nu$.
21. $\phi$ ที่s $\eta$ n ovi: three Eng. words, yes or no?, will translate this. See on où $\phi \hat{\tau} \tau \epsilon, 25 \mathrm{~b}$.
 complex prot., which falls into two simpler conditions, each of which ex-
cludes the other. The latter apply the broader supposition $\epsilon \check{I} \pi \epsilon p$ daímovas $\dot{\eta} \gamma o v ิ \mu a \iota$ in turn to alternative apodoses, both of which it limits. $C f$. Xen. An. vii. 6. 15 , for a very similar construc-

 readily have taken the form of a

 $\pi \rho \delta \sigma \theta \in \nu$ aù $\tau \hat{\varphi} \ldots \phi i ́ \lambda o s ~ \omega \nu \nu v ̂ \nu \ldots \delta \iota \alpha-$
 $\dot{v} \phi^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ aitíà $\epsilon_{\chi} \chi o l \mu t ;$ On the combination of indic. and opt., see GMT. 503 , and on $\epsilon i$ i $\delta \iota \alpha \phi \theta \in i \rho \in t, \kappa \tau \in \in,, 25$ b above.

 єi... $\delta a i \mu o \nu \in s$, are grasped into one; and, thus combined in $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau o$, they become the subj. whose pred. is the suppressed (ėкєivo) antec. of ö. To ő $\sigma \in$ aivi $\tau \tau \in \sigma \theta a \iota$
 which explains it and has the same subj.; all this points back to $\theta \in o \stackrel{\Delta}{s}$ ov $\nu o \mu i \zeta \omega \nu$ à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \theta \epsilon o \grave{s} \nu o \mu i \zeta \omega \nu, 27$ a.
27. $\omega^{\imath} v$ : equiv. to $\epsilon \xi \hat{\omega} \nu$, for "when the antecedent stands before the relative, a preposition (in this case éк) belonging to both usually appears only with the first." See H. 1007. Sí: you know.

 $\sigma \grave{v}[\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha]$ ov̉ $\chi \grave{i} \dot{\alpha} \pi о \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ є́ $\gamma \rho \alpha ́ \psi \omega \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \grave{\eta} \nu$



 $\eta{ }_{\eta}^{\eta} \rho \omega a s, ~ o v ̉ \delta \epsilon \mu i ́ a ~ \mu \eta \chi \alpha \nu \eta$＇̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$.






 not interfere with the grammar，al－ though they make sad havoc with the sense，unless ${ }^{\circ}$ disappears．
 doubt was Socrates＇s real view of the case of Meletus（ $c f .23 \mathbf{d}$ ），whereas all that precedes is only to bring home to the court how foolish and self－contradictory the charge is．à $\pi$ o－ $\rho \bar{\omega} \nu$ and $\grave{\alpha} \pi о \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \varsigma$ ，in connexion with ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \rho^{\prime} \psi \omega$ ，refer to continued action
 represents Meletus＇s original reflexion $\tau_{i}^{i}$ є̀ $\gamma \kappa a \lambda \bar{\omega}$ ；The subjv．might have been retained．GMT． 677.

34．ötwss $\delta$ ह̀ $\sigma \dot{v} \kappa \tau \mathcal{\epsilon}$ ：：here Socrates closes his argument to the effect that it is a contradiction in terms to say of one and the same man（1）that he is a complete atheist，and（2）that he believes in $\delta a \mu o ́ v i a$ ．The second $\tau o \hat{v}$ à̀ $\boldsymbol{\text { avù }}$ must be regarded as redundant， a simple repetition of the first one
which might be dispensed with．See App．－$\pi \in$（ Oots åv ws［ov̉］：is not simply pleonastic，as in the case of two negatives in the same clause，but it is irrational，and can hardly be right．öncos means how or by which after $\mu \eta \chi a \nu \dot{\eta}$ ．A similar use of $\dot{\omega} s$ is explained GMT．329， 2.
XVI．1．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho, \ldots$ ．$\tau$ uv̂ta：this phrase dismisses one topic to make room for the next one．
 be the condemnation of me，if condemna－ tion it is to be．aip $\bar{\nu} \nu$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta a$, are technical terms of the law，as is the case with $\phi \in \dot{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ and $\delta \omega \dot{\kappa} \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ．
7．$\delta \mathrm{r}^{\prime}$ ：certainly．The allusion is to facts generally known and acknowl－ edged，cf． 31 d ．－mo $\lambda \lambda$ ov̀s kal ä $\lambda \lambda$ dous кal ajatovis：instead of кal aג入ous полдoùs кal araAoús．The first kal is the idiomatic kal of comparisons．$C f$ ． 22 d, öтєр каl oi $\pi о \neq \tau a l$ ，and the idiom











 equally idiomatic，and joins $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o u ́ s$ with a second adj．Cf．$\pi о \lambda \lambda о l$ каl бофоl án $\delta \rho \in s$ ．
 rule is in no danger of breaking down in $m y$ case．Cf．Phaed． 84 b ，ov̀ $\delta \grave{\iota} \nu \delta \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \nu$ $\mu \grave{\eta}$ фоßךө⿱⺈⿵⺆，we need not apprehend that the soul will have to fear．Gorg． 520 d， and Rep．v． 465 b ．There is a touch of irony in this way of saying＂I do not think．＂Socrates as it were en－ lists on the side of the rule．This idiom throws no light on ov $\mu \dot{\eta}$ with subjv．or fut．indic．GMT．294， 295．For the quasi－impersonal use of $\sigma \tau \hat{\eta}$ ，come to a stand－still，$c f$ ．Arist． Eth．Nic．vi．9．9，$\sigma \tau \grave{\jmath \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota}$ үà $\rho$ ка̀кєぇ．

 $\sigma \omega \zeta \epsilon \tau \alpha, \ldots \epsilon \mathfrak{l} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \mathfrak{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \hat{u} \tau 0$ あ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$
 $\phi \theta a \rho \in i \eta$ ．In such contexts the aor． $\sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ denotes the entrance into a state of quict or collapse．GMT．55，
 indicating surprise．The perversity of Socrates，in view of the fact just recited，is unreasonable．When such a question is accompanied by an urgent statement of the reason for
surprise（here тooỗav．．．$\epsilon \xi$ ô̂，$\kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$ ．），it 28 may be introduced by $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \tau \alpha$ or $\not{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \tau \alpha$ ， otherwise not．
 the same thought，and Xen．$A n$ ．iii．r． 43，for its application to the risks of war．In the Ajax of Sophocles，473－ 480 ，the same idea is brought to the following climax：－

Honor in life or honorable death The nobly born and bred must have．
 the question of life or death．Cf．for the use and omission of the art．，Rep． i． $334 \mathrm{e}, \kappa \iota \nu \delta \nu \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$（perhaps we，etc．）
 $\theta$ ध́ $\sigma \theta a t$（have defined）．$C f$ ．for the thought，Aj．475－476：－

15．öтаv тра́тт！：whenever he does anything．GM＇T．532．See App．

17．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \nu \theta \in \epsilon \omega \nu$ ：i．e．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \omega \nu$ ． Hesiod，W．and D．158，calls the

 among their number the heroes that laid siege to Thebes and to Troy．
 to the example of Achilles was always





 25 Өavátov каì тov̂ кıvסúvov $\dot{\omega} \lambda \iota \gamma \omega ́ \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon, \pi o \lambda \grave{v}$ $\delta$ è $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$





 which all Greeks regarded this hero was shown by temples raised in his honor and by countless works of art in which he appeared. Homer, Od. xi. 489, tells how Achilles found his favored condition in the lower world hardly to be endured. The posthomeric story-tellers said that he was living in the islands of the blest. $C f$. Symp. 179 e, where this same scene between Thetis and Achilles is quoted, and the scholion (Bergk 10) to Harmo-dius:-

No, sweet Harmodius, thou art not dead, But in the Islands of the Blest men say, Where lives swift-foot Achilles far away, And Tydeus' son, they say, brave Diomed.
We hear that Ibycus, and after him Simonides, wishing no doubt to make Achilles's happiness complete, represented him as married to Medea in Elysium.
21. $\theta$ єòs ov̉סa: added in a very unusual way, because the circumstance has unusual weight. The utterance of Thetis was not only prompted by
the natural anxiety of a mother for her son, but also was inspired by the unerring wisdom of a goddess. $C f$. Hom. Od. iv. 379 and 408, $\theta$ єol $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ t $\tau$ $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$ İ $\sigma \alpha \sigma \nu$. The passage from Hom. Il. xviii. 70 ff ., is quoted rather loosely in part (ovi $\omega \omega \sigma_{\imath}^{\prime} \pi \omega s$ ), and partly word for word.
 this point $\underset{\omega}{\sigma} \tau \tau$ is forgotten. The long speech and explanation given to Thetis makes this break in the const. very natural. In fact, this clause is as independent as if a co-ord. clause (with or without $\mu^{\prime} \nu$ ) had preceded it. - тov $\theta a v a ́ \tau o v: ~ n o t i c e ~ t h e ~ e x c e p-~$ tional use of the art., which is usually omitted with $\theta$ d́paros as an abstract noun. Cf. $28 \mathbf{e}, 29 \mathbf{a}, 32 \mathbf{c}, 38 \mathbf{c}, 39 \mathbf{a b}$, Crit. 52 c. For the art. used as here, $c f .29 \mathrm{a}, 40 \mathrm{~d}, 41 \mathrm{c}$.
29. $\mu \eta^{\prime}$. . o olєє : see on à à $\lambda^{\prime}$ ă $\rho a, 25$ a. d
 of $\bar{\psi} \dot{u} \pi^{\prime}$ ap $\rho о \nu \tau o s ~ \kappa \in \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \theta \in$ ís or even. $\tau \alpha \chi \theta \in t s$. Some such expression is called for grammatically by the form of the first alternative $\bar{\eta} \dot{\eta} \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \boldsymbol{\nu}$

 $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\nu} \nu \pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau o \hat{v} ~ a i \sigma \chi \rho o \hat{v}$.
 the finite const. represents the facts better. The commander's order, if given at all, was peremptory, and requires a more positive statement than the less urgent $\dot{\eta} \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu \in \nu o s \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$. In the sense $\dot{v} \pi^{\prime}$ á $\rho \chi o \nu \tau o s ~ \tau \alpha \chi \theta \hat{\eta}$ is the alternative of $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \alpha u \tau \delta \nu \tau \alpha \dot{\xi} \xi \eta$. See App.
 $\dot{\text { úro }} 0 \boldsymbol{\gamma} \backslash\} \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ means take into account, i.e. in striking a balance. Cf. Crit. 48 d , where nearly the same idea is expressed. For a detailed description of the process of striking a
 Phaedr. 231b, oi $\mu \not ̇ \nu ~ Ł ̇ p \omega ̄ \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \sigma к о-~$

 $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \iota \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ท̀ $\gamma 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \tau a \iota ~ \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \iota ~ \tau \eta े \nu ~$


 oйтє $\tau 0 \grave{\nu} s \pi \alpha \rho \in \lambda \eta \lambda u \theta \delta \tau \alpha s \pi \delta \nu o v s$ $\dot{v} \pi o \lambda o \gamma\{\zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \kappa \tau \in$. The force of $\dot{u} \pi \delta$ here is very near to that of $\dot{a} \nu \tau \ell$, and, so far from primarily indicating a process of subtraction, it involves first of all an addition.
34. $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ a l \sigma X \rho o v ̂: ~ m o r a l ~ t u r p i-~$ tude (turpe), not death, was the harm which Socrates struggled to avoid at any and every price. $C f .29 \mathrm{~b}$ and Soph. Ant. 95 ff .,
Nay, leave me and my heart's untoward plan To suffer all thou fear'st; naught will I suffer That shall estop me from a righteous death.
XVII. Having established the proposition that disgrace is more frightful than death, Socrates can now answer the question of 28 b , if he can
prove that it would have involved, and would still involve, disgrace for him not to have followed the pursuit which has brought him in danger of his life. This point he makes clear by an appeal to the analogy of military discipline, which, as he claims, applies to his relations to the gods. He is a soldier in the army of Apollo.
 $\xi เ v:$ much here depends upon disentangling past, pres., and fut. See GM'T. 509. The protasis (limiting
 prove to have done a dreadful thing) includes various acts in the past which are looked upon from a supposed time in the fut. It falls into two parts: one, marked off by $\mu^{\prime} \nu$, states (in the form of a supposition) well-known facts in the past ; the other, distinguished by $\delta \epsilon$, states a supposed future case in connexion with certain present circumstances. See on 5 . The outrageous conduct for him would be with this combination of facts and convictions, after his past fidelity to human trusts, at some fut. time to desert his divinely appointed post of duty: if while then I stood firm I should now desert my post. The repetition of $\mu^{\prime} \nu$ and $\delta t$ respectively is for the sake of clearness. For the same repetition $c f$. Isocr. vii. I8, $\pi \alpha \rho$ ' oîs $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ रà $\rho$ $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ филакो̀ $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ Ґ $\eta \mu i ́ \alpha ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ тoเoúт $\omega \nu$



 фаעєроîs $\gamma \in \nu 0 \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o i s ~ \sigma v \gamma \gamma \nu \omega \mu \mu \eta s$ $\tau v \chi \in i ̂ \nu$,

#   

28
 какопөєias, for (they knew) that while among those who have neither established safeguards nor penalties for such crimes nor any strict organization of justice, that while among these, I say, even righteous characters are corrupted; at the same time, where wrong-doers find it easy neither to conceal their transgressions nor to secure condonation when detected, there $I$ say (they knew that) evil dispositions end by dying out. Cf. also Gorg. 512 a. Notice that the $\mu^{\prime} \nu$ clause is important only with reference to the $\delta$ é clause, upon which the main stress is laid; the $\delta \epsilon^{\prime}$ clause is made prominent through the contrast afforded by the logically subordinate $\mu \epsilon \prime \nu$ clause. This same relation is indicated in the Eng., French, and
e German idiom by the use of some word like "while" in the $\mu \epsilon \in \nu$ clause.
2. of apxovtes: not the nine archons, but, as the context shows, the generals in command upon the field
 are here taken as representing the whole $\delta \tilde{\eta}_{\mu}$ os, from which they were selected by lot. See Introd. 66. Perhaps Socrates has also in mind the other Athenians present at the trial. See on 24 e and 25 a . The generals were elected by show of hands ( $\chi \in i \rho o-$ rovia) and their electors were the $\epsilon^{\prime} \kappa$ $\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota a \sigma \tau a i ́ . \quad C f .25 \mathrm{a}$.
 daea, a Corinthian colony on the peninsula Chalcidice, which became a tributary ally of Athens without wholly abandoning its earlier connexion with Corinth. Perdiceas, king of Macedonia, took advantage of this divided allegiance to persuade the Po-
tidaeans to revolt from Athens, which they did in 432 в.c. 'The Potidaeans, with the reinforcements sent them by the Peloponnesians, were defeated by the Athenian force under Callias. For two whole years the town was invested by land and blockaded by sea, and finally made favorable terms with the beleaguering force. In the engagement before the siege of Potidaea, Socrates saved Alcibiades's life. Cf. Symp. 219 e-220e, where Alcibiades gives a most enthusiastic and witty account of the bravery and self-denial of Socrates during the whole Potidaean campaign, and says of the battle in question: öтє $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \dot{\eta}$
 (the prize for gallantry in action) Ébr-
 $\sigma \in \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu \nu$ \#̀ oî $\tau o s, \tau \in \tau \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \in \nu 0 \nu$ (when I was wounded) ò̀к $\grave{\epsilon} \theta \in \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ à ào入ıлєìv,
 ${ }_{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon$ '. Alcibiades says that Socrates ought to have had the prize which was given to himself by favoritism. $C f$. Charm. 153 b c. - The battle at Amphipolis, an Athenian colony on the Strymon in Thrace, took place in the year 422 . The Athenians were defeated, and their general, Cleon, perished in the rout, while Brasidas, the Spartan general, paid for victory with his life. -Delium was an enclosure and a temple sacred to Apollo in Boeotia near Oropus, a border town sometimes held by the Athenians and sometimes by the Boeotians. The battle, which was a serious check to the power of Athens, resulted in the defeat and death of their general, Hippocrates. Cf. Xen. Mem. iii. 5. 4, à $\phi^{\prime}$













 $\tau \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \tau a \pi \epsilon l \nu \omega \tau a \iota$ (has been hum-
 Botaroùs ктє. Notice that both Plato
 cause at the time there was no extended settlement at or near the place. For the gallantry of Socrates in the retreat, $c f$. Symp. 221 a b. Alcibiades was mounted, and therefore could observe better than at Potidaea how Socrates behaved, and he says: áktov $\hat{\eta} \nu \quad \theta \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \eta$, ö $\tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \quad \Delta \eta \lambda i ́ o v$
 $\tau o \nu \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ ö ơov $\pi \in \rho เ \hat{\eta} \nu$ ) $\Lambda \alpha ́ \chi \eta \tau o s(h i s ~ c o m-~$ panion in flight) $\tau \hat{\varphi} \underset{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \mu \phi \rho \omega \nu$ є $\epsilon \nu a \iota$.

 $\nu \epsilon i \tau \alpha$. . See also the similar testimony of Laches in Lach. 181 b .
 The repeated allusions which are scattered through Plato's dialogues to the brave conduct of Socrates in these battles show that it was well known
 just like many another man. He is careful not to make too much of the
facts. The indef. ris here means some, i.e. any indefinite person, because many persons are thought of under ${ }^{\circ} \lambda \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda}$.
5. тov̂ $\delta \underset{\text { è }}{ } \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ov̂ $\tau$ átrovtos: i.e. now that my post is assigned me by the god, a circumstance of the supposition $\epsilon i$ $\lambda i ́ \pi o \iota \mu$, which is repeated in $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha \hat{v} \theta \alpha$.
 as $I$ thought and understood, sc. when I heard the oracle which was given to Chaerephon. - $\delta \in i ̂ v: ~ d e p e n d s$ on
 Apollo gives him an injunction, to the effect that he must live, etc.
 to suggest $\lambda \iota \pi \sigma \tau \alpha \xi$ iov $\gamma \rho a \phi$ и, a technical phrase of criminal law. Any one convicted of $\lambda$ ıтота $\xi^{\prime}$ a forfeited his civil rights, i.e. suffered $\dot{\alpha} \tau \not \mu i ́ a$.
9. тäv: тol, truly, emphasizes this repetition of the strong statement which begins the chapter.
 i.e. the same indef. subj. which is to be thought of with the preceding infs. $C f$. below b, and 39 d . As a rule, the third person, when it means vaguely any one (the French on) or anything, is








 $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ o \hat{v} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ oî $\delta \alpha$ ő $\tau \iota \kappa \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ ~ \epsilon ่ \sigma \tau \iota \nu, ~ a ̀ ~ \mu \grave{\eta}$ oî $\delta \alpha ~ \epsilon i ́$


 by prolepsis for oo $\wp^{\prime}$ єi $\delta$ $\theta \alpha^{\prime} \nu a \tau o s, n o t$ even whether, i.e. whether death may not actually be. Thus he is as far as possible from knowing that death is the greatest of harms. For a fuller statement, cf. 37 b . See on $\tau o \hat{v} \theta a \nu \alpha-$ $\tau o j, 28 \mathrm{c}$, for the use of the art.
15. öv: here, as usual, in the gender of $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \dot{o} \nu$, which is implied in the pred. $\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma เ \sigma \tau o \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\omega} \nu$.
17. тои̃тo: not in the gender of à $\mu \alpha$ ia. This makes a smoother sent.
 $\dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$. , which was the alternative. -
 reprehensible, limiting à $\mu \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{a}$ and recalling the whole statement made above, $21 \mathrm{~b}-23 \mathrm{e}$.
19. тоv́т $\varphi$, тоv́т $\omega$ àv: repeated for the greater effect. Both represent the same point of superiority, i.e. $\delta \tau \iota$ $\kappa \tau \epsilon$. Notice the cleverness of the ellipsis after $\alpha \nu$. Socrates thus evades any too circumstantial praise of himself. For the ellipsis in the leading clause, see on $\hat{\eta}$. . . $\alpha \kappa \omega \nu, 25$ e. кal évтaû̀a: here too.
20. $\epsilon \frac{l}{} \delta \eta^{\prime}:$ if really, i.e. if, as the $\underset{b}{29}$ oracle suggests.
 ò̀к oîठa . . oütc. oü $\tau \omega s$ sums up a previous partic. clause, and its force is nearly so likewise. Cf. Men. 80 c,


24. $\widehat{\omega} v . .$. stance of assimilation. G. $1031 ; \mathrm{H}$. 994. See on $\widehat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \overline{\dot{v}}$ oì $\delta^{\prime}$ ö $\tau \iota \kappa \alpha \kappa \bar{\omega} \nu$ $\overleftarrow{\omega} \nu \tau \omega \nu, 37 \mathrm{~b}$. кака́ is related to $\check{\tilde{\omega} \nu}$ as à $\gamma a 0 \alpha$ in the next line is related to ${ }^{\alpha}$.
 above $\mathbf{a}$.

 $\dot{\alpha} \phi \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ (if you are now ready to acquit $m e)$ by the explanatory detail of $\epsilon I$ $\mu o \iota \epsilon \check{\pi} \pi \iota \tau \epsilon$ and by various reiterations of the conditions upon which this release may be granted, until the weaker clause $\epsilon i$ à áloıt comes of itself to his lips as all that is left of the more positively worded prot. with which
 the idea of disregarding rather than that of disbelieving. This meaning
 $\epsilon i \sigma \eta ̂ \lambda \theta o \nu$ ，oủ oîóv $\tau \epsilon$ єîval тò $\mu \grave{\eta}$ à $\pi о \kappa \tau \epsilon i v a i ́ ~ \mu \epsilon, ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu$












c of a $\pi / \sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ is not uncommon in Plato． Cf．Laws， 941 c，$\delta \mu$ ѐ $\boldsymbol{\circ}$ о $\bar{\delta} \nu \pi \in \iota \sigma \theta \in l s$


 $\nu \delta \mu \varphi$ ．

27．ov่ $\delta \in i$ iv，oióv $\tau \epsilon$ єival：in the original form this would be oùk $€ \delta \in \iota$ and ou่ $\chi$ oibv $\tau \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ．GMT．119； H． 853 a ．－$-\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \in \mathrm{iv}$ ：on this use of $\epsilon l \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，see Introd． 70 with the note．Anytus probably argues：＂If Socrates had not been prosecuted，his evil communications might have been ignored；once in court，his case al－ lows but one verdict．To acquit him is to sanction all his heresies．＂

29．el SLaфєv\}of $\mu \eta v$ ：fut．opt．in indir．disc．GMT． 128 ； 667 ；H． 855 a．
 common apod．See GMT． 197 ；H． 845．See App．

33．＇́ $\phi^{\prime}$ థं $\tau \epsilon$ ：for const．with inf．， see GMT．610ヶ H． 999 a．

35．oṽv：after a digression．

36．äv $\delta$ pes ${ }^{\text {＇A }} \mathbf{A} \theta \eta$ vaiot：a fictitious apostrophe．Cf．Dem．viII．35，єi oi

 $\kappa \tau \epsilon$ ．See App．－а́ $\sigma \pi \alpha^{\prime} \zeta о \mu a \iota$ каl фь－ $\lambda \hat{\omega}$ ：you have my friendship and my love，but，etc．à $\sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ designates the greeting of friends．Cf．Od．iii．34－35， where Nestor and his sons see Tele－ machus and Mentes，$\dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \delta o \iota ~ \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu \quad \ddot{\pi} \pi \alpha \nu-$ $\boldsymbol{\tau \epsilon S}, \mid \chi \in \rho \sigma i \nu \quad \tau^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \sigma \pi a ́ \zeta о \nu \tau о$ каl





 （in the sight）тồ $\theta \in \circ \hat{v}, \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ àко $\boldsymbol{v} \epsilon \iota \nu$ $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ औे $\tau о \hat{v} \theta \in o \hat{v} \kappa \rho i \nu a \tau \epsilon$, ibid． v．28，$\pi \in \iota \theta a \rho \chi \in \hat{\imath} \nu$（obey）$\delta \in \hat{\imath} \quad \theta \in \hat{\varphi}$


38．ov่ $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi a v ́ \sigma \omega \mu a l$ ：see on où $\delta \grave{c} \nu$ $\kappa \tau \in ., 28$ a．For où $\mu \grave{\eta}$ with the subj． in strong denials，see GMT． $295 ; \mathbf{H}$ ． 1032.











 Xen. An. vii. 3. 19 , $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \grave{\omega} \nu$ $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ каl

 $\mu \in \gamma \iota \sigma \tau \delta \nu \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \tau$. The gen. is in appos. with 'A $\theta \eta \nu a \hat{o} o s=$ ' $A \theta \eta \nu \omega ิ \nu ~ \omega \nu . \quad C f$. Hipp.
 G. 913, n.; H. 691. For the points of superiority, cf. Thuc. ii. 35-46.
42. eis ooфlav kal l $\sigma$ Xuv: for the full meaning, $c f .38 \mathbf{c}-39 \mathbf{d}$, also Thuc. ii. $40,4 \mathrm{I}$. Here i $\sigma \chi^{u}$ 's means the strength which rules the kingdom of the mind ( $\sigma 0 \phi(\alpha)$. Cf. Thuc. i. 138, where he says of the typical Athenian Themistocles: $\bar{\eta} \nu \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \delta \Theta \epsilon \mu \iota \sigma \tau о \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} s$, $\beta \in \beta a t o ́ \tau \alpha \tau \alpha$ ठ̀̀ $\phi \dot{v} \sigma \in \omega s$ i $\sigma \chi$ ì $\nu \delta \eta \lambda \omega$ $\sigma a s, \kappa a l ~ \delta \iota a \phi \in \rho \delta \nu \tau \omega s$ тı '̇s aùтठ $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$
 $i \sigma \chi$ ús, when circumstances disclosed its perfection, was $\sigma o \phi i \alpha$, the virtue of virtues, chiefly prized by Socrates as including all others.
$X \rho \eta \mu \alpha \tau \omega \nu \ldots \psi v \eta_{\eta}:$ the same prolepsis as that in 29 a, where $\tau \delta \nu$ 0áva$\tau o \nu$ is pointedly mentioned before its time. Notice the significant use of the art. with $\psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$, a word which
like $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ often appears without the art. in cases that seem to require it; $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ accordingly has the force of a possessive pron. G. 949 ; H. 658.
 є̇ठбкєь, 21 е.
 words in this order represent the process by which Socrates so often disconcerted his fellow-countrymen. Beginning with a harmless question or two, his method soon proved uncomfortably scrutinizing ( $\langle\xi \in \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$ ), and generally ended by convicting ( $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\gamma} \xi \omega$ ) of ignorance.
 like $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ and $\epsilon \rho \gamma \dot{\alpha} \zeta_{\epsilon} \epsilon \theta \alpha \iota$, of ten takes in addition to the acc. of the thing done a dat. of the person for whom the thing is done, but the acc. of the person to whom it is done. $C f$. Xen. An. iii. 2. 3, ơouaı yà $\rho$ à
 oi $\theta \epsilon o l$ тoı $\eta \sigma \epsilon \iota a \nu$. Tbid. 24, каl $\dot{\eta} \mu i ̀ \nu \gamma^{2}$ あ $\nu$ ois' ${ }^{\circ} \tau \iota \tau \rho \iota \sigma d \sigma \mu \in \nu 0 s$ (thrice gladly)
 бкєva§ouévous.










of Socrates insensibly returns to his hearers, in whom he sees embodied the whole people of Athens. The correlative of ö $\sigma \omega$ readily suggests itself with $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu . ~ C f . ~ t h e ~ s a m e ~ c a s e, ~ 39 ~ d . ~$


 סov̂лos, Crit. 50 e, and contrast rov̂ $\theta \in o \hat{v}$ $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon \mathfrak{i} \alpha \nu, 23 \mathbf{c}$; cf. also $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ тov̂ $\theta \in o \hat{v}$ $\delta \delta \sigma t \nu$ ú $\mu i \nu, d$ below; see also on $\tau \grave{\alpha}$
 takes the same dat. of interest which is found with the verb from which it is derived. The Lat. idiom is the same, e.g. Cic. de Legg. i. 15.42, Quod si iustitia est obtemperatio scriptis legibus institutisque populorum, etc.
58. $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ v: s c$. औ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \psi u \chi \hat{\eta} s$, which has to be supplied out of $\dot{\omega} \tau \hat{\eta} s \psi v$ $\chi \hat{\eta} s . \quad \mu \eta \delta \bar{\epsilon}$ is not a third specification with $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \ldots \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$. It serves only to connect oü $\tau \omega \sigma \phi \delta \delta \rho \alpha$ with $\pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$, and is neg. only because the whole idea is neg.
 dation of real prosperity is laid in the character; the best of windfalls is natural good sense sharpened by experience; this is the making of your successful man's character, and
the mending of his fortunes; this is 30 a $\rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\prime}$ (skill in the art of right living), i.e. wisdom ( $\sigma o \phi i \alpha$ ). See on cis $\sigma o \phi i \alpha \nu$, 29 d. Such is in substance Socrates's theory of getting on in the world, which may be gathered from Xenophon's Memorabilia in many places: see (i.6) his defence against the $\sigma$ oфıбти́s Antiphon, who accuses him of
 his hint to a parsimonious friend, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \xi \in-$
 cin; (ii. 6. 22-25) his analysis of what makes a ка入ós $\tau \epsilon \kappa$ кảzaós (gentleman), where of all such he says,' $\delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \nu \tau a t$ $\pi \epsilon \iota \nu \omega ิ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ (fasting) каl $\delta \iota \psi \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ à $\lambda u ́ \pi \omega s$

 $\kappa \tau \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ (selfish greed) $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \chi \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \iota, \nu 0 \mu i \mu \omega s$
 ג $\lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda o \iota s$; and see particularly (ii. 7,8 , 9, and io) the success which his practical advice brought to his friends Aristarchus, Euthērus, Crito, and Diodorus in their various difficulties. For a full elaboration of Socrates's rule of right living in the abstract, see his conversation on $\epsilon \bar{\delta} \pi \rho \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu$ with young
 278 e-282 d, where Cleinias is startled to learn that roфía is ej̀zuxia (goodluck). The gods endow us with such








 15 a, Rep. ii. 366 c, 375 c-e, 379 b c; we owe it to them that it is possible to thrive and in the end to win, Rep. x. 613, 617 e.
62. $\tau a v ̂ \tau^{\prime}{ }^{\text {anv }} \epsilon^{\prime \prime} \eta \eta \lambda \alpha \beta \in \rho a ́:$ this $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau a$, all this, covers more ground than the тaṽ a above. The first means what Socrates says, the second means that and also the fact that he says it. "If this corrupts the youth, my practice in saying it would do harm ; but the truth cannot corrupt them, therefore my speaking it can do no harm. To prove that I am a corrupter of the youth, you must prove that I have said something else; that cannot be proved, for it is not true." With ei
 25 b , where see note.
63. $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau a v ̂ \tau a: ~ w h e r e f o r e . ~$
65. is '่ $\mu \mathrm{ov} \kappa \tau \epsilon$.: knowing that 1 should never alter my ways. $\pi$ orńoon тos ằ represents $\pi 0 \circ \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ ă $\nu$. GMT. 216 ; H. 845 and 861. Cf. Dem. xix.

 See on $\delta ı a \phi \theta a \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \nu \tau a \iota, 29 \mathrm{c}$. For an important question of Ms. reading here, see App. For the $\epsilon i \mu_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ used as periphrastic fut. see GM'T. 73; H. 846. For the indic. fut. or subjv. pres. in prot. depending upon the opt.
in apod. with $a \nu$, see GMT. $503 ; \underset{b}{30}$ H. 901 a .
66. то入入ákis: many times or many $\mathbf{c}$ deaths. The Eng. idiom like the Greek requires no definite specification such as "to die a hundred deaths." In certain cases in Greek as in Eng. a large number is specified. Cf. а̀кйкоаs $\mu$ ирıа́кıs à $\gamma \grave{\omega}$ Boúдодаı, Ar. Nub. 738; ё́tvous (for pea-soup?);
 Cf. $\tau \rho \iota \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu \in \nu o s$, quoted from Xen. $A n$. iii. 2. 24 on 30 a. Demosthenes not unnaturally uses $\mu$ vpıákis where he exclaims (ix. 65 ), $\tau \in \theta \nu$ á $\nu$ at $\delta \epsilon \in \mu \nu \rho ı \alpha^{-}$
 $\pi o v .-\tau \epsilon \theta v a ́ v a l:$ the absolute contradictory of $\langle\hat{\eta} \nu$, here used rather than the somewhat weaker $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \theta \nu \hat{̣} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$. This distinction is, however, not strictly maintained. $C f .39 \mathrm{e}, 43 \mathrm{~d}$, and the similar use of $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \nu$ and $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a t$, $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \kappa \epsilon \in \nu a l, \mu \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ and $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a l, \kappa \tau \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta a \iota$ and $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \tau \eta \bar{\eta} \theta a \iota$.
XVIII. 2. oits $\epsilon \in \in \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu \quad \dot{\nu} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ : he asked them $\mu \grave{\eta} \theta o \rho \nu \beta \in i ̀ \nu$. See above on $\theta o \rho v \beta \epsilon i \nu, 17 d$, and on $\mu \dot{\eta} \theta_{o \rho v} \beta \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon, 20 \mathrm{e}$.
3. кal үáp, $\mu \in ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ үáp, єv̉ үàp โбтє : the first $\gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho$ is closely connected with áкои́єiv, the second goes back to the leading clause $\mu$ خो $\theta o p v \beta \epsilon i \nu$ and accounts for the renewal of a request which the speaker has made three



 ov̉ $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$ oïo $\mu \alpha \iota, \theta \epsilon \mu \iota \tau o ̀ v ~ \epsilon i ̉ \nu a \iota ~ a ̉ \mu \epsilon i ́ \nu o \nu \iota ~ a ̉ \nu \delta \rho i ~ v i \pi o ̀ ~ \chi \epsilon i ́ \rho o \nu o s ~ d ~$







 merely points the new statement for which Socrates has been preparing the court．Compare the use of $\gamma \alpha \rho$ after prons．and advs．，e．g． $31 \mathbf{b}$ after ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \theta^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \nu \delta \epsilon$ ，and in general after any pref－ atory form of words to give point to any statement which is expected，as in $\tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \bar{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\eta} s, 20$ e．$\gamma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho$ with this force is esp．freq．after $\delta \delta \grave{\epsilon}(\tau \delta \delta \grave{\epsilon}) \mu \epsilon \cdot \gamma เ \sigma \tau o \nu$, $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \tau a \tau o \nu$ ，also after $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i ̂ \nu \nu \delta \epsilon \in, \tau \epsilon \kappa \mu \eta \eta^{-}$ pıov $\delta \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ and other favorite idioms of like import in Plato and the orators． H．1050， 4 a．
5．及o $\sigma \in \epsilon \sigma \epsilon$ ：this is more than a disturbance（ $\left.\theta_{o \rho \nu \beta \in i \nu}\right)$ ；it is an outcry．
 $\sigma \theta a l: c f .21 \mathrm{~b}$ ．$\theta \epsilon \mu \iota \tau o ́ \nu$ takes the dat．，
 inf．$\left(\beta \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \pi \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha_{l}\right)$ is added．The pass． $\beta \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \pi \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ makes this const．appear more unusual than e．g．in Phaedo， 67 b ，
 $\pi \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \mu \grave{\eta}$ où $\theta \epsilon \mu \tau \tau \delta \nu \hat{\eta}$ ．For the im． port of the words $\theta \epsilon \epsilon \mu i s$ and $\theta \epsilon \mu i \tau \delta \nu$ ， see on oj $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \theta_{\epsilon \epsilon} \mu t s, 21$ b．
 30 àтоктєiveเv is used here secondarily of the $\delta$ ıкa⿱⿰㇒土儿⿱⿰㇒一乂， and primarily of the accusers whose prosecution aims at compassing Soc－ rates＇s death．d̀ $\quad$ ruía involved the for－ feiture of some or of all the rights of citizenship．In the latter case the átıuos was looked upon by the state as dead，i．e．he had suffered＂civil death＂（la morte civile），and his property，having no recognized owner， was confiscated．Cf．Rep．viii． 553 b，

 $\mu \omega \theta$＇́ $\nu \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha \ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ o $\dot{v} \sigma!\alpha \nu$ ä $\pi \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu$ $\alpha{ }_{\alpha} \pi o \beta \alpha \lambda \delta \nu \tau \alpha$ ．See App．

11．ä入入os $\tau$ is mov：many another． See on ă $\lambda \lambda \boldsymbol{\prime},{ }^{2} \mathbf{e}$ e．
 remark just before the trial，Euthyph．

 （rotten）$\grave{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota, \kappa \alpha l$ то入̀े あ $\nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \pi \rho \delta-$








 instead of a clause with oîos to explain $\tau o u o ̂ t o v . ~ S e e ~ o n ~ o l o s ~ \delta \delta \delta \delta o ́ r \theta a t, ~$
 it sounds rather absurd to say so, or better, "if I may use such a ludicrous figure of speech." This is thrown in to prepare his hearers for the humorous treatment of a serious subject which follows. A close scrutiny of the simile shows that Socrates mistrusted the sovereign people. пробкє $\mu \varepsilon \nu \nu \nu$ is the regular pass. of $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \tau \iota \theta \epsilon-$ $\nu$ a. . See below (22) for the same idea put actively. See App. for the reading $\dot{\text { und }}$ тov̂ $\theta \in o \hat{v}$, and for the remaining difficulties here involved.
21. vimò $\mu$ vi $\omega \pi$ ós $\tau$ vos: by a gadfy. For this word, cf. Aesch. Supp. ${ }^{\text {n }} 7$, 308, ßoŋ入á $\quad \eta \nu$ (ox-driving) $\mu \dot{\omega} \omega \pi a \kappa \kappa \nu \eta-$ тípoov (urging on), oïctpov (gadfly) ка-
 in the Prometheus Io's tormentor is called oīवтpos (567) and ógúvтouos $\mu \dot{v} \omega \psi(674 \mathrm{f}$.). Here the tormentor of Athens is a $i \pi \pi \eta \lambda d \tau \eta s \mu \dot{\omega} \omega \psi$. Notice how humorously ( $\gamma \in \lambda o t o$ ó $\tau \in \rho o \nu$ ) the situation is met. First the Athenians are compared to a horse bothered out of inaction by a buzzing horse-fly. The metaphor of the horse is not pressed, but that of the $\mu \dot{j} \omega \psi$ is ingeniously elaborated as follows: "Socrates gives them no rest but bores them all day long ( $\pi \rho o \sigma \kappa \alpha \theta i \zeta \omega \nu$ ), and does not allow them even a nap; he bothers them incessantly when they
are drowsing (oi $\nu v a \tau \dot{a} \dot{S}_{\text {Sovtes) }}$ ). Then they make an impatient dash (кpoúбaveєs) at him which deprives them forever of his company." For similar irony, cf. Verg. Aen. vi. 90 , nec Teucris addita Juno|Usquam aberit. $\mu \nu^{\prime} \omega \psi$ is by some taken in its later and metaphorical sense of spur. See App. - $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ เvós: like the Lat. quidam used to qualify an expression which is startling. - otov $\delta \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \mu \mathrm{ol}$ סокє $\hat{\imath}$ ó $\theta$ єòs . . . $\pi$ тробтє $\theta$ etкéval: lit. in which capacity God seems to me to have fastened me upon the state, - such an one (in fact) as never ceases, etc., a repe-
 Avoid the awkwardness of too lit. translation. Notice that oiov really refers not to the $\mu \dot{v} \omega \psi$ simply but to the $\mu \dot{v} \omega \psi$ engaged in enlivening the horse. This is implied by $\tau o l o \hat{\tau} \neq \partial \nu$ riva and the explanatory clause with ös.
 requires the dat. Cf. 11 . ii. $254, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$
 $\lambda \alpha \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{j} \sigma \alpha \iota o \quad \nu \in \iota \delta i \leqslant \omega \nu$, and below 41 e . The acc. here is due to the preponderating influence of $\pi \epsilon \in \theta \omega \nu$; both $\pi \epsilon i-$ $\theta \omega \nu$ and $\dot{\partial} \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \delta i \zeta \zeta \nu$ are however introduced simply to explain ' $\gamma \epsilon \in \dot{\rho} \rho \omega$, with which they are as it were in apposition. The awakening process here thought of prob. consisted of questions persuasive in part and partly reprehensive.
 this specifies the means by which the ${ }^{\text {a }}$
















 the three preceding partics．，was made possible．Pres．and aor．partics．ex－ press the means，as the fut．partic．ex－ presses purpose．GMT． 832 f．；H． 969.

26．Kows ráx’äv：may be perhaps， a combination which is by no means infrequent．The importance of $\delta \alpha \delta i \omega$ is well indicated by the repetition of the $\alpha \nu$ ，which has already served to em－ phasize крóv́a⿱亠乂兀єs．Notice，however， that grammatically it is required only once and goes with the verb of the
 $a \nu, 17 \mathrm{~d}$ ．
 men disturbed in their nap．This sar－ casm could not fail to raise a laugh
 $\zeta \omega \nu$ was a common sight．Cf．Rep．

$\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau 0 \hat{v}$ ．Cf．Quint．Inst．iv．I． 73.
 31．oíos $\delta \in \delta^{\circ} \sigma$ Oat：cf．Crit． 46 b ． For the inf．without the art．，limiting certain adjs．and advs．，see GMT．759； H． 1000 ．
32．ov̉ yáp：see on кal $\begin{array}{r}\text { áp，} \\ 30 \\ \mathbf{c} \text { ．－b }\end{array}$ ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i v \varphi$ ：the neut．used subst．Cf．
 monly the neut．is used predicatively，

 acc．or gen．allowed with this verb， and for the added partic．see GMT． 879；H． 983.

37．єl $\mu$ éviol：if，to be sure．toí in－
 well，then at least I should have some reason，i．e．there would be an obvious explanation of my conduct．$C f .34 \mathrm{~b}$ ，



 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega, \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \epsilon \nu \dot{a} \alpha \nu$.

 $\delta \eta \mu o \sigma i ́ a ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ ov̉ $\tau o \lambda \mu \hat{\omega}$ àvaßaiv $\omega \nu$ єis $\tau o ̀ ~ \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os $\tau o ̀ ~ \dot{v} \mu \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon$－

41．ov̉X oĩoi $\tau \epsilon$ ：＂They would doubt－ less make the assertion，$c f .19 \mathrm{~d}$ ；but what they did not find it practicable to do was to bring evidence in sup－ port of it．＂R．The leading idea of the clause $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \nu a \iota \sigma \chi \nu \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota \ldots \mu \dot{\rho} \rho \tau v \rho a$ is expressed in the partic．，not in $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \nu a l-$ $\sigma \chi \nu \nu \tau \bar{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ ．For cases where aif $\chi^{\dot{v}}$－ $\nu \in \sigma \theta a l$ ，used with a partic．，does not contain the main idea，cf． $28 \mathrm{~b}, 29 \mathrm{~d}$ ， Crit． 53 c．－тоиิто ámavaiनXvvテท̂－ бal：sc．таút $\eta \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ à $\nu \alpha l \sigma \chi \nu \nu \tau i ́ a \nu ~ a ̀ \pi \alpha-~$ $\nu \alpha \iota \sigma \chi \nu \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota . \quad \grave{\alpha} \pi \delta$ in this compound contributes the idea of completion， which in the case of shamelessness involves going to an extreme，to go to such an extreme with their shamelessness， or，to be so absolutely shameless as this． The kindred notion of fulfilling a task undertaken is also involved．$C f$ ． Xen．An．iii．2．13，àmot́vovatv，meaning pay off the arrears of a promised sacri－ fice．
 тира каl ó $\mu a ́ \rho \tau u s$ òv таре́ $\chi o \mu a ı ~ i к а \nu o ́ s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu . \quad C f .20$ e．iкavóv is used predi－ catively，and the necessity of the art． is obvious．
 $\pi 0 v$ ：Socrates has two good reasons： （1）his divine mission，（2）the per－ sonal disaster involved in any other course．Of these the first really in－ cludes the second．That he did not regard abstention from public duty as in itself commendable is proved
by his conversation with Charmides

 （to address the people）каl $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \bar{\lambda} \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \bar{i} \sigma \theta \alpha u$ ．He pointedly asks Charmides：$\epsilon i \delta_{\epsilon} \tau \iota s$ ， $\delta \nu \nu a \tau \partial े s \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \delta \partial \epsilon \omega s \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$
 rance the common weal）кal aùzঠs $\delta$ เà

 also ibid．i．6． 15.
 See on $\pi \in \rho \iota \epsilon \rho \gamma \alpha \dot{\Omega} \zeta \tau \alpha 1,19 \mathrm{~b}$ ．Nothing short of a divine mission could jus－ tify this．Plato invariably uses the word in an unfavorable sense．$C f$ ．
 $\pi \rho a ́ \xi a \nu \tau o s ~ к а l ~ o ̀ ̀ ~ \pi о \lambda u \pi \rho a \gamma \mu o \nu \eta ́ \sigma \alpha \nu \tau o s$ $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \beta \boldsymbol{\beta} \dot{\varphi} \varphi$ ．There is a subtle irony in $\pi o \lambda \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu o \nu \bar{\omega}$ as here used by Soc－ rates．It was his business to mind other people＇s business，therefore he was far from being really $\pi 0 \lambda \nu \pi \rho \alpha \alpha_{-}^{-}$ $\gamma \mu \omega \nu$ ．Cf．Xen．Mem．iii．11．16，каl $\delta$
 aứov̂ à àpay $\mu \sigma \sigma u ́ \nu \eta \nu$（abstention from

 leisure）－каl $\gamma$ à $\uparrow$ tठıа $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu a \tau \alpha ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ каl $\delta \eta \mu \delta \sigma \iota a ~ \pi а \rho \epsilon ́ \chi \in \iota ~ \mu о \iota ~ a ̀ ~ \sigma \chi o \lambda i ́ a \nu ~(k e e p ~$ me busy）．＂Cf． $33 \mathbf{a b}$ ．

3．ávaßaiv＂v єls тò $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os：there is no implication，as in 17 d ，of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \pi} \boldsymbol{\pi}$ $\tau \delta \beta \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$ ．The $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os commonly assem－ bled in the Pnyx，to which Socrates

 $\tau \iota \kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta a ı \mu o ́ v \iota o \nu ~ \gamma i ́ \gamma \nu \epsilon \tau a \iota, ~[\phi \omega \nu \eta ̀], ~ o ̀ ~ \delta \grave{\eta} \kappa a i ̀ ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \gamma \rho a \phi \hat{\eta}$ đ












c thus wóuld，like every one else，be obliged to ascend．Cf．Dem．xviri．


 on $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \epsilon \epsilon, 21$ a．
 ［ $\phi \omega \nu \nu^{\prime}$ ］：see Introd． 27 ，with first N. on p．21，and 32．$\phi \omega \nu \dot{\eta}$ is explanatory of the vague $\theta \in \hat{i} \partial \nu \tau_{t}$ кal $\delta a t \mu \delta \nu ı \nu$, and is in the pred．：a something divine and from God manifests itself to me，a voice． This thought is earnestly reiterated below in nearly the same words．See App．
 －ї $\pi\llcorner\kappa \omega \mu \varphi \delta \omega \hat{\nu}$ ：Meletus caricatured Socrates＇s utterances about the $\theta$ eî̀ $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ т кal $\delta a \mu \delta \nu \nu ⿺ 辶 ⿱ 亠 乂$, be the belief in кaııà $\delta a \not \mu \partial \nu \iota a . C f .26 \mathrm{e}$.
 my boyhood．This partic．followed by $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta$ or $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa$ ，when time is referred to，
corresponds to various idioms，here to ever since．The case of the partic．is that of the word which it limits．$C f$ ．

 vícifas．
9．а̇тотре́тєє，èvavtıồtal $\pi$ ра́ттєtv： cf． $32 \mathbf{b}$ ，and see on $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\delta} \nu$ пoוєî̀．－ тovito：governed by $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ，which is expressed in the subordinate clause． Cf．Lach． 179 a，àveìvaı à̉тoùs 8 $\tau$ Boúdovтal поєєิ̀，to leave them free to do what they wish．
12．$\pi$ á入at ．．．$\pi$ á入at：the rights and duties of Athenian citizenship began as soon as a man was twenty．
13．$\dot{\alpha} \pi о \lambda \omega \lambda \eta \eta$ ，$\omega \phi \in \lambda \eta \eta_{\eta} \kappa$ ：the earlier Att．writers rarely use the plpf．in －-ll ．G．777，4；H． 458 a．
 markable repetition of the neg．$C f$ ． 34 e．



#### Abstract
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19．sal $\epsilon$ ：introduces a very ex－ treme form of supposition，implying that even then the conclusion is unas－ salable； ci $^{i}$ каí（ $c f .30 \mathrm{e}$ ）introduces a condition implying that in that case， as in many others，the conclusion re－ mains．See H．1053，1， 2.

20．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \mu \eta^{\prime}$ ：and not．The Eng． idiom avoids the Greek abruptness． For $\mathfrak{a} \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime}$ in abrupt transitions，see H．1046， 2 b．

XX．2．ova $\lambda$ óyous ктє́．：as Demos－ themes says（iI．12），ámas $\mu \grave{\iota} \nu \lambda \delta^{\prime} \gamma o s$, $\downarrow \nu$ à $\pi \grave{i} \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu a \tau \alpha$（deeds），$\mu a \tau \alpha \iota o ̛ \nu \tau \iota$ （folly）фаірєтає каl кєขס̀．Cf．Lash． $188 \mathrm{c}-\mathbf{e}$ ，where the harmony of a man＇s deeds and words is spoken of


 ＇$E \lambda \lambda \eta \nu เ \kappa \eta$＇$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ áp $\rho o \nu i \alpha$, really living in tune，where a man makes his own life a concord of words and deeds，composed really in the Dorian mode，which is the only true Greek harmony．－ô $\mathbf{v} \mu \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mathbf{i s} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \tau \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ．： the audience as representing the Athe－ naans in general．＂You appreciate facts only，there is no nonsense about you．＂Here appears what amounts to the common $\tau 6 \pi \sigma$ of rehearsing a man＇s services in his own defence，of which practice Lysias（xiI．38）says，




 issues）द̇viorє $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \pi \alpha \tau \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu, \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi o-$ $\delta \in \iota \kappa \nu \dot{v} \nu \tau \in S$ ஸ́s $\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \iota \omega \tau \alpha \iota \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha-$ $\theta o i \in i \sigma \iota \nu \kappa \tau \in \in$ ．For another instance of this practice indulged in，cf． 28 e－ 29 a．

3．out $\delta^{\prime}$ âv $\mathfrak{\epsilon} v l$ ：stronger than $o \dot{v} \delta \in \nu l$


 $\epsilon เ \nu \mu \eta \delta^{\prime}$ をे $\nu$ ê $\nu \tau o v ́ \tau \omega \nu \pi \alpha \theta \epsilon i ้ \nu .$. ，How confident you seem，Socrates，that you never will suffer any of these things！ G．378；H． 290 a．

4．ป̇тєเка́ $\theta_{\circ} \mu \mathrm{L}$ ：second ar．opt．from $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ with $\alpha \theta$ appended to the stem， i．e．$\dot{v} \pi \epsilon เ \kappa$－．See G． 779 ；H． 494 and a． The present $\dot{\cup} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \alpha ́ \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ ，like $\delta เ \omega \kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ （ $\delta \iota \omega ́ \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ ），à $\mu \nu \nu \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$（ $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{v} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ ）and $\sigma \chi \epsilon$＇ $\theta_{\epsilon I \nu}\left({ }^{\circ} \chi \epsilon \iota \nu\right)$ ，is prob．a fiction．It is hard to prove that this $\theta$ adds strength to the meaning of $\dot{\sim} \pi \in \mathfrak{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．In certain cases this $\theta$ is appended in the pres． $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon I \nu, \phi \alpha^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota \nu, \phi \lambda \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ．Cf．Curt． Griech．Etym．pp． 62 and 63.
 maintains，is what Plato really wrote， the necessary $\alpha \nu$ gets itself supplied from oud $\delta^{\prime}$ を $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{l}$ above．Tron，fol－ lowing Stallbaum，writes ar $\mu \alpha$ каl ad $\mu \alpha$ $\measuredangle \nu$ ；Riddell defends Ant＇s conjecture， $\ddot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \kappa \check{\alpha} \nu$. The text here still remains hard to establish．See App．－фор－ тıкà cal Sıкavıкá：cheap and tedious commonplaces，a collocation which suggests the words of Callicles，who，



by way of reproof, says to Socrates (Borg. 482 e) $\sigma \grave{v} \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \tau \hat{\varphi}$ ừ $\nu \tau \iota, \bar{\omega} \Sigma \Sigma_{\omega} \kappa \rho \alpha-$ $\tau \in s$, ais тoıav̂тa ar $\gamma \epsilon \iota s$ фортıкà каl
 бьш́кєเข фортька́. Cf. Rep. ii. 367 a,

 रotev $\nless \nu, \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi o \nu \tau \in S$ aủtoî̀ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$
 For $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma \circ \rho \iota \kappa \alpha$, which has the sense of in bad taste, cf. Gorg. 494 c , where Callicles, shocked at Socrates's remarks, says $\dot{\omega} s \not a ̈ \tau o \pi о s ~ \epsilon \bar{l}, \bar{\omega} \Sigma \omega \kappa \kappa a \tau \epsilon s$, $\kappa$ к $\mathfrak{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \chi \nu \bar{\omega} s \delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma \delta \rho o s$. See also on $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \epsilon \pi \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o u s, 17 \mathrm{c}$. It was common in the courts and assemblies at Athens for the speakers to call a spade a spade. Of course they always declared that they must speak the truth, and the whole truth. This duty was often made the pretext for utterances not strictly in good taste.
b
 to the senate, ie. the senate of five hundred, chosen by lot. One of this senate's chief duties was to act as a committee, so to speak, before whom came, in the first instance, the queslions to be dealt with by the éккл $\quad$ б $\AA \alpha$ (assembly). A preliminary decree ( $\pi \rho o-$ Bout $\lambda \epsilon \nu \mu a)$ from this senate was the regular form in which matters came before the assembly.
 fifty representatives in the senate of each of the ten tribes (each $\phi u \lambda \dot{n}$ talking its turn in an order yearly determined by lot) had the general charge of the business of the senate, and directed the meetings both of the senate and of the popular assembly, for 35 or 36 days, i.e. one tenth of the
lunar year of 354 days, or in leapyears, for 38 or 39 days. Of this board of fifty (whose members were called $\pi \rho u \tau a ́ v \epsilon i s$ during its term of office) one member was chosen every day by lot, as $\grave{\epsilon} \pi เ \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \eta s$, or president. The $\dot{\epsilon} \pi t-$ $\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \mathrm{s}$ held the keys of the public treasury and of the public repository of records, also the seal of the commonwealth, and, further, presided at all meetings of the senate and of the assembly. Later (prob. in 378 в.c., the archonship of Nausinicus, when the board of nine $\pi \rho \sigma \in \delta \rho o l$, whom the $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a ́ \tau \eta s$ chose every morning by lot from the non-prytanising tribes, was established) a new officer, the $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \eta s \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \epsilon \delta \delta \rho \omega \nu$, relieved him of this last duty. In Socrates's time, the $\phi \nu \lambda \eta$ ो $\pi \rho \nu \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon v^{\prime} o v \sigma a$, and the $\epsilon \pi t-$ $\sigma \tau a ́ \tau \eta s$ of the day, had the responsibility of putting to the vote ( $\epsilon \pi / \psi \eta$ $\phi i(\epsilon i \nu)$ any question that arose or of refusing to allow a vote. Socrates belonged to the $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu o s$ ' $A \lambda \omega \pi \epsilon \kappa \dot{\eta}$, in the $\phi \nu \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} A \nu \tau t o \chi$ ls. Notice the addition of 'Avtooxis here without the art. and as an afterthought; $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \phi u \lambda \dot{\eta}$ would have been sufficient, though less circumstantial. - öтє $\mathbf{v} \mu \epsilon$ îs $\kappa \tau \dot{\tau} \epsilon$ : : after the Athenian success off the islands called Arginusae, in 406 b.c. This battle is also spoken of as $\dot{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho l \Lambda \epsilon-$ $\sigma \beta o \nu v a v \mu a \chi$ ${ }^{\text {a }}$, Yen. Hell. ii. 3. 32-35. The victorious generals were promptly prosecuted for remissness in the performance of their duty. Accused of having shown criminal neglect in failing to gather up the dead and save those who, at the end of the engagement, were floating about on wrecks, they pleaded " not guilty." The squad-

32
b


 ron detailed for this duty had been hindered, they said, by stress of weather. The main fleet went in pursuit of the worsted enemy. The details of the case for and against them cannot satisfactorily be made out, though the reasons are many and strong for thinking them innocent. The illegality of the procedure by which they were condemned is undoubted. They were condemned $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \mu \omega s$ (1) because judgment was passed upon them $\dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \delta$ -
 illegal, since not only the general practice at Athens, but the decree of Cannonus ( $\tau \delta$ Ka $\alpha \nu \omega \nu 0 \hat{v} \psi \eta ́ \phi \iota \tau \mu \alpha$ ) pro-
 (2) because they had not reasonable time allowed them for preparing and presenting their defence. $C f$. Xen. Hell. i. 7. 5, врахє́a єєкабтоs à $\pi \epsilon \lambda о \gamma$ ń- $^{\prime}$ $\sigma a \tau o$, où $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \pi \rho o \grave{v} \tau \epsilon \epsilon \theta \eta \phi i \sigma \iota \lambda \delta-$ ros кат $\grave{\alpha} \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \nu \nu \delta \mu o \nu$. See Xen. Hell. i. 6.33 ff : and 7; Mem. i 1.18 ; iv. 4. 2.
9. тov̀s $\delta$ '́ka $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \circ$ vis: the round number of all the generals is given here. One of the ten, Archestratus, died at Mitylene, where Conon, another of them, was still blockaded when the battle was fought. Of the remaining eight who were in the battle, two, Protomachus and Aristogenes, flatly refused to obey the summons to return to Athens. Thus only six reached Athens, and these, Pericles, Lysias, Diomedon, Erasinides, Aristocrates, and Thrasyllus, were put to death. - тov̀s ék т $\hat{\mathbf{s}}$ vavaaxias: not only the dead but those who were floating about in danger of their lives. $C f$. Xen. Hell. i. 7. 11, $\pi a \rho \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon$
 $\tau \epsilon \dot{\cup} \chi o \cup s$ à $\lambda \phi i \tau \omega \nu$ (on a meal-barrel) $\sigma \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \cdot$ '̇ $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu$ (enjoined upon) $\delta^{\prime}$



 $\gamma \in \nu 0 \mu \in ́ v o u s . C f$. Xen. An. i. 2. 3, where $\tau o \grave{s} \hat{\epsilon}^{\kappa} \tau \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$ is equiv. to $\tau o \grave{s}$
 Here the fuller expression would perhaps be oùk à $\nu \in \lambda о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o u s ~ \epsilon ̇ \kappa ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \nu a \nu \mu a-~$
 $\kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} s \pi \epsilon \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \delta$ б́as. See G. 1225; H. 788 a . For this subst. use of oi $\boldsymbol{\epsilon k}$ with the gen. there are many parallels; such subst. use is common with preps. denoting close relation to their object, -in, on, from, etc. Notice the point given to $\pi \alpha \rho a \nu o ́ \mu \omega s$ by its position; it comes in almost as if it began an independent sent. Cf. Lach. 183 b,

 $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \delta \delta \epsilon i \kappa \nu v \sigma \iota \nu \in i \kappa \delta \tau \omega s$. Xenophonsays that the Athenians soon repented of their rash and illegal action. $C f$. Xen. Hell. i. 6. 35, каl ò̀ $\pi \delta ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ र $\rho \dot{\partial} \nu \omega$ च̈ $\sigma \tau \epsilon-$

 (deceived) $\pi \rho o \beta o \lambda \alpha ̀ s \alpha u ̉ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \in \bar{l} \nu a \iota$ (their case was thus prejudiced by an informal vote of the assembly) $\kappa a l$ $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \nu \eta \tau \alpha{ }_{\alpha} s \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota, \quad \notin \omega s$ あ $\nu$ $\kappa \rho \iota \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$. The fate of these generals was remembered thirty years afterward by the Athenian admiral Chabrias. He won a great victory off Naxos (в.c. 376) but neglected to pursue the enemy, in order to save the men on the wrecks and bury the dead. Cf. Diod. xv. 35 .






 є́ $\gamma \dot{v} \nu \epsilon \tau о$ ，oi $\tau \rho\llcorner$ áкоขта ẩ $\mu \epsilon \tau a \pi \epsilon \mu \psi a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o i ́ ~ \mu \epsilon \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \tau о \nu$
 as often．－$\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ тoteiv：after the neg．idea in $\dot{\eta} \nu \alpha \nu \tau \iota \omega \theta \eta \nu$. GMT．807，$c$ ； H． 963 and 1029．But $c f .31$ de．

13．кal évavtia é $\psi \eta \phi \iota \sigma a ́ \mu \eta v: ~ a n d ~ I ~$ voted against it，i．e．allowing the ques－ tion to be put．See App．Socrates was $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \nu \tau \alpha ́ \nu \epsilon \omega \nu$ on this day and followed up this opposition，－ manifested when in consultation with the other $\pi \rho v \tau \alpha \dot{d} \varepsilon \epsilon s$, －by absolutely refusing to put the question to vote． $C f$ ．Gorg． 474 a ；Xen．Mem．i．1．18；iv． 4．2．For a different account of the facts，see Grote＇s Greece，c．64，fin．

 $\notin \nu \delta \in!\xi \iota s$ and $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$ were two sum－ mary methods of procedure in mak－ ing prosecutions．Both dispensed with the usual delay，and allowed the magistrates（in $\epsilon \nu \delta \epsilon t \xi(s$, it was the board of the Thesmothetae；in ${ }^{2} \pi \alpha-$ $\gamma \omega \gamma \dot{n}$ ，it was usually the board called oi $\left.{ }^{\prime \prime} \nu \delta \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha\right)$ to deal summarily with cer－ tain charges．${ }^{\ell} \nu \delta \in t \xi \in s$ was a form of summary indictment，laying informa－ tion usually against one who dis－ charged functions or exercised rights for which he was legally disqualified， as when an árıuos entered public places in Athens；$\dot{\alpha} \pi a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$ was the summary arrest and giving in charge
of a man caught in actual crime．Cf．${ }_{\mathbf{b}}^{32}$ Poll．viII．49，$\dot{\eta}$ $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ à $\pi \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$ ，ö $\tau \alpha \nu$

 àmaरá $\eta$ ．The two processes might therefore be used in the same case．

14．т $\omega \hat{\nu} \dot{\rho} \eta \tau \sigma^{\prime} \rho \omega \nu$ ：these professional speakers had no class privileges；only their more frequent speaking distin－ guished them from ordinary citizens．

15．及oш́yr $\omega v$ ：cf．Xen．Hell．i．7．12，

 $\tau \alpha \iota$ ．Apparently the crowd jeered at Socrates．Cf．Gorg： 474 a，$\pi \epsilon ́ \rho v \sigma t$


 $\sigma \tau \alpha \mu \eta \nu$ є̇ $\pi / \psi \eta \phi \ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$.

16．$\mu \in \theta^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma \in v^{\prime} \sigma \theta a l:$ to place $\mathbf{c}$ myself on your side．

19．oi $\tau p$ ákovтa：they were called the Thirty rather than the Thirty Ty－ rants．－avi：in turn．Both democ－ racy and oligarchy，however opposed in other respects，agreed in attempt－ ing to interfere with the independence of Socrates．

20．єls Tท̀̀ Oólov：the Rotunda． The name $\sigma \kappa$ tás was also applied to it from its resemblance to a parasol． Cf．Harp．（s．v．日binos）who further










（dine）oi $\pi \rho u \tau \alpha ́ \nu \epsilon t s . \quad C f$ ．also Poll． viii．155，ì $\theta \delta \lambda$ os $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \hat{f} \sigma v \nu \epsilon \delta \epsilon i \pi \nu o v \nu$
 $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha \kappa о \sigma!\omega \nu \quad \beta \quad u \lambda \hat{\eta} s, \dot{\eta} \pi \rho v \tau \alpha \nu \in \dot{v}-$ cvoa фv入й．Cf．E．M．s．v．日бдos
 $\xi \cup \lambda i \nu \eta \nu, \dot{\omega} s \tau \grave{\alpha}$ ă $\lambda \lambda \alpha$ oiккобоц $\eta \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ ．The Thirty used the $\theta$ ó $\lambda o s$ as their official residence．

21．Méovia：Leon of Salamis was an Athenian general．He，like Ly－ sias＇s brother Polemarchus and many others（Xen．Hell．ii．3．39），fell a vic－ tim of the rapacity of the Thirty．－ oìa：i．e．тotav̂̃a $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ ．Cf．vic．Cat． iII．10． 25 ，quale bellum nulla ．．．barbaria．．．gessit．－$\delta \eta^{\prime}$ ：in speaking of an incontrovertible fact， indeed．Notice the order of words．

23．ava $\boldsymbol{\pi} \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a \mathrm{l}$ ：implicate，the Lat． implere，or contaminare．à ${ }^{\prime} a^{-}$ $\pi \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ is used similarly．Cf．Phaed． 67 a, Ł̇à $\nu \delta ̊ \tau \iota \mu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \eta \delta \dot{\iota} \nu \delta \mu \iota \lambda \hat{\omega}$－ $\mu \in \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \omega \mu \mu \tau \iota \mu \eta \delta$ ¢ $\kappa о \iota \nu \omega \nu \omega \hat{\omega} \mu \in \nu$ ， ö $\tau \iota \mu \grave{\eta}$（except so far as）$\pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \alpha_{\alpha} \nu \alpha \alpha^{\gamma} \gamma \eta$ ， $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ à $\nu a \pi^{\prime} \iota \mu \pi \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \mu \in \theta a$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ тoútov $\phi \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ ．With this passage $c f$ ．espe－ cially Antipho，in．a，10，$\sigma v \gamma \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \pi / \mu-$ $\pi \lambda$ ával toùs àvaltıoús．For the facts， $c f$ ．Lys．xil．93，$\sigma v \nu \omega \phi \in \lambda \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta a \iota \mu \grave{\nu} \nu \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ ú $\mu \hat{a} s$ oùk خ̀ $\mathfrak{\xi} \mathfrak{i} o v \nu, \sigma v \nu \delta \iota a \beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ $\delta^{\text {’ }} \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \kappa$ aऽov．See also Critias＇s speech in the Odeum，Xen．Hell．ii． 4.
 $\xi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ov̀ $\tau \omega \kappa \alpha<\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \iota \nu \delta \dot{\nu} \nu \omega \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．
 $\tau \alpha \psi \eta \phi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \rho$ Є̇ $\sigma \tau i \nu, \ell_{\nu} \alpha \tau \alpha u ̉ \tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{\eta} \mu i ̂ \nu$ $\kappa \alpha l \theta a \rho \rho \hat{\eta} \tau \in \kappa \alpha l \phi o \beta \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ．
 a supposition contrary to fact with suppressed apod．used by way of show－ ing hesitation．$C f$ ．the same const． in Euthyd． $283 \mathrm{e}, \hat{\omega} \xi \in \in \in \Theta$ ©ópıє，$\epsilon i \mu \grave{\eta}$
 \＆$\nu$＂$\sigma o l$ єis кєфа入ท́n，＂＂o $\tau \iota \mu a \theta \omega \nu \nu$ $\kappa a l \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \not \partial \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \psi \epsilon v \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \tau \epsilon$ ．The usages of gentle speech at Athens adopted this formula to soften and excuse a strong expression．Cf．Gorg．

 poîs каl à $\delta a \mu a \nu \tau l \nu o i s ~ \lambda \delta \gamma o i s . ~$ The àpoıкотєро $\tau \iota$ ，for which Soc－ rates apologizes，is undoubtedly the curt and blunt colloquialism of $\mu \epsilon \lambda^{\prime} \in t$ $\mu o \iota ~ o u ̀ \delta ' ~ \delta \tau \iota o \hat{v} \nu$ ．Such an apology per－ haps would prepare the less sensitive modern for language not less curt and blunt，but far more＂colloquial．＂

26．roûtov $\delta$ é：pointedly summa－ rizes the preceding clause．

28．おठтt：not the correlative of ovitcos，but to be connected immedi－ ately with $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \xi \in \pi \lambda \eta \xi \in \nu$ ．The idiom $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa$－ $\pi \lambda \dot{n} \tau \tau \epsilon เ \nu \tau \iota \nu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \tau_{s} \tau t$ is similar．









 idía ó aủjòs oûtos, ov̉ $\delta \epsilon \nu i ̀ \pi \omega ́ \pi o \tau \epsilon \xi v \gamma \chi \omega \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha$ s oủסèv $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha$




d off. The recurrence of the same word only makes more plain the diference of the courses pursued.
31. ठıà $\tau a x \epsilon \epsilon \omega v$ : a common expression with Thucydides and Xenophon, equiv. to $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau a ́ \chi o u s . ~ C f f . ~ \delta ı a ̀ ~ \beta \rho a \chi \epsilon ́ \omega \nu$, Prot. 339 a ; Gorg. 449 a. The Thirty were only eight months (June 404Febr. 403) in power, for they ceased to rule when Critias fell at Munychia in the engagement with Thrasybulus and the returned exiles. In the interim before the restoration of the democracy, ten men, doubtless one for each $\phi u \lambda t$, were put in their place. Cf. Xen. Hell. ii. 4. 23.
e 32. $\mu$ а́ $\rho$ тирєs: possibly proceedings were here interrupted for these witnesses, though it seems quite as likely that Socrates is appealing to the $\delta t-$ кабтal themselves to be his witnesses. Hermann, who thus understands it, reads $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ instead of $\dot{\varphi} \mu \hat{i} \nu$, an unnecessary change.
XXI. 1. áp’ oưv: by o ${ }^{\boldsymbol{z} \nu}$ we are
referred to what immediately pre cedes for our answer to this question.
2. '̈т $\pi$ раттоv: distinctly refers to a continued course, a line of action.
3. тoîs Sıkalos: whatever was just, neut., a concrete way of expressing an abstraction.
5. $\alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \gamma \omega^{\prime}$ : i.e. "however it may be with others, as for me, I, etc."
6. roovitos: explained by $\xi v \gamma \chi \omega$ $\rho \eta \quad \sigma a s$. This amounts to a very direct appeal to the facts, and may be regarded as a shorter substitute for
 $\xi \nu \gamma \chi \omega \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$, каl $\gamma$ 人̀ $\rho$ фа $\nu o \hat{\nu} \mu a t$ $\mu \eta \delta \in \nu l$ $\xi v \gamma \chi \omega \rho \eta \sigma \alpha s$. For the commoner but more vague idiom, $c f$. Crit. 46 b .


 exclude either $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \theta \dot{v} \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$, but rather implies them. $C f . \tau \nu \gamma \chi \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu \epsilon$ in 18 d . The notion of habitual action is conveyed in the form of the same single act indefinitely repeated.









12. oưठ́: applies neither to the $\mu_{\epsilon ́ \nu}^{\nu}$ nor to the $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ clause separately, but to their combination. See on $\delta \in \iota \nu \bar{\alpha}$ $\downarrow \nu \epsilon \not ้ \eta \nu, 28 \mathbf{d}$.
 teristic of the Socratic ouvouria. See
 $\epsilon i v$ is to be construed with Bovidntal (see on $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau 0,31 \mathrm{~d}$ ), then $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime} \chi$ ' $\boldsymbol{\omega}$
 the preceding. After $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \in \chi \omega$, àкой $\epsilon \iota$, like $\epsilon \rho \omega \tau a ̂ \nu$ above, expresses purpose. See G. 1532 and H. 951; also, for the use of the act. voice, see G. 1529 ; H. 952 a. Socrates means: I am ready for questions, but if any so wishes he may answer and hear what I then have to say.
 next to $\tau o v^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu$ for the sake of contrast, while $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{c}$ ícov, though it is governed by ths, inevitably adheres to
 responds as a pass. to aitíav $\overline{\epsilon \pi} \pi \phi \in \rho^{\rho} \epsilon \ell \nu$ or $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \tau \imath \theta^{\prime} \mathrm{e}$ al. The notion of responsibility is colored, like the Eng. "have to answer for," with the implication of blame. For an account of those whom Socrates had chiefly in mind, see Introd. 24 and 33.
17. $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \sigma \times \boldsymbol{o}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\eta \nu}$ : is meant probably as a side thrust at imposing promises like the one attributed to Pro-
tagoras about his own teaching in Prot. 319 a. Socrates himself followed no profession strictly so called, had no ready-made art, or rules of art, to communicate. His field of instruction was so wide that he can truly say that, in the accepted sense of $\delta \delta \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ and $\mu a \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ at Athens, his pupils got no learning from him. They learned no $\mu \dot{d} \theta \eta \mu a$, acquired no useful (professional) knowledge. He put them in the way of getting it for themselves. Plato makes Socrates decline to become the tutor of Nicias's son (Lach. 207 d). He taught nothing positive, but removed by his searching questions the self-deception which prevented men from acquiring the knowledge of which they were capable. See his successful treatnient of the conceited E $\dot{\imath} \theta \dot{v} \delta \eta \mu o s \quad \delta$ кал $\delta$ s, in Xen. Mem. iv. 2.
19. ä $\lambda$ 入ot $\pi$ ávtes: not very differ-
 It differs from oi â $\lambda \lambda 0$ ot $\pi \dot{d} \nu \tau \epsilon s$, the common reading here, just as ad́vees a $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ (all conceivable men) differs
 cases if the noun alone would not have taken the art., it does not take it when qualified by $\pi$ âs and the like. Compare all others and all the others. Here we have a complete antithesis




 $\phi \eta \mu \iota, \pi \rho о \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \tau \alpha \kappa \tau \alpha \iota$ vino $\tau о \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \circ \hat{v} \pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ каì èкк $\mu а \nu$ -




 to $i \delta i \alpha$, which takes the place of the more usual $\delta \eta \mu \sigma \sigma i ́ a$; Socrates calls attention to the publicity of the places where he talks ( $c f .17 \mathrm{c}$ ) and to the opportunity of conversing with him offered to all alike.
c XXII. 3. $\epsilon \mathfrak{i n t o v}$ : the oft clause really answers $\delta i \grave{\alpha}$ $\tau i ́ \ldots$. . $\delta ı a \tau \rho!$ io votes; but grammatically it is an appended explantation of $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \epsilon a \nu$, and is gov-
 vols: both are in close relation with xaipovat; contrast the constr. of the same parties. in 23 c .
 $\lambda \iota \tau \delta \tau \eta s$ (simplicity), or $\mu \in i \omega \sigma \iota s$ (diminuion), quite like the Eng. not at all unpleasant. Such are the common oo $\chi$
 (cf .not quite). Socrates perhaps agreed with La Rochefoucauld, Maximes, 31, Si nous n'avions point de défauts, nous ne prendrions pas ant de plaisir à en remarquer dins les autres. us er $\gamma \omega \dot{\prime} \phi \eta \mu \mathrm{L}:$ as I maintain, implying not so much that he makes his asserdion now as that he now emphatically calls attention to the assertion already made and substantiated. For the analogous use of the pres. express-
ing continued result of past action, see GMT. 27 ; H. 827. Here $\phi \eta \mu l$ almost means $I$ am maintaining and have maintained. See on on $\pi \in \rho \lambda \epsilon \prime \gamma \omega 21$ a,



 phrase which suggests that $\epsilon \in \kappa \pi a \nu \tau \partial s$ $\tau \rho \delta \sigma_{0} v$ has made room for $\pi \alpha \nu \tau i \quad \tau \rho \delta \sigma \pi \varphi$. The cai before $\pi \alpha \nu \tau l$ is best rendered by and generally. For the facts, $c f$. 21 b and Crit. 44 a.
7. ais тотє кal ä $\lambda \lambda \eta$ : ever at any time at all, any other.
8. $\theta \in i ́ a ~ \mu о i ̂ p a: ~ w i l l ~ o f ~ P r o v i d e n c e . ~$ What is appointed by the Deity is contrasted with a man's own choice; the phrase freq. qualifies what man attains or enjoys through no effort or desert of his own but almost a ja $\alpha \hat{\eta}$ moipa (by the grace of good luck). Cf. Rep. 493 a ; Arist. Eth. i. 9. 1.
 to disprove. So $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \chi \epsilon \nu$ means prove a point by disproving its contradictory.
10. $\epsilon l$ yap $\delta \eta^{\prime}:$ for if really, ie. as we must suppose if Meletus speaks truth.
11. Xp $\bar{\nu} \nu$ катךүорєîv: $\nsim \nu$ is not re- d quire. See GMT. 415. The con-




 $\pi o ́ v \theta \epsilon \sigma a \nu$ av̉т $\hat{\nu} \nu$ oi oíкєîoı, $\nu \hat{v} \nu \mu \epsilon \mu \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ [каì $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath}-$




33
d clusion states an unfulfilled obligation. H. 897. All the prots. here expressed, including $\epsilon i \quad \delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \omega$ and $\epsilon i{ }^{i} \pi \epsilon \pi \delta \nu-$ $\theta \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$, belong to the first class (GMT. 415 ; H. 893), and the apod. $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$ involves its own unfulfilled condition. But see GMT. 417. $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$ together with this implied prot. forms the apod. which goes with $\epsilon l$ $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \omega$ $\kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$. GMT. 510. This prot. is disjunctively elaborated in two parallel


 $\ldots \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \delta_{\epsilon}^{\prime}$ (like oй $\tau \epsilon \ldots$ ov̀ $\bar{\epsilon}$ ), which gives a certain independence to the second member. Hence it is treated as a condition by itself, and the leading protasis, $\epsilon i \delta \iota a \phi \theta \in i \rho \omega$, is substantially repeated in $\epsilon \grave{\iota} \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \pi \delta \nu \theta \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$. If (as Meletus urges) I am corrupting some young men, and have corrupted others, then (if they were doing their duty) they would, supposing some of them convinced on growing older that in their youth I, etc., now stand forth, etc.
13. ávaßaivovtas: see on $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \lambda$ ठıка$\sigma \tau$ ท́pıov, 17 d.
15. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \in \in \in \mathfrak{L} \omega \boldsymbol{v}$ : on the repetition of the art. here, see $\mathrm{G} .959,2 ; \mathrm{H}$. 668.
16. тоv̀s пробท́коитаs: Eng. idiom
suggests either $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \eta \kappa \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ or $\pi \rho о \sigma \eta$ йкогая without the art. After the detailed enumeration, $\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ p a s . .$. a $\lambda \lambda$ дous, $\tau o u ̀ s ~ \pi \rho o \sigma \eta к о \nu \tau \alpha s$ is introduced appositively to sum up, and thèrefore the article is used.
17. кal $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \in$ î $\sigma a r:$ combine with $\mu \in \mu \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a l$, and the idea is that of $\mu \nu \eta$ бוкакєі̀, a word which had lately been much used in the political turmoils at Athens. $C f$. the final agreement between oligarchs and democrats, Xen. Hell. ii. 4. 43, $\bar{\eta} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \iota \kappa а к \eta$ $\sigma \epsilon เ \nu$.
18. mávтws: as in answers, certainly. - évrav日oî: connect with $\pi \alpha^{\prime}-$ $\rho \in \iota \sigma \iota \nu$, which thus denotes the result of $\pi$ aptéval. We might call it here the perf. of $\pi a p t \epsilon \epsilon^{2} a l . \quad C f$. Xen. $A n$. i. 2. 2, каl $\lambda \alpha \beta \delta \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \tau \grave{\alpha}$ ö $\pi \lambda a \quad \pi \alpha \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu \epsilon$ is $\Sigma \alpha^{\alpha} \delta \delta \epsilon t s$. For the converse, cf. 36 c , èvтav̂өa oùk ț̃a.
19. Kpitcv: it is he whose name is given to the well-known dialogue of Plato. See Introd. 62.
 ov $\sigma a, 32 \mathbf{b}$. - Kpıтоßoṽえov: although his father Crito modestly declares (Euthyd. 271 b ) that he is thin ( $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta$ $\phi \rho \sigma$ ) in comparison with his exquisite playmate Clinias (cousin- of Alcibiades), Critobulus was famous for his beauty. See Xen. Symp. 4. 12 ff.







He was one of Socrates's most constant companions. The Oeconomicus of Xenophon is a conversation between Socrates and Critobulus. The affection between Socrates and Crito is best shown by the pains taken by the former in furthering Critobulus's education. In the Memorabilia (i. 3. 8 ff .) Socrates indirectly reproves Critobulus by a conversation in his presence held with Xenophon. The same lesson he reinforces (ii. 6. esp. 31 and 32 ). That it was needed appears from the impetuous character shown by Critobulus in Xenophon's

 (of what are you proudest?); $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \pi} \boldsymbol{\imath}$ кd่入$\lambda \epsilon t, \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \phi \eta$. That Critobulus perplexed his father is shown in Euthyd. 306 d, where, speaking of his sons, Crito says:
 ting on) kal $\delta \in i ̂ \tau a i ́ \tau ı \nu o s, ~ o ̈ \sigma \tau i s ~ a ~ d u-~$ e $\tau \delta \nu \dot{\partial} \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon!.-\delta \Sigma \phi \dot{\eta} \tau \tau 10 \mathrm{os}$ : of the

21. Aloxivov: like Plato, Xenophon, and Antisthenes, Aeschines (surnamed $\delta$ इјккрatıкós) carefully wrote down the sayings of Socrates after the master's death. Three dialogues preserved among the writings of Plato have been attributed to Aeschines the Socratic. The Eryxias possibly is by him, but hardly either the Axiochus or the treatise $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ d̀ $\rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} s$. Aesclines was unpractical, if we can trust the amusing account given by

Lysias (fr. 3) of his attempt to establish, with borrowed money, a тє́ $\chi \nu \eta$ $\mu \nu \rho є \psi \kappa \kappa$ й (salve-shop). His failure in this venture may have led him to visit Syracuse, where, according to Lucian (Parasit. 32), he won the favor of Dionysius. - 'Avтьф̂̀v: Aeschines and Antiphon here present should not be confused with their more celebrated namesakes, the orators. This Antiphon was of the $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu \mathrm{os} \mathrm{K} \eta \phi \iota \sigma a d^{\prime}$ in the $\phi \nu \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \rho \epsilon \chi \theta \eta$ is, but nothing further is known of him.
22. 'Exivévous: the same whom Socrates saw (Xen. Men. iii. 12) ע́́ $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \boldsymbol{\tau \epsilon}$
 rates reproached him then and there for not doing his duty to himself and to his country by taking rational ex-ercise.- ooivov: moreover, a transition. The fathers of some have been named, now he passes on to the case of brothers.
23. тavitn : i.e. the one in question.
25. éккivós $\gamma \in$ : he at least, i.e. $\delta$ éкєi $=\delta \varepsilon_{\nu}{ }^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{A} \star \delta o v, \Theta \epsilon \delta \delta o \tau o s$, named last but the more remote. Cf. Euthyd. 271 b , where ékeivos refers to Critobulus just named.— aưroû: Nıкб́бтратоs, of whom he is speaking. Since his brother is dead, Nicostratus will give an absolutely unbiassed opinion. - катабєๆ$\theta \epsilon$ í : lit. deprecari, but really it means here overpersuade, i.e. persuade a man against his better judgment. $C f$. ката$\chi$ арi $\zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a t, 35 \mathrm{c}$.
26. Otáyns: this brother of Para-








 lus is known through Rep vi. 496 b, where Plato uses the now proverbial expression, ó tov̂ $\Theta \in a ́ \gamma o u s ~ \chi a \lambda ı \nu b s$, the bridle of Theages, i.e. ill health. Such was the providential restraint which made Theages, in spite of political temptations, faithful to philosophy; otherwise, like Demodocus, his father, he would have gone into politics. Demodocus is one of the speakers in the Theages, a dialogue wrongly attributed to Plato.
27. 'A8єíavтos: son of Aristo and brother of Plato and of Glaucon (Xen. Mem. iii. 6. 1) ; botl. of Plato's brothers were friends of Socrates. Glaucon and Adimantus are introduced in the Republic; Adimantus is older, and is represented as not on so familiar a footing with Socrates as his younger brother.
28. 'A $A \pi \lambda \lambda{ }^{\prime} \delta \omega \rho o s:$ surnamed $\delta \mu \alpha-$ עıкós because of his intense excitability. Cf. Sympos. 173 d. This is nowhere better shown than in the Phaedo, 117 d, where he gives way to uncontrollable grief as soon as Socrates drinks the fatal hemlock. In the Symposium, 172 e, he describes his first association with Socrates with almost religious fervor. In the 'A $\pi 0$ -入oria $\Sigma$ इшкра́тous (28), attributed to Xenophon, he is mentioned as $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi t \theta \nu \mu \dot{\eta}-$
 34
$a$ $\lambda \omega s \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{v} \dot{\eta} \theta \eta s$ (a simpleton). Of the persons here mentioned, Nicostratus, Theodotus, Paralus, and Aeantodorus, are not elsewhere mentioned; and of the eleven here named as certainly present at the trial (there is doubt about Epigenes) only four (or five with Epigenes), Apollodorus, Crito, Critobulus, and Aeschines, are named in the Phaedo as present afterwards in the prison.
29. $\mu \mathrm{a} \lambda_{\iota} \sigma \tau \alpha \mu_{\epsilon ́ v}$ : by all means. In the clause beginning with $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon^{\prime}, \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\psi}$ €́autov̂ is referred to by $\tau \delta \delta \tau \in$ and contrasted with $\nu \hat{v} \nu \pi \alpha \rho a \sigma \chi \chi^{\prime} \sigma \theta \omega$.
31. Є̇ $\gamma \omega$ м тарахшрй: parenthetical. "The full expression occurs Aeschin.

 for introducing evidence was not counted as a part of the time allotted for the pleadings, but the water-clock ( $\tau \delta \quad \ddot{\delta} \omega \omega \rho$ ) was stopped while a witness was giving account of his evidence. $C f$. Lys. xxiif. 4, 8, 11, 14, and 15, кal $\mu 0 \iota \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \lambda \alpha \beta \in$ (addressed to an officer of the court) $\tau \delta \delta \delta \omega \rho$. See App.
35. үáp: calls upon us to draw a b conclusion suggested by the preceding clause. Socrates means: this fact ( $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau a s \beta_{0 \eta \theta \epsilon i \nu,} \kappa \tau$ द.) proves my inno-
 à $\delta a \dot{\alpha} \phi \theta a \rho \tau о \iota, \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{v} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \iota \stackrel{\eta}{\eta} \delta \eta \stackrel{a}{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon \varsigma$ ，oi $\tau \circ \hat{\tau} \tau \omega \nu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \eta^{\prime}-$











b cence；for how else can we account for the following？$\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ applies to both clauses à̇vol $\mu \in ́ \nu$ and oi $\delta \dot{\text { ćt }}$ ；more especially to the latter．For $\lambda o \gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\circ}$ є́хоוєข，see on єi $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau o l, 31 \mathrm{~b}$ ．
 partic．，like ă $\rho \chi \omega \nu$ and $\sigma u \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \omega \nu$ ，has by usage become substantially a noum． The poets apparently were the first to use partics．in this way．$C f$ ．Aesch．
 El．335，$\delta$ е̇кєivov тєкш́v．The parti－ cipial use and the use as a noun sub－ sisted side by side．Cf．Legg．ix． $868 \mathrm{~b}, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \eta \kappa \delta \partial \nu \tau \omega \nu \quad \tau \hat{\varphi} \quad \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \nu \tau \eta$－ бavtı，and ibid．тò̀s $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \hat{\eta} \kappa o \nu \tau a s ~ \tau o \hat{u}$ $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \tau \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau o s$. GMT．828；H． 966.

38．$\dot{d} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \eta^{\prime}$ ：see on $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \eta, 20 \mathrm{~d}$ ．
XXIII．1．$\epsilon$ โढv $\delta \eta^{\prime}$ ：this closes the argument proper of the defence，and marks the beginning of the perora－ tion．
2．Nows tolav̂ta：in much the same strain．
3．àvaцvๆбөeis éavtov̂：many סıка－ $\sigma \tau a i$ had been defendants．

4．$\epsilon \mathfrak{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \quad \kappa \tau \mathcal{\varepsilon} .:$ see，esp．for the force of $\mu \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \nu$ and $\delta \epsilon$ ，on $\delta \in L \nu \grave{\alpha}$ a $\nu \epsilon^{\prime} \eta \nu$ ，
 à $\gamma \omega \dot{\prime} \nu$ was one involving a man＇s fran－ chise and his life．$C f$ ．Dem．xxi．99， $\pi \alpha \iota \delta i ́ a ~ \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ тарабтй $\sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ каl клай $\sigma \in \iota$

 $\rho \in i ̃ a \iota$（the defendant will bring his children and burst into lamentations）каl $\pi о \lambda \lambda o u ̀ s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o u s ~ к а l ~ \tau \alpha \pi \epsilon \iota \nu o u ̀ s ~ \epsilon € ~ ¢ \epsilon \hat{\imath}, ~ \delta \alpha-~$
 $\alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \delta \nu$ ．For another appeai which was customary in Athenian courts，see on ò̀ 入ójous and фортıкà каl ठıкауıка́， 32 a．

6．$\pi \alpha \iota \delta i a$ avírov̂：see App．
 To be sure Socrates had enough friends and to spare who were pres－ ent in court，but he refused to make such wrongful use of their presence and sympathy．ápo implies that any one who knew Socrates of course would be surprised at such unseemli－ ness where he was concerned．













9. $\dot{\omega}$ äv $\delta_{o ́ \xi a l \mu l: ~ o f ~ c o u r s e ~ S o c-~}^{\text {S }}$ rates is far from believing himself that the risk he runs is a desperate one.
 too easily offended, more lit. represented by more (than otherwise) selfwilled. The $\delta ı \kappa a \sigma \tau a i ́ m i g h t ~ e a s i l y ~ b e ~$ too proud to submit to criticism of their own conduct in like cases; the more so because Socrates said that he was too proud ( $c f$. e below) to follow their example. Cff. La Rochefoucauld, Maximes, 34, Si nous n'avions point d'orgueil, nous ne nous plaindrions point de celui des autres.
11. aưtoîs тov́тots: causal. - $\epsilon l \delta \eta^{\prime}$ : see on cỉ $\delta \dot{\eta}, 29$ b.
d 12. yàp: "(I say if,) for though I do not expect it of you yet (making the supposition) if it should be so." 'The force of $\epsilon i \delta^{\prime}$ o $\dot{v} \nu$ is resumptive.
13. €̇тtєเкฑ̂: not harsh, i.e. conciliatory.
14. kai oikfiot: "I am not alone in the world, but I too have relatives." -

(with the gen. of the proper name) is common in quotations. No verb is expressed, and the quotation is in apposition with rov̂ro, etc. Cf. Theaet.

 $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s \tau \epsilon$. This const. is not confined to quotations. $C f$. the freq. use of $\delta v o i ̂ \nu ~ \theta a ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu ~ a s ~ i n ~ P h a e d . ~ 66 e, ~$

 quotation is from Hom. Od. xix. 163,
 à $\pi \partial{ }_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\tau} \rho \eta$.
16. kai, kal: not correlative. The first кaí means also, while the second introduces a particular case under oikeion and means indeed or even.
17. $\tau p \in$ is : not added attrib. but appositively, three of them. Their names were Lamprocles (Xen. Mem. ii. 2. 1), Sophroniscus, and Menexenus. Diog. Laert. II. 26 ; Phaed. 116 b.
20. aù $\theta a \delta i \zeta_{0}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s:$ it is not in a rein of self-will or stubbornness. See on cabove.












whether I can look death in the fuce or not. At this point the grammatical consistency breaks down. à $\lambda \lambda \alpha$ ought to be followed by a partic. (oio $\mu \in \nu 0 s$ perhaps), but oй $\mu о \boldsymbol{\text { б }} \boldsymbol{\delta о к є \imath ̂}$ is the only trace of it. See on ö $\mu \omega \boldsymbol{s} \delta_{\epsilon}$ é éóкєє, 21 e. The anacoluthon $(\mathrm{H} .1063)$ is resorted to becauise Socrates wishes to mention his real motive, and yet to avoid saying bluntly " I am too brave to do anything so humiliating." Having said $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon \grave{\nu} \quad \theta a \rho \rho a \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega s k \tau \dot{\epsilon}$. the next clause ( $\pi \rho \delta \rho_{s} \delta$ ' o $\hat{\nu} \nu \kappa \tau \in$. .) slapes itself accordingly.
22. ä入入os $\lambda$ óyos: another question or matter. $C f$. Dem. ix. 16, $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$

 oviv: but at all events or at any rate, like certe after sive-sive. See on $\delta^{\prime}$ o $\grave{\nu} \nu, 17$ a.
24. oưठ'́v: see on à à $о \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota, 31$ d. - тои̂тo тойvoua: sc. бофós. See on
 avoids using the word oopós either here or below.
25. $\psi \in \hat{v} \delta o s: ~ u s e d ~ a s ~ t h e ~ c o n t r a r y ~$ of the adj. à $\lambda \eta \theta_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} . \cdot$ Cf. Euthyd. 272 a,
 times it is even used attrib. with a
noun. Cf. Polit. $281 \mathbf{b}$, парáסo̧óv $\tau \epsilon$ $\kappa \alpha \grave{\psi} \psi \in \hat{v} \delta$ os ơ $\nu о \mu \alpha$. Cf. Hom. Il. ix. 115,

 however that may be, people have arrived at the opinion. Cf. Prot. 327 c, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} o \hat{b} \nu \alpha u ̀ \lambda \eta \tau a l$ रov̂ $\nu \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon s \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$
 sionals).
26. to': used here to indicate that what follows is quoted. G. $955,2$.
27. oi סoкoûvtes: those generally reputed. Here Socrates may have had Pericles in mind, if Plutarch's gossip is truth. Cf. Pericl. 32. 3,
 $\pi a ́ \nu \nu \pi \alpha \rho a ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta i ́ \kappa \eta \nu, \dot{\omega} s$ Ai $\sigma \chi^{i} \nu \eta s$ ф $\eta \sigma i \nu$,
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \delta \iota \alpha a \tau \omega \bar{\omega}$, he begged Aspasia off, though Aeschines says it was by a flagrant disregard of justice, by weeping for her and beseeching the jurymen.
 this gen. abs. is the same as that of $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \theta a \nu o \hat{v} \nu \tau a t$. This is not the regular const., for usually the gen. abs. expresses a subord. limitation, and clearness demands an independent subj. Here, and in many cases where it introduces an independent idea, it depends








 $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu \pi o \iota o \hat{v} \nu \tau o s \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\eta} \tau 0 \hat{v} \dot{\eta} \sigma v \chi i \alpha \nu$ ä $\gamma о \nu \tau o s$.






35 on the leading clause for its subj. Cf. Xen. An. i. 4. 12, каi oùr éq̆
 каі тoîs тротє́poıs $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ Kúpov à $\nu a \beta a ̂ \sigma \iota$
 $\tau \omega \nu$. G. 1152 and 1568 ; r. 972 ad.
b 36. ov̂rol: a very pointed reiteration.
39. $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \mathrm{\epsilon} \mathrm{i}$, $\mathbf{v} \mu \mathrm{as}$ : the defendant and the $\delta_{\text {ıка }}$ atai. Cf. $\mathbf{c}$ below.
40. тov̂ eloayovios: the one who, etc., or 'him who,' here conveying the notion of quality, the man so shameless as to. G. 1560 ; H. 966 . The phrase is borrowed from the stage. Cf. Legy.
 roóas eí $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \tau / \nu$.
 Sikatov: alter the unseemly practice has been condemned by reference to $\tau \delta$ к $\kappa \lambda o ́ v(\delta o ́ \xi a)$, it is found still more inconsistent with $\tau \delta \delta i$ ikaoov, and this is conclusive against it. The second oùfé(with à $\pi o \phi \in \dot{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \nu)$ is merely the idiomatic correlative of the first
one. On the argument involved, see $\underset{b}{35}$ Introd. 71, fin.
 the full idea would be, $\delta \delta \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ кal $\delta_{\delta \delta \alpha} \dot{\xi} \alpha \nu \tau a($ or $\delta \delta \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa o \nu \tau a) \pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \ell \nu$. For, strictly speaking, $\pi \epsilon \in \theta \in \ell \nu$ may be the result of mere entreaties, but this Socrates would probably have called $B \dot{\alpha} \hat{\zeta}_{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ rather than $\pi \epsilon \in \theta \epsilon \iota \nu . \quad C f . \mathbf{d}$ below.

 סikalov, " make a present of justice." Notice the evil implication of кatá in composition.
5. дна́локєv: part of the oath taken

 $\dot{\delta \mu o i ́ \omega s}$ д̀ $\mu \phi$ oì . The orators were always referring to this oath. $C f$. Aeschin. in. 6 ff.; Dem. xvin. 6, etc. See Introd. p. 49, note 2. $C f$. also the sentiment, grateful to Athenian hearers, with which Iolaus be-








 Athens, Eur. Heracl. 181 ff., ă $\nu a \xi$ ú úáp-


 $\theta \epsilon \nu$. ov̀ belongs to $\dot{\partial} \mu \dot{\omega} \mu о \kappa \epsilon \nu$ not to the inf., for otherwise the negative would be $\mu \dot{\eta}$ and not où. (Cf. Phaedr.

 $\nu \partial s \in \operatorname{\epsilon } \pi i \delta \in i \xi \in i \nu)$. He has suorn not that he will, etc., but that he will, etc. See Dr. Gildersleeve's article in the American Journal of Plilology, Vol. I. p. 49.
7. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \in \sigma \theta a \mathrm{a}$ : allow yourselves to be habituated.
8. $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ : includes both the speaker and the court referred to above $\mathrm{l} y$ $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ and $\dot{\psi} \mu \hat{a} s$ respectively.
9. à $\mu \eta^{\prime} \tau \epsilon$ ท่ $\gamma o v$ ual: notice the order. Socrates adds $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ ö $\sigma \iota a$ last because he remembers the ėmıoркєiv above. Perjury involves wrong to the gods named in the violated oath,

10. äd $\lambda \omega \mathrm{s} . . . \mathrm{kal}:$ the hyperbaton (H. 1062) consists in interrupting the familiar phrase $\nless \lambda \lambda \omega s{ }^{\prime} \tau \epsilon$ каí to make room for $\mu \in ́ \nu \tau o u ~ \nu \grave{\eta} \Delta i ́ a$, after which $\alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \omega$ is forgotten and $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega s$ is brought in with kaí, ten thousand times less so too because I actually, etc.

See $\Lambda$ pp. There is an intended humor in this accumulated agony of emphasis which leads up to what Socrates has called Meletus's practical joke. Cf. 26 e , бокє̂̀ $\nu \epsilon \delta \tau \eta \tau \iota \quad \gamma \rho a ́ \psi \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ and
 the ironical allusions to this charge throughout the Euthyphro, particularly (3 b) ф $\quad \sigma 亢 \gamma^{\alpha} \rho \mu \epsilon \pi o \iota \eta \tau \eta \grave{\eta} \nu$ (almost, manufacturer) $\epsilon \bar{l} \nu a \iota ~ \theta \epsilon \omega ิ \nu$, and (16a)

 tions) $\pi \in \rho \grave{\imath}$ à̀ $\tau \alpha ́$ ( $\tau \grave{\alpha} \theta \in i ̂ a$ ).
 $\mu \eta \nu$ : a double opposition which forcibly brings out (1) the absurdity of doing any real violence ( $\beta \iota \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ is a strong word) by simple entreaties, (2) the incompatibility between $\pi \in i^{\prime}-$ $\theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ and $\beta \alpha^{\prime} S_{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha l$. All this gives in a nutshell the drift of Socrates's earnest objection to the practice of irrelevant appeals for pity and mercy. For the full force of $\beta$ ta $\zeta_{\xi} \epsilon \theta a t, c f$. Rep.
 persuasion or by violence) $\tau \delta \nu \nu a u ́ \kappa \lambda \eta$ pov.
13. ब̂̀zùs... €ival: extraordinarily separated, giving, great emphasis to єival. The whole whangonent of words here is intended to arrest the attention and thus prevent their important meaning from being slighted.

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ катך


## 

 from (lacks much of) being the case (so).
 $\lambda o \nu \pi a \nu \tau l \pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \eta \geqslant \pi \hat{\varphi} \quad \theta \in \hat{\varphi}$. Socrates sees a divine providence in any decision that may be rendered, and concludes his plea with words of submission.
18. ápırтa: what Socrates understood to be ápiozov for every man may be read in the Euthydemus (279 a281 e), where Socrates discusses happiness with Clinias; and at the end of the Phacdrus in his prayer: $\bar{\omega} \phi i \lambda \epsilon$
 $\mu о \iota \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\varphi} \gamma \in \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta n \theta \in \nu$ (within) - $\epsilon \xi \omega \theta \in \nu$ (outward acts and fortunes)
 $\pi \lambda o v ́ \sigma \iota o \nu$ ठ̀ $\nu o \mu i \zeta o \iota \mu \iota \tau \delta \nu \quad \sigma o-$

 $\delta \sigma \omega \dot{\phi} \rho \omega \nu$. - кal $\dot{\text { u }} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\nu} \nu$ : he is loyal to the $\delta$ ıкабтаi; since they represent Athens, they are his friends. $C f$. the words of Phaedrus at the end of the prayer, каі $\epsilon^{\prime} \mu o l$ rav̂̃a $\sigma v \nu \epsilon v ́ \chi o v \cdot \kappa о \iota \nu \grave{a}$ $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{y} \phi^{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu$.
XXV. Here ends Socrates's plea in answer to Meletus, Anytus, and zyco. But much remained to be discussed and decided wefore the case was disposed off THE pleadings in a $\gamma \rho a \phi \grave{\eta}$ $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon$ ías, like those in a $\gamma \rho \alpha \phi \grave{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho a \nu \delta$ $\mu \omega \nu$, were (1) a speech of the prosecution, (2) a speech of the defend-
ant in reply, (3) a vote on the de- ${ }^{35}$ fendant's guilt or innocence. This would end the matter if the defendant were acquitted. But the judges found a verdict of guilty against Socrates. After such a verdict there remained always (4) a speech from the prosecution urging the penalty already proposed or a compromise, and (5) a speech on behalf of the defendant in which he actually proposed some penalty to be inflicted (à $\nu \tau \iota \tau i \mu \eta \sigma \iota s$ ) in place of his opponent's. Cf. Aeschin. ini. 197 f. After c.xxiv. comes the verdict of the $\delta$ юк $\alpha \sigma \tau \alpha$, which is followed by the $\tau i \mu \eta \sigma \iota s$ of Meletus. Then with c. xxv. begins the $\grave{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \tau i \mu \eta \sigma \iota s$ of Socrates. Then comes the final vote fixing the penalty. See Introd. 74.

1. тò $\mu \dot{\eta}$ áavakтєiv: the inf. with e the art. is placed at the beginning of the clause, and depends upon a word of prevention expected instead of $\xi \nu \mu-$ $\beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau a l$. "Many things contribute toward my not grieving," i.e. prevent me from grieving. G. 1551 and 1058 ; H. 961. The fat that I feel no :ay, osition to make an outcry, results from many causes, etc. Cf. Rep. i.

 $\dot{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \chi \rho \eta \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu \kappa \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s \sigma v \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \in \tau \alpha \iota$, where the parallel is complete except that, because of the long and intricate specifications (omitted in quot.
 тò $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \circ \nu o ̀ s ~ \tau o v ̂ \tau o, ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \pi o \lambda \grave{v} ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu ~ \theta a v \mu a ́ \zeta \omega ~ \epsilon ́ \kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu ~$



 $\pi \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon v \gamma a$, каì ov̉ $\mu$ óvov dj $\pi о \pi \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon v \gamma a$, ả $\lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \pi \alpha \nu \tau \grave{\imath} ~ \delta \eta ̂ \lambda o \nu ~$
above), there is a repetition of the inf. in cis rov̂тo.
 nation of $\tau 0 \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \tau \hat{\varphi} \gamma \in \gamma \sigma \nu \delta \tau \iota$.
2. каl... үє́ $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ : a departure from the beaten track. каl of $\tau$ t oùк к $\kappa \dot{\varepsilon}$., though regular, would have been cumbrows. The important fact detaches itself from any connective like $\delta \tau \tau$. This is often the case in clauses connetted with $\tau \epsilon$. . . каĺ, oй $\tau \epsilon$. . ova $\tau \epsilon$,
 21 e , and $\delta \iota \alpha \phi \epsilon$ दípovaıv, 25 b . - oúk
 pected. Compare $\varphi \delta \mu \eta \nu$ just below almost in the sense of $\eta \lambda \pi \iota \zeta_{o \nu}^{\circ}$. The use of $\epsilon \lambda \pi i s$ and $\epsilon \lambda \pi i \zeta_{\epsilon \epsilon \nu}$ and the like to express expectation, without reference to the pleasure or pain involved in the event expected, is common enough in Greek; sometimes even the context makes the expectaton one of pain or harm to come. In English, hope is rarely used in the sense of mere expectation, but $c f$. Rich. III. ii. 4, I hope he is much grown since last I saw him; Mer. of Ven. ii. 2, As my father, being I hope an old man, shall fruitify unto you.
 is separated from $\dot{\text { i }}$ if $\gamma o \nu$ by $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha$, a case of apparent hyperbaton. See on ax $\lambda \lambda \omega s \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \varepsilon$., 35 d . The combination $\pi a \rho^{\prime} \dot{\partial} \lambda i ́ \gamma o \nu$ is treated as inseparable, because the whole of it is required to express the idea " a little beyond," ie.
close. The whole idea of by a small majority is qualified by ouvcos. The od $\lambda$ if $\gamma o \nu$ was thirty votes. $C f$. Dem. xxiv.
 gov víd̀ $\mu \iota \kappa \rho o \hat{v}$ (almost) $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ à $\pi \epsilon \kappa \tau \epsilon i ́-$

 (within a small majority) $\grave{\eta} \tau \iota \mu \omega \sigma a \tau \epsilon$. The subj. of $\neq \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ is of course to be supplied from $\tau \delta \nu \gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \gamma \nu o ́ \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \theta \mu \delta \nu$. is '̈otsev: used freq. (like the Eng. "as it appears") in cases even of the greatest certainty.
3. gl трıа́коขта ктє́.: strictly speaking 31. Dig. L. ii. 5.41 , says : kat-

 $\phi \omega \nu)$. The total number of votes against him was therefore 281 ; so that 220 of the $501 \delta_{\text {os к }} \sigma \tau a l$ (see Untrod. 66) must have voted in his favor. Socrates probably counted the numbers roughly, as he heard them, and said that thirty votes would have turned the scale. When Aleschines was acquitted of the charge of $\pi \alpha \rho a \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \in i ́ a$, betrayal of trust when on an embassy, brought by Demosthemes, his majority is said to have been also thirty votes. For Demosthemes, as here for Socrates, such defeat was, under the circumstances, victory. See Untrod. 72.
4. גытотє́фє $\downarrow \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{a}$ : ie. alone, Meletus could not have got 100 votes, since with two helpers he failed to get 300 .

 $\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \tau o \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \rho o s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \psi \eta \dot{\eta} \phi \omega \nu$.
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a
 their respective importance, see Introd.

11. $\mathrm{X}^{\llcorner\lambda \text { ías } \delta \rho a \chi \mu \text { ás : see Introd. } 72 .}$
b - тò $\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \tau о \nu \mu$ е́ $\rho o s:(c f$. Dem. xviil.
 the indispensable fifth part, not $a$ fifth part. The ace. is used because the whole fifth is meant. Cf. Prot. 329 e, $\mu \in \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ \nu o v \sigma \iota \nu \ldots \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \rho \in \tau \hat{\eta} s$
 Xen. An. iv. 5. 5, où $\pi \rho o \sigma i \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu \pi \rho \partial े s ~ \tau \grave{~}$



XXVI. 1. тццâtal $\theta a v a ́ \tau o v: ~ f i x e s ~$ my penalty at death. See Introd. 73. For the omission of the art. when $\theta$ ávazos means the penalty of death, $c f .37 \mathrm{~b}$, and see on tô $\theta a \nu \alpha ́ \tau o v, 28 \mathbf{c}$.
2. ที $\mu \mathrm{i} ข$ : ethical dat. G. 1171 ; H. 770.
3. $\eta$ そ $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o v \kappa \tau \dot{\varepsilon}$ : with $\eta$ (an) is appended the interrogative answer to the first question, which is merely
 ellipsis is so common that $\dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \xi_{i}^{\prime} \alpha$ is treated as a noun; here $\tau i \mu \eta \mathrm{\eta}$ may easily be supplied from the verb. On $\pi \alpha \theta \epsilon \hat{i} \nu \hat{\jmath} \dot{\alpha} \pi o \tau i \sigma \alpha$, , see Introd. 74 .
4. ò $\tau \iota \mu \alpha \theta \dot{v} v:$ strictly speaking, this is the indir. form of $\tau i \mu \alpha \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$, which hardly differs from $\tau \mathfrak{l} \pi \alpha \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$. See GMT. 839 ; H. 968 c. Both idioms ask, with astonishment or dis-
approval, for the reason of an act They resemble two English ways of asking 'why ?' ' what possessed ( $\mu \alpha$ $\theta \omega \nu \nu$ ) you?' 'what came over ( $\pi \alpha \theta \omega \omega \nu$ ) you?' So \& $\tau \iota \mu a \theta \omega \nu=$ an emphatic because. The indir. question here is loosely connected with the leading clause. Such connexion as there is depends upon the notion of deciding a
 tioal, "what sort of a penalty do I deserve to pay since the question involved is what possessed me," etc. This is more striking than the regular phrase où $\chi \dot{\eta} \sigma u \chi i a \nu \not a \gamma \omega \nu$ or $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \gamma \omega \nu$. Cf. Euthyd. 299 a, $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu \downarrow \nu \tau \partial \nu$ $\dot{v} \mu \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$ ти́лтоıцı ö $\tau \iota \pi \alpha \theta \grave{\omega} \nu$ бофоѝs viєîs oüt $\lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma a s:$ this is more fully explained below by $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau a \hat{v} \theta a$ oùic $\hat{\eta} \alpha$, for which see on 9 below.
 supplied from ${ }^{\alpha} \mu \in \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha s$. Cf. Hdt. vii.



 often to be supplied from ovideís. For a similar ellipsis, see Hom. Od. vi.

 $\grave{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \alpha ́ \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \alpha$ (sc. $\mu \grave{\eta} \delta \epsilon \in \dot{v} \in \sigma \theta a \iota)$. Socrates's specifications cover both public and private life.
$\mu i \alpha a s$ каi $\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \eta \gamma \iota \omega \nu$ каi $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma о \rho \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha i \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu 36$





 $\sigma \tau o \nu ~ \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \epsilon i ̂ \theta \epsilon \iota \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu \mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ є $\alpha \nu \tau o \hat{v} \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu o ̀ s$



 magistracies besides and plots and fac－ tions．$\alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ is attrib．to $\alpha \rho \chi \bar{\omega} \nu \xi \nu \nu \omega-$ $\mu \sigma \sigma \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$, and $\sigma \tau \dot{d} \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu$ ．Cf．Phaedo， 110 e， кal 入itooss kal $\hat{n}$ кal тоîs ă入入oıs S $\psi$ ous（as well as in animals）$\tau \epsilon$ каl фutoîs．Homer uses a similar idiom，

 Socrates means to include all per－ formances which bring a citizen into public life；he talks of responsible public offices as on a par with irre－ sponsible participation in public af－ fairs．Of course $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma i \alpha$ is a public office，and among the most important；
 of the $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau o \rho \epsilon s . ~ F o r ~ t h e ~ f a c t s, ~_{\text {cf }} \mathbf{3 2} \mathbf{b}$ ．
7．$\xi v \nu \omega \mu \circ \sigma \iota \omega \bar{\omega}$ кal $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \omega v$ ：the former relates to political factions， the so－called éracpiau，instituted to overthrow the existing government， the latter to revolutions，whether from democracy to oligarchy，or from oli－ garchy to democracy．Such combi－ nations and seditions were rife toward the end of the Peloponnesian war． See Grote，c．lxv．
 the pron．is not given，and then the
const．is different．Cf．Xen．An．v．${ }_{\mathbf{b}}^{36}$
 $\tau \grave{a} \pi \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \kappa \tau \epsilon$ ．Like the present
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ 光 $\tau \iota \pi \delta \rho \rho \omega \theta \in \nu$ à $\phi \in \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \nu \in \mathfrak{\epsilon} \nu \alpha a$.
 can hardly be defended．See App．
 vately benefiting individuals．This is strictly the completion of the thought introduced by $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{a} \mu \in \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha s$ ，which， though $\mathfrak{e} \nu \tau a \hat{v} \theta a \mu \dot{\mu} \nu \quad$ ò̀к $\grave{j} a$ furnishes its verb，still requires a positive ex－
 $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau a \dot{v} \theta a$, as is often the case with oìros，
 ёкабтоע $\kappa \tau \mathcal{\epsilon}$ ．The whole period is full of repetitions，but $i \omega \cdot \nu$ comes in most unaccountably．See App．See on


 opt．on the principle of oratio obli－ qua，since the tense of the leading verb（ $\bar{j} a$ ）is secondary．GMT．644； H． 924.

16．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ：not a third spe－ cification in line with $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \ldots \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ ， but connected with the whole $\mu \eta \pi \rho b-$
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c

 conveyed by out $\omega$, which points back to $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu . . . \pi \rho i v$, i.e. so that what was essential might not be neglected in favor of what is unessential.
d 17. Ti oûv ктє.: a return to the question asked above, with omission of what does not suit the new connexion. Notice in the next line the position of $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, which is emphasized by the $\gamma^{\prime}$ that follows, if you insist that, etc.
 man who has richly served the state. He is poor, and therefore needs the air $\eta \sigma \iota s$, which he deserves because he is an $\epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon ́ \tau \eta s$. $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \in \tau \eta s$ was a title of honor, bestowed under special circumstances upon citizens and noncitizens.
22. $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda 0 \nu \pi \rho \epsilon ่ \pi \epsilon\llcorner$ ova $\omega \omega$ : with colloquial freedom Socrates combines


23. év mputaveị citeío日al: those entertained by the state (1) were invited once or (2) were maintained permanently. Socrates is speaking of (2), ie. maintenance in the prytaneut. The archon dined in the $\theta \in \sigma \mu \sigma$ -
$\theta$ 的 $\sigma \iota o \nu$; the senatorial Prytanes dined in the $\theta \delta \lambda o s$, and in later times also those called $\dot{\alpha} \epsilon \mathfrak{l} \sigma t \tau o t$, - certain Eleasimian priests, scribes, heralds, etc. See on $\epsilon$ is $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \theta \delta \lambda o \nu, 32 \mathrm{c}$. The public guests sat at table in the חpuzaveiov, which was at the foot of the northcast corner of the Acropolis. Some of them earned the distinction by winning prizes in the national games, some received it on account of their forefathers' benefactions to $t$.. 'state, egg. the oldest living descendants of Harmodius and of Aristogeiton respectively were thus honored. The most ancient חрuvaveiov on the Acropoles was in historic times used only for certain religious ceremonies.
24. ї $\pi \pi \varrho$ ктє́. : ie. кє́ $\lambda \eta \tau \iota$, race-horse; $\xi \nu \nu \omega \rho i \delta \iota$, a pair; $\zeta \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \gamma \epsilon \iota$, four horses abreast. Since a victory in the great panhellenic festivals was glorious for the country from which the victor came, he received on his return the greatest honors, and even substantial rewards. Cf. Rep. v. 465 d , where Plato speaks of the $\mu \alpha \kappa \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \tau \partial s$ Bios $\hat{\delta} \nu$
 Olympian victors lead.
26. oủסèv סєitau: only rich men e could afford to compete.
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XXVII．＂I $\sigma \omega$ s ov̂̀ $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$ каі̀ $\tau \alpha \nu \tau \grave{\iota} \lambda \epsilon \prime \gamma \omega \nu \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \lambda \eta$－





 тov $\mu \grave{\eta} \mu i ́ a \nu ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha \nu ~ \mu o ́ \nu o \nu ~ к \rho i ́ \nu \epsilon ı \nu, ~ \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ s, ~ \grave{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i ́ \sigma \theta \eta \tau \epsilon \mathbf{b}$


 ผ́s ä乡ıós єiцí тоv какоv，каi $\tau \iota \mu \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \tau о \iota о и ́ \tau о v ~ \tau \iota \nu o ̀ s ~$



 The art．is omitted，since this is thrown in merely to explain rov́rou．

XXVII．3．ámavӨaסı乡ó $\mu \in v o s:$ in the spirit of stubbornness．This serves to explain $\pi a \rho a \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i \omega s$ ктє．For the facts，see on $\tau \hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \beta ı a \zeta o i ́ \mu \eta \nu, 35 \mathrm{~d}$ ． －то̀ $\delta \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ：refers to the act which has been only incidentally touched upon （ $\tau \alpha \nu \tau \ell \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \omega \nu=\delta ̈ \tau \iota \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \omega$ ）．ó $\delta \epsilon \in$ ， oi $\delta \epsilon \in, \tau 亠 े \delta \epsilon$ ，are used without a pre－ ceding $\mu^{\prime} \nu$ when they introduce some person or topic in contrast to what has just been dwelt upon，here $\pi \epsilon \rho$ l $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ ơкктov ктє．For a different use of $\tau \delta \delta \epsilon ́$, see on $\tau \delta \delta \dot{\delta} \kappa \iota \nu \delta \nu \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \iota, 23 \mathbf{a}$ ．
 fluous inf．G． 1535 ；H． 956 a．For the facts，see on $\begin{aligned} \\ \alpha\end{aligned} \kappa \omega \nu, 25 \mathrm{e}$ ．

7．$\omega^{\circ} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ кal ä $\lambda \lambda$ дoss：for instance the Lacedaemonians．$C f$ ．Pseudo

Plut．Apopth．Lac．s．v．＇A $\nu \alpha \xi \alpha \nu \delta p i ́ \delta o v$ or
 aùtơv，סià $\tau i ́ \tau \grave{\alpha} s \pi \epsilon \rho$ tov̂ $\forall a \nu a ́ \tau o v ~ \delta i k a s$

 öтı $\pi \in \rho$ l $\theta a \nu a ́ \tau o v ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \delta ı a \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha ́ \nu o v \sigma \iota \nu ~$ （those who go completely urong）ò̀к є̌бтı $\mu \in \tau \alpha \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$（to reconsider）．Thu－ cydides also says in his account of Pausanias，i．132． $5, \chi \rho \omega \dot{\omega} \mu \in \nu$ ot $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\tau \rho \delta \pi \psi \ddot{\psi} \pi \epsilon \rho \in i \dot{i} \theta a \sigma \iota \nu$ देs $\sigma \phi \hat{a} s a \dot{u}-$ toús（their own countrymen），$\mu \grave{\eta} \tau \alpha \chi \epsilon i s$
 $\phi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \kappa \mu \eta \rho!\omega \nu$ ßou $\epsilon \in \hat{v} \sigma \alpha i ́ \tau$ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \kappa \in \sigma \tau \sigma \nu$ ．
 fut．is used to disclaim the fut．（GMT． 113；H．855）intention．

13．$\tau l$ סeloas：what fear is there to $\mathbf{b}$ induce me？Supply verbs from the three infs．above．

14．$\phi \eta \mu l$ ：see above 28 e－30b．
 тои́тоv тıцךба́ $\mu \epsilon \nu о s ; \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu ~ \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu о \hat{v}$ ；каì $\tau i ́ \mu \epsilon \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ с



 $\sigma \omega \mu \alpha \iota$ ；$\imath \sigma \omega s$ रà $\rho \stackrel{a}{\alpha} \nu \mu o \iota ~ \tau o v ́ \tau o v ~ \tau \iota \mu \eta ́ \sigma \alpha \iota \tau \epsilon . ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda \grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu$－




15．$\notin \lambda \omega \mu a \iota ~ \grave{\omega ิ \nu ~ . ~ . ~ o ~ o ́ v \tau \omega v: ~ a ~ r e m a r k-~}$ able const．，arising from＇̈ $\lambda \omega \mu$ ai $\tau$
 similation of $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon i \nu \omega \nu \dot{\alpha}$ to $\hat{\omega} \nu$ and of $\kappa \alpha \kappa \alpha ̀ ~ \check{v} \nu \tau \alpha$ to как $\omega \nu \quad \ddot{u} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ，and the in－
 and oif＇${ }^{\circ} \tau \iota$ occur freq．（in parenthe－ sis）where ö $\tau \iota$ is superfluous．See on $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ öтı，Crito， 53 a，and $c f$ ．Dem．xix．
入oùs vinouгท̂бat，to remind you，although I know that most of you remember its $C f$ ． Gorg． 481 d ，ai $\sigma \theta$ ávoual oūv $\sigma 0 \hat{v}$ є́ка́ $\sigma \tau о \tau \epsilon$
 où $\delta \nu \nu a \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o v a ̀ \nu \tau \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．So the acc．and inf．may follow ötı and $\dot{\omega} s$ ．

16．тov́тov $\kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} .:$ a part（ $\tau i$ ）of $\bar{\omega} \nu$ ， by fixing my penalty at that．See App．

17．Sov $\lambda \in$ viovera ：$^{\text {as a }}$ a man in prison， who ceases to be his own master．

18．тоîs évסєкa：see Introd． 75 and
 a neg．answer to the preceding rhetori－ cal question is here implied；other－ wise $\ddot{\eta}$ might equally well have been used．The second $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ introduces an objection，which answers the ques－ tion immediately preceding it．－kal $\delta_{\epsilon} \delta^{\prime} \sigma \theta a \mathrm{a}$ ктє．：to remain in prison． GMT．110．Cf．in Dem．xxiv．63， the document which winds up with：


19．vûv $\delta \mathrm{r}^{\prime}$ ：just now．
20．ékitow：for the fut．with rel． denoting purpose，see GMT． 565 ；H． 911．－${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \delta \eta^{\prime}:$ but then．See on $\alpha \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ $\delta \dot{\eta}$, Crit． 54 a．The $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$ points to the impossibility just asserted of Socra－ tes＇s paying a fine himself，while $\delta \dot{\eta}$ introduces the one possible alternative．

22．фı入o廿vx（a：clinging to life，which is opposed to $\epsilon \dot{v} \psi u \chi^{i} a$（courage）．$C f$ ． Eur．Hec．315，$\pi \dot{\sigma} \tau \in \rho a \quad \mu \alpha \chi o \hat{v} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \theta^{\prime}, \hat{\eta}$ $\phi \iota \lambda о \psi v \chi \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \in \nu$ ；ibid．348，какो фа⿱亠䒑ov̂यaı каl $\phi \iota \lambda \delta \psi v \chi$ os $\gamma v \nu \eta$ ；also the speech where Macaria chooses to



 miring words of Iolaus，ibid． 597 ff ．，
 $\pi \alpha \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma \nu \nu \alpha \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu, \ldots-\epsilon \boldsymbol{l} . . \epsilon^{\ell} \mu l: c f$ ． 30 b ，and see on $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \in\{\rho o v \sigma \iota \nu, 25 \mathrm{~b}$ ．

23．ơтt vícis $\mu$＇́v：that（if）you，my fellow－citizens，proved unable to bear my company．After this we look for something like this：＂then others will prove still less able to bear it．＂But instead，we find a question with ${ }^{2} p a$ ， will others then，etc．，answered by $\pi 0 \lambda$－












 5 каì $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau o v ̂ \tau ’ ~ a ́ \delta u ́ v a \tau o \nu ~ \dot{\eta} \sigma v \chi i ́ a \nu ~ a ̈ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$, ov̉ $\pi \epsilon i ́ \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon ́ \mu o \iota$ whole upon ö $\tau \iota$ is forgotten because of the intervening detailed statement.
d 25. ßapútєpal:, fem. because tàs ${ }^{\prime} \mu \dot{\alpha} s \delta_{\iota} \alpha \tau \rho \iota \beta a ́ s$ is the most important idea and ooùs $\lambda$ órous is incidentally added by way of explanation. For agreement with the most prominent noun, see G. $924 b$.
28. of $\beta$ ios: the art. as here used has something of its original demonstrative force; accordingly $\epsilon_{\xi} \xi \in \lambda \theta \delta \nu \tau \iota$ .. . $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ is appended as if to a dem. pron., that would be a glorious life for $m e$, to be banished at my time of life. Notice that $\left.{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon}\right\} \epsilon \rho \chi \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ means go into exile; $\phi \in \dot{\gamma} \gamma \epsilon \iota$, live in exile; and кatเє́vat, to come back from exile. Instead of $\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa \hat{\varphi} \delta \in \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\alpha} \pi \varphi$, the commoner idiom would be $\tau \eta \lambda_{t \kappa} \omega \delta \epsilon \epsilon$ óvтt. But

 $\kappa \delta \delta \delta \epsilon \not{a} \nu \delta \rho a$, and Legg. i. 634 d, où $\gamma$ à $\rho$

 v. 4. 31, $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \beta o \omega \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$ छ $\nu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa o v o \nu$
 Elsewhere we find the substantive repeated, e.g. тóтои . . тóтод, 40 c .

The whole expression suggests the restless life led by the so-called sophists. Cf. Soph. 224 b , where the typical sophist is described as $\tau \partial \nu$
 $\lambda \epsilon \omega s$ vo $\mu \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \mu a \tau o s \dot{a} \mu \epsilon i \beta o \nu \tau \alpha$, one who goes from town to town buying up and selling knowledge for coin. Cf. also Prot. 313 a314 b.
33. $\delta$ i' aútov̀s tov́tous: to describe e the involuntary cause in contrast to ồtol aùtoó.
XXVIII. 2. $\begin{gathered}\xi \\ \xi \in \lambda \theta \omega \nu \\ \zeta \boldsymbol{\eta} \eta v: ~ t o ~ l i v e ~ o n ~\end{gathered}$ in exile. This forms a unit to which $\sigma \iota \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu$ and $\dot{\eta} \sigma u \chi^{\prime} \alpha \nu \alpha \not a \gamma \omega \nu$ are added by way of indicating the manner of life he will lead. The meaning of $\dot{\eta} \sigma v-$ $\chi^{\prime} \alpha \nu \not \partial \gamma \omega \nu$ is plain from $36 \mathbf{b}$.
3. тoutl $\delta \eta^{\prime}$ : that is the thing of which, etc.; cognate acc. after $\pi \in i \quad \sigma \alpha \iota,-\tau \iota \nu \alpha_{s}$ :

 $\tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o v s ~ \pi o \iota \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu ~ \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \grave{\omega} \nu ~ \dot{v} \mu \epsilon i ̂ s$
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some, used habitually by the orators where they will not or camnot be definite. Socrates probably means almost all of the Athenians.
6. єlр $\boldsymbol{\nu} \epsilon \cup о \mu \epsilon ́ v \varphi$ : see Introd. 26. -
 not duty only, it is the highest good and gives the greatest pleasure.
8. тov̀s $\lambda$ óyous: his speeches.
 unexamined, unscrutinized, or without scrutiny, in which latter case a man neither examines himself nor others, that is, his life is unthinking. Verbal adjs. in $\tau o s$, esp. with a privative, occur with both an act. and a pass. sense. Here the act. meaning substantially includes the pass. in so far as it involves self-examination (каi
 ßıштós: worth living. Cf. 廿eктós, hameworthy, and є̇สalvetós, proiseworthy. тaûta $\delta^{\prime}$ є’ $\tau$ : : $\delta$ '́ introduces apod. (GMT. 512) in order to bring it into relation with the preceding ov $\pi \epsilon i-$ $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \in \mu o t$. The two correspond very much like the two introductory clauses
 $\epsilon \neq \eta \nu \kappa \tau \epsilon \in ., 28$ d.
11. $\tau$ à $\delta \epsilon ́:$ see on $\tau \partial \delta \delta \epsilon ́, 37$ a.
 38
$\mathbf{a}$ Socrates, in 28 e-30 c and here, has shown that he neither can nor should abandon his customary manner of living, and has thus proved that he neither can nor should live in exile; he further adds ( $c f$. the reasons given in 37 b ) that he cannot propose banishment as his penalty. Banishment he has already ( 28 e ff.) rejected, though here he rejects it in a somewhat altered form.
 lated to the thought which lies unuttered in the previous explanation: not from love of money do $I$ refuse to make a proposition. The apod. includes ö $\sigma \alpha \underset{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$. See on ôs ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu, 20 \mathbf{a}$.
15. vîv $\delta$ è - ov่ үáp: but as it is, b (I name no sum of money,) for money I have none. The connexion is similar to ${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda \lambda{ }_{\alpha} \gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho(19 \mathbf{d}, 20 \mathbf{c})$, where the unexpressed thought alluded to by $\gamma \alpha^{\prime} \rho$ is easily supplied. $\nu \hat{v} \nu \delta \epsilon ́$ expresses forcibly the incompatibility of facts with the preceding supposition. Cf.
 каì $\sigma o \hat{v}$.
16. ©l $\mu \eta$ à äpa: see on cl $_{i} \mu \grave{\eta}$ ă $\rho a, 17 \mathrm{~b}$.














18. $\mu v a ̂ v$ dipyuplov: about seventeen dollars. This is certainly small compared with the fines imposed in other cases, egg. upon Miltiades, Pericles, Timotheus.
21. aútol $\delta^{\prime}$ '̇үүvâodal: sc. фafív, to be supplied from $\kappa \in \lambda \epsilon$ v́ouvı. Their surety would relieve Socrates from imprisonment.
22. ${ }^{2} \xi$ เó $\chi \rho \epsilon$ : responsible, an assurane hardly needed in Crito's case.
XXIX. Here ends Socrates's $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \tau \iota ́-$ $\mu \eta \sigma \iota s$, and it was followed by the final vote of the court determining Sacrates's penalty. With this the case ends. Socrates has only to be led away to prison. See note on c. xxv. above, 35 d . See Introd. 35 and 36. In the address that follows, Socrates is out of order. He takes advantage of a slight delay to read a lesson to the court.
c 1. ova $\pi \mathrm{o} \lambda \lambda \mathrm{\lambda} 0 \hat{\mathrm{v}} \hat{\gamma}^{\prime}$ èv oka Xpóvov: a
compressed expression. By condemning Socrates, his judges, in order to rid themselves of him, have hastened his death by the few years which remaine to him; thus, to gain a short respite, they have done a great wrong.
2. övoцa é $\xi \in \tau \epsilon$ каi altiav: the name and the blame. See on rò övoна каl

 - $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ and ait aa $\sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$. See on $\pi \epsilon \pi \delta \nu^{\nu}$ $\theta a \tau \epsilon, 17$ a. Some periphrasis like
 by the Greeks to their somewhat cumbrows fut. pass. (of which there are only two examples in Homs.).
7. тóppo тov̂ $\beta$ hov: far on in life. For the gen. with advs. of place, see
 and near unto death. The contrast introduced by $\delta \epsilon$ is often so slight that but overtranslates it. $C f$. Yen. Syr. i. 5. 2, $\delta$ Kuagá $\rho \eta \mathrm{s}$ o $\tau o \hat{v}$ 'A $\sigma \tau v \alpha{ }^{\prime} \gamma o v s$















 An. i. 7. 9, єі̆тєр $\Delta \alpha \rho \epsilon i ́ o v ~ \grave{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{l}$ тaîs,
 $\lambda \dot{\eta} \psi о \mu a t$.
d
 i.e. in order to escape. The Greek idiom expresses not so much purpose as result. There really seems very little difference between this $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ with the inf. and an obj. clause with $\delta \pi \pi \omega$ and the fut. ind. GMT. 582 and 339 ; H. 953 and 885. Cf. Phaedr. $252 \mathbf{e}, \pi \hat{a} \nu$ тolov̂ซıl ö $\pi \omega \mathrm{s}$ тoloûtos (sc.


 $\approx \sigma \tau \epsilon \delta \iota \alpha \phi \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu, 39$ a below.
14. тó $\lambda \mu \eta \mathrm{s}$ : in its worst sense, like the Lat. a udacia. $C f$. $\epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \nu \quad \tau, s \tau o \lambda-$ $\mu \hat{a}, 39$ a below, and Crit. 53 e.
16. Өрךขov̂vтos ктє́.: a development of the idea in $\tau o \iota a \hat{v} \tau \alpha$, o $\hat{i} \stackrel{a}{a} \nu \tau \tau \dot{\epsilon}$. Here is a transition from the acc. of the thing (sound) heard to the gen. of
the person heard, unless $\theta \rho \eta \nu o \hat{v} \nu \tau o s .$. $\phi \eta \mu t$ is looked upon as a gen. absolute thrown in as an afterthought for the sake of a more circumstantial and clearer statement. For the facts, $c f$. Gorg. 522 d, where (evidently with reference to the point here made) Plato puts the following words into Socrates's mouth : $\epsilon i$ ठѐ кодакєк̂̂s $\dot{\rho} \eta \tau о \rho \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} s$ (rhetorical flattery) è $\nu \delta \epsilon i ́ a \quad \tau \in \lambda \epsilon \nu \tau \notin \eta \nu$ є $\gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon$, є

19. oưסヒ́v : see on où $\delta \epsilon ́ v, 34$ e. e
 way, etc., i.e. after such a defence. oütos above means as I have, and that idea is vividly repeated by $\widehat{\$ \delta \epsilon}$. Thus its contrast with ékeivas (sc. $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \lambda o \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu o s)$ is made all the more striking. - $\tau \epsilon \theta v a ́ v a t:$ see on $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu a \iota$, 30 c.
23. $\pi \hat{\alpha} v \pi o เ \hat{\nu}$ : by doing anything and everything. Cff. $\pi \alpha \nu o \hat{v} \rho \gamma o s, a \operatorname{ras}-$ cal. $C f: 38 \mathbf{d}$.

 àфєis каi є̀ $\phi$ ’ ікєтєía $\tau \rho а \pi о ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \delta \iota \omega к о ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu . ~ к а \grave{~}$












XXX．Tò $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \delta \grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau o \hat{\tau} \tau o ~ \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta v \mu \hat{\omega} \dot{v} \mu i \nu \quad \chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \omega \delta \hat{\eta}-$

28．$\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon: c f . \mu \eta \chi \alpha \nu \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ö ö $\omega \omega$ just above，and see on $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \pi o \phi v \gamma \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$ ， 38 d ．

29．$\mu$ ทे ．．．ท̂：substituted rhetori－ cally for a statement of fact．See on $\mu \grave{\eta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \mu \mu a \tau \alpha$ ？！，Crit． 48 c．For the idea of fearing implied，see GMT． 366.
 we should have $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \pi o \lambda \dot{\nu} \quad \chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega^{-}$
 Oavárov $\theta$ єî：flies faster than fate，to preserve the alliteration，which here， as often，is picturesque．For the thought，$c f$ ．Henry V．iv．1，＂Now if these men have defeated the law and outrun native punishment，though they can outstrip men，they have no wings to fly from God．＂In the thought that wickedness flies faster than fate，we have perhaps a remi－ niscence of Homer＇s description of ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~A} \tau \eta, I l$ ．ix． $505 \mathrm{ff} ., \dot{\eta} \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{A} \tau \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon \dot{\nu} \alpha \rho \eta \eta^{\prime}$




34．Өavátov $\delta<\kappa \eta \nu$ óф $\lambda \omega \dot{v}$ ：with b ò $\langle\lambda \iota \sigma \kappa \alpha \dot{\prime} \epsilon \nu$ ，whether used technically （as a law term）or colloquially，we find the crime or the penalty either （1）in the acc．or（2）in the gen．with or without $\delta i \kappa \eta \nu$ ．On the accent，see App．

36．кal є́ү⿳亠丷厂犬 ктє́．：i．e．they escape their punishment just as little as I escape mine．The каí before $\epsilon \delta \in \iota$ makes a climax：＂perhaps it was necessary for the matter actually to shape itself just as it really has．＂

37．$\sigma \chi \in i v:$ on the meaning of $\sigma \chi \in i \nu$ and $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ respectively，see on $\check{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ， 19 a．
 $\tau \delta \delta \epsilon$ is used adverbially；see on тঠ $\delta \epsilon$ ， 37 a．$\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \varphi \delta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ ，declare $a$ prophecy．













Methinks I am a prophet new-inspired, And thus expiring do foretell of him: His rash fierce blaze of riot cannot last, For violent fires soon burn out themselves.
4. ámєктóvatє: sc. by their verdict, and by the penalty which they voted after Socrates had made his coun-ter-proposition (of a penalty), à $\nu \tau \iota \tau l-$ $\mu \eta \mu \alpha$.
6. ol̃av є́pè áтєкто́varє: this is after the analogy of $\tau i \mu \omega \rho^{\prime} \alpha \nu \tau i \mu \omega \rho \in \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a i$ тıva, without some reminiscence of which it would hardly occur to any
 à $\pi \epsilon \kappa \tau \dot{o} \nu a \tau \epsilon$. à $\pi \epsilon \kappa \tau \delta \nu \alpha \tau \epsilon$ is substituted, as more vivid and concrete, for the expected $\tau \epsilon \tau \iota \mu \omega ́ \rho \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$. Similarly we have $\mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \chi \eta \nu \nu \iota \kappa \hat{\alpha} \nu$ or $\grave{\eta} \tau \tau \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta a \iota$ as more specific equivalents of $\mu d \chi \eta \nu \mu d \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$. - vv̂v: expresses reality. This use of $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ is akin to its very frequent use in contrast to a supposition contrary to fact (cf. 38 b, Lach. $184 \mathbf{d}$ and 200 e ); but here it is connected with a false account of what will come to pass, in contrast with the true prophecy of Socrates.
8.. $\tau \grave{\grave{c}} \mathrm{\delta è} \kappa \tau \epsilon \mathfrak{\epsilon}$.: for a similar idiom, though more strongly put, cf. Soph.
 prob. Socrates has in mind such cases as Homer mentions, Il. xvi. 851 ff ., where Patroclus as he dies prophesies truly to Hector, ov̌ $\theta \eta \nu$ où $\delta^{\prime}$
 $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \in \nu$ өávaтоs каl моîра кратаıи́, and xxii. 358 ff ., where Hector's last words foretell the killing of Achilles by Paris and Phoebus Apollo. $C f$. Verg. Aen. x. 739, -
Ille autem expirans: Non me, quicumque es, multo,
Victor, nec longum laetabere; te quoque fata Prospectant paria, atque eadem mox arva tenebris.
$C f$. also Xen. Cyr. viii. $7.21, \dot{\eta} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \tau o \hat{v}$

 $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon \tau \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu \pi \rho o o \rho a ̂ \cdot ~ \tau \delta \tau \epsilon$
 same idea is found in many literatures. $C f$. Brunhild in the song of Sigfried (Edda), -
I prithee, Gunther, sit thee here by me, For death is near and bids me prophecy.
See also John of Gaunt's dying speech, Rich.II. ii., - .



 $\nu o \iota s ~ \mu \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon v \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о$ à à $\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda a ́ \tau \tau о \mu \alpha \iota$.









 as Schanz has it. The position of $\neq \sigma \tau \iota$ near ov at the beginning of the clause justifies the accent. G. 144, 5 ; H. 480, 3.
 press no man, corresponding to the pre-

e XXXI. 2. $\mathbf{v \pi} \pi \dot{p}$ : has just the same meaning with $\pi \epsilon \rho i$. See L. and S. s.v. $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho$, fin. Socrates speaks about what has befallen him, which he looks upon as for the best since it is the will of Divine Providence. - oi ${ }^{\prime} p X o v \tau \epsilon s$ : sec Introd. 75, and cf. 37 c .
 were occupied with the arrangements for conveying Socrates to prison. For $\tau \in \theta \nu \alpha \dot{\nu} \alpha a l$, see on $\tau \in \theta \nu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \nu \alpha, 30$ c.
4. $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$ : used freq., for the sake of greater vivacity, before the imv. or subjv. of command. See on $\dot{\alpha}^{2} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ दُ $\mu \mathrm{ol}$ ктє́., Crit. 45 a.
 calm self-possession of Socrates, so strongly contrasted with the ordinary attitude of those under sentence of death.- $\delta \iota a \mu v \theta 0 \lambda 0 \gamma \eta \bar{\sigma} a l:$ more friendly and familiar than $\delta \notin a \lambda \epsilon \prime \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$. Thus Socrates prepares to open his heart upon matters not strictly relevant, which only those of whom he is fond and who care for him need hear. Cf. Phaed. 61 e, خ̀ $\sigma \omega s$ каl $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ трє́тєь
 $\pi \in \hat{\imath} \nu \quad \tau \in \kappa \alpha \mathfrak{l} \mu \nu \theta o \lambda o \gamma \in \hat{i} \nu \pi \in \rho l$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ à $\pi о \delta \eta \mu i ́ a s ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ e ̀ \kappa \epsilon i ̈, ~ \pi o i ́ a \nu ~ \tau ı \nu \grave{\alpha} ~ \alpha u ̀ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ oỉ $\mu \in \theta a$ eìval.
 $\dot{v} \mu$ is, 17 a.
 many short statements of fact crowd one upon the other. This serves to arrest the attention. The $\theta a \nu \mu \alpha \sigma t o ́ \nu$ $\tau \iota$ is that now, when Socrates has such a fate before him, the voice is silent, while previously, etc. See on $\delta \in \iota \nu \alpha ̀$ à $\nu$ єไ̈ทv. (fin.), 28 e.















 $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \xi \epsilon \iota \nu$.
10. $\dot{\eta}$ тoû $\delta a \iota \mu o v i o v: ~ s e e ~ o n ~ \delta a ı \mu b-~$ עıov, 31 d . See App.
 $\pi \alpha \rho '$ ò $\lambda i ́ \gamma o \nu, 36 \mathbf{a}$.
12. ó $\rho \theta \hat{\omega} s \pi \rho \dot{a}^{\xi} \xi \iota v$ : i.e. so that all would be for the best, an expression which is closely allied to $\epsilon \tilde{v} \pi \rho \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \epsilon \nu$. C.f. below c, à $\gamma \alpha \theta \partial \nu \pi \rho \alpha ́ \xi \in \nu \nu . \quad C f .45 \mathrm{~d}$.
 the idea expressed, and $\delta \dot{\eta}$ appeals to the patent fact. $C f$. $\phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa о \nu \tau \alpha ́ \gamma \in \delta \dot{\eta}$, Crit. 45 d. - каl... vоцічєтаи: a shift from act. to pass. Cf. Charm. 156 c,
 as $\nu o \mu i \zeta \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ expresses the opinion actually in vogue, it should be strengthened in translation by some adv.
14. $\epsilon \omega \theta \in v$ : in the morning. Cf. Xen. $A n$. iv. 4.8 ; vi. 3.23 ; and Hom. Od. i. 372.
17. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda a x \circ$ ō $\delta \eta^{\prime}:$ in many situa- $\frac{40}{\mathbf{b}}$ tions, and hence, ofter.
18. $\lambda \in ́ y o v \tau a ~ \mu \epsilon \tau a \xi v i: ~ f o r ~ t h i s ~ a n d ~$ other advs. with the temporal partic., see G. 1572 ; H. 976 . Usually $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \xi \dot{u}$ is prefixed, not appended.
19. $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\rho} \tau \alpha v ́ \tau \eta \nu \tau \grave{\eta} v \pi \rho a \hat{\xi} t v:$ in regard to this whole affair, referring to the whole trial, and including everything that led up to it.
20. ข่ $\pi о \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ v \omega$ : not subjv., since there is no question of doubt. The question is only a vivid fashion of speech, of which Plato is very fond.
22. $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \mathrm{e}$ is : to be cannected immediately with örou. This use of the pron. gives a genial color to the a whele; in Eng. we should use a partitive expression, all those among us.
25. $\epsilon_{\mu}^{\prime} \mu \lambda \lambda о \nu$ : referring definitely to $\mathbf{c}$








 of continued action. $\quad C f$. Xen. $A n$. v. 8. 13, $\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \delta \grave{̀}$ тov̂to $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ é $\pi o \iota o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$ (had done), ä $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon s \not \partial \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \omega \lambda \lambda \not \partial \mu \theta \alpha$. For the facts, see Introd. 27, fin.
XXXII. 1. kal $\tau \mathfrak{\eta} \delta \epsilon$ : after an argument based upon the silence of his inner voice, Socrates considers the question upon its merits.
2. єival: not $\underset{\epsilon}{\boldsymbol{\prime}} \sigma \in \sigma \theta$ al. G. 1286 ; H. 948 a. Cf. Hom. Il. ix. 40, $\delta a!\mu \delta \nu l^{\prime}$,

 àropévets; Cf. also Il. xiii. 309, èmel


3. oîov $\mu \eta \delta \in ̀ v$ € $โ v a l: ~ w i t h o u t ~ d e f i-~$ nitely expressed subj. (cf. ỗo à àoo $\eta$ $\mu \hat{\eta} \sigma a t$ in e below), to be dead is as to be nothing, i.e. its nature is such that a man when dead is nothing.
 (not of $\epsilon i \nu a \iota$ ), which is an after-thought.- кaтà $\tau \grave{\alpha} \lambda \in \gamma o ́ \mu \in \nu a$ : Socrates associates his idea of the life hereafter with stories and traditions which are themselves a development of Homer's utterances about the 'H $\lambda \hat{\prime} \sigma t o \nu \quad \pi \in \delta i o \nu$ and Hesiod's account of the $\mu \alpha \kappa \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho \omega \nu$ $\nu \eta$ चool. The later poets, e.g. Pindar, continued what Homer and Hesiod began. And Pindar, furthermore, in-
corporates into his descriptions of life after death Orphic and Pythagorean accounts of metempsychosis. Here and in the Phaedo ( 70 c-72 a) Socrates appeals to a $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha i \partial s ~ \lambda \sigma \gamma o s$.
5. $\tau \hat{n} \psi v \times n \hat{n}: ~ a ~ d a t . ~ o f ~ i n t e r e s t . ~$ G. 1165 ; H. 771. The gen. would express the subject of the action designated. - тov̂ тómov: governed by $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \beta o \lambda \grave{\eta} \kappa a l \mu \epsilon \tau o i ́ \kappa \eta \sigma \iota s$. Of these two the latter repeats the former in more specific form. The gen. corresponds to the acc. with $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ and (rarely) $\mu є \tau о \kappa \epsilon i ̂ \nu . ~ C f$. Theaet. 181 с, д̈ $\tau \alpha \nu \tau$

 vavpaұias, 32 b. See also App. - каl $\epsilon 火 \tau \epsilon$ : the second member is introduced by $\epsilon i \delta \alpha \hat{i}$ in line 19 .
7. oilov üாvos: $c f$. Hom. Od. xiii.

 ă $\gamma \chi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ є̇оıка́s.
8. кє́p $\delta o s:$ not à $\gamma a \theta \delta \nu$, because Soc. d rates does not consider such a condition as in itself a good.
9. aٌv oโนal: à $\nu$ belongs to $\epsilon \dot{u} \rho \in i \nu$, and on account of the length of the prot. is repeated first with oî $\mu \mathrm{a} \iota$ in 14 , and again just before the inf.; similarly $\delta$ 白o is twice used in the prot. See on


















 two partics. coupled by каí are subordinated to $\sigma \kappa \in \psi \alpha ́ \mu \in \nu=\nu$, just as it is subordinated in turn to eimeiv. See on ö $\boldsymbol{\tau} \iota \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \chi \theta \alpha \nu \delta \mu \eta \nu, 21 \mathbf{e}$.
 of any one in private station, no, not the Great King, etc. à $\lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ is used here to introduce a climax. See H. 1035 a.
e 16. aútóv: this pron. gives a final touch of emphasis to $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$ ́a. Socrates talks of the king of Persia in the strain which was common among Greeks in his day. Polus, in the Gorgias ( 470 e), is startled because Socrates refuses to take it for granted that the king of Persia is happy.
 үap $\kappa \tau \epsilon$.: for thus the whole of time appears no more than a single night, etc.
named in the Gorgias as the ministers of justice in the world below. In Dante's Inferno (v. 4-17) Minos, curi-
20. ws äpa: a conclusion derived immediately from the admission that death is a migration from earth to some other place.
23. Sıкабт $\omega$ v: for case, see G. 931 ; H. 940 a.
25. Miv $\kappa \kappa \kappa \epsilon$.: connected grammatically with the rel. sent. rather than with rois $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau a$ s. Cf. Phaed.

 $\sigma \in \omega s, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \grave{\alpha} \nu \quad \tau \in \lambda \epsilon \nu \tau \dagger \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \bar{\nu} \kappa \tau \epsilon \in$. The three first mentioned, Minos, Rhadamanthys, and Aeacus, were sons of manthys, and Aeacus, were sons of
Zeus, and while living had earned great fame by their scrupulous observance of justice. They are also
a






 long tail, still fulfills the same duties,-
... When the spirit evil.born Cometh before him, wholly it confesses; And this discriminator of transgressions Seeth what place in Hell is meet for it; Girds himself with his tail as many times As grades he wishes it should be tbrust down.
In Ar. Frogs, Aeacus is Pluto's footman. For a painting representing the judges of the underworld,seeGerhard's Vasenbilder, plate 239. - Tpırтó入єцоs: a son of Eleusis, glorified in the traditions of Demeter $\theta \in \sigma \mu \circ \not \subset$ б́pos. He was the disseminator of intelligent agriculture. Plato uses here the freedom which characterizes all his mythical digressions, and adapts the myth to the point which he desires to make. $\delta_{\text {red }} \hat{\zeta}_{\epsilon}, \nu$ implies action in two capacities: (1) as judge, pronouncing upon the deeds and misdeeds of every soul that has lived and died (this is the account of Minos in the Gorgias), and (2) as king and legislator. Cf. Hom. Od. xi. 568 ff ., where Minos is shown
 $\nu$ е́кvoriv. Probably here the prevailing idea is that of king and legislator. Homer (Od. iv. 564 ff .) places Rhadamanthys among the blessed in the Elysian fields.
 saeus with Homer and Hesiod were honored as the most ancient bards and seers of Greece.
28. $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \pi l \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\pi} \sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma} \omega:$ price stated in the form of a condition. - The repetition of $a \nu$ has an effect comparable to the repeated neg. The first ă $\nu$ is connected with the most important word of the clause, while the second takes the place naturally belonging to $a \check{a} \nu$ in the sent. GMT. 223. Cf. 31 a.
29. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ ákıs $\tau \in$ tvával: $c f$. Dem. ix.
 Cf. 30 c.
 more particularly.
31. osтóte: when (if at any tine) $I \mathbf{b}$ met.
 plius, a king in Euboea. The wisdom of Palamedes provoked the jealousy of Odysseus, Diomedes, and Agamemnon, and was his ruin. Acc. to the post-homeric story Odysseus plotted so successfully, by forging a message to Palamedes from Priam, that Palamedes was suspected of treason and stoned by the Greeks. Cf. Verg. Aen. 82 ff . and Ov . Met. xiii. 56 ff . The title is preserved of a lost tragedy by Sophocles called Palamedes and of one by Euripides. The fate of Ajax is well known through Hom. Od. xi. 541 ff . See also Met. xiii. and the Ajax of Sophocles.
 asyndeton (H. 1039), which occurs not infrequently where as here a sent. is thrown in by way of explanation.




 $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \sigma \tau \rho a \tau i \alpha ̀ \nu \hat{\eta}$ 'O




 $\epsilon \gtreqless \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \dot{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha$ ả $\eta \theta \hat{\eta}$.
moí is easily supplied from the preceding $\epsilon \mu о г \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$. The partic. is used as with $\eta \delta \delta \sigma \theta a l$, to which oùk à $\nu \dot{a} \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} s$ $\epsilon^{\prime} \eta$ i $\eta$ is substantially equivalent. $C f$. also the partic. with impers. expressions like $\check{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \nu$ Ł̇ $\sigma \tau \iota, \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu о \iota$, etc.
35. kal $\delta \grave{\eta}$ тò $\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma เ \sigma \tau 0 v:$ and what after all is the greatest thing. Then follows, in the form of a clause in apposition, explanation of the $\mu^{\prime}$ $\gamma \iota \sigma \tau o \nu$. The whole is equivalent to
 $\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ (with an indef. personal subj.). See on oîov $\mu \eta \delta \grave{j} \nu \in \bar{l} \nu a l, 40$ c.
 it represents ós $\grave{j \gamma \epsilon}$. GMT. 140 ; H. 856 a. Cf. Tim. 25 b c, where the fabled might of prehistoric Athens is
 $\kappa \rho \alpha \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ Ł̇ $\pi เ \partial ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \quad \tau \rho o ́ \pi \alpha \iota \alpha$ є̀ $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma \sigma$. This loose use of the impf. instead of the aor. is not uncommion where extreme accuracy is not aimed at.
c
39. ミícuфov: cf. Hom. Il. vi. 153 ff ., Od. xi. 593 ff . - The most comprehensive clause, ì... $\gamma v \nu \alpha i ̂ \kappa \alpha s$, escapes from the grammatical const., a not uncommon irregularity. Cf. Gorg. $483 \mathbf{d e}$ e,


 $\tau о \iota \alpha \hat{\nu} \tau \alpha$ $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$.
40. oîs $\delta \iota a \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \in \sigma \theta a l$ kal $\xi u v \in i ̂ v a l ~ k a l ~$ $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \tau \alpha \mathfrak{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau$ : when verbs governing different cases have the same object, the Greek idiom, usually expresses the object once only, and then in the case governed by the nearest verb.
41. $\alpha_{\mu} \eta_{X}$ avov $\epsilon$ vंठaluovias: more blessed then tongue can tell. Cf. Theaet. $175 \mathrm{a}, \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \tau о \pi \alpha$ а̀े $\tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \phi а \stackrel{\nu}{\nu} \tau \tau \alpha \iota ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\sigma \mu$ ккоолоүias (pettifogging), and Rep. viii. 567 e , where $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$, something like which is probably implied in the above cases, is expressed, $\bar{\eta} \mu а к \alpha$ -

 $\mu \eta \nu \ldots \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu \chi \chi \lambda \epsilon \pi \dot{\partial} \nu \tau 0 \hat{v} \beta$ íov $\hat{\eta}^{\alpha} \pi \hat{\omega} S$

42. $\pi \alpha^{\prime} v \tau \omega \mathrm{~s}$ ov่ $\delta \mathfrak{\eta} \pi \mathrm{Tov}$ : in any event, we knou that they kill no man there, etc. - тov́тov $\gamma \in$ ëvєкa: spoken pointedly and not without an intended thrust at those who voted his death; the reason given certainly proves more than the point here made.












XXXIII. 2. '̇v rı тоvิтo: this one thing above all. The position of $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau o$, coming as it does after instead of before ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \nu \tau \iota$, is very emphatic.
 pf. is used, because to speak of the completion of the change, i.e. to be dead, is the most forcible way of putting the idea. $\pi \rho \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu a r a$ applies to the trouble and the unrest of a busy life.
7. $\beta$ édtıov ท̂v: Socrates considers the whole complication of circumstances in which he is already involved, or in which he must, if he lives, sooner or later be involved. Deliverance from this he welcomes as a boon. Cf. $39 \mathbf{b}$. - $\delta$ เà $\tau 0$ v̂тo $\kappa \tau \hat{\epsilon} .:$ $c f .40$ a c. Socrates argued from the silence of $\tau \delta \delta \alpha, \mu \delta \dot{\nu} \iota o \nu$ that no evil was in store for him when he went before the court. This led him to conclude that his death could be no harm. On further consideration, he is confirmed in this, because death is never a harm. Applying this principle to his own actual circumstances, its truth becomes the more manifest, so that, finally, he can explain why the divine
voice was silent. Contrast the opposite view expressed by Achilles (Hom. Od. xi. 489 ff.), and in Eur. 1. A. 12491252, where Iphigenia, pleading for

 $\sigma \tau o \nu \beta \lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon \nu, \mid \tau \grave{a} \nu \epsilon \epsilon \rho \theta \in \delta^{\prime}$ où $\delta \epsilon \in \nu$.
 $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu \kappa \rho \in \hat{\imath} \sigma \sigma O \nu \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} s \theta \alpha \nu \in \hat{\imath} \nu$.
11. $\beta \lambda a ́ \pi \tau \epsilon เ \nu: ~ u s e d ~ a b s . ~ w i t h o u t ~$ acc. of the person or of the thing, because the abstract idea of doing harm is alone required. - тоข̂то . . . ä $\xi$ เov $\mu \dot{\mu} \mu \phi \in \sigma \theta a \mathrm{a}$ : so far it is fair to
 $\epsilon \in \delta \xi \epsilon \nu$ a $\tau \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, this ...about them; and $c f$.
 $\kappa \tau \epsilon$. They deserve blame for their malicious intention and for the reason given in $29 \mathbf{b}$. - agtov: it is fair. Cf. e
 $\mu \eta \nu \stackrel{\ominus}{\epsilon} \chi \in L \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\prime}$.
12. тобóvסє $\mu \in ́ v \tau \sigma$ : " although they certainly are far from wishing me well, yet I ask so much as a favor," i.e. so little that they can well afford to grant it. Then follows an explanation of $\tau 0 \sigma \delta \nu \delta \epsilon$.








 $\pi \rho \hat{\gamma} \gamma \mu \alpha, \alpha{ }^{2} \delta \eta \lambda o \nu \pi \alpha \nu \tau \grave{\imath} \pi \lambda \eta{ }_{\eta} \nu \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\varphi} \hat{\theta} \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega}$.

41
e


 $\sigma \tau o \nu, 30$ e.
18. $\delta$ (каса $\pi \epsilon \pi о v \theta \omega ́ s: ~ t o ~ b e ~ u n d e r-~$ stood in the light of ce. xviii. and xxvi. Socrates looks upon what is usually taken as the most grievous injury as the greatest possible blessing.
 $\kappa \tau \epsilon \in . \quad C f$. Crit. 50 e. $C f$. Soph. O. C.


20. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{a} \rho \kappa \tau \epsilon$. : serves to close the
speech, giving at the same time the $\begin{gathered}42 \\ \text { a }\end{gathered}$ reason for coming to an end.
22. $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} v{ }_{\eta}$ : pleonastic like $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ 方 in 20 d. See App. - $\boldsymbol{\omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ : $c f$. the subtly ironical way in which the same thought is put in the Euthyphro (3de), where, speaking of his accusers, Socrates says, $\epsilon i \hat{i} \epsilon \dot{\nu}$ oủ̀,$\delta \nu \hat{v} \nu \delta \hat{\eta}$




 $\pi \lambda \eta \nu \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$ тô̂s $\mu d \nu \tau \in \sigma เ \nu$. See. on $\alpha \rho \iota \sigma \tau \alpha, 35 \mathrm{~d}$.

## П $\Lambda$ AT $\Omega$ NOE KPIT $\Omega$.

## TA TO؟ $\triangle I A \Lambda O \Gamma O \Upsilon ~ П Р O \Sigma \Omega П A$

$$
\Sigma \Omega \text { K P A T H } \Sigma, \quad \text { K P I T } \Omega \text { N. }
$$

St. 1. p. 43.
 є́ $\sigma \tau i ́ \nu$;

KР. Пá $\nu v \mu$ èv oûv.
$\Sigma \Omega$. Пŋріка $\mu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$;
5. KP. "O $\rho \theta \rho o s \beta a \theta$ v́s.
 $\phi u ́ \lambda \alpha \xi$ vimaкоиิ $\sigma \alpha$.


$\Sigma \Omega .{ }^{*} А \rho \tau \iota \delta \epsilon ̀ ~ \eta ้ \kappa \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \hat{\eta} \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \iota ;$

1. $\mathrm{K}_{\rho}(\tau \omega v$ : see Introd. 62. See on Apol. 33 d, fin., and $c f .38$ b, fin.
2. $\pi \eta \nu$ кка $\mu{ }^{\prime} \lambda_{1 \sigma \tau a}$, about what time is it? In Lat. maxime and admodum are so used, e.g. locus patens ducentos maxime pedos, Liv. x. 38. 5; locus in pedum mille admodum altitudinem abruptus, id. xxi. 36. 2.
3. őpfoos $\beta$ ävis: the adj. limits ú $\rho \theta \rho o s$, so that the whole expression means rather the end of night than the beginning of day. $C f$. the time when the Protagoras begins (310 a),
 Ba日白os ö $\rho \theta \rho o u$. The description in the same dialogue of young Hippocrates feeling his way through the dark to Socrates's bedside shows that úp $\theta \rho o s$
ßaOús means, just before daybreak. Cf. Xen. $A n$. iv. 3.8 ff., where Xenophon

 ėvóovio. Here ö $\rho \theta \rho o s$ means the dark before the dawn. $C f$. also $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \iota \lambda \delta \kappa \eta$



4. $\dot{\eta} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon$ vimakov̂бal: did not refuse to let you in. $\quad C f$. Xen. An. i. 3. 8 for oùk $\eta \theta \in \lambda \epsilon$, he refused. With íma$\kappa o \hat{\sigma} \sigma a!, c f$. Acts xii. 13, and Xen. Symp.



5. кal...кal ктé: and what is more, I've done a little something for him. $\tau l$ is equiv. to $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \sigma i \alpha \nu \tau \iota \nu \alpha \alpha^{\prime}(a \mathrm{tip})$.

KP. 'Е $\pi \iota \epsilon \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \varsigma \pi a ́ \lambda a \iota$.
 тарака́ ${ }_{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \iota$;




 $\nu \iota \sigma \alpha$ тồ $\tau \rho o ́ \pi o v, \pi o \lambda \grave{v} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \nu \nu \hat{v} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \omega \sigma \sigma \eta$










12. €íca: refers to $\epsilon \pi t є เ \kappa \hat{\omega} s \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha a$ in a vein of wonder or perhaps of gentle reproof.
14. ov́ $\mu \mathbf{\alpha}$ тòv $\Delta$ ía: the neg. belonging to the clause that follows is inserted by anticipation in the oath. The answer to Socrates's question is implied clearly in the use of ov̀ $\delta \epsilon$, and becomes categorical in каl द̀ $\pi i \tau \eta \delta \epsilon s$ $\kappa \tau \in$.
 $\tau \epsilon$ is introduced after qoбaúr $\eta$, which belongs to both substs. This position of $\tau \epsilon$ is very common after the art. or a prep. - ${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ кal: but furthermore.
17. đva סLáyns: for the subjv. after
a secondary tense, see GMT. 318 ; ${ }^{43}$ H. 881 a.
18. єv่ठaццóvเซa тоv̂ трómov: for the gen. of cause, see G. 1126; H. 744. At the end of the sentence, a clause with $\omega s$ (equiv. to ö $\tau \iota$ ov́ $\tau \omega$ ) is introduced in place of the gen. - For the facts, see Introd. 36 and note 6, p. 26.
21. $\pi \lambda_{\eta \mu \mu \in \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon_{s}: ~ c f . ~ A p o l . ~}^{22} \mathbf{d}$ and see on $\epsilon \mu \mu \epsilon \lambda \omega \hat{\omega}$, Apol. 20 c.
 is here qualified by ov $\delta \delta \epsilon \in$, and is used in the sense of preventing. Hence the doubled neg. GMT. 95, 2, n. 1 b; H. 1034 .
29. кal $\chi$ a $\lambda \epsilon \pi \dot{\eta} v$ кal $\beta$ apєíav: an effective and almost pathetic reitera-
 $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ àфıконє́vov $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu$ ávaı $\mu \epsilon$;





II. $\Sigma \Omega$. 'А $\lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}, \hat{\omega}$ Крíт $\omega \nu$, $\tau v ́ \chi \eta$ à $\gamma a \theta \hat{\eta}$. єi $\tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~$
 $\mu \epsilon \rho о \nu$. tion of the first $\chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi \dot{\eta} \nu$, made all the stronger by the doubled $\kappa a$ i.
 in Hdt., Thuc., Plato, and later writers, ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{2} \nu \tau o i s$, about, is idiomatically used to limit the superl. Thus $\underset{\epsilon}{e} \nu$ toîs becomes an adverb, which describes not absolute precedence but an average and comparative superiority. $C f$. Thuc. iii. ${ }_{17}$, द̇ $\nu$ roîs $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ eí $\tau a t$, among the most numerous (not 'the very most numerous,' since Thuc. adds that the number was exceeded once) where the gender of $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \tau a t$ is noticeable. $C f$. also id. i. 6. 3, $\frac{\epsilon}{} \nu$, $\tau 0 i ̂ s ~ \pi \rho \bar{\omega} \tau o l \delta \hat{\epsilon}$
 Here the position of $\delta \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime}$ shows that $\bar{\epsilon} \nu$ $\tau 0 i ̂ s ~ \pi \rho \omega \hat{\omega} \tau o \iota$ is taken almost as one word, i.e. $\pi \rho \hat{\omega}$ тol limited so as to mean practically the first, or substantially the first of those who laid down, etc.
31. tiva tavitqu: connect with $\phi$ '́$\rho \omega \nu$ above. For $\hat{\eta}$, see on $\eta \delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o \nu$, Apol.



 to be sacrificed to the Minotaur) $\varphi_{\chi} \chi \in \tau$


 emn embassy) $\alpha \pi \alpha \xi \xi \epsilon \nu$ єis $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu \cdot \hat{\eta} \nu \delta \eta$
 (every twelvemonth) $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \in \hat{\varphi} \pi \epsilon \prime \mu \pi o v \sigma \iota \nu$. $\epsilon \in \pi \epsilon t \delta a ̀ \nu$ oủ $\nu \not ้ \rho \xi \omega \nu \tau \alpha t$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\theta \in \omega \rho i a s, \nu \delta \mu o s$
 $\epsilon \iota \nu \tau \eta ̀ \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$ каl $\delta \eta \mu о \sigma$ ix $\mu \eta \delta \in ́ \nu a$ à $\pi o-$ $\kappa \tau \iota \nu \nu$ '́val (to put no one to death by public execution), $\pi \rho i \nu$ \& $\nu$ єis $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ à $\phi$ i-
 Cf. Introd. 36.
 30 c.
33. Soкєi $\mu \in \dot{\nu}$ : with no following $\delta \epsilon$. In such cases the original affinity of $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ with $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ is usually apparent. Its meaning is, indeed, surely.
35. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \dot{\lambda} \omega \nu$ : can hardly have been written by Plato, since ă $\gamma \gamma \in \lambda$ os in the sense of ${ }^{2} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda^{\prime} a$ is not used except by later writers (Polybius), while $\epsilon \kappa$ prevents us from taking ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu$ as referring to persons. See App.
 it's all for the best, Crito. d̀ $\lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ introduces in vivid contrast to Crito's despondency the cheerful hope of Socrates. - $\tau \boldsymbol{v} x \boldsymbol{a} \dot{\alpha} y a \theta \hat{n}$ : a hopeful invocation often prefixed to a solemn statement. Cf. Symp. 177 e , à à ${ }^{2}$ à $\tau \dot{\chi} \chi \eta$ à $\gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\eta}$ катар $\bar{\epsilon} \tau \omega$ Фаїঠpos, let Phaedrus make a beginning and good luck to him. Used freq. like the

KР. Пó $\theta \epsilon \nu$ тои̂то $\tau \epsilon \kappa \mu \alpha i \rho \epsilon \iota$;












${ }^{43}$ Lat. quod bonum felix faustumque sit, or quod bene ver-
 $\beta \in \lambda \tau\{\omega \cdot \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \pi о \iota \epsilon i ̄ \tau \epsilon$ à $\gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\eta}$ тú $\chi \eta$. Cf. also the comic perversion of it in Ar. Av. 436, крє $\mu \dot{a} \sigma a \tau o \nu \tau \dot{v} \chi \grave{a} \gamma а \theta \hat{p} \mid$ '́s $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$
 the most formal use of this word, see many inscriptions and the decree, Thuc. iv. 118. 11, ^áx $\eta s$ єìm $\tau u ́ x \eta$
 piav (armistice). In Xen. Hell. iv. i. 14, it is used of a betrothal: $\bar{\epsilon} \mu o l{ }_{\mu}^{\dot{\epsilon} \nu} \nu \tau 0$ -






 premiss that follows the conclusion stated above in où $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau o t \geqslant \eta \xi \in \epsilon \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon-$ pov, the second is contained in the account of the dream.
7. oi тoútcv кúpoo: see Introd. 75, and cf. Apoul. 39 e.

same as $\tau \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \rho \nu$, for Socrates is now thinking of the fact that day has not yet dawned. See on üp $\theta \rho o s \beta a \theta$ ús, 43 a.
10. тavitns $\tau \hat{1} \mathrm{~s}$ vukтós : in the course of this night. The vision came after midnight, a circumstance of the greatest importance, according to Mosch.


 Hor. Sat. i. ıo. 32 ff. ,-

Atque ego cum Graecos facerem, natus mare citra,
Versiculos, vetuit me tali vace Quirinus Post mediam noctem visus, cum somnia vera.
 by the shorter $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu} \kappa$ кatp $\bar{\psi}$, opportunely.
 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$. The $\tau l s$ has the effect of a
 there is good und sufficient reason for it.
15. ทึцать ктє.: quoted from Hom. ${ }^{\text {b }}$
 $\beta \omega \lambda$ о ікот $\mu \eta \nu$.
 which nearly approaches the form of a regular sent. Cf. Hom. II. i. 231,









 d $\nu \mathrm{d} \sigma \sigma \sigma \epsilon t s$ ，and ibid．v．403，$\sigma \chi \epsilon ́ \tau \lambda \iota o s$ ，



17．Є̇vapyès $\mu \grave{\mathrm{c} v}$ ov̂v：it is surely plain enough，immo evidens．The full meaning can hardly be under－ stood without reading the context of the verse（363）which is quoted．$C f$ ． Hom．Il．ix．，vv．356－368．Socrates thinks of dying as going home，and Phthia was the home of Achilles． － $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime} \mu \mathrm{ol}:$ not $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \mathrm{ol}$ ．The emphasis falls on the verb rather than on the


III．1． $\mathfrak{\omega}$ סaupóvtє：most excellent， meaning about the same as $\bar{\alpha} \theta \alpha \nu \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \iota \epsilon$ ， or え $\mu а к \alpha ́ \rho เ \epsilon$, rather stronger than $\dot{\omega} \gamma a \theta \epsilon \in$ ．Of course no color of irony is given here．$C f$. Symp． $219 \mathrm{~b}, \tau o v \tau \hat{\varphi} \tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\delta a!\mu \nu \nu i \omega$ ف̀s à $\lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$ каl $\theta a v \mu a \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}$ ，and Gorg． 456 a，where Socrates is speak－ ing of the scope（ $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu s)$ of rhetoric：

 סaıubvios，which was used by Homer only in addressing persons，received from Pindar an enlarged meaning，so as to include whatever proceeds from the gods．This was adopted by Att．writers， and of course its adoption involved applying it to things．Plato still further enlarged the ground which it
covers．In addressing persons，he gives it a flattering or an ironical implication；applied to things，he uses it for what is extraordinary，super－
 Apol． 27 d．

2．${ }^{\prime \prime} \tau \iota$ кal $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ ：this gives a hint as to what Crito has planned．It is devel－ oped later．See Introd． 62.

3．$\xi \cup \mu \phi o \rho a ́ ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau เ v: ~ m o r e ~ v i v i d ~ a n d ~$

＇̇тし סє́：quite apart from my losing，etc． ．．I shall further，etc．See App．

4．$\epsilon \sigma \tau \in \rho \bar{\sigma} \sigma \theta$ al：the pf ．inf．with
 où $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi o \tau \epsilon$＇$\tau \iota \nu a$ ，and so here with the fut．indic．，$I$ shall certainly never，etc． GMT．295；H． 1032.

6．ws olós $\tau \epsilon$ ఱ̈v $\kappa \tau \epsilon \in$. ：I shall seem to many to have neglected you whereas $I$ was able to save you．olós $\tau \epsilon \grave{\omega} \sigma \alpha^{\prime} \zeta_{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu$ represents oîds $\tau \epsilon \bar{\eta} \nu \sigma \omega \zeta_{\epsilon \iota \nu, I} I$ might have saved you，if I had wished．GMT． 421 ；H． 897.

8．$\eta$ そ Soкєîv．．．$\phi$（ $\lambda$ ous：explaining e $\tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta s$ ，which covers．an idea already contained in what precedes．Cf．Gorg

 which what would a man be more in－ clined to pursue with diligence）．．．介 тоиิтo，$\delta \nu \tau \iota \nu \alpha \chi \rho \grave{\eta} \tau \rho \delta \pi \sigma о \nu$ ऽ $\eta \nu \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$. Where the gen．after a comp．is a dem，or
ov̉ $\gamma$ à $\rho \pi \epsilon i ́ \sigma o \nu \tau a \iota ~ o i ́ ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda o i ̀ ~ \omega ं s ~ \sigma u ̀ ~ a v ̉ \tau o ̀ s ~ o v ̉ k ~ \grave{\eta} \theta \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha s ~ 44$



 $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{a} \nu \pi \rho a \chi \theta \hat{\eta}$.

 $\nu v \nu i ́, ~ o ̀ \tau \iota ~ o i ̂ o i ́ ~ \tau \epsilon ́ ~ \epsilon i \sigma \iota \nu ~ o i ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda o i ̀ ~ o v ̉ ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \sigma \mu \iota к \rho o ́ \tau \alpha \tau \alpha ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 aủroîs $\delta \iota \alpha \beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o s$ ग̂.
$20 \Sigma \Sigma$. Eỉ $\gamma$ à $\rho \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda o \nu, \hat{\omega} \mathrm{~K} \rho i ́ \tau \omega \nu$, oiooí $\tau \epsilon \epsilon i \hat{\nu} a \iota$ oi $\pi o \lambda \lambda o i ̀$ $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ какà $\epsilon \rho \gamma a ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, ${ }^{\circ} \nu \alpha$ oioioí $\tau \epsilon \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$ каì ả $\gamma \alpha \theta \grave{\alpha}$

 ठढ̀ $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau o$ ö $\tau \iota \stackrel{a}{a} \nu \tau u ́ \chi \omega \sigma \iota \nu$.
 $\kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \in \mu o \iota \cdot \hat{\alpha} \rho a ́ \gamma \epsilon \mu \grave{\eta}$ є́ $\mu о \hat{v} \pi \rho о \mu \eta \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \kappa \alpha i ̀ \tau \omega \nu \nu a ̈ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ with the inf., cf. Eur. Her. 297) introduced by $\eta$, may always be appended. $C f .53 \mathrm{~b} \mathbf{c}$.
 $\lambda^{\prime} \gamma \omega$, Apol. 20 e. The aor. subjv. has the force of the fut. pf. GMT. 90 ; H. 898 c.
15. ópâs $\delta \boldsymbol{\eta}$ : Crito means to point at the case in hand. "The fact is that the many are really in a position, etc." Crito has profited but iittle by what Socrates has said in the court-room. $C f$. Apol. $30 \mathrm{~d}, 34 \mathrm{e}, 40 \mathrm{a}$, etc.
d
 the object of which is not attained. Yva oioó $\tau \in \bar{\eta} \sigma a \nu$ expresses an unattained purpose depending on the preceding unfulfilled wish. GMT. 333;
H. 884. See on oे ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu, A$ pol. 20 a. ${ }^{4}$
21. 'ipyd́fer $\begin{gathered}\text { ar : serves as a repeti- }\end{gathered}$ tion of ${ }^{\xi} \xi \in \rho \gamma \dot{\alpha} \oint^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ above. Such repetition of the simple verb is common. $C f .49 \mathbf{c d}$ and $L y s .209 \mathbf{c}, \tau i \pi o \tau^{\prime}$ t $\nu \in \iota_{\eta}$


22. кал $\bar{\omega} \mathrm{s} \kappa \tau \mathcal{\epsilon}$.: indeed (i.e. if this wish were granted) it would be delightful. - vôv $\delta \epsilon \in:$ introduces the fact. Supply $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \dot{\xi} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ here, and $\pi о \iota \eta=a \nu \tau \epsilon s$
 and rel. sents. $\tau v \gamma \chi \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \nu$ may be used without the partic., which is always suggested by the leading clause.
IV. 2. ${ }^{\text {¿pá }} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu \eta^{\prime}$ : like $\mu \dot{\eta}$ alone e (Apol. 25 a), ìpa $\mu \eta$ looks for a neg. answer, but it may also (see on $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}, 45 \mathrm{e}$ ) convey an insinuation that in spite






 $10 \kappa \alpha i ̀ \mu \grave{\eta} \stackrel{a}{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega s \pi o i ́ \epsilon \iota$ ．
$\Sigma \Omega$ ．К $\alpha i$ т $\alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \pi \rho о \mu \eta \theta o \hat{v} \mu \alpha \iota, \hat{\omega} \mathrm{~K} \rho i ́ \tau \omega \nu, \kappa \alpha i \quad \stackrel{a}{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ $\pi o \lambda \lambda \alpha ́$.




of the expected denial the facts really would justify an affirmative answer； you surely don＇t，though I imagine you do， is Crito＇s meaning．The $\mu$＇，which fol－ lows $\pi \rho o \mu \eta \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ is obviously connected with the notion of anxiety in that verb．The same idea is again pre－ sented in фовєi（are fearful）below． The subjv．$\pi \alpha \rho \hat{\epsilon} \chi \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ conveys an idea of action indefinitely continued，where－ as $\grave{\epsilon} \xi \in \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \eta_{s}$ and $\grave{\alpha} \nu a \gamma \kappa \alpha \sigma \theta \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ denote simply the occurrence of the action．

8．Síkaıoí $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \kappa \tau \epsilon \in .:$ see on $\delta i-$ кaıós єímı，Apol． 18 a．
 no，no！do as $I$ say．d̀̀ $\lambda \alpha$＇with the imv．introduces a demand or a request made in opposition to an expressed re－ fusal or to some unwillingness merely implied or feared．This vigorous re－ quest is reinforced by the neg．$\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ moíti，do this and do not do that．Cf． 46 a．

13．$\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon$ ：the second clause，which we miss here，appears below（b）in the resumptive statement ö $\boldsymbol{\pi} \epsilon \rho \lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma \omega, \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$
$\kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} .-\phi \circ \beta \circ \hat{\text { in }}$ reiterating $\phi o \beta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ above， be fearful．It is a part of Crito＇s char－ acter to return again and again to his point．$\quad C f .43 \mathrm{~d}$ ，and see Introd． 62. Further he had here a welcome oppor－ tunity for airing his grievances against the sycophants（blackmailers）．Crito had been himself the victim of these rascals until he found a vigorous friend，＇A $\rho \chi \epsilon ́ \delta \eta \mu о \nu, \pi \alpha ́ \nu v \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ iка $\nu \partial \nu \in i-$ $\pi \epsilon i \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha l$ $\pi \rho \hat{\rho} \xi \alpha \alpha, \pi \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \tau \alpha$ $\delta \epsilon$ ，as Xeno－ phon puts it，who delivered him from them．This good riddance was due to the advice of Socrates．Cf．Xen． Mem．ii．9．4，оѝк à̀ ô̂̀ $\theta \rho \in ́ \psi \alpha$ aıs кад ．á $\nu \delta \rho a$（ $s c$ ．just as you keep dogs to protect sheep from wolves），ö $\sigma \tau \tau s{ }^{2} \theta \epsilon^{\prime}-$
 $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \rho o \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha s$ à $\delta \iota \kappa \epsilon i \nu \quad \sigma \epsilon$ ．

15．тov́rous ：said with scorn．$C f .48 \mathrm{c}$ ， $\tau 0 ข \dot{\tau} \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \sigma \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，and Dem．xviir．

 $\lambda \alpha \nu \theta \alpha ́ v \in ⿺ 辶 ⿱ 亠 乂 寸$（this fellow could do．．．un－ detected）．







 $25 \sigma \alpha v \tau \hat{\omega}$ ．$\pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha \chi o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ каi ar $\lambda \lambda о \sigma \epsilon$ őто८ ar $\nu \dot{\alpha} \phi i ́ \kappa \eta$

 $\lambda \epsilon \iota a ́ \nu$ бo兀 $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon ́ \xi о \nu \tau \alpha \iota ~ \check{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \mu \eta \delta \epsilon ́ \nu \alpha$ $\lambda \nu \pi \epsilon i ้ \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ кат⿳亠 Єєт $\frac{1}{}$ ía $\nless$

 тоıav̂ta $\sigma \pi \epsilon v ́ \delta \epsilon \iota s \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \sigma \alpha v \pi o ̀ v ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \iota, ~ व ̈ \pi \epsilon \rho ~ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\alpha} \nu ~ \kappa \alpha i ́ ~ o i ~$
 follows：the amount required to settle with these sycophants，I should be ready enough to expend for almost

 $\phi \iota \lambda o v \sigma \alpha \alpha$ au $\tau \partial \nu \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \hat{\eta} \kappa \tau \varepsilon \in .$, Yen．$A n$ ．
 є́ко́vтєє $\gamma \alpha \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon \delta \epsilon ́ \xi о \nu \tau \alpha$, ，ibid．v．6． 23. －wis $\bar{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ o in oinal：said with reference 10 the appositive iкада．

18．oủk olift：Crito recollects what Socrates had said（ $45 \mathbf{a}$ ，in connexion with 44 e$)$ ．See on on $\phi \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, Apo． 25 b ．
 тoívò ồтo، ктє．The pron．calls up the $\xi^{\xi} \dot{\nu} \boldsymbol{y}$ as present in $A$ thens，and，for rhetorical purposes，within sight．The art．is omitted because $\xi^{\prime} \boldsymbol{v}^{\prime} 0$ is a pred．， these others who are $\xi \in \underline{\varepsilon} v o$.

21．K＇${ }_{\epsilon} \eta_{\mathrm{s}}$ ：Cubes also was from Thebes，and the two play a very in－ portant part in the Phaedo．

23．a่тока́ $\mu \eta \mathrm{s}$ бavi̇̀̀v $\sigma \hat{\omega} \sigma a t:$ get tired of trying，etc．Here is no impli－ cation that Socrates has already tried to get away．Crito only hints that any other course is nothing short of moral
 Apoc． 37 ed．

24．Xрюо：the opt．representing the subjv．of doubt．GMT． 186.

25．ä $\lambda \lambda o \sigma \epsilon$ ：for $\not \approx \lambda \lambda o \theta_{l}$ ，which we expect after mo 入入a㐅ov̂ on account of ӧтоь．This is attraction，or inverse assimilation．Cf．Soph．O．C．1226，

 for emphasis and to disconnect it from そ̌cтєuбav．
$\qquad$






 $\pi \omega \rho \epsilon \stackrel{\imath}{\nu}$ каі $\tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi о \nu \tau \alpha$ каi $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon v ́ о \nu \tau \alpha \cdot \sigma \grave{v} \delta \epsilon ́ \mu о \iota$ бокєis







d V. 7. тò бòv $\mu \in ́ p o s: ~ p r o ~ t u a ~$ parte or quod ad te attinet.ó $\tau \iota a ̂ ้ \nu \tau \dot{X} \omega \sigma \iota$ : see on $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \delta \epsilon^{\prime}, 44$ d.
8. тои̂тo $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\xi} \neq v \sigma เ v: ~ c f . ~ \epsilon \hat{v}, \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} s$, and even àjatóv (used adv.) with $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu}$ (Apol. 40 c). See on $\mu \grave{\eta}$ ò $\rho \theta \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s} \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \xi \in \iota \nu$, Apol. 40 a.
10. $\eta^{\eta \pi} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \kappa \tau \epsilon \in .:$ the $\gamma \alpha \rho$ is connected with an unexpressed reproof.
13. фáokovтá $\gamma \in \delta \eta^{\prime}:$ sc. $\sigma \epsilon \in$, at all ${ }^{`}$ events you who maintain, etc., or particularly when you maintain. See on á $\gamma \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ $\delta \dot{\eta}$, Apol. 40 a.
e 16. $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ : see on $\not \chi_{\rho} \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu^{\prime}$, 44 e. The notion of fear is remotely implied. For this const., very common in Plato, see GM'T. 265 ; H. 867.
 cowardice on our part. Notice the emphasis given to $\tau \hat{\eta} \hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \alpha$, for which we are responsible. If Crito and the rest, by showing more energy, by using all possible influence against Meletus and his abettors, had carried the day, they would have been more
genuinely $a \partial \delta \rho \in s$ in the proper sense of the word. They failed $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \nu \delta \rho i a$ тוví, Cf. Euthyphro's boast, єüpou ${ }^{\prime}$


 $\sigma \epsilon$. On the meaning of the technical terms, see Introd. 70, with note $1, \mathrm{p}$. 52. Preciscly how the trial of Socrates could have been avoided except by flight from Athens is not clear. There is a wholly untrustworthy tradition that Anytus offered him terms of compromise. Probably there were abundant means at hand for raising legal technicalities and for securing in this way an indefinite delay. All that Crito necessarily suggests is that flight was open to Socrates before proceedings began. At Athens, as at Rome, the law allowed a man to go into voluntary exile. See Introd. 72.
18. ó ajow: the management of the case. See on єis à $\gamma \hat{\omega} \nu a \kappa \alpha \theta_{\imath} \sigma \tau \alpha ́ s, A p o l$. 24 c .






 $\lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ．$\mu i ́ a ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \beta o v \lambda \eta ́ \cdot \tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ ढ́ $\pi \iota o v ́ \sigma \eta s$ vvктòs $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$


19．тò тє入єuтaiov $\tau 0 v \tau i:$ the scene of this act is laid in the prison．

20．катá $\notin \lambda \omega \mathrm{s}$ ：because，in Crito＇s opinion，all who were involved made themselves a common laughing－stock by their weak－minded negligence and irresolution．Cf．C＇ymbeline，i．，－

Howso＇er＇tis strange， Or that the negligence may well be laughed at， Yet it is true，sir．

In the whole drift of Crito＇s phrase－ ology，the notion of acting a part on the stage before the Athenian public is prominent．－какía ктє́．：this is really in Crito＇s cyes the culmination of disgrace（connect with $\tau \grave{o} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \nu-$ raiov）in a matter that has been dis－ gracefully mismanaged．Here is a return to the leading thought and a departure from the regular gram－ matical sequence．The anacoluthon is most obvious in the repetition of бокєiv after $\delta$ о́ $\xi$ ？．
 think they allowed every advantage and every opportunity，especially the possibility of escape which now en－ grosses Crito＇s thoughts，to pass unim－ proved．$\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s$ is the object．Cf．Charm． 156 e ，тоиิтo aı้тเò $\tau 0 \hat{v} \delta \iota \alpha \phi \in \dot{v} \gamma \in \iota \nu$ тoùs $\pi \alpha \rho a ̀ ~ \tau o i ́ s " E \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma t \nu$ la $\alpha \rho o u ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi o \lambda \lambda a ̀$ робウиaтa，i．e．the reason why Greck doc－ tors fail to cure most diseases．
 Crito hints at Socrates＇s part，then recurs to his own．The interjection of such a clause in a relative sent．
 above．For the fact，ff． 45 b c．
 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ f r e q . ~ i s . ~ C ' f . ~ S y m p . ~ 195 ~ c, ~ \nu \epsilon ́ o s ~$
 is young and in addition to his youth he is tender．Cf．also Theat． 185 e，кад̀̀s $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \epsilon \bar{l} \ldots \pi \rho \Delta \dot{s} \delta \bar{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\omega} \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}$（in addition
 d $\lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime}$ ：cf．line 28 below，and see on $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \grave{̀} \pi \epsilon$ í $\theta o v, 45$ a．This speech has the dignity which genuine feeling alone can give．Cf．Rich．III．iv．3，－
－Come，I have learned that fearful commenting Is leaden servitor to dull delay；
Delay leads impotent and snail－paced beg－ gary；
Then fiery expedition be my wing．
On $\beta \in \beta$ ou $\lambda \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta a$, ，to have done with de－ liberation，cf．Dem．vini．3，olpal тो̀ $\nu$ $\tau \alpha \chi^{i} \sigma \tau \eta \nu \quad \sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \beta \in \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \theta a \iota$ $\kappa \alpha \grave{\imath} \pi \alpha \rho \in \sigma \kappa \in v a ́ \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，and iv．19，$\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \ldots$ $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \delta \epsilon \delta \delta \chi \chi \theta \iota \downarrow \eta \mu i \quad \delta \epsilon i ̂ \nu . \quad$ GM＇T． 109 ； H． 851 a ．

27．$\epsilon \ell_{\epsilon \in} \tau \iota \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \in \nu 0 \hat{\nu} \mu \in \nu$ ：this adv． use of $\tau l$ is developed out of the cog－ nate ace．（kindred signification）．$C f$ ． the Eng．idiom，＂to delay somewhat （a bit）．＂G． 1054 ；H． 715.


VI. $\Sigma \Omega$. ${ }^{`} \Omega$ фí̀є К $К i ́ \tau \omega \nu, \dot{\eta} \pi \rho o \theta v \mu i ́ a ~ \sigma o v ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda o \hat{v}$ b






 фаìvovтaí $\mu о \iota, \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ a u ̀ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon v ́ \omega ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau \iota \mu \omega ิ ~ o v ̃ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho ~ \mathbf{e}$


46 VI. 2. agio: sc. e่ $\sigma \tau i \nu$, in spite of the opt. in the protasis. GMT. 501; H. $901 \mathrm{~b} .-\epsilon \mathrm{l}$ є $\mathrm{l} \eta$ : not if it should be, but if it should prove to be. Sf. $\delta \in \iota \nu \alpha$ む $\nu$ є'خ $\eta \nu$ ai $\rho \gamma a \sigma \mu$ é $\nu o s, A p o l .28$ d. For the present, Socrates does not decide whether Crito's zeal is right or wrong.
4. ova $\mu$ óvov $\kappa \tau \in \in .:$ : Socrates maintain that " truth is truth to th' end of reckoning" (Measure for Measure, v.1). $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ and $\grave{\alpha} \epsilon i ́ m i g h t ~ a l m o s t ~ c h a n g e ~$ places, since the important point is that Socrates, after proclaiming the supremacy of reason (cf. A pol. 38 a) in prosperity, finds his belief still firm in adversity. $C f: 53$ e and e. $C f$. As You Like It, ii. 1, -

## Sweet are the uses of adversity,

Which, like the toad, ugly and venomous, Wears yet a precious jewel in his head.
Socrates meets in his trial and deathsentence "the counsellors that feelingly persuade him what he is." For collocations similar to this combinadion of $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ and $\dot{a} \epsilon i ́, c f .49 \mathbf{e}$; Homs. Il. ix.
 $\nu \hat{v} \nu$. Cf. also Eur. Med. 292, oui $\nu \hat{v} \nu \mu \epsilon$


סóga ктє́, and Soph. Phil. 965, є́цо̀ $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$


5. тolov̂tos oils: for the omission (rare except with the third person) of the copula, of. Gory. 487 d , каl $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$

 $\theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$, see on totồтos, $1 \mu o l .33$ a. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} .: ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} \epsilon \not \epsilon \alpha$ includes all the faculties and functions both of body and of mind. Among these $\lambda$ boos is included, since it means man's reason as well as his reasons and his reasoninge, - his utterances and his principles. Cf. below 47 e , $\epsilon$ is $\tau i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ nov
 $\lambda_{i} \mu \in \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$.
6. тov̀s $\delta \dot{\text { ex }} \lambda$ 人óyous $\kappa \tau \in \in$. : these words imply a measure of reproof at least when spoken to Crito, who had in general approved of Socrates's primciples.
8. öpotor: not different in sense from oi aùzoí, and to be understood in the light of what immediately follows. See on cal $\pi \rho o ́ t \epsilon \rho o \nu, 48$ b. "They seem like what they formerly were."

## b

$\pi \alpha \rho o ́ \nu \tau \iota, \epsilon \hat{v} \stackrel{\imath}{\iota} \sigma \theta \iota$ ö $\tau \iota$ ov̉ $\mu \eta^{\prime} \sigma o \iota \xi v \gamma \chi \omega \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, ov̉ $\delta^{\prime} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\alpha} \nu \pi \lambda \epsilon i \omega 46$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \hat{v} \nu \pi \alpha \rho o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \delta v ́ \nu \alpha \mu \iota s \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \pi a \hat{\imath} \delta a s$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} \varsigma \mu о \rho \mu о \lambda v ́ \tau \tau \eta \tau \alpha \iota, \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu о$ ѝs каi $\theta \alpha \nu a ́ \tau o v s ~ \grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi о v \sigma \alpha$ $\kappa \alpha i ̀ \chi \rho \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \phi \alpha \iota \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s$. $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ ov้̉ $\stackrel{a}{a} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau \rho \iota \omega \tau \alpha \alpha \tau \alpha$ бко$15 \pi o i ́ \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$ av̉ $\alpha^{\prime}$; $\epsilon i ̉ \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \tau o v ̂ \tau o \nu ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu ~ \alpha ̉ \nu \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \beta o \iota-~$






46
Supply кal $\pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ (from what follows) with ópotot.
 hobgoblins to scare us. $\mu о \rho \mu о \lambda \dot{\tau} \tau \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ has the double acc. like $\beta \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \pi \tau \epsilon เ \nu \tau \iota \nu \alpha$ тı. Mop $\mu \dot{\omega}$, like ${ }^{2} \mathrm{E} \mu \pi \sigma v \sigma \alpha$, was one of the fictitious terrors of the Greek nursery. Cf. Gorg. 473; Ar. Av.
 $\lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma о v \sigma a$ иор $\mu о \lambda \dot{\prime} \tau \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ бокєis; The Schol. there suggests that the alarm began $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \omega \pi \epsilon i \omega \nu$ (masks) $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$

 $\tau$ à $\pi a \iota \delta i ́ a ~ \phi o ß o v ̂ \sigma \iota \nu . ~ C f . ~ P l a e d . ~ 77 e . ~$
13. $\delta \in \sigma \mu$ о̀̀s кal $\theta a v a ́ t o v s ~ \grave{~} \pi เ \pi \epsilon ́ \mu-$ movoa $\kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$ : by confronting us with bonds, with death, with loss of wordly goods. These are the usual punishments, to the harshest of which Socrates has been condemned. The plural is used to put an abstract idea more vividly and concretely, as it were, by a process of multiplication. $C f$. the use of mortes, neces, and the common poetical use of $\theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \tau o t$ to describe a violent and premature death, and in general the free use of the plural by the poets in phrases like $\pi \eta \kappa \tau \bar{\omega}$, $\kappa \lambda_{t}$ $\mu \alpha ́ \kappa \omega \nu \quad \pi \rho o \sigma \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ \sigma \epsilon!$ s, Eur. Phoen. 489, and Bacch. 1213, $\delta \omega \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu \quad \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \alpha \mu \beta \alpha^{-}$
$\sigma \epsilon i s, I . T .97$, єiбßá⿱㇒日धis, ibid. 101, also the common use of $\delta(a \lambda \lambda \alpha \gamma a l$ both in poetry (Eur. Phoen. 701) and in prose (Lys. xir. 53 ; xili. 80, etc.). That such plurals were only a stronger way of putting the singular is clearly shown in Eur. Bacch. 1350, aiaî, $\delta \in \delta \delta \kappa \tau \alpha$, $\pi \rho \in ́ \sigma \beta v, \tau \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu o \nu \in s \quad \phi v \gamma \alpha i ́$. For $\theta \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \nu-$ ros, meaning the penalty of death, see on Apol. $36 \mathbf{b}$.
 should begin by taking up your point, etc. That is, such thorough consideration ( $44 \mathrm{~b}, 45 \mathrm{e}$ ) of Crito's ( (ò $\sigma$ ò̀ $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota s$ ) point involves considering the whole question whether, etc.
 second question is superadded, which substantially forestalls the answer to the first. Cf. Apol. 26 b . Here the answer suggested by ápa is to be taken ironically. See on à $\lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha_{~} \chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$, Apol. 37 e, and $c f .47$ e below, and esp. 50 e and 51 a , where we find $\rangle \pi \rho \partial s$
 $\pi \alpha \tau \rho i ́ \delta \alpha a ̆ \rho \alpha$.
19. ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \mathrm{s}:$ not at all seriously, as a mere joke, i.e. in a sense other than its proper one; the expression is a strong one. Cf. Phaedo, 76 e, $\epsilon i \frac{i}{t}{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta$














KP．Kà $\omega$ s．
 $35 \mu \eta^{\prime}$ ；

KP．Naí．
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \phi \rho o ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ；

KP．Пิ̂s $\delta$＇oṽ；

46 form＇s sake（dicis causa）－quite different from $\lambda$ doov $\chi$ ápı（exempli causa）－is brought in éк $\pi a \rho a \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda o v$. See on єiкरु $\kappa \tau \epsilon .$, Apol． 17 c．

24． $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \bar{\epsilon} \gamma \in \iota v$ ：the contradictory of oùठ̀̀̀ $\lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon \iota$ ．Cf．Apol． 30 b ．It means， ＂to say something that can be de－ pended upon，that amounts to some－ thing．＂Cf．Lach． 195 с，$\tau i$ ঠокєî
 $\lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon \nu \tau$ ，to which Nicias humorously
 à $\lambda \eta \theta$＇́s $\gamma \epsilon$ ．

25．vûv $\delta$ ทí：just now．
e 28．ö́ra $\gamma \in \operatorname{tajv} \theta$ рө́tela：humanly speaking．Cf．Dem．xvin．300，б̈бoy

as human calculation could．For the adv．acc． $\begin{aligned} & \text { of } \sigma \text { ，see G．} 1060 ; ~ H . ~ \\ & 719 .\end{aligned}$ One who is but a man can be sure of his life for no single moment，though he may have a reasonable confidence． Cf．IIenry V．iv．1，＂I think the king is but a man，as I am ；the violet smells to him as it doth to me；all his senses have but human conditions．＂Notice the force of $\gamma \epsilon \in . \quad C f .54 \mathrm{~d}, \quad \partial \sigma \alpha \alpha \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ दे $\mu$ ol סокой $\tau \tau \alpha$ ．
30．iкavwิs：sufficiently，satisfacto－ rily，and hence rightly or truly．iкav⿳亠二口今 very commonly appears in conjunc－ tion with $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho i \omega s$ or $\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} s$ ，to either one of which it is substantially equiv． Cf．Symp． 177 e and Phaed． 96 d ．
32．For an omission here，see App．
VII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Ф'́ $\rho \epsilon \delta \eta^{\prime}, \pi \hat{\omega} \varsigma$ av̂ $\tau \grave{\alpha} \tau o \iota \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ є’ $\bar{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \tau о ; \gamma v-47$



5 KР. ‘Evòs بóvov.

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$.

KР. $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha \delta \eta^{\prime}$. because the new question ( $\alpha \hat{v}$ ) involves a matter which has already been discussed. GMT'. 40 ; H. 833. тà $\tau 0$ auta: refers to what follows. The definite instance given is only one of many possible illustrations of the kind. On the inductive method, see Introd. 18, and for further examples, cf. Apol. 25 b. Cf. also Lach. $184 \mathbf{c}-185 \mathrm{~b}$, where the same example is elaborated to establish the same principle that approval and instruction alike should, if we are to heed them, come from the one man who has made himself an authority, $\delta \mu \alpha$ $\theta \dot{\omega} \nu \kappa a l$ 白 $\pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma a s$, while the praise and blame of the many is to be neglected. There also the importance of deciding aright in regard to gymnastic training is strongly insisted upon,
 $\kappa \iota \nu \delta \nu \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa \alpha l$ ò̀ каl $\Lambda \nu \sigma i ́ \mu \alpha \chi o s, a ̀ \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$



2. тоиิто $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu$ : a man who makes this his work, and hence is an expert in earnest about it. One whose opinion professionally given is worth more than any layman's would be. $C f$.


 $\epsilon \epsilon \pi \rho \alpha \tau \tau o \nu$. As this $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ refers to $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \delta o v \lambda o \hat{v} \sigma \theta a l$, so the $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau o$ in question refers to the notion of gymnastics implied in $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \zeta o ́ \mu \in \nu o s ; ~ t h e ~ w h o l e ~$ phrase means, a person who wishes to make an athlete of himself. C'f. Hdt. vi. Іо5, à $\pi о \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi о \nu \sigma \iota \nu$ द̀s $\Sigma \pi \alpha ́ \rho \tau \eta \nu$ кй $\rho \nu \kappa \alpha$ $\Phi \epsilon i \delta \iota \pi \pi i \delta \eta \nu$ ' $\mathrm{A} \theta \eta \nu \alpha i ̂ o \nu \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ ă $\nu \delta \rho a$, ă $\lambda \lambda \omega s$
 $\lambda \in \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a$.
4. la coupled together as having special charge of bodily vigor and health. The iarpós was expected to cure and to prevent disease by a prescribed regimen ( $\delta \iota \alpha \iota \tau \eta \tau \iota \kappa \frac{1}{\eta}$ ); the $\pi \alpha \iota \delta o \tau \rho(\beta \eta s$ professed and was expected (Gorg.
 $\tau o \grave{s}$ à $\nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi o v s ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \sigma \omega ́ \mu \alpha \tau a ; ~ h e ~ i t ~ w a s ~$ who really gave instruction in gymnastics. For fuller details, see Schömann, Antiquities of Greece, I. 505 f . Iccus of Tarentum, glorified as a successful gymnast, is reputed to have been most strict in regard to a temperate diet. Cf. the proverbial phrase ${ }^{\wedge}$ Iккои $\delta \epsilon i \pi \nu o \nu$. Sometimes medicine and gymnastics were both made the business of the same man, as in the case of Herodias of Selymbria. $C f$.
 $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} \nu$ (sc. professed teachers




KP. ${ }^{*} \mathrm{E} \sigma \tau \iota \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$.




KР. $\Pi \hat{\omega} s \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ oṽ;
 $\tau i ́ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau o \hat{v} \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \iota \theta$ о̂̀ $\nu \tau o s ;$

$\Sigma \Omega$. К $\alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} s \lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \varsigma$. ои̉коиิע каi $\tau \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \alpha, \hat{\omega} \mathrm{~K} \rho i ́ \tau \omega \nu$,

 $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̂ \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \hat{v} \nu \dot{\eta} \beta o v \lambda \grave{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \tau \nu, \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \sigma \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$





 Mєqapєús. The great physician Herodicus is ridiculed for coddling his bodily infirmities, Rep. iii. 406 b, $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$

 $\tau \delta \nu, \ldots \delta v \sigma \theta \alpha \nu a \tau \bar{\omega} \nu($ dying hard) $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ índ $\sigma o \phi i \alpha s$ єis $\gamma \dot{\gamma} \rho \alpha s \dot{\alpha} \phi\{\kappa \in \tau o$.
11. kal éEєनтéov $\boldsymbol{\gamma \epsilon}$ : $\gamma^{\prime}$ ' serves where various points are enumerated, to mark a new departure, i.e. a fact different in kind from the preceding ones and thus belonging to a new class. Cf. Gorg. 450 d , à $\iota \theta \mu \eta \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\jmath}$ кац入оүเбтькウ̀ (calculation) каl $\gamma \in \omega \mu \in \tau \rho \iota \kappa \grave{\eta}$


 (smells) каl $\psi v ́ \xi \in \iota s$ (chills) тє каl каи́-


15. тov̀s $\lambda$ óyous: states collectively $\mathbf{e}$ what has been subdivided into $\delta \delta \xi \alpha$,

 in fact who have no special knowledge whatever. See App.

22. кal $\delta \dot{\eta}$ каl: and then also, of course. See on кal $\delta \grave{\eta} \kappa \alpha i ́, 18$ a. Here Socrates has at last reached his goal; his point has been established by induction. Notice the doubly chiastic arrangement, -

C


$\lambda o v \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \epsilon \nu, \delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon \rho \circ \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$ 乇̇кєîvo каì $\lambda \omega \beta \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$, ò $\tau \hat{\varphi} 47$



КР. Ої $\mu a \iota \not{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon$, $\widehat{\omega} \Sigma \omega \kappa \kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \varsigma$.



 5 тò $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \cdot \vec{\eta}$ oủ ${ }^{i}$;

KP. Naí.
 $\delta_{\iota \epsilon \phi \theta a \rho \mu \epsilon ́ v o v ~ \sigma ஸ ́ \mu a \tau o s ; ~}^{\text {; }}$

KP. Oи̇ $\delta a \mu \hat{\omega} \varsigma$.



 $\sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \dot{a} \pi \delta \lambda \lambda \nu \sigma \theta a \iota \dot{\dot{\epsilon}} \bar{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \tau 0$, the so-called philosophical impf., which carries a statement of the admitted results of a previous discussion back to the well-remembered time when the facts stated were established in argument. GMT. 40 ; H. 833. Cf. Cic. Off. i. 40. 143, itaque, quace erant prudentiae propria, suo loco dicta sunt.
VIII. 3. $\pi \epsilon \in \theta^{\prime} \mu \in \nu 0 \iota \mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \kappa \tau \epsilon \in .:$ by its position $\mu \dot{\eta}$ contradicts $\tau \hat{\eta} \ldots \delta \delta \xi \eta$, but not $\pi \epsilon \iota \theta \dot{\prime} \mu \in \nu 0 \iota$, and implies $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \grave{\alpha}$ $\tau \hat{̣} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \epsilon$ ढ่ $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu \delta \delta \xi \eta$. The effect of writing $\pi \epsilon \iota \theta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu O l \mu \dot{\eta}$ instead of $\mu \bar{\eta}$ $\pi \epsilon \iota \theta \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \iota$ is to lay greater stress on both words, and the failure to say distinctly whose opinion it is which. is obeyed leaves all the more stress on $\mu \dot{\eta}$. - ápa $\beta \iota \omega \tau o ̀ v$ ктє́.: see on à $\nu \in \xi \notin \notin \tau a \sigma \tau o s ~ B i ́ o s, ~ A p o l . ~ 38 ~ a . ~ T h e ~$
meaning is that life is worthless, i.e.
 and Rep. iv. 445 a, $\grave{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau l$ $\sigma \kappa \in ́ \nLeftarrow \alpha-$ $\sigma \theta a \iota, \pi \delta \dot{\tau} \epsilon \rho o \nu$ aî $\lambda \nu \sigma \iota \tau \in \lambda \epsilon \hat{i}$ (pays) סíkaıá

 $\epsilon i v a l$. The expressions $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon \iota \rho \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$ and $\delta ı o \lambda \epsilon \in \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ bring us to the point of extreme deterioration at which life becomes impossible.
10. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda{ }_{\alpha}$. . . ápa: ironically op- e posed to the preceding negative statement, but at the same time requiring no for its answer. This last must be indicated by the tone in which the question is asked. See on ápa, 46 d .
11. $\hat{\aleph}:$ after both verbs, though òvıvávaı does not govern the dat. See on oîs . . . $\dot{\epsilon}_{\xi} \xi \tau \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, Apol. 41 c. Even $\dot{\lambda} \omega \beta \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$ usually takes the acc.
12. ó $\tau \iota \pi \mathbf{\pi} \tau^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{l}$ : it was not specified above ( $\mathbf{d}$ ), and there is no reason
 є́ $\sigma \tau \mathfrak{\nu} \nu ;$
15 KP. Ở $\delta a \mu \omega \hat{\omega}$.
$\Sigma \Omega$. 'А $\lambda \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \tau \mu \mu \omega \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$;
KР. Поли́ $\gamma \epsilon$.












for arguing about its name ( $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta})$ here. 18. ov̉к äpa $\pi$ ávv ov̈ть : then we must not . . at all . . so much as all that, etc. oüt $\omega$ refers back to the drift of Crito's argument. Here again Socrates takes the last step in a long induction.
19. $\tau \mathbf{i} \ldots$. . ó $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ : a not unusual combination of the dir. and indr. forms of question. Cf. Gorg. $500 \mathrm{a}, \hat{\alpha} \rho$ ' oî $\boldsymbol{\pi} \pi \nu-$

 (specialist) $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ єis és $\kappa \alpha \sigma \tau o \nu$; The double acc. as in кака̀ (как $\omega$ ) $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \alpha ́$.
 speaking with the lips of $\delta \dot{\epsilon \pi a i \omega \nu}$, or appearing as the result of strict and patient inquiry.
23. $\mathfrak{a} \lambda \lambda \boldsymbol{\alpha} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \quad \delta \eta_{\eta}^{\prime}:$ again Socrates reproves Crito, this time for his appeal to the Athenian public ( 44 d ).

- $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu \delta \eta^{\prime}$ : certainly, equiv. to $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ or nearly so.

25. $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a$ 该 $\kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} .:$ Crito eagerly b catches at this objection and strengthens it with kai. Thus he implies that there is more than meets the eye, i.e. that there are many other valid objections. Cf. 45 a. See App.
26. oùtós $\tau \epsilon$ ơ $\lambda$ óyos ктє́.: $\tau \epsilon \in$ corresponds to кal . . . aӥ following. For a similar каl . . . каl a $\hat{v}^{\text {, }}$, see Lach.
 $\sigma \nu \mu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu \not ้ \nu \tau \iota \delta \dot{v} \nu \omega \mu \alpha \iota$ каl $\alpha \hat{v}$ à $\pi \rho o-$ $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$ тоוєiv. The connexion of thought would not hinder us from subordinating the first clause: "as our discussion just closed agrees with what we argued formerly (when dealing with the same matter), so, etc."


30 KP．＇А $А \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \epsilon \iota$ ．
 $\mu \epsilon ́ v \epsilon \iota ~ \geqslant \vec{\eta}$ ov̉ $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \in \iota$ ；

KP．Мє́vєı．
IX．$\Sigma \Omega$ ．Ои̉кои̂̀ є่к $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ó $\mu о \lambda o \gamma o v \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ тои̂тo $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \pi$－



5 бкє́ $\psi \epsilon \iota \varsigma \pi \epsilon \rho i ́ \tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \lambda \omega \prime \sigma \epsilon \omega \varsigma \quad \chi \rho \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu \kappa \alpha i \quad \delta o ́ \xi \eta s$ каì $\pi \alpha i ́-$

 oîoí $\tau^{’} \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$ ，ov̉ $\delta \epsilon \nu \grave{\iota} \xi v \nu \nu \hat{\varphi}, \tau o v ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ ．$\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \delta^{\prime}$ ，




1． $\boldsymbol{\tau o} \delta \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \mathfrak{v} \kappa \tau \mathfrak{\epsilon}$ ．：this is needed be－ cause of the confused ideas which many associate with $\epsilon \bar{u}$ S $\bar{\eta} \nu$ ，e．g．（1） plain living and high thinking，or（2） high living and no thinking．For the latter meaning，of．$R e_{l}$ ．i． 329 a，oi

 $\dot{\omega} s \mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \nu \quad \tau \iota \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu 0 t$ ，каl
 $\tau \epsilon s$ ．On this whole subject consult the discussion in Prot． 851 b ff．
c IX．4．ràs $\sigma \kappa$＇$\psi \in ⿺ 𠃊 ⿴ 囗 十 一$ ：drawn into the const．of the rel．clause，to which pre－ cedence has been given．The art．is commonly not retained in such a case，
 The corresponding demonst．$\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ is attracted into the gender of the pred．

6．$\mu \mathfrak{\eta}$ ．．．ที：sc．©́pa ктє̇．Look to it， Crito，lest all this，at bottom，may prove to be，etc．A milder way of saying $\tau \alpha \tilde{\tau} \tau \alpha \sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ ö̀ $\nu \alpha \alpha$ фаívєтal，strength－
ened by $\dot{\omega} s \dot{a}^{\lambda} \eta \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$ ．See on $\mu \grave{\eta}$ ò̀ ${ }^{48}$

 would bring them to life again too．The ${ }_{a} \nu$ forms with this partic．the apod． $\grave{\alpha} \nu a \beta \iota \omega \sigma \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ is used here like $\grave{\alpha} \nu \alpha \beta \iota \omega$－ $\sigma a \sigma \theta a t$ in Phaed． 89 d．Usually it is intransitive，like à áßı$ิ \nu a l$.

9．ò $\lambda$ óyos oüt $\omega \mathrm{s}$ aipєi：the argu－ ment has prevailed thus far．$C f$ ．Hor． Sat．i．3，115，nec vincet ratio hoc，tantundem ut peccet idemque｜qui teneros caules alieni fregerit horti et qui nocturnus sacra divum lege－ rit．Thid．ii．3， 225 ，vincet enim stultos ratio insanire nepo－ tes，and 250 ，si puerilius his ratio esse evincet amare．It is rare to find this idiom with an acc． of the persons discussing，as in Rep．
 ．．．ท̂：as in 6 above．



 ä $\lambda \lambda о$ ó ótov̂ $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \epsilon \iota \nu \pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau o \hat{\alpha} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \iota \kappa \epsilon i \nu$.
 ठè $\tau i \quad \delta \rho \omega \hat{\mu} \mu \nu$.






 selves too, stands for Crito and Socrates. Crito is responsible, in the supposed case, not only for his expenditure of money ( $\chi$ pभ́n $\alpha \tau \alpha \tau \in \lambda o \hat{v} \nu$ $\tau \epsilon s$ ), but also for instigating the act of Socrates, or rather for persuading him to allow various things to be
 is especially strong, "we ourselves are both rescuers and rescued."
15. ov̈тє $\pi \dot{d} \sigma \chi \in \iota v: s c$. $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, to be supplied from the preceding clause.
 The sense is, "there must be no question about submitting to the uttermost ( $\dot{\delta} \tau o \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \in i \nu$ ) rather than committing unrighteousness." Sce also 54 b , where, as in this case, a choice is involved, and $\pi \rho o \sigma^{\prime}$ is used in the sense of in preference to or instead of.
23. ws: inasmuch as, equiv. to $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon$ i. $C f$. quippe in Lat.
24. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta े$ äкоvтоs: opposed distinctly to $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a s ~ \sigma \epsilon$, with your approval. $C f .49$ e fin., and Xen. An. v. 6. 29,

 $\dot{v} \mu \mathrm{a} s$. The vivid contrast of these two clauses makes the omission of $\sigma o v$, the subj. of ákodzos, the easier. Indeed, cases are common where a personal or a dem. pron. or some vague general notion of persons or things is the subj. implied. For a somewhat similar case, cf. Hom. Od.


 ment shall satisfy you. éád does not like $\epsilon i$ ( $c f .48 \mathrm{~b}$ ) mean whether. GMT. 71, n. 1. Cf. Phaedo, $64 \mathrm{c}, \sigma \kappa$ ќч $\downarrow \iota$
 $\kappa \tau \epsilon$. The subj. of the dependent sent. is made by anticipation (prolepsis) the object of ofpa. Cf. Milton, Sonnet to Sir Henry Vane, xvir., "Besides to know | Both spiritual power and civil, what each means, | What severs each, thou hast learned, which few have done." Cf. below ( 49 d ). Socrates is carnestly enforcing a principle.
 $\nu o \nu \hat{\eta} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{a} \nu \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ oì $\eta$ ．

KP．＇А $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$ ．









 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega \prime \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \chi \epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon$ ו̈тє каi $\pi \rho a ̊ o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha$ ，ő $\mu \omega s \tau o ́ \gamma \epsilon$

26．ท่̂ oln：sc．кат⿳亠口冋 $\tau \delta$ à $\lambda \eta \theta^{\prime} \in s$ à $\nu$
 in the question $\pi \hat{p} \mu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ; \quad C f . R e p$. vii． 537 d ，ồ $\downarrow \nu \mu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ тоьov̂тoı $\bar{\omega} \sigma \iota$ ， тoúrous єis $\mu \in i ́ l o u s ~ \tau ı \mu a ̀ s ~ \kappa \alpha \theta ı \sigma \tau a ́ \nu \alpha ı . ~$
 The const．with the acc．corresponds to the equivalent $\delta \in i$ with the acc． and inf．GMT． 923 ；H． 611 a ．For the facts，see Introd． 65.
2．$\eta$＂$o \dot{\delta} \delta a \mu \hat{\omega} \mathrm{~s} k \tau \mathcal{\epsilon}$ ．：here the first member of the disjunctive question is resumed，so that the questioner gives notice to the questioned，as it were，of his opinion．For the accent of $\tau \nu{ }^{\prime}$ when（exceptionally）it begins its clause，see G．144，1；H． 119 a．
 written by Plato．If genuine，it can－ not refer to anything here，but relates to the drift of 46 b and 48 b ．See App．
5．in $\pi$ àaat $\kappa \tau \hat{\varepsilon}$ ：：here and in the words $\hat{\eta} \pi \alpha \nu \tau \partial s$ ẫ $\lambda \lambda o \nu \kappa \tau \epsilon$ ．below，we see how hard Crito finds it to assent．

After each double question（1）oì $\delta \epsilon \nu$
 $\tau р \delta \pi \varphi ;$ Socrates has looked at Crito for an answer．Finally he extorts the briefest assent by the pointed

6．èккєХขрéval єlot：thrown away． Cf．Henry VIII．iii．2，＂Cromwell，I charge thee，fing uway ambition，＂ and Soph．Phil．13，$\mu \grave{\eta} \kappa a l \alpha^{\prime} \theta \eta \mu^{\prime}$

 Lat．effundere gratiam，labo－
 two partics．forms the predicative complement of ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta o \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，the other stands in opposition to the pred．By the added $\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o i \delta \epsilon \mathscr{a} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$（see on $\tau 0-$ $\sigma o \hat{\tau} \tau \nu \sigma \dot{v}, A_{p o l} .25 \mathrm{~d}$ ），this opposition is put still more strongly．${ }^{2} p a$ gives point to the irony．See on $\not{ }^{p} \rho^{\prime}$ oüv， 47 e ．
 tinct reiteration of what $\bar{\eta} \pi a \nu \tau \partial s \mu \hat{a} \lambda-$ $\lambda o \nu \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$ ．has already stated．There－ fore one as much as the other belongs
 $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \grave{\imath} \tau \rho o ́ \pi \omega$; $\phi \alpha \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \hat{\eta}$ ov̈;

KР. Фан $\nu$.

KP. Ov̇ $\delta \hat{\eta} \tau a$.


${ }_{6}^{49}$
b to the twofold disjunctive prot. $\epsilon$ IT $\tau$

 ing harm to one's enemies' was part and parcel of the popularly accepted rule of life is plain from many passages like that in Isocrates to Demonicus I., 26, $\delta \mu o i \omega s$ ai $\chi_{\chi \rho \delta \nu}^{\nu} \nu \dot{\mu} \mu \zeta_{\epsilon}$
 $\kappa a l \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \phi i \lambda \omega \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \in \dot{v} \in \rho \gamma \in \sigma i ́-$ als. Compare the character of Cyrus the younger, Xen. An. i. 9. 11, фavє-

 $C f$. also Meno's definition, Men. 71 e,
 $\tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \delta{ }^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \omega s \pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$, каl $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau о \nu \tau \alpha$
 $\kappa а \kappa \omega ̂ s . ~ P l a t o ~ e l o q u e n t l y ~ d e f e n d s ~ h i s ~$ more Christian view throughout the first book of the Republic, in the Gorgias, and elsewhere. That the many do assert this, Socrates might say is not only made probable by the known tendencies in human character, but it is proved by every-day experience in dealing with men. Many recognized authoritics encouraged them in such a view. $C f$. Archil. Frg.
 $\mu \epsilon \delta \rho \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha$ бєเขoîs à $\nu \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon i \beta \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ какоі̂s. Solon, Frg. 13, 5, where he prays to the Muses that they would grant him
 $\ldots!\ldots \delta \epsilon \nu \partial \nu \nu i \delta \epsilon i \nu . \quad$ In Soph. Aj. 79, it is Athena herself who asks, ойкоиг
 trast Soph. Ant. 523 f.: КР. ойтоь $\pi o \theta^{\prime}$

 Eur. Andr. 520 ff ., where Menelaus says it is folly to spare the offspring of

 where Orestes says, $\dot{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \dot{a} \nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\mu o i ̂ p a \nu$ єis à $\nu \alpha \sigma \tau \rho o \phi \grave{\eta} \nu$ (for us to destroy it) $\delta \alpha i \mu \omega \nu \delta i \delta \omega \sigma \iota . \quad C f$. Eur. Heraclid. 1049 ff ., the grim humor of Alcmena,

 Bacch. 1344-1348, where Agave admits her guilt but asks for mercy, and Dionysus refuses mercy because he has been offended. Agave an-
 ov̂z $\alpha a \iota$ Bpozoîs. This shows an ideal of moral conduct for the gods, such as Plato preaches for men. Compare



 nô̂̀тa, with Henry VIII. iii. 2, "Love thyself last, cherish those that hate thee; $\mid$ still in thy right hand carry gentle peace | to silence envious tongues. Be just and fear not." Shakspere thus expresses the view of the Platonic Socrates and of Plato in contrast to that of the Greek public at large. That the historical (in contrast to the Platonic) Socrates at least
b)
i

$\qquad$

KP. Ov̉ фаívєтаl.


 $\pi о \lambda \lambda о i ́ ~ \phi а \sigma \iota, ~ \delta i ́ к \alpha \iota o \nu ~ \eta ै ~ o v ̉ ~ \delta i ́ к \alpha \iota o \nu ; ~$

KP. Ov̇ $\delta a \mu \hat{\omega} s$.
 ov̉ $\delta$ è $\nu \delta \iota \alpha \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \iota$.

KP. 'А $А \lambda \eta \hat{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon \iota$.







did not contradict this maxim of popular morality is perhaps evident from one place in the Memorabilia (ii. 6. 35), where, apparently with the ready approval of Critobulus, Socra-

 roùs $\delta^{\prime}$ '̇ $\chi \theta \rho o \grave{s} \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} s$. This does not make him precisely responsible for the maxim, since he practically quotes it from the mouth of The Many. Indeed, the context has a playful color, which ought to warn us not to take Socrates precisely at his word.
c 19. ov̉ фaivєтau: plainly not. As oṽ $\phi \eta \mu$ means $I$ deny rather than $I$ do not assert, so oủ фaívetat means not it does not appear, but it does appear not.
20. какоируєiv: this word, like какิิs moleî, covers more cases than
 cases of harm done where there is
little or no question of right and wrong involved. Apparently, it was more commonly used in every-day matters than $\grave{\alpha} \delta \iota \star \epsilon i \nu$. In Crito's answer his uncertain certainty is indicated by $\delta \dot{r}_{\text {- }}$ mov; had he meant that he was perfectly certain, he would have used $\delta \dot{\eta}$.
28. จข้тє äpa $\kappa \tau \in$. : the completest presentation of this precept must be sought in the teaching of Christ. Cf. Luke vi. 27, à $\lambda \lambda$ à $\dot{\text { pì }} \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda \epsilon} \gamma \omega$ тoîs àкоú-




 strongly set forth in the Gorgias, where the Sophist and the true Philosopher represent respectively these two clashing theories. See Introd. 65.
34. $\beta o v \lambda \in \dot{\prime} \mu a \tau a$ : counsels, i.e. their manner of thinking and acting.





 $\epsilon i$ ठє є́ $\mu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon, ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau о \hat{v} \tau о$ äкоขє．


 45 ＇ُ $\xi \alpha \pi \alpha \tau \eta \tau \epsilon ́ O \nu$ ；

KР．Поıךтє́oข．

 $\mu \epsilon \nu$ ，каì $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ oûs $\eta^{\prime \prime} \kappa \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ~ \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ ทै оv゙；каi $\epsilon \mu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu о \mu \epsilon \nu$ oîs


36．wis oủ $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi о \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$ ．：a statement of what is involved in $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \theta \in \nu$ ，which is equiv．to ék qoúrov qoû 入órov（taking this principle for granted）．$\dot{\omega}$ with the gen．abs．is used in this same way also after $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．Cf．Men． 95 e，


 $\tau \in \hat{v} \theta \in \nu$ above．$\dot{a} \rho \chi \chi \dot{\eta}$ is the starting－ point of an investigation，－a principle，
e a conviction．－кal $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda a \iota \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} .:$ see on où $\mu$ óvo $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \tau$ є́， 46 b ．

41．ті̀ $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тoûto：not what re－ sults，but what comes next．It may be taken adv．（like $\tau \grave{\partial} \dot{a} \pi \delta \tau o \hat{v} \delta \epsilon$ and the like）and translated further．What is referred to is expressed in $\pi o ́ \tau \in \rho o \nu$ $\boldsymbol{\kappa \tau \epsilon}$ ．below．

43．$\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \frac{1}{} \delta \epsilon \in:$ or rather．Cf．Lach．
 ท่ $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ ．

44．ท゙ $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi a \pi a \tau \eta \tau \in \dot{\prime} \circ v:$ Socrates says this rather than ì où $\pi o \iota \eta \tau \epsilon \in \sigma$ because of the preceding $\hat{\alpha} \not \ddot{a}_{\nu} \tau \tau \varsigma \dot{\delta} \mu о \lambda o \gamma \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma$ $\tau \omega$ ．Such an admission pledges a man to put his principle in practice． $\hat{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \pi \alpha \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$ is not only construed with an acc．of the person，here easily supplied from $\tau \omega$ ，but furthermore takes the ace．of the thing．$C f$ ．Xen．

 $\pi \alpha \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha, \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu \delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \epsilon \in \tau \omega$ ．

XI．1．éк тov́т $\omega \boldsymbol{v}$ ：in the light of this．See on 48 c，èк $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ о $\mu о \lambda о \gamma о \cup \mu \epsilon ́-$ $\nu \omega \nu$ ，and $c f$ ．Henry IV．i．1，＂For more is to be said and done｜than out of anger can be uttered．＂The particular plan of flight Socrates considers in the light of，or out of，the general conclusion just approved．

3．oîs ov̂ocv：the dat．is assimilated regularly to the omitted obj．of $\epsilon \mu \mu \epsilon \cdot$
 $\tau \hat{c}{ }^{\text {s．}}$ ov̉ $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$ ć $\nu \nu 0 \hat{\omega}$ ．





 the acc．as in 49 e above．

5．oủk éX $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \tau \dot{\tau}$ ．：Crito seems afraid of understanding what is meant；the in－ evitable consequences involved alarm him．See on какоир $\gamma \epsilon \stackrel{\imath}{\nu}, 49$ c．This natural state of mind on his part gives good and sufficient reason for a reconsideration of the whole subject from a new point of view．



 on $\widehat{\psi}, 47 \mathrm{e}$ ．The statement there given covers a very large number of cases where a partic．and a finite verb are


8．$\epsilon \ell^{\prime \prime} \theta^{\prime \prime}$ ö $\pi \omega$ s $\kappa \tau \epsilon$ ．：this softening phrase is used purely out of consid－ eration for Crito．To use the word applied to runaway slaves might give offence．One of the annoying mis－ haps that befell a well－to－do Athenian was to have to give chase when a slave ran off to Megara or Oenoe． Cf．Prot． 310 e，where Hippocrates nearly lost his dinner，$\mu \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \alpha \gamma \epsilon \partial \dot{o} \psi \grave{\epsilon}$
 $\mu \epsilon \delta$ ミátupos à $\pi \epsilon \in \delta \rho a$ ．Of course such conduct on the slave＇s part was con－ sidered despicable．Cf． 52 d，$o$ ồnos фаu入óтатos．The $\delta o u ̄ \lambda o s ~ \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau o ́ s, ~ w h o ~$ appears in tragedy more frequently
than in real life，would not run away， because of his attachment to his mas－ ter．$C f$ ．Eur．Med．lines 54 f．，$\chi \rho \eta$－

 first of which recurs in the Bacchae （1029），Alc．768－77；and $c f$ ．also Eur． Andr．56－50，where the slave says to
 $\hat{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \hat{\omega} \pi \delta \sigma \epsilon \iota$ ．In Xen．Oec．7． 37 and 38 ，and $9.11-13$ ，is an interesting account of the position of slaves in the household．

9．тò кolvòv $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \pi \mathrm{o}^{\prime} \mathrm{\lambda}_{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{\omega s}$ ：the com－ monwealth．Cf．Xen．An．v．7．18，and Hdt．i．67，इ $\pi a \rho \tau \iota \eta \tau \epsilon \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \kappa о \iota \nu \hat{\varphi} \delta \iota \alpha-$ $\pi \in \mu \pi o \mu \epsilon \in \nu o u s$, sent by the commonwealth of Sparta．So Cicero says commune Siciliae．The personification of the state and the laws which here follows is greatly admired and has been abun－ dantly imitated，e．g．by Cicero in his first Catilinarian Oration（7．18）．The somewhat abrupt transition from $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$ above to $\bar{\omega} \Sigma \dot{\omega} \kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon s$ suggests the fact that Socrates considered himself alone responsible to the laws in this matter．
 Apol． 24 c．

11．тov́s $\tau \epsilon$ vó ${ }^{\prime}$ ors：notice the order and cf． 53 a，$\dot{\eta} \mu \in i ̂ s$ oi $\nu \delta \mu o u$.

12．тò $\sigma \grave{v} \nu \mu$ ќpos：see on $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\partial}$ бò $\boldsymbol{\nu} \mathbf{b}$ $\mu \epsilon \rho \rho s, 45 \mathrm{~d}$ ．Here it is about the same in sense with $\kappa \alpha \theta^{\circ} \dot{\sigma} \sigma 01$ ס́va $\alpha \sigma a, 51 \mathbf{a}$ ．







 $\tau a v ̂ \tau \alpha \hat{\eta} \tau i ́ \epsilon \in \rho \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu ;$

KP. Tav̂ta $\nu \grave{\eta} \Delta i ́ a, ~ \widehat{\omega} \Sigma \omega \kappa \kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon s$.









13. eival: the attention is drawn to єival, exist, by the negative statement of the same idea in $\mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \theta \alpha$, not to be utterly overturned, which follows. GMT. 109.
17. ä $\lambda \lambda \omega s$ т $\tau$ кal $\dot{\rho} \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$ : a side thrust at the trained speakers which recalls the irony of the opening page of the Apology. - vimèp тov́тov тov
 law whose existence is in jeopardy. Cf. below d, è $\pi \iota \chi \in \iota \rho \epsilon i s ~ a ̀ m o \lambda \lambda u ́ v a l . ~ T h i s ~$ notion of threatened action is often attached to the pres. and impf. of this verb. See GMT. 32 and 38 ; H. 828. $C f . A n$. v. 8. 2, öтov $\tau \hat{\varphi} \rho_{\ell} \neq \epsilon$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \omega \lambda \lambda \dot{\cup} \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$. The whole wording of
this passage recalls the Athenias 5 usage which required that a law, if any one proposed to change or repeal it, should be defended by regularlyappointed state-advocates ( $\sigma v \nu \dot{\eta} \gamma \quad \rho o \iota$ ).
19. ӧть $\dot{\eta} \delta$ 亿кєь $\gamma$ 人а́p: öть followed by direct quotation, as in 21 c. Notice how spirited and quick the answer is made by $\gamma \alpha$ ó. "Yes (I certainly have this intention) for, etc."
XII. 2. кal тav̂ta: sc. that in cer- $\mathbf{c}$ tain cases the sentence of the laws may and should be set at nought. -
 tween us) simply to abide by, etc.
3. aîs $\alpha \nu \delta \iota \kappa a^{\prime \prime} \eta$ : ccf. 50 b and 51 c.
5. є́тєєठทे $\kappa \tau \epsilon \in$. : see Introd. 19.

10 тoîs vó $\mu o \iota s$ тoîs $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ тoùs $\gamma$ á $\mu o v s, \mu \epsilon ́ \mu \phi \epsilon \iota \tau \iota$ ©ंs ov̉ ка入ิ̂s 50






入os，aủtós $\tau \epsilon$ каi oi $\sigma o i ̀ \pi \rho o ́ \gamma o \nu o \iota ; ~ к \alpha i ~ \epsilon i ̀ ~ \tau o v ̂ \theta ’ ~ o v ̃ \tau \omega s ~$

10．roîs $\pi \in \rho$ ì tov̀s $\gamma \dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{ous}$ ：probably Socrates was thinking particularly of the laws governing marriage which established the legitimacy of children （ $\gamma \nu \eta \sigma$ ớ $\neq \eta s$ ）．See Schoemann，Antiqui－ ties of Greece，p． 357.

11．à $\lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime}$ ：instead of $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \tau \alpha} \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ ， which would have been written here to correspond to $\pi \rho \omega \bar{\omega} \neq \nu \mu^{\prime} \nu$ if Socra－ tes＇s answer had not intervened．
 words cover the whole of education （ $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon^{\prime}(\alpha)$ ，as Plato，$R e e^{\prime}$ ．ii． 376 e，says，

 tion of the average Greek gentleman， like that of the average English gen－ tleman，comprised a certain amount of mental cultivation and a certain amount of athletic exercise．The former，besides reading，writing，and some elementary mathematics，con－ sisted mainly in the reciting and learn－ ing by heart of poetry，along with the elements of music，and sometimes of drawing．Perhaps because so much of the poetry was originally sung or accompanied，the word＇mu－ sic＇was sometimes applied to the education in literature as well as in music proper，and it is in this wider sense that Plato habitually uses it． Cnder the term＇gymnastic＇was un－
derstood the whole system of diet and exercise which，varying with the customs of different states，had for its common object the production of bodily health and strength，and the preparation for military service．＂ Hellenicu，The Theory of Education in Plato＇s Republic，by R．L．Nettleship， M．A．，p．88．See on $\tau о \hat{v} \tau o ~ \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu$, 47 a．See also Schoemann，Greek An－ tiquities，pp． 359 ff ．
 Cf．Hdt．vii．104，where Demaratus says to Xerxes that the Lacedaemo－

 $\nu \delta \mu o s$ ．Elsewhere Plato uses $\delta$ ou－ $\lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \operatorname{ld}$ of the obedience which the law requires，e．g．Legg． $762 \mathrm{e}, \delta \mu \bar{\eta}$ бov－





 тоîs $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta v \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o 1 s ~ \kappa \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} . ~ C f . ~ A p o l . ~ 23 \mathbf{b}$ ， 30 a，and also Eur．Orest，418，where Orestes says in a very different spirit，
 C $f .52 \mathrm{~d}$ ．This high standard of obe－ dience，unhesitating and unqualified， to the established law，was familiar to the Athenians before Plato wrote．









50

Among many passages in the tragedians, cf. Soph. Ant. 663 ff., ठ̈ $\sigma \tau \iota s \delta^{\prime}$



 каl $\sigma \mu \iota \kappa \rho$ м̀ каl $\delta$ 〔каєа каl $\tau$ à$\nu \alpha \nu \tau i ́ a . ~ C f$. also Cic. Clu. 53. 146, legum idcirco omnes servi sumus, ut liberi esse possimus, and cf. in Eur. Suppl. 429 ff., the speech of Theseus, beginning,




 316-353, 403-408, and the words of Aethra, $312 \mathrm{f} ., \tau \delta \gamma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau o \iota ~ \sigma u \nu \epsilon ́ \chi o \nu$ (bond of union) $\left.\mathfrak{d} \nu \theta \rho \omega \bar{\omega} \pi \omega \nu \pi \delta \lambda \in \epsilon s \mid \tau o \hat{\nu} \tau^{\prime}\right\} \sigma \theta^{\prime}$,
 $\lambda \hat{\omega} s$. Many lines in the Heraclidae of Euripides show that ready and free obedience to law distinguished
 ( 379 f.). Cf. 181-198, 305 f., 329-332, 420-424.
18. aútós $\tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \epsilon \in$ : see on aủ $\tau \delta \delta \tau \epsilon$ $\kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} .$, Apol. 42 a.
 first clause is logically subordinate. See on $\delta \in \iota \nu$ à đ $\nu \in l \eta \eta \nu$, Apol. 28 d. äpa is ironical. See on $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha_{2} \ldots \not{ }^{2} \alpha, 47 \mathrm{e}$,
and particularly on $\eta^{\eta} \pi \rho \ell \nu \mu^{\dot{\epsilon}} \nu \kappa \tau \dot{\varepsilon}$., 46 d, where apa occurs only in the second clause. For the repetition,
 $\theta \in p a \pi \epsilon u \tau o \hat{u}$ (sc. $\grave{\alpha} \rho \in \tau \hat{\eta} s$ ) $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ ă $\lambda \lambda a$



 Notice the position of ooi, which is nevertheless not the emphatie word.
22. ทiv: "when you were under your father or perhaps your master." The past ( $\bar{\eta} \nu$ ) is opposed to the fut.
 the סoû̀os $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau o ́ s$, see on סoûдos in 17 above.
 (at any time) done to you. GMT. 532 ; II. $914 \mathrm{l3}$ (2). Though subord. to
 limited by the neg. statement où $\notin \xi$ Yoou $\bar{\eta} \nu$, which limits the clause $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ . . . $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ á.
24. oütє ... $\pi$ т $\lambda \lambda$ á: an explanation of $\dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \ldots \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \pi \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \bar{\nu}$, in which the neg. of ovic $\epsilon \xi$ toou $\bar{\eta} \nu$ is repeated.
 to $\lambda о i \delta o \rho o u ́ \mu c \nu o \nu \dot{\alpha}: \nu \tau i \lambda o i \delta o \rho \in i \nu$.
 so that you in your own turn will, etc. $\sigma$, when expressed in $\Lambda$ tt., has emphatic position. кal indicates equality,









$\delta \epsilon ́$ points the contrast between $\sigma \dot{v}$ and $\grave{\eta} \mu \in i ̂ s$.
29. тav̂ta $\pi 0 เ \hat{\nu}$ ठíkaıa $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon เ \nu:$ cf. Dem. ix. 15, каl tolav̀ $\tau \alpha$ $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu$ $\tau \iota$ Є̀ $\pi o i ́ \epsilon t$; and iv. 2, ovi $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \nu \delta \epsilon \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ $\pi о เ \circ \cup ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$. $\tau \omega \nu$. And yet Aristotle often makes a careful distinction between moteî and $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \epsilon \epsilon \nu$.
30. ó $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi<\mu \epsilon \lambda{ }^{\prime} \mu \in \operatorname{vos} \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} .:$ for the art., see on $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ єi ${ }^{\prime}$ d́ $\gamma 0 \nu \tau o s, A p o l . ~ 35 \mathrm{~b}$. The irony comes out in oüros (ita not tam) $\epsilon \hat{l} \sigma o \phi \delta ́ s, \tilde{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda_{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \in \nu \quad \sigma \epsilon$. $\bar{\eta}$ conveys very vigorously the covert reproof of the whole question, are you really? in would be comparatively weak. See App.
31. $\mu \eta$ тоós : for a similar order of



 Cf. also Hom. Od. ix. 367, $\mu \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \rho$ 引̀ $\delta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$ $\pi a \tau \grave{\eta} \rho \grave{\eta} \delta{ }^{\prime}$ à $\lambda \lambda o \iota \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ є́ $\tau \alpha i ̂ \rho o t . ~$
32. $\mathfrak{\eta}$ тarpis: by the addition of the art. the definite fatherland of each and every man is indicated. Cf. below, b, and 54 c. For the art. used as a poss., see G. 141 , x. 2 ; H. 658. Cf. Henry V. iv. 6, "He smiled me in the face." $C f$. e below. On the facts, $c f$. Cic. Off. I. 17. 57, cari sunt parentes, cari liberi, propin-
qui, familiares; sed omnes omnium caritates patria una complexa est, pro qua quis bonus dubitet mortem oppetere, sieisit profuturus? $C f$.
 $\sigma \theta a \iota \pi \in \rho i ̀ \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \eta s$, Hom. 1l. xii. 243.
33. év $\mu \in$ lyov $\mu \mathrm{ol} \rho \underline{\mathrm{c}}$ : after the analogy of Homeric expressions like that used by Poseidon of Zeus, Il. xv. 195, $\mu \in \nu \in ́ \tau \omega ~ \tau \rho ı \tau \alpha ́ \tau \eta ~ \grave{\epsilon} \nu l$ loíp $\eta$, i.e. in the one of the three parts of the world allotted to him as one of the three sons of Cronos. Cf. Eur. I. T.


 $\mu \in \gamma \alpha \boldsymbol{\lambda} \eta \hat{\eta} \gamma \mathrm{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ (considered of little or no account, nullo magnopere loco habebant).
 $\beta \in \sigma \theta a t$ is an implied $\tau \iota \nu \alpha$, not $\dot{\eta} \pi a \tau \rho / s$.
35. $\pi a \tau p i \delta a$ Xa入є $\pi a i v o v \sigma a v: ~ t h e$ acc. after $\sigma \epsilon \in \in \sigma \theta a l$, $\dot{\text { v }} \boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathfrak{\ell} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$, and $\theta \omega-$ $\pi \epsilon \mathcal{U} \epsilon \nu$, though $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \in \kappa \in t \nu$ should be followed by the dat. See on $\hat{\psi}, 47$ e. $C f$. Liv. xxvii. 34. 14 , ut parentium saevitiam, sic patriae patiendo ac ferendo leniendam esse.
36. $\pi \in i \theta \in t v:$ used absolutely, as in Apol. 35 e, to change her mind, to convert to your way of thinking; some-








 $\hat{a} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ тov̀s $\nu o ́ \mu o v s \hat{\eta}$ ov ;

КР. "Е $\mu о \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon$ бокєі.



 $\sigma \alpha^{\prime} \mu \in \nu 0 \iota \pi \in \pi\{\theta o \iota \mu \in \nu$. Cf. c below. The first two $\epsilon^{\prime} \alpha \nu \quad \tau \epsilon$ clauses (like єЇтє... є $\iota \tau \epsilon$, sive...sive), with $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \tau \eta$ understood, are explanatory of $\epsilon \dot{\alpha} \alpha \nu \tau \iota \pi \rho o \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \tau \eta \pi \alpha \theta \epsilon i \nu$, while the third takes a new verb with a new apod. The two former are specifications under $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, the third instances analogous cases where unqualified obedience to the state is necessary. The emergencies of war are taken as typical of a host of others, and then with $\epsilon \nu \delta$ owa $\sigma \tau \eta \rho!\omega$ the argument is brought to a head. This elaboration of the period leaves to its own devices $\pi 0 \not \eta \tau \epsilon \in \nu \quad \tau a \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha$ (which, grammatically, is subordinate to $\lambda \epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \eta \theta^{\prime} \varphi \sigma \sigma$ ).
 iteration of поıๆтє́од таиิта. We must not draw back, we must not retreat, we must not leave the ranks. Corresponding to these three duties, there
were three forms of indictment, $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \rho \alpha-$ тeías, $\delta \in i \lambda i \alpha a s, \lambda ı \pi o \tau a \xi i o u . ~ O n ~ t h e ~ l a s t, ~$ cf. Apol. 28 e-29 a. àтıía was the penalty involved in all these cases.
43. $\eta \pi \in i \theta_{\epsilon \tau v}$ : the inf. coming after e an impersonal verbal often depends on an implied $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ even when no $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ precedes. GMT. 925 ; H. 991 a.



 - र̂ं ... $\pi \in ́ \phi$ икє: quomodo iustum comparatum sit, an explanation of $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$, which implies $\delta \delta \delta \alpha^{\prime}-$ $\sigma \kappa \in \iota \nu$ (cf. Apol. 35 с, סıঠáбкєı кад $\pi \in i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu)$.
XIII. 1. бко́тєь тоโทvข ктє́.: an application of the universal truth to. a particular instance.
2. ӧть ктє́,: the relation of סiкаıa to $\hat{\alpha} \kappa \tau \hat{\epsilon}$. is the same in which $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$ $\theta \hat{\eta}$ of the clause preceding stands to rav̂̃a. Supply an inf. governing á.















7. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon เ \delta \dot{\alpha} \nu$ סoкı $\mu a \sigma \theta \hat{\eta}$ : there was strict examination ( $\delta о \kappa \iota \mu \alpha \sigma^{\prime} a$ ) into every youth's claim to be declared an Athenian citizen when he had completed his cighteenth year. If he proved of Athenian parentage, and otherwise qualified, he was declared of age, and registered in the $\lambda \eta \xi$ tap$\chi$ «кдข $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon i 0 \nu$ of his deme. See Schömann, Antiq. of Greece, pp. 359 f .
9. $\lambda a \beta$ óv $\tau \alpha$ : the dat. might stand here, bat cf. Symp. 176 d , Rep. iii. 414 a, Euthyph. 5 a, Eur. Heracl. 693, Soph. El. 479 ff., Aesch. Cho. 410 f.,



 is what makes ready for us all happiness, what makes us capable of being friends and familiars of our fellow-men and also of the gods, who are mightier than we. See G. 928,1 ; H. 941.

 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \beta o u ́ \lambda \eta \tau \alpha \iota$ in line 9 is a future supposition and depends on the future
 $\sigma \kappa \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ in 8 above). Then $\epsilon i \mu \grave{\eta}$ à $\rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \kappa о-$ $\mu \in \nu$ comes in naturally as a vaguer supposition subordinated to the others. If any of you wants (shall want) to go off' to a colony, supposing we and the state should not satisfy him. The notion of a citizen's not being suited by the law is so monstrous that it is stated as remotely as possible.
12. éáv тє $\mu \in \tau о к є є i v: ~ c f . ~ 52 ~ e, ~ a l s o ~$ the picturesque use of $\mu$ є́тоוкоs, Aesch. Pers. 319, and by Eurystheus, in speaking of his own body buried in foreign soil, Eur. Heracl. 1030 ff ., $\theta a-$ עóvтa $\gamma \alpha ́ \rho ~ \mu \epsilon ~ \theta \alpha ́ \psi \epsilon \theta^{\prime}$ ồ тठ $\mu \delta \rho \sigma \iota \mu о \nu$,

 dós.

















 $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, although $\pi \in i ́ \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ would mean about the same. See GMT. 100. $C f .52 \mathrm{~d}$ below, where $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \cup \in \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ is twice used similarly, with 52 c in.
 i) $\pi \in i \theta \in \iota \nu$ must be supplied from what precedes. The same idea is then expressed negatively and once again positively. aip $\rho \sigma \iota \nu$ т $\rho \circ \tau \iota \theta^{\prime} \nu a \iota$ is also used, meaning to leave a man free to choose. Socrates can never repeat too often that the state is right, as against those who seek to evade the authority of its law. This fact accounts for the clause which follows: $\tau o v ́ \tau \omega \nu$ oìS $\epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha$ поוє $\hat{\imath}$, a mere repeti-

22. Өáтєрa: the notion of plurality has here practically disappeared, as is often true also in the case of $\tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau a$.
 тaı каl $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma о \nu \tau a$. . These are cases of the anomalous use of the fut. mid. of these verbs for the fut. pass. кal: and what is more.
4. є̇v toîs $\mu$ ádıбтa: see on ṫv roîs $\beta a \rho \mathcal{U}_{\tau} \alpha \tau \alpha, 43$ c.
10. кal ov่тє. . . ov̉тє: the promi- b nence of the hypothetical expression (oủ $\gamma$ àp $\not \partial \nu \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$.) grows less here, and completely disappears with ò̀ $\delta$ '́, as the contradictory $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ plainly shows. $\theta \in \omega$ pía means not only a state embassy to games and festivals (see the passage from the Phaedo quoted on $\tau \boldsymbol{r}$ $\pi \lambda o i o \nu, 43$ c) but also attendance at religious festivals, particularly at the great national games, on the part of private individuals. See on $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \tau \tau \tau \omega$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \sigma \alpha s, 53$ a.
















 $\kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \varphi, a \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ov̉ $\lambda o ́ \gamma \omega, \vec{\eta}$ ov̉к ${ }^{a} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$ ．$\quad \tau i ́ \phi \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$

$b$ the campaigns of Socrates，see on ${ }_{\epsilon} \nu$ Потібаia，Apol． 28 e．Euphony，per－ haps，prevented the addition of oiv $\epsilon$－ $\mu^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \nu$ after $\grave{\alpha} \pi о \delta \eta \mu \dot{\prime} \alpha \nu$ ．C $f$ ． $52 \mathbf{e}$ and $54 \mathbf{b}$ ．

14．$\epsilon i \delta \in \dot{\epsilon}$ ar ：added for the sake of clearness and precision．The result is that the preceding gen．seems to be a case of prolepsis．Cf．Hom．Il．


 $\sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota \pi \lambda \hat{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu$ ．The subj．or obj．of the inf．is often put by anticipation as the obj．of its governing verb， noun，or adj．
c 17．каі．．．．$\dot{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \pi o เ \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega: ~ i s ~ f r e e d ~ f r o m ~}$ its connexion with $\dot{\omega} \mu 0 \lambda \dot{\sigma} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon$ ，to which， however，$\tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ is still attached．

irregularity was hardly avoidable， since a participle would have been clumsy，and the idea does not suit a clause with öтt．Accordingly it was hardly possible to subordinate it to


18．＇ítı tolvuv：transition to a new point，which，however，remains closely connected with the leading idea．

19．фvүฑ̂s $\tau \mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \sigma$ al ：cf．Apol． 37 c and see on $\tau \mu \mu \hat{\alpha} \tau \alpha \iota$ өavátov，$A p o l .36 \mathbf{b}$ ．
20．то́тє $\mu \in ́ v$ ：cf．Apol． $37 \mathrm{c}-38$ a．
21．е̇ка入入 $\omega \pi$（弓）：cf．Apol． 20 e ，


23．éketyous rov̀s $\lambda$ óyous aloxú－ $v \in \mathrm{t}$ ：not ashamed of those words，but， ashamed to face those words．H． 712. The words are personified and con－ front him with his disgrace．Cf． 46 b ．

KР. 'А $\nu a ́ \gamma \kappa \eta, \hat{\omega} \Sigma \dot{\omega} \kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon s$.











 professions. That $\oplus \mu 0 \lambda о \gamma \eta \kappa$ évat is the verb with which ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega$ is connected appears from the context. Cf. 51 e.
30. ä入入o $\tau \iota$ ท̈: see on ă $\lambda \lambda o \quad \tau \iota \tilde{\eta}$, ${ }^{-}$Apol. 24 c, and cf. Phaed. 79 c quoted below.
32. ทi $\mu \mathrm{a} \mathrm{s}$ aưtov́s: without any reflexive meaning. Cf. Phaed. 79 a,


 17 d . Socrates here speaks less accurately than in 51 d .
38. äs $\delta \dot{\eta}$ éка́бтотє ктє́: Plato, like many others, often praises these states, whose similar institutions were all of them based upon the common character due to their Dorian origin. In the Memorabilia, Xenophon, himself the ardent admirer of Sparta, reports various conversations where Socrates praises Dorian institutions. See (Mem. iii. 5. and iv. 4) his commendation of the strict obedience to law at Sparta and of the education
which prepares men for it. The education of Spartan women was less admired and less admirable. Cf. Eur.




 $\delta \epsilon \dot{\cup} \tau \tau \epsilon$;
 230 c, where Phaedrus says to Socrates as they are taking a walk in the

 $\mu^{\boldsymbol{e}} \boldsymbol{\nu} \varphi$ (a stranger come to see the sights in



 Socrates answers : $\sigma \nu \gamma \gamma i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \epsilon \epsilon \mu o l, \bar{\omega}$



43. $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda \frac{0}{}$ öt $\tau$ : appended at the end of the sent. by way of emphasis without having any place in the const.

 $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \varsigma \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \xi \in \lambda \theta \omega \dot{\omega} \nu$.
XV. ミкóтєє $\gamma$ à $\delta \eta_{\eta}, \tau \alpha \hat{\imath} \tau \alpha$ тараßàs каi $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha ́-$ $\nu \omega \nu \tau \iota \tau o v i \tau \omega \nu \tau i ́ a ̉ a \theta o ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon ’ \rho \gamma a ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \sigma \alpha \nu \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \eta ̀ ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \epsilon i-~$








See on $\widehat{\omega} \nu$ ơ $\nu \tau \omega \nu$, Apol. 37 b. H. 1049, 1 a. Cf. Eur. Suppl. 396, Ka $\delta \mu \epsilon i o s, \dot{\omega} s$

 $\gamma o \hat{v} \nu \tau^{\prime}$, o $\bar{l} \delta^{\prime}$ ö $\tau \iota$. Its stress is given chiefly to кal $\grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon i s$ oi $\nu o ́ \mu o t$.
44. ov̉к $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \mu \mu \dot{\operatorname{c} v} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ เs: a more vivid form of question than $\epsilon \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon i s$. The laws give answer to their own question in $\grave{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \quad \gamma \in \pi \epsilon \in \hat{i} \theta \eta$, which implies $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon i ̂ s$. Socrates might have said $\grave{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon \in \epsilon \omega$.
45. катаүє́ $\lambda a \sigma \tau о s:$ with reference to his preceding operations. $C f .52 \mathrm{e}$ above, $\sigma \grave{\nu} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu \kappa \tau \epsilon \in$.
XV. 1. бко́тєь: prefixed to an independent sent. just as ópấs often is. Cf. 47 a and Prot. 336 b . - тара-

 the continuance of the action.
b 5. $\sigma X \in \delta^{\circ} v \quad \tau l$ : this adv. use of $\tau l$ is common with $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu v, \sigma \chi \epsilon \delta \dot{\sigma} \nu, \pi \lambda \epsilon \sigma^{\prime} \nu$, $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$ and $\pi o \lambda \dot{v} .-\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu \mu \dot{v} v$ : the corresponding clause follows below (d) in a different form. See on $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime}$, 50 d .


61 ; H. 219. - єv่voцoûvтal үáp: for the facts, see on $\dot{\alpha} s \delta_{\grave{\eta}}$ є́ка́бтотє, 52 e , and cf. Soph. O. C. 919 ff., каíтоь $\sigma \in \Theta \hat{\eta} \beta a i ́$

 before and during the Peloponnesian war, there was a moderate oligarchy
 $\delta u \nu a \sigma \tau \epsilon i ́ a \dot{o} \lambda i \gamma \omega \nu$ of the time of the Persian wars) in political sympathy with Sparta. Megara also had an oligarchical form of government, and had been, since the battle of Coroneia ( 447 в.c.), on the Spartan side.
8. $\tau$ ovi $\omega \omega \nu$ : referring either to the cities (instead of év tovíots) or to their inhabitants. Cf. Hom. Od.



 Homeric $\dot{v} \pi o ́ \delta \rho \alpha$ i $\delta \omega \nu$. "They will look upon you with suspicion." The implication of suspicion is conveyed by the $\dot{v} \pi \delta$ in $\dot{v} \phi o \rho \hat{a} v, \dot{v} \pi o \psi i ́ a$, as in Xen. An. ii. 4. 10, oi $\delta \frac{1}{\epsilon}{ }^{\omega} E \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \in s$ v́vo o $\hat{\omega} \nu$ -





 $\tau \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\nu} \nu о \mu о \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu a s$ $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota s$ каi $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ то̀̀s ко $\sigma \mu \iota \omega \tau \alpha ́-$








 є̇к $\tau о \hat{v} \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \omega \tau \eta \rho i ́ o v ~ a ̀ \pi \epsilon \delta i ́ \delta \rho a \sigma \kappa \epsilon \varsigma \sigma \kappa \epsilon v \eta \nu_{\nu} \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \iota \nu \alpha \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \theta \epsilon ́-$

10. кal $\beta \in \beta a \iota \omega ́ \sigma \epsilon t s$ к $\tau \dot{\epsilon}$.: $\delta o ́ \xi \alpha$ and бокєì in the same sense, as in 44 c. "Indicibus opinionem confirmabis ut recte videantur tulisse sententiam." Wolf.
c 17. $\eta^{\prime \prime}$ : see App.
19. ăv фavєíनOal: see on oùk $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu\end{gathered}$ тоєŋ́бovтos, Apol. 30 b.
 more than a periphrasis for $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime} \tau \eta s$. Cf. $\tau \delta \sigma \delta \nu \pi \rho \alpha \hat{\alpha} \mu \alpha$, Apol. $20 \mathrm{c} ;$ Hipp.
 $\pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a$ каl iठьштєкóv, I should be a wretched ignoramus. Eur. Heracl. 57 f.,


 mon way of answering one's own question. $C f .54 \mathrm{~b}$.
 speaks as if the fact were familiar to Crito. The nobles of Thessaly
were rich and hospitable, and bore the reputation of being violent and licentious. Some light is thrown upon the whole subject by the character of Meno given by Xenophon, An. ii. 6. 21 ff . Cf. also Dem. i. $22, \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \Theta \epsilon \tau \tau \alpha-$
 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega$ óroıs. This chiefly relates to their political character. $C f$. also the ironical words of Socrates on the Thessalians in Plato's Meno, 70 a b.
 first clause the disjunctive $\hat{\dagger} \delta^{\delta} \phi \theta \epsilon \epsilon \rho a \nu$
 $p a$ was, according to the Schol. on Ar. Nul. 73, а $\pi о \iota \mu \epsilon \nu \kappa \grave{\partial} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta o ́ \lambda \alpha \iota o \nu$.
 of costume, and are also used of the costumes of actors. Cf. Ar. Achar. 383 f ., where Dicaeopolis, before beginning his defence, says: $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ oủ $\nu \mu \epsilon$



 $\theta \nu \mu \epsilon i \nu ~ \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu, \nu o ́ \mu o v s ~ \tau o ̀ ̀ s ~ \mu \epsilon \gamma i ́ \sigma \tau o v s ~ \pi a \rho a \beta a ́ s, ~ o u ̉ \delta \epsilon i s ~ o ̂ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \rho \epsilon i ̂ ; ~$








 $\sigma \theta a i ́ \mu$ ' oîov à $\theta \lambda \iota \omega$ tazav. Cf. also ibid. 436. $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$, on the other hand, relates to the other disguises of face and figure necessary to complete the transformation.
28. wis to elkós: that is according e to the law of nature. - '̇тó $\lambda \mu \eta \sigma a s:$ see on $\tau \delta \lambda \mu \eta s$, Apol. $38 \mathbf{d}$, and App.
29. oúbels ös: will there be nobody to say this? i.e. "absolutely every one," expressed interrogatively. Here, as in many common idioms, the verb" to be" is omitted.
30. $\epsilon \frac{\ell}{} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu \eta$ : otherwise. See GMT.
 like $\dot{\alpha} \kappa о \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa \alpha \kappa \alpha ́(\dot{v} \pi \delta \quad \tau \iota \nu o s)$ is the passive of $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ кака́. Cf. 50 e . The $\kappa \alpha i ́ l$ between $\pi o \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime}$ and $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\xi} \iota \alpha$ should not be translated.
31. $\delta \eta^{\prime}$ : accordingly. He must make up his mind to it, he has no choice.
32. кai $\delta o u \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \omega v$ : better understood absolutely than with an implied dat. Here we have a blunt statement of the fact which Socrates had in mind in saying $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \chi \delta \mu \in \nu \rho s$. - $\tau i \pi o \iota \omega \nu$ $\eta{ }_{\eta} \kappa \tau \mathcal{E} .:$ the partic. goes with the verb
of the foregoing clause. This cannot be reproduced in Eng., "in fact how can you live there except in one continual round of revelry, as if you had come to Thessaly to eat and drink." No ă $\lambda \lambda o$ is needed after $\tau \dot{i}$.
35. $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \grave{\alpha} \delta \eta^{\prime}:$ a new objection raised and answered by the laws themselves in respect of what Crito said, 45 c $46 \mathbf{a}$ - $-\boldsymbol{d} \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime}$ : relates to the preceding thought: of course these sayings are nowhere, "but are you actually willing ?" etc. See on Apol. 37 c.
38. 'iva кal тоиิто ктєٔ.: i.e. in addition to all other obligations. àmodav́$\epsilon \iota \nu$ is often used, as here, ironically. How a Greek looked upon exile is plain from passages like Eur. El. 1311 ff ., où $\chi$ й $\delta^{\prime} \mid$ oiк $\tau \rho \alpha{ }^{2} . \Delta \mathrm{I} . \pi \epsilon ́ \pi o \nu \theta \epsilon \nu$,


 388 ff ., where Polynices, answering Iocasta's question, $\tau_{i}^{\prime} \tau \delta \quad \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \pi a \tau \rho!-$

 i. $3,-$




 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ боь фабко́vт $\omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \tau \eta \delta \epsilon i \omega \nu$ єî̀al, oї $\epsilon \sigma \theta a i ́ \gamma \epsilon \chi \rho \dot{\eta}$. b












What is my sentence then but speechless death,
Which robs my tongue from breathing native breath?
and Dante, Puradiso, xvir., -
Thou shalt abandon everything beloved Most tenderly, and this the arrow is Which first the bow of banishment shoots forth.
$C f$. also many well-known passages in the Odyssey, e.g. Od. i. 58 , $i_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \mu \in \nu о s$ каl





44. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$. . . єival: explanation of $\alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \hat{\nu} \nu$. $\sigma o i ́ l$ is not to be connected
b with фабкóvт $\omega \nu$. - ol $\epsilon \sigma \theta a l \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathrm{X} \eta^{\prime}$ : cf. 53 с.
XVI. 3. $\pi \rho o^{\prime}:$ after $\pi \epsilon \rho l \pi \lambda \epsilon$ ío 0 os. ${ }^{5}$ See on $\pi \rho \delta$ тồ à $\delta \kappa \kappa \epsilon i v, 48 \mathrm{~d}$.
5. ä $\mu \epsilon เ v o v . . . \delta \iota \kappa a เ o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \circ v:$ see on ă $\mu \in \iota \nu=\nu$, Apol. 19 a.
6. oí $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \mu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu$ : the laws add this for Crito's benefit. $C f$. 45 c-46 a.
7. vôv $\mu \in ́ v$ : assuming that Socrates has made up his mind not to take Crito's advice.
8. oux $\dot{v} \phi \phi^{\prime} \eta \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} .:$ the laws add this in the vein of what has gone before.

fallible mortals who act as guardians and representatives of the blameless laws. See Introd. 30-35. Cf. Apol.
 тoû̃o ol̂̀ॄ, $\tau o u ̀ s ~ \nu \delta \mu o v s . ~$
11. тараßás, є́pyaба́цєvos: subordinated to the foregoing partics.

## b





 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\eta} \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i s$.
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 $\tau \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon$, | оѝ $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\eta}$ そúvoเкоs $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ка́ $\tau \omega \quad \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ ді́кךктє́.
d
 Socrates speaks with great tenderness in order to make his final refusal the less hard to bear. The exceptional feature in this form of address lies in the mention of Crito's name at the end.
2. oi кори $\beta a \nu \tau \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s: ~ к о \rho v \beta a \nu \tau \iota a ̂ \nu$ means act like the Corybantes. These were priests of Phrygian Cybele, whose orgiastic rites were accompanied by dances and deafening music. Here a species of madness seems to be indicated, under the influence of which men imagined that they heard the flutes that were used in Corybantian revels. Cf. Ion, $534 \mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ oi $\kappa о \rho \cup \beta a \nu \tau \iota \omega ิ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ оѝк $\not{\epsilon} \mu \phi \rho о \nu \epsilon s$ ú $\nu \tau \epsilon s$ ò $\rho$ -

 $\sigma \iota \nu$, and the song of the bacchants in Eur. Bacch. 114-129 and 155-161, -

Soon shall the country rejoice in the dance;
Soon with his revellers Bacchus advance;
Into the hills, the hills shall he fare,
Joining the host of his women-folk there.
Far from their homes and their weaving they came,
Goaded by Bacchus and stung by his name.
$O$ wild Curetes' vaulted lair!
O hallowed haunts of Crete!
Where new-born Zeus found faithful care, And kind protection meet
In caverns safe from every snare.
Corybantes, wearing helms three-rimmed, Stretched skins to make my drum's full round;
Then they, in hollowed caves, lithe-limbed,
With drums, and, with the flute's shrill sound
Full Phrygian, bacchic ditties hymned.
Sing Dionysus, and praised let him be;
Beat ye the deep-sounding drums as of old;
Sing to the Evian god evoe!
Greet him with Phrygian cries, and let flutes Trill in your revels and ripple shrill joy; Instruments holy the holy employ.
5. ö $\sigma a \gamma \in \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon}$.: a limitation added to soften the assertion. See on ö $\sigma \alpha$ $\gamma \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \epsilon \iota, 46$ e. No obj. is needed with $\lambda \in ́ \gamma!!s$. $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \in \iota \nu \pi \alpha \rho \grave{\alpha} \kappa \tau \epsilon \in$. comes
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##  <br> 54 §ウ̀ $\tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta$ ò $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s ~ \dot{v} \phi \eta \gamma \epsilon i ̄ \tau \alpha l$.

54 very near the meaning of à $\nu \tau i \lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \epsilon i \nu$. $C f .48 \mathrm{~d}$. Cf. also the omission of the obj. $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon$ with the preceding aot $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \hat{\imath}$ $\mu \grave{~} \delta u ́ v a \sigma \theta a \iota \kappa \tau$ к.
e 8. ëa: used abs. with a following subjv. or imv. to dismiss a matter under discussion. Cf. Charm. 163 e,
 $\sigma \kappa о \pi \bar{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ b̀ $\sigma \grave{v} \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon เ s \nu \hat{v} \nu$. Euthyd.
 $\kappa a l \mu \grave{\eta} \chi \chi \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega \hat{\omega} \mu \in \pi \rho o \delta i \delta \partial \sigma \kappa \epsilon$. - таv́тך: the repetition of the same word is effective.
9. ó $\theta \epsilon$ ós: sec on $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \in \hat{\varphi}$, Apol. 19 a. Here, as at the end of his de-
fence proper, Apol. 35 d , and at the end of his closing words in court, Apol. 42 a, Socrates mentions ó $\theta \in$ ós. Dante closes each one of the three parts of his great poem with a referparts of his great poem with a refer-
ence to the stars. This is no accident in either case, though Plato had a philosopher's reason which Dante could not give, except for the closing line of the Paradiso, which is $\delta \theta \in \dot{c}$ s translated into the language of the poet, " L' Amor che muove il Sole e l'altre stelle," The love which moves the sun and the other stars.

## MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS.

Since all the extant Mss. of Plato follow or attempt to follow Thrasyllus in his subdivision into nine tetralogies or groups consisting of four members each, and since Thrasyllus was instructor to the emperor Tiberius, it follows that the origin of no Ms. of Plato now known to exist can be assigned to a date much earlier than the middle of the first century A.D. The following is a table exhibiting Thrasyllus's tetralogies, and also naming the best Ms. in which each tetralogy is preserved:-

| I. | Euthyphro. | Apology. | Crito. | Phaedo. | Clarkianus(B). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II. | Cratylus. | Theaetetus. | Sophist. | Statesman. | " " |
| III. | Parmenides. | Philebus. | Symposium. | Phaedrus. | " " |
| IV. | Alcibiades 1. | Alcibiades II. | Hipparchus. | Auterastae. | " " |
| V. | Theages. | Charmides. | Laches. | Lysis. | "، " |
| VI. | Euthydemus. | Protagoras. | Gorgias. | Meno. | " ، |
| VII. | Hippias maior. | Hippias minor. | Io. | Menexenus. | Venetus T. |
| VIII. | Clitophon. | Republic. | Timaeus. | Critias. | Parisinus A. |
| IX. | Minos. | Laws. | Epinomis. | Letters. | ، " |

Of the three Mss., the most trustworthy is Clarkianus, and the least trustworthy is Venetus 'T. Schanz constructs the pedigree of the existing Mss. of Plato, and traces them all to an original or Archetypus. This parent Ms. consisted of two volumes: Vol. I. contained the first seven tetralogies; Vol. II. contained the last two tetralogies, together with a number of works attributed with more or less confidence to Plato. The copies made of Vol. I. were of two kinds, (1) incomplete, omitting the seventh tetralogy, and (2) complete. The best Ms. now preserved represents an incomplete copy of Yol. I. of the Archetypus; this is the codex Clarkianus, the capital authority for the first six tetralogies. The complete copy of Vol. I. is represented by the much less trustworthy codex Venetus T, the best authority for the seventh tetralogy.
The best representative of Vol. II. of the Archetypus is codex Parisinus A.

The leading facts about these three Mss. are as follows :-
I. Codex Clarkianus, referred to by the single letter B for brevity's sake and because the Ms. is called also Bodleianus. It is now in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, and is "the fairest specimen of Grecian caligraphy which has descended to modern times." Daniel Clarke found this Ms., in October, 1801, in the library of a monastery on the island of Patmos. It was beautifully written on parchment, in the year 896 A.D., by a skilful scribe, one Joannes, for the use of Arethas, who afterwards became archbishop of Caesarea. See M. Schanz, Novae Commentationes Platonicae, pp. 105-118; and Daniel Clarke, Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa.
II. Codex Venetus T, Bekker's t . This Ms. is now in the Library of St. Mark's in Venice, and is chiefly valuable where the Clarkianus entirely fails, i.e. for the seventh tetralogy. For a more detailed account, see M. Schanz, Ueber den Platocodex der Marcus-Bibliothek in Venedig; also the preface to Vol. IX. of the same author's critical edition of Plato's works. The date of this Ms. is very uncertain.
III. Parisinus A, No. 1807 (formerly 94 and 2087). This Ms. is now in the National Library at Paris; it was probably written early in the tenth century after Christ. It comprises the eighth and ninth tetralogies of Thrasyllus, together with seven spurious dialogues. The Clitophon, with which it begins, is numbered twenty-nine. See M. Schanz, Studien zur Geschichte des Platonischen Textes, and the general introduction to his critical edition of Plato's works. There are many other Mss. of Plato, for some account of which also see Schanz in his general introduction, and in Bursian's Jahresbericht ( $9,5,5,1$, pp. 178-188), where he summarizes his results and defends them against Jordan and Wohlrab.

## IMPORTANT EDITIONS OF PLATO'S COMPLETE WORKS.

Platonis opera quae extant omnia. Ex nova Joannis Serrani interpretatione, perpetuis ejusdem notis illustrata. Henrici Stephani de quorundam locorum interpretatione judicium, et multorum contextus graece emendatio. - Excudebat Henricus Stephanus. M.D.LXXVIII. 3 vol. in fol.

In all modern editions of Plato, numbers and letters which refer to the pages of the edition of Stephanus are found in the margin. This is the most convenient mode of reference, and is now universally employed to the exclusion of the less well-established subdivision into chapters. The edition of Stephanus (Henri Estienne) is in three volumes, but to give the volume is superfluous, since the name of the dialogue is given in every reference. Each page is divided into five parts by the letters (a) bcde placed down the margin.

Platonis Dialogi. (Gr. et Lat.) Ex recensione Imm. Bekker. 3 Partes. in 8 Voll. Commentaria crit. et scholia. 2 Voll. Berolini, 18161823. (This edition contains the first systematic collation of Mss., and the result is a great improvement upon the Stephanus text.)

Platonis Dialogi. Text. ad fidem codd. Florent., Paris., Vindobb. aliorumque recogn. Gdfr. Stallbaum. 12 Tom. Lipsiae, 1821-1825.

Platonis Opera omnia. Rec. prolegomenis et comment. illustr. Gdfr. Stallbaum. 10 Voll. Lipsiae, 1827-1877. (In the Bibliotheca Graeca of Jacobs and Rost.)

Platonis Opera quae feruntur omnia. Recogn. I. G. Baiterus, Ioa. C. Orellius, A. G. Winckelmannus. Acced. variet. lectionis Stephanianae, Bekkerianae, Stallbaumianae, scholia, Timaei lexicon, nominum index. 2 Pts. Turici, 1839-1842.

Platonis Dialogi secundum Thrasylli tetralogias dispositi. Ex recognitione Caroli Friderici Hermanni. 6 Voll. Lipsiae (1851, 1853), 1873, 1874.

Platonis Opera, quae feruntur omnia, ad codd. denuo collatos, ed. Martinus Schanz. Ed. ster. Lipsiae, 1875-1877.

## IMPORTANT OR CONVENIENT EDITIONS OF THE APOLOGY AND OF THE CRITO.

Platonis Dialogi V. Amatores, Euthyphro, Apologia, Crito, Phaedo. Recens. notisque illustravit Nath. Forster. Edit. III. Oxonii (1745), 1765.

Platonis Dialogi IV. Euthyphro, Apologia, Crito, Phaedo. E rec. Henr. Stephani. Gr. Ad fid. codd. Mss. Tubing. August. aliorumque et librorum editorum veterum rec. animadvers. illustravit, tertium edid. Ioa. Frid. Fischer. Lipsiae, 1783.

Platonis Dialogi IV. Meno, Crito, Alcibiades uterque cum annotatione critica et exegetica, cur. I. Er. Biester. Ed. V. Cur. Ph. Buttmann. Berolini (1780), 1830.

Platonis Apologia, Crito et Phaedo. Accedit emendationis specimen in nonullis reliquorum dialogorum. Edidit R. B. Hirschig. Trajecti ad Rhen, 1853.

Platonis Apologia Socratis et Crito. Ed. V. aliquanto auct. et. emendat. quam cur. M. Wohlrab. Lipsiae (1827), 1877. (This is Vol. I., Section 1, of Teubner's ten-volume publication of Stallbaum's complete Plato mentioned above.)

The Apológy of Plato, with a revised text and English notes, and a digest of Platonic idioms. By the Rev. James Riddell, M.A. Oxford, 1867.

Plato's Apology and Crito, with notes. By W. S. Tyler. New York, 1860.

Plato's Apology of Socrates and Crito, with notes. By W. Wagner. Cambridge, England, 1869. (Boston, 1877.)

Platons Verteidigungshede des Socrates und Kriton. Erklärt von Dr. Christian Cron. Achte Auflage. Leipzig, 1882. (This edition is the basis of the present work, and is the first part of an edition of the selected works of Plato, edited for the use of schools by Dr. Cron and Dr. Julius Deuschle.)

## CRITICAL NOTES.

These notes are Dr. Cron's necessary explanation of the text which he has adopted. Where departures have been made from Dr. Cron's text, they are in turn discussed. The first reading is the one adopted in this edition. I 3 denotes Codex Clarkianus ( $=$ Bodleianus). T denotes Codex Venetus T. S denotes the reading, adopted by Schanz, W that adopted by Wohlrab. Bem. denotes Dr. Cron's "Kritische und exegetische Bemerkungen zu Platons Apologie, Criton, und Laches. Separat Abdr. aus dem fünften Supplement-band der Jahrb. für classische Philologie," pp. 64-132. Leipzig, 1864. Teubner.

## APOLOGY.

17 a, p. 55 (1). ö $\tau \iota$ : with S . Cron writes ört, following the analogy of óvтıs, $\eta$ ท̈rıs, but ó $\tau$ l is unquestionably needed for clearness.
$17 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{p} .56$ (13). yoûv: with inferior Ms. and B (second hand). ousv, B (first hand) and Cron following $S$.

17 b, p. 56 (14). $\delta \epsilon \in \mu o v: \delta^{\prime} \notin \mu o v ̂, ~ S W ~ w i t h ~ H e i n d o r f . ~$
17 c, p. 57 (17). d $\lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ : with Bessarion's Ms. (Venetus E). d $\lambda \lambda \lambda$ d, Cron and $S$ following B .

17 c, p. 57 (18). ovó $\mu a \sigma \iota$ : with B. óvó $\mu a \sigma \iota v$, Cron and S with Bessarion's Ms. and Venctus 185 (Bekker's $\Pi$ ).
 $\pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \omega$, which is found only in inferior Mss. Hermann adopted $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\beta} \delta \circ \mu \eta^{\prime}-$ коута.


18 a, p. 59 (4). $\gamma \in$ үóvaat: with the best Mss. $\gamma \in \gamma$ óvárı, Cron following S. There are marks of correction in B and other Mss., but no Mss. cited by $S$ reads $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{f}$ yóvactv.
 bracketed $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o v . . . \alpha \lambda \eta \theta$ '́s as a gloss, while the Zürich edition lets the words

 is the best unless these words are simply to be cut out. Riddell says "the shythm would be intolerable without the three words $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o v ~ o v i \delta e ̀ v ~ d i \lambda \eta \theta e ́ s . " ~$

18 b, p. 60 (10). фроvтıбт $\grave{s}$ : Albert von Bamberg (Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher,
$113,10)$ proposes to cut out $\phi \rho o v \tau \iota \sigma \tau \dot{s}$, because no exact parallel to this acc. of the dir. obj. has been found in prose. So far he is right, even against Krüger's citation of various adjs. joined with єโval, for such combinations are very closely akin to verbal forms. On the other hand, to make such a point of the distinction between the indir. (or remoter) obj. which Bamberg would allow, and the dir. obj. which he proposes to disallow, is to ignore the difference in this particular between Greek and Latin syntax. In the shifting of voice from act. to pass., for instance, the distinction between dir. and indir. obj. is far less scrupulously defined in Greek than in Latin. To be sure Xenophon
 and Mem. iv. 7.6, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ oúpavi $\omega \nu \phi \rho o \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta})$. It should be remembered that consistency may be too much insisted upon. Furthermore ä $\pi \alpha \xi$ єipqu't $\nu a$ are not surprising in a speech, which, like the Apology, aims to give Socrates's personal hobbies in language as in thought.

$18 \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{p} .61$ (13). ákov́ovtєs: ákov́бavtes, S following B (first hand).
18 d, p. 62 (20). єl' тis: $\boldsymbol{\epsilon l} \mu \eta^{\prime} \tau i s$, W. See his prolegg., p. 42.
18 d, p. 62 (21). к $\omega \mu \omega \delta$ เo $\quad$ otós: with S following B. Elsewhere $\kappa \omega \mu \omega \delta 0-$


18 d, p. 63 (23). $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \epsilon s: \pi \alpha \nu \tau \omega v$, W. See his prolegg., p. 42.
18 e, p. 63 (32). Uhlig quotes (Rhein. Mus. 19, 1, and Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 121,10 ) the authority of several grammarians to prove that the exclamation єiєv has no connexion with єival. He maintains that it is and always was an interjection, and that there was originally an aspirate at the beginning of the second syllable, like $\epsilon$ voil, $\operatorname{\epsilon vaj} \boldsymbol{v}$ (bacchic interjections), and the $\Lambda$ ttic $\tau a \omega \hat{s}$.
 фúyoıцı, Cron.

19 d, p 66 (19). $\mu$ ккро̀v: with Cron and S following B. $\sigma \mu$ ккрòv, inferior Mss. Judging from other cases, cf. below ( 28 b) and in the Crito ( 46 a), $\sigma \mu \kappa$ кóv and $\mu$ ккро́v have about equal claims in any given place.
 19 e, p. 67 (7). olós $\tau^{\prime}$ モ̇ $\sigma \tau เ v:$ [olós $\left.\tau^{\prime} \epsilon \in \sigma \tau i v\right]$, S.

20 a, p. 67 (10). $\sigma \phi i \sigma \iota$ : with B (second hand) and other Mss. $\sigma \phi i \sigma \iota v$, Cron following $S$ with $B$ (first hand).

20 a, p. 67 (17). ка入ы́ $\tau \epsilon$ кal áyä̀̀: following $B$ with $S \mathrm{~W}$. Venetus $T$
 jects the reading of $B$ and defends $T$, but he has not the eourage of his convictions, and finally retains the reading of $B$.

 Bobrik (Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 113, 5) argues against bracketing the words, "that the meaning of $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau \sigma^{\prime} v$ is quantitative while that of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda_{0} \hat{o}^{2} v$ is qualitative." $\mathbf{S}$ (Bursian's Jahresbericht, 9, 5, 1, p. 188) is not convinced.


20 e, p. 70 (18). $\mu \eta \delta^{\prime}$ '́àv: with Heusde (Spec. crit. p. 11). $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ äv, Cron following $S$ with $B$.

$20 \mathrm{e}, \mathrm{p} .71$ (21). $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota: \epsilon \in \tau \tau \nu, \mathrm{S}$ W.
 Struibing gives at too great length (Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 121, 2) his too ingenious account of Ar. Clouds, 1072 ff .; but in a note (pp. 90, 91) he very acutely suggests that $\Sigma \phi \eta^{\prime} \tau \tau$ os was a nickname bestowed by Aristophanes in the
 on Ar. Plut. 720. Cf: Laches, 197 c, fin., with Stallbaum's note.

21 c, p. 73 (11). бофஸ́тєpós є́ $\sigma \tau \iota$ : with S W. But the reading of B , as Gaisford specifically says, is $\neq \sigma \tau$.
 includes these words in the parenthesis and connects them with $\pi \rho \circ{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ of $v$ $\boldsymbol{\kappa \tau \in}$.


22 a, p. 76 (11). iva $\mu \mathrm{o}$ : "ıva $\mu \eta^{\prime} \mu \mathrm{ol}$, S with H. Stephanus, and Madvig. The latter (Adv. Crit. I. p. 367) says "Sed residet scrupulus in kai, quod aptum non est."

22 b, p. 77 (17). $\mu$ á $\lambda_{\iota \sigma \tau a: ~ S c h a n z ~(P h i l o l . ~ 28, ~ 3, ~ p . ~ 556) ~ s u g g e s t s ~ к a ́ \lambda \lambda ı \sigma \tau a ~}^{\text {a }}$
 might be compared Hor. Sat. i. 10, 58, Versiculos magis factos et euntes mollius.
 rior Mss. See, however, Heindorf's Annotatio critica in Apologiam Socratis, p. IX. Berolini MDCCCV.

23 a, p. 80 (9). тоиิтo: with Stallbaum following inferior Mss. тov̂' ov่, S W with F. A. Wolf. The reading of B and all the best Mss. is rovitov, which Ast defends (Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Kunst, Vol. I. part 2, p. 104). See Bem. p. 90 f.

23 c, p. 82 (8). oủX aúroîs: oủk aủzoîs, W following inferior Mss. with H. Stephanus and Engelhardt, who refers aúroîs, of course, to the young. But it is by no means natural that men who are found out should not be angry with their discoverers. Their natural anger is, however, turned against Socrates, the real instigator of their discomfiture. Socrates is not saying that they should not be angry with him, but rather urges that they should be angry with themselves, i.e. with their own conceit of knowledge. This is the meaning demanded by the context, see $\mathbf{d}$ below, ad fin. Further, rovíols would give the sense required by $W$ far more clearly than av́roîs.

 to the way in which the words are introduced or to the words themselves.
$23 \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{p} .83$ (15). of $\mu \mathrm{at}$ : with Stallbaum. olo $\mu \mathrm{a}$, Cron following S and all good Mss. In this chapter 13 has ofuat twice, see lines 5 and 17. It looks like superstition to write olopal here.

23 e, p. 83 (17). $\xi \nu \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \alpha \gamma \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega s: \xi \nu \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ v \omega s, S$ with Hermann following Bessarion's Ms.

 crasure in B .

24 b, p. 84 (5). ${ }^{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ : is, Rieckher.

 traces of crasure in B; similar traces after clot in this line do not lead them to write $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$.
 Cobet. See Bem. p. 93.

 ing of B. ćrav, Cron. W reads $\hat{\dot{\omega}} \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$. Krause explains it as meaning $\hat{\omega} Z \in \hat{v}$ 25 d, p. 89 (7). а̇токрivov: ámóкрıval, W.
 Naber reads $\eta_{\eta}, \epsilon \ell \delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \omega, \delta \iota a \phi \theta \in i \rho \omega$ äк $\omega \nu$.

26 a, p. 89 (21). кal d́kovoi $\omega v$ : bracketed as a gloss by S with Cobet.

 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i v$, Cron's eighth edition with Schanz, who, however, says of the two word (Novae Commentationes Platonicae, p. 163), "Verba minime necessaria velim deleantur."

26 c, p. 91 (10). тоvтolol: with B (second hand) and Vaticanus 1029 (Bekker's r). Cron following $S$ writes tov́rous with Venetus 185 (Bekker's ח). тov̂тoเs, B .

26 c, p. 91 (13). ${ }^{\text {ad }} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ : with Bessarion's Ms. Cron following $S$ writes $\alpha \lambda \lambda d$ with $B$ and other Mss.

26 d, p. 92 (20). "Avakayópov: ['Avakayópov], S. Baiter requires $\Sigma \omega \kappa$ кárous.
 sen, Berlin, 1882, p. 434, Rem. 4) says, "The notion that these writings were themselves sold $\dot{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} v} \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\partial} \rho \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \rho \underline{q}$ is not conveyed here, for, if so, why should
 else which is sold for a drachma and which, therefore, cannot have been the $\beta \iota \beta \lambda i a$. ."
 lows B in respect of $\nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{i} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega}$.
 the emphasis is wholly on $\epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \omega$ ，there seems to be no good reason for disre－ garding the reading of B ．
 $\left.\eta^{\prime} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu}^{\prime} v o u s\right]$ ，Cron．A change of some kind is unavoidable；the least possible change is to bracket $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ with Forster，who is followed by Heindorf and Cobet． This yields perfectly good sense，better，in fact，than Cron obtains by brack－

 үрaфウ̀v тaú $\tau \eta \nu]$ ，Cron．S and Cron agree that both expressions cannot stand．
 bracketed，as a gloss added to explain $\dot{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \pi \epsilon\left\llcorner\rho \omega^{\mu} \mu \in \boldsymbol{v o s}\right.$.

27 e，p． 98 （35）．［ov่］тoû aủtov̂：ov่ тov̂ aủtoû， S W．Wecklein says（Rhein． Mus．36，1，p．145），＂Any one who grasps the argument summarized at this point in the Apology ought to agree to the following completion of it：ötwos $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$

 $\delta a l \mu o v a s \mu \eta^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon 0 v{ }^{\prime}$ ，ov́ $\delta \epsilon \mu i a \mu \eta \chi \alpha \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \tau เ v$ ．＂Gochel，in the Programm of the Gymnasium at Fulda，first rejects all the interpretations made with a view to retaining ov่ before $\boldsymbol{\tau 0} \hat{v}$ av่тov̂，and then proceeds to defend it by arguing that $\pi \epsilon \hat{\theta}$ Oors is used in an absolute sense，while the clause beginning with wis he takes as a causal parenthesis．The chief objection to this explanation is that it explains the whole sentence away，leaving it not a leg to stand on．It is better，therefore，to reject ov and to consider that $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \omega a s$ was added along with the rest in Meletus＇s anxiety to make his charge of irreligion a sweeping one．A religious－minded $\Lambda$ thenian certainly believed in gods and in heroes． The term $\delta a^{\prime} \mu \boldsymbol{v} \epsilon \mathrm{s}$ ，since the precise meaning of the word was hard to fix， might－so far as Meletus＇s immediate purpose went－have been omitted， but the preceding $\delta a \mu_{\text {óvia }}$ make its introduction here indispensable．On Meletus＇s ascription to Socrates of belief in Salpóvıa is based Socrates＇s asser－ tion that so far from being an atheist，he believes like any other Greek in gods and demi－gods，called $\delta a\left\{\mu o v \epsilon s\right.$ or more commonly $\eta^{\prime \prime} \rho \omega \epsilon s$ ．
$27 \mathrm{e}, \mathrm{p} .98$（36）．aṽ $\boldsymbol{\tau 0} \mathrm{v}$ av่тov̂：av̂［ $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ av่тov̂］， S with Hirschig．

28 a，p． 98 （7）．kal ä入入ovs：кa入av̀s，$S$ with Hirschig．

$28 \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{p} .100(21)$ ．$\AA \pi \alpha \mathrm{i}: \mathrm{S}$ omits these words which are added in the mar－ gin of $B$ ．

28 d, p． 100 （31）．$\tau \mathfrak{a} \xi \eta \eta \eta_{\eta}$ ：with B and other best Mss．Cron following S writes $\tau \alpha{ }^{\prime} \eta$ with Bessarion＇s Ms．，strengthened by various authors who quote $\tau \alpha \xi \eta$ ，omitting the $\eta$ ．

29 b，p． 104 （22）．áSıkєîv：Otto Erdmann proposes（Fleckeisen＇s Jahrb． 119，5，p．412）to substitute ámьбтєiv．
 following Bessarion's Ms.
$29 \mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{p} .105(36) .{ }^{2} \nu \delta \rho \in \mathrm{~s}$ : following B. $\hat{\omega}$ äv $\delta \rho \in \mathrm{s}$, inferior Mss.
29 d, p. 106 (43). alซxúveเ: B. aloxúvך, other Mss.
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 plainly has this thought in mind already, as is proved by his postponing its amplification until after another thought introduced with $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon} v \gamma{ }^{\boldsymbol{v}}{ }^{\prime} \rho$ has been developed. The point is that $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \grave{\nu} \nu \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is also in the closest connexion with the leading idea тoเov̂тov oैvтa.


 this comes in very awkwardly.

30 e, p. 110 (21). oilov is taken by Goebel as a neuter, and he does not connect ós with rowôtóv rıva, but with épé. He does not urge that the other way is ungrammatical, but apparently he thinks that the sense is in favor of his explanation. His argument is hardly convincing.
 best Mss.
 writes $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \notin \epsilon \epsilon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ on the authority of Venetus 185 (Bekker's II) and of an erasure in $B$.

31 b, p. 111 (37). $\mu \in ́ v \tau o l: \mu \epsilon ́ v, S$ with Cobet and Hermann.


31 d, p. 113 (6). [ $\left.\phi \omega \nu \eta^{\prime}\right]$ : bracketed by Forster, whom F. A. Wolf followed. $\phi \omega v \eta^{\prime}, B$. Cron omits the word.

31 d, p. 113 (12). $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \lambda a l:$ bracketed by $S$ with Cobet.
32 a, p. 113 (18). $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ : with $S$ and Bessarion's Ms. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$, Cron.
 $\alpha_{\mu}^{\prime} \mu \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ каl ${ }_{\alpha}^{\prime \prime} \mu \alpha \alpha_{\alpha} v$, Cron following B. S, previously to his collation of Venetus T, argued as follows: "Plato scripsit ä $\mu a$, quo cum dittographia á $\mu \boldsymbol{a}$ äv conjuncta est; inde lectionum varietas nata; äv ex antecedentibus posse suppleri notum."
$32 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{p} .115$ (8). 'Avtrox's : bracketed by Hirschig and S. The preceding $\eta_{\eta}^{j} \mu \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{v}$ certainly makes it plausible that 'Avtıox's may have been introduced as a marginal gloss. See Bem. p. 104.


Jahrb. 119, 1, p. 15) supposes that Horace had this passage (chap. xx.) in his mind when he wrote the third ode of the third book of his Odes.
 words but W believes them to be genuine. If they are retained, it follows either (1) that Socrates was not (in spite of reasonable evidence that he was)
 sition when it came up in the assembly as any member might have done, or (2) that Socrates voted alone in a preliminary meeting of the prytanes against having the question put to the people in an unlawful form. (2) explains the context best. But when all is said and done, the whole wording is clumsy and repetitious, since $\eta v a v \tau \omega \dot{\theta} \theta \eta v$ would do quite as well alone, and the cumulative effect of kai is tiresome.

33 b, p. 120 (14). є́ $\rho \omega \tau a ̂ v: ~ G o e b e l ~ p r e f e r s ~ \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \tau \omega ̂ \nu . ~$

 with $S$ following B. Sauppe argues that the art. is not necessary here; it certainly is desirable.

34 a, p. 124 (32). тоข́тоv: Goebel prefers тоข́тоus.
 $\alpha^{\alpha} \nu \alpha \mu \nu \eta \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon$ is is read.

34 e, p. $12 \overline{5}$ (6). aưrov̂: B. aữov̂, W. Heller argues in favor of $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ aúrov̂. He is right in so far that the ordinary idiom would give us the art.; but after all the art. would be indispensable only if $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi a \iota \delta i \alpha$ (meaning all his children) had preceded.
 tıves, Cron.
34 d, p. 126 (17). vieîs : P. Foucart (Revue de Philologie, I. 35) bases upon Attic inscriptions the following remarks as to the orthography of this word: "une série d'exemples depuis le cinquième siècle jusqu'au deuxième avant notre ère montre que au moins en prose, les Athéniens employaient toujours la forme vós. ... A partir de la conquête romaine, viós se rencontre dans les inscriptions attiques, ainsi que vós; la forme de la langue commune finit par l'emporter, et c'est la seule qu'emploient les copistes." The Attic form without $\iota$ is preserved only in Parisinus (A). See S, Vol. XII. pp. viii. and ix.

34 e, p. 127 (26). тò $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \rho^{\prime} \tau \eta$ : $\tau \hat{\varphi} \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon$, S W with Riddell. This dat. was preferred by Bernhardy. Nevertheless, the analogy of $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \eta_{\eta} \kappa \in \nu$
 $\eta$
of $B$ is $\tau \ddot{\hat{\omega} \iota} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \omega \kappa \rho \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon$, which suggests that the interlinear correction may be the right reading. If the dat. be adopted here, then appeal would have to be
 $35 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{p} .128$ (38). ípâs: B. ị $\mu \mathrm{a} \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{S}$ W.
35 d, p. 129 (11). [ $\pi$ ávr $\omega$ s] : with $S$ W. Stallbaum brackets vì $\Delta$ la $\pi \alpha^{2} v$. $\tau \omega s$. $\pi \dot{a} v \tau \omega \mathrm{~s}$, Cron following B.
 indeed, rejects these three words because he thinks they have come into the text from the margin. There is certainly room for doubt.

36 a, p. 131 (7). ג̇тотєфєर́y $\eta$ : S argues for $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \phi \epsilon \mathcal{v}^{\gamma} \eta$ in Vol. XII. p. xiii.
36 c, p. 133 (9). lóvia: with S W following E. öv 1 , Cron following B. Cron defends ővia in his Bem. p. 109 f . The example quoted from Tac. Ann. vi. 22 (where see Nipperdey's note) is not convincing.

36 c, p. 133 (11). [ $\mathfrak{\omega} \omega \nu]$ : with S W. โ $\omega$ v, Cron. S says (Studien, p. 35) of the whole passage: "Hermann was for doing away with évzaûӨa ท̉a. But
 culty is solved. The word was apparently added by an interpolator who con-

 explanation absurd."

36 d, p. 134 (22). $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o v:$ liebhold proposes, not to bracket $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o v$, but to change it into $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda}$.

36 d, p. 134 (25). Soкєîv єival: סoкєiv [єival], S with Hermann.
37 b, p. 136 (16). тov่тov: тov̂, S W with Meiser.

37 c, p. 136 (22). $\mu є v \tau a ̈ v: \mu \epsilon ́ v \tau^{\prime}$ ảv, W.
37 e, p. 137 (4). є́ $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ : Cron following S writes $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ because of signs of erasure in B .

37 e, p. 137 (5). *oút' : with Bessarion's Ms. Cron following S writes тоиิтo with B.

39 b, p. 141 (34). óф $\lambda \omega \boldsymbol{v}$ : Cobet and S, Vol. V. p. x. ő $\phi \lambda \omega \nu$, W following B T. See Wohlrab in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 1876, p. 127.
 later (second) hand in the margin of B and is also the reading of some inferior Mss., which, however, also retain $\pi 0$.'.

 strength of signs of erasure in B , which were also detected by S .
 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta^{\prime}, \mathrm{S}$ and W , who neither of them make any mention of Gaisford's report on the reading of $B$.

40 a, p. 144 (10). $\dot{\eta}$ тov̂ $\delta a \iota \mu o v i o v: ~[\dot{\eta} \tau 0 \hat{v} \delta a \iota \mu o v i o v], ~ S ~ w i t h ~ S c h l e i e r m a c h e r . ~$
40 c, p. 145 (5). то̂̂ тóтоv тov̂: bracketed as a gloss by S with Hirschig.
41 a, p. 147 (29). '́ $\theta \in \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega$ : with Bessarion's Ms. Cron following S writes $\theta^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \lambda \omega$ with the best Mss. Here, and Phaedr. 249 b, we have the only two clear cases where the best Mss. credit Plato with using $\theta^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \lambda \omega$ after a word ending in a consonant.

41 a, p. 147 (30). тav̂тá є̇ढтเv: following S with Bessarion's Ms. тav̂т' €̇orlv, Cron with best Mss.
 $\lambda о \nu \tau \iota, S$.
$41 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{p} .148$ (34). е̇кєiv 1

 ris $\delta \dot{\eta}$ aù $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\omega}$, Cron with S , who adds the $\delta \mathfrak{\eta}$ as his own conjecture.
 signs of erasure in B, and Venetus 185 (Bekker's $\Pi$ ).
$41 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{p} .148$ (39). ảyovia: B. áyayóvтa, S W following other Mss.
$41 \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{p} .148(46) . \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$ : with all Mss. Cron following S writes $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\eta}$ '̇oriv because it is added in the margin of $B$. $S$ argues against admitting it in Nov. Comm. p. 161.
 not be made out, but Gaisford and S incline to think it is $\pi \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{v} \in \mathrm{l}$.

## CRITO.

 Mss. and the Zürich edition.
$43 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{p} .152$ (19). ขv̂v: vvvi, W.
$43 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{p} .152$ (20). $\pi \rho \mathrm{a}^{\prime} \omega \mathrm{s}$ : $\pi \rho \alpha^{2} \omega \mathrm{~s}, \mathrm{~S}$ following the Mss. The 七 subscript is an essential part of the word. See Curtius, Grundzïge, No. 379. The Mss. authorities leave the matter doubtful, though for Plato $\pi \rho \ldots 0$ s is the prevailing orthography. mpaús is always without $\iota$. S has lately made up his mind to write $\pi \rho \underline{i} o s$ even in Plato. See Vol. XII. p. 6.



$44 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{p} .155$ (3). тov̂ $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \mathrm{l}$ : Sallier. Hermann keeps the Mss. reading $\sigma 0 \hat{v} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \rho \eta \hat{\eta} \theta a \mathrm{a}$. Madvig (Adv. p. 368) finds reason for writing $\sigma 0 \hat{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon$. $\rho \eta^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \mu a t$ in the strange combination of the inf. and fin. moods by $\mu \dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{v}$ and $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$.


 $\theta$ ád $\epsilon$, W with the explanation practerea, praeter me. See Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 1877, pp. 222 ff. and Cron's Bem. p. 117. It certainly seems far more natural to take $\dot{\epsilon} v \theta \dot{a} \delta \epsilon$ as a gloss explaining ovitou than to regard ovitol as a gloss.
 his usual practice, has not been able to resist a tempting but unnecessary emendation.

46 b, p. 161 (4). ov่ $\mu$ óvov $\nu v \hat{v}$ : ov่ vv̂v $\pi \rho \omega \hat{\tau} \neq v, S$ with A. Nauck. See the preface to the third edition of Cron's Apology and Crito (p. xiv. f.).

46 d，p． 162 （19）．vv̂v $\delta$ è：S（XII．p．xviii．）proposes to write vuv ing B．But see S，VIII．p． 159.

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime} \circ$ ै ；］，Cron with W．The words bracketed do not occur in B，and S rejects them as a confusing interpolation（Nov．Comm．p．162）．They occur in the margin of B and in inferior Mss．
 vous］，S．тウ̀v סógav kal тov̀s 廿óyous kai toùs émaívous，itallbaum．тoùs廿óyous kal tov̀s émalvovs，Hirschig．
 carefully kept on $\tau i$ ，on $\pi o \hat{\text { ，}}$ ，and on $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} l_{s} \tau i$ ，and not put on the verbs．
 lowing inferior Mss．
$47 \mathrm{c} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{p} .165$（ 24 ff ．）．The simpler punctuation of Cron＇s seventh edition has been preferred to that of the eighth．In the latter Cron follows Goebel．

48 b，p． 167 （25）．$\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a$ 浐 кal тav̂тa：given to Socrates by W with Butt－

 is to be omitted，$\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \lambda \in \dot{\prime} \in$ เs could best be spared．

48 e，p． 169 （23）．$\pi \epsilon \boldsymbol{l} \sigma a s \sigma \epsilon$ ：with Buttmann．$\pi \epsilon i \sigma \alpha i \quad \sigma \epsilon$ ，W following the Mss．See Cron＇s preface to his first edition of the $\Lambda$ pol．and Crito，p．xii．， also Bem．p． 117 f．Meiser（Fleckeisen＇s Jahrb．109，1，p．41）favors a change
 $\sigma \epsilon$ ，which would，however，be intolerable after $\pi \alpha \hat{v} \sigma a l \geqslant{ }_{\eta} \delta \eta$ ．

49 a，p． 170 （4）．［ӧтєр каl äрть є̇лє́ $\gamma \in \tau 0$ ］：Meiser proposes to find room for this between $\eta$＇and $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma a l$ ．
 Some authority for not bracketing would perhaps be found in Lach． 180 d．

50 d，p． 176 （10）．тoîs vó $\mu$ oıs：［ $\tau$ oîs vó $\mu$ oıs］， S with Hirschig．

50 e，p． 177 （20）．$\sigma o l: \sigma \grave{v}$ is preferred by Buttmann，Stallbaum，Hirschig， Goebel．
 Hirschig．

51 a，p． 178 （30）．$\hat{\eta}: \hat{\eta}$ ，W following the Mss．$S$ says the first hand in B wrote $\eta$ ．See on 53 c ．

51 d，p． 180 （12）．áé $\sigma \kappa о \not \mu \epsilon \nu$ ：ápé $\sigma \kappa о \mu \in \boldsymbol{v}$ ，S with Madvig．
51 e，p． 181 （19）．$\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a l: \pi \epsilon$ í $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a l, S$ with Buttmann．
 $\sum \omega \dot{k \rho a \tau \epsilon s, ~ \tau a i ̂ s, ~ W . ~}$

reasons as follows: Verba örı . . ' 'Io $\theta \mu$ óv, quae jam Athenaeus 5, 15, legisse videtur, in marg. add. be, incluserunt Turicenses delevit MS [i.e. Schanz himself]. See his Nov. Comm. p. 162.

$53 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{p} .183$ (43). $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \mathrm{ov} \ldots$. vó $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ : bracketed by S with H. Stephanus and Hirschig, who also both reject oi vópor.
 in B.

 sage also ?
53 c, p. 185 (17). $\hat{\eta}$ : B. $\quad \eta$, S W. As in 51 a, p. 178 (30), where the reading of $B$ is harder to make out, so here also $S$ writes $\mathfrak{n}$. The more vigorous $\hat{\eta}$ (really) is better suited to the context than $\eta$, which simply makes affirmation a matter of course.
53 e, p. 186 (28). aloxpus : with $S$ and $W$. Still $\gamma \lambda i \sigma x \rho \omega s$, which is added on the margin of B , deserves attention, and perhaps should be preferred. $C f$. in the preceding line (27) the undoubtedly correct $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \xi a s$, which is on the margin of B , while in the text we find кatad入ágas, which both S and W reject.
 macher.

 по́тєрои, S.




## GREEK INDEX．

［Numbers not followed by letters refer to paragraphs of the Introduction；numbers followed by letters refer to the Stephanus pages noted on the right of the Text．］
àүроько́тєро⿱⿱亠䒑日儿 32 d．
à áv $^{2} 3,24$ c．
á $\delta \iota \kappa \omega ̂ 19 b$ ．
aipô $28 a, 48 c$ ．
aloxpóv 28 d ．
alбXúvopal 22 b．
áкроатаl $24 e$ ．

à $\lambda \lambda$ á $32 a, 39 e, 43 d, 45 a$ ．
à入入 $\gamma$ वáp $19 c, d, 28$ ．
à $\lambda \lambda \alpha{ }^{2} \delta \dot{\eta} 37 c, 54 a$ ．
ä入入a каl ä $\lambda \lambda a \ln b$ ．
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \geqslant \geqslant 20 d, 34 b$ ．
ä入入os $28 e, 30 d, 36 \mathrm{~b}$ ．
ä入入o $\tau \iota \geqslant ้ 24 c, 52 d$ ．
à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oűv 27 c ．
à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oủ $23 c$ ．
ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \mathrm{s} 46 \mathrm{~d}$ ．
á $\mu \mathrm{a} 46$ a．
дд $\mu$ ¢ 18 b．
äv 17 d ．
àvákpıós 69.
ávaßalvo $31 \mathrm{c}, 33 \mathrm{~d}$ ．

ảvèスrıoтov 36 a．
ávє€є́тaбтos 38 a．
ávéXєбӨaı 31 b ．

ảvoío $20 e$ ．
àvтเүрафウ́ 27 c ．
ảvт $\omega \mu$ об́a 69， 27 c．
à $\mathfrak{\xi} เ \omega \sigma$ батє 18 d ．
ámáyєเv 32 b．

ä $\pi$ เбтos $26 e$ ．
á $\pi$ ó $31 b$ ．

а̇тофєи́үต $36 a, 38 d$.
а’ра $17 b, 25 a, 26 d, 34 c$ ．
а́рєтŋ́ 30 b ．
ápXŋ́ 49 d．
àpxoнат 31 d ．
äpXovtes，oi， $28 e$ ．

ả $\sigma \pi a ́ \zeta 0 \mu a \iota 29 \mathrm{~d}$ ．
а́бтратєía 51 b ．


áт $\tau \mu \mathfrak{i} a 74,29 a, 30 d, 32 b$ ， 51 b．

äтота 26 d ．

a⿱̇то́цатоц 23 c ．
ßактпріа 66.
ßáбavos 69.
ßaбı入єús 31， 68.
$\beta\llcorner\boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\alpha} 26 \mathrm{~d}$ ．
$\beta \iota \omega$ тóv 47 d．
及oáw $30 c, 32$ b．
ßоu入єutal 25 a．
ßou入єv́ف 32 b．

үáp $19 c, d, 28 a, 30 c, 34 b$ ， 38 a．
$\gamma^{\prime} 21 d, 22 d, 46 e, 54 d$.
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ 人оเо́тєрои $30 e$ ．

үขクбเótクs 50 d ．

үра́ццата 20 d．
үраццатєи́s，70，75．
үрафй 31，67，（68．
үрафウ̀ $\dot{\operatorname{aj}} \sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon$ las 31，73， 35 d ．

Saípoves $27 c$.
סaццóvia 27 c．
бaчนóvıє $44 b$ ．
Salpóviov 31 c，cf．27， 32.

ס́́ $17 b, 38 c$ ．
$\delta \in \iota \lambda i ́ a j 1 b$ ．
Stûpo $24 c$ ．
$\delta \dot{\eta} 22 e, 26 b, 28 a, 33 c$ ．
$\delta \eta \mu o ́ \tau \eta$ s $33 d$ ．
ठเaßo入ŋ́ 19 a．


§เà тахє́فv 32 d ．
Sıkavıкá 32 a．
Sıkaбтai 66 note 4， $17 a$ ， $26 d$.
Sıкабтท́pıov 66.
ठікп 67.
ठเш́кш 18 c， 28 a．
ठ七七нобia 69.
Soкıцаатia 51 d．
סокоиิvтєs 35 a．
סóg $\eta \mathrm{s} .35 \mathrm{~b}$ ．
Soû入os $50 e$ ．
§＇oův $17 a$ ．
$\dot{\epsilon} \theta i \xi \in \sigma \theta a l: 3: \overline{3}$ ．
єîcv 18 e．
$\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \hat{\eta} 17 \mathrm{c}$ ．
єโ̌val 23 a．
єโршขєบо́ $\mu є \boldsymbol{v o s} 37 e$ ．
cls $17 c$ ．
єloáy $24 d$ ．
єІбаүшүท́ 70.

єでoodos 70， 45 e．
єĩa $23 c, 28 b, 31 a$ ．
ék $23 \mathrm{e}, 32 \mathrm{~b}, 49 \mathrm{e}$ ．
ékeìvos 33 e ．


${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \mu \in \lambda \lambda о \stackrel{2}{ } 20$ a．
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon \lambda \omega \bar{s} 20 c$ ．
є́vavtia $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon เ v 27 a$.
év $\delta \in \iota \kappa v$ v́val $32 b$ ．
 $39 e, 44 a$.
év $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ois with superl． $4: 3 \mathrm{c}$ ．
є́ $\xi \in \tau a ́ \sigma \omega 29 e$.
є́скк ${ }^{2}$（6e．
Є̇ $\pi \in \mathfrak{C} 19 e, 20 a$.
Є̇ $\pi 17 \mathrm{l} d, 27 \mathrm{~b}, 40 \mathrm{a}, 41 \mathrm{a}$ ．

ध́ $\pi เ \epsilon \iota \kappa \hat{\eta}: 34$ d．
є̀ $\pi \iota к \in \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu$ ќvol 70 ．

є́тітьноs $2 \overline{2} a$ ．



モ́ $\pi \omega \beta \in \lambda i ́ a$ 72.
єр $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\eta} 72,18$ с．
$\notin \varnothing \chi \in \tau \in 19 a$ ．

єธี そท̂v 48 b．

є ่่єрүย่าท $36 d$ ．
＇ $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\omega}^{\boldsymbol{\top} \tau \epsilon} 29 \mathrm{c}$ ．
$\epsilon \omega \theta \in v 40 a$.

ぞ $\delta \eta 21 e$.
そ̀入ıaía 67.
ท̄ $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{v} 22$ a．
$\grave{\eta} \mu \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\theta} \omega \nu 28$ b．

Өávatos $28 c, 36 b, 37 a$ ．
$\theta$ $ө$ цıs 21 b．
$\theta$ єцıтóv 30 c．
$\theta$ cós $19 a, 27 c, 28 c, 35 d$ ， $42 a, 54 e$.
$\theta \in \omega$ рía 43 c ．
$\theta$ ó入os 32 c ．
Oориßєív 17 d．
latpós 47 b．
iкаขติs $47 a$ ．
iva 22 a．
l $\sigma x$ v́s 29 d．
ใ̛ $\sigma \omega \mathrm{s} 18$ a．

каí $22 a, d, 28 a$.
kal $\operatorname{\epsilon l} 32$ a．
кal ס̀̀ каí 18 a．
кal $\mu$ évтol $17 c$ ．
какоирүєîv $49 c$ ．
катá $35 c$ ．
катаүเүレผ́бкш 18 c．
катабє́оаи 33 e．
катахарі广єбӨаь ：35 $c$ ．
катךүорڤ 18 c．

к $\lambda \in ́ \notin v \delta \rho a ~ 71,: 34 a$.
$\kappa \lambda \eta \tau \eta ิ \rho \epsilon s(69$.
кoıvóv，тò， 50 u．
корvßavtเติvтєs $54 d$ ．
киріа，ї， 70.
$\kappa \omega \mu \varphi \delta$ เотоเós 18 d ．
入atpeiav 23 c ．
$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \in L v 21 b, 23 a$.
$\lambda \eta \xi\llcorner a \rho \chi$ เкòv үраццатєєiov 51 d ．
$\lambda \hat{\eta} \xi$ เs 68.
入і́тоцць 29 а．
入ıтотаگ́a $29 a, 51 b$.
入óyos $26 b, 32 a, 34 c, 52 d$ ．
нáptupes $32 e$.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \tau \tau a, \tau \grave{\alpha}, 22 d$.
$\mu \dot{\mu} \nu 17 b, 43 d$ ．

$50 e$.
$\mu \epsilon ́ v \tau o l ~ 31 b$.
$\mu \in \tau о ו к \in$ îv 51 d ．
$\mu \dot{\eta} 25 a, 39 a, 44 e, 45 c$ ， 48 c ．
но́үıs $21 b, 27 c$ ．
$\mu o i p a \quad 51$ a．
щорцоли́ттๆтаا $46 c$ ．
$\mu v ́ \omega \psi 30 e$ ．
ขงิข $18 a, 38 b, 39 c$ ．
vvaтáそovтєs $31 a$.
$\xi \nu \nu \tau \epsilon \tau a \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ v \omega s 23 e$.
$\xi ้ \nu \omega \mu \circ \sigma เ \omega ิ \nu 36 b$ ．
őpopos 43a．

ó入íyou $17 a$ ．
öного 46 b．
ỏvet $\delta$ i̧ $\omega \boldsymbol{v} 30 e$ ．
övoца 17 b， $20 \mathrm{~d}, 38 \mathrm{c}$ ．
öтav 28 b ．
อ̈тเ $21 c, e$ ．
o $\tau \iota \mu a \theta \omega \nu 36$ b．
oง่ $26 d, 35 c$ ．
oủ $\delta \mathfrak{c}$ ．．．oủ $\delta$ ć $20 d$ ．
ov่ $\mu$ ท่ 29 d ．
－บิv $21 a, d, c, 26 b, 29 c$ ．
oủ $\pi$ ávv 19 a．

－ن̂tos $21 a, 24 e$.
๐ข้тผ 29 b．
òф入ıбкávต $18 c, 39 \mathrm{~b}$ ．

$\pi \alpha ̂ v \pi \circ เ \omega ิ v 39 a$ ．
тávт $\omega$ s 33 d ．
тávv 19 a， 26 b．
$\pi а р а \lambda а \mu \beta a ́ v \omega 18$ b．

$\pi \alpha \rho a \times \omega \rho \omega \hat{\omega 4}$ а．
$\pi \epsilon(\theta \omega 29 d, 35 c, 51 b$ ．
$\pi є \pi$ о́vӨatє 17 a．

тєрьтто́тєроv 20 c．
тпиіка 43 а．
тьбтєv́ $\omega \boldsymbol{v} 19$ ．
т入ヒ́ov тoteîv 19 a．
$\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \operatorname{Oos} 21 a, 31 c$ ．
$\pi \lambda \eta \mu \mu \in ́ \lambda \in \iota \alpha 22 d$.
$\pi \lambda \eta \mu \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ s 43$ b．
тоเท́ $\sigma \omega 30$ a．
толє́ $\mu$ архоs 68.
то入入áкıs 30 c．
то入ขтраүноvผิ 31 c．
тóvous 22 a．
$\pi \rho \hat{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\mu} \alpha 20 c, 41 d, 53 c$ ．
$\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau \in \dot{́} \epsilon \sigma \theta a<22 b$ ．
тра́ттєเv 40 a， 45 d， 51 a．
$\pi \rho \boldsymbol{v} 36 c$ ．
$\pi \rho \circ \beta$ ои́ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon ч \mu a ~} 32$ b．
$\pi \rho о ́ є \delta \rho о \iota 32 b$.
тро́द́єvos 18 a．
тро́s $18 b, 21 c, 24 b, 30 b$ ．
тритavєúoưa $32 b$ ．
$\pi \rho \cup \tau a ́ v \in \iota s 32 b, c$ ．
$\pi \rho \cup \tau a v \in โ ఱ 36 d, 37 a$ ．

ค̂ทิ $\mu a 17$ b．
 50 b．

テкєบท́v 5：3 d．
бкıaцахєîv 18 d．
бофía 29 $l$ ．
бoфós $18 b, 23 a, 27 a$ ， $34 e$ ．
$\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu 30 b$ ．
$\sigma \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta} 28$ a．


$\Sigma \phi \eta ́ \tau \tau \cos 33 c$ ．
$\sigma \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \boldsymbol{a} 53 d$ ．

т $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ Өvával $30 c, 43$ d．
тє $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu} 22 c$ ．
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \iota \nu 46 d$.
тı $\mu \hat{a} \sigma a^{\prime} 35,36 \mathrm{~b}, 52 \mathrm{c}$ ．
ті $\mu \eta \sigma$ เs 73， 35 d．
tis $18 b, 19 c, 25 b, 28 e$ ， $30 e, 37 e$ ．
тò 8 є́ $23 a, 37 a, 39 b$ ． тоí 29 a．
то́ $\lambda \mu \eta$ s 38 d ．
тоบ่vavтiov $25 b$ ．
тро́тш 17 d．
тúxท á үa日も̂ 43 d．
ű $\delta \omega \rho$ ，тò， 34 ．
บ̀тakovิซal 43 a．

ن̇ாápXєட $45 a$.

บ́тŋрєбía： 30 a．
บ́тє́p $22 e, 23 e, 39 e$.
ú $\pi$ ó $17 a, 19 c, 38 c$ ．




фáбкш 21 b．
фєú $\boldsymbol{\omega} \omega 18 c, 19 c, 26 a$,
28 a．
фпиі 25 b， 27 d．
фı入o廿uxía 37 c．
фортıка́ 32 a．
фроитıбті́s 18 b．
$\phi \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \in 22 c$ ．
$\phi \omega v \hat{\eta} 17 d$.

XaplevtiఢGtal $24 c$.
Xрท́ $17 a, 3 ;) a, 34 a$ ．
$\psi \epsilon v \delta \hat{\eta} 18 a$.
$\psi \in \hat{v} \delta o s 34 e$ ．

$\psi \eta$ ŋ́фо 72.

ผ゙vทoas $27 c$ ．
ás 30 b ．

$\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ảv $\in l 23 a$ ．
$\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon 25 e$ ．
ふ тáv $25 c$ ．

## ENGLISH INDEX.

[Numbers not followed by letters refer to paragraphs of the Introduction; numbers followed by letters refer to the Stephanus pages noted on the right of the Text.]

Abstract noun with $\tau$ is 25 b .
Acc. adv. 25 b.
cognate $21 a, 20 b, 27 b$.
double with $\lambda^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} เ \nu \geq: 3$ a. with $\mu \eta \nu$ v́єเv, 24 ( $l$.
of specification with adj. $22 \mathrm{c}, 23 \mathrm{a}$.
Accusers 30, $18 b, e, 23 e$, $24 b$.
Achilles 28 c.
Adimantus 34 a.
Adj. used pers. with inf. $18 a$.
$A d v$. with temporal particle 40 l .
Aeacus 41 a.
Aeantodorus 34 a.
Aeschines $33 e, 34 a$.
Ajax $26 d, 41 b$.
Alcibiades 24, 33, 28 e.
Alliteration 39 a.
Amphipolis 28 e.
Anacoluthon $19 e, 21 c$, $28 c, 34 e, 37 c, 45 e$.
Anaxagoras $10,26 d$.
Anaximander 2.
Anaximenes 2.
Antiphon $33 e$.
Antithesis 33 b .
Anytus 30, 23 e.
Aor. Subjv. as fut. perf. $44 c$.
as imv. $17 c, 20 e$.

Apodusis suppressed $32 d$. with Xคๆ̂v 33 d .
Apollodorus 34 a.
A postrophe 29 d .
Appeals to jury 71, $32 a$, $34 c$.
Arginusae 32 b.
Aristo 34 a.
Aristogeiton $36 d$.
Aristophanes, Clouds 25, $18 b, d, 19 c, 23 d$.
Article with $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta \varepsilon} 37 a$.
as dem. 87 d.
with èk $32 b$.
generic with $\theta$ tós 19 u.
omitted 28 b .
with mâs :3: $b$.
with $\pi$ o $\lambda$ 入oi 18 b .
as possessive $27 b, 29 d$, : 4 a.
repeated :3: $d$.
with $\theta$ ávatos $28 c, 36 b$, $37 a$.
Assembly, members of 25 t.
Assimilation of case $29 b$, $37 b, 50 a$.
of gender 18 .
inverse $45 b$.
Astronomy $19 b$.
Asyndeton 41 b.
Athenian citizenship $31 d$, 51 d .
courts of law 66-75.

Athenian greatness 29 d . Atomists 9.
Attraction of case in comparison $17 c$.
Audience in court $27 b$.

Books 26 d.

Callias 20 a.
Cebes 45 b.
Chaerecrates 21 a.
Chaerephon $20 e, 21$ a.
Chiastic order $25 d, 47 \mathrm{c}$.
Children in court 71, 34 c.
Citizenship, age of 31 d .
Clause in appos. with neut. $18 c, 34 d, 41 b$.
Climax 23 a.
Clouds of Aristophanes $25,18 b, d, 19 c$, 23 d .
Comparison to Heracles $22 a$.
idioms of $17 c, 19 b, 22$ $a, d, 28 a$.
Condition, complex $27 d$. mixed $19 e, 25 b, 30 b$.
Contrast $48 e$.
Co-ordination 18 b.
Corybantes $54 d$.
Critias 24, 25, 33, 32 c, d.
Crito 62, 33 d, $34 a, 38$ b, $43 a, 45 a$.
Critobulus $33 d$, $34 a$.

Daemonion 27，32， 27 c， 31 c.
Dat．with verbal nouns 23，$c, 30 a$ ．
with $\pi$ oteîv $30 a$.
Death 28 b， $40 c, d, e$ ， 41 d.
Delian ship 43 c．
Delium 28 e．
Demigods 28 b．
Democritus 9.
Demodocus $33 e$ ．
Dilemma 26 c．
Direct discourse $21 e$ ．
Disfranchisement 30 d．
Dream 44 a．

Education 50 d．
Eleatics 4， 45.
Eleven，the，75， $37 \mathrm{c}, 39 \mathrm{e}$ ， $44 a$.
Ellipsis 23 a， 24 d， 26 b， 36 l.
Elysium 28 c， 40 c．
Empedocles 8.
Enemies，hated 493.
Epigenes 33 e， 34 a．
Euclides 42.
Evenus 20 b．
Exile，voluntary $45 e$ ， $54 a$.

Fatherland，precious 51 a． Fines 74， 38 b．
Foreigners in court 18 a．
Future infin． 37 a．
partic． 30 b ．
Gadfly 30 e．
Genitive abs． 35 a．
with adv． $17 \mathrm{~d}, 38 \mathrm{c}$ ．
in appos．with adj． 29 d ． of cause， 43 b ．

Genitive partic．with alo－
 $\sigma \kappa \omega 27 a$ ，àvéx $\chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ 31 b．
with verbal noun $23 c$ ， $26 \mathrm{~b}, 40 \mathrm{c}$ ．
Glaucon ：， 4 a．
God $21 \mathrm{~b}, 54 e$ ．
allwise 28 c ．
Golden rule 49 b，c．
Gorgias 13， 19 e，23 c．
Great King 40 d，e．
Gymnastic training $47 a, b$.

Hades $41 a, b, c, 54 c$ ．
Harmodius 36 d．
Heracles 22 a， 26 a．
Heraclitus 5，6，7，45．
Hippias 14.
Homer $34 d$.
Hyperbaton 35 c．
Imperfect，philosophical， 47 d.
Imprisonment for a fine $37 c$.
Inceptive aor． $19 a, 28 a$ ， $41 e$.
Indic．with $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon 25 e$ ．
Infinitive with adj．and adv． 31 a．
after є́кต́v $37 a, \mu \dot{\mu} \lambda \lambda \omega$ $20 a, \phi \in v ́ \gamma \omega 26 a$ ，白 $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\prime}$ $\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \tau \epsilon 29 \mathrm{c}$ ，${ }^{\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{\sigma}} 38 \mathrm{~d}$ ．
with a neg．idea $32 b$ ， 35 e ．
of purpose 33 b ．
Io 30 e．
Ion 26 d ．
Irony $20 e, 22 a, 28 a$ ， $31 c, 47 e, 49 a, 51 a$ ， $54 a$ ．

Islands of the blest 28 c ， $40 c$.

Juryman，form of ad－ dress， $6 ; f_{i}$ note $4,17 a$, $26 d$.
asleep ：31 $a$ ．
oath 6f note 2 ，：35 c．

Law，majesty of， $50 e, 51 e$.
Legal terms，á $\gamma \omega \hat{\omega} \in s \tau \mu \eta-$ тоі́，áтццๆтоі， 73.

ávákpıoıs ${ }^{69}$ ．
а̉vтıүрафŋ́ $27 c$ ．
ávтıтน $\mu \mathrm{a} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ 3 \overline{3}$.

àvт $\omega \mu \sigma \boldsymbol{i}$ a 69， 27 c．
á $\pi a \gamma \omega \gamma \eta \dot{\eta}^{32} b$ ．
а́тофєи́үш $36 a, 38 \mathrm{~d}$ ．

á $\sigma \tau р а \tau \epsilon$ โa 51 b ．
а́тццía 74，29）$a, 30 d$ ， ：32 $b, 51 \mathrm{~b}$ ．
а́тццптоі 73．
ßактŋрía 66.
ßáravos 69.
ßaoclıєús 31， 68.
ßou入єutaí $25 a$ ．
$\beta$ ouncúa 32 b ．
$\gamma \nu \eta \sigma$ เóт $\eta \mathrm{s} 50 \mathrm{~d}$ ．
$\gamma р а \mu \mu а \tau є$ v́s 70， 75.
үраццатєiov $51 d$.
үраф $\eta^{\prime}$ 31，67， 68.
үрафŋ̀ á $\sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon$ є́as 31，73， $35 d$.
үрафท̀ $\pi a \rho a v o ́ \mu \omega v$ 35 $d$ ．
$\delta \epsilon \boldsymbol{\lambda} \mathfrak{f a} 51 b$ ．
$\delta \eta \mu$ о́т $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ s 33 d．
反ıкабтч́ptov 66.
סıкабти́s 66， $24 e$.
$\delta$ Ккп 67.
ठเш́к 18 c， $28 a$.

סокıцабía 51 d．
tioáy 24 d．
єібаүшүท́ 70.
єібє́pXоцаі 70， 29 с．
c＇rooos $70,45 e$ ．
є́кк入ךбเaбтаí $25 a$ ．

Є้ $\nu$ бкка，оі， $75,32 b,: 37 c$ ， $39 e, 44 a$.
̇̇ $\pi เ \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \circ$ ิ̂б $\theta a \iota 70$.

＇̇тітьноs 25 a．
є $\pi เ \psi \eta \phi<\zeta \omega 32 b$ ．
$\epsilon \pi \omega \beta \in \lambda i a \operatorname{t2}$.
＇єрй 72,18 с．

خ̀ $\lambda \iota a i a 67$.
خ̀ $\lambda$ ıaбтal 67， $24 e$.
катаүเугш́бк $18 c$
катךүора 18 c．
к入є́чuסpa 71， 34 a．
$\kappa \lambda \eta \tau \eta ิ \rho \epsilon s 69$.
кирі́а，$\dot{\eta}, 70$.

$\lambda \eta \hat{\xi}$ เs 68 ．
$\lambda$ ıлота $\mathfrak{\xi}$ ia $29 a, 51 b$ ．
на́ртирєs $32 e$ ．
нє́тоткои 68,51 d．
óф入ıбка́vळ $18 c, 39 b$ ．
$\pi а р а т р є \sigma \beta \epsilon \mathcal{L} 36$ с．
$\pi о \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu а \rho х о$ оя 68.

$\pi$ то́є $\delta$ роь $32 b$ ．
$\pi \rho o ́ \xi \in v o s 18 a$ ．
$\pi \rho u \tau a v \in \dot{v} \omega, \pi \rho u \tau a ́ v \in เ s$, $32 b, c$ ．

$\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta$ о $\lambda_{0} 66$.
бvvท́หopot 30，71， 50 b ．
$\tau \iota \mu \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota 35,36 b, 52 c$ ．
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \mu \eta \sigma$ เs $73,35 d$ ．
тицๆтоі 73.
v̈ $\boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\rho}$ ，т̀̀, 34 a．
фє่́үш $18 c, 19 c, 28 a$ ．

廿ท̂фo 72.
Leon 32 c．
Leucippus 9.
Litotes $33 \mathrm{c}, 44 a$ ．
Love of country $54 a$ ．
Lyco 30，23 e．
Lysias 32 c．

Marriage laws 50 d ．
Megarian oligarchy 53 b ．
Meletus $30,23 e, 25 d, 26 e$ ， $27 e, 35 c$.
Minos 41 a．
Musaeus 41 a．

Natural philosophy $18 \mathrm{l}, \mathrm{c}, 19 \mathrm{c}$ ．
Negative pron． 32 a． repeated 31 d ．
with $\phi \eta \mu(25 b$ ．
Nestor 29 d ．
Neuter adj．for fem． $29 a$ ． adj．as subst． 31 b ．
art．with gen． $21 e$ ．
with concrete force $32 e$ ．
Nicostratus $33 e, 34 a$ ．
Oath，of Socrates $21 e$.
of juryman 66 note 2 ， 35 c．
Object omitted 23 b．
Objections，dramatized 20 c ．
Oligarchy 53 b ．
Olympian victors 36 d ．
Optative in indirect dis－ course $20 b, 27 e, 29 c$ ．
with $\pi \rho!v 36 c$ ．
Oracle $21 a, b$ ．

Orators $23 e, 32 b, 36 b$ ， $50 b$.
Order of words $17 b, 25 c$ ， $26 e, 35 d, 36 d$.
chiastic $25 d, 47 c$ ．
Orpheus 41 a．

Palamedes 41 b．
Paralus 33 e， 34 a．
Parmenides 4.
Partic．used adv． 22 c．
with al $\sigma$ X $\mathbf{v} v \boldsymbol{\mu}$ at 31 b ．
of means $30 a$ ．
as noun $34 b$ ．
subord．to another par－ tic． $21 e, 27 a$ ．
Penalties，how fixed，73， $35 d$.
Pericles 35 a．
Perfect，$\beta \in \beta$ ou $\lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \theta a \mathrm{al} 46$ ．
тe日vával 30 c ．
Periphrasis 38 c， 53 c．
Pers．pron．for refl． $13 \alpha$ ．
Personification $21 c, 50 a$ ， 52 c．
Physicians 47 b．
Plato，Academy 46.
Apology 53－61．
Critias 48.
Crito 62－65．
death 50 ．
dialogues 52.
family $37,34 a$ ．
Gorgias 40－41．
journeys 42，43， 49.
laws 48.
Parmenides 45.
Phaedo 47.
Phaedrus 47.
Philebus 47.
Politicus 45.
Protagoras 39.
Republic 48.

Plato, Sopliist 45.
Symposium 47.
Theaetetus 4.4.
Timaeus 48.
as a writer 51.
Pleonasm $20 d, 34 b, 42 a$.
Pluperfect in $-\eta v: 31 d$.
Pluralmore concrete $46 c$.
Pnyx 31 c.
Poets $22 b, c, 23 e$.
Polemarchus 32 c.
Potidaea 28 e.
Potential indic. 18 c.
Present of habitual action $33 a$.
result of past action $33 c$.
vivid $44 b$.
President of senate 32 b .
Prodicus 14.
Prolepsis 29 a, d.
Prometheus $26 d$.
Prophecy at death 39 c.
Protagoras 12, 39, $19 e$, $20 b, 23 c$.
Protasis implied $25 b$.
Providence $33 c, 35 d$.
Prytaneum 32 c, 36 d.
Pun 25 c.
Purpose with pres. partic. 27 a.
Pythagoras 3.
Question, dir. and indir. 48 a.
of surprise $28 b$.
with $\mu \dot{\eta} 25 a, 44 e, 45 e$.
Quotation, not exact $19 c$, $24 b, 28 c$.
Quotations, Browning 21 a.
Dante $41 a, 54 a, e$.
St. Luke $49 c$.

Quotations, Milton 48 e.
Nettleship, Education 50 d.
La Rochefoucauld 33 $c$, 34 c.
Shakespeare, As You Like It 46 b. Cymbeline 45 e. Henry IV. 49 e. Henry $V$. 39 a, 46e, 51 a.
IIenry VIII. $49 a, b$. King Lear 24 d. Measure for Measure 46 b.
Mer. of Tenice 36 a. Rich. II. $20 e$, 25 c, $39 c, 54$ a.
Rich. III. 36 a, 46 a. Two Gen. of Ter. 18 a.

Repetition $21 c, 28 d, 29 b$, $31 a, 36 c, 44 d, 49 c, d$.
Rhadamanthys 41 a.
Senate $32 b$.
Shops as lounging places 17 c .
Short sents. $21 \mathrm{~b}, 40 \mathrm{a}$.
Simile of gadfly $30 e$.
Sisyphus 41 c.
Slaves 50 a.
Socrates,
accusation against 31, $32,3: 3,56,23 \mathrm{l}$.
accusers $30,18 b, e, 23 e$, $24 b$.
age $17,17 c, d, 52 e$.
Apology by Plato 5361.
affair of Arginusae $32 b$.
a 'busybody' $19 b, 20 c$, $31 c$.

Socrates, in the Clouds 25, $18 b, d, 19 c, 23 d$.
convicted by few votes 36 a.
Salpóvtov 27, 32, 31 c.
defense 34.
at Delium $28 e$.
deme and tribe $32 b$.
dialectic 19.
distrust of people 30 e .
feelings towards enemies $49 b$.
fortitude $46 b$.
friends at trial $34 a$.
highest good $35 d$.
imitators $23 c$.
independence 38 d .
irony $26,37 e$.
method $18,19,25,26$, $17 c, 29 e, 33 b, 47$ a.
as midwife 25.
mission from God, $22 a$, $81 c$.
moral courage, $28 b, d$, 48 d .
not a natural philosopher $19 c, 23 d, 26 d$.
oaths $21 e$.
parents 17,25 .
not a politician 31 c .
at Potidaea $28,28 e$.
poverty 23 b .
practical views $30 b$.
religion $27,32,26 d$.
sons $34 d$.
'Sophist' 11 note, $18 b$, $23 a, 27 a, 34 e$.
sun-worshipper $26 d$.
style colloquial 55,17 $b, c, 18 b, d, 19 d, 21 e$, $23 a, 26 a, 32 a$.
teaching ethical 20,27 .
no traveller 53 u.

Socrates, view of death $29 a, 40 a-41 d$.
views of manual labor $23 e$.
'Virtue is knowledge, $17,18,25 e$. writers on 21.
Sophists 11-15, $19 e, 20 b$, $23 c, 33 \mathrm{~b}, 37 \mathrm{~d}$.
Spartan institutions $52 e$.
Subjv. after a secondary tense 43 b .
with $\mu$ भ́ $39 a, 48 c$.
with öтav 28 b .

Subjv. with ov̉ $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} 29 \mathrm{~d}$. Sun-worship 26 d. Sycophants 45 a.

Telemachus 29 d. Thales 2.
Theages $33 e$.
Theatre $26 d$.
Theban oligarchy 53 b.
Theodotus 34 a.
Thesmothetae 32 b .
Thessaly lawless 53 d .
Thetis 28 c.
The Thirty $21 a, 32 c, d$.

Trials, length 37 a. proceedings 66-73,35d. Triptolemus $41 a$.

Vote of jury 36 a.
Water-clock 71, 34 a.
Witnesses in court 71, $32 e$.

Xenophanes 5.
Xenophon 21, 24, 25.
Zeno 4.
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Texts are supplied free to professors for classes using the text and note editions. See also the Announcements.

## The Clouds of Aristophanes.

Edited on the basis of Kock's edition. By M. W. Humphreys, Professor in University of Virginia. Square 12mo. 252 pages. Cloth: Mailing Price, $\$ 1.50$; for introduction, $\$ 1.40$.
TEXT EDITION. 88 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.
SINCE the place of Aristophanes in American Colleges is not definitely fixed, the Commentary is adapted to a tolerably wide range of preparation.

## The Bacchantes of Euripides.

Edited on the basis of Wecklein's edition. By I. T. Beckwith, Professor in Trinity College. Square 12 mo .146 pages. Cloth: Mailing Price, $\$ 1.35$; for introduction, $\$ 1.25$.
TEXT EDITION. 64 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.

THE Introduction and Notes aim, first of all, to help the student understand the purport of the drama as a whole, and the place each part occupies in the development of the poet's plan; and in the second place, while explaining the difficulties, to encourage in the learner a habit of broader study.

## Introduction to the Language and Verse of

## Homer.

By Thomas D. Seymour, Hillhouse Professor of Greek in Yale College. Square 12mo. 104 pages. Cloth: Mailing price, 80 cents; Introduction, 75 cents.

Tis a practical book of reference designed primarily to accompany the forthcoming edition of Homer in the College Series of Greek Authors, but equally well adapted to any other edition. It clears away many of the student's difficulties by explaining dialectic forms, metrical peculiarities, and difficult points in Homeric style and syntax, with carefully chosen examples.

The Table of Contents occupies one page; the Index ten pages.

## Homer's Iliad, Books I.-III. and Books IV.-VI.

Both edited on the basis of the Ameis-Hentze edition, by Thomas D. Seymour, Hillhouse Professor of Greek in Yale College. Square 12 mo . Books I.-III. 235 pages. Cloth: Mailing price, $\$ 1.50$; for introduction, \$1.40.
Books IV.-VI. 214 pages. Cloth: Mailing price, $\$ 1.50$; for introduction, \$1.40.
TEXT EDITION of each. 66 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.

THE editor has made many additions to the German edition in order to adapt the work more perfectly to the use of American classes. But he has endeavored to aid the teacher in doing scholarly work with his classes, not to usurp the teacher's functions. References have been made to the editor's Homeric Language and Verse for the explanation of Epic forms. Illustrations have been drawn freely from the Old Testament, from Vergil, and from Milton. A critical Appendix and an Index are added.
The second of these volumes contains the only full commentary published in this country on Books IV.-VI.

## Homer's Odyssey, Books I.-IV.

Edited on the basis of the Ameis-Hentze edition. By B. Perrin, Professor of Greek in Yale College. Square 12mo. 230 pages. Cloth. Mailing Price, $\$ 1.50$; introduction, $\$ 1.40$.
TEXT EDITION. 75 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.

## Homer's Odyssey, Books V.-VIII.

Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by B. Prerrin, Professor of Greek in Yale Uuiversity. Square 12 mo . Cloth. iv +186 pages. Mailing price, $\$ 1.50$, for introduction, $\$ 1.40$. TEXT EDITION. 62 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.
THE German edition has been freely changed to adapt it to the needs of American college classes, but record is made in the appendix of all important deviations from the opinions of the German editors. References are rather liberally given to the leading American grammars, and also to Monro's Homeric Grammar. Much attention has been paid to the indication or citation of iterati, conventional phrases, and metrical formulæ. The latest accepted views in Homeric Archæology are presented. The Appendix gives not only strictly critical data, but also material which should enable a student with limited apparatus to understand the historical and literary status of controverted views.

## The Apology and Crito of Plato.

Edited on the basis of Cron's edition. By Lours Dyer, formerly Assistant Professor in Harvard University. Square 12mo. iv + 204 pages. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.50$; introduction, $\$ 1.40$.
TEXT EDITION. 50 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.
THIS edition gives a sketch of the history of Greek philosophy
before Socrates, a Life of Plato and of Socrates, a summarized account of Plato's works, and a presentation of the Athenian law bearing upon the trial of Socrates. Its claims to the attention of teachers rest, first, upon the importance of Schanz's latest critical work, which is here for the first time made accessible - so far as the Apology and Crito are concerned - to English readers, and second, upon the fulness of its citations from Plato's other works, and from contemporary Greek prose and poetry.

## The Protagoras of Plato.

Edited on the basis of Sauppe's edition, with additions. By Professor J. A. Towle, formerly Professor of Greek in Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa. Square 12 mo . 175 pages. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.35$; for introduction, $\$ 1.25$.
TEXT EDITION. 69 pages. Paper. By mail, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.
THE Protagoras is perhaps the liveliest of the dialogues of Plato.
In few dialogues is the dramatic form so skilfully maintained without being overborne by the philosophical development. By the changing scenes, the variety in the treatment of the theme, and the repeated participation of the bystanders, the representation of a scene from real life is vivaciously sustained.

Noticeable, too, is the number of vividly elaborated characters: Socrates, ever genial, ready for a contest, and toying with his opponents. Protagoras, disdainful toward the other sophists, condescending toward Socrates. Prodicus, surcharged with synonymic wisdom. Hippias, pretentious and imposing. The impetuous Alcibiades and the Lranquil Critias.

Herr Geheim-Rath Sauppe was the Nestor of German philologists, and his Introduction and Commentary have been accepted as models by scholars.

## The Antigone of Sophocles.

Edited on the basis of Wolff's edition. By Martin L. D'Ooge, Ph.D., Professor of Greek in the University of Michigan. Square 12mo. 196 pages. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.50$; for introduction, $\$ 1.40$.
TEXT EDITION. 59 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.

THE Commentary has been adapted to the needs of that large number of students who begin their study of Greek tragedy with this play. The Appendix furnishes sufficient material for an intelligent appreciation of the most important problems in the textual criticism of the play. The rejected readings of Wolff are placed just under the text. The rhythmical schemes are based upon those of J. H. Heinrich Schmidt.

## Thucydides, Book I.

Edited on the basis of Classen's edition. By the late Charles. D. Morris, M.A. (Oxon.), Professor in the Johns Hopkins University. Square 12 mo . 353 pages. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.75$; for introduction, $\$ 1.65$.
TEXT EDITION. 91 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.

## Thucydides, Book III.

Edited on the basis of Classen's edition. By Charles Forster Smith, Ph.D., Professor of Greek, University of Wisconsin. Square 12 mo . xi +320 pages. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.75$; for introduction, $\$ 1.65$.
TEXT EDITION. 75 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.

## Thucydides, Book V.

Edited on the basis of Classen's edition. By Harold North Fowler, Ph.D., Professor of Greek, Western Reserve University. Square 12 mo . 213 pages. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.50$; for introduction, $\$ 1.40$.
TEXT EDITION. 67 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.

## Thucydides, Book VII.

Edited on the basis of Classen's edition. By Charles Forster Smith, Ph.D., Professor of Greek, University of Wisconsin. Square 12mo. 202 pages. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.50$; for introduction, \$1.40.
TEXT EDITION. 68 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.
THE main object of these editions of Books I., III., V., and VII. of Thucydides is to render Classen's Commentary accessible to English-speaking students. His text has been followed with few exceptions. The greater part of his notes, both exegetical and critical, are translated in full. But all the best commentaries on Thucydides, and the literature of the subject generally have been carefully studied to secure the best and latest results of Thucydidean research. Frequent reference is made not only to the standard grammars published in the United States, but also to the larger works of Krüger and Kühner.

## Xenophon, Hellenica, Books l.-IV.

Edited on the basis of the edition of Büchsenschütz, by J. Irving Manatt, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Greek Literature and History in Brown University. Square 12mo. 300 pages. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.75$; for introduction, $\$ 1.65$.
TEXT EDITION. 138 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.

T[HIS work, treating of an extremely interesting period of Greek history, is admirably adapted to classes in rapid reading. The Commentary deals largely with the history and antiquities of the period, but provides grammatical information and suggestion for the review and inculcation of grammatical principles. Very full indexes are added.

## Xenophon, Hellenica, Books V.-VII.

Edited on the basis of the edition of Buichsenschütz by Charles E. Bennett, Professor of Latin in Cornell University. Square 12mo. 240 pages. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.50$; for introduction, $\$ 1.40$. TEXT EDITION. 128 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.

IMPORTAN'I additions have been made in this edition to the notes of Buichsenschuitz in the way of material drawn from other sources, particularly from the commentaries of Breitenbach, Kurz, and Grosser. Special attention has been paid to the language. The orthography has been made to correspond as closely as possible with the Attic usage of Xenophon's day, as determined by the testimony of contemporary inscriptions, while syntactical peculiarities receive careful consideration. An Introduction by the American editor gives a review of the salient events in the history of the important period covered by the text. Besides an Appendix devoted to matters of textual criticism, the book contains a full grammatical index and an index of proper names.

## The Prometheus Bound of Æschylus.

With the Fragments of the Prometheus Loosed. With Introduction and Notes by N. Wecklein, Rector of the Maximilian Gymnasium in Munich. Translated by F. D. Ailen, Professor of Classical Philology in Harvard University. Square 12 mo . iv +179 pages. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.50$; for introduction, \$1.40.
TEXT EDITION. 57 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.
THE book is a translation, with some freedom as to form of expression, of Wecklein's second edition (1878). A few changes in text and commentary have been requested by the German editor, and references to American grammatical works, replacing in some cases the original references to Krüger, have been added by the translator. In the transcription of the metrical schemes into the notation commonly used in this country, the translator has assumed a somewhat greater responsibility than elsewhere, but here too he has endeavored to follow the editor's intentions. The copious explanatory commentary is followed by a critical appendix.

## Euripides' Iphigenia among the Taurians.

Edited by Isaac Flagg, Professor of Greek, University of California. Square 12mo. 200 pages. Mlustrated. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.50$; for introduction, $\$ 1.40$.
TEXT EDITION. 72 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.

THIS edition is an independent work from the hands of a scholar of established reputation. The Introduction, which is very full, treats of the Age and Celebrity of the Play, the Legend and its Growth, Plot and Scenic Adjustment, Artistic Structure, and Metres and Technique. The commentary is an admirable interpretation of one of the most interesting of the plays of Euripides, - a play especially well fitted, with its spirited adventure, thrilling suspense, and happy ending, to captivate young and ingenuous readers.

## Aeschines against Ctesiphon.

Edited on the basis of Weidner's edition. By Rufus B. Richardson, Professor of Greek in Dartmouth College. Square 12mo. iv + 279 pages. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.50$; for introduction, $\$ 1.40$.
TEXT EDITION. 78 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.
$T$ HIS edition puts into the hands of English-speaking students an oration, adequately interpreted and illustrated, of unique importance. The necessary connection between this oration and Demosthenes on the Crown has been kept in view.
'The Introduction covers 32 pages, and includes a valuable Chronological Table. The commentary is complete. A summary of Weidner's method in establishing the text is given in the Appendix, where the main changes that he has made are also noted.

## The Gorgias of Plato.

Edited on the basis of Deuschle-Cron's edition. By Gonzalez Lodge, Associate in Bryn Mawr College. Square 12mo. iv +308 pages. Cloth. Mailing price, $\$ 1.75$; for introduction, $\$ 1.65$.
TEXT EDITION. 117 pages. Paper. Mailing price, 45 cents; for introduction, 40 cents.

TIE American editor has adhered in the main to the lines of literary interpretation adopted by the German editor. The Introduction has been enlarged by the addition of a full summary of the dialogue. In the notes on syntax especial attention has been paid to the labors of English and American scholars. References to American manuals have been inserted when required.
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[^0]:    1 The most important facts are to be found: (1) in Plato's writings, (2) in Aristotle's writings, especially in the first book of his Metaphysics. The chief modern books are: (I) Historia Philosophiae Graecae et Romanae ex fontium locis contexta. Locos colleg. H. Ritter et L. Preller. Ed. 5. (2) Brandis, Handbuch der Geschichte derGriechisch-RömischenPhilosophie. 2 Theile. (3) Zeller, die Philosophie der Griechen, translated by various hands, and published by Longmans in

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Schleiermacher has collected and explained the fragments that are preserved (Museum der Alterthumswissenschaft, I. 3, Berlin, 1808; or, Werke zur Philosophie, II. 1). See the at-

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the interesting fragments of his well-written work, cf. Mullach's "Democriti Abderitae operum frag-

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Plato's Protagoras, p. 317 a, $\mathbf{b}$.
    ${ }^{2}$ His birth is variously placed between 490 and 480 b.c. (in 487,485 , or 481 ), and his death between 420 and 408 в.c.
    ${ }^{3}$ Plato's Protagoras, p. 317 c : où$\delta \in \nu \partial े s$ öтov oủ $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ à $\nu \dot{\cup} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \lambda \star \kappa i ́ a \nu$ $\pi a \tau \grave{\eta} \rho$ єin $\nu$, there is not a man of you all whose futher I might not be so far as years go.
    ${ }^{4}$ The original words as given by Diog. Lacrt. (ix. 51) are: " $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$
    
     Є$\sigma \tau \iota \nu$." This is sometimes so interpreted as to mean simply that nothing can be measured, i.e. known, unless there is some one to measure or know. This might then mean that the right measure of all things would be taken

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ This same name is applied to the inhabitants. Ptolemaeus is alone in calling the town $\Lambda \epsilon \delta \dot{\partial} \tau t o \nu$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Diodorus xii. 53. Thuc. iii. 86 does not mention him by name.

[^5]:    ${ }^{3}$ The dates given for his birth vary from 496 в.c. (Foss) to 483 в.c. (Frei); for his death, from 384 в.c. to 375 в.c.
    ${ }^{4}$ See on Apol., p. 18 b.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ The ordinary date given for his birth is Ol. 77,3 or $4=470 / 69$ в.c.: probably Ol. 77,2 or $1=472 / 1$ в.c. is nearer the truth. Cf. infra note on § 30, and Apol., p. 17 d.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Apol., p. 29 d ff., particularly
    
    ${ }^{3}$ It cannot be denied that even in

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ We may summarize the philosophical situation as follows: Protagoras said: Man is the measure; Socrates met this by asking: What is man ?

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ It has been claimed that the Memorabilia are referred to by Horace (A. P. v. 310), as Socraticae chartae.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ Apology, p. 32 c d with note.
    ${ }^{2}$ In the Clouds, first put on the stage in b.c. 423 , Aristophanes brings Socrates before his audience in that capacity. An added piquancy was given by Socrates's peculiar personal appearance, which fell so very far short of the Hellenic ideal of beauty. Indeed Socrates himself frequently

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Alcibiades I., p. 431 e ; Theaetet., p. 149 a.

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hdt. I. 32.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Apology, p. 37 e ; Republic,
     крázous.

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ Sympos., p. $220 \mathbf{a b}$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Crito, ch. XIV. with note on p. 53 a.
    ${ }^{3}$ Apol., p. 17 d and supra, p. 14, note 1. Ol. 95, $1=400 / 399$ в.с.
    ${ }^{4}$ Aristoph. Frogs, v. 1302.
    ${ }^{5}$ K. F. Hermann, in his Disputatio de Socratis accusatoribus, maintains that there were four different persons

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ Apol., p. 36 a.
    2 [Xen.] Apol. 29, sqq. Probably there is some reference to Anytus's unjust hatred of Socrates in Xen. Cyrop. iii. 1. 38 sqq.
    

[^14]:    1 " Hermogenes, the son of Hipponicus," a friend of Socrates, " noticed that Socrates, though he conversed freely on things in general, avoided any allusion to the impending suit. ' My dear Socrates,' said he, 'surely you ought to be attending to your brief.' 'Why, do I not seem to you,' answered Socrates, 'to have passed my life with my brief constantly in view?' 'What do you mean by that?' asked Hermogenes. 'I mean that I have shunned evil all my life, that, I think, is the most honorable way in which a man can bestow attention upon his own defence.'" [Xen.]Apol., § 3 sqq. $\quad C f$. Mem. iv. 8.4 sqq., where

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ This chronological coincidence is not certain. See p. 27, note 1.

[^16]:    ${ }^{1}$ Xen. Mem. iv. 2. 10.
    ${ }^{2}$ Over the door of his lecture-room was written, it is said: Let no one unversed in geometry enter here, $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon i s$
    

[^17]:    ${ }^{3}$ It is very commonly asserted that he solved the Delian problem (the doubling of a cube), and on doing so, criticized the usual manner of dealing with mathematics.

[^18]:    1 This whole account of Plato's being sold as a slave and then ransomed is not well substantiated by trustworthy authorities.

    2 It is important at this point to have clearly before the mind some statement of Plato's theory of ideas. In the Theaetetus (p. 210 a) Socrates is made to say: "Then, Theaetetus, knowledge is not (1) sensation (ało $\theta \eta$ $\sigma(s)$; nor is it (2) true opinion ( $\delta \delta \xi \alpha a$ $\dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\eta} s)$; nor again, (3) true opinion coupled with definition ( $\lambda$ óros $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \gamma \iota \gamma \nu$ b$\mu \in \nu 0 s)$." This of course represents the view of Plato and not of Socrates, for (3) is very nearly what Socrates would have called knowledge. Without any direct allusion to his theory of ideas, Plato shows in this dialogue that no definition of knowledge is logically possible unless the definition itself contains the term defined. To

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. supra, p. 3, n. 3.
    ${ }^{2}$ This division into three parts is based in the Timaeus upon a division into two parts. The soul has (i) its immortal or rational part, and (2) its irrational or mortal part. This last (2) is subdivided into (a) a noble part

[^20]:    1 Socrates said that wisdom was virtue. Plato said (I) wisdom acquired and exercised for the whole state is the ruler's virtue, (2) wisdom

[^21]:    ${ }^{1} C f$. Laws iv., p. 709 e $s q q$. This passage irresistibly suggests the general condition of things which Plato, on the occasion of his last two journeys, expected to find at Syracuse, and indeed largely what he actually did find.
    ${ }^{2}$ Seneca is probably repeating an 'idle tale' when he says that Plato

[^22]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Apology, p. $18 \mathbf{a b} s q q$.

[^23]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Apol., p. 26 b ad fin. and c, also p. 28 e $s q q$.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Apol., p. 20 a-c; p. 29 c at
    ${ }^{2} C f$. Apol., pp. 24d-27e.
    the end $s q q$. and elsewhere.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. supra, § 31.
    ${ }^{5} \mathrm{Cf}$. Apol., p. $26 \mathrm{~b} s q q$.

[^24]:    ${ }^{1} C f$. infra, § 71, note 2.

[^25]:    ${ }^{1}$ Rhet. ad Herenn. I. 10, 17 : Enumeratione utemur, cum dicemus numero, quot de rebus dicturi simus.

[^26]:    ${ }^{2}$ Ibid. Expositio est, cum res, quibus de rebus dicturi sumus, exponimus breviter et absolnte.

[^27]:    ${ }^{1}$ Rhet. ad Herenn. II. 29, 46: Exornatio constat ex similibus et exemplis et rebus iudicatis et amplificationibus et ceteris rebus quac pertinent ad exaugendam et collocupletandam argumentationem.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 4: " oủsc̀̀ $\nu$
     тapà toùs vópous motinनat, he lent himself to none of the violations of law which were customarily committed in courts." It appears that there was no special law forbidding in so many words an oratorical appeal to the emotions of the judges in the ordinary courts. This is confirmed, indeed, by Aristotle in his Rhetoric (I. 1, a passage particularly important in connection with the Apology). There Aristotle first criticizes various rhetorical practices, and then proceeds to say: "prejudice, pity, anger, and all such emotions of

[^28]:    ${ }^{1} C f$. supra, § 36 and note.

[^29]:    ${ }^{1}$ For most of the details of the analysis given above Cron is not responsible, though it is substituted for his $\S 63$, where there is a less
    detailed analysis of the dialogue on the same principle.
    ${ }^{2}$ See on $\dot{\omega}$ oi $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ ol olovzal, Crito, p. 49 b.

[^30]:    ${ }^{1}$ To this correspond the words $\dot{\eta}$
     we find $\epsilon i \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \nu$ used both of $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta i-$ $\kappa \eta \nu$ and of $\tau o \dot{s} \dot{\alpha} \mu \varphi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau o \hat{v} \nu \tau \alpha s$. Correspondingly, we find $\epsilon^{i} \sigma \epsilon \rho \rho \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ and eiot'tval said both of the suit and of the parties to the suit, meaning sub-

[^31]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. supra, § 31 ; also, § 69 and note.
    
    2 The technical terms which were used are found in Apol., pp. 36 b, 37 c. It is noticeable that not only $\tau \iota \mu \bar{\alpha} \sigma \theta a \iota$
    (Xen. Apol. 23) were used.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Apol., p. 36 b.
    ${ }^{4} C f$. Phaed., p. 116 b.

