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## gindure in, Agtymore

 NOTES. dialogue generally has two or even three titles: the Bodleian ms for example denotes the other three members of the first Tetralogy by
 $\dot{\eta} \theta \iota \kappa \delta s, \Phi a i \delta \omega \nu \ddot{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho l \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$. $\dot{\eta} \theta \iota \kappa o ́ s$. In each case only the first of these titles dates from Plato, who generally (but not always) named the dialogue after one of the characters appearing.in it. The second title was added by Thrasylus, a rhetorician and literary critic who flourished about the Christian era: it is intended to explain the subject treated of in the dialogue. It is not clear whether the third title was added, as Grote believes (Plato Vol. i. p. 160), by Thrasylus, or by Diogenes Laertius either on his own responsibility or in obedience to some other authority (see Diog. Laert. III. 49); at all events it is meant to indicate the formal scope of the dialogue —whether a dialogue of exposition ( $\dot{v} \phi \eta \gamma \eta \tau \iota \kappa \delta \delta s$, of which $\dot{\eta} \theta \iota \kappa 0$ ós is a subdivision), or a dialogue of search (乡ŋ $\quad \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s)$. Here the Crito is correctly described as an ethical dialogue dealing with a question
 $\pi \rho a \kappa \tau \epsilon \prime \circ \nu$ єi't $\mu \dot{\prime}$ )-viz. is it right to save one's life by breaking the law?

Crito was one of Socrates' oldest and most attached friends (Apol. 33 D, Phaedo 115 A foll.). He appears to have been rich and not indisposed to make more money (Euthyd. 304 C ). The fact that he had stood surety for Socrates after the trial (Phaedo $I_{5}$ D) increased his personal danger if Socrates should escape from prison, and reveals in a yet stronger light his devotion to his friend : see note on 45 D. "Plato's picture of Crito is as of a sensible and kindly man of the world, looking upon life from the point of view of an honest Athenian gentleman, but without any capacity for philo-sophy".-Archer-Hind's Phaedo p. 42.

The scene is in the prison, just before daybreak.

## CHAPTER I.

Crito warns Socrates that the ship is on its way back from Delos, and will arrive to-day.
43 A I. $\tau \eta \nu \kappa \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \delta=$ ' at this hour' $)(\tau \eta \nu i \kappa \alpha$ 'at that hour': so $\tau 0$ óo $\sigma \epsilon$ $=$ ' of this sort' )( roios ' of that sort'. The distinction is like that between öס $\delta$ and oûros. $\tau \eta \nu i \kappa a$ seems to have been originally a Doric adverb ( $\tau \hat{\eta} \nu 0 s$ is Doric for $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon i \nu 0 s$ ): the suffix reappears in au̇ $\tau-\dot{\kappa} \alpha$.
2. $\pi \rho \dot{\varphi}$. Socrates is not surprised to see Crito, for we learn from the Phaedo (59D, cf. Xen. Mem. Iv. 8. 2) that he was daily visited by his friends during the interval between his condemnation and his death: but he is surprised to see him so carly. The prison was generally opened somewhat later ( $\dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \varphi^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \tau \% \gamma$ रà oú $\pi \rho \psi^{\prime}$ Phaed. l.c.). $\pi \rho \leqq$ and not $\pi \rho \omega t$ is the correct Attic form of this word. The Bodleian has $\pi \rho \omega$ i.
3. $\pi \alpha ́ v v ~ \mu \grave{̀ v} \nu$ oûv = 'imo, valde quidem' (Göbel). $\mu$ èv ô̂v is cor-


4. $\pi \eta \nu i к \alpha \mu$ а́льбта. $\pi \eta \nu i к \alpha$ means 'at what precise time?' $\pi o ́ \tau \epsilon$ only 'at what time?' $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ makes the question more vague: ' $\Lambda$ bout what o'clock is it?' So $\tau i \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$; =quid potissimum? Gorg. $44^{8}$ D.

 is the morning twilight, and $\beta a \theta$ ús implies that it was more dark than light: cf. the expressions $\beta a \theta \epsilon i a \sim \nu \dot{\xi} \xi, \beta a \theta \in i a \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \epsilon \in \rho a$.
6. $\quad$ avpáíj ö $\pi \omega$. Stallbaum quotes Xen. Mem. I. I. 20 $\theta a v$ -
 'I wonder how it was that etc.': $\theta a v \mu a ́ \zeta \omega ~ \epsilon i$ would mean 'I wonder
 used of answering the door: cf. Phaed. 59 E ó $\theta v \rho \omega \rho o ̀ s ~ o ̈ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho ~ \epsilon i \omega ̈ \theta \epsilon t$ $\dot{v} \pi \alpha \kappa о \cup ́ \epsilon \iota \nu$ and $\dot{\delta} \dot{\cup} \pi \alpha \kappa о v ́ \sigma \alpha s$ of the porter in Xen. Symp. I. il.
 met in the $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \rho \iota o \nu$, which adjoined the prison (Phaed. 59 D), and waited till the prison was opened.
9. єủnpүє́тๆтal. Where initial єủ- or oi- precede a vowel in Attic verbs, "that vowel, and not the initial diphthong, receives the
 (Rutherford, New Phrynichus, p. 245). " $\tau i$ is equivalent to $\epsilon \dot{v} \in \rho$ -
 editors ${ }^{1}$, except Kral, read $\left.\epsilon \dot{v} \in \rho \gamma \epsilon ́ \tau \eta \tau a \iota.\right]$


13. єîta. On єita indignabundum see Apol. 28 в ( $\epsilon i \tau^{\prime}$ оі́к 43 Р aio $\chi \dot{\nu} \nu \epsilon \ell ;$ ) and my note there. For $\epsilon i \tau a$ followed by $\pi \hat{\omega} s \mathrm{cf}$. (with
 $\delta i \delta \omega s$ 入aßєî̀;
15. oú $\mu \dot{\text { d̀ }}$ тòv $\Delta$ 'a $\kappa \tau \lambda$. $=$ ' no! Socrates, believe me, I could wish that I myself were not so sleepless and sorrowful'. ov́ does not anticipate the following oưס́́ in oươ' äv aúrós (ne ipse quidem), but is part of Crito's reply to Socrates' question, since $\epsilon i \uparrow a-\pi а р а к a ́-$ $\theta \eta \sigma a \iota=\dot{\epsilon} \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \theta \dot{\theta} s \in \pi \pi \epsilon \gamma \epsilon i \hat{\rho} \alpha i \quad \mu \epsilon, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{a} \mu \grave{\eta} \sigma \iota \gamma \hat{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho a \kappa \alpha \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$. For the displacement of $\tau \epsilon$ Stallbaum compares Phaed. $94 \mathrm{D} \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \kappa a \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta \nu} \kappa \alpha i$ ті̀ $\nu$ iaтрıкй $\nu$. Wohlrab takes ov่ as merely anticipatory of the following negative: I agree with Göbel.
17. $\alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ кai $\sigma o \hat{v}-\theta a v \mu \dot{a}\} \omega$ sc. just as yout were lately sur-
 Goodwin's Greek Grammar p. 222. Cron on the other hand takes à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ кai as='but furthermore', while Göbel connects кal $\theta a v \mu a ́ \zeta \omega$


 first sight we should expect the optative $\delta$ od' $\gamma$ ous in the next line, Crito contrives to indicate that he still wishes Socrates $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{s} \eta \delta \sigma \sigma \tau a$

 aủт $\omega \hat{\nu} \dot{\dot{j}} \mu 0 \lambda_{0} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$. In Apol. 40 D Socrates declares that nothing is $u^{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \nu \kappa \alpha i \not \eta \delta \iota \nu$ than sound dreamless sleep.
 in Rep. v. ${ }_{4}{ }^{6}$ b.
20. そư $\delta \alpha \not \mu o ́ v \iota \sigma \alpha$ тov̂ $\tau \rho o ́ \pi o v$. Inscriptions of the age of Plato shew that verbs beginning with $\epsilon \dot{v}$ - regularly had an augment in the secondary tenses: see Rutherford New Phryn. 244 and Meisterhans, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften 78. Here the msS and edd. (except Kral) read $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta a \iota \mu$ óvıбa. On the genitive with $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta a \iota \mu o \nu i \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ compare Goodwin's Greek Grammar p. 224: and for the sentiment

[^0] $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \sigma \gamma \omega \nu$.

24. тŋ入ıкоиิтov övтa. Socrates was seventy years of age: v. infra $5^{2} \mathrm{E}$.
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ more often takes the dative without $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$.
 them from being indignant'. Verbs of hindering, if negative themselves, are regularly followed by $\mu \dot{\eta}$ oú with the infinitive, which may or may not have the article. Goodwin MT. 198 foll. With the

 ou $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i \nu \dot{\alpha} \tau i \mu \omega s \kappa \tau \lambda$. Whitelaw (Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society III. I, p. 41 foll.) endeavours, I think with success, to prove that both negatives have a value, the infinitive being consecutive. Thus while $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \omega \dot{\omega} \lambda v \sigma \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\eta} \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu=$ 'he hindered
 not hinder me, so that I did not refrain-from-speaking' i.e. keep silence (oủk єimeiv).
 K $\rho i \tau \omega \nu$; on $\pi \rho \dot{\psi}$ v. note ibid.
34. द̇v тoîs $\beta$ apútata. Note the climax: $\chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi \eta{ }^{2}-\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \grave{\eta} \nu$ кal $\beta a p \in i ̂ a \nu-\epsilon ̀ \nu \tau o i ̂ s ~ \beta a \rho u ́ \tau a \tau a$. The phrase $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau o i ̂ s a d d s ~ e m p h a s i s$ to the superlative. When occurring with the superlative of adjectives, it is best explained by supplying a fresh superlative to agree with the article: this superlative is sometimes expressed, e.g. Cratyl.
 but Schanz rejects $\mu \epsilon$ خiбтors): compare also the kindred expression in Symp. 195 E $̇ ่ \nu \mu a \lambda a \kappa \omega \tau \alpha ́ \tau o \iota s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu a \lambda a \kappa \omega \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$. When as here the phrase is linked to an adverb, we must repeat the superlative along with a participle supplied from the verb to which the adverb

 become purely adverbial and may be used even with feminine adjectives, as in the well-known $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ roîs $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \tau a \iota ~ \delta \grave{\eta} \nu \hat{\eta} \epsilon s$ III. $1 \eta$, where see Classen's note. Compare Kühner, Griechische Grammatik II. 27.
 my note on Apol. 26 B. The annual mission to Delos, during
which no criminal was put to death at Athens, had begun the day before Socrates' trial, when the priest of Apollo decorated the bow of the vessel with garlands. On this occasion the boat was absent thirty days. The mission was intended to commemorate the deliverance of Athens under Theseus from the annual tribute of young men and maidens sent to Crete: see Phaed. 58 A foll. and Xen. Mem. Iv. 8. 2.
36. $\tau \in \theta$ vával is slightly more emphatic than $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ : see on Apol. 30 C oú $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon i \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ то入入áкis $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu$ ával, and infr. $5_{2} \mathrm{C}$. The infinitive $\theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ is hardly used by good Attic prose writers, $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \theta \nu \hat{\prime} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ being used instead: but $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha$, $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ are alone right, never $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha, \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\jmath} \kappa \eta$. Rutherford Babrius p. 36 .
37. oú $\tau 0 \iota \delta \eta \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \phi \hat{\kappa} \kappa \tau \alpha \iota=$ 'no, it is true that it has not arrived'. 43 D

 as with the Latin videri, the personal construction is generally preferred: if we follow Schanz סoкeîv $\mu \epsilon ́ v \nu 0<$ is to be taken as an infinitive used absolutely='in my opinion': cf. Ar. Aves 1235

 and the common phrase $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu \epsilon i \nu a \iota$. The construction $\delta о к \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu 0<$ $\ddot{\eta}_{i} \xi_{\epsilon \iota}$ though rare is also allowable: see Phaed. 108 D ó $\beta$ ios $\mu \mathrm{ol}$
 Schanz, Novae Commentationes p. 130) Menex. 236 в öтє $\mu о \iota$ бокє $\hat{\imath}$ $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \tau i \theta \epsilon \iota \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \alpha ́ \phi \iota \circ \nu \lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu$ : see also infra on 50 B. For $\mu \epsilon \nu$ (after $\delta o \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath})$ without a following $\delta \epsilon$-a frequent idiom in a clause with $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$, the antithesis to which is really contained in the preceding negative clause-compare (with Stallbaum) Prot. 344 A ov̉ $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ fival, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota \mu \epsilon \in \nu \notin \sigma \tau \iota \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.
39. Sovvíov. Homer Od. HI. 278 इ (Fischer). Cape Sunium was the great landmark for seamen on the South coast of Attica.
 'news' (nuntii) is not found before Polybius. $\epsilon \kappa$, before $a^{\alpha} \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ is like $\epsilon \kappa$ of the agent (conceived of as the source) after passive verbs, e.g. Tim. 47 в $\delta \omega \rho \eta \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$. Wohlrab and Kral read $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \lambda \iota \omega \hat{\omega}$ with some MSS: Cron, Schanz and Göbel bracket $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$, on the ground that $\dot{a} \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ cannot $=\dot{a} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \iota \hat{\omega} \nu$, and that $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ to express the source must be followed by a neuter or inanimate object: but the example I have cited is enough to defend the idiom.

## CHAPTER II.

Socrates relying on a vision declares that the ship will not arrive till to-morrow.
 be for the best'. The formula is frequent on inscriptions and

 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \tau \cup ́ \chi \eta \dot{a} \gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \rho \chi \epsilon \in \tau \omega$ Фaîठpos. With $\epsilon i \tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta \tau o i ̂ s ~ \theta \epsilon o i ̂ s$ $\phi i \lambda o \nu, \tau a u ́ \tau \eta$ È $\sigma \tau \omega$ compare the last words of the dialogue:

44 A 5. т $\hat{n}$ रáp mov. This is the introductory $\gamma{ }^{\prime} \rho\left(\gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \rho a\right)$ and should not be translated: see on Apol. 20 E Xat $\rho \in \phi \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a \quad \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ й $\sigma \tau \epsilon \pi$ тou.
6. ขீ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho a i ́ a-\eta$ " $\hat{\mathrm{n}}$. " $\dot{\eta} \pi \rho о \tau \epsilon \rho a l a$ et $\dot{\eta} \dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho a i a$ perpetuo usu de diebus dicuntur, omisso semper $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha-\pi \rho o \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ e t ~ \dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ d e ~ a l i i s ~$ rebus quibuslibet repetitis, concione, proelio etc." Cobet, Variae Lectiones $2 \nleftarrow 6$. The words are often confused with one another in MSS. íбтєpaia being a virtual comparative is followed by $\ddot{\eta}$. Note the orthography in $\dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \theta \nu \dot{j} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ : the $\iota$ is found in B here and infra 46 D and $4^{8} \mathrm{D}$ : inscriptions also furnish evidence to the same effect: see Meisterhans, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften p. 86. $\theta \nu \eta \mathfrak{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega$ is connected with $\theta \epsilon i \nu \omega$, фóvos, Skt. han: the ending $-i \sigma \kappa \omega$ is probably on the analogy of $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho-i \sigma \kappa \omega$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \kappa \circ \mu \alpha \iota$ and the like. Compare Gust. Meyer, Griech. Gr. ${ }^{2}$ pp. 259, 45 I.
7. $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime}$ тol $\delta$ n'. $^{\prime} \gamma^{€} \tau 0 \iota=$ ' at all events'.
oi тоút $\omega \nu$ кúpıot viz. oi $\notin \nu \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha$, the board of eleven (ten ordinary members and a $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon$ 's) who had general charge of the prisons and saw that the capital sentence was carried out: Phaed. 59 е, i 16 в foll.
 or that which was just beginning. Soph. O. T. 78 I т $\grave{\eta}_{\nu} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ ô̂ $\sigma a \nu$
 रov. From Phaedo 59 D-E it appears that Socrates was right: the boat did not arrive till the second day.
10. таúтŋs $\tau \eta$ § $\nu$ vктós: genitive of time within which: Goodwin, Gk. Gr. 227.
ri. кเขסvvєvés in the sense of $\delta$ ккєîs: so frequently in conversational style.
év kaıp̣̂ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \imath \iota$ 'peropportune' (Stallbaum). $\tau \iota s$, as Cron re-

oủk є̇ $\gamma \epsilon i ̂ p a l$. Not $\mu \grave{\eta}$ є̇ $\gamma \epsilon i ̂ p a l$, because oủk є̇ $\gamma \epsilon i ̂ p a l$ is a single no-


 Socrates was greatly influenced by dreams and oracles and $\mu a \nu \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$

 story of this vision is also told (inaccurately) by Diogenes Laertius, iI. 5. 35, and referred to in Cic. de Div. I. 52. For two other examples see Phaed. 60 E and Diog. Laert. III. 5. In his respect for divination Socrates presents the most striking contrast to Plato, who places priestcraft and divination in the lowest of the three classes of arts distinguished in the Politicus ( 290 c foll.). See on this subject Nohle's excellent essay "Die Statslehre Platos in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung", Jena, 1880.
 of white was significant of joy: compare Legg. XiI. 947 B, where Plato in speaking of funerals ordains $\lambda \epsilon \nu \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ Єॄ $\chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \nu, ~ \theta \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu \nu \nu \delta \grave{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha a l$ ódup $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \chi \omega \rho i s \gamma^{\prime} \gamma \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$. So in Aeschylus
 identified the vision with $\dot{\eta}$ єi $\mu \alpha \rho \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta$ : see Phaed. II5 A $\epsilon \in \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$

 $\Phi \theta i \eta \nu \quad \epsilon \rho i \beta \omega \lambda$ ov $i \kappa o i \mu \eta \nu$, spoken by Achilles. It is possible (as Cron suggests) that the meaning of the line for Socrates lay partly in the fact that Phthia was the home of Achilles: but I feel sure that (rightly or wrongly) Socrates associated $\Phi \theta i \eta$ with $\phi \theta i \omega$ and $\phi \theta i \sigma \iota s$, and derived comfort from the epithet $\epsilon \rho i \beta \omega \lambda o \nu$. In Euripides' Electra 836 there is what seems to me a similar play upon the word $\Phi$ tias. Orestes has been dissecting a victim with a $\Delta \omega \rho \iota \kappa \grave{\eta}$ котis, in the presence of Aegisthus. Suddenly he lays it aside and exclaims:
 котióa; With this $\Phi \theta$ iàs котis he slays Aegisthus. I am glad to find that Lambinus (as a pupil has pointed out to me) took the same view of $\Phi \theta i \eta \nu$ in this passage. See also infra on 47 в line $\mathrm{r}_{4}$.

reading. Possibly we should read ämopov, as affording a better antithesis to $\epsilon_{\nu} \nu \rho \gamma \epsilon^{\prime}$ : $\lambda i \alpha \nu \gamma \epsilon$, $\dot{\omega} s{ }_{\epsilon}^{*} \neq \kappa \kappa \epsilon \nu$, is ironical, for it is clear from the sequel that Crito does not believe the vision: see on 46 A .
19. द̇vapyès $\mu \hat{v} \nu$ oûv 'No, it is plain': on $\mu \hat{้} \nu$ oûv (immo) v. above $43 \mathrm{~A} \pi \alpha ́ \nu \nu \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ oûv.

## CHAPTER III.

Crito entreats Socrates to escape and save the reputation of his friend.
 address in Athenian society. The adjective meant originally 'more than human': in Homer it is generally used as an epithet of reproach, in Attic, of affection coupled with remonstrance (as here), or ironically. $\hat{\omega} \mu \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ \rho \epsilon \epsilon$ is used in the same way. Other kindred
 three first mean 'my excellent friend' or 'my fine fellow' (ironical): the last 'my dear sir' (with remonstrance). Often the precise shade of meaning can only be conveyed by the tone of the voice in translating aloud.
2. '่̇ $\iota$ kaì vôv. The words imply that Crito had already made many attempts to induce Socrates to escape: cf. infra 48 E mav̂oaı


 collocation of present and aorist in $\pi \epsilon i \theta_{0}$ ккаi $\sigma \dot{\omega} \theta \eta \tau \iota$ cf. Gorg. 486 c

3. oú $\mu$ ía $=$ non una $=$ 'more than one'. The Bodleian has oú$\delta \epsilon \mu i a$ : but this can hardly be right. Crito proceeds to enumerate two misfortunes: the loss of his friend and the loss of his reputation. Observe that Crito thinks his reputation will suffer more if Socrates remains to die than if he breaks his own pledge to the Athenian people by inducing Socrates to escape : see Phaed. II 5 D. In Crito's judgment (and Crito here as elsewhere represents the average Athenian gentleman of the day) it is a higher duty to serve one's friend than to be true to one's country. It is this point of view which Socrates combats in the sequel, as utterly fatal to the very existence of the State.
 Bodleian, which all the recent editors have changed. $\chi \omega$ ois is an adverb, as the balance between $\chi \omega \rho i s \mu \epsilon \bar{\prime} \nu$ and $\epsilon \epsilon \tau \iota \delta \epsilon$ proves (see also Madvig Adv. I. 369) : to regard it as a preposition and insert rov̂ before $\sigma 0 \hat{v}$ (as Ast does), or to change $\sigma o \hat{v}$ to $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ with most editors, introduces far greater difficulties than those which it is sought to overcome. The construction is $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \chi \omega \rho i s \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ (on the one hand)
 is substituted for $\chi \omega \rho i s \delta \epsilon$ in the second half of the antithesis because $\chi \omega \rho i s \delta \epsilon$ would require каì $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ оis $\delta$ ок $\epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu<\mathrm{sc}$. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \circ \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon \in \sigma \tau \nu \nu>$ to balance $\chi \omega \rho i s \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma 0 \hat{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ : this would be awkward, with $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$ so far removed. For $\chi \omega \rho i s \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ followed by $\chi \omega \rho i s \delta \epsilon$ compare Parm. 1 $з$ о в
 $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ầ $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \chi o \nu \tau a$. Translate the whole sentence thus: 'For to me your death is more than a single calamity: on the one hand, there is the loss of you, a friend such as I shall never find again, and moreover many men, who do not know you and me well, will think me guilty of neglect, because I might have saved you, if I had been willing to spend money'.
 in Plato as in Attic generally: either 'I am debarred from', or 'I am deprived of': an example of the former meaning is Rep. vi.


 is of course future. ov' $\mu \dot{\eta}$ with the future indicative (rare), or (far more often) the aorist conjunctive (cf. infr. 46 C ov $\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma o \iota \xi v \gamma \chi \omega \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ ), is a strong negative: for the sense of futurity in the aorist conjunctive compare $\pi i-0-\mu a l$, $\epsilon \delta-0-\mu a l$ (conjunctives with the short vowel as in $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}(\imath-0-\mu \epsilon \nu)$ and perhaps Latin faxo, i.e. fac-s-o: see my note on Apol. 29 D and compare Goodwin MT. p. 184.
7. oi- $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ' $\sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma เ v$. Not oi-ou because the clause is virtually conditional: no one who knew Crito and Socrates well could imagine that Crito had treated him with neglect.
 'I might have saved you'. This clause is explained by $\dot{a} \mu \epsilon \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ : it was because Crito had the money, and didn't use it, that ignorant men might charge him with neglect: had he been penniless, he would have escaped the charge. Crito was very well off : see Euthyd. 304 C. Cron and Göbel take is to mean 'although': so

Schanz in Zeitschrift für die österreichen Gymnasien, Vol. 20 (1869) p. 87, comparing the concessive use of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \boldsymbol{l}$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \mathfrak{i}-\gamma \epsilon$ in Prot.

 only in the modern idiom that even this use of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \boldsymbol{l}$ is concessive : to the Greeks it was causal, 'for, as for the many, they etc.' Note the iota subscript in $\sigma \psi_{\zeta}^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ : it is regularly found in the present stem of this verb down to 160 B.C.: see Meisterhans, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften, p. 87.
 refers forward, not to $\delta о к \epsilon i v$, but to $\hat{\eta} \delta о к \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$. For a similar case see
 $\theta \rho \omega \pi$ os, $\hat{\eta} \tau 0 \hat{v} \tau$ о $\kappa \tau \lambda$. and Cicero De Fin. I. 19 quo nihil turpius physico, quam fieri quicquam sine causa dicere. For the repetition


 himself very lofty views on the subject of friendship: see Mem. II.

 saying that a true and good friend is the best of all possessions, and yet caring more for money than for friends.
13. $\tilde{\omega} \mu$ ака́pıє Kрít $\omega v$. See on $\hat{\omega} \delta \alpha \iota \mu o ́ \nu \iota \epsilon$ supra 44 в.
 opinion of the many is worthless, in comparison with that of the man who knows: see my introduction to the Apology p. x. and the passages there cited.
15. фpovtifelv with a genitive, as often in Plato, e.g. Soph.

cútá is frequently used, without any expressed antecedent, for the matter under discussion, e.g. $46 \mathrm{c} \pi \hat{\omega}$ s oûv ằ $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho \iota \omega ́ \tau \alpha \tau \alpha$ бкото $\mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$


44 D 18. av̉ $\alpha$ dè $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a$. This use of aưtá throws light on aưtíka in the sense of 'for example'. $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha$ (sc. $\bar{\epsilon} \sigma r i \nu)$ is passive: so in Rep. I. $348 \mathrm{E} \nu \hat{v} \nu \delta \dot{\delta} \delta \hat{\eta} \lambda$ os $\epsilon \hat{\imath} \partial \ddot{\partial} \iota \iota \phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$ : the idiom is like 'I see thee, who thou art'. As to the omission of the copula it should be noted that Plato rarely leaves it out except in the present indicative ( $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{i}$ is more often omitted than $\epsilon \hat{\imath}$ or $\epsilon i \mu l$ ), and in the present infinitive: see Schanz, Novae Commentationes Platonicae, p. 3 I foll.

 $\zeta \eta \tau a \iota$, oü $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \rho$ каi $\epsilon \pi \alpha \iota \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, i.e. it has reference to a court of law. With auvoîs alone the phrase would mean 'at odds with them': $\pi \rho o ̀ s a u ̛ \tau o \dot{v} s \delta \iota a \beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu 0 s$ would be 'calumniated to them'.
22. Єi $\gamma \grave{\rho} \rho{ }^{\circ} \phi \epsilon \lambda 0 v:$ formula of wishing: Goodwin MT. ${ }_{177}$. Compare our colloquial 'You ought to have been there'. $\epsilon i$ in wishes is not to be explained by assuming an ellipse of the apodosis : it is more probable that $\epsilon i$ in conditional sentences is a later use, derived from the use of $\epsilon i=\sigma F \epsilon \ell$, cf. sei in Plautus and si-c(e) to introduce a wish. See Monro's Homeric Grammar, p. 232 foll.
23. โva oiol $\tau$ ' $\mathfrak{j} \sigma a v=$ 'that they might have been able'. iva, ö $\pi \omega s$, etc. are used with a secondary tense of the indicative (without $\left.a^{\prime} \nu\right)$ in final clauses depending on a wish that can no longer be realised, or on the apodosis to an impossible protasis: see Goodwin MT. p. 72 . A similar rule holds for $\pi \rho^{i} \nu$ and $\notin \omega$ : Goodwin 145, I44. Scribes frequently misunderstand the idiom and corrupt the text either (a) by inserting ${ }^{d} \nu$, or (b) by changing the indicatives to conjunctives or optatives: see Cobet, Variae Lectiones pp. 102, 359. Two passages, so far as I know, have not yet been emended. Marc. Aurelius,
 $\ell \nu a \dot{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\eta} \pi a ́ \nu \tau \eta \tau \grave{o} \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi i \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu a \dot{v} \tau \hat{\psi}$, where read $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\eta} \nu$. The other

 where we should read $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \rho \alpha \dot{\xi} a s$ and possibly $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \hat{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \nu$, unless the corruption in $\epsilon^{\prime} \xi \in \in \lambda \eta$ lies deeper.
24. каi ка入 $\omega$ s äv $\epsilon \AA_{\chi} \in \nu$. Not of course dependent on $\eta_{\nu \alpha}$, as the ${ }_{a} \nu \nu$ shews, but an independent clause.

The statement that a power to do harm implies the power of doing good rests on the Socratic doctrine that virtue is knowledge. If we know what is good, we are good, but we cannot know what is good without knowing what is evil (this Socrates proved by the analogy of the arts), and so being able to do what is evil: conversely, the power to do evil implies the power to do good. This is all worked out at length in the Hippias Minor (a genuine dialogue), where it is proved that the veracious man is $\dot{o} \delta u \nu a \dot{\mu} \mu \nu 0 s \psi \in \dot{v} \delta \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ : see especially 366 в foll. and 369 в ( $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ oûv aī $\theta$ ávєt, öть $\dot{\partial} \nu a \pi \epsilon ́ \phi a \nu \tau a \iota$

$\nu \hat{v} \nu \delta \epsilon ́=' b u t$ as it is': see on Apol. 18 A and Prot. 335 C (quoted there) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \sigma v \gamma \chi \omega \rho \epsilon i \nu — \nu \hat{v} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon \iota \dot{\partial} \dot{\eta}$ oùk
$\dot{\epsilon} \theta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$. The Latin is 'nunc'. ouv $\delta \in ́ \tau \epsilon \rho a$ in the next line is probably adverbial as in Theaet. 184 a ( $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ 㬵 ov́ $\delta \epsilon \in \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha$ i.e. neither $\epsilon \nu \nu \alpha \rho \epsilon \rho \gamma \varphi \sigma \kappa \epsilon \psi \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota$ nor $i \kappa \alpha \nu \omega \hat{s} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \psi \psi a \sigma \theta a \iota)$, although here it would be easy to supply $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \rho \gamma \alpha \dot{\zeta} \epsilon \sigma \theta a u$.
 not mean 'they act wholly at random' (Church), as all the editors take it : had Plato meant that, he would have written $\pi \rho \alpha \alpha_{\tau} \tau v \sigma \iota$ as in

 is quite usual: cf. infra $5^{1}$ A. Translate: 'they treat a man just as it occurs to them'. Cf. Gorgias $521 \mathrm{C} \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \eta \tau 0 s a ̈ \rho a \in i \mu l$, $\hat{\omega} \mathrm{K} \alpha \lambda \lambda i \kappa \lambda \epsilon \iota s$,
 $\pi \alpha \theta \in \imath \nu$. Ibid. 522 C (which Stallbaum actually quotes to illustrate his view, as if $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ could be a passive to $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu$ as well as to
 means that 'the many' are altogether thoughtless in their treatment of the individual: witness the way in which Miltiades, Cimon and Pericles were treated (Gorg. $515 \mathrm{E}-516 \mathrm{E}$ ). They would lightly put a man to death and just as lightly bring him to life again if they could: see infra 48 c $\mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\omega} s \dot{\alpha}^{\lambda} \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$, $\hat{\omega} \mathrm{K} \rho i \tau \omega \nu, \sigma \kappa \notin \mu \mu a \tau \alpha$
 $\epsilon i$ oîoí $\tau^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$, oú $\delta \epsilon \nu i \xi \dot{v} \nu \nu \hat{\varphi}, \tau \sigma u ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$.

## CHAPTER IV.

In this chapter Crito urges Socrates not to let the fear of danger to his friends or exile to himself prevent him from absconding.
$44 \mathrm{E} \quad$ I. $\mu \grave{̀} \nu \delta \eta \eta_{j}$. This particle is regularly used to indicate that some topic is concluded. So at the end of speeches oi $\mu \grave{\varepsilon} \nu$ $\delta \grave{\eta} \tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha$
 between $\tau a \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha$ retrospective and $\tau \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon$ prospective.
2. $\hat{\alpha} \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mu \eta \eta^{\prime}$. $\hat{\alpha} \rho \alpha$ or $\hat{\alpha} \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \epsilon$ (the addition of $\gamma \epsilon$ makes the question more animated) merely indicates that a question is asked: $\hat{\alpha} \rho a \mu \eta$ ' or $\hat{\alpha} \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta}$ expects the answer 'no': $\hat{\alpha} \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon$ oú or $\hat{\alpha} \rho$ ' oú expects the answer 'yes'. $\mu \eta^{\prime}(\mu \hat{\omega} \nu)$ can of course stand by itself in the sense of num? as ov in the sense of nonne?
3. $\pi \rho \sigma \mu \eta \theta \in \hat{\imath}-\mu \eta$. $\quad \pi \rho \sigma \mu \eta \theta \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota$ being virtually a verb of fearing is followed by $\mu \dot{\eta}^{\prime}$.
4. oi oukoфávтal 'the informers'. The great part played by the law-courts and litigation in Athenian life caused a class of informers to spring up, resembling the 'delatores' of the early Roman empire. The origin of the name is obscure : see Liddell and Scott s. v., where a suggestion of Mr Lancelot Shadwell is quoted, according to which the word originally means 'one who brings figs to light by shaking the trees': and then metaphorically 'one who makes rich men yield up their fruit by accusations and other vile

5. $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau \alpha \pi \alpha \rho \in ́ \chi \omega \sigma เ \nu$ of a prolonged action )( $\dot{\nu} \nu \alpha \gamma \kappa \alpha \sigma \theta \hat{\omega} \mu \in \nu$ of the act and nothing more.

7. $\alpha^{\prime} \pi \circ \beta a \lambda \epsilon i v$ is used both of voluntary and of involuntary loss (as here): cf. Symp. 179 A $\bar{\delta} \pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \pi o \beta a \lambda \omega^{\nu} \nu$ (voluntary): Rep. VIII. 553 в $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ov̉ $\sigma$ ià ä $\pi \alpha a \sigma \alpha \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi o \beta a \lambda o ́ \nu \tau a$ (voluntary).
ä入入о $\tau \iota \pi \rho \grave{s}$ тоv́тoเs $\pi a \theta$ єiv : euphemistic for death or exile.
9. Síkawo $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu=$ 'it is right that we'. The Greek idiom is 45 A personal while ours is impersonal. Goodwin MT. p. 195.
 idiomatic expression $=$ 'to refuse', 'to decline': Symp. 173 e $\mu \grave{\eta}$
 Aristoph. Aves 133 каi $\mu \eta \delta \alpha \mu \omega \hat{s}$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega s \pi o \iota \eta \quad \sigma \eta$. The expression does not seem to occur except in prohibitions or entreaties with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ : see Schanz, Novae Commentationes Platonicae p. ${ }^{25}$.
12. каi тav̂тa $\pi \rho \circ \mu \eta \eta_{0} \hat{\mu} \mu a \iota-\pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha$. Socrates lets the Laws reply infra 53 в.
14. $\mu \eta^{\prime} \tau \epsilon$ тoivvv. Note the effective balance: каi $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha-\kappa \alpha i$ $\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \alpha \pi o \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$, says Socrates: $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon-\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha-\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$. says Crito. The second $\mu \gamma_{i}^{\prime} \tau \epsilon$ is in 45 B , line 24 : Crito's earnestness has an injurious effect upon his style: observe for example the recurrence of ย̈ $\pi \epsilon \iota \tau a$ within three lines just below. Wohlrab takes a somewhat different view: "Crito ut ipse hebetioris erat ingenii, ita oratio eius non nullis locis durior est minusque elegans".
kal $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ov́ $\delta \epsilon ́=$ neque enim.
15. Oé $\lambda o v \sigma \iota$. Even after a vowel Plato more frequently uses
 Symp. 190 D $\mu \eta \grave{\eta}^{\theta} \hat{\lambda} \lambda \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ : Schanz Nov. Comment. Plat. p. 102.
17. тov́тous тov̀s $\sigma u k o ф a ́ v \tau a s . ~ \tau o u ́ t o u s ~=~ ' i s t o s ' ~ e x p r e s s e s ~ c o n-~$ tempt: so very frequently in Greek: cf. Symp. 181 E $\tau 0$ órovs $\tau$ oùs $\pi a \nu \delta \eta \dot{\eta} \mu$ ous $\epsilon \rho a \sigma \tau a ́ s$. Our English 'your' is often used in the same way.

єu่te $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon$ îs ='cheap': Crito contemptuously speaks of the informers as a commodity to be bought. We are told in the Memorabilia (II. 9) that Crito had himself suffered much from the $\sigma v к о ф \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \iota ~ u n t i l ~$ following the advice of Socrates he engaged a vigorous but poor friend Archedemus to retaliate.
18. ' $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi$ ' av́rov́s $=$ 'for them': there is much scorn in this phrase. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\ell}$ in this sense is regularly used of inanimate objects ( $\dot{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime}$ aúvò $\boldsymbol{\tau} 0 \hat{\tau} \tau o$ line 22): the idea implied in $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i$ is is therefore kept up.

 generally precede the word or phrase which they modify: cf. infr.
 $\pi \alpha ́ \nu v \kappa^{\kappa a \tau a \phi \rho o \nu \omega ิ \nu} \dot{\alpha} \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$, and ibid. 462 A .

20. '่ $\mu \mathrm{ov}$ к $\boldsymbol{\delta \delta o ́ \mu \epsilon v o s : ~ o n ~ a c c o u n t ~ o f ~ t h e ~ d a n g e r ~ f r o m ~ t h e ~ \sigma v к о - ~}$ фávtal, not of course for the loss of the money. Socrates did not think money a good nor the loss of it an evil, either in his own case or in that of his friends: see Apol. $3^{8}$ в, where he proposes the penalty of 30 minae, to be paid by Plato and Crito and others.
 фáyzal. The pronoun oûtoc is deictic: 'see! here are foreigners ready to spend theirs'. Crito in his animation speaks as if the $\xi \in \in ́ v o c$ were actually present in the prison: "de degentibus in urbe quosque fere quotidie videbat quasi de praesentibus loquitur Crito"

 $\pi \rho \circ \theta \dot{v} \rho \varphi \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau \tau \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$ : where Socrates is not as yet visible. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \alpha \dot{\sigma} \delta \epsilon$ means 'in Athens'. There is a certain awkwardness in the collo-
 to omit either of the two words. Crito is somewhat excited and prefers expressiveness to logic: see on 45 A line it above. The omission of the copula with $\ddot{\text { Eroouoc is common but not universal in }}$
 Novae Comment. Plat. p. 35.
22. '̇ $\pi^{\prime}$ aúrò $\tau 0$ îto: see on line 18 ( $\epsilon$ ' $\pi^{\prime}$ aủroús) above.
$\Sigma \iota \mu \mu$ ias ó $\Theta \eta \beta a i ̂ o s-K \dot{\beta} \beta \eta s$. Simmias and Cebes (who was also a Theban) play a prominent part in the discussion about immortality in the Phaedo. See Archer-Hind's edition of the dialogue pp. 40-42.
 in Phaed. 59 b-C as present at the death of Socrates.
24. ठ"тєр $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega$ : viz. supra line 14. In such phrases the present is preferred to the past: see on ö $\pi \epsilon \rho \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \omega$ Apol. 21 A.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi о к а ́ \mu \eta s . \quad \dot{a} \pi о к \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ is to give over from weariness: cf. infra
 sometimes absolutely (especially in phrases like Rep. Iv. 435 D $\mu \grave{\eta}$
 sometimes with a participle: this seems to be the only passage where he has an infinitive following it, but cf. Eur. Ion 134-135 $\mu \circ \chi \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ oủk $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ ок ка́ $\mu \nu \omega$. Jacobs is here guilty of the solecism $\mu \dot{\eta}$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \nu \hat{\eta} s$, which is also printed by Schanz in his text.

 little to Crito that Socrates should be false to what was said in the excitement of his defence when he himself was ready to break his deliberate promise to the Athenian people: see above on $4+\mathrm{C}$ line 3. On $\mu \dot{\eta}$ with the $3^{\text {rd }}$ person of the Aorist Imperative see Goodwin MT. 18r.
及ios $\epsilon^{\prime \prime \eta} \epsilon^{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\sigma} \nu \tau \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$. This shews that $\epsilon_{\xi} \xi \in \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ refers to quitting Athens, not to quitting the prison.
27. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \alpha \times 0 \hat{0}-a ̈ \lambda \lambda o \sigma \epsilon$. We should expect ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda_{0} \theta_{\iota}: \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \alpha-$ $\chi \dot{\delta} \sigma \epsilon$ would not mend matters, since $\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \pi \hat{\alpha} \nu \pi o \iota$ is not Greek. The phrase is not strictly grammatical: $\kappa \alpha i=$ 'also', not 'and'. á $\lambda \lambda \frac{\lambda}{} \sigma$ is of course attracted to the following relative, as in $\beta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \kappa \in \hat{\imath} \theta \epsilon \mathcal{\nu}$ $\ddot{\circ} \theta \epsilon \nu \pi \in \rho \ddot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \iota$ in Soph. O. C. 1227.
28. єis Oєrтa入íav. According to Diog. Laert. II. 5. 25 So- 45 C crates declined invitations from Scopas of Crannon and Eurylochus of Larissa. The story that he refused an invitation to the court of Archelaus (whither Euripides, Agathon, Zeuxis and others went) is better authenticated: see Arist. Rhet. III. 23. 1398 ${ }^{2}{ }_{2}{ }_{4} \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \eta s$

 with Thessaly is significant as to his political sympathies: in so far as he felt any interest in politics, he favoured the калоi кá $\gamma a \theta o i$ or oligarchical party.

## CHAPTER V.

Crito concludes his appeal to Socrates by urging that it is wrong to choose the more indolent course and remain to die: he ought to think of his children and his friends.
 Apol. 35 в (the concluding part of Socrates' appeal as this is of
 ${ }_{\kappa \tau \lambda}$. It is not correct to translate diкaıov here as 'just': it is 'right', 'moral'. This is the original meaning of the word, and far more frequent than the other, i.e. just )( $\sigma \dot{\omega} \phi \rho \omega \nu, \phi \rho \delta \nu \tau \mu o s, \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon i o s-$ the other three cardinal virtues. Aristotle recognises both meanings of the word: see Eth. v. $1129^{\text {b }} 25$ where the pseudo-Theognic
 to illustrate the wider meaning. It was this sense that Socrates assigned to the word when he declared $\tau \delta$ diкalov to be identical with $\tau \grave{o} \nu o ́ \mu \mu \mu \nu \nu$ : see Mem. IV. 4. 12 and cf. Introd. p. xiii. This wider meaning survives in the English 'justify'.
2. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \in i ̂ v \pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a$. $̇ \pi \iota \iota \chi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \hat{i} \nu$ may take the accusative of a neuter noun denoting some inanimate object. Wohlrab compares
 explanatory of $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a$, to which it stands in apposition.
3. kai $\tau o \iota a v ̂ \tau a ~ \sigma \pi \epsilon v \dot{\delta} \epsilon \iota s$. There is more force and indignation in $\sigma \pi \epsilon v \dot{\delta} \epsilon \epsilon \varsigma$ than $\sigma \pi \epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$ would have conveyed.

Crito means that Socrates' defence was meaningless unless he regarded it as important that he should live. He had spoken of himself as God's minister to the Athenians: was he to desert his post because they rejected him? See Apol. Chapter xvili.
5. $\sigma \epsilon \begin{gathered} \\ \delta \\ \iota\end{gathered} \phi \theta \in \hat{\rho} \rho a \iota-" \sigma \epsilon$ is accented for emphasis, and to discon-

7. vieîs. Socrates had three sons: Lamprocles and two others. Lamprocles was the eldest (Mem. II. 2. 1) ; but he was still a youth when Socrates died (Apol. 34 D): the other two were children (Apol. 1. c. and Phaed. ı16 в). We do not know whether they suffered in any way from their father's death. For the form vieis see my note on Apol. 20 A : the forms of the second declension (except viéos vici as well as viov̂ vi $\hat{\varphi}$ ) are preferred in the singular: those of the third in the dual and plural. Attic inscriptions of Plato's time more often omit the $\iota$ than not ( ós vítos etc. See Meisterhans, Gram-
matik der Attischen Inschriften, p. 62) : there are traces of the same omission in some MSS of Plato, and Schanz now everywhere writes the word without the $\iota$ (see his preface to the Laws p. viii).
$\pi \rho o \delta \iota \delta o ́ v a \iota=\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon i ̂ \nu \pi \rho o \delta o u ̂ \nu \alpha \iota$, whence the present. So $\delta i \delta \delta ́ v a \iota$ often means 'to offer'.
 already begun: whence the preposition: cf. infra $50 \mathrm{E} \epsilon \xi \in \tau \rho a ́ \phi \eta s$ (Socrates was a grown man) каi є̇ $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon \dot{v} \theta \eta s . \quad \tau \rho \circ \phi \eta^{\prime}$ is rather personal and moral surveillance than intellectual: $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i a$ vice versa.
9. oix $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \in \iota$ ката入ıா $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}=$ 'you will leave in the lurch'. The words imply that there would be something selfish and cowardly in the betrayal. $\tau \grave{\delta} \sigma \grave{\nu} \nu \mu^{\prime} \rho \circ$ = pro tua parte, quod ad te attinet (Cron): so infra 50 B .
ö $\tau \iota a ̆ v \tau u ́ X \omega \sigma \iota$ (sc. $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau о \nu \tau \epsilon s) \tau 0 v ิ \tau 0 \pi \rho a ́ \xi \circ v \sigma \iota=$ 'they will have to fare as chance directs', 'they will have to take their chance in life': ö $\tau \iota$ ằ $\tau u ́ \chi \omega \sigma \iota$ as in 44 D. With $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau 0 \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ cf. ả $\gamma a \theta_{o ́ \nu}^{\nu} \tau \iota$ $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \xi o \nu \tau \epsilon s$ Alc. II. 141 D .
ir. év raîs ópфavíaıs-ópфavov́s. Göbel points out that the repetition of the idea has a pathetic effect.
 owes a duty to one's family as well as to the State: Socrates placed his duty to the State before his duty to his family. $\pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \pi a i ̂ \delta a s$ i. q. $\pi a \iota \delta o \pi o \iota \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota$.
 that Crito contrasted the indifference of Socrates with the zeal displayed in his behalf by himself and the others: there is a touch of injured friendship about these words. See the reply of Socrates in
 there.
16. фáбкоขтá $\gamma \in \delta \dot{\eta}=$ quippe qui dicat. The touch of sarcasm in $\phi$ áбкоутa is made sharper by the addition of $\delta \dot{\eta}$. For the assertion itself compare Apol. 30 A and 37 B. $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \nu \tau \grave{s}$ tov̂ $\beta i o u$ has more force if taken with ф́á $к о \nu \tau \alpha$ than with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a \iota$.
 may be followed by $\dot{\omega}$ in the sense of 'for'.
18. $\mu \eta \dot{\eta}$ סó $\xi \mathrm{\eta}$. For ail $\chi \chi^{v} \nu 0 \mu a \iota$ followed by $\mu \eta$ cf. Theaet. 183 E 45 E


 of 15 ) is openly made: for by $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho q($ as is clear from $\dot{v} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho \sigma 0 \hat{v}$ in
 his friends. It is implied that death requires less courage than life -a view which Socrates himself held. The reproach is made less biting by $\tau \iota \nu i$.
 тоvті-סокє̂̀v. This explains in detail ätav $\tau \grave{\partial} \pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a$. There is clearly an allusion to the stage. The tragedy begins-( $\left.\epsilon^{\circ} \sigma \sigma \circ \delta o s\right)$
 $\left.\pi \rho a_{s}^{\xi} \epsilon \omega s\right)$ : "solvuntur risu tabulae". The words are carefully chosen to suggest the comparison. eivodos may be used both of the entrance of an actor (compare the use of $\epsilon i \sigma a \dot{\gamma} \epsilon \iota \nu$ in Apol. $35^{\text {B }}$ ), and of the coming on of a law-suit (see on Apol. 24 D) : á $\gamma \omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ signifies 'acting' as well as 'pleading': the word always implies rivalry as well as publicity.

2I. єio $\hat{\eta_{1}} \lambda 9$ es. So I read with $E$ and the second hand in $B$ : the editors (except Stallbaum) generally read $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$. The latter is very idiomatic Greek, for tioćp ooual is used in this way as the passive to $\epsilon i \sigma a ́ \gamma \omega$ : compare Dem. $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \Lambda a ́ к \rho \iota \tau o \nu ~ 49 \pi o ̂ ̂ ~ o u ̂ \nu ~ \delta \epsilon i ̂ ~ \tau a u ́ \tau \eta \nu ~$ $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \delta i \kappa \eta \nu$, but (see following note) $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon s$ goes better with $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \partial \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon i \nu \nu$ : cf. also on 45 E infra какía $\tau \iota \nu i-\delta о к \epsilon i \nu$.
 might have effected his escape in the interval between the lodging of the indictment with the King Archon and the actual trial. Had he done so, the case would have been decided against him by default, see on $\epsilon \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ кат $\quad$ रुорои̂̀тєs Apol. 18 c . If we read $\dot{\omega}$ $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ and not $\dot{\omega} s \epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon s$, we must understand aủ $\hat{\eta}$ i.e. $\tau \hat{\eta} \delta i \kappa \eta$ after $\epsilon_{\xi}^{\xi} \dot{\sigma} \nu:$, this can hardly be right, for even if Socrates had absconded the trial would have come on: the only difference would have been the absence of the defendant. There is no good authority for the tradition that Anytus wished to make terms with Socrates after the indictment had been lodged; nor would such a course have been tolerated by Athenian law, since $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \in \beta \epsilon \iota a$ was a $\gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta}$ or offence against the State, not a $\delta i \kappa \eta$ or lawsuit with a private individual.
 $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \epsilon \in \tau \epsilon \iota \alpha$ as it were or catastrophe of the tragedy. The Bodleian has $\delta \dot{\eta} \pi{ }^{2}$.
23. $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ катá $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \omega s \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \rho \alpha \xi_{\epsilon \omega}=$ ' a reductio ad absurdum as one might say of the whole affair'. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \rho \alpha^{\prime} \xi \epsilon \omega s$ is an objective genitive: cf. Aesch. Ag. $1264 \tau i \delta \delta \hat{\eta} \tau^{\prime}, \epsilon^{\prime} \mu a v \tau \hat{\eta} s \kappa a \tau \alpha \gamma \epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \omega \tau^{\prime}$, $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \chi \omega$


 какia $\tau เ v i-\delta$ окє $\hat{\nu}=$ 'that you should be thought to have given us the slip, through a sort of cowardice and unmanliness on our
 $\pi \rho o \delta o \hat{v} \alpha \iota$ is of $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a$ in 45 C line 2. The subject to $\delta$ окє $\hat{\nu}$ is $\sigma \epsilon$ : this is easily supplied from the context ( $\tau \grave{\partial} \pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a$ $\tau \grave{\partial} \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \sigma \epsilon$ in in and $\dot{\omega} s \epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon s$ in 21). For the expression compare Phaed. 1I5C

 $\nu \iota \kappa i o c s$. Göbel takes $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ as subject to $\delta$ окєìv: Wohlrab $\tau \grave{\nu} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u \tau a i ̂ o \nu$ $\delta \grave{\eta}$ rout $i$ : the other editors fail to give any clear explanation of this difficult passage. There is some awkwardness in having סокєì ס८a$\pi \epsilon \phi \epsilon v \gamma \epsilon \in \nu a \iota$ as virtually a subject to $\delta \delta \xi \eta \eta$ in line 18 above: but the grammatical subject is $\tau 0 v \tau i$, to which $\delta о \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ is in apposition. Mudge conjectures $\delta$ ок $\hat{\eta}$, but the text is quite sound.
25. oú8̇̇ $\sigma$ v̀ oavcóv. The relative clause passes into a main 46 A
 $\kappa а i ~ a ̉ \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ o u ̉ \kappa ~ \epsilon \ell \omega \nu$, oủסè $\tau$ às $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho a ́ s:$ compare also Gorg. 452 D


oîóv $\tau \in$ öv kal $\delta$ vvacóv. The twofold expression is for emphasis: cf. infra line 3 I doóv́vaтov каl oưкє́ $\tau \iota$ oîóv $\tau \epsilon$. oîóv $\tau \epsilon$ is 'feasible': סuvaтóv 'possible'.
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\psi}$ is substantival. So in the Gorgias ( 474 E foll.) $\tau \grave{o}$ ai $\sigma \chi \rho^{\prime} \nu$ is defined as that which is at once $\lambda \cup \pi \eta \rho^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i$ какóv: see also 475 в


28. $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \lambda_{0} \delta \epsilon \epsilon=$ vel potius, as in Gorg. 449 A $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta \hat{\epsilon}, \hat{\omega}$ Гopria, aúròs $\dot{\eta} \mu i \hat{v} \epsilon i \pi \epsilon$. o ờót is ne-quidem.

 $\lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a$." Jacobs. Note the fourfold recurrence of $\beta$ 伩 $\epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (Зои入 ${ }^{\prime}$ ).
 lieve the vision (see on 44 в above): the $\gamma \nu \nu \grave{\eta} \kappa a \lambda \grave{\eta} \kappa a i \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta} \dot{s}$ left Socrates one night more in which to effect his escape. With $\tau \hat{\eta} s$



## CHAPTER VI.

Crito's pleading is now concluded. In reply, Socrates begins by laying down the principles which should guide his decision. He first recalls one great doctrine on which he had insisted throughout all his life, viz. that no opinions are worth regarding except the opinions of those who know. See Introduction pp. xi and xii.
46 B 2. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda 0 \hat{a} \mathfrak{a} \xi i ́ a$ sc. $̇ \in \tau i \nu$, although $\epsilon i-\epsilon i \eta \eta$ follows: a " mixed conditional sentence" Goodwin MT. n18. It would not be possible to understand $a^{a} \nu \epsilon i \eta$ : if the optative of the copula is omitted in an apodosis with $a \not \nu$, the $\not \partial \nu$ must be inserted: see Meno 96 в оv́кои̂ $\epsilon i$

 cases like the present Greek prefers the more dogmatic form of expression. Note $\epsilon i-\epsilon i \eta$ and not $\epsilon i-\hat{\eta} \nu$ : Socrates speaks as one who
 $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{u} \mu \alpha \phi_{\epsilon} \rho \eta$ (Rep. III. 394 D ).
4. $\sigma \kappa о \pi \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \theta \theta a t$ is placed in the emphatic position at the beginning of the sentence as if $=\sigma к о \pi \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a \iota \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta} \pi \rho \circ \theta \nu \mu \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a \iota$.
5. ov̉ $\mu$ óvov vûv. So the mSS: there is no reason to read ov่ $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu$ with Nauck and Schanz. The omission of the copula is not very common in Plato except when it is $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$ : yet cf. Prot. 335 C $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$
 $\epsilon \in \kappa \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$. $\hat{\ell} \tilde{l}$ and $\hat{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ are also sometimes omitted: $\hat{\eta} \nu$ rarely, except in the phrase $\epsilon i \mu \eta \delta \delta \iota a ́ \tau \iota \nu a(\sigma \hat{\epsilon}$ or the like) : parts of the conjunctive and optative are very seldom omitted: cival however is left out very frequently. See Schanz, Novae Comm. Pl. $3 \mathrm{I}-35$.
 Crito's $\pi \epsilon i \theta$ ov $\mu 0 \iota(46 \mathrm{~A})$, for $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \epsilon \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ includes Socrates' friends as well as everything else that could be called his.
 rule of life. For example, before entering on a line of conduct he would inquire if it harmonised with the conception or definition ( $\lambda$ bros) of tò dikalo which he had arrived at by the exercise of his reason: and if it did, nothing ever deterred him from so acting : see my Introduction to the Apology p. xi; compare also Phaed. 100 A , where Plato uses the phraseology of the Socratic method to de-





 roloûtov, $\mu \dot{\eta} \phi \hat{\omega}$ : and compare as to this point Dr Jackson on the "incomplete Protagoreans" of the Theaetetus in Journal of Philology, Vol. XIII. 249-250.
9. é ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \circ v$ : imperfect, because Socrates is referring to the teaching of his whole life. Infra $\epsilon \kappa \beta a \lambda \epsilon i \nu=$ 'throw over', 'discard',


 $\sigma \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau о \tau \epsilon \gamma і \gamma \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$.
10. öpotol (sc. 入óroc) is probably the subject and not the predicate, otherwise in place of $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \beta a \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ we should expect a word
 not $=$ oi aúroi (idem) but=Latin similes: the two ideas are carefully distinguished in Theaet. I 59 A $\epsilon i$ äpa $\tau \iota \sigma \nu \mu \beta a i v \in \iota$ ö $\mu \circ \iota \circ \frac{1}{} \nu \tau$

 more confident as he goes on: $\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta \dot{\nu} \nu \tau$ б̈ $\mu \circ \iota \circ$-каi $\tau$ oùs aútoùs $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon \dot{\prime} \omega \kappa \tau \lambda$.
11. $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \approx v i \omega$ is a lofty and somewhat pnetic word, frequently 46 C used of regard paid to the gods.



 $53 \mathrm{~A} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega \dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\xi} \dot{u} \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \dot{\delta} \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \sigma \alpha s$. The Mop $\mu \dot{\omega}$ was well known

 Мор $о \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ќк $\eta,{ }^{\text {² }} \mathrm{E} \mu \pi$ ои $\alpha$ : see Becker's Charicles E. T. pp. 224 225. Compare the well-known passage in the Phaedo ( 77 E ) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ '

 $\lambda$ र́кєъa.

It should be noted that the order of the words $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \pi a \hat{i} \delta a s$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ is very idiomatic: the effect is almost to identify the objects
 the two would be much less close. Still more idiomatic is the A. C.
construction in similes with $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ and a preposition. If it is wished to bring the objects compared into the closest possible union, $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho(\dot{\omega} s)$ with the preposition is placed first, and the preposition itself written only once: see for example Rep. viri. 545 E

 scripts however often violate the rule so far as the omission of the preposition is concerned: see Cobet, Variae Lectiones p. 165 foll.
 prisonment: see on Apol. 32 C . The plural ( $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0$ í, $\theta \dot{\alpha} \nu a \tau o l, \chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha{ }^{-}$$\tau \omega \nu \dot{a} \phi a \iota \rho \epsilon \in \epsilon(s)$ adds to the rhetorical effect: the many have a variety of deaths etc., from which to choose our $\mu \circ \rho \mu \omega$.
 $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s \epsilon \pi \iota \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \psi$. The word means 'inflicting on' (Church), not of course 'threatening with'. Socrates means that death is only a $\mu \circ \rho \mu \dot{\omega}$, not simply in the anticipation but in the actual suffering of it. Dr Verrall suggests $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \pi o v \sigma a$ as if $=$ 'assuming the forms of' like the Empusa. I am not quite satisfied that $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \sigma \sigma \sigma a$ is rightly formed, nor even allowing this does the construction seem quite natural : but I am convinced that Plato wrote $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi o v \sigma a$ rather than $\epsilon \pi \iota \phi \dot{\rho} \rho \frac{v}{} \alpha$ let us say, because the ending is identical with $\because \mu \pi \sigma v \sigma a$ : sce my note on 47 в line 14 for more examples of the play upon words in Plato.
17. aú $\frac{1}{}=$ 'the question': see on 44 C $\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma o \nu \tau a l ~ a u ́ \tau \dot{\alpha} ~ o " ̈ \tau \omega ~$ $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \bar{\chi} \chi \theta c u$.
 $\dot{o} \rho \theta \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{s} \epsilon i \sigma \eta \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath})$, where the first inquiry is concluded: the second point is then raised by way of protest against the first (ibid. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}^{\prime}$,
 $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu$ has no $\epsilon i \tau a$ or $\epsilon i \tau \tau \alpha \dot{\delta} \epsilon$ to balance it.
 is often $=$ 'that of yours', here made clearer by ôv $\sigma \dot{v} \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon$ cs. $\dot{a} \nu a \lambda a \mu$ $\beta a ́ v \omega$ is 'iterum sumo'-'take up where I laid down' as in Rep. vi. $490 \mathrm{D} \pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \iota \lambda \dot{\eta} \phi a \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s \phi \iota \lambda \sigma \sigma \delta \phi \omega \nu \phi \dot{u} \sigma t \nu$. The reference is to $4+\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{D}$, and 45 E .
 cf. Apol. 19 A $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \lambda \alpha \dot{\beta} \beta \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ ov̂ $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ тís $\dot{\eta} \kappa \alpha \tau \eta \gamma o \rho i a \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$; In English we must say 'recur-and ask if'. The subject to $\begin{gathered}\lambda \\ \text { ' } \\ \gamma \epsilon \tau \sigma\end{gathered}$ is $\dot{o} \lambda$ oros, to be understood from rov̂тov rò̀ $\lambda$ ó $\gamma o \nu:$ it is defined by the clause ör $\tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \mu \grave{\Sigma} \nu$ —oũ. The imperfect is used because Socrates
refers to the teaching of his whole life, see on é $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \circ \nu$ in line 9 above. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau o \tau \epsilon$ means on every occasion when the subject was discussed. If there was one thing on which Socrates insisted more than any other, it was that no man's opinion is worth anything on any subject which he has not studied: see Grote Vol. viri. p. 239 foll.
 doctrine that only some $\delta o \xi a \iota$ are worthy of regard was right, or (b) it was wrong, or $(c)$ it was right then and wrong now. In his statement of the third alternative Socrates substitutes the application for the statement of the general principle-was $I$ right in thinking it my duty to die then, although others thought otherwise, and am I wrong now?

 same in declining Crito's former invitations to escape: see on 44 B

 ठiккalos Greek prefers the personal mode of expression. äpa='after all' expresses surprise and disappointment. See on Apol. 34 C $\epsilon ่ \gamma \dot{\omega}$

 $\omega^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega s:$ the expression ( $\dot{\delta}$ 入óros) ä $\lambda \lambda \omega s$ ëvєка $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v$ is excessively awkward. For ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \mathrm{s}$ used in this way ( $=$ 'otherwise than it ought'
 $\epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu 0 s \epsilon i \eta$, and the adverbial expression $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega s$, as in Theaet.

23. $\omega \mathrm{s} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$. Like $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ ö $\nu \tau \iota$ and $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i \neq a$ this expression is frequent in the dialogues of Plato's early and middle period: in the later dialogues $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$, ö $\nu \tau \omega \mathrm{s}$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i \dot{a}$ (less frequent) are more common: see Schanz in Hermes (1886) xxi. 3, pp. 439-459. As for the origin of the phrase, Schanz accepts the explanation given by lox, according to whom $\dot{\omega}$ s is the ablative of the article, as $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$ is of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \in s:$ but surely $\tau \dot{\omega} s$ and not $\dot{\mu} s$ is the ablative of $\tau o ́$. The old explanation (which I prefer) is to regard the phrase as parallel to $\dot{\omega} s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \omega s$, $\dot{\omega} s \not a ̈ \lambda \lambda \omega s$ etc., and due to attraction like $\theta a \nu \mu a \sigma i \omega s$ $\dot{\omega} s: a ̈ \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ $\sigma 0 \phi 0 l$ is $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$ (Phaed. 63 A ) for example is short for $\sigma o \phi o l$ oü $\omega \mathrm{s}$,

 etc. were almost technical terms of the Socratic dialectic: see Introd. to Apol. p. xv.

25．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ дoítєpos，like $\dot{\delta}$ aúvós，is in the predicate．
 but he chooses a phrase which will include Crito too，so as to make his conclusion appear as the verdict of all right－minded men．$\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ $\left.\tau_{\iota}\right)($ ovi $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu \lambda \epsilon \prime \gamma \epsilon \nu$ ，＇to be right＇）（＇to be wrong＇：so in English＇there is something in what you say＇．So $\tau i \pi 0 \iota \epsilon \hat{\nu}=$＇to be making some－ thing of it＇in Symp． 173 A ．$\hat{\psi} \dot{\phi} \delta \epsilon$ before $\dot{v} \pi \dot{o} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ oio $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$ refers


 $\delta \dot{\eta}=\dot{\alpha} \rho \tau i \omega s$ as so often（see my note on Apol． 37 c）：Cobet would write $\nu v \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ ，and Schanz now follows him：B too has $\nu v \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ here． There is no special force in the imperfect：$\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \sigma \nu$ and $\neq \phi \eta \nu$（like $\epsilon \epsilon \kappa^{\prime} \lambda_{\epsilon} v_{0}$ in Phaed． 59 e and Phaedr． 228 в）are sometimes used as aorists．See also Goodwin MT． 8.
 lines $19-20$ ．The principle is enunciated more precisely because upon it hinges the argument down to 48 A ．
46 E 30．$\pi \rho \frac{\grave{s}}{} \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ ：only in entreaties，not in asseverations：Apol． 25 C ．
 cf．infr． 54 D ö $\sigma a \gamma \in \tau \dot{a} \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \circ \grave{\imath}$ ठокои̂ $\nu \tau a$ ．
 Socrates believed that he would die upon the third day，but as Crito disbelieved the vision（see on 46 A）Socrates waives the point for the present．$\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \theta \nu \eta \eta \prime \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu=\dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \theta a \nu \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a l$ ．
47 A 33．таракроv́ol．Like $\sigma \phi a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ this word is probably a metaphor from the palaestra：cf．Theaet． $168 \mathrm{~A} \tau \dot{a} \sigma \phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \mu a \tau a$
 The original meaning may have been to give an unfair blow， hit below the belt．There is a touch of irony in oủk ä̀ $\sigma \grave{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$ крои́л：Socrates knew well that it was Crito and not he whose mental vision was dimmed by the coming doom（see Phaed． $8+$ E）．I think the words are meant as a reply to Crito＇s taunt in $45 \mathrm{D} \sigma \dot{v} \delta \hat{\epsilon} \mu 0 \iota$ ठокєîs $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\rho} \dot{q} \theta v \mu o ́ \tau \alpha \tau a$ aipeî $\theta \theta a l$ ，where $\sigma \dot{v}$ is emphatic：see note．For this reason I have printed $\sigma \grave{\epsilon}$ with an accent．

34．ov่x íкavติs：infra oủxi ка入ิิs in line 36 is stronger：cf． in $4^{6} \mathrm{~B}$ the change from ö $\mu \mathrm{otot}$ to $\tau 0$ ：̀s aúroús：see note in loc． Hirschig＇s ouxi кал⿳亠二口今（the one tolerable suggestion of the thirty odd
suggestions which he has made on the Crito) completely misses the point.
 mss (and the second hand in B) read oúò̀ $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$, $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \alpha ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \mu \hat{c} \nu$, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime}$ oú; Apart from their slender ms authority, the words are objectionable (a) because they correspond to nothing either in 46 C
 ( $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta o \xi \hat{\nu} \nu$ äs oi $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o \iota$ סo弓ásovalv $\kappa \tau \lambda$.), and ( $\beta$ ) because they
 $\dot{\alpha} \phi \rho o \nu_{\omega} \nu$; Plato is especially careful to avoid any premature indications of the course of an argument: he professes to follow ö" $\eta$ ä̀ ó 入óyos «̈̈ $\sigma \epsilon \rho \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha$ фє́ $\rho \eta$ (Rep. HI. $39+1$ ).

## CHAPTER VII.

In this chapter Socrates recalls the familiar illustrations by which he used to enforce the doctrine that no opinion deserves to be considered except that of those who know, and applies them to the case in point. Introduction p. xii.

 $\pi \epsilon \in \rho \iota \epsilon i \tau \epsilon \mu l a ̂ s$. It is a mistaken idea that $\tau 0 \iota \delta \sigma \delta \epsilon$ is invariably prospective, and $\tau o \omega o \hat{\tau} \tau o s$ retrospective. The imperfect $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \tau \circ$ is used because Socrates is recalling the doctrines taught throughout his life: see on $\epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \gamma 0 \nu$ in 46 в.


 $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \kappa \kappa \lambda$.

кal тои̂то $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu=$ 'and making this his work': hoc agens. Buttmann compares Xen. Hell. Iv. 8. 22 ởoè $\gamma$ àp èкрáтouv aủtoû
 Compare $\pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \gamma \mu a=$ 'profession' in Apol. 20 C.
 is there regarded as the $\delta \eta \mu \iota o v p \gamma o s$ irctias: the $\pi \alpha \iota \delta o \tau \rho i \beta \eta s$ as the
 $\tau$ à $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a:$ and so Soph. 228 e $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ $\mu \grave{\iota} \nu$ aî $\chi$ os $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$, $\pi \epsilon \rho l$
 ( $+\sigma_{4}$ B foll.) laтpıк and $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ are described as the two
branches of the art which looks after the body ( $\dot{\eta} \tau 0 \hat{u} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu \alpha \tau 0 s$ $\theta \in \rho a \pi \epsilon i a$ ); they are correlative ( $\dot{\alpha} v \tau i \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \circ \iota$ ) with $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma \dot{v} \eta \eta$ ( $\delta \iota-$ $\kappa а \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ ) and $\nu о \mu о \theta \epsilon \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$, the two subdivisions of $\pi о \lambda เ \tau เ к \eta$ or the art which pays attention to the soul. Plato frequently places the two professions side by side: e.g. Prot. 3 I3 D $\epsilon a d \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \iota s \tau u ́ \chi \eta \gamma v \mu-$ $\nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ s ~ \ddot{\eta}$ iatpòs ${ }^{\circ} \nu$ : Polit. 295 C et al. Cron remarks that both professions were united in the person of Herodicus of Selymbria:



9. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \dot{\eta}: \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ is regular in such antitheses: see on Apol. 23 D.
12. $\tau \alpha v ์ \tau \eta-\hat{ŋ} \alpha{ }^{2} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$. Note the position of $\tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta:$ it serves to throw special emphasis on the clause introduced by $\hat{j} d{ }^{2} \nu$.
 $\tau \epsilon \in \nu$. In $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \nu \quad \gamma \epsilon$ the $\gamma \epsilon$ is added because what follows inculcates obedience to the iarpós as $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma \tau$ '́ov to the $\pi a \iota \delta o \tau \rho i \beta \eta s$ : $\kappa a i-\gamma \epsilon$ is frequently used in this way to introduce something which belongs to a different class from the things already enume-

 hang together, being all concerned with number or mathematics. On the food of a Greek athlete cf. Aristotle Eth. Nic. iI. i iof ${ }^{\text {a }} 36$ ff.


 $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \varphi \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma \nu \mu \nu \alpha \sigma i \omega \nu \pi 0 \lambda u ́$.
 tional point if it is noted that the word $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a \dot{\tau} \eta s$ suggests $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \alpha-$
 example of training the general principle that only he who knows deserves to be regarded. The word $\epsilon \pi \tau \iota \tau a \dot{\tau} \eta$ s is sometimes used in
 $\pi \epsilon i \theta 0 \nu \tau a l$ roîs $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha \iota s$ (=paedotribis, as Schneider correctly
 $\sigma \epsilon \omega s \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ (sc. $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ ). Plato repeatedly thinks of $\epsilon \pi i-$ $\sigma \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$ when he uses the words $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \eta \mathrm{s}$ or $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a \tau \hat{\omega}$ : see for






 $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \xi \epsilon \iota \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$. I have no doubt that Socrates thought it a real confirmation of his view that knowledge should everywhere hold rule when he found that $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta$ s and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \alpha \mu a \iota$ seem to be connected, and I think Plato hints at this in such passages as Polit. $3_{\text {II }}$ с $\dot{\text { ódóta }}-\hat{a} \rho \chi \eta \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a \tau \hat{\eta}$. 'God and Nature do nothing in vain': even the similarity of names is not without its significance: hence Plato wrote the Cratylus. A precisely similar phenomenon appears in the case of the word $\epsilon \hat{v} \pi \rho \dot{\hat{u}} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$. Just as here $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \eta$ forms the transition to $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \dot{\omega} \circ \nu \tau \iota$, so in Charm. 173 D $\epsilon \hat{v}$ ä $\nu \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau o \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ is the link between $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \mu \dot{o} \nu \omega s$ ä̀ $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau o \tau \mu \in \nu$ and $\epsilon \dot{v} \delta a \iota \mu о \nu 0 \hat{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu(\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \mu b \nu \omega s$ à $\nu \pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau о \nu \tau \epsilon s \in \hat{v}$ ă $\nu \pi \rho \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \tau о \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ каi $\epsilon \dot{u} \delta \alpha \iota \mu \circ \nu$ о $\hat{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu)$ : see also 1 72 A and Alcibiades I. II 6 в and compare Aristotle Eth. Nic. I. $109 \mathrm{~S}^{\mathrm{b}} 20$ $\sigma \downarrow \nu \dot{q} \delta \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\psi} \lambda \delta \gamma \psi$ каi $\tau o ̀ ~ \epsilon \hat{v} \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu \kappa a i$ $\epsilon \hat{u} \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \epsilon \dot{\nu} \delta a i \mu o \nu a$. So also in Phaed. $99 \mathrm{C} \delta \epsilon \in \neq \nu$ (which has two meanings) forms the link between áraOóv and $\xi v \nu \delta \in i \nu-\kappa a l$
 should be noted that the omission of the article before $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon_{\nu}$ (as here before $\epsilon \pi a t i o \nu \tau t)$ favours my view. Similarly in Symp. 204 C, where Plato proves that tò $\epsilon \rho \dot{c}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu_{\nu \nu}$ is $\kappa \alpha \lambda \delta \nu$ by means of the middle term
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \delta \nu \tau \iota \kappa \alpha \lambda \grave{\iota} \kappa \tau \lambda$.: the entire passage from 203 A to 204 D is full of such double meanings and constructions. See also Symp. 196 C. This sort of chain-inference (incorrectly called Sorites) was afterwards very popular in the Stoic school : see Reid on Cic. Acad. Pr. 49.

I have insisted on this point partly because the editors have ignored it and partly on account of the light it throws on the meaning of the vision in 44 B: Socrates was greatly influenced by similarity of name.

It should be noted that $\epsilon \pi a i \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ is a favourite word of Plato's, but less common in other authors. Protagoras used the word frequently: according to Kock on Arist. Nubes 650 it was probably an importation from the Ionian philosophical schools into the sophistic and philosophical circles of Athens.
17. $\epsilon \mathbb{i} \epsilon \nu$ was pronounced $\epsilon i \hat{e} \nu$ with intervocalic aspiration as in $\dot{j} a \hat{\omega}$ : the derivation is doubtful, but it can hardly come from $\epsilon i \mu i$ :
sce on Apol． 18 e．Possibly it is connected with eia：for as Timaeus s．v．says，it is not only $\sigma v \gamma \kappa a \tau \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \epsilon \sigma \iota s \tau \omega ิ \nu \epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \omega$ ，but also $\sigma v \nu a \phi ं \eta$ $\pi \rho o ̀ s \tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda_{\text {ov }} \tau \alpha$ ：whence Suidas explains it as $=a ̈ \gamma \varepsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$ ．Here for example it leads up to $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \iota \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma a s \quad \delta \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．：cf．Symp． 204 C $\epsilon \hat{i} \epsilon \nu \delta \delta \dot{\eta}$ ，


 all the best mss．The difficulties felt with regard to the text arise from a misapprehension of the argument．Socrates is gradually passing from the illustration to the case which it was intended to illustrate．Hence at first when he is only elucidating the illustration he introduces more detail：supra 47 в $\phi$ o $\beta \epsilon i \sigma \theta$ al đpウ̀ $\tau$ oùs $\psi$ brovs
 there is somewhat less detail（ $\dot{\alpha} \tau \mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma a s \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta o ́ \xi a \nu$ каi $\tau о \dot{s} \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \mathfrak{i}-$ $\nu$ ous）：when we are on the verge of the application，there is only
 which all this was meant to illustrate，viz．that Crito and his friends and Socrates himself are cowards in leaving Socrates to die．Schanz brackets and Kral omits кai zous $\epsilon \pi \pi a i \nu o v s: ~ t h e ~ o t h e r ~ e d i t o r s ~ r i g h t l y ~$ retain the words．Ziwsa in the Zeitschr．f．d．öst．Gymn．1879 p． 106


 like $4^{6}$ в $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu \dot{i}{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ ．

25．ov̉коиิv кal $\tau$ ä $\lambda \lambda \alpha$－oivt ${ }^{2}$ ：＂verbo omisso，ut Lach．181 A


26．kal $\delta \dot{\eta}$ kal is used to introduce a climax，or（as here）the crowning point of the reasoning－the application：see on Apol． 26 D．
 arrangement：


47 D
 छ̀v́uтa⿱㇒兀 тoîs ä入入oıs．
 $\mu \in \theta a$ ．$\epsilon i \mu \eta^{\prime}$ with fut．ind．is more vivid and impassioned than $\ddot{\eta} \nu \mu \dot{\eta}$ with aor．conj．$\lambda \omega \beta \hat{a} \sigma \dot{\theta} a \iota$ is to add insult to injury．$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \in \hat{\epsilon} \nu o$ is



 (and truth is seen by $\nu 0 \hat{\text { ôs, cf. Rep. vi. } 508 \text { C--D and Symp. }}$ 212 A ). Observe that the doctrine of the duality of soul and body is implied throughout the whole of this passage: it is one of the most distinctive traits of Plato's teaching, as it was of his master's: see Phaed. 79 c, 82 E (the soul investigates things by looking out of the prison-house of the body). To Plato the body is but the öpravoy


 ŋ̉ $\delta i a ̀ ~ \tau o u ́ t \omega \nu ~ o i o \nu ~ o ́ ~ \rho \gamma a ́ \nu \omega \nu ~ a i \sigma \theta a \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a ~ o ̈ \sigma \alpha ~ a i \sigma \theta \eta \tau \alpha ́: ~ c o m p a r e ~ a l s o ~$ Kep. v. 469 E , where those who wreak their vengeance on the dead bodies of their enemies are likened to hounds ait roîs $\lambda i \theta o c s$ ois ä̀

 right, and disabled by wrong' (Church): see last note. For this
 $\pi \rho \hat{\nu} \tau o \nu \mu \dot{\nu} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota a \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$. Goodwin MT. 8. The use of $\hat{\eta} \nu='$ is ex hypothesi' does not differ greatly from this.

## CHAPTER VIII.

Here Socrates finally disposes of the first point raised by Crito, viz. that we should regard the opinions of the many, and proceeds to discuss the second (see above, 44 D )-that the many can take away our lives.
2. ข่mò $\tau 0 \hat{2}$ vorísous. $\nu 0 \sigma \hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon s$ is not here $=$ 'diseased', but


 of $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ : Plato has arranged his words so as to express the double meaning of $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \epsilon \iota \theta^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ol $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi a i ̈ o ̈ \nu \tau \omega \nu \delta \delta \delta \xi \eta$, and $\pi \epsilon \iota \theta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \iota \tau \hat{\eta}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$., for the text at once suggests $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \ddot{o ̈} \nu \tau \omega \nu$. Compare Legg. II. 67I D $\nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \phi \nu \tau \tau a s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \eta े ~ \nu \eta \phi o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu ~ a \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o u ́ s, ~$
 $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{a} \theta o \rho \dot{\prime} \beta \omega \nu$ sc. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{a} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \chi^{6} \tau \tau \omega \nu \nu \eta \phi_{o ́ v \tau \omega \nu}$. Hirschig foolishly corrupts the text to $\pi \epsilon \iota \theta_{0}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu \subset \iota \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \iota o ̈ \nu \tau \omega \nu \delta o ́ \xi \eta$.
6. тov̂to $\tau \grave{o} \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$. $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau 0$ is of course in the predicate: Wohl- 47 玉 rab is wrong in reading $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau 0 \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ with Buttmann; for $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ without
the article is 'body' generally, i.e. 'matter', not 'the body': cf.


8. $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \circ \chi \theta \eta \rho o \hat{v}$. The preposition $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ is far more frequent than $\sigma \dot{v} \nu$ in Plato, as in Attic Greek generally (except Xenophon):
 originally 'afflicted' (as here), then 'depraved', 'corrupt', for toios
 $\mathfrak{a} \nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \epsilon$ (Hom. Od. xviil. 136-137). So also Ar. Av.

 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \pi 0 \nu \eta \rho o i \pi a ́ v \tau \epsilon s$, and Hesiod Frag. 95. I (ed. Göttling) $\pi{ }^{2} \nu \eta-$ pótatov каi äpıotov (of Heracles). It is we and not the Greeks who by suffering are made strong. Cf. Simonides Frag. 5. 10-13 ed. Bergk.
10. ov́ $\delta \alpha \mu \hat{\omega}$ s. Plato held that it is better to die than to suffer incurable cisease: Gorg. 512 A -a passage which is parallel to this both in respect of the illustration and the application- $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon \in \nu \tau$

 the "meditative skipper". The whole subject is discussed in Rep. III. 405 foll. The presence of too many doctors, says Plato, proves that a city is physically unsound just as a plethora of $\delta \kappa \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau a l$ proves that it is unsound morally: ibid. 410 A it is prescribed that doctors



 merciful way of treating the patients themselves and the best thing for the State. Herodicus is censured as $\mu \alpha \kappa \rho \partial ̀ \nu — \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \theta a ́ \nu a \tau o \nu ~ a \dot{v} \tau \hat{\psi}$
 medical treatment: the right view is that oú $\sigma \nu i \quad \sigma \chi o \lambda \dot{\eta}$ $\delta i \grave{\alpha} \beta i o u$ $\kappa \alpha ́ \mu \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ ia $\alpha \rho \in \nu \circ \mu \notin \nu \varphi(\mathrm{ib} .406 \mathrm{c}$ ).
 leian : the editors mostly follow less good MSS and read $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ - apa. The $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha^{2}$ introduces a fresh point in the argument: cf. Apol. 37 c
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' $\mathfrak{u} \rho \alpha$ ( $\tilde{\alpha} \rho \alpha$ in this connection generally invites the answer 'no')


 $\tilde{\alpha} \rho a$ is separated from $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$ in order to let the full stress of the sentence-accent fall on $\mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime} \epsilon_{n} \epsilon^{\prime}(\nu)$
 cusative after $\lambda \omega \beta \dot{\bar{j} \sigma \theta a l}$ : the dative is here preferred in order to avoid the appearance of ambiguity. Ar. Eq. 1408 ' $\nu$ ' ' $\hat{0} \omega \sigma \sigma \nu$ aútòv ois ' $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \beta \hat{a} \theta$ ' oi $\xi \in \nu 0 \iota$. The verb of kindred meaning $\lambda \nu \mu a i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota-$ not found in Plato-may also be construed with a dative as well as with an accusative.
13. ท̋ фаu入óтєроข ทं $\gamma \circ \cup ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a \alpha$ кл. Compare Xen. Mem. IV. 3.
 $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon i o v \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \chi \in \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$. and Prot. 3 I 3 A ô $\delta \epsilon \frac{1}{} \pi \epsilon \rho i \pi \lambda \epsilon$ lovos $\tau 0 \hat{v}$

 of asserting the dignity of the soul.




19. oúk a̋pa- $\pi \alpha ́ v v$ ท̊ $\mu i ̂ v$ oű $\omega$ : ov̋ $\tau \omega$ goes with $\pi \alpha ́ \nu v$. I think this more probable than to take oú $\pi a ́ \nu v$ together: $\pi \alpha ́ p v$ seems too emphatic to admit of this interpretation.
 right, as the Greeks probably considered ö $\tau \iota$ and ör $t$ to be the same word (=quod) : see my Apology p. 123.
22. $\pi p \omega \hat{\omega} \tau \circ \nu \mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu$ instead of being followed by $\epsilon i \tau \alpha$ or ${ }^{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \tau \alpha$ ( $\delta \epsilon$ ) corresponds to $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ in line 25 below : the second argument of Crito is quoted as an objection to Socrates' refutation of the first: see on $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu \mu \hat{\prime} \nu$ in 46 c.
 means to introduce a subject or a proposal in a formal way: see

 $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta_{0} \hat{\sigma} \sigma \nu$ aủ入 $\eta \tau \rho i \delta a$ रaipєıv $\epsilon \hat{a} \nu \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$. Perhaps Plato chooses the word in order to suggest that Crito as it were єiбŋิभє $\delta i \kappa \eta \nu$ катà $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\nu \dot{\prime} \mu \omega \nu$-the Laws being on their defence: see Introd. pp. vii-xi.
25. $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\nu} \delta \dot{\eta}$ : here begins Socrates' reply to the second point raised by Crito: see above 44 D. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}=$ 'for that matter', 'as to that': cf. Gorg. 47 L A $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon, \hat{\omega} \phi i \lambda \epsilon$, ä $\delta \iota \kappa 0 s$. $\alpha \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon े \nu \delta \grave{\eta}$

 ili. 409 в.

27. $\delta \hat{\jmath} \lambda \alpha$. $\delta \dot{\eta}$ кai таv̂тa кт入. ='of course, that is also evident: yes, Socrates, he will say so'. If the text is right, I think $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \quad \delta \dot{\eta}$ каl таи̂тa is an aside: the answer to Socrates' remark is contained in $\phi a i \eta \gamma$ à $\rho{ }_{a} \nu \nu$. Crito (who is not yet convinced by Socrates' reasoning) first declares that the power of the many to put one to death (rav̂̃a) is as obvious as the necessity of regarding what they think of one (каi): he then assents to Socrates' remark. See above
 $\kappa \tau \lambda$.

With Cron and Kral I have retained the vulgate, because I think it presents the fewest difficulties. Wohlrab gives $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \quad \delta \dot{\eta}$ кai
 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon t s$ to Socrates: Schanz brackets $\phi a i \eta \gamma$ qà $a ̈ v$, and gives both $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha$ 就 каi $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon s$ to Crito: Göbel prints " $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha$
 think the text is probably right as it stands: but if not, I should
 taking $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \alpha \dot{\eta}$ as an adverb as it is in the MSS ( $\delta \eta \lambda a \delta \hat{\eta})$.

oûtós $\tau \epsilon: \tau \epsilon$ corresponds to каl in каl тóv $\delta \epsilon$ av̉ $\sigma к о ́ \pi \epsilon \iota$ line 3 r . There is virtually an anacoluthon, since oùtós $\tau \epsilon \dot{o}$ خó $\quad$ os- $\delta 0 \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$
 oú ró $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.: but whether the second principle is still binding or not, has not yet been decided: whence каi тóvঠє aî $\sigma к о ́ \pi \epsilon \iota ~ к \tau \lambda$.
30. ő $\mu$ оьos єival kal $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu:$ the MSS read $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ каi $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu:$ but as $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \nu$ for $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \circ \tau \epsilon \hat{\rho} \hat{\psi}$ or $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ єip $\eta \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \varphi$ is, to say the least of it, unusual, and the кai is awkward, I follow Wex, Madvig and recent editors (except Göbel) in reading kai $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$. ó $\mu о \iota o s$ каi т то́тєроу $=$ similis quam antea: see above 46 в $\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta o ́ v$
 $\pi \rho о ́ т \epsilon \rho о \nu$.
 held this view during the trial: see Apol. 28 в and ch. xxiri. Com-




necessary because $\epsilon \hat{v} \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ has a double meaning（see above on 47 B $\tau \hat{\varphi} \hat{\epsilon} \pi \tau \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta$ каi $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \mathrm{to} \mathrm{\nu} \mathrm{\tau} \mathrm{\iota})$ ：it is necessary also to identify $\epsilon \hat{U}$ with $\delta \iota \kappa a i \omega s$ because the next chapter opens with the question $\pi \dot{\delta} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$


It should be noted that taủtón toroûtov tolô̂tov $\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa 0 \hat{\tau} \tau o \nu$ are regular in Plato，not taúró and the like：see on Apol．${ }^{24}$ C．Schanz now thinks it probable that Plato always used the forms in $-\nu$ ：sce his Preface to the Laws p．vi．

## CHAPTER IX．

This and the following chapter make a kind of interlude．Socrates has now reached his principle or 入óros，viz．öтt oủ $\tau \dot{\delta} \zeta \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\imath}$ $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \tau o v \pi$ по८ $\tau \epsilon \in \circ \nu, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ rò $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha l \omega s \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ ．Before introducing the Laws to prove that if Socrates made his escape he would violate this principle，Socrates pauses to emphasize the full force and meaning of this 入óros，and the irrelevancy of every other．Throughout this and the following chapters it must be borne in mind that Socrates

 like（Graser quoted by Wohlrab）．Sce above on ö $\pi \epsilon \rho \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \omega$ in 45 B．


2．то́тєроข סíkatov кт入．Siкalov is＇right＇：see on 45 C above． Crito had put the question on the same grounds in the passage re－
 is not＇to permit＇（ $\epsilon \phi(\epsilon \in \nu a l)$ ，but＇to let go free＇，as in Apol．29C $\dot{\alpha} \phi \ell \epsilon \mu \epsilon^{\prime} \nu \sigma \epsilon$ ．

4．$\eta$ そ oủ $\delta$ ícalov：more emphatic and clear than $\eta$ グ ov่：so in B 48 C

 clause is placed first so as to let emphasis be thrown on $\sigma \dot{v})(\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ ： ai $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \in \psi \epsilon \iota$ äs $\sigma \dot{v} \lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \epsilon \iota s$ would be much less pointed．Cron remarks that when the antecedent is adopted into the relative clause，the article is more usually omitted，as in oüs $\dot{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \iota s$ vouijє $\theta \in o u ̀ s ~ o u ́$ $\nu o \mu i \zeta \omega \nu$ ．Tr．＇as for the considerations you mention，about＇etc．

8．$\omega$ s $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$ ：see on 46 D above．
9．$\sigma \kappa \kappa^{\prime} \mu \mu a \tau \alpha$ ก̂．$\sigma \kappa \epsilon \in \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ is of course in the predicate．The


кai $\pi a i \hat{o} \omega \nu \tau \rho \circ \phi \bar{\lambda}$, s. On $\mu \eta^{\prime} \dot{\eta}$ ( $=$ nescio an sit) see Goodwin MT. 83: probably some word expressing fear or apprehension ought to be understood : see on Apol. $39 \mathrm{~A} \mu \dot{\eta}$ ou' $\tau 0 \hat{\imath} \tau^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \delta^{\prime} \nu$.

 $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \dot{o} \nu \tau \iota \nu 0 \hat{v} \nu a ̈ \nu o ̈ \sigma \iota \tau \dot{u} \chi 0 \iota \tau 0 \hat{v} \tau 0 \pi a \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$. We are of course not justified in seeing tiere an allusion to the alleged remorse of the Athenians after Socrates' death: the tradition about their repentance is late and untrustworthy: see Grote, Vol. viif. p. 302. For äp with the participle in apodosis cf. Legg. vi. 78ı a $\pi 0 \lambda \grave{v}$ ä $\mu \in \iota \nu 0 \nu$ ä $\nu$
 $\sigma \kappa \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ more often means 'to come to life again': for the causative
 $\sigma \theta a \iota$.
10. oí $\delta \epsilon v i \xi i v \nu \omega \hat{\omega}$. Wohlrab compares Ar. Nub. $580 \hat{\eta} \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \hat{\eta}$ $\tau \tau \xi \xi \xi \delta \delta o s \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu i \xi \dot{u} \nu \nu \hat{\varphi}$. Plato occasionally uses $\xi u ́ \nu$ in such adverbial phrases, e.g. $\xi \dot{\nu} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega}$ $\theta o \rho \dot{\nu} \beta \omega \varphi$ Rep. vi. 492 B: otherwise it generally occurs in religious uses like Legg. inf. 682 A $\xi$ v́v $\tau \iota \sigma \iota \mathrm{X} \alpha \dot{\rho} \iota \sigma \iota$ каi Mov́rals, or where the connection is a very close one, as in Legg.

 $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$ : see also note on $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha ́$ in 47 E .
$\tau 0 \cup \tau^{\tau} \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ : oîtos like the Latin iste expresses contempt. Note in the next sentence the eniphatic place assigned to $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu)(\tau o i s$ $\pi o \lambda \lambda o i ̂ s$.
II. ó $\lambda o ́ y o s$ ovit $\omega s$ aipє $=$ ' ratio ita evincit' (Cron) is a frequent

 Near akin is the use of aipeì = 'to secure a conviction', as in Apol.


## 12. vûv $\delta \eta$ '. See on 46 D above.

14. kal Xápıtas: the plural is preferred to the singular, not only because Socrates is speaking for Crito as well as for himself, but because it balances the plural $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau \alpha$ more neatly. It is hardly necessary to supply $\epsilon i \delta o ́ \tau \epsilon s$ from $\tau \epsilon \lambda o u ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ : $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \nu \chi$ áp $\rho \nu$ ( $\chi$ ápı $\iota a s$ ) is to 'pay a debt of gratitude'.
 be more logical and less grammatical.
$\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \in \dot{i} \dot{a}$ : see on $\dot{\omega} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s{ }_{4} 6 \mathrm{D}$.

 pointing to the opposite line of conduct from that which we are, or ought to be, pursuing' : see on Apol. 28 в. We have the same sentiment and the same mode of expression in Apol. $28 \mathrm{D} \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}-\mu \hat{\epsilon}$ -

 'staying here' from 'standing fast' or 'holding our ground '.
 Schanz reads ovँ $\tau^{\prime} \epsilon i$ after Forster. $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon i$ is to be supplied from the preceding clause.
15. $\kappa \alpha \lambda \omega \hat{\omega}-\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$-öpa $\delta \hat{\varepsilon} \tau i \quad \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ : it is time for deeds,
 ย̈ $\tau \iota ~ \omega ̈ \rho a, ~ \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \beta \epsilon \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$. $\delta \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ is the deliberative conjunctive.
16. $\pi a v ิ \sigma a l$. In Attic 'stop!' is $\pi \alpha \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota$ or $\pi a \hat{v} \epsilon$ (not $\pi \alpha v ̊ o v, 48 \mathrm{E}$ though in Homer $\pi a v v^{\prime} \sigma$ is found). $\pi a \hat{v} \epsilon$ is the only form of this word used intransitively in good writers: the plural is $\pi a v \in \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ and $\pi \alpha v ́ \sigma a \sigma \theta \epsilon$ : see Cobet V. L. pp. 264, $36_{7}$, and Rutherford on Babrius 28.8 .
 reading $\pi \epsilon i ̂ \sigma a i ́ ~ \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha \pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta}$ äкоутos cannot be right: for apart from the awkwardness of $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta}$ äкоע $\tau o s, \tau a \hat{\imath} \tau a \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ could only mean 'to let me remain and die': an impossible meaning, since it leaves raûta without an antecedent, Socrates as yet professing not to have made up his mind but to be willing to follow ö $\pi n$ ä้ ó $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s a ้ \gamma \eta$ : see line $22 \sigma \kappa о \pi \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu, \hat{\omega} a \dot{a} \gamma \theta \theta$, коь $\nu \hat{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$. I follow Meiser (Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 1874, p. 40) in transposing raû̃a $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \alpha ̈ \kappa о \nu \tau о s(s c . \sigma o \hat{)}$ ): таи̂та $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ ( $=$ 'to do what I do', 'to act herein') depends on $\pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \pi 0 \lambda \lambda o \hat{\imath} \pi o \omega o \hat{u} \mu a l$, and is coordinate with and not subordinate to $\pi \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \alpha \iota$, which is used absolutely. Translate: 'for I think it important to persuade you, and not to act in this without your consent '. Cron, Schanz and Kral retain the MS order, changing $\pi \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma a l$ to $\pi \epsilon i \sigma \alpha s$, with Buttmann, Hermann and Madvig: Wohlrab alone among recent editors retains the ms reading. By Wex (Fleckeisen's Jahrb. for 1856 , p. 669) $\pi \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma a \iota$ is rejected as "ein erklärendes Glossem zu dem falsch verstandenem
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta \grave{\eta}^{\alpha} \kappa о \nu \tau 0 s$ sc. $\pi \rho \hat{a} \tau \tau \epsilon$ ". Göbel discusses the passage at length in his Fulda program 1882 p. 10 foll., and claims to have solved all difficulties by the change of $\pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma a \iota$ to $\pi a \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$ : but in reality this is
only mending one fault by two others, for (a) $\pi a \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$ would inevitably lead to ákоขтa: (b) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu$ ' is not 'aber nicht', but 'nicht'; i.e. it must introduce not a mere qualification, but a direct antithesis to some word in the preceding clause: and $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a l$ (or $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a s$ ) is exactly such a word. The choice clearly lies between Meiser's view and that of Cron: I prefer the former, because (a) even if $\pi$ eioas were right I think Plato would either have written $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi 0 \lambda \lambda o \hat{v} \pi o \iota o \hat{\mu} \mu a \iota$ $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a s \quad \sigma \epsilon$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta}{ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \kappa о \nu \tau о s, \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \quad \pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$, or (less likely) $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{ }$
 (b) because in $\tau \alpha \hat{\imath} \tau \alpha \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu=$ 'do what I am doing', 'act in this matter', the force of $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ seems to me more obscure if it follows $\sigma \epsilon$ than if it follows äкоутоs.
 (with Wohlrab) Rep. Iv. 432C öpa oûv каì $\pi \rho \circ \theta v \mu o v ̂ ~ к а \tau \iota \delta \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \epsilon ́ a ́ \nu ~$
 (a meaning it never bears), but 'si forte', 'in case' : in such expressions there is no real ellipse of the apodosis : see Monro's Homeric Grammar, p. 212.
$\tau \eta \dot{ } \boldsymbol{v}$ ápX $\eta$ 'v is 'the outset', 'the start': from its use in such examples as the present it came to mean 'principle', as so often in Aristotle.
 most inclines: $\hat{y}$ is adverbial and goes with oťn, as in oit $\sigma \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta$ : ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ is not to be understood.

## CHAPTER X.

In this chapter Crito is made to admit (a) that it is wrong to requite wrong with wrong or evil with evil, and (b) that it is our duty to carry out in practice that which we have in theory admitted to be right. Introduction p. xii.

 $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \tau \epsilon \in \nu \kappa \alpha i \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \eta \tau \epsilon \in \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$., and for the sentiment itself Apol.

 Kep. I. 335 D.

phatic: see on Apol. 26 c ( $\epsilon$ ival $\tau \iota \nu$ às $\theta$ 保s), where I refer to
 $\tau \eta \theta \in$ is.


 and others whether the doctrine here maintained was ever held by the historical Socrates : but I have no doubt that it was. In harmony with his egoistic principles, Socrates denied that it is ever right to wrong another, because wrongdoing has an injurious influence on one's own soul: see Introd. p. xii.
5. ท̄ $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \mathrm{L}$. In the mss öт $\pi \rho$ каi äpть $\overline{\epsilon \lambda \epsilon} \bar{\gamma} \epsilon \tau 0$ is written before $\hat{\eta} \pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \iota$ : but as there is nothing to which the words can be referred, I agree with recent editors in omitting them. The alternative



 from losing or throwing goods overboard at sea: cf. Rep. vill. 553 B


 ठúvaual $\nu \hat{v} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \beta \beta \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$.
 as usual expresses surprise: sce on Apol. 34 C द́ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ ôè oư $\delta \dot{v} \nu a^{\prime} \rho a$

$\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o i \delta \epsilon$. After $\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o i \delta \epsilon$ the mss read $\gamma \epsilon \rho \rho \nu \tau \epsilon s a^{\prime \prime} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ : I think with Cron and Schanz that $\gamma^{\prime} \rho \rho \nu \tau \epsilon s$ is a gloss on $\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o i \delta \epsilon$. Fischer and Wohlrab defend the word on the ground that $\gamma \epsilon \epsilon \rho \nu \tau \epsilon s a^{\prime} v \delta \rho \epsilon s$ makes a good antithesis to $\pi a i \delta \omega \nu$ : but the phrase $\gamma \epsilon \epsilon \rho 0 \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ä $\nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ is a trifle awkward, and ä$\nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ alone seems to me more forcible as the opposite of $\pi a i \delta \omega \nu$.
9. $\sigma \pi 0 v \delta \hat{\eta}$ is emphatic, nearly $=\sigma \pi o v \dot{\delta} \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' ov $\pi a \iota \delta \iota \hat{\not ̂}$ (suggested by $\pi a i \delta \omega \nu$ in the next line).

 $\dot{a} \pi о \mu \alpha \rho a i \nu \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota, \omega ̈ \sigma \tau \epsilon \pi a i \delta \omega \nu \nu \mu \eta \delta \grave{\nu} \nu \delta \kappa \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu \iota \iota \alpha \phi \in \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ : Prot. 342 E $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \tau o ̀ \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \delta \iota a \lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu \pi \alpha \iota \delta \grave{s} \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i \omega$. Here and indeed generally $\delta \iota a \phi \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota \nu$ means 'to be better than' and not simply 'to differ'.
A. C.
11. $\pi a v \tau o ̀ s ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o v=' a s s u r e d l y ' ~(i . e . ~ m o r e ~ t h a n ~ a n y t h i n g) ~ i s ~$ frequent in Plato, e.g. Prot. $34+\mathrm{B} \pi a \nu \tau o ̀ s ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu{ }^{\text {é }} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi$ ós є̇ $\sigma \tau$.

 $\nu 0 \mu i \zeta \omega$ катà $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ бò $\nu$ $\lambda 6 \gamma \sigma \nu$. Asyndeton is regular in this kind of explanatory clause : see on Apol. 22 A. I have printed a colon before $\epsilon i \tau \epsilon$ фaбiv, cf. Apol. 1. c. $\quad \ddot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{s}$ in line 14 thus becomes more easy and natural.


14. тó $\gamma \in$ á8ıxєîv: see on 49 A , line 3 .

кal какòv кal aíxpóv. In Gorg. 474 C foll. it is shewn that $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ is both ка́кьov and aïб Xıo than $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma a l$. Note the symmetry throughout this speech of Socrates: it begins with oi $\delta \in \nu l$ $\tau \rho \dot{\prime} \pi \varphi$ and ends with $\pi a \nu \tau i \tau \rho \delta \pi \varphi:$ and the two alternatives are presented in such a way that the one which finally prevails is placed both first and last: the order is a.b.a.b.a.
 fore': for ádıкои́ $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu \dot{a} \nu \tau a \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ is $\dot{a} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \pi \omega s$. Socrates does not in this assume that he has been wronged by the lazus: only by men: see on 54 C.
$\dot{s}$ oi $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda 0$ olovral. The ordinary Greek view is well summed



 $\sigma \iota \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \mu \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \cdot \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma$ व̀ $\rho \tau 0 \iota o u ́ \tau \omega \nu \epsilon \dot{\jmath} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \in \sigma \tau a \tau 0 s \beta l o s$. Socrates himself declares that this was the prevailing morality in Greece: Mem. II. 3.

 is against the supposition that this view commended itself to him, and even Pittacus, if we may trust Diogenes Laertius (1. 4. 78 ), had already declared against it in the memorable words $\phi \dot{i} \lambda o \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon \nu$ $\kappa а \kappa \hat{\omega} s, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \chi \chi \theta \rho o ́ \nu$. See Introd. p. xii.
 $\tau i \delta \dot{\epsilon}$; (infra line $2^{4}$ ) the departure is less new: from $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{L} \nu$ to какоирүєì the transition is greater than from какоирүєiv to $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota к а-$ коי'pүєі̀

least Crito can answer without hesitation，for какоир $\gamma \epsilon i v$ suggests the idea of a criminal or malefactor：see L．and S．s．v．

27．тò үáp $\pi$ ou какต̂s moteîv кт入．In Rep．I． 335 в foll．
 through the middle term $\beta \lambda \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \epsilon \nu \nu$ ．
 какоирүєîv．For oưo’ ầ ótьô̂̀ $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \eta=$ ne tum quidem si quidvis
 Polit． 297 B oủk ä้ $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os oú $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \nu \tau \iota \nu \omega \nu \circ \hat{\nu} \nu$ ．The subject to $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \eta$ is understood from the unexpressed subject to $\dot{a} \nu \tau a \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon i \nu$ and $\kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} s$


32．кaӨoцo入оү $\hat{\nu}$ ：the $\kappa a \tau \alpha$ points to the gradual piecemeal character of the admissions：cf．Gorg． 499 в $\pi$ d́入aı roi $\sigma o v \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho о \omega \hat{\mu} \alpha \iota$

 where it is said that Socrates leads one on little by little till lo！ when at the end all the little admissions are added up $\mu^{\prime} \gamma \alpha$ $\tau \delta$

 doctrines are for the few and not for the many is more in the vein of Plato than of Socrates．It is possible that Socrates may have been led to hold this language by his condemnation on an unjust charge： but while actively engaged on his mission he was as far as possible from despairing，as is clear from Xen．Mem．1iI．5．See Intro－ duction $\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{xv}$ ．






36． $\mathfrak{a} \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$ кaтaфpovєiv：the many laugh at the philosopher （Rep．Vil． 517 A ），and if the philosopher laughs at them，$\hat{\eta}^{7} \tau \tau 0 \nu \stackrel{a}{c} \nu$
 $\psi(\chi \hat{n}):$ Rep．vil． 5 I8 в．

38．koเv $\omega v$ єis is used with reference to $\kappa$ oıv $\grave{\eta} \beta$ oud $\dot{\eta}$ in 38 ：so infra in 42．$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \nu$ in the same line $=\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ тoútou $\tau o \hat{v}$ 入ó $\gamma o u$ and is explained by $\dot{\omega}$ oט́ס́́тотє $\kappa \tau \lambda$. ：compare（with Jacobs）Prot．




$$
6-2
$$

ойтє $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ какоup $\bar{\epsilon} \hat{\nu}$, but as Göbel points out $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon i \nu$ has already been identified with какоир $\bar{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{i} \nu$ (in C above, line ${ }_{27}$ ): and besides it is on the injustice of $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota к \alpha к о v \rho \gamma \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ rather than of $\tau \grave{~ к а к о v \rho \gamma \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ t h a t ~}$ the rest of the dialogue turns.
49 E 42. $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ápX $\hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ : said with reference to $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\omega} \mu \in \theta \alpha$ in 28: see note on 48 E above.
44. Tò $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тoûto = 'my next point': see on Apol. 39 b.
48. $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \lambda_{0} \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \rho \omega \tau \hat{\omega}=$ vel potius interrogo: Socrates said his say by questions oftener than by answers: see Apol. 33 B. For $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta \epsilon ́$ see above on 46 A.
50. द́ $\xi a \pi \alpha \tau \eta \tau$ '́ov: to believe a theory and yet not carry it into practice is a living lie: to Socrates this seemed not only wrong, but impossible, since knowledge is virtue and oúdeis $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \grave{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha \dot{\nu} \varphi \iota$ : see Introd. to Apol. p. xi.

## CHAPTER XI.

With this chapter the third division of the dialogue begins. Crito has now admitted the major premise which is to determine the action of Socrates, viz. that under no circumstances is it right to do wrong or requite wrong with wrong or evil with evil. The minor premise is still wanting, and to establish this Socrates introduces the Laws of Athens, who endeavour to prove that if he complied with Crito's invitation, Socrates would be guilty of wrongdoing, and retaliation in wrong-doing. In this chapter they urge that escape would be wrong because it would mean the entire negation of the State and civic life. See Introduction pp. x-xiv.
r. '́k $\boldsymbol{\tau} \mathbf{o v} \tau \omega \boldsymbol{\nu}=$ 'in the light of this', 'starting from these premises': so in 48 в $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\partial} \mu о \lambda о \gamma о \nu \mu \hat{\prime} \nu \omega \nu$.


 to ois = rov́rols ä: for a similar case see Apol. 37 в ảvti rov́rov dì
 оîo’ öт七 кака̀ oै̀та.
 Crito sees but too clearly what the conclusion will be.
 is characteristic of Socrates to let the Laws speak for themselves:
like Plato he was nothing if not clear and emphatic. For a similar example see Theaet. 166 A foll. I think too that Plato wished to save Socrates from the charge of selfishness and lack of feeling, when his friends were so deeply moved, and hence the fatal argument comes not from his mouth but from the Laws.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda o v \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$ : the dative depends on $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\partial} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ : Cron com-

 runaway slave or a deserter, and these words are added to spare Crito's feelings, "mitigandae orationis causa" (Stallbaum). For the Greek Stallbaum compares Legg. I. 633 A $\pi \epsilon \rho i \tau \omega ิ \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s a ̈ \lambda \lambda \eta s$


 is added with a view to $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \pi \dot{\partial} \lambda \iota \nu$ (line $1_{5}$ ) and $\dot{\eta} \pi \dot{o} \lambda \iota s$ (22) afterwards. The editors refer to Prot. $319 \mathrm{D} \tau \grave{\grave{\prime}}$ коьข̀̀ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$
 possible that Cicero had the whole passage in view when he wrote (Cat. I. ${ }^{17}$ ) Quae (sc. patria) tecum Catilina sic agit et quodam modo tacita loquitur.
II. '̇̇ı৮テávtєs is regularly used of a vision 'standing over' one: see Symp. 192 D (quoted on line 8 above). The word occurs naturally to Socrates, who had a devout belief in visions: see on
 ad caput adstitit.
12. $\alpha^{\wedge} \lambda \lambda 0 \tau \iota \geqslant \neq$ aliurlne quid quam? i.e. nonne? see on Apol. 24 C: ${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda o \tau \iota$ alone can bear the same meaning. With $\hat{\psi} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon i s$ contrast 45 C $\dot{\epsilon \pi} \pi \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \in i \hat{\nu} \pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \gamma \mu a$ : the influence of the preceding ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \varphi$ causes $\dot{\psi}$ to be preferred to the more usual $\dot{o}^{\prime}$.
 deictic: the voice should pause before and after it. The laws and constitution of Athens are arraigned before Socrates: whence ado$\lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma a l ~ ' t o ~ k i l l ', ~ ' d e s t r o y ', ~ v i z . ~ b y ~ g i v i n g ~ a n ~ a d v e r s e ~ v e r d i c t . ~ S o ~$ in Legg. Ix. 857 A, where the metaphor is still kept up: $\pi \rho o \delta \delta \tau \eta$
 the parricide, as it were, of his country's laws. See Introduction pp. vii-viii.

тò $\sigma$ òv $\mu$ épos: 'as far as lies with you': so in 45 D above. In
 ('think you') and understand $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$ with otóv $\tau \epsilon$ than to understand
 see on 43 D above.
 but $\epsilon i \nu a t$ here $=$ ' $\left.\mathrm{exist}^{\prime}\right)(\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha ́ \phi \theta a \iota$ : it is not the copula.
16. $\delta$ ikar is here 'judgments', 'decisions' not 'lawsuits': this use is frequent in Homer, but rare in Attic. $\gamma \epsilon \nu \delta \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota=\delta \iota \kappa a-$ $\sigma \theta \in i \hat{\sigma} \alpha \iota$ as in line 20.
17. äкvроt is opposed to кúpıal: see line 21 .
19. ä $\lambda \lambda \omega s \tau \in$ kai $\dot{\rho} \eta(\omega \omega$ : the imagery of a trial is still kept up: see Introduction p. vii.
20. ámo $\lambda_{\nu \mu \dot{\mu} v o v: ~ s e e ~ n o t e ~ o n ~ l i n e ~} \mathrm{I} 3$ above. Cron remarks that throughout all this passage there is an allusion to the custom of appointing ouvinरopol or advocates to defend any law which it was proposed to repeal.
21. ő $\tau \mathrm{t}$ introduces the direct quotation as in Apol. 21 C
 ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \eta \sigma \theta a:$ infr. 50 C.
 wrong the laws) for' etc. Instead of $\dot{\eta} \delta i \kappa \epsilon \iota$ Heindorf requires $\dot{\alpha} \delta \kappa \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ : the present of this verb is frequently used of an injury committed in the past because the injury is supposed to continue till it is atoned for. But Socrates speaks as one who has outlived the sense of injury: the imperfect $\dot{\eta} \delta i \kappa \epsilon \iota$ is thus in keeping with the spirit of his motto $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \dot{\cup} \phi \eta \mu i \not q \chi \rho \eta े ं \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \hat{a} \nu$ (Phaed. 117 E).
23. ékpıvєv: the Aorist, not the imperfect, in spite of $\eta_{\delta i} \dot{\prime} \kappa \epsilon$.

## CHAPTER XII.

The Laws proceed to argue that Socrates is their child and slave, bound to render them all the obedience due to parents and masters, or rather more, because one's fatherland should be more to one than parents.
2. kai тav̂ta ='this too', viz. the reservation that you were to question our decrees, and disobey them if they seemed to you wrong.

 connection and leaves $\kappa a i$ unexplained: the meaning of $\kappa a i$ is fixed by the following line: $\ddot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \epsilon \nu-\delta \omega \kappa \alpha ́ S \eta$, i. e. ' or to ạbide by the
decisions delivered by the State', sc. without any clause of reservation.
3. Taîs $\delta$ ikaıs: $\delta$ ikal $=$ 'decisions', 'judgments', as in 50 B , line 16 .
 language': $\theta a v \mu a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ is regularly followed by a genitive of the person: Goodwin, Gk. Gr. 222.
5. öть: see on 50 B. Infra in line $7 \mathrm{kal}=$ 'also'.
 periphrasis: Stallbaum refers to Phaed. 75 D каi $\grave{\epsilon} \nu$ тaîs $\bar{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$

10. ámo $\lambda \lambda$ úval: see on 50 B , line I 3 . $\pi \rho \hat{\jmath} \tau 0 \nu \mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu$ corresponds 50 D to $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime}$ in line 14 : the second question thus becomes more vivid: for a similar case compare 48 A and 53 B. $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu=\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi o \iota \eta \quad \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$ 'called into existence': Aristotle has $\gamma \in \nu \nu \omega \nu \tau \omega \nu$ aútó $\nu$ (sc. $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ oủ $\mu \alpha \nu \grave{\nu} \nu$ ) $=\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta$ a८ aútò $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ (De Cael. II. $283^{\text {b }}$ 31).
 $\epsilon \quad \epsilon \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \mu \nu$. Note $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \dot{\prime} \nu$ in the sense of 'I take to wife': so
 remarks that the imperfect calls up the circumstances and provisions of the courtship (if there was any) and wedding: for the collocation of the imperfect and the aorist cf. infra 52 C oüt $\omega \sigma$ бójpa $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} \mathrm{s} \dot{\eta} \rho \circ \hat{v}$

12. тov́тoเs $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ тois vóposs: here and in line ${ }_{7} 7$ Schanz follows Hirschig in bracketing roîs vóuoss ( $\nu 0 \mu \mathrm{ol}$ ) : but the addition of these words makes the Greek far more explicit and emphatic. тov́тors is deictic.
13. тoîs $\pi \in \rho$ l $\tau$ ov̀s $\gamma$ ápous: Cron remarks that Socrates is thinking chiefly of the laws which established the legal validity of marriage and as a consequence the legitimacy of the children. Some account of the laws relating to marriage is given in Becker's Charicles E. T. pp. 473-498.
14. EXoucıv is probably the participle : $\tau \iota$ points to this (Cron). For $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \alpha ́$ v. note on line 10 above.
15. трофグv $\tau \epsilon$ кai $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i a v$. Plato frequently uses this expression to denote the upbringing and education of a child: e.g.
 $\tau \rho \circ \phi \eta^{\prime}$ is the wider term, including the general care of the body: in mal $\delta \epsilon l a$ the care of the soul is the prominent idea.
16. ท̉ oủ ka入ิิs: $\eta$-the less authenticated reading-would $=$ Lat. An ? $\hat{\eta}$ ov́ is simply Nonne ?
oi é $\pi$ l тoúzols $\tau \in \tau \alpha \nmid \mu$ évol vó $\mu$ ol: the antecedent to roúroıs is implied in $\tau \rho 0 \phi \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i \pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i a \nu$ (line 14). The word $\pi a \rho a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \lambda$ $\lambda^{\prime} \nu \tau \tau \epsilon$ is not to be pressed : it is doubtful to what extent Athenian parents were compelled by law to educate their children: see Becker's Charicles E. T. p. 228.
ı8. $\mu$ оибเки̂ каi $\gamma \cup \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \hat{n}$ : the two branches of Greek edu-cation-the end being to produce a sound mind in a sound body:
 $\nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}, \dot{\eta} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \in \pi i \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \circ v \sigma \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$. The latter in its wider signifi-
 (lyre-playing), and learning by heart passages of the poets, especially Homer. See Becker's Charicles E. T. 226-236.
50 E 19. ка入ิิs. This only commits Socrates to the utility of $\mu \sigma v \sigma \iota \kappa \eta$ and $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ : whether $\mu$ оvбьк $\dot{\prime}$ and $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ were rightly taught is quite another question. It is impossible to believe that Socrates approved of Athenian methods of teaching : for he never wearied of attacking the ignorance of his countrymen, and knowledge according to him could be taught. In the Protagoras (339 foll.) Plato makes him prove by an elaborate caricature of the popular way of expounding the poets that no true education comes from that quarter. Plato himself rejected the popular education both in its actual curriculum and still more in respect of its method: see Rep. ViI. 521 C foll.

єiٔє : see on 47 в above.
20. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi \in \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\phi} \phi \eta \mathrm{\eta}$ : $\bar{\epsilon} \xi-$ signifies that Socrates was no longer a child:

 where Demaratus says of the Lacedaemonians $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \dot{\theta} \theta \epsilon \rho \circ \iota \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \delta \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ov̉ $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau a$ é $\lambda \epsilon \dot{\theta} \theta \epsilon \rho o l ~ \epsilon i \sigma \iota \cdot ~ Є ̈ \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \gamma \alpha ́ \rho \sigma \phi \iota \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \delta \tau \eta s \nu \partial ́ \mu o s$. See also


22. aútós $\tau \epsilon$ kal oi $\sigma$ ol $\pi \rho$ óyovol: Socrates is, so to speak, $\delta o \hat{\lambda} \lambda o s \kappa \dot{\alpha} \kappa \delta \quad \delta o u ̀ \lambda \omega \nu$. With this form of expression compare Apol.

 on a level with ours?' (Church) : $\kappa a i=a t q u e$, as in pariter atque. The $\kappa \alpha i$ after $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ is explanatory, as in 50 D , line 1 I.
 argument: you may not retaliate on your parent or your master :
how much less upon your country and her laws! Compare Apol.


 on the passage. Here, as usual, äpa expresses surprise: the presence of $a p a$ in both clauses makes the antithesis more pointed, and increases the rhetorical effect: Cron compares Prot. 325 B-C $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{e} \nu$

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ оौкк $\omega \dot{\alpha} \nu a \tau \rho о \pi a l, \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau a \delta^{\prime} a^{\prime \prime} \rho a$ óv $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa о \nu \tau a \iota$. The position of $\sigma o l$ between the preposition and its noun is noteworthy: it is the less remarkable, because $\sigma o \iota ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \pi a \tau \epsilon \in \rho a$ is nearly equivalent to $\sigma o ̀ \nu$ $\pi a \tau \hat{\epsilon} \rho a$ : cf. Eur. Med. $324 \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho \rho^{\prime} s \varepsilon \gamma^{\gamma}{ }^{\alpha} \alpha \dot{\sigma} \tau \omega \nu$ : and the well-known "Lydia dic per omnes te deos oro" of Hor. Carm. I. 8. r.
26. oủk ' $\xi$ 'ioou $\mathfrak{\eta} v$ : the imperfect implies that Socrates' father is dead. ои́к goes closely with $\epsilon \xi$ loov: beware of taking it as = nonne?

 is the apodosis, for Greek (like Latin) prefers the more direct and dogmatic mode of expression ( $\hat{\eta} \nu$, erat, rather than $\hat{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu$, esset): Goodwin MT. 97-
 equality of rights, Socrates might retaliate: otherwise not. As oủk $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ toov forms a single negative idea ) ( $\ddot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau a \iota s c$. $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ t'oov in line 30 , we
 just as in $3 \mathrm{r}-33$ we have a positive clause with $\dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ to explain the
 rather than oúk $\epsilon \xi$ toov. Perhaps he was anxious to avoid the accumulation of negatives.
28. ov̋тє $\kappa a \kappa \bar{\omega} s-a ̈ \lambda \lambda a$ тolav̂тa $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda a ́$. This is not epexegetic

 the passive of $\kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} s \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu$ (male dicere): so $\dot{a} \pi \circ \theta \nu \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega \phi \in \cup ́ \gamma \omega$ etc. serve as passives to $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu \omega \delta \iota \omega \kappa \omega$ etc. : see on Apol. 17 A.
 Clouds 1409 foll. Phidippides beats his father Strepsiades, justify-



$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu \epsilon \dot{\nu} \nu 0 \in \hat{\imath} \nu, \tau \dot{\delta} \tau u ́ \pi \tau \epsilon \epsilon \nu$; It should be noted that one of the charges falsely brought against Socrates was that he set sons against their parents: see Introduction to Apol. p. xxx.
 which Stallbaum vainly defends. The choice lies between $\epsilon \xi$ toov Ëбтal $\sigma o \iota$ (Hirschig) and そ̈ $\sigma \tau a \iota ~ \sigma o \iota$ (Schanz). I prefer the latter, both because it changes less, and because I dislike the cadence of the first: I think Plato, had he chosen to repeat $\epsilon \xi$ ioov, would have omitted $\sigma o \iota$. I have added a mark of interrogation after ë $\sigma \tau \alpha \iota \sigma o \iota$ : see on line 32 .
 Note the emphatic $\sigma \dot{\epsilon})(\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i \hat{s}$ and in the next line $\sigma \dot{v})(\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s: ~ I$ follow Göbel and Kral in writing $\sigma \dot{\epsilon}$ against $\sigma \epsilon$ of the MSS.
32. кal $\sigma \grave{̀} \delta \dot{́} \kappa \tau \lambda$. In place of кai $\sigma \grave{\epsilon} \dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s-\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon i \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$. -as we should naturally expect after $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$, a vivid question is substituted: compare on 50 D line 10 . At the same time a better antithesis is provided for $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \sigma \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \pi \tau \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{i} S \dot{a} \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \dot{\prime} \nu \alpha \iota$, and the awkwardness of the two accusatives in каi $\sigma \grave{\epsilon} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s \kappa \tau \lambda$. is avoided. For $\kappa \alpha l-\delta \epsilon$ see following note.
 no case of $\kappa a i-\delta \epsilon$ in a dependent sentence. This example is instructive as to the origin of the combination $\kappa a l-\delta \epsilon=$ 'and also': the каi goes with the intervening words (cf. Aesch. Prom. 972-973 $\chi \lambda \lambda \delta \hat{\omega}$;
 $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega)$. The precise force of $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ in this place is difficult to explain. The editors say that it is used "ad augendam oppositionis gravitatem: pro simplici кai $\sigma \dot{v} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ dictum est : кai $\sigma \dot{v} \delta \grave{~} \dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s, u s u ~ h a u d$ infrequenti" (Stallbaum). For this 'not uncommon use' no parallels are quoted: and I prefer to regard it as the $\delta \varepsilon$ found sometimes in interrogative sentences, e.g. Prot. $312 \mathrm{~A} \sigma \dot{v} \delta \hat{\epsilon}, \hat{\eta} \nu \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \omega^{\prime}, \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$,

34. $\tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau a$ motôv sc. $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{s}$ : cf. 50 E line 24 and note on 44 D
 Socrates habitually professed $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta a \iota \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} s:$ see Apol. 30 A and $4 \mathrm{IE}: \epsilon \in \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ indeed was almost a technical term in Socrates' preaching: see Xen. Mem. I. 2. 3, 4 etc. Sarcasm is frequently brought out by adding a qualifying participial clause at the end of.a



scripts of Plato often fluctuate between $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda o v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \delta_{-}^{-}$ $\mu \epsilon \nu 0$ : here the Bodleian has $\epsilon \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda 6 \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$. On the adverbial phrase $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \in \dot{i} \dot{q}$ see supra note on $\dot{\omega} s \dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s 4^{6}$ D.
35. ท̋ oűrшs $\epsilon \mathfrak{i}$ бoфós. The Bodleian has $\eta$ without accent: other MSS read $\hat{\eta}$. $\quad \boldsymbol{\eta}$ is a far superior reading: for the Laws having first taken Socrates at his own estimate ( $\dot{o} \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i \underline{q} \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \mu \epsilon \lambda \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s)$ now proceed to take him at other people's. It is clear from Apol. 18 в that $\sigma o \phi$ ós (like $\phi$ poutiot $\dot{\prime}$ s) was almost a nickname of Socrates. Here of course the word is used with bitter irony, as indeed it often was in Socrates' time: cf. Meno 75 C $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma o \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$ -

36. $\lambda \in ́ \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \in \nu \sigma \in$ öтı $\kappa \tau \lambda$ : it is implied that the new oodia (of which Socrates and the Sophists were thought to be the professors) tended to lessen the hold of the State upon the individual: see Ar. Nubes 889-1ro4.
$\mu \eta$ трós $\tau \epsilon$ кal $\pi$ atpós. For the order compare with Cron Prot.

 $\tau \epsilon \rho a$. For the sentiment Stallbaum compares Cic. De Off. I. 57 "Cari sunt parentes, cari liberi, propinqui, familiares: sed omnes omnium caritates patria una complexa est: pro qua quis bonus dubitet mortem oppetere, si ei sit profuturus?" That one's country has the first claim on one, and one's family and friends only the second, was the recognised principle of both Greek and Roman civic life, during their most flourishing periods. In setting self-study above political life Socrates was unconsciously preaching a view whose logical issue amounted to the dissolution of the old life which it was his aim to restore.
37. тєцเต́тєроv-каі $\sigma \in \mu \nu o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$ каl $\dot{\alpha} \gamma เ \omega ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$ is a climax: $\tau i \mu c o s$ is one of the loftiest epithets that can be applied to $\tau \dot{d} \nu \theta \rho \omega$ $\pi \iota \nu a$ : $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu o ́ s$ is applied to $\tau \grave{\alpha} \theta \epsilon i a$ as well : ä $\gamma \iota o s$ almost exclusively to $\tau \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon i a$. Translate 'worthier and more august and more sacred '.
38. ̇ंv $\mu$ ei'gov $\mu \mathrm{olpa}$ : an elevated and somewhat poetic ex- 5 I B pression: Cron compares Hdt. II. 172 каi $\grave{\epsilon} \nu$ oú $\delta \epsilon \mu \iota \hat{\eta} \mu o i \rho \eta$ $\mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \eta \in\lceil\chi \circ \nu$.

 $\beta \rho a \chi$ ú $\tau$.

4 I. кai $\eta$ ท̃ $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ sc. $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$. For $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ used absolutely cf. Apol. $35 \mathrm{C} \delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa \alpha i \operatorname{\pi \epsilon i} \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$, and supra 48 е $\pi \epsilon i \hat{\sigma} a \iota \sigma \epsilon$.
 This is to explain $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau \iota \pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \eta \eta \pi a \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ of line 42 .
 apodosis is $\pi o \iota \eta \tau \epsilon \in \rho \nu \tau a \hat{\tau} \tau a$. Socrates had himself fought bravely for his country at Potidaea ( 432 b.c.), Delium ( 424 B.c.) and Amphipolis (422 B.C.): see on Apol. 28 E.
 give way (it may be slowly) before the enemy, rather than remain
 $\kappa о \nu \tau \alpha-\tau \iota \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa о \nu \tau \epsilon$. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \chi \omega \rho \epsilon i \nu$ is to retreat: Symp. 221 A àmò
 the $\lambda \iota \pi \frac{\pi}{} a \xi$ iov $\gamma a \phi \dot{\eta}$. The whole clause is meant to elaborate


51 C frequent idiom. Stallbaum quotes Gorg. 492 D $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mathrm{s} ~ \mu \grave{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu i a s$


50. $\beta$ lá $\zeta \in \sigma \theta a l$. $\beta l a ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ and $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon l \nu$ are often connected or

 ขaúк入ทроу.

## CHAPTER XIII.

In this chapter the Laws insist that to remain in Athens is to have pledged oneself to obey them, for emigration is free to all.
2. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$ is of course predicative, like ou dicala in the next line.
 on 50 E.
 asmuch as we have given permission'. $\tau \hat{\varphi} \beta$ ou $\lambda o \mu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu \varphi$ depends on

 permission is ipso facto accorded as soon as the סoкı $\mu$ aria is past.
 belongs to $\pi \rho \circ a \gamma \circ \rho \in \dot{0} \rho \mu \in \nu$. The apparent awkwardness of the sen-
tence is due to the use of $\bar{\xi} \xi$ ovola without a following infinitive: but this use is not uncommon in Plato, e.g. Rep. viif. 557 D where
 Ėovola was perhaps one of the familiar watchwords of Athenian democracy: cf. Thuc. vil. $69 \dot{\text { úno }} \mu \iota \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega \nu — \tau \hat{\eta} s-a \dot{\nu} \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \alpha ́ \kappa \tau o v \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$ - $\dot{\epsilon} \xi 0 v \sigma \mathfrak{l} a s$.
 Athenian was enrolled in the $\lambda \eta \xi \iota a \rho \chi \iota \kappa \grave{\nu} \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \hat{i} o \nu$ or register of his deme, after the usual $\delta о к с \mu a \sigma i a$ or examination. This particular examination was called $\delta о к \iota \mu \alpha \sigma \mathfrak{l a}$ єis ä $\nu \delta \rho a s$ to distinguish it from the $\delta о \kappa \iota \mu a \sigma i a \iota$ which the various magistrates had to undergo before entering upon office. It marked the coming of age of the young Athenian citizen: but it was not till he was 20 that he took part in the public assembly and attained the full privileges of citizenship. From 18 to 20 he had to serve in the $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi \sigma \lambda o t$ or patrol which guarded the frontiers of Attica. Stallbaum compares



II. $\lambda a \beta o b v a$, in spite of the preceding dative $₫:$ : cf. Euthy-


 оіктор.
12. кal oúסєis- $\beta$ oú $\lambda \eta \tau a t$ : omitted by mistake in B.
14. ámotkiav: an Athenian colony: contrast $\mu \epsilon \tau о \kappa \epsilon i ̄ \nu$ in 15 . á $\rho \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa о \iota \mu \boldsymbol{\nu}$ is changed by Madvig (Adv. Crit. I. 369) into á $\rho \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa о \mu \epsilon \nu$ : but the text is quite sound. $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{a} \rho \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa o \not \mu \epsilon \nu$ is the protasis to the apodosis implied in $\beta$ oú $\lambda \eta$ ral- $\epsilon$ is ámouкià léval: it explains why one might wish to emigrate: tr. 'if any of you wants to go to a colony, supposing we and the State shouid not satisfy him'. oúdeis-aं (as opposed to a particular or special) conditional sentence: Dem.
 $\nu \in \tau$ a८ каl кє $\frac{\nu}{\prime} \nu:$ Goodwin MT. 108.
15. '̇ $\lambda \theta \dot{\omega} v$ is not otiose : since $\mu \epsilon \tau о \kappa \epsilon \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu=$ 'be an alien' ( $\mu \epsilon ́ т о к к о s): ~$
 See Goodwin MT. 24 .
 with us'.
21. $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta$ raîs: so $B$, rightly: inferior mss have $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \dot{\gamma}$ acs. " $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \tau a l$ sunt genitores: $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta ิ \tau a \iota$ gentiles.-Legg. XI. 928 D $\delta \iota a-$

 rou's $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \in i ̂ s "$. Wohlrab. MSS however do not always observe this rule.
22. т $\rho 0 \phi \in \hat{v} \sigma!$ : Socrates, so to speak, would have paid no $\tau \rho \circ \phi \in i ̂ a: ~ R e p . ~ v i l ~ 520 ~ B . ~$
 taken with $\dot{\delta} \mu 0 \lambda о \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma a s$. For the present $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ cf. $50 \mathrm{C} \hat{\eta}$ каi $\tau \alpha \hat{u} \tau \alpha \dot{\omega} \mu 0 \lambda \sigma \gamma \eta \tau 0-\hat{\eta} \hat{\epsilon} \mu \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \in \iota \nu \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \delta i \kappa \alpha \iota s: ~ a n d ~ i n f r . ~ 52 ~ D ~ \dot{\omega} \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma \eta-$ $\kappa \epsilon \in \nu a \iota \pi$ то入ıтєย́є $\sigma \theta a \iota$. In each of these passages Madvig (Adv. Crit. I. 370 note 1) changes the present to the future infinitive, on the ground that $\dot{\delta} \mu 0 \lambda \circ \gamma \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \pi о \epsilon \epsilon \hat{\nu}=$ confiteor me facere, promitto me facturum $=\dot{\delta} \mu 0 \lambda 0 \gamma \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \pi \circ \iota \eta \sigma \epsilon L \nu$ (not $\pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\nu})$. The truth is that ó $\mu \mathrm{o} \lambda 0 \gamma \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \mathrm{\nu}$ has two meanings, viz. 'to confess', and to 'bargain' or 'promise': and, since the word 'promise' itself implies futurity, it may even in this sense be followed by a present infinitive, although the future is preferred, when the notion of futurity is more prominent. Just so in English we can say ' I promise to do' as well as 'I promise that I will do'. The same distinction holds in my
 $\nu о \mu i \xi \omega$, бок $\hat{\omega}$, єiко́s $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota$ etc. with the present and future infinitive: although Madvig, Cobet, and the stricter school of critics generally insist that the notion of futurity must be expressed by the infinitive as well. See Madvig Adv. Crit. I. 156 foll., Cobet Var. Lect. 97 foll., Kutherford's Babrius p. 13, and on the other hand Kühner Gr. Gr. iI. p. 163 ff.
 is to propose some course of action, without, at the same time, excluding an alternative: this is still further brought out in $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ '
 tyrant: Gorg. 510 в $\tau$ úpav
 the asyndeton see on $\tau \dot{\alpha} \tau o \alpha a \hat{v} \tau \alpha \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{\prime} \gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \tau 047 \mathrm{~A}$ above. I have printed a colon before $\pi \rho \circ \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \nu$ as in 49 в.

## CHAPTER XIV.

It is here argued that Socrates, if he were to abscond, would more than any other Athenian be guilty of a breach of bargain, because throughout all his life, even during the trial as well as before, he had shewn that Athens was more to him than any other city.
I. इókparєs. So B: inferior msS read $\hat{\omega}$ इók $\rho a \tau \epsilon s$. The 52 A effect of omitting $\hat{\omega}$ is to increase the impressiveness, since $\hat{\dot{u}}$之'́nкparєs is the regular mode of address: in English we obtain the same effect by exactly the opposite means.


5. кaӨáттоьขто. каӨámтєбӨal (in Homer with acc., in Attic with gen.) is 'to fasten on', 'attack': Thuc. vi. 16. I ává $\gamma \kappa \eta \gamma \dot{a} \rho$

9. тov́t $\omega v$ refers forward to the clause introduced by öть.
11. Sıaфєрóvt由s: differently from, i.e. more than: so too $\delta<a-$ $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$. For the repetition of $\delta \iota a \phi \epsilon \rho \delta \dot{\rho} \tau \omega \mathrm{~s}$ in the protasis cf. Apol.
 $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda a l a ̈ ้ \dot{a} \pi{ }^{2} \lambda \dot{\lambda} \lambda \eta$.
r3. е̇ $\pi i \quad \theta \epsilon \omega \rho i a v=$ "ad spectandos ludos sollemnes, videlicet Olympicos, Nemeaeos, Isthmios, Pythios, ad quos spectandos ex universa Graecia homines confluebant''. Stallbaum.
 is now followed by an unconditional statement of fact. After $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \hat{\zeta} \hat{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$ in inferior MSS and in the margin of B are found the
 probably is) was already in the text used by Athenaeus: see v. 2 I6 в
 $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \dot{a} \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \xi \omega \tau \hat{\eta} s \in i s{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I} \sigma \theta \mu \dot{\partial} \nu \pi o \rho \in i a s$. Nowhere else in Plato do we find any mention of such a journey, and at least one passage seems distinctly to deny it: Phaedr. 230 C éк $\tau$ ô̂ ä $\sigma \tau \epsilon \circ \mathrm{os}$ oü $\tau^{\prime} \epsilon i s \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$
 $\pi a \nu \epsilon \xi \iota \epsilon \nu a \iota$. Diogenes Laertius seems to have found the story in Favorinus, but not in Plato: he also attributes to Aristotle (no (loubt wrongly) a statement to the effect that Socrates visited Delphi


 polis: see on 5 I B above, and Apol. 28 E.
 $\dot{a} \pi \sigma \delta \eta \mu i a \nu$ for the sake of euphony.
 Cf. Hdt. I. 30, where Croesus says to Solon: $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathfrak{l} \sigma \notin 0$ dóros à $\pi i ̂ \kappa \tau \alpha \iota$ $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o ́ s-$, $\dot{\omega} \phi \quad \phi \lambda o \sigma o \phi \hat{\epsilon} \omega \nu \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu-\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda v \theta a s$.
 gous to oiidá $\sigma \epsilon \tau i s \epsilon \hat{i}$ the object of the infinitive $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon \nu a l$ is made dependent on the word ( $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta \mu \dot{a} a)$ upon which the infinitive itself

 $\pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ oikij $\epsilon \iota \nu$. So in Latin quarum potiendi spe (Cic. de Fin. I. 60).
 fect and aorist see on 50 D $\kappa \alpha i \delta \iota^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \mu \beta a \nu \epsilon \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \mu \eta \tau \epsilon \in \rho \alpha \sigma o v$
 51 Е í $\mu 0 \lambda о \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma a s \dot{\eta}_{\mu i}^{\prime} \nu \pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ : see note in loc.
20. $\tau \alpha ́ \tau \epsilon \alpha \not \lambda \lambda \alpha \kappa \alpha i=$ 'and in particular'. The $\tau \alpha ́ \tau \epsilon \not ̈ \lambda \lambda a$ goes grammatically with $\dot{\omega} \mu 0 \lambda o ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota s$, not with $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (Cron) or with каì є̇то入ıтєv́ou to be supplied from it (Stallbaum, Wohlrab, Göbel) : to beget children in the city was virtually to pledge oneself ( $\dot{\rho} \mu \mathrm{o} \mathrm{No}_{0}$ $\gamma \epsilon i v)$ to obey its laws.
21. ' 'ть тoívuv. $\tau$ oí $\nu v \nu=$ ' moreover', as often in Plato and the orators. Apol. 33 E.
22. $\phi \cup \gamma \eta{ }^{2} s \tau \mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota=$ 'to propose the penalty of exile'. Cf.
 $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota \tau \epsilon$. In an $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu \tau \iota \mu \eta \tau o ́ s$, like Socrates' trial, it was the duty of the accused, should he be found guilty, to propose a counter penalty to that demanded by the prosecutor. Socrates proposed a fine of 30 minae: see Apol. 38 в.


25. $\tau \epsilon 9 v a ́ v a l:$ see on $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu$ ával in 43 C above.
26. $\lambda o ́ y o u s ~ a i \sigma \chi u ́ v \epsilon \iota: ~ q u i t e ~ d i f f e r e n t ~ f r o m ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi i ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o ı s ~ a i \sigma \chi ̛ ́ \nu \epsilon \iota: ~$
 $\pi a \rho \delta \nu \tau a s$.
 'regard': so advertere in Latin.
52 D
28. Sıa $\phi \in \in \hat{p} \alpha \iota:$ because the Laws are personified: see Introd. p. vii.
29. ámoסเסpá⿱ккเข is the regular word to denote the running away of a slave: see on 50 A above.
 in 51 E .

 $\lambda \sigma \gamma \omega$ is bracketed by Göbel, after Hoenebeek : but the words serve to emphasize ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \varphi$-' with deeds, not with words'. It is implied that a verbal compact is less binding than one in which deeds take the place of words. The opposition of $\lambda$ óos and ${ }^{\prime} \rho \gamma o \nu$ is familiar from Thucydides. For $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{a}$ see note on 47 в.
 deliberative conjunctive: like imperatival expressions generally, the deliberative conjunctive can be used in subordinate as well as in principal clauses: as here the full construction is $\ddot{d} \lambda \lambda 0 \tau i \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu \hat{\eta}$ (=quam, not aut) $\dot{\partial} \mu o \lambda o \gamma \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$. Cf. Crat. 425 D $\epsilon i \mu \grave{\eta} \not{ }^{\alpha} \rho a \delta \dot{\eta}-\dot{\alpha} \pi a \lambda$ $\lambda a \gamma \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ i.e. 'unless perhaps we are to get off'. See Postgate in Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Vol. III. Part I. pp. 50-55.


38. $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s ~ a u ́ r o u ́ s . ~ a u ̉ z o u ́ s ~ s e e m s ~ t o ~ e m p h a s i z e ~ \grave{\eta} \mu a ̂ s: ~ t h e r e ~ i s ~ n o ~$ reflexive meaning. Cron compares Phaed. 79 A $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda 0$ $\tau \iota \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$
 tures $\sigma \alpha v \tau o \hat{v}$, comparing 54 C : at first sight there seems no occasion for the unusually emphatic mode of expression. I think the meaning is 'bargains made actually with us': bad as it always is to break a bargain, it is still worse when the party to it is one's




 ${ }^{15}-16$ and Iv. 4. 15, and often in Plato e.g. Prot. 342 A foll. and Rep. VIII. $544 \mathrm{C} \eta \ddot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \pi \grave{\partial} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \omega \hat{\nu} \epsilon \in \pi \alpha \iota \nu 0 \nu \mu \epsilon \in \nu \eta, \dot{\eta} \mathrm{~K} \rho \eta \tau \iota \kappa \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$
 in Crete and Sparta was their implicit obedience to the law: they formed the best possible illustration of his principle- $\tau \dot{\delta} \delta i \kappa \alpha \iota o \nu$ is $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \delta \mu \mu 0 \nu$ : see Introd. p. xiii. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha ́ \sigma \tau о \tau \epsilon$ sc. quotiescumque de iis loqueris (Stallbaum).
45. oưठè $\tau \hat{\omega} v \quad \beta a p \beta a p ı \kappa \omega ̂ v$. Socrates had occasional glimpses of a world beyond the pale of Hellenism, if we may trust Phaed.

 should be noted that oúס́́ goes closely with oviסॄ $\epsilon$ lav : it of course has nothing to do with the preceding oű $\tau$.
 For the statement itself see note on $\epsilon \xi \hat{\xi} \hat{\lambda} \theta \epsilon \mathrm{s}$ in 52 B above
47. ávánņor are "quicumque carent vel membro aliquo et parte corporis vel certe eius usu". Fischer. For the àa- cf. àva$\pi \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \omega s$, à $\nu a \pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda a v a l$ in their medical sense : see on Apol. 32 C .
 is placed for emphasis at the end of the sentence as $\epsilon k \delta \tau \omega s$ is so often in Demosthenes: just so in Symp. 195 в $\phi \in \dot{\jmath} \gamma \omega \nu \phi \nu \gamma \hat{\eta} \tau \delta$

50. ävev $\nu \dot{\prime} \mu \omega \nu$ goes closely with $\pi \delta \lambda \lambda t s$ : 'a city without laws'. The other meaning which suggests itself-' who could like a state without liking her laws?'-cannot be got out of the Greek : ävev
 could like a state which had no laws : you like your state, therefore you like her laws. Schanz (after Hirschig) brackets $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ ö $\tau \iota-a ̆ v \in v$ $\nu 弓 \mu \omega \nu$ : but the clause contains a valuable and strictly relevant idea,

 oúk $\grave{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon \nu$ ếs (so Schanz with the second hand in B): cf. $\pi \rho$ ár $\tau \epsilon \epsilon$ s and $\pi$ apaßalvels in 52 D .

 see also $53 \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{D}$ and 54 b .


 often='funny' 'amusing'. Symp. 189 в (loquitur Aristophanes) фоßồ $\mu a \iota \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{\rho} \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$, ov้ $\tau \iota \mu \grave{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \lambda$ oîa $\epsilon i \hbar \pi \omega$, $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau 0$
 $\kappa а \tau а \gamma \epsilon \lambda a \sigma \tau \alpha$.

## CHAPTER XV.

The Laws now reply in detail to the arguments of Crito: see Chapters III-v and compare Introduction pp. viii-ix. Escape will bring danger on his friends, misery and disgrace upon himself, and to say the least will leave his children in no way better provided.
I. $\sigma$ кó $\pi \in \iota ~ \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \delta \eta$ ' 'Just consider'. $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ is introductory: see on 44 A .
 $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a$ remains so till it is expiated. Cf. $\eta \delta i \dot{\delta} \epsilon \iota$ in 50 C , where see note. $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ in $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha ~ \pi a \rho a \beta a ́ s ~ i s ~ n o t ~ ' t h e s e ~ d u t i e s ' ~(G o ̈ b e l), ~ b u t ~$ 'these transgressions' : a cognate accusative.
 of sound, and also perhaps because $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \delta \epsilon \iota \circ$ is still felt to be an adjective.
5. kal av́тò $\phi \in \cup ́ \gamma \epsilon เ \nu=$ 'et ipsi exulare': sc. as well as you: $\kappa a i ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ i.q. ä $\tau \iota \mu 0 \iota \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ s c$. by banishment. On $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a t$ see above, note on 44 B. The Laws here reply to Crito's pleading in 44 E and 45 E .
 $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon i \nu$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta \rho a \chi \dot{v}$ all mean much the same: the first generally goes with adjectives, the second with oú $\delta \epsilon i$ or $\pi \hat{a} s$; the third is found

7. $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ : the second alternative comes infra in D $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon \in \kappa$
 on $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu \mu \epsilon \nu$ in 50 D.
9. $\Theta \dot{\eta} \beta a \xi \epsilon$. For $\Theta \dot{\eta} \beta a s \delta \epsilon$ : $\zeta$ was in fact pronounced $d z$ : see
 $\chi a \mu \hat{a} \zeta \epsilon$. Note the double accent in M $\epsilon \gamma \alpha \rho \alpha \dot{\delta} \delta$ (so Bekker, Cron, Schanz, Göbel: Wohlrab however reads Meyápaסє and Kral Me$\gamma a \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \epsilon): \delta \epsilon$ is enclitic. The constitution of Thebes and Megara was
 a touch of sarcasm) from Socrates' point of view.
 you approve of their constitution, you have violated your own, and may violate theirs next, now that you have ceased to believe that $\delta i \kappa a t o \nu$ is $\nu o ́ \mu ц \mu о \nu$. тоút $\omega \nu$ is masculine.
12. ن́maß入є́ $\psi o v \tau a i ́ ~ \sigma \epsilon=$ 'will eye you askance'. So in Symp.

$\dot{v} \pi 0-$ is 'from under the eyebrows': i.e. with a scowling expression ( $\tau \alpha v \rho \eta \delta \delta \partial \nu \dot{v} \pi о \beta \lambda \epsilon \notin \psi a s$ Phaed. 117 B ), or sometimes furtively, of the stolen glances of lovers: see L. and S. s. v.

 $\delta \kappa \alpha a \sigma a i ̂ s$ is a dativus commodi. For $\tau \eta \eta \nu \delta \delta \xi ̆ a \nu \omega ̈ \sigma \tau \epsilon \delta o \kappa \epsilon i v$ see on

 $\rho \epsilon \epsilon \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \circ \dot{\eta} \tau o u s \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi$ ous than reasonable laws. $\nu \delta \mu \omega \nu$ and $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega}-$ $\pi \omega \nu$ are opposed. The indictment of Socrates is to be found in



 àvauб $\chi \nu v \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$.
20. tivas $\lambda$ óyous; -ท̂ oűrafp. More vivid than roùs aủroùs $\lambda$ dorous oüvтєp. B has $\eta$ i: so Cron and Göbel. Schanz and Wohlrab read $\tilde{\eta}$ with some ms authority. $\hat{\eta}=$ Latin - ne? $\eta=$ Latin an?: see on Apol. 26 в.

 Goodwin MT. p. 6o. Hirschig reads d̀ $\nu a \phi a \nu \epsilon i ̄ \sigma \theta a l$.

тò $\tau<\hat{v} \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha \dot{\tau} o v s$ т $\pi \rho \hat{\gamma} \mu \mu=$ 'Socrates and everything about him'. So oi $\pi \epsilon \rho$ l "Avutov ='Anytus and those with him': Apol. 18 B. There is some contempt in the expression: cf. Hipp. Maior
 used in much the same way, only with still more contempt, e.g.
 Weariness and disgust are expressed by a similar phrase in the first

24. ol' $\epsilon \theta$ ai $\gamma \epsilon \mathrm{Xp} \eta^{\prime}$ : a way of answering one's own question: so infra 54 B .
25. $\dot{\text { a }}$ apeis: Socrates as an exile moving from city to city : cf.

 Laws are now replying to Crito's proposal in 45 C .

 saly and Macedonia were almost proverbial for licence and debauchery: see (for Thessaly) Xen. Mem. I. 2. 24 K $\operatorname{\text {Ltilas-}-\phi u\gamma \dot {\omega }\nu ~\epsilon is~}$




 ßiò $\pi a \rho a \sigma \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \nu \tau a l$ кєкоб $\mu \eta \mu$ évov．

28．á $\pi \epsilon \delta i \delta p a \sigma k \in s:$ the pictorial imperfect．$\sigma \kappa \in u \eta$ is dress or apparel of some kind，generally unusual，as for instance the dress of an actor．

29．$\eta^{\eta} \delta \iota \phi \theta \epsilon \rho \rho \alpha \nu \lambda \beta \omega \nu \geqslant \eta \nexists \lambda \lambda \alpha$ ：two kinds of $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \omega \eta$ are specified． The $\delta \iota \phi \theta \epsilon \in \rho a$ was a shepherd＇s skin coat．

30．ėv $\sigma \kappa \in v a ́ g \epsilon \sigma \theta a$ a $=$ induere．
кal тò $\sigma x \hat{\eta} \mu a \mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda \lambda a ́ \xi a s:$ кal corresponds to $\tau \epsilon$ in $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon \in$ $\tau \iota \nu a$（line 28）．The clause refers to personal disguises not connect－ ed with dress．B has катa入入á̧as corrected to $\mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda \lambda a ́ \xi a s$ in the margin．$\mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu=$＇to change＇：ката入入á $\sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu=(\mathrm{I})$＇to ex－ change＇（2）＇to reconcile＇．

33．ov゙т $\tau$ s aloxpês goes with $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ and is explained by $\nu \delta \mu$ ous 53 E тoùs $\mu \epsilon \gamma i \sigma \tau o u s$ тapaßás．
 oủ．
 ＝alioquin：cf．（with Forster）Phaed．91 C teà̀ $\mu \notin ́ \nu \tau \iota ~ \dot{v} \mu \imath \imath \nu \delta о к \hat{\omega}$


 Indicative in good Attic：when＝＇go under＇，then like ${ }^{\prime \prime} \rho \chi o \mu a \iota$ and its compounds generally，it supplies the other parts from $\epsilon i \mu l$（ $\hat{\eta} a$ ，

 $\epsilon \beta i \omega \nu, \beta \epsilon \beta i \omega \kappa \alpha, \beta \epsilon \beta i \omega \tau a i \quad \mu o \iota$ ．$\beta t \hat{\omega}$ et $\dot{\epsilon} \beta i o v \nu$ nemo dicit，sed $\zeta \hat{\omega}$ et
 semel et iterum comparet．＂Cobet，Var．Lect．p．6io．

37．Sou入túตv is not ctiose，as Stallbaum points out：for the $\delta o u ̂ \lambda o s ~ i s ~ a ~ d e g r e e ~ b e l o w ~ t h e ~ к \delta \lambda a \xi . ~$

 $\mu \eta \delta a \mu \hat{\omega} s \gamma^{\prime}, \notin \notin \phi \eta, \pi a v ́ \sigma \eta, \epsilon i \mu \eta \prime \tau \iota, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda a \dot{a}-\delta \epsilon \epsilon \xi \iota \omega \nu$ ．For $\epsilon \dot{v} \omega \chi \circ v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$ used in connection with the luxury of the north cf．Ar．Ran．83－

 thon had settled at the court of Archelaus king of Macedon. Schanz brackets and Kral rejects $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \epsilon \tau \tau a \lambda i a q$ : but there is rhetorical force in the double mention of Thessaly at the end of the two clauses: see on 53 D line 26 .
38. $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \mathfrak{l} \delta \in i ̂ \pi v o v-O \epsilon \tau \tau a \lambda i ́ a v ;$ added with bitter scorn to explain the $\theta_{\epsilon \tau \tau a \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu}$ ej$\omega \chi \chi$ ia.
54 A 40. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \eta \dot{~: ~ a l l u d i n g ~ t o ~ C r i t o ' s ~ p l e a ~ i n ~} 45$ C-D. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\eta}$ is like 'at enim' 'oh but', and introduces a counter-argument: see

 aip $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon \kappa \pi \lambda$. In accordance with this and other examples, I have printed a full stop after maióevong : the other editors take the sentence as interrogative.
42. $\tau i \delta \epsilon \in ;=q u i d$ vero? Note the emphatic place of $\epsilon$ is $\theta_{\epsilon \tau \tau \alpha}$ -入iav: Thessaly had an evil name: see on 53 D .
 $\lambda a v e l \nu$ has ironical force: the word is ordinarily used of something

 construed generally with gen. of the object from which the enjoyment is derived, except where that object is a neuter pronoun: inferior MsS here read $\tau 0$ ôtb бov.
 бонаи in the passive sense: $\theta \rho \epsilon \in \neq \mu a l$ is however better than $\tau \rho a \phi \eta^{\prime}$ бонаи.
45. छvvóvtos. छ̌veival and दuvovoía are regularly used in Plato of the relation between teacher and pupil, e.g. Gorg. 515 в
 the $\tau \delta \kappa o s{ }^{\dot{\epsilon}} \nu$ к $\alpha \lambda \hat{\varphi}$ of Symp. 206 в.

4б. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \mu \mu \in \lambda \eta$ そ́ $\sigma$ ovtal : see on 51 A line 34 above. Schanz brackets
 tence is spoken from Socrates' point of view.
5.4 B 49. $\quad$ oot of course goes with $\epsilon \pi \tau \tau \eta \delta \delta \epsilon \omega \nu$. For ol $\epsilon \sigma \theta a i \gamma \epsilon \chi \rho \eta^{\prime}$ in the next line see on 53 D .

## CHAPTER XVI．

The Laws conclude their appeal by asking Socrates to think of the future world as well as this：see Introd．pp．viii and xvi．

2．трофєv̂бレ：see 51 A．Meiser reads toîs бoîs $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta r a i ̂ s ~ к a l ~$ $\tau 0 i ̂ s ~ \sigma o i ̂ s ~ \tau \rho \circ \phi \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \iota$ ．

3．$\pi \rho$ ò $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ Sıkaiou after $\pi \lambda$ eionos，as after other comparatives

 $\tau \alpha ́ \tau \tau \eta$ ．Cobet needlessly rejects $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime}:$ see Wohlrab in Fleckeisen＇s
 סiкalov above．

4．¿va єis＂Aıסov è $\lambda \theta \omega \dot{v}$ ：the belief in a future life is expressed more dogmatically here than in the Apology ：see 40 C foll．Com－ pare Introd．p．xvi．





 $\sigma \grave{v}$ єкєє．


 Gorg． 507 B．

 $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon$ ：cf．$\tau 0 \hat{i} \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \hat{\iota}$ à $\rho \chi o v \sigma \iota \nu$ in line 5 and $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ in c line 16.
 $\pi ⿰ 丿 ⺄ ⿱ ㇒ ⿻ 二 丿 ⿴ 囗 ⿱ 一 一 ~ a r e ~ t h e ~ \delta \kappa \alpha a \sigma \tau a l$ ，falsely so called ：see Apol． 24 D－E．For the full significance of this sentence see Introduction pp ． x －xi ：and cf ．
 and áyтєкакоирүท̆ซas in II and 12 have for their object not the laws，but the $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau a l$ ．
 two participles that follow．There is an allusion to $49 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{D}$ ．

I3．тараßג̀s каl какд̀ є́ $\rho \gamma \alpha \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu о s:$ these participles explain

 of $\sigma a v \tau \delta \nu$ : oneself is the last person one should injure. Compare
 $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu a v \tau \delta \nu \gamma \epsilon \dot{a} \delta \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$. Socrates' philosophy was egoism: see
 up the argument of Chapters XI-xv.
16. oi év"Aıסov vópor: Cron refers to Soph. Antig. 450 foll. oủ


54 D 19. $\mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \eta$ : Goodwin MT. p. 181.

## CHAPTER XVII.

Socrates concludes by giving his verdict in favour of the laws and constitution of Athens. Introd. pp. xi and xvi-xvii.
I. $\hat{\omega} \phi \dot{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \tau a \hat{\imath} \rho \in \mathrm{~K} \rho i \tau \omega \nu$. There is pathos and sympathy in this unusually long mode of address: Cobet and Naber utterly spoil the passage by omitting K $\mathrm{K} i \tau \omega \nu$ : Göbel omits $\dot{\epsilon} \tau a i \rho \rho \epsilon$.
 Corybantes were priests of Cybele whose worship was attended with much clamour of dancing and music on the flute. Lambinus aptly compares Hor. Epist. I. r. 7 ' est mihi purgatam crebro qui personet aurem'. Göbel omits $\delta о к о \hat{\sigma} \iota \nu$ d́кои́єь, but the text as it stands is far more impressive. Just so the demonstrative is repeated in aüt $\eta$ $\dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \chi \grave{\eta} \tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \lambda \delta \delta \gamma \omega \nu$, and in the last line of the chapter : $\pi \rho \alpha \alpha^{\tau} \tau$ -

 might have said much the same of his $\delta a \iota \mu \dot{\nu} \nu \iota \nu$ $\sigma \eta \mu \in \hat{\imath} 0 \nu$ : compare Apol. 40 A-B. I think Plato meant to suggest that the pleading of the Laws coincided with the voice of the divine sign: see Introd. p. xvi.
 teristic: cf. Rep. vi. 506 E $\pi \lambda \epsilon \neq \nu \gamma \alpha ́ \rho ~ \mu o t ~ \phi a i \nu \epsilon \tau a l ~ \eta ̈ ~ к a \tau a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \pi a \rho o u ̂-~$
 all only my present opinion '). Compare Gorg. 527 A and Phaed.

 which the Apology concludes ( 42 A ) $\alpha \delta \eta \lambda o \nu \pi a \nu \tau i \pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega}$. The voice of the Laws seems to Socrates to be the voice of God: his divine sign would not allow him to escape. See Introd., p. xvi.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ By "the editors" I mean Cron, Schanz, Wohlrab, Göbel and Kral : see Ireface.

