The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Platonica VIII.

Herbert Richards

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 2 / Issue 01 / January 1908, pp 9 - 15

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800025210, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800025210

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1908). Platonica VIII.. The Classical Quarterly, 2, pp 9-15 doi:10.1017/S0009838800025210

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

PLATONICA VIII.

(Continued from THE CLASSICAL REVIEW, Vol. XX, p. 11.)

CLITOPHON.

406 A. ΣΩ. Κλειτοφῶντα τὸν Ἀριστωνύμου τις ἡμῖν διηγείτο ἑναγχος, ὅτι Λυσία διαλεγόμενος τὰς μὲν μετὰ Σωκράτους διατριβὰς ψέγοι, τὴν Θρασυμάχου δὲ συνουσίαν ὑπερεπαινοῖ.

ΚΛΕΙ. ὅστις, ὦ Σώκρατες, οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἀπεμνημόνευσέ σοι τοὺς ἐμοὶ περὶ σοῦ γενομένους λόγους πρὸς Λυσίαν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἔγωγε οὐκ ἐπῆνουν σε, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐπῆνουν.

On ὅστις, which cannot be right, Mr. Burnet's note is 'ὅστις ἦν Hermann: ὅστις * * * Schanz.' Of the two I prefer Hermann's conjecture, but I would suggest a smaller change instead, namely to read the exclamation ὥς τις . . οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἀπεμνημόνευσε, *how wrongly he stated!* For this ὥς with a negative cf. Menander 555 K ὦ γῆρας βαρύ, ὥς οὐδὲν ἀγαθόν, δυσχερὴ δὲ πόλλ' ἔχεις, and other comic fragments.

408 C. Should we read *προτρεπτικωτάτους* δέ?

TIMAEUS.

20 E. ἦν μὲν οὖν οἰκείος καὶ σφόδρα φίλος ἡμῖν Δρωπίδου τοῦ προπάππου.

Perhaps ἡμῶν, but the dative may be right.

23 B. τὸ κάλλιστον καὶ ἄριστον γένος ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ παρ' ὑμῖν οὐκ ἴστε γεγονός.

I have no change to propose with regard to ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, but we ought to notice the great peculiarity of its use. This ἐπί of *extension over* is elsewhere in passages akin to this attached to a word expressive or suggestive of something that extends, such as *rumour, report*, etc. Mr. Archer-Hind for instance illustrates it in verse from *Il.* x. 213, μέγα κεν—κλέος εἶη πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, and in prose from Plato's own *Critias* 112 E ἐπὶ πᾶσαν Εὐρώπην καὶ Ἀσίαν . . ἐλλόγιμοι ἦσαν. But it is one thing to say κλέος ἐπί, ἐλλόγιμος ἐπί, and quite another to say ἄριστος

ἐπί, because the latter phrase gives nothing that can be thought of as extending. I would not therefore exclude the possibility of a third epithet with a καί having been lost.

25 D. The island Atlantis was sunk in the sea by an earthquake, διὸ καὶ νῦν ἄπορον καὶ ἀδιερεύνητον γέγονε τὸ ἐκεῖ πέλαγος, πηλοῦ κάρτα βραχέος ἐμποδὼν ὄντος, ὃν ἡ νῆσος ἰζομένη παρέσχετο.

It has of course been noticed that the mud can only be called βραχύς by a strange confusion of terms. It would be the water above the mud that was really shallow. Can Plato have used such an expression? Codex A indeed has βαθέος; but this gives an unsatisfactory sense, because the depth of the mud when reached is immaterial. <ἐκ> βραχέος would yield the sense we really require, *near the surface*, like ἐξ ὀλίγου, etc., and may be worth considering. ἐκ would of course fall out most easily between πηλοῦ and κάρτα, but an Attic writer would prefer κάρτα ἐκ βραχέος to ἐκ κάρτα βραχέος, if indeed the latter was admissible.

For the insertion of a preposition cf. on 80 E below.

29 B, C. τοὺς δὲ (λόγους) τοῦ πρὸς μὲν ἐκείνο ἀπεικασθέντος, ὄντος δὲ εἰκότος, εἰκότας ἀνὰ λόγον τε ἐκείνων ὄντας.

εἰκότας and ἀνὰ λόγον ὄντας are predicates, if the words are right, to some such phrase, not quite clearly shaped in Plato's sentence, as τοὺς λόγους εἶναι δεῖ. But can ὄντας stand as part of a predicate? I should have thought not, and that ἀνὰ λόγον, the real predicate, would repudiate an ὄντας. If this is so, read γε for τε. In the next words should γάρ be added after περ, where it would easily fall out?

33 D. χειρῶν δέ, . . μάτην οὐκ ᾔετο δεῖν αὐτῷ προσάπτειν οὐδὲ ποδῶν οὐδὲ ὅλως τῆς περὶ τὴν βάσιν ὑπηρεσίας.

A difficulty has been felt about the genitive χειρῶν. Mr. Archer-Hind supposes an anacoluthon: Stephanus suggested τὴν . . ὑπηρεσίαν to govern it: Stallbaum made it depend on an understood τι. In reality it depends on δεῖν, the infinitive προσάπτειν being thrown in extra, as in C of this very page οὐδ' αὖ τινος ἐπιδεὲς ἦν ὀργάνου σχεῖν: *Rep.* 459 B δεῖ ἄκρων εἶναι τῶν ἀρχόντων: *Xen. Oecon.* 21. 11 δεῖν φημι . . φύσεως ἀγαθῆς ὑπάρξαι: *Herod.* 1. 73. 1 γῆς ἰμέρῳ προσκτῆσασθαι: *Thuc.* 5. 15 ἐμιθυμία τῶν ἀνδρῶν . . κομίσασθαι: *Eur. Med.* 1399 χρήζω στόματος παίδων . . προσπτύξασθαι.

46 E. ὅσαι δὲ <τῶν> ὑπ' ἄλλων μὲν κινουμένων, κ.τ.λ.

The partitive genitive seems to me to need the article.

48 B. προσῆκον αὐτοῖς οὐδ' ἐν συλλαβῆς εἵδεσι μόνον εἰκότως . . ἀπεικασθῆναι.

The phrase is always ἐν—εἵδει (see Ast's lexicon s.v.), and the plural seems unsuitable. Cf. the common ἐν—μέρει.

Ib. D. πειράσομαι μηδενὸς ἦττον εἰκότα, μᾶλλον δέ, καὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς περὶ ἐκάστων καὶ ξυμπάντων λέγειν.

It is difficult to make any sense of καὶ ἔμπροσθεν, though Archer-Hind defends it and Burnet does not notice the suggestions for altering it. They are indeed not very satisfactory. I do not know whether my own is any better, but I think we might perhaps read μᾶλλον δέ καὶ <τῶν> ἔμπροσθεν, *more probable even than what went before*. Cf. on 46 E above.

49 E. Nothing which *becomes* (γίγνεται) has permanence enough to be spoken of as *this* or *that*: φεύγει γὰρ οὐχ ὑπομένον τὴν τοῦ τόδε καὶ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν τῷδε καὶ πᾶσαν ὅση μόνιμα ὥς ὄντα αὐτὰ ἐνδείκνυται φάσις.

τῷδε is very unintelligible here, and Burnet cites Cook Wilson's conjecture, τὴν τοῦ ὧδε. I fear this is not good Attic, for ὧδε in Attic is *hither* not *here*. (It is in fact difficult to find it used for *here* without a verb of motion in any prae-Alexandrian Greek. Herodas furnishes an instance or two (2. 98: 3. 96) and Theocritus several.) Before seeing this conjecture in Burnet's note I had thought of τὴν τῇδε, and that might perhaps stand. Of course the thing, not the point of space, would be in question.

52 C. οὐδ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐφ' ᾧ γέγονεν αὐτῆς ἐστίν.

Archer-Hind is right, I think, in saying that the genitive αὐτῆς depends on the whole phrase αὐτό—γέγονεν, but why did he not illustrate the construction from the well-known *Rep.* 438 A foll. ὅσα γ' ἐστὶ τοιαῦτα οἷα εἶναι του? The genitive there is our genitive here.

53 E. τούτου γὰρ τυχόντες (they have not done it yet) ἔχομεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

ἔχομεν, though not necessary, is very probable.

66 B. Burnet ignores Stallbaum's proposed introduction of ἀνάγκη to give accusative and infinitive some construction. Without binding myself to ἀνάγκη—συμβαίνει for instance is just as likely—I think something is certainly needed.

69 B. ταῦτα ἀτάκτως ἔχοντα ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἐκάστῳ τε αὐτῷ πρὸς αὐτὸ καὶ πρὸς ἄλληλα συμμετρίας ἐνεποίησεν.

Stallbaum calls ταῦτα—ἔχοντα 'absolute'; Archer-Hind governs it 'by the compound phrase συμμετρίας ἐνεποίησεν, as though Plato had written ξυνηρμόσατο'; Kühner-Gerth ii. 2. p. 90 calls it an anacoluthon. I should conjecture that the participle παραλαβών is to be inserted, probably before or after ὁ θεός. So a few lines below, οἱ δὲ μιμούμενοι παραλαβόντες ἀρχὴν κ.τ.λ.: 30 A πᾶν ὅσον ἦν ὁρατὸν παραλαβών: 68 E ταῦτα πάντα . . ὁ . . δημιουργός . . παρελάμβανεν.

80 C. I am surprised at Burnet's not noticing Stephanus' change of τὸ δέ . . τό τε to τῷ δέ . . τῷ τε, which seems absolutely necessary to give

construction and is a most easy correction. Cf. for instance the readings in *Rep.* 547 D τῷ μὲν τιμᾶν.

80 E. ἡ δ' ἐρυθρὰ πλείστη περὶ αὐτὸ χροῖα διαθεῖ, τῆς τοῦ πυρὸς τομῆς τε καὶ ἐξομόξεως ἐν ὑγρῷ δεδημιουργημένη φύσις.

Construction and meaning are very difficult until we read <διὰ> τῆς. Cf. on 25 D above.

86 D. καὶ σχεδὸν δὴ πάντα, ὅποσα ἡδονῶν ἀκράτεια καὶ ὄνειδος ὥς ἐκόντων λέγεται τῶν κακῶν, οὐκ ὀρθῶς ὀνειδίζεται.

Mr. Archer-Hind comments on the odd juxta-position of ἀκράτεια and ὄνειδος, for which however he can see 'no plausible correction.' If correction is needed, as I think it is, an easy means lies close at hand. Did not Plato write κατ' ὄνειδος? The confusion of καί and κατά is familiar. I have doubted whether ἀκρατεία might not be an improvement, but probably the nominative is right.

87 D. ἀξύμμετρον γὰρ ταῖς μεγίσταις ξυμμετρίαις.

It seems to me very questionable whether we ought not to substitute accusatives for datives here. Cf. the phrase immediately following, ἡ καὶ τινα ἄλλην ὑπέρεξιν ἄμετρον, which, to tell the truth, also gives me an uneasy feeling that ἀξύμμετρον . . . ἀξυμμετρίας (or ἀξυμμετρίαις, for the dative would be better in this phrase than in the other) was Plato's real expression.

88 A. σῶμα . . μέγα καὶ ὑπέρψυχον.

ὑπέρψυχον has been noticed as a strange compound, though there are parallels. Perhaps ὑπὲρ ψυχὴν ὄν may be worth considering.

Sufficient notice has perhaps not been taken of the remarkable discrepancy between the exordium of the *Timaeus* and the *Republic* of which (or part of which) it is a summary. Socrates in the *Timaeus* gives the chief points laid down in the *Republic* faithfully enough: it is the implication involved in his references to it that presents the peculiarity. Not only is there no explicit mention of the *Republic* having been a narrated dialogue, that is, of Timaeus and the others now present having only heard from Socrates the narration of a dialogue supposed to have taken place the day before (that is two days before the *Timaeus*); but his language would certainly imply according to any ordinary method of interpretation that they had been present and taken part in the dialogue itself. This would seem to be the natural meaning of the repeated first persons plural, διειλόμεθα, εἵπομεν, ἐλέγομεν. It is not natural, though of course possible, to understand the *we* contained in these words to be *I and the people I was talking with* rather than *you and I*. Anyone who read all this without knowing the *Republic* would certainly think Timaeus, Critias, and Hermocrates were then present.

The fiction of a fifth person who was to have been present at the *Timaeus* dialogue is no doubt only introduced as a little detail to give verisimilitude and reality to the scene. Similar, I suppose,—for there does not seem to be any other reason for it—is the pretence in the *Philebus*, another late dialogue, that Philebus has handed over to Protarchus the defence of his position, so that the dialogue is named after one who takes next to no share in it. We naturally ask why Philebus has done this: that is, we fall into Plato's trap and take the thing seriously. So here we want to know who the absent man is. The disturbance of the order of speeches in the *Symposium* by Aristophanes' hiccough is another such device.

CRITIAS.

107 E. ἐκ δὴ τοῦ παραχρῆμα νῦν λεγόμενα, τὸ πρέπον ἂν μὴ δυνώμεθα πάντως ἀποδιδόναι, συγγιγνώσκειν χρεών.

The first words (ἐκ . . λεγόμενα) are curiously devoid of construction, much more so than the accusatives we occasionally find at the beginning of sentences, which the writer vaguely meant to provide with a construction as he went on, but finally left without one. In such a case we can usually see pretty clearly what he had in his mind. But here the turn of the sentence is so harsh and clumsy, that I cannot but suspect error. Did not Plato add to λεγόμενα some participle governing it and standing as a sort of subject to συγγιγνώσκειν, such as ἀκούοντας or σκοποῦντας? The omission of any τά with λεγόμενα (τὰ δὴ ἐκ—λεγόμενα) seems to make the case especially doubtful. Contrast the otherwise more or less parallel openings of sentences in 109 A and 110 B.

108 B. εἰ μέλλεις αὐτὰ δυνατὸς γενέσθαι παραλαβεῖν.

I hardly know what those who are satisfied with αὐτά suppose it to refer to. There is nothing definite in the context with which it can be associated, nor does it seem possible to make it mean vaguely *the speaking, the turn to speak* (παραδίδομεν . . τὸν ἐξῆς λόγον 106 B). Probably we should write αὐτό and refer it to θέατρον, the audience, whom Critias is about to take over from Timaeus.

109 C. ἄλλοι μὲν οὖν κατ' ἄλλους τόπους κληρουχήσαντες θεῶν ἐκεῖνα ἐκόσμου.

(1) Elsewhere κληρουχεῖν is transitive: (2) ἐκεῖνα is strange. We should get over both difficulties by reading <τὰ> κατ' ἄλλους τόπους. The dialogue contains many examples of this somewhat periphrastic use of the article, e.g. 114 B τὸ τῆς χώρας: 114 E τὰ περὶ τὰ ζῶα: 117 A τὸ τῆς ἐργασίας. Plato is indeed always fond of it.

110 A. I think τούτων πέρι needs a δέ or τε added.

111 C. χρόνος δ' οὐ πάμπολυς ὅτε δένδρων αὐτόθεν εἰς οἰκοδομήσεις τὰς μεγίστας ἐρεψίμων τμηθέντων στεγάσματ' ἐστὶν ἔτι σᾶ.

Burnet marks this as wrong and gives in a note the words which Cobet proposed to insert after *ὅτε*. It does not seem to me, especially considering the involved order of words often adopted in the *Critias* and other late dialogues, that there is any real need for suspicion. In sense *ὅτε* and *τμηθέντων* should be taken closely together, as though Plato had said *χρόνος οὐ πάμπολυς ὅτε (since) ἐτμήθη στεγασμαθ' ἃ ἔστιν ἔτι σᾶ*.

Ib. καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ὕδωρ ἐκαρποῦτ' ἐκ Διὸς (ἢ χώρα), οὐχ ὥς νῦν ἀπολλύσα ἀπὸ ψιλῆς τῆς γῆς εἰς θάλατταν, ἀλλὰ πολλὴν ἔχουσα καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν καταδεχομένη.

Stallbaum wished to read *πολύ* for *πολλήν*, and Jowett in like manner understands it of abundance of water, reading I suppose also *αὐτήν*. But this is quite a mistake. *πολλήν* is *much soil*, into which the water is received. But what exactly is ἀπὸ ψιλῆς τῆς γῆς? If *γῆ* is *soil*, it surely cannot be called *ψιλή*. The rock, the land, the place can be called *ψιλος*, but not the soil itself. It would be an odd epithet for *γῆ* in almost any case; but, if *γῆ* is removable soil, as *πολλήν* seems to show, it becomes almost impossible. Perhaps then we may consider whether *ψιλῆς* does not agree with *ἐαυτῆς* or *χώρας* implied in the subject of the sentence, so that *τῆς γῆς* would depend on *ψιλῆς* and not have *ψιλῆς* agreeing with it. This is the construction a little further on, 112 A *γῆς αὐτὴν (i.e. τὴν ἀκρόπολιν) ψιλὴν περιτῆξασα πεποίηκε*.

112 A. σεισμῶν ἅμα καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος φθορᾶς τρίτου πρότερον ὕδατος ἐξαισίου γενομένου.

Scholars have to some extent boggled over *τρίτου*, but I do not find that any one has suggested, as I venture to do, that we should read *τρίς*.

Just below should *ἀποβεβηκυῖα* be *καταβεβηκυῖα*? Cf. 110 E, etc. No such use of *ἀποβαίνειν* is cited,

Ib. D. τὸ δυνατόν πολεμεῖν ἤδη καὶ τὸ ἔτι (i.e. δυνατόν πολεμεῖν) certainly seems right: *those who were old enough and those not too old*.

113 A. Should τὸ δ' ἔτι be τόδε δ' ἔτι?

116 B. τοῦ δ' ἐντός should be τὸν δ' ἐντός, like the τὸν δέ following.

117 A. ταῖς δὲ δὴ κρήναις, τῇ τοῦ ψυχροῦ καὶ τῇ τοῦ θερμοῦ νάματος, πλήθος μὲν ἄφθονον ἐχούσαις, ἡδονῇ δὲ καὶ ἀρετῇ τῶν ὑδάτων πρὸς ἑκατέρου τὴν χρῆσιν θαυμαστοῦ πεφυκότος, ἐχρῶντο κ.τ.λ.

Burnet indicates no doubt about this passage, but it is difficult to see what he makes the subject of *πεφυκότος*. If we put *ἑκατέρου* before or after *πρὸς τὴν χρῆσιν*, we shall provide it with a proper subject. *ἑκατέρου* might either refer to *νάματος* or go with *ὑδάτων*, and it might either govern *ὑδάτων* or be added in an appositional way and determine the number of the participle (like *Rep.* 346 D *αἱ ἄλλαι πᾶσαι τὸ αὐτῆς ἐκάστη ἔργον ἐργάζεται*, and many other passages in verse and prose).

I cannot make out whether Stallbaum wishes to take *ἐκατέρου* in this way. His translation is against it.

118 B. *ἔλλην δὲ καὶ πλήθει καὶ γένεσι ποικίλῃν σύμπασιν τε τοῖς ἔργοις καὶ πρὸς ἕκαστα ἀφθονον.*

As the words stand, *πλήθει* must be constructed with *ποικίλῃν*, but what can *πλήθει ποικίλη* mean? Another slight transposition will help us. Read *ἔλλην δὲ καὶ γένεσι ποικίλῃν καὶ πλήθει . . ἀφθονον.*

1b. E. διάπλους ἐκ τῶν διωρύχων εἰς ἀλλήλας τε πλαγίας καὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τεμόντες. The editors ceremoniously record a *v.l. πλατείας*, but what sense *πλαγίας* makes they fail to tell us. Read *πλαγίους*.

120 C. *νόμοι δὲ πολλοὶ μὲν ἄλλοι . . ἦσαν ἴδιοι, τὰ δὲ μέγιστα μήτε ποτὲ ὄπλα ἐπ' ἀλλήλους οὔσιν βοηθήσειν τε πάντας . . κοινῇ δέ, . . βουλευόμενοι τὰ δόξαντα περὶ πολέμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πράξεων.*

πράξειν is not, I think, to be added after *πράξεων*, as has been suggested, but to be substituted for it. *πράξεων* is quite superfluous. *βουλευόμενοι* should of course be *βουλευομένους*, unless Plato was confusing in his mind *νόμοι ἦσαν* and *ὥμοσαν*, as the futures *οὔσιν* and *βοηθήσειν*, which are quite irregular after *νόμοι*, suggest. But the next sentence, *θανάτου δὲ κ.τ.λ.*, goes on properly from *νόμοι* with *μηδενὸς εἶναι κύριον*.

HERBERT RICHARDS.