The Classical Review

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

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Platonica

R. G. Bury

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 01 / February 1906, pp 12 - 14

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993491, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993491

How to cite this article:

R. G. Bury (1906). Platonica. The Classical Review, 20, pp 12-14 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993491

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

PLATONICA.

Euthyd. 271 D τούτω δὲ πρῶτον μὲν τῷ σώματι δεινотάτω ἔσθ' ὅν καὶ μάχη ἢ πάντων ἔστι κρατεῖν—ἐν ὅλοις γὰρ αὐτῷ τε σοφῶ πάνυ μάχεσθαι κτλ.

The clause καὶ μάχη . . . κρατεῖν is awkward, and Burnet, after Badham, rejects it; Gifford, however, the latest English editor, attempts to defend it as it stands, but hardly with success. The Bodleian codex omits ἔστι: whence Schanz excises both ἢ and ἔστι, and Madvig conj. μάχη ἢ πάντων κρατεῖ. That ἐν ὅλοις μάχεσθαι was distinguished from παγκρατιάειν is shown by *Gorg.* 456 D: while *Laws* 834 A shows that one could speak of ἡ τοῦ παγκρατίου μάχη: similarly *Rep.* 333 E mentions μάχη πυκτική. A man might be a good pancratiast (τῷ σώματι δεινός) without being an expert in the other form of μάχη, viz. ὀπλιτική (cf. *Rep.* 374 D). Hence, as I suppose, the clause ἐν ὅλοις κτλ. could hardly follow immediately on τῷ σώματι δειν., so that I should prefer to emend, rather than to expunge, the clause καὶ μάχη . . . κρατεῖν. With Schanz, I would delete ἢ as due to dittography: in place of πανΤΟΝ I would write πανΤΟΙΑΙ: and ἔστι I would either omit with the Bodleian, or else write ἐπικρατεῖν. Then μάχη παντοία will serve to expand τῷ σώματι (which refers especially to πάλη and πυγμή, *Laws* 795 B), and so prepare the way for the mention of ἐν ὅλοις μάχεσθαι. In *Phil.* 15 D we find παντοίας . . . μάχης.

Euthyd. 273 A καὶ ὀλίγῳ ὕστερον εἰσέρχεσθον τούτῳ . . . καὶ ἄλλοι μαθηταὶ ἅμα αὐτοῖς πολλοὶ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν.

αὐ appears in Bodl. but is omitted in T, Vind. Schanz writes αὐτοῖν. αὐ can hardly be right. It might possibly be taken for a fragment of <πά>ν, but more probably for a fragment of <μά>λ' εἶ (cp. *Theaet.* 156 A). It is, indeed, not unlikely that we should omit ἅμα and read simply μαθηταὶ μάλ' αὐ πολλοί—ascribing to μάλα εἶ a derisive force, 'quite a host of them!' The other order, εἶ μάλ', occurs in *Tim.* 22 B.

Euthyd. 290 B οὐδεμία, ἔφη, τῆς θηρευτικῆς αὐτῆς ἐπὶ πλέον ἔστιν ἢ ὅσον θηρεῦσαι καὶ χειρώσασθαι.

Schanz records a long list of emendations, mostly aiming to supply a substantive to οὐδεμία and to remove αὐτῆς. To his list may

be added Dümmler's not over-happy ἀρετή. I think, however, that αὐτῆς may stand, although not exactly in the sense advocated by Gifford ('αὐτῆς marks the distinction between actual "hunting" and the metaphorical hunting of the geometers' etc.), but rather as distinguishing 'hunting' proper from ἡ στρατηγική, which has just been described as θηρευτική τις. If so, it only remains to supply a substantive to οὐδεμία. Badham proposed to insert χρεία or ὠφέλεια after αὐτῆς. Heindf.'s δύναμις is also a suitable word; and ἐργασία (after θηρευτικῆς) might be thought of. But perhaps the likeliest insertion would be ἐπὶ ΠΛΑΘΟΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ <ΟΝΗCIC> Η ΟCΟΝ.

Euthyd. 293 D τὸ γὰρ λεγόμενον, καλὰ δὲ πάντα λέγεις.

So Bodl., T. But the Scholiast has καλὰ δὲ πάντ' ἄγεις, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλλειν ἐπὶ τῶν αἰσία ἀναγγελλόντων. Abresch conj. παταγείς, which Stallb., Badh., and Schanz adopt. Burnet and Gifford, however, retain πάντα λέγεις. I suspect that Plato wrote καλὰ δὲ πάντα ἃ ἄγεις (or ἃ γεις), meaning by ἃ ἄγεις, 'your importations' or 'your foreign wares,' ironically. Cp. *Soph.* 224 A τὸν ἄγοντα καὶ πωλοῦντα: and the emphasis on the foreign origin of the two Sophists in 297 c below, σοφιστῇ ἐκ θαλάττης . . . καταπεπλευκότη. Had it not been for the scholium, one might have conjectured an ironical λαλαγείς, 'you chirrup prettily!' (Another explanation of ἄγεις might be derived from Antiphon fr. 99 (Blass) 'A. δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀληθείας φησί τοὺς νόμους μεγάλους ἄγοι, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡγοῖτο.)

Meno 76 A ἀνδρὶ πρὸς βύτη πράγματα προστάττεις ἀποκρίνεσθαι, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐκ ἐθέλεις κτλ.

Mr. E. S. Thompson rightly defends προστάττεις against the substitute (παρέχεις) proposed by Cobet and Schanz. It is sufficiently confirmed by such a parallel as *Parm.* 136 D πολλὰ ἔργον . . . προστάττεις ὡς τηλικῶδε. But I am still offended by the otiose and clumsy infinitive ἀποκρίνεσθαι. If ever there was a marginal gloss which crept into the text surely this is one. It is a case precisely similar to that in *Phaedo* 115 A where the gloss νεκρὸν λούειν has crept in beside πράγματα παρέχειν, as Vermehren and Hartman have rightly pointed out. Another suspicious, though less certain, instance occurs in *Euthyd.* 288 E (οὐδὲν πλέον, οὐδ' εἰ

ἀνευ πραγμάτων † καὶ τοῦ ὀρύττειν τὴν γῆν † τὸ πᾶν ἡμῖν χρυσίον γένοιτο), as observed by Hartman.

Meno 78 D πότερον προστιθεῖς τι τούτῳ τῷ πόρῳ, ὃ Μένων, τὸ δικαίως καὶ δόσιως, κτλ.

Mr. E. S. Thompson and Burnet (after F) eject *τι*, and Schanz alters it to *πουν*. Why not read *ἔτι*, either in the sense of *praeterea*, *προσέτι*, or as marking a reference back to 73 D, οὐ προσθήσομεν αὐτόσε τὸ δικαίως?

Meno 80 E ὁρᾷς τοῦτον ὡς ἐριστικὸν λόγον κατὰγεις, ὡς οὐκ ἄρα ἔστι κτλ.

Mr. Thompson marks *κατὰγεις* as corrupt, and mentions with approval Buttmann's *παράγεις*. Certainly *κατὰγεις* cannot well mean 'spin'; but why should it not mean 'bring to land' or 'import'? For the use of *λόγος* in a nautical metaphor, cp. *Phileb.* 13 D, 14 A: and for the allusion to 'eristic' as an importation (? from Megara), see my note (above) on *Euthyd.* 293 D.

Meno 91 A B ταύτην οὖν τὴν ἀρετὴν σκοπεῖ παρὰ τίνας ἂν πέμποντες αὐτὸν ὁρθῶς πέμπομεν.

Mr. Thompson, after Schanz and Cobet, assumes a lacuna before *σκοπεῖ*,—to be filled by a word such as *κτησόμενον* or *μαθησόμενον*. I suggest that we insert here the words *ζητοῦντα μανθάνειν* which Mr. Thompson, following Naber and Schanz, rightly ejects from 90 E.

Meno 94 B ἵνα δὲ μὴ ὀλίγους οἷη καὶ τοὺς φανουλότατους Ἀθηναίων ἀδυνάτους γεγονέναι τοῦτο τὸ πρᾶγμα, κτλ.

These words, as Mr. Thompson observes, are 'not free from difficulty.' The most probable solution, in my view, is the excision of *καὶ . . . Ἀθηναίων*, which may have been an adscript characterizing the δύο υἱεῖς of Thucydides mentioned just below—or else the sons of Pericles mentioned just above. Of the various emendations proposed Vermehren's ἤ for *καί* is the most simple: it would be improved, however, by the insertion of a second ἤ before *ὀλίγους*.

Phaedo 73 A ἐνὶ μὲν λόγῳ . . . καλλίστῳ, ὅτι ἐρωτώμενοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι, εἰάν τις καλῶς ἐρωτᾷ, αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν πάντα ἢ ἔχει . . . ἔπειτα εἰάν τις ἐπὶ τὰ διαγράμματα ἄγῃ . . . ἐνταῦθα σαφέστατα κατηγορεῖ ὅτι τοῦτο οὕτως ἔχει.

Mr. Williamson adopts Heindorf's *ἐπεὶ τοι*, with the note: 'The MSS. have *ἔπειτα*, which is retained by some editors, and made to introduce a specially striking instance of the general truth expressed in the earlier clause . . . but it is very doubtful whether

ἔπειτα will bear this meaning.' He does not mention Vermehren's conjecture *αὐτίκα*, which would more easily carry this meaning. I would suggest, however, that the *ἔπειτα* clause is not intended to be subordinate in sense, but rather to introduce a second, more convincing (*σαφέστατα*), form of the *λόγος*: the process *ἐπὶ τὰ διαγρ. ἄγειν* being opposed to, rather than included in, the process *καλῶς ἐρωτᾶν*. If so, *ἔπειτα* will bear its normal meaning (= *ἔπειτα δέ . . .*), and the words which need correction will be ἐνὶ μὲν λόγῳ. This is the more likely as the combination ἐνὶ λόγῳ is elsewhere used regularly in the sense of 'to sum up,' 'in a word' (without an adjective). I would restore, accordingly, *πρῶτον μὲν λόγῳ*.

Phaedo 84 A ἀλλ' οὕτω λογίσαιτ' ἂν ψυχὴ ἀνδρὸς φιλοσόφου, καὶ οὐκ ἂν οἰηθείη τὴν μὲν φιλοσοφίαν χρῆναι ἑαυτὴν λύειν, λυούσης δὲ ἐκείνης αὐτὴν παραδίδόναι ταῖς ἡδοναῖς καὶ λύπαις ἑαυτὴν πάλιν αὐτὴν ἐγκαταδεῖν καὶ ἀνήνυτον ἔργον πράττειν, Πηνελόπης τινὰ ἐναντίως ἰστὸν μεταχειριζομένης.

Here two questions arise.

In the first place, is not the phrase *καὶ ἀνήνυτον ἔργον πράττειν* otiose and suspiciously like a gloss explanatory of Penelope's method of weaving? I only wonder that Hartman did not scent it. Secondly, is *μεταχειριζομένης* in the right case? Mr. Williamson holds it to be accommodated to Πηνελόπης, and prefers the accusative (in agreement with *αὐτήν*, sc. *τὴν ψυχὴν*): Vermehren would write *μεταχειριζομένης* (in agreement with *ταῖς ἡδοναῖς καὶ λύπαις*). But the subject of the whole sentence is *ψυχὴ* in the nominative, and surely it is the soul as subject, and not as object to itself, that would represent a reversed Penelope. Moreover, the participles in the sentence following (*παρασκευάζουσα, ἐπομένη, etc.*) are all in the nominative. Hence I should prefer to write *μεταχειριζομένη* regarding both the oblique forms given in the codd. as due to accommodation.

[Since writing this note, I find that Burnet, after Peipers, prints *-ομένη*: but in view of the treatment of the passage by our latest English editor, it may be worth while to reiterate.]

Rep. 376 D ἵνα μὴ ἐῷμεν ἱκανὸν λόγον ἢ συγχρὸν διεξίωμεν; ἵνα . . . διεξίωμεν in marg. A: om. A ἱκανὸν λόγον ἢ συγχρὸν ADM: συγχρὸν λόγον ἢ ἱκανὸν F' (Burnet). Teuffel would adopt the latter reading, with the change of *μὴ* to *ἤ*: Herwerden proposes ἵνα μὴ ἢ ἐῷμεν συγχρὸν λόγον ἢ οὐχ ἱκανὸν διεξ. :

Jackson *ἵνα μὴ ἔωμεν ἱκανὸν λόγον ἢ οὐχ ἱκανὸν διεξ.* This last is attractive; but I am loth to oust *συχρόν*, in view of *οὐκ ἄρα ἀφετόν, οὐδ' εἰ μακροτέρα τυγχάνει οὔσα*, and of the fact that Plato is fond of the combination *συχρὸς λόγος* (*Theaet.* 185 E, *Gorg.* 465 E, etc.). I venture, therefore, to propose yet another alternative, *viz.* *ἵνα μὴ ἔωμεν οὐχ ἱκανὸν λόγον ἢ συχρὸν διεξ.*, 'that we may not leave standing an incomplete argument, nor yet pursue a lengthy one.'

Rep. 387 C *ἄλλα ὅσα . . . φρίττειν δὴ ποιεῖ ὡς οἴεται τοὺς ἀκούοντας.*

Adam follows Hertz in ejecting *ὡς οἴεται* as a gloss. Campbell conjectures *ὡς ἐτεά*, a word not elsewhere found in Plato, but possible owing to the Homeric echoes in the passage. Perhaps we should read *ὡς οἰστέα*, and compare Soph. *O.C.* 1360. But even so, the words are probably interpolated.

Rep. 400 E *εὐλογία ἄρα . . . καὶ εὐρυθμία εὐηθεία ἀκολουθεῖ, οὐχ ἢν ἄνοιαν οὔσαν ὑποκορίζομενοι καλοῦμεν ὡς εὐήθειαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ὡς ἀληθῶς εὖ τε καὶ καλῶς τὸ ἦθος κατεσκευασμένην διάνοιαν.*

The words *ὡς εὐήθειαν* are difficult. Burnet follows Herwerden in obelizing them. Baiter ejects *ὡς* only, and Cobet would emend it to *νῦν*. Adam, however, attempts to defend the text on the ground that *ὡς* 'goes with *οὔσαν* understood,' not with *εὐήθειαν* directly, the sense being 'which we euphemistically designate as if it were *εὐήθεια* (. . . in the good sense of the word)': but this construction does not strike me as at all probable. It seems clear that if *εὐήθειαν* is to be retained it must be con-

strued in the *bad* sense, in contrast to the clause following. On the other hand, it is an objection to the removal of *ὡς εὐήθ.* that it leaves *καλοῦμεν* rather bare and spoils the symmetry of the sentence. Hence, I am led to the conclusion that *εὐήθειαν* should be retained and *ὡς* emended, so as to leave *καλοῦμεν* with its normal double accusative; and I propose to read *καλοῦμεν <εὐμεν> ὡς εὐήθειαν*, 'we benevolently term "good-nature."'

Rep. 560 D *μετριότητα δὲ καὶ κοσμίαν δαπάνην ὡς ἀγροικίαν καὶ ἀνελευθερίαν οὔσαν πείθοντες ὑπερορίζουσι κτλ.*

Our latest editors, Burnet and Adam, appear to accept this traditional text without demur. To me *πείθοντες* is a stone of stumbling. Inasmuch as it has been stated in the context immediately preceding that οἱ ἀλάζονες λόγοι are already masters of the youth's soul (*κατέλαβον τὴν τοῦ νέου τῆς ψυχῆς ἀκρόπολιν* 560 B; *κάτεσχον τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον* 560 C; *κρατοῦσι μαχόμενοι* 560 D), it should be obvious that *πείθοντες* is not the appropriate term; for the method pursued by these λόγοι is that of tyrants,—violence rather than persuasion. Moreover, were *πείθοντες* right, we should expect its object (presumably αὐτόν or τὸν νέον) to be expressed. Accordingly, I suppose *πείθοντες* to be corrupt and would substitute for it *τιθέντες*, which will correspond to the foregoing participles, *ονομάζοντες* and *καλοῖντες*. Dr. Adam's *Index* will supply Platonic parallels for all the letter-changes involved; and for the construction, *τιθέναι ὡς c. partic.*, cp. *Laws* 860 C, *Phaedo* 100 A, etc.

R. G. BURY.

AN EMENDATION OF ISOCRATES, *PANEGYRIC* 140.

ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐκ ἐκ τούτων δικάϊον ἐστι σκοπεῖν τὴν βασιλείως δύναμιν, ἐξ ὧν μεθ' ἐκατέρων γέγονεν, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὧν αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πεπολέμηκεν.

The construction of the second *ἐξ ὧν* is plain enough, as it stands for *ἐκ τούτων α*, where *α* is cognate accusative to *πεπολέμηκεν*. But what is the first *ἐξ ὧν*? If we take it to be for *ἐκ τούτων α* with *α* cognate accusative to *γέγονεν* we get indeed an Isocratean antithesis, but we get also what no one ever heard of, for *α γέγονεν* implies that one can say *ταῦτα βασιλεὺς γέγονεν* to mean 'the king has done these things.' If to this it

be said that *γέγονεν* does not mean *has done* but goes with *μεθ' ἐκατέρων*, true enough, but then what is *α*? You can say *μεθ' ἐκατέρων γέγονεν*, 'he has joined one of the two sides,' you cannot say *ταῦτα μεθ' ἐκατέρων γέγονεν*, 'he has joined them in this.' But again if we take *α* to be nominative, in the first place we get no sense, for it is no sense to talk of 'exploits which have happened in company with one of the two sides,' when we want 'exploits performed by the king in company with them,' and in the second place it is very doubtful grammar, because the nominative of the relative, despite a very