

NOTE ON PLATO *REPUBLIC* 368A

The playful address ὦ παῖδες ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀνδρός has been the subject of many discussions which are summed up in Adam's article in *Classical Review*, X, 237 and in his note *ad loc.* Following Stallbaum and others he takes "that man" to be Thrasymachus, whose doctrine Glaucon and Adeimantus are restating. So in *Philebus* 36D Protarchus is facetiously saluted ὦ παῖ 'κείνου τὰνδρός because he has inherited or taken over the argument of Philebus, or as Bury suggests because he was a disciple of Gorgias. But whatever the jocose application in the *Philebus*, Badham is right in saying that "the word ἐκείνος is often substituted for the proper name in speaking of an absent, or deceased person with respect." The entire context in the *Republic* shows that this honorific suggestion predominates here. Adam's fancy that Ἀρίστωνος in the verses is a pun on ἄριστος, that is, "his excellency" Thrasymachus, is wholly out of keeping with the tone and feeling of the passage that celebrates the prowess of Plato's family in war.

A parallel, not, to my knowledge, hitherto cited in this connection, may explain Plato's predilection for the phrase. In Iamblichus *Vit. Pythag.* 88 we read εἶναι δὲ πάντα ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀνδρός· προσαγορεύουσι γὰρ οὕτω τὸν Πυθαγόραν καὶ οὐ καλοῦσιν ὀνόματι, and again in 255 ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῷ μηδένα τῶν Πυθαγορείων ὀνομάζειν Πυθαγόραν, ἀλλὰ ζῶντα μὲν, ὅποτε βούλονται δηλώσαι, καλεῖν αὐτὸν θεῖον, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐτελεύτησεν, ἐκείνον τὸν ἄνδρα, καθάπερ Ὅμηρος ἀποφαίνει τὸν Εὐμαιον ὑπὲρ Ὀδυσσεώς μεμνημένον,

τὸν μὲν ἐγών, ὦ ἕξινε, καὶ οὐ παρεόντ' ὀνομάζειν || αἰδέομαι· πέρι γάρ μ' ἐφίλει καὶ ἐκήδετο λίην·

If this represents a genuine Pythagorean tradition Plato's playful adoption of the expression is explained. In ἐκείνον τὸν Θεαλῆν (Aristophanes *Clouds* 186) the more colloquial term differs by the retention of the proper name. How natural the phrasing is in Greek appears from the tone of Pindar's κείνος ἀνὴρ O. 6. 7, where the application is of course different but the honorific substitution for the proper name is analogous. λοιπὸν περὶ τοῦ Ἀγχιόου φησὶν the painfully explicit scholiast comments.

PAUL SHOREY

GREEK PARALLELS FOR *OPUS EST*

In his discussion of *opus est* and *usus est* with the ablative Bennett in his *Syntax of Early Latin*, Vol. II, "The Cases," pp. 356 ff., properly rejects the theory of Reifferscheid¹ that in this expression *usus* is a genitive. In his treatment of *opus est*, however, Bennett accepts the fantastic hypothesis of Reifferscheid that *opus* is a genitive meaning "of service." As the strongest

¹ *Index Lectionum*, Breslau, Wintersemester, 1877.

evidence in favor of such a view he cites Cato (*Frg.* p. 79, 7 [Jord.]): "Emas non quod opus est, sed quod necesse est; quod non opus est, asse carum est (cf. Cic. *de Off.* iii. 32, 115, and Livy, xliii. 19. 4). If the theory of the genitive origin of *opus est* be true, is it not strange that in the foregoing quoted sentence Cato balances *opus est*, not by *necessus est* or *necessis est*, forms that are sometimes defended as containing a word of genitive origin, but by *necesse est*, for which a genitive origin is never claimed?

The origin of the construction *usus est* with the ablative offers no real difficulties. The use of the ablative with *usus est* may owe its origin to the use of the ablative with *utor*. The development of a special meaning for *usus est* may have caused the Roman mind at an early date to analyze the ablative with *usus est* (ablatival) as being of a different nature from that used with *utor*, which was clearly instrumental. For instance, in Greek we have *χράσθαι* governing the instrumental dative; but in the expressions *οὐ πόνων κεχρήμεθα* (Eur. *Med.* 334) and *ἰν' οὐ χρεὼ πείσματος ἔστιν* (Hom. *Od.* ix. 136, cf. Plato *Legg.* 834b) we find a genitive that has an ablative flavor. This distinction should be borne in mind as we pass to the consideration of *opus est*.

That *usus est* may have exerted considerable influence in helping the development of *opus est* is not unlikely, but it can be shown from certain Greek parallels that such a development in the meaning of *opus est* was easily possible unassisted, by itself. In opposing the position of Schoell,¹ who holds that the development of the ablative with *opus est* was due to analogy with *usus est*, Bennett says: "The weak point in Schoell's argument is his failure to explain how *opus est* (*opus* meaning 'work') could have acquired a meaning sufficiently similar to that of *usus est* to give opportunity for any such analogical process. Both Hoffmann and Schoell feel compelled to apologize for their difficulty in finding any adequate rendering for *opus est aliqua re* which shall explain how its force developed." True, Schoell did not cite any such parallel; for he (like Bennett himself, I fear) overlooked the significance of the Greek parallels cited by Hoffmann, *Studien auf dem Gebiet der lat. Syntax* (1884), where (p. 126 n. 3) he cites the Greek parallels Herod. i. 79, *εὑρίσκει πρῆγμᾱ οἱ εἶναι ἐλαύνειν ὡς δύναιτο τάχιστα ἐπὶ τὰς Σάρδεις* (cf. *ibid.* i. 207; iv. 11; vii. 12); also Herod. i. 17, *ὡς τε ἐπέδρης μὴ εἶναι ἔργον τῇ στρατιῇ*. Hoffmann may not have chosen the most felicitous examples for proving the case, but his examples are sufficient to show that one's work (*opus*, *ἔργον*, *πρᾶγμα*) may be regarded as one's duty, obligation, need, "mussarbeit."² This *opus*, *ἔργον*, etc., may be defined by an infinitive clause, as in Herod. i. 79, cited above; or, a genitive (in Latin the ablative, though probably under Greek influence the genitive occurs in Livy, Propertius, Quintilian, and Apuleius) may be used to specify the instrument or the

¹ ALL., II, 207 ff.

² See Walde² and Meringer in *IF.*, XVII, 127; XVIII, 208 f.

quality needed wherewith to carry out the work. The transition between the two meanings may well be seen in the two following examples:

τί δῆτα τόξων ἔργον, εἰ δίκην ἔχεις;

[Eur. *Alc.* 39.]

“What . . . then, is the work of arrows. . . . What need is there, then, of arrows. . . .” In Plato *Resp.* 537d: καὶ ἐνταῦθα δὴ πολλῆς φυλακῆς ἔργον, ὃ ἐταῖρε, “And therein verily there is need of great precaution, my friend.” In the latter passage the translation “work” would no longer do justice to the meaning. Other instances of the genitive with ἔργον are Eur. *Hipp.* 911; *Androm.* 551; Soph. *El.* 1373; Her. i. 17 (see above); Arist. *Pax*, 1310; *Plut.* 1158; Plutarch, *Popl.* 13; (with *πρᾶγμα*) Plutarch, *Pomp.* 65.

ANDREW R. ANDERSON

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH