Some Passages In Plato

R. Renehan

I

Meno 98A

toûto ὀ´εστίν, ὁ Μένων ἔταϊρε, ἀνάµνησις, ὡς ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν ἥμιν ὁμολογηται.

ὁ F: om. BTW

"ὁ Μένων ἔταϊρε. Ὡ is not normally omitted (as it is here by BTW) unless the tone is somewhat peremptory (Kühner-Gerth, I, 48) . . . . In our passage Thompson reads ὁ but follows Naber in excising Μένων as 'a gloss upon ἔταϊρε which has extruded ὁ'. Possibly the omission of ὁ can also make for impressiveness: cf. Crito 52a, where B omits it: if so, this might justify its omission here. For other possible instances of its omission, cf. Hipp. Ma. 289b, Soph. 220d, Lach. 198a." R. S. Bluck ad loc. Bluck (as also Burnet and the Budé editors) prints ὁ Μένων ἔταϊρε on the authority of F,1 but it is clear from his note that he had doubts. Actually, Bluck's approach to the problem misses the main point, since every parallel cited in his note is an example of ὁ expressed or omitted with an otherwise unmodified proper name.2 What is wanted is some account of the ways in which Plato employs the vocative ἔταϊρε, and that I propose to give. First, by far the commonest use is the simple ὁ ἔταϊρε, with no proper name expressed; this occurs over seventy times in Plato.3 The evidence thus is overwhelming that Plato's normal, and frequent, practice was to write ὁ ἔταϊρε, not ἔταϊρε. The next commonest locution is ὁ φίλε ἔταϊρε, again with no proper name expressed. Brandwood lists nine examples;4 φίλε ἔταϊρε is not found in Plato. In addition, there are three other Platonic occurrences of the word (not counting


2 E.g. Soph. 220d ὁ Θείτηε Ψ Stob.: Θείτηε BT.

3 The passages can be found in Leonard Brandwood, A Word Index to Plato (Leeds 1976) s.v. ἔταϊρε.
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*Meno* 98A), all of them unique types for Plato: ὃ ἑταῖρε Ἀνωτε (*Meno* 94ε2); ὃ φίλε ἑταῖρε Κρίτων (*Crito* 54D); ὃ ἑταῖρε Σιμμία τε καὶ Κέβης (*Phaedo* 82C). I return now to *Meno* 98A. Both ὃ Μένων ἑταῖρε and Μένων ἑταῖρε are singular expressions;⁵ that is no argument against them. I have just given several unique forms of vocative address in Plato; here are some others: ὃ τὰν (*Ap.* 25C); ὃ μέλε (*Thet.* 178Ε); ὃ φιλότης (*Phdr.* 228D); ὃ φιλούμενε (*Symp.* 201C); ὃ φέριστε (*Phdr.* 238D); ὃ Πρῶταρχε φίλε (*Phlb.* 53D); ὃ παῖ φίλε (*Soph.* 230C).⁶

Clearly, the fact that a vocative phrase happens to occur once only in Plato is, in itself, insufficient reason for questioning the phrase. In the present case, the position of ἑταῖρε after the proper name (with or without ὃ) is most unusual, a phenomenon which Bluck, to judge from his silence, does not seem to have adequately appreciated. But the position of φίλε in ὃ Πρῶταρχε φίλε and ὃ παῖ φίλε (*supra*) parallels the position of ἑταῖρε here and may be taken as a reasonable guarantee of its soundness.⁷ This brings us back to the elusive ὃ. Is it possible to determine with any assurance whether Plato wrote ὃ in *Meno* 98A? I think so. Read ὃ Μένων ἑταῖρε. In all of Plato there is no example of ἑταῖρε, alone or in combination, used without ὃ. Μένων ἑταῖρε is a singularity which I am not prepared to admit,⁸ and *Philebus* 53δ ὃ Πρῶταρχε φίλε, an exact parallel to ὃ Μένων ἑταῖρε, ought to tip the scale.

The vocative ὤγαθε (sometimes written ὃ ὤγαθε with scriptio plena in the MSS.) occasionally presents comparable difficulties. Bury prints *Symposium* 189A as follows: ... καὶ τὸν Ἐφυξίμαχον, Ὄγαθε, φάναι, Ἀριστόφανες, ὃ παῖ τοι ποιεῖς. ... Here is Bury's comment ad loc.: "[Ἀριστόφανες]. I follow Sauppe and Hug in regarding the proper name as a gloss on ὤγαθε: as a rule, ὤγαθε stands alone." As in *Meno* 98A, so here the spectre of proper name as

⁵ The suggestion that Μένων be deleted as "a gloss upon ἑταῖρε" is fanciful and should be dismissed. Even were one to consider deletion, the obvious procedure would be to assume that, in ὃ Μένων ἑταῖρε, the vocatives Μένων and ἑταῖρε are variant readings which have been conflated in the text. (Why would ἑταῖρε require a 'gloss' here? The passage occurs in the middle of a long conversation between Meno and Socrates.) In that case the choice would be between ὃ Μένων and ὃ ἑταῖρε; there is no means of deciding. Should any find this solution attractive, let them toss a coin and be done with it.

⁶ I take these examples from my *Studies in Greek Texts* (*Hypomnemata* 43 [1976]) 125 q.v.

⁷ In *Studies* (*supra* n.6) I suggested that this postposition of φίλε was perhaps "a mannerism of Plato's late style." ἑταῖρε in *Meno* 98A shows that the qualification 'late' should be removed.

⁸ In rejecting the 'singular' Μένων ἑταῖρε after my remarks in defence of singular expressions, I am guilty of no inconsistency: both Μένων ἑταῖρε and ὃ Μένων ἑταῖρε are singular phrases. In such a situation one should choose the expression which agrees more closely with the author's style as otherwise known.
‘gloss’ hovers over us. And the reason given in justification? “As a rule, ὢγαθὲ stands alone.” The facts are—my debt to Brandwood’s Word Index to Plato will be obvious—that (1) ὢγαθὲ (ὁ ἀγαθὲ) stands alone about forty times in Plato, and (2) ὢγαθὲ (ὁ ἀγαθὲ) followed by a proper name occurs a full seven times (not counting this passage).9 So much for the rule. There are no grounds for tampering with Ἀριστόφανες.

Consider next Protagoras 311A:

... καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπιθετόμενον: “Μηπω, ἀγαθὲ, ἐκεῖσθε ίωμεν, πρὸ γὰρ ἔστιν, ἄλλα δὲ ὑπὸ ἐξαναστῶμεν εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν...”

μηπω ἀγαθὲ Ἡσ. μηπω ὢγαθὲ corr. Coisl.: μηπω γε, ὢ ἵαθὲ
Hirschig: μηπω γ’, ὢγαθὲ Cobet (secl. mox ἐκεῖσθε ίωμεν)

Both Burnet (whose apparatus criticus I have reproduced) and the Budé editors, Croiset and Bodin, print the reading of Ἡς as above, μηπω, ἀγαθὲ.10 These editions appeared, respectively, in 1903 and 1955. But already in 1893 J. and A. M. Adam, in their edition of the Protagoras, had printed μηπω, ὢγαθὲ with the remark: “The MSS have μηπω ἀγαθὲ: probably the archetype had μηπωγαθὲ, by a natural mistake. Cobet rejects ἐκεῖσθε ίωμεν, reading μηπω γε, on the ground that with μηπω γε the Greek idiom does not repeat the verb: but there is no proof that the verb could not be expressed with μηπω (without γε).” This is basically correct. Nowhere else in Plato does ἀγαθὲ occur without ὦ; we should be reluctant to admit the singularity here, where there is such an obvious mechanical cause of corruption. The Adamses are probably not correct in positing an original μηπωγαθὲ; the corruption is slightly easier if we assume for the archetype μηπωγαθὲ with scriptio plena (compare above). Read then μηπω, (ὁ) ἀγαθὲ (recognizing, of course, that Plato may have pronounced this ὢγαθὲ).

II

Phaedo 89D

ἡ τε γὰρ μισανθροπία ἐνδύεται ἐκ τοῦ σφὸδρα τινὶ πιστεύσαι ἄνευ τέχνης, καὶ ἡγησασθαι παντάπασι γε ἀληθῆ

9 Cpa. 401b, 428d, 436c; Grs. 511b; Leg. 811c; Phdr. 243c; Resp. 423d.
10 The apparatus criticus of the Budé edition differs slightly from that of the Oxford text: “ἀγαθὲ Ἡς: γ’ ὦ γαθὲ Hermann ὢγαθὲ Vatic. 1029 (forsan recte).” The main point, that the principal mss. have ἀγαθὲ, and not ὢγαθὲ, is not in dispute.
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ei{a} kai voui kai pi{st}oN ton an{th}ropon, e{pe}ita ol{y}gon os{te}ron e{ure}in toutou po{ny}roN te kai ap{st}oN, kai a{th}i{z} e{te}ron' kai stan touto po{ll}a{ki}s pa{th}i tis ktl.

Read possibly ... kai a{th}i{z} (e{te}ron kai) e{te}ron' kai ... ? The same idiom, in a comparable context, occurs on the next page, 90B: e{pe}i{d}aN tis p{si}teu{si} log{w} tini al{th}e{e}i ei{nai eneV ti{h} peri to{u} log{ou} te{kh}i{z}i, kapei{ta} ol{y}gon os{te}ron a{u}te{w} do{z}i{z} pev{di}zi{e}i ei{nai ... kai a{th}i{z} e{te}ros kai e{te}ros. Note the verbal echoes. The same usage occurs in Menander fr. 656.8 Koert{e}, e{te}ran perim{e}iNai xat{e}r{a}n triko{mi}aN. Compare the similar idiom at Apology 27B, μη all{a} kai all{a} the{ru}be{it}w (where see Burnet for further examples). With e{te}ron kai e{te}ron, followed by po{ll}a{ki}s in the next clause, compare Xenophon Anab. 1.5.12 all{a} log{e} ... kai all-{lo}N, e{t}ta po{l}loi.

III

Phaedo 99E–100A

σωσ μηN o{d}N φ el{i}ka{z}oN tro{p}on tina o{N}k e{oi}keN o{u} γαρ
p{a}N{noN} sym{x}oroN toN eN [to{i}z] log{ou}N sk{op}ou{me}noN t{a} d{N}ta
en el{k}o{N}i{z} ma{l}l{loN} sk{op}e{N}i{N} η t{a}N eN [to{i}z] e{r}g{oi}N.

to{i}z log{ou}N BW: to{i}z om. T Stob. to{i}z e{r}g{oi}N
B Stob.: to{i}z om. TW

So prints Burnet; Robin (who wrongly reports Stobaeus as omitting the article to{i}z in both places) agrees, giving in his text en log{ou}N and en e{r}g{oi}N respectively. The oldest testimony for this passage, one which goes back practically to the Academy of Plato himself, seems to have been overlooked in constituting the text, Aristotle, Metaphysics 987b31–32 (discussing Plato): ... kai
η tωN eid{o}N e{i}sa{g}oγη di{a} τηN en to{i}z log{ou}N e{gen}eto sk{e}ψ{i}ν (οι
gαρ πρ{o}te{P}roN di{a}lek{t}i{ki}ς o{u} mete{i}XοN). ... Ross ad loc. observes “... the Platonists are called oi en to{i}z log{ou}N in Θ 1050b35. The phrase used here is pretty clearly a reminiscence of Phaedo 100A, where t{a}N en to{i}z log{ou}N sk{op}ou{me}noN t{a} d{N}ta, ‘one who studies things by the method of definitions’, is Socrates’ description of his own method.’ I agree with Ross that the Aristotle passage is a reminiscence of the Phaedo, but even if it is not, it is a cogent parallel for en to{i}z log{ou}N (as is Metaph. 1050b35). Compare further this very passage of the Phaedo, 99E: el{z} to{i}z log{ou}N kata{phu}-
γόντα ἐν ἐκείνοις σκοπεῖν. Future editors should print . . . ἐν τοῖς λόγοις . . . ἐν τοῖς ἐργοῖς here.

IV

Phaedo 112c

ὅταν τε οὖν ὑποχωρήσῃ τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ὅθη κάτω καλούμενον, τοῖς κατ᾽ ἔκεινα τὰ ῥεύματα [διὰ] τῆς γῆς εἰσερέθε τε καὶ πληροὶ αὐτὰ ὁσπερ οἱ ἐπαντλοῦντες. ὅταν τε αὖ ἐκείθεν μὲν ἀπολίπῃ, δεύρῳ δὲ ὀρμήσῃ, τὰ ἐνθάδε πληροὶ ἀδῆς κτλ.

διὰ ἀντε τῆς γῆς om. Stob., del. Burnet

A difficult passage. Burnet renders τοῖς κατ᾽ . . . εἰσερέθε “the streams flow into the regions on the further side of the earth,” construing τὰ ῥεύματα as subject and taking τοῖς κατ᾽ ἔκεινα τῆς γῆς together. Hackforth rightly pronounces this impossible; he explains the passage thus: “I retain διὰ before τῆς γῆς, and take the literal meaning to be ‘it flows through the earth into the beds of the rivers of that region (hemisphere)’. Plato writes τοῖς κατ᾽ ἔκεινα τὰ ῥεύματα rather than ἐκείνοις τοῖς ῥεύμασι simply because the ῥεύματα do not exist until the water fills (or refills) their beds” (Plato’s Phaedo 178 n.5). This is nearer the mark, but fails to explain the dative τοῖς; as has long been recognized, τοῖς κατ᾽ ἔκεινα . . . εἰσερέθε is very questionable Greek for “flows into the parts about those streams.” εἰς c. acc. would have been expected. Compare immediately above, 112B: ὅταν εἰς τὸ ἐπὶ ἔκεινα τῆς γῆς ὀρμήσῃ καὶ ὅταν εἰς τὸ ἐπὶ τάδε κτλ. Accordingly, Wytenbach conjectured τότε ἀντὶ τοῖς here and Ast, followed by Archer-Hind, deleted the word. Neither proposal convinces. There is a simpler remedy to hand:

ὅταν τε οὖν ὑποχωρήσῃ τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ὅθη κάτω καλούμενον, (ἐν) τοῖς κατ᾽ ἔκεινα τὰ ῥεύματα διὰ τῆς γῆς εἰσερέθε τε καὶ πληροὶ αὐτὰ κτλ.

The periphrastic ἐν τοῖς κατ᾽ ἔκεινα τὰ ῥεύματα may be compared to εἰς τὸ ἐπὶ ἔκεινα and εἰς τὸ ἐπὶ τάδε in 112B.

Archer-Hind (ad loc.) has raised a further objection to the transmitted text: “Mr. Cope translates ‘it flows through the earth to the neighborhood of those streams and fills them, as it were by a
pump'. But surely διὰ τῆς γῆς describes the progress of the water after it has entered the channels: it would be a strange expression to apply to its surging up and down Tartarus.” This objection seems quite valid to me; the insertion of ἐν before τοῖς has the further advantage of removing all difficulty on this score. The corruption is of the easiest sort; uncial έΝ dropped out after ΟΝ. (The omission of διὰ in Stobaeus may be similarly explained: ΔΙΑ fell out after ΑΤΑ.)

V

Symposium 176b

ἀκοῦσαντα οὖν αὐτῶν ἡ Ἑρωνίμαχον τὸν Ἀκοῦμενον Ἡ
καλῶς, φάναι, λέγετε. καὶ ἐτὶ ἐνός δέομαι ὑμῶν ἀκούσαι
πώς ἔχει πρὸς τὸ ἔρρωσθαι πίνειν Ἀγάθων. Ὅδαμώς,
φάναι, οὐδ’ αὐτὸς ἔρρωμαι.

Ἀγάθων: Ἀγάθων (ος) Vahlen

“I still require to hear from one of you how Agathon is disposed with regard to engaging in drink.” “I’m not up to it either,” said Agathon.

Difficulties have been rightly felt about this sequence. What is the point of asking a third party about Agathon’s condition rather than Agathon himself, who is present? What is the purpose of the emphatic, and unspecified, ἐνός ... ὑμῶν (stronger than, and distinct from, τινὸς ... ὑμῶν)? Vahlen’s Ἀγάθων (ος), printed by Burnet, provides a smooth thought-sequence at the cost of an intolerable word-order. Had the MSS given Ἀγάθωνος in that position, it would have been deleted as a gloss. A change of punctuation sets everything right:

... καὶ ἐτὶ ἐνός δέομαι ὑμῶν ἀκούσαι. πώς ἔχει πρὸς τὸ ἔρρω-
σθαι πίνειν Ἀγάθων; Ὅδαμώς, φάναι, οὐδ’ αὐτὸς ἔρρωμαι.

“I still require to hear from one of you. How is Agathon disposed with regard to engaging in drink?” “I’m not up to it either,” he said. The emphatic ἐνός ... ὑμῶν refers to Agathon, who is elegantly addressed in the third person. He understands Eryximachus’ meaning and answers accordingly. A passage from Boswell’s Life of Johnson will illustrate the usage:
As Mr. Burke and Mr. Langton were walking home, Mr. Burke observed that Johnson had been very great that night; Mr. Langton joined in this, but added, he could have wished to hear more from another person; (plainly intimating that he meant Mr. Burke). "O, no (said Mr. Burke) it is enough for me to have rung the bell to him."  

Plato himself in the *Phaedrus* (228A–C), availing himself of this same device, has Socrates address Phaedrus to his face in the third person for some dozen lines.

**VI**

*Symposium* 181D

\[ \text{παρεσκευασμένοι γὰρ οἴμαι εἰσίν οἱ ἐντεῦθεν ἄρχόμενοι ἐράν ὅς τὸν βίον ἀπαντά συνεσόμενοι καὶ κοινὴ συμβιωσό-μενοι, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἔξαπατήσαντες, ἐν ἁφροσύνῃ λαβόντες ὡς νέον, καταγελάσαντες οἰχήσεσθαι ἐπὶ ἄλλην ἀποτρέχοντες.} \]

"παρεσκευασμένοι κτλ. For the change of construction from ὡς with fut. partic. to (fut.) infin., cp. *Charm*. 164D, *Rep.* 383A ποιεῖν ὡς μῆτε ... ὅντας ... μῆτε ... παράγειν. The clause ἐν ἁφροσύνῃ ... νέον is best taken closely with the preceding participle, and καταγελάσαντες ... ἀποτρέχοντες closely together." Bury *ad loc.* "ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ... οἰχήσεσθαι is coordinated with ἐράν, and both depend on d3 παρεσκευασμένοι ... εἰσίν ...” Dover *ad loc.* This latter explanation can hardly be correct; the natural contrast is between ὡς τὸν βίον ... συμβιωσόμενοι and ἔξαπατήσαντες ... ἀπο- 

τρέχοντες, which express, respectively, a noble and ignoble intention. The main statement runs from παρεσκευασμένοι to ἐράν; the rest of the sentence is subordinated to these words. Moreover, the shift of tense from the present ἐράν to the future οἰχήσεσθαι (on which Dover is silent) is very harsh, if the two infinitives are to be coordinated. (Herwerden conjectured οἴχεσθαι, a Procrustean solution.) Furthermore παρασκευάζεσθαι with the *future* infinitive is a doubtful construction. (Still, it may occur at Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.12, and I would be prepared to admit it here, were there not other objections to this interpretation.) Bury’s interpretation is closer to

the mark. He rightly sees that the basic contrast is between ως ... συμβιωσόμενοι and οίχησεσθαι, and his analysis of the relationship to one another of the various cola, from ἐξαπατήσαντες to ἀποτρέχοντες, is correct. However, he does not really explain the shift in construction from ως with future participle to simple future infinitive, nor are his parallels particularly close. The best explanation is to assume, as so often in Plato, an anacoluthon, or rather a constructio ad sensum. ως with the future participle is used to indicate purpose or intention; another common way of expressing intent is by μέλλω with the infinitive. Plato wrote οίχησεσθαι as if he had begun ἄλλα ὅδε μέλλοντες ...; the shift was all the easier since Plato had not repeated ως in the second section (i.e., he did not write ἄλλα ἥδη ως). The suggestion that οίχησεσθαι—here clearly expressing intention—is used specifically on the analogy of μέλλω c. inf. may seem too precise; but compare W. W. Goodwin: “The future infinitive with μέλλω forms the only regular exception to the general principle which restricts the use of the future infinitive to indirect discourse” (Syntax² §75).

It remains to discover Plato’s motive for the change to the infinitive, which seems to have been quite deliberate, and not the result of careless composition. In the two contrasting clauses (ως τὸν βίον ... συμβιωσόμενοι ~ ὅικ ἐξαπατήσαντες ... ἀποτρέχοντες) the key concepts are συνεσόμενοι καὶ κοινὴ συμβιωσόμενοι and οίχησεσθαι, referring respectively to the faithful and fickle lover. In this sentence there are no less than eight participles, four of them occurring in the last section (beginning with ἄλλα ὅδε). Had Plato written the participle οίχησεσθαι in the midst of these other participles, it would have lacked the emphatic prominence which the infinitive succeeds in bringing out. There was another reason for avoiding the participle here. οίχησεσθαι is frequently used with a supplementary participle (οίχομαι ἀπιών etc.). Here οίχησεσθαι ἀποτρέχοντες is such a construction. One will search a long time to find an example of the participle of οίχομαι so collocated with a supplementary participle. A combination such as οίχησεσθαι ἀποτρέχοντες simply does not sound right, and Plato instinctively avoided it.
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VII

Symposium 182a–b

καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ περὶ τὸν ἔρωτα νόμος ἐν μὲν ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσι νοήσαι ράδιος, ἀπλῶς γὰρ ὡρισται ὁ δὲ ἐνθάδε καὶ ἐν Λακεδαίμονι ποικίλος. ἐν Ἡλίδι μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐν Βοιωτοῖς, καὶ οὐ μὴ σοφοὶ λέγειν, ἀπλῶς νενομοθέτηται . . . τῆς δὲ Ἰωνίας καὶ ἄλλοθι πολλαχοῦ αἰσχρὸν νενόμισται, ὅσοι ὑπὸ βαρβάρους οἰκούσιν.

τῆς δὲ Ἰωνίας: τοῖς δὲ Ἰωνίας ci. Ast: τῇ δὲ Ἰωνία Thiersch

"τῆς δὲ Ἰωνίας. The genitive is taken by Hug as dependent on πολλαχοῦ, by Stallb. as dependent on ὅσοι, 'vel potius ex demonstrativo ante ὅσοι intelligendo'. Hug quotes Xen. Hell. IV.4.16 πολλαχόσε καὶ τῆς Ἀρκαδίας ἐμβαλόντες." Bury ad loc. "τῆς δὲ . . . πολλαχοῦ 'in many parts of Ionia and in (sc. many) other places'." Dover ad loc., who, to judge from this translation, agrees with Hug in making Ἰωνίας dependent upon πολλαχοῦ.

Stallbaum's proposal to govern Ἰωνίας by ὅσοι is unnatural and, indeed, desperate. Nor can Ἰωνίας be governed by πολλαχοῦ (as Hug, Dover, and others); it should have been obvious that τῆς Ἰωνίας and ἄλλοθι πολλαχοῦ are coordinate phrases linked together by καὶ. In Xenophon Hell. 4.4.16, compared by Hug, the word-order makes all the difference; the two passages are not at all parallel. For true parallels see Protagoras 326ε καὶ παρ’ ὦμιν καὶ ἄλλοθι πολλαχοῦ and Republic 394ε ἐν τῇ τῶν ἐπών ποιήσει, πολλαχοῦ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοθι, which show both that the two phrases are to be taken as contrasting coordinates and that ἄλλοθι πολλαχοῦ is a set phrase to be taken by itself. (See also Symp. 209ε, Resp. 440α οὐκοῦν καὶ ἄλλοθι, ἐφην, πολλαχοῦ αἰσθανόμεθα, Xen. Cyr. 7.1.30 πολλαχοῦ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλοθι . . . καὶ ἐν τούτῳ δὲ . . .)

Two words have caused all the difficulty, Ἰωνίας and ὅσοι: what is the construction of the genitive and what is the antecedent of ὅσοι? Both uses are in fact quite idiomatic. ὅσοι is a constructio ad sensum, introduced for variety where οὐ might have been expected; it is as if ἐν Ἡλίδι καὶ ἄλλοις πολλοῖς had preceded; compare, immediately above: (1) ἐν Ἡλίδι . . . καὶ (2) ἐν Βοιωτοῖς καὶ (3) οὐ μὴ σοφοὶ λέγειν. The other stumbling-block, τῆς δὲ Ἰωνίας, is not ‘governed by’ any word in the sentence; it is rather one more example of the common genitive of connection, placed (with connective, but with or without preposition) at the beginning
of a new sentence as a separate colon: "But as regards Ionia, and in many other places. . . ." For the usage in general, see Fraenkel on Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 950, with references.

The same construction occurs at *Phaedrus* 247A:

μένει γὰρ Ἑστία ἐν θεών οἶκω μόνῃ τῶν δὲ ἄλλων δοσι ἐν τῷ τῶν δώδεκα ἁρτήμῳ τεταγμένοι θεοὶ ἀρχοντες ἤγοινται κατὰ τάξιν ἢ ἐκαστὸς ἐτάξιθ.

tῶν δὲ ἄλλων δοσι is not to be rendered "But as many of the others as . . .," as if τῶν ἄλλων were genitive dependent upon δοσι. Hackforth, for example, has understood the sense: " . . . but for the rest, all such as are ranked in the number of the twelve. . . ." tῶν δὲ ἄλλων is a separate genitive of connection; editors should have printed a comma after it. So also in *Symposium* 221c ἄλλα τῶν μὲν ἄλλων ἐπιτηδευμάτων, τάχ' ἀν τις καὶ περὶ ἄλλων τοιαύτα εἶποι (where editors omit the comma after ἐπιτηδευμάτων). Compare *Phaedrus* 250C: περὶ δὲ κάλλους, ὁσπερ εἴπομεν, μετ' ἐκείνων τε ἐλαμπὲν ὁν κτλ. That περὶ δὲ κάλλους was felt to be a distinct colon is shown by the fact that the subject of the main verb ἐλαμ-πεν is also κάλλος.

VIII

*Symposium* 184D—E

ὅταν γὰρ εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ ἔλθωσιν ἐραστῆς τε καὶ παιδικὰ, νόμων ἔχων ἐκάτερος . . . ὁ μὲν δυνάμενος εἰς φρόνησιν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετὴν συμβάλλεσθαι, ὁ δὲ δεόμενος εἰς παιδείαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην σοφίαν κτάσθαι, τότε δὴ . . . συμ-πίπτει τὸ καλὸν εἶναι παιδικὰ ἐραστῆς χαρίσασθαι, ἄλλοθι δὲ οὐδαμοὶ.

eἰς post δεόμενος del. Schütz κτάσθαι: ἰστάσθαι Schanz: κτάσθαι τι Hug

The soundness of the MSS here has often been questioned. I quote Bury's note as typical: "εἰς παιδείαν . . . κτάσθαι. If the text is right we must suppose that κτάσθαι is here equiv. to ὀστε κτάσθαι, appended to the main verb χυμβάλλεσθαι which is to be supplied with εἰς παιδείαν κτλ. (so Vahlen). Of the corrections suggested . . . Schanz's is the neatest, but spoils the sense-balance with χυμβάλλεσθαι. The corruption is, perhaps, to be sought else-
where: the expression τὴν ἄλλην σοφίαν is open to suspicion, since σοφίαν as here used after ἄλλην stands as a generic subst. whereas σοφία has just been termed (184c) μέρος ἀρετῆς: moreover, we should expect that σοφία should itself constitute the κτήμα of the recipient, just as φρόνησις is itself the contribution of ὁ ξυμβαλ-λόμενος. On these grounds, I venture to suggest that another fem. subst., such as διδαχήν, may have fallen out after ἄλλην (ἐκπαίδευσιν for εἰς π. is just possible).” Dover too, in his recent edition, follows earlier scholars in expressing doubts about the soundness of the text: “ἐἰς παίδευσιν ... κτάσθαι: if this is what Plato wrote, we must understand φρόνησις καὶ ἀρετήν as object of κτάσθαι; but if εἰς were deleted (as by Schütz) παίδευσιν ... σοφίαν would be the object, and the sentence would be easier to follow.”

All this is much ado about nothing. The speech of Pausanias, from which this sentence comes, contains a generous portion of those tricks of rhetoric associated in particular with the sophists. Παυσανίου δὲ παυσαμένου, says the narrator at its conclusion (185c), διδάσκουσι γὰρ μὲ Ἰσα λέγειν ὁτ异味 ἡ σοφία, and the present sentence is clearly an instance of τὸ Ἰσα λέγειν, wherein rhetorical balance counts for more than normal idiom:

(i) ὁ μὲν δυνάμενος—ὁ δὲ δεόμενος
(ii) εἰς φρόνησιν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετήν—
εἰς παίδευσιν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην σοφίαν
(iii) συμβάλλεσθαι—κτάσθαι

κτάσθαι is in obvious sense responsion to συμβάλλεσθαι; note the force of the present, ‘acquire’ (not κεκτήσθαι, ‘possess’). The one makes a contribution; the other acquires the same. Render the disputed phrase quite literally: “... the other needing to make an acquisition in regard to παίδευσις and the rest of σοφία...” No object need be supplied with κτάσθαι; the verb is used absolutely.12

Objections to the transmitted text clearly have taken their start from the assumption that εἰς παίδευσιν ... κτάσθαι is awkward, or even impossible, Greek. I have argued that a desire for artificial balance determined the choice of phrase; no one would deny that κτάσθαι followed by a direct accusative object would have been

12 Even were it necessary to supply an object, the comments of Bury and Dover would still be misleading. For here φρόνησις καὶ ἡ ἄλλη ἀρετή καὶ παίδευσις καὶ ἡ ἄλλη σοφία are, for all practical purposes, synonymous; the change of diction was determined solely by a desire for stylistic variation, and it is a mistake to press any difference of meaning. This is apparent from the context: ὁ δεόμενος κτάσθαι is here equivalent to ‘the one needing to receive a contribution’ and corresponds to ὁ δυνάμενος συμβάλλεσθαι. Obviously, giver and recipient are concerned with the same contribution.
more usual. Possibly the expression is unusual; certainly it is Pla­
tonic. For this use of eis (= ‘in regard to’, ‘with a view to’), where
another construction might be expected, is a feature of Plato’s
style. From this same speech compare 184b εὔφρεγοτύμενος eis
χρήματα (the dative, vel sim., would be ‘normal’). So also below in
the Symposium, 219 D . . . ἀνθρώπῳ τοιούτῳ σοὶ ἦγοροι δὲν ὑμήν
ποτ’ ἐντυχεῖν eis φρόνησιν καὶ eis καρτερίαν. For further Platonic
examples see J. Riddell, A Digest of Platonic Idioms § 115.

IX

Phaedrus 233D

καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις has bothered many; consequently καὶ τῶν ἄλ-
λων was printed in the Aldine edition and Badham proposed καὶ
τοῖς ἄλλοις. De Vries ad loc. defends the mss: “The readings καὶ
tῶν ἄλλων (Aldina, Heind., St., Sch.) and καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις (Bad-
ham, Vollgr., Buchw., accepted by Hackf.) are evident attempts
to make the text smooth. Ficinus (Bekker) already rendered τοῖς
ἄλλοις well by ‘omnino’. For the dativus limitationis which he
rightly sees in τοῖς ἄλλοις, Verd. 271 refers to 234c7 [τὰ . . .
ἄλλα, accusative!], Lysis 215c ἄρα γε ὅλω τινὶ εξαπατώμεθα; Rep.
430a ἐπαιδεύομεν μονοσικὴ καὶ γυμναστικὴ, Hom. Od. 18.234, Hdt.
I 29, Thuc. IV 73, 4, K.G. I 437 f. (Rob., too, took it as such, as
may be seen from his punctuation καὶ, τοῖς ἄλλοις, and his trans-
lation ‘par ailleurs’; Rob. Pl., however, wrongly takes τοῖς ἄλλοις
as masculine, ‘pour les autres aussi’; Mor. unnecessarily suggests
καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις).”

Thus the majority opinion seems to be that καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις is
either corrupt or neuter (or some combination thereof). It is sound
and masculine, as Robin once took it—only to change his mind
later. For neuter τοῖς ἄλλοις = omnino no one has produced a
true parallel; I doubt that any exists. Neither the accusative τὰ
ἄλλα (common) nor the dativus limitationis of other substantives
is pertinent, much less decisive. What is wanted is another instance
of τοῖς ἄλλοις so used; that usage, if it exists, is unknown to me.
(On this compare below.) To understand the sentence, construe as follows: . . . περὶ χρή [sc. τοῖς ἐρωμένοις] τοῖς δεομένοις μᾶλλα χαρίζεσθαι, προσήκει καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις—etiam ceteris hominibus praeter τοὺς ἐρωμένοις—. . . τοὺς ἀπορουτάτους εὖ ποιεῖν μεγίστων γὰρ ἀπαλλαγέντες κακῶν πλείστην χάριν αὐτοῖς [sc. τοῖς ἄλλοις] εἴσονται. Note that αὐτοῖς has no reference unless τοῖς ἄλλοις be both sound and masculine.

The argument—which comes from the *oratio erotica* which Plato has fathered on Lysias—is a *reductio ad absurdum*. The general thesis of this speech is that a boy should bestow his favors upon the non-lover rather than the lover. The particular argument here is: “If a boy should yield to those most in need [i.e., to lovers], it follows that it is appropriate for ‘the others’ also to treat well specifically those who are most at a loss [in any human sphere]. . . .” The consequences of such a position are then illustrated; for instance, consistency would require that one invite to a private dinner not his friends, but beggars and those in need of a meal (233DE).

That such is the correct interpretation and that τοῖς ἄλλοις is sound is proved by the words τοῖς ἄλλοις themselves. For it does not appear to have been remarked that in this speech οἱ ἄλλοι, ‘the others’, is frequently used, almost in a technical sense, in explicit contrast to ἔρωντες. The relevant passages are self-evident and need only be set forth, not interpreted:

(i) ἔτοιμοι εἰσί [sc. οἱ ἔρωντες] . . . τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀπεχθανόμενοι τοῖς ἐρωμένοις χαρίζεσθαι (231C)
(ii) εἰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἔρωντων τὸν βέλτιστον αἴροι, εἰ δὲ ὀλίγον ἂν σοι ἣ ἐκλεξίας εἴη; εἰ δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων (231D)
(iii) εἰκόσι ἄστι τοὺς μὲν ἔρωντας, οὕτως ἂν οἰόμενοι καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ξηλοῦσθαι ὧσπερ αὐτοὺς ὑφ’ αὐτῶν (231E–232A)
(iv) διόσπερ καὶ τὰς πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους τῶν ἐρωμένων συνουσίας ἀποτρέποσιν [sc. οἱ ἔρωντες] (232C)
(v) τοιαύτα γὰρ ὁ ἔρως ἐπιδείκνυται δυστυχῶντας μὲν, ἢ μὴ λύπην τοῖς ἄλλοις παρέχει, ἀναρά ποιεῖ νομίζειν (233B)
(vi) οὐδὲ οἱ διαπραξάμενοι [sc. οἱ ἔρωντες] πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους φιλοτιμήσονται (234A)\(^{13}\)

I return for a moment to the suggestion that τοῖς ἄλλοις in 233D is a neuter = *omnino*. The reason why τοῖς ἄλλοις is not

\(^{13}\) Note also 252d (from the great myth), πρὸς τε τοῖς ἐρωμένοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁμαλεῖ τε καὶ προσφέρεται. We are perhaps justified in regarding this as a mannerism of Plato’s and one more, albeit minor, argument for the Platonic authorship of the speech attributed to Lysias.
found so used (quod sciam) is that in the dative ending -οις neuter and masculine are not distinguished; the gender is unmarked and τοῖς ἄλλοις = omnino would be ambiguous.\textsuperscript{14} Hence the preference for τὰ ἄλλα everywhere in ancient Greek. Consider \textit{Phaedrus} 234 c: τί σοι φαίνεται, ὁ Σώκρατες, ὁ λόγος; οὐχ ὑπερφυός τὰ τὲ ἄλλα καὶ τοῖς ὑφόμασιν εἰρήσθαι; Here the accusative of respect τὰ ἄλλα is used despite the fact that it is collocated with a dative of respect, τοῖς ὑφόμασιν. In other words, Plato himself in this very dialogue avoids τοῖς ἄλλοις where one might most expect it. There is no doubt of the soundness of the text; Plato repeats the phrase verbatim below, 257\textsuperscript{A}. Elsewhere\textsuperscript{15} I have argued for the reality of the collocation of accusatives and datives of respect in Greek; \textit{Phaedrus} 234\textsuperscript{D} and 257\textsuperscript{A} provide the clearest evidence to date for the existence of the usage in classical prose.\textsuperscript{16}
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\textsuperscript{14} One might wish to raise the same objection against a masculine τοῖς ἄλλοις in 233\textsuperscript{D}. There is far less reason to do so. In the sequence προσήκει/τάτων/ιντιφιτίκη in ancient Greek was not likely to be confused, given the frequency of the construction προσήκει cwm dat. et infl. Context determined the sense. But even if the passage is felt to be ambiguous, the fact is that προσήκει/masc. dat./inf. is a normal and frequent collocation, whereas τοῖς ἄλλοις = omnino is apparently unattested.


\textsuperscript{16} I am grateful to my students Lorna Holmes and Morgan de Tarr for reading a draft of this paper and making a number of helpful suggestions.