In view of this, Woodhead’s statement regarding Cleon’s introduction which contributes a considerable amount to his final conclusion, and which in a certain way actually conditions the reader of his article to his view of Thucydides’ treatment of Cleon, must in my opinion be detracted from his general argument, with which one may very well still be in agreement.

University of Pretoria.  
B. X. DE WET

A NOTE ON PLATO “EUTHYPHRON” 15D 6-7

... ἄλλα καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐν ἔδεισας παρακινθυνόμενι μὴ οὖχ ὅρθως αὐτὸ ποιήσως ... καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἠχεύνης.

Burnet comments ‘The construction here is very difficult. Probably τοὺς θεοὺς ἐν ἔδεισας is treated as a single word, which then takes the infinitive. “The fear of the gods would have kept you from taking the risk of.”’ He is followed by L.SJ, which quotes the passage s.v. παρακινθυνόμενοι 4, commenting ‘in a double construction’. Ast translates ‘etiam deos timens refugisses periculum ne...’; Jowett: ‘You would not have run such a risk of doing wrong in the sight of the gods’.

There is a difficulty in this interpretation: κινδυνεύω and its compounds are not elsewhere followed by the μὴ/μή οὖ construction, but by the infinitive. L.SJ quotes no example (except the present passage) of such a construction after κινδυνεύω or a compound. Seven examples of the use by Plato of παρακινθυνόμενοι are quoted by Ast; one is the case under discussion, and of the other six none is relevant (in three cases the verb is absolute, in three it is followed by a cognate accusative). In the 26 cases quoted by Ast where κινδυνεύω really means ‘run a risk’ or ‘risk’ (as opposed to being equivalent to δοκίμασι), it is absolute 13 times, followed four times by a cognate accusative, and nine times by an infinitive. Other compounds found in Plato are διακινθυνόμενοι (twice: once absolute, once followed by the infinitive) and συγκινθυνόμενοι (twice: once absolute, once followed by the dative). The prolagative infinitive is natural after κινδυνεύω.2 κίνδυνος ἐστι is a different case: ‘There is a risk/danger that’ almost equals ‘I am afraid that’, and naturally may take the construction which follows verbs of fearing.3 A further difficulty is the portmanteau verb τοὺς θεοὺς ἔδεισας, for which I can find no parallel in Plato or elsewhere.

Presumably to avoid these difficulties, T. R. Mills in his edition proposes an ingenious but, I think, untenable solution: ‘The verb of fearing has here a threefold construction: (a) accusative of the direct object, (b) an infinitive, (c) a dependent clause introduced by μη. “You would have feared the gods,

---

1 J. Burnet, Plato’s Euthyphro, Apology of Socrates and Crito (1924), 61-2; F. Ast, Lexicon Platonicum vol. 3 (1838), 39, s.v. παρακινθυνόμενοι; B. Jowett, The Dialogues of Plato vol. 1 (1953), 326.
2 See L.SJ s.v., 4., and Goodwin, Moods and Tenses (1886), § 46 n. 8 (c).
3 H. Weir Smyth, Greek Grammar (1956), § 2224 a.
feared) to run a risk, (and feared) lest ... " Nowhere in the examples quoted by Ast (about 50 passages) or LSJ s.v. δειδω is there a usage which would justify such a clumsy portmanteau construction.

A simpler solution of the passage seems not to have been considered by the commentators: i.e. that τοὺς θεοὺς is the object not of ἔδεισας but of παρακινδυνεύειν: 'You would have been afraid to risk the gods, lest ... '. H. N. Fowler, in the Loeb translation, comes nearest to this meaning: 'You would have been afraid to risk (the anger of) the gods, in case ... ' (my brackets). Ast, s.v. δειδω, quotes τοὺς θεοὺς ἔδεισας παρακινδυνεύειν without explanation: it is difficult to see how else he expects the phrase to be taken, despite his explanation of the whole passage quoted above. After active forms of κινδυνεύω and its compounds an accusative object is not usual, unless it be a cognate accusative, e.g. κινδυνον, τούτο. But the same is not true of the passive 'to be risked, to be in danger': this may have a non-cognate subject, e.g. Demosth. 34.28: τὰ χρήματα κινδυνεύεται.

τοὺς θεοὺς, as Socrates uses the phrase here, does not mean the gods as Socrates himself conceives them, but the gods as Euthyphro conceives them. Further, the verb παρακινδυνεύειν is used in an unusual sense. The usual, intensive, force of the prepositional prefix is not especially appropriate in the context. It seems to have the full force of 'besides, as well', a meaning closely associated with the more common 'beside'. τοὺς θεοὺς παρακινδυνεύειν seems then to mean 'to endanger the gods (as well as yourself)', i.e. 'to endanger yourself'—run the risk of ridicule (Euthyphro has mentioned occasions when he had incurred ridicule)—'and the gods'—or at least the conception of them which you profess—'as well'. So the apparently straightforward phrase 'risk the gods' implies 'risk your reputation for knowledge of the gods'.

Two other examples of the use of παρακινδυνεύομαι in Plato give some confirmation of this meaning or a similar one in the prefix: (a) Laws 810d μεθ' ὅν διακελεύῃ με παρακινδυνεύοντά τε καὶ βραφύντα τὴν ὦδον ... πορείας [you order me together with them cheerfully to risk myself (as well) and travel the road], and (b) Laws 967b καὶ τινές ἐπόλεμσις τότε γε σκότο παρακινδυνεύειν καὶ τότε, λέγοντες ὡς νοοῦ ἡ διακεκασμένης πάνθυ βίοσ καὶ σφόντα [Some men conjectured that the sun and the stars have soul] and even at that time some ventured to run another risk too by saying that ... . It is possible to find a similar meaning for the prefix in a third passage, Euthyd. 285c. In the other three passages of Plato where the word occurs (Ep. 7. 325a; Theat. 204b; Alc. II 151a) the prefix would seem to have only intensive force. Where the word is used by other writers, it seems to have again only intensive

5 For another example of this 'double construction'—an infinitive with an accusative object and a μη clause both following the verb of fearing—see Gorgias 457e.
6 E.g. παρακρηστέγασα 'say as well' (Euthyd. 296a), παρακριθώ 'eat as well' (Hipp. Dent. 16) and, much later, παραστηγήτω 'read as well' (Galen 5.244); cf. παραστηγησώ in Phaedo 65c and Thuc. 2.51.1, where the prefix refers to an additional subject, not object.
force, except Dion. Halic. 9. 1902 and Plut. Eum. 2. 1, where it could mean 'run further risk'.

The idea of 'endangering (the reputation of yourself and your conception of) the gods' is not out of place here: Socrates has just described what really happened (as opposed to this unreal potential): Euthyphro has 'endangered the gods', and his reputation as well, by initiating this unusual prosecution, but he has done it without fear, because he is certain of his ground (15d 4: Ἕνεκεν ἄφθονος). Indeed, fear of loss of reputation and of ridicule are more likely to have swayed Euthyphro in his decision than real fear of the gods: he is a formalist, as Hoerber well points out. Further, Socrates goes on in the rest of the sentence (καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἡσυχῶνθης) to give explicit expression to this idea. On the surface there is a parallelism between τοὺς θεοὺς ἔδειχας and τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἡσυχῶνθης, but this is, I think, a further example, of which many occur earlier in the dialogue, of Socrates' kindly but ironic saving of Euthyphro's self-esteem.

University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Salisbury.
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