

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 "EUTHYPHRO" 15D 6-7

... ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἂν ἔδεισας παρακινδυνεύειν μὴ οὐκ ὀρθῶς αὐτὸ ποιήσοις . . . . καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἡσχύνῃς.

Burnet comments 'The construction here is very difficult. Probably τοὺς θεοὺς ἂν 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 LSJ, which quotes the passage s.v. παρακινδυνεύω 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'.<sup>1</sup>

There is a difficulty in this interpretation: κινδυνεύω and its compounds are not elsewhere followed by the μή/μή οὐ construction, but by the infinitive. LSJ quotes no example (except the present passage) of such a construction after κινδυνεύω or a compound. Seven examples of the use by Plato of παρακινδυνεύω 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 δοκῶ), it is absolute 13 times, followed four times by a cognate accusative, and nine times by an infinitive. Other compounds found in Plato are διακινδυνεύω (twice: once absolute, once followed by the infinitive) and συγκινδυνεύω (twice: once absolute, once followed by the dative). The pro-lative infinitive is natural after κινδυνεύω.<sup>2</sup> κίνδυνός 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.<sup>3</sup> 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 μή. "You would have feared the gods,

<sup>1</sup> J. Burnet, *Plato's Euthyphro, Apology of Socrates and Crito* (1924), 61-2; F. Ast, *Lexicon Platonicum* vol. 3 (1838), 39, s.v. παρακινδυνεύω; B. Jowett, *The Dialogues of Plato* vol. 1 (1953), 326.

<sup>2</sup> See LSJ s.v., 4., and Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses* (1886), § 46 n. 8 (c).

<sup>3</sup> H. Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (1956), § 2224 a.

(feared) to run a risk, (and feared) lest . . .”<sup>4</sup> Nowhere in the examples quoted by Ast (about 50 passages) or LSJ s.v. δίδω 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. δίδω, 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.<sup>5</sup> After active forms of κινδυνεύω and its compounds an accusative object is not usual, unless it be a cognate accusative, e.g. κίνδυνον, τοῦτο. 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’.<sup>6</sup> 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 παρακινδυνεύω in Plato give some confirmation of this meaning or a similar one in the prefix: (a) *Laws* 810d μεθ’ ὧν διακελεύη με παρακινδυνεύοντά τε καὶ θαρροῦντα τὴν ὁδὸν . . . πορεύεσθαι [you order me together with them cheerfully to risk myself (as well) and travel the road], and (b) *Laws* 967b καὶ τινες ἐτόλμων τοῦτο γε αὐτὸ παρακινδυνεύειν καὶ τότε, λέγοντες ὡς νοῦν εἶη ὁ διακεκοσμηκῶς πάνθ’ ὅσα κατ’ οὐρανόν [(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; *Theaet.* 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

<sup>4</sup> T. R. Mills, *Plato: Euthyphro* (n.d.), 60.

<sup>5</sup> For another example of this ‘double construction’—an infinitive with an accusative object and a μή clause both following the verb of fearing—see *Gorgias* 457e.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. παραφθέγγομαι ‘say as well’ (*Euthyd.* 296a), παρσθίω ‘eat as well’ (*Hipp. Dent.* 16) and, much later, παραγιγνώσκω ‘read as well’ (*Galen* 5.244); cf. παραλυπῶ 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: ἤδησθα σαφῶς). 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.<sup>7</sup> Further, Socrates goes on in the rest of the sentence (καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἡσχύνθης) to give explicit expression to this idea. On the surface there is a parallelism between τοὺς θεοὺς ἔδεισας and τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἡσχύνθης, 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.

M. P. FORDER

---

<sup>7</sup> R. G. Hoerber, 'Plato's *Euthyphro*', *Phronesis* 3 (1958), 95-107.

# ACTA CLASSICA



*Acta Classica* is published annually by the Classical Association of South Africa. The journal has been in production since 1958. It is listed on both the ISI and the SAPSE list of approved publications.

For further information go to:  
[http://www.casa-kvsa.org.za/acta\\_classica.htm](http://www.casa-kvsa.org.za/acta_classica.htm)