

Socrates in this passage recalls a certain incident which had taken place some time previously, in which Prodicus had attempted to propound the thesis just successfully established by Critias and, after being refuted by a youthful member of his audience, had been requested to leave the gymnasium. This digression has a certain dramatic propriety; it gives Eryxias time to regain his composure and prepares us for Critias' discomfiture. But apart from this it is difficult to explain the insertion of an episode which occupies a sixth of the total extent of the work and adds nothing to the subject under discussion. No interpretation appears to me to be wholly satisfactory, but the following is perhaps the most plausible:—

(1) The passage is an account of a contemporary or nearly contemporary controversy placed in a fifth-century setting.

(2) The view propounded by Prodicus is identified by the author with the one previously upheld by Critias. Consequently Prodicus may be a Stoic in disguise, most probably Zeno if the date suggested above is correct.¹

(3) The critical *reductio ad absurdum* employed by the youth at 398A5-9 is similar in form to one which the Megarian Alexinus (flor. 290 B.C.) employed against Zeno. (This latter argument is quoted from Sextus by Zeller, *Socrates and Socratics*, p. 216.) Consequently the young man may be a Megarian eristic in disguise, possibly Alexinus, who was a staunch opponent of Zeno (see Diogenes Laertius II, 109).

(4) Socrates' sarcastic intervention on behalf of Prodicus (398E) may perhaps be taken to imply that the author, while regarding certain Stoic doctrines as unsound, did not approve of the methods of attack employed by the Megarian eristics. (His disapproval of eristical devices is expressed elsewhere, in par. 393B-C.)

D. E. EICHHOLZ.

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL.

¹ We may compare the *Axiochus* (369B, etc.), where *Epicurean* doctrine is attributed to Prodicus. Possibly this device was derived from the *Eryxias*.

CORRIGENDUM.

In the April No., 1935, p. 66, I asserted that Bechtel's proposal to read *Κυλαίθιδος* at Theocr. 5. 15 was prompted by Hdas 6. 55, which is now read otherwise. This is a mistake; it comes from 6. 50, where the papyrus is quite legible.

A. S. F. Gow.