

J. Cotter, 'Eπαποθανεῖν τετελευτηκότι: (Plato, Symp. 180 A) 161

mestra anstrengen muß, der vollkommen unschuldigen armen Seherin eine Schuld anzuhängen, um auf diese Weise ihr eigenes Verbrechen zu rechtfertigen. So wird nicht nur Cassandra selbst von ihr voller Hohn als 'treue Konkubine' (1442) Agamemnons verächtlich gemacht, weil sie tot neben ihm am Boden liegt, um sich niemals mehr von seiner Seite zu erheben, sondern sogar ihr Schicksal, für das sie nichts kann, wird ihr wie eine Schuld vorgeworfen. Sowohl die göttliche Auszeichnung ihres Sehertums, das ihr zum Unglück ausschlug, als auch ihr Sklavenstand als Kriegsgefangene, in dem sie notgedrungen eine lange Seereise unter rauhen Soldaten machen mußte, dient Klytimestra dazu, sie herabzusetzen. Ihr blinder Haß verrät sich in ihrer Sprache, nicht zuletzt in dem verächtlichen Wort *ιστοτριβής*, das, wie sich gezeigt hat, nicht viel mehr bedeutet als *ἡμένη*⁹⁾.

'Eπαποθανεῖν τετελευτηκότι: (Plato, Symp. 180 A)

By JOSEPH COTTER, University Park (Pennsylvania)

Abstract

Plato's Phaedrus celebrates the uniqueness of Achilles' devotion to Patroclus with an emphatic neologism *επαποθανεῖν*. Translators follow *LSJ*'s rendering "to die after," assuming that *επι-* gives to its compound the temporal significance of posteriority. The literary use of *επί* in funereal and related contexts and its use in tomb inscriptions suggest that it has here rather a socio-locative meaning ("beside" or "over") with a contextually determined overtone of a benefactive "for". The meaning is "to die beside and for one dead."

Ἀχιλλέα τὸν τῆς Θέτιδος ὄν ἐτίμησαν καὶ εἰς μακάρων νήσους ἀπέπεμψαν, ὅτι πεπνυμένος παρὰ τῆς μητρὸς ὡς ἀποθανοῖτο ἀποκτείνας Ἔκτορα, μὴ ἀποκτείνας δὲ τοῦτον οἴκαδ' ἐλθὼν γηραιὸς τελευτήσοι, ἐτόλμησεν ἐλέσθαι βοηθήσας τῷ ἔραστῇ Πατρόκλῳ καὶ τιμωρήσας οὐ μόνον ὑπεραποθανεῖν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπαποθανεῖν τετε-

⁹⁾ Die medizinische Disziplin, welche sich mit den menschlichen, tierischen und pflanzlichen Geweben beschäftigt, deren Feinbau und besondere Leistungen sie erforscht, heißt bekanntlich Histologie (*ιστολογία*).

λευτηκότι ὄθεν δὴ καὶ ὑπεραγασθέντες οἱ θεοὶ διαφερόντως αὐτὸν ἐτίμησαν, ὅτι τὸν ἐραστὴν οὕτω περὶ πολλοῦ ἐποιεῖτο (Plat. *Symp.* 179 e 1–180 a 4).

Phaedrus is the "father of the argument" in Plato's *Symposium* and the culmination of his initiatory encomium of Eros lies in its celebration of the uniqueness of Achilles' demonstration of his love for Patroclus. But in what did that uniqueness consist? The version of Otto Apelt (Hamburg 1960) runs:

Wie anders steht es um Achilles! Ihn, der Thetis Sohn, ehrten sie und versetzten ihn auf die Inseln der Seligen. Denn von seiner Mutter belehrt, daß er sterben müßte wenn er Hektor tötete, andernfalls aber in die Heimat zurückkehren und als Greis sein Leben beschließen würde, entschied er sich gleichwohl ohne Zagen dafür, für seinen Liebhaber, Patroklos, als Helfer und Rächer nicht nur in den Tod zu gehen, *sondern ihm auch im Tode zu folgen*. Daher zollten die Götter ihm höchste Bewunderung und ehrten ihn vor allen anderen, weil er seinem Liebhaber so selbstlos ergeben war.

Leon Robin (Budé 1958) translated the crucial passage: "il a choisi courageusement de secourir Patrocle, son amant, de le venger aussi; et de la sorte, non pas seulement de mourir pour lui, *mais encore, en mourant, de le suivre dans son trépas*." So, too, Jowett: "... he gave his life to revenge his friend, and *dared to die, not only on his behalf, but after his death*." In Jowett's precise rendering the rhetorical bathos of the conceit is painfully clear; as it is in Sykoutris's version (Athens 1949): "ἐπροτίμησε νὰ βοηθήσῃ τὸν ἐραστὴν τοῦ Πάτροκλον καὶ νὰ τὸν ἐκδικήσῃ καὶ ὕστερα ν' ἀποθάῃ ὄχι μόνον χάριν ἐκείνου ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀμέσως κατόπιν ἐκείνου, ὅταν πλέον ἐκεῖνος ἦτο νεκρός."

Dover supports the assumptions that lie behind these translations with the following arguments¹): "Achilles could not die ὑπὲρ Patroclus, since Patroclus was already dead; he could only add (ἐπ-) his own death as a foreseeable consequence of avenging Patroclus." Dover here follows Galli²) in treating the generic concept (ἀποθνήσκειν) as consisting of two contrary species: (1) to die for a living person (ὑπερ-) and (2) to die for one already dead (ἐπι-). However, since Phaedrus admits that in avenging (τιμω-

¹) *Plato: Symposium* (Cambridge 1980) 94.

²) *Platone: Il Simposio* (Torino 1935) 50.

ρήσας) Patroclus, Achilles did in fact render him assistance (βοηθήσας), Hug³) was surely right in explaining that “ἀλλὰ καὶ bezeichnet das Hinzukommen des besonderen Merkmales der species ἐπαπ. zu dem genus ὑπεραπ.”

Dover and the majority of translators suppose that the adverbial prefix ἐπι- as used in Phaedrus's emphatic coinage ἐπαποθανεῖν has a temporal meaning of posteriority as its primary significance; this is implicit in the French *suiivre* and the German *folgen* and explicit in the English “after his death”. *LSJ* was content with “die after another” for the meaning here, at *Symp.* 209 d (the only Classical instances), and at Josephus *BJ* 5.12.3. There is room for doubt. The latter's τοῖς ὑπ'αὐτῶν θαπτομένοις ἐπαπέθνησκον may mean only that the Jews “kept dying beside the ones they were burying”, and “together with” or “beside / besides” will suffice as well for the adverbial component's contribution to this compound at Josephus *AJ* 13.11.3 and Plutarch *Aem.* 35⁴). At Athenaeus 13.602d2 (ὃ καὶ ἐπαπέθανεν ὁ ἐραστής Ἀριστόδημος, λύσιν τ' ἔλαβε τὸ δεινόν), the translation “beside whom also his lover Aristodemus died, and the terrible act was atoned for” fits the context better than one using the more indeterminate “after”, since both deaths may be thought to contribute to the act of atonement. Nor will “after” do for the *Symposium* passage, where the perfect participle τετελευτηκότι puts the emphasis not on Patroclus's prior death but on his present state as one of the dead⁵). It is hard to imagine that Phaedrus's rhetorical point was simply that Achilles chose to die *subsequently* to Patroclus. Would anyone not? Nor does it help to suppose that the uniqueness of Achilles' choice lay in his willingness to die for someone already dead, thus needlessly sacrificing a second life; for it was not uncommon in heroic saga that a warrior should meet death in battle over the body of a fallen comrade.

Phaedrus's rhetorical play with compounds is picked up by Socrates's Diotima at 208 d 2: ἐπεὶ οἶμι σύ, ἔφη, Ἀλκῆστιν ὑπὲρ Ἀδμήτου ἀποθανεῖν ἄν, ἢ Ἀχιλλεῖα Πατρόκλω ἐπαποθανεῖν, ἢ προ-

³) *Platons Symposium* (2nd. ed. Leipzig 1884) 45.

⁴) Cf. *LSJ*, ἐπί, B. I. b; P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique II Syntaxe* (Paris 1963) 105–109, and *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque II* (Paris 1970), 358; and E. Schwyzler *Griechische Grammatik II* (Munich 1950), 465–473.

⁵) Similarly in English, “after”—though having a stronger etymological claim to the meaning of posteriority than does ἐπι- can lose such significance in contexts such as “to strive after glory” or “to look after one's reputation”.

ἀποθανεῖν τὸν ὑμέτερον Κόδρον ὑπὲρ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν παιδῶν, μὴ οἰομένους ἀθάνατον μνήμην ἀρετῆς πέρι ἑαυτῶν ἔσεσθαι, ἦν νῦν ἡμεῖς ἔχομεν; While it may be admitted that Codrus's death on behalf of his living offspring is colored by an artificial notion of priority (προαποθανεῖν) when contrasted by the sophistic jingle with ἐπαποθανεῖν, it can hardly be thought that the προ- compound has here the basic temporal significance it has when used of Kassandane at Hdt. 2.1. Codrus was famous because he died *for* not *before* his family and city, and it would be absurd to use Socrates's little joke as evidence for the intended point of Phaedrus's encomium.

Inscriptional evidence and a line of Homer suggest that the true meaning of Phaedrus's pregnant compound lies in a metaphorical development of the locative use in sepulchral contexts, where a monument can be viewed as both standing *over* the buried remains and at the same time existing *for* the person commemorated there. Tanagra IG. VII. 593 ἐπὶ ἠΦεκαδάμοε εἰμί would serve, then, as a gloss on ἐπαποθανεῖν τετελευτηκότι⁶). The meaning "over" is vividly attested at Π. 11.261: τοῖο δ' ἐπ' Ἰφιδάμαντι κάρη ἀπέκοψε, and the benefactive "for / in honor of" occurs at Π. 23.274 (where Achilles is speaking of the games in honor of Patroclus): εἰ μὲν νῦν ἐπὶ ἄλλῳ ἀθλεύοιμεν. The sepulchral use of the bare dative gives evidence that even with ἐπί the epigram did not merely indicate that the monument stood physically over so-and-so⁷). This use of ἐπι- tends to contrast (but need not always) with that of ὑπερ- in ὑπεραποθνήσκειν, which is naturally taken to mean "to die for the sake of someone living," as is clear from its use in the case of Admetus and Alcestis at Symp. 179 b, Xenophon's use of it at Cyn. 1.14, and the familiar use of ὑπὲρ of living persons on dedicatory inscriptions.⁸)

If one compares the use of ἐπαποθανεῖν at Achilles Tatius 7.9.5 (σκοπεῖτε δὲ εἴ τις ἀποκτείνας τινὰ ἀληθῶς ἐπαποθανεῖν αὐτῷ θέλει καὶ ζῆν δι' ὀδύνην οὐ φέρει) with the prior assumption at 7.7.6 (ἵνα με πέμψητε πρὸς τὴν ἐρωμένην), it is clear that the compound does not simply mean "to die after" but must imply as well that

⁶) Ἐπί is frequently used on sepulchral inscriptions in Boeotia, Phocis, Locris, and Aetolia. See IG. VII, 589; Eduard Schwyzer, *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla Epigraphica Potiora*, (Leipzig 1923), nr. 348; R. Gunther, "Die Präpositionen in den griech. Dialectinschriften," *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 20 (1906), 113–14. Cf. Herodotus 1. 45. 1,5 and the peroration of Lysias's *Epitaphios Logos*, 2. 80.

⁷) See P. Jacobsthal, *Athen. Mitt.* 31 (1906), 416 n. 1.

⁸) Cf. IG I², 524, which claims to have been set up by Smykutte ὑπὲρ παιδῶν καὶ ἑαυτῆς. See also *LSJ* ὑπὲρ A. II.

the accused ends up "beside" the murdered girl. There is an exact parallel at Plato *Ep.* 13.361d; ταύτας ἐκδοτέον ἐμοί ἐστι καὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐπιτηδεύουσιν, αἷς δ' ἄν ἐγὼ ἐπιβιῶ means literally "a dowry must be given these girls by me and my friends, at least to those *beside whom I remain alive.*" There is, further, a strong thematic argument for favoring such a sociative interpretation in the *Symposium*, a dialogue in which the 'affinities' between ἐρώμενος and ἐραστής are related to the metaphysical connections between instances of the beautiful and the good and the Forms of the Beautiful and the Good. There exists no more pregnant example of this sociative use of ἐπί than that at *Symp.* 210b: τὸ κάλλος τὸ ἐπὶ ὄψον σώματι τῷ ἐπὶ ἑτέρῳ σώματι ἀδελφόν ἐστι, καὶ εἰ δεῖ διώκειν τὸ ἐπ' εἶδει καλόν, πολλὴ ἄνοια μὴ οὐχ ἔν τε καὶ ταῦτόν ἡγεῖσθαι τὸ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς σώμασι κάλλος.⁹)

No reader of the *Iliad* need be reminded of the extremes to which Achilles goes in his treatment of the dead. A silver bowl, offered in the footrace (*Il.* 23.740–49) during the funeral games ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ (Plato *Ion* 537a), gives testimony to his lavishness; and no less memorable is the Homeric mass of ox dung, portions of which end up in Ajax's mouth and nose as the great hero stumbles in it while losing first prize in a famous race—ox dung left by the roaring cattle (*Il.* 23.776):

οὐς ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ πέφνεν πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς.

The Homeric passage gives both a situational and a stylistic background for Plato's coinage—a coinage whose context serves to restrict the polysemy by excluding the merely temporal meaning of posteriority. There is a similar heightened use of 'on' in Pope's mock-heroic couplet (*Rape of the Lock* 5.77–78):

Nor fear'd the Chief th' unequal fight to try,
Who sought no more than *on* his foe to die.

In Pope's "to die *on* a foe," in Homer's "to slaughter *over* Patroclus," and in Plato's "to die *beside* the dead Patroclus"—in all three the vivid physical metaphors overpower any logically implicit temporal relationships.

Given, then, Achilles' celebrated addiction to funereal sacrifice, Plato has had Phaedrus portray his traditional choice of death and vengeance as a unique and ultimate manifestation of that sacrificial spirit. So gratuitous and special an act demanded its hapax

⁹) See K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (Cambridge, Massachusetts 1978), 160–165.

legomenon, and I would translate: "... though he had learned from his mother that he would die if he killed Hector but if he did not kill him could go home and grow old, he—helping his lover Patroclus and getting revenge—dared choose not merely to die for him but even *to die beside him in death*".

Evidence that the point of Phaedrus's praise was that Achilles died *beside* Patroclus and so chose to be *with* him in death can be found in a related passage—either an echo or an anticipation—at *Phaedo* 68a, where Socrates hyperbolically claims: ἡ ἀνθρωπίνων μὲν παιδικῶν καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ ὕεων ἀποθανόντων πολλοὶ δὴ ἐκόντες ἠθέλησαν εἰς Αἴδου μετελθεῖν, ὑπὸ ταύτης ἀγόμενοι τῆς ἐλπίδος, τῆς τοῦ ὄψεσθαι τε ἐκεῖ ὧν ἐπεθύμουν καὶ συνέσεσθαι.¹⁰) Greek mythology provides us with a memorable symbol of one such *Liebestod* in the famed golden amphora made by Hephaistos and given by him to Dionysos, then given by Dionysos to Thetis, and finally given by Thetis to her son. In it the bones and ashes of Achilles and Patroclus would be together forever. The motif was celebrated by Homer, Stesichorus, and Kleitias¹¹); and so Aeschines, in his echo of the *Symposium* passage at *In Tim.* 145, immediately connects it with the amphora motif (*In Tim.* 149). This interpretation of Phaedrus's argument permits us better to appreciate the most important of the two reasons the gods gave for so honoring Achilles, *ὅτι τὸν ἐραστήν οὕτω περὶ πολλοῦ ἐποιεῖτο*. The choice which proved how greatly Achilles loved (*ἀγαπᾷ* 180 b) his erastes Patroclus and for which he was especially praised by the gods (180A) was extraordinary (cf. *διαφερόντως* 180A) in that only Achilles chose to be together with his erastes in death. The second reason was that it was Achilles, the eromenos, who chose to die for his erastes—the latter being inspired by Eros and so more god-like than the eromenos (180B).

¹⁰) Cf. A. Hackforth, *Plato's Phaedo*, (Cambridge 1955), 53 n. 2.

¹¹) See *Il.* 23. 83–92; *Od.* 24. 71–77; Stesichorus fr. 234 *PMG* and, for the François Vase, A. Rumpf, *Gnomon* 25 (1953), 469–70, and A. Stewart, "Stesichorus and the François Vase," in *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (Madison 1983), 55–56.